CHANGING CULTURAL MEMORY THROUGH TRANSLATION:

A new understanding of democracy

By Maren Rohde Pihlkjær

In 1452, Lorenzo Valla finished the first ever Latin translation of Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War*, in which he introduced Thucydides' version of the political phenomenon of democracy to fifteenth-century readers. This article examines and discusses how Valla, by changing the sense of belonging on which the Greek original builds to one of* othering*, in his translation offered his audience a new understanding of democracy: one that differed both from the cultural memory of Thucydides' fourth-century BC audience and from that of Valla's own fifteenth-century AD readers.*

Introduction

> χρώμεθα γὰρ πολιτείᾳ... καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ᾽ ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία κέκληται.[1]

> Our constitution... is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the greatest number.[2]

These immortal words echo in modern Europe, where democracy is still defined as Pericles defined it. When the constitutional treaty for the EU was drafted in 2003, the quotation above was proposed as its epigraph.[3] Though the EU chose not to keep the quote in the final treaty, it shows the value traditionally attributed to Pericles' funeral oration in discussions of how to define democracy. For what is democracy? In a time where nationalism is growing alongside the border fences, the question of the nature of democracy is once again relevant, and one of the most prolific discussions is whether

---

[1] Thucydides, *Historiae* 2.37.1.
[2] Hansen 2008, 16.
[3] Hansen 2008, 15–16.

democracies are based on *belonging* or *othering*.[4] In a democracy based on *belonging*, the democracy is defined and constituted by the citizens belonging to it; whereas in a democracy based on *othering*, the democracy is defined and constituted by its distinction from all other nations.

This article examines a cornerstone in the historical definition of democracy in Europe: the 1452 translation of Thucydides' funeral oration by Pericles from Greek into Latin by the Renaissance humanist Lorenzo Valla. It argues that Valla, through his use of *othering* rather than *belonging*, offered a new understanding of democracy that differed from how it was understood both in the original work and in the recipient culture.

Early modern understanding of democracy

A significant feature of Renaissance humanism is the new interest in ancient Greek literature. However, the rarity of the ability to read Greek proved a barrier for the Italian humanists as they strove to find and read the classical works. Only when Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1355–1415) was invited to Florence to teach Greek in 1397 did the ability to understand the ancient language begin to flourish once again. It is not known how many people mastered ancient Greek, but we do know that as the popularity of the Greek authors grew, the prestige in translating them into eloquent and fluent Latin increased as well, and that as a consequence, a great number of Greek texts were translated by Renaissance humanists during the fifteenth century.[5] Pope Nicholas V played a significant role in the transferring of Greek works into Latin. In the mid-fifteenth century he commissioned a great number of Latin translations, among which were *The history of the Peloponnesian war* by Thucydides.[6] This translation, made by the renowned humanist and Latinist Lorenzo Valla, became the standard version of the work for centuries to come; the first printed edition was produced in 1483, and the last published in Paris as late as 1840. Furthermore, several translations into vernacular languages were made directly from the Latin version.[7]

During the Middle Ages and up to 1400, few Greek authors were accessible in Latin translations. Among them was Aristotle, whose *Ethics* and *Politics* had both been translated before the arrival of Chrysoloras. The *Politics* had been translated into Latin in the mid-thirteenth century and formed an important part of the self-understanding of the city-states in

---

[4] The public debate on the subject was supported by several institutions such as the SFU Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue (SMWCD), the Centre for Public Impact, and the Othering and Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley.

[5] Taylor 2014, 330–331.

[6] Pade 2015, 29.

[7] Pade 2006, 789.

northern Italy. Its descriptions of the Greek city-states gave the Italian city-states a powerful role model for an independent form of government without a monarch. The prime example of an ancient city-state, according to Vincent Azoulay, was considered to be Sparta.[8] Azoulay argues that the city-states' interest in discipline and in military achievement made it easier for them to identify with the political system in Sparta. The Athenian democracy, on the other hand, was criticized by Aristotle. In the *Politics*, he concludes that democracy is the rule of the masses and of the poor, and as a result he considers it to be deviant, while he deems *πολιτεία* (politeia) to be the better form of majority rule.[9] Other than Aristotle, no noteworthy Latin translations of Greek political and historical literature had been made before the arrival of Chrysoloras in 1397.

