

This article was downloaded by: 10.2.97.136

On: 26 Sep 2023

Access details: *subscription number*

Publisher: *Routledge*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG, UK



Edited by Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale and Manuel Delgado

The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies

Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale, Manuel Delgado

Revisiting the History of Medieval Translation in the Iberian Peninsula

Publication details

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch8>

Julio-César Santoyo

Published online on: 28 Mar 2017

How to cite :- Julio-César Santoyo. 28 Mar 2017, *Revisiting the History of Medieval Translation in the Iberian Peninsula from*: The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies Routledge

Accessed on: 26 Sep 2023

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch8>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/legal-notices/terms>

This Document PDF may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproductions, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The publisher shall not be liable for an loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

8

REVISITING THE HISTORY OF MEDIIEVAL TRANSLATION IN THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

Julio-César Santoyo

La part des traductions dans l'ensemble du corpus que nous a légué le Moyen Âge espagnol, si elle était établie quantitativement, étonnerait par son importance.

(Clare and Chevalier 1972, 159)

Tracing the history of medieval translation in the Iberian Peninsula is an extremely complex task, especially because a degree of periodization is rendered necessary by the very broad time span involved, and the existence of texts and documentation from different stages within it. Indeed, as far as the history of translation is concerned, the early and late centuries of the Middle Ages have virtually nothing in common, to such an extent that accounts of these two periods seem at times to be dealing with two separate countries; in fact, this formulation may not be so far from the truth, bearing in mind that for centuries there were two cultural and linguistic traditions inhabiting the Iberian space: the Christian and the Muslim. Only very tentatively, then, is the following schema suggested, by which the medieval millennium may be divided into three stages: 1) the fifth century to the eleventh, where both texts themselves and paratextual documentation are very rare; 2) the twelfth century, where texts are relatively abundant, but paratextual documentation is still very scarce; and 3) the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, a period where texts abound and paratextual documentation is more common, but which in turn must be subdivided into: a) the thirteenth century, when Arabic is the principal source language, and b) the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which feature a wide variety of source and target languages (Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Castilian, Catalan, Galician-Portuguese, Aragonese, Provençal, French, Italian, English), and in which textual interaction within the Peninsula is common. Against these temporal co-ordinates three different religious and cultural traditions must be plotted (Jewish, Christian, and Muslim), as well as various nationalities which constantly influence one another and whose borders are unstable.

The picture is thus a complex one, but to see it clearly it is also necessary to correct several errors which have been perpetuated in previous studies, and some mistakes which have been the *communis opinio* for more than 100 years. The truth is that we are still far from having a panoramic view of what the translator's task was during the 1,000 years of the Peninsular Middle Ages, when a multi-faceted textual corpus was created, of which only one facet – the book – is now given the attention it deserves. In the meantime, other clearly distinct sub-corpus

have been ignored, not only for having a different textual status, but also, more importantly, because of the different translation strategies that each one of them requires. The frequent medieval testimonies of the everyday practice of translation, for example, tend to show that it was not uncommon, at least from the end of the tenth century; such evidence comes from innumerable town charters and legal codes translated into Castilian, along with documents detailing land divisions and royal, noble, and monastic privileges, private wills, diplomatic and other correspondence between Christian and Muslim kingdoms, papal bulls, and so on, all of which were translated with a strictly local purpose, and consistently show a clear desire for precision. In these works, the act of translation is the result of the immediate need for their content to be understood. *Est latine, non legitur*: since it is in Latin, it cannot be read, and therefore it is translated. The same may be said of Arabic: *est arabice, non legitur*. Everything indicates, in effect, that the practical importance of this type of everyday translation means that the search for a precise equivalence is the overriding objective. This is a long way from what Lemarchand (1995, 30) considers normal among medieval book translators, when she claims that “se sentían perfectamente autorizados para modificar el texto de un autor en función del público al que iba destinado.” In fact, book translation and everyday translation are opposing practices, because they represent two opposing conceptualizations of translation carried out for clearly different purposes.

However, as well as stand-alone translations such as books and documents, a third sub-corpus of “inserted” translations is already very common by the thirteenth century; this has also been virtually, if not completely, ignored. These consist of the inclusion in an original text of isolated translations from other (Arabic or Latin) texts, which are at first grafted onto the framework of the original composition, usually as quotations of various kinds. These are fairly literal translations made by the author of the composition into which they are inserted, who provides a vernacular version of a textual fragment written in a language which the reader will not know. Such inserted translations are very frequent, for example, in the vast historiographical work of the collaborators of Alfonso X. And together with this kind of translated text, which is usually reasonably lengthy, comes a second, microtextual variant: very short translations inserted in vernacular texts such as sermons and homilies, which are very literal, are almost always produced by the author of the work. The texts in this group therefore feature very different translation strategies from those of the previous two sub-corpuses.

