Elwira Buszewicz (Jagiellonian University in Kraków)

From the Renaissance through to Our Times: The Reception of Neo-Latin Poetry in Polish Translation

Since in recent decades many different books have been published in Western Europe and America on translatology, I shall begin with some reflections on the essence of translating, thereby to prepare a background for further consideration of the Polish translations of Neo-Latin Poetry.

The fundamental and almost obvious question concerning the matter was posed by Albert Mancini in 1993:

> What is translating? What need do translations attempt to satisfy? What presuppositions does the practice of translation imply? These questions have become preoccupations for the translators of our time, but were present to practitioners of the art in all ages.[1]

Mancini evokes several ancient Latin reminiscences and reminds the reader of the well-known passage from *De optimo oratorum genere* in which Cicero comments on his own art of translating Greek speeches: *non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere*. He does not consider rendering word for word necessary (sc. *verbatim*), but tries to let each word preserve its full energy and meaning. Hence the two attitudes the translator may take: literal translation, in which the transcriber focuses on *verbum ad verbum* equivalence, and creative translation. An echo of Cicero's words is perceivable in the well-known rule of St. Jerome concerning Bible translation: *non verbum a verbo, sed sensum exprimere a sensu*. This rule had a significant impact on the debate on the translation of the Scriptures into vernaculars. Moreover, it became a model for the Renaissance theory and practice of translation. Thus, as Mancini points out, it established a new attitude to translation, consisting of

[1] A. Mancini, "Translation Theory and Practice in Seventeenth Century Italy: The Case of the French Novel," *Symposium* 47 (1993): 136.

creative imitation rather than of mechanical transcription into another linguistic code. The latter was considered a typically medieval method which had to be abandoned. Leonardo Bruni's translation of Plato could serve as an example. The creative transcriber regarded the *ad sententiam* (*non ad verbum*) formula as the best means of preserving the sense of the original work without losing its literary qualities. As Agnieszka Fulińska remarks, similar tendencies could be observed to a certain extent in the 12th-century Renaissance, but a fundamental crisis came in the *Trecento*. The creative translator's attitude was emphasised by Antonio Minturno in the 16th century.[2] The transposer's activity was to be an adaptation of the original text to the stylistic and aesthetic exigencies of another cultural ambience. As Mancini points out, terms like *trapianto*, or *acclimatamento* were preferred.

By analogy, the same principle was established as obligatory for translation practice in the Old Polish period both in prose and poetry, for the translation from both classical and modern languages and (in the case of Latin) from both the ancient and modern versions. A creative adaptation could well have been regarded as an act of translation, for instance in the brilliant Polish version of Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, *Dworzanin polski* [The Polish Courtier] by Łukasz Górnicki, which was, of course, the "translation" of a prose work from Italian. The transcriber carefully described his art in a preface to the work; he delineated the criteria for his selection from the text imitated.[3] In the case of poetry we can notice that the transposer in a sense became a new author: a creator worthy of glory equal to that of the original author. He often treated the imitated text as an inspiration for his own lyrical reflections or as a challenge to his own poetic virtuosity in his vernacular language. Thus in a sense we tend not to notice that several Old Polish compositions are in fact translations of Neo-Latin poetry; I am thinking of the work of Jan Andrzej Morsztyn, who, apart from translating Giambattista Marino, borrowed material from Renaissance Latin poets like Benedictus Lampridius and Michael Marullus. He also rendered two of Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski's poems into Polish. Significantly, Morsztyn translated

[2] A. Fulińska, *Naśladowanie i twórczość. Renesansowe teorie imitacji, emulacji i przekładu* [Imitation and Creativity. Renaissance Theories of Imitation, Emulation and Translation] (Wrocław, 2000), 63.