The word *democratia* was in use during the Late Middle Ages and occurs in Thomas Aquinas' *De regno ad regem Cypri* (1,2), Marsiglio of Padova's *Defensor pacis* (I, VIII, 2), and Dante's *Monarchy* (*c*. 1309–1313).[10] All these works reflect Aristotle's views on democracy, and render *democratia* as a deviant form of government that in its pure form should be avoided. Another proof of widespread use of the word is a passage in Leonardo Bruni's *De interpretatione recta* (c. 1420), where Bruni criticizes the use of *democratia* as a translation of *δημοκρατία* in place of the Latin term *popularis status*:[11] he finds that there is no reason to transcribe the term, since another and more correct Latin term is available. Bruni is right in his critique, in the sense that the term *democratia* was not widely used in classical Latin – the lemma *democratia* in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* is remarkably short, with only three textual references, all referring to post-classical authors.[12] However, the term *popularis status* is not common either, and, in fact, is not even classical.[13]

This narrow understanding of democracy following Aristotle is significant in the discussion of the cultural memory of democracy; but before engaging in this, I shall define the central theoretical concept *cultural memory*.

Cultural memory

Cultural memory is the dynamic long-term shared memory of a group or society, and it forms part of the cultural identity. It is inherited from one

---

[8] Azoulay 2014, 153.

[9] Aristotle, *Politics* 1279b.

[10] See Pade 2017 for greater details on the use of the word *democratia* in late medieval and early humanist sources.

[11] Bruni Interpr. 95.

[12] For a thorough study of the political lexica in Neo-Latin see Pade 2017.

[13] See Pade 2017, 315.

generation to another, but at the same time it is also under constant development, especially as societies encounter and interact with other societies. Aleida Assmann describes the development of cultural memory in this way:

> This type of memory [cultural memory] does not come into existence or persist of its own accord; it has to be created, established, communicated, continued, reconstructed, and appropriated. Individuals and cultures construct their memories interactively through communication by speech, images and rituals. Without such representations it is impossible to build a memory that can transcend generations and historical epochs...[14]

Cultural memory comprises both physical memories, such as archive records, and non-physical memories, such as traditions and rituals, which provide self-images as well as normative standards for its members. Cultural memory is an integral part of memory, and it influences the way individuals perceive both new and well-known objects and phenomena. It is based on generations of knowledge and experience, yet at the same time, it is constantly changing.

Both the human mind and physical archives have their limitations in storage capacity. That limited capacity signifies that not everything can be remembered, and that remembrance therefore must always be accompanied by forgetting. Forgetting, in the context of cultural memory, can occur on two different bases,[15] *active* and *passive*. Active forgetting is an intentional act, such as trashing and/or destroying. This can be a necessary part of social and cultural transformations, but it can also be a destructive and violent tool when inflicted top-down. Passive forgetting, on the other hand, is a non-intentional act through which a memory is lost or neglected, but still conserved in some form.

It is the exception rather than the norm that memories are remembered. Remembering, like forgetting, takes two forms, *active* and *passive*. Active memory is actively circulated, while passive memory is stored passively to conserve the past. Assmann[16] exemplifies this using the image of a museum. Active remembering is the displaying of objects in the part of the museum accessible to the public: these objects are actively remembered, and are also referred to as the *canon*. Passive remembering is the objects hidden away in the storage vaults of the museum, inaccessible to the public: this Assmann also refers to as an *archive*.

