THE COURTIER ABROAD: OR, THE USES OF ITALY

Peter Burke

INTRODUCTION

Students of the Renaissance have long been discontented with the traditional account of its "reception" outside Italy, with the unfortunate implication that Italians alone were active and creative, while other Europeans were passive, mere recipients of "influence". In order to drive out the simplistic diffusionism embodied in this traditional account, it may be advisable to draw on its opposite or antibody, in other words functionalism, or at least to ask what the "uses" of Italy were for writers scholars and artists in other parts of Europe, and how far Italian forms or ideas were assimilated into indigenous traditions. To escape the limitations of functionalism, however, it is important to study the ways in which these foreigners interpreted what they saw, heard or read, their perceptual schemata, their horizons of expectation.[1,*] An ordinary working historian would be ill advised to take sides in current controversies in the field of literary theory, to pronounce on the ultimately metaphysical question whether real meanings are found in texts or projected onto them. All the same, there can be little doubt of the relevance of reception theory (concerned as it is with a temporal process), to the work of cultural historians in general and in particular to historians of the Renaissance (long concerned with reception in a narrower sense).[2] They need to assimilate the still somewhat alien notion of *Rezeption* (or *Wirkung*) into their own craft traditions.[3]

* Excepcionalmente as notas do autor virão após o final deste artigo.

A few years ago, two enterprising scholars put together a collection of articles on "The Enlightenment in National Context", stressing regional variation and local needs rather than the French model.[4] It would be extremely useful to have a study of the European Renaissance on similar lines.

To make a small contribution to such a collective volume is the purpose of this paper, an essay in every sense, since it is a provisional report on work in progress presented in order to test reactions to both method and interpretation.[5] It is concerned with "the historical process of acceptance, appropriation, transformation, rejection and substitution" in the case of a work which might be described as unofficially authoritative in some social circles in quite a number of countries. It deals with the reception, or as Italian scholars would say, the "fortune" of one famous Renaissance text, Castiglione's *Courtier*. The area surveyed in this study is essentially Europe minus Italy, though there are odd references to the *Courtier* in Japan and to the New World.[6] Italy is omitted not because reactions to Castiglione were uniform – they were in fact rather diverse – but because the process of adaptation is revealed more clearly by the history of his reception in other countries, other cultures.[7]

The period with which this essay is concerned runs from 1528, when the *Courtier* was first published, in an elegant folio edition (ironically enough, in republican Venice), to the early seventeenth century, when frequent reprints finally come to an end.[8] In the ninety years 1528 – 1619 there were at least 110 editions of the Courtier, 60 in Italian and 50 or more in other languages.[9]

I cannot, however, begin in 1528 and discuss the *Courtier* after the *Courtier* without more ado. Historians of the reception of texts face different types of problem according to the kind of book with which they are concerned. The practical relevance of the *Courtier* to daily life in some social circles encouraged contemporary comment, favourable and unfavourable, providing a thick dossier for future historians of its reception.

On the other hand, its combination of ambiguity with a lack of original ideas makes Castiglione's book particularly difficult to handle. With respect to its ambiguity, I am inclined to agree with those modern readers who find *The Courtier* what is sometimes called an "open" work, despite the fact that (as this essay will try to show), the author's contemporaries generally seem to have seen a clear and distinct message in the book.[10] The dialogue form is exploited in such a way as to anticipate the objections of most of its later critics.[11] The ambiguities of the *Courtier* may not all be intentional; they owe something to the fact that the process of writing and revision was spread over some twelve years at a time when the situation of the author, not to mention Italy as a whole, was changing rapidly.[12]

As for the book's lack of originality, it obviously complicates (not to say undermines) any attempt to study its "influence". We cannot safely approach this text without bearing in mind the history of the *Courtier* before the *Courtier*. The book was far from the first treatise in its genre.[13] It was self-consciously

modelled on classical treatises by Cicero and others, and the borrowing from antiquity include certain central concepts, notably that of "grace".[14] However, Cicero wrote in a society without a court. Courtesy, like the court itself, has been described as a medieval "invention".[15] Castiglione has his place in a tradition (going back to he tenth century) of writers who adapt the ancient Roman vocabulary of good manners to the court milieu. He owes an unacknowledged and perhaps indirect debt to medieval discussions of courtly behaviour in France and elsewhere.[16]

Bearing all these problems in mind, we may embark on a study of the reception process, discussing in turn the physical diffusion of the book, its translations, imitations, and other reactions, friendly or hostile.