The gloss is another extraordinarily widespread phenomenon, in its twin form of translation glosses and explanation glosses. The first of these may be located in various parts of the page (they may be marginal, intratextual, interlineal, and so on), and were very common in the Iberian Peninsula from the days of the first texts, whether those texts were written in Latin or in Arabic, Hebrew, or the various Romance languages. Many of these glosses, especially the lexical glosses, are simply translations, and even though they do not constitute what we might call a “text,” they form a very wide, diverse sub-corpus which differs from the characteristics of earlier texts, in terms of both typology and purpose. Meanwhile, it should not be forgotten that in the south and east of the Peninsula in particular, the daily need for this kind of interlinguistic mediation was the result of the extensive use of Arabic, which had to be rendered for the new Romance arrivals, whether Castilian, Aragonese, or Catalan. The constant presence of Arabic translators in day-to-day work should therefore come as no surprise. Oral translation was just as common as written translation, if not more so, and though it has obviously left no written texts, we do have a very wide sub-corpus of testimonies from across the whole medieval period, especially after 711, which often give us insight into the circumstances of the task of translation; these pieces of sociological-historical data are often just as important as linguistic data, if not more so. On the basis of these twin foundations of periodization and

variety of corpus a story is built that will span 1,000 years, but the brief scope of this study means that, as so often, it will focus on book production.

* * *

It is eminently possible that the first translations to be known in the Iberian Peninsula from the mid-third century were variants of Old and New Testament texts from the *vetus latina*, which had earlier circulated among the Christian communities in northern Africa. Little is known of these, save for some speculation, until the late fourth century, when a married couple from Hispanic Andalucía, Lucinius and Theodora, received word of a new Latin version of the Bible and other texts, which Saint Jerome was working on in his Bethlehem retreat; they took what was then an unusual step, and sent six scribes there in the year 397, to make copies of Jerome's versions and bring them back to the Peninsula. Saint Jerome's letters make it quite clear that even during his own lifetime, a large part of the Vulgate Bible was known in Hispania, perhaps along with other original or translated works of his. Less than twenty years after the date of these letters, the Iberian Peninsula had its first translator, Avitus de Bracara (present-day Braga, in Portugal), who was in Jerusalem in 415. There he translated the story of the recent discovery of the tomb of the proto-martyr Saint Stephen from Greek into Latin. According to Gennadius of Massilia in his *De viris illustribus* (ca. 475), Avitus, "homo hispanus genere ante relatam Luciani presbyteri scripturam transtulit in Latinum sermonem et adiecta epistola sua per Orosium presbyterum Occidentalibus dedit" [(Avitus,) a Spaniard by race, translated the above mentioned work of the presbyter Lucianus into Latin, and sent it with his letter, by the hand of Orosius the presbyter, to the Western churches] (see Martínez Caveró and Beltrán Corvalán 2006, 593).

More than a century was to pass before the north-west of the Iberian Peninsula produced its first translators: in ca. 550 two clerics, Martinus and Paschasius, in a small monastery in Dume, once again near Braga, produced very literal Latin versions of several Greek originals – two collections of *exempla* and *sententiae*, and a run of 84 council canons. This was followed by almost four centuries of silence. The Muslim conquest of the Peninsula in 711 brought the collapse of the Visigothic kingdom, and with it the disappearance of all cultural activity in the small bastions of Christianity that survived in the mountainous north. In the rest of the country, the conquerors' Arabic was imposed over Latin, and what was left of the Christian population still living there – the Mozarabs – either lost their own language or became bilingual. If there was any kind of translation activity (as there must have been), hardly any evidence survives to attest to this fact. The texts that do survive are all very late, such as those from the second half of the tenth century: the four gospels translated into Arabic by Ishaq ibn Balasq al-Qurtubi in 946; the so-called *Calendar of Cordova*, a parallel text in Arabic with a Latin translation, which Bishop Recemundus presented to al-Hakam II in ca. 961; or the psalter translated by Hafis ibn Albar al-Quti in 989. There is little more. Perhaps the most notable translation was the Arabic version of Dioscorides' Greek pharmacopoeia *Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς* [On Medical Matters], which an embassy of the Byzantine emperor gave as a gift to Abd al-Rahman III, and which was then translated into Arabic by a small group of Jewish and Christian intellectuals in ca. 951. The Byzantine delegation also gave the caliph another codex containing Paulus Orosius's work *Adversus paganos historiarum libri septem*, which was also translated into Arabic. Around the same time, in 967, the young Gerbert d'Aurillac (the future Pope Sylvester II) came to study at the cathedral school in Vic, close to Barcelona and to the monastery at Ripoll, whose library contained a small selection of scientific treatises on topics such as the astrolabe, geometry, astronomy, and the manufacture of timepieces, all translated from Arabic into Latin.

Nor were these the only translations produced in Catalonia during the late tenth century: there is also a record of a treaty entitled *De multiplicatione et divisione numerum*, translated by a certain Joseph; a *liber de astrologia* translated by Sunifred Llobet; and a *Mathematica Alhandrei*, whose translator is anonymous. After these few examples, silence once again descends, scarcely to be interrupted throughout the whole of the eleventh century, save for very brief accounts of a very few Arabic to Hebrew and Latin to Arabic translations, the second of these groups including a significant collection of canons and papal decrees translated in 1049–50 by the Mozarabic priest Vincentius. Otherwise, the eleventh century is bereft of translations. In Europe as a whole, this was not a propitious time for the cultivation of the arts; still less for that of letters. In the Iberian Peninsula, this was a time of Christian and Muslim attack and counter-attack, including the reconquest of Coimbra (1064), Toledo (1085), and Valencia (1094), while the caliphate of Cordova was split into more than thirty local *taifas*; this, then, was a *siglo de hierro* in which, as Lemay notes, “on n’a pratiquement aucun vestige d’échange scientifique ou philosophique entre Latins et Arabes ou Mozarabes” (1963, 643–644).

