Daniel Heinsius, Martin Opitz and Vernacular Self-translation*

TOM DENEIRE

1. Renaissance Self-Translation

Since the turn of the century, scholarship in translation studies has witnessed increasing attention for the phenomenon of 'self-translation', i.e. the translation of one's own writings.¹ Such research, however, has mainly focused on modern authors like the famous self-translators Samuel Beckett and Vladimir Nabokov. Considerably less attention has been paid to the occurrence of the phenomenon in Early Modern literature, which is surprising considering the largely bilingual culture of the time.² Moreover, it appears that self-translations, especially those from Latin into the vernacular, played an important and specific role in Renaissance poetics. As Grutman explains in the lemma 'self-translation' in the Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies:

In Renaissance Europe, for instance, it was not uncommon for poets to translate their own Latin musings, as finger exercises. Trained in Latin, they had reached a level of competence unequalled even in their native language, and needed 'to form their poetic diction in the vernacular'.³

---

¹ A much shorter version of this paper was published as Tom Deneire, Heinsius vertaalt Heinsius. De zelfvertaling van zijn 'Ad suavissimam puellam' (1613–1616), in: Filter: Tijdschrift voor Vertalen en Vertaalwetenschap, 18/4 (2011), 30–37. This research was conducted within the context of the NWO-project 'Dynamics of Neo–Latin and the Vernacular. The Role of Self–Representation, Self–Presentation and Imaging in the Field of Cultural Transmission, Exemplified by the German Reception of Dutch Poets in a Bilingual Context'. I am grateful to the project’s members for their useful suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.


Grutman (as in n. 1), p. 257 (quoting Leonard Forster).
This paper deals with one of Heinsius' self-translations, his Dutch version of the poem *Ad suavissimam puellam* (1613), and its link with a German self-translation by Martin Opitz from his *Hipponax ad Asterien* (1618). After presenting the texts of these poems and self-translations, we will go on to analyse Heinsius' and Opitz' (self-)translational strategies, and to interpret the (meta)poetic function of both self-translations. Finally, the paper will discuss the relationship between both texts, which will involve a comparative study of their original Latin versions as well.

2. Text and Translation

A. Heinsius, *Ad suavissimam puellam* (1613) and *Vyi zijn yngan Latijn, in Hippo-necta, Dulcis puella* (1616)

Daniel Heinsius, professor of Greek at Leiden University and a prolific poet in both Latin and Greek, first published his poem *Ad suavissimam puellam* as part of a larger section, entitled *Hipponax*, in his 1613 *Poemata* collection, which was dedicated separately to Reinerus Bontius (1576–1623), professor of medicine at Leiden University. When Heinsius’ Nederduytsche Poemata were published in 1616, his own translation of this poem was added to the collection, as is clear from the title, *Vyi zijn yngan Latijn, in Hippo-necta, Dulcis puella* (‘From his own Latin, in *Hipponax*, Dulcis puella (…)’), which refers not only to the specific section of Heinsius’ Latin *Poemata*, but also to the opening words of the poem.

*Ad suavissimam puellam*

*Dulcis puella, mentis ultimus nostrae
Et serus arbor, quo calibimus semper,
Donec suave flammæae inhar lauis
Phoebique lautos intuebimur nullus:*

To the prettiest girl

Sweet girl, last and late fire of our mind, by which we will forever burn, as long as we will gaze upon the splendour of


5 Adrius Hofferus, Nederduytsche Poemata (Amsterdam: Broer Jans., 1635). Sometimes such translations are rather strict, at other times they are really better characterized as imitations or variations in another language. For examples, see ibid., pp. 236–238, pp. 243–244, p. 270, pp. 353–355, p. 370 and pp. 372 sqq.


9 Text from Daniëls Heinsii poemaet emendata locis infinitis et aucta, Editio quarta (Leiden: J. Oterus–J. Maire [1613], 183–224 (Hipponax), p. 220 and Daniëls Heinsius Nederduytscbe Poemata, by een vergaderd en uitgegeven door Pleutors sserveriuser (Amsterdam: Willem Janssen, 1616), pp. 43–44. The English translations, which have deliberately been kept quite verbum e verbo, are my own.

10 For recent literature on Daniel Heinsius, see e.g. Lefèvre–Schäfer (as in n. 7).
flaming light / and Apollo’s happy features: / sweet girl, now that the Fates are willing / we send to you these final words. / Not so that they could touch a mind rigid like an unmoving rock and / dafter than the battling winds / and the raging Adriatic Sea; / but so that you — you haughty, cruel, stubborn, harsh girl — / may now enjoy this final triumph. / Goodbye cruel girl. Henceforth we will roam / over all the lands, exiles both of your face / and of this homeland: and we will be judged by future generations / an inexorable accusation of such / ferocity and arrogance. / Yet you despise with brutal ears the prayers / I launch and pour out into the furious winds? / Whatever destiny oppresses our wishes / and has so far frustrated my useless mind, / whether it is the throng of idle cocxombs / — arrogant, unlearned, circus folk, / hostile to the Muses — or your charming form / the mother of your wildness, and your large power of mind, / or the accompanying throng of shameless maidens, / who always tingling and chattering, / dream of nothing but swords and crests covered with long hair / and of glorious soldiers wearing coats of mail; / virtue cannot be repelled. Higher and bigger than whatever fortune, she only is never broken / and does not halt before the tribunal of girls; / high above the axes and fasces of those in charge. / Depending on and secured by this sole dowry, / wherever Fortune, wherever the winds may bring us / let me be shipwrecked, let me be naked and without anything: / I will woo Kings and the servants of Kings.

Vyt zijn eigen Latiijn, in Hippocratae, Dulcis Puella, geschreven een Thaumantis bereyt sijnde om met den gesant Bzvanval naer Vranckrijk to reysen.

Soet meyské, laatste vier, dat my alhjij sl prangen Int diepste van my hert, en in de sineé hangen, Soo lang als ik eenschou dat liefdiek gesicht Van Phoebi goudé hoof, de vader van het licht, Soet meysken wilt dit woort, alts immers soo moet wesen, Geschreven voor het laest, van uwen dienaer lesen, Niet dat ik hopen wil dijn sieren gemoet Veel harder als een klep, int midden van de vloet Van d’ongehaende zee, bevochten van den regen Gegeeselt van den windt, daer mede te bewegen, Maer op dat gely groot voors Tears eerst ende weert, Noch eens u herte mooch verheugen in myn leet. Vaert wel onmenschick dier, ick sal gaen ballinck wesen Bey van ons vaderlandt en van u soete wesen. Vaert nu wel voor het lest. het vonnis dat ghy geeft Sal worden overleyt, als ghy niet meer en leeft. VVhy breken door den tijden, en senden naer ons leven Ons boden over al, die ghy geuygyns geven VVie dat wy sijn geweest: ick sweere by mijn pijn, Dat ick u naer mijn doort een groote vleck sal sijn. Doch ghy slaet in de windt dees woorden ende reden Met een gesloten oor, en spot met mijn gebeden. Hoort maer eens aen dit woort. wat dat het oock mach sijn, Dat mijn hoochoemeljck hert soo lang’ houden in de pijen, Het sy de hoofsch[e] locht, oft het geduiuht praeten Van die dy volgen naer, recht slippers van de straeten, Bequaern om niet te doen: een volck dat ongeleert De wissheyt niet en kent, geleerthet niet en eert. Die u met ydelheyt het moedich hert ontslenten,

From his own Latin, in Hippocratae, Dulcis Puella, written to Thaumantis ready to travel to France with the ambassador Bzvanval.

