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Abstract

‘An ocean untouched and untried’: Translating Livy in the Sixteenth Century

John-Mark Philo, Worcester College
D. Phil. English
Submitted Trinity Term, 2015

This is a study of the translation and reception of the Roman historian Livy in the sixteenth century in the British Isles. The thesis examines five major translations of Livy’s history of Rome, the *Ab Urbe Condita*, into the English and Scottish vernaculars. The texts considered here span from the earliest extant translation of around 1533 to the first, full-scale translation published in 1600. By taking a broad view across the century, the thesis uncovers the multiple and versatile uses to which Livy was being put and maps out the major trends surrounding his reception. The first chapter examines Livy’s initial reception into print in Europe, outlining the attempts of his earliest editors to impose a critical order onto his enormous work. The subsequent chapters consider the respective translations undertaken by John Bellenden, Anthony Cope, William Thomas, William Painter, and Philemon Holland. Each translation is treated as a case study and compared in detail with the Latin original, thereby revealing the changes Livy’s history experienced through the process of translation. By locating these translations in the cultural and political contexts from which they emerged, this study reveals how Livy was exploited in some of the most pressing debates of the period, from arguments over women’s apparel to questions of faith. The thesis also considers how these translations responded to the most recent developments in European scholarship on the *Ab Urbe Condita* and on classical history more generally. Livy’s contribution to the development of Scottish historiography is also considered, both as a stylistic model and as a rich source of narrative material. Ultimately this thesis demonstrates that Livy played a fundamental though hitherto underexplored role in the development of vernacular literature and historiography in the British Isles.
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Introduction

This is a thesis on the translation and reception of the Roman historian Livy in the British Isles during the sixteenth century. It explores the role played by Livy’s history of Rome, the *Ab Urbe Condita* (hereafter *AUC*) in some of the most pressing concerns of the day, from Tudor foreign policy to the Renaissance debate over women. The thesis takes its title from Andrea Bussi’s (1417–75) description of the history as an ‘intactum pelagus atque inexpertum’ (‘an ocean untouched and untried’).\(^1\) This study examines the attempts of Livy’s early modern readers and translators to navigate this vast, historical expanse.

Livy was born in Patavium, modern day Padua, and lived between 64BC and 12AD.\(^2\) He began writing his history between 27 and 25BC.\(^3\) According to Seneca, he was also the author of philosophical dialogues, though these have not survived.\(^4\) Livy was a contemporary of Octavian, later Augustus (63BC–AD14), and his relationship with the emperor has been the subject of much critical debate.\(^5\) As a speech by the historian Cremutius Cordus (recorded by Tacitus) suggests, Livy had backed the wrong horse during the civil wars: ‘Titus Livius, eloquentiae ac fidei praecelarum in primis, Cn. 

---

\(^1\) Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* (Rome: Konrad Sweinheim and Arnold Pannartz, 1469) 2° I have included running translations of foreign language material. Translations of individual words and smaller phrases appear in curved brackets in the main text, while longer translations appear in footnotes. All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.


\(^4\) ‘scripsit enim et dialogos, quos non magis philosophiae adnumerare possis quam historiae, et ex professo philosophiam continentes libros’ (‘he also wrote dialogues, which you can count as history no less than philosophy, and books avowedly containing philosophy’). Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, 100.9.

Pompeium tantis laudibus tuit ut Pompeianum eum Augustus appellaret’.\(^6\) It seems reasonable to assume with Bernard Mineo, however, ‘that Livy, similar to Virgil or Horace, faced with either chaos or the hope of a return to civil harmony, had preferred the second option’.\(^7\) Livy was thought by at least some early modern readers to have been at the heart of Roman political life. Thus Antoine De La Faye (1540–1615) in the preface to his French language translation of 1582 remarked that ‘c’est un histoire, voire histoire excellente, d’un peuple excellent, descrite non par quelque tel quel apprenti, main par T. Liue, florissant du bon temps des Cesars, & precepteur mesme d’un Caesar’.\(^8\) De La Faye probably has in mind Suetonius’s remarks concerning the formative years of the emperor Claudius: ‘Historiam in adolescentia hortante T. Liuio, Sulpicio vero Flauo etiam adiuuante, scribere adgressus est’.\(^9\) Livy’s apparent encouragement of Claudius to write history, however, need not imply the full-time employment suggested by De La Faye’s precepteur.

Roman histories can be divided into essentially two kinds. The first is the monograph, typically written on a particular historical moment or war, of which the most notable surviving examples are Sallust’s *Bellum Iugurthinum* and *Bellum Catilinae*. The second kind follows the annalistic style, cataloguing the domestic and foreign affairs of the Roman people and structured around the consular year.\(^10\) Livy wrote the *AUC* in the latter mode, punctuating his history with narrative set pieces such as the rape of Lucretia and the death of Verginia. In terms of Livy’s style, Quintilian (c.25AD–c.90)

---

\(^6\) ‘Titus Livius, famed for eloquence and credibility among the best, extolled Gnaeus Pompeius with such great praise that Augustus called him “Pompeian”’. Tacitus, *Annales*, 4.34.

\(^7\) Mineo, xxii.

\(^8\) ‘It is a history, indeed an outstanding history, of an outstanding people, written not by some apprentice, but by Titus Livy, who flourished at the height of the Caesars, and was himself a tutor to a Caesar’. Antoine De La Faye, *Histoire Romaine de Tite Live Padovan* (Geneva: Jacob Stoer, 1582) a2v.

\(^9\) ‘In his youth he started to write history with the encouragement of Titus Livius and indeed the help of Sulpicius Flavus’. Suetonius, *Claudius* (41).

records a remark made by the literary critic and historian Gaius Asinius Pollio (76BC–AD4) concerning Livy’s alleged Patavinitas. Given the context (the comment appears in a passage urging the orator to avoid foreign and dialectical idiosyncrasies), it seems that some of Livy’s contemporaries found something slightly provincial about his language.\(^\text{11}\)

Of an original 142, only thirty-four books of the \textit{AUC} now survive (books 1–10 and 21–45) along with a few other fragments. Yet almost all of the \textit{Periochae}, short summaries of the individual books, are extant, including those which describe the lost decades. As Michael Reeve has observed, although the transmission of the \textit{Periochae} was distinct from that of Livy’s text during the middle ages, they were frequently printed alongside the history from the editio princeps onwards.\(^\text{12}\) As Freyja Cox Jensen has argued, for the early modern reader the \textit{Epitome} offered a gateway into the intimidating expanse of the text itself.\(^\text{13}\) It was once believed that Pope Gregory I (540–604) was responsible for destroying Livy’s lost books, having expunged them from his library to allow more space for Biblical texts. This tale was rehearsed in Isaac Casaubon’s (1559–1614) 1609 edition of Polybius, while Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527) had referred to Gregory’s hostility towards classical texts in his \textit{Discorsi sopra la Prima Deca di Tito Livio}.\(^\text{14}\) This rumour was perhaps inspired by Suetonius’s description of how Caligula (12–41AD) came close to removing Livy’s history from ‘all the libraries’, dismissing him as a ‘verbose and negligent’ historian.\(^\text{15}\) But Livy also had his

\(^\text{11}\) \textit{et in Tito Livio, mirae facundiae viro, putat inesse Pollio Asinius quandam Patavinitatem.} (‘And Pollio Asinius thought that there was a certain Patavinity even in Titus Livius, a man of remarkable eloquence’); Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, 8.1.3. Cf. Ibid. 1.5.56.
\(^\text{15}\) \textit{Sed et Vergili ac Titi Livii scripta et imagines paulum afuit quin ex omnibus bibliothecis amoveret, quorum alterum ut nullius ingenii minimaque doctrinae, alterum verbosum in historianeglegentem}
ancient admirers. According to Pliny the Younger (c.62AD–114), such was Livy’s fame during his lifetime that an inhabitant of Cádiz was inspired to travel to Rome purely to see the historian in the flesh.\textsuperscript{16} Pliny himself even found time to peruse Livy’s writings during the eruption of Vesuvius.\textsuperscript{17}

Livy was received with enthusiasm in the Italian Renaissance. For Dante (1265–1321) he was ‘Livio […] che non erra’ (‘Livy who does not err’), while Petrarch (1304–74) played no small role in his textual transmission.\textsuperscript{18} As Giuseppe Billanovich demonstrated, Petrarch’s annotated copy of Livy (now preserved at the British Library) came into the possession of the celebrated philologist Lorenzo Valla (1407–57), who implemented Petrarch’s readings in his \textit{Emendationes} on the \textit{AUC}.\textsuperscript{19} Boccaccio (1313–75) relied on Livy for the \textit{De Mulieribus Claris}, his collection of famous women, and is commonly identified as the author of a fourteenth-century vernacular translation of the history.\textsuperscript{20} As Jillian Robbins has shown, episodes from Livy’s history were frequently reworked in the visual arts in Renaissance Italy.\textsuperscript{21}

carpebat.’ (‘Moreover, he all but removed the writings and likenesses of Virgil and Titus Livius from all the libraries, the former of whom he slandered as having no talent and very little learning, the latter as verbose and negligent in his history’). Suetonius, \textit{Gaius}, 34.

\textsuperscript{16} ‘Numquamne legisti, Gaditanum quendam Titi Livi nomine gloriaque commotum ad visendum eum ab ultimo terrarum orbe venisse, statimque ut viderat abisse?’ (‘Have you never read of a certain man of Cádiz, who, moved by the name and renown of Titus Livius, came from the ends of the earth to see him, and, once he had seen him, immediately departed?’) Pliny the Younger, \textit{Epistles}, 2.3.

\textsuperscript{17} In a letter to Tacitus, Pliny explains that as the earth quaked, ‘posco librum Titi Livi, et quasi per otium lego atque etiam ut coeperam excerpo’ (‘I asked for my book of Titus Livius, and, as if at leisure, read and still gathered extracts as I had begun to do’). Pliny, \textit{Epistles}, 6.20.5.


Livy’s reception in the early modern period has attracted some detailed critical interest. Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton launched the modern study of the history of reading with their article on Gabriel Harvey’s (1552/3–1631) annotated copy of the AUC. Fred Schurink subsequently used this study as a springboard for his own research on Anthony Cope’s (1486/7–1551) translation of Livy. Peter Culhane has produced studies on Philemon Holland’s (1552–1637) translation and the historical context from which it emerged, and on Livy’s place within early modern theatre. Livy’s reception on the continent has also been explored in some detail. This is the first thesis-length study, however, to pursue the question of Livy’s reception in the British Isles. In doing so, it highlights Livy’s enduring contribution to the development of vernacular literature and historiography throughout the sixteenth century.

The thesis is structured chronologically around five major translations of Livy into the English and Scottish vernaculars undertaken across the sixteenth century. The first chapter begins slightly earlier, however, by exploring Livy’s initial reception into print in 1469. This chapter examines the literary fame enjoyed by Livy in Europe towards the end of the fifteenth century as well as the attempts of his earliest editors in print to impose some kind of critical order onto this monolithic work. Chapter two focuses on John Bellenden’s (c.1495–1545x8) translation of the first five books into Scots, completed in around 1533. This chapter establishes some scholarly essentials,

including the edition of Livy from which Bellenden was working as well as the hermeneutic tools at his disposal. Chapter three moves the focus south of the border by examining Sir Anthony Cope’s (1486/7–1551) appeal to contemporary, diplomatic lexicons in his treatment of the Second Punic War. Chapter four identifies William Thomas’s (d.1554) translation of Livy as a hitherto unremarked contribution to the English querele des femmes. Chapters five and six deal with William Painter’s (1540?–1595) selections from Livy for the first and second volumes of his Palace of Pleasure (1566; 1567). These chapters explore the special attention paid by Painter to the first three books of the AUC and posit his novel, the Two Roman Queenes, as a new source for Shakespeare’s (1564–1616) Macbeth. The final chapter turns to Philemon Holland’s (1552–1637) Romane Historie (1600), the first full-scale translation of Livy into English, completed in the closing years of the sixteenth century. This chapter examines Holland’s treatment of the Bacchanalian scandal and the dialogue he established between illicit religious rites at Rome and contemporary responses to Jesuit seminary priests.

By tracing Livy’s reception and translation across a broad period (1469–1600), this thesis identifies some major trends surrounding Livy’s reception in the British Isles. As Jardine and Grafton have shown, Livy was being read in the sixteenth century for lessons in war, politics, and governance.26 For the most part, this represents the importance of Livy’s history for Bellenden, Cope, and Holland. Livy was also popular amongst educators. The humanist and statesman Thomas Elyot (1490–1546) compiled The Governour (1531) with an eye to the ‘education of them, that hereafter may be demed worthy to be gouernours of the publike weale’.27 Here he urged that the young

student begin his studies by reading Livy ‘not onely for his elegancie of writinge […] but also for as moche as by redyng that auctor, he may knowe, howe the most noble citie of Rome of a small and pore begynnynge, by prowes and vertue, lyttel and lyttel came to the empire and dominion of all the worlde’. The daughters of Sir Thomas More (1478–1535) were, according to Erasmus (c.1466–1536), set to reading the AUC. As Lorna Hutson notes, Sir Francis Walsingham (c.1532–1590) advised his nephews to read ‘Titus Livius and all the Roman histories which you shall find in Latin’, the which ‘shall cause you in process of time to frame better courses both of action and counsel, as well in your priuate life as in public government’. Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540) in the De Disciplinis (1531), a vast treatise on education, included Livy first and foremost among those authors to be read by the young student. The first printed catalogue for the Bodleian Library (1605) cites three copies of Livy’s history. These include a 1588, Froben edition, a 1547 translation of the history into Italian, and an unspecified, 1573 edition, probably one of the three Parisian volumes produced in that year. Livy was evidently seen as a model of good prose and good historiography for the young student.

Roman Catholic and Protestant authors alike exploited Livy in arguments concerning faith and religious practice. Thus the radical Protestant John Hooper (c.1495–1555) incorporated examples from the AUC in his Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandementes (1549), while Stephen Gardiner (c.1495–1555) enlisted Livy to

---

28 ibid. 36v.
29 Thus Erasmus remarks of More’s daughters that ‘Nullam illic videbis ociosam, nullam ineptis muliebribus occupatam. Illis T. Liuius est in manibus’ (‘You won’t see any of them there idle, or employed with womanly trifles. They have Titus Livius in their hands’). Erasmus, Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami, P. S. Allen et al. (eds), 12 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906–58) III. 577.
31 Juan Luis Vives, Ioannis Lodovici Vivis de Disciplinis: Libri XX (Köln: Johann Gymnich, 1532) 301.
32 In contrast, the catalogue includes only one entry for Tacitus. Thomas James, The First Printed Catalogue of the Bodleian Library (1605) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986) 342; 396.
support the doctrine of transubstantiation. Chapter three includes a specific case study, namely a sermon by the Catholic James Brookes (1512–1558), as a demonstration of how Livy’s history could be yoked to a particular religious debate.

Livy was also being read for his depiction of extraordinary women. Time and again, early modern readers and authors appealed to Livy for his examples of women who behaved outside what were believed to be their natural bounds. The translations by Thomas and Painter can best be understood as responses to this literary and cultural trend. Thomas tapped into a tradition established in Quattrocento Italy which read Livy as a champion of womankind, while Painter developed a space in vernacular literature for female characters who played active roles in politics. As demonstrated in the chapters that follow, this was one of the strongest trends surrounding Livy’s reception in the British Isles.

Livy played no small part in the development of early modern historiography. Chapter one discusses Livy’s importance as a stylistic model for the Scottish historians Hector Boece (c.1465–1536) and John Mair (c.1467–1550). Chapter six returns to Boece’s national history of Scotland, the *Scotorum Historia* (1526), to explore how Boece fleshed out the bare bones of his narrative by borrowing material from Livy’s history of Rome. As the chapter suggests, this has significant implications for how we understand the transmission of Scottish history in the sixteenth century.

Each chapter is concerned with the changes experienced by Livy’s history during the process of translation. In the early modern period, translation functioned as ‘part of a continuum that includes imitation, paraphrase, and commonplacing, as well as what we

---

33 John Hooper, *A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandements* (Zurich: Augustine Fries, 1549); Pri’; Stephen Gardiner, *An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholique Fayth* ([Rouen: R. Caly], 1551) 102.
might consider to be original composition’. This study highlights the expansions, contractions, and occasionally radical transformations which the AUC underwent in the hands of its sixteenth-century translators, comparing the new, vernacular works in detail with the Latin original.

This research is grounded in the examination of archival material from multiple university and national collections. This study has also been enabled by recent developments in digital archiving, which has opened up an impressive corpus of Neo-Latin scholarship published across Europe. The St Andrews Universal Short Title Catalogue is an extremely useful tool in this regard, offering an expansive view of works published in Europe in both Latin and the vernacular. An appreciation of the continental interest and scholarship surrounding Livy is fundamental to understanding his reception in the British Isles, where, as this thesis explores, his translators frequently took their cues from continental precedents.

The project is a timely one. As Translation Studies has emerged as an academic discipline in its own right, there has been a concomitant increase in works focusing on early modern translation. The Tudor and Stuart Translations series has produced a library of modern editions of translations from classical and continental languages, while the Renaissance Cultural Crossroads project has provided an online catalogue of

---

35 These include the university libraries of Glasgow, Edinburgh, St Andrews, and Aberdeen; the Bodleian library, Oxford; the college libraries of Oxford and those of the National Libraries (National Library of Scotland; British Library).
36 Collections of Livy online include those hosted by Biblioteca Digital Hispanica, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, the University of Gent, Cervantes Biblioteca Virtual, and the Hathi Trust Digital Library.
37 http://ustc.ac.uk/index.php
38 See, for example, Mike Pincombe (ed.), Travels and Translations in the Sixteenth Century (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Gabriela Schmidt (ed.), Elizabethan Translation and Literary Culture (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).
translations printed in Scotland, England, and Ireland prior to 1641. Gabriel Harvey’s personal copy of the AUC has now been made readily available through Annotated Books Online. Meanwhile, ‘Classical reception studies are booming’. In the last five years alone, there have been four monographs published on the reception of comparable classical authors in the early modern period. As critical interest in the reception of classical texts continues to grow, there is room to apply detailed scrutiny to the historians. By expanding the period of focus and examining the translations not only as events but works of literature in their own right, this study fills what is perhaps a surprising but genuine gap in current scholarship.

39 http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/rcc/index.php
40 http://abo.annotatedbooksonline.com/#binding-5-1
Chapter 1

The Reception of Livy in Europe and Scotland (1469–1533)

Introduction

This chapter explores Livy’s early reception in Renaissance Europe. It examines the first, key decades in which the history reached a wider audience through its publication and dissemination on the continent. It was during these years that a new style of reading and interpreting the history emerged, which sought to locate the work within its original cultural and semantic contexts. To assess how and why Livy was being read in Europe, this chapter provides the first, detailed analysis of Livy’s earliest appearance in print.¹

The first section lays out the literary fame enjoyed by Livy upon the publication of the editio princeps at Rome in 1469. The second deals with the textual interventions made by Livy’s earliest editors in print: Giovanni Andrea Bussi (1417–75), Marcantonio Cocci Sabellico (c.1436–1506), and Jodocus Badius Ascensius (1462–1535). Though previous scholarship has shed light on the manuscript transmission of the AUC, this section provides a detailed study of the history’s early print existence, highlighting the efforts of Livy’s first editors to construct a critical prism through which the history might be viewed.² Tracing the patterns of thought which developed around the text, this

---


section covers a period from the editio princeps of Konrad Sweynheim and Arnold Pannartz (fl.1463–77) in 1469 to the later, more accessible editions produced by Ascensius at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The third section examines the key role which the imitation and translation of Livy’s history played in the reinforcing and legitimising of power in courts across Europe. More specifically, it shows how Bellenden’s translation and reworking of the first five books (1533) under the patronage of James V sought to harness a continental model of culturally sanctioned legitimacy. Bellenden’s work is contextualised within a series of projects concerned with Scottish history. By appealing to the cultural prestige with which classical history had come to be associated, these projects sought to emulate and compete with similar, humanist works on the continent.

1. Reputation

When Sweynheim and Pannartz printed the AUC for the first time in 1469, Livy’s literary fame had long since been established among the Italian humanists. A perennial interest in Livy was sharpened by the tantalising prospect of discovering the lost books of the history. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, of an original 142 books, only 29 were thought to have survived (though Petrarch reports that this number was commonly rounded up to thirty). \(^3\) It was not until 1518 that a ‘perquam uetustum […]

---


\(^3\) ‘Vix triginta ex omnibus supersunt. O mos pessimus nosmet ipsos de industria fallendi! Triginta dixi quia omnes vulgo id dicunt, ego autem deesse unum his ipsis invenio’ (‘Scarcely thirty of them are extant. Oh what a most wretched habit of intentionally deceiving ourselves! I said ‘thirty’ because everyone typically says it, but I myself have found that there is one book missing’). Francesco Petrarca, ‘Ad Titum Livium Historicum’, *Canzoniere, Trionfi, Familiarium Rerum Libri* (Florence: Sansoni, 1975) *Epist.* XXIV.8, 1, 1265–66 (1265).
A ‘codicem’ (‘extremely old codex’) was uncovered at the cathedral library at Mainz, which included two sections of the history previously assumed lost. This was followed by a second and yet more dramatic discovery in 1527 made by Simon Grynaeus (c.1494–1541), German humanist and sometime professor of Greek at the University of Basel. Grynaeus unearthed a manuscript at a monastery in Lorsch containing five books of Livy’s fifth decade (41–45). Before these discoveries were made, however, rumours abounded as to the survival of the missing decades. In a letter written towards the end of the fourteenth century and addressed to the Margrave of Moravia, Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) responded to the promise that ‘totus vel maxima pars’ (‘the whole or at least the greatest part’) of the history had been found in the monastery of St Benedict at Lübeck. Coluccio had his doubts, but the hope, however small, of recovering the lost books proved too strong a temptation to ignore. As the humanist and jurist Sicco Polenton (1375–1447) remarked in correspondence with Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444), ‘tantum enim valet iocundissimum T. Liuii nomen, quod nihil insulsum reputatur, in quo vir ipse nominatus sit’. Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), rescuer of classical works per excellence, expresses a similar curiosity in a letter to Niccolò Niccoli (c.1365–1437), dated 8 January, 1428. A Danish monk has arrived in the court of Pope Nicholas V (1397–1455), bringing fresh hope that the lost books may yet be recovered: ‘idem retulit se vidiisse X decades Livii, duobus voluminibus magnis et oblongis, scriptas litteris

---

4 These sections included the latter chapters of book 33 (33.17–49), featuring Hannibal’s flight to Syria, and a section of book 40 (40.37–59). They appeared in print for the first time in the 1519 edition published by Johann Schöffer (c.1475–c.1531). Livy, T. Liius Patauinus Historicus. Duobus Libris Auctus (Mainz: Johann Schöffer, 1519) Tt'. The first half of book 33 was not recovered until 1615; it was published in the following year at Rome. Cf. Gian Conte, Latin Literature: A History (London: John Hopkins University Press, 1999) 375.

5 These books were printed for the first time in the Froben edition of 1531, prefaced with a dedicatory epistle by Erasmus: T. Livii Patavini Latinae Historiae Principis Quicquid Hactenus Fuit Aeditum.


7 ‘Indeed the most delightful name of Titus Livius carries such weight that nothing is thought absurd in which this man has been named’. Sicco Polenton, La Catinia, le Orazioni e le Epistole di Sicco Polenton, ed. Arnaldo Segarizzi (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano D’Arte Grafiche, 1899) 160.
Much like Salutati, Bracciolini had his reservations as to the accuracy of this claim, but once again the very mention of Livy’s name was enough to quell his scepticism: ‘melius est enim peccare in hanc partem, ex qua tantum lucrum fieri posset quam esse omnino incredulus’. Some twenty years later in 1451, Pope Nicholas sent Enoch of Ascoli to Northern Europe to seek out the lost books of Livy. Four years later he returned, having failed to recover anything of the AUC. These attempts, albeit unsuccessful, speak of a very genuine desire to uncover yet more of the historian’s work.

So great was his reputation, in fact, that something close to celebrity had attached itself to the name of Livy. This is evinced by a curious episode recorded by Sicco Polenton in a letter to the aforementioned Niccolò Niccoli. During building work at the church of St Justina in Padua, a coffin was discovered. The body within was assumed to be none other than that of Livy himself: ‘Livii mox clamatur, quod relatu patrum sepultus ibi Livius haberetur’. The discovery was immediately announced to the city dignitaries, who pledged a yet more splendid resting place for the bones. Of special interest is the reverence with which the remains were treated, a respect more typically reserved for saints. This quasi-worship was enough to excite the concerns of one monk to whom the bones had been entrusted for safekeeping: ‘concursu hominum terrefactus, fortasse futurum ratus his istis ossibus, si diutius superessent, ad gentilia popula revocari

---

8 ‘The same man stated that he had seen ten decades of Livy in two immense and rather long volumes, written in Longobardian script […] and that he had read some of these volumes’. Poggio Bracciolini, Poggio Bracciolini Lettere, ed. Leo S. Olschki (Florence: Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, 1984) I.74.
9 ‘It is better to err in this respect, from which such great gain could arise, than to be altogether disbelieving’. Ibid. I.74.
11 This account is paraphrased in Ullman, 53-77.
12 ‘Soon they shout the name of ‘Livy’, because Livy, according to the city fathers, was thought to be buried there’. Polenton, 78.
13 ibid. 78
[...] puro homini videbatur hunc quasi deum coli’. Faced with potential idolatry, he decides that the skeleton must be destroyed and manages to grind down the skull before he can be stopped by his brethren. The teeth had already gone missing, stolen by students by way of a memento – we might compare those holy relics pervading the Middle Ages which so often included skeletal fragments, supposedly taken from a particular saint. What is left of the corpse was then carried in procession to the town hall, while a crowd gathered carrying garlands of laurel, a nod to Livy’s literary triumphs. It was then unanimously decided that a new tomb would be constructed at public expense.

This curious tale tells us something important about Livy’s increasing fame: his remains were found because Padua’s learned elite were ready, eager even, to find them. The physical testament of Livy’s existence was understandably of special importance to Padua, the historian’s place of birth. But the renown and cultural capital of such a popular figure could also be appropriated elsewhere. A Paduan engraving from 1451 records the donation of Livy’s tibia to King Alfonso of Aragon (1396–1458), where the gift is presented in direct relation to the king’s role as ‘STUDIORUM FAUTORI’ (‘patron of studies’).

The account of Livy’s re-interment at Padua gradually spread across Europe. Thus the 1518 Mainz edition of the AUC, edited by Nicholas Carbach and prefaced with an introduction by Erasmus, provides a visual reproduction of a monument from the church of St Justina at Padua, the same church to which Polenton refers above. On the

\[14\] ‘Terrified by the people rushing round, he reckoned that these bones, if they existed much longer, might lure the people back to pagan ways [...] it seemed to this holy man that he [Livy] was being worshipped like a God’. Ibid. 79

\[15\] Ibid. 79.

\[16\] Ibid. 81.


\[18\] Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 16 vols (1872) V. 2865.
page directly preceding the translation we find two boxes, one inside the other. The corners have been shaded to resemble shadows, giving the impression of a physical object. The smaller box contains capitalised text, and the overall effect is of a marble engraving:

![Figure 1. Livy’s epitaph as reproduced in the 1518 Mainz edition.](image)

T. LIVII PATAVINI
UNIUS OMNIUM MOR
TALIUM IUDICIO DI
GNI CVIVS PROPE IN
VICTO CALAMO INV
CTI P. R. RES GESTAE
CONSCRIBERENTUR

19 ‘[The tomb] of Titus Livius of Padua, worthy in the judgment of all mortal men, by whose almost unconquered pen the deeds of the unconquered republic were written’. Livy, *T. Livius Patavinus Historicus Duoibus Libris Auctus* (Mainz: Johann Schöffer, 1518) s.p.
Below this, we find the following printed in smaller characters: ‘Fragmentum Epitaphij T. Liuij Patauij in uestibulo diuae Iustinae in lapide uetustissimo’. It was before this same uestibulum that Petrarch had written his epistle ‘Ad Titum Livium Historicum’ (‘to the historian Titus Livius’). There Petrarch signed off ‘Apud superos, in ea parte Italie et in ea urbe in qua natus et sepultus es, in vestibulo Iustine virginis et ante ipsum sepulcri tui lapidem’. With this appeal to archeological evidence (one of the earliest, if not the earliest, of its kind), the reader is offered some insight into the life and death of Livy. For the readers of the 1518 Mainz edition, this visual supplement, which glances to Livy’s discovery and re-interment at Padua, served as an historical fact on which they might anchor their understanding of Livy.

2. Livy’s Reception in Print

This was then the increasing interest surrounding Livy which heralded the publication of the editio princeps in 1469. Between 1469 and 1533, around fifty editions of Livy were produced across Europe. During this period, multiple vernacular translations were also produced, some of which were, much like John Bellenden’s, dedicated to a specific monarch. This section examines the methods of three of Livy’s most important editors in print: Giovanni Andrea Bussi, Marcantonio Cocci (more commonly known as Sabellicus), and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. The rational behind this focus is twofold.

---

21. ‘Among the living, in the part of Italy and in the city in which you were born and buried, at the entrance of St Justina the virgin and before the very tombstone of your sepulchre’. Petrarch, Epist. XXIV. 8, I. 1266.
22. Pedro de la Vega’s Las quatorze decadas de Tito Livio, for instance, printed in 1520, was dedicated to Emperor Charles V (1500–1558), while the Romische Historie, printed in 1505 by Johann Schöffer at Mainz, was dedicated to Maximilian I (1459–1519).
Their editions had the most obvious impact on how Livy was being printed: the textual emendations they implemented along with their critical presentation of the history would be reproduced almost \textit{ad verbum} in subsequent editions. Secondly, theirs are the voices most readily heard in Bellenden’s translation of 1533. As will be explored in detail in the next chapter, through comparative analysis of the manuscripts and editions extant, it is clear that the variant readings offered by Sabellicus as well as the lexical aids offered by Ascensius had a direct influence on Bellenden’s Livy.

What is most striking about Livy’s initial reception into print is the text’s complete absence of any paratextual commentary, despite a long-standing critical interest in the \textit{AUC}. From as early as 1475 classical texts were beginning to be published alongside commentaries explaining and supplementing their content.\footnote{The first classical text to be published with commentary was Tibullus’ \textit{Elegiae} with notes by Bernardinus Cillenius (Rome: Georgius Lauer, 1475).} Discussing the growth of this trend towards the end of the fifteenth century, Howard Jones remarks that ‘Such has been the transformation in the presentation of the classical text that there are barely a half dozen major Latin writers whose works have not been printed with commentary’.\footnote{Howard Jones, \textit{Printing the Classical Text} (Utrecht: Hes & De Graaf Publishers, 2004) 88.} This half dozen included Livy. Unlike his fellow classical authors, whose works were being printed alongside marginal glosses and full-scale commentaries, not once from 1469 to 1533 was Livy published with anything approaching a comprehensive commentary. Petrarch, it is true, had annotated and edited his copy of Livy, yet it is not clear how far his readings were disseminated.\footnote{For Petrarch’s annotations on Livy, see Billanovich (1951) 137–208.} Andrea Bussi, bishop of Aleria and editor of the editio princeps, mentions Petrarch favourably in the dedicatory epistle as the first scholar to lecture on Livy in recent years (‘primi \textit{aevo nostro praelectoris’). However, as he explains, he has heard of Petrarch’s teaching only
in passing (‘quod fando accepi’). The first substantial commentaries on Livy, prepared by Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) and Sigismundus Gelenius (c.1498–1554), did not appear until 1535, when they were printed alongside the Basel edition of the history.

These were, however, textual *Annotationes* and were concerned less with matters of style and content and more with the problems of transmission.

The medieval manuscript versions of the history had included a kind of intratextual scaffolding in their chapter divisions and summaries. Though these divisions are relatively small intrusions when compared to the vast commentaries with which classical works were often juxtaposed, they reveal an attempt on the part of medieval readers and scribes to impose some kind of critical order onto this monolithic work. As Carlotta Dionissotti notes, Donato degli Albanzani (?1328–1411), friend of both Petrarch and Boccaccio and *grammaticus* at the University of Ravenne, carved Livy’s history into chapters and produced a *Tabula Titii Liuii*. His chapter divisions and summaries were subsequently incorporated into manuscript versions of Livy. Thus British Library MS Burney 198 includes the *Tabula* and works Donato’s chapter summaries into the text itself. And yet when we come to the first print editions, these chapter divisions and summaries have disappeared. The text and the text alone is printed on the page.

---

26 Livy (1469) 2v.
What then gave rise to this apparent jettisoning of (an albeit limited) paratextual scaffolding? There are practical factors to consider. As Dionisotti notes, the same Andrea Bussi in a 1469 edition of Aulus Gellius complained that the printing press was unable to accommodate the existing annotations: ‘impressoribus erat penitus nostris impossibile quicquam in marginibus effingere’. Above all, the sheer scale of Livy must have proved a daunting prospect to both humanist commentators and printers alike. The enormity of Livy’s work was proverbial. On the final page of the Advocates Manuscript

---

29 It was completely impossible for our printers to represent anything in the margins’. Quoted by Dionisotti, 534.
of Bellenden’s translation, an early reader has quoted Martial’s celebrated remarks on the history's expanse: ‘pellibus exiguis aratur Livius ingens, / quem mea non totum bibliotecha capit’. Tellingly, in describing the role of Vittorino da Feltre (1378–1446) as one of the first humanist schoolmasters to lecture on the AUC, Bussi appealed to mankind’s first attempt to cross the sea: ‘Liuium primus: ut intactum pelagus atque inexpertum noster Tiphys aperuit. & Patauinos thesauros Hesperidum hortis clusiores patefecit.’ Here in the guise of Tiphys, helmsman of the Argonauts, Vittorino embarks upon an ‘untouched’ ('intactum’) and ‘untried’ ('inexpertum’) stretch of ocean, an adventure on par with the search for the golden fleece. The sheer length of Livy’s history, then, may well have proved a deterrent for potential commentators.

Yet despite the absence of a running commentary or marginal annotation in the early editions, from the editio princeps onwards, Livy’s editors tried to establish something of a critical introduction to the history in their prefatory material. Andrea Bussi’s dedicatory epistle to Pope Paul II (1417–71) thus served as one of the first attempts in print to engage with the AUC on a critical level. The epistle, which originally prefaced the editio princeps, was reproduced in almost every Italian and French edition of Livy between 1469 and 1533. Beyond the blandishments and militant praise – at one point Bussi casts the historian as a demi-god, the ‘Hercules of histories’ (‘Herculem [...] historiarum’) – Bussi introduces a way of discussing Livy that would follow the historian well into the sixteenth century. Bussi appeals to Virgil, Rome’s imperial poet, as a means of highlighting Livy’s patriotic intent. Drawing from Virgil’s second Georgic, he prepares the reader for Livy’s celebrations of Roman grandeur:

[…] ut breuissime verissimeque Poeta magnus cecinerit.

30 'Huge Livy is ploughed on tiny parchments, whom my library cannot contain in his entirety’. National Library of Scotland, Advocates MS 18.3.12; cf. Martial, 14.190.
31 'He was the first, just as our Tiphys discovered the ocean untouched and untried, to lay open the Paduan treasures rather hidden away in the gardens of Italy'. Livy (1469) 2'
Here Bussi plays on the idea of Rome as an ever-increasing power, albeit that the application of its influence has significantly changed. He refers to Roman *imperium* no fewer than seven times throughout the epistle, and three times to her *maiestas*, words which Virgil had strongly associated with Rome in the *Aeneid*. He hails the city’s *magnitudo* (‘greatness’) a further three times and, on an equal number of occasions, invokes Rome as the supreme *potentatus* (‘power’). Bussi readily yokes Livy to this celebration of Rome’s imperial might, equating him with the empire itself as ‘Imperio par’ (‘equal to their empire’) and ‘Romani Imperii Liuium’ (‘Livy of the Roman empire’). 140 years later in his 1609 edition of Polybius, Isaac Casaubon employed a very similar idiom, remarking of Livy that ‘hoc solum ingenii (de historicis loquor) populus Rom. par imperio suo habuit’. In terms of the Rome’s historic narrative, the appeal to Virgil is particularly apt; Livy’s history begins with the events that formed the focus of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, that is, Aeneas’s flight from Troy and his arrival in Italy.

The next generation of Livy’s editors engaged more closely with the text on a critical level and attempted to reconstruct something of the original context in which the history was written. As with Bussi, they too depended on the reader’s familiarity with Virgil by way of introducing the work to a wider audience. In his 1491 Venice edition of Livy, Sabellicus proved far more forthcoming than Bussi in discussing his editorial method. The *Breuissimae in Livium Annotationes* which preface this edition reveal a

---

32 As the great poet sang very succinctly and accurately: ‘Rome clearly became the most beautiful of all states: / And enclosed her seven citadels in a wall’. Ibid. [1r]; cf. Virgil, *Georgics* 2.534-5.
33 For *imperium*, see Jupiter’s words to Venus: ‘imperium sine fine dedit’ (‘I have given them power without end’). Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.279. Cf. Ibid. 6.819-20. For *maiestas*, see Juno to Jupiter on the Roman people: ‘pro maiestate tuorum’ (‘for the sovereignty of your own’) Ibid. 12.820.
34 Livy (1469) [fol. 1r’]; [fol. 1’].
35 ‘the Roman people had in this genius alone (I mean among the historians) an equal to their empire’.
36 Polybius, oii’
36 Cf. Livy (1.1).
humanist urge to restore the history to a classical standard. In discussing his first emendation, Sabellicus acknowledges the textual tradition as it stands before defecting from it: ‘Facturus ne sim opereae precium sic vulgo omnes liuiani codices habent: vere Fabius Quintilianus docet non liuinium exorsum: sed facturusne opera[e] precium sim atque eo auctore ita reponendum curaui’. Hexameter verse was most often associated with epic poetry; it is the metre in which Virgil wrote his Aeneid. Livy’s metrical opening was perhaps read as an error by the history’s earliest scribes and the order of these words was amended. Thus the first printed editions of Livy in the fifteenth century preserve the alternative sequence: ‘Facturusne ne sim opere pretium’. Sabellicus re-established the metrical nuance of Livy’s opening line. Now from the very outset Livy was distinguished for his poetic flare. By reconstructing the original reading, Sabellicus attempted not only to restore the text to its ancient form, but also to offer a sense of how it was once being read, that is, with an eye to poetry. According to Quintilian, on whose authority Sabellicus amended the preface, the language of history was essentially poetic: ‘[historia] est enim proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum, et scribitur ad narrandum non ad probandum […] verbis remotioribus et liberioribus figuris narrandi taedium evitat’. Quintilian praises history for its ability to entertain rather than its accuracy, describing it in terms of what we might call prose-poetry (‘carmen solutum’). Above all the historian must avoid the taedium of a dull narrative, and in doing so should appeal to literary effect (‘verbis remotioribus et liberioribus figuris’). Livy himself in the preface states that he would, were he only a poet, begin his work,

---

37 Each Livy codex typically has ‘facturus ne sim operaec pretium’: in fact, Quintilian informs us that this is not how Livy begins, but rather ‘facturusne operaec precium sim’, and on his authority I have thus taken pains to restore it’. Livy, Historiae Romanae Decades (Venice: Johannes Rubeus Vercellensis, 1491) ci‘

38 Livy (1469) s.p.; Livy, Historiarum Decades I, II, et IV. (Treviso: Michael Manzolus, 1480) 1‘; Livy, Historiae Romanae Decades (Treviso: Johannes Rubeus Vercellensis, 1482) ciiv‘.