* * *

Moses Sefardi, a Jew baptized as Petrus Alphonsus, physician to the King of Aragon and Henry I of England, opens our survey of the twelfth century with a classic of the Middle Ages, *Disciplina clericalis*: a miscellany of anecdotes and aphorisms taken from Arabic and even some Hebrew sources, translated from those languages and adapted to fit the work’s moralizing tenor. His contemporary, Abraham ibn Ezra, traversed much of Europe while he made Hebrew translations of Arabic commentaries on al-Khwarizmi’s astronomical tables, as well as texts on astronomy, astrology, and geomancy. Nonetheless, this century has been defined as the “first generation” of what has erroneously been termed the “School of Translators” in Toledo: there never was such a school in Toledo, either in the twelfth century with Archbishop Raimundus, or in the thirteenth with Alfonso X. All modern criticism without exception denies the existence of this “school,” which is now unanimously seen as myth, fiction, or legend. It also denies that Archbishop Raimundus was the founder or patron of any such “school:” of all the twelfth-century translations written in Toledo, which number over 100, only one is dedicated to that prelate, and only one is dedicated to his successor in the seat of Toledo, Archbishop Juan. More than 200 years ago, Amable Jourdain deduced a whole “school of translators” from these two dedications and the presence of three translators in Toledo, but that “school” never existed. What is true – and this is all that is documented – is that only three of the twelfth-century translators who were traditionally ascribed to this non-existent “school” worked in Toledo; the rest worked in Tarazona, Barcelona, León, Limia (in Galicia), Tudela, or Segovia. These men worked individually or in one-off collaborations; some were itinerant, while others were based in one place; some were Christian, others Jewish; some from the Peninsula, others from lands beyond the Pyrenees, including Italy, England, Normandy, Belgium, Scotland, Istria, and Germany. In the early years of that century, for instance, Barcelona saw the frequent collaboration of Plato Tiburtinus (from Tivoli, near Rome) and Abraham bar Hiyya: the former produced around ten texts translated from Arabic into Latin, including Ptolemy’s *Tetrabiblos*; the second wrote Hebrew translations of Arabic texts. For five years between 1138 and 1142, two friends and translators, Hermann of Carinthia and Robert of Ketton (or Chester), lived *circa fluvium Hiberum*, perhaps in Tudela (Navarre), where there was a significant Muslim, Mozarabic, and Jewish population; both men were engaged in the study and translation of Arabic texts on astronomy and geometry, such as al-Khwarizmi’s *Algebra*, Euclid’s *Elements*, or the

Liber de compositione alchymiae – the first such work known in Western Europe. In 1142, Peter the Venerable (Petrus Venerabilis), Abbot of Cluny, who was interested in Islamic texts and especially the *Koran*, paid a good sum of money to commission its translation from Robert of Ketton and Hermann of Carinthia, who spent months collaborating on the project; also involved were a Mozarab, Petrus Toletanus; a Muslim, Mohamed; and the Abbot's own secretary, Pierre de Poitiers. The translations commissioned by the Abbot – the *Koran* along with four minor texts – were completed in July 1143. However, all the indications are that the translation of the *Koran* in particular was the work of Robert of Ketton, with the contributions of the other members of the team limited to collaboration in isolated sections. Robert remained in the Peninsula until his death (post 1160), and his biography as arch-deacon of the diocese of Pamplona and Tudela, and a man trusted by the kings of Navarre, is familiar enough (see Santoyo 1999, 82–85).