[3] The phenomenon involves inculturation in a broader and deeper sense, not a mechanical one; the selective substitution of local features may amaze a contemporary reader or make him laugh; take, for example, an anonymous Polish version of Iacobus Locher's *Iudicium Paridis,* entitled *Sąd Parysa*, *krolowica trojańskiego* [The Judgement of Paris, Prince of Troy], in which Menelaus leaves Paris with Helen and goes to Bohemia [*sic!*]; moreover, when Cupid is sending his arrows "the monks escape from the monastery."

or paraphrased about thirty poets, including passages from John Barclay's *Argenis,* which are still, in a certain sense, unrecognised. Another representative of the Morsztyn family, Zbigniew, translated a poem by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola into Polish and did not fail to inform readers of the fact.[4] However, nowadays students have been constantly neglecting this information and interpreting the poem as an example of the "Baroque vision of the world."

At any rate, even if we look at imitation or translation in the Old Polish period from a broad perspective, it is evident that there was not much of it. This holds true even if we include the poetic practice of Mikołaj Rej, who made creative adaptations of Thomas Naogeorgus (Kirchmayer)[5] and Palingenius (Pier Angelo Manzolli);[6] even if we consider several psalms from Jan Kochanowski's *Psałterz*[7] as paraphrases of Buchanan (and if we remember that Kochanowski's poem *Szachy* [The Game of Chess] was a free imitation of Marco Girolamo Vida's *Scacchia ludus*);[8] even if we appreciate the high interest in Neo-Latin tragedy which was generated by translations such as Jan Zawicki's rendering of Buchanan's *Jephtes*[9] or Stanisław Gosławski's translation of Szymonowic's *Castus Ioseph*,[10] not to mention the paraphrase of John Owen's epigrams by Jan Gawiński and Wespazjan Kochowski. In general we can assert that the number of Polish early modern translations from Neo-Latin poetry is difficult to define precisely, many of them still unidentified,[11] hid-

---

[4] Z. Morsztyn, *Żywot – sen i cień* [A Life – Dream and Shadow]; the translator refers to his source as Ioannis Pici Mirandolae principum litteratissimi et litteratorum principis *Metra* 12.

[5] M. Rej, *Kupiec, to jest kształt a podobieństwo Sądu Bożego ostatecznego* [The Merchant, that is the Shape and Simulacrum of God's Last Judgement] (Königsberg, 1549) was a free paraphrase of T. Naogeorgus' (Kirchmaier's) *Tragoedia nova, Mercator seu iudicium* (1540).

[6] M. Rej, *Wizerunk własny żywota człowieka poczciwego* [The Faithful Image of an Honest Man] (Kraków, 1558) is an imitation of *Zodiacus vitae* by Palingenius (*editio princeps* Venezia, 1531).

[7] *Psałterz Dawidów* przekładania Jana Kochanowskiego (Kraków, 1579). Several of Buchanan's psalms were also paraphrased by Mikołaj Sęp-Szarzyński (1551–1581).

[8] Cf. Wiktor Weintraub, "Kochanowski's Gambit: Kochanowski's *Szachy* and *Vida's Scacchia ludus*," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983): 655–665.

[9] We know next to nothing about the translator. Probably he was close to Jan Zamoyski's circle. *Jephtes* appeared in print in a Polish version in 1587. Some clear influences of Kochanowski's verse (especially of the *Psałterz* and *Treny*) may be observed in it.

[10] S. Szymonowic, *Castus Jozeph,* transl. S. Gosławski (Kraków, 1597). Interestingly, Szymonowic's scriptural poem *Joel propheta* (Kraków, 1593) was translated into Polish by Józef Minasowicz in the 18th century, and published 1772.

[11] Current research has been regularly contributing new identifications. One example is Grzegorz Czaradzki's poem on the Virgin Mary in childbed; the work had virtually sunk into oblivion, and hardly ever received scholarly attention. It has only recently been identified as a translation of Sannazaro's *De partu Virginis* and published, cf. Grzegorz Czaradzki, *Rytmy o porodzeniu przenaczystszym Bogarodzice Panny Maryjej*, eds. Roman Mazurkiewicz,

den in printed or manuscript collections of poetry. Although the poets sometimes indicate the originals of their translations, paraphrases or imitations in these collections (for example by a note such as "from Sannazaro," as Hieronim Morsztyn did), usually they suppressed such information giving no hint at all or satisfied with an allusion or two in an meta-poetical poem (as in Wespazjan Kochowski's epigrams).

