The Latinization of Machiavellian Thought

The Translation of Latin Quotations as a Case Study for Experimental Translation in Early Modern Europe

Julia Heideklang

Niccolò Machiavelli's (1469–1527) probably most widely known work, *Il Principe* (1513), was not only printed but also translated for the first time posthumously. His famous treatise has been translated not only once, but multiple times into Latin, with numerous printed editions. Each translation stems from different periods and political contexts and incorporates different approaches to translating a text into Latin.

After a short introduction to the complex and intriguing history of translating Machiavelli's *Il Principe* into Latin, I will analyze three different cases of quotations from ancient source texts, how they are presented to the readers of Machiavelli's Italian treatise in the early print editions, and how they were subsequently translated by Silvestro Tegli (1560), Hermann Conring (1660), and Caspar Langenhert (1699) (Table 1).[1]

1 In addition to the three translators mentioned above, Giovanni Stoppani (1542–1621) must be mentioned: Stoppani was famously involved in the revised translation printed in 1580, which cannot be overestimated in its impact regarding reception and knowledge transfer and, therefore, should be kept in mind; but, as I will point out in this paper, the actual text of the translation was most probably not reworked by Stoppani and, at least for all quoted passages included here, shows no alterations to the translation done by Tegli in 1560.
Due to simultaneous drafting, another paper just recently published and cited here (Heideklang, "Recreations of Machiavellian Thought in Latin") is in part informed by the same details, especially with regard to the analysis of table 4. All translators will be cited as authors of their translations and will be found in the bibliography accordingly. All translations of the quoted passages are my own, unless noted otherwise. While this article is mostly formatted according to MLA guidelines, some stylistic conventions were not adapted in order to maintain the practices of Latin philology.

Table 1: Overview of the different translations of Machiavelli's Il Principe into Latin.

Translator: Title	**Year of Printing**	**Printer**	**Location**
Silvestro Tegli: **Nicolai Machiavelli Reip. Florentinae A Secretis, ad Laurentium Medicem de Principe libellus** **VD16 M9**	1560	Pietro Perna	Basel
Silvestro Tegli/Giovanni Niccolò Stoppani: **Nicolai Machiavelli Princeps ex Sylvestri Telii Fulginati traductione diligenter emendate** **VD16 M10**	1580	Pietro Perna	Basel
Hermann Conring: **Nicolai Machiavelli Princeps aliqua nonnulla ex Italico Latine nunc demum partim versa, partim infinitis locis sensus melioris ergo castigate** **VD17 1:002017A**	1660	Henning Müller the Younger	Helmstedt
Caspar Langenhert: **Nicolai Machiavelli Florentini Princeps**[2]	1699	Johann Janssen-Waesberge	Amsterdam

Against this background, I will discuss the seemingly curious occurrence of translating back quotations from ancient Latin texts via an Italian intermediary as a case study for experimental translation in the early modern period. Experimental translation is discussed in recent publications as a translation practice that subverts or defies expectations of established translation practices, transgressing shared norms and boundaries (Robert-Foley 401; Luhn 63–66; Lee 1–3).[3] Since this term is usually applied to modern translations, I will use this case study as an opportunity to explore the potential of experi-

2 Langenhert's translation is not documented in VD17; the remaining copy, held by Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (signature Pol.g.1169w), may serve as physical evidence.

3 On the transmission from experimental literature to experimental translation, see Marília Jöhnk's Introduction to this volume.

mental translation as an approach in analyzing and understanding early modern translation processes.

Machiavelli's Writings and Their Latin Translations

The Latinization of Machiavelli's political thought was initiated by a translation of *Il Principe* issued by the printer and bookseller Pietro Perna (1520–82) in Basel in 1560. Indeed, Latin was not the first target language, as *Il Principe* was first translated into French: in the year 1553, two different translations were issued, one by Guillaume Cappel (1553) and one by Gaspard d'Auvergne (1553); these preceded the translation into Latin (Soll 11–13; Cappel; D'Auvergne).[4] The translation of d'Auvergne would become the standard French translation, a point to which I will return (Soll 13).

Additionally, *Il Principe* first circulated in the form of manuscripts and was printed only a considerable number of years later, in 1532; in the cases of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*, *Discorsi* (1513–17), and *Istorie fiorentine* (1526), the print editions even followed posthumously. With this, already the first Italian print editions were not within the author's control and allowed for interventions and manipulations, among them those Latin quotations discussed below. Consequently, such alterations impacted the Latin translations in later decades and centuries.[5]

At the time, Basel was already a center of printing and bookmaking; it was also the center of a network of immigrant Italian Protestants, mainly from

4 The first French translation in manuscript form dates even to 1546 (see Soll 11).

5 As Soll emphasizes, "when *The Prince* was first published posthumously in Rome, by A. Blado in 1532, it was already a text altered from its initial form and status, as were subsequent Italian editions" (10–11). The first print edition by Antonio Blado in Rome was followed a few months later by a second print edition issued by Bernardo Giunta in Florence; on the relationship between those two first print editions, see De Pol (560). For the purpose of this paper, I will exclude Agostino Nifo da Sessa's *De regnandi peritia* (1523), which benefitted greatly from the unpublished circulation of Machiavelli's manuscripts of *Il Principe* (Mordeglia 59–60; Cosentino; Valetta) and which, as far as I have compared the texts, has not impacted the style or terminology of the Latin translations (Heideklang, "Recreations of Machiavellian Thought in Latin").
Although the first Latin translation is based on the first printed Italian edition, the text will be quoted from the 1532 edition printed by Bernardino Giunta (Florence 1532). This is due to a lack of access to a digitized copy of the first edition, printed in Rome.

Lucca—a network that still had connections back to circles of Italians and humanists (Mordeglia 60–61; Guggisberg; Bietenholz, esp. 16–18, 78–79; Pasterk 39). Printer and bookseller Pietro Perna emigrated to Basel due to religious persecution (Reske 87; Kaegi 13–14). Silvestro Tegli of Fogliano (d. 1573) became part of the same network, after leaving Genova due to conflicts with Johann Calvin (1509–64) (Mahlmann-Bauer; Mordeglia 63–66; Bietenholz 3, 13; Kaegi 8).[6]

In this environment, Tegli began his translation into Latin in 1559, the same year that Machiavelli's *Il Principe* was included in the Roman *Index librorum prohibitorum* (Marcus).[7] Still, the project seems to have been economically promising to Perna and fit seamlessly into the printshop's own focus on promoting Italian writers and texts (Kaegi 16, 22; Perini; Mordeglia 61; Bietenholz 15).[8] It also had an increased impact and selling value, as it was the first Latin transla-

6 See also Tegli's own description of his stay in Genova and the circle there in his dedicatory letter to Abraham Zbaski, III, a Polish nobleman who was also part of that network (fol. 2r–3v; see also Kaegi 7–8, 15–16). An important and central figure of that network was Celio Secondo Curione (1503–69). The university professor was one of the leading men in the circle of Italian immigrant Protestants in Basel. Tegli also contacted him, as did many others looking for support and help when arriving in Basel (Kaegi 10–12). He probably had a great influence on who was chosen as a translator in the project (Mordeglia 67).

7 The question of whether one of the main figures involved, Pietro Perna, Silvestro Tegli, or Celio Secundo, must have known about the banning of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* can most probably be answered in the affirmative (Mordeglia 62–63; Perini 177). Not only was Celio Secundo in a central position to be informed of current events and shifts, but for printers and publishers as well, it was key to be informed about current changes in order to calculate costs and risks in printing projects accurately. Furthermore, we have to keep in mind not only that different indices were published, but also that they were not enforced immediately, and that no systematic orientation was given on how to enforce them. On this point, see the very insightful monograph of Hanna Marcus. Finally, there are many examples to be found of printers, publishers, and booksellers who were quite informed and who still either circumvented or directly ignored certain printing prohibitions or the *Indices*. Soll even remarks that "[b]y banning *The Prince* in 1559 and recognizing its subversive, secularizing potential, the Church in effect made the clandestine manuscript into a an [sic] internationally recognized book, and a desirable one" (11).

8 Kaegi (10–12) also sees a connection to the immigrants from Lucca specifically, who themselves wanted to work towards a Christian republic, free from the influence of the de' Medici family as well as Spanish rule (see also Mordeglia 62).

tion: *Nunc primum ex Italico in Latinum sermonem versus* ("Now for the first time translated into the Latin language"; Tegli).