Together, these four phases (active and passive forgetting, active and passive remembering) form the foundation of our understanding of cultural

---

[14] Assmann 2011, 10.
[15] Assmann 2008, 98.
[16] Assmann 2008, 98.

memory. In the present study, the fate of the classical Greek texts that following neglect and lack of interest went unread to such a degree that knowledge of their language was lost is considered a case of passive forgetting. The texts were left unconsulted in libraries and archives. The renewed interest in ancient texts in Latin as well as Greek during the Renaissance caused a shift from passive forgetting to passive remembering, which ended in active remembering and the canonization of most of the works now termed "classical". In the case of Thucydides, Valla's translation can be seen as a result of, as well as an agent in, this process.

In the case of the cultural memory of democracy in Renaissance humanist society, it is debatable whether we should categorize this as passively remembered or passively forgotten. It is my estimation that democracy, as portrayed by Thucydides, must be recognized to have been passively forgotten, while I understand the word and the phenomenon of democracy to have been passively remembered owing to the works of Aristotle that were read throughout the Middle Ages.

I am working from the hypothesis that the cultural memory of democracy, as portrayed by Thucydides, shifted from passively forgotten to actively remembered in Renaissance humanist society owing to a change in physical artefacts: the appearance for the first time of a translation of the *History of the Peloponnesian war*. In the following I will examine the portrayal of the Athenian democracy both in the original Pericles funeral speech and in the Latin translation, in order to show how the scarce knowledge of Athenian democracy influenced Valla's translation and his portrait of the Athenian democracy. I will furthermore discuss whether the translation was capable of effectively altering the cultural memory of democracy in the humanist environment.

The translation

To examine how Valla conveys the notion of democracy, I have analysed the senses of *belonging* and *othering* linked to the Athenian democracy in the Greek text of Pericles' funeral oration and in the Latin translation. I understand the sense of *belonging* as how the Athenians saw themselves (the Athenian "*us*"), and the sense of *othering* as how they saw others (allies as well as enemies, here referred to as "*them")*. I have registered forty-two instances of discourse on "*us"* and "*them"* in the Greek text, and below I will examine how Valla has transferred these passages into Latin. I shall not comment on all forty-two examples, but highlight some of the most significant.

Translating "us"

In the Greek text,[17] the most common term (with fifteen occurrences) for "*us*", that is, the Athenian community, is the word *πόλις*, which was and still is quite difficult to translate.

According to Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ), *πόλις* has the following definitions:

- "city" (A.I.1)
- "one's city or country" (A.I.2)
- "community or body of citizens" (A.III.1)
- "state or community" (A.III.2)

The various meanings contained in the word *πόλις* are difficult to render with just one word. Perhaps for this reason, many modern languages transcribe the word. *Πόλις* can signify both the state/city as a physical entity and the state as the committed, emotional unification of its citizens that gives them a reason to work and fight for the nation. Valla renders this in four different ways, *civitas* being the most frequent, with nine occurrences.[18] The remaining three are *patria* (three occurrences), *urbs* (two) and *res publica* (one). None of Valla's four Latin translations fully covers this, but the most equivalent term is *civitas*.[19] Seemingly, Valla is using four different terms that corresponds to the different meanings of *πόλις*.

Patria

Of the four words used by Valla to translate *πόλις*, *patria* (fatherland) conveys the strongest pathos. It may come as a surprise that in a speech delivered in time of war, at a time when it is necessary to stand up for your fatherland and be patriotic, Valla only translates *πόλις* with *patria* three times. The first example of *patria* in the speech is found in 2.36.3:

καὶ τὴν **πόλιν** τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσκευάσα-μεν καὶ ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην αὐταρκεστάτην.	et **patriam** omnibus que uel ad pacem uel ad bellum pertinent instruximus atque ornauimus.

---

[17] For this study I have used the text edition of Thucydides' *Historiae* published by J. Alberti, Thucydides 1972–2000.

[18] The archetype of the translation is available online through DigVatLib, https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.1801 (seen 1.9.2020).

[19] Lewis and Short defines *civitas* as: "the condition or privileges of a (Roman) citizen, citizenship, freedom of the city"; "the citizens united in a community, the body-politic, the state, and as this consists of one city and its territory, or of several cities, it differs from urbs, i.e. the compass of the dwellings of the collected citizens"; "= urbs, a city (rare and mostly post-Aug.; not in Cic. or Caes.)"

