



Bertolio, Johnny L. Il trattato “De interpretatione recta” di Leonardo Bruni

Elena Brizio

Volume 44, Number 3, Summer 2021

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1085841ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i3.38014>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Brizio, E. (2021). Review of [Bertolio, Johnny L. Il trattato “De interpretatione recta” di Leonardo Bruni]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 44(3), 263–265. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i3.38014>

fondamentale pour mieux comprendre Marc Antoine Muret, mais il s'agit aussi d'un instrument de travail important pour ceux qui souhaitent étudier la richesse des relations culturelles entre la France et l'Italie à la Renaissance.

MATTEO LETA

University of Toronto

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i3.38013>

Bertolio, Johnny L.

Il trattato “De interpretatione recta” di Leonardo Bruni.

Fonti per la Storia dell'Italia medievale – *Antiquitates* 52. Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 2020. Pp. clxiii, 53. ISBN 978-88-31445-009 (paperback) €20.

Johnny Bertolio offers readers the most complete critical edition of Leonardo Bruni's *De interpretatione recta* (1424–26) yet published. Bruni's work was briefly mentioned by Carl Wotke in 1889, and a short, incomplete edition was provided by Hans Baron in 1928. Bertolio's volume is divided into four sections: a thorough introduction, a densely-packed *nota al testo*, the critical edition of *De interpretatione recta* with the related bibliography, and an index of names.

The central focus of Bruni's work is a critique against superficial and maladroit translators, whom Bruni considered *medievals interpretes*. In his opinion, they proposed again, wearily and dully, their translations, repeating and distorting the texts because they were not able to translate them appropriately. The models that Bruni follows are Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum* and Jerome's *Epistola a Pammachio*, but the arrival of Manuel Chrysoloras in Florence in 1397 and his teaching of Greek changed Bruni's approach to education and highlighted the importance of correct understanding and translation from Greek into Latin. Typical of scholasticism, Bruni counterposes the literal tradition, referring to Horace and his *Ars Poetica*, where Horace suggests applying the criteria of *variatio* to translation: that is, a translation without comment.

Bruni thus offers the rules, still valid today, for correct translation, where “correct” means attention to style—to the equilibrium of the syntax, as well as to the literary substance, the comprehension of the *verba*, and the ability to “fully investigate etymologically the meaning of a word” (xxiv, my translation).

To translate appropriately, translators must have essential characteristics that make them different from the copyists who wearily repeat the texts. The passage from the Greek text into its Latin version should be respectful of both languages, without sloppy concessions that allow misunderstanding or the loss of the real verbal meaning. The linguistic competence needed for translation is based upon an extensive knowledge of all authors and genres, thus providing a “solid cultural background” (xxv, my translation). This allows the translator to catch the nuances of the words and to choose the most suitable terms for the translation. Bruni is, in fact, the first to use the Latin verb “traducere” (using six different nuances of the verb) in the modern sense of “to translate,” building a semantics that moves from the verb to the noun to the interpreter, thus giving the interpreter a central and fundamental role in the process.

For Bruni, the oversights and errors of medieval translators—who have, nevertheless, preserved Latin translations of Greek texts that would have been lost without their works—are to be highlighted and corrected, but without attacking the individuals responsible. Next to “consuetudo,” defined as the correct use of words that guides the interpreter (xxxii), Bruni places “suavitas”; both need to be respected in the lexical choices. The rediscovery in the first decades of the Quattrocento of complete works by Cicero and Quintilian marks an important moment in the reception of texts and in translating them accurately.

Even the title of Bruni’s work has undergone different interpretations. The adjective “recta,” in fact, has been placed either before the noun “interpretatione” (in the copies owned by Giannozzo Manetti and Vespasiano da Bisticci) or after it (as Baron did), thus confirming the different attention of the copyists. The position of the adjective allows Bertolio to create a derivations chart of manuscripts.

Bertolio also finally identifies the dedicatee of the work. It is Berto Ildebrandini, the chancellor of the Sienese republic and member of the humanistic circle that gravitated around the Petrucci family. In these years, Ildebrandini played a central role, not only as chancellor, ambassador, and public officer but as intellectual, “conversing” with people like Filelfo, Poggio Bracciolini, Enea Silvio Piccolomini (later Pope Pius II), and Antonio Panormita. Ildebrandini owned works by Bruni and considered “Messer Leonardo” to be his Virgil, further contributing to the diffusion in Siena of Bruni’s translation of Aristotle’s *Politics*.

In the second chapter (“Nota al testo”), Bertolio accurately describes, following codicological, archival, and philological rules, the twelve extant manuscripts that contain the text, about which no incunabula or *cinquecentine* are known. The *stemma codicum* shows how the codices, none entirely autographed, can be grouped into two categories: those belonging to the Quattrocento, all related, and two later copies belonging to the mid-seventeenth century. Bertolio speculates that Brunni intervened personally in the Florentine codex Riccardiano 1030, adding “Bertum Senensem” in the white space left by the copyist for the inscription, and the word “finis.”

For every manuscript, Bertolio notes additions and emendations, comparisons and oversights—including the inks used. His considerable scholarly and bibliographical work is an excellent example of philological rigour and of professional accuracy that should be taken as a model not only by those who publish critical editions but by all who publish texts.

ELENA BRIZIO

Georgetown University Villa Le Balze

<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i3.38014>

Christiansen, Keith, and Carlo Falciani, eds.

The Medici: Portraits and Politics 1512–1570.

New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art/New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021. Pp. 328 + 212 ill. ISBN 9781588397300 (hardcover) US\$65.

This exhibition catalogue, for the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s *The Medici: Portraits and Politics 1512–1570*, is edited by curators Keith Christiansen and Carlo Falciani; it marks the last exhibition of Christiansen’s long career at the institution before his retirement. Prompted by the Metropolitan’s 2017 acquisition of Francesco Salviati’s portrait of the Florentine physician, intellectual, and politician Carlo Rimbotti (no. 45), the exhibition, and therefore its catalogue, encompasses portraiture across different media in the pivotal decades between the return of the Medici family from exile to their elevation as grand dukes of Tuscany. The looming figure of Cosimo I de’Medici (1519–74) and his shrewd use of the arts to promote himself, his family, and his state, and quite often all three at once, provide the structure for a comprehensive