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Abstract

This article discusses the first published Dutch translation, by the Dutchman Simon Ingels, of an ode by the Polish poet Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, one of the most renowned Neo-Latin lyricists. It opens with a discussion of Sarbiewski’s links with the Low Countries, followed by an introduction of the translator and his works. A comparison between Sarbiewski’s original text and Ingels’ translation then shows how the translator cleverly adapted the work to his own, Dutch, context: where Sarbiewski called for unity amongst the Polish and Lithuanians knights, Ingels turned that into a similar message for the Dutch Republic.
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The name Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, or, in Latin, Mathias Casimirus Sarbievius (1595–1640), will probably not ring too many bells with the average modern reader. Nevertheless, the Polish Jesuit poet, whose numerous Neo-Latin compositions won him the name ‘the Christian/Sarmatian Horace’, was famous throughout Europe for over two hundred years. In the Low Countries, his poetry was read and praised by many renowned authors, such as Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft, Hugo Grotius and Constantijn Huygens. As a result of his popularity, several of the Pole’s poems were translated into Dutch.

It is surprising, therefore, that to this day there has been but little scholarly interest in these translations. As they form a significant part of Sarbiewski’s literary heritage in the Low Countries, however, it is of great importance that these translations be investigated in detail, in order to better understand the international reception of the Polish Jesuit’s works, and the spread and popularity of his writings in the Netherlands. In addition, these texts inform us about the evolution of poetic translations and adaptations, and the ways in which some translators sought to appropriate foreign literature to their own contexts.

This paper investigates the first published Dutch translation of one of Sarbiewski’s poems, *Lyr. iv, 36 Ad equites Polonos et Lithuanos*, by the little-known author Simon Ingels. The aim is to assess how Ingels went about translating Sarbiewski’s original and why he did so. First, a thing or two should be said about the Pole’s popularity in the Low Countries in general, so as to paint a background for the rest of the paper. Then, the translator himself, Simon Ingels, will be briefly introduced. Finally, Sarbiewski’s original and Ingels’ translation will be analysed and compared with one other.

---

Sarbiewski and the Low Countries

Although Sarbiewski’s first claim to fame may be that his poetry was probably much admired at the court of Pope Urban VIII (Maffeo Barberini, 1568–1644) while the Polish Jesuit lived in Rome during the 1620s, and although the great majority of translations of Sarbiewski’s works was written on the British Isles, it is safe to say that the Sarmatian Horace owed his international popularity to the Low Countries, and more specifically to Antwerp. The first edition of his poems issued there is said to have been produced by a printer named Montus or Monti, in 1624. It contained only four epodes, and did not mention Sarbiewski as their author. Thus, when Joannes Cnobbaert (or Jan Knobbaert), the printer of the enlarged 1630 edition, wrote in his preface that Sarbiewski’s poetry ‘e Polonia huc denuo advolavit’ (‘has flown here from Poland once again’), he may have been referring to this, or another, earlier edition, which he then substantially expanded. However, since Cnobbaert’s printing press was located next to the Antwerp Jesuit domus professa, it is perhaps more likely that he received the material from his neighbours.

Cnobbaert’s volume in turn probably inspired Balthasar Moretus (1574–1641), grandson of the famous Christoffel Plantin (c. 1520–1589) and owner of one of the most important printing houses in Europe, to publish Sarbiewski’s poetry himself, in 1632 and 1634. As Antwerp was ‘a Jesuit stronghold,’ the Plantin-Moretus publishing house was no stranger to Jesuit works, and Balthasar Moretus had


4 This edition is mentioned by several sources, but it appears to be untraceable. See J. Warszawski, Mickiewicz uczniem Sarbiewskiego, Rzym (Rome) 1964, p. 113. The Montus or Monti printing house, moreover, does not feature in F. Olthoff, De boekdrukkers, boekverkopers en uitgevers in Antwerpen sedert de uitvinding der boekdrukkunst tot op onze dagen, Antwerpen 1891. There was a Montanus, or Dumont, in Antwerp (Willem van den Bergh), but he lived in the sixteenth century. On this Montanus, see A. Rouzet, Dictionnaire des imprimeurs, libraires et éditeurs des xve et xvie siècles dans les limites géographiques de la Belgique actuelle, Nieuwkoop 1975, p. 153.


7 Many archival documents suggest strong links between the Antwerp Jesuits and the Plantin-Moretus press. The Jesuits used to be called upon to examine religious texts, for example, and the Officina Plantiniana published the works of such Jesuit authors as Hieronymus Nadal, Leonardus Lessius, and Carolus Scribani. Several other Jesuit works were printed by Moretus not long before his edition of Sarbiewski’s Lyricorum libri iv, such as Iacobus Fuligatto’s Vita Roberti Bellarmini in 1631, and Hermannus Hugo’s Vita P. Caroli Spinolae Societatis Iesu in 1630.
Paul Hulsenboom successfully worked with Polish authors and printers in the past. Furthermore, when the Polish crown prince Władysław Wasa visited Antwerp in 1624, Moretus was able to offer him a special edition of Robert Bellarmine’s (1542–1621) *De officio Principis Christiani libri tres* and several other works. The Antwerp printer thus had every reason to be enthusiastic about Sarbiewski’s poetry, all the more so because Moretus himself was no mean poet, and he may well have appreciated the Pole’s literary talents.