39 ‘History is indeed closest to the poets and is, to some degree, prose-poetry, and is written to relate events not to prove them […] it avoids dullness through rather recherché vocabulary and unrestrained figures of speech’. Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria (X.I.31).
‘votisque et precationibus deorum dearumque’ (‘with offerings and prayers to the gods and goddesses’).\(^{40}\) The invocation of the classical pantheon suggests more specifically those addresses with which epic poetry begins – Homer’s ‘ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα’ (‘sing to me of the man, O Muse’), Virgil’s ‘Musa, mihi causas memora’ (‘O Muse, remind me of the reasons’) – and thus Livy indicates that he is to present, as Virgil puts it, a ‘maior rerum […] ordo’ (‘a greater order of events’), covering a breadth and gravity of narrative equalling that of epic.\(^{41}\) Translating Livy’s appeal to the traditions of Greco-Roman poetry, John Bellenden said he would ‘convert oure prayeris be Imitacioun of poetis, to Implore with solemne cerymonis þe favour of goddis and goddesss’.\(^{42}\) Bellenden picked up Livy’s flirtation with this poetic trope at the beginning of his own verse ‘proloog’ with an invocation to ‘Armpipotent Lady Bellona’, ‘bricht apollo’, and ‘my souerane’ in the first, second, and third stanzas respectively.\(^{43}\) Bellenden thus took Sabellicus’ approach one step further by extending and realising what he understood to be the poetic intent of Livy’s preface.

Unlike those of Venice and Rome, the printers of Paris did not produce a Latin edition of the AUC during the fifteenth century.\(^{44}\) The texts published during this period included Virgil (of whom thirty-three editions were produced at Paris before 1500) and Cicero (twenty-three editions), but also the historians Sallust, Florus, Valerius Maximus, and Aurelius Victor, all of whom had already found their way into print.\(^{45}\) Livy would not appear at a Parisian press until the 1510 edition published by Jean Petit and edited by his protégé, Ascensius, the Flemish printer whom Paul White has recently identified as

\(^{40}\) Livy, praefatio, 13.
\(^{41}\) Homer, Odyssey, 1.1; Virgil, Aeneid, 1.8; 7.44.
\(^{43}\) ibid. I.2
\(^{44}\) There were, however, three vernacular translations published in this time, the first of which was printed by Antoine Caillaut and Jean du Pré in 1486.
\(^{45}\) Jones, 85.
‘one of the major driving forces of the Renaissance in France’.\textsuperscript{46} A further five Ascensian editions of Livy appeared in 1513, 1516, 1530, 1531, and 1533 respectively. Ascensius was also responsible for producing a version of Lorenzo Valla’s (1407–57) \textit{Emendationes in T. Livium} in 1528.\textsuperscript{47} Ascensius’ presentation of Livy’s text was evidently informed by Sabellicus’ desire to restore the history to its original state. He not only incorporates Sabellicus’ emendations, but also provides the reader with something of the work’s historical context. In his \textit{Explanatio}, Ascensius sought to remove the Christian connotations which had, via ecclesiastical usage, entrenched themselves in Latin vocabulary. Thus of dominus he remarks, ‘Dominus nunc venerationis & honoris nomen frequens est: antiquis autem tyranni & suis pro servis habentis: vocabulum erat’.\textsuperscript{48} The differentiation Ascensius draws between the here and now (‘nunc’) and the historical context in which Livy was writing (‘antiquis autem’) could not be clearer. The idea is to semantically bleach the Latin of its medieval colourings, to read Livy, as far as is possible, with an eye to the author’s personal experience of the language.

For Ascensius then, the emphasis was very much on establishing the history as a work of pagan Rome. As with Sabellicus, Ascensius introduces the text by describing Livy’s preface as borrowing from the language of Roman poetry. Using his predecessor’s emendations as an interpretive springboard, Ascensius argues that the language (let alone the metrical quality) of the phrase ‘facturusne operae pretium’ places Livy firmly within the Greco-Roman poetic tradition:

\begin{quote}
Nam facere poetarum est propium. vnde Maro. Pollio & ipse facit noua carmina. Et Comicus. Populo ut placerent quas fecisset fabulas: vnde graeco verbo ποιέω
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{47} Lorenzo Valla, \textit{Libri Duo […] Quibus Historiam a se Scriptam Defendit et Livianam Corrigit et Emendat} (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1528).

\textsuperscript{48} ‘Dominus is now often used as a word of reverence and honour: among the ancients it was the word used of a ruler on account of his owning slaves’. Livy, \textit{Titi Liuii Patauini Historici Clarissimi: Quae Extant Decades} (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius and John Petit, 1516) aaii
Here Ascensius appeals to Latin authors familiar to the Renaissance schoolroom in an attempt to familiarise the contemporary reader with the comparative novelty of Livy. His first comparison (‘Pollio &…’) he takes from Virgil’s *Eclogues*, the second (‘Populo ut placerent...’) from the prologue to Terence’s *Andrea*, both of which were used as examples in contemporary grammars and textbooks. The comparison Ascensius draws with Christian prayer forms is just that, a comparison: there is no combing the text for hidden nods to Christianity.

Ascensius again turned to poetry to explain another feature of Livy’s preface. Livy explains that even if his work were to be submerged in a host of competing histories, ‘nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum qui nomini officient meo consoler’ (‘I would take solace in the renown and greatness of those who obscured my name’), of which Ascensius remarks: ‘quod licet vincí triste est tamen non nisi a maximis vincí posse gloriae deputatur [...] Et contra Aeneas miserantem Lauso moribundo dixit: Hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem Aeneae magni dextra cadis.’ Ascensius once again quotes from Virgil, trading on his familiarity. Significantly, he draws an example from Virgil’s ‘maius opus’, and, like Livy, implicitly suggests the similarities between history

---

49 ‘To make’ is a poetic device. Whence Virgil has, ‘And Pollio himself makes new songs’. And the comic playwright has, ‘that the plays he has written might please the people’. Whence ‘poet’ which is from the Greek word, ποιέω, that is, ‘I make’. To the extent that we sing of God as maker of heaven and Earth in the Apostles’ Creed, so the Greeks sing ‘poet”.


51 Livy, *praefatio*, 3; ‘Though being conquered is bitter, it cannot be considered glorious unless at the hands of the greatest men. And thus Aeneas said to the dying Lausus: ‘yet you should find solace in this for your pitiful death, that you die by the hand of great Aeneas’.”

and epic.\textsuperscript{53} With these literary parallels, Ascensius attempts to show not only how Livy writes, but how history should be read, namely with an eye to epic poetry.

Livy and the composition of a Livian style of history were also associated with Virgil in Scotland in the first half of the sixteenth century. During the minority of James V, the humanist and contemporary of Bellenden, Hector Boece (c.1465–1536), composed the \textit{Scotorum Historia} (1526), which not only drew on Livy in terms of style but, as is explored in chapter six, also incorporated key sections of the \textit{AUC} in an effort to fill in the historical blanks of Scotland’s past. In writing a linear narrative of Scotland’s growth, Boece sought to harness the \textit{Aeneid}’s function as an aetiological account of the foundation of Rome. Thus in his dedicatory epistle to James Beaton (c.1473–1539), archbishop of St Andrews, he employs a series of indirect questions which suggest a resonance with Virgil’s epic: ‘quae prisca Scotorum genti fuerit origo, quas sedes, quibus sub ducibus priusquam in Albionem venissent tenuere […] in lucem extuli’.\textsuperscript{54} The successive interrogatives here recall the list of questions Virgil poses in the invocations at the beginning of the first and seventh books of the \textit{Aeneid}.\textsuperscript{55} Tellingly, the passage from Boece in which these indirect questions appear juxtaposes the words ‘pietatem’ and ‘insigni’, a nod to Aeneas’s celebrated epithet deployed by Virgil in his first invocation.\textsuperscript{56} Boece’s \textit{Historia} was printed by the same Ascensius who produced multiple editions of both Livy and Virgil at Paris. In the prefatory poem addressed to James V, Ascensius also nods to Virgil’s epic: ‘Iuppiter ergo bonus faxit, diuique

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, 7.45.

\textsuperscript{54} ‘I have brought out into the light what was the ancient origin of the Scottish people, and what places they occupied under which leaders before they came into Albion’. Hector Boece, \textit{Scotorum Historia} (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1527) avi’.

\textsuperscript{55} ‘Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso / quidue dolens regina deum tot uoluere casus / insignem pietate uirum […] impulerit’ (‘O Muse, tell me the reasons why, through what divinity injured, or wherefore grieving, the queen of the gods drove a man outstanding for his devotion, to tumble through so many misfortunes’). Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, 1.8–11; ‘Nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora, rerum / quis Latio antiquo fuerit status […] mone’ (‘Now, Erato, tell me, who were the kings, what were the times, what was the state of ancient Latium’). Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, 7.37–41.

\textsuperscript{56} ‘insignem pietate uirum’ (‘a man outstanding for his devotion’). Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, 1.10.
fauentes, / Per te claudatur Martia porta’. Ascensius’s ‘Martia porta’ refers to the Gates of War housed in the temple of Janus, which were symbolically closed during peacetime. In the first book of the Aeneid, Jupiter, predicting the pax Augusta (‘Augustan peace’), promises that ‘dirae ferro et compagibus artis / claudentur belli portae’. By fostering this intertextual resonance, James is thus cast as a second Augustus, bringer of peace and bulwark of empire. In introducing Boece’s thoroughly Livian history, Ascensius thus appealed to elements of Virgilian epic as a means of highlighting how Boece’s work should be read, namely as a steady progression towards the peace achieved under Stewart rule.

This appeal to Virgil as a means of understanding Livy would continue well into the sixteenth century. Thus in the preface to his French language translation of 1582, Antoine De La Faye (1540–1615) remarked of Livy’s depiction of empire that ‘il semble que ç’aït esté le vray mestier des Romains, de bien gouuerner & commander’. Here De La Faye nods to Anchises’ words to Aeneas in the sixth book of the Aeneid, wherein he speaks of the subduing and ruling of nations as a quintessentially Roman trait. In the preface to his translation of 1600, Philemon Holland not only quoted directly from the Aeneid but compared Livy favourably with Virgil’s hero, Aeneas: ‘I wot not wel, whither they were more beholden to that fortune of theirs, (whereof so much they boasted) for Æneas the author of their beginning and admirable greatnes: than for this writer Livie, who commended their deeds to everlasting fame’. There were also later attempts to explore Livy’s poetic resonances. Some seventy years after the publication

57 ‘Therefore good Jupiter and the gods, showing you favour, will make it so, that the gate of war is closed through you’. Boece, aii58.
58 ‘The dread gates of war will be shut with iron and tight joints’. Virgil, Aeneid, 1.93.
59 ‘It seems that governing well and ruling has been the true craft of the Romans’. De La Faye, a55.
60 ‘tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento / (hae tibi sunt artes), pacique imponere morem, / parcere subiectis et debellare superbos’ (‘Remember, Roman, to rule the people under your sovereignty and (these are your arts) to establish a custom of peace and to spare the subdued and vanquish the haughty’). Virgil, Aeneid, 6.851-3.
of Sabellicus’s *Annotationes*, Julius Caesar Scaliger’s (1484–1558) *Poetices* (1561) argued that Livy was more deserving of the name ‘poet’ than Lucan. Scaliger’s comments were based not on the metrical quality of Livy’s preface, but the speeches he puts into the mouths of historical figures.\(^6^2\) Nevertheless, the association of Livy with the poetic was evidently lasting.

The first generation of Livy’s print editors were tentatively constructing a critical gaze through which the history might be read, one which understood the *AUC* to be working within the same conceptual and ideological framework as the *Aeneid*. These allusions to Virgil’s epic, a text familiar to every schoolboy of the period, functioned as a kind of critical shorthand. The reader is asked through these allusions to think of Livy’s history as an exploration of patriotism and of imperial rule. As we will see, this reading of the history would underpin the text’s reception in the Stewart history projects.

3. Livy in Scotland: ‘the seeds and sparks’ of classical learning

In 1513, the battle of Flodden resulted in the death of Scotland’s self-styled patron of the arts, King James IV (1473–1513). Fifteen years would pass before his son and successor, James V (1512–1542), could once again cultivate this role. In a letter to Hector Boece

---

\(^{6^2}\) *Quin equidem Livium potius poetae nomen meruisse quam Lucanum amisisse censeo. Nam quemadmodum tragici rem ipsam denarrant veram, personis actiones et dicta accommodant, sic Livius et Thucydides interserunt contiones, quae numquam ab iis quibus sunt attributae cognitae fuerunt*. (*‘But indeed I judge that Livy rather earned the name of poet than Lucan lost it. For just as the tragic poets narrate a true subject, and fit the actions and words to the characters, so Livy and Thucydides add speeches, which were never known to them to whom they have been attributed’*). Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices Libri Septem*, 6 vols, ed. Manfred Fuhrmann et al. (Stuttgart: Frommmann-Holzboog, 1994–2011) I. 88.
dated 15 March 1530, Erasmus expressed his hope that the young James would inherit not only his father’s crown but also his commitment to the arts:

intellego Scotiae regnum, ut aliis pluribus ornamentos, ita liberalium artium studiis indies magis ac magis expoliri. Hoc nomine semper amaui Iacobum Regem, quod ditionem suam non tam proferre studuerit quam exornare […] non dubito quin filius illius ut in paternum regnum successit, ita paternis vestigiis ingrediatur.63

Contemporary accounts, however, provide mixed reviews with regard to James’s learning. As Sally Mapstone has highlighted, William Stewart (fl.1499–1541) in the prologue to his verse translation of Boece’s *Historia* draws attention to James’s limited familiarity with the classical languages:

The kingis grace I knaw is nocht perfite
In latin toung, and namelie in sic dyte
It wil be tedious, that dar I tak on hand,
To reid the thing he can nocht understand.64

Sir David Lyndsay (c.1486–1555) despairs in the ‘Complaynt’ that ‘Imprudentlie, lyk wytles fullis, / Thay tuk that young prince frome the sculis’.65 It appears then that the king to whom Bellenden dedicated his translation had small Latin, less (if any) Greek.

Yet if James’s formative years, which proved to be a period of intense political unease, denied him first hand experience of Greek and Latin texts, this did not preclude the young prince from an active interest in vernacular poetry.66 The same Lyndsay in

---

63 I understand that the kingdom of Scotland is thus being polished day by day, as it is by a great many other ornaments, by the study of the liberal arts. It was for this reputation that I always loved King James, because he did not so much extend his dominion as adorn it […] I do not doubt that when his son has succeeded to his father’s kingdom, he will thus walk in his father’s footsteps’. Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, 12 vols, ed. P. S. Allen et al. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906-58) VIII. 373.


‘The Answer to [...] the Kingis Flyting’ dubs James ‘the Prince of Poetry’. If the poem’s title is taken at face value, the poetic contest implied therein (‘the Kingis Flyting’) would appear to have been instigated by James himself, suggesting that on at least one occasion the monarch composed his own verse. Bellenden in the ‘prolog’ to his translation of Livy (1533) invokes not only the classical gods (Bellona and Apollo, gods of war and poetry respectively) but also James:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{3e […] writis in ornate stile poeticall} \\
\text{Qwik flowand verss of rhetorick cullouris,} \\
\text{Sa freschlie springand in youre lusty flouris,} \\
\text{To þe grete conforte of all trew Scottismen}\end{align*}
\]

Here poetry is linked to nationhood, while the enjoyment of James’s ‘qwik flowand verss’ is presented as a patriotic act – his poetry is enjoyed by ‘all trew Scottismen’.

James in his role as poet king becomes for Bellenden a god himself, on a par with Bellona and Apollo: ‘Be now my muse and ledaire of my pen’.

In fact, upon his assumption of personal rule in 1528, James instigated a programme of cultural, literary, and architectural reform, inspired by continental precedents. The courtyard at Faulkland Palace was to prove ‘the first British example of the wholesale utilisation of a Renaissance architectural scheme’, imitating the styles developed by Francis I at Blois (1515), Chambord (1519), and Fontainebleau (1528).

By joining chivalric orders at home and abroad (those of the Garter, Thistle, Golden Fleece and St. Michael), James sought to bolster his credentials as a monarch on the European stage. Using the insignia of these orders to decorate the gate at Linlithgow palace, James advertised his cosmopolitan credentials. As John Leslie (1527–96) records in his De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum (1578), ‘Cuius rei ut luculentius

---

67 Lyndsay, I. 102.
68 Bellenden (1901–03) I.I.
69 ibid. I.I.
signum toti posteritate eluceret, insignia regia in porta Lithceonis palatii figenda, singulaque ordinum singulorum […] circumplicanda curauit’.\textsuperscript{71} James wished to compete with his royal cousins across Europe, and this evidently extended to the architectural features of his kingdom. But the humanist reinvention of the Scottish court also included the rewarding and commissioning of literary works of significant cultural capital, most notably histories, treating subject matter both native and foreign, but all (ostensibly) to the glory of the Stewart line.

The Scottish history projects undertaken in the first half of the sixteenth century included John Mair’s (c.1467–1550) \textit{Historia Maioris Britanniae} (1521), Hector Boece’s \textit{Scotorum Historia} (1526), John Bellenden’s translation thereof, \textit{The History and Chroniklis of Scotland} (1531; revised version printed c.1538) and finally Bellenden’s translation of the first five books of Livy (1533).\textsuperscript{72} Bellenden’s ‘prolong’ states that the Livy translation had been commissioned by James - ‘as ye commandit me’ - while the accounts of the Lord High Treasurer record the monarch’s financial backing of the project: ‘Nov. 30. To Maister Johne Ballentyne, be the Kingis precept for his labouris done in translating of Livie. xx li.’.\textsuperscript{73} John Mair’s \textit{Historia Maioris Britanniae} and Hector Boece’s \textit{Historia}, both of which were printed by Ascensius at Paris, were also dedicated to James. In July 1527, Boece was granted an annual pension of £50 (which was subsequently doubled) for his \textit{Historia}, while Bellenden was paid in three installments.

\textsuperscript{71} ‘So that a token of this might shine forth for all posterity, he ordered the royal insignia to be fixed onto the gate of Linlithgow palace, and for each of the emblems of each of the orders to be entwined around them’. John Leslie, \textit{De Origine Moribus & Rebus Gesti Scotorum Libri Decem} (Rome: ‘in aedibus populi Romani’, 1578) 439–440.

\textsuperscript{72} It was for the Boece translation that Bellenden was commemorated in John Bale’s (1494–1563) \textit{Illustrium Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium}: ‘Cum iste uidisset suæ gentis historiam ab Hectore Boethio uiro disertissimo in .xvij. libris copiose tradita, a multis affectari, a paucis uero ob latinism ignorantiam intelligi, in idioma Scoticum eam fideliter transtulit, ut omnibus æque communis, ab omnibusq eperciperetur’. (‘When he had seen that the history of his people, eloquently handed down by Hector Boece, a most eloquent man, in seventeen books, was aspired to by many, but because of the ignorance of the Latin language understood by few, he faithfully translated it into the Scottish dialect, so that it was equally shared by everyone, and grasped by everyone’). John Bale, \textit{Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium} (Wesel: Theodoricus Plateanus, 1549) fol. 226r.

\textsuperscript{73} Bellenden (1901–3) I. 2; records cited by W. A. Craigie, ‘introduction’, ibid. vii–xvii (viii).
totaling £66 for his vernacular translation thereof in 1531. So too William Stewart undertook his translation of the *Historia* ‘his princeheid for to pleis’.

But the top-down model, which has the monarch commissioning literary works at his own expense, does not sufficiently account for the growing interest in the recording and reproduction of history in Scotland in the early years of the sixteenth century. James did not assume personal rule until 1528. The first edition of Boece’s *Scotorum Historia*, however, had appeared the previous year, while Mair’s *Historiae Maioris Britanniae* had been published a full seven years earlier. Under the guardianship of Archibald Douglas, sixth earl of Angus (c.1489–1557), who exacted over the young king ‘not so much control as slavery’, James was hardly in a position to offer financial support to these works. Boece and Bellenden were ultimately rewarded for their efforts by James, but Boece was only reimbursed *post factum*; only Bellenden’s translations can properly be said to have been commissioned. As Nicola Royan notes, on the title page of the first edition of the *Scotorum Historia* we find that the imprint was in fact funded by Boece himself. The situation does not appear to have changed for the second edition: ‘impensis autem Nobilis & praedocti viri Hectoris Boethii Deidonani’. Boece thus supported his own project financially, perhaps with the expectation, but by no means certainty, that he would eventually be reimbursed by James.

What then provoked the emergence of these classically-inspired histories? From what we can reconstruct of the period’s intellectual milieu, it seems that it was Scotland’s learned elite who encouraged these projects. The tail end of the fifteenth
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75 Stewart, I.1, line 21.
76 ‘imperium illud Angusii, tanquam quondam seruitutem’. Leslie, 428.
77 ‘Quae impressa sunt Typis Iodoci Badii & impensis Hectoris Boethii’ (‘which have been printed in the type of Jodocus Badius and at the expense of Hector Boece’) Boece, 1526; cf. Royan, 2004.
century had seen the foundation of a new university in Aberdeen, while the sixteenth century would witness the reputation of the Scottish universities spread across Europe. Thus the historian and prelate Paolo Giovio (1483–1552) praised St Andrews for its ‘authoritate’ (‘reputation’), Aberdeen as ‘Gymnasium optimarum artium’ (‘the university of the liberal arts’), and Glasgow as a ‘Gymnasio celebri’ (‘famous university’). The material prefacing Boece’s Historia is littered with references to the contemporary Scottish intellectuals who populated these institutions. Here the remarks of Boece suggest something of an intellectual school or movement, one which was encouraging this interest in Scottish historiography. Thus in his dedicatory preface to James V, Boece explains that he undertaken the work ‘amicorum […] hortatu’ (‘through the encouragement of friends’), and most especially from Gavin Dunbar (1455–1532), chancellor of the University of Aberdeen. In the dedicatory epistle to James Beaton (c.1473–1514), archbishop of St. Andrews and chancellor of the university, Boece once again states that he has composed the history ‘amicorum impulsu’ (‘at the instigation of friends’).

In the Veremundus episode, Boece refers to historical records apparently recovered on Iona. Here he appeals to the reputation of William Elphinstone (1431–1514) as an intellectual and academic. Boece presents Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen and founder of King’s College, as a Scottish Poggio, acting out of love for his homeland (‘patriae amore’), who scoured Scotland ‘si quo in loco reperire posset uetus ullum rerum nostrarum monumentum’. It would be hard to conjure a figure from the period more strongly associated with the universities, both Scottish and French alike. Before

79 Paolo Giovio, Descriptio Britanniae, Scotiae, Hyberniae, et Orchadum (Venice: Michael Tramezino, 1548) 30°; 31°; 31v.
80 Boece (1527) aiii°.
81 Ibid. aiii°.
82 ‘to see if he might be able to find anywhere any ancient monument of our exploits’. Ibid. aiii°.
founding the University of Aberdeen in 1495, Elphinstone had studied at the Universities of Glasgow (1457–62), Paris (1465–68) and Orléans (1470). In 1472, he became the Dean of Arts at the University of Glasgow and was elected as rector in 1474. Telling of the ties which were being forged between these academics, Elphinstone had elected Boece as the first principal of King’s College in September, 1505. The inclusion of these figures by Boece combined with the fact that he twice describes the project as being spurred on by academic acquaintances suggests that a new style of history was being called for by the intellectual milieu to which he belonged. There is also the case of Gavin Douglas’s (c.1476–1522) Eneados (1513), a work which was dedicated neither to the regent nor to the young king, but to a distant relation, Henry, Lord Sinclair. As Bawcutt notes, Douglas presents Sinclair not as a venerable and distant patron, but as a fellow bibliophile, dubbing him ‘Fader of bukis, protectour to sciens and lair’. Once again, the evidence suggests that literary works were being encouraged through intellectual bonds rather than the purely financial expectations of the patron-poet relationship.

But even if the early Scottish humanists could rely on each other for encouragement and support, it is clear that they expected great things from their king in his capacity as patron. The dedication to James which prefaces Boece’s Historia functions as a rallying cry for Scottish humanism. Here Boece sets down Scotland’s pressing need to emulate continental developments in learning: ‘Atque vtina [meliores litterae] aeque apud nos quoque vt in aliis regionibus uigerent, vt barbarie illa ferocitateque aliquando mansuetioribus cicurata musis cultui simul uirtutique dediti

---

Scotland is presented as developing from an unknown backwater into a cultural stronghold, able to compete with the European centres of learning. James will secure for himself a fame which spans the length and breadth of Europe, provided that he cultivates the arts at home: ‘si & doctos (quod facis) semper fouveis, ac honoribus praemiiisque non tam quos domi habes quam ex alienis regionibus tuum in regnum omni ex parte peritos inuitatos affeceris’. Boece hopes that Scotland, under James’s personal rule, will flourish as an outward-looking and thoroughly cosmopolitan bastion for humanist learning. He thus imagines a kingdom as busy with the flow of new people as it is with their ideas. Bringing his exhortation to a close, Boece makes his meaning absolutely clear: the Scots will share in the renown of their European counterparts – ‘non minus celebres in hac nostra quam in quaud alia regione’ (‘men no less renowned in this our land than in any other’) – when and only when a programme of humanist education is established to guide the way: ‘si igniculi illi aut semina a natura insita habemus bonarum literarum fomentis excitentur excolanturque’. The diminutive ‘igniculi’ along with the early stages of growth implied by ‘semina’ indicate that Boece has in mind not only youths of university age but also adolescents. James IV’s statute of 1496, more commonly known as the Education Act, had attempted to ensure that ‘all barounis and frehaldaris that are of substance’ should send their eldest son to grammar school at around the age of eight years until ‘that be competentlie foundit and have perfite latyne and thereftir to remane thre yeris at the sculis of art and jure’. But it was

---

84 ‘O that the liberal arts thrived equally amongst us as they do in other lands, so that, once this former barbarity and savageness has been tamed by the rather gentle muses, we might live devoted to refinement as well as honour’. Boece (1527) avv.

85 ‘If you will forever show favour to learned men (which you do) and bestow upon them honours and rewards, not only upon those whom you have here at home but also upon those learned men from foreign lands invited into your kingdom from every other part of the world’. Ibid. avv.

86 ‘If those sparks and seeds which we have sown in us by nature are roused and developed by the nourishment of the liberal arts’. Ibid. avv.

during James’s minority and personal rule that humanist models of education were formalised within the grammar schools. John Vaus’s (c.1484–c.1539) *Rudimenta in Artem Grammatica*, printed by Ascensius at Paris in 1522 (reprinted in 1524, 1531, and 1533) appears to have been prepared specifically for students at an Aberdeen grammar school and as such offers a unique insight into contemporary approaches to education under James’s reign. As Sally Mapstone notes in her article on a recently discovered version of the work, the *Rudimenta* is essentially a condensed version of the *Ars Minor*, a popular medieval grammar by Aelius Donatus.\(^8\) The 1522 edition of the *Rudimenta* was printed alongside Vaus’s commentary on De Villedieu’s *In Primam Doctrinalis Alexandrini*. Both works speak of the ambition fostered on behalf of the Scottish youth by contemporary pedagogues. In the ‘Operis & authoris commendatio’ which appears at the end of the de Villedieu commentary, Robert Gray, one of Aberdeen University’s contemporary grammarians, addresses the town’s ‘studiosae iuventute’ (‘studious youth’).\(^8\) Having presented the example of Euclides, who risked his life to hear Socrates speak, Gray explains that similar feats of bravery would arise ‘si quis in terra Scotia adolescentes ad philosophiam capessendam adhortari velit’.\(^8\) Implying that just such a man has been found, he goes on to recount how John Vaus has risked life and limb to produce the grammar, shipwrecked and surrounded by pirates on his first voyage to Paris. Vaus is thus celebrated as a heroic figure of the new, humanist education, drawing from the ‘uberrimum fontem’ (‘extremely rich source’) at Paris to provide for the next generation of the learned elite.

---


\(^8\) ‘if anyone in Scotland wished to encourage the young men of Scotland to take up philosophy’. Ibid. mvii.
Vaus’s commentary draws on a host of classical and later Latin authors. Using a familiar metaphor, Gray explains that Vaus ‘apes imitatus quae quicquid vagae carpunt id totum in vnum fauum ad communem alimoniae vsum studiose inferunt’. On one page alone, Vaus quotes from Martial, Pliny, Horace, Lucan, Virgil, and Sallust. Further and repeated reference is made to Quintilian, Juvenal, Ovid, Statius, Vallerius Flaccus, Aulus Gellius, Cicero, and Livy. Clearly it was Vaus’s intention to familiarise the youth of Aberdeen with as many classical authors as possible. The version held at Glasgow University Library preserves the marginal annotations of at least two contemporary schoolboys. Next to Vaus’s note on irregular feminine nouns, one student complains ‘hoc est facile dictu tamen difficile factu’ (‘this is easy to say but difficult to do’); later, another student practises his signature.

Evidently then Boece’s hope that the ‘seeds’ of humanist learning would be sown in Scotland’s youth was, in some parts of Scotland at least, already being fulfilled. But what of his desire that Scotland, under James’s rule, should win renown across Europe? As noted above, in 1527 Boece’s *Historia* was printed at Paris by Ascensius, opening the work up to a wider, European audience. As Nicola Royan observes, the *Historia* ‘appears in library catalogues in the Hague, Leiden, Madrid, Mons, Nantes, Strasbourg, Uppsala and Vienna’. To this we might add the fact that Boece’s history actually helped to mould European perceptions of Scotland. Enumerating Scotland’s virtues in his *Descripito Britanniae*, Paolo Giovio refers specifically to ‘Hectore Boethio,

---

91 ‘has imitated the bees, which, as they wander, whatever they pick, they eagerly turn every bit of it into one honey-comb for the shared enjoyment of nourishment’. Ibid. mvi\textit{ii}r. For the bee metaphor, see Seneca, *Epistile* 84.
92 Vaus, iii\textit{r}.
93 The edition preserved at Glasgow University Library is damaged, and has been supplemented with hand-written entries. Glasgow University Library Sp. Coll. RQ 3053; Aberdeen University Library A3 Vau r.1.
94 ‘Vilhame strange / with my hand’. Ibid. gii\textit{r}.; iiii\textit{r}.
qui insigni facundia, & pari diligentia perpetuam Scotorum Regum historiam ad Iacobum eius nominis Tertium deduxit’. Tellingly, his praise of Boece’s Historia reaches a climax with a paean to James himself. The Scots, he explains, can trace a continuous line of kings all the way from Fergus I to ‘Iacobum Quintium, qui hodie iuuenis adhuc iam peruirginti, & septem annos, nullis unquam externis, aut inestinis bellis implicitus tranquilla, & maxime diuturna pace perfruitur’. Giovio accepts uncritically the Stewart version of history, which places the dynasty at the pinnacle of a long line of absolute monarchs. The history projects can thus be seen to legitimise and reinforce James’s succession to the Scottish throne. It is worth remembering that James did not simply mature into his personal rule, but had to wrestle the reins of power from his guardian and captor, the Earl of Angus. According to Leslie’s De Origine, at the age of seventeen James called a council of nobles to Stirling, ‘ut ceruices suas tanto iugo subduceret’ (‘to steal his neck away from such a great yoke’), and marched on Edinburgh and Angus, ‘duobus hominum milibus stipatus’ (‘accompanied by two thousand men’).

James’s commissioning of the Livy translation emerged from a conscious effort to emulate continental developments in humanism. But why Livy? There was already an established trend across Europe for the translation of classical history into the vernacular, and Livy was no exception. Italy could boast La terza Decha de Tito Liuio (1478) published in Venice by Antonio da Bolognia, while Spain had Las decadas, translated
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96 Hector Boece, who, with outstanding eloquence and an equal zeal composed a continuous history of the Scottish kings down to James, the third of that name’. Giovio, 26v.
97 ‘James V, who today, a young man of 27 years, has never been involved with any external or internal wars, enjoys calm and extremely long lasting peace’. Ibid. 26v.
98 Although Boece’s Historia ends with the death of James I, his idea of a linear chronology of monarchs has clearly informed Giovio’s perception of Stewart rule.
99 Leslie, 428.
by Pero López de Ayala (1332–1407) and published in 1497 in Salamanca. France had seen Pierre Bersuire’s (d.1362)’s *Les Decades* (1486) and Robert Gaguine’s (c.1423-1501) *Les Gestes Romains* (1504), published at Paris by Jean Dupré and Jean Petit respectively. Bernhard Schöfferlin and Ivo Wittich had produced a German-language version of Livy, published as *Romische Historie* at Mainz in 1505 by Johan Schöffer (c.1475–c.1531). The translation of Livy was therefore an obvious model to emulate. Many of the factors that had contributed to Livy’s continental popularity were equally applicable in Scotland. In fact, part of the mythology surrounding Livy and his lost books pertained to Scotland itself. One legend had Fergus II (d.501), ancient prince of Scotland, hide the *AUC* in its entirety on the isle of Iona, having rescued the work from the sack of Rome. As Boece tells it in the seventh book of the *Historia*, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405–64), while serving as a papal legate on a mission to Scotland, had intended to travel to Iona, ‘explorandi animo, si quid illic Titi Livii Patauini Decadum, quas bella […] in Italia absumpserant, inuenire possit’.\(^{100}\) There is more than a passing resemblance here to Enoch of Ascoli’s attempt to scour northern Europe for Livy’s lost decades. The death of James I (1394–1437), Boece explains, unfortunately interrupted Piccolomini’s plans to visit the island.\(^{101}\)

This account was subsequently repeated in the *Descriptio* (1548), wherein Giovio marks out Iona for its extraordinary library and praises Fergus as an ‘amator Historiae’ (‘lover of history’).\(^{102}\) Giovio by no means doubts its authenticity. In fact, he claims that portions of those missing books have recently been sent to the French king, Francis I (1494–1547), ‘Ita, ut non omnino uanum, & irritum uideri possit reliquas T. Livii decades expectare, quarum è tenebris erutarum certa exempla ad Franciscum

\(^{100}\) With the intention of exploring, to see if he could find anything there of the decades of Titus Livius of Padua, which the wars in Italy had consumed’. Boece (1527) cxviii\(^{v}\).

\(^{101}\) Ibid. cxviii\(^{v}\).

\(^{102}\) Giovio, 39\(^{v}\).
Galliae regem Scotorum literis prolixè, atq\emph{ue} munificè præmissa nupe audiuimus'\(^{103}\).

The phrasing is ambiguous. ‘Scotorum literis’ could suggest that the samples were sent ‘with Scottish letters’, in the sense of epistolary correspondence, or that the samples themselves were written ‘in Scottish letters’, that is, in a Scottish hand, or perhaps even in a Scots translation. That Giovio reproduces this narrative quite so readily is hardly surprising in light of the very real recoveries which had been made in 1518 and 1527. Intriguingly, Erasmus in the *Adagia* (published in their final and revised form in 1540 as part of the *Opera Omnia*) identified northern Europe as an untapped source of ancient manuscripts.\(^ {104}\) The promise that Iona had preserved some of Livy’s work was not then such an outlandish possibility for scholars of the sixteenth century.

Livy was a popular choice of reading material for certain members of the learned elite in Scotland. In a marginal note to the *Eneados* (1513), Gavin Douglas referred to ‘the mast nobill and famus historian and mylky flud of eloquens, gret Tytus Lyuius’, drawing on St Jerome’s description of the historian as ‘lacteo eloquentiae fonte manantem’ (‘flowing from the milky spring of eloquence’).\(^ {105}\) Of the early editions which have survived from the period, some can be traced to a specifically Scottish provenance. These include the 1498 Venice edition prepared by Sabellicus, which was owned by a Walter Ogilvie.\(^ {106}\) The same edition also passed through the hands of Robert

\(^{103}\) ‘And thus it seems not altogether fruitless or invalid to hope for the remaining decades of Livy, certain examples of which, plucked from obscurity, I have recently heard have been sent courteously and generously to Francis, king of France, in Scottish letters’. Ibid. 39\(^{v}\).

\(^{104}\) ‘Latitant in collegiis ac monasteriis Germanorum, Gallorum et Anglorum peruetusti codices, quos exceptis paucis non communicant vltro, vt rogati vel celent, vel pernegent, vel iniquo precio vendant vsum, decuplo aestimatorum codicum’. (‘There lie hidden in the colleges and monasteries of the Germans, French, and English very ancient books, which they do not share voluntarily, with very few exceptions, so that when asked they either hide them, or deny that they have them, or sell their use at an unfair price, at ten times that suggested by the valuers of the books’). Erasmus, *Adagia* (II.i.I), *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera Omnia* (Amsterdam: North–Holland, 1969–2015), II.3.24.

\(^{105}\) Douglas’s marginal notes to Prologue 1 and Book 1 are preserved in the Trinity MS and were reproduced by David Coldwell in his critical edition of the *Eneados*. Douglas, II.35, f.n. 35; St Jerome, ‘Epistola LIII ad Paulinum’, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, Tomus XXII, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1864) column 541.

\(^{106}\) This copy is now held at Glasgow University Library (Sp. Coll. Bn-d.2).
Cockburn (d.1526), bishop of Ross. According to data provided by Durkan and Ross, William Gordon (d.6 August, 1577), bishop of Aberdeen had in his possession Le Premier Volume des Grans Decades (1530), the first part of Bersuire’s translation of Livy. John Annand (d.1550), canon regular at St Andrews and principal of St Leonard’s college, also owned Ascensius’s 1533 edition of Livy.

The Scottish historians writing in the years preceding Bellenden’s translation also took an active interest in Livy. That Boece depended on the AUC as an exemplar of style for his Historia has long since been noted. In the dedicatory verse which precedes the Historia, Ascensius describes Boece as bringing the glory of Livian history to the Scots: ‘historiae Liuiique decus pataunini, / Lacteaq ad Scotos transtulit eloquia’ (‘he has brought the glory of Paduan Livy and his milky eloquence to the Scots’). With the phrase ‘lactea [...] eloquia’, Ascensius nods to Quintilian’s praise of Livy’s ‘lactea ubertas’ (‘milky richness’), thus presenting Boece as a second Livy. John Mair would flag up his own familiarity with Livy in the preface to his Historia Maioris Britanniae. Here Mair juxtaposes the ‘majesty’ of James’s ancestors with a direct allusion to Livy’s preface: ‘Quocirca cum omnia tuae maiorumque tuorum celsitudini debeamus, operae precium mihi facturus visus sum, si eidem susceps labores deuouerem’. Mair’s ‘operae precium mihi facturus visus sum’ plays on the opening words of Livy’s own praefatio – ‘facturusne operae pretium sim’ – reworking Livy’s uncertainty into bold
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107 J. Durkan and A. Ross, Early Scottish Libraries (Glasgow: J. S. Burns, 1961) 34.
108 ibid. 71.
109 In the De Origine John Leslie describes Boece’s style as ‘rationum uerborumque ponderibus ita nervosus, ut Liuianum grauitatem in suam naturam transtulisse penitus uideatur’ (‘so vigorous in the weight of its arguments and words, that he seems to have completely carried over Livy’s gravity into his own nature’). Leslie, 434. Cf. Nicola Royan, ‘The Uses of Speech in Hector Boece’s Scotorum Historia’, A Palace in the Wild: Essays on Vernacular Culture and Humanism in Late-Medieval and Renaissance Scotland, (eds) Houwen et al. (Bondgenotenlaan: Peeters, 2000) 75–93 (75).
110 Boece (1527) aii.
111 Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria (10.1.32).
112 ‘Seeing that we owe all things to your majesty and that of your ancestors, it seemed to me that it would be worth my while if I dedicated the labours I have undertaken to the same’. John Mair, Historia Maioris Britanniae, tam Angliae quam Scotiae (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1521) aii.
fact: the opportunity to dedicate the history to the memory of Scotland’s kings is reward enough in itself.113

The translation of classical history into the vernacular was also acknowledged in Europe as a means of augmenting the cultural prestige of one’s court. In this respect, Claude de Seyssel’s (c.1450–1520) translation of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* provides an intriguing analogue for Bellenden’s Livy. Completed between 1504–5, the work was presented to Louis XII (1462–1515), Henry VII (1457–1509), and Duke Charles de Savoie, copied onto illuminated parchment.114 Presented to these three dignitaries, the giving and receiving of the translation functioned as a symbol of their diplomatic importance and as recognition of their political worth. In 1527 the work was printed by Ascensius as *l’Histoire de Thucydide Athenien de la Guerre, Qui Fut entre les Peloponnesiens et Atheniens*. Jaques Colin, *lecteur du roi*, explains in his preface to this edition that the king has permitted the publication of the history from his personal library ‘voyant que la science des langues estrangieres nestoit encorez generalement espandue parmy la noblesse de son Royaulme’.115 Some thirteen years later this type of vernacular translation would be discussed in terms of patriotic duty. In the preface to his *Manière de Bien Traduire d’une Langue en Aultre* (1540), Étienne Dolet (1509–46) described vernacular translation as a means of celebrating one’s homeland: ‘mon affection est telle enuers l’honneur de mon pais que ie veulx trouver tout moyen de l’illustrer. Et ne le puis myeulx faire que de celebrer sa langue, comme ont fait Grecs, &

---

113 Ascensius had similarly punned on Livy’s preface in the dedication to Georgius Haloinus which appeared in every edition of Livy he published: ‘operae pretium mihi facturus visus sum: si hanc Liuianum impressionem dexteritati, nominique tuo felicissimo nuncuparem’. (‘it seemed to me that it would be worth my trouble if I dedicated this print of Livy to your skill and to your most blessed name’) Livy (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1516) i.

