



Translation and Manipulation in Renaissance England

John Denton

FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS
2016

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE
DIPARTIMENTO DI LINGUE, LETTERATURE E STUDI INTERCULTURALI
BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI DI FILOLOGIA MODERNA: COLLANA, RIVISTE E LABORATORIO
JOURNAL OF EARLY MODERN STUDIES

Quaderni di JEMS

– 1 –

FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS
2016

Quaderni di Jems, 1
Supplemento di Journal of Early Modern Studies, 1-2016

Editors

Donatella Pallotti, University of Florence

Paola Pugliatti, University of Florence

Journal Manager

Arianna Antonielli, University of Florence

Advisory Board

Arianna Antonielli, University of Florence

Janet Clare, University of Hull

Jeanne Clegg, University of Venice Ca' Foscari

Louise George Clubb, University of California, Berkeley

Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti, University of Florence

Lucia Felici, University of Florence

Tina Krontiris, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki

Corinne Lucas Fiorato, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris 3

Adelisa Malena, University of Venice Ca' Foscari

Natascia Tonelli, University of Siena

Editorial Board

Arianna Antonielli, University of Florence

Luca Baratta, University of Florence

John Denton, University of Florence

Alessandro Melis, University of Florence

Donatella Pallotti, University of Florence

Paola Pugliatti, University of Florence

Translation and Manipulation in Renaissance England

John Denton

Translation and Manipulation in Renaissance England - John Denton
Journal of Early Modern Studies. -
n. 1, 2016 -
Supplemento, 1
ISSN 2279-7149
ISBN 978-88-6453-411-4 (online)
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-1971> F

Direttore Responsabile: Beatrice Töttössy
Registrazione al Tribunale di Firenze: N. 5818 del 21/02/2011

Il supplemento è pubblicato on-line ad accesso aperto al seguente indirizzo: www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems

The products of the Publishing Committee of Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna: Collana, Riviste e Laboratorio (<<http://www.iils.uni-fi.it/vp-82-laboratorio-editoriale-open-access-ricerca-formazione-e-produzione.html>>) are published with financial support from the Department of Languages, Literatures and Intercultural Studies of the University of Florence, and in accordance with the agreement, dated February 10th 2009 (updated February 19th 2015), between the Department, the Open Access Publishing Workshop and Firenze University Press. The Workshop promotes the development of OA publishing and its application in teaching and career advice for undergraduates, graduates, and PhD students in the area of foreign languages and literatures, as well as providing training and planning services. The Workshop's publishing team are responsible for the editorial workflow of all the volumes and journals published in the Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna series. *Jems* employs the double-blind peer review process. For further information please visit the journal homepage (<www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems>).

Editing: The Open Access Publishing Workshop (<laboa@iils.uni-fi.it>) with Arianna Antonielli and the trainees Flavia Di Mauro and Costantino Sferrazza

Graphic design: Alberto Pizarro Fernández, Pagina Maestra

Peer Review Process

All publications are submitted to an external refereeing process under the responsibility of the FUP Editorial Board and the Scientific Committees of the individual series. The works published in the FUP catalogue are evaluated and approved by the Editorial Board of the publishing house. For a more detailed description of the refereeing process we refer to the official documents published on the website and in the online catalogue of the FUP (www.fupress.com).

Firenze University Press Editorial Board

G. Nigro (Co-ordinator), M.T. Bartoli, M. Boddi, R. Casalbuoni, C. Ciappei, R. Del Punta, A. Dolfi, V. Fargion, S. Ferrone, M. Garzaniti, P. Guarnieri, A. Mariani, M. Marini, A. Novelli, M.C. Torricelli, M. Verga, A. Zorzi.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial – No Derivatives - 4.0 Italia License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>)

CC 2016 Firenze University Press
Università degli Studi di Firenze
Firenze University Press
via Cittadella, 7, 50144 Firenze, Italy
www.fupress.com



Contents

Preface	7
1. Introduction. Research on Translation in Renaissance England: An Overview of Recent Developments	9
2. Changing Clothes, Opening Windows and Letting in Light. Describing the Process and Purpose of Translation in Metaphorical Terms in the English Renaissance	23
3. Translation and Manipulation of Ancient History in Renaissance England	33
4. Domesticating Plutarch's <i>Parallel Lives</i> for Elizabethan Readers: Thomas North's Translation of Jacques Amyot's Translation	43
5. Shakespeare's Perception of Plutarch via North: Examples from <i>Coriolanus</i>	53
Postscript. Thomas North's Successors: 400 years of English trans- lations of Plutarch's <i>Parallel Lives</i>	65
Appendix	69
Conclusion	73
Works Cited	75
Index of Names	99



Preface

In a recent study devoted to Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity, Colin Burrow (2013, 270) notes, with reference to the reception (or afterlife) of Classical authors, that it 'does finally seem to be recognized as a valuable way of studying classical literature by all but the most stubborn reactionaries in classical departments'. Among other developments, the setting up in the UK of the Classical Studies Reception Network in 2004, the publication of the *Classical Reception Journal* as of 2009 and the second volume of a planned five volume set of *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature* (Cheney and Hardie, eds, 2015), following on from the earlier *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* and the Institute for the Classical Tradition at Boston University and the University of Tübingen, have undoubtedly enlivened Classical Studies along the lines originally set out by the glorious Warburg Institute (in London since 1934, where it has long since expanded its interests beyond the visual arts). In their introduction to a recent Companion volume on 'Classical receptions' the authors state: 'By "receptions" we mean the ways in which Greek and Roman material has been transmitted, translated, excerpted, interpreted, rewritten, re-imaged and represented' (Hardwick and Stray 2008, 1). The key word for my aims in presenting this supplement to the *Journal of Early Modern Studies* is 'translated'. In the chapters that follow most attention is devoted to the reception of Classical historical texts in Renaissance England and in particular the perception of one of the most popular writers (Plutarch) by Shakespeare via vernacular translation, in which manipulative domestication played a dominant strategic role.

The following chapters draw, to some extent, on previously published material dating mostly from the 1990s listed in the references section at the end of the volume (Denton 1992a onwards). Much of the material in these publications was discussed at conferences, seminars and follow up of lectures at the universities of Rome (La Sapienza), Catania, Parma, Milan (Gargnano sul Garda), Ragusa, Florence,

East Anglia (Norwich), Vienna, Boston (USA), Arras and Warsaw. I am happy to recall many hours of discussion on problems of translation studies with colleagues in what has now become my former department at Florence University (especially, Nicholas Brownlees, Fiorenzo Fantaccini, Donatella Pallotti and Christine Richardson). My thanks are due to one of the anonymous referees of the pre-publication manuscript for reminding me, among other things, of the ancient origins of the 'wh- questions' discussed in Chapter 1. Last, but certainly not least, I am very grateful to Paola Pugliatti and Donatella Pallotti, the editors of *JEMS* for accepting this supplement to the Journal for publication and for their patience in waiting for the goods to be delivered.

John Denton, Florence, April 2016



1. Introduction. Research on Translation in Renaissance England: An Overview of Recent Developments

A remarkable development of the last decade or so has been an ever increasing interest in translation on the part of scholars working especially in the fields of (not only English) Literature, Renaissance and Cultural Historical Studies. The fact that the products rather than the process of translation tend to be foregrounded in many cases has led to this phenomenon of intercultural communication being seen in a somewhat different light than that predominant in the many faceted (inter)discipline known as Translation Studies, established in the early 1970s. In this section I will outline what I see as the positive aspects of this development as well as the drawbacks of emphasis on the role of translations as products situated in societal and ideological contexts as opposed to rather than in conjunction with the textual manipulative aspect of the translation process. This does not mean of course that Translation Studies scholars are only interested in context free comparative analysis of source and target texts; far from it. This clearly emerges from key statements by leading scholars working within the Translation Studies research paradigm:

What they have in common is, briefly, a view of literature as a complex and dynamic system: a conviction that there should be a continual interest between theoretical models and practical case studies; an approach to literary translation which is descriptive, target-oriented, functional and systemic; and an interest in the norms and constraints that govern the production and reception of translations, in the relation between translation and other types of text processing, and in the place and role of translations both within a given literature and in the interaction between literatures. (Hermans 1985a, 10-11)

This 'manifesto' (further discussed in the light of later developments in Hermans 1999, 32-45 and 2004)¹ marked a turning point in previous translation research as a reaction by a group of scholars mostly

¹ See also Lambert and Van Gorp (1985), Lambert (1991).

from the field of comparative literature, inspired by the founding document of James Holmes (1972) and with a number of conferences already behind them, at the first of which the content of the discipline was outlined (Lefevere 1978; Hermans 1999, 11-14), against the prevailing view at the time, which they saw as linguistically formalist, source-text oriented and still often prescriptive. The electric atmosphere of these early days has recently been described by one of the participants at these formative meetings: Susan Bassnett (2014), who was to become the scholar who introduced the exciting new approach to the UK.² Hermans (1985a, 11) goes on to say that ‘... all translation implies a certain degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose’, a statement that explains why the group began to be known as the ‘Manipulation School’ (Hermans 1999, 8-9; Snell-Hornby 2006, 48). The important point here is that translation should not be seen as a straightforward source text to target text transmission of content. Admittedly, manipulation does not necessarily imply censorial, ideologically motivated intervention in the target text, although this is frequently the case in the period under study, but could also be an attempt on the translator’s part to fill in gaps in his/her readers’ knowledge by incorporation of explanatory glosses or direct domesticating substitution. This international research group originating in Belgium and the Netherlands, but spreading out to Israel, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Canada and the USA did not of course have a monopoly in the study of translation.³

The so-called ‘cultural turn’ was an unsurprising development in the new (inter)discipline, especially at the hands of Susan Bassnett (1998) and André Lefevere (1992),⁴ the latter providing a neat description of the framework of future research, where interaction between the translation process and non-linguistic contextual features is foregrounded:

² Initially by means of Bassnett (2013 [1980]), which has now reached its 4th edition.

³ Gideon Toury (2012 [1995], 1, note 1), one of the founding members, has however complained about the misuse of the label ‘Translation Studies’ by many recently established university departments, often concerned with translator and interpreter training, and thus not following the non-vocational research paradigm of the original group of pioneers.

⁴ The ‘cultural turn’ was initiated by the influential volume Bassnett and Lefevere, eds (1990). Further evidence of the innovative nature of this ‘turn’ is to be found in the editors’ introduction to their volume (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990, see also Bassnett 2007).

It should also be clear that a productive study of the translation of literature can, for the most part, be only socio-historical in nature. The most important consideration is not how words are matched on the page, but why they are matched that way, what social, literary, ideological considerations led translators to translate as they did, what they hoped to achieve by translating as they did, whether they can be said to have achieved their goals or not, and why. (Lefevere, ed., 1992, 81)

A parallel research group working in Göttingen, where admittedly greater emphasis was placed on textual matters, later on joined up with the leading lights of the 'Manipulation School' and other scholars to produce a massive three volume encyclopedia numbering 2883 pages (Kittel *et al.*, 2004-2011), which includes, among many other aspects, extensive discussion of the history of translation throughout the world. To this *magnum opus* we should add the two volume encyclopedia covering the history of translation into English of the major works of World literature (Classe, ed., 2000) as well as the smaller one volume guide to literature in English translation (France, ed., 2000).⁵

In the light of the interdisciplinary claims of Translation Studies, the remark by the editor of one of the recent collective volumes containing a series of articles on translation in Tudor England by literary scholars not normally associated with this research paradigm (Schurink 2011a, 1) concerning what he sees as its having 'the unfortunate tendency to separate translation from the mainstream of literary and historical studies' comes as something of a surprise.⁶ After a call for the placing of translation in the context of other areas of Tudor history and literature he adds (2011a, 2) that 'this does not mean that the essays collected in this volume are not also sensitive to the status of translations as translations'. On reading this in many ways innovative and well researched volume this sensitivity does not, in my view, emerge in the majority of the articles to the extent the editor claims that it does. This point is also raised in an extensive review of recent contributions to translation in the English Renaissance when dealing with the book in question: 'This clear turn towards culture and towards the paratext includes an unfortunate turn away from an im-

⁵ The latter contains an excellent introduction to translation in the English Renaissance (Boutcher 2000).

⁶ Schurink does, however, subsequently (2011a, 3-4) acknowledge, with reference to works by Lefevere (1992) and Venuti (2008 [1995]), the importance of the 'cultural turn' in modern Translation Studies as compared with previous scholarship of the late 19th-early 20th centuries.

portant aspect of translations: comparative analysis of the translation text itself with the source text' (Reid 2014).⁷ Typical of the volume is the detailed and indeed necessary study of the historical context in which the first English translation of Polybius was produced (Boutcher 2011), but it devotes very little space to comparisons with the source (in this case a 15th century Latin translation of the Greek historian) and target texts (and thus the important question of the translator's presumed attitude to reader response via translation strategies conditioned by contextual features).

One of the leading members of the above mentioned Göttingen group posited: 'Die für Übersetzungsforscher zentralen Fragen – WAS wurde WANN, WARUM, WIE übersetzt und WARUM wurde es so übersetzt' (Kittel 1988, 160),⁸ and these were taken up, though on the basis of an English paraphrase by Lambert (1993, 11), by Peter Burke, a culturally oriented historian who has shown great interest in translation recently (2005, 2007a, 2007c, 2009, Burke and Po-Chia Hsia, eds, 2007). Burke expanded them to 'six large questions': 'The following overview of these regimes, or as I prefer to call them, the "cultures of translation", in early modern Europe offers provisional answers to the following six large questions: Who translates? With what intentions? What? For whom? In what manner? With what consequences?' (2007a, 11). He had already recognised the important role of translation in his study of the afterlife of Castiglione's *Cortegiano* (1995, 55-80) and has more recently approached what he calls 'cultural translation' or 'cul-

⁷ This and another extensive review article (Kennedy 2008) are evidence of the attention that the new interest in translation among scholars from various disciplines has attracted. Several examples of this kind of comparative analysis are: Sørensen (1960), Cratty (1975), Cattaneo (1990), Iamartino (1992), Nocera Avila (1992), Sowerby (1998) and Morini (2013). Two of the most recent case studies embodying all the virtues of the Translation Studies research paradigm come from two leading scholars in the field: Cummings (2013) and Hermans (2015).

⁸ These so-called 'wh questions', well known in the English speaking world as a pragmatic check-list for aspiring journalists, have an ancient origin, transmitted by Latin writers on rhetoric (for example Cicero in his *De Inventione*) from Hermagoras of Temnos (1st century B.C.), only a few fragments of whose Greek text survive (Nord 2005 [1991], 41-42; Hermans 1999, 70; D'hulst 2001, 24-31; Bennet 2005; Nord 2012, 402). They were transmitted by Matthew of Vendôme (Matthaeus Vindocinensis) in 1170 as: Quis (who)? Quid (what)? Ubi (where)? Quibus auxiliis (with whose help)? Cur (why)? Quomodo (how)? Quando (when)?

tures of translation' in a more systematic way.⁹ Although he is well acquainted with research that has been carried out in Translation Studies, his work does not appear to have attracted as much attention as it deserves by scholars working at the core of the discipline. There is definitely a problem with terminology here. In a recent survey of modern translation theories, Pym devotes a chapter (2014 [2010], 138-158) to 'cultural translation', which deals mostly with anthropological and post-colonial issues and makes it very clear that the 'cultural turn' in Translation Studies and 'cultural translation' are two quite different phenomena (Pym 2014 [2010], 149).¹⁰ Burke is actually dealing with the former and thus taking up and developing a research paradigm already well-established in Translation Studies, at least as far as socio-historical contextual features are concerned.

Turning specifically to translation in the Early Modern period (mostly) in England, we now have access to a series of indispensable research tools ranging from extensive bibliographical surveys (Cummings 2007, 2009a, 2009b), the online *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads Catalogue* (<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/rcc/>), *Universal Short Title Catalogue* (<http://www.ustc.ac.uk/>) and *Early English Books on line* (<http://eebo.chadwick.com/>), a collection of texts illustrating English Renaissance translation theory (Rhodes, ed., 2013) in the Modern Humanities Research Association *Tudor and Stuart Translations* series (Hadfield and Rhodes, eds, 2011-), to the second volume (1550-1650) in the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Braden, Cummings and Gillespie, eds, 2010),¹¹ as well as an apparently unending, though very welcome, series (over the last decade or so) of monographs, collective volumes and special numbers of scholarly journals (in some cases only partially) on aspects of Early Modern translation

⁹ See also Boutcher (2015, 22) who, rather surprisingly, attributes the introduction of the concept of 'cultural translation' to George Steiner (1975) and does not mention the fundamental contribution of the Translation Studies scholars discussed in this chapter. The latter were quite aware of the 'highly intricate nexus of authors, translators (including intermediary translators), paratext-writers, editors and correctors, censors, printers, booksellers, patrons and readers' (Boutcher 2015, 23).

¹⁰ Sturge (2011, 67) actually does refer to 'a somewhat narrower use of the term' referring to 'those practices of literary translation that mediate cultural difference...'

¹¹ Reference to specific chapters in this historical survey will be made in subsequent sections of this Supplement.

in England and the rest of Europe¹² (Pincombe, ed., 2004; Wyatt 2005; Bermann and Wood, eds, 2005; Morini 2006; Burke and Po-Chia Hsia, eds, 2007; Scarsi 2010; Gillespie 2011; Reynolds 2011; Schurink, ed., 2011; Cox Jensen 2012; Barker and Hosington, eds, 2013; Schmidt, ed., 2013; Coldiron 2015b; Demetriou and Tomlinson, eds, 2015; Fernández Pérez and Wilson-Lee, eds, 2015; Hosington, ed., 2015; Newman and Tylus, eds, 2015).

The *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads Catalogue* (Hosington 2011a) provides the most accurate coverage to date of translations published in England between 1473 and 1640, expanding the time span covered by the previous study of about 1,000 translations dating from 1560-1603 by Ebel (1967). Among its many qualities, it provides a more complete picture of translation in Renaissance England than ever before, not being limited to translations into English or to literary texts alone, as well as detail on paratextual material, intermediary language(s) (if any) and information on the translator and much else. Its usefulness to scholars clearly emerges from the chapters in the collective volume published to celebrate its arrival (Barker and Hosington, eds, 2013). For access to the actual translations one only has to turn to *Early English Books on line*.

The *Universal Short Title Catalogue* is an outstanding online database of books (including translations) held in European libraries, printed before the end of the 16th century (to be extended). As far as vernacular (English, French, German Italian and Spanish) classical translations before 1600, which interest us here, are concerned, the lists in Bolgar (1954, 508-541)¹³ were until recently the main resource, though they are still useful for initial research, being conveniently arranged in parallel columns. One of the attractive features of this new (expanding) catalogue are the links to digital copies, where available, of works listed, as well as library holdings. It goes without saying that it

¹² At the time of writing (September 2015) the works dated 2015 had come out too late to be consulted in any detail, with the exception of the special number of *Renaissance Studies* edited by Brenda Hosington. Hosington (2010, 50) wrote that 'A study of the relationship between translation and book production in early modern England remains to be written'. Hosington, ed., 2015 is a contribution to satisfying this need, as are Coldiron 2015b and Fernández Pérez and Wilson-Lee, eds, 2015, all three of them dealing with a wider European perspective.

¹³ Corrected for the English items in Nøgaard (1958). See also, for translations of Classical literature into English 1550-1700: Cummings and Gillespie (2009).

is a great advantage to have the direct access to texts provided by *Early English Books on line*, though nothing can really replace the pleasure of direct handling of copies of printed books (whose size and weight are important features) in the rare books rooms of academic libraries!

One of the most appealing aspects of the above mentioned collection of texts edited by Rhodes illustrating 16th century English ideas on translation, mostly limited to paratextual material (it could hardly be otherwise) accompanying the actual translations, is the to date only opportunity readers whose Latin is not up to the task have of getting to know at least a portion (about 30 pages translated into English by Gordon Kendal) (Rhodes, ed., 2013, 263-294) of Laurence Humphrey's treatise on Translation (1559).¹⁴ This 600 page book written by a leading member of Oxford University in exile during Mary's reign in Basle, where it was published, first came to my notice when reading the first edition of George Steiner's *After Babel* (1998, 277 [1975, 263]). Up to that time it had practically been ignored in work on Early Modern English translation theory (or the supposed lack of it).¹⁵ I suspect

¹⁴ On the need (as yet unfulfilled) for a complete English translation of the treatise Schurink (2011a, 16, note 9) writes: 'A full, annotated edition and translation of Humphrey's important treatise remains one of the major desiderata for the study of early modern English translation (preferably incorporating Gabriel Harvey's substantial annotations in the margins to his copy, now at Trinity College, Cambridge...)' On Harvey's annotations see Stern 1979, 222.

¹⁵ It is not mentioned by Amos (1920) or Jacobsen (1958) or T.R. Steiner (1975), who postdate the beginnings of systematic theories of translation to Dryden and his contemporaries. Even more surprisingly it is not mentioned by Kelly (1979). More recently Oakley-Brown (2010, 121) states that '... there is no Tudor or early Stuart equivalent of John Dryden's tripartite division of metaphor, paraphrase and imitation.' Humphrey (1559) does actually make an equivalent division:

'14 Triplex omnino est interpretandi ratio....Prima rudior & crassior, quum à uerbis nihil recedit:.....22-23 Altera ratio, qua nonnulli interpretes hodie utuntur, in contrariam partem offendit, liberior & solutior, quae nimum sibi permittit licentiate.....30 Superest de tertio genere, id est media via dicamus, quae utriusque particeps est, simplicitatis sed eruditae, elegantiae sed fidelis:...

Broadly speaking, there are three kinds of translation...The first kind is rather crude and lacking in refinement, since there is no distancing it from the actual words....The next method, favoured by some translators nowadays, has the opposite fault. It is freer and looser and allows itself too much licence.....It remains to discuss the third method, the 'middle way'. This has features in common with both of the preceding. It is straightforward but

that one of the problems is that the treatise is written in Latin. In the words of Binns (1990, 395):

Only when the Latin language itself began to lose its primacy in the middle of the eighteenth century, did the vernacular literatures of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries begin to achieve their present prestige, and only in the last four or five generations.... has it been possible even for scholars specializing in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period to forget that Latin writings, one of the epoch's most brilliant and outstanding achievements, ever existed.¹⁶

Significantly, the author of a social and economic history of Elizabethan England, in the second edition of his book (Palliser 1992 [1983], 416) admits having exaggerated the 'growing importance of the vernacular' in the first edition, under the influence of Jones' *The Triumph of the English Language* (1953), acknowledging the fact that Binns has shown this 'triumph' 'to be at best a half truth'. One small piece of evidence that Binns' call for attention to such an important sector of English Renaissance literary production has not fallen entirely on deaf ears is the fact that the volume edited by Schurink does include a chapter on Latin translation in Tudor England (Taylor 2011), while Burke (2007b) has foregrounded the role of Latin translations in Early Modern Europe (including England). It should be remembered that Bartholomew Clerke's Latin translation (1571) of Castiglione's *Cortegiano* was reprinted five times between 1577 and 1612 (1577, 1585, 1593, 1603, 1612) in London, once in Frankfurt (1606) and twice in Strasbourg (1619, 1663) and was highly regarded by the Queen and many members of her court.¹⁷ It appears to have gained a considerable reputation among English scholars, who apparently preferred the Latin version to the one in their native language (Burke 1995, 65-66). On the other hand, Thomas Hoby's English translation, to which modern scholars have devoted far more attention,¹⁸ had only four editions be-

learned, elegant but faithful.....' (translation by Gordan Kendal in Rhodes, ed., 2013, 266-268).

¹⁶ Binns (1990, 209-212) provides a short summary of the contents of Humphrey's book.

¹⁷ Binns (1990, 258-264), Rhodes (2011, 112). On Latin translations in Elizabethan and Jacobean England from 1) Greek and 2) English and other European vernaculars see Binns (1990, 215-240 and 241-269).

¹⁸ See Nocera Avila (1992), Cummings (2007, 305-306 and 2009b, 601-602), Venuti (2005, 184-185), Morini (2006, 77-83), Partridge (2007).

tween 1561 and 1587, one of them a trilingual edition: Italian, French and English (Coldiron 2015a).

Admittedly Humphrey has attracted more attention over the last few years in the wake of Norton's (1984, 14) remark that his treatise 'has no equal in the literature of Renaissance translation,' and especially its inclusion in Renier's (1989) fundamental study of pre-Romantic translation theory, on a par with the Latin treatises by Vives, Schottus and Huet (265). Actually Renier devotes more space to Humphrey than any other translation theorist. Schmidt in the introduction to her edited volume (2013, 1-4) gives Humphrey pride of place right from the start and Rhodes (2013, 37-40) also foregrounds his role as the only author of a theoretical work on translation in the period in England, while the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* is somewhat lukewarm:

There is one comprehensive, indeed fairly hefty treatise on the theory and practice of translation by an Englishman - *Interpretatio linguarum* (1569 [sic!]), from the Oxford divine Laurence Humphrey toward the end of his Marian exile - but it was written in Latin, published in Basle, and never reprinted. At least one figure in late Elizabethan literary circles, Gabriel Harvey, owned and annotated a copy, but there is no reason to think the work circulated at all widely. (Braden 2010a, 89)

That a book of this type should be written in Latin rather than the vernacular was a more frequent practice at the time (Renier 1989, 261-265), considering the fact that its addressees were the international scholarly community, whose relatively limited number probably did not justify a reprint. The fact that it was printed abroad is arguably irrelevant, seeing that so many foreign editions were present in English libraries of the time. It is significant that Humphrey (Laurentius Humfredus), long after his death, was included in Pierre Daniel Huet's short list of famous English translators into Latin in the second book of his *De interpretatione* (first published in 1661) together with Thomas Linacre, Thomas More, John Cheke and John Christopherson, despite the fact that Humphrey's works were on the Vatican's index of prohibited books and Huet was a Catholic bishop (albeit a somewhat unorthodox one).