From a number of letters written to or about Sarbiewski by Moretus in the years surrounding his two editions of Sarbiewski’s lyrics, it becomes apparent that the Jesuit father Joannes Bollandus (1596–1665) formed the most important link between the Polish poet and the Antwerp printer. Bollandus may have informed Sarbiewski about Moretus’ plans to publish the Pole’s works. In response, Sarbiewski composed the flattering *Lyr. iii, 31 Ad Balthasarem Moretum*, for which Moretus thanked the poet in one of his letters. Moreover, Moretus’ enthusiasm may have been excited even more when Bollandus told him of numerous new, still unpublished poems.

Moretus went on to publish what would become the standard editions of Sarbiewski’s poems until well into the eighteenth century. Containing four books of odes, Moretus published numerous works by Polish authors, such as Mikołaj Radziwiłł’s *Ierosolymitana peregrinatio* in 1614, and Szymon Starowolski’s *In obitum (...) Sigismundi iii, Poloniae et Sueciae Magni Regis* in 1632. Several Polish presses, on the other hand, made use of printing plates which had come from the Antwerp publishing house. See J.A. Chrościcki, “‘Horatius Sarmaticus’. Dwa antwerpskie wydania „Lyrorum” Sarbiewskiego z frontispisami wedle projektów Rubensa’, in: J. Białostocki (ed.), *O ikonografii ściekowej doby humanizmu. Tematy, symbole, problemy*, Warszawa 1977, p. 281–333.

During his visit, the crown prince was also portrayed by Rubens, who would later fashion the title-pages of Moretus’ Sarbiewski editions. Additionally, the fact that many of Sarbiewski’s poems were eulogies of pope Urban VIII may have been attractive to Moretus as well: in 1634, in the same year he printed his second edition of Sarbiewski’s lyrics, Moretus published the pope’s *Poemata*.

On Bollandus and Sarbiewski, see J. Bollandus, G. Henschenius, and D. Papebrochius (eds.), ‘Tractatus praeminaris de vita, operibus et virtutibus Joannis Bollandis S.J.’, in: *Acta sanctorum quotquot toto urbe coluntur, vel a Catholicis scriptoribus coluntur. Martii tomus primus*, Paris, Rome 1865, xiv: ‘Et primum quidem, qui poeseos studiorumque humaniorum amans perinde ac peritus erat, intima ei familiaritas coaulit cum externarum provinciarum poetis, praecipue autem P. Joanne [sic!] Casimiro Sarbievo; cuius carmina non tantum Antverpianis typis cudi reeduque curavit, sed etiam exornanda epicitharismatis aliorum in eadem arte illustrium virorum’ (‘And first, indeed, as he [Bollandus] equally loved and was skilled at both poetry and the human studies, he nourished his profound familiarity herewith poets from foreign countries, and especially with P. Joannes [sic!] Casimirus Sarbievus; of whose poems he did not only make sure that they were printed and reprinted by the Antwerp presses, but also that they were furnished with epicitharismas by other men, distinguished in the same art’). The passage goes on to enumerate the contributors to the *Epicitharisma*, and mentions that Bollandus accumulated their poems. Bollandus was a well-known hagiographer, who gave rise to the Jesuit *bollandistae*.


In 1759, the Parisian Barbou printing press published a new, enlarged edition. It was reprinted in 1791.
one of epodes and one of epigrams, they were also the largest collections of the Polish Jesuit’s works until that time. As the 1632 volume soon sold out, another edition was sent to the press in 1634, of which no fewer than five thousand copies were issued, indicating the book’s enormous popularity. Importantly, however, the editions did not only include Sarbiewski’s own poetry, but works by other poets as well: in a so-called Epicitharisma at the end of the volume, a ‘finale’, we might say, we find a collection of fifteen Latin poems by fourteen authors, mostly Antwerp Jesuits, all eulogising Sarbiewski. Some of the more famous poets contributing to this collection were Sidronius Hosschius (1596–1653), Jacobus Wallius (1599–1690) and even Erycius Puteanus (1574–1646), the only non-Jesuit. Sarbiewski’s international status thus received a welcome boost in the form of a number of laudatory poems, which suitably extol the Pole to nigh unreachable heights: Sarbiewski is even said to outdo Horace and Orpheus! Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), himself a poet of great renown, is credited to have had the same high opinion of the Polish Jesuit’s writings, and Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687) too appears to have been an avid reader of Sarbiewski’s oeuvre, excited as he was to receive the 1632 issue.


16 Numerous sources mention the phrase ‘non solum aequavit, sed interdum superavit Flaccum’ (‘not only did he [Sarbiewski] equal Horace, but at times he also surpassed him’). It features, e.g., in L.A. du Maurier, Mémoires pour Servir à l’Histoire de Hollande et des Autres Provinces-Unies, Paris 1687, p. 438, but its original source is never mentioned.