114 Paris, BnF, MSS. fr. 701, 702; London, BL, MS Royal 19 C VI.

115 ‘seeing that the knowledge of foreign languages had not yet generally spread among the nobility of his kingdom’. Claude de Seyssel, *l’Histoire de Thucydide Athenien de la Guerre, Qui Fut entre les Peloponnesiens et Atheniens* (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1527) av’
Romains la leur’.\textsuperscript{116} It is not unreasonable to assume that James, spurred on by Boece’s encouragement, was similarly motivated to expand the cultural horizons of his court with works of a patriotic bent.

Livy also represented a specific style of historiography, one which could be readily yoked to ideas of national identity and patriotism.\textsuperscript{117} As Ruth Chavasse notes, the AUC had served as a benchmark of both structure and style for Sabellicus in his pro-republican Historiae Rerum Venetarum Ab Urbe Condita Decades (1487).\textsuperscript{118} Robert Gaguin humanist and would-be royal historian appealed to Livy when he envisioned a national history of France in which a Livian style would surpass that of Les Grandes Chroniques. In a letter to the French Chancellor, Pierre Doriole (1407–1485), dated 4 November 1476, Gaguin suggested that just as Rome had Livy to polish and refine its histories, France required its very own Livy to rewrite the chronicles: ‘Nam enim autores qui res romanas initio scripsere, Cato, Fabius Pictor aut Piso, amplitudine scribendi omnino commendantur [...] Titus Livius, propter veterum errata cautior et ideo eruditior factus, purgatissime copiosissimeque pre ceteris scrispit’.

The French chroniclers have thus far produced history ‘nude atque peranguste’ (‘simply and very concisely’); it is for a new kind of humanist historian to adapt Livy’s copia. With the comparatives ‘cautior’ (‘more cautious’) and ‘eruditior’ (‘more learned’), Gaguin

\textsuperscript{116} ‘My fondness towards the honour of my country is such that I wish to find every means of demonstrating it. And I can do that no better than by celebrating its language, as the Greeks and Romans did theirs’. Étienne Dolet et al., Quatre Traites de Grammaire (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1972) a2.
\textsuperscript{117} That the writing of a national history was essentially an act of patriotism was posited by Cicero in the De Legibus. Cf. Cicero, De Legibus (1.5).
\textsuperscript{119} ‘Indeed the authors who first wrote of Roman affairs – Cato, Fabius Pictor and Piso – are altogether recommended for the copiousness of the writing [...] Titus Livius, who was made more cautious and thereby more learned on account of errors made by the ancients, wrote history making many emendations and very copiously, beyond the others’. Robert Gaguin, Roberti Gaguini Epistole et Orationes, ed. Louis Thulasne (Paris: Emile Bouillon, 1903) 254.
suggests something of this new style of history and its commitment to fact; Livy becomes in this model not only a standard of style but also of historical truth.

Bellenden in the ‘proloug’ presents his translation as a patriotic venture. Addressing James directly, he explains how the history will benefit the country as a whole by instructing its monarch in the arts of war:

Richt proffitabill till undermynde ȝoure fais  
And for to lere þe arte of chevelrie,  
Seand how romanis […] all cuntries wan  
Be Ieoperdyis abone Ingyne of man\textsuperscript{120}

The value of Livy’s history would be tied to its depictions of warfare throughout the early modern period. Thus the printer Thomas Berthelet (d.1555) would attempt, in a poem which prefaces Anthony Cope’s (1486/7–1551) 1544 translation of Livy, to sell the work as something of a military manual. He identifies the translation’s target audience as:

VVHO so euer desireth for to rede  
Marciall prowesse, feactes of chiualrie,  
That may hym profite at tyme of nede\textsuperscript{121}

It was, as Fred Schurink has shown, for examples of martial valour that Gabriel Harvey read both Livy’s history and Cope’s translation thereof.\textsuperscript{122} Bellenden, however, was the first translator in the British Isles to lend special emphasis to Livy’s treatment of war: ‘Sa knightly dedis in bukis historiall / Sall neuer be fundin quhil þe warld Indures’.\textsuperscript{123} So too James can hope to find examples of imperial expansion, ‘seand […] how þai all cuntreis wan / Be Ieopordyis abone Ingyne of man’\textsuperscript{124}. Bellenden highlights the didactic

\textsuperscript{120} Bellenden (1901–3) I.5  
\textsuperscript{121} Anthony Cope, The Historie of Tvwo the Most Noble Capitaines of the Worlde, Annibail and Scipio  
(London: Thomas Berthelet, 1544) ai\textsuperscript{v}.  
\textsuperscript{122} Schurink (2011) 58-78.  
\textsuperscript{123} Bellenden (1901–3) I. 3.  
\textsuperscript{124} ibid. I.5.
qualities of the history, along with the ways in which it will serve Scotland by reinforcing the strength of James’s rule:

\[\text{Ye may also be mony stories see}
\text{Quhat besynes may profitt or avance}
\text{Youre princely state with ferme continuance.}\]

This emphasis on history’s utility as a textbook for princely conduct once again has precedents on the continent. In the preface to Seyssel’s translation of Thucydides, Colin had discussed the utility of history in much the same way. It is in history that the monarch will find ‘la ciuile et militaire discipline, les constitutions et loix des royaumes, les facons par lesquelles ilz sont acquis et entretenus’. Boece had presented the value of his \textit{Historia} in strikingly similar terms. In the preface addressed to James, he promised examples of the methods by which ‘imperium hoc iam supra millesimum octingentesimum quinquagesimum sextum annum retentum est’ (‘this power has been preserved for now over 1,856 years’). Bellenden is deliberately drawing on these established modes of expression by way of introducing his vernacular translation: if the language of history has changed, the manner of its presentation remains consistent.

But Bellenden’s concern in 1533 with martial valour was more than the reproduction of an historiographical trope. The emphasis on warfare may well have been prompted by James’s early attempts to establish his sovereignty through displays of military might. Upon his accession to the throne in 1529, James had performed a series of justice ayres at the borders by way of inscribing his authority onto his newly acquired kingdom. It is also worth noting that, following Henry’s schism from the church in 1532, James was under increasing pressure from Rome to enter into hostilities with his

\[^{125}\text{ibid. I.4.}\]
\[^{126}\text{‘civil and military discipline, the composition and laws of kingdoms, the ways in which they are acquired and maintained’. de Seyssel, aiii’}\]
\[^{127}\text{Boece (1527) aiii’}\]
\[^{128}\text{Cf. Leslie, 431.}\]
uncle. According to Leslie’s *De Origine*, upon Henry’s dissolution of the monasteries, Pope Clement VII (1478–1534) immediately sent an ambassador to the court at Edinburgh to encourage James to take up arms against England.\footnote{‘Quamprimum ergo, misso ad nostrum Regem Legato, rogat vt sibi opem contra Anglum ferat’ (‘therefore as soon as possible, once an ambassador has been sent to our king, he asked him to take up arms against the Englishman’). Leslie, 441.} There was therefore a timely relevance to Livy’s ‘mony exemplis’ of how the Roman people, in war and statecraft, ‘thare commoun weill augmented day be day’.\footnote{Bellenden (1901–3) I.1-3.}

James’s commissioning of the Livy translation should then be understood as complementing a wider movement of humanist learning in Scotland. Bellenden’s vernacular translation was essentially an attempt to catch up with similar precedents on the continent and intended as a means of re-enforcing the cultural prestige of James’s foundling court.

The key role that Bellenden played in these history projects is understandable. Bellenden had been educated at St Andrews (perhaps also at Paris) and most probably sympathised with the programme Boece set out in his dedication to the *Historia*.\footnote{Bellenden matriculated at St Andrews in 1508, graduating in 1512. John Bale’s *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytannie Catalogus* (1557) refers to Bellenden as ‘scholasticae theologie doctor’. David Buchanan later recorded in his *De Scriptoribus Scotis* (c.1627) that after his studies at St Andrews, Bellenden moved to France, ‘ubi scholasticae theologiae operam dedit’ (‘he focused his attention on scholastic theology’). John Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytannie Catalogus* (Basel: Johann Oporinus, 1557) 223; David Buchanan, *De Scriptoribus Scotis* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1837) 98.} In Bellenden’s preface to the *Chroniklis* (his translation of Boece), he proudly displayed his familiarity with contemporary humanism and its preoccupation with the classics. Indeed, the first words of his preface invoke one the period’s most celebrated and prolific humanists: ‘Erasmus Roterodamus schawis, maist nobill Prince, na thing in moir admiracioun to the pepill than werkis of kingis’.\footnote{Hector Boece, *The Chronicles of Scotland*, 2 vols, trans. John Bellenden, ed. R. W. Chambers and Edith C. Batho (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1938–41) I.15.} With this glance to continental humanism, namely Erasmus’s *Institutio Principis Christiani* (1516), Bellenden...
establishes an intellectual framework in which his translation is to be viewed. Erasmus had already begun to influence humanist thinking in Scotland, as is evinced from a letter he received from Hector Boece, dated 26 May 1528 (two years following the publication of the *Historia*). Boece tells Erasmus of one Hans Bogbinder (‘Ioannes Bibliopagus’) and his visit to St Andrews, where Hans marvels at the popularity of Erasmus among the students. So popular have Erasmus’s works become ‘ut qui Erasmum […] non imitatur pro viribus, eius codicibus diligentius non incumbit, is nullo discendi ardore teneri a condiscipulis iudicatur’.133 By appealing to a recent work by Erasmus in the preface to the *Croniklis*, Bellenden thereby flagged up the relevance and the modernity of the work he had produced.

Bellenden takes the opportunity to share his familiarity with the classics, alluding in the same preface to Cicero’s *Orator*, Aristotle’s *Ethics*, and Seneca’s *Tragedies*. This self-conscious incorporation of classical material continues in the poem with which the *Croniklis* concludes. There Bellenden nods again to Aristotle, but also to Pliny, Juvenal, and Homer.134 The modesty topos employed by Bellenden at the beginning of both the Livy and the Boece translations reveals a conscious effort to emulate the styles of contemporary humanists. In the sailing metaphor with which the ‘proloug’ to the Livy translation ends, Bellenden expresses his fear that ‘e passage and stremes ar sa stark / Quhare I haue salit, full of crag & clynt’ that ‘my schip (without ye make supporte) / Will periss lang or it come to port’.135 As Thomas Rutledge has observed, Bellenden thereby nods to Douglas’ ‘Exclamatioun’, a poem placed at the end of his *Eneados*:

Now throw the deip fast to the port I mark
[...]

---

133 ‘He who does not imitate Erasmus with all his strength and does not devote himself rather attentively to his books, is judged by his fellow students to have no youthful passion for learning’. Erasmus, VII. 399.
134 Boece (1938–41) II.403.
135 Bellenden (1901–3) I.5.
In sour raid now ankyrrit is our bark

Bellenden takes Douglas’ confident assertion of completion, placed at the climax of his epic – ‘heir is endyt the lang disparyt wark’ – and reworks it into a modest aspiration placed at the beginning of his translation: ‘I intend of þis difficill werk / To mak ane end’. By cultivating this intertextual resonance, Bellenden signals himself as a literary successor to Gavin Douglas, the figurehead of Scottish vernacular humanism, while presenting his Livy as a natural complement to Douglas’s translation of the \textit{Aeneid}. The modesty topos in the preface to the \textit{Croniklis} similarly draws on contemporary modes of scholarly and literary expression. Bellenden has successfully completed the translation, ‘pocht the charge was importabill throw tedious laboure and feire of this huge volume, quhilk has impeschitt my febill ingyne, havand na crafty witt nor pregnant eloquence to decoir the samyn’.\footnote{Boece (1938–41) I.16.} Ryoko Harikae, commenting on these lines, argues that this ‘apologetic tone was often seen at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the vernacular, especially English, was discredited as an inferior language to Latin and Greek […] What Bellenden expresses here is the same notion of vernacular translation being inferior to the original Latin text’.\footnote{Ryoko Harikae, ‘John Bellenden’s \textit{Chronicles of Scotland}: Translation and Circulation’, unpublished D. Phil. thesis (Oxford: St Hilda’s College, 2009) 30.} Yet Bellenden makes no such comparison between the vernacular and the Latin he translates. Rather, Bellenden’s words have their origin in the Latin history he is reworking. Boece in his preface to the \textit{Historia} explains that he has undertaken ‘opus arduum ac difficile, et quod summo ingenio parem requirat eloquentiam’.\footnote{‘a difficult and laborious task which requires an eloquence equal to supreme talent’. Boece (1527) aiii.} In fact, the sentiment is typical of the prefatory
material included in early humanist works and is indicative of a desire to emulate rhetorical styles developed on the continent. Thus Campanus, in the dedicatory epistle to his 1470 edition of Livy, remarks that he has tackled ‘operosam quidem rem & plenam laboris’ (‘a painstaking task, full of toil’). By emulating Douglas, Boece, and humanist modes of expression more generally, Bellenden cultivates the sense that he is at the cutting edge of contemporary learning.

At the end of the fifteenth century, Livy’s history of Rome stood at a critical crossroads, pulled between competing readings, allegorical and humanist alike. Livy’s earliest editors saw themselves as scraping away the textual barnacles which had become encrusted onto the medieval versions of the history and re-discovering the truly Livian. Before his first appearance in print in 1469, Livy had long since enjoyed a literary and personal fame among the Italian humanists. For Salutati, Polenton, Bracciolini and their compeers, Livy and the AUC functioned as a benchmark of historiography and good prose. This popularity grew through the efforts of Livy’s first editors to open the work up to a yet wider audience. Sabellicus and Ascensius, through the collation of external, classical works, revised the manuscript tradition of the history. The readings they introduced would, as we will see in the next chapter, continually resurface in Bellenden’s translation, indicating his dependence on a print edition. Sabellicus and Ascensius established a new mode of reading and interpreting Livy. Deliberately distancing themselves from the allegorical, Ovide Moralisé tradition, their prefatory material drew special attention to the historical and literary contexts from which the work had originally emerged. This too would help shape Bellenden’s translation as he grappled with the significance of Livy’s lexical idiosyncrasies.

140 Livy (1470) s.p.
This chapter has begun to explore the relationship between structures of power and the deployment of cultural and literary symbols of legitimisation in Renaissance Europe and Scotland. When James V commissioned Bellenden’s translation of the first five books of Livy, he was emulating similar projects on the continent. Following the leads of his royal counterparts across Europe, James hoped to harness something of Livy’s cultural prestige to his fledgling court. Written in the wake John Mair’s *Historia Maioris Britanniae* and Boece’s *Scotorum Historia*, Bellenden’s translation can be seen as working within a wider series of history projects which sought to reinforce Stewart rule. By exploiting the cultural prestige with which classical history had come to be associated, these projects sought to match and compete with European advances in humanist learning. Bellenden’s translation therefore contributed to a wider programme of reform intended to establish James’s fledgling court as a serious player on the European stage.
Chapter Two

John Bellenden’s Livy and the Tools of Translation

Introduction

In around 1533, John Bellenden, archdeacon of Moray, completed the earliest extant translation of Livy in the British Isles.\(^1\) The translation covered the first five books of the *AUC*, spanning a period of Roman history from the city’s legendary foundation by Romulus and Remus to its sack by the Gauls in 390BC. Though some critical attention has been paid to Bellenden’s translation of Boece, his Livy remains relatively unstudied.\(^2\) This chapter establishes that Bellenden depended on a print edition of the *AUC*, specifically one produced by Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Though there has been some speculation as to the version of Livy which Bellenden was using, this chapter offers hitherto unexplored evidence that points to an edition by Ascensius.\(^3\) Through a detailed comparison of the manuscript witnesses extant, this chapter also reveals that Bellenden turned to the proto-dictionaries of Niccolò Perotti (1429–80) and Ambrogio Calepino (c.1435–1509/10). These pioneering reference works allowed Bellenden to

\(^1\) Royan (2004). For the dating of Bellenden’s translation, see Craigie, ‘introduction’ in Bellenden (1901–1903) I. vii-viii. Gavin Douglas translated the opening line of Livy’s first book in a marginal note preserved in the Trinity MS of the *Eneados*, which Coldwell dated as ‘not later than 1515’. Bellenden’s is, however, the earliest substantial translation to have survived. Cf. Douglas, II.35, f.n. 35; I.97.


\(^3\) Harikae (2010) 214.
negotiate the semantic complexities of the Latin original and can be heard throughout his translation. Finally, this chapter nuances our understanding of the influence exerted on Bellenden’s Livy by the French translation by the Benedictine monk Pierre Bersuire. By returning to the manuscript witnesses extant in Edinburgh, London, and Aberdeen, this chapter uncovers the key hermeneutic tools which enabled Bellenden to complete his project.

Bellenden’s translation of Livy survives in three manuscripts. The earliest of these is preserved at the British Library (MS Add 36, 678, hereafter ‘BL MS’). Salvaged from the binding of an early Scottish print, the manuscript was presented to the British Museum by George Reid in 1903. This fragmentary copy includes sections from the first and third books and preserves the working of both an amanuensis and Bellenden himself. This is a rough version of the translation, with frequent deletions and additions. It reveals, as Ryoko Harikae has observed, a work very much in progress. This copy also contains a series of marginal notes, written in both Latin and Scots, explaining loan words found in the main text and pointing the reader to comparable moments in other classical works, most frequently to the Memorable Doings and Sayings of Valerius Maximus and Ovid’s Fasti.

The second manuscript witness is held at the National Library of Scotland (Adv. MS.18.3.12, hereafter ‘Advocates MS’), the composition of which E. A. Sheppard dated as ‘not later than 1538’. This is a fair copy of the translation. All five books are extant.

---

4 Bellenden’s use of Bersuire was first posited by Christian Baumann in Livius, Bersuire und Bellenden: Vergleichende Studien zu Bellenden’s Liviusübersetzung (Leipzig–Reudnitz: August Hoffmann, 1905).
5 Harikae, 211.
6 Thus, for example, in the first book, beside a description of Horatius’s murder of his sister, the reader is directed to Valerius’s account of the event. The BL MS notes that ‘This Historie is rehersit be Valerius Maximus, liber vi., de seueritate, ubi […] [sororem nec]lait horatius post prælium trium fratrum’, while the Advocates MS has: ‘[Vale]rius max. lib[ro sext]o .de seueri[tate]. ca. horatij […] – illus.’ BL MS Add 36, 678 (hereafter BL MS), 8”; Adv. MS.18.3.12 (hereafter Adv. MS), 50.
7 Boece (1938–1941) II.148.
here except the last chapter of the fifth book. In terms of provenance, the manuscript was once in the hands of an ‘A. Home’, who provided his own translation of the missing chapter along with some verse on Bellenden’s achievement. At some point, the manuscript was held at Stichill School near Kelso on the Scottish borders, before being acquired by the Advocates Library and ultimately housed at the National Library of Scotland. Only minor emendations have been made to this copy, and for the most part these are corrections to scribal slips. Only occasionally do they involve a significant change in meaning. Many of the glosses which appear in the BL MS have also been incorporated here, although intriguingly they are now entirely in Latin. The glosses preserved in the Advocates MS exist only in fragmentary form since the margins of this manuscript have been trimmed in the rebinding process. The last witness, known as the Boyndlie MS, is now at the University of Aberdeen (MS 2740/box 63). William Craigie dated the composition of this copy between 1550–60 (and therefore after Bellenden’s death) and identified ‘no less than eleven’ different hands at work. Unlike the earlier witnesses, the Boyndlie manuscript reproduces none of the marginal glosses, nor does it include the verse ‘prologue’ which prefaces the Advocates MS. If there was once a presentation copy of Bellenden’s Livy, as there is with the Boece translation, it has not survived.

---

8 ‘Fyve buikes ar heir by Ballentyne translated / restis ʒet ane hundredth threttie fyve behind, / Quhilkes, if the samyn war als weill compleated, / wald be ane volume of ane monstrous bind. // Ilk man perfytes not quhat they ons intend, / so fraill and brittle ar our wretched dayes. / Let sume man then begine quhat he doeth end, / giue him þe first, tak þame þe second praise, / No no! to Titus Liuius giue all, / That peirles prince for feitis historicall’. Bellenden (1901–3) I.234, f.n. 1.

9 On p.168, an anonymous hand has written ‘My hand at Stitchill school’.

10 A dated annotation on Rome’s population in the third book suggests, by the fact that it is intact and has been made to fit the new, trimmed margin, that the manuscript was first rebound at some point before 1678: ‘26 august 124224 persone Thomas Wieson 1678’. Adv. MS.18.3.12, p.231.

11 Bellenden (1901–3) I.xi-xii.

12 Unlike his Chroniklis, Bellenden’s Livy was not printed in his lifetime. It was first published in 1822 in an edition produced by James Ballentyne. This was followed by an edition prepared by William Craigie at the beginning of the twentieth century which, though primarily drawing from the Advocates MS, was supplemented with readings from the Boyndlie MS.
There has been some confusion surrounding the marginal glosses which appear in the BL and Advocates manuscripts. Their presence in the Advocates MS has not so much been ignored by scholars as altogether denied, most probably because William Craigie did not include these glosses in his modern print edition. The glosses are, however, very much a feature of both manuscripts and form an integral part of the translation, allowing for the incorporation of Latinate vocabulary into the text proper without compromising reader comprehension. Most importantly, these glosses offer vital clues as to the resources to which Bellenden turned, drawing, as they do, on Ascensius, Perotti, Calepino, and Bersuire. Their absence in the Boyndlie manuscript can perhaps be explained by the fact that this version was undertaken after Bellenden’s death, the commissioner or scribes of this manuscript deeming them of less importance than the translation itself. The situation is comparable to Gavin Douglas’s treatment of the Eneados. In the verse which suffixed the translation, Douglas explained that ‘I haue alalso a schort comment compilyt / To expon strange histouris and termys wild.’ The traces of this ‘comment’ are, however, preserved in one manuscript witness alone (Trinity MS, Cambridge) and only in part – the manuscript includes marginal glosses on the first prologue and the first book alone. Bellenden was also following in the footsteps of Pierre Bersuire, whose French translation included a series of annotations on the text proper, as is explored below.

Though the critical attention Bellenden has received has mainly centered around the Boece translation, the Livy translation has been the subject of growing interest over the last two decades. John MacQueen includes an analysis of Bellenden’s Livy in a

---

13 John Macqueen, referring to the notes which appear alongside the BL rough copy, states that ‘no trace of [them] appears in the more complete versions’. Following Macqueen, Harikae remarks that ‘it is hard to know why these glosses are not found in the Advocates MS or in the Boyndlie MS’. Baumann made the same slip in *Livius, Bersuire, und Bellenden*. John Macqueen, *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press: 1990) 14; Harikae, 213; Baumann, 13.

14 Douglas, IV.191 (lines 141–2).
chapter on the development of humanist interests in Scottish literature of the Scottish Renaissance.\textsuperscript{15} Cornelia Jumpertz-Schwab has conducted a rich, comparative study on the influence of Latin lexis and syntax on sixteenth-century Scots via translation. Part of this survey involves an examination of the linguistic characteristics of Bellenden’s translations of Boece and Livy.\textsuperscript{16} Most recently, John Leeds has examined the Livy translation in Renaissance Syntax and Subjectivity, comparing close readings of Bellenden with the works of two later historiographers, John Knox (c.1514–1572) and George Buchanan (1506–1582).\textsuperscript{17} There has not yet been any serious attempt to identify the version of Livy which Bellenden was using, nor to establish the hermeneutic resources at his disposal. These have, however, important implications for tracing and understanding the development of humanism in Scotland.

1. Bellenden’s edition of Livy

As noted in chapter one, unusually for a classical text published during the period, a detailed commentary did not yet exist for Livy. Machiavelli’s Discorsi, a series of topics inspired by his reading of the first decade, had been printed in 1531 at Florence.\textsuperscript{18} Though it is not impossible that these reached Scotland in the first half of the sixteenth

\textsuperscript{15} MacQueen, 10–31.
\textsuperscript{18} Niccolò Machiavelli, Discorsi Sopra la Prima Deca di Tito Livio (Florence: Bernardo Giunta, 1531).
century, Bellenden has left no indication that he was familiar with them. Unlike Gavin Douglas then whose copy of the *Aeneid* included both Servius’s commentary and that of Ascensius, there was no such guide available to Bellenden. What we do find in these early editions, however, are the attempts of Livy’s first editors in print to amend and polish the text. The medieval manuscripts extant, with the exception of the *Codex Veronensis*, descend from what is known as ‘the Nicomachean Recension’, the efforts of the Nicomachi to edit Livy in the fifth century A.D. Consistently when the early print editions diverge from the consensus of the [N] manuscripts, these changes resurface in Bellenden’s translation. This suggests that it was primarily a print edition which Bellenden consulted.

In his 1491 Venice edition of Livy, Sabellicus introduced a series of textual emendations which he defended in the *Breuissimae in Livium Annotationes* which preaced his version of the text. In one such instance, Sabellicus tackles the Virginia episode, found in the third book of the history. According to the manuscript tradition, it is Virginia’s ‘avus’ (‘grandfather’) who appears at the scene to defend her. Thus Pierre Bersuire in his fourteenth-century translation refers to ‘P. Numitorius qui estoit ayeul de la dicte pucelle’. Sabellicus, however, by collating Livy with the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius Halicarnassus, offers ‘avunculus’ (‘uncle’) instead, an alteration which Bellenden reproduces in his translation: ‘uncle to þis Virgine’; ‘baith Icelius hir spouss and Numitoris hir uncle’.

---

20 For Douglas’s use of an Ascensius edition of the *Aeneid*, see Bawcutt, 97–120.
23 The following moment is taken from the first book, where the manuscript consensus has: ‘[Tullus] principes Albanorum in patres ut ea quoque pars rei publicae cresceret legit, Tullios, Serrulios, Quinctios, Geganios, Curiatios, Cleolios’ (‘Tullus chose Alban princes to be city fathers so that that part of the commonwealth would also increase: the Tulli, Serrulii, Quinctii, Geganii, Curiatii, ...
the possibility that Bellenden was also consulting a manuscript version of the history, but it does suggest that he was most probably consulting a print edition produced in the wake of Sabellicus’s *Annotationes*.

The cultural and intellectual context from which Bellenden’s translation emerged points to the editions prepared by Ascensius. Between 1510 and 1531, Ascensius edited five editions of the *AUC*.²⁴ He prefaced these with the *Epitome* of Florus, an index of contents, Sabellicus’s *Annotationes* (Ascensius also reproduced Sabellicus’s changes to the text proper), his own *Isagoge* (‘introduction’) to the history, consisting of eleven precepts for reading Livy’s history and an *Explanatio primi proœmii* (‘explanation of the first proem’). In the 1513 edition, Ascensius increased the precepts from eleven to twenty and introduced the *Vocabulorum Liuianorum Explanatio Ascensiana* (‘Ascensius’s Interpretation of Livy’s Vocabulary’). As he explains in a note at the end of his glossary, ‘these are the words which, while I was going through Livy again, because I thought they wouldn’t reveal themselves to everyone upon the first reading, I reckoned I should explain with a few words’.²⁵ Thus we find entries on the martial (e.g. *scutum, aries, stipendia facere*), religious (*flamen, sacrificium lustrale, Elicius Iuppiter*) and political (*candidati, ambitio, plebiscitum*). These words are also marked out in the text proper by an asterisk to alert the reader that a definition is available in the *Explanatio*. Unlike his other editions, however, which came replete with running commentary, often written by Ascensius himself, Ascensius’s editions of Livy are relatively bare (figure 3). The margins include short summaries of the action in the main

---

²⁴ These appeared in 1510, 1513, 1516, 1530, and 1531.
²⁵ ‘Haec sunt quae dum Liuium relegerem / quia non omnibus prima lectione se proditura putau: his paucis explicanda duxi’. Livy (1513) s.p.
text for ease of consultation, but nothing to compare to his extremely detailed *familiaris interpretatio* which appears, for example, alongside his edition of Sallust (1506). Here Ascensius places a short passage of the original text to the left of the page, while he devotes the vast majority of space to his own commentary (figure 4).

Figure 3. Ascensius’s Livy, 1516.
Figure 4. Ascensius’s Sallust, 1506.
It would be difficult to overstate the importance of Ascensius to the development of humanist learning in Scotland. By printing Mair’s *Historia Maioris Britanniae* and Boece’s *Historia*, he had helped to nurture an interest in Scottish historiography in the years preceding Bellenden’s translations. Ascensius was also responsible for printing Boece’s glossary of logic, the *Explicatio Quorundam Vocabulorum* (1519) along with the *Episcoporum Vitae* (1522), Boece’s biography of Aberdonian bishops. This represents only a sample of the works printed by Ascensius of Scottish authorship.\(^\text{26}\) As noted above, Gavin Douglas consulted an Ascensius edition of Virgil for his translation of the *Aeneid*.

There is then a strong contextual likelihood that Bellenden too was relying on Ascensius. But crucially Bellenden’s glosses and the translation itself also suggest an Ascensian edition. In the third book, a holiday is proclaimed at Rome when ‘[mon]ly vncoth and strange mervellis’ suddenly appear in the sky, ‘teribill to þe sicht of man’.\(^\text{27}\) As Livy explains, ‘his auertendis terroribus in triduum feriae indictae’\(^\text{28}\). In the earliest, rough copy version, Bellenden reproduces this as: ‘[To] remove þ[ir] terrouiris was institut þe sacrifice feriall [continew]ing thre dayis to gidder’\(^\text{29}\). Here his initial translation of *feriae* as ‘sacrifice feriall’ has been scored through and replaced with the Latinate ‘feries’ in the margin, a reading which is reproduced in the later, Advocates MS: ‘to remove þir terrouiris war institute þe feries continewing thre dayis toggider’\(^\text{30}\). For the reader’s better understanding, a gloss in Scots has been introduced in the margin.

\(^{26}\) For a full account of Ascensius’s Scottish prints, see *Scottish Latin Authors in Print up to 1700: A Short–Title List*, (eds) R. P. H. Green, P. H. Burton and D.J. Ford (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2012) 62–3; 131; 186; 198–9; 202; 260–1.

\(^{27}\) BL MS, 26r. Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 294.

\(^{28}\) ‘a holiday of three days was announced to drive off this terror’ Livy (3.5.14).

\(^{29}\) BL MS, 26r. Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 294.

\(^{30}\) Bellenden (1901–3) I. 244.
of the BL MS: ‘feries war callit halij days in quhilkis þe peple cessit fra mechanik & crafty lawbour’.\(^{31}\) The phrasing here borrows from Ascensius’s entry for *feriae* in the *Explanatio*: ‘Feriae sunt cessationes ab opere moechanico indictae: vt festiuis & laetis vacemus,’ from which Bellenden has derived ‘mechanik & crafty lawbour’.\(^{32}\) So too in the Advocates MS, a gloss on ‘feries’ in the first book rehearses Ascensius’s phrasing.\(^{33}\) In his French translation, Pierre Bersuire made no attempt to translate *feriae*, choosing to ignore the word altogether.\(^{34}\) Bellenden, however, by incorporating Ascensius’s gloss, is able to reproduce the word in a form which closely resembles the Latin original (‘feries’) while also accommodating for a readership unfamiliar with such technical vocabulary.

At another moment in the third book, Bellenden includes a gloss on ‘candidatis’.\(^{35}\) Here the main text of the BL manuscript has ‘It wes all ways vncertane quheder þis appius suld be nomerit amang þe x men or amang þe candidatis’.\(^{36}\) This was subsequently reproduced in the fair copy without alteration. The margin of the BL copy offers the following definition: ‘Candidatis war callit new litiiis afore þare election to ony office or dignite. Sic personis war clothit in quhit vesture to signify þare Innocente & clene lif but ony spot of Cryme.’\(^{37}\) Ascensius offers a very similar account in the *Explanatio*: ‘Candidati id est. candidis vestimentis induti erant magistratuum competitores: vt se innocentes & pura intentione, & nullis suis meritis petere

---

\(^{31}\) BL MS, 26r. Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 294.

\(^{32}\) ‘feriae are publicly-announced respite from mechanical labour so that we have time for festive and joyful things’. Livy (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1513) aaaiii


\(^{34}\) Bersuire avoids translating *feriae* directly, giving a periphrasis which incorporates the action subsequently described by Livy: ‘furent ordonnez a Romme trois iours esquelz tous les temples estoient plains de homes & de femmes requerans & supplians la paix & la reconciliation auec les dieux’ (‘three days were decreed on which all the temples were filled with men and women entreating and beseeching peace and reconciliation with the gods’) Bersuire, hi². Cf. Livy(3.5.14).

\(^{35}\) BL MS 35v. Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II.310.

\(^{36}\) Ibid.

significant’. There is both a visual and etymological resonance between Bellenden’s ‘to signify bare Innocente & cline lif’ and Ascensius’s ‘vt se innocentes [...] significant’, once again suggesting that Bellenden was using the *Explanatio* to unpack the technical nuances of Livy’s vocabulary.

Ascensius’s *Explanatio* is also responsible for an apparent slip in Bellenden’s translation. At the climax of the first book, Lucretia summons her husband home following her attack. Livy includes a brief dialogue between the two:

> quarerentique uiro ‘Satin salve?’ ‘Minime’ inquit: ‘quid enim salui est mulieri amissa pudicitia? Vestigia uiri alieni, Collatine, in lecto sunt tuo’.

For which Bellenden gives:

> quhen hir husband had demandit gif all thingis war sauf, scho anwuerit, ‘nay; For na thing may be sauf to ane woman quhen hir chastitie & womanhede Is gane. O collatyne, þe futesteppis of ane uthirman ar left in thy bed’.

Though *vestigia* in its primary sense suggests ‘futesteppis’, Livy appeals here to a secondary, figurative sense, that is, *traces*, a meaning which Bellenden appears to have missed. The phrase ‘satine salve’ is an abbreviation of ‘satis ne salve’, where ‘salve’ is used adverbially and the absent ‘agis’ is understood – essentially ‘are you well?’ For this, Bellenden gives the literal ‘gif all thing war sauf’. He may have been unfamiliar with the archaic phrase, found as it is almost exclusively in the comedies of Plautus and Terence. It is likely, however, that he was prompted to this translation by Ascensius’s gloss in the *Explanatio*, wherein he refers to this very moment in Livy:

---

38 *Candidati*, that is, rivals for civic offices who were dressed in white clothing to indicate that they were innocent and of a pure purpose, and not seeking the office for their own rewards’. Livy (1513) aiiii.
39 ‘When her husband asked ‘Are you well?’ she said ‘Not at all. What can be well for a woman whose chastity has been lost? The traces of another man, Collatine, are in your bed’. Livy (1.58.7).
40 Bellenden (1901–3) 1.125.
41 Cf. Plautus (*Trinummus* 1177; *Menaechmi* 776) and Terence (*Eunuch* 978).
Saluæ nomen est. non verbum neque aduerbiuM cum dicitur ab aduentante: satin saluæ. id est. satis ne sunt res saluæ: vnde respondet Lucretia: minime sup. saluæ sunt. Quid enim salui est mulieri / amissa pudicitia?

Working from Ascensius’s definition, Bellenden gives ‘thingis […] sauf’ for the apparently hidden ‘res […] saluæ’. The phrase proved less problematic to Livy’s later translators in England. In William Painter’s (1540?–1595) version of the same passage, Collatinus asks his wife more idiomatically ‘whether all thynges were well’. So too Philemon Holland (1552–1637) offered a colloquial turn, ‘How now my deere (quoth her husband) is all well?’ The linguistic resources at the disposal of Painter and Holland were, however, more comprehensive than those available to Bellenden.

Bellenden then was most probably working with a version of Livy printed by Ascensius. Since the Explanatio was first introduced to the edition of 1513, this rules out the 1510 Livy. Bellenden may have consulted the editions of 1510, 1513, or 1516, or even those as late as 1530 and 1531. It is equally possible that Bellenden consulted more than one print edition. It is clear from his translation, and from the glosses that accompany it, that Bellenden was relying on Ascensius’s prefatory material to negotiate the more complex items of Livy’s vocabulary. But the Explanatio was far from exhaustive, and Bellenden would have to turn to other, richer sources as he grappled with the Latin original.

42 *Saluæ* is a noun. It is neither a verb nor an adverb when ‘satin saluæ’, that is, ‘are all things safe enough?’ is said by someone who is arriving, to which Lucretia replies below, ‘by no means are they safe. What can be safe for a woman once her chastity has been lost?’ Livy (1513) s.p., s.v. ‘Saluæ’.


44 Philemon Holland, *The Romane Historie* (London: Adam Islip, 1600), Eiii’

45 In 1532, Joachim Périon gave a more satisfactory gloss on ‘satin salve’ in his collection of Livy’s speeches: ‘intelligendum est verbum est, aut agis: vt sit intellectus: An satis prospere tibi est, aut agis? Nam particula salue, aduerbi uim obtinet (‘The word ‘is’ or ‘do’ must be understood so that the phrase is understood as: ‘is all well with you?’ or ‘how do you do?’ For the particle ‘salue’ has the function of an adverb’). Livy, *T. Liuii Patauini Conciones, Cum Argumentis et Annotationibus Ioachimi Perionij* (Paris: Simon de Colines, 1532) 16.
2. Niccolò Perotti and Ambrogio Calepino

In the final years of his life, Niccolò Perotti, humanist and archbishop of Siponto, completed the *Cornucopia*, a vast, word-by-word commentary on Martial. The work boasted remarkably detailed entries on the Latin language, drawing illustrative quotations from classical and ecclesiastical authors alike on an impressive range of topics, from ancient religious ceremonies to the minutiae of Roman political life. The *Cornucopia* was printed posthumously at Venice in 1489 and soon became a popular reference work, used more as a dictionary than a commentary on Martial. Thus the title page of the 1510, Paris edition presents the *Cornucopia* first and foremost as an *Opus Commentariorum Linguae Latinae* (‘A Work of Commentaries on the Latin language’), while Martial is mentioned only halfway down the page. As Martine Furno notes, thirty-eight editions of the *Cornucopia* appeared between 1489 and 1536. Some of these had made their way into Scottish hands.