Sweet girl, last fire, which will always press me / deep in my heart and will stay in my mind, / as long as I gaze upon the charming face / of Apollo’s golden head, the father of light, / sweet girl, please read this word, if this is how it has to be, / written for the last time by your servant, / not that I want to hope to move your iron mind / much harder than a cliff, in the middle of the flood / of the hazardous sea, battled by the rain, / whipped by the wind, / but so that you — full of pride, haughty and cruel — / might again rejoice in my pain. / Farewell inhuman animal, I will go in exile / from our fatherland and from your sweet face. / Farewell now, for the last time. The verdict that you pass / shall be pondered, when you are not alive anymore. / We break through time and after our lives send / our messengers everywhere, who will give good testimony / that we were alive. I swear by my pain,
En niet dat roeck en windt, en groote staeten speken: De deucht wort niet vedelyght, czy staet als eenen wandt Diep in der derdt gegrondt, altijdz in eene standt, Vast, steerk en onbeweekte: en sonder aen te hooren Het oordeel van het volck, of sich daer in te stooren, Blijft altijdz dat Zy is, en let niet wat men secht, En is in niemandts macht, is boven vrouwen recht. Met desen pandt sal iech, waer my de winden drijven, En mijn fortuyne leyt, altijdz te vreeden blijven. En of my schoon de zee smijt ieweers aan een endt Van eene dorren kant, daer iech ben onbekent, Schipbreuchich, sonder vriente, en sonder gelt of panden, Gelijk het die wel gaat die doot in vreemde landen, Soo saelt ghy noch verstaen, dat die ghy doet dit spijt, Van Prinsen wordt gekent, van Koningen geveijt.

/ that I will be a great stain for you after my death. / But you throw these words and reason to the winds / with a closed ear, and mock my prayers. / But listen to this word, whatever it may be, / that holds my proud heart so long in pain. / Whether it be the courtly air or the continuous chatter / of those who follow, those who truly idle on the streets11, / not fit for anything: an unlearned people that / does not know wisdom nor honour learnedness. / Those who ignite your courageous heart with vanity / and speak nothing but smoke and wind and biggest: / virtue is not diminished. She stands like a wall / deeply rooted in the earth, always in one stance, / resolve, strong and unmoved: without hearing / the judgement of the people, or being bothered by it, / she always stays what she is, and pays no attention to what is said, / and is in no one’s power and above the law of women. / With this pledge I will, whenever the winds blow me, / and my fortune guides me, always be happy. / And whether already the sea throws me somewhere at an end / of a dry patch of land that I do not know, / shipwrecked, without friends, and without money or pawns, / like a person who wanders in foreign lands, / you will come to realise that he unto whom you do this regret, / is respected by Princes and courted by Kings.

12 Latin text from Hippocrates. The original is a translation of 1816. The text was printed in Görlitz in 1816, which already contained six German poems. In 1624 he would publish his own translation of a part of this Latin poem, under the title Aufl meinem Lateinischen an die Asterien, in his anthology of German poetry called Deutsches Poemata, which imitates Heinsius’ Nederduytse Poemata. One year later, a revised version of the poem would appear in Opitz’ Acht Bücher Deutscher Poemata (and all subsequent editions) under the title Aus des Auftorn Hippocrates an Asterien.16

Hippocrates. The original is a translation of 1816. The text was printed in Görlitz in 1816, which already contained six German poems. In 1624 he would publish his own translation of a part of this Latin poem, under the title Aufl meinem Lateinischen an die Asterien, in his anthology of German poetry called Deutsches Poemata, which imitates Heinsius’ Nederduytse Poemata. One year later, a revised version of the poem would appear in Opitz’ Acht Bücher Deutscher Poemata (and all subsequent editions) under the title Aus des Auftorn Hippocrates an Asterien.16


11 Cf. Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (online version 2007), s.v. ‘straatslijper’.
Opinione clara fac oeillonum
Transanna foedalitate absque virtute est;
Os, intumorem ducis sensuum ilium,
Lacivia unalis; abius, opitatae
Incenditatis illa pyrois, obsoveni
Cloaca foeda coeni, abyssus infandae
Libidinis specusque; non papillarum,
Rivus sorosatianum gemellarum,
Scatebro Cirex poculi, sinus, vtae
Portus severus, centrum amoris et timor,
Pruniginis palaestra, fossa peccati,
Castrense velationis impurae.
At quando mens decoras corporis inuncta est
Non indecero pulcher in domo pulchra
Hospes morator.

From my Latin to Asterie

What is your nice body, you wicked blind youth; when it is not endowed with the grace of discipline and virtue? The bright eyes, a window of evil lust, the body is a chest, filled with muck and junk. The mouth, a door from which all slander comes, the tender well of the breasts, a source of shame and sin: the port of joy, the shoot, a grave of voluptuousness and a battle field where honour has remained in

Aus des Auctorn Hipponacae an Asterien (1625)
Was ist dein schöner Leib, du schnöde blinde Jugend,
Gebricht es ihm am Zier der guten Zucht und Tugend?
Die hellen Augen sind ein fenster böser Lust,
Der Leib ist eine Kist', erfüllt durch Koh und Wust,
Der Mund ist ein Thor, daraus sich Schand' und Laster finden,
Der zarten Brust ein Brunn en der süßen Sünden.