Hermann, however, crossed the Pyrenees to Béziers and Toulouse before 1143 was out; thereafter, his name disappears from the record. At around the same time, the Norman cleric Hugo de Cintheaux (Hugo Sanctilliensis) was also working alone in Tarazona under the patronage of Bishop Michael (the fictitious name “Hugo de Santalla” has been attributed to this translator without foundation, along with the erroneous claim that he came from the north-west of the Peninsula). He was interested above all in texts relating to astrology, alchemy, geomancy, and the arts of divination, and penned a dozen Latin translations of Arabic originals which seem to have come from the library of the Banu Hud, petty kings of Rueda de Jalón between 1110 and 1131, which stands one or two days distant from Tarazona. Iohannes Hispalensis (*nom de plume* of Johannes ibn David [Avendauth], who was perhaps a *converso* or the son of one) began to work on translations in ca. 1118, in the Galician region of Limia, where he translated into Latin several texts of pseudo-Aristotle, Qusta ben Luqa, al-Tabari, al-Harrani, Masha'allah ibn Athari, Albumasar, and al-Farghani. From 1135, he worked on his translations in Toledo, until ca. 1150; irrespective of dates, he used variants of a certain formula in the majority of his translations, which identify them as his: *cum/sub/in laude Dei et eius auxilio*, *cum/sub laude Dei et eius adiutorio*, and so on. He was a translator of remarkable range, as his many works deal with topics including medicine, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy and astrology, the use of the astrolabe, and more. He collaborated with Dominicus Gundisalvi, arch-deacon of the Cathedral of Toledo, on three translations of ibn Gabirol, al-Gazzali, and Avicenna; in the last of these, in a statement which perhaps holds true for all three, the *modus operandi* is described by ibn Dawud as “me singula verba vulgariter proferente et Dominico archidiacono singula in latinum convertente” (Santoyo 1999, 114): ibn Dawud gave an oral translation of a fragment of Arabic in the vernacular, proceeding word by word, and Dominicus retranslated from the vernacular into Latin. Dominicus Gundisalvi also put his name to at least ten translations done without collaborators, most of which were of Arabic philosophical texts. Very soon after, now in the second half of the century, Gerardo de Cremona (Gherardus Cremonensis) came to Toledo, “magnus linguae arabicae translator.” His name enters the record in Toledo in 1157, as his *socii* claim that he came to the city because he could not find a copy of Ptolemy's *Almagest* in Italy. Either alone, or in an imprecise collaboration with some of his *socii*, of whom we know only the Mozarab Galib, he translated around eighty works from Arabic into Latin, many of which were originally in Greek, including works on medicine, philosophy, physics and mechanics, mathematics, astronomy and astrology, geometry, and alchemy: his output as a translator was remarkable, yet he never put his name to the works.

Scarcely seventy years passed, then, between 1118, the probable date of the first translation by Iohannes Hispalensis, and the year of Gerardo de Cremona's death in 1187; but these seventy years were to mark a paradigm shift in the Peninsula and in Europe as a whole. Nothing

would ever be the same again in European culture: these 100 or so works translated from Arabic, which passed from the Peninsula into the rest of Europe and were spread throughout the continent in manuscript copies, took with them a new kind of medicine, a new astronomy and astrology, a new alchemy, a new kind of philosophical thought, a new mathematics and geometry, and an introduction to Islamic religious texts; in short, this was “an entirely new summa of scientific knowledge, based on sources which were almost completely unknown fifty years previously, but which were to remain standard textbooks for many centuries to come” (Burnett 1978, 133).

* * *

A new generation of Arabic-Latin translators, unrelated to the earlier translators noted previously and apparently unrelated to one another, emerged in the late twelfth century and early thirteenth: Marcos de Toledo (Marcus Toletanus), who became Canon in 1198, was a physician, translated several treatises by Galen and Hunayn ibn Ishaq, and in 1209–10 produced a new Latin version of the *Koran*. He was followed by several foreigners who lived for some time on the Iberian Peninsula, such as the Italian Salione Buzzacarini (Salio da Padova), or Alfred of Sareshel and Michael Scott, from Britain. Scott spent more than five years in Toledo, where, with the help of a certain Abuteus, he produced Latin translations of Arabic copies of al-Bitruji’s *De sphaera*, and Aristotle’s *De animalibus*. The last, and youngest, of this second generation of itinerant translators was Hermannus Alemannus (Herman the German), Canon of Palencia and then of Toledo, and finally Bishop of Astorga. Between 1240 and 1246 in Toledo, he made Latin translations of several of Averroes’s and al-Farabi’s commentaries on Aristotle’s *Ethics*, *Poetics*, and *Rhetoric*. As all this implies, until the mid-thirteenth century, translations were usually from Arabic into Latin (and vice versa). There is only very slight evidence of texts being translated into the emerging Romance languages on the Peninsula, and these were always from Latin, such as the Catalan version of the Visigothic *Forum Iudicum*, or the six sermons known as the *Homilies d’Organyà*, which are really adaptations, rather than translations, of a collection of French sermons. As regards Castilian, the real turning point for the abandoning of Latin and the adoption of Castilian as the target language of translation must be said to come with the express wishes of Alfonso X, even before he came to the throne in 1252. Translators formed part of Alfonso’s courtly surroundings, as his court included a group of twenty Christian, Muslim, and Jewish men, some Hispanic and others Italian, who were clerics, *alfaquines* or physicians, notaries, and royal scribes; these men included Bonaventura da Siena or Pietro da Reggio, Judah ben Moshe ha-Kohen or Samuel ha-Levi, Garci Pérez, Álvaro de Oviedo, and Ferrando de Toledo or Bernardo el Arábigo. For more than thirty years, these and other translators translated into Castilian – and sometimes subsequently into Latin or French from the Castilian – a wide array of Arabic texts which almost always corresponded to a personal interest of the King, to such an extent that the King himself would intervene in certain parts of the process: the choice of text and translator(s), revision of language and style, details of the final edition, and so on; the texts involved ranged from the sixteen treatises that comprise the *Libros del saber de astrología* to the *Libro de la escala de Mahoma*, in a parallel translation into Castilian, Latin, and French, or the *Libro del aqedrex, dados e tablas*.