17 This is suggested by his correspondence: from J.P. Boddens to Huygens, 4 January 1633, from Huygens to Boddens, 31 March 1633, and from Huygens to De Monmor, 4 February 1666. See C. Huygens, Briefwisseling: 1608–1687, ed. J.A. Worp, 6 vols., ’s-Gravenhage 1911–1917, vol. 1, letters 748 and 773, and vol. 6, letter 6520. In letter 748, Boddens writes that he is glad to find that Huygens is fond of Sarbiewski, and that he ‘likewise’ compares him to Lucan. He informs Huygens that he will send him
The reason I emphasise the importance of the Antwerp editions, is because it is highly likely that the first Netherlandish translators of Sarbiewski’s works made use of them. For apart from the appraisals he received, the influence he had on other authors, and the place of his works in school curricula, 18 the Low Countries also produced a number of translations of his poetry, ranging from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century. Until now, I know of eight translations by six authors, three of which are well known. Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft (1581–1647) was the first to translate an ode by Sarbiewski, in 1634, accompanying a letter to a friend with his paraphrase of Sarbiewski’s Lyr. 1, 2 Ad Aurelium Lycum, and saying he did not find its author inferior to Horace. 19 He was followed by the prolific poet David van Hoogstraten (1658–1724) in 1697, who included two of the Pole’s poems in his collection of translations of for example Horace, Martial, and Jacopo Sannazaro, 20 and finally, in 1838, the Fleming Prudens van Duyse (1804–1859) produced a translation of Sarbiewski’s Lyr. iii, 29 Ad amicos Belgas. 21 Furthermore, a couple of translations were composed by two little-known authors, one in the eighteenth, and one in the nineteenth century. 22

Moretus’ 1632 edition in due time, for which Huygens thanks his friend in letter 773. In letter 6520, Huygens expresses his delight over the 1665 Paris edition of Sarbiewski’s poems.

18 A Flemish textbook centered around Sarbiewski is Odae M.C. Sarbievii excerptae in usum gymnasi Alostani, Alosti 1824. See D. Sacré, “Etiamis in tus laudes totum consipret Belgium” (n. 5), p. 116, 124–126, for more instances of Sarbiewski’s poetry in textbooks and reference books throughout Europe, as well as for further information on the Pole’s reception in the Low Countries. On this topic also see Borowski, Iter Polono-Belgico-Ollandicum, p. 139–150. A fine example of Sarbiewski’s Nachleben in the Low Countries which has until now escaped scholarly notice, is a long laudatory poem by Sebald Fulco Johannes Rau (1765–1807), a professor in poetry and rhetoric from Utrecht. His eulogy, entitled Aan Sarbiewski (To Sarbiewski), was first published in Mnemosyne 4 (1817), p. 10–14.


20 Van Hoogstraten produced translations of Sarbiewski’s Lyr. ii, 3 Ad suam testudinem and iv, 23 Ad cicadam, entitled De dichter aen zyn lier (The poet to his lyre) and Aen de krekel (To the cricket) respectively. See D. van Hoogstraten, Gedichten, Amsterdam 1697, p. 353–354.


22 The first translation, of Sarbiewski’s Epigr. xviii Mater Neronis ad Neronem, by the Dutchman Ahasuërus van den Berg (signed A. van den Berg), can be found as Agrippina aen haren zoon Nero (Agrippina to her son Nero) in Proeven van poetische mengelstoffen, door het dichtliedvend kunstgenootschap, onder de spreuk: kunstliefde spaart geen vlijt, en prijsvaarzen, behelzende den lof der dankbaarheid, 13 vols., Leiden 1773–1796, vol. 4, p. 166. The epigram was also translated by Simon Ingels (see below). The other
The majority of these translations have a few things in common: firstly, most follow the originals relatively closely, at least when it comes to their meaning. Secondly, most inform the reader that they are indeed translations of Sarbiewski’s lyrics. This is not the case with the translation at the heart of this paper, however.

S.I.

That poem, which is the first published Dutch translation of any of Sarbiewski’s works, comes from the hand of a man who does not share the fame of Hooft, Van Hoogstraeten, or Van Duyse. In fact, we cannot even be sure of his name: the title-page of his collected poetry, printed by Abraham van Blanken in Amsterdam in 1658, gives us only his initials: S.I. For a long time, these were thought to represent one S. Ingen, yet for some time now, scholars think the man was actually called Simon Ingels. Born in Amsterdam in 1618, Ingels studied law in Leiden in 1640 and in 1660 moved to Barcelona as consul. What became of him after that, we do not know.

The volume in which we find Ingels’ translation of Sarbiewski’s *Lyr. iv*, 36 is entitled *De getrouwe herderin. Lantspel. Door S.I. Met enige gedichten van de zelve* (The loyal translation, of Sarbiewski’s *Lyr. ii*, 5 *E rebus humanis excessus*, by the Fleming J.H. Bormans, appeared as *Sarbiewus, Lyric. ii. 5 in Lettervruchten van het Lewensch genootschap tijd en vlijt. Deel 1. Dichtstukken*, Antwerpen 1845, p. 166-169. It is dated June 1, 1836.