From this first translation onward, a central point of each translation and edition was to justify why reading Machiavelli's *Il Principe* was not to be condemned, and why it should instead be pursued. On the title page, one finds the following statement: *nostro quidem seculo apprimé utilis & necessarius, non modo ad principatum adipiscendum, sed et regendum & conservandum* ("namely, in our time [a book] quite useful and necessary, not only in achieving a republic, but also for ruling as well as preserving it"; Tegli).[9] As observed by Mordeglia, Tegli demonstrates his own prowess in writing humanistic letters, deploying various topoi (*captatio benevolentiae, labor,* the dedicatee's *eruditio*) characteristically employed in dedicatory letters (66–70). This translation facilitated the Latinization of Machiavellian thought and served as a catalyst for further Latin as well as vernacular translations. While Mordeglia claims, based on the remaining copies extant today, that this print edition cannot have been circulated very much (75), Soll emphasizes that this "international" translation "enjoyed large circulation and served as a basis for new vernacular translations, becoming one of the main vehicles of diffusion of Machiavelli's political doctrines in Northern Europe" (12).[10] The translation was subsequently reprinted in 1570 (Mordeglia 75).

In 1580, a revision of this first translation was issued, again by Pietro Perna in Basel, which was reprinted at least ten times over the following decades (Mordeglia 75; Almási 1). This revision was printed twenty years after the first Latin translation and was issued in quite a different environment as well, as the reception of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* had shifted greatly towards reprehension of his political doctrine (Almási 1–3; Kaegi 29). A first indicator of this

9 See also the argument developed by Tegli in his dedicatory letter (fol. 5r–6v).

10 See also Petrina (83–115). Mordeglia builds her claim upon finding only three to four copies via catalogs, held today within European libraries. However, her list needs to be completed to draw a final conclusion. I agree that the remaining copies of Tegli's first edition are difficult to track down (the *Karlsruher Virtueller Katalog* [KVK], for instance, does not give out any results, even with various search options). But there are at least six more copies: one in the *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek* (signature: Pol. g. 589, see bibliography), another in the *Staatliche Bibliothek Regensburg* (signature: 999/Jur.597), and four additional copies listed in the VD16's entry—and there are probably copies that can be found in other public and private libraries as well when searching all catalogs individually.

changed perception is the new arrangement of the title page, which advertised this translation as a new *emendatio* and emphasized its new paratextual apparatus meant to frame and balance its scandalous centerpiece: *ex Sylvestri Telii Fulginatii traductione diligenter emendata. Adjecta sunt eiusdem argumenti aliorum quorundam contra Machiavellum scripta de potestate & officio Principium contra Tyrannos* ("diligently edited from Sylvestro Tegli of Fogliano's translation; to the same have been added arguments of certain other [authors] against Machiavelli's writings on the Prince's rule and office against Tyrants").[11] The making of this third edition was filled with conflicts that came to light only due to the juridical consequences of the printed copies from 1580.[12]

Maybe the most interesting point about the collaboration between Perna and Stoppani is the fact that the initiation of various translation processes seems to stem from Perna himself: After the reprint of Tegli's first translation in 1570, both Tegli and Celio Secundo, who was Perna's advisor and was deeply involved in the project, died. Hence, Perna approached another Italian immigrant humanist, Giovanni Niccolò Stoppani (1542–1621), who at the time was also a university professor of Aristotelian logic. Apparently, Perna already planned to issue a more comprehensive translation of Machiavelli's writings, or at least an edition with both *Il Principe* and *Discorsi,* in Latin translation.[13] Maybe Perna was inspired by the success of what had become the French

11 See also Mordeglia (77–78).

12 For the very detailed and insightful analysis, see Almási. Almási's findings correct some of Mordeglia's hypotheses (77–78). Since the documents have been reviewed in detail by Almási, I will only point to a few aspects of the collaboration of Perna and Stoppani regarding the reconstruction of the translation process.

13 This becomes evident from court documents: "Es hab sich begebenn, dass vor etlichen Joren Perna zu Ime kommen, begert, daß er Ime die Opera Machiauelli welte transferieren, dass aber von vile der gschefften nit beschehen kennen, solang biss uf die Herpstmess verschinen 80. Jars, sig Perna zuo Im kommen und vermant, er Stupanus ziehe in uff, fürcht er werde umb das exemplar kommen, soll im nur eine praefation über den alten text machenn, sind also der sachen eins worden, und er ime 6 Reichsthaler verheißen, hab Perna gsagt, er soll sie uff den fürsten von Münpelgart und Deckh stellen, welchs Stupanus nit thun wellen, sonder gsagt, er welle es dem Bischoff von Basell Christoph Blasero dedicieren: […]." (StAB, UAH 2,1, f. 29r; 16 Aug. 1581; qtd. in Almási 10n54). The court documents seem to support a slightly different process in the making of the 1580 edition than proposed previously by Kaegi (28–30). Additionally, Perna and Stoppani had already collaborated for ten years in producing Latin translations, particularly of Italian historical, scientific, and medical works (Kaegi 27; Mordeglia 77).

standard edition: the 1571 edition of the French translation of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* and *Discorsi* by Gaspard d'Auvergne, mentioned above (D'Auvergne; Soll 13). Stoppani's preface also suggests a comprehensive translation project when he speaks of Machiavelli's writings as *partim politica, partim historica, partim denique de ratione bellum gerendi* ("in part political, in part historical, [and] finally, in part on the art of war").[14] However, the wording of the correspondence and the court documents also raise the question of whether Stoppani himself ever even laid a hand on the text of Tegli's translation. With the death of Pietro Perna in 1582, his ambitious project did not come to a halt; rather, the printing of Latin translations of Machiavelli's writings further migrated throughout Europe.[15]

In 1660, another collaborative effort was made to achieve a new translation of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*. That the seventeenth century was characterized by an intense debate on Machiavellianism and Antimachiavellianism is reflected in the number of prints around the turn of the century (Stolleis, "Machiavellismus" 186–94). By the mid-seventeenth century, however, there was still no scholarly and commented translation of the text, which was now fundamentally embedded within debates in the field of political theory. University professor and polyhistorian Hermann Conring (1606–81) turned his massive reading notes into a new, or rather revised and actualized, translation of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*, followed by his *Notae et animadversiones* a year later (Stolleis, "Einheit").[16] Quite aware of living in times of structural changes and the rise of military absolutism and territorial states (Dreitzel 143; Dauber 102), Conring also felt the lack of an annotated translation, and it seems, considering his corrections and modifications within the translation as well as his dedicatory epistle to Gebhard von Alvensleben (1619–81), that he wanted to reinstate the more "original" thought of Machiavelli within a less biased scholarly debate (Stolleis, "Macchiavellismus" 186). It also seems that all the previous printed editions

14 See also Kaegi's commentary on Stoppani's remark (28) and Mordeglia (77).

15 In the context of this paper, it would lead too far to discuss the different "routes" of Machavellian thought through Europe, but I want to at least stress the fact that other printers seem to have taken up the enterprise of producing a Machiavellian canon via Latin translations; on the discussion of different routes, see particularly Zwierlein.

16 From 1632 onwards, he was a professor of natural philosophy in Helmstedt, later also for medicine and political theory (Nahrendorf; Döhring, 342–43). For a more complete understanding of the figure of Hermann Conring, his writings, and his network, see the collected volume by Stolleis.

were at that point no longer easily accessible or available (Stolleis, "Macchiavellismus" 186). While the consequences for Stoppani, due to the 1580 edition, were quite severe, the situation in 1660 and the political network to which Conring addressed his publications were much better suited to achieve a favorable reception.[17] From the start, Conring defines his own translation in relation to the first translation by Tegli.[18] It becomes apparent that for Conring, the good translator (*bonus interpres*) needs to follow the principle of faithfulness (*fides*), and that this "faithfulness" extends to the style that the translated author has chosen for his work:[19] in Machiavelli's case, this meant a rather rough and incisive manner of writing (*sive de industria sive quod accurate scribendi docendique artis fuerit imperitus*; "either because he lacked industry, or he was not skillful in the artistry of writing and teaching"; fol. a2r–a2v).[20] In contrast to Tegli's first translation, Conring had a particularly scholarly interest that ultimately manifested in his scholastic commentary published a year later.[21] Therefore, Conring approached his translation with a nearly archeological sense of translation. In contrast, the interest of Tegli and Perna seems to have lain in producing a translation that allowed for Machiavelli to be read among other "clas-

17 On Conring's relationship with leading French politicians, see Stolleis, "Einheit" (25); on the reception of the translation and commentary in 1660 and 1661, see Stolleis, "Macchiavellismus" (187–91).

18 He knew about the earlier print editions, and his own dedicatory letter either implicitly builds upon arguments that have been used by Stoppani and Zetzner or explicitly comments on the earlier editions (Stolleis, "Macchiavellismus" 187).

19 Conring seems to echo the famous line in Hor. ars 133–34: *nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus / interpres* (text following the critical edition of Shackleton-Bailey). Whereas Horace uses the *fidus interpres* ("the faithful interpreter") as one end of the spectrum against which he sets the poet apart (Hinckers 88–90; Brink 211), Conring seems to read it as advice for the *bonus interpres* to be faithful; on Horace's *fidus interpres* and the philological debate surrounding it, see Hinckers (88–92). She provides a comprehensive overview of the terms used for translation processes and the discourse on translation in ancient Latin literature.

