Translating Plutarch, Honouring Cicero

Adrien Turnèbe's Translation of *On the generation of the soul in the Timaeus* (1552)[*]

Bram Demulder

Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO)

From his activity as a scholar at the *Collège des lecteurs royaux* and from his publications as the *Imprimeur royal pour les livres grecs* it becomes clear that Adrien Turnèbe (1512 – 1565) had two literary loves – the one Roman, the other Greek[1]. The former is well-known: Turnèbe's voluminous work on Cicero was influential for centuries and the quarrel he had with Petrus Ramus on the interpretation and importance of the Arpinate was as bitter as it was memorable[2]. Turnèbe's Greek love – more surprisingly, perhaps – was Plutarch of Chaeronea[3]. In 1552, during his first months as royal printer, Turnèbe published no less than four Plutarchan volumes: an edition and a Latin translation of *On the generation of the soul in the Timaeus* (*De animae procreatione in Timaeo*) and a similar diptych for *On the principle of*

[*] I would like to thank Prof. Dirk Sacré and Dr Demmy Verbeke for generously sharing their knowledge in matters of Renaissance humanism with a *tirunculus*. I also owe thanks to Prof. Geert Roskam, not only for his comments on a draft of this article, but mainly for his continued support as a rare and treasured, exceptionally kind and patient specimen of the Socratic οἶστρος.

[1] Turnèbe (Adrianus Turnebus) was appointed Royal Reader in Greek in 1547. From 1561 until his death in 1565 he occupied the chair of Royal Reader in Greek and Latin Philosophy. Between August 1551 and April 1556 he assumed the duties of *Imprimeur royal pour les livres grecs*: after a remarkably productive period during which he edited, translated and commented a wide variety of classical texts, both pagan and Christian, he was succeeded by his trustee Guillaume Morel. The best monograph on Turnèbe is without a doubt J. Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe (1512 - 1565). A Humanist Observed* (Genève: Droz, 1998); the biographical information offered in this paragraph is taken from Lewis' work. See also L. Clement, *De Adriani Turnebi regii professoris praefationibus et poematis* (Parisiis: Picard, 1899) and J. Letrouit, "Turnèbe (Adrien) (Tournebus Adrian) (1512-1565)," in *Centuriae latinae. Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat*, ed. C. Nativel (Genève: Droz, 1997), 761–66.

[2] On Turnèbe's Ciceronian output and its influence, see Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 21 n. 26 and 131–139. On his quarrel with Ramus, see Ibid., 213–261 and, more recently, the case studies in M.-L. Demonet, "Le match Ramus-Turnèbe. Du *De fato* au *De methodo*," in *Ramus et l'université*, ed. K. Meerhoff and M. Magnien (Paris: Presses de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, 2004), 49–70 and M. G. M. Van der Poel, "The Dispute between Ramus and Turnebus on Cicero's Orations on the Agrarian Law," in *Autour de Ramus. Le Combat*, ed. K. Meerhoff and J.-C. Moisan (Paris: Champion, 2005), 323–39, as well as the useful overview in J. R. Henderson, "Professors of Eloquence and Philosophy. Muret in two Parisian Controversies," in *Autour de Ramus. Le Combat*, ed. K. Meerhoff and J.-C. Moisan (Paris: Champion, 2005), 363–368.

[3] On the renaissance reception of Plutarch, see e.g. R. Aulotte, *Amyot et Plutarque. La tradition des Moralia au XVIe siècle* (Genève: Droz, 1965); Id., "Plutarque et l'humanisme en France et en Italie," in *Les humanistes et l'antiquité grecque*, ed. M. Ishigami-Iagolnitzer (Paris: Éditions du CNRS, 1989), 99–104; I. Gallo, ed., *L'eredità culturale di Plutarco dall'antichità al rinascimento* (Napoli: D'Auria, 1998); M. Pade, *The Reception of Plutarch's Lives in Fifteenth-Century Italy*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2007); Ead., "The Reception of Plutarch from Antiquity to the Italian Renaissance," in *A Companion to Plutarch*, ed. M. Beck (Malden - Oxford - Chichester: Blackwell, 2014), 537–542; F. Becchi, "Le traduzioni latine dei *Moralia* di Plutarco tra XIII e XVI secolo," in *Plutarco nelle traduzioni latine di età umanistica*, ed. P. Volpe Cacciatore (Napoli: D'Auria, 2009), 11–52 (as well as the other contributions in P. Volpe Cacciatore, ed., *Plutarco nelle traduzioni latine di età umanistica* (Napoli: D'Auria, 2009)); O. Guerrier, ed., *Plutarque de l'Âge classique au XIXe siècle: présences, interférences et dynamique* (Grenoble: Millon, 2012); Id., "The Renaissance in France," in *A Companion to Plutarch*, ed. M. Beck (Malden - Oxford - Chichester: Blackwell, 2014), 544–48.

cold (*De primo frigido*). Four years later an annotated translation of *The obsolescence of oracles* (*De defectu oraculorum*) followed, while other scholarly engagements with Plutarch can be found in Turnèbe's posthumously published *Opera omnia*, in his text-critical *Adversaria*, and even in his personal library[4].

The present article focusses on the translation of *De animae procreatione*, the treatise in which Plutarch defends the most important aspects of his interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*, the dialogue at the very heart of his Platonism (and of Middle-Platonism in general)[5]. In the first section, the letter of dedication by which Turnèbe prefaced his translation will be discussed. Next, I will look at how the translator treats Plutarch's interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*. Finally, by way of a first case study, a short passage of the translation itself will be discussed. These three approaches will lead to the conclusion that Turnèbe's translation of Plutarch's treatise should be appreciated as a literary effort to express his devotion to his Latin love Cicero through a translation of his Greek love Plutarch, rather than as a work concerned with philosophical consistency and exegesis, thus exhibiting a totally different intention than the source text.

1. The letter of dedication: Ciceronian intertextuality

J. Lewis remarks that, due to the straightforward nature of the humanist's works on Plutarch, we should turn to the dedicatory epistles accompanying these works in order to gain insight in

[4] In the *Opera omnia* (ed. Stephanus Turnebus, Strasbourg, Lazarus Zetznerus, 1600), II, 48-104, we find further translations of *The dinner of the seven wise men* (*Septem sapientium convivium*) and the pseudo-Plutarchan works *On fate* (*De fato*) and *On rivers* (*De fluviis*). Moreover, a manuscript conserves a translation of *On virtue and vice* (*De virtute et vitio*). Two further sources of Turnèbe's reading of Plutarch have been particularly influential for later textual criticism. Plutarch is discussed several times throughout the 30 books of his *Adversaria*, Turnèbe's best known work, a seemingly endless hotchpotch of readings and emendations of classical texts (on this work, see Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 197–204, on this 'genre' in general, see H.-J. Van Dam, "*Adversaria*, *Annotationes*, *Miscellanea*," in *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World. Micropaedia*, ed. P. Ford, J. Bloemendal, and C. Fantazzi (Brill, 2014), 921–23) . Here, the *Lives* seem to be the focal point of his attention. Finally, Turnèbe's own copy of the Aldine edition of the *Moralia* contains numerous notes *in margine* which have made it into several later editions and sources (see M. Cuvigny, "Giannotti, Turnèbe, Amyot : résultats d'une enquête sur quelques éditions annotées des *Moralia* de Plutarque," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1973): 57–77; M. Decorps-Foulquier, "A propos des différentes écritures marginales dans l'exemplaire aldin des *Moralia* d'Adrien Turnèbe," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 8 (1978): 281–87; B. Demulder, "Quot lectiones, tot Turnebi. Adrien Turnèbe in Recent Editions of Plutarch's *De animae procreatione*," in *Plutarque: éditions, traductions, paratextes*, ed. O. Guerrier and F. Frazier, forthcoming). An overview of Turnèbe's Plutarchan output can be found in Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 177–184 (see also Clement, *De Adriani Turnebi praefationibus et poematis*, 29–31), to which should be added the *De virtute et vitio* translation preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, France), Nouveau Fonds Latin, Lat. 13042, see P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum. Volume III (Alia Itinera I): Australia to Germany* (London - Leiden: The Warburg Institute - Brill, 1983), 255.

[5] For an excellent introduction, see J. Opsomer, "Plutarch's *De animae procreatione in Timaeo*: Manipulation or Search for Consistency?," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 47 (2004): 137–62.

his views[6]. Although, at least in this case, the translation itself reveals more than meets the eye (see sections 2 and 3), it is indeed appropriate to start with a close reading of the dedicatory letter, addressed to Pierre Galland (1510 – 1559), in order to probe Turnèbe's intentions[7]. In order to facilitate the discussion, I have subdivided the letter in three parts, which will be considered subsequently.