3. (Self-)Translational Strategy
A. Heinsius

Dulcis puella, mentis ultimus nostrae
Et seris arhor, quo calebimus semper

Soet meyské, laetste vier, dat my
altjít sal prangen / Int diepste van
mijn hert, en in de sinné hangen

The first thing that strikes one in the opening verses of Heinsius’ self-translation is the fact that the Latin mentis nostrae (of our mind) has been replaced by the Dutch int diepste van mijn hert (in the deepest part of my heart); in other words that the Latin first person plural has been turned into a Dutch first person singular, which is a general trend in Heinsius’ self-translation (although not exclusively, cf. infra). This gives the poem a more personal feel, even if the first person plural is obviously quite common in Latin poetry. However, the first person singular is also regularly found and especially in erotic lyric poetry (Catullus, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus...),
which makes Heinsius' choice for the first person plural in the Latin version more significant and lends the poem a somewhat rhetorical air. Furthermore, the translated version contains the phrase 'en in de sinne hangen' ('will stay in the mind'), which is more or less an echo of the Latin mentis but mainly added to create the rhyming effect. This points at a second general difference between the poetics of both poems: the Latin metric verse (choliambus) has been turned into a rhyming, rhythmic verse (Alexandrine), although both run rather similarly as both have an iambic base. Moreover, 'sal prangen' ('will press/squeeze') is less strong and uses a different metaphor than the Latin calebitur (we will burn/be hot). Finally, semper ('always') has a more emphatic position at the end of the Latin verse than 'altijd' ('always'), which is found in a less prominent position in the Dutch Alexandrine.

Donec suave flavmeae inubur lucis
Phoeboque laetus intuebur vulnus:
Soo lang als ick aenschou dat liefelick
gesicht / Van Phoebi goudé hooft, de
vader van het lich,

The explicit 'ick' ('I') of the Dutch version which is easily contrasted with the implicit first person plural in the Latin intuebur ('we will gaze') continues the aforementioned tendency of a stylistically more personal expression. The biggest difference between the original and the translation here, is found in rendering the Latin flavmeae inuobar lucis Phoeboque laetus (... vulnis) ('the rays of flaming light and Apollo's happy face') as 'het liefelick gesicht / Van Phoebi goudé hooft' ('the charming face / of Apollo's golden head'), by which the Dutch version appears to be a condensation of the Latin. However, since the Dutch phrase contains some additional explanation ('de vader van het licht' — 'the father of the light'), this extra material does somewhat compensate for the loss of the Latin flavmeae inuobar lucis ('rays of flaming light'). Finally, the Latin version also seems to echo Seneca's Phaedra — a figure quite fitting in the context of this erotic invective (cf. infra) —, which is lost in the Dutch translation.20 Nevertheless, unlike other cases where elements of classical mythology disappear in the translation (cf. infra), the image of Apollo or Phoebus has been retained here.

Puella dulcis, cum volentibus Parcis
Nunc hanc supremam mittimus tibi vocem.

Sooz meysken wilt dir
woort, alz immers soo
moet wesen, / Geschreven
voor het laatst, van uwen
dienaer lesen

While the Latin poem produces a kind of chaotic reddito (/xy...xy/) at this point, with Dulcis puella in the first verse and Puella dulcis here, the Dutch version (less flexible as to word—order) has a perfect anaphora of 'Soo zte myskelyn' ('Sweet girl'). Moreover, the mythological element of cum volentibus Parcis ('with willing Fates') has been replaced by the neutral 'als immers soo moet wesen' ('if it has to be so'), which renders the expression rather plain. Still, we do see that by translating mittimus tibi ('we send you') as 'Soo zte myskelyn...lesen' ('Sweet girl please...read') the Dutch version is more committing and more direct through the use of the imperative mood versus the indicative Latin version ('read instead of we send').

Non quo rigentem cautis instar immotae,
Magisque surdam praebantibus venitis
Et fluctuante tangat Hadria mentem

Niet dat ick hopen wil dijn
yseren gemoet / Veel harder
als een klip, int midden van de
vloet / Van d'ongebeaende zee,
bevosten van den regen, / Gegeesselt van den windt, daer
mede te bewegen

In this passage, the first thing that catches the eye is the fact that the Dutch version is a full verse longer than the Latin. This is mainly due to the concision possible in Latin through the use of the ablativus absolutus (praebantibus venitis and fluctuante (... Hadria)), but also to the introduction of several additional elements. Neither 'int midden van de vloet' ('in the middle of the flood') nor 'bevosten van den regen' ('bombarded by the rain') are present or explicit in the Latin. Moreover, the element of 'hope' is also added in the Dutch version, resulting in a more explicitly personal expression ('Niet dat ick hopen wil' — 'Not that I want to hope') than the Latin non quo tangat (sc. voc) ('not so that my voice would touch'). We also see that Heinsius cannot preserve the long hyperbaton rigentem (...) surdam (...) mentem, which brackets the whole Latin passage and therefore intensifies the feeling of frustration and anguish, although the distance between the Dutch object 'dijn yseren gemoet' ('your iron mind') and verb group 'daer mede te bewegen' ('to move by that') has a somewhat similar effect. Moreover, the Dutch word choice is again more direct that the Latin: instead of rigentem ('being hard') Heinsius uses 'yseren' ('iron'), and instead of cautis instar immotae ('like an unmoving rock') he chooses the stronger simile 'veel harder als een klip' ('much harder than a cliff'). Finally, the whole Latin passage is quite reminiscent of classical or

20 Cf. et te, coruscum luiscs aestebius inubar (Sen., Phaedr., 889) and tuaque Phoebus vulnis aut Phoebi mei (Sen., Phaedr., 654). Cp. non ille vulnis flammeum intendens inuar (Sen., Trs., 448).
Neo–Latin poetic topoi of erotic poetry, as we find them in Ovid or Joachim Du Bellay for instance. In the Dutch version such echoes have been lost.

Sed ut superba, saevus, pertinax, dura
Nunc hoc triumpho perfuraris extremo.

Maer op dat ghy vol trots, hoo
veerdich ende wreet, / Noch eens u herte moocht verheugen
in mijn leet.

In this sentence, we notice that four Latin adjectives *superba, saevus, pertinax, dura* (haughty, cruel, stubborn, harsh!) have been replaced by only three Dutch, probably because of the extra syllables produced by the Dutch *ende* (and), which was needed because asynelta of the kind present in the Latin poem are rather unusual in Dutch. Moreover, we see that the phrase *verheugen in mijn leet* (take pleasure in my pain) is a more explicit and a harsher reproach than *hoc triumpho perfuraris extremo* (that you may enjoy this final triumph). Again, this amounts to a stronger evocation of the disappointed lover’s personal feelings of anguish than in Latin.

Vale cruenta. nos vagabimur post bae
terras per omnes, oculus tui vultus,
Simulque patriae poiterisque venturis
Non elenendum indicabimus tanta
Ferocitatis et superbiae crimine.

Vaert wel onmenschlik dier, ick
sal gaen ballinck wesen / Bey van
ons vaderlandt en van u soete we-
sen. / Vaert nu wel voor het lent.
het vonnis dat ghy geef / Sal
worden overleyt, als ghy niet meer
en leeft. / VVy breken door den
tijd, en senden naer ons leven / Ons
boden over al, die goë
getuygnis geven / VVie dat wy
sijn geweest. ick sweere by mij
pijn, / Dat ick u naer mijn doot
een groote vleck sal sijn.