THE DIFFUSION

The outlines of the story of the diffusion of Castiglione's book abroad are well known, but details can be added almost *ad infinitum*. By 1534 it was possible to read the *Courtier* in Spanish, by 1537 in French, by 1561 in English, by 1566 in German and Polish. In fact two German versions were produced in the sixteenth century, two and a quarter Latin renderings (the third being a translation of book 1 alone), and three French translations. Between 1534 and 1619 there were over fifty editions of the *Courtier* in languages other than Italian, including 21 in French, 10 in Spanish and 13 in Latin.[17]

In any case, some foreigners read Castiglione in the original. At least three Italian editions of the text were printed at Lyons (by Rovillio, in 1550, 1553, and 1562). In 1530, only two years after the first edition appeared, Edmund Bonner was writing to Thomas Cromwell asking for the loan of "the book called Cortegiano in Ytalian".[18] There are more than 20 copies of Italian editions of the *Courtier* in Cambridge alone.[19] A few of them have been acquired recently, but most were bought at the time and in some cases the names of former private owners are known. One of the copies of the *Courtier* in Italian now in the library of Trinity College Cambridge has a name written in it a sixteenth-century hand, "Thomas Wryght", presumably the man who was sizar, scholar and chaplain at the college between 1563 and 1572.[20] Of the nine references to Castiglione in Cambridge inventories in the reign of Elizabeth (almost enough to confirm Gabriel Harvey's famous observation on the Cambridge fashion for modern Italian writers), only one is to the Hoby translation. One reference is to the Italian text, owned by Abraham Tillman of Corpus; and seven, in that academic culture, to a Latin translation (three specifically to the Latin translation made by Bartholomew Clerke of King's). Tillman owned both a Latin and an Italian version, perhaps to improve his languages.[21] Similarly, at Oxford, E. Higgins of Brasenose owned copies of the *Courtier* in Italian, Latin, French and English.[22]

Sir Thomas Tresham, a compulsive book collector, owned more than one *Courtier* in Italian and in Latin.[23]

Details of this kind, if collected from all over Europe, could offer a basis for a social history of Castiglione's reception. It is, for example, not without interest to note that Castiglione's readers included the emperor Charles V, Francis I, Zygmunt August King of Poland, and James VI and I.[24] It is also intriguing to learn (given Professor Jonathan Brown's recent observations on the painter's calculated spontaneity), that Velazquez owned an Italian edition of the *Courtier* (by his time, the Spanish translation had been banned).[25] A study of the books mentioned in 219 inventories from 16th-century Paris has turned up references to no fewer than 18 copies of the *Courtier*, five in Italian and 13 in French. The owners were generally men of the law (*procureur*, *lieutenant criminel* etc.), though there was also one *marchand hostelain*.[26] In provincial Amiens, on the other hand, a similar study of 887 inventories 1503 – 76 turned up only one reference, to a French edition owned by a *procureur général*.[27] However, researches of this kind on the presence of the *Courtier* in the libraries of individuals from different social groups, and in different parts of Europe has barely begun.

THE TRANSLATIONS

The translations of the *Courtier*, on the other hand, or at least some of them (English, French and Spanish rather than Latin, German and Polish), have been studied in considerable detail, mainly from a linguistic and literary point of view. It may be worth noting the European languages into which the *Courtier* was not translated in the period, difficult as it is to say whether this is to be explained by the state of society, the state of language (or indeed by accident). There was no translation into Flemish or Dutch until the later seventeenth century (although at least three of the Spanish editions were published in Antwerp); no translation into the Scandinavian languages; or into Slav languages other than Polish; or into Portuguese (unless one includes the adaptation by Rodrigues Lôbo, to be discussed in its place); or into Hungarian (despite the receptivity of Hungary to the Renaissance) – but then the book was published two years after the disaster of Mohâcs, when Hungarians had other things to think about.

In this brief discussion from the point of view of a socio-cultural historian, it seems advisable, however, to focus on the social identity of the translators and on the way in which they rendered certain key passages in the text. The translators included the following: Juan Boscán (*c.* 1487 – 1542), a Catalan patrician and poet who probably knew Castiglione in his last years as nuncio in Spain;[28] J. Colin, possibly Jacques Colin (*d.* 1547), abbé, Latin poet, courtier, and diplomat, who was posted to Italy in 1528 and presumably discovered the

Courtier there;[29] Gabriel Chappuys (*c.* 1546 – *c.* 1613), poet, historian, interpreter, theologian, and the translator of Ariosto and Boccaccio as well as Castiglione;[30] Sir Thomas Hoby, a Herefordshire gentleman, a Cambridge man, and a Marian exile (though he spent more of his exile in Catholic Italy than in Protestant Germany), who made his translation at the request of the marquis of Northampton;[31] Bartholomew Clerke (1537 – 90), Professor of Rhetoric at Cambridge, Fellow of King's and MP for Bramber, a man whose social circle included John Caius and Lord Buckhurst;[32] Lukasz Górnicki (1527 – 1603), a Polish courtier, encouraged to make his translation by King Zygmunt August;[33] Laurentz Kratzer, customs officer (*Mautzahler*) of Burghausen in Bavaria, who dedicated the book to his Duke;[34] and Johann Engelbert Noyse, another Bavarian apparently, who dedicated his version to one of the Fuggers.[35]

It is impossible to discuss the reception of a text in translation without going into philological detail. In a brief account such as this, such detail can only be presented at the price of extreme selectivity. I shall concentrate on the rederings of certain of Castiglione's key terms, notably *cortegianía* and *sprezzatura*, placing the Hoby translation in the foreground but looking at it from a comparative perspective.