> Explicanti mihi Timaeum Platonis, Petre Gallandi, quem in dialogum quicquid de rerum natura commode cogitare potuit philosophorum princeps, id omne contulit, venit in mentem commentarium Plutarchi in procreationem animi in Latinum convertere. Quod cum fecissem, de nostro, credo, diuturno contubernio tuisque in me meritis statim occuristi, cui hoc quicquid est interpretationis et, ut ait Catullus, libelli donarem. Nam ut in somnis Ennio saepenumero Homerus obversari videbatur, de quo vigilans crebro cogitabat, ita tu quoque, quocum diu vixi, de quo saepe loquor et cuius in me beneficia semper recordor, mihi hic fortasse dormitanti et tanquam somnianti (vide quam verbis munus exornem meum) statim adesse visus es cui hoc offerem. (f. 3[8])
>
> While I was lecturing, dear Pierre Galland, on Plato's *Timaeus* – the dialogue in which the most distinguished of the philosophers brought together all he could conceivably contemplate about the nature of things – I got the idea of translating Plutarch's commentary on the generation of the soul into Latin. Doing that, my thoughts immediately turned to our truly long-lasting comradeship and the many favours you granted me. It is to you, then, that I dedicate this translation – for what it is worth – and, as Catullus puts it, this booklet. Homer often seemed to appear in the dreams of Ennius, who thought about him often while he was awake. In the same way you too, to whom I dedicate this, seem to be immediately present to me while I am sitting here, perhaps dozing off and, one could say, dreaming (look how I adorn my gift with words) – you, with whom I have shared a large part of my life, about whom I often talk and whose favours toward me are always present in my mind.

From the outset, it seems like Plutarch takes second place. Although it is self-evident from Turnèbe's bibliography that he was genuinely interested in Plutarch's oeuvre, he states that his interest in Plutarch's *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* is derived from his course on Plato's *Timaeus*. The posthumously published *Opera omnia* preserve an introduction to such

---

[6] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 177.

[7] On the history of letters of dedication see the succinct overview in D. Verbeke and J. De Landtsheer, "Letters of Dedication," in *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World. Micropaedia*, ed. P. Ford, J. Bloemendal, and C. Fantazzi (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 1034–36. A more detailed treatment is provided in D. Verbeke, "The Dedicatory Epistle in an Historical Perspective: A Brief Overview," *De Gulden Passer* 89 (2011): 269–74. See also, on various aspects of Renaissance dedications, K. Schottenloher, *Die Widmungsvorrede im Buch des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1953); W. Leiner, *Der Widmungsbrief in der französischen Literatur (1580-1715)* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1965); J.-F. Maillard, "Le rôle de la dédicace et de la page de titre dans la naissance de la critique philologique," *Nugae Humanisticae* 3 (2003): 25–39; I. Bossuyt et al., eds., *"Cui dono lepidum novum libellum?" Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2008).

[8] References are to the separate edition of the *De animae procreatione* translation, which can also be found in the *Opera*, II, 67-76.

a course[9]. In this low-level introduction to students who were apparently new to the subject (or even to ontology and metaphysics in general), Turnèbe laments the vast distance which separates the humanist scholar from his ancient sources: 'Today we are forced to consult an endless amount of books, so that we would have some help in grasping the authors' views in order to form at least some suspicion or conjecture as to their intentions'[10]. For Turnèbe, Plutarch's *De animae procreatione* was probably part of this (quite familiar) burden of secondary literature: a useful tool in the interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus* – the *magnum opus* of the *philosophorum princeps*. And the interpretation of the *Timaeus* must have been a popular topic in the Parisian intellectual milieu around the time Turnèbe wrote his letter of dedication. In 1551, Louis Le Roy's French translation received its *editio princeps* and Thomas Richard published his edition of Ficino's Latin translation. Around the same time, Cicero's partial translation of the *Timaeus* (27D – 47B[11]) received two Parisian editions: in 1549 by Thomas Richard and the next year by Turnèbe's associate Guillaume Morel, who also published a Greek edition in 1551[12].

After setting out his reason for translating Plutarch's treatise, Turnèbe turns to his dedicatee, his friend and colleague Pierre Galland[13]. The dedication to Galland is first voiced with what

---

[9] *Opera*, II, 46-49. The reference to the *Timaeus* course in the dedicatory letter to Plutarch's treatise has been taken as an indication that the undated preface to the *Timaeus* in the *Opera* dates from the same year or shortly before, see Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 109 n. 16 and 171 and Clement, *De Adriani Turnebi praefationibus et poematis*, 22 n. 4. However, it is perfectly possible that Turnèbe taught the *Timaeus* on several occasions. In 1556, in the *Admonitio ad Adrianum Turnebum* published under the name of Omer Talon, Petrus Ramus criticized that Turnèbe was an inadequate teacher in matters of Greek syntax, but instead proposed to explain 'Plato's *Timaeus* or anything else in which he would have seemed admirable to his students, but useless' ('Timaeum Platonis aut eiusmodi aliquid sibi proposuit, in quo discipulis esset admirabilis, sed inutilis'); text and translation in Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 228 (with n. 61). We can thus even suspect that the *Timaeus* course was a pet subject of Turnèbe's, which makes any attempt at dating the *Timaeus* preface rather suspect.

[10] *Opera*, II, 46: '[H]odie infinitam librorum multitudinem evolvere cogimur, ut ad sententiam auctorum percipiendam adiumentum aliquod habemus: aut ut illinc aliqua saltem suspicione et coniectura eorum voluntatem informemus.'

[11] Besides only translating part of the dialogue, Cicero also omits Socrates' replies to Timaeus, thus abandoning the dialogue setting. Moreover, he added an introduction, which suggests that his intention was to use the translation, in one way or another, in a philosophical dialogue of his own. See M. Puelma, "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer," *Museum Helveticum* 37 (1980): 151–152; J. G. F. Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek," in *Cicero the Philosopher. Twelve Papers*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 280–281; C. Lévy, "Cicero and the *Timaeus*," in *Plato's* Timaeus *as Cultural Icon*, ed. G. J. Reydams-Schils (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003), 96–99; D. Sedley, "Cicero and the *Timaeus*," in *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC. New Directions for Philosophy*, ed. M. Schofield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 194–195 and 200.

[12] Data from the *Universal Short Title Catalogue*.

[13] By 1552, Turnèbe and Pierre Galland had become good friends. It is not clear how they met, but around 1544 Turnèbe accompanied Galland on his travels to Flanders and Northern France, where they discovered numerous new manuscripts and fragments of ancient text. The edition of *De agrorum conditionibus, et constitutionibus limitum [scriptores varii]* (1554), which resulted from their travel, as an example of the close collaboration ('diuturno contubernio') between Turnèbe and Galland, is discussed in K. Meerhoff, "Pierre Galland: un mélanchthonien masqué," in *Autour de Ramus. Le Combat*, ed. K. Meerhoff and J.-C. Moisan (Paris: Champion, 2005), 280–281. See also K. Meerhoff, "Galland contre Ramus: la dignité du philologue," in *La philologie*

can only be described as a cliché in dedicatory writing: a reference to Catullus' 'cui dono lepidum novum libellum'[14]. After that, however, the dedicatee is praised with a much more ingenuous literary reference. Turnèbe evokes the famous story of Ennius' dream[15]. In this literary dream, as we can gather from fragments of his *Annales* and later testimonies, Homer was staged to appear to Ennius and the Greek poet taught the Roman about the 'rerum natura'[16]. Moreover, Ennius learns that Homer's soul is reincarnated in his own body. In the context of a letter preceding a translation of Plutarch's treatise on the *Timaeus*, all this is eminently fitting. Ennius' dream, being a lesson on the *natura rerum* and a testimony of Pythagorean metempsychosis[17], perfectly mirrors the *Timaeus* as Turnèbe understood it. At the beginning of the letter he described the Platonic dialogue as a text 'de rerum natura'. Moreover, as appears from his introduction to the *Timaeus*, Turnèbe saw Pythagoreanism as a central influence on Plato's thought. This influence is most apparent in the *Timaeus*, where the Pythagorean Timaeus, whom Renaissance scholars erroneously took to be Plato's teacher in Pythagorean matters and the real-life inspiration for the dialogue, is the central figure[18]. It is no surprise, then, that Turnèbe states that, in the *Timaeus*, much of the material is Pythagorean ('multa ex Pythagorae scholae deducta')[19].

However, the connection between Ennius' dream and Plato's *Timaeus* is not the only thing Turnèbe is after. The intertextual reference is not to the Ennius fragments directly, but to the

---

humaniste et ses représentations dans la théorie et dans la fiction, ed. P. Galand-Hallyn, F. Hallyn, and G. Tournoy, vol. 2, 2005, 510. From 1547 onward Turnèbe and Galland, who held the Chair of Latin at the *Collège des lecteurs royaux* after having served as Rector of the University, became close colleagues. On Galland see C. B. Schmitt, *Cicero Scepticus. A Study of the Influence of the* Academica *in the Renaissance* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972), 92–102; Meerhoff, "Pierre Galland: un mélanchthonien masqué"; Meerhoff, "Galland contre Ramus: la dignité du philologue".