At first glance, the majority of the glosses which appear alongside Bellenden’s Livy appear to have been taken from the *Cornucopia*. Matters are complicated, however, by the fact that Perotti’s definitions were rehearsed almost verbatim by Ambrogio Calepino in his *Dictionarium*, first printed in 1502 and thus also predating Bellenden’s translation. Calepino’s borrowings from Perotti did not go unnoticed by his early

---

46 Perotti was also responsible for the *Rudimenta Grammatices*, a pioneering grammar first printed at Rome by Sweynheym and Pannartz in 1473. The *Grammatices*, which proved to be one of the most popular grammars of the late fifteenth century, even made an appearance at a London press in 1512, printed by Wynkyne de Worde.
49 Higgitt records three copies of Perotti with a specifically Scottish provenance in his study of early Scottish libraries. One of these is mentioned in a list (compiled in around 1551) of books loaned by King’s College, Aberdeen, while another belonged to John Grieson, a monk at the Dominican convent at St Andrews. Grieson also owned a copy of Perotti’s *Grammatices Rudimenta*, along with three other works on the Latin language. John Higgitt, *Scottish Libraries* (London: The British Library, 2006) 65; 250.
modern readers. Thomas Elyot (c.1490–1546) notes disparagingly in the preface to his Latin-English Dictionary (1538) that ‘Frye Calepine (but where he is augmented by other) nothyng amended, but rather appaired that which Perotus had studiously gathered’. Calepino’s dictionary, which would ultimately supplant the Cornucopia, thrived as a reference work for almost three centuries, appearing in 211 editions between 1502 and 1709. Though borrowing heavily from Perotti’s work, Calepino also incorporated new definitions, not least for the Scots, who were glossed as polygamous cannibals. Bellenden’s namesake, Sir John Bellenden (d.1576), justice clerk, owned a copy of Calepino, namely the 1540, Lyon edition printed by Sebastian Gryphe. Calepino’s first appearance in France was due to none other than Ascensius, who prepared the Dictionarium for publication in 1509, printing further editions in 1510, 1516, and 1519. This link with the Parisian printer notwithstanding, Bellenden’s glosses tend to follow Perotti’s phrasing more closely than they do Calepino’s, though the difference is admittedly slight. Most probably Bellenden had access to both reference works.

The presence of these proto-dictionaries is apparent throughout Bellenden’s translation. In the first book of Livy’s history, Numa Pompilius, second king of Rome

52 'Scoti populi Britannici apud quos nulla coniunx propria est. Hierony. Quid loquar de cæteris nationibus: cum ipse adolescentulus in Gallia viderim Scotos gentem Britiannicam humanis vesci carnibus? Et cum per sylulas porcorum greges & armentorum pecudumque reperiant: pastorum nates & feminarum papillas solere abscindere: & has solas ciborum delicias arbiteri.' (‘The Scots are a British people among whom no one has his own wife. St Jerome: ‘But why should I talk about other nations, when I myself as a young man in France saw the Scots (a British race) feeding on human flesh? And when they stumbled on herds of pigs, cattle, and sheep in the forests, they would lop off the shepherds’ buttocks and the women's breasts and considered these (and these alone) a delicacy’). Ambrogio Calepino, Dictionarium ex Optimis Quibusque Authoribus (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1509) Qv.
53 This copy is now preserved at the University Library at Aberdeen (pi f473 Cal 1). Bellenden has left his signature on both the title and final pages. The signature on the final page includes his position: ‘J Bellenden clericus Justiciarie’. The presence of the Dictionarium in Scotland is also attested by three records in Higgitt’s Scottish Libraries. Higgitt, 250; 289; 291.
(to whom James V had been compared in a poem marking his succession), founds a series of religious rites by way of imposing discipline on the Roman people.\textsuperscript{54} Machiavelli praised the political utility of Numa’s actions in the \textit{Discorsi}, remarking that ‘Whoever considers well the Roman histories sees how much religion served to command armies, to animate the plebs, to keep men good, to bring shame to the wicked’.\textsuperscript{55} To bolster the authority of his innovations, Livy’s Numa alleges that he has received divine instruction from the nymph Egeria:

\begin{quote}
rem ad multitudinem imperitam et illis saeculis rudem efficacissimam, deorum metum iniciendum ratus est. Qui cum descendere ad animos sine aliquo commento miraculi non posset, simulat sibi cum dea Egeria congressus nocturnos esse; eius se monitu quae acceptissima dis essent sacra instituere, sacerdotes suos cuique deorum praeficere.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

For which Bellenden gives in the BL MS:

\begin{quote}
he thocht maist proffitable to Induce þe rude and symple pepill in þai days to Religion and dredour of goddis. And becaus nowthir þe weneratioun of Religioni nor ȝit þe dredour of goddis mycht synk nor be Imprentit ony ways in þe hartis of his pepill but sum New Inuentiou of vncoth miracle or sic thingis (quhilkis war abone þe commoun and naturall operatioune of man) he fenȝeit þat he had familiare cumpany on þe nycht with þe goddess egeria, & by hir avyse he wald Institute certane divyne sacrifce quhilkis suld be maist acceptable to þe goddis, and wald found and limete diuers præficere to beire speciall charge and curis of þir sacrifcis.\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

The margin next to this passage includes the following gloss: ‘Egeria nimpha fuit cui pregnantes sacrificare solebant, quia eam putabant facile fetum ex alyo egerere’\textsuperscript{58}. Next to the same passage in the Advocates MS, there remains a fragmentary gloss with a

\textsuperscript{54} James is described as ‘Ancus pace […] Relligione numa’ (‘an Ancus in peace, a Numa in religion’). \textit{Ad Serenissimum Scotorum Regem} (Edinburgh: Thomas Davidson, 1535) s.p.
\textsuperscript{55} Machiavelli, p.34 (I.2).
\textsuperscript{56} ‘He reckoned that a fear of the gods should be instilled, a thing most efficacious for the ignorant and, in that period, wild multitude. Since this was not able to sink into their hearts without some feigned miracle, he pretended that he had nightly meetings with the goddess Egeria, and that it was through her advice that he was establishing sacred rites that were most welcome to the gods, and was appointing priests for each of them’. Livy (1.19.4–5).
\textsuperscript{57} BL MS 4\textsuperscript{v} Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 245.
\textsuperscript{58} ‘Egeria was a nymph to whom pregnant women were wont to sacrifice because they thought she delivered the child easily from the womb’. BL MS 4\textsuperscript{v} Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 245.
similar phrasing: ‘egeria nim[pha] … cui preg[nantes] sacrif[ica]re’.\textsuperscript{59} Both glosses are clearly drawing on the definition offered by Perotti:

\begin{quote}
Egeria Nympha cui sacrificare praegnantes solebant: \textit{quia eam} putabant facile foetam aluo egerere.\textsuperscript{60}
\end{quote}

and subsequently by Calepino:

\begin{quote}
Egeria: nympha cui sacrificabant prægnantes: \textit{quia eam} putabant facile foetum aluo egerere.\textsuperscript{61}
\end{quote}

Though the entries by Perotti and Calepino are practically identical, the inclusion of the verb \textit{solere} in the BL MS points more obviously to Perotti. In the same section of Livy, Numa founds the priestly college of \textit{Salii} for the worship of Mars: ‘Salios item duodecim Marti Gradiuo legit tunicaeque pictae insigne dedit et super tunicam aeneum pectori tegumen caelestiaque arma, quae ancilia appellantur, ferre ac per urbem ire canentes carmina cum tripudiis sollemnique saltatu iussit’.\textsuperscript{62} For which the BL manuscript gives:

\begin{quote}
Attore, he dedicat xij priestis namit salis to þe honoure of mars gradius, and gaif to þame abulgements paintit in manere of cote armouris, commanding þame to bere abone þare cote armouris certane targis of brass namit ancilia, þat is to saye þe hevynlie armour. and als commandit þat þir priestis sall paß throw þe stretis of þe tovne singand melodius sangis with solempne dancing and leping.\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

Bellenden has introduced here the chivalric ‘cote armouris’, that is, coats of arms. Douglas, translating Virgil’s ‘arma uiri […] exuuiasque omnis’ had also harnessed the

\textsuperscript{59} Advocates MS, p. 37.  
\textsuperscript{60} ‘Egeria was a nymph to whom pregnant women were wont to sacrifice because they thought she delivered the child easily from the womb’. Perotti, CXCV, 4, 54ff.  
\textsuperscript{61} ‘Egeria was a nymph to whom pregnant women would sacrifice because they thought she delivered the child easily from the womb.’ Ambrogio Calepino, \textit{Dictionarium ex Optimis Quibusque Authoribus Studiose Collectum} (Paris: Jodocus Badius Ascensius, 1516) Qvi’  
\textsuperscript{62} ‘Likewise he chose twelve Salii for Mars Gradivus, and gave them the uniform of an embroidered tunic and over the tunic a bronze cuirass and ordered them to carry heavenly armour, called \textit{ancilia}, and go singing through the city with jumping and solemn leaping’. Livy (1.20.4).  
\textsuperscript{63} BL MS 5’ Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 246-7.
phrase, ‘Hys cote armour, and other clethyng all’.

Bellenden is alert to the stylistic nuances of Livy’s prose, reproducing the alliterative ‘canentes carmina cum tripudiis sollemnique saltatu iussit’ with his own sibilance, ‘singand melodius sangis with solempne dansing’. He inverts the order of Livy’s internal gloss on the decorative armour carried by the Salii – ‘caelestiaque arma, quae ancilla appellantur’ – with ‘ancilia, þat is to saye þe hevynlie armour’. The margin of the BL manuscript provides a more detailed definition, which slips seamlessly from Scots into Latin: ‘ancile vas ane round targe þat fell out of þe air in þe towne of rome in þe tyme of numa pompilius; & quia in eo pendebat so[r]s Romani imperii ideo undece m facta sunt ancilia (ne illud subtraheretur in quo fatum urbis fuit)’.

At the foot of the same page, there features another gloss on the same, though this has been partially cut off: ‘Ancile scutum erat breue quod regnante nvma pompilio cum pestilens esset e celo cecidisse fertur, ideo sic appellatum quia ex utroque latere erat [recisum]’. It is the latter of these two glosses which resurfaces in the margin of the fair copy, Advocates MS. All three annotations draw from Perotti’s entry for ancile:


---

64 Virgil, *Aeneid*, 4.495–6; Douglas, IV.ix.49.
65 ‘And because the fortune of the Roman empire hung from it, eleven ancilia were made (lest when it was dragged down, the fate of the city went with it)’. BL MS 5º Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 246.
66 ‘Ancile was a small shield which, when there was a plague year during the reign of Numa, is said to have fallen from the sky, and was so called because it was shortened on each side’. BL MS 5º Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 246.
68 ‘It was a small shield which, when there was a plague year during the reign of Numa, is said to have fallen from the sky: it was so called because it was shortened on each side and its top and bottom side was exposed in the middle. At that time a voice was heard simultaneously declaring that it would be the most powerful state of all, so long as the shield remained in it. And thus several others of the same
The second of the BL glosses cited above, which was subsequently reproduced in the fair copy, Advocates MS follows Perotti’s phrasing precisely, though with a slightly different word order. Calepino offers a similar definition, but describes the shield as ‘non rotundum’ (‘not round’), a detail contradicted by Bellenden’s ‘ane round targe’. In this instance the glosses therefore point most obviously to Perotti. Time and again, Bellenden includes these dictionary definitions in the margins, thereby allowing Latin loan words to appear directly in the main text.

But Perotti’s influence does not end with the transcription of particular definitions. As with Ascensius’s Explanatio, the Cornucopia helped to shape the translation itself. In the first book, Livy refers briefly to the origin of Quirites, used in classical Latin as a synonym of Romani. According to Livy, it is as a mark of respect to the newly amalgamated Sabines that a Roman tribe is named Quirites after the Curii, a Sabine tribe: ‘ut Sabinis tamen aliquid dare tur, Quirites a Curibus appellati’. Bellenden, however, appeals to another etymology: ‘ʒi þe romanis, to mak þaim sum part different fra þe sabynis, namit þaim self quiritis, þat is to say, beraris of dartis’. Bellenden derives Quirites not from Curii, as Livy does, but from the Sabine curis, meaning type were made: with which the heavenly one was mixed lest it could be told apart’. Perotti, XVIII, 2, 57ff.

69 Calepino (1516) diii

70 At another moment Bellenden incorporates the Latin proconsul into the main text of his translation. The margin of the rough copy gives the following gloss: ‘proconsul est qui cum potestate consulari extra ordine[m] mittitur ad aliquam prouinciam administrandam, quem sex fasces tantum precedebant’ (‘the proconsul is he who is sent to manage a certain province with consular powers in special circumstances, who was preceded by only six fasces’). This is repeated in the fair copy: ‘proconsul[ul] qui cum po[testate] consu[lar][i] extra or[denem] ad aliquam prouinciam adminis[trandum] mittitur…’. Both have their origins in Perotti’s entry for proconsul: ‘cum potestate consulari extra ordinem ad aliquam prouinciam administrandam mittitur: qui tamen non duodecim: sed tantum sex fasces habet’ (‘he is sent with consular powers in special circumstances to manage a certain province, who has however not twelve but only six fasces’). BL MS, 25v; cf. Bellenden (1901-3) II.292; Adv. MS, 233; Perotti, CLIII, 3, 9ff.

71 ‘so that something might be conceded to the Sabines, the Quirites were named after the Cures’. Livy (1.13.15).

72 Bellenden (1901–3) I.36.
‘spear’. Perotti had associated Quirites with Curis in his commentary where he explains that ‘Romulus Quirinus est dictus: quod hastam ferre solitus erat. A quo Romani quirites nuncupati’. It was in Perotti and not Livy that the connection between Quirites and curis was made.

By comparing the rough and fair copies of the translation, it becomes apparent that Bellenden also corrected his translation with recourse to Perotti. Ryoko Harikae has examined the progressive stages of Bellenden’s translation, comparing Bellenden’s various translations of the phrase ‘peruenere ad tertium lapidem Gabina uia’ (‘they came to the third milestone on the Gabine Way’). In his first attempt, as preserved in the rough copy, Bellenden misses the secondary sense of lapis, lapidem, that is ‘ milestone’, and translates the phrase as a place name: ‘The ennimess […] come to ane place namyt þe thrid stane in the gabyne [w]ay’. This has been scored through, however, and Bellenden gives a gloss in the margin: ‘thrid stane þat Is to say within iij myle to rome’. When we come to the later, Advocates manuscript, we find that the correction has been preserved and the enemy ‘come to the third stane in þe gabyne way’. This much has been demonstrated by Harikae. The gap between Bellenden’s initial slip and subsequent correction can be filled by the Cornucopia. Here Perotti remarks of the phrase quartus lapis that: ‘lapidibus enim apud veteres miliaria signabantur: quos nuncque quibusdam in locis aspicimus. vnnde lapis aliquando pro miliari accipitur: vt

---

73. Romanus was called Quirinus because he had been wont to carry a spear, from which the Romans were called Quirites’. Perotti, CLXIII, 3, 28ff. Ovid had also associated Quirites with curis in the Fasti when discussing the etymology of Romulus’s cult title Quirinus. Cf. Fasti (II. 477–80).

74. The glosses undergo the same process of revision as the main text. Thus, for example, a note on ‘Cures’ was initially included in the rough copy: ‘Cures was ane castell or ciete in þe land of sabynis quhar Numa duelt afor his election to þe empyre of romanis.’ This has however been scored through (perhaps because it was thought superfluous) and is thus not reproduced in the Adv. MS. BL MS 12

75. Livy (3.6.7).

76. BL MS 26’. Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 295.

77. Ibid.

78. Bellenden (1901–03) I. 250.

79. Harikae, 213. Harikae was unaware, however, of the gloss that accompanied this moment in the Advocates MS: ‘[ad] tertium lapidem id est] ad tertium[um] [ab] urbe miliare’. Adv. MS, 236.
cum dicimus ad tertium lapidem, ad quartum lapidem’. Calepino carried this definition into his *Dictionarium*. Here the first example given by Perotti – ‘ad tertium lapidem’ – matches Livy’s phrasing exactly. The *Cornucopia* thus played a key role not only in Bellenden’s initial composition but also in his subsequent revision thereof. This might suggest that Bellenden gained access to the Perotti only after the initial stages of his translation were complete. In this regard, it is telling that the *lapis* correction has also been made to the fair copy, Advocates MS, one of very few alterations to be made to this copy.

Bellenden often preferred Perotti’s phrasing to Calepino’s, but Calepino’s *Dictionarium* nonetheless left its mark on the Livy translation, albeit indirectly. This is because Ascensius, who by 1533 had produced four editions of the *Dictionarium*, relied on Calepino for some of the definitions which featured in his *Explanatio*. These definitions, lifted from Calepino, ultimately resurfaced in Bellenden’s translation. Consider, for instance, Bellenden’s gloss on *verbena*. In the first book, Tullus Hostilius, third king of Rome, makes preparations for a treaty with the Albans. It is of special interest because, as Bellenden translates it, ‘of ony vthir mare anciant band of confederacioun is na memorie’.

In the main text of Bellenden’s translation, one of the ambassador priests tells his king, ‘Deliver to me’ (said the faciall) ‘the herbe Namit’.

---

80 ‘Among the ancients, miles were marked out with stones, which we see nowadays in certain places, whence ‘stone’ is sometimes taken for ‘mile’, as when we say ‘at the third stone’, ‘at the fourth stone’’. Perotti, CXCIII, 3, 25ff.
81 ‘Et quem apud veteres lapidibus miliaria signabantur: ponitur quandoque lapis pro miliario. Vnde legitimus, ad tertium: ad quartum lapidem’ (‘And since among the ancients miles were marked with stones, *lapis* was sometimes used for *milestone*. Whence we read ‘at the third, at the fourth milestone’”). Calepino (1516) Rii
82 This is found in the second book of the Advocates MS, where Bellenden translates the phrase ‘ad secundum lapidem Gabina via’: ‘Valerius laid tytus hermyneus with ane buschement of men hid in þe gabell rew beside *ane stane callit* þe secund’, where ‘ane stane callit’ has been scored through and ‘stane’ inserted in the margin to give ‘þe secund stane’. Adv. MS, 135. Cf. Livy (2.11.7).
verbane’, rendering Livy’s ‘sagmina’, inquit, ‘te, rex, posco’. It is not immediately clear why Bellenden has chosen to translate *sagmina* (that is, the bundle of grass carried by the *feciales* representing their diplomatic immunity) as ‘verbane’, a Scotticised version of *verbena* (a branch used for either religious or medicinal purposes). The gloss which appears beside this passage in the BL MS, however, is illuminating: ‘Verbene was ane herbe þat grew nocht bot in allowit places. It grew within þe capitol, & with þe samyn war crovnit þe fecialis or faders patronatis quhen þai ʒid in ony solemnne message’. The phrasing here borrows from Ascensius’s detailed entry for *sagmina* in the *Explanatio*, wherein he treats the words *sagmen* and *verbena* as interchangeable. The entire entry is actually lifted from two distinct definitions for *sagmen* and *verbena* in Calepino’s *Dictionarium*. It is Ascensius’s paraphrase of Servius (as mediated through Calepino) that most obviously corresponds with Bellenden’s gloss above: ‘Seruius autem Verbena inquit proprie est herba sacra sumpta de loco sacro capitolij qua coronabantur feciales & paterpatratus fecedera facturi vel bella indicturi’. It is possible that Bellenden took his gloss from Ascensius, Calepino, or even directly from Servius, whose commentary on the *Aeneid* accompanied early editions of Virgil’s epic (including those printed by Ascensius). However, the equation in the main text of Bellenden’s translation of *verbena* with the Latin *sagmina* points most obviously to Ascensius’s conflation of the two terms.

Bellenden thus harnessed some of the most recent, philological scholarship developed on the continent to tackle the Latin original. By uncovering the hermeneutic

---

84 Livy (1.24.4).
85 Cf. OLD s.v. ‘sagmen’; ‘verbena’.
86 BL MS 7r. Cf. Bellenden (1901–3) II. 251.
87 Calepino, s.v. ‘Sagmina’, Pv’; s.v. ‘Verbena’, Zii’
88 Servius says that *verbena* strictly speaking is the sacred grass taken from a sacred place on the capitol with which the *feciales* and *paterpatratus* were crowned when they were going to make treaties or declare war’. Livy (1513) s.p., *Explanatio*, s.v. ‘sagmina’. Cf. Servius, *Commentary on the Aeneid*, 12.120.
tools to which Bellenden turned as well as the ways in which these resources nuanced and altered his translation, the fundamentally experimental nature of the project emerges. Bellenden, embarking on what is the earliest extant translation of classical prose into Scots, turned to the leading, linguistic resources of the day, incorporating as much detail and semantic precision as possible. There is, however, another voice at work in Bellenden’s Livy.

3. Pierre Bersuire

Born towards the end of the thirteenth century, Pierre Bersuire was a Benedictine monk, a friend of Petrarch and at one point a prisoner of the Church.\(^89\) He was also a translator of Livy. At the behest of Jean II (1319–1364), he undertook a translation of the three decades then known to exist. Completed by September, 1356, an illuminated presentation copy of his translation was prepared in 1358.\(^90\) Following the death of Jean II in April, 1364, the dedication was reworked for the young Charles V (1338–1380).\(^91\) The translation was first printed in 1486 at Paris by Antoine Caillaut as *Les Decades* and would continue to be published in the sixteenth century. As with Calepino and Perotti, Bersuire was also to be found in Scottish libraries.\(^92\) Below I refer to the 1530 edition

\(^{89}\) In 1351, Bersuire was imprisoned ‘for being too independent in his interpretation of matters of dogma and for expressing, in the form of moralisations, unacceptable views on the activities of the clergy’. K.V. Sinclair, *The Melbourne Livy* (Sydney: Melbourne University Press, 1961) 14.

\(^{90}\) BNF, ms. n. acq. fr.27401.


\(^{92}\) This is based on data provided by the University of Aberdeen Provenance Project, [http://www.abdn.ac.uk/library/provenance/802/](http://www.abdn.ac.uk/library/provenance/802/)
prepared at Paris by Galliot du Pré, as well as a manuscript version now held at the British Library (Lansdowne MS.1178).

Friedrich Baumann first identified the presence of Bersuire in Bellenden’s translation over a century ago. This section considers some as yet unexplored areas of Bersuire’s influence, including the shaping of Bellenden’s glosses in the BL and Advocates manuscripts (which were unknown to Baumann), as well as exploring how the voices of Perotti, Calepino, Ascensius, and Bersuire came together to texture Bellenden’s Livy.

Both clergymen, Bersuire and Bellenden dedicated their translations of Livy to their sovereigns. In the dedication which prefaces the manuscript versions of the French Livy (which was not included in the print versions and was thus also unknown to Baumann), Bersuire outlined the practical use of such a work to a monarch:

C’est tout certain, tres souverain seigneur, ques tous excellens princes, de tant comme il a l’ingin plus clervoyant et de plus noble et vive qualité, de tant veult il plus exercer les vertueux fai et savoir les nottables euvres des princes anciens et les sens d’armes, raisons et industries par lesquelx ilz conquistrent jadis les pays et les teres et ediffierent empierres et royaumes et les fonderent et acrurent, deffendirent et gouvernerent, et tindrent par gras successions et par longues durees, a fin que par semblables guises ilz puissent les leur deffendre leurs subgis et aidier leurs amis.93

Bellenden expressed very similar sentiments in the verse ‘proloug’ addressed to James V. As he explains, ‘Of awfull batallis þe crafty gouernance, / The wise array, þe manlie Ieoperdie, / þe may fynd here’, as well as the ways in which the Romans ‘Thare commoun weill augmented day be day’, and ‘how þaie all cuntries wan / Be Ieoperdyis

93 ‘It is entirely certain, your majesty, that all outstanding princes, the more perceptive their intelligence and the more honourable and alert its condition, the more they desire to perform excellent deeds and to know the distinguished works of ancient princes and the knowledge of arms, reasons, and ingenuity through which they once conquered countries and lands and built empires and kingdoms and established and augmented them, defended and ruled them, and directed them through great successions and through long periods, so that through similar ways the were able defend their subjects and help their allies’. BL Lansdowne MS 1178, 1r
abone Ingyne of man’. Both translators draw attention to the history’s depiction of Rome’s military might, and both place an emphasis on the expansion of empire. The idea that classical history was a storehouse of martial and governmental exempla was by no means exclusive to Bersuire, but the exploration of this idea specifically in a prefatory address to one’s monarch is perhaps more than coincidence. It is possible then that Bellenden had access to a manuscript version of Bersuire’s translation.

As Baumann noted, Bersuire divided Livy’s books into distinct chapters. So too Pedro de la Vega’s Laz Quatorze Decadas de Tito Liuiio (1520) included chapter divisions, while Gavin Douglas had similarly divided his translation of the Aeneid. Typically Bellenden includes a greater quantity of material in each chapter than Bersuire. Thus Bellenden’s third book contains twenty-five chapters, but Bersuire’s forty. There is, however, occasional cross-over:

Comment anthenor fonda Venise & Eneas vint en ytalie / & comme il fut Roy & les hoirs apres luy. Chapitre .ii.

How Eneas and antenor come in Italy efter the eversion of troy; how antenor foundit Venys; and how Eneas foundit lavyne, and was allyat with King latyne; of his sundry adventuris and deith.

In this particular instance, both chapters encompass the same material, concluding with the apotheosis of Aeneas. Bellenden in fact occasionally reproduces the wording of Bersuire’s chapter headings. For instance, where Bersuire gives ‘De la grant mortalite qui fut a Rome’, Bellenden has ‘Of sindry prodigies and of grete mortalite amang þe

---

94 Bellenden (1901–3) I.4; ibid. 2.; ibid. 5.
95 Baumann, 12–13.
96 Bersuire, aii.
97 Bellenden (1901–3) I.12.
98 Bersuire, aii; Bellenden (1901–3) I.15. Douglas used a similar formula for some of his chapter headings, though these appear in rhyming couplets, e.g. in the fifth book: ‘Quhou Irys, send fra Iuno in gret ire, / Gart Troiane wemen set thor schippys in fyre.’ Douglas, V.xi.
Romanis’.99 Tellingly, in this section of Livy there is no single word corresponding to Bersuire and Bellenden’s ‘mortalite’, only the phrase ‘annus pestilens’.100 Bellenden’s word choice may have been prompted by Bersuire. Similar examples can be produced.101 So too the formulae which introduce and conclude each of Bersuire’s books are echoed in Bellenden:

    Cy commence le tiers liure de la premiere decade de Titus Luiius.102
    Here begynnys the thrid buke of titus Luiius.103
    Cy finist le tiers Liure de la premiere decade de Titus Luiius.104
    And sa endis here þe thrid buke of titus Luiius.105

The manuscript transmission of Bersuire’s translation may also account for Bellenden’s decision to translate the first five books alone. At least one manuscript version of Bersuire’s translation, dated to the final years of the fifteenth century, includes only the first five books of his translation.106

Beyond structure, the content of Bellenden’s translation also owes something to Bersuire. The glosses which accompany the BL and Advocates manuscripts were most probably inspired by Bersuire’s example. Throughout his translation, Bersuire included incidents, which, unlike Bellenden’s marginal glosses, were woven into the text itself. Though Bellenden for the most part turned to more recent sources for his glosses, namely the Cornucopia, Dictionarium, and Explanatio, Bersuire’s incidents

---

99 Bersuire, hi’; Bellenden (1901–3) I.249.
100 Livy (3.6.2).
101 As, for example, with their choice of ‘discention’ and ‘dissensioun’ for Livy’s ‘discors’ in the following chapter headings: ‘Cy parle de la discention qui fut a Romme entre les peres et le menu peuple. Chapitre xvi.’; ‘how grete dissensioun raïß betuix the faderis & pepil of rome […] Ca. xj.’ Bersuire, eiii’; Bellenden (1901–3) I.166. Cf. Livy (2.23.1).
102 Bersuire, lii’.
103 Bellenden (1901–3) I.240.
104 Bersuire, lii’.
105 Bellenden (1901–3) II.49.
106 BL MS 16622.
occasionally make an appearance in Bellenden’s translation. In a chapter entitled ‘Comment Romme fut fondee & edifice & en quel temps & de la mort Remus’, Bersuire offers a chronological detail from the Judeo–Christian tradition: ‘Incident. Romme fut faicte au temps que Achaz regnoit en Judee apres Troye destruicte lespace de .iiii. cens et xx. ans ou enuiron auant lincarnation .vii. cens & .lii. sicomme dient Eutrope & Eusebe’. Beside the equivalent chapter in the Advocates manuscript – ‘How rome was foundit; of the slauchter of remus’ – we find the following gloss:


This account is found in neither Perotti nor Ascensius – Bellenden has translated Bersuire’s incident directly into Latin. Bellenden thus followed in Bersuire’s footsteps in terms of structure and the inclusion of glosses. The section below compares extracts from the two translations to examine the synthesis of external voices at work in Bellenden’s translation.

4. Bellenden’s Polyphonic Livy

There was then a confluence of voices at work in Bellenden’s Livy. By focusing on Bellenden’s translation of a specific passage, this section demonstrates how Bellenden brought these multiple resources to bear on his translation in the same moment. In the

107 ‘Rome was founded at the time when King Ahaz reigned in Judea 420 years after the destruction of Troy or thereabouts and 752 years before the incarnation, as Eutropius and Eusebius attest’. Bersuire, aiii.

108 ‘Rome (as Eusebius and Eutropius attest) was founded at the time when Ahaz reigned in Judea 420 years after the destruction of Troy and seven hundred […] before the word was made flesh and the birth of Christ’. Adv. MS, 3. The equivalent section in the BL manuscript has not survived.
second book, Livy documents one of the multiple civil disturbances which appear throughout the first pentad. The first five books in fact catalogue a series of social and political upheavals, including Rome’s transition from a monarchy to a consular republic, the exile of Coriolanus, the rise and fall of the *decemviri*, as well as many successful demonstrations by the *plebs*. This seems a strange choice of subject to dedicate to one’s monarch. But as Bellenden explains in the ‘prolougi’, these examples are to be studied that they might be avoided:

| Quhat realmes and cieteis for fault of Iustice lost, |
| Quhat vailjeand campiouns & dukis militare |
| For falt of wisdome bene tynt with all þare Oist, |
| Myne auctor shewis, and sum tame will declare |
| The damage of division populare, |
| Quhilk haistilie (quhare na concorde is socht) |
| The commoun will resoluis in to nocht.109 |

In this formulation, Livy’s many depictions of ‘division populare’ become lessons within the Advice to Princes tradition. The minority of James V had witnessed a special kind of civil unrest, with various and opposing nobles making claims to the regency. Thus in ‘The Testament’ (1530), Lyndsay refers to ‘Quhat gret mysreule, in to this regioun rang, / Quhan our þong prince could noder spek nor gang’.110 ‘Division populare’ was also a familiar theme for Bersuire’s contemporary readership in France. When Bersuire finished his translation in September, 1358, Jean II was a prisoner of England and the revolution at Paris was only just coming to an end.111 For both Bellenden and Bersuire, then, Livy’s depictions of popular dissent had a pressing relevance.

In the following extract, tension builds to crisis point at Rome over private debts. Roman citizens, unable to repay interest on money borrowed, have been reduced to slavery. This section in particular presented some linguistic challenges for Bellenden,

---

109 Bellenden (1901–3) I.3.
from technical vocabulary (nexus; ergastulum; usura) to the syntactical complexities of spoken Latin.

In the following extract, Livy describes the beginning of the unrest at Rome,

Sed et bellum Volscum imminebat et ciuitas secum ipsa discors intestino inter patres plebemque flagrabaet odio, maxime propter nexus ob aes alienum. Fremebant se, foris pro libertate et imperio dimicantes, domi a ciuibus captos et oppressos esse, tutoriemque in bello quam in pace et inter hostes quam inter cives libertatem esse

For which Bersuire gives,

La guerre des Vosques estoit appareille & la cite de Romme estoit plein de discention entre les peres & le menu peuple. Et le peuple auoit dueil pour cause de ceux qui estoient prins & liez pour aucune debte / et disoit que eulx qui auoient dehors guerroye et combatu pour la franchise de la Cite estoient en lhostel de leurs propres cytoiens chetiz & dolens et que la franchise Rommaine estoit plus seure en temps de guerre que en temps de paix & entre leurs enemys que entre leurs ouysins.

And Bellenden,

Now was þe batall of the wolchis apperand haistelie aganis þe romanis, quhen þe ciete of rome was full of haitrent and dissensioun amang them self; for þe faderis and small pepill war of sindri & contrarius opinions. This dissencioun raiß in special throw certane Indigent pepill, quhilkis war haldin in captiuite for non-payment of dettis to þare creditouris. The small pepill lamentit heuilie, Sayand þai war send furth of þe said ciete, fechtand continually for þe liberte & empire þareof; And at þare returnyng þai war takin & opprest Be þe cietezanis, throw quhilk noc/h allanerlie apperit þare liberte mare sikkir in tyme of were þan pece, bot was als mare sikkir amang þare Inemyis þan amang þare freyndis.

112 ‘But war with the Volsci was imminent and the state was at odds with itself and an internal hatred burned between the fathers and the people, primarily because of those enslaved on account of debt. They murmured that, though fighting abroad for freedom and power, they had been captured and overthrown at home by their fellow citizens, and that freedom was safer in war than in peace and among enemies than among citizens’. Livy (2.22.1–2).

113 ‘The war with the Volsci was at hand and the city of Rome was full of dissention between the fathers and the commons. And the people were grief-stricken on account of those who were held and bound for a certain debt, and said that they who had fought wars and battled for the freedom of the city were chattels and wretches in the households of their fellow citizens and that Roman freedom was safer in times of war than in times of peace and among their enemies than among their neighbours’. Bersuire, eiii.

114 Bellenden (1901–3) I.166.
Bellenden’s use of Bersuire is immediately apparent. While Livy uses the image of civil discord burning with hatred between the fathers and the people (‘intestino inter patres plebemque flagratabat odio’), Bersuire gives the simpler ‘la cite de Romme estoit plein de discension entre les peres & le menu peuple’, a phrasing which Bellenden reproduces with ‘þe ciete of rome was full of haitrent and dissensioun amang them self’. Here Bellenden has followed Bersuire’s treatment of civitas (‘la cite de Romme’; ‘þe ciete of rome’) as well as plebem (‘le menu peuple’; ‘small pepill’) and discors (‘discension’; ‘dissensioun’). Throughout their translations Bersuire and Bellenden reproduce plebs as ‘menu peuple’ and ‘small pepill’ respectively – it is likely that Bellenden was prompted to do so by the French example. Both translators unpack Livy’s phrase ‘nexos ob aes alienum’, that is, ‘those imprisoned on account of debt’. Bersuire gives the literal ‘ceuxx qui estoient prins & liez pour aucune debte’, rendering ‘nexos’ with a doublet, while Bellenden expands with more detail: ‘Indigent pepill, quhilkis war haldin in captiuite for non-payment of dettis to þare creditouris’. Intriguingly, Ascensius had deemed the phrase unusual enough to warrant definition in the Explanatio: ‘Nexos ob aes alienum .id est. vinculis addictos ob æratos: qui lege duodecim tabularum creditoribus in temporaneam seruitutem temporaneam donec aes alienum reponerent’.115So too Ascensius had glossed aes alienum, ‘id est. debitum’.116 Ascensius’s ‘debitum’ and ‘creditoribus’ may well have inspired Bellenden’s ‘dettis’ and ‘creditouris’.117

The plight of one man in particular, a veteran of the Sabine war, enrages the people to such an extent that they fill the streets of Rome in protest. In the following extract, the specific points of interest for discussion have been highlighted in bold:

115 ‘Bound because of debt, that is, those enslaved in chains because of debt, who were by the law of the twelve tables in temporary thrall to their creditors until they repaid their debt’. Livy (1513) aav.
116 ibid.
117 Perotti does not include an entry on this very specific use of nexus, though Calepino does, and actually appeals to Livy’s account thereof. Calepino, Eiii.
inuidiamque eam sua sponte gliscentem insignis unius calamitas accendit. Magno natu quidam cum omnium malorum suorum insignibus se in forum proiecit. Obsita erat squaloare uestis, foedior corporis habitus pallore ac macie perempti; ad hoc promissa barba et capilli efferauerunt speciem oris. Noscitabatur tamen in tanta deformitate, et ordines duxisse aihebat, aliaque militiae decora ulgo miserantes eum iactabant; ipse testes honestarum aliquot locis pugnarum cicatrices aduerso pectore ostentabat. Sciscitantibus unde ille habitus, unde deformitas, cum circumfusa turba esset prope in contionis modum, Sabino bello ait se militantem, quia propter populationes agri non fructu modo caruerit, sed uilla incensa fuerit, direpta omnia, pecora abacta, tributum iniquo suo tempore imperatum, aes alienum fecisse. id cumulatum usuris primo se agro paterno auto exuisse, deinde fortunis aliis; postremo uelut tabem peruenis se ad corpus; ductum se ab creditor non in servitium sed in ergastulum et carnificinam esse. Inde ostentare tergum foedum recentibus vestigiis uerberum.

Ad haec uisa et audita clamor ingens oritur. Non iam foro se tumultus tenet, sed passim totam urbem pe ruadit. Nexi, uincti solutique, se undique in publicum proripiunt, implorant Quiritium fidem. Nullo loco deest seditionis uoluntarius comes; multis passis agminibus per omnes uias cum clamore in forum curritur.  

Et ceste enuie par soy naissante aluma & esprint la grande pourete et la misere de vng honneste vieillart qui se vint mettre en plain marche deuant aucuns de ses amys duquel la robe estoit toute vsee & commme pourie / le corps maigre & palle / la barbe longue & les cheueulx auoient efface la moitie de son uiyre / mais touteffois en celle deformite trouuoit il que se cognissoit & disoit que iadiz il auoit estre cheuitaine des gens darmes. Et monstroit en sa poictrine les traces des playes lesquelles il auoit receus en maintes batailles. Le commun peuple auoit pitie de suy & le souoit des beaulx faictz de cheualerie quil auoit faictz. Et comme beaucoup de gens semblassent entour luy on luy a demande dont estoit venue celle deformite quil auoit. Il dist que luy iadiz estant en la guerre Sabine les ennemys auoient gaste son heritaige si quil lauoit perdu non pas seulement ses fruictz & ses reuennes / mais encore la ville dont il estoit fut ars & destruc
& ses biens gastez / et que neautmoins en celluy mauuais temps on luy enchargea
de payer tribu & tailles. ¶ Contra exactores pecuniarum a pauperibus. Pour
lesquelles il auoit emprunte beaucoup dargent & sen estoit oblige en grosses
debtes qui estoient tant multiplies par vsures que elle laboroient despouille de son
heritage tant de par son pere que par son yeul / & apres toutes ces fortunes toute
male meschance en maniere de pourriture estoit venue a son corps et que celluy
qui luy auoit preste largent lauoit prins et mene non pas seuellement en servitude
/ mais en vne prison et vne boucherie. Si leur monstra les playes de son dos
lequel estoit tout escorche pour cause des batemens que len luy auoit faictz
nouuellement. ¶ Incident. Anciennement ilz auoient vne coustume que ceulz qui
prestoient argent pouoient prendre & emprisonner leurs debteurs quant ilz ne
payoient & les lyoient & faisoient seruir a toutes choses. Et ce fut la cause de
ceste sedition / car le commun peuple vouloit que ceste coustume fust abatue &
pourc tous les debteurs qui estoient liez ou non qui peurent eschapper sen
vindrent tout incontinent au marche.
¶ Seditio in roma. Ces choses veues et ouyes tresgrant cry sest esleue / si que la
tumulte ne fut pas seuellement emmy le marche / mais par toute la cite & sen est
alle le peuple et a prie la foy des quirites & ny auoit nul qui tantost ne
saccompaignast tout de gre a la sedition. Toutes gens acouroient de toutes pars
au marche119

This Invy and dissensioun of pepill, sproutand in þis maner, was gretumly
inflambit be calamyte of ane agit man, qhilk was discendit of Illuster lynnage.
This man past with þe ansenʒeis of all his eldaris to ane opin place, quhare maist
confluenc was of pepil, eftr þat he was haldin in lang captiuite be his

119 ‘And this resentment, born of itself, illuminated and shone a light upon the great poverty and
misfortune of a virtuous old man, who took himself into the open marketplace in the presence of some
of his friends, whose clothing was completely worn away and like dust, his body thin and pale, and his
beard long, and his hair had disfigured half his face. But nonetheless in this deformity he found that he
was recognised and said that he had once been a captain of men-at-arms. And he showed the traces on
his back of the wounds which he had received in many battles. The commons felt pity for him and
recalled the fine feats of warfare which he had performed. And when many people had gathered
around him, they asked him whence had come this deformity he suffered. He said that, when he had
previously been in the Sabine war, the enemy had destroyed his ancestral estate with the result that he
had lost not only his produce and his income, but that the farmstead in which he resided was burnt and
destroyed, and his goods spoiled, and nevertheless at this awful time they obliged him to pay tribute
and taxes. Against exactors of money from the poor. For these taxes he had borrowed a great deal of
money, and was thus bound in immense debts which had been so multiplied by interest that it had
stripped him of his ancestral estate (as much his father’s as his grandfather’s) and after all these
misfortunes, every mishance had come upon his body in the manner of decay, and said that he who
had lent him the money, had taken and led him not only into servitude but into a prison and butchery.
He thus showed them the wounds on his back that was completely flayed on account of the beatings
which that man had recently given him.