The same general tendency is continued in this passage where the girl goes from *cruenta* (bloody/cruel) to an *onnemenschlik dier* (inhuman animal). Again we notice the contrast in the person (*nos* or *we* versus *iék* or *I*), but on the other hand Heinsius does introduce the first forms of *wij* (we) and *ons* (*us*) in this passage by which, however, he specifically alludes to himself and the *dulcis puella* together. Heinsius also lets go of the Latin *enjambment oculae tui vultus / simulque patriae (exiles of your face / and this homeland)* and he switches the order of the expression because of the rhyme, resulting in *bey van ons vaderlandt en van u soete wesen* (from our fatherland and from your sweet face). This creates a slightly more forgiving air in the Dutch poem and a similar effect is obtained by the omission of the Latin *terras per omnes* (over all the lands). Another omission is found in the translation of *ferocitas et superbiae crimine* (the accusation of ferocity and arrogance) which loses the concrete reproaches of *ferocitas and superbia* in the Dutch *vonnis* (*the verdict*) and the final two lines, which also translate the idea of *ferocitas ... crimine*. However, Heinsius makes up for these losses by adding the expression *Vaert nu wel voor het leest* and the verse *Sal worden overleyt ... leeft*, which is more elaborate and explicit than the Latin which was rather lapidary. The same happens in the passage *en senden ... mijn pijn* which basically replaces one Latin word, *vagabimur* (*I will roam)*.

At tu proterva spernis auro quas iacto,
Procursa venitis impotenti Bus fundo?

Doch ghy salet in de windt dees
woorden ende reden / Met een
gesloten oor, en spot met mij
gebeden.

This sentence most importantly figures the first instance of the Latin first person singular, obviously because this passage contains the most personal expression of the rejected lover. Next, we also notice that the Dutch translation shortens the Latin metaphorical phrase *spernis (...)* *quaes iacto / proccursa venitis impotenti Bus fundo* (you spurn the prayers that I launch and pour out into the furious winds) into *ghy salet in de windt*. The place gained is used to double the Latin *preces* (*prayers*) into the Dutch *woorden ende reden* (*words and reason*) and to introduce the element of *spot* (*you mock*). Moreover, the Latin *proterva ... auro* (*with a brutal ear*) has been replaced by the even more definitive *met een gesloten oor* (*with a closed ear*). Finally, through the image of throwing one’s prayer for love into the wind, the Latin Heinsius nicely recalled the Catullan *vena* that had been resounding throughout the poem since *Vale cruenta*, an effect which he cannot keep in the Dutch version.22

Quodsumque vota sidus oppressit nostra,
Et hactenus frustratur iritatis mentem,
Sens tumultuosum sicut aegyptium turbato,
Fastidiosa, illittera, desirvis,

Hoort maer eens aen dit woort.
wat dat het oock mach sijn, / Dat
mijn hoochoemdeich hert
soo lang' houdt in de pijn, / Het

---

21 Verg., *Aen.*, 6, 469–471: *illa sole forcis oculis aurea tenebat / nos magis imposito vultum terrena
monstrat / quam si dura silex aut ster Marpeisa cautes Orv. / met, 13, 801–804: *his immobilitat spehmis,
iamitor Orni, / Cui sedent tortis anguibus Eumenides, / Flictibus Ionios, et littore surdior omni / Averus nostras despectis usque preces.*

22 Cf. Cat. 8, 12: *Vale puella* and 30, 9–10: *idem nunc retrahis te ea tua dicta omnia factaque / ventus
irritat ferro ac nebulas aeras inixis 70, 3–4: red mulier capisco quod dicit amans, / in vento et rapida
scribere aperit aqua.*
Infesta Muses, ven ferociae mater
Formae venustas, ingenique vis larga,
Sive improbarnun virginitum cures turbas,
Quae timentes et loguae semper
Nil praeter ennis cum comatus cistas,
Et gloriros sonnant cataphractos;
Virtus repellit vestit. altior quo quis
Maiorque casu, sola frangitur nunquam,
Nec ad tribunal sittit puellare;
Supra secures imperantium et fasces.

This passage has obviously undergone the most changes in the translation process. In the first part, we notice many omissions: the ten Latin verses Quodcumque (...) cataphractos have been replaced by only eight Dutch verses, which lack much of the expressive Latin verbiage. Guépin has judged that in this way 'the most beautiful part has been left out', as phrases like ferociae mater / formae venustas or the plasticity of words like cataphractos have been replaced by more abstract expressions such as 'niet dan rooik en windt, en groote staeten' ('nothing but smoke and fire and big gestic')\(^\text{22}\). In the next part, however, the four verses Virtus repellit (...) fasces have been translated slightly more explicitly in six verses of Dutch (De deucht ... recht), which also use the more direct imagery 'zy staet als eenen wandt' ('she stands like a wall') for the rather abstract altior quo quis maiorque casu ('higher and bigger than whichever fortune'). In the second part of the passage, matters have again been reversed, as the Latin has the more expressive and direct imagery with ad tribunal (...) puellare (before the tribunal of girls') and secures imperantium et fasces ('the axes and fasces of those in charge'), whereas the Dutch version uses more general expressions like 'het oordeel van het volck' ('the judgment of the people') and 'is in nie-


mandts macht, is boven vrouwen recht' (is in no one's power, above the law of women). Besides, the Dutch is also more politically correct, so to speak, leaving out the impressionability of women by men in uniform and the bad influence of their girlfriends.\(^{24}\) In this way, it is clear that the translation has above all lost the classical and Roman air that the original evoked with references to elements like the Muses, cataphracti or fasces, and with learned or rare Latin vocabulary like trussus, desultrix, tinnire, loguculus or comare. Finally, this also means that the winks to classical epic literature contained in Heinsius's comites cristae (cf. Verg., Aen., 3, 468; Sil., Pun., 4, 551–516; Stat., Theb., 9, 699) or to the theme of Plautus's Miles glorus is lost in the Dutch translation.

Hac fretus et munitis unica dote,
Quocunque nos Fortuna, quo feren venti,
Sim naufragus, sim nudus omnium atque expers
Reges procuror, et domesticos regum.

\(^{24}\) I owe this remark to Dr Harm-Jan van Dam.
tone, which contains a final element of the erotic language of the poem (Dutch: gevrijt' and Latin procabob) and insists on the theme of the slighted lover who will have his revenge, as known from classical poetry (Catullus, Horace, ...).

B. Opitz

*Persona nuda est aureae venustatis,*

*Quaecid venustum furtur insci vulgi*  

*Opinione:*

Was ist dein schöner Leib, du schönste blinde Jugend, / Wann er nist ist begabt mit Zier der Zucht und Jugend?