[14] Catullus 1, 1 ed. D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary* (Toronto - Buffalo - London: University of Toronto Press, 1997). This has been a dedicatory *topos* since Antiquity, see H.-J. Van Dam, "'Vobis pagina nostra dedicatur': Dedication in Classical Antiquity," in *"Cui dono lepidum novum libellum?" Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. I. Bossuyt et al. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2008), 26–27. Note that Turnèbe's 'quicquid est interpretationis' already anticipates the Catullus reference by echoing the poet's description of his own work as 'quidquid hoc libelli qualecumque' (Catullus 1, 8-9).

[15] Ennius, *Annales* I, fr. 2-10 ed. O. Skutsch, *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), with commentary and later testimonies Ibid., 147–167.

[16] Ennius, *Annales* I, fr. 4 ed. Skutsch = Lucretius, *De rerum natura* I, 120-126.

[17] On the Pythagorean aspect of Ennius' dream (an aspect mentioned in several ancient testimony, see, e.g., Horatius, *Epist.* II, 1, 50-52) see Skutsch, *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius*, 148–149; T. N. Habinek, "The Wisdom of Ennius," *Arethusa* 39 (2006): 473–474 and 485.

[18] Following the Neoplatonists, Renaissance scholars assumed that Plato's *Timaeus* was heavily influenced by a treatise by a certain Timaeus of Locrus. See S. K. Heninger, *Touches of Sweet Harmony. Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino (CA): Huntington Library, 1974), 47–49. Scholarship has since shown that the text attributed to Timaeus Locrus is spurious: it is a (probably) first-century text which uses material from Plato's dialogue and not the other way around. See e.g., F. M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology. The* Timaeus *of Plato* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1935), 3.

[19] *Opera* II, 48. Cf. also *Opera* II, 47 on Plato's Pythagorean curriculum.

beginning of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*. There, the character Scipio Aemilianus, after reminiscing about his dead grandfather Scipio Africanus for hours, falls into a deep sleep. In his dream, Africanus appears:

> Hic mihi (credo equidem ex hoc quod eramus locuti; fit enim fere, ut cogitationes sermonesque nostri pariant aliquid in somno, tale quale de Homero scribit Ennius, de quo videlicet saepissime vigilans solebat cogitare et loqui) Africanus se ostendit, ea forma quae mihi ex imagine eius quam ex ipso erat notior […]. (Cicero, *De re publica* VI, 14 ed. Powell[20])
>
> At this point – and I believe that it was the result of what we had said: our thoughts and words often bring forth in sleep something like Ennius' report of Homer, about whom he obviously used to think and speak a great deal when he was awake – Africanus showed himself to me in the appearance which I knew better from his portrait than from having seen him. (tr. Zetzel[21])

Turnèbe's 'de quo vigilans crebro cogitabat, […] de quo saepe loquor' echoes Cicero's 'de quo videlicet saepissime vigilans solebat cogitare et loqui'. Turnèbe elegantly cuts Cicero's relative clause in two pieces in order to emphasize the parallels between Galland and Homer (the inspiring masters) on the one hand and between himself and Ennius (the inspired pupil) on the other[22]. Apart from mimicking the Timaeus and praising Galland, the reference to Ennius' Homeric dream may also anticipate the topic of the next part of the letter: the relation between Greek and Latin. By beginning his *Annales* with the Homeric dream, Ennius proudly announces the transmigration of Greek epic into Roman literature[23]. For Turnèbe, however, the translation of Greek into Latin will turn out to be a less cheerful event.

> Istud autem meum etsi minus est quam ut te movere debeat (non enim te dignum est), tamen quia est, ut ait idem, μνημόσυνον tui sodalis, non minus gratum tibi fore confido animum aestimanti, quam si pluris esset. Nam quod at me attinet, culpa

[20] J. G. F. Powell, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Re Publica, De Legibus, Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2006).

[21] J. E. G. Zetzel, *Cicero. On the Commonwealth and On the Laws* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[22] There is another aspect of Ciceronian intertextuality here: by insisting, in both parts of the comparison, that a dream is just an appearance ('videbatur […] visus es'), Turnèbe recalls the use of Ennius' dream in another work of Cicero, the *Academica*. *Acad*. II, 51 ed. and tr. H. Rackham, *Cicero. De natura deorum, Academica* (Cambridge (MA) - London: Havard University Press, 1933): 'Do you fancy that when Ennius had been walking in his grounds with his neighbour Servius Galba he used to say, "Methought I was walking with Galba"? But when he had a dream he told the story in this way: "Methought the poet Homer stood beside me". […] And so as soon as we wake up we make light of that kind of visions, and do not deem them on a par with the actual experiences that we had in the forum' ('Num censes Ennium cum in hortis cum Servio Galba vicino suo ambulavisset dixisse : "visus sum mihi cum Galba ambulare"? At cum somniavit, ita narravit: "visus Homerus adesse poeta". […] Itaque simul ut experrecti sumus visa illa contemnimus neque ita habemus ut ea quae in foro gessimus'); Ibid., 88: 'Because, you said, when Ennius had woken up he did not say that he had seen Homer but that he had seemed to see him' ('Quia, cum experrectus esset Ennius, non diceret se vidisse Homerum sed visum esse').

[23] On this aspect of Ennius' dream, see P. Aicher, "Ennius' Dream of Homer," *The American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 227–32.

> ingenii mihi videor scriptum Plutarchi doctissimum vel detrivisse, vel contaminasse. Ita plerique omnes solemus: libros alienos male vertendo iam usitatis vindiciis nostros facimus et de praeclaris scriptoribus sic meremur: quamquam si reviviscat Plutarchus ne Graecum quidem asserat, ut ista tibi sint de malis Graecis deteriora Latina. (f. 3-4)
>
> This gift of mine, although it is not enough to impress you (for it is not worthy of you), is nevertheless, like the same poet [sc. Catullus] said, a *souvenir* from your comrade. I therefore rust that you will not be less grateful for this as you would be for a more valuable gift. For, as far as I am concerned, I seem to have either weakened or defiled Plutarch's most learned work because of my lack of talent. In our profession almost everyone is used to applying the following routine: we translate the work of others badly and we appropriate it with our well-worn claims. Such is our service to the most excellent writers. However, if Plutarch were to awake from the dead, he would not even admit it was Greek that we have translated. So what I dedicate to you is a double failure: it is bad Greek in an even worse Latin version.

After a second quite unoriginal Catullian reference[24] follows a reflection on Turnèbe's capacities as a translator and on the merits of translation in general. Although a show of (false) modesty is a topos in dedicatory writing, Turnèbe's intention is, once again, more complex[25]. By diminishing his own work, he shows himself aware of two limits of translating Plutarch's treatise into Latin. Firstly, the 'deteriora Latina' point to the limits of translation itself, especially, as we can gather from Turnèbe's other writings, the translation of the linguistically and philosophically superior Greek into Latin[26]. Secondly the 'mala Graeca' point to the corrupted state of the Greek texts with which humanist editors had to deal[27]. In the case of *De animae procreatione*, the corruption must have been particularly clear to Turnèbe from the two disruptive *lacunae* he suspects and indicates in the translation[28].

---

[24] Catullus 12, 13 ed. Thomson: 'mnemosynum mei sodalis'. See esp. the same reference ('μνημόσυνον tui soldalis') in the dedicatory letter of Erasmus' *Moriae encomium*, published in 1511 (ed. C. H. Miller, *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami. Ordinis quarti tomus tertius. [Moriae encomium id est stultitiae laus.]* (Amsterdam - Oxford: North-Holland, 1979), 68). Cf. also later Montaigne's letter to his father on the death of La Boétie, who died in 1563: shortly before his death the latter 'dedicated' his library to Montaigne as a 'μνημόσυνον tui sodalis' (ed. A. Thibaudet and M. Rat, *Montaigne. Oeuvres complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1962), 1352).

[25] Cf. T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964), 159 on prose prefaces in (late) Antiquity: 'The quality receiving by far the greatest emphasis is the writer's modesty. There is stressed in every conceivable way what little faith the author has in his own capacity and particularly in his capacity to write.' See Ibid., 116–149 for various forms of the modesty *topos*; Leiner, *Der Widmungsbrief in der französischen Literatur (1580-1715)*, 72–80 for modesty in French dedications between 1580 and 1715.

[26] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 52–55.

[27] Clement, *De Adriani Turnebi praefationibus et poematis*, 30 n. 3: 'Nempe subaudiendum est: "latina prava fuisse quia graeca in priscis exemplaribus pravissima fuissent"'. Cf. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature. Fourth Edition* (Oxford, 2013), 158–159 on the issue of textual corruption in the prefaces to Aldine editions.