Here Pericles is describing how the πόλις has been prepared for the future by its citizens, be that in case of war or peace. In the Greek text, it is difficult to decide which of the meanings of πόλις is in use. It seems that the πόλις is the object of practical preparations and is consequently to be understood as either the physical city (LSJ A.I.1) or the state (LSJ A.III.2); but by translating it with *patria*, Valla brings home to the reader how much more than the physical city is at stake. With his use of *patria,* he marks the city's importance for the Athenian identity. Here Valla's text appeals to the emotions, while the Greek text of the passage can be read as appealing to logos.

The second example is in 2.37.1:

οὐδ᾽ αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι **τὴν πόλιν**, ἀξιώματος ἀφανείᾳ κεκώλυται.	neque propter paupertatem quis quominus publico munere non fungatur, dummodo **patrie** prodesse possit pro uirili parte prohibetur.

Here it is stressed that all citizens, no matter their social rank or status, are seen as capable of contributing to the wellbeing of the state. In this case, it is clear that Valla's use of *patria* is equivalent to the meaning of πόλις in the Greek text, and it stresses the importance of the argument: if we work together, regardless of individual social status, we can achieve more. The appeal to emotions contained in *patria* is important if this argument is to be valid in Latin as well as in Greek.

The third and last example is found at the climax of the oration in 2.43.1:

Καὶ οἵδε μὲν προσηκόντως **τῇ πόλει** τοιοίδε ἐγένοντο..	Et isti quidem quales par erat tales in **patriam** extitere.

Here Pericles finally addresses the fallen soldiers in whose honour he is giving the oration. Pericles stresses that the soldiers' death was worthy, because they died defending the πόλις. This is one of the most emotionally charged moments in the oration, made very clear in Valla's translation by the use of *patria*. It is worth noting that even in this pathos-filled passage, Thucydides has Pericles use the word πόλις rather than, for instance, πατρίς (fatherland).

Besides the three translations of πόλις, Valla also uses *patria* as the translation of πατρίς, the more direct equivalent term in Greek. *Πατρίς* is used only once, in 2.42.3:

καὶ γὰρ τοῖς τἆλλα χείροσι δίκαιον τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ **τῆς πατρίδος** ἀνδραγαθίαν προτίθεσθαι: ἀγαθῷ γὰρ κακὸν ἀφανίσαντες κοινῶς μᾶλλον ὠφέλησαν ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἔβλαψαν.	Etenim iustum est eos qui prestare alia nequeunt, certe in bellis **patrie**, fortitudinem animo proponere, cum melius publice de ciuitate quam peius priuatim meruerint, hoc malum illo bono obruentes.

Here Pericles states that any defects on the part of individual Athenians before the war have been rendered invisible by their laying down of their lives for the fatherland. This effect is diminished in the Latin version because Valla uses *patria* repeatedly.

Civitas

As stated previously, Valla's most-used translation for πόλις in the oration is *civitas* ("the citizens united in a community, the body-politic, the state", LS II). Especially when Pericles is speaking of the nature and structure of the πόλις – of its military education and strategy, for instance –Valla has chosen to translate with *civitas*. This is the case in six of the nine translations with *civitas.* The remaining three, however, are a little different.

The first of these special cases is in 2.43.1:

ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὴν **τῆς πόλεως** δύναμιν καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἔργῳ θεωμένους καὶ ἐραστὰς γιγνομένους αὐτῆς,	sed uel magis si contemplantes quotidie ex operibus potentiam **ciuitatis** efficiamini illius amatores

Here Pericles encourages his audience to feast their eyes upon "τὴν τῆς πόλεως δύναμιν" (the power of the polis) from day to day, the result of the hard-working Athenians, so that they are filled with love for the πόλις and eventually become its ἐρασταί – lovers of the state. This word, frequently used to designate physical lovers, creates an emphatic image of the bond between city-state and citizen. Valla transfers the image using *amatores*, an equivalent word. The argument by Pericles clearly relies on pathos, which makes the translation of πόλις with the otherwise logos-appealing *civitas* seem odd standing next to a pathos-filled word like *amatores*. Of Valla's four different translation choices, *patria* here would have emphasized the pathos of the text and strengthened the argument.