Which were the favourite models? The 15th-century continuation of Virgil's *Aeneid* by Maffeo Veggio was translated twice: the first translator was Jan Achacy Kmita (*O Aeneaszu trojańskim księgi trzynaste*, Cracow, 1591), the second Marcin Błażewski (Cracow, 1606). The printed edition of Kmita's translation appeared a year after the first Polish translation of Virgil's original epic (by Andrzej Kochanowski);[12] this might indicate that a Polish costume for the Neo-Latin complement of the *Aeneid* was considered most welcome. The next epic enterprise to be addressed appears to have been *Carolomachia* by Wawrzyniec Bojer.[13] Bojer's historical poem describes the Battle of Kircholm (1605), in which the Polish-Lithuanian forces, led by one Carolus (Karol Chodkiewicz, the Lithuanian Field-Hetman) defeated the Swedish army under another Carolus (Charles IX of Södermanland, King of Sweden). The poem emerged from the literary ambience of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Obviously, in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth it was important to write a Polish translation. It appeared a few years later. Its author, Jan Eysymont, now almost completely forgotten in Poland, was also known as the poet who described the fire of Vilnius in 1610.[14]

What may be said of the lyrical verse and epigrams? We might consider Jan Kochanowski's Latin poetry. There were not many translations of them into Polish until the 19th century.[15] Curiously, the first translation

---

Elwira Buszewicz (Warszawa, 2009), Humanizm. Idee, nurty i paradygmaty humanistyczne w kulturze polskiej – Inedita, vol. I.

[12] *Aeneida. To jest o Aeneaszu Trojańskim ksiąg dwanaście* (Kraków, 1590).

[13] Vilnius, 1606 – edited by "Krzysztof Zawisza."

[14] J. Eysymont, *Threnodia albo żałosne pienie o zgorzeniu Wilna* [A Threnodie or Lamented Singing about the Burning of Vilnius] (Wilno, 1610). The translation of *Carolomachia* was printed there in the same year.

[15] Similarly, we do not have many 17th-century translations of Sarbiewski's poetry. We can enumerate a few translations of individual poems (markedly less numerous than translations of Sarbiewski into English in that period); with a slightly Sarmatian tinge, as was the case with Andrzej Morsztyn or Samuel Twardowski, or much more loosely treated and intimate, by Jan Gawiński, to finish with abstruse curiosities by the 17th-century Jesuit Piotr Puzyna and elegant classical attempts by Enlightenment poets, especially Adam Naruszewicz. However, several imitations of Sarbiewski's verse or at least some poems inspired by his poetry may be still unidentified, as evidenced by the poem entitled "Łzy niepotrzebne" [Useless Tears] alluding to Sarbiewski's Lyr IV 13, in *I w odmianach czasu smak jest. Anto-*

of Jan Kochanowski's Latin verse into any modern language was *La madre dei auguri*…, an Italian version of a short epigram entitled *In Aquilam* from the *Foricoenia*.[16] The epigram was meant to decorate the triumphal gate erected in honour of the newly elected king, Henri de Valois. Its conceit was inspired by the French and Polish Coats of Arms (the Fleurs-de-Lys and Eagle respectively). An irony of fate preserved this unfortunate omen in the memory of the posterity:

> Augurii mater, volucrum regina vagarum,
> Corde enata tuo quid spondent lilia? Spondent
> Sarmatiam Henrico florentem rege futuram.[17]