20 On Machiavelli's style, see, for instance, Bernhard; Fournel.

21 See Conring as well as Stolleis ("Macchiavellismus" 189); on Conring's *Animadversiones* and partly against the analysis of Dreitzel, see Dauber (esp. 112).

sics" on political theory and that would spark interest among readers—both approaches seem to have resonated with contemporaries.[22]

Conring further argues that his translation, although technically a revision of the translation by Tegli, embodies such significant changes and corrections (*castigata et mutata*) and that it is practically new (*nova*).[23] Also new was the paratextual apparatus that not only featured the long dedicatory epistle by Conring that reinstated Machiavelli as a prematurely judged author on political theory (fol. a3r),[24] but also rid Machiavelli's writing of the various treatises accompanying the *Princeps* over the preceding decades (fol. a2v).

Overall, the Latin edition closely recreates the early Italian editions. For the first time, the two writings that were initially published together with Machiavelli's *Il Principe* in the first Italian print editions were also translated into Latin and combined in one Latin print edition.[25] Finally, Conring is also the first translator of *Il Principe* to add a Latin translation of Machiavelli's dedicatory epistle to Lorenzo de Medici.

A last Latin translation was done by Caspar Langenhert (1661–1730) and printed in Amsterdam by Johannes Janssen-Waesberge. Langenhert left the Netherlands and settled in Paris in 1697 (Jaworzyn 124n25), where he reworked the previous translations of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* into a new and quite different translation with a running commentary integrated in the form of foot-

22 The success of the translation by Tegli is supported by the numerous print editions and versions that followed in the eighty years after the first print in 1560. These were boosted, of course, by the controversy regarding the 1580 versions of Perna and Stoppani; for Conring's reception, see Stolleis ("Macchiavellismus" 189).

23 The participle *castigata*, as Mordeglia alluded to, is, therefore, of some importance and is emphasized by being placed on the title page and explained within the dedicatory epistle (80).

24 *Apud quammultos nimirum ipsum Machiavelli nomen sine execratione non auditur* ("Unsurprisingly, the name of Machiavelli itself is heard among many only with a curse"). See also De Pol (561). On his arguments as well as his criticism, see Dauber; Stolleis ("Macchiavellismus" 187–91); Conring fol. br–cv.

25 One of those writings, the *Vita Castrucci Castracani*, had been translated before. This anonymous translation was already printed in 1610 by Lazarus Zetzner and added to the *Historia Florentina*; see also Conring (fol. a2v).

notes.[26] In a separate short *Praefatio*, Langenhert comments on his own approach to and motivation for translating *Il Principe* anew:

> Amice Lector.
> Machiavelli Principem in latinum sermonem verti: tum quod satiari nequirem ratiocinia ejus legendo; cum quod, ut latinè, sic belgicè nimis quam sordidè traductus sit. Meo autem in vertendo & linguae genio liberrimè indulsi; non verba totidem anxius verbis, sed sensum reddidi, mentemque Florentini notationes ei adjeci aliquot, […]. (fol. 426r)

> Dear Reader.
> I translated Machiavelli's *Il Principe* into Latin: for one, because I could not be satisfied [just] by reading his thoughts, and also because he had been translated into Latin as well as into Belgian all too meanly. But as I translated, I freely indulged in the inspiration of language, not anxious to render the words in an equal number of words, I translated their meaning and the thought of the Florentine, and I added some annotations [sc. in the form of footnotes], […].

As we will see in the following analysis of the three translations, this translation indeed takes a quite different approach to translation and forsakes the fundamental principle of faithfulness (*fides*), laid out only a few decades earlier by Conring. Instead, Langenhert claims a certain freedom, a certain *libertas* for himself in translating and annotating Machiavelli.[27] As we will see in the examples below, this leads to a hermeneutic rewriting: rather than an interlingual

---

26 As of yet, I have not found any documentation of when Langenhert started his work on Machiavelli's *Il Principe*; it seems as if it is not related to his main occupation and publication efforts, such as the *Novus Philosophus*. See Jaworzyn on his philosophical views.

27 Langenhert references the distinction between two opposite approaches to translating: faithfulness to the wording (*verbum de verbo*) or the meaning (*sensum de sensu*). This distinction goes back to ancient Roman literature, most famously discussed by Hieronymus and Cicero (McEldruff; Hinckers 137–46). One might wonder whether Langenhert uses these references for general self-positioning or whether this might have been aimed at Conring's approach, in which the "good translator" observes "faithfulness," as previously discussed (*Est vero in boni interpretis officio* […] *praestare fidem*); see n19 above. He also invokes a *genius linguae*; see s.v. "genius," in: TLL, vol. 6.2, p. 1838, lines 41–61 (Bulhart). The metonymic understanding saw *genio indulgere* as the opposite of *genium (de)fraudare*, as "rejoicing or indulging into a certain lust or desire"; this opposition had a quite vivid reception in the early modern period (Starnes).

translation *sensu stricto* (or translation proper), the reader is presented with a translation that reworks and transforms Machiavelli's treatise, seemingly following in the footsteps of Langenhert's own reading process. [28]

Latin Quotations in *Il Principe* and Their Latin Translations

As we can observe, Machiavelli's *Il Principe* has been subject to retranslation. Retranslation signifies a text being translated twice or multiple times into the same target language (Berman; Bensimon; Cadera and Walsh; Poucke and Gallego; Chouit).[29] The retranslation hypothesis states that the first translation is less source-text oriented. It domesticizes the text, introducing it for the first time into the receiving cultural and linguistic system. In contrast, subsequent translations become increasingly source-text oriented, emphasizing the otherness of the text after the receiving system has familiarized itself with the text (Cadera and Walsh 5–6). This hypothesis came into focus in recent years and has already been critically debated (Poucke and Gallego).[30] This argument does not seem to hold in the case of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*. However, within these retranslations introduced above, an intriguing phenomenon occurs. This phenomenon concerns the Latin quotations within all three translations, which were integrated into the Italian treatise, were translated into Italian in the early print editions, and, ultimately, were translated back via the Italian intermediary into Latin.[31] As we will see in the analyses below, it is worthwhile to discuss this phenomenon not only as a special case of retranslation but also as a case of experimental translation.

---

28 Research of the past decades firmly suggests that each translation incorporates a form of reworking, transformation, or rewriting of the source text, wherein the processes of reading and translating are deeply intertwined (Bassnett; Sprivak; Stolze 223; Toepfer 207–09; on translated titles and rewriting, see Hosington 76).

29 On the development of the retranslation theory and its different components, from the first concept brought forward by Berman onward, see the helpful overviews by Poucke, Cadera Walsh, and Chouit. Chouit points out that the concept of retranslation lacks an overall consensus regarding various aspects.

30 Berman sees a main motivation for retranslation in the aging of the translation and the need for actualization (1); against Berman, see Susam-Sarajeva. Another motivation for retranslation, particularly within a short time span, can be posed by terminological struggles (Brownlie 156–57; Chouit 186–87).

31 On translating back and its relation to retranslation, see, for instance, Chouit (184).

In the following, I will compare the three examples of quotations from Latin source texts, looking at how they were presented to sixteenth-century readers in Machiavelli's printed treatise and subsequently translated back into Latin in all three (re)translations. Following the detailed analysis, I will return to the theoretical framework of retranslation and experimental translation.

As a reader of ancient literature, Machiavelli included quotes from ancient texts, e.g., Virgil's *Aeneis*, Tacitus's *Annales*, or Livy's *Ab urbe condita*.[32] It has to be noted that in the modern philological editions based on the critical evaluation of the surviving manuscripts of *Il Principe*, all three quotations are included either *verbatim* or in slightly modified Latin wording taken from the Roman source texts. However, looking at the early-sixteenth-century print editions, there is a notable discrepancy: here, only one is kept in the Latin wording, namely the quotation from Virgil's *Aeneis;* in the other instances, the early print editions presented to their readers an Italian translation of the Latin quotations. Since all of the translators will have likely used such print editions, we will look at the text as presented in the early Italian print editions, starting with a sentence taken from Tacitus's *Annales*:[33]

> Et fu sempre opinione, & sententia de gli huomini sauij; che niente sia cosi infermo, & instabile, com'è la fama della Potenza, non fondata nelle forze proprie: & l'armi proprie sono quelle; che non sono composte di sudditi, ò di Cittadini, ò di creati tuoi; tutte l'altre sono o mecennarie o ausiliarie. (Machiavelli fol. 22r)

> It was always the opinion and conviction of wise men that nothing is so weak or unstable as the reputation of power that is not based upon one's own forces. One's own soldiers are those composed either of subjects or of citizens or one's own dependents; all the others are mercenary or auxiliary forces.

---

32 Despite claiming that he was born poor, Machiavelli was well-educated; he gained good knowledge of Latin as well as of the classical authors of ancient Rome. But his tutors were even more focused on the works of famous authors of the Italian Renaissance, such as Petrarca and Dante (Celenza 4–5, 14–15; Bondanella and Viroli ix–x). This can be noted for his other works as well, such as his *Discorsi* (see, for instance, Wurm).