The important point is, nonetheless, the fact that the book does find its place in this important historical survey, though perhaps it deserved more extensive treatment. Surprisingly it is missing from an otherwise laudable attempt at a wide ranging treatment of the theory and practice of translation in Tudor England by Morini (2006), who states that: 'Unlike other European countries, England did not produce any

great theorist of translation before Dryden...' (vii).¹⁹ Despite this unfortunate omission, Morini's book is the first serious attempt at the daunting task for a single author of providing an overall view of Tudor translation to replace Matthiessen's, in my view still too frequently cited, 'classic' study of Elizabethan translation (1931),²⁰ which actually is anything but an overall view. A few quotes from the opening of Matthiessen's book²¹ can illustrate some highly questionable aspects of the American scholar's approach. Let us begin with his fulsome praise of the editors of the late 19th-early 20th century *Tudor Translations* series:

The idea for this book was suggested by the late Charles Whibley's penetrating analysis of the importance of the Elizabethan translations, in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Volume IV, Chapter 1), a suggestion that was given further stimulus by the excellent introductions to various volumes in the *Tudor Translations*...It would be hard to exaggerate my obligations to this group of recent scholars, and especially to Charles Whibley, who, with W.E. Henley, was chiefly responsible for the splendid revival of Elizabethan prose in the *Tudor Translations* series, and to whose critical genius so many of its introductions stand as a monument... (vii-viii)

The following is an example of Whibley's 'critical genius':

As their interests lay chiefly in the matter of their originals, they professed little desire to illustrate a theory of translation. They had neither the knowledge nor the sense of criticism, which should measure accurately the niceties of their craft. They set about their work in a spirit of sublime unconsciousness. (Whibley 1909, 2)²²

The supposed indifference to reflection on their activity on the part of Tudor translators was already contradicted by Lindeman (1981, 209) and, more thoroughly by Renner's (1989) groundbreaking study and

¹⁹ Scarsi (2010, 4) goes even further: 'Generally speaking, it is difficult to theorise on English Renaissance translation, because, before Dryden, there was no real English translation theorist.'

²⁰ Elsewhere (Morini 2004, 120) he calls Matthiessen the 'author of a fundamental book on Elizabethan prose translation'.

²¹ Described by Gunn (1975, 31) as 'in the main a derivative study based heavily, as Matthiessen was the first to admit, on Charles Whibley's pioneering (*sic*) analysis of Elizabethan translations in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*'.

²² This statement clashes with the information on the thorough grammatical and rhetorical education of the vast majority of translators referred to in the next chapter of this supplement!

the abundant examples provided by Rhodes (2013). The collection of Tudor Translations so admired by Matthiessen is pervaded by the nascent spirit of what were to become the 'glories' of the British Empire (it is dedicated to Cecil Rhodes!), and, one might add, by what Terence Hawkes calls the 'doublet and hose syndrome': 'Few things unhinge the British as much as doublet and hose. The merest hint unleashes golden phantasies of order and well-being, yoking together gentility and free-born earthiness within a deep dream of peace' (1992, 141). An expression like 'his use of the sturdy language of English sea-fighters' (Brower 1971, 207) when dealing with Thomas North's translation of Amyot/Plutarch shows how difficult it was to shake off this influence. Another unfortunate trend in the work of earlier studies is the use of anachronistic concepts when dealing with translators' aims and the context of the commissioning and production of their work. Conley (1927) argued for the existence of an English 'translation movement' supported by the 'progressive' protestant nobility. This was opposed by the residue of Catholic conservatives, who wanted to keep new knowledge hidden from large literate, though monolingual sections of the community. The idea that Catholics should oppose translation for the unlearned, considering the extent of vernacular translation in Renaissance Italy and Spain is, to say the least, difficult to accept. The real trouble is with terms like 'progressive' or even 'democratic'.²³ Elizabethan society, some of whose leading members, like the Earl of Leicester, were the patrons on whom a number of translators depended for social promotion, was characterized by political authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism and limited social mobility. Far from being 'progressive', translators tended to reinforce social conformity, particularly in the middle and lower orders.

Matthiessen's book opens with what still seems to be the most frequently quoted statement about translation in England in any historical period: 'A study of Elizabethan translations is a study of the means by which the Renaissance came to England (1931, 3)'. He, of course, meant translation into English. Latin works (including translations) by scholars such as Erasmus, More and Colet had introduced the principles of Humanist scholarship long before Elizabeth's reign as had English originals like *The boke named the governour* (1531) by

²³ Rosenberg (1955, 153) called Elizabethan translators 'democratic', since their aim was 'to make knowledge available to every man...'

Sir Thomas Elyot.²⁴ To say the least, Matthiessen's is an overstatement. What many Elizabethan translators did was to provide English translations of Classical and European Renaissance vernacular works for a growing, essentially monolingual readership, while others satisfied the scholarly community with translation into Latin.

After this dramatic opening, he continues:

The nation has grown conscious of its cultural inferiority to the Continent, and suddenly burned with the desire to excel its rivals in letters, as well as in ships and gold. The translator's work was an act of patriotism. He, too, as well as the voyager and merchant, could do some good for his country: he believed that foreign books were just as important for England's destiny as the discoveries of her seamen, and he brought them into his native speech with all the enthusiasm of a conquest...An important thing to remember from the outset is that the Elizabethan translator did not write for the learned alone, but for the whole country...His diction was racy and vivid, thronged with proverbial phrases, the slang of the streets, bold compounds, robust Saxon epithets, and metaphors drawn from English ports and countryside...My study of this Elizabethan art has been limited to works in prose. The reason is that the translations in verse present a wholly different problem in technique, and are, as a whole, distinctly inferior to those in prose... (3-5)

In our post-colonial, multicultural, politically correct days we are often left with a feeling of unease when reading this kind of 'over the top' prose, including the somewhat sinister tones of the reference to 'robust Saxon epithets', a reflection of the 19th century nationalist, Romantic current of thought known as 'Saxonism' (Dury, 1992). The first point is the exclusion of women translators (the 'he' does not appear to be a generic inclusive pronoun here!) who were actually quite numerous in this period.²⁵ Since Matthiessen ignores the role of Latin translation,

²⁴ This point was already made in Roberto Weiss's entry dealing with Matthiessen's book in the 1938 *Bibliography of the Survival of the Classics* published by the Warburg Institute. Though humanism did arrive relatively late in England and was more influential in literary and educational fields rather than the fine arts it had already been promoted even as early as the 15th century by influential patrons such as Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester and William Grey, Bishop of Ely (Guy 1988, 15-18).

²⁵ Modern translation studies have done much to redress the balance. See, for example, Sturiale (2003, 2008), Oakley-Brown (2010, 127-129), Wright (2010, 62-66), Hosington (2011b). Humphrey praises women translators like the daughters of Sir Thomas More and Sir Anthony Cooke as well as Lady Jane Gray and Queen Elizabeth I (1559, *Praefatio* a4v) and Queen Katherine Parr's English translation of Erasmus' *Paraphrases* (523).

he misleadingly states that ‘the Elizabethan translator did not write for the learned alone’. Actually *he/she* (i.e. the translator into English) did not write for the learned, who were targeted by Latin translators, at all, but for the ‘meane sort of men’ mentioned in the Preface to Dolman’s translation of Cicero’s *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1561):

...Besydes the raskell multitude, and the learned sages, there is a meane sort of men: which although they be not learned, yet by the quicknes of their wits, can conceiue al such poyntes of arte, as nature could giue. To those, I saye, there is nothing in this book to darke. (Rhodes, ed., 2013, 260-261)

Susan Bassnett has pointed out the unsystematic nature of Matthiessen’s treatment (2013 [1980], 52-53), and in general the personal value judgments on stylistic questions, and failure to place translators and translations in their ideological and poetological context ought to have long ago consigned this study to its rightful place in the pre-history of a systematic Translation Studies oriented approach, whose aim is descriptive and (hopefully) explanatory adequacy.

The same cannot be said of Morini’s study. To begin with he is far more comprehensive, presenting detailed treatment of both selected prose and poetic texts,²⁶ with systematic source-target text comparisons illustrating translation strategies. However, I would suggest that his underestimation of the presence of a theoretical underpinning of translation practice in the period and his limited treatment of Latin translation lessens the impact of the aim to ‘bridge the gap’ he mentions in his introduction (vii). A more extensive treatment of the latter would have provided an innovative and long overdue completion of the picture of Tudor translation, which was by no means restricted to the production of texts in English.

Translation Studies foregrounds the links of the socio-historical, ideological and poetological context with the essentially manipulative process of text transfer via translation from source to target culture:

The object of study has been redefined; what is studied is the text embedded within its network of both source and target cultural signs and in this way Translation Studies has been able both to utilize the linguistic approach and to move beyond it. (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990, 12)

²⁶ Matthiessen only deals with four prose translators. Braden (2010b, 3-4) criticises the limitation to Elizabeth’s reign and, especially, the ‘eccentrically small’ coverage, but still seems to have no fundamental objection to the American critic’s outdated stance.

It is precisely my aim to link network and text in the case study making up sections 4, 5, and the Postscript of this supplement to the *Journal of Early Modern Studies*.



2. Changing Clothes, Opening Windows and Letting in Light. Describing the Process and Purpose of Translation in Metaphorical Terms in the English Renaissance¹

Volume 2 of the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550-1660* (Braden, Cummings and Gillespie, eds, 2010, 433-470) provides 78 biographical sketches of 'the more prominent translators' (7 of them women, including Queen Elizabeth I) active in the period covered. Where possible (and this is in the majority of cases) information is provided on their educational background. 39 of them attended grammar school and university, 14 grammar school, university and one of the Inns of Court and 4 only grammar school. 11 were educated privately (necessarily including the women) or abroad (including 4 Catholics).² The majority had thus been subjected to 'full immersion' in Latin grammar (in the lower classes at grammar school) and rhetoric (in the upper classes at grammar school and at university) as well as selected (overwhelmingly) classical Latin historical, political, poetic and drama texts (Baldwin 1944; Cox Jensen 2012, 25-44; Burrow 2013, 21-50). A major revered classical authority on rhetoric, following on from Aristotle, Cicero and the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* was undoubtedly Quintilian,³ who in the eighth book of his *Institutio Oratoria* (VIII. vi. 4ff.) foregrounded Metaphor, 'by far the most beautiful of Tropes':

¹ This chapter draws on material from Denton 1992.

² Concerning the social origins of the students Green (2009, 76) states: 'Today, there is not much doubt that the main beneficiaries of the expansion of grammar school teaching in early modern England were the sons of the landed elite and of the 'middling sort' of men in the professions and merchant elites'.

³ After the complete manuscript had been unearthed by Poggio Bracciolini in 1416, subsequent printed versions had to be imported into England from the continent until the first Latin edition of Quintilian printed in London appeared in 1641. This was the case with many other classical writers (see Binns 1990, 194-195). The first English translation of Quintilian's *Institutio* (by William Guthrie) came out in 1756 (Pavlovskis-Petit 2000).

Incipiamus igitur ab eo qui cum frequentissimus est tum longe pulcherrimus, translatione dico, quae μεταφορά Graece vocatur. Let us begin then with the commonest and by far the most beautiful of Tropes, namely *translatio* which is called *metaphora* in Greek. (Trans. Russell)

which is defined thus:

Transfertur ergo nomen aut verbum ex eo loco in quo proprium est in eum in quo aut proprium deest aut tralatum proprio melius est. A noun or a verb, then, is “transferred” from a place in which it is “proper” to a place in which either there is no “proper” word or the “transferred” term is better than the “proper” one. (Trans. Russell)

its function being:

Id facimus aut quia necesse est aut quia significantius est aut, ut dixi, quia decentius. We do this either because it is necessary or because it expresses the meaning better or (as I said) because it is more decorative. (Trans. Russell)

A few pages later (VIII.vi.19) Quintilian goes on:

Nam tralatio permovendis animis plerumque et signandis rebus ac sub oculos subiciendis reperta est:... (...Metaphor is designed generally to affect the emotions, put a clear mark on things, and place them before our eyes,...) (Trans. Russell)

Students in Renaissance England will actually have read about or been told by their teacher about the primacy of metaphor in 16th century authors of Latin textbooks, one of the best known of whom was Susenbrotus, whose *Epitome Troporum Ac Schematum*, closely following Quintilian and other classical authorities, was first printed in Zurich in c. 1541 and first printed in England in 1562. Green (1999, 77-78, 105-110) has challenged the extent to which Susenbrotus’ text book was actually used in English grammar schools of the time, based on the presumed limited availability of the book either printed abroad or locally, between 1562 and 1586.⁴ He points out that much more attention was devoted to the English accident and Latin grammar making up the composite work known as ‘Lily’s Grammar’ (Lily and Colet 1549), which was available in a much larger

⁴ The book was, however, further reprinted in England in 1608, 1612, 1616, 1621, 1627 and 1635.

number of copies. This famous textbook was imposed by royal decrees and before 1700 had been reprinted 125 times (Green 1999, 78). Baldwin's classic study of Shakespeare's presumed educational background devotes several pages to the alleged importance of Susenbrotus for the latter (1944 vol 2, 138-175), though more recent scholarship has tended to criticize this scholar's over reliance on the curricula of far more prestigious schools such as Westminster and St Paul's than the provincial set up in Stratford (Keller 2009, 23 note 63; Burrow 2013, 22-23). Susenbrotus may well have been less present in grammar school education than earlier scholarship believed (Green 2009, 251), but he was certainly a considerable influence on rhetorical manuals in English and may well have been more widely used at the two universities, which most translators, as we have seen, attended, though not necessarily long enough to take a degree.⁵ In competition with another well-known continental manual also targeting the educational market by Mosellanus (1516), which was printed twice in England in 1573 and 1577, he provided 132 figures in comparison with the latter's 98 (Mack 2004, 85). These were the source of English students' knowledge of the rhetorical figures, albeit, at more advanced levels, rather than the English language books on the subject, which, by the very fact of being written in English were excluded from grammar school and university classrooms (Green 1999, 76). Like his Classical predecessor, Quintilian, Susenbrotus (sig. A5r) unsurprisingly also gives pride of place to metaphor (Mack 2004, 85-86):

Metaphora est cum vox a propria ac germana significatione ad alienam sed cognatam transfertur: Tropus longe pulcherrima ut, video pro intellige, perspicio pro cognitum habeo, devoro pro vinco et perfero, supicio pro admiror...

A metaphor occurs when a word is transformed from its proper and genuine significance to another but related one. This trope is by far the most beautiful: as 'I see' for 'I understand'; 'I grasp it' for 'I comprehend it'; 'to swallow' for 'to overcome' or 'to put up with'; 'I look up to' for 'I esteem'... (Trans. Brennan, rev. Mack)

⁵ Oxbridge colleges catered for those taking traditional degree courses (such as future clergy, lawyers and doctors) as well as the sons of the nobility and gentry and the wealthier merchant classes on shorter stays not leading to graduation but supplying instruction in history or modern languages (Green 2009, 194). There were, however, examples of men who were to become prominent translators, like John Florio, concerned about 'status anxiety' not only regarding the inferiority of vernacular translation as a literary genre but also their own humble social status in a world populated by gentlemen addressing other gentlemen (such as Sir Thomas Hoby addressing Sir John Cheke) (Rhodes 2011, 116-117).

In short a kind of anticipation of modern treatments of the trope with titles such as: *The Ubiquity of Metaphor* (Paprotté and Dirven, eds, 1985) or, even more appropriate, *Metaphors We Live By* (Lakoff and Johnson 1980).

All of the English rhetorical manuals, whose importance, especially in earlier studies, like the one by Howell (1956), has been overstated (Green 1999, 74-75) were heavily based on Quintilian and his neo-Latin followers (Mack 2004, 87; Keller 2009, 24-25), but, being excluded from the educational market, though there is some evidence of student use privately, had single or very short print runs. Sherry was only printed twice (1550, 1555), Peacham (1557, 1593) twice, Fraunce once (1588) and Puttenham twice in the same year (1589). There were, however, a number of exceptions, two of them being the *Arte of Rhetorique* by Wilson (1553-1554) and the *English Secretorie* by Day (1586), both of them, however, targeting a more mature (and more limited, owing to the greater cost of quarto volumes) audience of professionals (Green 1999, 75-76).⁶

A common feature of these English language style manuals was their close dependence on classical and neo-Latin treatises, some of which are discussed above. They are also characterized by certain difficulties in adapting the Latin terminology of their models to English (Mack 2004, 95-191). Mack (2004, 101) provides a neat summary of their relationship to these models:

In the first place the manuals are translations of Latin handbooks, providing an English version of a text which was useful in itself and which grammar school pupils were supposed to read (and probably did read) in Latin. Secondly, and as part of that function, they were guides to Latin rhetoric to assist people in reading and composing Latin. Thirdly they were guides to rhetoric for people who only wanted to read and write in English. To that end some of the figures were adapted to the needs of English. Fourthly, they were part of the process of absorbing the perceived advantages of Latin into English.

To return to the question of metaphor in early modern translation metalanguage, one of the authors of the English treatises, Henry Peacham (1593 [1577], 13),⁷ has this to say:

⁶ Wilson was printed 9 times between 1553/54 and 1585 and Day 9 times between 1586 and 1635.

⁷ The quotation is discussed by Vickers (1988, 325), using the expanded edition (1593) of Peacham's work.

First, they giue pleasant light to darke things, thereby remouing vnprofitable and odious obscuritie. Secondly, by the aptnesse of their proportion, and nearenesse of affinitie, they worke in the hearer many effects, they obtaine allowance of his iudgement, they moue his affections, and minister a pleasure to his wit. Thirdly, they are forcible to perswade. Fourthly to commend or dispraise. Fifthly, they leaue such a firme impression in the memory, as is not lightly forgotten.

It is hardly surprising that translators in the period should have made wide use of metaphor as an aid to communication with their readers, when presenting their work in the various forms of paratextual material (Smith and Wilson 2011) (i.e. letters to the reader and dedications to patrons) attached to their translated texts (which were often supplemented by laudatory texts by other writers showering fulsome praise on the translator's work),⁸ seeing that among the recognized purposes of metaphor were, as Peacham states, clear exposition of important ideas and help in memorizing them, by the use of vivid, concrete images, which would prove particularly helpful when dealing with an abstract process such as translation. That such devices could also have emotional and aesthetic appeal might well be of secondary importance, at least as far as some translators were concerned. On this basis, it seems hard to accept Hawkes' (1972, 14-15) contention that both later Classical authorities and their Renaissance followers had reduced metaphor to a mainly decorative role.

One image that had frequently been employed from Classical Antiquity was that of the 'habitus' (Rener 1989, 24-26). The idea that words were 'the dress of thought', that *res* had a separate existence from *verba*, was of fundamental importance to Renaissance translators. Again we can turn to Quintilian (VIII. Proemium. 20): '...quae illo verborum habitu vestiantur' (...which are clothed in this kind of verbal dress). If

⁸ The metaphorical images in these paratexts, as Hermans (1985b, 105) aptly points out: '...appear to be highly functional, and they form an integral and essential part of the Renaissance theory of translation' (see also Hermans 2007, 1425), alongside, I would add, the theoretical treatise by Humphrey discussed above. Rhodes (2013 and, ed., 2013) also deals extensively with these images, as do Coldiron (2010) and especially Morini (2006, 35-61). Conventionally the prefaces and dedications were apologetic (Rhodes 2011, 110), while the laudatory texts were obviously positive (Hermans 1986, 31-33). Rhodes (2013, 52-53) wisely describes more aggressive stances (often commented on, for example, in Holland's *Preface* to his translation of Pliny) as unrepresentative of translators' attitudes.

words and things were separate entities, then translation consisted in transferring the outward covering (or 'dress') from one language to another. In the case of English, the initial main cause of anxiety was that the target language was lexically and stylistically poorer than the source language, as was often pointed out by Elizabethan translators. Jones (1953), albeit in a somewhat excessive way as concerns the 'triumph' of English over Latin, (as I pointed out in Chapter 1 above), on the basis of the examination of numerous relevant texts, argued that between 1575 and 1580 there was a shift of opinion regarding the 'eloquence' of English, now no longer seen as a poor relation of Classical or certain vernacular European languages. The criteria for the status of 'eloquence' were 1) that important literary works had been written in the language (such as Sidney, Lyly and Spenser) 2) that the word stock should be 'copious', by whatever means this had been achieved 3) that the language should be adorned with the devices of classical rhetoric (though there were some anti-rhetorical voices) 4) that the language should be fixed (by grammars, dictionaries, spelling rules etc.). English was clearly deficient in category 4), but evidently could be seen to have fulfilled the first three criteria by the dates indicated by Jones (Barber 1997 [1976], 52-54).⁹

Two well-known prefaces, the first from Arthur Golding's translation of Justin's epitome of Trogus Pompeius (Rhodes, ed., 2013, 308-309) and the second from Thomas Wilson's translation of Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs* and *Philippics* (Rhodes, ed., 2013, 325) illustrate apologetic attitudes of the 'pre-eloquence' period:

Euen in lyke wyse it may come to passe, that this my rude translation voyd of ornate termes and elegant indyting, may in his playne and homely English cote, be as well accepted of the fauorable reader as when it were richely clad in Romayn vesture.

But all cannot weare Veluet, or feede with the best and therefore such are contented for necessities sake to weare our cuntrye cloth, and to take theselues to harde fare that haue no better.

Wilson adds a food metaphor, showing how monolingual readers lose much by being unable to share the linguistic riches of Greek (in this

⁹ A witness to the eloquence achieved by English is Mulcaster (1582). Barber (1997 [1976], 42-102) devotes ample space to the discussion of attitudes to English in the Early Modern period.

case – one of the rare examples of English translation directly from the original Greek, rather than by way of a Latin or European vernacular version). It is, however, always better to eat simple food than to die, metaphorically of starvation (as the opponents of translation would have the unlearned readers do).

Other metaphors were used to illustrate the value of the source language text for its readership in translation, as in the following example from the preface to Abraham Fleming's translation of Aelian (1576):

Open this base boxe, and lifte vp the lydd of this course casket, wherin so riche and costly a juell is enclosed: wey it, and weare it, the commoditie issuing from the same is singular, so is the delight redundant and plenti-full. (Bennett 1965, 91)

Many Classical authorities would have considered this passage, foregrounding pleasure more than moral profit, an over rich use of metaphor, a kind of clash between *perspicuitas* and *ornatus*. Metaphorical abundance of a more ornate kind can be illustrated by an extract from the preface to the translation of Herodotus (1584) (Bennett 1965, 97) by B(arnaby) R(ich):

Right Courteous Gentlemen, we haue brought out of Greece into England two of the Muses, Clio and Euterpe, as desirous to see the lande as to learne the language; whome I trust you will vse well because they be women, and you cannot abuse them because you be Gentlemen. As these speede, so the rest will followe, neyther altogether vnwilling to forsake theyr owne country, nor yet over hasty to arriue into this... If you lyke them not for the attire they weare, yet bid them welcome for the newes they bring, which I confesse are in many pointes straunge, but for the most parte true... Neyther of them are braued out in theyr colours as the vse is nowadays, and yet so seemely, as eyther you will loue them because they are modest, or not mislike them because they are not impudent, since in refusing ydle pearles to make them seeme gaudy, they reject not modest apparel to cause them to go comely. The truth is in making them new attire... I was cutting my cloth by another mans measure, beeyng great difference whether we inuent a fashion of our owne, or imitate a paterne not downe by another. Whiche I speake not to this end, for that my selfe coulde haue done more eloquently in Englishe than our Authour hath in Greeke, but that the course of his writing beeyng most sweete in Greeke, conuerted into Englishe looseth a great parte of his grace.

Excessive use of the 'most beautiful trope' could produce reactions like that of George Puttenham (1589, lib. III, Ch. VII, 128):

As figures be the instruments of ornament in euery language, so be they also in a sorte abuses or rather trespasses in speach, because they passe the ordinary limits of common vtterance, and be occupied of purpose to deceiue the eare and also the minde, drawing it from plainnesse and simplicitie to a certaine doublenesse, whereby our talke is the more guilefull and abusing, for what els is your *Metaphor* but an inuersion of sense by transport;...

The selected examples of translators' reflection on their interlingual activity in the 'pioneering' period of English Renaissance translation up to at least the mid-1570s, highlighted the spread of knowledge, freeing it from the obscurity of an unknown language. This brings us to the final important metaphor, illustrating the purpose of translation, i.e. the shedding of light, which can be illustrated by an extract from the dedication of one of the most popular secular translations of the period, that of Cicero's *De officiis* by Nicholas Grimald (1553)¹⁰:

... chiefly for our vnlatined people I haue made this Latine writer English: and haue now brought into light, that from them so longe was hidden: and haue caused an auncient writing to become, in maner, newe agayne: and a boke vsed but of fewe, to wax common to a great many: so that our men vnderstanding, what a treasure is amonge them (...) may in all points of good demeanour become peerless. (Hermans 1985, 118; Rhodes, ed., 2013, 252)

This 'austere' view of the moral value of translation survived, where one would expect it to, in the religious field. One finds, for example, a series of variations on the theme of allowing access to monolingual readers in the translators' preface to the 1611 Bible (Smith, 1611) (Nocera Avila 1990; Rhodes, ed., 2013, 185):

Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtaine, that we may looke into the most Holy place; that remooveth the couer of the well, that we may come by the water...