Note. In olden times they had a custom whereby those who lent money could take and
imprison their debtors when they didn’t pay and bound them and made them serve in all manner of
ways. And this was the cause of the sedition, because the commons wanted this custom to be
overturned and thus all the debtors who were bound or not, who were able to escape, came
immediately into the market. Sedition at Rome. Once these things had been seen and heard, a great cry
arose so that the crowd was not only in the middle of the market but throughout the entire city, and the
people went and prayed for the faith of the Quirates and there was no one who did not at once very
eagerly accompany the sedition. All the people came running from every part of the city into the
market’. Bersuire, eiii’
creditouris, for dett In quhilk he was deuoluit. his clething throw filth of presoun was vile and horribil, the habit of his body was richt fowsom, for he was lene and near consumyt throw hunge. The hare of his berde was lang and taty, & the hare of his hede made his face erlage & wylde; ʒt nochtwithstanding ĵis difformite he was knawin, for he was ane capitane sum tyme in þe romane weris, and had done grete vassalege for þe honour þe deuoluit throw presoun was vile and horribil, the habit of his body was richt fowsom, for he was lene and near consumyt throw hunge. The hare of his berde was lang and taty, & the hare of his hede made his face erlage & wylde; ʒt nochtwithstanding ĵis difformite he was knawin, for he was ane capitane sum tyme in þe romane weris, and had done grete vassalege for þe honour þe deuoluit throw presoun was vile and horribil, the habit of his body was richt fowsom, for he was lene and near consumyt throw hunge. The hare of his berde was lang and taty, & the hare of his hede made his face erlage & wylde; ʒt nochtwithstanding ĵis difformite he was knawin, for he was ane capitane sum tyme in þe romane weris, and had done grete vassalege for þe honour þe deuoluit throw presoun was vile and horribil, the habit of his body was richt fowsom, for he was lene and near consumyt throw hunge. The hare of his berde was lang and taty, & the hare of his hede made his face erlage & wylde; ʒt nochtwitstanding ĵis difformite he was knawin, for he was ane capitane sum tyme in þe romane weris, and had done grete vassalege for þe honour þe deuoluit throw presoun was vile and horribil, the habit of his body was richt fowsom, for he was lene and near consumyt throw hunge. The hare of his berde was lang and taty, & the hare of his hede made his face erlage & wylde; ʒt nochtwithstanding ĵis difformite he was knawin, for he was ane capitane sum tyme in þe romane weris, and had done grete vassalege for þe honour þe deuoluit throw presoun was vile and horribil, the habit of his body was richt fowsom, for he was lene and near consumyt throw hunge. The hare of his berde was lang and taty, & the hare of his hede made his face erlage & wylde; ʒt nochtwi\r

The weary and unkempt soldier was, as Ogilvie notes, a familiar topos of classical literature. Virgil describes the Greek soldier Achaemenides in similar terms in the third book of the Aeneid. As Gavin Douglas translates it,

We se a strange man, of form onknaw–
A lenar wight na mayr pyusty I ne saw,
Nor ʒt sa wrachitly beseyn a wy;
Towart the cost, quhar we stude in hy,
Hys handis furth he strekis askand supple.
We hym behald, and al his corβ gan se
Maist laithly ful of ordur, and hys berd

---

120 Bellenden (1901–3) 166–7.
Rekand doun the length neir of a zerd\textsuperscript{122}

The Roman citizen male was typically clean-shaven, though the \textit{barbula} (‘goatee’) was popular with young men of fashion.\textsuperscript{123} In Livy, as in Virgil, the veteran’s ‘promissa barba’ and unkempt hair are tokens of his distress. The display of a soldier’s scars in appeals \textit{ad misericordiam} had become something of a forensic cliché in the first century BC.\textsuperscript{124} Thus in Sallust’s \textit{Bellum Iugurthum}, as translated by Alexander Barclay (c.1484–1552), Marius declares in a speech to the people that ‘I coulde also if it neded shewe you in the fore part of my body manyfolde scarres of many & large wondes which I haue taken in my good worth for defence of our country and commen wele’.\textsuperscript{125} Here the old man’s scars are similarly presented as mementos of his ‘grete vassalege for þe honoure & defence of þe ciete’.

Again, there are a number of lexical similarities between the translations of Bersuire and Bellenden. They both preserve Livy’s ‘deformitas’, giving ‘deformite’ and ‘difformite’ respectively. While Bersuire unpacks Livy’s ‘tributum’ with a doublet, ‘tribu & tailles’, Bellenden gives simply ‘tribune’. ‘\textit{Ergastula}’, as Ogilvie explains, ‘were the prisons, usually underground, in which chained slave-gangs were kept’.\textsuperscript{126} Once again, Ascensius felt that the word required explanation: ‘\textit{Ergastulum} locus erat in quo mancipia deteriora in vinculis opus facere cogeabantur: vt metallarij serui solent. vn\textit{de} ab ergos quod est opus deductur’.\textsuperscript{127} Perotti similarly glosses the word as ‘locum in

\textsuperscript{125} Sallust, \textit{The famous Cronycle of the Warre / Which the Romaynes Had Agaynst Iugurth}, trans. Alexander Barclay (London: Richard Pinson, 1525) lxvi’
\textsuperscript{126} Ogilvie, 299.
\textsuperscript{127} ‘The \textit{ergastulum} was a place in which lesser slaves were forced to work in chains, as metal slaves are wont to do. Whence it is derived from ‘ergos’, that is, ‘work’. Livy (1513) aa\textit{i}ii‘
quo lapides aut metalla fodiuntur’ (‘A place in which stone or metal is dug out’) and describes it as a synonym ‘pro carcere’ (‘for prison’). Here Bellenden follows Bersuire’s treatment of ‘ergastulum et camificinam’ as ‘vne prison et vne boucherie’, giving ‘presoun and bouchery’. Bersuire includes an entire incident on the practice, while Bellenden drives the meaning home with the addition of certain details. The elderly veteran appears ‘eftir þat he was haldin in lang captiuite be his creditouris’, while his clothing has been ruined ‘through filth of presoun’. In terms of exposition, Bersuire’s use of Latin subtitles is also worthy of note. Here he gives ‘Contra exactores pecuniarum a pauperibus’ (‘against those who exact money from the poor’) and ‘Seditio in roma’ (‘sedition at Rome’). Similar titles run throughout his text, presumably added for ease of consultation, but also as a means of highlighting a passage’s ethical importance.

Both authors rework Livy’s verbal phrase, ‘[eum] ordines duxisse’, into a concrete noun: ‘cheuitaine des gens darmes’ and ‘ane capitane’. Translating Livy’s ‘aliaque militiae decora’, Bersuire’s captain has achieved ‘beaulx faictz de cheualerie’, while Bellenden’s has performed ‘grete vassalege for þe honoure & defence of þe ciete’. ‘Vassalage’ in Middle Scots implied a bravery befitting a knight. The word was therefore imbued with notions of allegiance to one’s superior and ultimately to one’s king. As David Lyndsay put it in ‘The Testament’, ‘thow bene bot officiare / And wassall to that kyng Incomparabyll’. Bellenden, translating Livy’s ‘virtutis’ in the second book, also gave ‘þis hie & singulare uassalage’, while the heading of the following chapter promised ‘the hardy Vassalege done be Chelia þe romane virgin’. Bellenden also introduces some localised, technical language here: ‘doubling and non-payment’.

---

128 Perotti, xxij, iii, 65ff.
129 Lyndsay, I.64.
130 Bellenden (1901–3) II.6-7; Livy (2.13.5-6).
‘termes assignit’, and ‘vsire and okkir’. The first two of these phrases were familiar to the law-courts, while ‘okkir’ was a stronger form of usury, suggestive of crime or sin.\textsuperscript{131}

Stirred by the appearance of the imprisoned veteran, the bondsmen rush onto the streets and ‘implorant Quiritium fidel’, that is, they appeal to the faith of the Roman people. In Bersuire, this is dealt with literally, and the people ‘prie la foy des quirites’. Bellenden expands, however, and describes the \textit{nexi} as ‘desiring pietuusly the romane pepill to support þame aganis troubil’. This complements Bellenden’s treatment of the phrase elsewhere. Thus in the third book, where Livy describes Valerius as ‘Quiritium fidel implorante’, Bellenden gives ‘valerius requirit þe pepill to assist to his opiniou̇n’.\textsuperscript{132} So too in the same book Bellenden reproduces six words in Livy, ‘ad clamorem nutricis fidel implorantis Quiritium’, with seventeen: ‘hir nuriß gaif ane lamentabil cry, requiring þe quiritis and romane pepill to cum to hir support’.\textsuperscript{133} Fond as Bellenden was of Latinate vocabulary, he was also ready to expand on Livy’s more esoteric turns of phrase.

This comparison of Bersuire and Bellenden suggests that although Bellenden was first and foremost concerned with Livy’s Latin original, as presented by Ascensius, he was also guided by the various readings offered by Perotti, Calepino, Ascensius, and Bersuire.

\textsuperscript{131} Cf. DOST, s.v. Term(e n., 4; Non–, \textit{adv. prefix.}, 6; Ok(k)er, Ocker, \textit{n.}, a

\textsuperscript{132} Livy, 3.41.4; Bellenden (1901–3) I.303.

\textsuperscript{133} Bellenden (1901–3) II.3.
Conclusion

Embarking on what is the earliest extant translation of classical prose into Scots, Bellenden exploited the leading linguistic resources of the day, incorporating as much detail and semantic precision as possible. He was working from an edition of Livy produced by Jodocus Badius Ascensius, and made frequent use of the *Explanatio*, Ascensius’s glossary on the more esoteric and technical items of Livy’s vocabulary. Having printed the histories of Boece and Mair, and having furnished Douglas with his edition of the *Aeneid*, Ascensius thus continued to play a significant role in the development of humanism in Scotland. Bellenden also harnessed the proto-dictionaries of Niccolò Perotti and Ambrogio Calepino, echoes of which can be heard throughout his translation. The French translation by Pierre Bersuire offered Bellenden yet another lexical resource, from which he regularly lifted words or complete phrases.

This study of Bellenden’s Livy raises two points which warrant further investigation. Firstly, Bellenden was probably not the only scholar in Scotland to exploit these proto-dictionaries. Though Gavin Douglas’s reliance on Ascensius for the *Eneados* has long been established, it is not unreasonable to assume that he too may have had recourse to Calepino and Perotti. Secondly, it would be fruitful to explore what role these reference works played in the literary debates which sprang up in the wake of the Reformation, when finding the correct translation of a sacred or patristic text was a matter of spiritual salvation. There is not space enough to press on this point here, but a collection of fixed, authoritative definitions must have been an attractive prospect to polemicists on either side of the religious divide. Referring to Martin Luther’s (1483–1546) jibe at the expense of Henry VIII (1491–1547) – ‘tam stolido assertori (ut uideo) proponendus esset aliquis uocabularius’ (‘as I see it, a vocabulary should be put in front
of such a stupid defender’) – the Catholic priest Thomas Heskyns (fl.1540–1565) appealed to ‘two sundrie editions of Calepine’ in a discussion of transubstantiation.\footnote{Martin Luther, \textit{Martinus Lutherus Contra Henricum Regem Angliae} (Basel: Adam Petri, 1522) F4; Thomas Heskyns, \textit{The Parliament of Chryste} (Antwerp: William Silvius, 1566) Hiiii} Meanwhile, the controversialist John Martiall (1534–1597) bid his opponents to ‘Conferre your Calepine’ and ‘Studie your Calepine better’.\footnote{John Martiall, \textit{A Replie to M. Calfhills Blasphemous Answer} (Leuven: John Bogard, 1566) Ziiii; Tiiv} There is a need then for further study of how these philological tools contributed more widely to literary and religious cultures in the early modern period. What is clear, however, is that they enabled John Bellenden to complete a pioneering work of translation more than a decade before Livy’s first appearance from a London press.
Chapter 3

Anthony Cope’s Livy: Tudor Propaganda and War with Scotland

Introduction

In the winter of 1544, Anthony Cope (1486/7–1551), courtier and chamberlain to Queen Katherine (1485–1536), produced a translation of Livy covering the events of the Second Punic War. The quarto volume was entitled:

*The Historie of Two the Moste Noble Capitaines of the Worlde, Anniball and Scipio, of theyrr Dyuers Battalles and Victories, Excedyng Profitable to Reade, Gathered and Translated into Englishe, out of Titus Liuius, and Other Authoures*

Cope has taken his title from Livy’s description of Hannibal and Scipio in Book Thirty: ‘congressi sunt, non suae modo aetatis maximi duces sed omnis ante se memoriae omnium gentium cuilibet regum imperatorumue pares’, which Cope condensed in chapter sixty-eight of his translation as ‘Thyther came the .ii. most noble capitaines of the world’. Despite the promise of ‘other authourues’, Cope’s *Historie* is essentially a translation, with liberal editing and omission, of Livy’s third decade. He divides his translation into seventy-four chapters, each with their own headings, highlighting narrative set pieces as he goes. The latter chapters, which deal with Hannibal’s flight to Bythinia and subsequent suicide, have been gathered from the fourth decade. In terms

---

2. ‘they came together, the greatest generals not only of their own time but in all previous memory, equal to any of the kings or generals of every other race’ Livy (30.30.1-2). Cope, Kkiii.
3. In the dedication to Henry VIII, Cope refers to ‘my chief authour Titus Liuius’. Cope, aiii.
4. Cope’s final chapter, ‘Anniball fleith to Prusias, the kyng of Bithynia, and howe he ended his lyfe’, translates Livy (39.51). Cope (1544) 143’–144’.
of dating the translation, a reference to the capture of Boulogne in Cope’s dedication to Henry VIII provides a *terminus post quem* (‘your late most noble, politike, and myghty conquest of Bollayne’).\(^5\) Boulogne had only been surrendered on the 14 September, meaning that Cope probably completed his translation in the latter months of 1544. The king’s printer, Thomas Berthelet (*d*.1555), first issued the *Historie* in 1544 and again in 1548. Thirteen years later in 1561, Thomas Marsh produced another edition of Cope’s translation, in a smaller, octavo volume, followed in 1591 by another octavo edition from the press of William How.

Cope’s translation has prompted some specific critical interest. Jardine and Anthony discussed Cope’s translation in their essay on Gabriel Harvey’s (1552/3–1631) annotated copy of Livy.\(^6\) Harvey, they found, was not only aware of Cope’s translation but actually used it to supplement his reading of the Latin original.\(^7\) Peter Culhane mentions *The Historie* in passing in his essay on Philemon Holland’s Livy, noting its habit of condensing Livy’s prose. Fred Schurink used the Jardine and Grafton article as a springboard for his own study of the translation, in which he paid particular attention to Cope’s dedication to Henry VIII and the dialogue this established with events of living memory.\(^8\) Most recently, Schurink has included *The Historie* in a wider discussion of how English, vernacular translations ‘grew out of, and responded to, the wars of

\(^5\) Cope, *Aiv*.
\(^6\) Jardine and Grafton, 30–78.
\(^7\) In an annotation towards the beginning of book twenty-one, Harvey writes: ‘M. Thomas Smith, & I reading this decade of Liuie together, founduerie good vse of M. Antonie Copes English historie of the two most noble Captaines of the world, Annibal, & Scipio. Which sumtime giues a notable light to Liuie; and was worthie to be dedicated to King Henrie the VIII. in the opinion of Sir Thomas Smith, who much commended it to his sonne. Sed tamen, Dulcius ex ipso fonte bibuntur aquæ. Et ego unus eorum sum, qui prudenti, uiuacique Liuij stylo nunquam satiantur’. (‘But the waters are drunk more sweetly from the fountain itself. And I am one of those who are never satiate of Livy’s skillful and lively style’). All quotations from Harvey’s Livy have been taken from the images prepared by *Annotated Books Online*, [http://abo.annotatedbooksonline.com/#binding-5-1](http://abo.annotatedbooksonline.com/#binding-5-1). Hereafter Harvey’s Livy, p. 269, image 291. Cf. Jardine and Grafton, 57.
\(^8\) Schurink (2011) 58–78.
sixteenth-century Europe’. The studies by Schurink then are the most comprehensive to date, but focus primarily on the prefatory material which introduces the translation. While the dedication is indeed key to understanding the Historie, this chapter provides the first, detailed examination of the translation itself.

The first section of this chapter offers some new insights into the detailed paratextual framework which accompanied Cope’s Historie, including the fact that this was modelled on a translation by one of the leading propagandists of the day, Sir Richard Morison (c.1510–1556). The second section considers how Cope recasts Livy’s oath-breaking Carthaginians as England’s perennial enemies, the Scots. As Livy tells it, the origins of the Second Punic War lay in the breakdown of diplomatic relations between Rome and Carthage. Faced with Hannibal’s rescinding of a peace treaty, Rome declared war on her great rival for the second time. This directly complements the official, Henrician view of the tensions which emerged with Scotland (and to a lesser extent with France) in the four years preceding Cope’s Historie (1540–1544). Cope lends emphasis to this parallel by imbuing his translation with a lexicon of diplomacy which, as Tracey Sowerby has shown, was being standardised by Henry’s government.

The third section compares Cope’s translation of an episode which showcases Roman diplomacy at its most dramatic (Fabius Maximus’s declaration of war to the Carthaginian senate) with a later treatment of the same episode by the staunchly anti-Protestant James Brookes (1512–1558). The comparison of these two radically different interpretations demonstrates the willingness of Livy’s Tudor readers to harness classical history to the most pressing affairs of church and state. The final section considers

---

Cope’s translation, which ostensibly celebrates Rome’s growing military presence in Europe and beyond, in relation to Tudor discussions of territorial expansion.

Though Cope relied predominantly on Livy, there were multiple accounts of the Second Punic War available to a Tudor readership. Polybius (c.200–c.120BC) included the conflict with Carthage in the third book of his *Histories*, from which Livy drew with alacrity.\(^{11}\) In the second half of the sixteenth century, Christopher Watson (1545/6–1580/1) translated Polybius’s account, to which he suffixed a biography of Henry V (1387–1422).\(^{12}\) The Italian humanist Donato Acciaiuoli (1429–78) supplemented Plutarch’s *Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans* with his own *Parallel Lives of Hannibal and Scipio*. As Jeremy Maule notes, ‘for a century or so after 1478, the lives of these two great generals travelled in Latin – and thence into Spanish, French and English vernaculars, as Plutarch’s work’.\(^{13}\) At some point before 1535, Henry Parker, 10\(^{th}\) Baron Morley (1480/1–1556) presented Henry with a translation of Acciaiuoli’s supplement, which Parker presented as the work of Plutarch.\(^{14}\) In 1555 William Maister translated Acciaiuoli’s life of Scipio and dedicated it to Henry Herbert (1506/7–1570), first earl of Pembroke.\(^{15}\) Intriguingly, these Renaissance additions later resurfaced in Thomas North’s (1535–1603?) *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes* (1579), a rendering of Jacques Amyot’s (1513–93) French language translation of Plutarch (*b*. before AD50, *d*. after AD120). Once again, no mention was made of their origins in

---

\(^{11}\) For the intertextual relationships developed by Livy in the third decade, see D. S. Levene, *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) 82–163.


\(^{14}\) BL Royal MS 17 D XI; cf. Maule, 107–130.

\(^{15}\) Glasgow University Library MS Hunter 466 (V.6.16).
Acciaiuoli and the additional lives were quietly accepted as Plutarch’s. The Punic Wars also featured in Appian’s *Roman History*, which appeared in an English translation by William Barker (*fl.* 1540–1576) in 1578, and in the *Punica* of Silius Italicus (*c.* AD 26–c.102), which would not appear in English translation until well into the seventeenth century. There was then a well-developed interest in this period of Roman history in sixteenth-century England.

Livy’s third decade spans from 218–201 BC. By this point, the empire has spread across the Western Mediterranean and Rome has found a formidable rival in Carthage, itself an expanding imperial power. Across early modern Europe the third decade was being singled out and printed in independent volumes, both in the Latin original and in vernacular translation. As early as 1504, Antoine Vérard issued Robert Gaguin’s French version of the third decade at Paris as *Les Gestes Romaines*. This would appear again in 1508 and 1515. As Schurink has noted, Ascensius referred to the young Anthony Cope as being in Paris in 1509, where he may well have gained access to Gaguin’s translation.

Hannibal (277–182 BC), the eldest son of Hamilcar Barca, was remembered by Sallust as the ‘duke and captayne of the Carthaginences [who] wasted the welth and

---


18 In 1537, Simon Vincent printed the third decade as an independent volume at Lyon as *Titi Liuii Patauini Decas Tertia*. Sébastien Gryphe, also based in Lyon, would do the same in 1542. In 1537, the German printer Christian Egenolff (*fl.* 1502–1555) issued a collection of speeches gathered specifically from Livy’s books on the Second Punic War. Chrestien Wechel printed the first book of the third decade alone in a small, octavo edition at Paris in 1537. John Loys would follow suit in 1543, printing the same book as a discrete volume, the title of which draws special attention to the war with Carthage: *Historiarum Ab Urbe Condita Decadis Tertiae (Quae est De Secundo Bello Punico) Liber Primus*.

Riches of Italy more than any other ennemy had euer done before’. In 219, he besieged the Spanish city of Saguntum, an ally of Rome, thereby precipitating a second conflict between the two powers. In September, 218, he managed to cross the Alps and in 216 he delivered a colossal defeat to Rome at Cannae. Hannibal campaigned for a total of sixteen years in Italy before being recalled to Africa where he was defeated by Scipio at the battle of Zama (202). In England, Hannibal was remembered as Rome’s greatest enemy. Thus Ranulf Higden (d.1364) in the Polychronicon, which by 1544 had been printed multiple times in English translation, referred to ‘Hannybal the moost cursed kynge of Penorum or of affricanorum mightely hated the Romayns / for he destroyed them almost to þe uttermost ende’. In Tudor literature, he was often spoken of with reverence. Hannibal was cited for his temperance in a tract on syphilis, referred to as ‘a ryght famous & a manly knyght’ in a translation of Christine de Pizan’s (1364–1429) Le Livre du corps du policie, and even made an appearance in John Fisher’s (1469–1535) eulogy for Henry VII, delivered at St Paul’s in 1509. So too Thomas Elyot (c.1490–1546) repeatedly cited Hannibal in The Gouernour (1531), singling him out for his ‘prowesse and crafte’.

Publius Cornelius Scipio (236–183BC) was one of Rome’s foremost generals in the second war with Carthage. In 208, he captured Carthago Nova in southern Spain and in 208 he overcame Hasdrubal Barca at Baecula. Despite the opposition of Fabius Maximus (d.203BC) and Quintus Fulvius Flaccus, Scipio invaded Africa in 204. Having

---


defeated Hannibal at Zama, he returned to Rome in triumph and was awarded the
cognomen Africanus. Almost twenty years later, Publius Scipio and his brothers were
accused of embezzlement. To avoid trial, he went into voluntary exile.\textsuperscript{24} In early modern
Europe, Scipio was mostly remembered for his military achievements. In 1532 Francis I
(1494–1547) commissioned twenty-two tapestries depicting the life of Scipio, while in
1544, Mary of Austria (1505–1558) commissioned a tapestry sequence treating the same
theme.\textsuperscript{25} That this period of Roman history lent itself to visual representation is evinced
by an exquisitely illuminated manuscript of Livy’s third decade now kept at Glasgow
University Library (figure 5).\textsuperscript{26} Petrarch had composed a verse biography of Scipio, the
Africa, also including him in the De Viris Illustribus. This was then Scipio’s reputation
on the continent. In early Tudor literature he was cited primarily for his defeat of
Carthage, but also for his exile. The English translation of Higden’s Polychronicon
laments that ‘This man so noble & so victorious by his own unkynde countrie was
outlawed / & there he dyed’.\textsuperscript{27} John Rastell’s (c.1475–1536) The Cronycles of Englande
(1530) rehearsed Scipio’s triumph over Hannibal, while Richard Morison (c.1510–1556)
used his exile as an example of popular ingratitude in A Remedy for Sedition (1536).\textsuperscript{28}
Cope himself concludes the Historie with a description of the exiles of both Hannibal
and Scipio, citing this ‘detestable ingratitude’ as a final parallel between the two
worthies.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{24} John Briscoe. ‘Scipio Africanus.’ In The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization. : Oxford
University Press, 1998. Accessed online,
http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198601654.001.0001/acref-
9780198601654-e-570.
\textsuperscript{25} Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, Concha Herrero Carreto and José A. Godoy, Resplendence of the
\textsuperscript{26} Glasgow University Library MS Hunter 370 (V.1.7).
\textsuperscript{27} Higden, xxiii’
\textsuperscript{28} John Rastell, The Cronycles of Englande (London: John Rastell, 1530) av’; Richard Morison, A
Remedy for Sedition (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536) Bi’
\textsuperscript{29} Cope, Nniv’
As Grafton and Jardine have demonstrated, Gabriel Harvey paid special attention to Livy’s account of the Second Punic War. Towards the beginning of the third decade, he remarks (at the top of a page describing Hannibal’s preparations for war) that ‘Quæuis decas præclara: sed hæc summorum actorum studio dignissima. Rerum ingenium, et magna uis; ubi Romana uirtus tantopère affligitur’. Concerned as he was with those figures responsible for establishing and edifying the Roman empire, it is not

---

30 ‘Every decade is excellent, but this is most worthy of the study of the greatest actors. A rare talent and great strength, when Roman valour is so greatly weakened’. Gabriel Harvey’s Livy, p. 277, image 299. Cf. Jardine and Grafton, 38.
surprising that Harvey was quite so captivated by the third decade. The Second Punic War boasts some of the most influential figures of Roman history, whom Harvey catalogued, noting their respective merits: ‘Fabius, bello melior: Marcellus prælio: Martius facinore: Nero itinere: Scipio omni bellica laude excellentissimus, id est, arte militari, et singulari uiértute; domina singularis Fortunæ’. For Harvey as well as Livy’s early Tudor readers, the individual biographies of these men were of as much interest as the events in which they were implicated. Cope’s translation thus contributed to a wider and consistent interest in the figures of Hannibal and Scipio throughout the sixteenth century, which explains in part the Historie’s republication in 1548, 1561, and 1591.

1. Cope’s Preface and Henrician Propaganda

When writing his dedication to the king, Cope imitated the approach of one of Henry’s most celebrated propagandists, Sir Richard Morison, ‘by far the most prolific of the propagandists working for Henry VIII in the 1530s’. Five years before Cope’s translation was published, Morison produced The Strategemes, Sleyghtes, and Policies of Warre (1539). This was a translation of the Strategemata, a collection of military vignettes gathered in the late first century AD by Sextus Julius Frontinus (c.AD30–103).

31 In a note written on the first page, Harvey describes his method for reading Roman history: ‘Eccè igitur sum[m]orum, singulariumque uiorum res gestæ, egregia facinora, mnemosyna, quicquid extat in ciuitate, campūde memorabile: et quæ sunt in Monarchia uicturo apti[sl]ma, ea curiosiūs obseruanda, diligentiūs applicanda ad suum usum’. (‘Behold then the achievements of the greatest and most remarkable men, their outstanding deeds, their souvenirs, whatever stands out as memorable in state or field; and those things which are most suitable for a man who would excel in a monarchy, and those things which are to be noted rather carefully and adapted to his use’). Harvey’s Livy, p.1, image 3.
32 ‘Fabius is better in war, Marcellus in battle, Martius in action, Nero on the march. Scipio is absolutely outstanding in every merit of war, that is, in martial skill and unique valour, the mistress of a unique fortune’. Harvey’s Livy, p.437, image 459.
Though Frontinus drew from multiple conflicts in Roman history, many of his examples had their origins in Livy’s account of the wars with Carthage. Cope modelled his preface closely on that of Morison’s *Strategemes*: both works were dedicated to Henry, both presented themselves as of practical, military use; they appealed to the same, Biblical passage in their justification of Henry’s belligerent foreign policy and both signed off with a swipe at the Catholic Church.

Addressing Henry directly in the dedication prefacing the *Strategemes*, Morison speaks of his translation as a practical guide to warfare:

> I entendynge here to serve my countreye, founde nothyng so fytte, for thaccomplyshement of this my purpose, as to set out the Strategemes, sleightes, & craftes, vsed by the noblest capytaynes, that all antyke hystories treate of. By redyng and reasonyng whereof, your gracis capytaynes shall not only increase and nouryshe their imagination, inuention, and dexteritie, in vsynge lyke sleightes, but easily escape al trappes, gynnes, and inbushementes, layde for them.\(^{34}\)

Besides the resonance here between Morison’s phrase, ‘the noblest capytaynes’, and the ‘two the most noble Capitaines’ of Cope’s title, Cope repeats the idea of a translation as a practical, martial tool in own preface. He too dedicated his translation to Henry and explained the impetus behind the work in very similar terms:

> Wherefore well ponderyng the tyme of warre to be nowe in hande, as a thynge so suche nede full for many consideracions, I (for my poore part) thought, that I shoulde dooe, not onely to your hyghnesse acceptable seruice, but also to all noble men, and ientilemen of the realme great pleasure and commoditie, if gatherynyng to gyther out of Titus Liuius, and other autours, the lyues, the policies, and the marciall actes of two the moste woorthie capitaynes, of the two moste renoumed empires of the worlde, that is to saie, of Anniball of Carthage, and Scipio of Rome, I woulde brynge the same into our englyshe toung: whereby, besyde the pleaasunt bestowyng of tyme, in the redyng ther of, men also may learne both to dooe displeasure to theyr ennemies, and to auoyde the crafty and daungerous baites, whiche shall be layde for them.\(^{35}\)

---


\(^{35}\) Cope, aiii.
As well as rehearsing Morison’s emphasis on the utility of his translation, Cope echoes the expectation that his gentlemen readers will thereby ‘easily escape al trappes, gynnes, and inbushementes, layde for them’. The sense that this is an occasional piece – ‘well ponderyng the tyme of warre to be nowe in hande’ – echoes another martial treatise produced in 1542. Thomas Becon (1512–1567) in the preface to *The Newe Polleceye of Warre* explained that his tract is ‘not vnworthy the readynge chefely at this tyme’ seeing that author and reader alike find themselves ‘in thys tumulte & noyse of warres’.  

Cope’s *Historie* also follows the *Strategemes* in its appeal to Ecclesiastes. As Morison puts it: ‘There is a tyme for al thinges, as Salomon wisely writeth. Whan tyme required peace, we talked lytell of warre. New occasyons bryng matters, not thoughte upon, in place […] Loue is lewdenesse, whan tyme biddeth hate. Peace is to be refused, whan tyme forceth men to warre’.  

Here Morison has reworked two verses to suit the immediate context, that is, a country on the verge of conflict with France. Cope in his dedication to Henry twice refers to the same passage of Ecclesiastes. In the first instance, it serves as a means of introducing the subject of war: ‘Emonge others Salomon saieth, that all thynges haue tyme. There is (saieth he) tyme of peace, and tyme of warre’. The second citation relates these verses directly, as Morison did, to current affairs. Having recalled ‘the manifold injuries, doen to your maiestee, and to your subiectes of this your realme, by your vnnaturall and vnkind enemies on sundry parties’, Cope remarks that:

Salomon in his booke entitleth Ecclesiastes, vpon consideracion (as I suppose) of suche lyke matier as this, saieth: There is tyme to loue, and tyme to hate, tyme of peace, and tyme of warre: whiche sentence the saied wyse man, endued by god with sapience, would neuer haue lefte vnto vs, if warre had not in some case ben both laufull and expedient.

---

37 Morison, av’–avi’.
38 Cf. Ecclesiastes, 3.1.
39 Cope, aii’.
40 ‘ibid. aii’
Cope also imitates Morison by concluding his dedication with an attack of the Roman church. Morison signs off praying that God will preserve Henry ‘to the comfort of all your subiectes, to the destruction, & deth of al popery’. Cope’s nod to the Catholic Church is more elaborate, and casts Henry as a second Hercules. Having noted that ‘Hercules [is] accounted mooste woorthy the crowne of honourable prayse, as the chief daunter of monsters’, Cope commemorates Henry’s ‘moste famous subduynge of the Romayne monster Hyrdra’. Cope thus took the inspiration for his preface from one of the leading propagandists of the day. In doing so, he aligned his translation with the pro-war sentiments repeatedly espoused by Morison, presenting the Historie almost as a call to arms to the same ‘noble men, and ientilemen of the realme’.

2. Embassies and Ambassadors: Livy and Tudor foreign policy

This section considers the dialogue Cope establishes between the Historie and Henry’s most recent campaigns against Scotland and France. As Schurink has noted, Cope’s dedication encourages the reader to approach the translation with an eye to the events of living memory. This section explores how this approach is continued in the main body of the text through the incorporation of contemporary, diplomatic lexicons, which had been promoted by literature endorsed by, or else directly concerned with, the state. Cope

---

41 Morison, avi.
43 Cope, aiii.
thereby highlights the parallels between the breakdown of diplomatic relations between Rome and Carthage and a similar collapse between England and the partners of the Auld Alliance, Scotland and France.

Cope’s *Historie* emerged from a constellation of texts published by the king’s printer, Thomas Berthelet (d. 1555), in support of Henry’s policies at home and abroad. The production and dissemination of propaganda was of central importance to Henry’s regime from the earliest years of his reign, and translation had a significant part to play in this programme. Besides Morison’s *Strategemes*, Thomas Paynell (d. 1564?) wrote *The Conspiracie of Lucius Cataline* (1541), the preface of which alludes to the fierce punishments exacted by Henry following the Pilgrimage of Grace and Exeter Conspiracy. Here the reader is expected to glean from this specific moment in Roman history ‘what the ende of them is, that rise agaynste theyr rulers, and euermore hatefuly abhorre to here speke of this cursed monster, this deadelye poison in a common weale, Rebellion’. Just two years before Cope’s translation, Henry had produced the *Declaration Conteeyning the Iust Causes and Consyderations of this Present Warre with the Scottis* (1542). Henry’s *Declaration* offered the official view of England’s relations with Scotland, a view that would resurface in Cope’s *Historie*. Cope’s translation, while fostering a dialogue with the events of living memory, draws on an idiom of diplomacy which was promoted and standardised by these works.

As Schurink has observed, Cope’s dedication makes direct allusions to the major achievements of Henry’s military career, and especially to his victories against the

---

45 ‘we haue seen some in our dayes, so slyp from god, that they attempted gret thynges ageynst your highe maiestie, whiche by his iuste judgement and wyll, receyued condigne punishment’. Thomas Paynell, *The Conspiracie of Lucius Catiline* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1541) Aii. Henry’s reign had already seen two notable risings. In 1525, plans to exact a forced loan known as the ‘Amicable Grant’ to finance a campaign against France were met with fierce resistance. More recently in 1536, the ‘Pilgrimage of Grace’ had seen the rising of 30,000 rebels in the north of England, led by Robert Aske, who managed to capture York. Henry exacted 216 executions.

46 Paynell, aii–a iii
French and Scots. There is, however, more to be said of Cope’s depiction of England’s enemies. Here Cope enumerates Henry’s accomplishments in an extended _praeteritio ficta_:

I will omitte to rehearse, that the emperour Maximilian, hearing the fame of your hyghnesse power and excellence, desyred to be of your maiesties bande, and vnder your baner in the fielde agaynst the frenchemen. I wyll also leave to rehearse the wyse and woorthy conquest of the realme of Irelande, wher of at this present your maiestee weareth the Diademe. Neither will I tary to declare the sundry and moste lucky victories, that your hyghnes hath of late had agaynst, the promisse breakers the double dealynge Scottes. [...] I haue thought best wholly to omitt the long recitall of your late most noble, politike, and mighty conquest of Bollayne, neuer heretofore by any prince subdued, no scarcely by any approached vnto, but lefte as a thynge invincible and therefore called the mayden towne, the hystory whereof requireth the lengthe of a longe volume, if it shall be fully chronicled.

The listing of a dedicatee’s _res gestae_ was already a feature of Tudor, historical writing. Thus the printer Richard Grafton (c.1511–1573), who would be appointed as royal printer after Berthelet, celebrated Thomas Howard’s (1473–1554) success in the most recent campaigns against Scotland in the preface to his edition of John Hardying’s _Chronicle_. So too in the dedication to his translation of Sallust’s _Bellum Iugurthinum_, Alexander Barclay commemorated the role played by Howard at the Battle of Flodden (1513): ‘ye nat with lesse wysdome / than valyantyse haue vanquysshed the inuasour and vyolent ennemy of the commen wayle of England’.

In the passage above, Cope begins by glancing back to Henry’s first engagement with the French. In 1513, Henry fought a successful campaign against the French in the Low Countries. Having defeated the French at the Battle of Spurs, Henry went on to capture

---

47 Schurink (2011) 69.
48 Cope, aiv.
50 Barclay (1522) _Preface_, s.p.
Thérouanne and Tournai. As for ‘the wyse and woorthy conquest of the realme of Irelande’, Henry had declared himself king of Ireland and head of the Irish Church in 1541.

But what made the Scots ‘promisse breakers’ and ‘double dealynge’? The years spanning 1542–1544 witnessed an intense period of conflict with Scotland. Following a series of border raids, English forces defeated the Scots at the battle of Solway Moss on 23 November, 1542. Swift on the heels of this defeat, James V died at Falkland Palace on 14 December. In March 1543, the war with Scotland was (temporarily) brought to a close with The Treaty of Greenwich, negotiated between the Scottish regent, James Hamilton, second earl of Arran (c.1495–1540) and the English council. The treaty promised the marriage of Mary (1542–1587), James’s only surviving child and heir to the Scottish throne, to Henry’s son, Edward (1537–1553). The Scots, however, had a change of heart and Henry renewed hostilities in the summer of 1543 with a series of invasions now known as the Rough Wooing. It is most probably the rescinding of this treaty that Cope has in mind when he refers to ‘the promisse breakers the double dealynge Scottes’.

The Scots were, however, in the English tradition at least, proverbially duplicitous. John Skelton (c.1460–1529) in his invective ‘agaynst the Scottes’, which was originally composed in the wake of Flodden (1513), accused James IV of ‘double dealing’.