The second instance is in 2.43.1:

οὐκ οὖν καὶ **τὴν πόλιν** γε τῆς σφετέρας ἀρετῆς ἀξιοῦντες στερίσκειν,	non statuerunt sua uirtute fraudandam esse **ciuitatem**

Pericles claims that no personal calamity could induce the Athenians to deprive the πόλις of their ἀρετή. The word ἀρετή is defined in LSJ as "goodness, excellence, of any kind" (LSJ A.I) and "active merit, good service" (LSJ A.II), but the concept of ἀρετή is relative and depends on who possesses it. Here the subject is the citizens, so Valla translates ἀρετή with *virtus*. This very powerful statement follows shortly after the first mention of the fallen soldiers over whom the funeral oration is being given. Both the nature of this example and its position in the speech call for a much more pathos-filled translation than

civitas. As in the example above, Valla could easily have translated this example with the patriotic *patria*, but instead chooses the more neutral *civitas*.

The third and last instance is at 2.46.1:

τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς παῖδας τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε δημοσίᾳ **ἡ πόλις** μέχρι ἥβης θρέψει	Quorum liberos **ciuitas** hinc ad pubertatem publice alet

This occurs at the very end of the oration. It differs from all the other instances of *πόλις* in that here, for the first and only time, the *πόλις* is doing something for its citizens. Up until this point, it has been stressed how the citizens should work together for the good of the *πόλις*, fight for the *πόλις*, and love the *πόλις*. Here, the *πόλις* suddenly becomes the active party: Pericles assures the audience that the *πόλις* will take care of the children of the fallen and raise them at the state's expense. Now the *πόλις* is the state as an institution (LSJ A.III.2) providing for its citizens, but Valla has chosen to continue the use of *civitas* rather than using *res publica*, which seems to be the equivalent to the meaning in LSJ A.III.2. In this example Pericles is making use of ethos, not on his own behalf, but establishes it on behalf of the *πόλις* by assuring that the state will take care of its citizens. It stresses the sense of community in the oration. Perhaps Valla translates with *civitas* and not *res publica* because *civitas* emphasizes the embodiment of the community, while, as we shall see below, this meaning is not associated with *res publica*.

Res publica

The appearance of *res publica* ("the common weal/state", LS II.K), used only once to translate *πόλις*, occurs when Pericles addresses the parents of the fallen soldiers and encourages them if they still can to have more children, both as a comfort and as a reassurance for the state, 2.44.3:

καρτερεῖν δὲ χρὴ καὶ ἄλλων παίδων ἐλπίδι, οἷς ἔτι ἡλικία τέκνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι· ἰδίᾳ τε γὰρ τῶν οὐκ ὄντων λήθη οἱ ἐπιγιγνόμενοί τισιν ἔσονται, καὶ **τῇ πόλει** διχόθεν, ἔκ τε τοῦ μὴ ἐρημοῦσθαι καὶ ἀσφαλείᾳ, ξυνοίσει· οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἴσον τι ἢ δίκαιον βουλεύεσθαι οἳ ἂν μὴ καὶ παῖδας ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου παραβαλλόμενοι κινδυνεύωσιν.	Tolerare tamen oportet spe aliorum liberorum eos qui in etate adhuc sunt procreandi. Siquidem futura soboles et quibusdam erit peculiaris obliuio defunctorum et **rei publice** bis proderit quod eam nec desolatam patietur et tutam prestabit. Non enim possunt aut par aut iustum consilium dare ii qui exponunt periculis liberos istorum more, et qui non exponunt.