See J.F.M. Sterck, *Oorkonden over Vondel en zijn kring*, Bussum 1918, p. 177. Sterck writes that Ingels was probably in love with Maria Crombalch, daughter of the well-known poetess Maria Tesselschade (whom he may have met at the Muiderslot), and that on April 19th, 1660 he signed a letter of attorney benefiting his brother, before leaving for Barcelona (Sterck also points out that Ingels’ brother, Reynier, or Reynier Engelen, was portrayed by Rembrandt on his famous *Nachtwacht*). Regarding Maria Crombalch, several of Ingels’ poems indeed indicate that he had strong feelings for her. In addition, note should be made of Hooft, *De Briefwisseling van Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft* (n. 19), vol. 2, p. 543, where in letter 646, dated July 21nd, 1634, and addressed to Hooft’s brother Jacob Baak, Hooft mentions a ‘lawyer Ingel’, who had sent him ‘some Latin verses’. This may well have been Simon Ingels’ father, the lawyer and poet Johannes Ingel, to whom Caspar Barlaeus dedicated a laudatory poem. See C. Barlaeus, *Caspari Barlaei Antverpiani poemata. Pars ii. Elegiarum et miscellaneorum carminum*, Amsterdam 1646, p. 573-574. It is likely, considering the different spellings of the family’s surname, that there is no one correct way of spelling S.I.’s name.
shepherdess. Country play. By S.I. With several poems by the same). It is largely taken up by another translation, although Ingels presents it as his own work: his *De getrouwe herderin* is a translation of *La fida ninfa* (1595) by the Italian Francesco Contarini (1556-1624). Following this play is a large collection of short poems on a variety of topics, ranging from eulogies to epitaphs to descriptions of works of art. In addition to the translation of Sarbiewski’s *Lyr. iv, 36*, there is a translation of the Pole’s *Epigr. lvii Mater Neronis ad Neronem*, erroneously entitled *Octavia aan Nero* (*Octavia to Nero*; the emperor’s mother was called Agrippina, not Octavia), which follows the original relatively closely. Nowhere is it indicated, however, that Ingels has included translations into his collection, nor is the name of Sarbiewski (or Contarini, for that matter) ever mentioned.

In the author’s preface, Ingels merely informs the reader that his inquisitiveness has caused him to produce his compositions, ‘like Apelles once did with his paintings’. He goes on to say that the writing of *De getrouwe herderin* had taken him some ten or twelve years, and that he has included the collection of poems, which he had composed both in the Low Countries and abroad, in order to appease a friend of his, as well as to make the whole ‘more agreeable’.

Following the actual preface is a Latin sentence which may prove useful when analysing Ingels’ translation of Sarbiewski’s poem: ‘Fructus legendi est ut aemuleris, quae in alius probas, et quae maxime in aliorum scriptis miraris, in aliquem usum tuum opportuna derivatione convertas’ (‘The fruit of reading is this, to strive for that which you approve of in others, and to apply for some use of yours, with a suitable derivation, that which you admire the most in the writings of others’). The sentence is a nearly verbatim quote from Macrobius’ (late fourth–early fifth century AD) *Saturnalia* iv, 1.2. In his book, Macrobius stressed the importance of collecting and adjusting the works of earlier authors, following the still older theory of the author as a bee, associated mostly with Seneca the Younger (4 BC–65 AD). The author must imitate a bee, Seneca said, which goes around from flower to flower, collecting nectar, and mingles the various nectars into ‘a single sweet substance’.

Ingels may therefore not have told the reader about his translations explicitly, yet by adding this one sentence to his preface,
he is signaling that not all of the material found in his collection is necessarily entirely original. Indeed, he has applied that which he admires ‘the most in the writings of others’ ‘for some use’ of his own. As will be shown below, this is exactly what he did with Sarbiewski’s ode.

Importantly, several of Ingels’ poems indicate why the Dutchman may have been drawn to Sarbiewski’s works in the first place: his odes on Christ Crucified, a statue of the Virgin Mary and ‘the poet beneath the cross’ are strongly reminiscent of the Polish Jesuit’s own lyrics. Considering this, there may well be more to the S.I. initials as well: at the time, these letters would automatically be associated with the Societas Iesu, the Society of Jesus, the order of the Jesuits. Could Ingels have been a Jesuit himself? Such an interpretation would explain why the author chose to leave out both his own name and that of Sarbiewski, at a time when most of the Dutch Republic was Calvinistic. The initials served to cover up Ingels’ identity, yet may simultaneously have hinted at the author’s religious convictions, addressing his fellow Jesuits specifically.

Sarbiewski’s original…

Let us now take a look at the poem Ingels has translated. The title of Sarbiewski’s Lyr. iv, 36, which first appeared in the Plantin-Moretus volumes, reads Ad equites Polonos et Lithuanos. Amphion, seu Civitas bene ordinata (To the Polish and Lithuanian knights. Amphion, or The well-ordered State).\textsuperscript{31} The ode thus ties in with other poems by Sarbiewski, who on multiple occasions addressed his fellow countrymen, either praising their victories or exhorting them to battle.\textsuperscript{32} The ode’s subtitle, however, reveals that Lyr. iv, 36 is slightly different: other than we might expect, perhaps, the poem does not only have a martial component, but in fact addresses a much more general issue, that of ‘The well-ordered State’. That state, of course, is Poland-Lithuania.\textsuperscript{33}

In the ode, Amphion, the mythical Greek lyre player who built the walls of Thebes using his divine music, calls upon the Thebans, asking them to cherish their ancient rites and customs, and to discard all that is new and foreign (1–4). Most of the poem is subsequently taken up by further admonitions: peace and unity must be strived for, while vices such as greed and laziness should be excluded. Thát, then, appears to be the essence of the well-ordered state from the ode’s title, of which we are again reminded

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{31}] M.C. Sarbievius, Lyricorum libri iv. Epodon lib. unus. alterq. epigrammatum, Antverpiae 1632, p. 202–204. See Appendix A. The Latin text has been copied literally, including the (sometimes confusing) punctuation and spelling. All translations are my own.
\item[\textsuperscript{32}] See Lyr. 1, 15, iv, 1, 16 and 29.
\item[\textsuperscript{33}] From 1569 to 1795, Poland and Lithuania formed a political union, which was led by Poland, called the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth.
\end{itemize}
at the poem’s end, when the walls of Thebes come together and form a harmonious unity, a metaphor for the well-ordered state itself.