[28] On f. 19 (at 1017C in current editions) and f. 30 (1022E) of his translation. 19th-century scholarship has shown that the manuscripts suffer from transposition of the part 1022E-1027F instead of major *lacunae*. The correct constitution of the text, as all current editions agree, is: 1012B-1017C; 1022E-1027F; 1017C'-1022E'; 1027F'-1030C. See M. Decorps-Foulquier, "Sur une interversion dans le *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* de Plutarque," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 12 (1982): 353–63.

Moreover, the text was judged to be in need of emendation and conjecture at several points[29]. These issues are emphasized with quite a hyperbole: throughout history, Plutarch's text has been so badly corrupted that even their original author – Plutarch is brought in as a zombie – would not recognize them. The situation is depressing and can only be bettered by making more adequate, less arrogant and arrogating translations and by ameliorating the Greek texts. This was indeed at the very heart of Turnèbe's project, which renders the modest veil of the criticism of his profession – carefully expressed in the first person plural so as to humbly include himself – at least somewhat suspicious.

Once again, Turnèbe's message is delivered through a subtle intertextual reference to Cicero which accounts for the awkward phrasing of the last sentence of the section under discussion. After all, Cicero, too, found himself confronted with the difficult problem of translating Greek philosophy into Latin[30]. Setting about the task of translating Plutarch's *De animae procreatione*, which was probably his very first published translation[31], Turnèbe must have felt like his hero Cicero at the beginning of *De finibus malorum et bonorum*. In his dedication to Brutus, Cicero felt compelled to defend himself against 'people, learned in Greek and contemptuous of Latin, who say that they would rather spend their time reading Greek' (*De fin.* I, 1)[32]. Cicero embarks on a passionate defence of the 'sermo patrius' and of philosophy in the Latin language (*De fin.* I, 4-10). Nevertheless, he makes one exception:

> Sed ex eo credo quibusdam usu venire ut abhorreant a Latinis, quod inciderint in inculta quaedam et horrida, de malis Graecis Latine scripta deterius. Quibus ego adsentior, dum modo de isdem rebus ne Graecos quidem legendos putent. (Cicero, *De fin.* I, 8 ed. Reynolds)
>
> However, I believe that the reason why some people are averse to Latin literature is that they have tended to come across certain rough and unpolished works which have been translated from bad Greek into worse Latin. I sympathize with these people, provided only that they consider that the Greek versions too are not worth reading. (tr. Woolf)

Although the challenge of rendering Greek philosophy into Latin certainly pertains to Turnèbe's problem here, his reference to 'de malis Graecis Latine scripta deterius' is

[29] On some of Turnèbe's conjectures in *De animae procreatione* see Demulder, "Quot lectiones, tot Turnebi".
[30] See esp. Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek".
[31] At the end of the translation, 'X. CALEN. FEBR. L. D. LII' (23 January 1552) is printed as the publication date. Although it is unlikely, the possibility that the *De primo frigido* translation, which was published in the same year but without the mention of an exact date, was published earlier, cannot be excluded.
[32] Tr. R. Woolf in J. Annas and R. Woolf, *Cicero. On Moral Ends* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Ed. L. D. Reynolds, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De finibus bonorum et malorum libri quinque* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998): 'eruditi Graecis litteris, contemnentes Latinas, qui se dicant in Graecis legendis operam malle consumere'.

problematic. Turnèbe's words are Ciceronian but his message is not. Whereas the context of *De finibus* is one of success (Cicero's work being opposed to the 'de malis Graecis Latine scripta deterius') the context of Turnèbe's letter is one of apparent failure (his translation being presented as an example of 'de malis Graecis deteriora Latina'). Accordingly, whereas Cicero is quite convinced of his own *ingenium* – in the same dedication he even feels the need to defend himself against 'critics' who claim he is too talented to occupy himself with bringing Greek philosophy to Rome (*De fin*. I, 1 and 10-11) – Turnèbe states that his failure is partly due to his own intellectual shortcomings. Moreover, whereas, in Cicero's text, the bad Greek is the fault of the original author, Turnèbe could obviously not claim this. On the contrary, he states that Plutarch's treatise is 'doctissimum'. Only by shifting the focus to the transmission of the text, which resulted in corrupted manuscripts, could he refer assentingly to Cicero's 'mala Graeca'. Consequently, the negative judgement of the implied reader, which is invoked by both Cicero and Turnèbe, is accordingly different: whereas Cicero could simply stage any reader to reject the Greek work ('ne Graecos quidem legendos putent'), Turnèbe has to go through the trouble of reviving Plutarch only to make him reject his own work in its transmitted form ('ne Graecum quidem asserat').

Behind this subtle intertextual play lie two diametrically opposite views on language. Cicero was, to borrow P. Botley's expression, a 'linguistic patriot'[33]. The context of the dedication in *De finibus* is one of a fierce belief in the philosophical possibilities of his *sermo patrius*, Latin. Turnèbe differs from this in two aspects. Firstly, in the *De finibus* dedication, Cicero proudly states: 'my view is, as I have often argued, that, far from lacking in resources, the Latin language is even richer than the Greek' (*De fin.* I, 10)[34]. Turnèbe, on the other hand, always upheld the superiority of Greek over Latin[35]. This superiority may well be the real reason – false modesty aside – why the corrupted Greek manuscripts are constantly badly translated ('male vertendos') into worse Latin ('deteriora Latina').

Secondly, the choice for the Latin language – despite its limitations, in Turnèbe's case – is a different choice for both authors. For Cicero it is a choice for his *sermo patrius*, for Turnèbe a choice *against* his *sermo patrius*. Turnèbe probably never published anything in French and

[33] P. Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 165. See also Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek," 283–284 and 290.
[34] Tr. Woolf. Ed. Reynolds: '[I]ta sentio et saepe disserui, Latinam linguam non modo <non> inopem, ut vulgo putarent, sed locupletiorem etiam esse quam Graecam.'
[35] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 52–55, 128, 205.

even criticized others for doing so[36]. His choice for using the same language as his literary hero puts him in a strange contrast with the same hero. This awkward situation was apparent to at least one of Turnèbe's contemporaries: his nephew, the French parlementarian, lawyer and famous historian Etienne Pasquier[37]. Pasquier was a great admirer of his uncle[38], but he did not hesitate to voice his disagreement on matters of language, most clearly so in a famous letter to Turnèbe written in 1552, the same year as Turnèbe's *De animae procreatione* translation and its dedicatory letter[39]. Pasquier seems to refer to the very same *De finibus* passage as the one Turnèbe is using in the passage under discussion:

> Et si peut estre vous vous deffiez ; d'autant que nostre François mis en balance avec le Grec ou Latin se trouve foible & leger de quelques grains. Bien fut vrayement à un Romain necessaire, oster ceste taye de ses yeux : lequel si pour mesme scrupule se fust tenu clos & couvert sans donner vogue à sa langue, pour un respect ou reverence qu'il eust porté au Grec, maintenant serions-nous frustrez de mille belles gentillesses & eruditions que nous aprenons du Latin. Cela mesme que vous m'objectez aujourd'huy fut autrefois proposé à Ciceron pour le destourner d'escrire en sa langue, qui ne le destourna toutesfois. (*Lettres* I, 2 ed. Thickett)

Here, the reference to Cicero's defence against those who advised against writing in Latin is used with a different goal, which is closer to Cicero's. Just like Cicero prefered his *sermo patrius* and was not intimidated by the prestige of Greek, a French humanist should write in French without being intimidated by the prestigious Latin language. By denying this, so Pasquier claims, Turnèbe puts himself in the camp of his hero's critics: an untenable position[40]. It was only by somewhat uneasily shifting the focus to the inadequacy of (his) translation and the corruption of the manuscripts that Turnèbe was able to have his cake and eat it too, i.e. to refer to Cicero without revealing his fundamentally different outlook.

---

[36] Ibid., 52 and 225.

[37] On the life and works of Pasquier, see D. Thickett, *Estienne Pasquier (1529-1615). The Versatile Barrister of Sixteenth-Century France* (London: Regency Press, 1979).

[38] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 17, 21 n. 27, 105 (with n. 1), 197 n. 163.

[39] On Pasquier's letter, 'sorte de manifeste plutôt qu'une lettre familière', see D. Thickett, *Estienne Pasquier. Choix de lettres sur la Littérature, la Langue et la Traduction* (Genève: Droz, 1956), 69–70: 'Justement célèbre, cette lettre est un document très important pour la campagne en faveur de la langue maternelle.'

[40] P. White, "France," in *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, ed. S. Knight and S. Tilg (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 416 points out that, in this letter, Pasquier borrows arguments from Joachim du *Bellay's Deffence, et illustration de la langue françoyse*, which appeared three years earlier. The use of Cicero's *De finibus* could be one of these parallels. Cf. Du Bellay, *Deffence* I, 12 ed. J.-C. Monferran and E. Caldarini, *Joachim du Bellay. La deffence, et illustration de la langue françoyse & L'olive* (Genève: Droz, 2007): 'Ceux, qui penseront, que je soye trop grand Admirateur de ma Langue, aillent voir le premier Livre des Fins des Biens et des Maulx, fait par ce Pere d'eloquence Latine Ciceron, qui au commencement dudict Livre, entre autres choses, repond à ceux, qui deprisoint les choses ecrites en Latin, et les aymoint myeux lire en Grec. La conclusion du propos est, qu'il estime la Langue Latine, non seulement n'estre pauvre, comme les Romains estimoint lors : mais encore estre plus riche, que la Greque.'