The view of translation presented by most Elizabethan practitioners was basically schematic and unproblematic, as is shown by the metaphors mostly chosen to conceptualize their activity and its supposed value. The translator may well have been 'conscious of having contributed substantially towards the spreading of knowledge and the enrichment of his native language in terms of *res* as well as *verba*'

¹⁰ 11 editions in 57 years (see Womersley 1991, 314 note 4).

(Renner 1989, 326). It is, however, easy to exaggerate the extent of this 'spread of knowledge' and a timely warning against the 'perils of paying too much attention solely to what appeared in print: of taking the early modern translators and compilers at their printed word, and giving credence to their prefatory posturing' comes from a recent article on the readership of Roman history in sixteenth century England (Cox Jensen 2014, 36). By 'prefatory posturing' the author means the claims made by several translators that their work addresses even the most underprivileged sectors of society. A frequently cited example comes from Holland's *Preface to the Reader* introducing his translation of Pliny's *Natural History* (1601):

Ouer and besides, the Argument ensuing full of varietie, furnished with discourses of all matters, not appropriat to the learned only, but accomodat to the rude paisant of the country; fitted for the painefull artizan in town and citie;... (Rhodes, ed., 2013, 380-381)

One wonders where the 'rude paisant' or 'painefull artizan' would have found the 13s which was spent on one unbound copy of the 2 large folio volumes of Holland's translation (Cox Jensen 2014, 43-44)!



3. Translation and Manipulation of Ancient History in Renaissance England

History (especially Ancient History) was considered a highly suitable genre for translation in our period, though initially as 'a storehouse of examples rather than processes' (Pocock 1985, 146). One of the many statements of the practical value of history, in the above mentioned sense, as opposed to the theoretical character of philosophy, can be found in the dedication of Brende's very popular translation of Quintus Curtius' *De rebus gestis Alexandri* (1553, Sig.A1v):

As in all artes there be certeyne prynciples and rules for men to folowe, so in hystories there be ensamples paynted out of all kynde of vertues wherin both the dignite of virtue, & foulenes of vyce appeareth much more lyuelye than in eny morall teaching: there beyng expressed by way of ensample, all that philosophy doth teach by waye of precepts.

and in Thomas North's preface to his translation of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* (1579, Sig.π3r):

Whereas stories are fit for euery place, reache to all persons, serue for all tymes, teache the liuing, reuiuie the dead, so farre excellling all other books, as it is better to see learning in noble mens liues, than to reade it in Philosophers writings.

Emphasis then was on the didactic value of the study of individuals' actions in the (especially classical) past. A distinction between what we now know as biography and history (in the sense of a chronicle of events) only began to emerge at the end of the sixteenth century, with Sir John Hayward's *The First Part of the Life and Reigne of Henry III* (1599) and the clear distinction made in Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* (1605), the actual term 'biography' only entering English vocabulary in c. 1660 (Buford 1952; Braden 2010c, 322).

Actually the term 'histories' was used in the early modern period for a wider variety of texts than that covered by our modern term 'history' (Cox Jensen 2012, 53-54). The former label included works like

Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*, the *Memorabilia* by Valerius Maximus, the *Lives* by Plutarch and Suetonius (at least in the earlier part of the period), the works on military tactics by Frontinus, Onasander and Vegetius (Schurink 2013), and even the poem *Pharsalia* by Lucan recounting, in verse, the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, in addition to the works of Aelian, Ammianus Marcellinus, Appian, Caesar, Cassius Dio, Diodorus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Eutropius, Florus, Herodian, Herodotus, Josephus, Livy, Polybius, Quintus Curtius, Sallust, Tacitus, Thucydides, Trogus Pompeius (Justin), Valleius Paterculus, and Xenophon. All of them (in some cases only partially) had become available in English by 1640 except Cassius Dio and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The details are given below in order of popularity (measured by the number of editions and the number of different translations).

English Translations of Classical Historical Writing in Renaissance England (1500-1640) (slightly shorter than the periods covered by *Early English Books Online* and the *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads Catalogue*) with reference to Bolgar (1954, 506-541+Nøgaard 1958 for corrections) (from the late 15th century to 1600) and Cummings and Gillespie (2009) for the period 1550-1640:

- Two or more editions or two or more different translators (editions beyond the 1640 cut-off are included, if the first edition is previous to 1640):

Josephus, *Opera* (Lodge) 1602 (1609, 1620 (2), 1632 (2), 1640 (2), 1655 (3), 1670 (3)); (Markham) part. 1622 (2).

Curtius, *De rebus gestis Alexandri* (Brende) 1553 (1561, 1570, 1584, 1592, 1602, 1614).

Tacitus, *Historiae, Agricola* (Savile) 1591 (1598, 1604, 1612, 1622, 1640), (from 1604 with Grenewey's *Annales, Germania*).

Annales, Germania (Grenewey) 1598 (1604, 1612, 1622, 1640), (from 1604 with Savile's *Historiae, Agricola*).

Lucan, *Pharsalia* (Marlowe) 1600; (Gorges) 1614; M[ay] part. 1626, complete 1631, (1635, 1650, 1659, 1679).

Plutarch, *Vitae* (North) 1579 (1595, 1603 (+Nepos *et al.*), 1612, 1631, 1657, 1676).

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* (extracts Cope) 1544 (1548, 1561, 1590); (Holland) (+Florus *Epitome*) 1600 (1659, 1686).

Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* (Tiptoft) part. 1530; (Golding) 1565 (1590); (Edmondson) part. 1600 (bks 1-5) (1604+bks 6-7), 1609 (+ *De Bello Civili*) (1655, 1677, 1695).

Florus, *Epitome* (Holland) 1600 (1659, 1686); (Bolton) 1618-19 (1621?, 1636, 1658).
 Pliny (the elder), *Historia Naturalis* A[lday?] part. 1566 (1585, 1587); (Holland) 1601 (1634, 1635).
 Trogus Pompeius, (Justin's *Epitome*) (Golding) 1564 (1570, 1578); W[ilkins] 1606.
 Thucydides, *Historia* (Nicolls) 1550; (Hobbes) 1629 (1634, 1648, 1676).
 Sallust, *Jugurtha* (Barclay) 1520? (1525?, rev. Paynell 1557); +*Catilina* (Heywood) 1608.
Opera (Crosse) 1629.
 Herodian, *Historia* (Smyth) 1556; (Maxwell) 1629 (1635).
 Xenophon, *Cyropedia* (Barker) part. 1552? *viii bks* 1567; (Holland) 1632 (1654).
Anabasis (Bingham) 1623.
 Polybius, *Historia* W[atson] part. 1568; (Grimeston) 1633 (1634 (2), 1635, 1648); (Ralegh) part. 1647.

- Single editions:

Aelian, *Varia Historia* (Fleming) 1576. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* (Holland) 1609. Appian, *Historia Romana* B[arker]? 1578. Diodorus, *Historia* (Stocker) part. 1569. Eutropius, *Breviarium* (Howard) 1564. Frontinus, *Strategemata* (Morison) 1539. Herodotus, *Historia* R[ich]? part. 1584. Onasander, *Strategicus* (Whitehorne) 1563. Suetonius, *Vitae* (Holland) 1606. Valerius Maximus *Memorabilia* W[ood] part. 1606. Vegetius, *de Re Militari* (Sadler) (1572). Velleius Paterculus, *Historia Romana* (Le Grys) 1632.

What clearly emerges is an overwhelming preference for Roman history either written in Latin or in Greek by Greeks living in the Roman Empire. Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius and Xenophon are much less in evidence. It is not difficult to see why the Elizabethan view of ancient history was a Roman rather than a Greek one. The Roman Empire, to which the Republic was traditionally seen as a prelude, was the last of the four monarchies which had ruled the world, the others being Assyria, Persia and Macedonia. This scheme was presented in the World History by Trogus Pompeius, known in the Renaissance in the third century A.D. Latin epitome by Justin. This Latin summary was a popular text book in Elizabethan grammar schools and was translated into English by Arthur Golding in 1564. This explains why the only part of Greek history that really attracted attention was that concerning Alexander and his successors (Leeds Barroll 1958). The English transla-

tion by John Brende of Quintus Curtius' *De rebus gestis Alexandri* was, in fact, the most popular translation (after the rather special case of Josephus), running into seven editions between 1553 and 1614 and the partial translation of Diodorus by Thomas Stocker (1569) was limited to the part concerning the successors of Alexander. By studying the number and frequency of editions of a particular work we can build up a kind of 'hit parade' of the most popular translations of classical history. In the period before c. 1600 the most popular writers were Josephus, Quintus Curtius, biographical extracts from Livy, Caesar, Sallust and Plutarch; quite a different line-up from the present day canon of classical history which foregrounds Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius (Burke 1966). The situation changed somewhat, especially with the translation of Tacitus and Holland's complete Livy, about which more will be said shortly.

The moralistic nature of historians like Sallust and Appian was amplified in the translations of their works dealing with the civil wars in Rome and the suppression of the 'usurper' Jugurtha. Their relevance to contemporary attitudes towards 'sedition' and the damnation of those who attempted was manipulated both in the paratextual material and in the translations themselves, as the following two examples illustrate, the first from the prefatory material to W(illiam) B(arker's) translation of Appian's *Historia Romana* (1578, Sig. Aijr):

How God plagueth them that conspire againste theyr Prince, this Historie declareth at the full. For all of them, that coniured against Caius Caesar, not one did escape violent death. The which this Author hathe a pleasure to declare, bycause he would affray all men from disloyaltie toward their Soueraigne.

The second example comes from Alexander Barclay's translation of Sallust's *Jugurtha* (1520?)¹ compared with Thomas Heywood's version (1608 for 1609):

¹ Sallust's works dealing with Catiline's conspiracy and the war against Jugurtha in Latin were set books in grammar schools of the time, because of their stylistic qualities and appropriate moral tone. Barclay's English translation was revised by Thomas Paynell in 1557. Womersley (1991, 317-318, see also Schurink 2013, 124-128) quotes from Paynell's revised text as an example of highly manipulative translation, although the examples provided are almost identical to the original passages in Barclay's translation which I have quoted here. He does not compare them with Thomas Heywood's later translation (see also Braden 2013, 109-110).

Latin text (*Bellum Iugurthinum*, v. 1):

Bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege Numidarum gessit...

Translation by Alexander Barclay (1520?):

In this warke I purpose to wryte of the warre, whiche the Romayns had and executed agaynst the tyranne Iugurth, wrongfully vsurpyng the name of kynge ouer the lande of Numidy.

Translation by Thomas Heywood (1608 for 1609):

In this Booke, my purpose is, to write the warre which the Romane people vndertooke against *Iugurth* King of *Numidia*.

The conclusion reads as follows:

Latin text (*Bellum Iugurthinum*, cxiv. 4):

Et ea tempestate spes atque opes civitates in illo [i.e. Marius] sitae.

Translation by Alexander Barclay (1520?):

... from thensforth al the hope of confort, helth, socors, & welth of the cite of Rome resisted in Marius. Jugurth was casten into prison: where he ended his wretched lyfe in miserable captuyte, and manyfolde calamitees, as to such a murderer vnnatural: and tyran inhumayne was conuenient.

Translation by Thomas Heywood (1608 for 1609):

From that time, the hope and prosperity the Citty wholly relyed vpon him.

One difference between the Barclay translation and the Parnell revision is that the former does include Sallust's Latin text in the margins. The inclusion of the Latin text might well have served the purpose of helping readers with their Latin as Schurink (2013, 124) suggests, but it also highlighted the substantial manipulative additions by the translator. The Heywood translation was much more suitable as a crib for students in their study of a set text in the curriculum, since, unlike the Barclay version, it stays very close to the Latin. Parnell's revision was printed with potential threats to the government of Queen Mary

and the suppression of heresy in mind (Schurink 2013, 126-127) and thus addressed an audience outside the grammar school and university classroom. Wormesley (1991, 317) writes about Parnell's revision (but he could equally have applied it to the original Barclay version) that 'It is in fact as much an interpretation as a translation'. A statement of this type could never have been made by a scholar working within the Translation Studies research paradigm. It appears to limit 'translation' to a close rendering at the code level of the linguistic substance of the source text, without taking into consideration inter-cultural transfer problems, or indeed a new ideological agenda behind the translator's strategic choices and intertextual additions and shifts. In any case the relationship between translation and interpretation is a highly complex matter that has been extensively dealt with by Umberto Eco (2001, 2003a, 2003b), among others. To put it in a nutshell, 'every translator is an interpreter... but this does not mean that every interpreter is a translator' (Eco 2003a, 125).

The above quotes from Sallust and his earlier translator are convincing examples of the general trend in classical historical translation, especially in the 16th century, to foreground the ideological relevance to contemporary society of the ancient authors,² who were taken as indisputable authorities and not subjected to critical analysis as sources. This is confirmed by the fact that missing periods in ancient historians were filled in by translators according to the so-called 'scissors-and-paste' method, exemplified by Henry Savile's addition to his translation of Tacitus (1591) of an essay on 'The Ende of Nero and beginning of Galba' to fill in the gap between the end of the *Annales* and beginning of the *Historiae* (66 A.D. to 1 January 69 A.D.) (Womersley 1991, 314-315). In this sense Savile was not particularly innovative, but, in another sense, he was, as the initiator of a new trend in the production of classical history translation.

² Blanshard and Sowerby (2005) examine Thomas Wilson's scholarly translation (1570) (direct from the Greek) of Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs* and *Philippics* (not strictly a 'historical' text in the modern sense of the word). The translation was at the same time a work of humanist scholarship and a piece of anti-Spanish propaganda, in which Wilson carefully piloted his readers in the direction of parallels between ancient Athens and contemporary England by means of polemical marginal notes and other metatextual material, without actually intervening in the translated text itself. The basic message was that if there was no military intervention in the Netherlands then England would suffer the same fate as Athens which lost Olynthus.

Hunter (1971, 97-102) convincingly argues that Savile's Tacitus (+ Grenewey) and Holland's Livy (1600) represent something of a turning point in translation of classical historical writing. Before the last decade of the 16th century, translations of this genre had tended to be fragmentary (see also Kewes 2011, 518-519), i.e. individual lives illustrating examples of good and bad behaviour (especially North's Plutarch, or the Roman emperors in Herodian), works on military tactics (not just the explicit military manuals by Frontinus, Onasander and Vegetius) of famous ancient commanders (Brende's Alexander, Scipio Africanus in Cope's extracts from Livy, cf. Schurink 2011b; Caesar, Marius in Barclay's Jugurtha, Xenophon's Cyrus, Watson's extract from Polybius on the Romans at war with Carthage, cf. Boutcher 2011), short summaries of ancient history for use in and beyond the classroom (Golding's Justin, Howard's Eutropius and later Florus' summary of Livy, initially only available in Latin for school and university study - Cox Jensen 2009 - and then included in Holland's complete Livy in English), extracts or short works centring on specific individuals on the evils of civil strife and the absolute necessity of obedience to the sovereign (Barker's Appian). Savile and Holland introduce a new period of complete works continued by Pliny the Elder (1601), Sallust (1608-1609), Thucydides (1629), Xenophon *Cyropedia* (1632) and *Anabasis* (1623), Velleius Paterculus (1632), and so on.

Much has been written on Savile's Tacitus (Hunter 1971; Womersley 1991; Smuts 1993; Sowerby 2010, 307-309; Kewes 2011) and less on Holland's Livy (Culhane 2004; Sowerby 2010, 304-306), especially in the former case, though, foregrounding the political context in which the translation appeared and the translator's close connection with the so-called 'Essex circle' and its 'lobbying' for a more aggressive policy towards the Catholic powers and concern over Elizabeth's successor. Less attention (with the partial exception of Sowerby 2010, 305-306, illustrating Holland's 'expansive' translation strategy and deliberate adoption of a 'plain style' in the case of Livy and Sowerby 2010, 307-309, in the case of Tacitus) being devoted to the actual translation process illustrated by extracts from the translated target text compared with the Latin source text. For this kind of comparison we need to turn, in the case of Livy, to a Ph.D thesis dating from 1975 (Cratty 1975). Admittedly this study does not provide the degree of contextual detail available in the above mentioned studies (especially in Womersley and Kewes in the case of Tacitus), but it does contain ample discussion (albeit following a somewhat dated theoretical model) of the translator's (in this case Holland's) strategical choices in the context

of expected target readership reception, i.e. the ample use of doublets and explanatory glosses.

It has often been stated that both Holland and Savile also represent a turning point in their choices of texts that had either not been translated into English before (Tacitus) or only partially (Livy). The surviving books of Livy present the Roman republic in a specially favourable light and Tacitus (though in a less moralistic tone than that of the former) deals severely with the corruption of the Imperial court and especially the 'tyrant' Nero, and Savile, in his own composition filling in the gap between the Roman historian's two works, showers praise on Julius Vindex, who made a decisive contribution to Galba's overthrowing Nero (Womersley 1991, 318-319; Smuts 1993, 25-29). When we consider the fact that official texts such as the *Homilie against disobedience and wyfull rebellion* (c. 1570) had used the very example of Nero to demand submission to the ruler, however evil, Savile's attitude could appear somewhat subversive:

And whether the prince be good or euyl, let vs according to the counsel of the holy scriptures pray for ye prince, for his continuance and increase in goodnesse yf he be good, and for his amendment yf he be euill. Wyll you heare the scriptures concerning this most necessarie point? I exhort therefore saith saint Paul, that aboue all things, prayers, supplications, intercessions, & geuing of thankes be had for all men, for kynges, and all that are in auctoritie... This is saint Paules counsel. And who I pray you was prince ouer the most part of Christians, when Gods holy spirite by saint Paules pen gaue them this lesson? Forsooth, *Caligula*, *Clodius*, or *Nero*, who were not only no Christians, but Pagans, and also eyther foolishe rulers, or most cruel tyrauntes. (Womersley 1991, 319-320)

The seemingly unorthodox stance of the translator of Tacitus is attenuated, nevertheless, by fulsome expressions of devotion to the sovereign (Womersley 1991, 331), as is also to be found in Holland's dedication to the Queen of his Livy, as a kind of 'defensive manoeuvre' (Culhane 2004, 272-273).

Kewes (2011) in a highly stimulating and detailed article presents an innovative study of the crucial status of Savile's translation, challenging the conclusions of previous scholars. The opening statement of Kewes' long article deserves quotation in full (516):

In what follows, my aim is twofold. First, I wish to illustrate the sheer variety and richness of Roman themes in the works of this period that in turn elicited correspondingly diverse applications from audiences and readers.

Second, by reconsidering what is arguably the most influential contemporary translation of a Roman historian, Henry Savile's Tacitus of 1591, I wish to challenge the current approach to the uses of Roman history at the turn of the century. While it is a truism that in analyzing the political bearing of translations we must be alive to the contexts that produced them, in practice much recent scholarship has read Savile's Tacitus proleptically. Some treat it as a knowing supply of images and vocabularies of corruption, despotism, and faction that had not in fact come to determine the view of Elizabeth among Essex and his followers until several years later; others anachronistically emphasize the role of Savile's book in the development of a quasi-republican sensibility. A rigorous contextual reading of the 1591 Tacitus demonstrates, however, that in its moment of composition and publication the volume served first and foremost to articulate the pressing preoccupation with the dangers, which the Crown allegedly failed to address, from Spain, Catholicism, and the unsettled succession.

Although most of the article deals with contextual questions, some welcome space is also devoted to actual textual strategies adopted by Savile, in view of the need for directing his unlatined (or only partially competent readership of a 'difficult' author from the linguistic point of view) in appreciating the contemporary relevance of Tacitus' history. Both in the original composition and translation (either directly in the text or as marginal annotations) there is considerable modernization of place names and titles (e.g. 'France' instead of 'Gaul' and references to the Dutch revolt against Spain and the Huguenot opposition to the French Holy League, as well as comparisons with the 'popish' obsequies to the funeral effigy of Charles IX and the divine status of Roman Emperors; cf. Kewes 2011, 529 note 54, 534).

I could hardly conclude this chapter without a few words of appreciation of Thomas Hobbes' translation of Thucydides (Sowerby 1998, 2010, 309-310). Here we have a perfect match of an empirically minded translator with an empirically minded ancient historian. Though, as was common, even in the case of linguistically accomplished scholars like Hobbes, the translator did his job with a revised version of the Latin translation by Laurentius Valla dating from the 1450s (in the edition of Aemilius Portus, Frankfurt 1594) beside the original Greek text (Sowerby 1998, 149-150), there is no doubt about his excellent knowledge of Greek, a remarkable stylistic match, as far as this was possible, being achieved between the source and target languages. Hobbes also felt a certain affinity with the Greek historian, who he saw as sharing his politically conservative outlook. Thucydides had a critical view of Athenian democracy, which made him generally attractive to schol-

ars like Hobbes,³ who shared the widespread opposition of his time to any form of government involving the decisive participation of the common people; 'there were no democracies in the Renaissance' (Sowerby 1998, 157). In contrast with some of the manipulative translation strategies illustrated above, and which will be foregrounded in the case study covered by Chapters 4 and 5 of this supplement (Thomas North/Amyot/Plutarch), Hobbes' Thucydides is a remarkably straightforward presentation of the Greek text to his early 17th century readership. As a result it is 'probably one of the very few translations of a classical prose writer, perhaps the only one, that has to some extent survived the test of time...' (Sowerby 1998, 147).

³ This is illustrated by the frequent use of the word 'sedition' in Hobbes' translation (Sowerby 1998, 151).



4. Domesticating Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* for Elizabethan Readers: Thomas North's Translation of Jacques Amyot's Translation¹

This chapter and the following one consist of a case study of Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* and its impact on one of its best known readers i.e. Shakespeare. Considering the theme of Chapter 5, the examples are all drawn from the *Life of Coriolanus*, by far the most important source for Shakespeare's play. I will apply the six large questions in Burke's checklist of the 'cultures of translation' already mentioned in Chapter 1 to the translation under scrutiny: 'Who translates? With what intentions? What? For whom? In what manner? With what consequences?' (2007a, 11):

1) Who translates? Sir Thomas North,² a member of a (recent) noble family (the younger brother of Roger Lord North), educated (probably) at Peterhouse (which had connections with the North family) Cambridge and (certainly) at Lincoln's Inn in London,³ though he did not enter the legal profession, which was not unusual at the time, there being no evidence for Burrow's reference to him as 'a lawyer' (2013,

¹ This chapter draws on material from Denton 1992b and 1998b.

² There is not enough material to write a biography of Thomas North. The fewer than twenty pages in Bushby (1911, 175-192) are supplemented by the entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Lockwood 2004). North's activities as a translator are discussed by Wyndham (1895) and Matthiessen (1931, 54-102) among others, but the authors' dated evaluative stance is, as pointed out in Chapter 1, unacceptable both in the Translation Studies perspective adopted here and the essentially paratextual and historical contextual approaches of other contemporary literary scholars and historians dealing with early modern translation. Somewhat more in line with my viewpoint are Bellowini (1964) and Worth (1986). North is nearly always only discussed in the context of his status as a source for Shakespeare.

³ The Inns of Court were for many younger members of the gentry more a kind of 'finishing school' than a first step to the legal profession (Prest 1972, 23, 137-173, see also Archer, Goldring and Knight, eds, 2011). Archer (2011) singles out particularly Lincoln's Inn as a 'stronghold of puritanism'.

210). He could have studied modern foreign languages (privately) during his time at Cambridge and in London, where he was presumably resident in the family home in the former Charterhouse and received financial support from his brother, an ongoing situation. His family were supporters of the Calvinist wing of the established church and close to the circle of the Earl of Leicester.⁴

2) With what intentions? It would be difficult to exaggerate the perceived value of Plutarch in all of 16th century Europe (Criniti 1979) as an encyclopedia of anecdotal information on ancient institutions and customs and, more importantly, a source of moral instruction both in the *Moralia*, sections of which had been translated into English throughout the 16th century (Schurink 2008) until a complete translation by Holland appeared in 1603, and especially in his *Parallel Lives* of famous Greeks and Romans, chosen as examples of good behaviour to be emulated and bad behaviour to be avoided. In North's own words from his preface 'To the Reader':

... there is no prophane studie better than Plutarke. All other learning is priuate, fitter for Vniuersities than cities, fuller of contemplacion than experience, more commendable in the students them selues, than profitable vnto others. (1579, Sig.n3r)

And his recommendation is echoed, in the light of encouragement of the grammar school (or privately tutored) and university educated younger members of the gentry and merchant classes to pursue the *vita activa* in the service of the Elizabethan *commonwealth*,⁵ by other members of the Elizabethan establishment, such as Sir Francis Walsingham writing to his nephew:⁶

... For that knowledge of histories is a very profitable study for a gentleman, read you the *Lives* of Plutarch and join thereto all his philosophy which shall increase greatly with the judgement of the most part of things incident to the life of man... (Quoted in Martindale 1985, 35)

⁴ On North's family's relationship with Leicester see Collinson (1967, 220, 265, 337, 378 and 1982, 160-163 and 182-188, especially 185), also Rosenberg (1955, 152-183).

⁵ Enshrined in Cicero's *De Officiis* a set book in Latin in all educational institutions as well as its immensely popular English translation (see note 10 p. 30).

⁶ This modernised spelling version is a transcription from a copy made before the original ms. was destroyed by fire (Read 1925, vol. 1, 18).