Hoby wanted, so he tells us, "to follow the very meaning and wordes of the Authour, without [...] leaving out anye parcell one or other" or "being misledde by fantasie".[36] Like the other translators, however, he encountered serious problems because the language into which he was translating lacked precise equivalents for some of the book's most important concepts.[37] Hoby's difficulties began with the very subject of the book, *cortegianía*. In English the term "courtesy", like "courtier", was in use by the thirteenth century at the latest, but courtes in the medieval sense is not quite what Castiglione is discussing. Hoby has to coin a new word, "courtiership" or to paraphrase it as "the trade and manner of courtiers". By the end of the sixteenth century, new terms had come into existence, including "courtliness" or even "courtship" in a non-amorous sense, thanks perhaps to the vogue for Hoby's translation. However, the terms were not available to him. The French translators had similar problems. Colin coined a word, *courtisannie*, while the anonymous translator tried out alternative paraphrases such as *profession courtisane*, *lart du courtisan*, or *façon de bon courtisan*.[38]

A still greater challenge was posed, as one might have guessed, by what has become the most famous concept in the whole of Castiglione's book, *sprezzatura*. It is presented as as new coinage. Count Lodovico Canossa, explaining the need to avoid affectation, declares that the courtier must, "per dir forse una nova parola, usar in ogni cosa una certa sprezzatura, che nasconda l'arte, e dimostri ciò che si fa e dice venir fatto senza fatica e quasi senza pensarvi" (Book 1, ch. 26). *Sprezzatura* was not, literally speaking, a new word but rather a new sense given to an old word, the basic meaning of which was "setting no price

on'', or as Florio suggested at the end of the century in his *Worlde of Wordes*, ''a despising or contemning''.

This passage seems to have given some initial trouble to Boscán, who first translated *sprezzatura* literally, as *desprecio* (''contempt''), and then more in accordance with the context as *descuido* (''carelessness''), the term he uses when the word crops up again later. Colin opts for *nonchalance*, which has become a close analogy to the Italian term (whether or not it already was in his day). The anonymous French translator and Chappuys are both more cautious and double words up, *nonchalance et mesprison* in the first case, *mespris et nonchalance* in the second.[39]

As for Hoby, he made more than one attempt at finding the right word. In his rendering of the Italian passage quoted above, he writes that the courtier must ''(to speak a new word) [...] use in everye thing a certaine disgracing to cover arte withall, and seeme whatsoever he doth and saith, to doe it without paine, and (as it were) not minding it''. Castiglione himself twice used the word *disgrazia* in a similar sense a few lines later on, when Hoby translates it ''disgrace''. The next time *sprezzatura* occurs, it is again rendered ''disgracing'', but on the third occasion Hoby chooses ''Recklessnesse''.[40]

Hoby's choice of terms is precious evidence of his own reaction to Castiglione, if only we can interpret it (which is no easy task, given all the changes which have taken place in the English language in the four hundred odd years which separate us from him). We can begin by asking what alternatives were open to him. He did not opt for ''nonchalance'' like the French translators.[41] He also avoided the terms ''carelessness'' and, perhaps more surprisingly, ''negligence'', employed in English as early as Chaucer, a word which corresponds to the *non ingrata neglegentia* advocated in Castiglione's own model, Cicero, and adopted by Clerke in his Latin version, referring to the need to behave ''negligenter et (ut vulgo dicitur) dissolutè'', the latter term being his attempt to render Castiglione's neologism. Clerke also uses the term *incuria*.[42]

What were the associations of the terms which Hoby did use? Unlike *sprezzatura*, ''disgracing'' was not newly-coined. It seems to have been strongly pejorative. ''Rude and unlearned speech defaceth and disgraceth a very good matter'' wrote Robinson in his 1551 translation of More's *Utopia*. ''Filthy disgracements'' wrote Norton in his 1561 translation of Calvin.[43] We must therefore at least entertain the possibility that the translator was, consciously or unconsciously, subverting his text.[44] Hoby was, after all, a Protestant, indeed a Marian exile, and some other renderings of his have been interpreted as signs of a ''protestant bias'', notably ''trifling tales'' for Castiglione's *novelle*.[45] There was deliberate paradox and desire to surprise in Castiglione's invention of the term *sprezzatura*, which etymology and context between them rendered highly ambivalent, but Hoby perhaps stressed the negative side at the expense of the positive. It is unfortunate that his journal gives us no clue to his feelings about Italy at the time he was studying there.[46]