> Hoc autem neque ut in aestimationem accipias, neque in solutum postulo, praesertim cum ita tibi obnoxius sim, ut fides mea liberari non possit, nisi beneficio tabularum novarum. Extare tantum argumentum volui tuorum erga me meritorum, ut invidi et vituperatores tui quemadmodum antea tua disertissima et eruditissima oratione doctiorem te quam vellent maxima cum animi aegritudine experti sunt, ita nunc cum testimonio meo et promeritorum in me tuorum professione te multo meliorem virum et beneficentiorem quam velint intelligent, animi maerore misere contabescant. Vale. (f. 4)
>
> Moreover, I do not expect you to accept this as a valuation of my debt, nor as a discharge, especially since I owe you so much that my debt cannot be settled unless by the privilege of the *tabulae novae*. Before, due to your very eloquent and very erudite oration, your envious detractors have discovered, much to their chagrin, that you are more learned than they would like. I wanted the proof of your favours towards me to be highlighted to such an extent, so that they would once again be wretchedly consumed by grief because they now have learned from my testimony and profession of your benefactions towards me that you are a much better and more charitable man than they would like you to be. Goodbye.

In the last part of the letter, Turnèbe returns to Galland and expresses his immense intellectual debt towards him. A third Ciceronian reference is introduced. The only way for Turnèbe to settle his debt, would be if the *tabulae novae* would be introduced. These *tabulae novae* refer to Catilina's plan to clear all debt, a proposal against which Cicero of course vehemently reacted – as should a Ciceronian like Turnèbe[41]. However, Turnèbe pays off at least part of his debt in the last section of the letter, in which he attacks the dedicatee's adversaries. The dedication to Galland is a retaliation for the attacks which followed his *Pro Schola Parisiensi Contra Novam Academiam Petri Rami Oratio* (1551), which was a response to Ramus' attack on the dogmatism of the university's educational curriculum[42].

Lewis comments on this passage of the dedicatory letter by emphasizing that the quarrel between Galland and Ramus was 'over the extent to which Aristotelian logic should continue to dominate the Arts syllabus in the University of Paris'[43]. However, the controversy was not only – and, for Turnèbe, not primarily – about Aristotle. It was about the ancient authorities in general. In the dedicatory letter to the polemic *Animadversiones in Rullianos Petri Rami commentarios* (1553), for instance, Turnèbe criticizes Ramus in this vein, describing him as

---

[41] Cicero, *De officiis* 84; *In Catilinam* II, 18. See M. W. Frederiksen, "Caesar, Cicero and the Problem of Debt," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 56 (1966): 128–41. Interestingly, more than fifty years later Casaubon would use the same imagery in his dedicatory letter to his famous edition *Auli Persi Flacci Satirarum Liber* (Paris, apud Ambrosium & Hieronymum Drouart, 1605): 'cum autem meritorum in me tuorum is sit cumulus, ut fides mea sine beneficio tabularum novarum liberari nequeat'.

[42] See Meerhoff, "Galland contre Ramus: la dignité du philologue," 510–513. On the Ramus controversy see the references in n. 2.

[43] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 180.

‘some sad branch [‘Ramus’], who wants to harm his mother, the tree, and rages against his parents Quintilian, Cicero and Aristotle in a wantonly and furious fashion’[44].

For Turnèbe the most honoured *parens* was of course Cicero and for his part in the Ramus controversy he would focus exclusively on combatting Ramus’ interpretation and criticism of Cicero[45]. Lewis aptly summarizes Turnèbe’s concern: ‘Turnèbe was one of Ramus’ strongest critics on the interpretation of Cicero; for Turnèbe Cicero represented all that was best in civic humanism […]. Turnèbe felt that Ramus was incapable of appreciating Cicero, because he lacked the intellectual, linguistic and literary sophistication needed to understand Cicero’s position on moral philosophy’[46].

It seems, thus, that the end of the dedicatory letter is in accordance with the rest of it. Although Cicero’s name is not mentioned anywhere, he has been present throughout the letter. Although, on the other hand, Plutarch’s name is featured on the cover of the book, he has been of secondary importance at best. We now turn to the treatise itself to see if the Chaeronean fares better there, and if the Arpinate holds on to his subtle omnipresence.

2. The world soul in the *Timaeus*: Cicero versus Plutarch

Plutarch’s treatise deals with the interpretation of *Timaeus* 35A-36B, a passage notorious for its difficulty[47]. In this passage, Plato explains how the demiurge composed and divided the world soul. After an introductory sentence, Plutarch begins his interpretation by quoting the first part of this passage (*Tim.* 35A-B), i.e. the part in which the composition of the world soul is described[48]. This is how Plutarch read the passage:

> τῆς ἀμεροῦς καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ ταὐτὰ ἐχούσης οὐσίας καὶ τῆς αὖ περὶ τὰ σώματα γιγνομένης μεριστῆς τρίτον ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἐν μέσῳ συνεκεράσατο οὐσίας εἶδος, τῆς τε

[44] *Opera* I, 72: ‘[…] infelix nescio quis Ramus […], qui arbori matri suae vim afferre cupiens, in eius parentes Quintilianum, Cic[eronem] et Arist[otelem] ita petulanter et propemodum furiose debacchatus esset’.
[45] On Ramus and Cicero see K. Meerhoff, “Ramus et Cicéron,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 70 (1986): 25–35; J. R. Henderson, “Must a Good Orator Be a Good Man? Ramus in the Ciceronian Controversy,” in *Rhetorica Movet. Studies in Historical and Modern Rhetoric in Honour of Heinrich F. Plett*, ed. P. L. Oesterreich and T. O. Sloane (Leiden - Boston - Köln: Brill, 1999), 43–56 (a critique of A. Grafton and L. Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities. Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge (MA): Havard University Press, 1986)).
[46] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 224.
[47] See e.g. A. E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato’s* Timaeus (Oxford: Clarendon, 1928), 106 (‘the most perplexing and difficult passage [i.e. *Tim.* 35A-B] of the whole dialogue’); Cornford, *Plato’s Cosmology*, 59 (‘the sentence [i.e. *Tim.* 35A] is one of the most obscure in the whole dialogue’).
[48] The second part of the passage, on the division of the world soul (*Tim.* 35B-36B), is treated by Plutarch in the second part of the treatise (*De an. procr.* 1027A-1030C). This second part seems to have been of secondary importance to Plutarch and is certainly less engaging and original than the first part, see H. Cherniss, *Plutarch. Moralia. Volume XIII, Part I* (Cambridge (MA) - London: Harvard University Press, 1976), 135.

> ταὐτοῦ φύσεως αὖ πέρι καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἑτέρου καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα συνέστησεν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ τ' ἀμεροῦς αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ σώματα μεριστοῦ. καὶ τρία λαβὼν αὐτὰ ὄντα συνεκεράσατο εἰς μίαν πάντα ἰδέαν, τὴν θατέρου φύσιν δύσμικτον οὖσαν εἰς ταὐτὸ συναρμόττων βίᾳ μιγνὺς δὲ μετὰ τῆς οὐσίας. καὶ ἐκ τριῶν ποιησάμενος ἕν πάλιν ὅλον τοῦτο μοίρας εἰς ἃς προσῆκε διένειμεν, ἑκάστην δὲ τούτων ἔκ τε ταὐτοῦ καὶ θατέρου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας μεμιγμένην· ἤρχετο δὲ διαιρεῖν ὧδε. (*De an. procr.* 1012B-C ed. and tr. Cherniss)
>
> Of the indivisible and ever invariable being and of the divisible on the other hand that comes to pass in the case of bodies he blended together out of both a third kind of being in the middle, and in regard to the nature of sameness again and that of difference he also in this way compounded it in the middle of the indivisible and what is divisible among bodies. And he took them, three as they were, and blended them all together into a single entity, forcibly fitting into sameness the nature of difference, which is refractory to mixture, and mixing them together with being. And, when out of three he had made one, he again distributed the whole of this into fractions that were appropriate and each of these a blend of sameness and difference and being; and he began the division in the following way.