Plutarch as a 'safe' writer was also considered suitable for women readers:⁷

... the holie Scripture, or other good books, as the books of Plutarke, made of such renowned and virtuous women as liued in tyme paste... (Salter 1574, sig. D3v)

3) What? North's was the first complete English translation of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* (1579)⁸ after a few previous cases of manuscript translations of single lives from Latin, such as those by Lord Morley (Maule 2000) in the reign of Henry VIII. North used as an intermediary text the by then prestigious French translation⁹ by Jacques Amyot (1559),¹⁰ evidently not having the linguistic competence to attempt the original Greek, the printed *editio princeps* of which had appeared in Florence in 1517 (MacDonald 2001), shortly followed by the Aldine edition from Ven-

⁷ As pointed out by Dodds (2011, 212-213) Salter is more likely to be referring to the *Moralia*, rather than the portraits of men of action in the *Lives*.

⁸ New editions appeared in 1595, 1603, 1612, 1631 and 1657 and 1676. The *Lives of Hannibal and Scipio Africanus* written in Latin by Acciaiuoli in imitation of Plutarch were translated from the French translation by Charles de l'Escluse and from 1603 further *Lives* translated from Simon Goulart's French translation of Cornelius Nepos were added. The first edition (two printings) was published in 1579 by the French Huguenot refugee Thomas Vautrollier. In the same year he was joined as an apprentice by Richard Field, who printed the 1595, 1603 (three printings for different publishers/book-sellers) and 1612 editions. Field, who later married Vautrollier's widow, was a native of Stratford and had close connections with Shakespeare. It was probably Field who gave Shakespeare the chance of consulting a copy of North's translation. North, as an ardent protestant was no doubt attracted in his choice of publisher/printer by the like-minded Vautrollier couple.

⁹ Demetriou and Tomlinson (2015, 4-6) remind us that French was by far the most common 'pivot' language for Early Modern English translators. They supply the following information based on the *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads Catalogue* for intermediary languages of translation into English 1500-1660: Latin 42.1%, French 40.0%, Italian 8.5%, Dutch 5%, German 2.4%, Spanish 1.2% (+ some other tiny percentages).

¹⁰ At least 30 different editions of Amyot's translation appeared between 1559 and 1645 (Sturel 1908, 93-148. 615-619) as compared with North's 7. Both North and Amyot were replaced by other translations from the later 17th century, though Amyot enjoyed something of a revival in the 18th and 19th centuries (Billault 2002, 231-235, Frazier 2014). The translation chosen for inclusion in the *Pléiade* collection was significantly Amyot's with modernized spelling and some lexical updating (Plutarch/Amyot, ed., Walter 1951). North had to wait until the end of the 19th century for his revival (Plutarch/North, ed., Wyndham 1895).

ice (1519). Two further Latin translations appeared in the 16th century by Wilhelm Holtzmann (Xylander) (1561) and Hermann Crusier (Cruserius) (1564) (MacDonald 2000). Up to that time readers with sufficient Latin had read the many translations by 15th century Italian humanists (collected together in 1470).¹¹ North may well have had sufficient Latin to use one of the above mentioned translations or the edition of Plutarch's complete works prepared by Henri Estienne (Stephanus 1572) with the amended Greek text accompanied by a Latin translation (in the case of the *Lives* that of Cruserius). His reason for choosing Amyot's translation may not have been solely the fact that it was in a language he obviously knew well, but also its prestige as a work of philological scholarship and literary merit (acknowledged by both Xylander and Cruserius in their paratextual material, quoted by MacCallum 1967 [1910], 133-134, as well as famous contemporary readers, such as Montaigne; cf. Billault 2002, 226-231, Guerrier 2014, 547). He actually included a translation of Amyot's Preface to the Reader, evidently recognizing the greater authority in matters of translation theory and comparative stylistics of the French translator (Demetriou and Tomlinson 2015, 1-3). Concerning other aspects of the translators' paratexts, Amyot only added a small number of marginal notes, mostly of a textual nature and conversions of ancient sums of money (Worth 1986, 287-291). The copious notes in the margins of a number of editions of Amyot's translation were not the work of the translator himself but were added by the Calvinist pastor Simon Goulart (S.G.S. = Simon Goulartius Silvanectinus) who brought out a number of editions from 1583 *Enrichies... d'amples sommaires sur chacune vie: d'annotations morales en marge qui monstrent le profit qu'on peut faire en lecture de ces histoires* substantially pushing Amyot, whose translation he left intact, in a fundamentalist protestant direction.¹² North, on the other hand, includes many marginal notes, in part summarizing events but also touching on moral and political themes with notes of the type: 'See

¹¹ The pioneering article by Giustiniani (1961) has been replaced now by the exhaustive 2 volume study by Pade (2007).

¹² One example will suffice. At the point where the episode of Titus Latinus' dream of Juppiter (to be discussed in Chapter 5) is described, Goulart adds in the margin: 'Satan se fourre à la traverse tant pour attiser le feu de division par ses prodiges & miracles de mensonge, que pour establir tant plus ses superstitions & idolatries'. On Goulart see Jones (1917), Pineaux (1986) and Carabin (2003).

the fickle minds of common people', when Coriolanus seeks popular support for his candidature for the consulship.¹³

Amyot's translation also addressed a readership unacquainted with the cultural context in which Plutarch's characters lived, and, although North's translation strategies differed to some extent from those of the French scholar, as we shall see, the latter's incorporation of so many explanatory glosses certainly facilitated the English translator's task, since he was addressing a similar type of English audience.

Amyot's reputation is reflected in the abundant scholarly attention he has attracted.¹⁴ He enjoyed the protection of several kings of France, particularly Henri II, François II, Charles IX and Henri III, the last two having been his pupils. Charles IX appointed him Lord High Almoner of France and, in 1570, Bishop of Auxerre. At the beginning of the reign of Henri III in 1574, Thomas North accompanied his brother Roger Lord North at the head of an ambassadorial mission to the French court. It is very likely that Thomas will have met Amyot during his stay there up to November 1574. He most probably acquired a copy of Amyot's translation of Plutarch's *Lives* in the edition printed in Lausanne by François Le Preux in 1574. Gentili (1991, 36 note 22) suggests that the identity of the portrait medallions placed at the beginning of each *Life*, which supposedly appeared for the first time in this edition, with those also present in North's first edition five years later is sufficient evidence that this was the edition of Amyot North used for his English version.¹⁵ One could add that North's title page includes reference to Amyot being Bishop of Auxerre (he was appointed in 1570). Admittedly an edition of Amyot printed in 1572 mentions the medallions but does not refer to Amyot as Bishop of Auxerre.

We cannot provide such good evidence for Amyot's Greek source text, for the simple reason that he did not use one of the three ready-

¹³ On the crucial role of marginal notes in the global reading of an early modern book see Tribble 1993.

¹⁴ He has a biography, unlike North (Cioranescu 1941) and a series of articles and book length studies. In general see Aulotte (1959), Balard, ed. (1986) and, for the *Lives* Sturel (1908), and the *Moralia* Aulotte (1965) and Guerrier, ed. (2008). Thomas North has no statues or monuments to commemorate him, unlike the statue of Amyot in his native Melun of which a photograph appears in a major collective volume on translators through history (Delisle and Woodsworth, eds, 2012 [1995], 20, fig. 4),

¹⁵ All quotations from Amyot's translation are taken from the 1574 Le Preux edition.

made printed editions available but built up his own text on the basis of his studies of manuscripts in libraries in Venice and Rome from 1548 to 1552. Sturel (1908 164-169), despite the fact that there is a copy of the Aldine edition with notes in Amyot's hand, argues that the Florentine *editio princeps*¹⁶ is probably closer to Amyot's 'home made' text.¹⁷

4) For whom? North was clearly addressing the kind of readership mentioned by Dolman in his translation of Cicero referred to in Chapter 1 (Cicero/Dolman 1561), the 'meane' sort of men between the 'raskell multitude' and the 'learned sages' i.e. the so-called 'middling sort', the wealthier merchants, active in cities rather than college cloisters, for example, who wanted to enrich their 'cultural capital' by the purchase of elegant folio volumes of classical writers to be prominently displayed in their homes (Cox Jensen 2014, 44-45). These were the kind of readers able to afford the 14s spent on a bound copy of the 2,500 folio volume containing North's Plutarch by a Cambridge physician (Braden 2013, 107; Cox Jensen 2014, 43-44). When considering the fact that a country parson could live on £20 per year and that a skilled carpenter could earn about 5s per week, it is pretty obvious that volumes like North's Plutarch were only affordable by readers much higher up the social scale. There were no cheaper editions available in the case of Plutarch's *Lives*. If you wanted to read them in English translation the only option was the hefty folio volume.¹⁸ In modern terms, if we think of the average wages of a factory worker in contemporary Italy being about 1,300 euros per month, then the price of the folio volume in question would be about 1,000 euros!

5) In what manner? Identification of the target readership is closely linked to the translation strategies adopted. Clearly a translation into a modern vernacular was a quite different undertaking than say a translation from Greek into Latin for an international scholarly audi-

¹⁶ Dana (2004) argues that this Florentine edition is a better reflection of the ancient manuscript tradition than the Aldine one.

¹⁷ The quotations from Plutarch's Greek text used in this and the following chapter are based on the 1572 edition by Stephanus of Plutarch's Complete Works.

¹⁸ This option was no doubt often taken up by upper class women readers, like Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, a critical reader of North's translation of the *Lives* which provided material for some of the reflections in her *Sociable Letters* (Dodds 2011).

ence ('the learned sages'), as the examples below will illustrate. In the former case translators tended more towards 'domestication' and in the latter case towards 'foreignization' (Venuti, 2008 [1995]).¹⁹ The problem of filling cultural gaps when translating from a classical language into an early modern European vernacular which lacked the necessary lexical items for unfamiliar concepts was acutely felt by translators of the time, as illustrated by the following quote from the preface to an Italian translation of Pliny's *Natural History* by Landino (1476):

Molte cerimonie, molti sacrifici, molti giuochi, molte altre cose [...] hebbono i Latini, le quali no furono mai in consuetudine appresso di quegli che hanno vsato la lingua nella quale scriuo [...]. Non è adunque marauiglia se non ho trouato vocaboli toscani alle cose non mai state in vso appresso de' Toscani. Ma se ai Latini fu lecito, non auendo molte cose e vocaboli latini, vsare e greci come veggiamo in tutte dottrine e arti [...] perchè non sarà lecito a me dire gladiatori, meta, circense e megalense e simili altre cose, le quali non hanno nome fiorentino? (Quoted by Renner 1989, 100, note 7)

Amyot was evidently well aware of the gaps in the knowledge of the ancient world among his target readership, and, as an experienced teacher, he used the technique of the incorporated gloss, introduced by the textual marker 'c'est à dire',²⁰ as the following example from Plutarch's *Life of Coriolanus* (11) illustrates (this is part of one of Plutarch's characteristic anecdotal digressions, this time dealing with the phenomenon of Roman *cognomina*):

ἕτερον δὲ Κέλερα, σπεύσαντα μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀλίγας τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτῆς ἐπιταφίους μονομάχων ἀγῶνας παρασχεῖν, ...

¹⁹ Venuti (2008 [1995], 68) defines 'domestication' as 'an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to dominant cultural values' and 'foreignization' as 'an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text'. There is no doubt about his preference for the latter.

²⁰ Though the explanatory gloss and rhetorical doublet were common strategical features of translations by Amyot and his contemporaries, they were foregrounded in the famous negative critical analysis of Amyot's translation presented to the Académie française in 1635 by Claude-Gaspard Bachet de Mézirac (Renner 1989, 225-226; Ballard 1995, 160-170), who states: 'Ces remarques et toutes leurs semblables, dont la plus subtile n'excédé pas la capacité d'un petit écolier de grammaire, tiennent du ridicule quand elles osent paraître dans les écrits d'un si grave et si docte philosophie'. Here we have a scholar addressing other scholars. Amyot was a scholar addressing readers with little or no knowledge of ancient languages and the historical and social context of their speakers.

Cruserius: *Alium Celerem, quod paucis ab obitu patris diebus, munis funebre gladiatorum mira celeritate maturavisset exhibere.*

Amyot: ... vn autre de la mesme famille, qui fut appellé Celer, c'est à dire, prompt, à cause qu'en bien peu de iours apres la mort de son pere il fit voir au peuple des combats de Gladiateurs, c'est à dire d'escrimeurs à outrance,...

North: One other of his owne familie was called *Celer*: the quicke flye. Bicause a fewe dayes after the death of his father, he shewed the people the cruell fight of fencers at vnrebated swordes,...

Scott-Kilvert (revised Tatum): Another member of this same family was named *Celer**, because he so hastened to provide the public with funeral games in which gladiators took part - within days after his father's death... (endnote: *Celer*: Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer (*Swift*; tribune of the people in 90 B.C.); Plutarch expects his reader to know or to infer that *Celer* means *swift*...).

This example clearly illustrates three different approaches by three different Renaissance translators. Cruserius assumes that his international classically educated readership were aware of the characteristics of gladiatorial combats and would not have appreciated any moralising comment on them (i.e. that they were 'cruell'). Amyot introduces the Latin based neologism, followed by an explanatory gloss (i.e. swordsmen fighting to the death), which attentive readers will have recognised as being an insertion by the translator, and obviously not in the Greek source text. North prefers direct modernisation (or 'lexical actualisation') replacing the bloody ancient Roman fight to the death with the contemporary gentleman's sport of fencing (albeit with untipped rapiers), plus an evaluative adjective condemning the practice, at least as conducted in ancient Rome. His readers may well have assumed, quite incorrectly, that Plutarch disapproved of this type of combat (especially in connection with a funeral). The modern translation (aimed at an educational market) obviously foresees no difficulty on the reader's part with gladiators (after all, who hasn't seen Kirk Douglas or, more recently, Russell Crowe!).

The second example comes from the point in the *Life of Coriolanus* (32) when a religious delegation is despatched to negotiate with him during his siege of Rome:

Ἵσοι γὰρ ἦσαν ἱερεῖς θεῶν ἢ μυστηρίων ὀργιασται καὶ φύλακες ἢ τὴν ἀπ' οἰωνῶν πάτριον οὔσαν ἔκπαλα μαντικὴν ἔχοντες, τοῦτους πάντας

ἀπιέναι πρὸς τὸν Μάρκιον ἐψηφίσαντο [...] Ἐπανελθόντων οὖν τῶν ἱερέων...

Xylander: Decretum est enim, vt omnes pontifices, sacrificuli, aeditui, auguresque, irent ad Marcium [...] Vbi rediere Sacerdotes...

Cruserius: Quotque enim erant deorum immortalium sacerdotes, sacrifici, aeditui, augures, quod patrium iis erat & antiquum sacerdotium... vt Marcium adirent [...] Quibus regressis vrbe...

Amyot:... car il ordonna que tout tant, qu'il y auoit de prestres, religieux, ministres des dieux & gardes des choses sacrees, & tout les deuins, qui par l'observation du vol des oiseaux predisent les choses à aduenir, qui est vne sorte de prophetie et de diuination propre de toute ancienneté aux Romains, allassent deuers Martius [...] Quand ces gens de religion furent de retour...

North: For then they appointed all the bishoppes, priestes, ministers of the goddes, and keepers of holy things, and all the augures or soothesayers which foreshowe things to come by obseruation of the flying of birdes (which is an olde auncient kynde of prophecyng and diuination amongst the ROMAINEs) to goe to *Martius* [...] When all this goodly rable of superstition and priestes were returned,...

Scott-Kilvert (revised Tatum): A decree was passed that the whole order of priests, the celebrants or custodians of the sacred mysteries, and those who practised the ancient and ancestral art of divination* from the flight of birds, should go in procession to Marcus [...] When the priests returned... (endnote: *order of priests*... *art of divination*: Plutarch refers to the three leading priestly colleges: (i) the pontiffs (*pontifices*), (ii) the two men responsible for sacred actions (*duoviri sacris faciundis* – the number of whom during the republic was later increased to ten and then to fifteen) and (iii) the diviners or augurs (*augures*). All of these offices were routinely filled by members of the senatorial class).

Interestingly the Renaissance Latin translators do not even include Plutarch's explanation to his Greek readers (albeit citizens of the Roman Empire) of the specifically Roman office of augur, evidently thinking that their readers did not need it. They also use the technical Latin terms, while Plutarch is more generically descriptive, lacking the adequate Greek terminological equivalents. Amyot adds further explanation which is translated by North. Amyot is a cautious lexical modernizer, though remaining generic, while North uses contemporary Christian terms like 'bishoppes', so as to communicate to his readers

that the delegation was at the highest level, but also reminding them of early modern Roman Catholic Rome (Puritans like North were not particularly fond of bishops!; cf. Burrow 2013, 235. North also goes well beyond Amyot when dealing with the return of the delegation, unable to repress his hostility to pagan superstition ‘rable of superstition and priestes’²¹ as opposed to ‘gens de religion’).

6) With what consequences? An important consequence of North’s translation was the availability of the most important collection of biographies from Classical Antiquity mostly for readers presumably belonging to the so-called ‘middling sort’,²² who could afford them and, by choice or necessity, wanted to read them in their mother tongue, rather than in French or Latin, albeit in a version that had accentuated the moral message of the original by manipulation in the direction of late 16th century English protestant ethics. Unlike those in his French source text, the English translator’s interventions were covert as against Amyot’s frequently overt insertions often, though not always, making readers aware of what Plutarch had actually written and what the translator had added for didactic and moral purposes. Obviously we could hardly leave out the best known consequence, i.e. the use made by Shakespeare of the appropriate *Lives* in North’s translation and their partial intersemiotic ‘translation’ from prose text to play. The main purpose of Chapter 5 is to examine the perception of Plutarch by Shakespeare as a reader of North’s translation, and to highlight the need to always bear in mind the fact that ‘Plutarch’ and ‘North’ are not interchangeable, in contrast to the unfortunate tendency on the part of many scholars to seemingly think that they are. Moreover, a particularly significant episode, in my view, from Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus* will hopefully persuade my readers of the need to bear in mind that Shakespeare was reading a domesticated contemporary translation (even in the apparently ‘innocent’ sphere of clothing) and not Plutarch’s Greek text or even a Renaissance Latin translation. Not doing so could lead to confusion and misunderstanding.

²¹ ‘Priest’ in the Christian context did not have a positive connotation for the Puritan North. The English liturgical texts of the time preferred ‘minister’.

²² Keith Wrightson (1991, 1994) has analyzed in detail certain semantic changes in the language of class description in late 16th century England, noting the passage from the more static language of ‘estates and degrees’ to that of ‘sorts’.



5. Shakespeare's Perception of Plutarch via North: Examples From *Coriolanus*¹

I shall begin with an episode from the *Life of Coriolanus* (24) and its treatment in an essay by Terence Hawkes entitled 'Slow, slow, quick quick, slow' (Hawkes 1992, 79-120) dealing with the Puritan opposition to dancing:²

Τίτος ἦν Λατίνος, ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἄγαν ἐπιφανής, ἀπράγμων δὲ καὶ μέτριος ἄλλως καὶ καθαρὸς δεισιδαιμονίας, ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον ἀλαζονείας. Οὗτος ὄναρ εἶδεν ὡς τοῦ Διὸς εἰς ὄψιν ἦκοντος αὐτῷ καὶ κελεύοντος εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, ὅτι κακόντων ὀρχηστὴν ἔστειλαν αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς πομπῆς καίστερπέστατον.

Amyot: Il y auoit vn citoyen Romain, nommé Titus Latinus personnage de petite qualité mais au demeurant homme de bien, viuant doucement sans superstition quelconque, & moins encore de vanité et de mensonge. Cestuy eut vne vision en dormant, par laquelle il luy fut aduis, que Iupiter s'apparut à luy, & luy commanda d'aller signifier au Senat, qu'on auoit fait marcher deuant sa procession vn tres-mauuais et tres-deplaisant danseur,...

North: There was a cittizen of ROME called *Titus Latinus*, a man of meane qualitie and condition, but otherwise an honest sober man, geuen to a quiet life, without superstition, and much lesse to vanitie or lying. This man had a vision in his dreame, in the which he thought that *Jupiter* appeared vnto him, and commanded him to signifie to the Senate, that they had caused a very vile lewde daanser to goe before the procession:...

Scott-Kilvert (revised Tatum): There was a certain Titus Latinus, not a prominent citizen but a quiet and sensible man, who was by no means addicted to superstition nor to pretentious exaggeration of his experiences. He had a dream in which Jupiter appeared to him and commanded

¹ This chapter draws on material from Denton 1993b and 1997.

² This negative attitude on the part of Puritans is also treated by Collinson (1996 especially page 35).

him to tell the senate that the dancer whom they had chosen to lead the god's procession was a bad performer and thoroughly displeasing to him.

Although all Hawkes' quotations come from North's translation, the reader of his essay would be under the impression that the translation is a close rendering of Plutarch's Greek text, since references are made throughout to 'Plutarch' and not 'Plutarch/Amyot/North', 'Plutarch/North' or just 'North' (which would have been more appropriate). The dancer in the original Greek text is presented simply as a bad performer, and thus an insult to Jupiter, this being a good reason for the religious rite to be repeated, as was the Roman custom. There are no moralizing overtones revealing a negative attitude to dancing in a religious procession (albeit a pagan one). North in general tends to introduce negatively connotated adjectives when dealing with certain aspects of pagan religious observances. Amyot is more restrained. However both translators introduce the idea that Titus Latinus couldn't actually have seen Jupiter, a non-existent pagan god in their view, in his dream ('il luy fut aduis, que Iupiter s'apparut à luy'; 'he thought that *Jupiter* appeared vnto him'). They are followed by Hawkes, who writes in the part of his essay dealing with this episode (1992, 99-100): '... a man called Titus Latinus – stricken with a kind of paralysis – *claimed* (my *italics*) that Jupiter had appeared to him in a dream'.³

Vanna Gentili (1984) has shown that important results can be obtained by detailed comparative study of even a few lines of a Classical text (in this case Appian) with various Renaissance translations and the consequences of their use by an 'unlearned' writer such as Shakespeare⁴ (in this case in *Julius Caesar*). I shall do something similar with

³ There are, however a number of studies that show greater sensitivity to the need to distinguish between Plutarch's Greek text and the manipulation it underwent at the hands of Renaissance vernacular translators (in our case the Amyot-North interface), for example Heuer (1957), Honigmann (1959), Gordon (1975) and Serpieri, Elam and Corti (1988). MacCallum (1967 [1910]) is still valuable, as are the source repertoires of Bullough (1964) and Gillespie (2004). The same cannot be said about Green (1979).

⁴ The much debated issue of Shakespeare's classical learning is obviously linked to Ben Jonson's celebrated remark, in the prefatory material introducing the 1st Folio (Shakespeare 1623) on his 'small Latine and lesse Greeke'. One of the most convincing contributions to the debate arguing for Shakespeare's extensive use of translations is still Dover Wilson (1957) and this line is followed in Martindale and Martindale (1990), and Martindale and Taylor, eds (2004). Burrow (2013, 19-20) argues that rather than saying that Shakespeare was 'ignorant of the classics' Jonson was 'making it clear

the episode concerning Coriolanus' candidature for the consulship and his walking through the forum in Rome wearing, in accordance with custom, a toga with no tunic underneath it, with the purpose of showing the people, who had to vote on the senate's nomination, the scars of his battle wounds visible on the uncovered part of his body, as well as his modesty signalled by the simplicity of his attire. The first extract comes from Plutarch's text:⁵

... και γὰρ ἕθος ἦν τοῖς μετιούσι τὴν ἀρχὴν παρακαλεῖν και δεξιούσθαι τοὺς πολίτας, ἐν ἱματίῳ κατιόντας εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἄνευ χιτῶνος, εἶτε μᾶλλον ἐκταπεινοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς τῷ σχήματι πρὸς τὴν δέησιν, εἶτε δεικνύοντας, οἷς ἦσαν ὠτειλαί, προφανῆ τὰ σύμβολα τῆς ἀνδρείας. Οὐ γὰρ ὑποψία δῆπου διανομῆς ἀργυρίου και δεκασμῶν ἄζωστον ἐβούλοντο προιέναι και ἀχίτωνα τοῖς πολίταις τὸν δεόμενον αὐτῶν· ὅψῃ γὰρ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον ὠνῆ και πρᾶσις ἐπεισηλθε και συνεμίγη ταῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς ψήφοις ἀργύριον. (*Life of Coriolanus*, 14)

The key words, to begin with, are ἱμάτιον and χιτῶν, the Greek equivalents used by Greek writers dealing with Rome of the Latin *toga* and *tunica*, both of which have now entered the English wordstock, with a small morphological adjustment in the second case. The two 16th century Latin translations read as follows:

Xylander: Mos enim erat Romae, vt qui magistratum aliquem ambiret, is ciues praeuensaret, oraretque ut sum petitionem iuuarent: & eius rei causa in forum prodibat tunicatus, sine toga: siue vt humilitatis aliquid is habitus supplicantium adferret, siue vt cicatrices suas aperta fortitudinis signes ostendere posset. Nondum enim eo tempore plebs donorum accipiendorum suspecta fuit, vt largitionum praecindendarum causa iuberent candidatum sine toga & discinctum progredi ad ciues. Longo post tempore venditio & emtio in campum insinuauit, permixtaque est suffragiis pecunia...

that his own kind of classicism was sharper and more modern than Shakespeare's... His (i.e. Shakespeare's) knowledge of the classics was substantial-ly that of an extremely clever Elizabethan grammar-school boy...', see also Burrow (2004).