33 Since the first print edition, printed by Antonio Blado (Rome 1532), is currently not accessible to me on-site or via digital sources, my transcripts and translations are based on the print text presented in the edition printed by Bernardino Giunta (Florence 1532). All translations of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* are based on the translation of Bondanella but modified where my own understanding of the text digresses from Bondanella's reading.

The source of this *locus communis* is the beginning of chapter nineteen in the thirteenth book of Tacitus's *Annales*:

> Nihil rerum mortalium tam instabile ac fluxum est quam fama potentiae non sua vi nixae. (Tac. ann. 13, 19; Heubner; Wellesley)
>
> Nothing in the human realm is as unstable and fleeting as the reputation of power that is not built upon one's own strength.

It comments on the intrigue and power struggle within the Roman emperor's house following the death of Britannicus. As soon as Emperor Nero strips his mother, Agrippina, of her privileges, she finds herself seemingly standing alone in this conflict. In chapter 13 of his treatise, Machiavelli incorporates this statement, criticizing the use of auxiliary and mercenary forces.[34] The quotation is only implicitly marked as such by the phrase "it has always been the opinion and conviction of wise men" (*fu sempre opinione & sententia de gli huomini sauij*), categorizing it as a well-known saying rather than as a quotation *sensu stricto*. Furthermore, in the early Italian print editions, we find neither typographical markers such as quotation marks nor printed marginalia highlighting the particular nature of this sentence to its readers.

At first glance, it becomes clear that Tegli did not substitute the Italian translation presented within the print editions with the original Latin quotation, but rather translated the Italian phrasing of Machiavelli back into classical Latin. The text remains without changes (aside from different ligatures) in Stoppani's revised translation (fol. 101 [g3r]). Just as in the Italian print, it is presented typographically without any quotation markers. From the start, there are some noticeable differences: The first is the elevation of style (*amplificatio*),[35] as, for instance, the "wise men" (*gli huomini savij*) are transformed into the *sapientissimi viri*. Equally, the simpler phrasing by Machiavelli is augmented by repetition (*nihil levius, nihil infirmius*). Secondly, a slight reformulation takes place: Machiavelli's Italian rendering of the Tacitean quote is actually closer to the wording than is the Latin translation by Tegli (and also the subsequent one

34 The critical edition of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* (Martelli) presents the following Latin wording: *Nihil rerum mortalium tam instabile ac fluxum est quam fama potentiae non sua vi nixa*. Although erroneous according to modern critical conjectures (Furneaux 176; Heubner; Wellesley), it was the wording still accepted as the correct reading of Tacitus in print editions contemporary to Machiavelli.

35 This is further supported by the observations of Mordeglia (70–71).

by Conring), which transforms "nothing so … as" (*niente così … com'è*) into "nothing weaker … than" (*nihil infirmius … quam*). Thirdly, Tegli mirrors Machiavelli's use of conjunctions with the use of the Latin *aut … aut … aut*.

Table 2: Latin translations in chronological order for a comparison of the integrated Tacitean quote from Machiavelli's Il Principe.

Tegli (1560, fol. 91)	
Atqui in ea semper & opinione, & sententia fuerunt sapientissimi viri, nihil leuius, nihil ea potentiae fama infirmius, quàm quae non propria sit suffulta virtute. Arma itaq(ue) propria ea sunt, quae constant aut ex ijs, qui tuo subjiciuntur imperio, aut ex ciuibus, clientibúsve, reliqua omnia aut in mercenarijs, aut in auxiliarijs numerantur.	And this was always the belief and opinion of the very wise men that nothing is more fleeting, nothing weaker than that reputation of power which is not held up by one's own strength. And so those forces are one's own which consist either of those who are subdued to your rule, or of citizens and vassals; all remaining are counted either among the mercenary or auxiliary [forces].
Conring (1660, fol. 58 [H2v])	
Et vero in ea semper & opinione & sententia fuerunt sapientissimi quique: nihil levius, nihil infimius, aut instabilius esse, quam famam potentiae non propriae virtute suffultam. Sunt autem arma propria, quae constant aut ex subditis tuis aut ex civibus aut ex clientibus; reliqua omnia mercenaria sunt, aut auxiliaria.	And indeed, particularly the wisest men always had the belief and opinion that nothing is more fleeting, nothing weaker or unstable than the reputation of power not held up by one's own strength. But those are one's own forces that consist either of your subjects or of citizens or of vassals; all remaining [forces] are mercenary or auxiliary.
Langenhert (1699, fol. 74–75)	
Sapientium fuit ab omni aevo sententia: "nihil rerum tam debile ac fluxum, quam fama potentiae non suâ vi nixae." Vis illa tui sunt milites, ex tuis civibus, subjectis, clientibusve conscripti; reliqui omnes vel mercenarii, vel auxiliarii.	This was the opinion of wise men of every age: "None of the things is as unstable and fleeting as the reputation of power not supported by one's own strength." This power are your soldiers, brought together from your citizens, subjects, or vassals; all remaining are mercenaries or auxiliaries.

Let's now turn to Conring's translation for comparison. He keeps the *amplificatio* in his introductory marker (*sapientissimi quique*), and he even expands the repetition introduced by Tegli to a tricolon of "nothing more fleeting, nothing

weaker, nothing more unstable" (*nihil levius, nihil infirmius, aut instabilius*). But he also simplifies the subsequent sentence structure. In the second sentence too, we might notice that he builds upon the translation made by Tegli rather than consistently mirroring Machiavelli's own style, contrary to his discussion in his dedicatory epistle of what ought to be a faithful translation.

In contrast to Tegli and Conring, Langenhert's translation is clearly marked by a tendency to simplify and reduce the text. This is also accompanied by generalizing effects. For instance, his introductory sentence now states that wise men of every age had this opinion (*sapientium fuit ab omni aevo sententia*), which increases the authority attributed to the following statement. It is noteworthy that Langenhert's reductions do not make a halt before Machiavelli's original wording. While both Tegli and Conring had rendered Machiavelli's Italian *opinione & sententia* into the Latin *opinio et sententia*, Langenhert reduces those two words, which form a hendiadys, to only *sententia*. In Langenhert's case this also might serve as a marker for the following statement being an actual *sententia* out of commonplace books.[36] Strikingly, Langenhert not only reinstates the (almost) correct Latin quotation from Tacitus's *Annales*; the print also reintroduces the typographical markers. Moreover, there is also an important semantic shift noticeable: Whereas Tegli and Conring both used *virtus* for Machiavelli's *forze*, Langenhert returns to the Tacitean *vis*; and he even more strongly emphasizes the importance of the word through repetition (*sua vî nixae; vis illa*). While Conring, in the last sentence of the segment, already returned to Machiavelli's syntax from Tegli's more elegant "the remaining are counted among" (*reliqua omnia … numerantur*), Langenhert again goes even further by foregoing conjunctions where possible, but also by eclipsing the verb (which would be a repetitive *sunt*) in the second part of the sentence, thereby taking advantage of the inherent conciseness of the Latin language.

With this first example, we already note the differences in the rendering of the Italian text, the different translation strategies, and the different approaches to the text. Of the three translators, only Langenhert reinstates the original source quote, which might even seem counterintuitive, considering his approach to translating *Il Principe*.

A different case follows at the beginning of the seventeenth chapter, where Machiavelli quotes two lines from Virgil's *Aeneis*:

36 On early modern commonplace books, see Moss, "Locating Knowledge"; Moss, *Printed Common-Place Books*; Blair, "Humanist Methods." In the broader context of early modern scholarly practices, see Blair, *Too Much*.

> Et intra tutti I Principi, al Principe nuouo è impossibile fugire il nome di crudele, per essere li stati nuoui pieni di pericoli: onde Vergilio per la bocca di Didone escusa la inhumanità del suo Regno, per essere quello nuouo: Dicendo. "Res dura, & Regni nouitas me talia cogunt, Moliri, late fines custode tueri." Nondimeno deue essere graue al credere, & al'muouersi, ne si deue fare paura da se stesso[.] (Macchiavelli fol. 25r–v)
>
> And among all the princes, the new prince cannot escape the reputation of cruelty since new states are full of dangers. Thus, Virgil, through the mouth of Dido, excuses the cruelty of her reign due to being new, saying: *Res dura et Regni nouitas me talia cogunt, Moliri, late fines custode tueri* [My harsh situation and the newness of my rule force me to take such measures, and to protect my borders extensively with guards]. Nevertheless, a prince must be cautious in believing and being moved, and he should not be afraid of his own shadow.