Plato, according to Plutarch's quotation, considers the world soul to be a mixture of three ingredients: (1) intermediate being (itself a preparatory mixture of indivisible and divisible being), (2) sameness, (3) difference. The first ingredient is put in the middle of the other two as a kind of buffer or substrate in order to establish the right blend. In his translation of Plutarch's treatise, Turnèbe does not translate the *Timaeus* quote himself but – and this will not come as a shock after reading the dedicatory epistle – *taciter* quotes from Cicero's partial translation of the *Timaeus* as follows[49]:

> Ex ea materia quae individua est et quae semper unius modi suique similis, et ex ea quae corporibus dividua gignitur, tertium materiae genus ex duobus in medium admiscuit, quod esset eiusdem materiae et quod alterius: idque interiecit inter individuum atque id quod dividuum esset in corpore. Ea cum tria sumpsisset in unam speciem temperavit, naturamque illam quam alterius diximus, vi cum eadem coniuxit fugientem et eius copulationis alienam, permiscens cum materia. Et cum ex tribus fecisset unum, id ipsum in ea quae decuit membra partitus est. Iam partes singulas ex eodem et altero et ex materia temperavit. Fuit autem talis illa partitio. (f. 5-6)

---

[49] For a critical edition of Cicero's *Timaeus* see R. Giomini, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. 46. De Divinatione, De Fato, Timaeus* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1975). On various philosophical and philological aspects of Cicero's translation of the *Timaeus* see C. Fries, "Untersuchungen Zu Ciceros Timäus," *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie* 54 (1899): 555–92; R. Poncelet, *Cicéron, traducteur de Platon. L'expression de la pensée complexe en latin classique* (Paris: De Boccard, 1957); Puelma, "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer"; N. Lambardi, *Il "Timaeus" ciceroniano. Arte e tecnica del "vertere"* (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1982); Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek"; Lévy, "Cicero and the *Timaeus*"; Sedley, "Cicero and the *Timaeus*". For a Latin text with a German translation and useful notes see K. Bayer and G. Bayer, *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Timaeus De universitate. Timaeus Über das Weltall. Lateinisch - deutsch* (Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 2006). In his *Praefatio in Timaeum Platonis* (Opera, III, 48), Turnèbe mentions Cicero's translation: 'Ac proinde ita Ciceroni placuit iste dialogus [i.e. the *Timaeus*], ut Latine fit interpretatus'. Morover, in his *Adversaria* (Aureliopoli, Petrus Quercetanus, 1604), XXVIII, 14, Turnèbe devotes a chapter to textual observations on Cicero's *Timaeus*.

Compared to the manuscript tradition and the Renaissance editions of Cicero's *Timaeus*, Turnèbe's quotation is different at some minor points. First, there are some apparent inaccuracies. For Turnèbe's 'ex ea quae corporibus dividua gignitur', the majority of the Cicero manuscripts read 'ex ea quae *ex* corporibus dividua gignitur'[50]. However, Turnèbe's reading, although it is not mentioned in our critical editions, is not unattested. It is the reading adopted in the Aldine edition of Cicero's works (Venice, 1523, f. 198vo), in Joachim Périon's commented edition of Cicero's *Timaeus* translation (Paris, 1540, f. 12), and in the edition by Turnèbe's associate Morel (Paris, 1550, f. 11). Hence, it seems that Turnèbe's 'corporibus' without preposition is neither an error nor an adaptation, but simply the version of the text as he knew it. Similarly, whereas the manuscripts read 'partis singulas' with the plural accusative in -is, the Renaissance editions just mentioned all print the more regular 'partes'[51].

Secondly, there are some variants which do not seem to appear in other sources. Cicero correctly renders Plato's (and Plutarch's) τῆς ταὐτοῦ φύσεως by 'eiusdem *naturae*', whereas Turnèbe writes 'eiusdem *materiae'*. However, since Cicero identifies the *materia individua* with the *eiusdem natura* (this will be discussed later), the difference between *materia* and *natura* is in this case not crucial for Cicero's philosophical standpoint. It is impossible to determine whether this inaccuracy is an error on Turnèbe's part (either a simple copying error or an error following an attempt to copy the text partly by heart) or a consequence of the text he had in front of him. In any case, since the variant does not change the philosophical content, there is no reason to suspect Turnèbe of consciously tampering with Cicero's translation. Similarly, reading 'quae permiscens cum materia cum ex tribus fecisset unum […]', Cicero seems to have started a new sentence, although the manuscripts offer several slightly different readings. Morel prints a text syntactically very similar to our critical text of Cicero (but reading 'effecisset' instead of 'fecisset'). According to Turnèbe's version, however, Cicero stayed closer to Plato's Greek by attaching 'permiscens cum materia' to the preceding sentence. Although the Aldine edition and Périon do the same, Turnèbe is the only

[50] This is the reading adopted in W. Ax and O. Plasberg, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. 46. De divinatione. De fato. Timaeus* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1938). The more recent Teubner edition (Giomini, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. 46. De Divinatione, De Fato, Timaeus*) records one manuscript (Escorialensis V III 6) which reads 'ex ea quae *in* corporibus dividua gignitur' and prefers this reading. However, the editor's argument is, in my opinion, not convincing. He states that, since Cicero translates Plato's τοῦ κατὰ τὰ σώματα μεριστοῦ in the same passage with 'quod individuum esset in corpore', we can assume that he had used the same preposition while translating the referentially identical τῆς περὶ τὰ σώματα γιγνομένης ('ex ea, quae *in* corporibus dividua gignitur'). The general accuracy of Cicero's translation and – in this instance – Cicero's variation between singular and plural in his translation of σώματα show that the translator cannot be trusted outright when such details are concerned.

[51] On this grammatical phenomenon see R. Kühner and F. Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Erster Teil* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1974), 334–335.

one to read ‘et cum’ instead of ‘cum’, thus including Plato’s καί in Cicero’s translation. Again, it is hard to tell whether this is due to an error (unconsciously or consciously in an effort to bring Cicero’s version closer to the Greek) or to Turnèbe’s text. Again, the variant does not affect the philosophical reasoning of the text. The same thing goes for Turnèbe’s reading ‘ex eodem et altero et ex materia’ where all other versions read ‘ex eodem et ex altero et ex materia’.

Turnèbe’s quotation of Cicero’s translation can thus be judged correct or at least philosophically adequate. There is, however, a fundamental problem when this quotation is considered in the context of a translation of Plutarch’s *De animae procreatione*. Simply put, Cicero’s translation of the text is not at all compatible with Plutarch’s interpretation. The crux is Cicero’s relative clause ‘quod esset eiusdem materiae et quod alterius’: Cicero interprets Plato’s τῆς τε ταὐτοῦ φύσεως καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἑτέρου (the Greek text Cicero was translating probably omitted αὖ πέρι) as a clarification of τῆς ἀμεροῦς καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ ταὐτὰ ἐχούσης οὐσίας καὶ τῆς αὖ περὶ τὰ σώματα γιγνομένης μεριστῆς. Consequently, he arrives at another list of ingredients for the generation of the world soul than Plutarch. Whereas, in Plutarch’s interpretation, Plato made the demiurge assemble the world soul from (1) intermediate being (= indivisible being + divisible being), (2) sameness and (3) difference, Cicero’s interpretation has (1) intermediate being, (2) indivisible being (= sameness) and (3) divisible being (= difference).

This might seem to amount to hair-splitting, or it might even seem just a difference in terminology. But the difference between the two readings touch upon two essential points of Plutarch’s interpretation, which make Cicero’s reading impossible from a Plutarchan perspective. First, Plutarch’s main concern in *De animae procreatione* is to provide an interpretation of the generation of the world soul in the *Timaeus* which is compatible with the other Platonic dialogues and which absolves Plato from inconsistency[52]. Therefore, Cicero’s interpretation would be rejected by Plutarch because it does not differentiate between (the kinds of) being and sameness / difference. Plutarch is clear about this when he states that ‘by Plato himself in the *Sophist* existence and sameness and difference and besides these rest and

[52] Cf., e.g., *De an procr.* 1014A, 1015F-1016E. See also Opsomer, “Plutarch’s *De animae procreatione*”, where the treatise is discussed as a ‘search for consistency’.

motion are distinguished and set apart from one another as being five things different each from each'[53].

Secondly, Cicero's interpretation would undoubtedly be considered absurd by Plutarch. According to the latter, probably taking his cue from Plato's description of difference as δύσμικτον, sameness and difference by themselves cannot be mixed: there is need of a third irreducible component (being) in order to make the mixture, and thus the world soul, possible[54]. Cicero does not acknowledge this, since his intermediary ingredient is directly derived from sameness and difference.

Of course, we cannot blame Turnèbe for putting trust in Cicero's interpretation. After all, most scholars defended a similar interpretation of the passage until G. M. A. Grube pointed out the correct text and interpretation of the *Timaeus* passage, which is neither Cicero's nor Plutarch's[55]. We can, however, hold Turnèbe accountable for introducing a translation which was incompatible with Plutarch's Greek[56]. It is hard to imagine that this would have escaped the humanist's notice. The emendations he proposed to the text of *De animae procreatione* in different sources (the translation, but also the edition and the marginal notes in his own copy of the *Moralia*) show that Turnèbe had a solid philosophical insight in even the most technical

---

[53] *De an. procr.* 1013E ed. and tr. Cherniss: αὐτοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐν τῷ Σοφιστῇ τὸ ὂν καὶ τὸ ταὐτὸν καὶ τὸ ἕτερον, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις στάσιν καὶ κίνησιν ὡς ἕκαστον ἑκάστου διαφέρον καὶ πέντε ὄντα χωρὶς ἀλλήλων τιθεμένου καὶ διορίζοντος. The context is Plutarch's criticism of the earlier and apparently influential interpretation by the Platonist Xenocrates, who is said to have equated sameness with rest and difference with motion.