Thus, while the poem’s beginning and end indicate a Theban context, the stanza’s in between move away from the ancient city, so as to put to the fore rather more generally applicable messages. ‘Holy Divine Right’, ‘Justice’, and ‘Truth and Peace and Love’ should banish all crime, for which, it seems, no walls are high enough (5–12).\(^3^4\) Deceit, lust for power and idle luxury should make place for poverty, and soldiers ought to concern themselves with iron, not gold (13–20). In order for all this to happen, men should join forces, for high temples are better supported by a hundred columns, a wandering ship is safer when led by a great many stars, and an anchor with a double grip will fasten a ship more firmly (21–28). Anger, responsible for the conflicts between the wealthy and the demise of great cities, should make way for ‘comradely strength’ with ‘an eternal bond’ (29–32).

In the final three stanzas, we return to Thebes, and the poem for the first time mentions Amphion’s name, as well as two geographical elements which strongly relate to the Greek musician’s myth: Amphion’s amazing powers are emphasised when we are told that his singing halted the waters of the otherwise streaming Dirce fount, while at the same time the mountain Cithaeron was forced to move (33–36).\(^3^5\) Next, all sorts of stones and the forest itself are said to have come hurrying towards the lyre player, and, as soon as he stopped singing, they clung together to form the walls of Thebes, famous for its seven gates (37–44).

What, then, did Sarbiewski have to say with Lyr. iv, 36? Anyone familiar with the Pole’s works will tell you that he loved to lecture his readers, and this poem is just that: a lecture. Sarbiewski presents himself as a ‘Vates’, a ‘Seer’, a second Amphion, who speaks to his fellow countrymen, the Polish and Lithuanian knights from the title. He seeks to influence them with his poetry, just as Amphion did before him: we must unite, he says, and stand as strong as the mythical walls of Thebes. Moreover, the fact that Sarbiewski has made sure to name the different types of ‘barbaric stones’ which make up the walls (stones, rocks, and boulders), suggests that he meant to underscore Amphion’s ability (and presumably Sarbiewski’s own desire) to unite what is disparate: we will stand strong despite of (or perhaps because of) our differences!

Furthermore, there could also be a religious message, implied by the number seven, the amount of gates in the city’s walls. Seven is, of course, a divine number, and it features in another of Sarbiewski’s poems to the Polish knights as well, in which

\(^3^4\) The ‘threefold gates of the city’ (10–11) may either point to the previously mentioned ‘Truth, Peace, and Love’ (6–7), or they may be a reference to the Holy Trinity. The third stanza, which appears rather gloomy, may either simply be a description of the works of evil, or it may foreshadow the power of Amphion’s singing: the wall he will build will be able to keep all crime, vengeance and faults at bay.

\(^3^5\) In Greek mythology, the Dirce fount owed its name to a woman who was killed by Amphion and his twin brother Zethus, after she had cruelly treated their mother Antiope. Her dead body is sometimes said to have been thrown into the fount’s waters. The two brothers were born on Mount Cithaeron.
he urges them to unite in their faith, symbolised by ‘a sevenfold flame’. Should the number seven signify the author’s religious beliefs in this case as well, the ode would not merely call for unity, but for unity through the catholic faith specifically. This reading, combined with the fact that the poem is addressed to the Polish and Lithuanian knights, would simultaneously indicate that the implied foe is one that does not share the author’s faith: the Ottoman Empire, one of the enemies of Poland Sarbiewski wrote about most frequently. To defeat them, however, the Poles and Lithuanians would have to overcome the vices in their homeland, and ‘unite the assembled powers’, thus creating a ‘well-ordered State’.

... and Ingels’ translation

Simon Ingels’ version of the Sarbiewski’s ode has a somewhat different meaning, caused not only by the fact that the Dutchman chose to compose a rhymed translation, in a different metre. This section will discuss Ingels’ poem, focusing naturally on those aspects which are, in my view, the most interesting, in the sense that they significantly differ from the original. In the conclusion, we will be able to assess exactly how Ingels has handled Sarbiewski’s Lyr. iv, 36 and why he has done so.

Ingels’ poem is entitled Amphion aan de Tebanen. Movit Amphion lapides canendo (Amphion to the Thebans. Amphion moved the stones with his singing), using a quote from Horace Od. iii, 11.2 in the subtitle. The Dutchman thus chose to make scarce the Polish and Lithuanian knights from Sarbiewski’s original, and he likewise removed any notion of the poem having a politic streak, which the Pole underscored by subtitling his ode Amphion, or The well-ordered State. Additionally, as was mentioned before, Sarbiewski’s name is notably absent from Ingels’ volume, nor is it in any way indicated that we are dealing with a translation. At first glance, then, Ingels’ poem would appear to be his own composition about Amphion, the mythical seer, speaking to his fellow Thebans, but nothing more.