The quotation is taken from the first book of Virgil's *Aeneis*, his epic narration following the journey of Aeneas from the ruins of Troy to their arrival in Latium and Aeneas's victory over Turnus. The two lines quoted in Machiavelli's treatise are part of the first book's description of Dido's first encounter with the Trojans, washed ashore on the North African coast after a severe storm had destroyed their fleet at sea:

Tum breuiter Dido uultum demissa profatur: "soluite corde metum, Teucri, secludite curas. res dura et regni nouitas me talia cogunt moliri et late finis custode tueri.	561	Then Dido briefly speaks, lowering her eyes: "Free your heart from fear, Trojans, let go of your sorrows. My difficult situation and my reign's novelty force me to take such measures and to protect my borders extensively with guards.
quis genus Aeneadum, quis Troiae nesciat urbem, uirtutesque uirosque aut tanti incendia belli?" (Verg. Aen. 1.561–566)[37]	565	Who does not know of Aeneas's family, or the city of Troy, the strength and men or the fire of such an immense war?"

37 The text is quoted following the critical editions of Mynors and Conte. On the translation of *demissa*, see Williams (202) and Austin (180), as well as Serv. Aen. 1, 561 (Thilo and Hagen 171). On *res dura*, see Austin (180); on *late finis custode tueri*, see also Austin (180) and Williams (202).

Dido's words follow the introductory speech of Iloneus, one of Aeneas's people, who explains their misfortune at sea, introduces Aeneas as the leader in a laudatory manner, and indicates their ultimate goal of reaching Latium. With this, she admits to forceful practices used in her new kingdom to sustain safety and rule, while she assures the Trojans that they are safe and welcome. In his commentary on Virgil's *Aeneis*, Servius points out that Dido alluded to two particular dangers.[38] Additionally, he claims that such fear is characteristic of a new reign.[39] In this particular case, the Latin quotation was kept in the early print editions. We also find typographical markers. The source is explicitly mentioned, and the hexameter lines are marked through capital letters. With this, we observe a different emphasis and treatment of quoted prose authors, such as Tacitus and Livy, and Virgil's epic poem.

Therefore, it might not be surprising to find an equally distinct handling of the segment within the three Latin translations as well.

Important for comparison is Tegli's decision to translate Machiavelli's phrasing *il nome di crudele* with the Latin *inclementia* ("mercilessness") and the Italian *inhumanità* with a corresponding *inhumanitas*.[40] The quotation is also marked in Tegli's Latin translation, although not through typographical markers, but rather through an inserted *inquit* signaling direct speech. In the revised translation, the *verbatim* quotation had been set in italics (Stoppani fol. 117). Here, the quotation is marked typographically. In both versions, the original hexameter is interrupted due to the position of *inquit* and is more strongly integrated into the prose text. Turning to Conring's translation in comparison, we note how he, again, kept certain translation decisions made

38 See Serv. Aen. 1, 563: *et duo formidat: vicinos barbaros et fratris aduentum, quae propter novitatem personarum generaliter dicens reliquit.*

39 See Serv. Aen. 1, 563: *et regni novitas quae semper habet timorem.* But it is noteworthy that Serv. Aen. 1, 563–64 distinguishes between fear (*timor, terror*) and cruelty (*crudelitas*). I wonder whether or how Servius's commentary, which was accessible in print by the late-fifteenth century, might have informed the translators' decisions. Was his commentary the reason why none of them used the term *crudelitas* in reference to the quoted example? Unfortunately, there is no other clear indicator allowing for such a conclusion.

40 There also seems to be a curious connection between the phrase *deve essere grave* in the Italian source texts and the translators arriving at the Latin *gravitatem quondam*—a choice that Conring also decided to keep in his revision. Indeed, Langenhert seems to come closest with his *gravis esto*. On *gravitas* as a (mental) quality and strength, often documented in combination with *auctoritas*, *disciplina*, or *firmitudo*, see s.v. "gravitas," in: TLL, vol. 6.2, p. 2306, ll. 35–75 (by Bräuninger).

by Tegli, such as the terminology used, equally using the adjective *inclementis* and the term *inhumanitas* for the core attributes discussed by Machiavelli. But there are also some shifts and eye-catching changes made by Conring: First, we note the subtle change from "among other rulers" (*inter alios principes*) to "among all Rulers" (*inter omnes Principes*); secondly, Conring expanded the text for small explanatory additions, which make the text's inner structure better accessible for its reader, e.g., adding the *sui* in the first sentence, adding one more *Princeps* after the quotation, and micro-expanding *moveatur* with a *quibusvis*. Once more, it becomes clear that while Conring tries to bring the style and wording closer to the printed version of Machiavelli's *Il Principe*, he also uses micro-expansions to subtly elevate the style and thus make its meaning clearer to its readership. As in the 1580 print edition, Conring's translation also presents the Virgilian quote in italics. Even more so, the different lines of the poem are indicated not only through capital letters, but also through presentation as separated lines, recreating the hexametric distich of the source text. Finally, Tegli's choice to use *inquit* is altered by Conring's more elegant choice *inquiens*, which echoes the Italian *dicendo* in meaning, position, and function more closely and allows the two hexameter verses to be "spoken" together as in Virgil's *Aeneid*.[41]

Finally, with Langenhert, we continue to observe a much more freely conducted translation or hermeneutic rewriting of the text. And this also includes semantic shifts. In the first sentence already, the text is distinguished from the two preceding translations by two key changes. First, there is now no supposed crowd of possible categories of rulers, but a clear statement that the *Princeps novus* is automatically the one perceived as cruel, or in the interpretation of Langenhert as "strict" (*severus*). This is a clear departure from the Machiavellian wording and insinuation of outright cruelty to maintain power. Langenhert even doubles down on his choice by translating *inhumanità* with *severitas*. He, too, has kept the Latin quotation typographically distinguished from the surrounding prose text. Additionally, Langenhert even added to the quotation three footnotes, which mostly explain the quotation and its meaning, in the context of Virgil's *Aeneid*, to the reader of his translation. But he also uses this opportunity to include his personal view on the chosen example: *Exemplum haud plane incongruum* ("An example indeed quite aptly chosen").

41 Note also that Conring translates the Italian *per la bocca di Didone* ("through the mouth of Dido") with *ore Didonis*.

Table 3: Latin translations in chronological order for a comparison of the integrated Virgilian quote from Machiavelli's Il Principe.

Tegli (1560, fol. 105 [g5r])	
Atqui inter alios principes, ille potissimum qui nouus est, fieri non potest, vt inclementiae nomen effugiat, cum noui dominatus adeò periculis sint referti. Hinc Vergilius sub Didonis persona, ex nouitate regni inhumanitatem excusat. Res dura, inquit, & regni nouitas me talis cogunt moliri, & latè fines custode tueri. Nihilominus grauitatem quandam adhibeat, quominus temerè omnia credat, aut moueatur, aut sibi ipsi metum injiciat [.]	Indeed, among other rulers, above all the one who is new can most likely not avoid a reputation of mercilessness, because new dominions are especially filled with dangers: hence, Vergil, under the disguise of the figure Dido, justified heartlessness with the novelty of her reign. "My difficult situation and my reign's novelty force me to take such measures and to protect my borders extensively with guards." Nonetheless, he must apply a certain dignity, so that he does not blindly believe everything, or get disturbed or instill fear of himself in himself [.]
Conring (1660, fol. 66–67 [l2v–l3r])	
Inter omnes autem Principes ille potissimum qui novus est, fieri non potest, ut inclementis nomen effugiat, cum novi dominates adeo periculis sint referti. Hinc Virgilius ore Didonis regni sui inhumanitatem novitiate excusat, inquiens: *Res dura & regni novitas, me talia cogunt* *Moliri, & late fines custode tueri.* Nihilominus gravitatem quandam adhibeat Princeps, quo minus temere omnia credat, aut quibusvis moveatur, aut sibi ipsi metum injiciat [.]	But among all the Rulers, the one who is new can most likely not avoid being named as "the cruel one," since new dominions are so much filled with dangers. Hence, Virgil through Dido's mouth justifies the heartlessness of her reign with its novelty, saying: "My difficult situation and my reign's novelty force me to take such measures and to protect my borders extensively with guards." Nonetheless, the prince must apply a certain dignity, so that he does not blindly believe everything or get excited by whatever, or instill fear of himself in himself [.]

Langenhert (1699, fol. 87 [F4r])

Immo ille, qui novus est, Princeps severus habeatur, necesse est; quod dominatus ejus discriminum plenissimus. Severitatem huc suam trahit Dido apud Virgilium:
Res dura & regni novitas me talia cogunt
Moliri, & late fines custode tueri.
Nec tamen umbram tuam metuas; gravis esto, temerè nihil quicquam credens, te non concutiens frustra [.]

Truly, it is necessary that the Ruler who is new, is perceived as strict; since his dominion is filled with danger. Hereto Dido attributes her strictness in Virgil:
"My difficult situation and my reign's novelty force me to take such measures and to protect my borders extensively with guards." But in the end take care not to fear your own shadow; be dignified, not believing blindly anything, not striking out wildly and in vain [.]