⁵ The word count for the extracts is: Greek 73, Xylander 79, Crusierius 66, Amyot 174, North 180, and Penguin 126. Crusierius, as usual, is the most essential with fewer words than the original Greek, while, unsurprisingly, considering their monolingual reader oriented strategies, Amyot and North are far more copious.

Cruserius: Nam de more, qui petebant consulatum, rogabant & pensabant ciues togis in comitiis sine tunicis amicti: siue quo magis in specie summitterent se ad petitionem: siue quo subiicerent oculis, qui cicatrices habebant, perspicuas virtutis notas. Neque enim ex populi suspitione largitionis et ambitus discinctum volebant & sine tunica ad comitia progredi candidatum serò enim & multis post saeculis nundinatio & redemptio irrepit, interuenitque comitialibus suffragiis pecunia.

There seems to have been some confusion, however, since Cruserius gets them right ('togis in comitiis sine tunicis amicti') while Xylander does not ('tunicatus, sine toga'). The problems begin with Amyot ('vne robe simple sur eux sans saye dessous') and North ('a poore gowne on their backes, and without any coate vnderneath'), who were writing for readers with no idea of how ancient Romans, including those of high social status, were dressed:⁶

Amyot: car la coustume estoit à Rome, que ceux qui poursuyuoient aucun magistrat & office public, quelques iours durans se trouuassent sur la place, ayans seulement vne robe simple sur eux sans saye dessous, pour prier & requerir leurs citoyens de les auoir pour recommandez, quand ce viendroit au iour de l'election, soit qu'ils le fissent, ou pour esmouuoir le peuple d'auantage le prians en si humble habit, ou pour pouuoir monstrier les cicatrices des coups, qu'ils auoyent receus és guerres pour la chose publique, comme certaines marques & tesmoignages de leur prouesse. Car il ne faut penser, que ce fust pour crainte & souspeçon du menu populaire, qu'il ne se laissast corrompre aux poursuyuans par distribution d'argent, qu'on faisoit ainsi venir les poursuyuans sur la place en robe simple tous desceints & sans saye dessous, pour faire leur brigade: car ç'à esté bien tard & fort long temps depuis, que le vendre & l'achepter sont entre-venus és elections des magistrats, & que les voix & suffrages des elisans se sont achetez à prix d'argent.

North: For the custome of ROME was at that time, that suche as dyd sue for any office, should for certen dayes before be in the market place, only with a poore gowne on their backes, and without any coate vnderneath, to praye the cittizens to remember them at the daye of election: which was thus deuised, either to moue the people the more, by requesting them in suche meane apparell, or els bicause they might shewe them their woundes they had gotten in the warres in the seruice of the common wealth, as manifest

⁶ Shakespeare was certainly among these readers. Dodds (2011, 216-217) interestingly refers to her examination of the seventeen copies in the Folger Shakespeare Library of early modern editions of North's translation and their evidence of wide ranging anonymous reader reactions by means of marginalia, underlining and 'other non-verbal annotations'. On defective knowledge of Roman costume in Shakespeare's time see Merchant (1957).

markes and testimonie of their valliantnes. Now it is not to be thought that the suters went thus lose in a simple gowne in the market place, without any coate vnder it, for feare, and suspition of the common people: for offices of dignitie in the cittie were not then geuen by fauour or corruption. It was but of late time, and long after this, that buying and selling fell out in election of officers, and that the voyces of the electours were bought for money.

The entries in the two most popular Latin-English dictionaries of the time for *toga* (Cooper 1565 and Thomas 1587)⁷ read thus:

Cooper: Toga A gowne, which garmente the Romaines alway did weare in peace
 A gowne loose about one, and girded vnto him...
 Thomas: Toga a gowne which garment the Romanes did alwaies weare in peace: a robe or gowne either for men or women

and Holland in his notes on his translation of Suetonius (1606) has this to say:

(Annotations vpon Octavius Caesar Augustus, 13)
 For, howsoever the Roman habit was the *Gowne*, yet permitted were they, vpon necessitie, namely to saue the said gowne in foule wether, or to defend themselues from cold to cast ouer it a cloak in any frequented place of the Citie,...

The preface to the 1611 translation of the Bible (*Authorized Version*) lists several examples of 'obscure' words used in 'Papist' biblical translations, including *Tunike* (Nocera Avila 1990, 68-69) and almost a century later Locke (1690, III, XI, 25) writes about 'gown' and 'coat' still being 'translations' of *toga* and *tunica*:

Toga, tunica, pallium are words easily translated by *gown, coat* and *cloak*; but we have thereby no more true *ideas* of the fashion of those habits amongst the *Romans* than we have of the faces of the tailors who made them.

He also significantly shows that there was no general idea even in late 17th century England of what these garments actually looked like. The passage from which the quotation is taken deals with the desirability of illustrations in a dictionary for objects from a different culture.

⁷ On these dictionaries see Starnes (1954, 85-110 and 114-138) and Stein (1985, 205-225 and 312-332).

The version in the Penguin Classics Plutarch can obviously count on modern readers' knowledge of Roman dress and the topography of Ancient Rome (thanks to the cinema etc.):

Scott-Kilvert (revised Tatum): Now it was the custom at Rome that the candidates for office should address their fellow-citizens and appeal to them personally for their votes, and they would walk about in the forum dressed in a toga, but without a tunic underneath it.* They did this in some cases to emphasize their humility by the simplicity of their dress, or else, if they had wounds to show, to display the evidence of their courage. Certainly the people's insistence that their candidates should present themselves ungirt and without a tunic had nothing to do with any suspicion of bribery, for it was not until long afterwards that the abuse of buying and selling votes crept in and money began to play an important part in determining the elections.

(endnote: *walk about... without a tunic underneath it*: Plutarch attributes this information about early Rome to the Elder Cato at *Moralia* 276c-d.)

Shakespeare expands the episode in Plutarch into the central theme of Act Two of *Coriolanus*.⁸ Corti (1988, 309) rightly argues that the whole act could be seen as an expansion of the Plutarch/North passage quoted above. The relevant passages from Act 2 as they appear in the 1st Folio are as follows:

Actus Secundus

(Sc.1. 229-234)

Brutus

I hearde sweare,
Were he to stand for Consull, neuer would he
Appeare i'th'Market place, nor on him put
The Naples Vesture of Humilitie,
Nor Shewing (as the manner is) his Wounds
Toth'People, begge their stinking Breaths.

(Sc. II. 135-139)

Corio.

I doe beseech you,
Let me o're-leape that custome: for I cannot
Put on the Gowne, stand naked, and entreat them
For my Wounds sake, to giue their sufferage:
Please you that I may passe this doing.

⁸ Kishlansky (1986, 3-9) begins his study of parliamentary selection in Early Modern England with the consulship episode from *Coriolanus*, foregrounding the divergences from the Plutarchan account linked to political practices of Shakespeare's own time.

(Sc. III. 41-42)

Enter Coriolanus in a gowne of Humility, with Menenius
(3 *Cit.*) Heere he comes, and in the Gowne of humility,
marke his behauior...

(Sc. III. 76-77)

Corio. ...I haue wounds to
shew you, which shall bee yours in priuate:...

(Sc. III. 85-86)

Coriol. ...I haue heere
the Customarie Gowne.

(Sc. III. 105-107)

(*Cit.*) 1 You haue receyued many wounds for your Country.
Coriol. I will not Seale your knowledge with shewing
them.

(Sc. III. 114)

Coriol. ...Why in this Wooluish tongue should I stand heere.

(Sc. III. 144-147)

Corio. May I change these Garments?
Sicin. You may, Sir.
Corio. That Ile straight do: and knowing my selfe again,
repayre toth'Senate-house.

(Sc. III. 161-164)

2 *Cit.* ...he should haue shew'd vs
His Marks of Merit, wounds receiu'd for's Country.
Sicin. Why so he did I am sure.
All No, no: no man saw 'em.
3 *Cit.* Hee said hee had Wounds,
which he could shew in priuate:

Most commentaries on *Coriolanus* have indicated Shakespeare's making his protagonist flatly refuse to show his wounds and only reluctantly go through the custom of dressing up in a 'Gown of Humility' and canvass the common people for their votes as a 'striking difference between Plutarch and Shakespeare' (Pelling 1997, 13)⁹. I would argue that there is a further 'striking difference' between Plutarch's text and its treatment

⁹ Pelling (1997) investigates a further link in the chain, i.e. Plutarch's main source: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, see also Russell (1963).

by Amyot and even more so North. North writes of candidates for election having to wear ‘a poore gowne’ and subsequently of their ‘meane apparell’, instead of simply wearing the normal toga (albeit without a tunic under it). No change of dress is implied by Plutarch, nor is an ostentatious uncovering of the body to show wounds, since they would be visible on the part of the body left bare by the absence of a tunic.

When Shakespeare read the words ‘poore gowne’ he surely imagined that this must imply a change of dress, since a Roman noble would never be seen in public in such attire. This would seem to be the reason for the invention of the ‘Gowne of humility’ (Burrow 2013, 228-229) and for Coriolanus’ request ‘May I change these Garments?’. At this point a few words must be devoted to one of the most problematic lines in the play from the textual point of view: ‘Why in this Wooluish tongue should I stand heere’. This is the version printed in the 1st Folio and the problems it has caused editors are evident from the five page note dealing with it in the *New Variorum* edition. The emendation *toge* was already suggested in 1790 by Malone and *wolvish* contributed by Steevens in 1793. This is the version incorporated into the 1976 *Arden Shakespeare*. The editor explains that the printing of ‘tongue’ was probably due to the mistaken idea that ‘toge’ was an abbreviated form (even though the conventional line above the ‘o’ was missing). A parallel case from *Othello* (Act 1 sc. 1, 25) is cited. Where I part company with the Arden editor is in his affirmation that ‘*Toge* was a common English form of the word *toga*’. So common, in fact, that it was misread by the compositor on both occasions when Shakespeare used it! It is also significant that the 2nd Folio replaces it with *gowne*. There seems to me little doubt that Shakespeare was using a *rare* Latinism, and this is supported by the words ‘single robe or loose gowne’ used by the learned Holland in his translation of Plutarch’s *Moralia* (1603):

Quaestiones Romanae 49

‘διὰ τί τοὺς παραγγέλλοντας ἀρχὴν ἔθος ἦν ἐν ἱματίῳ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἀχίτωνας, ὡς Κάτων ἱστορῆκε;’

Holland (867): How commeth it to passe, that those who stood for any of-
fice and magistracie, were woont by an old custome (as Cato hath writ-
ten) to present themselues vnto the people in a single robe or loose gowne,
without any coat at all vnder it?

Another key term in the episode of Coriolanus’ candidature for the consulship is ‘ἀγορά’, which was used by Greek writers on Rome as the

equivalent of *forum*. In 16th century England, however, the latter word was still part of Latin lexis and was usually domesticated as *market place*, as can be seen in the dictionaries and annotations referred to above in the case of *toga* and in North's translation of Amyot's *vaguer* 'la place'. The descriptions mention buying and selling activities and the seat of lawcourts, but no explicit political activity. In *Coriolanus* there is a clear distinction between the 'high' politics of the Capitol (where, in Shakespeare's time the Senate House was mistakenly believed to be situated – Fisher 1907) and the 'low' politics of the common people and their tribunes in the 'market place'. Here the use of a domesticated translation has led to a distorted view of the political topography of Ancient Rome. Popular participation (however limited) in political life was one aspect of the Roman Republic that was particularly alien to mainstream Elizabethan and Jacobean political ideas:

Vnhappie is that cowntrie where the meaner sorte hath the greatest swaye, for that in a base multitude is neuer seen any good cownsel, or stayed judgement. God keepe Englande frome any soche confused authoritie, and maynteyne vs with our annoynted souerayne, whose onelie sole power vnder Christ is the safetie of vs al.

Actually this statement by Thomas Wilson is a warning about following the example of the Calvinist Netherlands, but could equally apply to situations in Classical Antiquity.¹⁰ Although a considerable number of scholars argue in favour of a more 'tolerant' attitude towards the common people by Shakespeare in *Coriolanus*, without, however, turning him into an anachronistic 'democrat' (Arnold 2007, 192, Braden 2014, 581), there is no doubt about his hostile attitude towards the tribunes. His hostility was certainly in line with contemporary political debate connected with parliamentary opposition to James I, but will have initially been inspired by passages in North like 'busie pratlers that sought the peoples good will, by suche flattering wordes'¹¹ based on Amyot's 'harangueurs, qui alloient gaignant la bonne grace du menu peuple par telles flateries', an expanded translation of Plutarch's *oi*

¹⁰ Quoted in Palliser (1992 [1983], 354, taken from Kervyn de Lettenhove and Gilliodts van Severen, eds, 1882-1900 XI, 92)

¹¹ In one often cited treatment of Shakespeare's attitude to the common people (Stirling 1949, 41) the author attributes the term 'busie pratlers' to Plutarch, rather than seeing it as a hostile addition by North to Amyot's 'harengueurs'.

δημαγωγοί.¹² Although this term literally meant ‘leader of the people’ (and this is the somewhat ‘neutral’ translation in the Penguin Classics version), Plutarch tended to favour the pejorative sense, as in the case of negative characters like Marius and (in many aspects) Alcibiades (Wardman 1974, 52; Duff 2000, 119, 227-228), so that Amyot’s ‘flateurs’ and ‘harengueurs’ is actually closer to Plutarch than the modern translation, in which ‘demagogues’ would probably have been more appropriate. As Peltonen (2009, 246) points out: ‘... the numerous aristocratic accounts of popular rhetoric always described popular orators as flatterers’, which inevitably led to sedition. ‘Sedition’, and ‘seditious’ (the latter often an adjective qualifying ‘tribunes’) are in fact the most common terms used by North in connection with civil discord, the others being ‘rebellion’, ‘mutine/mutinous’, ‘confusion’, ‘dangerous tumults’, ‘sturre’, ‘broyle’, ‘discorde’, ‘insolencie’, ‘disobedience’, ‘uprores’, ‘ciuill dissention’, and ‘hurley burley’.¹³ The relevant texts are given below:

Life of Coriolanus 12

Παυσαμένω δὲ τῷ πολέμῳ τὴν στάσιν ἐπήγειρον αὐθις οἱ δημαγωγοί, καινὴν μὲν οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχοντες [...] ὀρῶντες οἱ δημαγωγοὶ μήτ’ ἀγορὰν ἔχοντα...

Amyot: Au demeurant ceste guerre acheuee les flateurs du commun populaire susciterent derechef vne autre sedition, sans qu’ils en eussent aucune nouvelle occasion, [...] Ainsi voyans ces harangueurs, qui alloyent gaignant la bonne grace du menu peuple par telles flateries, qu’il y auoit faute de blez en la ville...

North: Now when this warre was ended, the flatterers of the people beganne to sturre vp sedition againe, without any newe occasion, or just matter offered of complainte [...] Now these busie pratlers that sought the peoples good will, by suche flattering wordes, perceyuing great scarsitie of corne to be within the cittie,...

Scott-Kilvert (revised Tatum): The war was no sooner over than the leaders of the popular party began to stir up fresh quarrels. They had no fresh cause for complaint [...] and when the popular leaders saw that there were no provisions in the market,...

¹² Δημάρχος is the Greek equivalent used by Plutarch for ‘tribunus plebis’ usually translated by Amyot and North as ‘tribune’.

¹³ In Pugliatti’s listing of Shakespeare’s vocabulary of rebellion (1992, 88) 4 of these terms belong to the Old sector, 3 to the Old-New one and 2 to the New one.

Both Amyot and North will have seen many analogies between the situation in their pre-industrial society and the ancient Roman set up as described by Plutarch, who tended to simplify the state of affairs (omitting references to non-Greek institutions like clients, veterans, and the equestrian order etc.), in pre-Imperial Rome as a long series of conflicts between the common people and the aristocratic Senatorial party, basically reflecting the politics of the Greek city states, with the popular side being exploited for their own ends by cynical demagogues (Pelling 1986, De Blois 1992).¹⁴

The question remains, however, of the consequences for Shakespeare of the Amyot/North filter that separated him from Plutarch's Greek text. In other words: not only How Roman were Shakespeare's Romans?¹⁵ but also, How Roman were Shakespeare's Romans as presented through a further filter setup by a Greek living in the Roman Empire? The leading British Plutarch specialist Christopher Pelling (2009) has recently argued that, despite the manipulative obstacles I have, hopefully convincingly, foregrounded, Shakespeare did have a feeling for Plutarch's original voice. Gillespie (2011, 50-52), though clearly appreciating the great value of Pelling's work for Shakespeare scholars, is doubtful (and I share his doubts) about the claim (supported by Burrow 2013, 267 note 20) that Shakespeare can on the odd occasion appear to be closer to Plutarch's original Greek text than to those of his 16th century vernacular translator(s). The evidence of Shakespeare's almost exclusive reliance on North, at least in the case of *Coriolanus*, is overwhelming. I prefer to think of any case of what appears to be access to Plutarch's original voice as accidental.

¹⁴ On the still unresolved question for scholars of the origins of the conflict of the orders between the Patricians and Plebeians in the Early Republic, so important in the *Life of Coriolanus*, see Raaflaub ed. (2005 [1986]).

¹⁵ This is the title of an article by Gary Miles (1989), who is quite aware that Shakespeare's reading of ancient Roman institutions and ideological terminology in North's translation (in this case the concepts of 'honour' and 'nobility') denied him access to original conceptualizations (again through Plutarch's Greek filter). Another study, by Geoffrey Miles (1996, especially 110-111, and 117-121 for *Coriolanus*), argues that Amyot's and North's lexical simplification in their use of 'constant' and its derivatives for a variety of Plutarchan terms influenced Shakespeare's view of his Roman play as a 'trilogy of constancy', under the influence of Neostoicism for which 'constancy' was a key doctrine. The trouble is that Plutarch as a steadfast Platonist was no supporter of Stoicism (Braden 2004, 193-194, 2014, 581).



Postscript. Thomas North's Successors: 400 Years of English Translations of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*¹

This supplement concludes with a brief look at the post-North English translations of Plutarch's *Lives*:²

Dryden John, ed. (1683-1686), *Plutarch's Lives. Translated from the Greek by Several Hands in Five Volumes, to which is prefixt the Life of Plutarch*, London, Jacob Tonson³ (revised editions 1727, 1758, revised translation by A.H. Clough, 1859, Boston, Little Brown and London, Sampson Low).

Langhorne (1770), *Plutarch's Lives. Translated from the Original Greek with notes critical and historical and a New Life of Plutarch by John Langhorne D.D. and William Langhorne M.A. in six volumes*, London, Edward and Charles Dilly (revised edition by Francis Wrangham, London, J. Mawman 1809 (or 1810)).

¹ This *Postscript* draws on material from Denton 1993a and 2000.

² General studies, Collective volumes, Companions etc. devoted to Plutarch have as a standard feature a section on his 'afterlife'. Good examples are Russell (2001 [1972], 143-158) and Beck, ed. (2014, especially Mossman 2014, 592-597). Barrow (1967, 162-172) is less satisfactory. Mossman (2007) is an excellent study of the influence of Plutarch on English biography writing. Howard (1970, 15-32) provides a detailed list of editions, translations, commentaries and imitations published in eighteenth century Europe. The *Cambridge Companion to Plutarch* edited by Frances Titchener and Alexei Zadorojnyy is forthcoming (Cambridge University Press) as are the Proceedings of the Warburg Institute Symposium on the *Afterlife of Plutarch* held in May 2013 (Supplement to the *Bulletin of the Institute for Classical Studies* – University of London) and the volume on Plutarch in the *Brill's Companion to Classical Reception* edited by Katerina Oikonomopoulou and Sophia Xenophonos. The volumes on Plutarch's *Lives* and *Moralia* in MHRAs *Tudor Translations Series* will be edited by Fred Schurink.

³ The *Life of Coriolanus* in this collection was translated by Thomas Blomer.

Stewart Aubrey and George Long (1880-1882), *Plutarch's Lives, with an introduction*, 4 vols, London George Bell (incorporates George Long (1844-1848), *The Civil Wars of Rome*, 3 vols, London, Charles Knight).⁴

Perrin Bernadotte (1914-1926), *Plutarch's Lives* (parallel texts), 11 vols, London, Heinemann and Cambridge, Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]), *Plutarch. The Rise of Rome*, London, Penguin Books (originally published as *Makers of Rome. Nine Lives of Plutarch*. Translated with an Introduction by Ian Scott-Kilvert, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books).⁵

In his brief survey of English translators and translations, J.M. Cohen (1962, 9) observes that 'Every great book demands to be re-translated once in a century, to suit the change in standards and taste of new generations, which will differ radically from those of the past'. Plutarch's *Lives* are no exception.

In the later 17th century greater confidence developed in the expressive resources of English, one of the consequences of which was the need felt for new translations of the classics to replace the products of a more 'primitive' age, as that of North was considered by Dryden and his contemporaries. This is indeed one of the justifications given by Dryden in his 'Epistle Dedicatory' ('the English Language was then unpolish'd, and far from the perfection which it has since attain'd') to the new translation of Plutarch's *Lives* by a group of scholars (many from Trinity his own Cambridge college) under his supervision (1683-1686) (Sherbo, 1979) published by Jacob Tonson (Cummings 2011, 1815). The other reasons given for a new translation are the unscholarly nature of North's work ('it was but a Copy of a Copy, and that too lamely taken from the Greek original'), and the fact that English had changed so much in the period since that translation had been completed as to cause considerable comprehension difficulties ('So that the first Version is not only ungrammatical and ungraceful, but in many places almost unintelligible').

⁴ The *Life of Coriolanus* in this collection was translated by Aubrey Stewart.

⁵ Only one of the Penguin Classics volumes (currently under revision by Christopher Pelling) is listed, since it contains the *Life of Coriolanus*.

Similar arguments are used almost a century later against the 'Dryden' version to justify the need for a new translation to replace that of 'almost as many hands as there were lives'. The quotation comes from the preface to the translation by the Langhorne brothers (1770), who launch a violent attack on 'this motley work', which was 'full of errors, inequalities, and inconsistencies'. They also attack the 'insipid moralizations' of the earlier translations by North and Amyot (though, in the case of the latter, these are additions in the margin by the late 16th century Calvinist editor Simon Goulart), but still maintain a basically target language oriented approach, stating that 'no translator ought ever to lose sight of the great rule of humouring the genius, and maintaining the structure of his own language'. Although reader response is still the translator's concern, the (less frequent) gaps in the former's encyclopedia are now provided for by means of footnotes, rather than direct intervention in the text. Furthermore, he/she is no longer presented with a target language version that deliberately departs from the source language text for the purpose of imparting moral lessons.

The 19th century produced two further translations: the version based on the 'Dryden' translation by A.H. Clough (1859), and an entirely new version begun by George Long (*13 Lives* 1844-1848) and completed by Aubrey Stewart (1880-1882). As far as Clough is concerned, one reason for the decision to adapt a translation from a previous century lies in the Victorian idea that non-contemporaneity of language should characterize a translation of a work from the distant past. Clough substituted cultural terms from the classical world that had by his time been accepted into English vocabulary, toning down, by substitution or omission, the overtly morally evaluative linguistic choices of the original translators, and introducing grammatical and lexical changes, partly occasioned by a more accurate rendering of the Greek text. The classic status of the Clough revised translation is highlighted by its use for the Everyman Library (1910 and many reprints) and the Encyclopedia Britannica *Great Books of the Western World* (1952, Second Edition 1990). Both Clough and Stewart/Long avoid the extreme archaisms favoured by some Victorian translators, particularly of ancient poetry. Stewart and Long, considering the fact that their translation was part of the popularizing Bohn's Standard Library, a series including many translations at affordable prices, aimed at the 'general reader', with an average education (Cummings 2011, 1815), are decidedly 'plain' in their style, though they are still conscious of the morality 'of the purest and loftiest type' of Plutarch's text. Stewart, in his introduction to the complete edition, briefly surveys his predecessors and again jus-

tifies the need for a new translation, to replace the one immediately preceding his (that of the Langhornes) on the grounds that 'the taste of their age differs from ours'.

The parallel text version in the Loeb Classical Library (Perrin 1914-1926) is aimed at students who were still expected to refer to the original, and is consequently a close version (that, however, still shows some traces of Victorian solemnity), while the Penguin Classics selected translations (now under thorough revision) grouped into periods and themes of Greek and Roman history, belong to two phases in the evolution of the series. The earlier one still had the 'general reader' in mind, while later the student market appears to have priority. Technical and cultural terms are translated with recognized equivalents belonging entirely to the source language culture. Difference is not masked, but no need is felt to avoid contemporary language in more general grammatical, lexical and textual aspects. The aim of the founder of the series in 1946, E.V. Rieu, was 'to present the general reader with readable and attractive versions of the great writers' books in good modern English shorn of unnecessary difficulties and erudition, the archaic flavour and foreign idiom that renders so many existing translations repellent to modern taste' (Radice and Reynolds, eds, 1987, 13; Cummings 2011, 1817). By the time Betty Radice had replaced Rieu as general editor of the series, the growing audience of Anglo-American university students was being increasingly catered for. In his introduction to the Betty Radice *Festschrift*, her son states that the aim of the Penguin Classics translations is to reach 'the requisite balance between accuracy, readability, modernity and permanence' (Radice and Reynolds, eds, 1987, 19).

The problem here, however, lies in the idea, or rather illusion, of 'permanence'. Translations of an important classic like Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* will, with varying degrees of overttness, always reflect the ideological and cultural context in which they are produced and the translator's and his/her commissioner's view of readers' needs. The definitive translation is always a mirage.