[54] *De an. procr.* 1025B ed. and tr. Cherniss: '[The demiurge] united sameness and difference, contrary forces and antagonistic extremes, not just by themselves; but by first interposing other beings, the indivisible in front of sameness and in front of difference the divisible, as each of the one pair is in a way akin to one of the other, and by then making an additional blend with those between after they had been commingled he thus fabricated the whole structure of the soul, from what were various having made it as nearly uniform and from what were many as nearly single as was feasible.' (τὸ ταὐτὸν καὶ τὸ θάτερον, ἐναντίας δυνάμεις καὶ ἀκρότητας ἀντιπάλους, συνήγαγεν οὐ διὰ αὑτῶν, ἀλλ' οὐσίας ἑτέρας μεταξύ, τὴν μὲν ἀμέριστον πρὸ τοῦ ταὐτοῦ πρὸ δὲ τοῦ θατέρου τὴν μεριστήν, ἔστιν ᾗ προσήκουσαν ἑκατέραν ἑκατέρᾳ τάξας εἶτα μιχθείσας ἐκείναις ἐπεγκεραννύμενος, οὕτως τὸ πᾶν συνύφηνε τῆς ψυχῆς εἶδος, ὡς ἦν ἀνυστόν, ἐκ διαφόρων ὅμοιον ἔκ τε πολλῶν ἓν ἀπειργασμένος;); Ibid. 1025E: 'God [i.e. the demiurge] made from being the compound of the indivisible [being] and the divisible [being] as receptacle for sameness and difference' (τῆς οὐσίας τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀμερίστου καὶ τῆς μεριστῆς ὁ θεὸς ὑποδοχὴν τῷ ταὐτῷ καὶ τῷ θατέρῳ συνέστησεν); Ibid. 1025F-1026A: 'Even if it is a characteristic of sameness to be different from difference and of difference again to be the same as itself, mutual participation of this kind has no fruitful result; but a third term is required, a kind of matter serving as a receptacle for both and being modified by them, and this it is that he first compounded when with that which abides about the intelligibles [i.e. indivisible being] he bounded the limitlessness of that which is motive in the case of bodies [i.e. divisible being]' (καὶ γὰρ εἰ τῷ ταὐτῷ συμβέβηκεν ἑτέρῳ εἶναι τοῦ ἑτέρου καὶ τῷ ἑτέρῳ πάλιν αὑτῷ ταὐτόν, οὐδὲν ἡ τοιαύτη μέθεξις ἀλλήλων ποιεῖ γόνιμον, ἀλλὰ δεῖται τρίτης τινὸς οἷον ὕλης ὑποδεχομένης καὶ διατιθεμένης ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων. αὕτη δ' ἐστίν, ἣν πρώτην συνέστησε τῷ περὶ τὰ νοητὰ μονίμῳ τοῦ περὶ τὰ σώματα κινητικοῦ τὸ ἄπειρον ὁρίσας). Elsewhere, however, Plutarch is less clear about the distinction (e.g. 1024D).

[55] G. M. A. Grube, "The Composition of the World-Soul in *Timaeus* 35 A-B," *Classical Philology* 27 (1932): 80–82.

[56] Note that the incompatibility is even worsened by Turnèbe's reading 'eiusdem materiae' instead of 'eiusdem naturae'.

passages of the treatise[57]. It is more likely, then, that the issues voiced in the dedicatory letter are reflected in the translation choice under discussion here. Turnèbe decided to translate Plutarch's treatise in the context of his lectures on Plato's *Timaeus* and he was bound to turn to his hero Cicero for help in translating Plato – and, for that matter, Greek philosophy in general – into Latin.

That this manoeuvre caused Plutarch's interpretation to be misrepresented and that it neglects the main concern of the treatise (Plutarch's search for a consistent interpretation of Plato's *Timaeus*) did probably not even seem like a problem to Turnèbe. In the strange hierarchy at play here, the author of the translated treatise occupies the lowest rank. That Plato is ranked higher, is not surprising: Turnèbe states that his interest in the treatise stems from an interest in Plato and Plutarch himself makes clear that the true meaning of Plato's words is what he is after[58]. All the more remarkable is the observation that Cicero, like a true *homo novus*, has worked his way up and surpasses Plutarch in a hierarchy where one would never even expect his presence in the first place.

3. And now finally for some Plutarch?

The previous pages have merely tackled some preliminary issues for the study of Turnèbe's translation of Plutarch's *De animae procreatione*. A thorough and complete study of the translation itself obviously surpasses the scope of this paper. It has, however, become clear that anyone reading the work should be on the lookout for Ciceronian elements, given the translator's preoccupation with Cicero both in the dedicatory letter and in the *Timaeus* quote. A brief passage from the beginning of the translation is enough to suggest that these elements are present:

> Illius igitur corporis <u>ingenium</u>, quam omnium receptatricem naturam appellat, sedemque et nutricem omnium quaecumque generantur, dicit, non aliud profecto est. at <u>animi indolem</u> in Philebo infinitatem vocavit, quae est omnis numeri et proportionis privantia, defectus et exuperantiae, differentiae et dissimilitudinis nullum in se finem modumque continens. In Timaeo autem cum <u>animus</u> individua <u>admixtus et temperatus</u> natura et corporibus dividua esse dicitur […] [dici existimandum est] principium illud, quod multis locis necessitatem, in Legibus aperte animum inordinatum et maleficum nominavit. Iste quippe solus per se animus erat, mente autem, ratione sollertiaque <u>aptae concentionis</u> auctus est, ut animus mundi fieret. (f. 11-12)
>
> ἡ μὲν οὖν σώματος <u>οὐσία</u> τῆς λεγομένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πανδεχοῦς φύσεως ἕδρας τε καὶ τιθήνης τῶν γενητῶν οὐχ ἑτέρα τίς ἐστιν. <u>τὴν δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς</u> ἐν Φιλήβῳ μὲν ἀπειρίαν

[57] See Demulder, "Quot lectiones, tot Turnebi".
[58] *De an. procr.* 1013B-E and *passim.*

κέκληκεν, ἀριθμοῦ καὶ λόγου στέρησιν οὖσαν ἐλλείψεώς τε καὶ ὑπερβολῆς καὶ διαφορᾶς καὶ ἀνομοιότητος ἐν αὑτῇ πέρας οὐδὲν οὐδὲ μέτρον ἔχουσαν· ἐν δὲ Τιμαίῳ τὴν τῇ ἀμερίστῳ συγκεραννυμένην φύσει καὶ περὶ τὰ σώματα γίγνεσθαι λεγομένην μεριστὴν […] [λέγεσθαι νομιστέον] ἀρχὴν ἐκείνην, ἣν πολλαχοῦ μὲν ἀνάγκην ἐν δὲ τοῖς Νόμοις ἄντικρυς ψυχὴν ἄτακτον εἴρηκε καὶ κακοποιόν. αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ψυχὴ καθ' ἑαυτήν, νοῦ δὲ καὶ λογισμοῦ καὶ ἁρμονίας ἔμφρονος μετέσχεν, ἵνα κόσμου ψυχὴ γένηται. (*De an. procr.* 1014C-E ed. and tr. Cherniss)

So the substance of body is none other than what is called by Plato the omnirecipient nature, abode and nurse of the things that are subject to generation. As for the substance of soul, in the *Philebus* he has called it infinitude as being privation of number and ratio and having in itself no limit or measure of deficiency and excess and difference and dissimilitude; and in the *Timaeus* that which is blended together with the indivisible nature and is said to become divisible in the case of bodies must be held to mean […] [that] principle which in many places he has called necessity but in the *Laws* has openly called disorderly and maleficent soul. This, in fact, was soul in itself; but it partook of intelligence and reason and rational concord that it might become the soul of the universe.