For a final example, we will turn to the last chapter, the *Exhortatio ad capessendam Italiam in libertatemque a barbaris vindicandam* ("Exhortation to seize Italy and to free it from the barbarians"). Within this chapter, Machiavelli quotes Livy's *Ab urbe condita* in an effort to justify war under a particular circumstance:

> Qui è giustizia grande: "Perche quella guerra è giusta, che gli è necessaria; et quelle armi son pietose, dove non si spera in altro, che in elle." Qui è dispositione grandissima; né può essere, dove è grande dispositione, grande difficultà[.] (Macchiavelli fol. 40v)
> Here is great justice: Because "those wars that are necessary are just, and arms are sacred when hope lies in nothing else, but in them." Here the conditions are most favorable, and where circumstances are favorable, there cannot be great difficulty[.]

The Latin quote is again presented in Italian, but in the early print editions, it is clearly marked typographically by quotation marks in the margins of the printed text. Even to a reader who would not recognize the reference in an unmarked or vernacular form, it must have been clear as a quotation from an authoritative (Latin) text. It is noteworthy that Machiavelli also modified the quote: In Livy, this sentence is spoken by General Gaius Pontius to his fellow Samnites, justifying war against the Romans.[42] In *Il Principe*, however, the

42 Livius, *Ab urbe condita* IX, 1, 10: *iustum est bellum, Samnites, quibus necessarium, et pia arma, quibus nulla nisi in armis relinquitur spes* ("Samnites, war is just for those for whom it is necessary, and righteous are their arms to whom hope only remains, if in arms").

quote is presented without the original address, as the specific context of the statement is not referenced. Still, it is used as a *sententia* or *locus communis* to underline and affirm Machiavelli's own argument for justified war action.

Table 4: Latin translations in chronological order for a comparison of the integrated Livian quote from Machiavelli's Il Prinicpe.

Tegli (1560, fol. 171)	
Hîc iustitia summa est. Nam id bellum est iustum, quod est neccessarium: & ea arma pietatem redolent, cum nulla alia in re, quàm in illis spes omnis vertitur. Hîc summa rerum dispositio est, quae maxima vbi cernitur, nulla difficultas, quae magna esse possit, inesse videtur, […].	Here is the highest justice. As that war is just, which is necessary: and these arms smell of religious faithfulness, if all hope lies in no means other than them. Here are the best conditions, in which when perceived as the greatest, there seems to lie no difficulty within, that could be a great, […].
Conring (1660, fol. 106–07 [O2v–O3r])	
Hic Justitia summa est: quia id bellum est justum, quod est necessarium: & ea arma pietatem redolent, cum nulla alia in re, quam in illis spes omnis vertitur. Summa haec rerum dispositio est, quae quando maxima cernitur, nulla difficultas, quae magna esse possit, superesse videtur; […].	Here is the highest justice: since that war is just, which is necessary: and these arms smell of religious faithfulness, if all hope lies in no means other than them. Here are the best conditions, in which since perceived as greatest, there seems to remain no difficulty within, that could be a great; […].
Langenhert (1699, fol. 156)	
Caussa justissima est vestra, cum omne bellum bellum sit justum, quod est necessarium, arma sint aequa, nec non pia semper ea, in quibus unis unicè omnis vertitur salutis spes.	Your cause is a very just one, since every war is just, that is necessary, arms are adequate, and those are always righteous, in which alone as only choice lies all hope for welfare.

The text follows the critical text editions by Walters and Conway. For the broader Roman context of that statement and the close connection of *pius* and *iustus*, see Oakley (46–48).

This episode of the disaster at Caudium and the conflict with the Samnites has been accessible in various contemporary editions, and the text is presented congruent with modern critical text editions. See, for instance, the editions printed in Venetia in 1501, reprinted also in 1511, of *Titi Livi Decades* (1501, fol. 68 [liiiiv], digitized by Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: 2 A.lat.b.416, urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10140713-1).

At first glance, it becomes evident that none of the translators reinstates the Latin quote in the original Latin wording that Machiavelli chose for his treatise. Contrary to the clear emphasis that is found in the original Italian print edition, which is due to the difference in language and the typographical markings, no typographical solutions, such as quotation marks or key phrases, are deployed in the printed Latin translations to mark the sentence as a quote or reference. Instead, a new rendering of the famous quote is created by Tegli and then afterward modified by each of the subsequent translators, coalescing the original quotation with Machiavelli's thought a little bit more with each printed translation.

Tegli's new version of the Livian quotation keeps the sentence structure to the paratactic order of Machiavelli's Italian passage. As we can observe, the original wording in Livy, as well as in Machiavelli, is changed from "war is just for those for whom it is necessary" to "the war which is necessary is just" by substituting the *quibus* of the original quotation with a *quod*, and thus making the statement much more absolute and less tied to the perspective of an involved party. Two additional subtle changes can be observed: First, Tegli renders *justizia grande* as *iustitia summa,* which then is echoed in the subsequent *summa rerum dispositio* (*disposizione grandissima*); second, he slightly attenuates Machiavelli's train of thought by choosing for the Italian phrasing *grande disposizione* the more reserved Latin phrasing *maxima (sc. dispositio) cernitur* and for the absolute *ne può essere* the Latin *inesse videtur*—hereby softening the prediction of the proposed undertaking's success.

In 1660, Conring changed the *nam* to *quia*, strengthening the causal connection to the introductory statement (*Hîc Justitia summa est*), as if answering an unasked question, while again keeping the greater part of Tegli's translation. He also introduces a semantic shift into the text by substituting Tegli's *inesse* with *superesse*.[43]

Finally, Langenhert, who is, as we have seen, much more prone to a substantial rewriting of Machiavelli's *Il principe*, changes the segment significantly and even shortens it by cutting off the sentence following the Livian quote. His translations show a much more interpretative handling of Machiavelli's texts. Langenhert changes the sentence and adds pieces of information showing his reading of Machiavelli: Instead of an absolute *Justizia*, Langenhert chose *caussa*

43 He also chose the temporal *quando* (if once) instead of the quite literal rendition of Tegli's *ubi*.

[sic!] vestra est justissima.[44] Interestingly, he keeps the superlative that had already crept into the text through the earlier translations. This introductory statement is then directly connected to the Livian statement with a *cum causale*. He also augments the original statement by adding *omne*, now referring to *every* war, and by emphasizing the criteria for such a war. In his reading, the weapons are *aequa*, allowing fair game or giving equal strength to both sides in a conflict.[45] In the second part of his translation, he adds three words to really spell out the meaning of a necessity for war only in that case (*unis unice*); he also specifies *spes* (*salutis*). Despite changing the translation significantly, Langenhert has kept the basic structure and translation choices introduced by Tegli (*omnis spes vertitur*).

Reading this segment in the three different versions from 1560 to 1699 demonstrates how the Livian quote becomes more and more part of the Machiavellian thought presented in Latin translations. This handling of the original passage stands in quite some contrast to the *fides* invoked by Conring for the "good translator," particularly since he did know the Italian print editions, as the Latin print edition was oriented closely around the early Italian print editions. So why did he decide not to change it back to how it was presented within the Italian prints? Did he infer that those typographical markings might have been the printer's interventions? Last but not least, particularly in Langenhert's translation, one might ask whether a contemporary reader was able to perceive the distinction between Machiavelli's argument and the literary reference concealed in the translation.

Experimental Translation as an Approach for Early Modern Translations

Bringing those results back into the theoretical framework of retranslation and experimental translation, the following conclusions can be drawn: Machiavelli's *Il Principe* was subject to retranslation, allowing for actualized readings of his controversial treatise, while simultaneously enforcing re-readings and reinterpretations of the text. Each translation followed a different approach. The translations of Conring and Langenhert show enough indicators to conclude that, whether it is explicated or not, both translators build upon the

44 This is in congruence with Machiavelli's preceding argument.

45 OLD *ad loc.*: esp. no. 4.

first translation made by Tegli.[46] As discussed in other studies as well, the retranslation hypothesis cannot be simply affirmed. Although the two subsequent translations are dependent on the first, the introduction of actualizing changes, with the receiving system (the Latin *res publica litteraria*) now having become familiarized with Machiavelli's *Il Principe*, particularly in Langenhert's approach, fundamentally contradicts the assumption that subsequent translations have to become more source-text oriented.

Turning from the umbrella phenomenon of retranslation to the phenomenon of translating Latin quotations back into Latin, experimental translation is a useful concept to discuss the results of this case study, and even more so, it proves a worthwhile concept for approaching early modern translations in general.

Following Robert-Foley's broad array of potential experimental translations (401), text segments that have been wrongly translated also fall into this category. This would constitute a rather involuntary translation practice that plays on the contingencies of textual transmissions.