Appendix

There follow a number of short extracts from the translations of *The Life of Coriolanus* (the numbers refer to the modern chapter divisions of Plutarch's text) listed at the beginning of this *Postscript* illustrating the ideological and intercultural evolution of translational strategic choices with particular reference to presumed reader responses, from North onwards:

(a) (14)

North (1579): ... with a poore gowne on their backs, and without any coate vnderneath.

Dryden, ed. (1683-1686) (Thomas Blomer): ... clad only in a loose Gown without any Coat under it.

Langhornes (1770): ... clad in a loose gown without the Tunic.

A.H. Clough (1859): ... with the toga on alone, and no tunic under it.

Stewart and Long (1880-1882) (Aubrey Stewart): ... in a toga, but without a tunic underneath it.

Perrin Bernadotte (1914-1926): ... in their toga, without a tunic under it.

Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]): ... dressed in a toga, but without a tunic underneath it.

These extracts illustrate the gradual assimilation of specific terms for items of ancient Roman dress acknowledged by translators who, from at least the 19th century onwards, could count on increasing familiarity of readers with them, making earlier domesticating strategies unnecessary.

(b) (11)

North (1579): ... the cruell fight of fensers at vnrebated swords.

Dryden ed. (1683-1686) (Thomas Blomer): ... a Funeral Entertainment of so many pair of Gladiators.

Langhorne (1770): ... a funeral show of gladiators.

A.H. Clough (1859): ... a funeral entertainment of gladiators.

Stewart and Long (1880-1882) (Aubrey Stewart): ... a show of gladiators.

Perrin, Bernadotte (1914-1926): ... funeral games of gladiators.

Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]): ... funeral games in which gladiators took part.

Familiarity with gladiatorial combats was evidently already assumed by the late 17th century, the domestication and moral comment ('cruel') in North's translation now being discarded.

(c) (24)

North (1579): ... that they had caused a very vile lewd daunser to goe before the procession.

Dryden ed. (1683-1686) (Thomas Blomer): ... it was with a very uncouth and disagreeable Dancer that they had headed his procession.

Langhorne (1770): ... a very bad and ill-favoured leader of the dance.

A.H. Clough (1859): ... it was with a bad and unacceptable dancer that they had headed his procession.

Stewart and Long (1880-1882) (Aubrey Stewart): ... a bad dancer before the procession.

Perrin Bernadotte (1914-1926): ... the dancer, whom they had appointed to head his procession, was a bad one, and gave him the greatest displeasure.

Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]): ... the dancer... was a bad performer and thoroughly displeasing to him.

Again North's Puritan disgust at the presence of a dancer in a religious procession is abandoned by a more descriptive approach to ancient Roman custom.

(d) (5)

North (1579): ... they fell then euen to flat rebellion and mutine, and to sturre vp dangerous tumults within the cittie.

Dryden ed. (1683-1686) (Thomas Blomer): ... there began now to be open Mutinies and dangerous Factions in the City.

Langhorne (1770): ... then they filled the city with tumults and sedition.

A.H. Clough (1859): ... there began now to be open disorders and dangerous meetings in the city.

Stewart and Long (1880-1882) (Aubrey Stewart): ... there were violent outbreaks and riots in the city.

Perrin Bernadotte (1914-1926): ... Then there were tumults and disorderly gatherings in the city.

Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]): ... It was not long before violent demonstrations and riots began to break out in the city...

These extracts reflect diminishing hostility to popular protest in the pre-industrial through to the modern city (from 'flat rebellion and mutine' to 'violent demonstrations and riots').

(e) (13)

North (1579): ... But Sicinius & Brutus, two seditious tribunes...

Dryden, ed. (1683-1686) (Thomas Blomer): ... But Sicinius and Brutus, a couple of seditious tribunes...

Langhorne (1770): ... But the restless Tribunes Sicinius and Brutus...

A.H. Clough (1859): ... But Sicinius and Brutus, the popular orators...

Stewart and Long (1880-1882) (Aubrey Stewart): ... But Sicinius and Brutus the tribunes of the people...

Perrin Bernadotte (1914-1926): ... But the popular leaders, Sicinius and Brutus...

Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]): ... However, Sicinius and Brutus, the popular leaders...

Again we have an even more pronounced decline in hostile reactions to the tribunes from North's and Blomer's evaluative adjectives to a more neutral/technical descriptive approach.



Conclusion

In this Supplement to *JEMS* my aim has been to foreground the fact that investigation of domesticating manipulative translation strategies so frequent in the period under study should not be neglected in favour of the historical and cultural context in which translations were carried out. Translation as a process is as important as translation as a product.

In Chapter 1 surveyed recent developments in the study of Early Modern translation by literary scholars and historians and the sometimes uneasy relationship with the by now well established discipline of Translation Studies. Admittedly translations were not made in a societal and ideological vacuum (and this has always been acknowledged by the Translation Studies research paradigm) but attention to actual practice illustrated by appropriate source text/target text(s) examples should be an essential component of research in the field, and this is too often neglected by some of the new 'recruits' from other disciplines.

Chapter 2 examines the question of how the purpose and process of translation was discussed by practitioners and theorists, principally by recourse to metaphor, to the importance of which translators had been introduced by their rhetorical education.

Chapter 3 discusses one of the most important textual genres i.e. Classical History and particularly the choice of texts mostly concerning Roman history (a canon quite different from that of the present day) for translation into the vernacular by means of a manipulative domesticating methodology, considering the fact that political parallels were commonly drawn between contemporary and ancient events.

Chapter 4 is the first part of a case study of the English translation of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* by Thomas North to which are applied the six large questions in Peter Burke's checklist of the 'cultures of translation': Who translates? With what intentions? What? For whom? In what manner? With what consequences?'

Chapter 5 continues the case study (the examples in which are taken from the *Life of Coriolanus*) examining how Shakespeare's perception of Plutarch's biography, by far the most important source for his play,

was conditioned by the fact that he read Plutarch in a thoroughly domesticated, politically and religiously manipulated English translation.

The Supplement ends with a brief look at the afterlife of Plutarch's *Lives* (with examples drawn again from the *Life of Coriolanus*) in the English speaking world in his English translations from Thomas North to the present day, the point being to illustrate how translators' choices were conditioned by the ideological and societal circumstances in which they were writing, as well as their estimate of their readers' encyclopedic and lexical knowledge.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Aelianus/Fleming (1576), *A registrie of hystories, conteining martiall exploites of worthy warriours, politique practises of ciuill magistrates, wise sentences of famous philosophers*, London, Middleton.
- Anon (1570), *An homilie against disobedience and wylfull rebellion*, London, Jugge.
- Appian/W.B. (William Barker) (1578), *An Auncient Historie and exquisite Chronicle of the Romanes warres, both Ciuile and Foren...*, London, Bynniman.
- Castiglione/Hoby (1561), *The courtyer of Count Baldessar Castilo diuided into foure books...*, London, Seres.
- Castiglione/Clerke (1571), *Balthasaris Castilionis comitis de curiali siue aulico libri quatuor ex Italico sermone in Latinum conuersi. Bartholomaeo Clerke Anglo Cantabrigiensi interprete*, London, John Daye.
- Cicero/Dolman (1561), *Those fyue questions, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputed in his manor of Tusculanum... translated and englished by John Dolman*, London, Thomas Marsh.
- Cooper Thomas (1565), *Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Britannicae*, London, Berthelet.
- Day Angel (1586), *The English Secretorie*, London, Waldegrave.
- Demosthenes/Wilson (1570), *The three orations of Demosthenes*, London, Denham.
- Dryden John (1680), *Preface to Ovid's Epistles, translated by several hands*, London, Jacob Tonson.
- Dryden John, ed. (1683-1686), *Plutarch's Lives. Translated from the Greek by Several Hands in Five Volumes, to which is prefixt the Life of Plutarch*, London, Jacob Tonson¹ (revised editions 1727, 1758,

¹ The *Life of Coriolanus* in this collection was translated by Thomas Blomer.

revised translation by A.H. Clough, 1859, Boston, Little Brown and London, Sampson Low).

Fraunce Abraham (1588), *The Arcadian rhetorike: or The praecepts of rhetorike made plaine by examples...*, London, Orwin.

Herodotus/B.R. (Barnaby Rich) (1584), *The famous hystory of Herodotus*, London, Marshe.

Huet P.D. (Petrus Daniel Huetius) (1661, 1680, 1683), *De interpretatione libri duo: Quorum prior est, de optimo genere interpretandi: alter de claris interpretibus*, Paris, Cramoisy.

Humphrey Laurence (Laurentius Humfredus) (1559), *Interpretatio linguarum seu de ratione convertendi et explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos*, Basle, Frobenius.

Kervyn de Lettenhove J.M.B.C. and L. Gilliodts van Severen, eds (1882-1900), *Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre sous le règne de Philippe II*, 11 vols, Bruxelles, Commission Royale d'Histoire.

Langhorne (1770), *Plutarch's Lives. Translated from the Original Greek with notes critical and historical and a New Life of Plutarch by John Langhorne D.D. and William Langhorne M.A. in six volumes*, London, Edward and Charles Dilly (revised edition by Francis Wrangham, London, J. Mawman 1809 (or 1810).

Lily William and John Colet (1549), *A shorte introduction of grammar generally to be vsed in the Kynges Maiesties dominions, for the bryngynge vp of all those that entende to atteyne the knowledge of the Latine tongue*, London, Wolfe.

Locke John (1690), *An essay concerning humane understanding...*, London, Basset.

Mulcaster Richard (1582), *The first part of the elementarie*, London, Vautrollier.

Peacham Henry (1593 [1577]), *The garden of eloquence conteining the most excellent ornaments, exornations, lightes, flowers and formes of speech, commonly called the figures of rhetorike*, London, Field.

Perrin Bernadotte (1914-1926), *Plutarch's Lives* (parallel texts), 11 vols, London, Heinemann and Cambridge, Harvard University Press (Loeb Classical Library).

Pliny/Landino (1476), *Historia naturale di Caio Plinio Secondo tradocta di lingua Latina in fiorentino per Christophero Landino fiorentino*, Venezia, Jenson.

- Pliny/Holland (1601), *The historie of the world Commonly called, the natural historie of C. Plinius Secundus*, London, Islip.
- Plutarch *editio princeps* (1517), του σοφωτατου Πλουταρχου Παραλληλων. Βιοι Ῥωμαίων και Ἑλλήνων *Sapientissimi Plutarchi paralellum. Vitae Romanorum et Graecorum Quadriginta novem*, in aedibus P. juntae, Florentiae.
- Plutarch/Aldus (1519), Πλουταρχου Παραλληλαεν βιοις Ἑλλήνων τε και Ῥωμαίων 49 *Plutarchi quae vocantur parallela. Hoc est, vitae illustrium virorum Graeci nominis ac Latini...*, Venetiis in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri.
- Plutarch/Xylander (1561), *Plutarchi... opus quod Parallela et vitas appellant: Guilielmo Xylandro... interprete...*, Heidelbergae, Basileae, Oporinus.
- Plutarch/Cruzerius (1564), *Plutarchi... Vitae comparatae illustrium virorum, Graecorum et Romanorum, ita digestae et temporum ordo seriesque constat, H. Crusario... interprete*, Basileae, apud Thomam Guarinum.
- Plutarch/Stephanus (1572), Πλουταρχου Χαιρωνέως τά σωζόμενα συγγράμματα. *Plutarchi Chaeonensis quae extant opera, cum latina interpretatione. Ex vetustis codicibus plurima nunc primum emendata sunt, vt ex H Stephani annotationibus intelliges*, Genève, Henri II Estienne.
- Plutarch/Amyot (1559), *Les Vies des Hommes Illustres, Grecs et Romains, comparées l'une avec l'autre par Plutarque, Translatées de grec en François*, Paris, Vascosan.
- Plutarch/Amyot (1574), *Les vies des hommes illustres, grecs et romains, comparées l'une avec l'autre par Plutarque de Chaeronee translatées de grec en françois par Messire Jacques Amyot lors Abbé de Bellozane, à present Euesque d'Auxerre... En ceste seule edition sont mises toutes leurs medailles diligement recherchées de tous les plus excellens cabinets du Royaume de France et ailleurs*, Lausanne, François Le Preux.
- Plutarch/North (1579), *The LIVES of the Noble Grecians and Romanes compared together by that graue learned Philosopher and Historiographer Plutarke of Chaeronea: Translated out of Greek into French by Iames Amyot, Abbot of Bellozane, Bishop of Auxerre, ...and out of French into English by Thomas North*, London, Vautrollier and Wight.
- Plutarch/Amyot (ed. Simon Goulart) (1583), *Les Vies des Hommes Illustres, Grecs et Romains, comparées l'une avec l'autre par Plutarque de Chaeronee. Translatées par M. Jacques Amyot... Enrichies en cette dernière edition d'amples sommaires sur chacune vie: d'annotations*

- morales en marge qui monstrent le profit qu'on peut faire en lecture de ces histoires... Le tout disposé par S.G.S....*, Paris, Jeremie des Planches.
- Plutarch/Holland (1603), *The Philosophie commonlie called the Morals written by the learned philosopher Plutarch...*, London, Hatfield.
- Plutarch/North (ed. George Wyndham) (1895), *Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans Englished by Sir Thomas North*, London, Nutt.
- Plutarch/Amyot (ed. Gérard Walter) (1951), *Les vies des hommes illustres. Texte établi et annoté par Gérard Walter*, Paris, Gallimard (Collection La Pléiade).
- Plutarch/Scott-Kilvert (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]), *Plutarch. The Rise of Rome*, London, Penguin Books (originally published as *Makers of Rome. Nine Lives of Plutarch*. Translated with an Introduction by Ian Scott-Kilvert, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books).
- Puttenham George (1589), *The Arte of English Poesie*, London, Field.
- Quintilian (2001), *The Orator's Education*, vol. 3 Books 6-8, trans. Donald A. Russell, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge-London, Harvard University Press.
- Quintus Curtius/Brende (1553), *The historie of Quintus Curcius, conteyning the actes of the greate Alexander*, London, Tottell.
- Sallust (1569), *C. Crispi Sallustii De L. Sergii Catilinae coniuratione, ac Bellum Iugurthino historio*, London, Marsh.
- Sallust/Barclay (1520?), *Here begynneth the famous cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had against Iugurth vsurper of the kyngdome of Numidy...*, London, Pynson.
- Sallust/Barclay (rev. Paynell) (1557), *...the historye of Iugurth... translated into English by Alexander Barcklaye*, London, Waley.
- Sallust/Heywood (1608/9), *...the conspiracie of Cateline...*, and the warre which Iugurth for many yeares maintained against the same state... London, Jaggard.
- Salter Thomas (1579), *A mirrhor mete for all mothers, matrons, and maidens, intituled the mirrhor of modestie*, London, Kingston.
- Schade Peter (Petrus Mosellanus) (1516), *Tabulae de schematibus et tropis*, Augsburg, Uhart.
- Schade Peter (Petrus Mosellanus) (1573), *Tabulae de schematibus et tropis*, London, Kingston.
- Scott-Kilvert Ian (revised Jeffrey Tatum) (2013 [1965]), *Plutarch. The Rise of Rome*, London, Penguin Books (originally published as *Makers of Rome. Nine Lives of Plutarch*. Translated with an Introduction by Ian Scott-Kilvert, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books).

- Shakespeare William (1623), *Mr William Shakespeares comedies, histories and tragedies. Published according to the true original copies*, London, Iaggard and Blount.
- Sherry Richard (1550), *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes... Gathered out of the Best Grammarians and Oratours*, London, Day.
- Smith Miles (1611), 'The Translators to the Reader', *The Holy Bible, Conteyning the Old Testament and the New*, London, Barker.
- Stewart Aubrey and George Long (1880-1882), *Plutarch's Lives, with an introduction*, 4 vols, London George Bell (incorporates George Long (1844-1848), *The Civil Wars of Rome*, 3 vols, London, Charles Knight).
- Suetonius/Holland (1606), *The historie of twelue caesars...*, London, Lownes.
- Susenbrot Hans (Johannes Susenbrotus) (c.1541), *Epitome Troporum Ac Schematum Et Grammaticorum & Rhetorum, ad Authores tum prophanos tum sacros intelligendos non minus utilis quam necessaria*, Tiguri (Zurich), Froschauer.
- Susenbrot Hans (Johannes Susenbrotus) (1562), *Epitome Troporum Ac Schematum Et Grammaticorum & Rhetorum, ad Autores tum prophanos tum sacros intelligendos non minus utilis q[ue] necessaria*, London, Dewes.
- Thomas Thomas (1587), *Dictionarium linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*, London, Boyle.
- Trogus Pompeius/Golding (1564), *Thabridgment of the Histories of Trogus Pompeius*, London, Marshe.
- Wilson Thomas (1553/1554), *The arte of rhetorique*, London, Grafton.

Secondary Sources

- Amos F.R. (1920), *Early Theories of Translation*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Archer J.E. (2011), 'Education, Religion, Politics and the Law at the Early Modern Inns of Court', in J.E. Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight, eds, *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 27-31.
- Archer J.E., Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight, eds (2011), *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Arnold Oliver (2007), *The Third Citizen. Shakespeare's Theater and the Early Modern House of Commons*, Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press.

- Aulotte Robert (1959), 'Jacques Amyot, traducteur courtois', *Revue des Sciences Humaines* 94, 131-139.
- Aulotte Robert (1965), *Amyot et Plutarque. La tradition des Moralia au XVI^e siècle*, Genève, Droz.
- Balard Michel, ed. (1986), *Fortunes de Jacques Amyot*, Paris, Nizet.
- Baldwin T.W. (1944), *William Shakespeare's Small Latin and Lesse Greeke*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Ballard Michel (1995 [1992]), *De Cicéron à Benjamin. Traducteurs, traductions, réflexions*, Lille, Presses Universitaires de Lille.
- Barber Charles (1997 [1976]), *Early Modern English*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Barker S.K. and B.M. Hosington, eds (2013), *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain 1473-1640*, Leiden, Brill.
- Barrow R.H. (1967), *Plutarch and his Times*, London, Chatto & Windus.
- Bassnett Susan (2013 [1980]), *Translation Studies*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Bassnett Susan (1998), 'The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies', in S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 123-140.
- Bassnett Susan (2007), 'Culture and Translation', in P. Kuhiwczak and K. Littau, eds, *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 13-23.
- Bassnett Susan (2014), 'Translation studies at a crossroads', in E. Brems, R. Meylaerts and L. van Doorslaer, eds, *The Known Unknowns of Translation Studies*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 17-27.
- Bassnett Susan and André Lefevere, eds (1990), *Translation, History and Culture*, London, Pinter.
- Beck Mark, ed. (2014), *A Companion to Plutarch*, Malden, Wiley/Blackwell.
- Bellorini M.G. (1964), 'Thomas North traduttore di Anton Francesco Doni', *Aevum* 38, 84-103.
- Bennett B.S. (2005), 'Hermagoras of Temnos', in M. Ballif and M.G. Moran, eds, *Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians. Critical Studies and Sources*, Westport, Praeger, 187-193.
- Bennett H.S. (1965), *English Books and Readers 1558-1603*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bermann Sandra and Michael Wood, eds (2005), *Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Billault Alain (2002), 'Plutarch's Lives', in G. Sandy, ed., *The Classical Heritage in France*, Leiden, Brill, 219-235.

- Binns J.W. (1990), *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. The Latin Writings of the Age*, Leeds, Cairns.
- Blanshard A.J.L. and T.A. Sowerby (2005), 'Thomas Wilson's Demosthenes and the Politics of Tudor Translation', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 12 (1), 46-80.
- Bolgar R.R. (1954), *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Boutcher Warren (2000), 'The Renaissance', in P. France, ed., *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 45-55.
- Boutcher Warren (2011), 'Polybius Speaks British: A Case Study in Mid-Tudor Humanism and Historiography', in F. Schurink, ed., *Tudor Translation*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 101-120.
- Boutcher Warren (2015), 'From Cultural Translation to Cultures of Translation?', in T. Demetriou and R. Tomlinson, eds, *The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France 1500-1660*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 22-40.
- Braden Gordon (2004), 'Plutarch, Shakespeare, and the Alpha Males', in C. Martindale and A.B. Taylor, eds, *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 188-205.
- Braden Gordon (2010a), 'Translating Procedures in Theory and Practice', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 89-100.
- Braden Gordon (2010b), 'An Overview', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-11.
- Braden Gordon (2010c), 'Biography', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 322-330.
- Braden Gordon (2013), 'Classical Translation', in A. Hadfield, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500-1640*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 106-120.
- Braden Gordon (2014), 'Shakespeare', in M. Beck, ed., *A Companion to Plutarch*, Malden, Wiley/Blackwell, 577-591.
- Braden Gordon, R.M. Cummings and Stuart Gillespie, eds (2010), *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Brower Reuben (1971), *Hero and Saint. Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- Buford A.H. (1952), 'History and Biography: The Renaissance Distinction', in A. Williams, ed., *A Tribute to George Coffin Taylor*, Chapel Hill, University of N. Carolina Press, 100-112.
- Bullough Geoffrey (1964), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 5, *The Roman Plays*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Burke Peter (1966), 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians 1450-1700', *History and Theory* 5, 135-152.
- Burke Peter (1995), *The Fortunes of the Courtier*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Burke Peter (2005), 'The Renaissance Translator as Go-Between', in A. Höfele and W. von Koppenfels, eds, *Renaissance Go-Betweens*, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 17-31.
- Burke Peter (2007a), 'Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe', in P. Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia, eds, *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 7-38.
- Burke Peter (2007b), 'Translations into Latin in Early Modern Europe', in P. Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia, eds, *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 65-80.
- Burke Peter (2007c), 'Lost (and Found) in Translation: A Cultural History of Translators and Translating in Early Modern Europe', *European Journal* 15 (1), 83-94.
- Burke Peter (2009), 'Translating Knowledge, Translating Cultures', in M. North, ed., *Kultureller Austausch: Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühneuzeitforschung*, Köln, Weimar-Wien, Böhlau, 69-77.
- Burke Peter and Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, eds (2007), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Burrow Colin (2004), 'Shakespeare and Humanistic Culture', in C. Martindale and A.B. Taylor, eds, *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 9-27.
- Burrow Colin (2013), *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bushby Lady Frances (1911), *Three Men of Tudor Time*, London, Nutt.
- Carabin Denise (2003), 'Comment Goulart indexe-t-il le Plutarque d'Amyot?', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 65 (2), 331-345.
- Cattaneo Arturo (1990), *Tecniche traduttive nell'umanesimo inglese. L'Eneide in Gran Bretagna da Lydgate a Surrey*, Brescia, La Scuola.
- Cheney Patrick and Philip Hardie, eds (2015), *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature vol. 2 1558-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Cioranescu Alexandre (1941), *Vie de Jacques Amyot*, Paris, Champion.
- Classe Olive, ed. (2000), *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, 2 vols, London-Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Cohen J.M. (1962), *English Translators and Translations*, London, Longman Green.
- Coldiron A.E.B. (2010), 'Commonplaces and Metaphors', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 109-117.
- Coldiron A.E.B. (2015a), 'Form[e]s of transnationhood: the case of John Wolfe's trilingual Courtier', *Renaissance Studies* 29 (1), 103-124.
- Coldiron A.E.B. (2015b), *Printers without Borders. Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Collinson Patrick (1967), *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, London, Methuen.
- Collinson Patrick (1982), *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559-1625*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Collinson Patrick (1996), 'Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture', in C. Durston and J. Eales, eds, *The Culture of English Puritanism 1560-1700*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 32-57.
- Conley C.H. (1927), *The First English Translators of the Classics*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Corti Claudia (1988), 'Cicero's *De Officiis*', in A. Serpieri, K. Elam and C. Corti, eds, *Nel laboratorio di Shakespeare*, vol. 4 *I drammi romani*, Parma, Pratiche, 251-345.
- Cox Jensen Freyja (2009), 'Reading Florus in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Studies* 23 (5), 659-677.
- Cox Jensen Freyja (2012), *Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England*, Leiden, Brill.
- Cox Jensen Freyja (2014), '“Precious treasures made cheap”? The Real Cost of Reading Roman History in Early Modern England', in E. Patten and J. McElligot, eds, *The Perils of Print Culture. Print and Publishing History in Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 35-50.
- Cratty D.M. (1975), *Two Versions of Livy: A study of Tudor translations*, Diss. Bowling Green State University.
- Criniti Nicola (1979), 'Per una storia del plutarco occidentale', *Nuova Rivista Storica* 63, 187-203.
- Culhane Peter (2004), 'Philemon Holland's Livy: Peritexts and Contexts', *Translation and Literature* 13 (2), 268-286.

