

Dislokasjoner: Kulturforflytninger i den tidligmoderne periode

Seminar våren 2007

PROGRAM

Seminaret går på freager fra kl. 12.15 til kl. 14.00

23. februar, seminarrom 706, Niels Treschows hus, Ingrid Kristine Andersen: “Who holds the copyright to the word of God? Martin Luther’s Bible translation in the hands of his opponents”

Due to the invention of the printing press and the vast public interest in his theology Martin Luther's new German Bible translation (1522-) experienced a rapid spread that would not be held up by a ban alone. After having criticized Luther's translation, pointing out its many 'errors', one of Luther's opponents, Hieronymus Emser, published his own German New Testament in 1527. Over the years several 'Catholic' Bible translations followed (Dietenberger 1534, Eck 1537, Ulenberg 1630), but were the Catholic translators unimpressed by Luther's text? In his famous letter *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (a letter on translation) Luther accuses Emser of plagiarism. Still he is amused that his opponents are reading his words because they are published under a different name. In this talk I will take a closer look at the German Bible translations made by Luther and Hieronymus Emser, focusing on each translator's mandate and mission and the divergence and agreement between the different texts.

23. mars, undervisningsrom 2, Georg Sverdrups hus, Ronny Spaans: “Det genealogiske og topografiske landskapet til imitasjonskunsten”

28. mai 1647 vart ei liktale over den nederlandske nasjonaldiktaren P.C. Hooft lesen opp på det nye teateret i Amsterdam. Ho var skriven av den 21 år gamle poeten Geeraert Brandt. Ikkje lenge etter kom det reaksjonar på denne hendinga i form av ein satirisk pamflett. Den anonyme forfattaren av pamfletten skulda Geeraert Brandt for plagiat: Gravtala var ein nøyaktig kopi av Jacques Davy du Perrons “Oraison Funèbre” til Pierre de Ronsards gravferd i 1585. Poeten Joannes Six van Chandelier lét ikkje forfattaren av spotteskriftet få siste ordet. Han skreiv eit forsvarsdiikt til Brandt, “Teegen ’t lasterschrift op Gerrit Brandt”, der han rettferdiggjier litterært “tjuveri” med utgangspunkt i ordtaket “Ein seier ingenting som ikkje har vorte sagt før.” Eg vil ikkje gå så mykje inn på denne spesifikke striden, men med vekt på den merkelege allusjons- og allegoribruken i diktet til Six undersøkje det generelle synet hans på

“kreativ imitatio”. Kvifor jamfører han eit klassisk dikt med ein matrett? I diktet skisserer han opp eit genealogisk og topografisk kart over imitasjonskunsten. Korleis ser det ut?

13. april, grupperom 7, Georg Sverdrups hus, Anna Fåhraeus: “The Moor in English Renaissance Drama: Rewriting as the Revision of Discourses”

The four main plays to establish the figure of the Moor in the Renaissance, were all the object of adaptations or rewrites later in the Renaissance and during the Reformation. George Peele’s *The Battle of Alcazar*, Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* and *Othello*, and the multi-authored drama *Lust’s Dominion* were all taken over by other playwrights and rewritten. *Lust’s Dominion*, for example, was split in two during the Renaissance into William Rowley’s *All’s Lost by Lust* and Thomas Rawlins’s *The Rebellion*, and both of these plays were in turn re-adapted during the Reformation. In the process of retelling the stories, the discourse surrounding race and the interaction of white Christians and black Muslims changed dramatically – particularly between the Renaissance plays and the Reformation adaptations. The most spectacular visual change occurred when Edward Young re-wrote *Othello* as *The Revenge* (published in 1721). The black Othello became the white Alonzo while the white Iago became the black Zanga. This paper will deal with the most prominent shifts in the positioning of white against black from the early sixteenth to the late sixteenth-early seventeenth century.

4. mai, seminarrom 706, Niels Treschows hus, Kristin Gjerpe: “Giordano Bruno in conflict with Oxford (1583): ‘Some Jugler’ and ‘a grave man’”

A contemporary description of Giordano Bruno’s double performance at the University of Oxford in the summer of 1583 gives a picture of the philosopher as a reckless and ridiculous figure. The most serious offence, writes George Abbot in 1603, was that “both the former and later Lecture, [were] taken almost verbatim out of the workes of Marsilius Ficinus”. This made Oxford professors plan to “make trial of him ... if he persevered to abuse ... that Auditory the thirde time.” So Bruno had to leave. Bruno’s rewriting of Ficino and others in his own works is well documented, and is now generally regarded as highly original. But the accusation of plagiarism deserves further attention. In my talk I shall look at the wording of Abbot’s mocking description and compare it to Bruno’s own fictionalised account of the Oxford incident in the dialogue *The Ash Wednesday Supper* (London 1584). Here the professors are attacked for being “a constellation of the most obstinate pedantry, ignorance, and conceit mingled with rustic rudeness.” My argument will be that the accusation of plagiarism was not so much about Bruno’s use of passages taken *verbatim* from Ficino as it was about different scholarly habits and attitudes to learning.