Why Valla chooses to translate with *res publica* is unclear; if we compare this with his previous translation with *civitas*, both instances are focusing on the *πόλις* as institution and state (LSJ A.III.2) rather than citizen body. Consequently the meaning of *πόλις* is the same. Valla's translations, however, differ. As a result, the use of *res publica* distances the *πόλις* from the citizen

body, perhaps to stress that a new crop of children will reassure not only the bereaved parents, but also the state.

Urbs

The use of *urbs* (city) as a translation of *πόλις* occurs twice. The first occurrence, in 2.39.1, clearly refers to the physical city of Athens:

τήν τε γὰρ **πόλιν** κοινὴν παρέχομεν   quod **hanc urbem** omnibus exhibemus

The second occurrence in 2.41.2 is more interesting, since it occurs in a description of the nature of the *πόλις,* and therefore in a context where Valla usually translates with *civitas*. In this example, the word *πόλις* is used three times in a row, but it is translated differently into Latin, 2.41.1–2, 5:

ξυνελών τε λέγω **τήν** τε πᾶσαν **πόλιν** τῆς Ἑλλάδος παίδευσιν εἶναι καὶ καθ᾽ ἕκαστον δοκεῖν ἄν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλεῖστ᾽ ἂν εἴδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ᾽ ἂν εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα αὔταρκες παρέχεσθαι. [2] καὶ ὡς οὐ λόγων ἐν τῷ παρόντι κόμπος τάδε μᾶλλον ἢ ἔργων ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια, αὐτὴ ἡ δύναμις **τῆς πόλεως**, ἣν ἀπὸ τῶνδε τῶν τρόπων ἐκτησάμεθα, σημαίνει.... [5] περὶ τοιαύτης οὖν **πόλεως** οἵδε τε γενναίως δικαιοῦντες μὴ ἀφαιρεθῆναι αὐτὴν μαχόμενοι ἐτελεύτησαν, καὶ τῶν λειπομένων πάντα τινὰ εἰκὸς ἐθέλειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς κάμνειν.

Atque ut semel dicam uidetur mihi hec **ciuitas** tum in totum esse grecie magisterium, tum per singulos uiros corpus ad plurima rerum genera idoneum exhibere cum gratia precipue et uenustate. Et quia hec in presentiarum non orationis iactatione magis quam rerum ueritate nitimur, hec **urbis** potentia quam his artibus parauimus est documento [...] Pro hac igitur **ciuitate** et isti quod indignum ducerent eam euerti, preliantes generose occubuerunt, et reliquorum decet unumquenque uelle anniti.

As shown above, Valla translates with *civitas* the first and third time here, but for some reason chooses to change his strategy when he translates *πόλις* for the second time. Here *urbs* is used in the sense "as a political entity" (OLD 1,a). I see no other reason to translate with *urbs* than a wish to vary the language. The variation in Valla's language means that the repetitive use of *πόλις* in the Greek text is lost.

Democratia

Besides using *πόλις* to describe the "*us*" of the text, Thucydides also uses *πολιτεία* (two occurrences), *δημοκρατία* (one), and *ἀστός* (one).[20] One word seems to be missing in the formation of the idea of "*us*": the name "Athens" is never

---

[20] *πολιτεία* is always translated with res publica, and in both occurrences it is used in the description of Athens as a democracy. Ἀστός is used as the antonym of ξένος, and is translated with ciuis. In this article I will not comment further on these translations.

used in the oration, and furthermore "Hellas" is only used when referring to other cities than Athens.

Δημοκρατία occurs once in 2.37.1:

καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ᾽ ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν **δημοκρατία** κέκληται	nomenque habemus non quod ad paucos sed quod ad multos pertinent, **democratia**

This very famous appearance of *δημοκρατία* in the Greek text is crucial in the discussion of cultural memory in successive societies. The passage appeals strictly to logos without emotional implications, simply stating that the form of government used in Athens is called democracy. Nonetheless, the use of the word is crucial for readers not fully acquainted with Athenian democracy, including Valla's. Here Valla chooses not to translate the term, but to transcribe it. Bruni's critique of the use of *democratia* as a translation of *δημοκρατία* cannot have been unknown to Valla, and, in fact, elsewhere in the *Historiae,* Valla does translate with the endorsed *status popularis*: according to Pade,[21] the word *δημοκρατία* or words derived from it occur thirty-two times in the *Historiae*, and Valla almost invariably translates these with *popularis status*. In transcribing *δημοκρατία* rather than replacing it by, e.g., *popularis status*, Valla could have been following a strategy to promote, rather than domesticate, the concept. Pade argues that this is unlikely to be an oversight: she suggests that Valla opts for the transcription because Pericles mentions the term or *nomen δημοκρατία*.