However, the case study might also be considered under the "ludic aspect" ascribed to experimental translation: Luhn (65–66) and Lee (1–3) emphasize the ludic aspect of experimental translation. For instance, Lee emphasizes that translation has to be seen as a risk-taking adventure that can also result in an unfinished translation due to frustration. For the case discussed in this paper, I think it is safe to argue that the first two translations do not actively indicate any particularly ludic aspect (aside from the inherent playfulness of translation itself as a process); we might, however, argue that there is something playful in the approach of Langenhert (*genio linguae indulgere*).[47]

If we look at the broader field of early modern translations into Latin, we might notice a ludic aspect inherent to the topos of erudition: Within the *res publica litterarum*, the knowledge of the Latin literary tradition, along with the (re)cognition of intertextual references, was a key element of showing off learnedness and partaking in the early modern *lingua franca*. In the context of early modern scholarly practices, *sententiae* or commonplaces were part of textual production. Although the reproduction of excerpts, *sententiae*, and intertextual references denoted an author's erudition, they always constituted

46 We also have a dual dependency not only on the first Latin translation but also on the authority that seems to have been attributed to the earliest Italian print editions.

47 In a way, Langenhert also represents a stronger form of "inserting the translator's self," as Marília Jöhnk discusses for Wright's approach in the Introduction to this volume.

a textual basis for different writing techniques, enabling textual transmission and knowledge production (Blair, "Humanist Methods"; Moss, *Printed Common-Place Books*; Blair, *Too Much to Know*). With this, rewriting, cento-writing, and, overall, forms of experimental translation can be observed throughout the early modern period (generally, Burke 32–33; for political writings, De Bom; for herbals, Heideklang, "Hos Centones").

Although reconstructing specific norms and boundaries is challenging—for instance, only a few focused treatises discuss translation norms for Latin translations—reviews, critical distinctions, and approaches voiced in translators' prefaces and paratexts allow us to grasp transgressions by contextualizing specific translations.[48] The observed experimental translation decisions then implicitly raise the question of what has to be translated by early modern translators and how. Can we separate normative aspects of early modern translations from optional aspects of or potential experimental approaches to translation? Do the results of this case study suggest that the argument of the translated author was valued more or was seen as more normative for the translation process than were the integrated *sententiae*? In turn, this might lead to questions about what did not fall within the normative realm of translation in the early modern period, such as, in our case, the typographical markers of the used print version.

Finally, the retranslations of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* and the curious case of the translation of ancient quotations emphasize an important aspect of early modern translations: translations are collaborative processes that are impacted by the various actors involved. As I have shown above, an early modern printed translation comprises more than the text; it also includes the presentation of this text on the printed page, including quotation marks, footnotes, and emphasis through size, font, or the usage of white space. The distinction between text segments can be emphasized, as shown for the quotation from Virgil's *Aeneid*, or a previous distinction can be dissolved, as in the quotations from Tacitus and Livy. Although the translators assume a central role, they are not the only actors involved, and we have to consider the decisions made by printer-publishers as well.

Experimental translation, as it presents itself in this case study, opens up the text for translation as a communicative process, enabling dialogue between the author of the translated text, the translator(s), and the readers; it also em-

48 This leads back to the introductory remarks by Jöhnk in the Introduction to this volume.

phasizes the potential for manipulation, by shifting meanings, or even concealing translation processes before the reader's eye.

Works Cited

Almási, Gabor. "Experientia and the Machiavellian Turn in Religio-Political and Scientific Thinking." *History of European Ideas*, vol. 42, no. 7, 2016, pp. 857–81.

Anselmi, Gian Mario, and Nicola Bonazzi. *Niccolò Machiavelli*. Mondadori Education, 2011.

Austin, R. G. P. *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus: With a Commentary*. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1971.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation*. 4th ed., Routledge, 2014.

Bausi, Francesco. *Machiavelli*. Salerno Editrice, 2005.

Bensimon, Paul. "Présentation." *Palimpsestes*, no. 4, 1990, pp. ix–xiii.

Berman, Antoine. "La retraduction comme espace de traduction." *Palimpsestes*, no. 4, 1990, pp. 1–7.

Bernhard, John. "Writing and the Paradox of Self: Machiavelli's Literary Vocation." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 1, 2006, pp. 59–89.

Bietenholz, Peter. *Der italienische Humanismus und die Blütezeit des Buchdrucks in Basel. Die Basler Drucke italienischer Autoren von 1530 bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1959.

Blair, Ann. "Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book." *Journal for the History of Ideas*, no. 53, 1992, pp. 541–51.

———. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. Harvard UP, 2010.

Bondanella, Peter. *Niccolò Machiavelli, The Prince*. Edited and translated by Peter Bondanella, with an Introduction by Maurizio Viroli, Oxford UP, 2005.

Brink, Charles Oskar. *Horace on Poetry: The "Ars Poetica."* Cambridge UP, 1971.

Brownlie, Siobhan. "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory." *Across Languages and Cultures*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2006, pp. 145–70.

Burke, Peter. "Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe." *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia, Cambridge UP, 2007, pp. 7–38.

Cadera, Susanne M., and Andrew S. Walsh. "Retranslation and Reception – a Theoretical Overview." *Retranslation and Reception: Studies in a European Context*, edited by Susanne M. Cadera and Andrew S. Walsh, Brill, 2022, pp. 1–20.

Cappel, Guillaume. *Le Prince de Nicolas Machiavelle secretaire et citoyen de Florence, traduit de l'Italien en Françoise par Guillaume Cappel*. Charles Estiénne, 1553.

Celenza, Christopher S. *Machiavelli: A Portrait*. Havard UP, 2015.

———. "Petrarch, Latin, and Italian Renaissance Latinity." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2005, pp. 509–36.

Chouit, Abderraouf. "An Overview of Contemporary Research on Retranslations and Retranslation Theory." *Fittardjama*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2017, pp. 182–99.

Comiati, Giacomo. "Translating Petrarch's Vernacular Poems in Latin in Early-Modern Italy." *Gelehrte Liebesnöte – Lateinischer Petrarkismus in der Frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Beate Hintzen, De Gruyter, 2017, pp. 215–38.

Conring, Hermann. *Nicolai Machiavelli Princeps aliqua nonnulla ex Italico Latine nunc demum partim versa, partim infinitis locis sensus meliorism ergo castigata*. Henning Müller d. J. VD17 23:243953S, 1660.

Conte, Gian Biagio. *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis recensuit G. B. Conte*. De Gruyter, 2005.

Cosentino, Paola. "Un plagio del *Principe:* il 'De regnandi' di Agostino Nifo." *Semestrale di Studi (e Testi) italiani*, no. 1, 1998, pp. 139–70.

Dauber, Noah. "Anti-Machiavellianism as Constitutionalism: Hermann Conring's Commentary on Machiavelli's 'The Prince.'" *History of European Ideas*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2011, pp. 102–12.

D'Auvergne, Gaspard. *Discours de l'estat de paix et de guerre de messirs Nicolas Machiavelli … sur la première decade de Tite-Live, traduict d'italien en Françoys, plus un livre de mesme auteur intitulé: le Prince*. H. de Marnef et G. Cavellat, 1571.

De Bom, Erik. "Political Advice." *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, edited by Sarah Knight and Stefan Tilg, Oxford UP, 2015, pp. 135–49.

De Pol, Roberto, editor. *The First Translations of Machiavelli's Prince: From the Sixteenth to the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Rodopi, 2010.

———. "Lebens- und Regierungsmaximen eines Fürsten: Die erste gedruckte deutsche Übersetzung des 'Princeps.'" *Daphnis*, no. 32, 2003, pp. 559–610.

Döhring, Erich. "Conring, Hermann." *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 3, 1957, pp. 342–43. *Deutsche Biographie*, https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd11852190X.html#ndbcontent. Accessed 17 Apr. 2025.

Dreitzel, Horst. "Hermann Conring und die politische Wissenschaft seiner Zeit." *Hermann Conring (1606–1681). Beiträge zu Leben und Werk*, edited by Michael Stolleis. Duncker & Humblot, 1983, pp. 135–72.

Fournel, Jean Louis. "Is 'The Prince' Really a Political Treatise? A Discussion of Machiavelli's Motivations for Writing 'The Prince.'" *Italian Culture*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2014, pp. 85–97.

Furneaux, Henry. *Cornelii Taciti. Annalium ab excessu Divi Augusti libri. The Annals of Tacitus, edited with an introduction and notes by H. F. vol. II: Books XI–XVI.* 2nd ed., revised by H. F. Pelham and C. D. Fisher, with a map, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1951.

Gipper, Andreas. "Von der Translatio zur Traductio. Zur problematischen Entdeckung des Kulturfaktors beim Übersetzen im italienischen Frühhumanismus." *Kultur und Übersetzung, Studien zu einem begrifflichen Verhältnis*, edited by Lavinia Heller, transcript, 2017, pp. 13–35.

Guggisberg, Hans R. *Basel in the Sixteenth Century: Aspects of the City Republic before, during, and after the Reformation*. Center for Reformation Research, 1982.