Yet in the first few stanzas, when Amphion calls upon the Thebans to stay true to their ancient rites and customs, and he wishes for virtues such as love and peace to be triumphant, Ingels is relatively true to Sarbiewski. Some of the more notable alterations are the following. Firstly, instead of translating ‘Templa’ literally with ‘Temples’, Ingels has chosen to turn them into a ‘Church’ (5), something better suited to Ingels’ time and place of writing than the ancient temples Sarbiewski had in mind. Secondly, the Pole’s ‘Truth and Peace and Love’ (6–7) have become ‘Love, Unity and Peace’ (7), thus trading ‘Truth’ for ‘Unity’. It is an understandable alteration, considering that in the

36 See Lyr. iv, 1–53.
37 The battle with the eastern adversary features prominently in, e.g., Lyr. i, 6, 8, 12, 15, 20, ii, 1, 12, 17, 22, iii, 10, 20, 30, iv, 1, 3, 5, 6, and 29.
38 Sarbiewski’s original was written in a Sapphic stanza, Ingels wrote his poem in an iambic tetrametre.
rest of the poem ‘Truth’ plays virtually no role whatsoever, while ‘Unity’ is at the very heart of it. Moreover, these three elements, ‘Love, Unity and Peace’ are named ‘a holy trinity’ (8), making explicit what Sarbiewski left implicit: while the Polish Jesuit may have left the reader guessing as to whether or not his ode had a religious undertone, Ingels introduces it plainly at the beginning of his translation. Moving on, the Dutchman has left out an entire stanza: Sarbiewski’s third stanza had a rather dark edge to it, saying that crime has no walls, that vengeance had broken through the city’s high towers and threefold gates, and that ‘thunderbolts lie awake in all faults’ (9–12). Ingels has removed all this, however, perhaps because he thought the foreshadowing of Amphion’s wall too explicit, or he felt the verses did not tie in with the poem’s in the end positive message.

This is all but a prelude to what is to come, however. In the following stanzas, where in both versions Amphion gives further advice to the Thebans, Ingels has altered Sarbiewski’s original quite substantially. For whereas the latter remained somewhat abstract, speaking of the banishment of ‘Deceit’, the lust for power and idle gain (13–15), Ingels has made it more specific: he mentions ‘Thieves’, who spend public money on themselves, and ‘Rascals’ who stir up revolt (9–12). The poverty Sarbiewski wished for is not found in Ingels, nor is the Polish Jesuit’s comment on soldiers, iron and gold (17–20). Instead, the Dutchman makes it almost personal, describing ‘Servants who wish to be Masters’, ‘who but fain servility’, waste the country’s money and bring the land no good whatsoever (13–16). But who is Ingels talking about? Keeping in mind that he may have been a Jesuit, it is possible that Ingels was referring to the stadtholders, whose inclinations were mostly Contraremonstrant (i.e. strongly Calvinistic), or to the Orangists who supported them. Another, perhaps more convincing interpretation, however, would be to view Ingels’ criticism as a more general negative reaction against (religious) libertines, or perhaps even foreigners, at a time when the Dutch Republic was still relatively young.

Next comes the passage in which both authors urge their readers to unite and trust one another. The main message in both texts is virtually the same, and most dissimilarities are of no great significance (the soldier Sarbiewski spoke of, for example, is not present in Ingels’ version, yet he does mention war and ‘hard-fought Peace’), but there is one key difference, which gives extra credibility to the idea that a specific Dutch context should be taken into account. For whereas Sarbiewski spoke of ‘High temples’ standing on ‘A hundred columns’ (23–24), Ingels mentions a ‘House’, being supported by ‘seven Pillars’ (21–22). For any reader of the time, this must have been an

40 See n. 34 above.
41 This was first put forward in J.C. Arens, ‘Simon Ingels en Sarbievius (Amphion aan de Thebanen)’, in: Neophilologus 46 (1962), p. 319–323. In 1650, eight years prior to the publishing of Ingels’ volume, the stadtholder Willem II of Orange tried to commit a coup and laid siege to Amsterdam, Ingels’ home town. From 1650 to 1672/75, however, a significant part of the Dutch Republic, including Holland (and thus Amsterdam), did not have stadtholders. If we choose to believe Arens’ theory, this may therefore suggest that Ingels translated Sarbiewski’s ode several years before its publication in 1658, at a time when reproaching the stadtholders would have been more relevant.
undoubtedly clear reference to the Republic of the Seven United Provinces. All Ingels had to do was change one number, ‘one hundred’, into another number, ‘seven’, in order for the poem to gain a whole new meaning: the Dutch Republic, symbolised by the ‘seven Pillars’, must cease its civil strife and become united once more.42

Following this, Ingels again makes the abstract more specific when describing the dangers of discord, saying that the conflicts between rulers have often resulted in ‘ash, and the blood of Civilian corpses’ (32), while Sarbiewski wrote merely of the fall of ‘Great cities’ (32). Ingels has thereby given the poem a more harsh, realistic side. This realism can furthermore be related to the next section, in which Amphion’s supernatural talent is described: the Dutchman has replaced the stillness of the Dirce fount and the moving Cithaeron mountain, important geographical markers in the myth of Amphion, with the more simple ‘Sea and Lands’ (35). Sure, Amphion is still in the picture, but the scene itself no longer needs take place in Greece. Rather, it could be anywhere, for example in the Low Countries, where the sea and lands are more common than the Dirce fount and the Cithaeron mountain.