As I have said, Alfonso X’s translators never constituted a “school.” Nor, if there had been such a “school,” would it have been located in Toledo, which the King visited only very rarely. As was the norm at the time, the court of Alfonso X was an itinerant court: it went where the King was, and the ruler’s translators were also to be found where the King was, simply because for many of them, their principal employment was as part of the retinue that surrounded the

King. This explains why it was in Seville (and not in Toledo) that in 1264 Bonaventura da Siena translated the *Libro de la escala de Mahoma* for the King, from Castilian into French; or why it was Seville (and not Toledo) that in 1283 saw the Castilian version of the *Libro del açedrex, dados e tablas*. As well as the great catalogue of stand-alone translations, Alfonso X's collaborators also made frequent use of "inserted" translations: textual fragments, which could be very significant in length, translated from Arabic or Latin and included in the composition of other works, such as the *General Estoria*, which contains the prose translation-adaptation of the whole ten books of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, as well as long passages from Ovid's *Heroides*, and a litany of sections directly translated, adapted, or summarized from Paulus Orosius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Saint Jerome, Pliny the Elder, Isidore of Seville, and so on. To that sizeable corpus of translations – inserted and stand-alone, partial and complete – must be added a good number of anonymously translated works of wisdom literature, which stem from the same courtly environment of Fernando III, Prince Fadrique, Alfonso X, and his successor Sancho IV; these included such works as the *Sendebat*, *Poridat de poridades*, the *Libro de los buenos proverbios*, the *Libro de Apolonio*, *Barlaam & Josafat*, and so on. Also from this period are a few translations which subtly foreshadow the new cultural tendencies that began to arrive from the other side of the Pyrenees, such as the Castilian translation which Alonso de Paredes and Pascual Gómez made to Sancho IV's commission in ca. 1292 of Brunetto Latini's *Livres dou tresor*. Nonetheless, the Castilian court did not have a monopoly on translation during that period. Away from the court and the interests of each monarch, Arabic medicine was a topic of considerable interest, especially among the Christian and Jewish practitioners who used their knowledge of the subject to translate into Latin, Romance, or Hebrew a good number of texts by Avicenna, Maimonides, Hippocrates, Qusta ben Luqa, Averroes, Galen, al-Razi, al-Zahrawi, and more. Outstanding among the Christian physician-translators are Arnau de Vilanova, his nephew Armengaud de Blaise, and Berenguer Eimeric, who translated al-Zahrawi's *Tasrif*, first from Arabic into Catalan and then from Catalan into Latin.

Farther south, in the *studium arabicum et hebraicum* founded by the Dominicans in Murcia, Fray Domingo Marroquino translated the *Liber de egritudinibus oculorum*, and his student Rufino Alejandrino translated the *Isagoge in quaestiones medicae*, by Hunayn ibn Ishaq. Jewish physicians translating the same authors into Hebrew included Sem Tob de Tortosa, his son Abraham de Tortosa, Jacob ha-Qatan, and Solomon ben Josef ibn Ayyub ha-Sefardi; but they were not alone in this task. Also worthy of mention is the activity of many other Jewish translators across the whole of the Peninsula, many of them wandering globe-trotters and insatiable visitors of all parts of Europe; in the main, their translations were exclusively from Arabic into Hebrew, for the benefit of their own linguistic communities. Perhaps the most notable of all was the first of that century: the poet Judah ben Solomon al-Harizi, who produced Arabic-to-Hebrew versions of a dozen works by Maimonides, al-Hariri de Basora, Hunayn ibn Ishaq, Galen, and Aristotle. Many others followed in his footsteps throughout the century, leaving an enormous body of translated work that is now scarcely mentioned and even less studied: Judah ben Solomon ha-Kohen, who translated his own encyclopaedic treatise *Midrash ha-Hokmah* from Arabic into Hebrew; Zerahiah Gracián, a physician and philosopher who, while he was in Rome, translated a considerable number of texts by Aristotle, Averroes, Avicenna, al-Farabi, Maimonides, and Galen; Abraham ben Samuel ha-Levi ibn Hasdai; Sem Tob ben Josef ibn Falaquera; Isaac Albalag; and so on. The century closed with one of the most remarkable figures of the age, the indefatigable Ramon Llull, a trilingual author and self-translator writing in Arabic, Catalan, and Latin, whose extensive and varied work includes theology, philosophy, and Christian apologetics.