Kochanowski's only elegy to be translated during the Old Polish period was El I 15, concerning the legendary queen Wanda. The name became the title of the Polish version by Jan Daniecki.[18] To complete this brief list we could add several attempts by Kochanowski himself, who composed some verses both in Latin and vernacular versions. We may discern either pairs of texts in a fairly loose relation to one another (such as the Latin elegy and the Polish ode on Jan Tarnowski's death or the Latin ode *De expugnatione Polottei* [On the Recapture of Polotsk] and the Polish ode on the same topic)[19] or a very interesting artistic experiment, *Dryas Zamchana Polonice et latine*, which is a deliberate attempt at self-translation.[20]

---

logia polskiej poezji epoki baroku [Even the Changes of Time have a Flavour. Anthology of Polish Poetry of the Baroque Period], ed. J. Sokołowska (Warszawa, 1991), 645.

[16] The translator was Pietro Buccio, *Le coronationi di Polonia, et di Francia del christianissimo Re Henrico III con le attioni, et successi de' suoi viaggi descritte in dieci giornate* (Padova, 1576).

[17] See J. Kochanowski, *Dzieła wszystkie. Wydanie Pomnikowe,* vol. III (Kraków, 1884), 241 [*Foricoenium* 100].

[18] J. Kochanowski, *Vanda*, transl. J. Daniecki (Kraków, 1599).

[19] Scholars have considered some of the interrelations between Kochanowski's Latin and vernacular texts; to mention first of all Weintraub, "Polski i łaciński Kochanowski: dwa oblicza poety," in *Rzecz czarnoleska* (Kraków, 1977), idem, "Jan Kochanowski i Joannes Cochanovius: dwóch świadków historii," in *Nowe studia o Janie Kochanowskim* (Kraków, 1991); Z. Głombiowska, *Łacińska i polska muza Jana Kochanowskiego* (Warszawa, 1988); W. Walecki, *Twórczość łacińska Jana Kochanowskiego* (Wrocław, 1978). The problem is also addressed in the work of P. Wilczek.

[20] Jan Kochanowski did not make a Polish version of *Dryas*' companion, *Pan Zamchanus*. The poem was not translated into Polish until the 19th century (by W. Syrokomla) and later by J. Ejsmond (early 20th century); it has also appeared recently in my translation in the bilingual edition *Dryas Zamchana Polonice et Latine. Pan Zamchanus Latine et Polonice*, ed. A. Gorzkowski (Kraków, 2002) (Biblioteka Tradycji *Collegium Columbinum*, 46). As the publisher claims, the booklet is an edition of "intriguing yet minor and forgotten works" by Jan Kochanowski: *Dryas Zamchana* and *Pan Zamchanus*. The former was originally pub-

We may dub the volume entitled *Wirydarz abo kwiatki rymów duchownych* [A Pleasant Garden or the Flowers of Spiritual Verses] by Stanisław Grochowski an ambitious poetic enterprise. This work, completed and printed in the early 17th century, is a creative translation of the first part of *Floridorum libri octo* by the late 16th-/early 17th-century Jesuit poet Jacob Spanmüller known as Iacobus Pontanus SI. Spanmüller's *nom de plume* is an obvious allusion to another famous Neo-Latin poet, Giovanni Pontano. Thus, *Wirydarz* not only leads the reader into the realm of Jesuit mystical poetry, but it also resounds with echoes of *De amore coniugali* (as Justyna Dąbkowska, its contemporary editor, points out).[21] One would probably not be wrong in thinking in the 17th century Jesuit poetry gradually became a preferred resource for translation or imitation, as evidenced by many vernacular versions of Sarbiewski's poems in unpublished Jesuit manuscripts (lectures, notes etc.) and also by a special popularity of certain authors or works. The list includes Jacob Balde's *Poema de vanitate mundi* [On the Vanity of the World, 1636], which was translated twice into Polish in the early 17th century, the first translator being Zygmunt Brudecki (year of publication unknown), followed by Jan Libicki (1647); both versions entitled *Sen żywota ludzkiego* [A Dream of Human Life]. The popularity of Jesuit emblem poems, treated as books of devotion, should not be forgotten, either. Herman Hugo's *Pia desideria* [Pious Desires, 1624] was imitated indirectly in Zbigniew Morsztyn's *Emblemata*, and directly in Mikołaj Mieleszka's, *Nabożne*