Lastly, we come to the ode’s final two stanza’s, where Ingels has remained largely true to Sarbiewski’s version, but for a few minor details. Firstly, the Dutchman describes only ‘Oak trees’ and ‘large chunks of stone’ (37–38), which come hurrying towards Amphion, while the Pole made an effort to differentiate between the rocks, stones, and boulders, perhaps so as to emphasise the lyre player’s ability to unite what is disparate (37–40). Furthermore, instead of saying that Thebes had seven gates, Ingels mentions seven walls, perhaps simply because he needed his walls, his ‘muren’, to rhyme with the earlier ‘uren’ (43–44). Be that as it may, the original’s final words concerning Thebes’ seven gates offer the opportunity to read something new into the poem, something which Sarbiewski himself did not intend: for not only does the number seven have an inherent connection with Thebes, and not only may it represent the author’s faith, but in Ingels’ case it also corresponds with the seven pillars we saw earlier, and thus with the Dutch Republic. It is a metaphor which was there for the taking, and which in all likelihood attracted Ingels to Sarbiewski’s ode in the first place.

**Simon Ingels as a bee**

What, then, can be concluded from this comparison between the Latin original and the Dutch translation, regarding Ingels’ ‘treatment’ of Sarbiewski’s lyric? If we recall the Dutchman’s preface, including the reference to Macrobius and the theory of the author as a bee, we can see plainly just what Ingels had in mind: he has carefully read Sarbiewski’s poem, and subsequently applied it ‘for some use’ of his own when translating it into his native tongue. From a poem addressed to the Polish and Lithuanian knights,
admonishing them to work together in order to build a ‘well-ordered State’, and quite possibly containing a religious element as well, Ingels has made a poem which ties in perfectly with his own time and place, stripping it off its Polish context and adding a profoundly Dutch one.

Sarbiewski’s ‘Temples’ became a ‘Church’, abstract notions such as ‘Deceit’ and ‘idle gain’ were transformed into more specific ‘Thieves’, ‘Rascals’, and ‘Servants’, ‘A hundred columns’ were turned into ‘seven Pillars’, the danger of discord was made more palpable through ‘the blood of Civilian corpses’, and clear references to Greek mythological geography were erased and replaced by the rather more generally recognisable ‘Sea and Lands’. The recurrence of the number seven, thrown into Ingels’ lap by Sarbiewski himself, underlines the translator’s deeply Dutch meaning, which naturally fares better when expressed in a Dutch landscape of ‘Churches’, and ‘Sea and Lands’. Whether or not Ingels meant to scold the stadtholders and/or Orangists, or simply wanted to voice his worries about social change brought about by libertine or foreign influences we cannot be sure, but his main message is unmistakable: the Dutch Republic must unite and stand as firm as the walls of Thebes. Put simply, then, Sarbiewski’s call for unity between the Poles and Lithuanians has become a call for unity between the Dutch.

As Ingels’ composition was the first published translation of the Sarmatian Horace’s poetry in the Low Countries, it forms an important part of Sarbiewski’s Nachleben in that region: from later accounts we know that Ingels’ work was read and praised, which can only mean that his translation of Sarbiewski’s ode had an audience as well. It would serve, therefore, to investigate what other traces the poem of Amphion has left in Netherlandish literature, as well as to study the remaining Dutch translations of Sarbiewski, and compare them with the Pole’s literary reception throughout Europe, so as to place Ingels’ version in a wider perspective. Moreover, considering the many changes Ingels has made to the original, perhaps we would do well to consider his poem to be the first Dutch adaptation of the Polish poet’s works, rather than a translation. Indeed, the fact that Ingels chose not to name the original’s author, or that his was not the original in the first place, bears witness to the boundaries of a writer’s creative freedom at the time, and the relation between an original and its literary offspring: perhaps Ingels thought it crystal clear that his version was based on Sarbiewski’s lyric, particularly amongst his Jesuit readership, or perhaps it simply did not suit Ingels’ plans to name Sarbiewski, either because of the latter’s fame as a Jesuit poet, or simply because Ingels wanted his readers to think they were reading an original composition. In any case, the poem is a clear exponent of Macrobius’ and Seneca’s literary theory of the author as a bee, picking up nectar as he goes and creating a honey-sweet end result. And in this case, I believe that the end result is sweet enough to be studied and praised in its own right, just as Simon Ingels had intended.
Ad equites Polonos et Lithuanos

Amphion, seu Civitas bene ordinata

1 Exteros mores prohibete pulchra
   Lege, Thebani; patriasque leges
   Et pios ritus, & avita gnatos
   Sacra docete.

5 Templum Fas sanctum, Fora lustret Aequum;
   Veritas, & Pax, & Amor per omnes
   Ambulet vicis; scelus omne casta
   Exulet urbe.

Nullus est murus sceleri. per altas

10 Urbium turres, triplinesque portas
   Poena erruptit. Vigilant in omnes
   Fulmina culpae.

Concolor Vero Dolus, & superba

15 Desidis lucri, tacitoque segnis
   Copia luxu.

Publicos discat giminare census

20 Miles in auro.

Sive res bellis agitanda, sive

Pace; collatas sociate vires.

Alta centenis melius recumbunt
   Templo columnis:

Inter errantem scopolos carinam

25 Certius plures docuere stellae:
   Fortius proram gemino revincit
   Anchora morus.

Gliscit aeterno sociale nexu

30 Robur. arcans opulentiorum

Ira per rixas agitata magnas
   Eruit urbeus.