The very first verses of Opitz' poem already suggest a general tendency of his self-translation. Whereas his Latin version is quite baroque or convoluted both in style and argumentation, the German translation is much more straightforward both regarding language and structure. Not only does Opitz turn his rather obscure and elliptic syntax *Persona ... clara* ([If] your inner being is ... ([then])*) into a much clearer German question, this question also already contains the point of the argument: physical beauty and moral virtue have to go hand in hand. In the Latin poem we needed to wait until the following lines to get to that, since *Persona nuda est aureae venustatis* ([If] the inner being is void of golden charm) is rather more hermetic than the German 'Wann er nist ist begabt mit Zier der Zucht und Jugend' ([when] it is not endowed with the grace of discipline and virtue). Moreover, whereas the Latin had some word-play in the alliterating sequence *venustitas ... venustum ... vulgi,* the German poem has much more and, as Althaus has pointed out, with a clear harmonic compositional effect, connecting schöner und schöne, Zier und Zucht, and Jugend und Tugend. In this way, these radical interventions account for the fact that the German version differs rather strongly from the Latin original here, which will be much less the case in the following verses.

(... clara fac occellorum  
*Transenna foedistatis absque virtute est;  
Os, intumorum dulce venuum lilitus;  
Lascivias canalis; alius, opistae  
Feudantistatis illa pycis, obscoeni*  

Die hellen Augelein, ein fenster böser Lust, / Der Leib ist eine Kist, erfüllt mit Koth und Wust. / Der Mund, ein Thor, daraus sich alle Laster finden, / Der zarten Brüste quell, ein Bronn der Schand vnd Sünden. / Der Freud port, die schoß, ein Grab der Vipeligkeit / Vnd Waldstatt da die Ehr ist blieben in dem Streit.

In the second part of his poem, Opitz follows the Latin more closely although he severely abridges the original and reverses the order of the part on the mouth and the belly as the scheme below shows. In the abridgement we notice that, similarly to Heinsius' poem, especially the references to the ancient world have been discarded (Cires, palaestra), as has the learned or expressive Latin vocabulary (transenna, pycis, scalebra, prurigo). Yet the main difference between the Latin and the German version is that the positive interpretation of the different body parts (underscored in the scheme below) have been left out from the German version, or at least in the vast majority of cases.

1) clara fac occellorum / *Transenna foedistatis absque virtute est;*  
2) Os, intumorum dulce venuum lilitus, / Lascivias canalis;  
3) alius, opistae / *Feudantistatis illa pycis, obscoeni* / Cloaca foedae coeni, abyssus infandae  
4) fontis papillarum, / Rius sororantium gemellorum, / Scalebra Cires poci,  
5) sinus, vitae / *Portus severae, centrum amoris et limes,* / Pruriginis palaestra, fossa peccati, / Castrunque vetitationis impurae.

1) Die hellen Augelein, ein fenster böser Lust,  
2) Der Leib ist eine Kist, erfüllt mit Koth und Wust.  
3) Der Mund, ein Thor, daraus sich alle Laster finden,  
4) Der zarten Brüste quell, ein Bronn der Schand vnd Sünden.  
5) Der Freud port, die schoß, ein Grab der Vipeligkeit  
Vnd Waldstatt da die Ehr ist blieben in dem Streit.

This has a double effect. On the one hand, it means that in the German version the anti-Petrarchism of the passage (the horrors of physical beauty with-

---

25 Paul. ex Fest. p. 224 Müll: *proeoe, povere, unde procace vorices ab asidue poscendo, et procace procace in matronam* (I owe this remark to Dr Harm–Jan van Dam).


27 Althaus (as in n. 17), p. 66.

28 Cp. obscoeni / Cloaca foedae coeni, abyssus infandae / Libidinis specusque (a dirty sewer of obscene / mad, an abyss and cave of unspeakable / lust!) versus — eine Kist, erfüllt mit Koth und Wust (a chest, filled by muck and junk!).

29 He keeps it in 'Die hellen Augelein' (clara fac occellorum) and 'Der Freud port, die schoß' (sinus, vitae / portus severae).
out moral virtue) is even more apparent than in the Latin version.30 On the other hand, it is clear that the German passage also loses much of Opitz’ original poetic tone, since Opitz had obviously tried his best to use original figurative language like transenna foedilitatis, lascivia canalis or foecunditatis pyxis that is not attested in classical literature. Similarly, the only possible winks to classical literature that does surface — the use of the very rare verb sororinare in connection with papilae (cf. Plaut. Fragm. ap. Fest. p. 297 Müll.) — is also lost in the German translation.

At quand a mens deora corpori inuncta est
Non indecoro, pulcher in domo pulchra
Hospes moratur.

Wo aber Tugend sich bie
Zierlichkeit erzieget, / Ist wie
wenn ein Blum durchs Wasser
sich erueget: / Da stetet alles
wol, da sieht es lustig auß, / Da
ist ein schöner Wirt, da ist ein
schönes Haus.

The translation of the final part mainly differs from the original through the introduction of an extra element of imagery: Ist wie wenn ein Blum durchs Wasser sich erüget (it is like when a flower rises up through the water). Again, we also notice a much more parallel and ‘classic’ syntax, so to say, when Opitz turns the concision of the Latin pohptetion and hyperbaton in pulcher in domo pulchra / Hospes moratur (a beautiful host lives / in a beautiful house) into a balancing anaphora in ‘Da ist ein schöner Wirt, da ist ein schönes Haus’ (there is a beautiful host, there is a beautiful house).31 Finally, the possible wink to Friedrich Taubmann’s poetry, already pointed out by Caspar Barthius, which in itself is a variant on Juvenal’s mens sana in corpore sano, is lost in the German version.32

4. (Meta-) Poetic Function: Heinsius
The main scholar who has engaged with Heinsius’ self-translation, is Jan Pieter Guépin, who on two separate occasions — in 1994 and 200233 — advanced the same basic opinion: Heinsius’ translation is, to say the least, only a faint shadow of the original. In 1994 he would proclaim that, ‘His own translation is dated and not worth anything’, in 2002 he succinctly called it ‘dated’.34 In both studies (but most clearly in 1994) Guépin saw the main reason for this lack of quality in Heinsius’ experimental use of the Dutch Alexandrine verse as an alternative for the Latin choliambus, which in his view is something the Dutch language is not equipped for.35 These metrical constraints are therefore responsible, according to Guépin, for ‘the many inversions and patchwork phrases that have been introduced purely metri causa, or the wrought expressions, like „dit spijt“ (...)’ and ‘the construction in 25 „hetzij [door]“, which is difficult to follow’.36 In this way, Guépin’s general assessment of the poem is quite negative. To his feeling the best has been left out (cf. supra) in the middle of the Dutch poem and there is little good to say about the other passages either. Concluding, Guépin finds that ‘Heinsius was not able to preserve the concision of his tense rage in the Dutch version’.37