If the exact choice of words by Hoby tells us something about the *Courtier*'s reception in England, a great deal can be learned from the much freer version by Lukasz Górnicki, the *Dworzanin polski* (1566), a translation which is not a translation.[47] What Górnicki did with Castiglione's text was to transpose it. He transferred the setting from Urbino to a villa near Kraków belonging to his patron, bishop Samuel Maciejowski, chancellor of Poland. It was not only the setting which was naturalised. The *questione della lingua*, which is so important and so topical a theme in the *Cortegiano*, is transformed into a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the different Slav languages. There are also significant omissions. Górnicki explains at the start that he has left out Castiglione's discussion of painting and sculpture because, he remarks disarmingly, ''we don't know about them here'' (*u nas nie znaja*). Still more significant is the omission of the ladies, who have a significant if unobtrusive role to play in the original text. They disappear because in Poland, Górnicki explains, ladies are not learned enough to take part in such a discussion. Their disappearance necessitates other changes. The organisation of the third book, in which the characteristics of the *gentildonna da corte* are debated, is of course disrupte by the change, while the misogyny of Castilione's Gasparo Pallavicino becomes superfluous, and is very neatly replaced by the anti-Italian attitudes of Podlodowski. Given what the original author himself preached and practised on the subject of imitation, we may be allowed to conclude that Górnicki was more faithful to his original than the mere translators like Hoby and Clerke precisely because he was less faithful. All the same, the contrast between the two texts does reveal a good deal about the cultural differences between Poland and Italy and about the problems of reception and assimilation.

This effectively original work which claims to be a translation may be usefully juxtaposed to an example of the reverse. Nicolas Faret's *Honête homme* first appeared in 1630.[48] It is a treatise, not a dialogue, on ''the art of pleasing at court''. It makes no reference to Castiglione. However, it soon launches into a discussion of behaviour marked by ''une certaine grace naturelle [...] au dessus des préceptes de l'art''. The author criticises *la négligence affectée* but recommends *nonchalance*. It is not hard to find Faret's source. What is difficult is to reach a balanced verdict on this book. If you read it as an original work, it looks like pure plagiarism. On the other hand, if you regard is as translation, its freedom becomes apparent. Faret suppresses the ''dialogic'' element, thus flattening the text. He draws on later writers on good behavior, such as Della Casa, Guazzo, and Montaigne (on the education of children). He shortens some sections, such as that dealing with physical exercise, while he amplifies others, on poetry, for example, on boasters, on princes, and, above all, on religion. Once again, the contrast between the two texts reveals something of wider differences – between Italy and France, and between the 1520s and the 1630s.

ADAPTATIONS

The freedom of these adaptations has taken us more than half-way to the many works which were inspired by the *Courtier* or imitate it in a more or less precise sense. Too many to discuss here. An American scholar once listed no fewer than 945 treatises on the gentleman published in Europe before 1625, and later discovered 472 more.[49] In a brief essay concerned with general problems of reception, it seems best to discuss a small number of examples in relative detail. There have been many discussions of the importance of the Courtier in the culture of Renaissance England (from Sir Thomas Elyot on), and some of Renaissance France, so it may be more useful to take three examples from the Iberian peninsula, which should indicate in their variety something of the range of possible responses to Castiglione's book.[50]

Luis de Milán is probably best known today for his music for the *vihuela de mano*, but he also deserves to be remembered for a charming dialogue, *El Cortesano*, set in Valencia at the court of the royal duke of Calabria.[51] This dialogue includes a brief discussion of the quality of the perfect courtier by the duke and Don Luis himself, but it is so brief as to be little more than a kind of homage to Castigliones.[52] The rest of the book is taken up with songs and poems, with jests (the court fool takes part, speaking Catalan while the nobles reply in Castillian), and with descriptions of clothes, *impresas* and festivals. The book is a kind of anthology of anecdotes and verses without the central story or argument which gives at least an appearance of unity to Castiglione's work. *El Cortesano* has virtually nothing to do with classical antiquity. It draws on and celebrates late medieval traditions; knights errant, courtly love, tournaments, and so on. What it takes from Castiglione is generally what is most traditional in his book. It exemplifies a 16th-century way of reading his text.

Much closer to the spirit of Castiglione is the ''Court in the Village and Winter Nights'' [*Côrte na Aldeia e Noites de Inverno*] published in 1618 by a nobleman in the circle of the Duke of Bragança Francisco Rodrigues Lôbo (*c.* I573 – 1621).[53] In sixteen short nights the five main characters discuss a variety of socio-literary subjects, starting with the value and the dangers of romances of chivalry, and going on to the etiquette of visiting, correct forms of speech, the art of love, writing letters, composing impresas, responding wittily when the situation requires it, and even the art of dialogue itself. The conception and some of the themes seem to have been inspired by the *Courtier*, but Rodrigues Lôbo is well aware of Castiglione's own classical models and his discussion of grace and urbanity [*graça, urbanidade*] is closer to Cicero and Quintilian and their rhetorical context than it is to Castiglione himself. What he has followed in the *Courtier*, an indeed caught very well, is not so much specific details as the general lightness of touch and in particular the art of presenting a case in the form of an argument between contrasted characters who do impress the reader

as individuals; the Doctor of law, the Fidalgo, the Student, the old man, and so on. The characters are all men: in this and other respects the book is reminiscent of the *Dworzanin polski*. Like Górnicki's book, *Côrte na Aldeia* is still very much admired in its country of origin and only the contingent fact that it is written in a language not very well known in Europe has prevented the author from acquiring the literary reputation he deserves. Castiglione would surely have appreciated it as a creative and a graceful imitation in the manner of his own dealings with Cicero.