Heideklang, Julia. "Hos Centones: Brunfels' Herbarum vivae eicones (1530) and Contrafayt Kreütterbuch (1532)." *Cento-Texts in the Making: Aesthetics and Poetics of Cento-Techniques from Homer to Zong!*, edited by Manuel Baumbach, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2022, pp. 63–88.

———. "Recreations of Machiavellian Thought in Latin: *Il Principe* (1513) and its Multiple Translation Processes." *The Italianist*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2024, pp. 467–84.

Heubner, Heinrich. *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Tom. I: Annales edidit H. H.* Teubner, 1994.

Hinckers, Sandra. *Lateinische Übersetzungsreflexion in der Römischen Antike. Von Terenz bis zur Historia Augusta*. Frank & Timme, 2020.

Hosington, Brenda M. "Textual Standard-Bearers: Translated Titles and Early Modern English Print." *Thresholds of Translation, Paratexts, Print, and Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Britain (1473–1660)*, edited by Marie-Alice Belle and Brenda M. Hosington, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 75–100.

Jaworzyn, Michael. "Caspar Langenhert's Parisian 'School of Egoists' and the Reception of Geulincx's Physics from Occasionalism to Solipsism." *History of the Universities*, vol. 33.2, edited by Mordechai Feingold and Andrea Sangiacomo, Oxford UP, 2021, pp. 113–42.

Kaegi, Werner. "Machiavelli in Basel." *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, no. 39, 1940, pp. 5–52.

Langenhert, Caspar. *Nicolai Machiavelli Florentini Princeps*. Johannes Janssen-Waesberge, 1699.

Lee, Tong King. *Translation as Experimentalism: Exploring Play in Poetics*. Cambridge UP, 2022.

Luhn, Anna. *Spiel mit Einsatz. Experimentelle Übersetzung als Praxis der Kritik*. Turia+Kant, 2022.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Il Principe*. Bernardo Giunta, 1532.

Mahlmann-Bauer, Barbara. "Tegli, Silvestro." *Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz (HLS)*, version from 29 Oct. 2013, https://hls-dhs-dss.ch/de/articles/042838/2013-10-29/. Accessed 18 Apr. 2025.

Marcus, Hannah. *Forbidden Knowledge: Medicine, Science, and Censorship in Early Modern Italy*. The U of Chicago P, 2020.

Martelli, Mario. *Niccolò Machiavelli. Tutte le Opere*. 2nd ed., Giunti Editore S.p.A/ Bompiani, 1971.

McEldruff, Siobhán. *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*. Routledge, 2013.

Mordeglia, Caterina. "The First Latin Translation." *The First Translations of Machiavelli's Prince: From the Sixteenth to the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Roberto de Pol, Rodopi, 2010, pp. 59–82.

Moss, Ann. "Locating Knowledge." *Cognition of the Book: Typologies of Formal Organisation of Knowledge in the Printed Book of the Early Modern Period*, edited by Karl A. E. Enenkel and Wolfgang Neuber, Brill, 2005, pp. 35–49.

———. *Printed Common-Place Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford UP, 1996.

Mynors, R. A. B. *P. Vergili Maronis: Opera, recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. A. B. Mynors*. Oxford UP, 1969.

Nahrendorf, Carsten. "Conring, Hermann." *Frühe Neuzeit in Deutschland 1620–1720. Literaturwissenschaftliches Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 2, edited by Stefanie Arend et al., De Gruyter, 2020, col. 334–63.

Oakley, S. P. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*. Oxford Clarendon Press, 2005.

OLD = Glare, Peter G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. 9th ed., Oxford UP, 1997.

Pasterk, Christina Stephanie. *Die Rolle von Übersetzern und Druckern beim Transfer von Machiavelli's Il Principe im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert.* 2019. Universität Wien, Master's thesis.

Perini, Leandro. *La vita e i tempi di Pietro Perna.* Edizione di storia e letteratura, 2002. Studi e testi sul rinascimento europeo 17.

Petrina, Alessandra. "A Florentine Prince in Queen Elizabeth's Court." *The First Translations of Machiavelli's Prince: From the Sixteenth to the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Roberto de Pol, Rodopi, 2010, pp. 83–115.

Poucke, Piet van, and Guillermo Sanz Gallego. "Retranslation in Context." *Cadernos de Tradução*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2019, pp. 10–22.

Reske, Christoph. *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet*. 2nd (revised and extended) ed., Harrassowitz, 2015.

Robert-Foley, Lily. "The Politics of Experimental Translation: Potentialities and Preoccupations." *English*, vol. 69, no. 267, 2020, pp. 401–21. *Oxford Academic*, https://doi.org/10.1093/english/efaa032.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. *Quinti Horati Flacci Opera*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Teubner, 1985.

Soll, Jacob. "Introduction: Translating 'The Prince' by Many Hands." *The First Translations of Machiavelli's Prince: From the Sixteenth to the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Roberto de Pol, Rodopi, 2010, pp. 9–13.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation." *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, edited by Spivak, 2nd ed., Routledge, 2009, pp. 200–26.

Starnes, D. T. "The Figure Genius in the Renaissance." *Studies in the Renaissance*, no. 11, 1964, pp. 234–44.

Stolleis, Michael. "Die Einheit der Wissenschaften." *Hermann Conring (1606–1681)*, edited by Stolleis, pp. 11–31.

———, editor. *Hermann Conring (1606–1681). Beiträge zu Leben und Werk*. Duncker & Humblot, 1983.

———. "Machiavellismus und Staatsräson. Ein Beitrag zu Conrings politischem Denken." *Hermann Conring (1606–1681)*, edited by Stolleis, pp. 173–99.

Stolze, Ragundis. *Übersetzungstheorien. Eine Einführung*. 7th ed., Narr, 2018.

Stoppani, Giovanni Niccolò. *Nicolai Machiavelli Princeps ex Sylvestri Telii Fulginati traductione diligenter emendata*. Pietro Perna VD16 M10, 1580.

Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem. "Multiple-Entry Visa to Travelling Theory: Retranslations of Literary and Cultural Theories." *Target International Journal of Translation Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1–36.

Tegli, Silvestro. *Nicolai Machiavelli Reip. Florentinae A Secretis, ad Laurentium Medicem de Principe libellus: nostro quidem seculo apprime utilis & necessaries, non modo ad principatum adipiscendum, sed & regendum & conservandum. Nunc primum ex Italico in Latinum sermonem uersus per Syluestrum Telium Fulginatem*. Pietro Perna VD16 M9, 1560.

Thilo, Georg, and Hermann Hagen. *Servii Gramatici qui feruntur in Vergili carmina commentarii recensuerunt G. Th. and H. H. Vol I: Aeneidos Libri I–V Commentarii recensuit Thilo*. Teubner, 1881.

TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1900 ff.), *editus iussu et auctoritate consilii ab academiis societatibusque diversarum nationum electi*, https://thesaurus.badw.de/tll-digital/tll-open-access.html. Accessed 17 Apr. 2025.

Toepfer, Regina. "Sektionseinleitung II: Anthropologie und Wissen." *Übersetzen in der Frühen Neuzeit – Konzepte und Methoden / Concepts and Practices of Trans-*

lation in the Early Modern Period, edited by Toepfer, Burschel, and Wesche, pp. 205–19.

Toepfer, Regina, Peter Burschel, and Jörg Wesche, editors. *Übersetzen in der Frühen Neuzeit – Konzepte und Methoden / Concepts and Practices of Translation in the Early Modern Period*, Metzler, 2021. Übersetzungskulturen der Frühen Neuzeit 1.

Valetta, Giovanni. "A Proposito di un Plagio di Agostino Nifo." *Lettere Italiane*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1951, pp. 65–82.

Walters, Carl Flamstead, and Robert Seymour Conway. *Titi Livi ab urbe condita recognouerunt et adnotatione critica instruxerunt C.F.W. et R.S.C. Tomus II: Libri VI–X*. 1919. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1965.

Wellesley, Kenneth. *Cornelius Tacitus, tom. I, pars secunda, Annales XI–XVI edidit K. W*. Teubner, 1986.

Williams, R. D. *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 1–6: Edited with Introduction and Notes*. 1972. St. Martin's Press, 1977.

Wolkenhauer, Anja. *Zu schwer für Apoll. Die Antike in humanistischen Druckerzeichen des 16. Jahrhunderts. Einführung, Einzelstudien*. Katalog, 2002.

Wurm, Christoph. "Die Römer nicht bewundern, sondern nachahmen. Machiavelli als Leser des Livius." *Forum Classicum*, vol. 4, 2011, pp. 278–84.

Zwierlein, Cornel. "French-Dutch Connections: The Transalpine Reception of Machiavelli." *Fruits of Migration: Heterodox Italian Migrants and Central European Culture, 1550–1620*, edited by Cornel Zwierlein and Vincenzo Lavenia, Brill, 2018, pp. 320–61.