---

lished in two language versions, Latin and Polish; the latter is supplemented with a contemporary translation. These poetic, dramatic idylls, panegyrics praising King Stephen Báthory, ended a longer period of Kochanowski's artistic inactivity, and currently offer an inspiration for deeper reflection on the Renaissance art of translation and imitation;" at: http://www2.filg.uj.edu.pl/~wwalecki/collegium.php?seria=42&pozycja=85&wersja=en. It was also an inspiration for me as a translator: translating Kochanowski's odes, which have been published in several issues of *Terminus*, I rendered them in metrical imitation, without rhymes, to distinguish them from Kochanowski's vernacular poetry. However, when I was translating *Pan Zamchanus* I was certain that I ought to use rhymed verse (13-syllable) and make *Pan* similar to *Dryas.* [These and other new translations of Kochanowski's Latin poetry by Eliwra Buszewicz and other translators are on http://neolatina.bj.uj.edu.pl (accessed May 23, 2014), in an on-line critical edition of Jan Kochanowski's *Latin works*, as is part of the digital Library of Old-Polish and Neo-Latin Literature – editorial note.]

[21] S. Grochowski, *Wirydarz*, ed. J. Dąbrowska, Biblioteka Pisarzy Staropolskich, vol. 8 (Warszawa, 1997). Another interesting question is the convergence between Grochowski and Kochanowski: the former often borrows stylistic constructions from the latter. As Grochowski translated Pontanus, who in turn had imitated Pontano, and, on the other hand, Grochowski imitated Kochanowski, the complex pattern of interrelations opens up a new field of research on Kochanowski's poetry and its sources and models. If Grochowski's verses, which contain material drawn indirectly from Giovanni Pontano, perhaps we should be looking for Pontano's influence on Kochanowski's *Treny* (as Grażyna Urban-Godziek does)?

westchnienia (1657)[22] and Teodor Aleksander Lacki's, *Pobożne pragnienia* (1673). The third Polish version, *Pobożne żądania* [Pious prayers] by Jan Kościesza Żaba, appeared in 1744. (*)

One might be tempted to ask why we do not have many Old Polish translations of Neo-Latin poetry. To answer this question, we should take into consideration the fact that the *homo litteratus* was familiar with both classical and Neo-Latin poetry, so for him there was no need for translation. However, there was a circle of less refined readers who might have been interested in having an opportunity to read some easily accessible, popular versions; nevertheless, such renderings were usually not much more than free paraphrases, as happened in Mikołaj Rej's case. The problem appears to be even more complex. An early modern author writing in Latin was obliged to abide by narrowly defined rules. He could focus on the laudatory function, which postulated a choice of appropriate models and stylistic structures; imitating his models, he often transported entire ready-made constructions from classical or modern poetry; sometimes he indulged in various literary games or, finally, endeavoured to immortalise his literary work[23] or at least ennoble himself. What mattered most was that he entered an elite territory, that is to say he obtained his passport to the *Respublica litterarum* (this was deeply significant especially in a cultural borderland).[24] It is not easy to preserve such qualities in translation; but by omitting them a translator could disavow the fundamental functions of translation.

In our times, as the number of people with a literary interest and aspiration but no Latin increases, the translator, who now becomes indispensable, is more and more of an explainer, in the sense of the Latin word *interpres*. Often he simply explains what the idea of the poem is, without going into its artistic merit. He endeavours to be "the poet's poet" (if we may use Karl Dedecius' term), trying not to smuggle over his own feelings or aesthetic preferences; while the 19th-century translators of the eminent Latin poets usually reflected their own taste and sensi-

---

[22] When this paper was submitted, this translation was considered anonymous. In 2010 it was edited by Jakub Niedźwiedź and Radosław Grześkowiak, who identified the author. Cf. Mikołaj Mieleszka, *Nabożne westchnienia* [Pious Sighs], in idem, *Emblematy* [Emblems], ed. ut supra, Humanizm. Idee, nurty i paradygmaty humanistyczne w kulturze polskiej – Polonica, vol. III.