Translating "them"

Turning to the most-used term for "*them*" in the Greek text, this is the Greek word *πολέμιος* (enemy). This occurs only five times in the oration, meaning that the enemy is almost invisible in the Greek text. This is quite unexpected, considering that the Athenians are at war and the oration honours their fallen soldiers. Furthermore, the enemy – the Spartans – is mentioned only once by name (this goes for both the Latin and Greek texts). Valla translates all instances of *πολέμιος* with *hostis* (enemy), but interestingly this is not the only term that he translates with *hostis*: *ἐναντίος* (opponent or enemy), which occurs twice, is also translated with *hostis* or *hostilis*.

The first occurrence is in 2.39.1:

Διαφέρομεν δὲ καὶ ταῖς τῶν πολεμικῶν μελέταις **τῶν ἐναντίων** τοῖσδε	In studiis autem rei bellice hinc quoque differimus ab **hostibus**

---

[21] Pade 2017, 330–332.

Here *hostis* is used as the translation of ἐναντίος. Though this may seem an equivalent translation, Thucydides' choice of ἐναντίος rather than the πολέμι-ος he uses elsewhere in the oration indicates a differentiation between the two terms. *Πολέμιος* is the stronger of the two, since it removes all doubt: this is not just someone who is not "*us"*, but someone who intends "*us*" no good.

In the second occurrence, at 2.42.4, it seems a bit odd of Thucydides not to use πολέμιος:

τὴν δὲ **τῶν ἐναντίων** τιμωρίαν ποθεινο-τέραν αὐτῶν λαβόντες	preoptans [...] **hostilis** penę quam salu-tis sue cupidiores

Here it is quite clear that those in question are an enemy, since there is talk of vengeance. We might therefore expect Thucydides to use πολέμιος. My suggestion is that Thucydides wishes to stress the vengeance itself rather than the enemy: the desire is for vengeance, and the enemy is less important.

Besides these seven mentioned instances, Valla uses *hostis* one more time, when he translates "αὐτοῦ τούς τιμωρεῖσθαι" (his own revenge) with "*ultione hostium"* (revenge on the enemies). Valla's non-differentiation between πολέμιος and ἐναντίος brings the sum total of Valla's uses of *hostis/hostilis* eight.

Belonging or othering?

The most interesting discovery in the course of my analysis is the repetitive use of πόλις and the difficulty of translating this concept. In the Greek text, the repetitive use of πόλις portrays Athens and Athenian democracy as an inclusive institution founded on the collaboration between citizens and state. This builds a sense of *belonging* in the audience, and stresses the importance of the individual loving, working for, even dying for the community, the πόλις. Supported by the structure of the Athenian democracy in which the citizens take an active part in government, the sense of *belonging* becomes the dominant notion of democracy.

The analysis has also shown that Valla in his translation emphasizes "*them"* far more than does Pericles in the original version. Valla's use of *civitas* in some passages shows that he could have made *civitas* almost as present in the text as πόλις. Had he done so, he could have emphasized "*us*" and thereby the feeling of *belonging*. But instead of reproducing the existing imagery of *belonging* in the oration, he replaces it by fear of the other, the enemy. The result is to make the enemy – almost invisible in the Greek text – much more visible by cultivating a sense of *othering*. This very fundamental change of focus from the inclusive community of the city-state towards the alienation of the remainder of Hellas, specifically Sparta, gives a very different depiction of democracy than is portrayed in the Greek text.