---

54 In his ‘Chorus […] contra Scortos’, Skelton also speaks of ‘Barbara scortorum gens perfida’ (‘the barbarous and treacherous race of Scots’). John Skelton, *Certayne Bokes / Compiled by Mayster Skelton / Poet Laureat* (London: Richard Lant and Henry Tab, 1545) Bi‘; Bi‘ii
by Richard Grafton in 1548, which speaks of ‘the double dealyng, & craftie demeanor’ of James I.\textsuperscript{55} Robert Fabian’s (d.1513) Cronycle, which made its debut in print in 1533, similarly referred to the ‘gyle of Scottes’, a people who historically ‘neuer coude apply / To kepe theyr allegeaunce / but many a time rebelled’.\textsuperscript{56} Richard Grafton meanwhile had described God as using the Duke of Norfolk ‘to scourge the falsehood of Scotland / In whom is no truthe ne hold of any bande’.\textsuperscript{57}

Intriguingly, this was precisely the reputation which the Carthaginians enjoyed at Rome. Cicero remarks in the \textit{De Inuentione} that ‘Carthaginienses autem persaepe iam nos fefellerunt’ (‘indeed the Carthaginians have very often played us false’).\textsuperscript{58} When the author of the \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium} (also attributed to Cicero during the Renaissance) asks ‘Qui sunt, qui foedera saepe ruperunt’ (‘who are they, who have so often broken treaties?’), the answer is obvious: ‘Kartaginienses’ (‘the Carthaginians’).\textsuperscript{59} Sallust in the \textit{Bellum Iugurthinum} refers ironically to ‘Punica fide’ (‘Punic faith’), which Barclay glossed in his translation as ‘falshode & treason after the credence of affrycans’\textsuperscript{60} Similar examples are found in Plautus and Silius Italicus.\textsuperscript{61} This was the consistent portrait of the Carthaginians in Roman literature, and Livy’s history was no exception. The third decade marks out the Carthaginians, much like the Scots in early Tudor literature, for their guile, duplicity, and penchant for breaking oaths. The phrase \textit{Punica
fraus (‘Carthaginian deceit’) recurs, as Levene has shown, on multiple occasions throughout this decade of Livy.  

The prefatory material with which Cope and Thomas Berthelet have furnished the Historie, while targeting the Scots as ‘promisse breakers’ and ‘double dealynge’, encourages the reader to think of the Carthaginians in a similar light. Though Hannibal’s ingenuity was admired by many of Livy’s early modern readers, including Harvey, Berthelet asks us to think of Carthaginian guile as essentially inferior to a more honest, Roman valour. In the verse prefacing the Historie, he remarks:

Lo thus maie menne playnly here beholde,  
That wyly wytte, power, guyle, nor policie,  
Coulde Anniball euer styll vpholde,  
But that by Scipios worthy chiuallrie,  
His manhode, vertue, and dedes knyghtly  
He was subdued […]  

In the dedication, Cope places a similar caveat on Hannibal’s success. Though he notes that Hannibal ‘in Italie fought three or fower notable battailes to the great ruine of the Romaines’, these ends are diminished by their means: ‘they were achieued rather by crafty sleightes and policies, than by strength. In theim also he had the assured ayde of the frenche men. The citie of Tarrent he wanne by treason.’ There is a subtle resonance here between the phrase ‘crafty sleightes and policies’ and Morison’s The Strategemes, Sleyghtes, and Policies of Warre. Intriguingly, Morison’s preface had sided with ‘Polycy of mynde’ over ‘strength of body’, preferring the cunning of Ulysses to the brute

---

62 Livy (22.48.1); (26.17.15); (27.33.9); (30.22.6). Cf. Levene, 216.
63 The respect Harvey has for Hannibal is tied up with his admiration of the Roman Empire – Hannibal is remarkable because he came so close to undermining Roman ascendency: ‘The Romanes neuer so matched & tamed, as bie Annibal a long time. And therefore his Historie the more notable in manie weightie respects’. Harvey’s Livy, p.271, image 293.
64 Cope, ii
65 ibid. aiii
strength of Ajax.\textsuperscript{66} Cope looked to Morison for a structural template, but not, it seems, as a guide to reading classical history. The prefatory material also draws a subtle comparison between Henry and Scipio, the latter of whom Berthelet describes not in terms of a Roman, republican government, but rather of monarchy: ‘This prince Scipio, this mighty Romayne […] In continence a lorde and souueraigne’.\textsuperscript{67} On the opposite page, Cope addresses Henry in very similar terms as ‘the most mighty prince, and his most redoubted souereigne lorde’.\textsuperscript{68}

As Livy tells it, the Second Punic War begins with Hannibal’s attack on Saguntum, a city on the East coast of Spain and an ally of Rome. The treaty of Ebro, struck between Rome and Hamilcar, and subsequently renewed by Hasdrubal, agreed that Saguntum was to be left untouched by Carthage. The repercussions of this violation form the subject matter of the next nine books. Book Twenty-One thus introduces a recurring theme that will make repeated appearances throughout the decade, namely the Carthaginian penchant for breaking oaths. Cope could not have tuned into Livy’s preoccupation with duplicity at a more pertinent moment in Henry’s reign. ‘[T]he peryll’, as Cope translates it, ‘and ieopardy of the truce breakyng, and the vengeance whiche might folowe vpon the same’ had become a central theme of state-endorsed literature written in response to conflicts with Scotland and France.\textsuperscript{69}

The theme of oath-breaking is at work from the very beginning of Cope’s translation. Livy opens the third decade with a description of Hannibal’s minority. In the wake of Hamilcar’s death, Hasdrubal, ‘a man’, as Cope puts it, ‘of great wysedome and

\textsuperscript{66} Morison, Aiii\textsuperscript{iv}.
\textsuperscript{67} Cope, ai’
\textsuperscript{68} ibid. aii’
\textsuperscript{69} ibid. 4’
The opening chapter of Cope’s translation exhibits Hasdrubal’s diplomatic sleights of hand:

he by his gentyll entertainyng of princis, and frendly handlying of his neighbours, more than by batayle, brought many cities vnder the obedience of Carthage. Whose facion, in gettyng of frendes, whan the Romaynes perceiued, they sent vnto hym: and renewing their olde amitie, entred into a newe league, for the more sure and stable conservation wherof, they determined to set metes and boundes of both their empires. Wherfore they agreed, that the ryuer of Iberus shuld depart their two seigniories. Further, that the Sagantynes (a people that dwelled betwene both theyr dominions, and were then in amitie and league with the Romaines) shulde continue in peace, and be at libertie, not troubled nor oppressed by warre of nother partie.71

In the above, Cope has brought together two distinct sections of Livy:

Is plura consilio quam ui gerens, hospitiis magis regulorum conciliandiisque per amicitiam principum nous gentibus quam bello aut armis rem Carthaginiensem auxit. […] Cum hoc Hasdrubale, quia mirae artis in sollicitandis gentibus imperioque suo iungendis fuerat, foedus renouauerat populus Romanus ut finis utriusque imperii esset amnis Hiberus Saguntinisque mediis inter imperia duorum populum libertas seruaretur.72

Cope has removed a section describing Hasdrubal’s assassination, relocating it to the next chapter.73 He has also omitted the preface with which Livy introduces this decade. With these excisions, the first two pages of Cope’s translation push the treaty struck between the two powers into full focus. It is with ‘gentyll entertainyng’ and ‘friendly handlying’ that Hasdrubal is able to broker peace with neighbouring powers and eventually with Rome. This kind of politician, one who relied more on words than brute force, was very much a fixture of the early Tudor political milieu. Rather than dedicate his Preceptes of Warre ‘to some actyue and valyaunt capitayne, whose prowesse is wytnessed by his martiall affayres’, Peter Betham singled out the Lord Chancellor, Sir

---

70 Cope, 1r. Livy mentions only Hasdrubal’s ‘indolem […] animi’ (‘quality of spirit’). By adding ‘policy’, Cope introduces a political element latent but not explicit in the original description. Livy (21. 2).
71 Cope, 1v.
72 (21. 2. 5) and (21. 2. 6). Cope has omitted the section connecting these two passages.
73 Cope, Aii
Thomas Audley (1487–1544). Politicians such as Audley, he noted, serve their commonwealth through ‘aduyse and counsayle’ and Betham concludes that ‘greater renoume, is due to the polytike counsaylour, then to the stronge man of armes’. There were in fact a number of Tudor ambassadors who turned to Livy specifically for his exemplary diplomats. As Jardine and Grafton have highlighted, in a substantial note towards the end of his annotated Livy, Harvey singles out Valentine Dale (c.1520–1589) as ‘magnus pragmaticus, et legatorum, quos noui, cordatissimus’. Not one to be intimidated by foreign powers, ‘interritus Doctor nusquam pauebat [...] cum Liuianorum exemplarium semper memor; tum uerò regiæ, patriæ, suæ dignitatis’. As chapter five explores in greater detail, Roger Ascham (1514/15–1568) read the AUC before serving as secretary to Richard Morison in Germany. Hasdrubal as master diplomat would therefore have been a familiar figure to Cope’s Tudor readership.

In the extract above, Cope also taps into the Tudor lexicon of diplomacy and international relations with ‘amitie’ (x2), ‘league’ (x2), ‘dominions’, and ‘peace’. Although ‘amitie’ carried a more general meaning of ‘friendship’ (and in religious contexts, a sense of Christian agapé), it was being used in political discourse of positive relations between distinct sovereigns and states. Thus Richard Morison in his pro-war tract of 1539, An Exhortation to Styrre All Englyshemen to the Defence of Theyr
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74 Betham, aii
75 ibid. av
76 ‘a great pragmatic and the most prudent of the ambassadors I know’. Harvey’s Livy, z56, image 1141.
77 ‘The fearless doctor was never afraid anywhere, always mindful of Livy’s examples, and of his queen, his country, and his own authority’. Ibid. Cf. Grafton and Jardine, 64–5.
78 See chapter five, pp. 191–193.
79 OED, s.v. ‘amity, n.’. Both senses are at work in the 1525 translation of Jean Froissart’s Chronicles. It is decided that the kings of England and France ‘shulde mete and speke togyther / wherby by reason of syght and speakynge togyther shulde encrease loue and amyte’. Jean Froissart, The Thirde and Fourethe Boke of the Cronycles (London: Richard Pynson, 1525) CCxxxii.
Countreye, speaks of ‘peace, concorde, and ernest amitie, betwene nation and nation’.

Henry himself had used ‘amitie’ in this specialised sense no fewer than nine times in his Declaration. Cope above juxtaposes ‘amitie’ and ‘league’ almost in hendiadys, a coupling which was already at work in state literature. A proclamation issued in May of that year, urging the immediate departure of any French citizens living in England, had similarly juxtaposed ‘league and amitie’.

Henry’s Declaration combined them in a similar way, speaking of the ‘leage of amitie’ once fostered between England and Scotland.

The peace renewed by Hasdrubal, however, was soon to be undermined by the ambitions of the young Hannibal. Having crossed the river Ebro, Hannibal lays siege to Saguntum. Rome sends ambassadors to treat with Hannibal, but they are denied an audience:

> worde came to Hannibal, that the Romain Legates were come: Unto whome he / sente a messanger, to shewe theym, that there was ieopardy in passing through so perilous and doutfull battayles of straunge and wylde nations: And hym selfe was so intricate with busynesse, that he coulde not attende to speak with them, or to heare their legacy.

The situation was a familiar one. In the previous year, Henry’s council had identified King Francis’s refusal to give an audience to the English ambassadors as one of the primary contentions leading to the invasion of France. So too in the Declaration,
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80 Richard Morison, An Exhortation to Styrrre All Englyshemen to the Defence of theyr Countreye (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1539) Aii²
81 Henry VIII, A Declaration Conteyning the Iust Causes and Consyderations of this Present Warre with the Scottis (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1542) Aii²; Bi²; Bii²; Bi³²
82 A Proclamation that All Frenchemen (Not Being Denizens) Shall Departe this Realme (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1544). Thomas Elyot had also used the coupling ‘amytie and leage’ in The Gouernour in reference to Saguntum’s alliance with Rome. Elyot, The Gouernour (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537) 137²
83 Henry VIII, Aiii²
84 Cope, 3⁰ Cf. Livy (21.9.3).
85 A proclamation of 1543, announcing the forthcoming action against France, describes Francis as ‘fyrst refusing to receiue their harroldes [i.e. of Henry and Charles], whiche were sent to him to offer
Henry had flagged up the poor reception of his ambassadors in Scotland as part of the breakdown of relations between himself and James V.  

Meanwhile at Carthage, Hanno, a senior politician, addresses the senate to urge the surrender of Hannibal to the Romans. In Livy the surrender of Hannibal is presented not only as a way of appeasing the Romans with regard to the broken treaty but also of securing the stability of the commonwealth.  

Cope’s condensed version, however, focuses solely on the broken treaty. Hanno, as Cope translates it, ‘opened in the senate, the peryll and jeopardy of the truce breakyng, and the vengeance whiche might folowe vpon the same: and persuwaded, that it shuld be necessary, that Hanniball, shulde be yelded to the Romaynes, for amendes of the truce breakynge’. This is the first of multiple references to the broken treaty. Even when a peace is finally struck between the two powers in book thirty, a Roman senator asks (as Cope translates it), ‘If a peace be graunted to the Carthaginenses, by what goddis shall they sweare, and make peace, whan they haue broken promise, and deceiued the goddis, by whom they sweare, whan they laste toke peace with vs [?]’. The breaking of oaths and treaties had been a hot topic at the Tudor court for some time. In the Declaration of 1542, Henry attributes ‘this present warre with the Scottis’ to James’s breaking of ‘the leage of amitie’ (a nod to a peace treaty struck in 1534) by allegedly harbouring English rebels across the border.
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86 Henry had sent his ambassadors north to make a claim on some disputed territory: ‘The same was neuerthelesse by theim denied, refused, and the euidence only for this cause reiected, that it was made (as they alledged) by Englishemen’. Henry VIII, Aiii 

87 ‘nec dedendum solum id piaculum rupti foederis, sed si nemo deposcit, deuehendum in ultimas maris terrarumque oras, ablegandum eo unde nec ad nos nomen famaque eius accedere neque ille sollicitare quietae ciuitatis statum possit, ego ita censeo.’ (‘I thus judge that he [Hannibal] should be given up not only as atonement for the broken treaty but even if no one demanded him, that he should be sent off to somewhere where his name and reputation can’t touch us and from whence he would be unable to disturb the peaceful state of our nation’). Livy (21.10.12).

88 Cope, 4’

89 Cope, 138’ Cf. Livy (30.42.20).

90 Henry VIII (1542) Aiii'
Later in the same tract, he complains that his nephew lacks all ‘regarde to the obseruation of his pactes and leages’.\textsuperscript{91} As we have seen, the Scottish nobility had only recently rescinded the Treaty of Greenwich. So too the theme of oath-breaking played a central role in the official literature announcing hostilities with France. Following Henry’s refusal to supply king Francis with monetary aid in his war against Charles V in 1536, Francis declined to pay Henry his annual pension.\textsuperscript{92} A proclamation of 1543, which declares war on France, describes the French king as ‘obstinate against his leage fydelitie othe and honour’, acting ‘contrary to his leage othe and promyse’.\textsuperscript{93} Richard Morison in the \textit{Exhortation} describes Henry as the victim of the ‘guyle’ and ‘deceyte’ of hostile nations, despite the fact that he ‘hathe bene a longe season in leage with all christen princis’ and has ‘giuen no iust cause of breache, to any of them’.\textsuperscript{94} The official line thus presented Henry as an honest prince betrayed on all sides by duplicitous, foreign powers. This is exactly how Scipio Africanus was being read in relation to the Carthaginians in certain corners of Tudor thought.\textsuperscript{95} The sense of righteous indignation which colours contemporary portraits of Henry in relation to Scotland and France is also central to Livy’s description of the struggle with Carthage. At a later moment in book twenty-one, on the verge of his first encounter with Hannibal, the elder Scipio stirs up his troops by appealing to what he sees as Carthage’s violation of international law. Regretting that the mountains have already broken Hannibal, he remarks, ‘But so it is perchance necessary and mete, that the goddis without mans helpe, and without battayle,

\textsuperscript{91}ibid. Biii’ This is a recurring theme. On the following page, Henry refers to ‘such leages as haue passed betwene vs’. Henry VIII, Biii’
\textsuperscript{92}Richardson, 60.
\textsuperscript{93}Henry VIII (1543).
\textsuperscript{94}Morison (1539) Aii’
\textsuperscript{95}As, for example, in Betham’s translation of the \textit{De Re Militari}: ‘Scipio Africanus, in the tyme of truce, wyth the cytizens of Carthage [was determined] to kepe hys faythe of peace, otherwise then the citizins of Carthage, men notable for theyr falsehode, dyd perfourme towarde hym, knowynge traynes and deceiptes to come rather of a seruyle nature, then of honest mynde and noble herte’. Betham, Dv\textsuperscript{v}–vi’
shulde ouercome them, that are truce breakers. And we that be uiolated and disceyued, shulde next after the goddis (as their mynisters) bring them to vtter confusyon’. Here Cope collapses Livy’s ‘foederum ruptore duce ac populo’ into ‘truce breakers’, recalling his description of the Scots in the preface as ‘promise breakers’. The indignation felt by the Romans feeds into the idea that they are waging a just war. Thus in his speech to Hannibal before the battle of Zama, Scipio cites yet another breach of faith: ‘seeing that a peace and truce was ones taken, whiche ye haue broken, taking our shippes with force in tyme of truce, and violatinge our embassadours: I may righte well with honour, byd you prepare for the warre, sens you could not hold you contented with peace, when ye had it’. So too Henry was acting with just cause when he ordered the Earl of Hertford to level key Scottish cities in the spring of 1544. According to a Proclamation which was to be pinned ‘on the church dores or other notabull places’ during Hertford’s invasion, the king of England had ‘a just, lawfull, and godly cause to be revenged uppon’ the governour and nobles of Scotland, who ‘leavinge a parte all faithe and trouthe that ought to be in true gentlemen […] have swarfed and broken from their sayd couvenantes’. Cope’s Scipio is, much like the Henry of contemporary, state-endorsed literature, committed to righting international wrongs.

In terms of Cope’s approach to translation, it is worth noting that his incorporation of diplomatic vocabulary complements his wider preference for Anglo-centric word choice. Unlike Bellenden, Cope for the most part avoided transposing Latinate vocabulary from the original. This was unusual. Peter Betham in the preface of

96 Cope, Di’. Cf. Livy (21.40.11). As Levene notes, the idea that the Carthaginians will be divinely punished for their breaking of the treaty recurs throughout the decade. See Livy (28. 44. 7); (30.31.4–5); (30.42.21). Levene, 345.
97 Livy (21.40.11); Cope, aiv
98 Cope, Llii
his translation of the *De Arte Militari* identifies a trend for inter-lingual borrowings, complaining that ‘the translatours of thys age […] do marre and misframe our englysshe tounge, through theyr termes vnnedefullye borowed of other languages’. As a result of these ‘ynke horne termes’, contemporary translations are failing those whom they claim to help: ‘the common people of Englande, do not vnderstand the wrytynges ne yet the speach of them, for theyr trycke termes of theyr owne brayn shaped’. Though Betham was no doubt exaggerating the current state of affairs to bolster the appeal of his own, thoroughly English translation, he was not alone in making this complaint. Cope’s printer, Thomas Berthelet, had identified a similar phenomenon in the preface to his edition of John Gower’s (*d*.1408) *Confessio Amantis*. Berthelet even began furnishing the translations he printed with glossaries explaining the trans-lingual borrowings encountered in the text. Thus Gentian Hervet’s translation of Erasmus’s *De Immensa Misericordia Dei* was suffixed with ‘A good table for them that shall rede the sermon and vnderstande nat Latin and frenche termes vse in english’. The ‘table’ glosses loan words including ‘Puissance’, ‘Blaspeheme’, and ‘Congregacion’. So too William Thomas’s (*d*.1554) translation of Livy featured ‘A table of suche wordes as the reder smally skilled, shall not well perceiue’. Tellingly, no such glossary was required for Cope’s *Historie*. Cope’s incorporation of a diplomatic lexis thus complemented his wider Anglo-centric approach to translating Livy’s Latin.

There is then a persuasive resonance between the breakdown of diplomatic relations between Rome and Carthage as recounted in Cope’s translation and the deterioration of relations between England and her neighbours in the last decade of

---

100 Betham, avi
101 John Gower, *De Confessione Amantis* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1532) aaii
102 Erasmus, *De Immensa Dei Misericordia*, trans. Gentian Hervet (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1526) Mvi
103 William Thomas, *An Argument Wherin the Apparaile of Women is Both Reproued and Defended* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1551) Diivi–Div
Henry’s reign. The section that follows contrasts Cope’s translation of the Fabius Maximus episode with a later adaptation of the same. In both instances, Livy is made to comment on current affairs, but to two very different ends.

3. Fabius and the Carthaginian Senate

Book Twenty-One of Livy’s history showcases the potential strength as well as the limitations of Roman foreign policy. In this regard, it attracted the attention Gabriel Harvey, whose annotations hone in on Rome’s initial delegations to Carthage. Thus in the margin of a section which records a Roman embassy to Spain (21.18), Harvey remarks, ‘Romani legati, serij, et peremptorij: etiam magis succincti, aut expediti, quam Lacones. Atticorum ipsorum acerrimi, et pressissimi, magis politi, minus efficaces’. Following Hannibal’s destruction of Saguntum, a delegation of Rome’s most experienced ambassadors is sent ‘to inquere of the Carthaginenses, whether Haniball distroyed the citie of Sagunt, by the assent of the publyke counsayle or noo’. Should they find that Hannibal acted with the approval of the senate, then the ambassadors are to declare war. Unimpressed by the query, the Carthaginians accuse the Romans of hypocrisy – the Romans, a Carthaginian senator retorts, adhere to treaties as and when it suits them. Having offered the senate an ultimatum, Quintus Fabius Maximus, who will emerge as one of the leading commanders in the conflict, finally declares war. The

---

104 ‘The Roman ambassadors, grave and decisive: also more prepared, or ready for action, than the Spartans. The most active and urgent of the Athenians are more polished but less effective’. Harvey’s Livy, p. 276, image 298. Cf. Grafton and Jardine, 63.
105 Cope, 6
106 ibid.
delegation caught the eye of Harvey, and would later inspire Giambattista Tiepolo’s (1696–1770) celebrated painting of Fabius before the Carthaginian senate.\(^\text{107}\)

This section compares Cope’s treatment of the episode with that of James Brookes, master of Balliol college and eventual bishop of Gloucester, in a sermon preached before Queen Mary in 1553.\(^\text{108}\) Whereas Cope’s version speaks of the most recent dispute between the Tudor council and Scotland, Brookes reworks the original to call for the restoration of the Catholic Church in England. The comparison of these two versions demonstrates just how readily the AUC could be reshaped to comment on the most pressing, political questions of the day. It speaks also of two very different styles of adaptation. While Cope follows Livy’s account closely, Brookes exaggerates the dramatic qualities of the original to suit the rhetorical demands of his sermon. As we will see, both omit key parts of the original to serve their respective agendas. In the following extracts, the particular points of interest have been highlighted in bold:

His ita comparatis, ut omnia iusta ante bellum fierent, legatos maiores natu, Q. Fabium M. Liiuum L. Aemelium C. Licinium Q. Baebium in Africam mittunt ad percontandos Carthaginenses publicone consilio Hannibal oppugnasset, et si id quod facturi uidebantur faterentur ac defenderent publico consilio factum, ut indicerent populo Carthaginensi bellum. Romani postquam Carthaginem uenerunt, cum senatus datus esset et Q. Fabius nihil ultra quam unum quod mandatum erat percontatum esset, tum ex Carthaginiensibus unus: ‘Praecepse uestra, Romani, et prior legatio fuit, cum Hannibalem tamquam suum consilio Saguntum oppugnamentem deposesebatis; ceterum haec legatio uerbis adhuc lenior est, re asperior. Tunc enim Hannibal et insimulabatur et deposesebatur; nunc ab nobis et confessio culpae exprimitur et ut a confessis res extemplo repetuntur. Ego autem non priuato publicione consilio Saguntum oppugnatum sit quaedum censeam sed utrum iure an iniuria; nostra enim haec quaestio atque animaduersio in ciuem nostrum est quid nostro aut suo fecerit arbitrio: uobiscum una disceptatio est licueritne per foedus fieri. Itaque quoniam discerni placet quid publico consilio, quid sua sponte imperatores faciant, nobis uobiscum
foedus est a C. Lutatio consule ictum in quo, cum caueretur utrorumque sociis, nihil de Saguntinis – necdum enim erant socii uestri – cautum est. At enim eo foedere quod cum Hasdrubale ictum est Saguntini excipiuntur. Aduersus quod ego nihil dicturus sum nisi quod a ubois didici. Vos enim, quod C. Lutatius consul primo nobiscum foedus icit, quia neque auctoritate patrum nec populi iussu ictum erat, negastis uos eo teneri; itaque aliud de integro foedus publico consilio ictum est. Si uos non tenent foedera uestra nisi ex auctoritate aut iussu uestro icta, ne nos quidem Hasdrubalis foedus quod nobis inscis icit obligare potuit. Proinde omissite Sagunti atque Hiberi mentionem facere et quod diu parturit animus uester aliquando pariat.’ Tum Romanus sinu ex toga facto, ‘Hic’ inquit, ‘uobis bellum et pacem portamus; utrum placet sumite.’ Sub hanc uocem haud minus ferociter, daret utrum uellet, succl amatum est; et cum is iterum sinu effuso bellum dare dixisset, accipere se omnes responderunt et quibus acciperent animis iisdem se gesturos.\footnote{Livy (21.18)}

For which Cope gives:

All the the foresaide busynesses prepared and set in good order, Quintus Fabius, Marcus Liuius, Lucius Aemilius, Caius Lucinius, and Quintus Bebius were sent into Affrica, to inquere of the Carthaginenses, whether Haniball distroyed the citie of Sagunt, by the assent of the publyke counsayle or noo. And yf they wold graunt and defende, that it was done by the holle counsaile, than to declare vnto them, that they wold reuenge their wronges in battayle. After the Roman were come to Carthage, according to his com\textit{m}aundement, a prince of Carthage {\textit{ansuered}} in this wyse.

\footnote{‘Once these things had been prepared, so that everything was done justly before the war, they sent the older ambassadors – Quintus Fabius, Marcus Livius, Lucius Aemelius, Gaius Licinius, and Quintus Baebius – into Africa to inquire of the Carthaginians whether Hannibal destroyed the city of Sagunt, by the assent of the public council or no. And if they would grant and defend, that it was done by the whole council, than to declare unto them, that they would avenge their wrongs in battle. After the Romans came to Carthage, according to his commandment, a prince of Carthage answered in this way.’}
O ye Romaynes, your fyrst legacy (whan ye came and required Anniball to be deluyuered vnto you, as one that hadde besieged Sagunt of his owne mynde without our counsayle) was voyde and of none effecte: Howe than shulde this your cruell legacy take place, wherin ye require of vs a confession of the trespasse, and amendes for the same? I thinke it ought not to be inquired, whether Sagunt was distroyed by our publike or priuate counsayle, but whether it was done ryghtfully or wrongefully. For your question and consideraition, as concernyng our cytezen is, whether he enterprysed the siege and battayle by his owne mynde, or by our accorde: and our controuersy with you is, whether it might be done, the truce beyng obserued, or no. Therefore sythe it must be determyned, what rulars may doo by the common counsayle, and what of theyre owne wylle: Ye muste vnderstande, that the truce that was taken betwene you and vs, was gyuen by Luctatius, than being your consul: in whiche it was conteyned, that bothe our frendes shuld be spared, no mention being made of Saguntines, for as than they were not your frendes. But verily in the truce, that was taken with Hasdruball, the Saguntines were excepted, against which I wyll say nothing, but that I haue learned of you. Truely ye refused to obserue the truce, that C. Luctatius your consul dyd decree and make with vs, bycause it was not done by auctoritie of the fathers conscripte of your senate: than yf you do not obserue and kepe your bandes and truce, onelesse they be constitute and made by your auctorite and commandement: We also wyll not obserue the truce taken by Hasdrubal, wherof we were ignorant. Wherfore leaue now to speake of Sagunt and Iberus: and declare boldy that whyche you haue longe tyme consultyng, deuised. Than the Romayn Legate aduanced forthe hym selfe, and sayd: Here we brynge vnto you peace or warre: take whether you wyll, Whervnto they fiersely answered, that he shulde giue whether he wold. And when he agayn settyng forth his commandement, had shewed theym that they shulde haue warre, they aunswered all: that they wolde accept it, and with no lesse courage prosecute the warre, than they had receyued it.110

Cope must again negotiate Livy’s lexicon of diplomacy. In this short passage, foedus appears a total of seven times, which Cope reproduces as ‘truce’ and ‘bandes and truce’.

Here ‘publike or priuate counsayle’ is a straightforward rendering of ‘priuato publicone consilio’, while Cope gives ‘frendes’ for ‘socii’, ‘constitute and made’ and ‘taken’ for ‘icta’ and ‘legacy’ for ‘legatio’. Legacy was being used as early as the fourteenth century to suggest the duties of an ambassador.111 As we might expect, it appears in this sense in Tudor works with a specifically diplomatic bent.112 ‘Tresspass’ and ‘confession’,
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110 Cope, Biiiv.
111 OED, s.v. ‘legacy’, 1a.
112 As, for example, in the title of John More’s translation of Damião Góis’s account of an embassy sent to the Emperor of Portugal, The Legacye or Embesseate of the Great Emperour of Inde Prester John (London: W. Rastell, 1533).
however, carried distinctly religious undertones. Though ‘trespass’ appears occasionally in legal contexts, it was most often used to suggest ‘sin’ and thus it appears with this sense in English paraphrases of the Lord’s Prayer.\textsuperscript{113} Similarly, ‘confession’ was being put to work in religious contexts both to suggest ‘sacramental confession’, that is, confession to a priest as an act of contrition, as well as ‘the confession of faith’.\textsuperscript{114} This incorporation of religious vocabulary complements the running suggestion in Livy that the Carthaginians have committed a religious violation by breaking the Treaty of Ebro.

At the beginning of this passage, Livy explains that, should their suspicions be confirmed, the Roman ambassadors ‘indicerent populo Carthaginiensi bellum’ (‘were to declare war on the Carthaginian people’). Cope avoids a literal translation, giving ‘to declare vnto them, that they wold reuenge their wronges in battayle’, bringing the idea of retribution back into focus. Cope had described Henry with a very similar phrasing in the dedication, speaking of his ‘power to reuenge wronges of malice and vntruthe’ now that ‘your hyghnesse is dryuen to geat by the swoorde that, whyche by force is deteyned from you’.\textsuperscript{115} These ‘wronges’ refer most obviously to the rescinding of the Greenwich Treaty. We might recall Henry’s ‘just, lawfull and godly cause to be revenged uppon’ the Earl of Arran and the Scottish nobility as detailed in the \textit{Proclamation}.\textsuperscript{116} Richard Grafton had celebrated the earl of Norfolk with a similar phrasing, describing him as ‘from Scotland euen newly retended / Wher Englandes querele ye haue reuenged’.\textsuperscript{117} With this idiom of revenge and just retribution, Cope once again draws on current conceptualisations of Henry’s most recent conflicts with Scotland.

\textsuperscript{113} Examples of ‘trespass’ in its religious sense abound. In 1543, Henry VIII used ‘trespass’ repeatedly in \textit{A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man} (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1543) Biii\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{114} As, for example, in John Ryckes’ \textit{Ymage of love}: ‘we muste forgete our own synnes after due confessyon made’. John Ryckes, \textit{Ymage of love} (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1525) Ev\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{115} Cope, aii\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{The Hamilton} Papers, II.350.
\textsuperscript{117} Hardyng, *ii\textsuperscript{v}
Beyond vocabulary, this passage has a further and yet more explicit resonance with the events of recent history. Following the Scottish defeat at Solway Moss in November, 1542, James Hamilton, second earl of Arran and regent in the wake of James’s death, entered into negotiations with the English council. On the first of July, 1543, the Treaty of Greenwich was concluded, betrothing Mary of Scotland to the young Edward. Following these negotiations, the Scottish nobility, employing the very same tactic as the Carthaginian senate above, denied the authority with which the treaty had been struck. The strained, diplomatic exchange is recorded in a draft ‘Declaration by the English Herald’, which was to be delivered to the Scottish council, dated 20 December, 1543. Henry, the communication states,

Had been content […] to laye aside armour and puissance, and to entre communicacion and treatie with youe, with conclusion to place his pronepte [great-niece] in mariage with the noble prince his majestes eldest sonne and heire apparaint, prince Edward, and in the meane tyme and after, to lyve in pea[x] rest and quiet with youe. To which couenant ye haue, by aucthoritie of the three estates of Scotland, agreed and consented. […] Now, contrarywise, when ye haue fayled in performance of that ye be bounde unto, to the greate reproache of your fayth and loyalte […] ye call the publike aucthoritie pryuate doings, wherin ye denye the preeminence of him whom youe chose for your Governour, then chosen by you.\textsuperscript{118}

In May of the following year, 4,000 horsemen and 12,000 foot soldiers took Leith and Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{119} For the contemporary, courtly reader there must have been a distinct resemblance between the justification offered by Cope’s Carthaginians for the breaking of the Ebro Treaty and England’s most recent quarrel with ‘the double dealynge Scottes’. In both instances, the authority of the original truce-maker is brought into question and is used a means of rescinding the treaty. In Livy’s account, and Cope’s translation thereof, the Carthaginians are allowed to voice their interpretation of events, claiming that war was always the Romans’ true intent: ‘Wherfore leaue now to speake of Sagunt

\textsuperscript{118} The Hamilton Papers, II.235-6.
\textsuperscript{119} Powell and Cook, 165.
and Iberus: and declare boldy that whyche you haue longe tyme consultynge, devised.’

In the original, Livy immediately counters this by explaining in detail why this claim carries no weight. Intriguingly, Cope omits Livy’s retort and the allegations of hypocrisy are left untouched. With this in mind, it is worth noting the enthusiasm which Henry had expressed for a military response to the breaking of the Greenwich Treaty. In his initial draft of the Proclamation, Hertford had left some room for clemency:

\[
\text{thos that lyk good and lowving subjets wille condisend and agre ther unto and deliver good ostagis for the performans of the samme, I, wille not only tak them into proteccion and savegar, but alalso promis in mi soferan lords name they shall injoy the libarti and fredum of this reaulme with all ther lands, possecions and goods in as large and ampull manar as they now doth att this present.}^{121}
\]

This potential for a peaceful resolution was not, however, to Henry’s liking. As the Privy Council explained in their reply, ‘the Kinges majestie […] thinketh that whenne that proclamacion shall have bene sett furth, you cane not afterwa

\[.
\]

\[
\text{To avoid ambiguity, Hertford was provided with a revised version which made absolutely clear that retribution would be exacted: ‘Wherefore his majeste, myndyng to have Ednborough, etc., burned […] hath divised a proclamacion to be made by youe there’.}^{123}
\]

In light of Henry’s insistence on military action, the accusation leveled at the Romans by the Carthaginian senate – namely that the Romans, warmongering, had intended conflict all along – carries a new significance. It is not unreasonable to assume

\[120\] Livy (21.19.1–5).
\[121\] The Hamilton Papers, II.312.
\[122\] Ibid. II.348.
\[123\] Ibid. II.348.
that Cope, courtier and chamberlain to Queen Katherine, was aware of Henry’s belligerent foreign policy and deliberately removed Livy’s apologia as a means of criticising this response.

Less than a decade later, James Brookes appealed to the same episode in a sermon calling for the revival of Catholicism in England. Following the death of Edward VI in 1553, Brookes was one of the foremost figures in the restoration of Catholicism under Mary.124 In a sermon preached before the Queen at St Paul’s Cross on 12 November 1553, Brookes urged the reconciliation of England and the Church of Rome. This sermon was published in the same year, printed by Robert Caly ‘within the late dissolved house, of Graie Friers’ and again in 1544 as A Sermon Very Notable, Fruictefull, and Godlie.125 Brookes turns to Livy at the climax of his sermon:

I reade in Titus Liuius, that on a time, when the Romans were greuously offended with the Carthaginiens for breache of a certeine leage, that was betwene them, One Quintus fabius, being sent from Rome, as an Ambassadour to Chartage, to expostulat with them for the inuries doen, assone as he was admitted into the counsail house gathering his gowne together in maner of a lap, in few worodes he doeth his message after this sort. What nede any circumstance, tariance, or delay (saith he) O you counsailors of Chartage? In this lappe of mine, I haue brought you heare, both battle, an peace: whether you list, chose and haue: chose battell, and haue battell: choose peace, and haue peace: come of at ones. When the counsailors of Chartage, setting light of ye mater, cried together with one voice, Sir, geue whether you list, we passe not on it, No (saith Fabius thambassador) passe you no more on the matier? then battel haue you: then open battail doe I pronounce and bidde unto yo[u]. And with that, he cast abrode the lap of his gowne, with such a uhemencie, terriblenes, and horror, euen as thoughe he had brought uery battel in his lap in dede. Euenso good brethren, for as much as your father Go[d] almighty God, & your mother ye holy catholike churche, are both no lesse greeuouslie offended with you, at this present, for the breache of the leage & promisse euerie one of you made to them in you: baptisme, (whiche leage and promise you haue sore broken, through defection, misbeleuyng, and misleuinge, I, although moost unworthy suche an hie function, being minimus apostolorum, imo minor minimo, & qui non sum dignus, uocari apostolus, yeat am I come thys day, as sent from them unto you, as a messenger, and as an imbassader. And, to use few wordes with you, my message is this. In this lappe of myne, I haue brought you here, both benediction

125 Brookes, colophon.
& malediction: both lyfe, and deathe: both saluation, and dampnation: benediction lyfe and saluacion, if you retourne, and repayre the leage: malediction, death and dampnation, if you do the contrarie. Now whether you list, chose and haue. But if you set lyghte of the mater, as the Chartaginians dyd, passinge not whether you haue, passinge not whether you retourne or no, than, malediction, death and dampnation haue you, than, malediction, death and dampnation upon you, then, malediction, death, and dampnation, do I pronounce vnto you126

Brookes liberally reworks the original. He does away completely with the Carthaginian senator and Fabius now delivers his ultimatum ‘assone as he was admitted into the counsail house’. Brookes is clearly not interested in the Carthaginian response. Instead, he greatly amplifies the rhetorical force of Fabius’s ultimatum with an eye to its delivery from the pulpit. In Livy, Fabius has only one line of direct speech: ‘Hic’ inquit, ‘uobis bellum et pacem portamus; utrum placet sumite’. Brookes embellishes this with a pair of rhetorical questions (‘What nede any circumstance, tariance, or delay (saith he) O you counsailors of Charthage?’; ‘No (saith Fabius thambassador) passe you no more on the matier?’) and two carefully balanced imperative clauses (‘chose battell, and haue battell: choose peace, and haue peace’).

Having placed a greater emphasis on the ultimatum, Brookes then uses the episode to comment on current movements to restore Catholicism. Casting the English as the Carthaginians of Livy’s narrative, and the Catholic Church as Rome, he presents his congregation with a decision of no less consequence. Of note here is how readily Brookes combines political and liturgical lexicons. Paraphrasing St Paul – *minimus apostolorum, imo minor minimo, & qui non sum dignus, uocari apostolus* (‘the least of the apostles, rather less than the least, I who am not worthy to be called apostle’) –
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126 Brookes, Jvii’—ki’il. The words which appear in a cursive italic in the original to distinguish them from the rest of the text I have reproduced here in italics.
Brookes marries scriptural and classical examples of betrayal. Brookes’s congregation and contemporary readership may have been familiar with the remaining words of this verse – ‘quoniam persecutus sum ecclesiam Dei’ (‘because I have persecuted God’s Church’) – a nod perhaps to his own acquiescence under Henrician Protestantism. Introducing the same formula with which he had glossed Fabius’s ultimatum – ‘In this lappe of myne, I haue brought you here […]’ – he substitutes a series of spiritual key words – ‘both benediction & malediction: both lyfe, and deathe: both saluation, and damnation’ – for the previous ‘battle, and peace’. A ‘leage’ between nations thereby becomes the bond between the Roman Church and her prodigal sons. There is also a printed note in the margin of the sermon pointing the reader to the relevant moment in Livy, ‘libro.i.dec.iiij’. The reader is thus invited, if he or she wishes, to compare Brookes’s adaptation with the Latin original.