To imitate Castiglione creatively was easier if one left the court and wrote about another ideal. The obvious example to take is the school or university. It is not so far from the original, in the Fourth Book of which the objection is made to Ottaviano that he is describing a schoolmaster rather than a courtier. One English humanist, who is known to have admired Castiglione's book seems to have been tempted in this direction. Roger Ascham's *Schoolmaster* does in fact begin as a dialogue in a circle of friends who include William Cecil and Walter Mildmay. It is a pity that the book does not continue in the same manner. One wonders whether the author rejected the dialogue form as too playfull.

All the same, something similar had already been attempted, as Ascham could hardly have known, in Spain. It was probably in the 1550s that the humanist Cristóbal de Villalón wrote a dialogue on education which remained unpublished until relatively recently.[54] *El Scholástico*, as it is called, is concerned with the ideal student and the ideal teacher at the university, so we may all have something to learn from it. It is set at the University of Salamanca (or nearby, in a garden belonging to the duke of Alba) and it takes the form of a discussion between the rector and a group of nine dons. As in the case of the *Courtier*, the discussion is placed, somewhat nostalgically, a generation earlier (and the choise of the date 1528 is perhaps a kind of homage to Castiglione).

The main subject of this dialogue is the university curriculum, including the place of magic and the role of the pagan classics, but towards the end the speakers widen their concerns and move closer to the *Courtier* in their discussions of the virtues and failings of women; the importance of music, painting, and other arts; and the behaviour appropriate in a university, a gravity [*gravedad*] which you will be pleased to hear does not exclude grace or wit or the propensity to fall in love (honourable love, of course). The book ends with the speakers swapping funny stories. *El Scholástico* is not a great work of literature, but, like *El Cortesano*, is does have considerable charm and it was a loss to sixteenth-century readers that it was not published in their day, probably because of the criticism of the people who are "so delicate in their faith" [*tan delicados en la fe*] that they attack Greek and Latin literature as pagan. As the fate of the *Decameron* during the Counter-Reformation demonstrates, the Inquisition was always peculiarly sensitive to reflection on itself.

OTHER RESPONSES

Translations and adaptations are obvious evidence for the reception of a text. Another – heroic – way to study responses to the *Courtier* might be to examine all surviving 16th-century copies in the hope of finding annotations or at least underlinings.[55] The Earl of Surrey, for example, made notes in his copy of the Italian edition of 1541, while Gabriel Harvey inserted some opinions of his own in his copy of the Hoby translation.[56] My sample-survey of the annotated copies of the *Courtier* in Cambridge has produced nothing so interesting. However, an inspection of the rather jejune comments does produce some faint image of the sixteenth-century readers, even if only to suggest that they were more interested in the jokes, or the references to love than they were in *sprezzatura*.

Finally, one can collect favourable and unfavourable references to Castiglione and his book. Quit a number of each have been unearthed from England. To the much-quoted passages from Ascham and Harvey can be added the approving comments by William Patten (1548), Thomas Nashe (1589), Sir George Buck (1615), and others. However, here as elsewhere in this essay it will be necessary to be selective and to compensate for the flattering imitations already discussed, it is better to concentrate on unfavourable responses, his cool rather than his warm reception.

Thomas Wyatt's third satire, for example, addressed to Sir Francis Bryan, has been described as "the weightiest (and hitherto unrecognised) contemporary English critique of the Courtier".[57] At the end of the century another satirist, John Marston, took "the absolute Castilio" as his target on more than one occasion. "Take ceremonious compliment from thee | Alas, I see Castilios beggery".[58] One should perhaps take the attendant Balthasar in *Much Ado* as another crack at the *Courtier* because of the affected way in which he declines to sing: "Note this before my notes | There's not a note of mine that's worth the noting".

It was of course unjust to identify the author of the *Courtier* with the affected behaviour he pilloried; it has already been remarked that Castiglione has a way of exploiting the medium of dialogue to anticipate his critics. However, the point is to understand this reaction, whether just or injust. Castiglione had become a symbol and a scapegoat. Rejecting the *Courtier* was a way of rejecting the court, and Castiglione's book was read with spectacles coloured by a long tradition of anti-court literture.[59] It was perceived, as texts so often are, in stereotyped terms. Indeed, in a way reminicent of More's *Utopia*, the *Courtier* was perceived in terms of a genre which it subverts as well as follows.