In my opinion, this negative judgement of the poetic merits of Heinsius’ translation misses the mark on two levels. First of all, Guépin’s appreciation is rather debatable. It is true that the Dutch version is perhaps more neutral at certain points, but more often the word choice and syntax are not only more explicit, but also more direct and personal in the Dutch version. True, Heinsius could not keep the Latin bruits, but at the same time eminent Heinsius scholar Becker–Cantarino has pointed out that the Dutch poem ends in the pointed fashion of an epigram: ‘Das holländische Gedicht wirkt durch persönliche Wendungen (...) emotioneller und gegenständlicher; Heinsius’ eigene Position ist viel klarer herausgestellt, das Ende epigrammatisch zuge-spitzen.’38 Others come to the same positive appraisal as Becker–Cantarino and

30 On the Latin, see Opitz (as in n. 12), p. 352. I owe this remark to Prof. Dr Guillaume van Gemert.
31 Janis Little Gellinek, Die weltliche Lyrik des Martin Opitz (Bern 1973), pp. 29–43 suggests that this rhetorical technique in Opitz was influenced by his reading of Dutch poetry. I owe this remark to Dr. Beate Hintzten.
32 Cf. Seidel (as in n. 12), pp. 182–183, n. 38 and p. 184, referring to Taubmann’s Melodacia sine Epulum Musaeum (1597) which has the verse Inque domo pulchra pulchrior hospes habet. I am not convinced by the other parallel Seidel sees in this passage, viz. with Apul., Apol., 24: animo hominis e contrario in hospitum corporis immigrati (ibid., p. 184). Perhaps it is no coincidence that it was subsequently left out by Opitz (as in n. 12), p. 357.
33 Guépin (as in n. 34), 130–142 and Id. (as in n. 24), pp. 293–297.
34 Guépin (as in n. 34), p. 138 (‘Zijn eigen vertaling is verouderd en deugt in geen enkel opzicht’) and Id. (as in n. 24), p. 291.
35 Guépin (as in n. 34), p. 130. ‘De vertaling is zoveel slechter dan het origineel, omdat Heinsius verstrik was geraakt in een pogen om in het Nederlands een maat te introduceren, die op die van de antieke jambe leek, dus daar iets te doen dat in het Latijn kan, maar in het Nederlands niet’.
36 Guépin (as in n. 34), p. 138.
37 Guépin (as in n. 24), p. 291.
38 Guépin (as in n. 34), p. 138 and Id. (as in n. 24), p. 291: ‘Heinsius was niet in staat het kortaffe van zijn geladen toorn in het Nederlands weer te geven’.
39 Heinsius (as in n. 7), p. 52.
have even called the translation better than the original. In 1994 Guépin countered that opinion by questioning Becker–Cantamaro’s philological talents — a somewhat irrelevant issue, at least in this respect, which he left out of his 2002 version.

A second, more important point is that the question of whether Heinsius’ translation is as good, better or worse than the original is in fact beside the point. Such considerations are always subjective and often lead to contradictory conclusions. For instance, it seems quite wanton for Guépin to take fault with Heinsius’ patchwork phrases which originated because he needed to fill out his metre, while he does not object to Du Bellay’s use of the same technique, as according to Guépin it does not stand out among the general songiness of his poetry. All in all, such remarks tell us little about the process of translation. So instead of judging the differences between both poems, it is much more interesting to try and explain them functionally.

In order to do so, we need to take into account not only the text but also the context of the translatory process. As already mentioned, Heinsius’ Latin poem Ad suavisissam puellam is part of a bigger section, called Hippomæx, which bears a separate dedication. This points at the independent status of this section of poetry, which through its title also makes clear its general character. By referring to the 6th-century Greek poet Hippomæx, whose name became synonymous with his preferred metre, the choliamb or saecα, and his witty, but razor–sharp tone, it is clear that the verses in Hippomæx most likely be choliamb in metre and invective in tone. And indeed, the former is true for all seven poems in Hippomæx, while the latter does not fit with the last two poems, which are laudationes.

41 Guépin (as in n. 34), p. 139.
42 Ibid., p. 138.
44 For more information, see Seidel (as in n. 12), pp. 191–193.
45 One could perhaps also question the ‘invectiveness’ of poems 3 and 5 which employ the more neutral ad in the title instead of the more adversative in. In any case, we can state that the longer poem 3, which is often called Neoplatonic in theme by modern critics, is considerably more than just an invective. However, as analysed above, poem 5 is fundamentally invective, especially from the middle part onwards (Sed ut superba, sana, pertinax, dura / Nunc loc triumpho perfetnam extrema. / Vale cruenta).

In this way, our poem is set in a markedly invective context, a tone that is definitely mirrored in the poem’s contents. However, when we look at the self–translation in Heinsius’ Nederduytsche Poemata, we find it in a completely different context. There, it was published immediately after three translations from Theocritus (or what was considered to be Theocritus in Heinsius’ time) and just before another one of Heinsius’ self–translations from Latin.

1. Oversetting van het XII. Idyllium Theocriti (…) (pp. 38–40)
2. Adonis dicht, uyt Theocritus (pp. 40–41)
3. Capido Honich–dief, uyt Theocritus (pp. 42)
4. Vyi zijn oggen Latijn, in Hippomæx, Dictus puella (…) (pp. 43–44)
5. Elegie, ofte Nach–klacht (pp. 44–47)

In this way, our poem now does not fit in an invective context anymore, but in an explicitly ‘translational’ context. Indeed, like our poem, the other translations from Theocritus also explicitly present themselves as translations in their titles. What is more, this changed context reflects many of the changes the poem underwent when Heinsius translated it from Latin into Dutch. In the introduction to this paper, we have already drawn attention to the poietological implications of translations and self–translations, stating that Renaissance translations often serve the role of elevating status of the vernacular literature, and that self–translations specifically mark the author’s engagement with a personal poetic repertoire in that vernacular literature. And this is precisely what happens here in Heinsius’ Nederduytsche Poemata.