Why did Valla translate as he did? The answer may lie in a combination of two factors. The first of these may be his readers' ignorance of the Athenian democracy. Before Valla's translation, Athenian democracy must be considered a casualty of passive forgetting. Valla therefore presents a version of democracy that is more acceptable to his readers, one based on *othering* rather than *belonging*. Fear of an enemy is universal, and the need to stand together against the common enemy is easy to understand. The unifying idea implicit in direct democracy is more complex, perhaps even harder to understand for readers who are not part of a democracy. For the Renaissance humanists, Aristotle's criticism of democracy made it harder still.

The second factor may simply be a matter of following the prevailing translation strategy of "non verbum pro verbo": that is, not to render word for word, but sense for sense – a strategy celebrated by (Pseudo)Cicero in *On the Best Kind of Orators*.[22] This strategy was one of several adopted by the Renaissance humanists, who were great admirers of Cicero (to whom the text was attributed at the time). In the Renaissance period, this strategy was expressed as a wish to translate the ancient Greek texts as if the original Greek authors had written them in Latin in the first place.[23] Had Valla transcribed πόλις, or used just one term to render it, he would have been translating "verbum pro verbo" rather than translating the meaning of the word on each separate occasion.

In the end, Valla's translation strategy presents the readers with a slightly altered image of democracy from that portrayed by Thucydides. Not only that, but at the same time his approach portrays a new understanding of democracy that differs from that already existing in the cultural memory at the time. These physical texts represent the first step towards a possible change in the cultural memory. The vision of democracy that Valla offers is more accessible to his readers than the vision in the Greek text: Valla is offering the Renaissance humanists a new conceptual framework in which to understand, interpret, analyse and discuss democracy. It is a framework that makes space for a more nuanced discussion of democracy, perhaps even a re-evaluation of Aristotle's negative dismissal of democracy.

Once Valla's text was disseminated and read, the new understanding of democracy could become part of the active cultural memory and, over time, replace or give a more nuanced view to the image of democracy portrayed by Aristotle. Already in the second half of the fourteenth century, we see an increase in historiographers referring to Thucydides.[24] Today, we have

---

[22] Ps.Cic. *opt. gen.* 5.

[23] Like Bruni, who wishes to let Plato speak as if he had known Latin, Bruni 1741: ep. I 8 a. 1404–1405.

[24] Pade 2006, 791.

twenty-two existing manuscripts of the translation, as well as numerous printed editions.[25] Along with the version of democracy it presented, Valla's translation, in use for so long and across the whole span of Europe, became a key to the European cultural memory of democracy.

---

[25] Pade 2006, 789.

Bibliography

Assmann, Aleida 2011, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*: *Functions*, *Media*, *Archives*, New York.

Assmann, Aleida 2008, "Canon and Archive", *Cultural Memory Studies*: *An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds.: Astrid Erill & Ansgar Nünning, Berlin & New York, 97–108.

Azoulay, Vincent 2014, *Pericles of Athens*, Princeton.

Hansen, Mogens Herman 2008, "Thucydides' Description of Democracy (2.37.1) and the EU-Convention of 2003", *Greek*, *Roman and Byzantine Studies* 48, 1, 15–26

Pade, Marianne 2017, "Popular government revisited: new texts on Greek political history and their influence in fifteenth-century Italy", *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 19, 313–338.

Pade, Marianne 2015, "The Renaissance", *A Handbook of the Reception of Thucydides*, eds.: Christine Lee & Neville Morley, Chichester, West Sussex, 26–42.

Pade, Marianne 2006, "Thucydides' Renaissance Readers," *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, eds.: Antonis Tsakmakis & Antonios Rengakos, Boston & Leiden, 779–810.

Taylor, Andrew 2014, "Introduction: The Translations of Renaissance Latin", *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 41, 329–353.

Thucydides, 1972–2000, *Historiae*, ed.: Giovan Battista Alberti, Rome.

Venuti, Lawrence 1995, *The Translator's Invisibility*: *A History of Translation*. London & New York.