- Cummings Robert (2007), 'Recent Studies in English Translation c. 1520-c.1590', *English Literary Renaissance* 37 (2), 274-316.
- Cummings Robert (2009a), 'Recent Studies in English Translation c. 1590-c.1660 Part 1', *English Literary Renaissance* 39 (1), 197-227.
- Cummings Robert (2009b), 'Recent Studies in English Translation c. 1590-c.1660 Part 2', *English Literary Renaissance* 39 (3), 586-615.
- Cummings Robert (2011), 'Publication of Translation in Britain' in H. Kittel, A.P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert and F. Paul, eds, *Übersetzung/Translation/Traduction Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, vol. 3, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1811-1820.
- Cummings Robert (2013), 'Versifying Philosophy: Thomas Blundeville's Plutarch', in S.K. Barker and B.M. Hosington, eds, *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain 1473-1640*, Leiden, Brill, 103-120.
- Cummings Robert and Stuart Gillespie (2009), 'Translations from Greek and Latin Classics 1550-1700. A Revised Bibliography', *Translation and Literature* 18 (1), 1-42.
- Dana Yitzhak (2004), 'The First Printing of the Lives in 1517. A Possible Link with the Distant Past', in L. de Blois, J. Bons, T. Kessels and D.M. Schenkeveld, eds, *The Statesman in Plutarch's Lives*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 275-285.
- De Blois Lukas (1992), 'The Perception of Politics in Plutarch's Roman Lives', in W. Haase and H. Temporini, eds, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol 2.33.6, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 4568-4615.
- Delisle Jean and Judith Woodsworth, eds (2012 [1995]), *Translators through History*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Demetriou Tania and Rowan Tomlinson (2015), 'Introduction. 'Abroad in Mens Hands': The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France', in T. Demetriou and R. Tomlinson, eds, *The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France 1500-1660*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 1-21.
- Demetriou Tania and Rowan Tomlinson, eds (2015), *The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France 1500-1660*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Denton John (1992a), 'Metaphors the Elizabethans Translated by. Aspects of late 16th century English translation metalanguage', in C. Nocera Avila, N. Pantaleo and D. Pezzini, eds, *Early Modern English: trends, forms and texts*, Fasano, Schena, 255-271.

- Denton John (1992b), 'Plutarco come lo leggeva Shakespeare: la traduzione delle Vite parallele di Thomas North (1579)', in B. Scardigli, ed., *Plutarco: Le vite di Coriolano e Alcibiade*, Milano, Rizzoli, 57-78.
- Denton John (1993a), 'Plutarch in English from Sir Thomas North to the Penguin Classics', in D. Hart, ed., *Aspects of English and Italian Lexicology*, LIS serie ricerche 10, Roma, il Bagatto libri, 265-278.
- Denton John (1993b), 'Wearing a Gown in the Market Place or a Toga in the Forum; Coriolanus from Plutarch to Shakespeare via Renaissance translation', in G. Caliumi, ed., *Shakespeare e la sua eredità*, Parma, Zara, 97-109.
- Denton John (2012 [1995]), 'Elizabethan England: translating with a purpose', section of Chapter 7 'Translation and the Transmission of Cultural Values' (main author Yves Gambier), in J. Delisle and J. Woodsworth, eds, *Translators through History*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 196-199.
- Denton John (1997), 'Plutarch, Shakespeare, Roman Politics and Renaissance Translation', *Poetica* (Tokyo) 48, 187-209.
- Denton John (1998a), 'The Descriptive Turn in Historical Translation Studies, or the Decline (and Fall?) of Translation: An Elizabethan Art', in G. Iamartino, ed., *English Diachronic Translation. Atti del VII Convegno Nazionale di Storia della Lingua Inglese*, Roma, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 131-141.
- Denton John (1998b), 'Renaissance Translation Strategies and the Manipulation of a Classical Text. Plutarch from Jacques Amyot to Thomas North', in M. Ballard, ed., *Europe et Traduction*, Arras, Artois Presses Université, 67-78.
- Denton John (2000), 'Pluarch's *Parallel Lives*', in O. Classe, ed., *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, London-Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn, 1088-1090.
- Denton John (2007a), 'The Significance and Impact of Translation in the European Renaissance', in H. Kittel, A.P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert and F. Paul, eds, *Übersetzung/Translation/Traduction Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, vol. 2, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1389-1396.
- Denton John (2007b), 'Translators and their Tools in the European Renaissance', in H. Kittel, A.P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert and F. Paul, eds, *Übersetzung/Translation/Traduction Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, vol. 2, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1415-1420.

- Denton John (forthcoming), 'A Major (though sometimes overlooked) Elizabethan Contribution to Translation Theory: Lawrence Humphrey's *Interpretatio Linguarum* (1559)', invited paper read at the colloquium entitled *Translation: An Elizabethan Art - Revisited*, held in Ragusa (Università di Catania) 24-25 October 2013.
- D'hulst Lieven (1998), 'Traduire l'Europe en France entre 1810 et 1840', in M. Ballard, ed., *Europe et Traduction*, Arras, Artois Presses Université, 137-157.
- D'hulst Lieven (2001), 'Why and How to Write Translation Histories?', in J. Milton, ed., *Emerging Views on Translation History in Brazil*, Sao Paulo, Humanitas, 21-32.
- Dodds Lara (2011), 'Reading and Writing in *Sociable Letters*; or, How Margaret Cavendish Read her Plutarch', *English Literary Renaissance* 41 (1), 189-218.
- Duff Tim (2000), *Plutarch's Lives. Exploring Virtue and Vice*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Dury Richard (1992), 'Saxonism and the preference for 'native' vocabulary', in C. Nocera Avila, N. Pantaleo and D. Pezzini, eds, *Early Modern English: trends, forms and texts*, Fasano, Schena, 133-146.
- Early English Books Online: <<http://eebo.chadwick.com/>>.
- Ebel J.G. (1967), 'A Numerical Survey of Elizabethan Translations', *The Library* 22 (5th series), 104-127.
- Eco Umberto (2001), *Experiences in Translation*, translated by Alastair McEwen, Toronto-Buffalo-London, University of Toronto Press.
- Eco Umberto (2003a), *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Eco Umberto (2003b), *Dire quasi la stessa cosa: esperienze di traduzione*, Milano, Bompiani.
- Fernández Pérez J.M. and Edward Wilson-Lee, eds (2015), *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher L.A. (1907), 'Shakespeare and the Capitol', *Modern Language Notes* 22, 177-182.
- France Peter, ed. (2000), *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Frazier Françoise (2014), 'The Reception of Plutarch in France after the Renaissance', in M. Beck, ed., *A Companion to Plutarch*, Malden, Wiley/Blackwell, 549-555.

- Gentili Vanna (1984), 'Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the Elizabethan Roads to Rome', in K. Elam, ed., *Shakespeare Today. Directions and Methods of Research*, Firenze, La Casa Usher, 186-212.
- Gentili Vanna (1991), *La Roma antica degli elisabettiani*, Bologna, il Mulino.
- Gillespie Stuart (2004), *Shakespeare's Books: A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sources*, London-New York, Continuum.
- Gillespie Stuart (2011), *English Translation and Classical Reception. Towards a New Literary History*, Oxford, Wiley Blackwell.
- Giustiniani V.R. (1961), 'Sulle traduzioni latine delle *Vite* di Plutarco nel quattrocento', *Rinascimento*, 2nd Series 1, 3-62.
- Gordon D.J. (1975), 'Name and Fame: Shakespeare's Coriolanus', in S. Orgel, ed., *The Renaissance Imagination*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 203-219.
- Green D.C. (1979), *Plutarch Revisited. A Study of Shakespeare's Last Roman Tragedies and their Sources*, Salzburg, Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik.
- Green Ian (2009), *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education*, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Green L.D. (1999), 'Grammatica Movet: Renaissance Grammar Books and *Elocutio*', in P.L. Oesterreich and T.D. Sloan, eds, *Rhetorica Movet. Studies in Historical and Modern Rhetoric in Honour of Heinrich F. Plett*, Leiden, Brill, 73-116.
- Guerrier Olivier, ed. (2008), *Moralia et Oeuvres morales à la Renaissance: Actes du Colloque International de Toulouse (19-21 mai 2005)*, Paris, Champion.
- Guerrier Olivier (2014), 'The Renaissance in France: Amyot and Montaigne', in M. Beck, ed., *A Companion to Plutarch*, Malden, Wiley/Blackwell, 544-548.
- Gunn G.B. (1975), *F.O. Matthiessen: The Critical Achievement*, Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- Guy John (1988), *Tudor England*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hadfield Andrew and Neil Rhodes, eds (2011-), *MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations*, London, The Modern Humanities Research Association.
- Hardwick Lorna and Christopher Stray (2008), 'Introduction: Making Connections', in L. Hardwick and C. Stray, eds, *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, Malden, Wiley/Blackwell, 1-9.
- Hawkes Terence (1972), *Metaphor*, London, Methuen.

- Hawkes Terence (1992), *Meaning by Shakespeare*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Henley W.E., ed. (1892-1909), *The Tudor Translations*, 1st series 44 vols, London, Nutt.
- Hermans Theo (1985a), 'Introduction. Translation Studies and a New Paradigm', in T. Hermans, ed., *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, London-Sydney, Croom Helm, 7-15.
- Hermans Theo (1985b), 'Images of Translation. Metaphor and imagery in the Renaissance discourse on translation', in T. Hermans, ed., *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, London-Sydney, Croom Helm, 103-135.
- Hermans Theo (1986), 'Literary Translation: the Birth of a Concept', *New Comparison* 1, 28-42.
- Hermans Theo (1999), *Translation in Systems*, Manchester, St. Jerome.
- Hermans Theo (2004), 'Translation as an object of reflection in modern literary and cultural studies: Historical-descriptive translation research', in H. Kittel, A.P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert and F. Paul, eds, *Übersetzung/Translation/Traduction Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, vol. 1, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 200-211.
- Hermans Theo (2007), 'Concepts and theories of translation in the European Renaissance', in H. Kittel, A.P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert and F. Paul, eds, *Übersetzung/Translation/Traduction Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, vol. 2, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 1420-1428.
- Hermans Theo (2015), 'Miracles in translation: Lipsius, Our Lady of Halle and two Dutch translations', *Renaissance Studies* 29 (1), 5-18.
- Heuer Hermann (1957), 'From Plutarch to Shakespeare: A Study of Coriolanus', *Shakespeare Survey* 10, 50-59.
- Holmes J.S. (1972), 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies', Amsterdam, Translation Studies Section, Department of General Literary Studies (reprinted in J.S. Holmes (1988), *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi, 67-80).
- Honigmann E.A.J. (1959), 'Shakespeare's Plutarch', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 10 (1), 25-33.
- Hosington B.M. (2010), 'Commerce, Printing and Patronage', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 47-57.
- Hosington B.M. (2011a), 'The Renaissance Cultural Crossroads' Catalogue. A Witness to the Importance of Translation in Early Modern Britain', in M. Walsby and G. Kemp, eds, *The Book Triumphant*, Leiden, Brill, 253-269.

- Hosington B.M. (2011b), 'Tudor Englishwomen's Translations of Continental Protestant Texts: The Interplay of Ideology and Historical Context', in F. Schurink, ed., *Tudor Translation*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 121-142.
- Hosington B.M., (2015), 'Translation and Print Culture in Early Modern Europe', *Renaissance Studies* 29 (1), 5-18.
- Hosington B.M., ed. (2015), *Translation and Print Culture in Early Modern Europe*, special issue *Renaissance Studies*, 29 (1).
- Howard M.W. (1970), *The Influence of Plutarch in the Major European Literatures of the Eighteenth Century*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.
- Howell W.S. (1956), *Logic and Rhetoric in England 1500-1700*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Hunter G.K. (1971), 'A Roman Thought: Renaissance Attitudes to History Exemplified in Shakespeare and Jonson', in B.S. Lee, ed., *An English Miscellany Presented to W.S. Mackie*, London-New York-Cape Town, Oxford University Press, 93-115 (reprinted in Stephen Orgel and Sean Keilen, eds (1999), *Shakespeare and History*, New York-London, Garland, 189-211).
- Iamartino Giovanni (1992), 'Florio's and Cotton's Montaigne: Renaissance v. Restoration translation styles', in C. Nocera Avila, N. Pantaleo and D. Pezzini, eds, *Early Modern English: trends, forms and texts*, Fasano, Schena, 273-294.
- Jacobsen Eric (1958), *Translation: a Traditional Craft*, Copenhagen, Nordisk Forlag, 1958.
- Jones L.C. (1917), *Simon Goulart 1543-1628*, Paris, Champion.
- Jones R.F. (1953), *The Triumph of the English Language*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Keller S.D. (2009), *The Development of Shakespeare's Rhetoric*, Tübingen, Narr Francke.
- Kelly L.G. (1979), *The True Interpreter. A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Kennedy W.J. (2008), 'Social Contexts of Renaissance Translation', *Reformation* 13, 163-172.
- Kewes Paulina (2011), 'Henry Saville's Tacitus and the Politics of Roman History in Late Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 74 (4), 515-551.
- Kishlansky M.A. (1986), *Parliamentary Selection. Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Kittel Harald (1988), 'Kontinuität und Diskrepanzen', in H. Kittel, ed., *Die literarische Übersetzung. Stand und Perspektiven ihrer Erforschung*, Berlin, Schmidt, 158-179.
- Kittel Harald, A.P. Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert and Fritz Paul, eds (2004, 2007, 2011), *Übersetzung/Translation/Traduction Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, 3 vols, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter.
- Lakoff George and Mark Johnson (1980), *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Lambert José (1991), 'Shifts, Oppositions and Goals in Translation Studies: Towards a Genealogy of Concepts', in K. van Leuven-Zwart and T. Naaijken, eds, *Translation Studies: The State of the Art*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi, 25-37 (reprinted in Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst and Reine Meylaerts, eds (2006), *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation. Selected Papers by José Lambert*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 75-86).
- Lambert José (1993), 'History, historiography and the discipline. A programme', in Y. Gambier and J. Tammola, eds, *Translation & Knowledge*, Turku, Centre for Translation and Interpreting, University of Turku, 3-25.
- Lambert José and Hendrik Van Gorp (1985), 'On Describing Translations', in T. Hermans, ed., *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, London-Sydney, Croom Helm, 42-53 (reprinted in Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst and Reine Meylaerts, eds (2006), *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation. Selected Papers by José Lambert*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 37-48).
- Leeds Barroll J. (1958), 'Shakespeare and Roman History', *Modern Language Review* 53, 327-343.
- Lefevere André (1978), 'Translation Studies: the goal of the discipline', in J. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. van den Broek, eds, *Literature and Translation*, Leuven, ACCO, 234-235.
- Lefevere André (1992), *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Lefevere André, ed. (1992), *Translation/History/Culture. A Sourcebook*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Lefevere André and Susan Bassnett (1990), 'Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies', in S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere, eds, *Translation, History and Culture*, London, Pinter, 1-13.

- Lindeman Yehudi (1981), 'Translation in the Renaissance: A Context and a Map', *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 8, 204-216.
- Lockwood Tom (2004), 'North, Sir Thomas (1535-1603?)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MacCallum M.W. (1967 [1910]), *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background*, new edition with a Foreword by T.J.B. Spencer, London, Macmillan.
- MacDonald K.M. (2000), 'The Presence of Plutarch in the Preface to the Reader of Crusierius' Latin Translation of the Lives (1561)', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 62 (1), 129-134.
- MacDonald K.M. (2001), 'Selling Lives: The Publisher Bernardo di Giunta (fl 1518-50), Imitation and the Utility of Intellectual Biography', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 25 (3), 5-24.
- Mack Peter (2004), *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Martindale Joanna (1985), *English Humanism – Wyatt to Cowley*, London, Croom Helm.
- Martindale Charles and Michelle Martindale (1990), *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Martindale Charles and A.B. Taylor, eds (2004), *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Matthiessen F.O. (1931), *Translation: An Elizabethan Art*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Maule Jeremy (2000), 'What did Morley give when he gave a 'Plutarch' Life?', in M. Axton and J.P. Carley, eds, *Triumphs of English: Henry Parker, Lord Morley, Translator to the Tudor Court: New Essays in Interpretation*, London, The British Library, 107-130.
- Merchant W.M. (1957), 'Classical Costume in Shakespearian Productions', *Shakespeare Survey* 10, 71-76.
- Miles G.B. (1989), 'How Roman are Shakespeare's Romans?', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (3), 257-283.
- Miles Geoffrey (1996), *Shakespeare and the Constant Romans*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Morini Massimiliano (2004), 'Sir John Harington and the Poetics of Tudor Translation', in M. Pincombe, ed., *Travels and Translations in the Sixteenth Century*, Farnham, Ashgate, 120-136.
- Morini Massimiliano (2006), *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, Farnham, Ashgate.

- Morini Massimiliano (2013), 'Virgil in Tudor Dress: In Search of a Noble Vernacular', *Neophilologus* 97 (3), 591-610.
- Mossman Judith (2007), 'Plutarch and English Biography', *Hermathena* 183, 75-100.
- Mossman Judith (2014), 'The Post-Renaissance Reception of Plutarch in England' in M. Beck, ed., *A Companion to Plutarch*, Malden, Wiley/Blackwell, 592-597.
- Newman Karen and Jane Tylus, eds (2015), *Early Modern Cultures of Translation*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Nocera Avila Carmela (1990), 'La King James Bible nella teoria e storia della traduzione' in C. Nocera Avila, *Studi sulla traduzione nell'Inghilterra del seicento e del settecento*, Caltanissetta, Sciascia, 57-70.
- Nocera Avila Carmela (1992), *Tradurre il Cortegiano. The Courtyer di Sir Thomas Hoby*, Bari, Adriatica.
- Nøgaard Holger (1958), 'Translations of the Classics into English before 1600', *The Review of English Studies* 9, 164-172.
- Nord Christiane (2005 [1991]), *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi.
- Nord Christiane (2012), 'Paratranslation – a new paradigm or a re-invented wheel?', *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 20 (4), 399-409.
- Norton G.P. (1984), *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France*, Genève, Droz.
- Oakley-Brown Liz, (2010), 'Translation', in M. Hattaway, ed., *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, Oxford, Blackwell, 120-133.
- Pade Marianne (2007), *The Reception of Plutarch's Lives in Fifteenth-Century Italy*, 2 vols, Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Palliser D.M. (1992 [1983]), *The Age of Elizabeth. England under the Later Tudors*, London, Longman.
- Paprotté Wolf and Renè Dirven, eds (1985), *The Ubiquity of Metaphor*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Partridge Mary (2007), 'Thomas Hoby's English Translation of Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*', *The Historical Journal* 50 (4), 769-786.
- Pavlovskis-Petit Zoja (2000), 'Quintilian', in O. Classe, ed., *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, London-Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn, 1140-1141.

- Pelling C.B.R. (1986), 'Plutarch and Roman Politics', in I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart and A.J. Woodman, eds, *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 159-187 (reprinted in C.B.R. Pelling (2002), *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, London, The Classical Press of Wales and Duckworth, 207-236).
- Pelling C.B.R. (1997), 'The Shaping of *Coriolanus*: Dionysius, Plutarch, and Shakespeare', *Poetica* (Tokyo) 48, 3-32.
- Pelling C.B.R. (2009), 'Seeing a Roman Tragedy through Greek Eyes: Shakespeare's Julius Caesar', in S. Goldhill and E. Hall, eds, *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 264-288.
- Peltonen Markku (2009), 'Political Rhetoric and Citizenship in *Coriolanus*', in D. Armitage, C. Condren and A. Fitzmaurice, eds, *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 234-252.
- Pincombe Mike, ed. (2004), *Travels and Translations in the Sixteenth Century*, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Pineaux Jacques (1986), 'Un continuateur des *Vies Parallèles*: Simon Goulart de Senlis (S.G.S.)', in M. Balard, ed., *Fortunes de Jacques Amyot*, Paris, Nizet, 331-342.
- Pocock J.G.A. (1985), 'The Sense of History in Renaissance England', in J.F. Andrews, ed., *William Shakespeare: His World*, vol.1, New York, Scribner's, 143-157.
- Prest W.R. (1972), *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640*, London, Longman.
- Pugliatti Paola (1992), 'Shakespeare's Names for Rebellion', in C. Nocera Avila, N. Pantaleo and D. Pezzini, eds, *Early Modern English: trends, forms and texts*, Fasano, Schena, 81-93.
- Pym Anthony (2014 [2010]), *Exploring Translation Theories*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Raaflaub K.A., ed. (2005 [1986]), *Social Struggles in Ancient Rome*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Radice William and Barbara Reynolds, eds (1987), *The Translator's Art: Essays in Honour of Betty Radice*, Harmondsworth-New York, Penguin Books.
- Read Conyers (1925), *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Reid Joshua (2014), 'The Enchantments of Circe: Translation Studies and the English Renaissance', *The Spenser Review* <<http://www.english.cam.ac.uk/spenseronline/review/volume-44/441>> (10/2016).

- Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: <<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/rcc/>>.
- Renier F.M. (1989), *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi.
- Reynolds Matthew (2011), *The Poetry of Translation. From Chaucer & Petrarch to Homer & Logue*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Rhodes Neil (2011), 'Status Anxiety and English Renaissance Translation', in H. Smith and L. Wilson, eds, *Renaissance Paratexts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 107-120.
- Rhodes Neil (2013), 'Introduction', in N. Rhodes, ed., *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, London, Modern Humanities Research Association, 1-70.
- Rhodes Neil, ed. (2013), *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, London, Modern Humanities Research Association.
- Rosenberg Eleanor (1955), *Leicester Patron of Letters*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Russell D.A. (1963), 'Plutarch's Life of Coriolanus', *Journal of Roman Studies* 53, 21-28 (reprinted in Barbara Scardigli, ed. (1995), *Essays in Plutarch's Lives*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 357-372).
- Russell D.A. (2001[1972]), *Plutarch*, Second Edition. Foreword and Bibliography by Judith Mossman, Bristol, Bristol Classical Press.
- Scarsi Selene (2010), *Translating Women in Early Modern England*, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Schmidt Gabriela, (2013), 'Introduction', in G. Schmidt, ed., *Elizabethan Translation and Literary Culture*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 1-18.
- Schmidt Gabriela, ed. (2013), *Elizabethan Translation and Literary Culture*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter.
- Schurink Fred (2008), 'Print, Patronage, and Occasion: Translations of Plutarch's *Moralia* in Tudor England', *Yearbook of English Studies* 38, 86-101.
- Schurink Fred (2011a), 'Introduction', in Fred Schurink, ed., *Tudor Translation*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 1-17.
- Schurink Fred (2011b), 'How Gabriel Harvey Read Anthony Cope's *Livy*: Translation, Humanism, and War in Tudor England', in F. Schurink, ed., *Tudor Translation*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 58-78.
- Schurink Fred (2013), 'War What is it Good for? Sixteenth-Century English Translations of Ancient Texts on Warfare', in S.K. Barker and B.M. Hosington, eds, *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain 1473-1640*, Leiden, Brill, 121-138.
- Schurink Fred, ed. (2011), *Tudor Translation*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Serpieri Alessandro, Keir Elam and Claudia Corti (1988), *Nel laboratorio di Shakespeare*, vol. 4 I drammi romani, Parma, Pratiche.
- Sherbo Arthur (1979), 'The Dryden-Cambridge Translation of Plutarch's Lives', *Études anglaises* 32, 177-184.
- Smith Helen and Louise Wilson (2011), 'Introduction', in H. Smith and L. Wilson, eds, *Renaissance Paratexts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-14.
- Smuts Malcolm (1993), 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, 1590-1630' in K. Sharpe and P. Lake, eds, *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 21-43.
- Snell-Hornby Mary (2006), *The Turns of Translation Studies*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Sørensen Knud (1960), *Thomas Lodge's Translation of Seneca's De Beneficiis Compared with Arthur Golding's Version*, Copenhagen, Gyldendal.
- Sowerby Robin (1998), 'Thomas Hobbes's Translation of Thucydides', *Translation and Literature* 7 (2), 147-169.
- Sowerby Robin (2010), 'Ancient History', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 301-311.
- Starnes D.T. (1954), *Renaissance Dictionaries English-Latin and Latin-English*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Stein Gabriele (1985), *The English Dictionary before Cawdrey*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Steiner George (1998 [1975]), *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford-New York, Oxford University Press.
- Steiner T.R. (1975), *English Translation Theory 1650-1800*, Assen, Van Gorcum.
- Stern Virginia (1979), *Gabriel Harvey: A Study of his Life, Marginalia and Library*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Stirling Brents (1949), *The Populace in Shakespeare*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Sturel René (1908), *Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque*, Paris, Champion.
- Sturge Kate (2011), 'Cultural Translation', in M. Baker and G. Saldanha, eds, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Second Edition, London-New York, Routledge, 67-70.
- Sturiale Massimo (2003), *I Sermons di Anne Cooke. Versione "riformata" delle Prediche di Bernardino Ochino*, Catania, Università di Catania. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia Moderna.

Sturiale Massimo (2008), 'Translation: an Elizabethan 'female' art?', in G. Iamartino, M.L. Maggioni and R. Facchinetti, eds, *Thou sittest at another boke....English Studies in Honour of Domenico Pezzini*, Monza, Polimetrica, 85-97.

Taylor A.W. (2011), 'Humanist Philology and Reformation Controversy: John Christopherson's Latin Translations of Philo Judaeus and Eusebius of Caesarea', in F. Schurink, ed., *Tudor Translation*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 79-100.

Toury Gideon (2012 [1995]), *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Tribble E.B. (1993), *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*, Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.

Universal Short Title Catalogue: <<http://www.ustc.ac.uk/>>.

Venuti Lawrence (2008 [1995]), *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London and New York, Routledge.

Venuti Lawrence (2005), 'Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities', in S. Bermann and M. Woods, eds, *Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 177-202 (reprinted in Lawrence Venuti (2013), *Translation Changes Everything. Theory and Practice*, London and New York, Routledge, 116-140).

Vickers Brian (1988), *In Defence of Rhetoric*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Wardman Alan (1974), *Plutarch's Lives*, London, Elek.

Whibley C. (1909), 'Translators', in A.W. Ward and A.R. Waller, eds, *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. 4, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-25.