46 On the identification of the poems Adonis dicht, uyt Theocritus and Capido Honich–dief, uyt Theocritus see Heinsius (as in n. 7), pp. 58–59; respectively zu Heinsius’ Zeiten noch als Thekritus XXX. Idyll bezeichnet (…), jetzt aber als ein Werk Anakreons oder eines seiner Nachahmer betrachtet’ and ‘das anakreontische Idyll XIX (auch Moschus oder Bion zugeschrieben)’.
47 Cf. supra n. 8.
By translating both original works from Antiquity (Theocritus) and his own poetry into the classical languages — both literary actions that are quite prestigious in humanist literature — Heinsius tries to bestow some of the authority of such classical poetry on (his) poetry in the vernacular. His self-translation *Ad suavisissimam pularem* in particular testifies to an inevitable degree of experimentation with the poetic possibilities of that vernacular language that was criticized by Guépin in this poem.\(^{46}\) Indeed, Heinsius attempts to elevate its language and style to a higher level and quite possibly takes this too far in some cases. Guépin has already pointed out the attention for rhyme and metre in the Dutch poem which sometimes leads to a loss of certain aspects of the original. Moreover, we have seen how the translation has disposed of almost all mythological or historical references to the ancient world. Again, this is easily understood in the translational context: Heinsius leaves out typically Roman and therefore classical elements like the Muses, the *cataphracti* and the *fases* from his Dutch poem, as they do not really fit in with the vernacular cultural context of his target text. In this way, we can conclude that the changes Heinsius’ Dutch self-translation has undergone vis-à-vis its Latin original are not to be interpreted as bad poetic choices, as Guépin did, but as logical consequences of its status as a vernacular self-translation, namely of translating — both linguistically and poetically — a Latin poem into Dutch within a programmatic context of vernacular poetry.

In this way these poetic choices testify of a general metapoetic stance present in Heinsius’ vernacular oeuvre, which can also be read in this particular self-translation. In the poem, we see an author who is not only creating his own vernacular repertoire, but who is doing so by taking a stand against a contemporary brand of vernacular literature he did not agree with.\(^{47}\) Indeed, the poem appears to contain a reference to the so-called rhetoricians — a group of authors who stood for the practice of poetry according to strict, prescribed rules and who were organized in societies sometimes dating back to the fifteenth century, which in the Low Countries are still very much part of medieval (and therefore non-humanist) culture. This metapoetic subtext can be found in the passage:

```
Het sy de hoofsche locht, oft het geduerich prachten
Van die dy volgen naer, recht slijpers van de straeten,
Bequaem om niet te doen: een volek dat ongeleert
De wijsheyt niet en kent, geleerheit niet en eert.
```

\(^{46}\) Guépin (as in n. 24), p. 291.
\(^{47}\) I owe this remark to Eva van Hooijdonk.

---

Die u met ydelheyt het moedich hert ontsteken,
En niet dan roock en windt, en groote staeten spreken
where Heinsius appears to criticize the rhetoricians whom he opposes with his humanist vernacular poetry. Indeed, in Scriverius’ poetic introduction to his edition of Heinsius’ Nederduytsche Poeemata these rhetoricians are described in rather similar words when contrasted to Heinsius:

```
Den hemel volcht hy naer. en om niet stil te staen,
Is hy met onse spraeck en haeren loff begaan.
Dees heeft hy yct het slijk gebeurt, en opgenomen:
Zijn vverck daer van gemaect. niet slachtende de bomen,
Daer Nederland van vvaecht, en die nu (maer t’ onrecht)
De Reden-rijkers bend, en Rijmers sijn gesecht.
Een volek dat veellijdt is ontbloot van alle reden,
Onmatich, onbesuyst, vwaanschenen, onbesseneden.\(^{50}\)
```

He (Heinsius) follows the heavens. And to avoid standing still, he takes to heart our language and its praise.

He has pulled it out of the mud and done a good job, without paying attention to the dummies,

The Netherlands now talk about, and who are now (but unjustly) called ‘Rhetoricians’ and ‘Rymers’.

People mostly devoid of all reason,
without moderation, rash, misshapen, stubborn.

5. Heinsius and Opitz

The same functional interpretation has already been suggested for Opitz’ self-translation. Indeed, in his discussion of the 1624 German version and its 1625 revision (which especially focuses on some rhythmical issues),\(^{51}\) Althaus has made the same general observation on the differences between the Latin choliambic poem and the German Alexandrin epigram, which ends in a similarly epigrammatic *poëme* as Heinsius’ self-translation:

```
```

\(^{50}\) Sciverius, Voor—reden, in Heinsius (as in n. 7), p. 14.
\(^{51}\) See Althaus (as in n. 17), p. 63.
literarisch zu werden. Die primäre Absicht auf ein poetisches Sprechen überhaupt, in dichtunggeschichtlicher Perspektive: auf ein literarisches Barock, realisiert sich darin, daß epigrammatische Formationen der gezeigten Art gewonnen werden.\textsuperscript{52}

In this way, we see that the (meta)poetic function of the Dutch and German self-translation is completely the same: building vernacular poetics through translation from Latin. Yet, in view of Heinsius’ well-established influence on Opitz’ Teutsche Poemata (cf. supra), a question that still remains is how much direct influence there was between both self-translations. In other words, can we demonstrate that Opitz not only imitated Heinsius’ general self-translation poetics, so to say, but also his specific self-translation of Ad swavisissimam puellam?

The exact relationship between both the translations and the original Latin poems is somewhat complicated, and has only been partly studied in the past. First of all, it appears that the link between Heinsius’ Ad swavisissimam puellam (1613) and Opitz’ (part of his) Hipponax ad Asterien goes through another poem in Heinsius’ Hipponax-section, i.e. the much longer Hipponax ad Thaumantidem swavisissimam puellam. In quo vita, studia, morae poetae, tum, quae ex suis petitor, animi tranquillitas, descripturum. In quo conceptus (cf. supra). As Seidel has abundantly shown, this poem was a clear inspiration for Opitz’ Hipponax ad Asterien.\textsuperscript{53} However, Seidel’s general comparison of these two long poems did not identify the precise passage from Hipponax ad Thaumantidem the aforementioned part of Hipponax ad Asterien (viz. Persona nuda ... botes moratur, vv. 149–165) is based on. However, upon closer inspection, we find that especially the following lines show similarities at this point:

Hipponax ad Thaumantidem, vv. 492–516

Quem (sc. ego) non libido foeda, fervor inconstant
Pudendus, excors, mente devium jactat
Sed sanctus ardor visque numinum maior
Sed arduae virutis, indolis rarae
Mitaror ignis, fames aestheris magni
Qui quiescor virtus corpore emicas pulcro
Maior videri pulchriorque consuevit
Ut flos subunda, vitreose sub fonte
Pellicudo rore, gratius fulget.

Hipponax ad Asterien, vv. 136–165

(...), nonque corporis vestris
Externa pulchritudo mentis internae est
Character et figura: vera virtus
Abstrusa imago ab hoc splendor restitut.
Sic quando Titan mortis aligiae frater
Brevis reiulque, nobile antedentat
Lubor nitore sensa nostra delectat,
Stringens acumen montium serenorum.
Mens pulchra pulcro quippe corpore elucet,
Ut flos subunda, plura quæreri in vobis.