The book was also a focus for anti-Italian resentment which was not merely the response of good Protestant to the land of popery but also a backlash against what we might call Italian cultural imperialism, or, more vividly, in

Elizabethan style, the ''aping'' of foreign ways. This was the age of the proverb (whether devised by an Italian or an Englishman I would not care to speculate), *Inglese italianato è diavolo incarnato.*

In France they sometimes declared that ''Il n'est rien pire qu'un françois italiqué'', and there too reactions to the *Courtier* became associated with anti-court traditions, with Protestant rejection of Italy, and with a xenophobia which the regency of Catherine de Medici would do nothing to alleviate.[60] The critique of ''courtisanismes'' by the humanist Calvinist printer Henri Estienne, (whose fierce rejection of *François italianize* may remind modern readers of current attitude to *franglais*) is an obvious exemple of such over-determination.[61]

It would premature to offer any very precise or firm chronological, geographical, or sociological conclusions at this point. From the chronological point of view, however, it may be worth stressing the 1540s (with 8 French and at least 4 Spanish editions) as a peak in the publishing history of the book. On the geographical side, the importance of the book in Spain is attested by imitations as well as editions, let alone the presence of the work in private libraries up to the time of Velazquez. As for the sociology of the readership, the French evidence at least suggest's that the *noblesse de robe* (above all in Paris), were the most avid consumers of the book (whether because a group on the periphery of the nobility needed this kind of instruction, or because the *noblesse de robe* were the main general readers in this period).

Conclusions are most precise and most firm when we turn to the transformation of the text in the process of its reception – stripped bare by its readers, if not completely perverted. Castiglione might well have been amazed had he known that some of his readers would underline the jokes rather than the arguments, or that he would be associated with the very affectation and flattery he made his characters reject. In addition, we have seen his text lose its dialogic quality, its chiaroscuro, its three-dimensionality. We have watched it being flattened in the course of its reception. This is perhaps the inevitable fate of texts. Observations of this kind are unlikely to surprise modern students of ''Reception Theory'' or *Wirkungsgeschichte*. All the same, they are scarcely compatible with the traditional notion of ''tradition''.

NOTES

1. On schemata, A. Warburg, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Leipzig und Berlin, 1932), and E. H. Gombrich, *Art and Ilusion* (London, 1960). On "horizon of expectations", H. Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960: English trans. London, 1975), and H. R. Jauss, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation* (1974; English trans.).
2. D. Hay, *The Italian Renaissance in its Historical Background* (Cambridge, 1961), entitles two chapters "The Reception of the Renaissance in Italy" and "The Reception of the Renaissance in the North".
3. A somewhat mechanical view of the "diffusion" or "spread" of humanism can be found in scholars of the calibre of P. O. Kristeller, "The European Diffusion of Italian Humanism", *Italica* 39 (1962), 1-14, and R. Weiss, *The Spread of Italian Humanism* (London, 1964). On the other hand, F. Simone, *Il rinascimento francese* (Turin, 1961), S. Dresden, "The Profile of the Reception of the Italian Renaissance in France", in *Iter Italicum*, ed. H. Oberman and T. Brady (Leiden, 1975, 119 – 189), and Q. Skinner, *Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1978, esp. vol. 1, part 3), are aware, as Dresden puts it, that "whatever is transmitted changes".
4. R. Porter and M. Teich, eds, *The Enlightenment in National Context* (Cambridge, 1981).
5. The footnotes to this essay are intended to reveal both the extent of the secondary literature on Castiglione and the need (given the contradictions and gaps in this literature) for more work on a number of problems.
6. J. Cartwright, *Baldassare Castiglione* (2 vols., London, 1908), 2, 440, tells the story of two Japanese ambassadors who visited Mantua in 1585 taking the book home with them. J. M. Corominas, *Casiglione y la Araucana* (Madrid, 1980) claims to be "estudio de una influencia" but lacks precision. Alonso Ercilla (*s.* 1533 – 94), author of the epic *Araucana*, spent much of his !ife in Chile.
7. The fortunes of the *Courtier* in Italy have not yet been the object of systematic study. Parts of the story are told by V. Cian, *Archivio storico lombardo* 14 (1888), 661 – 727, G. Mazzacurati, "Percorsi dell'ideologia cortegiana", in *La corte e el cortegiano*, ed. C. Ossola (Rome, 1980), 149 – 72, and G. Patrizi,"Il *Libro del Cortegiano* e la trattatistica sul comportamento", in *Letteratura italiana*, ed. A. Asor Rosa, 3, part 2 (Turin, 1984).
8. However, the book was translated into Dutch in 1662, under the title *De volmaeckte hovelinck*, and translated for the second time into German in 1685, as *Galante Nachgespräche*. In 1773 Dr. Johnson was still praising it as "the best book that ever was written supon good breeding".
9. L. Opdycke, ed., *The Courtier* (New York, 1901), 419 f: cf. note 17 below.
10. On the idea of the "open" work, U. Eco, *The Role of the Reader* (London, 1981).
11. Cf. W. A. Rebhorn, *Courtly Performances* (Detroit, 1978), 186.
12. J. Guidi, "Les différentes rédactions et la fortune du 'Coutisan' ", in *Réécritures*, ed. Guidi (Paris, 1983).
13. On earlier Italian examples, see E. Mayer, *Un opuscolo dedicato a Beatrice d'Aragona* (Rome, 1937) and D. Rhodes, "Whose New Courtier?", in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance*, ed. C. H. Clough (Manchester, 1976), dealing respectively with Diomede Caraffa and (probably) Mario Equicoia.
14. On the history of "grace", S. H. Monk, "A Grace Beyond the Reach of Art", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 5 (1944), 131 – 50; on the ancient Roman concern with manners and self-presentation, E. S. Ramage, *Urbanitas* (Norman, 1973).
15. D. Brewer, "Courtesy and the Gawain Poet", in *Patterns of Love and Courtesy*, ed. J. Lawlor (London, 1966), 54.