Livy describes Fabius gathering up the folds of his toga and releasing them as he declares war (‘sinu ex toga facto’; ‘cum is iterum sinu effuso bellum dare dixisset […]’). Physical appearance, body language, and even the toga itself were vital tools in the Roman orator’s repertoire. Quintilian in the Institutio Oratoria gives very strict instructions as to how the sinus (‘fold’) is to be worn, as well as detailing how the toga might be used to enhance the orator’s delivery. Once the speaker has arrived at the crux of his argument, he can start to use his toga for dramatic effect since ‘ardent enim
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127 ‘ego enim sum minimus apostolorum qui non sum dignus vocari apostolus quoniam persecutus sum ecclesiam Dei’. 1 Corinthians 15:9.
128 Brookes, Jvii.
130 ‘Sinus decentissimus si aliquo supra imam tunicam fuerit, numquam certe sit inferior. Ille qui sub umero dextro ad sinistrum oblique ducitur ulcer balteus nec strangulet nec fluat’. (‘The fold is most becoming if it is hung at some point above the bottom of the tunic, but certainly never if it is below. Don’t let that type of fold which is worn on a slant under the right shoulder to the left like a belt choke you or hang loose’) Quintilian (11.3.140).
iam omnia’ (‘everything is hotting up now’).\textsuperscript{131} Once he reaches the climax of his oration, ‘paene omnia decent, sudor ipse et fatigatio et neglegentior amictus et soluta ac uelut labens undique toga’ (‘almost anything goes, even sweat and exhaustion and rather disheveled clothing and a toga let loose, almost as if it were slipping on each side’).\textsuperscript{132} Following his wider programme of domestication, Cope omits the description of Fabius’s dramatic release of the toga. Brookes, on the other hand, exaggerates this element, perhaps playing on the opportunities afforded him by his cassock. Not only is Fabius described as ‘gathering his gowne together in maner of a lap’, but now he releases it with an even greater flurry: ‘he cast abrode the lap of his gowne, with such a uehemencie, terriblenes, and horror, euen as though he had brought uery battel in his lap in dede’. With Fabius as his example, Brookes is able to reiterate the action before his own audience, ‘In this lappe of myne, I haue brought you here, both benediction & malediction: both lyfe, and deathe: both saluation, and dampnation’.

Both these adaptations bear witness to the fact that the development of vernacular humanism in early Tudor England was tied up with immediate, political demands. In Cope’s Livy, the line of argument employed by Cope’s Carthaginians may well have suggested the Scottish counsel’s denial of Arran’s authority in brokering the Treaty of Greenwich. In Brookes’s version, Livy was put to work in a renewed debate over England’s relationship with the Roman Church. The reworking of this episode to two radically different ends within the space of ten years is indicative of the flexibility with which classical history was being exploited and recycled.

\textsuperscript{131} ibid. (11.3.145).
\textsuperscript{132} ibid. (11.3.147).
4. The edition of 1548

The second edition of Cope’s translation was published at the height of the Rough Wooing, a series of assaults launched against Scotland by Edward Seymour, Lord Protector Somerset (1500–1552) with the hope of enforcing a marriage between Mary and Edward. As Marcus Merriman observes, ‘The two-and-a half years following the battle of Pinkie (from September 1547 to March 1550) witnessed the most intense Anglo-Scottish warfare of the sixteenth century’. The reprinting of the Historie once again played into a current preoccupation with broken oaths, but also commented on some embryonic discussions of empire.

In 1547, the question of broken oaths was still very much a concern for the Tudor court. Somerset’s (c.1500–1552) Proclamation (1547), printed by Richard Grafton and addressed to the people of Scotland, reiterated the terms agreed by the Treaty of Greenwich. In the following year, William Patten (fl.1548–1580) produced the The Expedicion into Scothande (1548), an account ‘set out by way of diarie’ of the campaign undertaken by Somerset in September, 1545. In the preface to The Expedicion, Patten compares Seymour to a series of Roman generals, including Scipio, implicitly casting the Scots as the barbarian enemies of Rome. Patten compares England with Rome again in a description of Seymour’s clemency. The Lord Protector is ‘neither cruell vpon victorie nor insolent vpon good successe, but with most moderate magnaminitee, vpon the respect of occasion, vsing as the Poet saith: Parcerre subiectis & debellare

---

134 Only one copy of this proclamation survives and is now kept by the Society of Antiquaries of London (Cab Lib e). It is reproduced in Merriman, 275.
135 William Patten, The Expedicion into Scothande (London: Richard Grafton, 1548) +viii’–ai’
superbos’. This line is taken from the pageant of heroes in book six of the *Aeneid*, wherein Anchises showcases the leading figures of Rome’s imperial future. To conquer and to rule peacefully, Anchises explains, are Rome’s particular arts. With this nod to the *Aeneid* and its promise of ‘imperium sine fine’ (‘power without end’, or ‘empire without a border’), there is the implicit suggestion of imperial expansion. Early Tudor England had no pressing imperial ambitions, though there were nevertheless occasional murmurs with regard to Scotland. As Merriman notes, John Dudley (1504–1553) motioned in 1542 that at least a portion of Scotland be annexed to England. Skelton in the Latin verse which suffixes his invective ‘agaynst the Scottes’ describes England, following the battle of Flodden, as annexing Scotland as a province: ‘Scotica redacta in formam prouincie / Regis parebit nutibus anglie’ (‘Scotland, reduced to the form of a province, will obey the commands of England’). Here ‘redacta in formam prouincie’ echoes the phrasing of the *Epitome* to book 45 of Livy which prefaced almost every edition of the *AUC* during the period. There Rome’s annexing of Macedonia is described with the same formula: ‘Macedonia in prouinciae formam redacta’ (‘Macedonia reduced to the form of a Province’). Edward Hall’s *Chronicle* (1548), which was published in the same year as the *Historie*’s second outing in print, makes Henry VIII declare ‘I am the very owner of Scotland’ and that ‘he [James IV] holdeth it of me by homage’. In this light, it is perhaps significant that Cope’s translation of Livy contains one of the strongest anti-imperial statements of classical literature. In his address to Scipio before the battle of Zama, Livy puts the following words into the mouth of Hannibal: ‘optimum

---

136 ‘to spare the conquered and subdue the proud’. Patten, aiii
139 Merriman, 13, f.n. 42.
140 Skelton, Bii
141 *Periochae* 45.
142 Hall, xxix
quidem fuerat eam patribus mentem datam ab dis esse ut et vos Italiae et nos Africae imperio contenti essemus; neque enim ne vobis quidem Sicilia ac Sardinia satis digna pretia sunt pro tot classibus, tot exercitibus, tot tam egregiis amissis ducibus. Sed praeterita magis reprehendi possunt quam corrigi’. 143 For which Cope gives:

I woulde it had pleased the goddes, to haue gyuen suche honest hertes to our fathers and predecessours, that they wolde haue ben contented with the empyre of Rome. For if we make a trewe rekenynge, neyther Sicilia, nor Sardinia, be a worthy recompence of the manyfolde nauyes, armies, and noble Capytaynes, that we haue loste, through our prowde contention. But it is easier to fynde faulte with thynges that be passed: then it is to amende the same. 144

Scipio refuses to treat with Hannibal, and ‘without any agrement of peace, the .ii. capytaines brake of their communication, and departed every one to his company’. 145 Nevertheless, Cope allows space for a voice of regret and doubt in what otherwise reads as a triumphant endorsement of Rome’s conquest of Carthage. 146

Conclusion

Cope translated Livy with an eye to Henry’s most recent conflicts with Scotland and France. Having established a dialogue with the events of living memory in the dedication, Cope textured his translation with contemporary, diplomatic vocabularies to sustain this resonance. The broken treaty, failed embassies, and more general collapse of

143 ‘Indeed it would have been better if our fathers had been given the disposition by the gods that you might have been content with the rule of Italy and we with the rule of Africa; nor to be sure are Sicily and Sardinia of value enough for you for so many fleets, so many armies, so many outstanding generals now lost. But things past can be more readily rebuked than corrected’. Livy (30.30.6–7).
144 Cope, Kkiii7
145 ibid. Lliir.
146 For the key discussion of further, dissenting voices in a classical and apparently pro-imperial narrative, see R.O.A.M. Lyne, Further Voices in Vergil’s Aeneid (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).
diplomatic relations which mark the beginning of the third decade of the *AUC* bear a striking resemblance to the relations between England and its neighbours in the years preceding Cope’s translation. By drawing on the Scots’ popular reputation for duplicity, Cope prepared the reader for his depiction of the Carthaginians, whose actions mirror official depictions of the Scots during the 1540s. The emphasis which Livy places on the breaking of oaths and treaties in the third decade plays a key part in this dialogue, echoing the emphasis of Henrician propaganda on the Treaty of Greenwich. Both the editions of 1544 and 1548 can be seen therefore as responding to the breakdown of diplomatic relations between England and the partners of the Auld Alliance. The comparison of Cope’s translation of Book Twenty-One with the adaptation by James Brookes reveals the flexible approaches of contemporary Tudor readers to ancient history. At one moment, Livy is made to speak of current tensions with England’s northern neighbours, and at another, of England’s need to re-embrace the Roman Church. Cope thus created a Livian history which could reach out and comment on the most pressing diplomatic concerns of the day.
Chapter 4. Tudor Humanists, London Printers, and the Status of Women: The Struggle over Livy in the English *Querelle des Femmes*

Introduction

In 1551, the king’s printer Thomas Berthelet issued what was the climax of a series of works interrogating the intellectual and social status of contemporary women. The small, duodecimo volume was entitled: *An Argument Wherin the Apparaile of Women is Both Reproued and Defended*.\(^1\) The *Argument* consists of a translation by the ‘scholar, administrator, and alleged traitor’ William Thomas (d.1554) of a brief, self-contained narrative from book thirty-four of Livy’s history.\(^2\) The episode features two speeches delivered in the wake of Rome’s most recent conflict with Carthage, both of which debate the possible repeal of a law named the *Lex Oppia*.\(^3\) The *Argument* thereby contributed to a wider vogue across Europe for Livy’s speeches. From as early as 1509, the orations were being cropped from the *AUC* and re-produced in smaller volumes, around fourteen of which were produced between 1509 and 1551.\(^4\)

The *Lex Oppia* was an emergency measure originally passed in 215BC at the height of the Second Punic War. It proscribed any woman from owning over half an ounce of gold or dressing in clothes dyed with multiple colours. It also forbade women

---

3. Livy (34.1–8).
4. The *Lex Oppia* speeches had in fact been printed in an independent volume at Paris as *Orationes Adversariae M. Portij Catonis, & L. Valerij de Lege Oppia* (1531).
to ride in a carriage within the walls of Rome or to travel over a mile beyond the city limits, with the exception of religious festivals. Though Livy does not explicitly say so, he implies that the excess gold was surrendered to the state to help with the war effort. Twenty years after the Oppian Law was passed, the women of Rome took to the streets to demand its repeal. Responding to these very public demonstrations, Marcus Porcius Cato, consul and vehement conservative, motions in a speech before the senate that the law be kept. He berates the men of Rome for failing to keep their wives in check, reminding them that Roman legislation has historically imposed limits on women’s behaviour and independence.

The most enduring message of Cato’s speech, however, was his suggestion that the Lex Oppia had originally been passed to curb female excess. This interpretation of the law (which is, as Valerius highlights in his rebuttal, historically inaccurate), became the definitive way of reading the episode during the sixteenth century. In fact, it remained unchallenged until the appearance of William Thomas’s Argument. The tribune Lucius Valerius replies to Cato with his own speech, stating that there is nothing intrinsically novel about the women’s protests. Women have, he explains, from the earliest moments of Roman history played an active role in the affairs of state. Exploring the law’s origins, Valerius notes that the Lex Oppia was the product of very specific, wartime desiderata which are no longer in play. It was never intended, he insists, as a measure to restrain women’s alleged excess. Valerius goes on to argue that

---

5 Livy (34.1.3). Valerius Maximus also provides an account (modelled on Livy) of the Lex Oppia and its repeal. Cf. Valerius Maximus (9.1.3).
6 Livy (34.6.16).
7 Cato was elected consul in 195BC with Valerius Flaccus. Cf. Livy (33.42.7).
8 ibid. (34.2–3).
9 ibid. (34.4.6).
10 ibid. (34.6.4–18).
since women enjoy none of the privileges typically afforded to male citizens, they should at least be granted this meagre, expressive outlet.\textsuperscript{11}

Traditionally, William Thomas has provoked interest as one of the first humanists to introduce Machiavelli into the English literary and political milieu.\textsuperscript{12} Having acquired gambling debts and stolen from his employer, Sir Anthony Browne (c.1500–1548), Thomas fled to Italy in 1545. Initially imprisoned at Venice, he was eventually released and spent the next three years familiarising himself with Italian language and literature.\textsuperscript{13} Thomas returned to England in 1548 and by 1552 he had been appointed as clerk to the Privy Council under Edward VI. Following Edward’s death, Thomas was implicated in the Wyatt rebellion. By 20 February 1554, he had been incarcerated at the Tower of London and was subsequently convicted of treason. On the 18 May, he was hung, drawn and quartered.\textsuperscript{14}

The first studies of Thomas explored how his years in Italy helped to shape his later role as clerk of the Privy Council and as an ‘informal royal tutor’ to Edward VI.\textsuperscript{15} Thomas wrote eighty-five topics of statecraft for the young Edward along with a series of \textit{Discourses} which, as Peter Donaldson notes, derived much of their material from Machiavelli.\textsuperscript{16} It was not until Arvid Carlson’s article of 1993 that the \textit{Argument} itself received any critical attention.\textsuperscript{17} Christine Fauré refers briefly to Thomas’s translation in her chapter on women and republicanism but her comments are for the most part

\textsuperscript{11} ibid. (34.7.1–10).
\textsuperscript{13} Hamilton.
\textsuperscript{14} ibid.
\textsuperscript{15} ibid.
inspired by Carlson.\textsuperscript{18} Cathy Shrank has provided a detailed account of Thomas’s life and writings, but is primarily interested in the Italian elements of his literary output, and the \textit{Argument} is mentioned only in passing.\textsuperscript{19} Most recently, Jonathon Woolfson has produced a chapter on the travels of Thomas Hoby and William Thomas through Italy. Again, Thomas’s classical learning is played down and the pair are described as ‘not entirely averse to Latin and Greek scholarship’.\textsuperscript{20} Carlson’s article is then the most detailed analysis of the \textit{Argument} to date. For Carlson, Thomas’s translation, emerging as it did during the most recent programme of numismatic reform, ‘is a cleverly done propaganda piece to urge the surrender of the old debased coins for the new issue of October 1551’.\textsuperscript{21} There is, it is true, a curt nod to ‘the baseness of our coyne’ in the preface.\textsuperscript{22} But the rest of that preface and indeed the work as a whole are concerned with countering popular trends in misogynist thought. This chapter argues that Thomas’s translation was not a subtle swipe at Tudor economic policy but an attempt to harness Livy as a pro-female authority in the debate over women. To do so, Thomas appealed to an earlier, Italian reading of the \textit{Lex Oppia} episode that exploited Valerius’s speech for its arguments in praise of womankind. He thereby teased out a distinctly pro-female voice from Livy which, in England at least, had previously gone unheard. By locating the \textit{Argument} within a wider context of works that were examining the social and

\textsuperscript{22} Thomas (1551) Aii’
educative roles of contemporary women, Thomas’s *Argument* emerges as a bold and hitherto unremarked intervention in the English *querelle des femmes*.23

Despite the critical underplaying of Thomas’s classical learning, the *Argument* was engaged in a complex network of relationships not only with ancient texts but with contemporary, humanist works which shared a strong, classical bent. The most important of these, Livy’s *AUC*, provided the basic material for Thomas’s translation. Thomas’s focus on the *Lex Oppia* was informed by an earlier, Italian preoccupation with the episode that developed during the Quattrocento. Time and again, Livy had been yoked by Italian humanists to debates over female apparel. In around 1453, the noblewoman Nicolosa Sanuti (fl.1453) composed a petition which demanded the repeal of a sumptuary law introduced at Bologna. The petition not only cited the *Lex Oppia*, but reworked Valerius’s speech in praise of women. Sanuti’s treatise prompted a positive response from the humanist educator, Guarino Veronese (1374–1460). In an epistle arguing for greater freedoms of female apparel, he borrowed extensively from the *Lex Oppia* passage. Then in 1467, three orations composed in Viterbo mined Livy for material in a dispute over women’s apparel. This was only the beginning of a struggle, which would last well into the sixteenth century, to claim Livy as an authority on either side of the Renaissance debate over women.

Thomas’s translation was also in dialogue with a number of contemporary works, most of which fell on either side of the English *querelle des femmes*. These included a
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23 The majority of criticism on the English *querelle* focuses on its later developments in the seventeenth century. The compendium of *querelle* literature compiled by Henderson and McManus for *Half Humankind* includes only four texts dating from the sixteenth century from a total of sixteen. The essays gathered in *Representing Women in Renaissance England* by Summers and Pebworth similarly focus on the seventeenth century. This trend is repeated in *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500–1700*, which concentrates on ‘writers defending women in seventeenth-century England’. Malcolmson and Suzuki, 3. Linda Woodbridge examines the early Tudor controversies in *Women and the English Renaissance*. Thomas’s *Argument* (1551), however, does not make an appearance and Woodbridge describes the debate as ‘lying dormant through the 1550s’.

Woodbridge, 49.
number of texts printed by Thomas Berthelet which presented the education of women in a distinctly positive light. Margaret Roper’s (1505–1544) translation of Erasmus’s commentary on the Lord’s Prayer, *A Deuote Treatise Vpon the Pater Noster* (1526), Thomas Elyot’s *The Defence of Good Women* (1540), and David Clapam’s (d.1551) translation of Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa’s (1486–1535) *De Nobilitate et Praeexcellentia Foeminei Sexus* (1542) all laid the conceptual groundwork for Thomas’s reworking of Livy.

Less sympathetic in its portrayal of women but of equal importance to the *Argument* was Juan Luis Vives’s (1492–1540) *De Institutione Foeminae Christianae* (1524), which appeared in an English translation from Berthelet’s press in 1529.²⁴ This treatise on female education helped to establish an orthodox way of reading the *Lex Oppia* episode that thrived during the sixteenth century, namely one which read the law as a means of curbing women’s alleged extravagance. William Parfey’s intensely misogynistic *Speculum Iuuenum* (1547) endorsed the same reading of Livy, against which Thomas would position himself in the *Argument*. Each of these texts, pro-female and misogynistic alike, can be seen to have prompted and textured Thomas’s translation.

2. Livy, the *Lex Oppia* and Quattrocento Italy

It was in Quattrocento Italy that the struggle over Livy as intellectual property in the debate over women first began. From as early as 1453, Italian humanists were appealing to the *Lex Oppia* episode in literary disputes concerning female apparel. Though these

texts presented themselves primarily as responses to contemporary sumptuary measures, they each engaged in a wider discussion of women’s intellectual and social worth.

The Italian city-states produced no fewer than eighty-three sumptuary laws during the fifteenth century; these were followed by more than 160 in the sixteenth.25 Much like the *Lex Oppia*, many of these laws were aimed exclusively at women.26 In one such instance, Bessarion (1439–72), theologian and governour of Bologna, passed a sumptuary measure on 24 March, 1453, demarcating what each class of Bolognese woman was permitted to wear in accordance to her rank. This inspired a petition devised by the noblewoman Nicolosa Sanuti and composed in Latin with the help of ‘a man of great pre-eminence and virtue’, that demanded the law’s repeal.27 The work is of special interest since it constitutes, as Catherine Kovesi Killerby observes, ‘arguably the first public defence of women in Italy conceived by a woman’.28

Despite the petition’s explicit references to the *Lex Oppia*, almost nothing has been said of the strong, intertextual relationship it develops with Livy.29 In her initial address to Bessarion, Sanuti echoes Livy’s introduction to the *Lex Oppia* passage:

‘Verum fortasses miraberis quod ego femina neque verecundia, neque tua auctoritate

---

29 Neither Hughes nor Killerby identified Livy as a literary model. Giuseppe Lombardi points to Livy as a source for Sanuti’s treatise in *Galiane in Rivolta*, but does not press on the full extent of the relationship. Lombardi, 1.CXX.
detrerrita in presentiarum apud tuam justissimam dominationem pro matronis causam egerim’.  

The phrase ‘neque verecundia, neque tua auctoritate’ (‘neither by modesty nor by your authority’) echoes Livy’s description of the Roman women, who could be dissuaded from their protest ‘nec auctoritate nec uerecundia’ (‘neither by authority nor by modesty’). With this nod to the Roman women’s demonstration, there is the suggestion that Sanuti will be drawing on the same daring exhibited by her (female) predecessors. Sanuti appeals to this sense of history repeating with her first explicit mention of the *Lex Oppia*: ‘Repititam itaque adversus nos legem, olim a Marchio Oppio tribuno plebis Quinto Fabio et Tito Sempronio consulibus, contra omnium mulierum romanarum decus ac dignitatem latam, et viginti annos post a M. Catone Portio abrogatam’. By citing the *Lex Oppia’s* repeal, Sanuti implies that Bessarion’s law will meet a similar end. In what Giuseppe Lombardi refers to as a ‘rather gross error’, she apparently forgets that it was Cato who spoke so vehemently against the law’s repeal. 

The same misidentification is made a few paragraphs later. This slip, however, is no accident. The petition as a whole follows Livy’s account closely and actively quotes from the original. It also paraphrases sections from Livy’s history besides the *Lex Oppia* episode. In short, Sanuti and her unnamed collaborator knew their Livy. With this deliberate misremembering, Sanuti re-casts Cato, a ‘gravissimus et severissimus vir’
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30. Yet perhaps you will marvel that I, a woman, discouraged neither by modesty nor by your authority, should now argue the case on behalf of women before your most righteous Lordship’. Sanuti, 251. 
31 ibid. 251; Livy (34.1.5). 
32 A law has been brought against us once again, originally passed by Marcus Oppius, tribune of the plebs, when Quintus Fabius and Titus Sempronius were consuls, against the glory and worth of every Roman woman, and repealed twenty years later by Marcus Porcius Cato’. Sanuti, 252. Cf. Livy (34.1.2-3). 
33 Lombardi, I.CXX. 
34 Sanuti, 253. 
35 As, for example, when Sanuti refers to the two women from Capua who helped the Roman troops during the Second Punic War. Sanuti, 261; cf. Livy (26.33.8).
Following the contours of Valerius’s speech, the petition demonstrates that the Oppian Law was a product of a very specific, historical moment. Condensing Valerius’s argument, Sanuti explains that the law was implemented at the height of the Second Punic War, when Rome lacked allies, funds, and soldiery. The observation with which the petition concludes – namely that women, who are denied all civil and religious offices, triumphs and the spoils of war, should at least be left their apparel – has again been inspired, in both content and phrasing, by Livy’s Valerius.

Sanuti also puts an emphasis on educated women, thereby anticipating one of the foremost themes in later, querelle literature. Having singled out Sappho as an ancient model of female learning, she lists examples from living memory, including Battista da Montefeltro (c.1384–1447), for whom Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444) wrote the De Studiis et Litteris (1424), his treatise on female education, and Costanza Varano (1426-47), ‘cuius et epistolae multae et orationes et elegantissima carmina adhuc sunt in manibus’.

36 Sanuti, 253.
37 'Tunc lata est Oppia Lex, quando Romanus populus in maximo discrimine erat! Cum Annibalem Romanus ad urbec castra posticurn timentem! Cum socii milites classes, comeatus, pecuniae deessent. Quae omnia huius legis condenclae causa fuere, tam dui dururiae, quamdiu populus romanus ab ea calamitate liber esset!’ ('The Lex Oppia was passed when the Roman people were in the greatest crisis! When the Romans were afraid that Hannibal would pitch his camp outside the city, when allies, fleets, supplies, and money were wanting. All of these were responsible for the promulgation of this law, which would last only until the Roman people were free from that disaster!’) Sanuti, 253. Cf. Livy (34.6.10–18).
38 'Magistratus mulieribus non concedentur: sacerdotia, triumphi, bellica spolia et ipsae non contendunt, quia hujuscemodi dona virorum esse solent. Ornatn autem et cultus, quia nostrarum sunt insignia virtutum a nobis eripi quoad poterimus non patiemur.’ ('Public offices are not granted to women: they do not strive after priesthoods, triumphs or the spoils of war, since gifts of this kind are wont to belong to men. We will not allow, however, as far as we are able, apparel and refinement, seeing that they are the emblems of our virtues, to be snatched from us’. ) Sanuti, 262. Cf. Livy (34.7.8–9).
39 ‘whose many letters, speeches and most elegant poems are yet still in people’s hands’. Sanuti, 256.
Sanuti’s petition was not received enthusiastically in all quarters, as is evinced by the correspondence between the canon regular, Matteo Bosso (1427/8–1502) and Guarino Veronese. Bosso complained that ‘in ore omnium et in manibus versabatur oratio’ (‘the speech was on the lips and in the hands of everyone’), with some applauding it, and others (including himself) lamenting the fact that that women’s ‘ornamentorum licentiam’ (‘liberty of ornamentation’) has been celebrated in a written work. In fact, so disquieted was Bosso by the treatise that he composed his own response, the *De Immoderato Mulierum Cultu Cohortatio* (c.1453). Referring contemptuously to that ‘libellus’ (‘little book’) (Bosso does not name Sanuti as its author), he too cites Rome’s legal precedent. For Bosso, the most disturbing detail of the *Lex Oppia* narrative is the Roman women’s public demonstration:

Ita. non locutus es, ac ignores eas […] post multos clamores, post multa iurgia fo êmina quadem rabie, & insano furore succensas Brutorum domum, qui legis abrogationem impedirent, obsedisse donec lex aboleretur, ac nullum pene Brutis auxilium fuisse, quia non perciperent Romani lubricum semper, & insaciabile mulierum studium.

Bosso has added a distinctly negative gloss to Livy’s account of the women’s protests, dismissing them as ‘fo êmina quadem rabie, & insano furore succensas’ (‘inflamed with a kind of womanly madness and manic frenzy’). By reaching out to a later account of the episode written by the heavily moralising Valerius Maximus, he introduces the idea that

---

40 Bosso in Veronese, 2.650.
41 Though composed in the wake of Sanuti’s protest in around 1453, Bosso’s *Cohortatio* was included in Franciscus de Benedictis’s *Recuperationes Faesulanae* (Bologna: Franciscus (Plato) de Benedictis, 1493).
42 Bosso (1509) Zi.
43 ‘You failed to mention, and indeed are ignorant of the fact that those women, after much shouting and after many quarrels, were inflamed with a kind of womanly madness and manic frenzy and laid siege to the house of the Brutii (who hindered the law’s abrogation) until the law was abolished, and that there was almost no help offered to the Brutii, because the Roman men did not perceive that women’s desire is forever slippery and insatiable’. Ibid. Ziii.
the men of Rome failed to grasp the full (and, as he implies, negative) consequences of the law’s repeal.\footnote{Valerius Maximus (9.1.3). Bosso refers explicitly to Valerius Maximus in the next paragraph. Bosso, 1509, Zijj’}

Sanuti’s petition did, however, manage to win the sympathy of Bosso’s addressee, Guarino Veronese. In a letter written in the summer of 1456 and addressed to Sanuti’s lover, Sante Bentivoglio (1424–1460), de facto ruler of Bologna, Veronese called for greater freedoms of female apparel. As with Sanuti, he borrowed freely from Livy. The first half of the epistle summarises the objections made by those ‘quasi Catones saevi magis quam severi’ (‘quasi Catos, more savage than severe’), gesturing to the consul’s proverbial reputation for conservative morals, but more specifically to his role in the Lex Oppia episode.\footnote{Veronese, 3.528, lines 59–60.} Veronese reproduces several of the concerns that Livy puts in the mouth of Cato: the fear that women will usurp the authority of their husbands, that they are wandering abroad to illicit ends, that sumptuous apparel breeds undesirable competition between women and that women are untamed animals requiring restraint are all arguments which have their origins in Cato’s speech.\footnote{ibid. 3.528, lines 69–75; cf. Livy (34. 2. 13 -14), 176 (34. 3.2 -4). Veronese, 3.528, lines 79–83; cf. Livy (34.4.15 –16). Veronese, 3.529, lines 100–102; cf. Livy (34.2.13), (34.3.2–3).}

Veronese then counters these anxieties in a kind of prosopopoeia, adopting a female persona to speak on behalf of womankind. Reworking Valerius’s argument (also cited by Sanuti) that women, because they are denied public office, rely on apparel as a means of expressing their honour, Veronese transforms Valerius’s third-person observations into a first-person testimonial: ‘munditiae nobis convenient, ornamenta cultusque et venustas feminarum studium et insignia sunt. His gloriamur his gaudemus,
per haec nobis ipsis placemus, his gravia lenimus onera’. 47 For Veronese as well as Sanuti, Livy functioned as a versatile source in the debate over female apparel.

The literary coteries of Bologna and Ferrara were not alone in their appropriation of the Lex Oppia. In the summer of 1467, three speeches were written in Viterbo in response to sumptuary measures passed by the city council. 48 The orations, two of which are written in defence of female apparel, the other against, are addressed to the Papal Governour of Viterbo (and author of the Cornucopia) Niccolò Perotti. According to the second oration, the city’s female populace has staged a protest, wherein they ‘non modo forum atque subsellia turmatim adire, sed quasi ipsae quoque rem publicam capessere velint, consulere senatum, rogare plebem, exquirere suffragia […] ausae sunt’. 49 The event shares an uncanny resemblance to the protest described by Livy and it is difficult to determine in these speeches where historical record ends and rhetorical exaggeration begins. 50 Nevertheless, to an even greater extent than Sanuti and Veronese, the Viterbo orations reveal, as Giuseppe Lombardi notes, ‘an almost obsessive quotation of the Lex Oppia’. 51

The first speech, for example, uses two points made by Valerius – that women too should experience the benefits of peace and that women have made significant contributions to the state – to bracket a novel argument concerning an apparent

---

47 ‘Elegance becomes us. Ornaments and apparel and grace are women’s endeavour and decorations. In these we pride ourselves, in these we take joy, through these we please ourselves, and with these we lighten weighty tasks’. Veronese, 3.533, lines 262–265. Cf. Livy (34.7.9).
48 The speeches have been edited by Giuseppe Lombardi with a detailed introduction in Galiane in Rivolta.
49 ‘They not only dared to approach the forum and the judge’s bench as a crowd, but, as if they wanted to seize hold of the state, consulted with the senate, interrogated the people and solicited votes’. Lombardi, 2.54.
50 Cf. Livy (34.1.5).
51 Lombardi, 1. CXXXIX. Lombardi provides a table in his introduction showing the precise points of contact between Livy’s narrative and the Viterbo orations. Ibid. CXLVI – CXLVIII.
correlation between outlawing sumptuous apparel and homosexual intercourse.\textsuperscript{52} Though ostensibly concerned with clothing, these speeches also comment on women’s social and moral worth in relation to their male counterparts: ‘Sed viros quoque decet in honore eas habere nec mancipiorum instar subesse sibi existimare’.\textsuperscript{53} The same speaker looks nostalgically to the ancient world for female participation in the political aspects of city life, recalling that ‘Fuit olim tempus quo sexui nostro publicis etiam consultationibus licebat interesse, nec prorsus a rerum publicarum exercitatione coercebamur’.\textsuperscript{54} The \textit{Lex Oppia} was thus juxtaposed in the Viterbo orations with a wider discussion of women’s social and political potentials.

Beyond the Quattrocento, sumptuary measures continued to be applied in the Italian city-states. As Killerby notes, ‘it was not until the eighteenth century that sumptuary laws were finally abandoned as an integral part of governmental policy’.\textsuperscript{55} Hand in hand with this legal and religious preoccupation with apparel, the \textit{Lex Oppia} narrative remained a popular example in texts produced in Italy concerning women’s clothing.\textsuperscript{56} Thomas probably became acquainted with this very specific use of Livy during his three-year sojourn in Italy (1545–48). Thomas’s \textit{Historie of Italie}, printed by Berthelet in 1549, referred not only to the ‘riche apparaill’ enjoyed by Italian women but

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{52}‘Dira iam dudum et plena sceleris atque abominanda consuetudo inolevit, ut relictio legitimo thor et coniugali fide posthabita, spreto etiam omni femineo sexu, mares maribus miscantur […] nihil sibi vult aliu haec lex, nisi ut aspernemur a maritis quo ipsi […] infandis marium complexibus uti possint’. (‘A terrible, detestable and sinful habit has developed, with the result that now that the lawful marriage bed has been abandoned and marital faith is held in low esteem, and the entire female sex has been spurned, men are having intercourse with men […] this law desires nothing else than for us to be detested by our husbands so that they [the supporters of the law] can enjoy the unspeakable embraces of men’). Lombardi, 2.32.
  \item \textsuperscript{53}‘Men should also hold women in esteem, not think of them as beneath themselves as if they were property’. Ibid. 2.2.
  \item \textsuperscript{54}‘there was once a time when our sex was allowed to attend public consultations, when we were not completely restrained from the exercise of public affairs’. Ibid. 2.12. The speaker is probably referring to the legendary foundation of Athens, in which a public consultation including both men and women determined whether the city should take Athena or Poseidon as its patron deity.
  \item \textsuperscript{55}Killerby (2002) 132.
  \item \textsuperscript{56}Orfeo Cancellieri cites both Livy and Valerius Maximus in this regard. Orfeo Cancellieri, \textit{Tractatus utilissimus de Ornatu Mulierum} (Bologna: [Girolamo Benedetti], 1526) s.p.
\end{itemize}
also to the ingenious methods by which they circumvented sumptuary laws. He was also in Bologna when he learned of Henry’s death, the city which had witnessed the debate inspired by Sanuti’s petition and boasted the greatest number of sumptuary laws targeting women during the sixteenth-century. But Thomas’s choice of subject, while bearing the hallmarks of this Italian tradition, also complemented the interests of his printer, Thomas Berthelet.

3. Thomas Berthelet, women patrons and female-centric works

In this extract from Thomas’s translation, Valerius observes the severe, social limitations placed on the Roman matrona. In the Latin original, Livy plays on the homophony of munditiae (‘elegance’) with mundum muliebrem, which suggests both ‘the articles a woman uses to beautify herself’ and also, as Thomas puts it, ‘the women’s worlde’. Valerius thereby suggests that the significance of a woman’s life can be reduced to her appearance. This section explores how Thomas’s translation complemented a wider trend for works, many of which were printed by Berthelet,
discussing exactly what constituted ‘the women’s worlde’. In fact, Berthelet and his press became primary conduits for the contemporary debate over women’s social and educative potential.\(^{61}\) Thomas’s *Argument*, printed towards the end of Berthelet’s career in 1551, can thus be understood as the culmination of a twenty-five year programme of female-centric works.

Thomas Berthelet owned a print shop on Fleet Street ‘at the signe of Lucrece.’\(^{62}\) He began printing in September 1524 and by the 22 February, 1530, Berthelet had been appointed as the king’s printer.\(^{63}\) In this capacity he was responsible for printing the laws and ordinances, but the role also connected him to literary figures and patrons within Henry’s court. His press was prolific; Thomas Olsen counts ‘more than 150 editions’ produced by Berthelet between 1524 and 1555.\(^{64}\) He also specialised in the printing of humanist works, issuing multiple translations of classical texts, including Plutarch and Xenophon, as well as several, English language versions of works by Erasmus. As we saw in the previous chapter, Berthelet was also responsible for printing Anthony Cope’s translation of Livy. Crucial to understanding the *Argument*, Berthelet performed a key role in the English reception of the continental *querelle des femmes*.

Berthelet began issuing works that touched on female education as early as 1526, only two years into his printing career. It was in this year that he printed a translation of Erasmus’s commentary on the Lord’s prayer, ‘tourned in to englisshe’, as the title tells

---


\(^{62}\) Berthelet chose for his emblem one of the foremost examples of women’s capacity to influence the affairs of state. The phrase ‘at the signe of Lucrece’ appears throughout Berthelet’s colophons, while the Lucrece device – she appears naked, with a sword held to her breast – was used until 1549. Lucreta’s rape, suicide and role as a catalyst for governmental change form the climax of the first book of Livy’s history. Cf. Livy (1.57–60).

\(^{63}\) Pantzer.

\(^{64}\) Olsen, 24.
us, by Margaret Roper (1505–1544), daughter of Sir Thomas More (1478–1535). In a prefatory epistle, Richard Hyrde (d.1528) attempts to assuage apparently popular anxieties surrounding the education of women and more specifically ‘whether it shulde be expedyent and requisite or nat / a woman to haue lernyng in bojes of latyn and greke’. Any such doubt, however, Hyrde attributes to ignorance and envy.

Some fourteen years later, Berthelet printed *The Defence of Good Women* (1540) by Sir Thomas Elyot (c.1490–1546) dedicated to Henry’s most recent consort, Anne of Cleves (1515–1557). Here two speakers, Caninius and Candidus, debate ‘the estimation of womankind’ and are finally joined by Zenobia, Elyot’s ideal, educated woman, who has pursued the liberal arts both for her own sake and for that of her children. The *Defence* states that women are to be educated to rather conservative ends. As Zenobia explains, the study of philosophy helps women ‘to honour our husbandes nexte after god: which honour resteth in due obedience’. But Zenobia is also a ruler in her own right, who ‘hath had of our [Roman] host uictory twise’ and has displayed in this role all the ‘nobylitye vertue and courage’ of her male counterparts. At one moment, the *Defence* even suggests that women might actively and successfully participate in ‘ciuile policy’.

Two years later in 1542, Berthelet printed David Clapam’s (d.1551) *A Treatise of the Nobilitie and Excellencye of VVoman Kynde*, a translation of the *De Nobilitate et

---

65 Erasmus’s *Precatio Dominica in Septem Portiones Distributa* was first printed in Basel by Johann Bebel in 1523.
67 *ibid.* Aii–v.
69 Elyot (1540) Aiiii; Elyot, Dvii: ‘She herself teacheth her children good letters’.
70 *ibid.* Bviii: ‘There is a resonance here with God’s injunction to Eve in Genesis (3. 16): ‘you will be under your husband’s control and he will be your master’.
71 Elyot (1540) Dvi
72 *ibid.* Div–v
*Praeecellentia Foeminei Sexus* (1529) by the German humanist, Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa. Composed in 1509 and printed in Antwerp in 1529, the *De Nobilitate* had already appeared in French and Italian translations. The *Treatise* also addresses the education of women, observing that ‘were it not, that women in our tyme ar forbydden, to gyue theym to good lernyges, we shulde euen nowe, haue women more excellent in wyt and lernynge than menne’. Agrippa’s *De Nobilitate* continued to play an active role in the English *querelle*, and was translated a further three times in the seventeenth century.