This short passage shows some Ciceronian characteristics of Turnèbe's translation technique which occur throughout the text[59]. In general, J. G. F. Powell's accurate characterization of Cicero's *Timaeus* translation as 'as close as is compatible with natural and elegant Latin style'[60] applies to Turnèbe's effort as well: he succeeds – more than, e.g., Xylander[61] – in closely following the word order and syntax of Plutarch's Greek without sacrificing the *Latinitas* of his text. A closer look reveals Turnèbe's choice to vary his translation of οὐσία: in this passage both 'ingenium' and 'indoles' (οὐσία is certainly implied in the Greek text) are used. Moreover, οὐσία was translated earlier (in the quote of *Tim.* 35A) with 'materia', which, in turn, can be Turnèbe's Latin rendering not only of οὐσία but also of ὕλη[62]. It goes without saying that, from a Plutarchan (and generally Platonic) perspective, these two terms should not be confused. From a Stoic perspective, however, they are roughly synonymous and this is what probably caused Cicero to translate οὐσία with 'materia' in his *Timaeus*

[59] Apart from a few orthographical variants and some differences in punctuation, Cherniss' text is identical to the text in Turnèbe's edition.
[60] Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek," 281. See the detailed observations in Lambardi, *Il "Timaeus" ciceroniano*, 22–41.
[61] *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* (Basileae, Thomas Guarinus, 1570): 'Ergo corporis natura alia non est, quam quae ab eo omnium receptaculum, sedes, nutrixque dicitur rerum ortarum. Animae autem naturam in Philebo appellat infinitatem, utpote numeri et rationis privationem, et in qua defectus, abundantiae, differentiae, dissimilitudinis nullus terminus insit, nulla mensura. In Timaeo autem cum dicitur individuae commixta naturae, et quae circa corpora versans dividua appelletur: […] [intelligi debet] principium illud, quod saepe necessitatem, in Legibus autem palam animam inordinatam dixit et maleficam. Ipsa enim ex sese natura talis erat: mentem autem et rationem harmoniamque solertem nacta est, ut fieret mundi anima.'
[62] E.g. *De an. procr.* 1014F ed. Cherniss: τῇ ὕλῃ προστιθέντες ἀλλὰ μὴ τῇ ψυχῇ, which is translated 'materiae acceptem ferunt, non animo'. Matters get confusing (and matter gets confusing) when, at *De an procr.* 1014B, Turnèbe translates τὴν δ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὕλην with 'naturam et materiam', whereas, in the quote of *Timaeus* 35A-B he (or rather Cicero) had reserved 'naturam' for φύσις, using 'materia' for οὐσία.

translation. Turnèbe takes over this Ciceronian choice without paying attention to Plutarch's anti-Stoic stance[63]. The main Ciceronian element in the passage under discussion, however, is the variation in the translation of the term οὐσία. Cicero, too, was prone to vary his translation of technical philosophical terms[64]. In the case of οὐσία, for instance, the term 'aeternitas' (*Tim.* 29C) occurs along with the aforementioned 'materia'[65].

A less benevolent way of addressing this terminological variation would be in terms of inconsistency. That consistency is not Turnèbe's main concern has already been pointed out and the same thing has been shown by others for Cicero's translation[66]. In this case Turnèbe shifts from 'animi indoles' to 'animus', while Plutarch is still talking about the (divisible) *being* of the soul (i.e. the kind of being which is eventually mixed together with indivisible being, τὴν τῇ ἀμερίστῳ συγκεραννυμένην φύσει). In an admittedly obscure interpretative endeavor Plutarch distinguishes between the original, divisible being of the soul in its pre-cosmic state and the cosmic soul, in which divisible and indivisible being occur combined (along with sameness and difference). However one may judge the value of Plutarch's interpretation, it is not the interpretation which is reflected in Turnèbe's translation. Turnèbe takes τὴν τῇ ἀμερίστῳ συγκεραννυμένην φύσει καὶ περὶ τὰ σώματα γίγνεσθαι λεγομένην μεριστὴν to refer to 'animus' as a whole. Starting from Cicero's translation of *Timaeus* 35A-B, as Turnèbe did, this is a legitimate step, but in the context of Plutarch's interpretation it disregards (1) the elements of sameness and difference needed to build a complete soul and (2) the distinction Plutarch wants to draw here between the (pre-cosmic, divisible) being of the soul and the (cosmic, composite) soul.

In the same sentence, συγκεραννυμένην is translated with 'admixtus et temperatus'. Such double translation is, again, a feature of Cicero's translation technique[67]. In the third book of *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, Cicero himself discusses the problem of translating Greek

---

[63] At *De an. procr.* 1022F Plutarch warns against bluntly equating divisible being with matter. On Plutarch's awareness of this being a Stoic position, see Cherniss, *Plutarch. Moralia. Volume XIII, Part I*, 180 n. b. On Plutarch's anti-Stoic stance in *De an. procr.* see D. Babut, *Plutarque et le stoïcisme* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1969), 139–142. On Cicero's 'materia' as a translation for οὐσία and its Stoic background see the insightful remarks by Lévy, "Cicero and the *Timaeus*," 104–105 (cf. also Lambardi, *Il "Timaeus" ciceroniano*, 124–142).

[64] See esp. Lambardi, *Il "Timaeus" ciceroniano*, 104–144 and the convenient list in Fries, "Untersuchungen Zu Ciceros Timäus," 582–591. See also Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek," 293–294; Puelma, "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer," 163–164.

[65] 'Materia', in turn, occurs in other philosophical works by Cicero as the translation of ὕλη, ἀρχή and χώρα, see Lambardi, *Il "Timaeus" ciceroniano*, 138–142.

[66] Puelma, "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer," 164; Lévy, "Cicero and the *Timaeus*," 105.

[67] Powell, "Cicero's Translations from Greek," 287 and 293; Puelma, "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer," 161–162.

philosophical terminology into Latin. One of the solutions is indeed using several Latin words for one Greek word (*De fin.* III, 15), which is the case here. Apparently, Turnèbe felt that only 'admixtus et temperatus' conveyed the full meaning of συγκεραννυμένην. This solution is Ciceronian not only as far as the technique is concerned: in the translation of *Tim.* 35A-B Cicero translated συνεκεράσατο the first time with 'admiscuit', the second time with 'temperavit'.

Turnèbe's *imitatio* of Ciceronian vocabulary, which can perhaps also be observed in his choice for 'animus' (Xylander, for instance, translates ψυχή with 'anima'), sometimes even contains a hint of *aemulatio*. At *Tim.* 37A, Cicero introduces the word 'concentio' and adds its Greek equivalent, as he is prone to do when he launches an original innovation: 'ἁρμονία Graece'[68]. This explicit way of translating is understandable in the context of Cicero's project of creating a Latin philosophical vocabulary. The message is: from now on, we can all translate ἁρμονία by 'concentio'. From the *De finibus* passage on translating philosophical terminology, however, it appears that the use of the Greek word itself is almost an admission of weakness. Turnèbe takes over 'concentio' as a translation for ἁρμονία without adding the Greek. However, in this case, Turnèbe must have felt like the single word 'concentio' did not reflect the full meaning, so he reverted to the technique of using two Latin words for one Greek word and added the adjective 'apta'[69].

4. Concluding remark: a Greek Cicero

For Turnèbe, the only problem with his hero Cicero was that he was not Greek. It seems like the humanist had different ways of dealing with this problem. For instance, he translated several of Cicero's works into Greek[70]. Another solution was, apparently, to bring Cicero closer to Plutarch, the Greek author at the centre of his scholarly attention. Cicero has been

[68] On this particular case, see Lambardi, *Il "Timaeus" ciceroniano*, 78–79; Puelma, "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer," 158 n. 51. Turnèbe was very much aware of the innovative character of Cicero's translation, as is shown by his remark on Cicero's translation of the term συναίτια in his *Praefatio in Timaeum Platonis* (*Opera*, III, 48) and the chapter devoted to the translation in the *Adversaria* XVIII, 14.

[69] Note also the slight syntactical change: the adjective (ἔμφρονος) is changed to a noun ('sollertia') governing 'aptae concentionis'. This was probably done in order to maintain the *Latinitas* of the sentence after introducing an extra adjective ('aptae'). Interestingly, in the translation of *De an. procr.* 1016B, where Plutarch quotes *Tim.* 36E-37A – the passage in which Cicero introduced 'concentio' – Turnèbe does not add the adjective, but he persists in leaving out the Greek equivalent. In cases such as this, where Plutarch quotes directly from the *Timaeus*, Turnèbe usually does not follow Cicero's translation exactly, but slightly adapts it, although the Ciceronian inspiration remains obvious.

[70] Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe*, 139 mentions a Greek translation of Cicero's *Paradoxa*. Unnoticed by Lewis was a translation of *Laelius*, preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, France), Nouveau Fonds Latin, Lat. 17890, see Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, 267.

shown to be omnipresent in Turnèbe's translation of *De animae procreatione* in several ways. First, the letter of dedication contained several intertextual references and ended with an attack on the man who wanted to throw Cicero, along with other authorities, off the university curriculum. Secondly, Turnèbe reads Plato's *Timaeus*, the dialogue which is the subject of Plutarch's treatise, through the eyes of Cicero. He borrows from Cicero's translation even if this means sacrificing the consistency of Plutarch's interpretation. Finally, Turnèbe's translation technique reveals several Ciceronian aspects. Indeed, Turnèbe's translation of Plutarch's *De animae procreatione* appears like a humble, reverential imitation of Cicero's translation of Plato's *Timaeus*. Whereas the Roman master translated the Greek master, Turnèbe was content with the honour of translating the *doctissimum scriptum* of Plato's interpreter.