16. S. Anglo, "The Courtier" in *The Court of Europe*, ed. A. G. Dickens (London, 1977), with special reference to medieval France. The German contribution to discussions of courtliness is emphasised by C. S. Jaeger *The Origins of Courtliness* (Philadelphia, 1985), Cf. G. Weise "Vom Menschenideal und von den Modewörtern der Gotik und der Renaissance" (1936) on medieval terms such as *gracieux, courtoys, hövesch.*
17. The only attempt at a complete list seems to be Opdycke (1901), 419 – 21, who reached a total of 49. His 17 Spanish editions may include a few ghosts. At any rate his list contrasts with A. Palau y Dulcet, *Manuel del librero Hispano-Americano* (Oxford and Barcelona, 1948–), who mentions only ten, which he has seen personally, and M. Morreale, *Castiglione y Boscán* (Madrid, 1959), who mentions twelve; but R. Klesczewski, *Die französischen Übersetzungen des Cortegiano* (Heidelberg, 1966), adds eight French editions which Opdycke missed. He also missed the Polish translation. The number of English editions is also controversial. The *D.N.B.* claims there were five in Elisabeth's reign, but W. Raleigh, ed., *The Courtier* (London, 1900), lx, could only find four.
18. P. Hogrefe, "Elyot and 'the boke called Cortegiano in Ytalian' ". *Modern Philology* 27 (1929 – 30), 303 – 9.
19. H. M. Adams, *Catalogue of the Books Printed on the Continent of Europe 1501 – 1600 in Cambridge Libraries* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1967), lists 20 Italian, one Latin and two Spanish editions; Trinity have acquired three more Italian copies since. These and other modern acquisitions need to be subtracted but on the other side, there are 17th-century editions and English editions to add. Emmanuel College alone, for example, has three copies of the London 1612 edition of the Latin translation.
20. I should like to thank the Librarian of Trinity for permission to examine the eleven Italian editions of the *Courtier* now in their possession.
21. E. Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1986).
22. M. H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition* (Oxford, 1958).
23. British Library. Add. Mss. 39, 830 [a scrap-book with lists of purchases], ff. 178^{v}, 187^{v}.
24. D. H. Willson, *James I* (London, 1956), 22.
25. J. Brown, *Velazquez: Painter and Courtier* (New Haven, 1986). Brown does not mention this item in the painter's library, recorded in the 1661 inventory as "Cortesano de Castellon en italiano"; F. Rodríguez Marín, *Francisco Pacheco maestro de Velazquez* (Madrid, 1923), 55. The book had been placed on the Spanish Index of 1612: Palau y Dulcet (1948 –), 3, 276. On the other hand, J. Cartwright, *Baldassare Castiglione* (2 vols., London, 1908), 2, 443, claims that it was already on the Spanish Index by 1576.
26. A. H. Schutz, *Vernacular Books in Parisian Private Libraries of the Sixteenth Century* (Chapel Hill, 1955), 43.
27. A. Labarre, *Le livre dans la vie amiénois du 16e siècle* (Paris and Louvain, 1971), 385.
28. Morreale (1959); D. H. Darst, *Juan Boscán* (Boston, 1978).
29. *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*; Klesczewski (1966), 24 f, who notes that the authorship of this translation is problematic [the candidates including a Jean Colin as well as Jacques], and that the work may have been shared .
30. *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française.*
31. *Dictionary of National Biography.*
32. *D.N.B.*
33. *Polski Slownik Biografyczny.*
34. R. Stöttner, "Die erste deutsche Übersetzung von B. Castigliones *Cortegiano*", *Jahrbuch für Münchener Geschichte* 2 (1888), 494 – 9, who confesses his failure to discover further biographical details.
35. Stöttner (1888), J. Ricius (*c.* 1520 – 87), who translated book 1 of *The Courtier* into Latin, was born in Hannover, and educated at Wittenberg before becoming Professor of Poetry at Marburg. He is known to have visited Italy. J. Turler, who also translated *The Courtier* into

Latin, may be the same person as the Hieronymus Turler (*c.* 1550 – 1602) who published a famous essay *De peregrinatione* and translated Machiavelli's *Istorie fiorentine* into Latin.