Although the relationship between both fragments is primarily one of theme — i.e. the relationship between virtue and physical beauty — several formal similarities put Opitz’ imitation beyond doubt. Especially his expressions Mens pulchra pulcro quippe corpore elucet, / Ut flos subunda, plura quæreri in vobis and quasi pulchra pulcro, / Rex sororiantium gemellarum\textsuperscript{54} are directly inspired by Heinsius (Quippe ipsa virtus corpore emicas pulcro, / Maior videri pulchriorque consuevit and Orbisque blandos mollium papillarum, / Sororiantae).\textsuperscript{55} Quite interestingly, this comparison also shows that an expression that seemed an addition in Opitz’ German translation (cf. supra), viz. the image of the flower (‘Jst wie wenn ein Blum durchs Wasser sich ereuget’), is actually already present in an earlier line from Opitz’ Latin Hipponax and also a clear imitation of Heinsius’ Latin Ut flos subunda, vitreose sub fonte / Pellicudo rore, gratius fulget.\textsuperscript{56} This instance, which demonstrates how the study of self-translation entails renewed attention for the ‘original’ and apparently even puts into question the boundaries of that original, is a good illustration of how dynamic the process of self-translation is.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., p. 66.


\textsuperscript{54} Rubensohn (as in n. 16), p. 52, n. 2 already points out this specific parallel, but on the other hand says that there is no other direct influence from Hipponax ad Thaumantidem.

\textsuperscript{55} Cf. Opitz (as in n. 12), p. 357.

\textsuperscript{56} Rubensohn (as in n. 16), p. 52, n. 1 and Opitz (as in n. 12), p. xxxviii.
was in bilingual Renaissance poetry. Indeed, in such cases self-translation seemlessly changes into self-imitation.

Turning back to Heinsius’ *Ad suavissimam puellam*, we find that previous studies have not explored the link between this poem and the longer *Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem* either. Indeed, although we can easily suspect such a link to exist because of the information added in the subtitle of the Dutch translation of *Ad suavissimam puellam* (Vst zijn egen Latijn, in Hippoponax, Dulaies puella, geschreven aan Thaumanti beroer tijde om met den gesagt Berugnan naer Vranckrijk te reysen), it still remains to be seen what its exact position is vis-à-vis the *Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem*. However, comparing the relatively short *Ad suavissimam puellam* (36 verses) with the much longer *Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem* (697 verses) is not that easy, as the latter poem is quite complex both in contents and style. Seidel has already explored the fact that there is no translation or commentary to the text.57 After due consideration, there seem to be at least three passages in the *Hippoponax* which have offered more or less direct inspiration for *Ad suavissimam puellam*.

*Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem*, vv. 194–208

*Nec spem fove verus imparem sorti:
Quae pulcha, quae fudit quae levis semper,
Ut Thais ad Gnaubaena, vel procax Pyrhyo,
Spondere larga, nec datur quae spondeat,
Umbra futuri laetam irritant mentem.
Sed vita linguis immoda, non nostra,
Prasentiaueque raptum, omne venturum
Fatis resigno, vel repasibus ventis.
Nec me curulis silla Nonis torquet.

Nec consolidis quod Vatinius strenua,
Utrat securis pateraque per fasces.
Nec quod Vercro, soeditatis infanfis,
Esquales factus non voluntibus Parcis.
Summat theatrum laetus occupat sedem,
Othonis ingens lusoria contentor.*

*Ad suavissimam puellam*

*Dulaies puella, mentis ultimus nostrae
Et seris arbor, quo celebimus semper,
Doneu saeva flammans imber lucis
Phoeboque laetus intebimus vultus:
Puella dulcis, cum voluntibus Parcis
Nunc hanc supremam mittimus tibi vocem.
Non quo rigente cautis instar immotae,
Magisque sardam praebantibus ventis
Et fluctuante tangat Hadria mentem;
Sed ut superba, saeva, pertinax, dura
Nunc hos triumpho perfurari extrems.
Vale cruenta. nos vagalimum post hor
Terras per omnes, eculos tua vultus.
Simulque patriae postserisque venturis
Non ebendum iudicibus tantae
Feroxitis et superbia crimine.
At tu proverba sernis auro quas iacte,
Precessa venis impotentibus fundo?
Quodcumque vota sidus oppressit nostra,
Et haec nos frustrat irritam mentem,
Sue tussulorum nil agentium turba,*

57 Seidel (as in n. 12), pp. 188–189.

In general, however, *Ad suavissimam puellam* seems to be a kind of summary of the erotic theme of *Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem*58 and accordingly we also find formal echoes from all over *Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem*, such as vv. 102–103 *Sic bos dicaces, bas caninas nostras, / Illidatos, litterarias feles*, vv. 245–246 *Vexant procellas, turbinesque venturum*. / *Hic occid erro laetum et meae spontis*, vv. 482–483 *Mares bonoso subitum, Des vivam*. / *Hoc dote fretus or vvr. 542–543 O Scylla quouis auspiciat portam*, or *O naufragio vic improbanda tempesata*.

In the end, it seems that the link between Optiz’ self-translation *Auf meinem Lateinischen an die Asterien und Heinsius’* self-translations *Vst zijn egen Latijn, in Hippoponax (…)* goes through the link between Heinsius’ *Hippoponax ad Thaumantidem* (part of which Heinsius reworked into *Ad suavissimam puellam*, the basis of his self-translation) and Optiz’ *Hippoponax ad Asterien* (part of which Optiz

used for his self-translation). In this way, Opitz’ self-translation is indeed an imitation of Heinsius’ self-translation, an element Opitz may have wanted to allude to by keeping his title quite similar to Heinsius’ (cp. *Vyt zijn oogen Latijn, in Hipponate (...) and *Auß meinem Latinischen an die Asterien*. Moreover, we have seen that there is not only a philological, but also a poctological link between both self-translations. Both translations differ in a very similar way from their original, as in both Heinsius’ and Opitz’ oeuvre these self-translations fit well within a literary program of vernacular self-emancipation. Quite unsurprisingly we find that those who continue this poetic tradition, such as Opitz’ imitator Paul Fleming, who also wrote a *Teutsche Poemata*, use the same technique of self-translation as part of this literary program.

6. Conclusion

This paper has studied two specific Renaissance self-translations from Latin into the vernacular language. Besides offering a detailed view on the manifold translational processes and strategies at work in such self-translations and a deeper insight into their interrelationship (and that of their source texts), it has above all shown that these texts need to be understood within their own (meta-)poetic context to avoid the kind of comparative criticism Guépin performed. No translation, and especially no self-translation, should be interpreted on the sole basis of its literary merits vis-à-vis its source text. Indeed, as Grutman put it: ‘Self-translators do not just master, but choose to create in more than one language. Their conscious awareness of this option cannot be overstated.’

Tom Deneire

Huygens ING, The Hague/Netherlands

---

59 Cp. Rubensohn (as in n. 16), p. 52, n. 2.
61 Grutman (as in n. 1), p. 257.