* * *

The fourteenth century has been forgotten in the Peninsular history of translation, a no-man's-land between the translation activity of Alfonso X *el Sabio* and the wave of translations brought by the fifteenth century. Yet it represents a crucial period of that history insofar as it marked a decisive move away from previous tradition. With Arabic and Hebrew now limited to religious contexts or very restricted cultural circles, Latin instead became the essential source language for the whole of the fourteenth century, as there was a great abundance of translations from Latin across the whole of the Peninsula, and with Catalan a much more common target language than Castilian. The first hints of proto-humanist tendencies that reached the Peninsula from across the Pyrenees found an immediate and warm welcome in the Catalan language. The large group of Catalan translators includes Metge, Antoni Canals, Jacme Conesa, Guillem Nicolau, Ferrer Saiol, Pere Sapllana, Antoni Ginebreda, Pons Saclota, Romeu Sabruquera, Guillem Corretger, Berenguer de Sarriera, and many more; there were also numerous anonymous translators active especially during the second half of the century, whose Catalan versions included not only a vernacular Bible and a *Koran* translated from the Latin, but also works by Seneca, Valerius Maximus, Ovid, Sallust, Palladius Rutilius, Frontinus, Boethius, Petrarch, André le Chapelain, Guido delle Colonne, Aegidius Romanus, Richard de Fournival, William of Conches, Albertano da Brescia, Laurent du Bois, Jacobus de Cessolis, and more. Not to forget the many practical and scientific translations, especially pertaining to medicine and veterinary science. Both in number and in range this is far greater than what is found in Castilian translation, but there too, especially in the second half of the century, we may still find a number of titles translated from Latin texts or from intermediary French versions, for which, at the end of the century, Chancellor López de Ayala was often directly or indirectly responsible; these include three decades of Livy, the *Historia troyana* of Guido delle Colonne, Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum et foeminarum illustrium*, the *Sententiae* of pseudo-Isidore of Seville, the Book of Job, and so on. To this short account of translations bearing López de Ayala's signature must be added a brief list of Castilian texts which ultimately derive from Latin originals, such as the *De regimine principum* of Aegidius Romanus, translated by Juan García de Castrojeriz; or Gottfried von Franken's *Tractado de plantar o enxerir arboles o de conseruar el vino*. Aragonese is also a popular language to translate into or to compose in during this century, to a degree that has perhaps been unmatched since then, especially as a target language for translations.

The patron of this vogue in translations was Juan Fernández de Heredia, Grand Master of the Hospitaller Order of Saint John of Jerusalem. Unlike other patrons such as Alfonso X or the Marquis of Santillana, Heredia's interests lay above all in historiographical topics. The list of Aragonese translations which were made under his patronage is certainly wide in scope, and includes the first translations into Aragonese from Greek (Thucydides, Plutarch, John of Zonaras), and from Italian, French, Latin, and Catalan (Orosius, Paulus Diaconus, Marco Polo, the *Crónica de los Reyes de Aragón*, the *Crónica troyana*, and so on); this formed "un corpus de obras realmente ingente, que en esta lengua no resulta paragonable con nada anterior ni posterior" (Alvar and Lucía 2002, 696). It is no surprise, then, that Heredia has been compared to Alfonso X: both showed a clear desire to give precedence to a Romance language as a target language, privileging Castilian or Aragonese over Latin. Nonetheless, the differences between the two cases are significant: by the time of the fourteenth century, the *auctoritas* of Arabic texts was somewhat reduced from the status they had held in the thirteenth; and the two men hardly shared the same personal tastes, as a brief survey of the texts each chose for translation will show. Indeed, these two men may illustrate the decisive move away from previous tradition alluded to in the foregoing discussion: Alfonso X is an archetypal example of the medieval world; Heredia, to a greater degree even than Chancellor Ayala, is a herald of the first stages of vernacular humanism.

The fourth Romance language with relevant activity in the field of translation is Galician-Portuguese, which offers for the first time during this century a short run of translations largely derived from Latin and Castilian texts. Moreover, it is also during this century that intra-Peninsular translations become a general phenomenon, with translations between Castilian and Galician-Portuguese (in both directions), and from Catalan to Castilian (the reverse, while not unheard of, was much less common). Indeed, the number of works translated from Catalan to Castilian was remarkable: in Riera's words, this body of work was "realmente impresionante: son muchísimos más de los que nadie había sospechado" (1989, 700). Finally, to this intra-Peninsular picture of translations from Latin, Greek, and Romance texts must be added the importance of three extra-Peninsular source languages: Italian, Provençal, and especially French, which included the works of John Mandeville, Laurent du Bois, Pierre Bersuire, Benoit de Sainte-Maure, and a good number of anonymous works, notably the Breton cycle, whose tales were translated into Castilian, Catalan, and Galician-Portuguese. This century also sees the first tentative steps on the Peninsula towards reflecting on translation itself, with embryonic analyses of the process of translation, its instruments, or the conditions under which it is carried out: these reflections are almost always clearly set down in a translator's prologue. Nonetheless, what is notable is that for the first time a meta-language is beginning to be developed concerning the process of translation, in the languages of the Peninsula.

In conclusion, then, our account of translation in the fourteenth century may be summarized thus: the practice of translation was widespread, especially in Catalonia, which often acted as a cultural bridge to the rest of the Peninsula; the "centre" of translation thus moved from Castile to the Kingdom of Aragon, and the growing activity of translation was uncoupled from royal patronage and "decentralized," spreading widely across the whole Peninsula and even to places beyond its borders, as translations were not made at court, but in Gerona, Montpellier, Barcelona, Paris, Cordova, Avignon, Valencia, Murcia, Alcobaça, or Bayona (see Santoyo 1999, 297). This wide reach meant that translation was consolidated as an established vehicle for cultural diffusion in all the Romance languages. The Arabic source texts of earlier centuries were replaced mainly by texts in Latin, Greek, French, Italian, or Provençal – a shift which also meant that the figure of the Jewish or Mozarabic collaborator no longer appeared; and there was a great proliferation in the number of source languages, as works were translated from Latin, Arabic, Castilian, Catalan, Hebrew, Greek, French, Portuguese, Italian, and Provençal. There was also a similar proliferation in target languages, as this was the first time translations of contemporary texts were made into, and between, the various Romance languages of the Peninsula, with translations into Catalan being particularly common; intra-Peninsular translations thus became standard practice. Finally, the century ends with the appearance of the first reflections on and critiques of translation, which also sets in motion the development of a meta-language of translation. In the whole history of translation on the Iberian Peninsula, there has been no greater moment of change, no greater movement away from established tradition, than that which took place in the fourteenth century. This was a fertile time of transition between the strictly medieval translation activity of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the new currents of Renaissance humanism, which were to establish themselves definitively in the Peninsula during the fifteenth century.