36. Prefatory epistle to Lord Henry Hastings; London, 1948 ed., 6.
37. A brief general discussion in C. Gabrieli, "La fortuna de 'Il Cortegiano' in Inghilterra", *La Cullura* 16 (1978), 218 – 52. On his problems with the aesthetic terms in the text, L. Gent, *Picture and Poetry 1560 – 1620* ((Leamington Spa, 1981), 15.
38. Klesczewski (1966).
39. Discussion in Klesczewski (1966), 168 f.
40. Castiglione Book 1, chs. 26, 27, 28; Hoby, 46, 47, 48.
41. The *Oxford English Dictionary*'s first reference to "nonchalance" is as late as 1678. However, Hoby probably knew one of the French translations of the *Courtier*. He was working on his translation in Paris and his epistle to Hastings refers to the book's high reputation in France.
42. Cicero, *De oratore*, 23.78; B. Clerke, *De curiali sive aulico* (1571: London, 1593 ed.), 45. However, according to the *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. S. E. Kuhn and J. Reidy, Ann Arbor 1954 –, in progress, *Necgligence* [*sic*] is not used (before 1500) except in moral and spiritual contexts, to mean something like "omission of duty" or "sloth". My thanks to Professor John Stevens for drawing my attention to this point.
43. *Oxford English Dictionary* s.v. "disgrace". The usage closest to Hoby's is Sidney's in his *Defence of Poetry*, [in his *Miscellaneous Prose*, ed. K. Duncan-Jones and J. van Dorsten, Oxford, 1973, 111] where "disgracefulness" seems to mean "inelegance", but this is *c.* 1580, and so carries on from Hoby and may even allude to him.
44. I should like to thank Professor Stephen Orgel for drawing this possibility to my attention.
45. Raleigh (1900), lix.
46. T. Hoby, *A Booke of the Travaile and Life of me Thomas Hoby*, ed. E. Powell (London, 1902: Camden Miscellany, 10).
47. The edition I have used is that edited by R. Pollak (Kraków, 1954). On the man and the book, R. Löwenfeld, *L. Górnicki* (Breslau, 1884), and D. J. Welsh, "Il Cortegiano Polacco", *Italica* 40 (1963), 22 – 6. Löwenfeld's book was in Lord Acton's library, now in Cambridge; its pages remained uncut till 1983.
48. I have used the modern reprint of the 1636 edition (ed. M. Magendie, Paris 1925). There is a useful introduction. Cf. M. Magendie, *La politesse mondaine en France de 1600 à 1660* (Paris, 1925).
49. R. Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the 16th Century* (Urbana, 1929); *id.*, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana, 1956). She found 891 itens on the lady.
50. On England, W. Schrinner, *Castiglione und die englische Renaissance* (Berlin, 1939); E. R. Vincent, "Il cortegiano in Inghilterra", *in Rinascimento europeo e rinascimento veneziano*, ed. V. Branca (Florence, 1964), 97 – 107; D. Javitch, *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England* (Princeton, 1978). On France, E. Bourciez, *Les moeurs polies* (Paris, 1886), C. A. Mayer, "L'honnête homme", *Modern Language Review* 46 (1951), 196 – 217, and P. M. Smith, *The Anti-Courtier Trend in French Renaissence Literature* (Geneva, 1966).
51. L. de Milan, *El Cortesano* (1561: repr. Madrid, 1874). For a good brief account of the author, *c.* 1500 – *c.* 1561, see the new (1980) edition of Grove's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*.
52. 79 f, "Reglas del cortesano". Mastre Zapater's description of the universe on the last day of the dialogue, pp. 362 f, is an echo or at least an equivalent of Bembo's famous speech at the end of the *Courtier*.
53. I used the Lisbon, 1972 edition. On the author, W. J. Schnerr, "Two Courtiers: Castiglione and Rodrigues Lôbo", *Comparative Literature* (1961) 138 – 53.
54. C. de Villalón, *El Scholastico*, ed. R. J. A. Kerr (Madrid, 1967). On the Author (*c.* 1500 – 58), J. J. Kincaid, *Cristóbal de Villalón* (New York, 1973).

55. R. Darnton stresses the importance of this approach in his unpublished paper, ''Steps Towards a History of Reading''.
56. Vincent (1964) cited; C. Ruutz-Rees, ''Some Notes of G. Harvey in Hoby's Translation of Castiglione's Courtier'', *Proceedings of the Modern Languages Association* 25 (1910).
57. D. Starkey, ''The Court: Castiglione's Ideal and Tudor Reality'', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld* 45 (1982) 232 – 9 (at p. 234).
58. J. Marston, *Poems,* ed. A. Davenport (Liverpool, 1961), 68, ''Castilio'' also occurs in Marston's *Antonio and Mellida.* Despite having an Italian mother, Marston apparently read Castiglione in the Hoby translation.
59. On this tradition, C. Uhlig, *Hofkritik im England des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Berlin, 1973).
60. Mayer (1951), on Philibert de Vienne's *Philosophe de Cour*; Smith (1966). On an English misunderstanding of Philibert, D. Javitch, ''The Philosopher of the Court'', *Comparative Literature* 23 (1971) 97 – 124.
61. H. Estienne, *Deux dialogues* (1538: ed. P. Ristelhuber, 2 vols., Paris, 1885).