Haec ubi dulci modulante nervo

35 Dixit Amphion; ter eunte fluctu
   Substitit Dirce, ter opaca movit
   Terga Cytheron.

Saxa repserunt, scopolique, circum

40 Devio campos petiere saltu,
   Et nemus pronusque silex ab alto
   Monte cecurrit.

At simul Vates tacuit; per omnem

Barbarae rupes coiere murum, &
   Septies clausae steterunt aheno
   Cardine Thebae.

To the Polish and Lithuanian knights

Amphion, or The well-ordered State

1 Prohibit foreign customs with a good
   Law, Thebans, and teach your sons the
   Laws of the forefathers, and the pious
   Ceremonies, and the ancestral rites.

5 May holy Divine Right cleanse the Temples,
   Justice the Forums, may Truth and Peace and
   Love walk through all the town’s quarters:
   May all crime leave the chaste city in banishment.

Crime does not have any walls. Vengeance has

10 Broken through the high towers and threefold
   Gates of the city. Thunderbolts lie awake in
   All faults.

May Deceit, in the colours of Truth, and the

15 The lust for idle gain, and abundance,
   Lazy through silent luxury.

May harsh poverty teach to double the public

20 Possessions; and may there be enough iron in
   Our weapons. A soldier often fights badly in stolen
   Gold.

Whether the state must be ruled with wars, or with

25 Peace, unite the assembled powers.

High temples are better supported by
   A hundred columns;

Many stars have guided a wandering ship

30 Through the cliffs more safely;
   An anchor with a double grip fastens a ship
   More firmly.

Comradely strength increases with an eternal

35 Bond. Anger, driven through the secret
   Quarrels of the wealthy, has overthrown
   Great cities.

When Amphion said these things with a

40 Melodious chord, Dirce, with a flowing
   Stream, halted thrice, [and] thrice did
   Cithaeron move his shady mountain ridges.

The stones crawled, and all around the rocks

45 Came to the fields from the distant wooded hill,
   And the forest and forth rushing boulders

Ran down the high mountain.

But as soon as the Seer fell silent, the

Barbaric stones came together over the

Entire wall, and the seven gates of Thebes
   Stood still with a bronze hinge.
Appendix B: Simon Ingels’ translation

Amphion aan de Tebanen

Movit Amphion lapides canendo

1  Tebanen, Lantsluy, luyster: laat
   Geen nieuwenheden in uw Staat;
   Noch schrijf het Volk geen and’re wetten
   Als eertijts onze Vaders zetten.

5  Leer in de Kerk oprecht en slecht.
  Spreek in de Rechtbank niet als Recht.
  Queek Liefde, Eenmoedighyt en Vrede
  (Een heylig drietal) in uw Steden.

Verban de Dieven, die ’t gemeen
10  Aan eygen pracht en praal besteên;
    De Schelmen die tot oproer voeden
    Bedaarde, of leydzame gemoeden.

De Knechts die Meesters willen zijn,
15  d’Ommutte die ’t Lant rijkdoms kosten,
    En ’t Lant noyt goet deên, of verlost.

Ten tijde van bevochte Vreê,
20  En houw uw machten by den ander.

Veel vaster staat een Huys van steen

Veel krachts en machte zaam’ gepaart,
30  Staat als een Mastboom pal in d’aard’,
    Waar op de stormen niet en hechten.

Der Heerschappen tweedracht en twist.
35  Een zaam-gevlochte kracht gesplitst,
    Ley meermaal heele Koninkrijken
    In ass’ en bloet van Burger lijken.

Terwijl Amphion met een swier
30  Dit zong op zijn yvore Lier,
    Op ’t leerzaam spel van stem en handen,
    Bewogen driemaal Zee en Landen.

De Eycke-boomen een voor een
40  De Eycke-boomen een voor een
    Uyt ’t Bosch, en groote brokken steen,
    Als bergen, van de Bergen gongen,

Maar zo de Lierman sweeg, de steen
45  En quamen tot hem aangesprongen.

Amphion to the Thebans

Amphion moved the stones with his singing

1  Thebans, Countrymen, listen: do not permit
   Any newness in your State;
   And do not prescribe other laws to the People
   Than the ones our Fathers once put in place.

5  Teach sincerely and plainly in Church.
   Speak only Justice in Court.
   Create Love, Unity and Peace
   (A holy trinity) in your Cities.

Banish the Thieves, who spend public money
10  On their own pomp and splendour;
    Banish the Rascals who stir up the
    Calm or meek masses.

The Servants who wish to be Masters,
15  The Land’s riches, and have never done the
    Land any good, nor liberated it.

In times of hard-fought Peace,
20  Or war on Land or at Sea,
    Trust, I say trust one another.
    And keep your strengths together.

A House of stone stands much more firmly
25  On seven Pillars than on one.
    Beneath many stars a ship will sail
    Much more safely through the waves.

Much strength and power joined together
30  Stands immovably in the earth like a mast,
    On which the storms have no effect,
    Of the Lordships fight it.

Intertwined strength broken apart
35  Has often laid entire Kingdoms
    In ash and the blood of Civilian corpses.

While Amphion elegantly sang this
40  On his ivory Lyre,
    The Sea and Lands moved thrice
    To the instructive play of voice and hands.

The Oak trees from the Forest, one by one,
45  The Oak trees from the Forest, one by one,
    And large chunks of stone,
    Like mountains from the Mountains came,

But when the Lyre player fell silent, the
50  But when the Lyre player fell silent, the
    Stones came together firmly;
    And in but a few hours,
    Thebes stood within seven unscalable walls.