[23] The immortalising function of Latin leads to a separate question concerning the universalisation of the masterpieces of Polish poetry through translations from the vernacular into Latin. Sarbiewski, for example, paraphrased the old Polish religious anthem *Bogurodzica* and several of Jan Kochanowski's poems, In the 18th century Franciszek Dionizy Kniaźnin translated Kochanowski's *Treny* into Latin, etc.

[24] Cf. *Łacina jako język elit* [Latin as the Language of Elites], ed. J. Axer (Warszawa, 2004).

bility; thus their translations do not meet the modern reader's expectations and needs.[25]

We may say that the traditional criteria for the evaluation of Neo-Latin poetry did not change until the last decades of the 20th century. By that time many stereotypes had been established which, though now questioned and revised, have by no means been abandoned.[26] The most prevalent is the opinion that there was something like a "struggle for the Polish language" instead of a harmonious co-existence of two parallel language codes (although the vernacular matured later, while Latin capitalised on ready-made structures). Another stereotype was the habit of censuring occasional poetry; it was considered inferior if it was panegyric, which meant submissive, disgusting, hideous etc., and quite good if "original" (strangely, some scholars spoke of "originality" when all they meant was that the model was unprecedented).[27]Another evaluative stereotype (of post-Romantic provenance) is the condemnation of poets hastily herded into the *minorum gentium* paddock. For example, we can take Gregorius Vigilantius Samboritanus, the author of numerous Latin elegies. He has been classified as a "disgusting panegyrist" or a "mechanical imitator of Virgil" who chose to write on banal topics such as his own haemorrhoids.[28] However, if we tried to analyse his poetry according to recent research into Neo-Latin (for instance as Ann Moss's latest book shows), we would be able to regard Samboritanus' work as a specific way of expressing the poet's reality and truth (in a certain conventional manner).[29] Why was a dead and fossilised language used for this? We can quote a significant observation, albeit closer to our times, made by Igor Stravinsky, who defined Latin as "a medium not dead, but turned to stone, and so monumentalised as to have become immune to all forms of vulgarisation."[30] And what could be better than stone to preserve, save, ennoble, build a monument – even for humanists of plebeian

[25] We have W. Syrokomla and M. Jezienicki, who translated Ianitius, Cochanovius and Sarbievius in the 19th century, and their 20th-century successors, for example Tadeusz Karyłowski, Jan Smereka, Leopold Staff.

[26] Ignacy Chrzanowski, *Historia literatury niepodległej Polski* [A History of the Literature of Independent Poland] (Kraków, 1912), 260–262. There he laments: "Co za szkoda, że Sarbiewski po polsku nie pisał!" [What a pity that Sarbiewski did not write in Polish!].

[27] A new point of view concerning panegyric poetry is shown by J. Niedźwiedź, in *Nieśmiertelne teatra Sławy* [The Eternal Theatres of Fame] (Kraków, 2003).

[28] Cf. Juliusz Nowak-Dłużewski, *Okolicznościowa poezja polityczna w Polsce* [Occasional Political Poetry in Poland], vol. II, *Czasy Zygmuntowskie* [The Times of the Zygmunt Kings] (Warszawa, 1966), 310 ff., Jerzy Ziomek, *Renesans* (Warszawa, 1977), 346.

[29] Cf. Ann Moss, *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn* (Oxford, 2003), passim.