* * *

"La historia de las traducciones peninsulares del siglo XV resulta asaz compleja y variada" (Russell 1985, 42). And indeed this is no overstatement, especially because "la mayoría de los escritores originales de este tiempo son también traductores" (García Yebra 1985, 78). The

long list of fifteenth-century translators is almost a duplicate of the names cited by histories of literature in the various Romance languages: in Castilian, we may note Juan de Mena, the Marquis of Villena, Juan Rodríguez del Padrón, Alonso de Madrigal “el Tostado,” Juan del Enzina, Antonio de Nebrija, Prince Carlos of Viana, or Alfonso de Palencia, among others; in Catalan, the outstanding names are Antoni Canals, Andreu Febrer, Ferran Valentí, Francesc Alegre, or Joan Roís de Corella. Indeed, this convergence of the author and the translator may have been a problem, as most of the many modern studies of fifteenth-century translation have focused on “important” authors or translators (in a literary or historical sense), while the rest of what is a very wide corpus has attracted very little interest. However, literary versions are merely a drop in the ocean of non-literary translation work – much of which was anonymous – with which the fifteenth century was inundated, so much so that it is no exaggeration to say that non-literary translation was a much wider-reaching phenomenon than the original work of Peninsular authors: this was essentially a century that existed in translation, and has therefore been misinterpreted by many scholars, whose focus has too often been on translated literature, whether Classical, medieval, or contemporary. Such works included translations of Virgil, Boccaccio, Cicero, Boethius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Leonardo Bruni, Seneca, Quintus Curtius Rufus, Sallust, Vegetius, Dante, Honoré Bouvet, Giannozzo Manetti, Pier Candido Decembio, Livy, and Valerius Maximus, among others: certainly they were translations which left a definite mark on the cultural outlook of the century, which grew ever more distinct from that of previous centuries. But neither the “classical” status of these works, nor their authors’ fame, nor that of the translators, and their patrons in turn – in particular the Marquis of Santillana and his great network of collaborators – should have been legitimate reason to ignore other, very different areas of the activity of translation.

Insofar as the lands of Aragon alone are concerned, Josep Pujol has recently written that “la historia de la traducción durante los reinados de los dos primeros Trastámara de Aragón, Fernando I (1412–1416) y Alfonso IV (1416–1458), está todavía por hacer, e incluso por hiltvanar” (2004, 641). If this *status quaestionis* is similarly applied to the remaining Peninsular lands, we may begin more clearly to see the enormous volume of work which remains to be done. The result of all this, at least for the case of the fifteenth century, is that we still have a very fragmentary view of Peninsular activity in translation, which extended into practically every sphere of human life. Such is the case – and it is one case among many – of religious literature, because the spiritual treatises (including evangelical, catechistic, doctrinal, hagiographic, ascetic texts and so on) translated into every Romance language of the Peninsula were legion; they are now hardly mentioned, but were nonetheless accessible to the reading public of the age, especially after 1472 with the establishment of printing in various areas of the Peninsula. “Se explica de este modo que *casi la mitad* de los textos traducidos en el siglo XV puedan agruparse bajo el rótulo de obras religiosas o morales” (Alvar and Lucía 2003, 1), and the same applies to Portuguese lands, where there is once again a proliferation of “traduções, sobretudo do latim, de obras de carácter religioso e filosófico, textos hagiográficos, ascéticos, místicos e espirituais” (Sampaio Lemos 2003, 163). Nevertheless, as Charles B. Faulhaber has written, “nótese que a pesar de su popularidad, son textos que jamás se estudian hoy, salvo entre los pocos especialistas del latín medieval o de la espiritualidad” (1997, 591). However, there is no doubt that in their own contemporary context, all of these texts (catechisms, saints’ lives, confession manuals, and so on), addressed to all kinds of readers (and listeners), engaged a large audience, and were much more widely read than the majority of the Classical and humanist texts cited previously, which were in general no more than “the exclusive intellectual preserve of an educated elite” (Wright 1997, 14).