Whibley Charles, ed. (1924-1927), *The Tudor Translations*, 2nd series London, Constable; New York, Knopf, 12 vols.

Wilson J.D. (1957), 'Shakespeare's 'Small Latin' – How Much?', *Shakespeare Survey* 10, 12-26.

Womersley David (1991), 'Sir Henry Savile's Translation of Tacitus and the Political Interpretation of Elizabethan Texts', *Review of English Studies* 42, 313-342.

Worth Valerie (1986), 'Les fortunes de Jacques Amyot en Angleterre: une traduction de Sir Thomas North', in M. Balard, ed., *Fortunes de Jacques Amyot*, Paris, Nizet, 285-295.

- Wright Gillian (2010), 'Translating at Leisure: Gentlemen and Gentlewomen', in G. Braden, R.M. Cummings and S. Gillespie, eds, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2 1550-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 58-67.
- Wrightson Keith (1991), 'Estates, degrees and sorts: changing perceptions of class in Tudor and Stuart England', in P.J. Corfield, ed., *Language, History and Class*, Oxford, Blackwell, 30-52.
- Wrightson Keith (1994), 'Sorts of People in Tudor and Stuart England', in J. Barry and C. Brooks, eds, *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England 1550-1800*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 28-51.
- Wyatt Michael (2005), *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wyndham George (1895), 'Introduction' in *Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans by Sir Thomas North with an Introduction by George Wyndham*, vol. 1, London, Nutt, vii-ci (Reprinted as 'North's Plutarch', in C. Whibley, ed, (1919), *Essays in Romantic Literature*, London, Macmillan, 117-235).



Index of Names

- Acciaiuoli Donato 45n.
Aelian 29, 34-35
Alcibiades 62
Aldus Pius Manutius 77
Ammianus Marcellinus 34-35
Amos 15n., 79
Amyot Jacques 5, 19, 42-43,
45n., 45-49, 49n., 50-56,
54n.-55n., 60n., 60-63, 63n.,
67, 77-78, 80, 82-83, 85, 87,
93, 95, 96
Appian 34-36, 39, 54, 75
Archer J.E. 43n., 79
Aristotle 23
Arnold Oliver 61, 79
Aulotte Robert 47n., 80
- Bachet de Mérizac Claude-
Gaspard 49n.
Bacon Francis 33
Balard Michel 47, 80, 93, 96
Baldwin T.W. 23, 25, 80
Ballard Michel 49, 80, 85-86
Barber Charles 28, 28n., 80
Barclay Alexander 35, 36n.,
37-39, 38n., 78
Barker S.K. 80, 84, 94
Barker William 35, 39, 75
Barrow R.H. 65n., 80
Bassnett Susan 10n., 21, 80, 90
Beck Mark 65n., 80-81, 86-87, 92
Bellorini M.G. 43n., 80
- Bennett B.S. 80
Bennett H.S. 29, 80
Bermann Sandra 14, 80, 96
Billault Alain 45n., 46, 80
Bingham John 35
Binns J.W. 16n., 23n., 81
Blanshard A.J.L. 38n., 81
Bolgar R.R. 14, 34, 81
Blomer Thomas 65n., 69, 70-72,
75, 75n.
Bolton E.M. 35
Boucher Warren 11n., 12, 13n.,
39, 81
Bracciolini Poggio (Poggius
Florentinus) 13, 17, 21, 23n.,
33, 36, 48, 61, 63, 81, 83, 88,
95, 97
Braden Gordon 21n., 23, 36n., 63n.
Brende John 33-34, 36, 39, 78
Brennan Joseph Xavier 25
Brower Reuben 19, 81
Brownlees Nicholas 8
Brutus 58, 71-72
Buford A.H. 33, 82
Bullough Geoffrey 54, 54n., 82
Burke Peter 12-14, 16, 36, 43, 73,
82
Burrow Colin 7, 23, 25, 43, 52,
54n.-55n., 60, 63, 82
Bushby Lady Francis 43n., 82
Caesar 34, 36, 39, 54, 57, 87, 93

- Carabin Denise 46n., 82
 Cassius Dio 34
 Castiglione Baldassarre 12, 16, 75, 92
 Catiline 36n.
 Cattaneo Arturo 12n., 82
 Cavendish Margaret (Duchess) 48n., 86
 Charles IX King of France 41, 47
 Cheke Sir John 17, 25n.
 Cheney Patrick 7, 82
 Christopherson John 17, 96
 Cicero 12n., 21, 23, 30, 44n., 48, 75, 94
 Cioranescu Alexandre 47n., 83
 Classe Olive 11, 83, 85, 92
 Clerke Bartholomew 16, 75
 Clough A.H. 65, 67, 69-72, 76
 Cohen J.M. 66, 83
 Coldiron A.E.B. 14n., 17, 27n., 83
 Colet John 19, 24, 76
 Collinson Patrick 44n., 53n., 83
 Conley C.H. 19, 83
 Cooke Anthony Sir 20n., 95
 Cooper Thomas 57, 75
 Cope Anthony 34, 39, 94
 Coriolanus 5, 43, 47, 49-50, 52-53, 55, 58-63, 65-66, 69, 73-75, 83, 85, 87-88, 93-94
 Cornelius Nepos 45
 Corti Claudia 54n., 58, 83, 95
 Cox Jensen Freyja 14, 23, 31, 33, 39, 48, 83
 Cratty D.M. 12n., 39, 83
 Criniti Nicola 44, 83
 Crosse William 35
 Crowe Russell 50
 Crusier Hermann (Cruserius) 46, 55n.
 Culhane Peter 39-40, 83
 Cummings Robert 12n., 13, 14n., 16n., 23, 34, 66-68, 81, 83-84, 88, 95, 97
 Cyrus 39
 Dana Yitzhak 48n., 84
 Day Angel 26, 75, 79
 De Blois Lukas 63, 84
 de l'Escluse Charles 45
 de Montaigne Michel 47, 84, 85,
 Delisle Jean 47n.
 Demetriou Tania 14, 45n., 46, 81, 84
 Demosthenes 28, 38n., 75, 81
 Denton John 3, 4, 7, 8, 23n., 43n., 53n., 65n., 84, 85, 86
 D'hulst Lieven 12n., 86, 90
 Diodorus 34, 35, 36
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 34, 59n., 93
 Dirven René 26, 92
 Dodds Lara 45n., 48n. 56n., 86
 Dolman John 21, 48, 75
 Douglas Kirk 50
 Dryden John 15n., 18n., 65-67, 69-71, 75, 95
 Dudley Robert, Earl of Leicester 19, 44, 44n.
 Duff Tim 62, 86
 Dury Richard 20, 86
 Ebel J.G. 14, 86
 Eco Umberto 38, 86
 Edmondes Clemens 34
 Elam Keir 54n., 83, 87, 95
 Elizabeth I Tudor (Queen) 20n.-21n., 23, 93
 Elyot Sir Thomas 19, 20
 Erasmus of Rotterdam 20n.
 Estienne Henri (Henricus Stephanus) 46, 77
 Eutropius 34-35, 39

- Fantaccini Fiorenzo 8, 100, 107
 Fernández Pérez J.M. 4, 14n., 86
 Field Richard 45n., 76, 78
 Fisher L.A. 61, 86
 Fleming Abraham 29, 35, 75
 Florio John 25n., 89
 Florus 34-35, 39, 83
 France Peter 11, 41, 47, 77,
 80-81, 84, 86-87, 92
 François II Valois (King) 47
 Fraunce Abraham 26, 76
 Frazier Françoise 45, 86
 Frontinus 34-35, 39

 Galba 38, 40
 Gentili Vanna 47, 54, 87
 Gillespie Stuart 13, 14n., 23,
 34, 45n., 54, 63, 81, 83-84,
 87-88, 95, 97
 Giustiniani V.R. 46n., 87
 Golding Arthur 28, 34-35, 39, 79,
 95
 Goldring Elizabeth 43n., 79
 Gordon D.J. 15, 54n., 81, 87
 Gorges Sir Arthur 34
 Goulart Simon (Simon Goulartius
 Silvanectinus) 45-46, 67, 77,
 82, 89, 93
 Gray Lady Jane 20n.
 Green Ian 23, 25n., 87
 Green L.D. 24-26, 87
 Green D.C. 54n., 87
 Grenewey Richard 34, 39
 Grey William Bishop of Ely
 20n.
 Grimald Nicholas 30
 Grimeston Edward 35
 Guerrier Olivier 46-47, 87
 Gunn G.B. 18n., 87
 Guthrie William 23n.
 Guy John 20, 87

 Hadfield Andrew 13, 81, 87
 Hannibal 45n.
 Hardie Philip 7, 82
 Hardwick Lorna 7, 87
 Harvey Gabriel 15n., 17, 94, 95
 Hawkes Terence 19, 27, 53-54,
 87-88
 Hayward Sir John 33
 Henley W.E. 18, 88
 Henri II Valois-Angoulême (King)
 47, 77
 Henri III Valois-Angoulême (King)
 47
 Henry VIII (King) 45
 Hermagoras of Temnos 12n., 80
 Hermans Theo 9, 10, 12n., 27n., 30,
 84-85, 88, 90
 Herodian 34-35, 39
 Herodotus 29, 34-36, 76
 Heuer Hermann 54n., 88
 Heywood Thomas 35-36, 37n., 78
 Hobbes Thomas 35, 41, 42n., 95
 Hoby Sir Thomas 16, 25n., 75, 92
 Holland Philemon 27n., 31, 34-36,
 39-40, 44, 57, 60, 77-79, 83
 Holmes J.S. 10, 88, 90
 Holtzmann Wilhelm (Xylander) 46
 Honigmann E.A.J. 54, 88
 Hosington B.M. 14n., 20n., 80, 84,
 88, 89, 94
 Howard M.W. 35, 39, 65n., 89
 Howell W.S. 26, 89
 Huet P.D. (Petrus Daniel Huetius)
 17, 76
 Humphrey Laurence (Laurentius
 Humfredus) 15n., 16-17, 20n., 27,
 76, 86
 Humphrey Duke of Gloucester 15n.
 Hunter G.K. 39, 89

 Iamartino Giovanni 12n., 85, 89, 96

- Jacobsen Eric 15n., 89
 James I Stuart (King) 61
 Johnson Mark 26
 Jones L.C. 46n., 89
 Jones R.F. 16, 28, 89
 Jonson Ben 54n., 89
 Josephus 34, 36
 Jugurtha 35, 36n., 39
 Julius Vindex 40
 Justin 28, 34-35, 39
- Keller S.D. 25-26, 89
 Kelly L.G. 15n., 89
 Kendal Gordon 15, 16n.
 Kennedy W.J. 12n., 89
 Kervyn de Lettenhove J.M.B.C. 61, 76
 Kewes Paulina 39-41, 89
 Kishlansky M.A. 58n., 89
 Kittel Harald 11-12, 84-85, 88
 Knight Sarah 43n., 66, 79
- Lakoff George 26
 Lambert José 9n., 12, 84, 85, 88
 Landino Cristoforo 49, 76
 Langhorne John 65, 67-72, 76
 Langhorne William 65, 67-72, 76
 Leeds Barroll J. 35, 81
 Le Grys Sir Robert 35
 Le Preux François 47, 77
 Lefevere André 10, 10n., 11, 21, 80, 90
 Lily William 24, 76
 Linacre Thomas 17
 Lindeman Yehudi 18
 Livy 34, 36, 39, 40, 83
 Locke John 57, 76
 Lockwood Tom 43n.
 Lodge Thomas 34
 Long George 66-67, 69-72, 79
 Lucan 34
- Lyly John 28
- MacCallum M.W. 46, 54n.
 MacDonald K.M. 45-46
 Mack Peter 25-26
 Malone Edmond 60
 Marius 37, 39, 62
 Markham Gervase 34
 Marlowe Christopher 34
 Martindale Charles 54n., 81-82, 91
 Martindale Joanna 44, 91
 Martindale Michelle 91
 Mary Tudor (Queen) 15, 37, 92, 95
 Matthaëus Vindocinensis 12
 Matthew of Vendôme (Matthaëus Vindocinensis) 12n.
 Matthiessen F.O. 18n., 19-20, 20n.-21n., 43n., 87
 Maule Jeremy 45
 Maxwell James 35
 May Thomas 59-60, 65
 Merchant W.M. 56n.
 Miles Gary B. 63n., 79, 91
 Miles Geoffrey 63n.
 More Thomas 15, 17, 19, 20n.
 Morini Massimiliano 12n., 14, 16n., 17, 18n., 21, 27n., 91-92
 Morison Richard 35
 Morley Lord Henry Parker 45, 91
 Mossman Judith 65n., 92, 94
 Mulcaster Richard 28n., 76
- Nero 38, 40
 Newman Karen 14, 92
 Nicolls Thomas 35
 Nocera Avila Carmela 12n., 16n., 30, 57, 84, 86, 89, 92-93
 Nøgaard Holger 14n., 34, 92
 Nord Christiane 12n., 92
 North Sir Thomas 5, 19, 33-34,

- 39, 42-48, 43n.-48n., 50-54,
 54n.-56n., 55-56, 58, 60-61,
 62n.-63n., 63, 65-67, 69-74, 77
 North Lord Roger 43, 47
 Norton G.P. 17, 92, 102

 Oakley-Brown Liz 15n., 20n., 92
 Oikonomopoulou Katerina 65n.
 Onasander 34-35, 39

 Pade Marianne 46, 92
 Palliser D.M. 16, 61n., 92
 Pallotti Donatella 2, 8
 Paprotté Wolf 26, 92
 Parr Katherine (Queen) 20n.
 Partridge Mary 16n., 92
 Pavlovskis-Petit Zoja 23n., 92
 Paynell Thomas 35, 36n., 78
 Peacham Henry 26n., 27, 76
 Pelling C.B.R. 59n., 63, 66n., 93
 Peltonen Markku 62, 93
 Perrin Bernadotte 66, 68-72, 76
 Pincombe Mike 14, 91, 93
 Pineaux Jacques 46n., 93
 Pliny The Elder 27n., 31, 34-35,
 39, 49, 76, 77
 Plutarch 5, 7, 19, 33-34, 36, 39,
 42-46, 47n.-48n., 49-53, 54n.,
 55, 58, 59n., 60-63, 65-69,
 73-81, 84-89, 91-97
 Po-Chia Hsia Ronnie 12, 14, 82
 Pocock J.G.A. 33, 93
 Polybius 12, 34-36, 39, 81
 Pompey 34
 Porto Emilio (Aemilius Portus) 41
 Prest W.R. 43n., 93
 Pugliatti Paola 2, 8, 62n., 93
 Puttenham George 26, 29, 78
 Pym Anthony 13, 93

 Quintilian 23n., 24-27, 78, 92
 Quintus Curtius 33-34, 36, 50, 78
 Raaflaub K.A. 63n., 93
 Radice Betty 68
 Radice William 93
 Raleigh Sir Walter 35
 Read Conyers 44n., 86, 93-94
 Reid Joshua 12, 93
 Rener F.M. 17-18, 27, 31, 49, 94
 Reynolds Barbara 68, 93
 Reynolds Matthew 14, 94
 Rhodes Cecil 19
 Rhodes Neil 13, 15, 16n., 17, 21,
 25n., 27n., 28, 30-31, 87, 94
 Rich Barnaby 76
 Richardson Christine 8
 Rieu E.V. 68
 Rosenberg Eleanor 19n., 44n., 94
 Russell D.A. 24, 50, 59n., 65n., 78,
 94
 Sadler John 35
 Sallust 34-35, 36n., 37-39, 78
 Salter Thomas 45, 78
 Savile Sir Henry 34, 38-41, 96
 Scarsi Selene 14, 18n., 94
 Schade Peter (Petrus Mosellanus) 78
 Schmidt Gabriela 14, 17, 90, 94
 Schottus 17
 Schurink Fred 11, 14, 15n., 16, 34 36-
 37, 38n., 39, 44, 65, 81, 89, 94, 96
 Scipio Africanus 39, 45n.
 Scott-Kilvert Ian 50-51, 53, 58, 62,
 66, 69-72, 78
 Serpieri Alessandro 54n., 83, 95
 Shakespeare William 5, 7, 25,
 43n., 45, 52-53, 54n.-56n., 58n.,
 59, 60-62, 63n., 73, 79-83, 85-
 91, 93, 95-96
 Sherbo Arthur 66, 95
 Sherry Richard 26, 79

- Sidney Sir Philip 28
 Smith Helen 27, 94-95
 Smith Miles 30, 79
 Smuts Malcom 39, 40, 95
 Smyth Nicholas 35
 Snell Hornby Mary 10, 95
 Sørensen Knud 12n., 95
 Sowerby Robin 12n., 38n., 39,
 41, 42n., 81, 95
 Spenser Edmund 28, 93
 Starnes De Witt T. 57n., 95, 103
 Steevens George 60
 Stein Gabriele 57n., 95
 Steiner George 13n., 15n., 95
 Steiner T.R. 14n., 95
 Stern Virginia 15, 95
 Stewart 66n., 67, 69-72, 79, 103
 Stirling Brents 61n., 95
 Stocker Thomas 35-36
 Stray Christopher 7, 87
 Sturel René 45n., 47n., 48, 95
 Sturge Kate 13n., 95
 Sturiale Massimo 20n., 95-96
 Suetonius 34-35, 57, 79
 Susenbrot Hans (Joannes
 Susenbrotus) 24-25, 79

 Tacitus 34, 36, 38--41, 89, 96
 Tatum J.W. 50-51, 53, 58, 62,
 66, 69-72, 78
 Taylor A.B. 54n., 81-82, 91
 Talyor A.W. 16, 96
 Thomas Thomas 2, 5, 16-17,
 19-20, 25, 28, 33, 36-38,
 41-43, 45, 47, 57, 61, 65,
 69-71, 73-75, 77-81, 84-85,
 91-92, 95-97
 Thucydides 34-36, 39, 41-42, 95
 Titchener Frances 65n.
 Titus Latinus 65n.
 Tomlinson Rowan 14, 45n., 46,
 81, 84

 Tonson Jacob 65-66, 75
 Toury Gideon 10n., 96
 Tribble E.B. 47n., 96
 Trogus Pompeius 28, 34-35, 79
 Tylus Jane 14, 92

 Valerius Maximus 34-35
 Valla Laurentius 41
 Valleius Paterculus 34
 Van Gorp Hendrik 9n.
 van Severen Gilliodts 61, 76
 Vautrollier Thomas 45n., 76, 77
 Vegetius 34-35, 39
 Venuti Lawrence 11n., 16n., 49n., 96
 Vickers Brian 26n., 96
 Vives 17

 Walsingham Sir Francis 44, 93
 Walter Gérard 45, 78
 Wardman Alan 62
 Watson Christopher 39
 Weiss Roberto 20n.
 Whibley Charles 18n., 96-97
 Whitehorne Peter 35
 Wilson John Dover 54n., 96
 Wilson Louise 94-95
 Wilson Thomas 26-28, 26n.-28n.,
 39n., 61, 75, 79
 Wilson-Lee Edward 14n., 14, 86
 Womersley David 30n., 36n., 38-40, 96
 Wood Michael 14, 80
 Woodsworth Judith 47n., 84-85
 Worth Valerie 43n., 46, 96
 Wrangham Francis 65, 76
 Wright Gillian 20n., 97
 Wrightson Keith 52n., 97
 Wyatt Michael 14, 91, 97
 Wyndham George 43n., 45n., 78, 97

 Xenophon 34-35, 39
 Xenophontos Sophia 65n.

 Zadorojhnyy Alexei 65n.

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LITERATURES AND INTERCULTURAL STUDIES
ADVISORY BOARD OF
BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI DI FILOLOGIA MODERNA:
SERIES, JOURNALS, AND OA PUBLISHING WORKSHOP

Published Works

The works listed below were submitted to Firenze University Press by the Advisory Board of the Dept. of Languages, Literatures and Intercultural Studies and set up for publication by its Open Access Publishing Workshop

Open Access Volumes

(<http://www.fupress.com/comitatoscienfico/biblioteca-di-studi-di-filologia-moderna/23>)

- Stefania Pavan, *Lezioni di poesia. Isif Brodskij e la cultura classica: il mito, la letteratura, la filosofia*, 2006 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 1)
- Rita Svandrlik (a cura di), *Elfriede Jelinek. Una prosa altra, un altro teatro*, 2008 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 2)
- Ornella De Zordo (a cura di), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Temi e prospettive di ricerca*, 2008 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 66)
- Fiorenzo Fantaccini, *W. B. Yeats e la cultura italiana*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 3)
- Arianna Antonielli, *William Blake e William Butler Yeats. Sistemi simbolici e costruzioni poetiche*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 4)
- Marco Di Manno, *Tra sensi e spirito. La concezione della musica e la rappresentazione del musicista nella letteratura tedesca alle soglie del Romanticismo*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 5)
- Maria Chiara Mocali, *Testo. Dialogo. Traduzione. Per una analisi del tedesco tra codici e varietà*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 6)
- Ornella De Zordo (a cura di), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Ricerche in corso*, 2009 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 95)
- Stefania Pavan (a cura di), *Gli anni Sessanta a Leningrado. Luci e ombre di una Belle Époque*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 7)
- Roberta Carnevale, *Il corpo nell'opera di Georg Büchner. Büchner e i filosofi materialisti dell'Illuminismo francese*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 8)
- Mario Materassi, *Go Southwest, Old Man. Note di un viaggio letterario, e non*, 2009 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 9)
- Ornella De Zordo, Fiorenzo Fantaccini, *altri canonici / canonici altri. pluralismo e studi letterari*, 2011 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 10)
- Claudia Vitale, *Das literarische Gesicht im Werk Heinrich von Kleists und Franz Kafkas*, 2011 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 11)
- Mattia Di Taranto, *L'arte del libro in Germania fra Otto e Novecento: Editoria bibliofila, arti figurative e avanguardia letteraria negli anni della Jahrhundertwende*, 2011 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 12)
- Vania Fattorini (a cura di), *Caroline Schlegel-Schelling: «Ero seduta qui a scrivere»*. Lettere, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 13)
- Anne Tamm, *Scalar Verb Classes. Scalarity, Thematic Roles, and Arguments in the Estonian Aspectual Lexicon*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 14)
- Beatrice Töttösy (a cura di), *Fonti di Weltliteratur. Ungheria*, 2012 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 143)

- Beatrice Töttössy, *Ungheria 1945-2002. La dimensione letteraria*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 15)
- Diana Battisti, *Estetica della dissonanza e filosofia del doppio: Carlo Dossi e Jean Paul*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 16)
- Fiorenzo Fantaccini, Ornella De Zordo (a cura), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Percorsi di ricerca*, 2012 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 144)
- Diana Battisti, *Estetica della dissonanza e filosofia del doppio: Carlo Dossi e Jean Paul*, 2012 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 16)
- Fiorenzo Fantaccini, Ornella De Zordo (a cura), *Saggi di anglistica e americanistica. Percorsi di ricerca*, 2012 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 144)
- Martha L. Canfield (a cura di), *Perù frontiera del mondo. Eielson e Vargas Llosa: dalle radici all'impegno cosmopolita = Perú frontera del mundo. Eielson y Vargas Llosa: de las raíces al compromiso cosmopolita*, 2013 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 17)
- Gaetano Prampolini, Annamaria Pinazzi (eds), *The Shade of the Saguaro / La sombra del saguaro: essays on the Literary Cultures of the American Southwest / Ensayos sobre las culturas literarias del suroeste norteamericano*, 2013 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 18)
- Ioana Both, Ayşe Saraçgil, Angela Tarantino (a cura di), *Storia, identità e canoni letterari*, 2013 (Strumenti per la didattica e la ricerca; 152)
- Valentina Vannucci, *Lecture anticanoniche della biofiction, dentro e fuori la metafinzione*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 19)
- Serena Alcione, *Wackenroder e Reichardt. Musica e letteratura nel primo Romanticismo tedesco*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 20)
- Lorenzo Orlandini, *The relentless body. L'impossibile elisione del corpo in Samuel Beckett e la noluntas schopenhaueriana*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 21)
- Carolina Gepponi, *Un carteggio di Margherita Guidacci*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 22)
- Valentina Milli, «*Truth is an odd number*». *La narrativa di Flann O'Brien e il fantastico*, 2014 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 23)
- Diego Salvadori, *Il giardino riflesso. Lerbario di Luigi Meneghello*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 24)
- Sabrina Ballestracci, Serena Grazzini (a cura di), *Punti di vista - Punti di contatto. Studi di letteratura e linguistica tedesca*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 25)
- Massimo Ciaravolo, Sara Culeddu, Andrea Meregalli, Camilla Storskog (a cura di), *Forme di narrazione autobiografica nelle letterature scandinave. Forms of Autobiographical Narration in Scandinavian Literature*, 2015 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 26)
- Arianna Antonielli, Mark Nixon (eds), *Edwin John Ellis's and William Butler Yeats's The Works of William Blake: Poetic, Symbolic and Critical. A Manuscript Edition, with Critical Analysis*, 2016 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 33)
- Augusti Brettoni, Ernestina Pellegrini, Sandro Piazzesi, Diego Salvadori (a cura di), *Per Enza Biagini*, 2016 (Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna; 34)

Open Access Journals

(<<http://www.fupress.com/riviste/>>)

«Journal of Early Modern Studies», ISSN: 2279-7149

«LEA – Lingue e Letterature d'Oriente e d'Occidente», ISSN: 1824-484X

«Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali / Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies», ISSN: 2421-7220

«Studi Irlandesi. A Journal of Irish Studies», ISSN: 2239-3978