[30] Cf. Joseph Farrell, *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times* (Cambridge, 2001), 117.

origin? When I was translating a selection of Samboritanus' elegies into Polish (using rhyming verse *ad modum Cochanovii*) I realised how many interesting aspects there are to his poetry and now I want to preserve more works by this likeable poet in translation.[31] For we do not have many of them truly "preserved in translation."

Out of all the anthologies of Neo-Latin poems translated into Polish the one we should appreciate most is Antonina Jelicz's collection.[32] It is worthy of notice for its good choice of translations, which read well and can be understood by the contemporary reader. It also creates a clear distinction between medieval poetry, which it omits, and strictly Neo-Latin poetry. This differentiation is not a rule either in the medieval anthology by Marian Plezia[33] or in the medieval anthology by Jelicz herself.[34] The deficiencies of Jelicz's Renaissance anthology are the absence of original Latin texts and too narrow a spectrum of authors. Moreover, the period it covers is from 1470 to 1543. Therefore Callimachus is included, but decidedly more poems by him would have been preferable. Rodolphus Agricola is present, but with just one poem. We have very few editions or translation of his poetry, many of which portray the atmosphere of Renaissance Cracow. Jan Kochanowski is not in Jelicz's anthology since he falls beyond the chronological limits, and we are still waiting for a critical edition of his works, or at least a decent bilingual edition with a commentary.[35] The gaps in Jelicz's anthology are partially filled by the bilingual anthology edited by Ignacy Lewandowski.[36] However, this

---

[31] This project has been completed; cf. Vigilantius Gregorius Samboritanus, *Carmina selecta/*Grzegorz z Sambora, *Poezje wybrane* [Selected Poems], ed. Elwira Buszewicz, Warszawa, 2011, Humanizm. Idee, nurty i paradygmaty humanistyczne w kulturze polskiej – Inedita, vol. V.

[32] *Antologia poezji polsko-łacińskiej 1470–1543* [An Anthology of Polish-Latin Poetry], ed. A. Jelicz (Szczecin, 1985, 1st ed. 1956).

[33] *Najstarsza poezja polsko-łacińska* [The Oldest Polish-Latin Poety], ed. M. Plezia (Wrocław, 1952).

[34] *Toć jest dziwne a nowe. Antologia literatury polskiego średniowiecza* ["It's Strange and New." An Anthology of Polish Medieval Literature], ed. A. Jelicz (Warszawa, 1987).

[35] There are two recent editions of Kochanowski's Latin verse; the first of them, Ioannes Cochanovius, *Pisma łacińskie* [Latin writings], ed. W. Walecki et al. (Kraków, 2008) [Biblioteka Tradycji LXX], is bilingual; however, it does not have satisfactory commentaries, and the translation is a slightly modified version of Krasnosielski. Another publication is not bilingual but has a critical commentary: Jan Kochanowski, *Carmina Latina. Poezja łacińska*. Pars I: *Imago phototypica-transcriptio*. Pars II: *Index verborum et formarum*, Pars III: *Commentarius*, edited by Zofia Głombiowska (Gdańsk, 2008, 2013).

[36] *Antologia poezji łacińskiej w Polsce*, vol. 2 *Renesans* [An Anthology of Latin Poetry in Poland, vol. II, The Renaissance], ed. I. Lewandowski (Poznań, 1998). For medieval texts, we have an analogous bilingual anthology by Kazimierz Liman, *Antologia poezji łacińskiej w Polsce*, vol. 2 *Średniowiecze* [An Anthology of Latin Poetry in Poland, vol. II, The Middle Ages] (Poznań, 2004).

book does not provide many examples of some poets' work. Moreover, some of the translations in it don't do justice to the *delectare* postulate.