What caused this great tide of religious translations? The answer was repeated throughout the century as a *locus communis*, with such frequency that we must believe the many translators who had recourse to it: the reason was simply the desire to translate texts on Christian spirituality into the prevailing language in daily use, where those texts were in Latin or in other Romance languages and therefore inaccessible to the majority of the faithful. Thus understood, translation in all areas of the Peninsula becomes an exercise in catechesis: one more form of religious instruction for those who did not know Latin. A second strand of such translations given very little attention comes with the vernacular versions – in Castilian, Catalan, and Galician-Portuguese – of medical, surgical, pharmacological, or veterinary material, usually translated from Latin. As was the case in previous centuries, these translations have been little studied, yet they form a rich store of works from the period, and many of them appear in printed editions dating from the later decades of the century: these include Castilian versions of medical treatises by John of Ketham, Lanfranco da Milano, Valesco de Taranta, Lundino dei Luzzi, or Bernard de Gordon; Portuguese versions of Rogerio di Palermo, Arnau de Vilanova, or Jacobus Kamintus; Catalan translations of Guy de Chauliac, Petro d'Argellata, Pero Cellerer, Girolamo Manfredi, or Antonio Richart; as well as a raft of short, anonymous translations from Latin into all of those three languages, including *Maçer erbolario*, *Tractat de flobotomia*, *Tractat de la conaxença dels polsos*, *Tractat de les viandes*, and so on. There were also intra-Peninsular translations dealing with these same topics, such as Manuel Dieç's *Libro de albeyteria*, translated from Valencian into Castilian by Martín Martínez de Ampíes, or the *Llibre dels cavalls*, an anonymous Catalan version of the *Libro de los caballos*. There are even examples of authors translating their own works, such as the physician Julián Gutiérrez, who wrote his *De potu in lapidis preservatione* in Latin, and soon afterwards translated it into Castilian as the *Cura de la piedra y dolor de la yjada*. The voluminous work of this century's many anonymous translators has also been largely forgotten, though this has recently been mitigated in the case of Castile by the exemplary study of Elisa Borsari (2011): there were anonymous translations of Lucian of Samosata, Cato, Johannes de Sacrobosco, Flavius Josephus, Eneas Silvio Piccolomini, Petrarch, Seneca, Thomas of Aquinas, Julius Caesar, Aesop, Albertano da Brescia, and so many more. And all this is to say nothing of translation in Portugal, whose own history is still waiting to be written. Given how incomplete our view of Peninsular translation in the fifteenth century still is, then, we must wait for new research finally to flesh out the complex and varied overview alluded to by Russell.

Works cited

- Alvar, Carlos and Lucía Megías, José Manuel. 2002. *Diccionario filológico de literatura medieval española*. Madrid: Castalia.
- . 2003. "Repertorio de traductores del siglo XV: tercera veintena." In *Traducción y práctica literaria en la Edad Media románica*, edited by Rosanna Cantavella et al., 1–40. València: Universitat de València.
- Borsari, Elisa. 2011. *Catálogo de traducciones anónimas al castellano de los siglos XIV al XVI en bibliotecas de España, Italia y Portugal*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nacional.
- Burnett, Charles. 1978. "Arabic into Latin in Twelfth Century Spain: The Works of Hermann of Carinthia." *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 13: 100–134.
- Clare, L. and J. C. Chevalier. 1972. *Le Moyen Âge espagnol*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Faulhaber, Charles B. 1997. "Sobre la cultura ibérica medieval: las lenguas vernáculas y la traducción." In *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval*, edited by José Manuel Lucía Megías, vol. 1, 587–597. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.

- García Yebra, Valentín. 1985. *Traducción y enriquecimiento de la lengua del traductor*. Madrid: Real Academia Española.
- Lemarchand, Marie-José. 1995. “¿Qué es un texto original? Apuntes en torno a la historia del concepto.” In *Cultura sin fronteras: encuentros a torno a la traducción*, edited by Carmen Valero, 23–30. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.
- Lemay, Richard. 1963. “Dans l’Espagne du XIIe siècle: Les traductions de l’arabe au latin.” *Annales: Économies Sociétés Civilisations* 18 (4–6): 639–665.
- Martínez Cavelero, Pedro and Domingo Beltrán Corvalán. 2006. “La desaparición de Orosio en Menorca.” In *Espacio y tiempo en la percepción de la Antigüedad tardía*, edited by Elena Conde Guerri et al., 591–600. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- Pujol, Josep. 2004. “Traducciones y cambio cultural entre los siglos XIII y XV.” In *Historia de la traducción en España*, edited by Francisco Lafarga and Luis Pegenaute, 623–650. Salamanca: Ambos Mundos.
- Riera, Jaume. 1989. “Catàleg d’obres en català traduïdes en castellà durant els segles XIV i XV.” In *Historia de la Llengua*, edited by Antoni Ferrando, 699–709. València: Institut Universitari de Filologia Valenciana.
- Russell, Peter. 1985. *Traducciones y traductores en la Península Ibérica (1400–1550)*. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Sampaio Lemos, Aida. 2003. “Textos de prosa literária escritos em português do século XV: a edição do Tractado das Meditações do Pseudo-Bernardo.” *Diacrítica* 17 (1): 163–188.
- Santoyo, J. C. 1999. *La traducción medieval en la Península Ibérica*. León: Universidad de León.
- Wright, Roger. 1997. “Translation between Latin and Romance in the Early Middle Ages.” In *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages*, edited by Jeanette Beer, 7–32. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University.