The Polish Neo-Latin poetry works "preserved in translation" entail some useful initiatives of the Biblioteka Pisarzy Staropolskich series, with special emphasis on Sebastian Fabian Klonowic's *Roxolania* translated by Mieczysław Mejor[37] and Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski's epigrams by Dorota Sutkowska and Magdalena Piskała.[38] Moreover, we should not forget Anna Kamieńska's translations of Hosius and Dantiscus, and Zygmunt Kubiak's translations of Clemens Ianitius.[39]

It is certainly true that scholars do prefer to preserve Neo-Latin poetry in an edition rather than in translation. Examples of this are provided by the Bibliotheca Medii et Recentiorum Aevi series and by the efforts to continue the Corpus Antiquissimorum Poetarum Poloniae Latinorum (CAPPL) series. Thanks to the latter, Marcin Kromer's Latin poetry and Eustace Knobelsdorf's *Lutetiae descriptio* are available, at least in their original form, to a readers' elite.[40]

Obviously there are many Neo-Latin poets and verses that should be preserved or commemorated in translation.[41] We have a vast amount of occasional poetry. There is the volume of Polish-Latin epithalamia translated by Mieczysław Brożek, but there are also epicedial, genethliac, epinicial, and many other types of poems.[42] Anthologies assembling Polish-Latin verse according to genre (for instance an anthology of epigrams, odes, elegies etc.) would be a requisite development. It would also be good to have translations not merely of Polish, but also European, Neo-Latin poetry, at least by its most eminent representatives.[43] It is difficult

---

[37] S.F. Klonowic, *Roxolania*, ed. and transl. M. Mejor (Warszawa, 1996).

[38] M.K. Sarbiewski, *Epigrammatum Liber. Księga epigramatów*, ed. and transl. D. Sutkowska and M. Piskała (Warszawa, 2003).

[39] S. Hozjusz, *Poezje*, transl. A. Kamieńska (Olsztyn, 2nd ed. 1988); J. Dantyszek, *Pieśni*, transl. A. Kamieńska (Olsztyn, 1987); Z. Kubiak, *Medytacje Janicjusza* (Warszawa, 1993) selected poems in translation with an "apocryphal" diary).

[40] M. Cromeri, *Carmina Latina*, ed. Georgius Starnawski, Romualdus Turasiewicz, CAPPL 9 (Kraków, 2003); Eustachii Cnobelsdorfii, *Carmina*, ed. G. Starnawski, CAPPL 8 (Kraków, 1995).

[41] This appears to be a very important postulate; the lack of translations of many Polish-Latin poets is clearly testified in Piotr Wilczek's article "Pisarze łacińscy w dawnej Polsce. Rekonesans," in *Civitas Mentis*, vol. I, (Katowice, 2005). Cf. particularly the table (pages 117–123), dealing not only with poets, but also with prose writers; all too often the column headed "Przekład polski" [Polish translation] has the entry "nie ma" (none).

[42] *Szesnastowieczne epitalamia łacińskie w Polsce*, transl. M. Brożek, ed. J. Niedźwiedź (Kraków, 1999).

[43] A valuable initiative is the edition of Alciatus' *Emblematum libellus*, transl. A. Dawidziuk, B. Dziadkiewicz, and E. Kustroń-Zaniewska (supervisor: M. Mejor), ed. R. Krzywy (Warszawa, 2002).

to suggest anything (as regards technique or stylistics) to future translators, who might be scholars, not poets. Clarity seems to be the most important principle. If one is to become acquainted with Neo-Latin poetry through translation, the translated works should neither be obscure nor falsify the sense of the originals. A modern translator should be an investigating explainer with both a good understanding of the text and the capacity to transpose it into Polish, even in prose, but in a communicative way. Translation is a creative job; however, it should never create a new, totally different *opus*.[44]

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Prof. Mirosława Hanusiewicz-Lavallee for her helpful comments and suggestions on particular points of this article.

[44] As an example we can take the new bilingual publication of Neo-Latin verse from the 18th century. Let us pass over the author, the title, and (primarily) the translator. The translation is full of misunderstandings, among which we can find the following curiosity: *De certis sequioris sexus figmentis* is rendered as: "O częstych przypadkach odmiany płci" [On frequent cases of changing sex]. We are all humans and *errare humanum est*. There are, however, certain limits.