Berthelet was also printing works which had been prompted by some of the most influential women of the Tudor court. In 1529, he issued Richard Hyrde’s translation of Vives’s *De Institutione Foeminae Christianae*. Vives, having arrived in England in March 1523, became the ‘friend and spiritual counsellor of Queen Katherine’, taking the role of tutor to Princess Mary. Both the *De Institutione* and Hyrde’s translation thereof were dedicated to Katherine. Then in 1531, Berthelet printed an English version of Erasmus’s *De Immensa Dei Misericordia* by the French humanist, Gentian Hervet. This translation was instigated by the prominent landowner and patron Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury (1473–1541). In 1544, Berthelet issued a volume of prayers

73 Berthelet had already printed Agrippa’s *De Beatissimae Annae Monogamia* (1534) in an English translation by David Clapam in 1540 as *The Commendation of Matrimony*. He would issue a further edition of *The Commendation* in 1545.
74 Gérard Morhè et Jean Pierre issued a French translation of the treatise as *De la Noblesse et Preexcellence du Sexe Feminine* (1530). The Italian version was printed at Venice in the same year: *De la nobiltà, e Preeccelentia del Femailine Sesso* (1530).
75 Agrippa (1542) Evi
76 The first of these was produced in prose by Edward Fleetwood, *The Glory of Women* (1652). The second was written in ‘heroicall verse’ by an ‘H. C.’ and was also entitled *The Glory of women* (1652). The third was undertaken by another ‘H. C.’ (Henry Care) under the title *Female preeminence* (1670).
77 Berthelet printed three further editions of Hyde’s translation in 1531, 1541, and 1547.
collected and translated by one of the foremost literary patrons of the period, Katherine Parr (1512–1548).\textsuperscript{79}

William Thomas seems to have enjoyed similar links to noblewomen of the Tudor court. In 1549 he dedicated *The Vanitee of This World*, also printed by Berthelet, to ‘the right woorshipfull and my singular good Ladie, the Ladie Anne Herbert of Wilton’.\textsuperscript{80} Thomas evidently saw Anne Herbert (c.1514–1552), Katherine’s sister, as a potentially lucrative patron. In the preface, Thomas explains that he has chosen a specifically female dedicatee ‘because I haue found so muche negligence in man, that almost he deserueth not to be warned any more of his folie: therefore did I determine to dedicate my boke vnto a woman, to proue whether it maie take any roote in them’.\textsuperscript{81} Thomas implies that though similar works have previously targeted male readers, this is the first to have been conceived with a specifically female audience in mind. Thomas is perhaps appealing here to an already established, female readership, one which knew that Berthelet was a printer with women’s interests at heart.

Yet Berthelet was, after all, a commercial printer and saw no contradiction in printing alongside these John Bourchier’s (c.1467–1533) *The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius* (1535), through which runs an aggressively misogynistic vein.\textsuperscript{82} As with the pro-female works issued by Berthelet, *The Golden Boke* also weighs in on the education of young girls: ‘The Romayne matrones, if they wil noursihe their doughters wel, ought to kepe these rules. Whan they se, that they wold goo abrode, than breke their legges: and if they wold be gasing, than put out their eies: and if they wyll harke, stop theyr

\textsuperscript{79} *Prayers or Meditacions Wherin the Mynde is Styred Paciently to Suffre All Afflictions Here* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1545).
\textsuperscript{80} Thomas (1549) Aii‘
\textsuperscript{81} ibid. Aii’
\textsuperscript{82} *The Golden Boke* reworked René Berthault’s (d.1536) French translation of the *Libro Aureo de Marco Aurelio* (1529) by Antonio de Guevara (c.1480–1545) and was reprinted by Berthelet in 1537, 1538, 1542, 1546, and 1553.
ears: if they wyl giue or take, cut of their handes: if they dare speke, sowe up their mouthes: and if they wyl entend any lyghtnes, bury them quicke. Nonetheless, the leading humanist figures of the Tudor court continued to approach Berthelet for the printing of treatises that endorsed a humanist education of women. Berthelet appears to have thus gained the reputation as the go-to printer for works exploring women’s educative potential.

By the time Thomas’s translation was published in 1551, the output of Berthelet’s press had been interrogating ‘the women’s worlde’ for a quarter of a century. The following sections explore the role the Argument was playing in this constellation of female-centric texts.

4. The Argument and the English Querelle

Thomas devised the Argument as a direct response to misogynistic literature emerging from the other side of the English querelle. Inspired by earlier Italian readings of the Lex Oppia episode, Thomas offered not only a rebuttal to anti-female tracts of the period but also a corrective to what he saw as a fundamental misreading of the Latin original.

Common to each of the female-centric works printed by Berthelet is an opposition fostered between Us and Them; between the enlightened author and his readers who appreciate the benefits of female education and their opponents, the male chauvinists who take pleasure in railing against womankind. A very similar effect is at work in the material which prefaces the Argument. In the introduction entitled ‘The printer to the reader’, Berthelet includes an anecdote explaining the origins of the

translation. Berthelet was prompted to print the translation following a banquet he had recently attended ‘a little before Shroftetide’ and ‘in companie of dyuers gentle men and gentle women’. There the conversation consisted ‘first of the baseness of our coyne, and afterwaerdes of excesse in apparayle (whiche are the common talkes of these daies)’. An unnamed gentleman among the company targets women in particular ‘for laiying out their heare, for wearyng of verdingales, for bonne graces, for silkes, and .xx. other thynges’.

This scene is remarkably similar to that described in the preface of Elyot’s *Defence of Good Women*, also printed by Berthelet. There Elyot had spoken of ‘the vngentyll custome of many men, whiche do set theyr delyte in rebukynge of women’. Elyot had apparently devised the *Defence* with the intention of arming his female readership for the very situation described by Thomas above: ‘Which thyng I of my nature abhorrynge, determyned […] to prepare for them a sufficient defence agaynst yl mouthed reporters’. Berthelet similarly explains that he has printed the *Argument* ‘to stoppe their mouthes, that with raylyng on womens maners, seeme to procure theim selues a credite’. The misogynistic attacks referred to by Berthelet and Elyot would apparently remain a staple of dinnertime conversation in the seventeenth century.

The preface provides another clue that the *Argument* is to be read as a complement to Elyot’s *Defence*. The anonymous gentlewoman was apparently so

84 Thomas (1551) Aii The post-dinner setting was perhaps suggested by Elyot’s *Defence*, where Candidus and Caninius debate ‘the estimation of womankind’ after they have dined at the former’s home. Elyot (1540) Bi.
85 Thomas (1551) Aii
86 ibid.
87 Elyot (1540) Aii
88 ibid. Aii
89 Thomas (1551) Aiiii
90 Esther Sowernam in another defence work of 1617 describes a familiar situation: ‘being at supper amongst friends where the number of each sex were equal, as nothing is more usual for table talk there fell out a discourse concerning women, some defending, others objecting against our Sex’. Esther Sowernam, *Ester Hath Hanged Haman: Or an Answere to a Lewd Pamphlet, Entituled, The Arraignement of Women* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1617) A2
impressed by Thomas’s account of the original speeches that she ‘desired maister Thomas of frendship, to sende theim translated vnto hir’.\textsuperscript{91} The work becomes in this light an emancipation of humanist learning to a specifically female audience, a concept which again has an Italian precedent.\textsuperscript{92} This translation, Berthelet insists, was never intended to reach the printing press: ‘And all be it, that he willed hir, to kepe it to hir selfe: yet she thinkyng it suche a matter for the honest defence of wom[e]n, as ought not to be hidden, hath intreated me, thus to sette it foorth, trustyng to pacify him wel enough, though he wold take it vnkindly’.\textsuperscript{93} Beyond the platitudes of the modesty topos, there is a subtle nod to Elyot’s dialogue in the phrase ‘the honest defence of wom[e]n’.\textsuperscript{94} It seems likely then that Berthelet saw the \textit{Argument} as complementing the \textit{Defence of Good Women}, which he himself had printed just over ten years before.

The ‘excesse in apparayle’, which the gentleman of Berthelet’s preface attributes especially to women, had become a staple target among the misogynisitc ranks of the English \textit{querelle}. Around a year before the \textit{Argument} was published, Thomas Raynalde (fl.1539–1552) printed Charles Bansley’s \textit{A Treatyse, Shewing and Declaring the Pryde and Abuse of Women Now a Dayes}. Here, amid other complaints, Bansley rails against sumptuous apparel in particular. The ‘Cytie of London’ flaunts its ‘wycked fashyon’, ‘proude raymente’, and ‘garmentes gaye’.\textsuperscript{95} With bawdy humour, he targets the most recent trends in female dress:

\begin{quote}
Downe for shame wyth these bot[t]el arste bummes,
and theyr trappynge [t]rinkets so uayne
A bounsinge packsadel for the deuyll to ride on,
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{91} Thomas (1551) Aiii\textsuperscript{v}.
\item \textsuperscript{92} In 1540, a translation of the \textit{Aeneid} appeared at Venice, dedicated to ‘Aurelia Tolomei de Borrghesi’, entitled \textit{I Sei Primi Libri dell’Eneide di Vergilio, Tradotti a Piu Illustre et Honorate Donne} (1540).
\item \textsuperscript{93} Thomas (1551) Aiii\textsuperscript{v}–Aiiii\textsuperscript{r}.
\item \textsuperscript{94} I am grateful to David Norbrook for highlighting this resonance.
\item \textsuperscript{95} Charles Bansley, \textit{A Treatyse, Shewing and Declaring the Pryde and Abuse of Women Now a Dayes} (London: Thomas Raynald, 1550) Ai\textsuperscript{r}.
\end{itemize}
Almost a decade earlier in 1541, *The Schole House of Women* had quipped that ‘The Pecocke is proudest, of his fayre tayle / And so be all women of theyr apparayle.’

But it was not only vernacular pamphlets that took an interest in berating female apparel. In 1547, William Parfey gathered a collection of passages in Latin, both ancient and ecclesiastical, which shared as their common theme an intense critique of the female sex. The compendium, printed by John Herford, was tellingly entitled *Speculum Iuuenum Uxores Impetuose Affectantium in quo Plurimos Feminarum Viperinos Mores (quibus Extremam Trahuntur in Pernitiem) ex Omni Penè Genere Eruditorum Selectos* (*A Mirror for Young Men Who Impulsively Desire Women in which a Great Many Snake-Like Habits (by which They Are Dragged into Utmost Ruin) Have Been Gathered From Every Type of Learned Man*) (1547). The *Speculum*, written entirely in Latin, was evidently aimed at an educated readership. The material on offer ranges from women’s supposed sexual incontinence to their loquacity. In one specific instance, Parfey targets female dress, quoting St Jerome’s complaint that ‘imperfectissimus mulierum affectus semper in uestibus, semper in auro. Lapidibus praeciosi & ornamenti extrinsecus

---

96 ibid. Aiii v.
98 The internal evidence suggests that ‘Guillelmus Parfeius’, a Latinised form of William Parfey, was a resident in the Welsh town of Denbigh. In the first of the epistles prefacing the *Speculum*, ‘Symon Thelvallus’ shares his concern that Parfey will be ‘aut minis dominarum Denbigenarum territus aut blanditijs victus’ (‘either terrified by the threats of Denbigh women or overcome by their seduction’) (Parfey, Aii’). In his epistle to the reader, Parfey signs off from ‘Denbige’. (Parfey, Avi’). That he was of English origin is suggested by an annotation on the title page of a copy now held at Cambridge University Library: ‘by William Parfey, Englishman.’ (CUL, Peterborough. H.2.39). Symon Thelvallus in his prefatory epistle refers to ‘the reverend patron Robert, bishop of Asaph’. (Aii’) On the 8 June 1536, Robert Warton (*d.*1557), or as he was otherwise known, ‘Robert Parfey’, had been elected bishop of St Asaph, a town located just over six miles from Denbigh. It seems likely that William was a relative of Robert who had gained employ in the diocese through this well-placed, family connection.
The association of women with extravagant clothing was then a recurring theme in works produced on the other side of the English *querelle*.

Thomas’s Tudor readers were also familiar with debates over apparel on a legislative level. Henry’s reign had seen the introduction of four sumptuary laws. These acts of apparel, passed in 1510, 1514, 1515, and 1533, were ostensibly concerned with preventing debts incurred by excessive spending. They also functioned as a means of regulating outward displays of rank and privilege. Berthelet, in his capacity as *regius impressor*, was responsible for committing such legislation to print. In one such instance, ‘An Acte Concernyng Reformation of Apparell Used Within This Realme’ complained that ‘the great and costly array and apparell used within this realme, contrary to good statutes thereof made, hath be the occasion of greate impouerysshing of dyuers of the kynes subiectes, and prouoked many of them to robbe & to do extortion, & other vnlaufull dedes to mayntayne therby their costly arraye’.

The act then outlined what an individual could wear according to his rank. Unlike the *Lex Oppia* and its Italian analogues, however, the Henrician sumptuary laws did not target women in particular. In 1551, the same year in which the *Argument* appeared in print, Edward drew up an act of apparel based on his father’s precedents. Written in his own hand, the bill once again stated exactly what was to be worn and by whom in accordance to their rank and means. Though the draft never made it to Parliament, it is not unreasonable to assume that Thomas (given his close links to the council and to the king himself) was aware of Edward’s plans to repeat Henry’s legislation.

---

99 ‘women’s most imperfect desire is always for clothes, always for gold. They display their pride on the outside with precious stones and trinkets’. Parfey, Biit.
101 *Certayne Statutes and Ordinaunces* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1543) viii.
These questions of apparel aside, the Argument’s preface also presents itself as correcting a popular misreading of Livy. The unnamed gentleman, continuing his attack on female mores, appeals to the speech delivered by Cato against the repeal of the Lex Oppia: ‘after many sentence of scripture alleged, he fell into an oracion that Cato made against the insolence of women, and so handled the matter, that it seemed he had put all men to silence: in suche wise as for a good space, no man spake a woorde’. The gentleman’s appeal to the classics seems to have convinced his audience. Fortunately, as Berthelet tells it, William Thomas was at hand to check the gentleman’s misappropriation of Livy. Anticipating the action of the speeches that follow, where two male citizens debate legislation exclusively affecting women, here a male speaker steps in to defend his female acquaintance: ‘This is much like the nonnes lesson, that whan she had found Omnia probate, tille she was great with child, could not finde, Quod bonum est tenete. For (under correction, quoth he) though ye have eloquently rehearsed Catos tale, yet haue you not tolde the occasion of the mattier, nor the ende that it come to’. Just as scripture can be misinterpreted to ill ends (in this case, St Paul’s dictum regarding prophecies: ‘try them all, keep a hold of what is good’), so too can the classical text. Intriguingly, the gentleman’s reading of Livy, with its focus on Cato’s speech at the expense of Valerius’s, is very much typical of the period.

Some twenty-seven years earlier, Vives had exploited the episode in much the same way in his De Institutione. Though Vives therein endorses the humanist education of young women, in terms of their moral and social qualities, ‘he remains’, as

---

103 Thomas (1551) Aiii;
104 ibid. Aiii;
105 1 Thessalonians 5:21. It is no small irony that Thomas, in an attempt to counter an argument ‘against the insolence of women’, draws on a mock-example which reinforces popular stereotypes concerning women’s sexual incontinence.
106 In a letter to Queen Catherine regarding the education of Mary, he includes Livy first and foremost in a list of historians to be studied by the young princess. Juan Luis Vives, De Ratione Studii Puerilis Epistolae Duae (Basel: Thomas Plattier and Balthasar Lasius, 1537) 10.
Charles Fantazzi notes, ‘staunchly traditional, even fanatically so’. In the first book of the *De Institutione*, though Vives gives a curt nod to Valerius’s speech, his focus and sympathy are very much with Cato. As Richard Hyrde translates it, ‘But Marcus Cato / ye great wyse man / gaue counsayle contrary / with an oration full of wysdome: and .ii. Tribunes spake for them: whose folisshe and feble orations be rehearsed in Liuie ye historiographer’. Hyrde has omitted the assertion which Vives makes in the Latin original that Valerius’s speech was watered down to more readily capture popular interest: ‘oratio […] diluta sane et auribus stultae multitudinis accommodatior quam sapientum’. Vives thus implies, however disparagingly, that a woman’s right to wear what she desires is a populist issue.

As with Matteo Bosso, one of the most alarming aspects of the law’s repeal for Vives is its potential to encourage women to appear in public: ‘And whan they be trymmed and dekked / than desyre they to go forth a monge men / to shewe them selfe. And therin is the shippe wracke of chastite’. The importance of the *Lex Oppia* for Vives rests therefore both in the control it might impose on a woman’s dress and on her personal conduct more generally. His interpretation of the law is grounded entirely in Cato’s assertion that the *Lex Oppia* was originally passed as a state-sponsored means of regulating female conduct. The logical conclusion of this view is to understand the women’s protests as a call for greater social freedoms. But Vives says nothing of these demonstrations, nor indeed of their success.

The idea of clothes as a visual expression of male authority prefaces the *Instruction*’s second reference to the *Lex Oppia*. In the second book, again in a section

---

108 Vives (1529b) Ki.
109 ‘the speech was clearly toned down to better suit the ears of the foolish rabble than those of wise men’. Vives (2000) 98.
110 Vives (1529b) Ki.
entitled ‘Of Raymentes’, Vives states that ‘arayment in lyke wyse all other thynges ought to be referred unto the husbandes wyll’.\textsuperscript{111} Vives channels specific examples from Cato’s speech, using the oration as a springboard into his own attack on female excess. In an apostrophe to womankind – ‘O proude and folysshe beastis / euen created unto uanite and pompe’ – he turns to Cato for support: ‘as Cato sayth very wysely in the story of Liuius […] the ryche women wolde haue that which none other shulde be able to come by. And on the other syde / the poure women / lest they shulde be dispised & naught set by / by yat meanes they streyne them selfe aboue theyr power’.\textsuperscript{112} Here Vives follows Cato’s argument closely. In Livy, Cato asks (as Thomas translates it), ‘will you Romaynes put this stryfe emongest your wiues? that the riche shall haue that, whiche other maie not? And that the poore (because they woulde not therfore be contempned) shall strayne them selfes aboue their powers?’\textsuperscript{113} Following his paraphrase of Livy, Vives expresses his hope that ‘some lawe wolde be made / suche as ye lawe was in Rome called Oppius lawe / to brydle and measure womens costlynes’.\textsuperscript{114} Cato in his speech had also described the law as a means of curbing female luxury: ‘the law Oppia was made to prohibite their [women’s] excesse’.\textsuperscript{115} But Vives makes no mention of Valerius’s reply, most probably because Valerius’s argument pivots on the contention that the original passing of \textit{Lex Oppia} had nothing to do with ‘measur[ing] womens costlynes’ but was rather a response to specific, war-time desiderata.\textsuperscript{116}

This way of reading the episode, with a heavy emphasis on Cato’s speech at the expense of Valerius’s, became the norm in the first half of the sixteenth century. In 1532,

\textsuperscript{111} ibid. Gi"r.
\textsuperscript{112} ibid. Giii"r.
\textsuperscript{113} Thomas (1551) Ciii"r.
\textsuperscript{114} Vives (1529b) Giii"r.
\textsuperscript{115} Thomas (1551) Ci"r.; cf. Livy (34.4.6).
\textsuperscript{116} ‘In deede, if this law had ben made to bridell the excesse of women, it might be suspected that the breche of it might reuoke their lascliousenesse. But why it was made, the tyme it selfe doth well declare’. Thomas (1551) Cvii"r.
the schoolmaster Leonard Cox (c.1495–1549) translated the opening of Cato’s speech for *The Art or Crafte of Rhetoryke*, ‘the first rhetorical treatise to be published in the English language’.¹¹⁷ In the section entitled ‘Of the preamble’, Cox refers to ‘the oracioun that Porcius Chato made agaynst the sumptuousnes of the women of Rome’.¹¹⁸ His allusion to the episode is brief, but it at least offers us a clue as to how it was being read, namely as a harangue ‘agaynst the sumptuousnes of the women of Rome’.¹¹⁹ Cox makes no mention, however, of Valerius’s retort. In the same year, Joachim Périon included both speeches in his collection of Livy’s orations, the *T. Liuii Patauni Conciones* (1532). In his introduction, he identifies the main thrust of the episode as ‘aduersus luxuriam mulierum’ (‘against women’s excess’).¹²⁰

Then in 1547, only four years before the *Argument* was printed, William Parfey included extracts from Cato’s speech in the *Speculum Iuuenum*, the collection of intensely misogynist writings cited above. In a prefatory letter addressed to Parfey, Symon Thelvvalus advises his friend as to which works he might include. Having first suggested the *Eclogues* of Baptista Mantuanus (1448–1516), he immediately turns to Livy: ‘Nec vero pigeat orationem M. Portij Catonis pro non abroganda oppia lege .T. Liuij. xiii. Libro. iii. percensere’.¹²¹ Sure enough, in the main body of the text, sandwiched between passages cropped from Aristotle’s *Politics* and Euripides’s *Medea*, Parfey includes Cato’s speech against the repeal of the Oppian Law. Unsurprisingly, no mention is made of Valerius’s reply. In this light, then, Thomas’s *Argument* can be seen as functioning as a corrective to a continual misappropriation of Livy.

¹¹⁷ Ryle.
¹¹⁹ ibid. Di⁷
¹²⁰ Livy (1532) 363.
¹²¹ ‘Nor indeed would it irk you to survey the speech made by M. Porcius Cato against the repeal of the Lex Oppia’. Parfey, Aii⁷
The material which prefaces the *Argument* asks the reader to think of Thomas’s translation both as a response to contemporary attacks on women and as a means of amending a popular misrepresentation of Livy. The following section takes a closer look at the speeches themselves and considers exactly how these, in English translation, managed to foster a self-conscious dialogue with comparable tracts emerging from either side of the English *querelle*.

5. The Speeches

Functioning as the climax to a series of female-centric works, Thomas’s translation includes one of the most extraordinary examples of women’s political influence to have been recorded in ancient history. The *Lex Oppia* episode shows the capacity for women to enter and exert influence in a political and, for the most part, exclusively male space. Historically, this makes it almost unique. As Bauman notes, the opportunities for the Roman *matrona* to participate on a political level at Rome were severely limited: ‘They were rigorously excluded from all official participation in public affairs, whether as voters, senators or magistrates; the only exception was priesthods, to which they were admitted as Vestal Virgins and in a few other cases’.  

122 As the legislative theorist Ulpian observes, writing in the early third century, ‘feminae ab omnibus officiis ciuilibus uel publicis remotae sunt’.  

123 This chimes with the observation of Livy’s Valerius that ‘Thei haue no part, neither in magistrates, nor in priesthod, nor in triumphes, nor in armes’.  

124

---

123 ‘women are debarred from all public and civil offices’. Justinian, *Digesta* (50.17.2).
124 Thomas (1551) Di*
The situation was much the same in early modern Europe. Heinrich Agrippa, writing in the early sixteenth century, complained of the legal pitfalls facing contemporary women. As David Clapam translated it, ‘all offyces belongyng to the common weale, be forbydden theym by the lawes. Nor it is not permitted to a woman, though she be very wise and prudent, to pleade a cause before a Juge. Furthermore, they be repelled in iurisdiction, in arbiterment, in adoption, in intercession, in procuration, or to be gardeyns or tutours, in causes testementary and criminaL’

It is all the more remarkable then that Livy’s account, and Thomas’s translation thereof, presented women wielding political influence in a space from which they were normally excluded. Livy’s narrative had the *matronae* surround the Roman Forum itself:

The matrones, neither for feare of authoritee, nor for shame, nor yet for the commandement of theyr housbandes could bee kept in; but filled all the stretes of the citee, and kept the waies enteryng in to the high streete, entreatyng all men as thei passed: that seeyng theyr common wealth florisshed, and euery mans priuate good fortune daiely increased, they wolde be contented, that the matrons might also be restored vnto their auncient ornamentes.

Here Thomas gives ‘high streete’ for Livy’s ‘forum’, a translation which he reproduces throughout the *Argument*. Though in its primary sense, *forum* suggests any public square in the centre of a town, the *forum Romanum* functioned as a public meeting place for debating issues affecting the state. Thus the historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus spoke of ‘the forum in which they pass judgment and hold their assemblies and accomplish other political matters’. It thus appeared in certain set phrases with a political resonance: *forum attingere* (to take part in public life); *in forum deducere* (to introduce a young man to public life). The *forum* was also, as Mary Boatwright has explored, a space which was almost entirely occupied by male citizens. The very structures which

---

125 Agrippa (1542) Fviii
126 Thomas (1551) Bv
128 OLD, s.v. ‘forum,’ n.4(a).
dominated it, from the Curia to the Fornix Fabianus, were made by men for men with an eye to the affairs of state. The forum Romanum was therefore, with a few religious exceptions, a predominantly male space.

Yet in Livy’s version of events it is the presence of women here and on the streets of Rome which precipitates the law’s repeal. As Thomas puts it, ‘the next daie the nombres of women encreased abrode, and all in a flocke besette the dores of the Brutij, whiche were the Tribunes, that resisted the purpose of their Colleagues: and wolde not depart thense, til these Tribunes relented vnto theim. Whervpon there rested no more doubt, but that all the Tribes wolde abrogate the law. So that . XX . yeres after it was made, it was annulled’.

It is with these lines that the translation concludes. The work as a whole thereby ends with the matronae successfully exerting pressure on Rome’s political elite. But the Argument does not only offer a practical demonstration of women’s involvement in the political sphere. The speeches of Cato and Valerius directly address points being debated on both sides of the English querelle.

5 (i) ‘Much adooe against women’: Cato’s Speech

As detailed above, William Parfey gathered together a collection of classical and ecclesiastical writings in his Speculum Iuuenum, which shared as their common theme the detraction of womankind. Among other sententiae, he quotes extracts from Cato’s speech which express anxieties similar to those surfacing in comparable misogynistic works of the early sixteenth century. By focusing on Parfey’s selections from the Cato
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130 Thomas (1551) Dii.
131 ibid. Aii.
oration, we can reconstruct what were the most important aspects of this speech for at least one early modern author and presumably for some of his readership. Below, Parfey’s selections from Livy are compared with the translations offered by Thomas in the *Argument*.

The context in which these selections appear in Parfey is significant. He has bracketed the Livy with two extracts from Greek authors, both in Latin translation. The first is taken from Aristotle’s *Politics*: ‘Si mulier sit eloquens non est uir[t]uti ascribendum sed loquacitati’.\(^\text{132}\) Parfey implies in his paraphrase of the Greek that, should a woman usurp a male preserve, in this case rhetorical prowess, any achievement therein is to be viewed in a wholly negative light: her skill is to be dismissed as loquaciousness as opposed to *virtus*.

Cato at the beginning of his speech speaks of the Roman *matronae* in similar terms. They have encroached upon a male privilege (in this instance men’s ‘ius et maiestatem’ (‘right and authority’) as opposed to eloquence) and invaded a space typically preserved for the citizen male.\(^\text{133}\) As Thomas puts it in his translation: ‘If euery one of you, O Romaynes, had determined to haue preserued the ryght and maiestie of a husbande ouer his owne wife, we shoulde now haue had lesse businesse with all these women together. But as our libertee, by our owne weaknesse is ouercome of the women in our owne houses: euen so here in the open stretes it is ouerthrowen and troden vnderfote’.\(^\text{134}\) Livy associates *libertas* (for which Thomas here gives ‘libertee’) in the first pentad with the freedom Roman citizens enjoyed following the abolition of the

\(^{132}\) ‘If a woman is articulate, it must not be attributed to valour but garrulity’. Parfey, Bvii\(^\text{v}\). This is a loose paraphrase of Aristotle’s *Politics* (3.2.10 / 1277b).

\(^{133}\) Livy (34.2.2).

\(^{134}\) Thomas (1551) Bv\(^\text{v}\)–Bvi\(^\text{r}\). Cf. Livy (34.2.2).
135 The phrase ‘uita libertas’ (‘conquered freedom’) is juxtaposed in the original with Cato’s description of a potential threat to the forum and thus cannot help but evoke those occupations of the city described in previous books. In Livy, the opposition of ‘domi’ (‘home’) and ‘foro’ (‘forum’) suggests the spread of the protest from the private to political sphere. In Thomas the phrases ‘our owne houses’ and ‘the open strestes’ still convey a spilling out into a public space, but perhaps lose the full political resonance of the original.

The second quotation with which Parfey has bracketed the extracts from Livy is taken from Euripides’ Medea: ‘Mulier timida est in pugnam & ferrum inspicere, sed quando circa lectum iniuria affecta fuerit non est alia mens magis homicida’. The sexual connotations of ‘marriage bed’ (Parfey’s Latin gives lectus for Euripides’s εὐνή) need hardly be pressed. Tellingly, the sections from Cato’s speech juxtaposed with the examples above present women as untamable and sexually incontinent: ‘Date frenos impotenti nature & indomito animali, & sperate ipsa[s] modum licentie facturas nisi uos faciatis. Minimum hoc eorum est quae iniquo animo femine sibi aut moribus aut legibus inunctum patiuntur. Omnium rerum libertatem, immo licentiam, si uera dicere uolumus desiderant’. Thomas would reproduce this as: ‘Bridle (I saie) this arrogant sexe, and these vntameable beastes. For if ye doe not bridle theim now, neuer loke to bridle theim. This is the least thyng, that offendeth the women of all thynges, that by the customes or

---

135 Compare Livy’s use of libertas at the beginning of the second book: ‘Quae libertas ut laetior esset proximi regis superbia fecerat’ (‘a freedom which the pride of the previous king had made all the sweeter’). Livy (2.1.2).
136 An army of exiles and slaves occupy the citadel in the third book, while the entire city is sacked in the fifth. Livy (3.15); (5.40).
137 Leonard Cox, however, in his translation of the same, was alert to the political nuances of forum, translating it as ‘parliament house’. Cox, Dii.
138 ‘A woman is afraid to look upon battle and the sword, but when the insult harms her marriage bed, there is no other mind more murderous’. Parfey, Cf. Euripides, Medea (263–266).
139 ‘Give a free rein to their wild nature and to this untamed animal, and hope that they themselves will set a limit to their licence if you do not. This is the least of things imposed on women either by custom or law which they bear with a hostile heart. It is a liberty of all things, or rather a licence, if we want to speak the truth, that they desire’. Parfey, Bviii. Cf. (34.2.13–14).
lawes they are burdened, but they desyre a libertee of all thynges, or rather to saie the
truth, a lasciuousenesse'. In his translation, Thomas teases out Cato’s implied
opposition between male and female behaviour with the deictic phrase ‘this arrogante
sexe’. The Latin licentia (licence) carries erotic overtones, with the suggestion of sexual
liberty. Thus Cicero uses the word alongside libido (lust) almost in hendiadys. The
English ‘lasciuousnesse’ was being used in much the same way. A decade after
Thomas’s translation, the lawyer and co-author of Gorboduc (1565), Thomas Norton
(c.1531–1584) equated the word with ‘wantonnesse’ in his translation of Jean Calvin’s
Institutio Christianae Religionis (1536). Though the adjective ‘lascivious’ is common
enough in literature of the period, the abstract noun is rare and Thomas’s
‘lasciuousnesse’ predates the OED’s first entry for the word by almost forty years.
Cato’s suggestion that it is the responsibility of husbands to curb the excessive
behaviour of their wives may have struck a Biblical chord with the sixteenth-century
reader, echoing the male authority of St Paul’s ‘the head of a woman is the man’. So
too the comparison of women to ‘untameable beastes’ has parallels in the Judeo-
Christian tradition. At another moment Parfey quotes a comparison drawn by St John
Chrysostom (c.347–407AD) between ‘the evil woman’ and lions and dragons.

The second of the Cato quotations included by Parfey expands on the idea that
the matronae are demanding privileges which are the rightful preserve of their husbands:

140 Thomas (1551) Bvii.
141 ‘licentiam libidinemque’ (‘licence and lust’). Cicero, In Verrem (3.77).
142 Jean Calvin, Institutio Christianae Religionis, trans. Thomas Norton (London: Reinold Wolf
and Richard Harison, 1561) Hiisi.
143 OED s.v. ‘lasciousness, n.’
144 1 Corinthians (11.3).
145 ‘Ego quidem existimo nullam esse in hoc mundo bestiam comparabilem mulieri male, quid inter
quadrupedia animalia leone seuitus, sed nihil hac ferocious, quid in serpentibus dracone acrius, nec
hic quidem cum muliere mala conferri potest, nam leo & draco in malo inferiores sunt’. (‘Indeed it
is my opinion that there is no beast on this earth comparable to a wicked woman. What among
four-legged animals is more savage than the lion? Yet nothing is more ferocious than she. What
among snakes is fiercer than the dragon? But even it cannot be compared to a wicked woman, for a
lion and a dragon are of lesser evil’). Parfey, s.p.
‘Si carpere singula [iura] & extorquere & equari ad extremum uiris patiemini, tolerabiles uobis eas fore creditis? extemplo, simul pares esse ceperint, superiores erunt’. For which Thomas would give: ‘Wherefore if ye now suffre your wyues to reproue lawes, and thus by one and one to wrest them out of your handes, and at length to make theim selfes equall unto their husbandes: thynke you than, ye shalbe hable to support them? For whan thei are become your felowes: foorthwith thei woll bee your betters’. The unnerving prospect of a wife who usurps her husband’s role was, by 1551, a theme already familiar to English, vernacular literature. Chaucer (c.1340–1400), for example, had touched on the anxiety, albeit comically, in the Canterbury Tales. By 1551, the Tales had appeared in three stand-alone editions and had been included in three, separate collections of the complete works, one of which was released only a year before Thomas’s Argument. In ‘The Wife of Bath’s Tale’, Chaucer combines the anxieties outlined above alongside women’s alleged, sexual insatiability. Tongue set firmly in cheek, Chaucer has the wife of Bath rework Paul’s assertions of male dominance:

An husbonde wol I haue I wol not let
Which shalbe both my detour & my thral
And haue his tribulacion with all
Upon hys fleshe, while that I am his wyfe
I haue the power duryng al my lyfe
Upon his proper body, and nat he
Right thus the apostle tolde to me

Though Chaucer employs a comic tone, he was evidently playing on a familiar anxiety, one which apparently spans the chronological divide between Republican Rome and early modern England.

146 ‘If you allow them to snatch and wrench away every single law and ultimately to be made equal to their husbands, do you think you will be able to withstand them? As soon as they start to be your equals, they will be your superiors’. Parfey, Bviii’ I have added punctuation to Parfey’s Latin for clarity. Cf. Livy (34.3.2–3).
147 Thomas (1551) Bviii’
The third and final extract from Livy is taken from the end of Cato’s speech. It returns to the idea of women’s perceived ‘lasciuiousnesse’. Unable to secure funds for their lavish spending, some of the Roman *matronae* will turn to illicit means: ‘Quae de suo poterit parabit, quae non poterit uiurum roga[b]it, miserum illum uiurum & qui exoratus, & qui non exoratus erit cum quod ipse non dederit datum ab alio uidebit’. Thomas would reproduce this as, ‘She that can prouide of hir selfe, maie doe it, but she that can not, must craue of hir housebande. And happie shall that housebande be, that whether he be praied or not praied (if he geue not) shall see that geuen by an other, that he hath not geuen him selfe’. Here Cato implies that, unable to secure funds from their husbands, the *matronae* will resort to adultery and prostitution. The idea that a wife might put pressure on her husband for material gain features elsewhere in the *Speculum*, in an epistle entitled ‘Hugo socio uolenti nubere’ (‘Hugo to a friend wishing to marry’) to the effect that: ‘Mulier diligit ut decipiat, decipit ut accipiat, amat quod habes, nec diligit quod es’. As with the gentleman of Thomas’s preface, Parfey exploited Livy’s history for Cato’s speech and its condemnation of female excess while ignoring Valerius’s retort. By recovering Valerius’s speech, however, Thomas would offer a radically alternative perspective.

5 (ii) ‘Your daughtres, your wiues, your sisters’\(^{152}\): Valerius’s Speech

---

\(^{149}\) ‘She who can buy at her own expense will buy; she who cannot will ask her husband. Wretched that husband, both he who has been persuaded and he who has not, when he sees that which he will not give, given by another man’. Parfey, Bvii”–Ci. Cf. Livy (34.4.16–18).

\(^{150}\) Thomas (1551) Ciii”–v.

\(^{151}\) ‘A woman shows favour in order to deceive, deceives to receive, loves what you have, but not what you are’. Parfey, s.p.

\(^{152}\) Thomas (1551) Di’
Though Cato’s oration furnished arguments for misogynistic works, Valerius’s speech and Livy’s history more generally provided material for tracts written in defence and praise of womankind. Valerius’s arguments regarding women’s positive contributions to the state, first harnessed by the sumptuary tracts of the Quattrocento, subsequently appeared in the pro-female treatises printed by Berthelet.

In contrast to the martial imagery employed by Cato, which casts the female protesters as an enemy invading the city, Valerius cites uniformly positive examples of women’s engagement in public life. He draws these examples, he explains, from Cato’s own history, the *Origines* (168–149BC). As Thomas translates it, ‘But for all that, what noueltee haue these wyues attempted in commyng by companies abrode to pursue their own cause? Came they neuer abrode before? I will turne ouer thyne owne bokes of Originalles against the, and see there, how often tymes thei haue done this, and all to the profyte of the common wealth’.

The reference Valerius makes to Cato’s history (now lost) is dismissed by Briscoe as ‘clear anachronism […] The ancient evidence states quite unequivocally that Cato began the *Origines* in his old age’. But there is something more subtle at work here. In a highly self-conscious move, Livy makes Valerius cite passages of Roman history which have already appeared in the *AUC*. By glancing back to these moments, Livy draws attention to his own role in recording the positive contributions made by women to the Roman state:

And to beginne, first whan *Romulus* reigned, the Capitoll beyng already taken by the *Sabines*, and thei feightyng with baners displaied in the middest of the high strete: was not the bataille staied by the womens rennyng betweene both armyes? And after the expulsion of kynges, whan the army of the *Volsci* were incamped within the fiue myles of this towne, under the leadyng of *Marcus Coriolanus*, did not the women turne backe that army, that els had destroied this citee? And whan this towne was taken by the frenche men, dyd not the matrones of theyr own free will, openly geue the golde, wherwith the citee was redeemed? Yea and (to passe

---

153 ibid. Cv7 Cf. Livy (34.5.7).
ouer these antiquities) euene the last warres, whan most neede of money was, dyd not the widowes releue the Treasoury with their owne money? And whan the new goddes were fet home to helpe vs in our great neede, went not the matrones to the sea syde, to receiue the mother of the goddes?155

Each of the episodes to which Valerius refers had already featured in Livy’s history. The intercession of the Sabine women, Veturia’s appeal to Coriolanus, and the redemption of the city from the Gauls all appear in the first pentad.156 Perhaps more pressing for Livy’s ancient readers were the events of recent history: the financial support administered to the treasury by the Roman widows was an event of the second Punic War, as described in Book Twenty-Four, while the reception of the Idaean Mother appears in Twenty-Nine.157

Intriguingly, each of these examples had been cited in the Quattrocento debate over female apparel. Sanuti, Veronese, and the first of the Viterbo orations all paraphrased Valerius’s description of female contributions to the state.158 They surfaced again in the English querelle. Elyot in The Defence has Candidus refer to the intervention of the Sabine women and more specifically to ‘Hercinia the wyfe of Romulus, and more than a thousand of her companions […] whiche in the rage of batayle ioyned between their husbandes and parentes, so reconciled theym, that with one consent they inhabited one citie, and lyued to gether in perpetuall vnitie’.159 The legend of the Sabine women was not exclusive to Livy and Elyot was probably also aware of Plutarch’s account in his Life of Romulus.160 But whether Elyot was familiar with the legend through Livy or Plutarch (more likely he had consulted both), the fact remains

155 Thomas (1551) Cv’—v. Cf. (34.5).
156 Livy (1.13); (2.40); (5.50).
157 Livy (24.18); (29.14.10-14).
158 Sanuti, 261; Veronese, 3.532–3, lines 225–243; Lombardi, 2.36.
159 Elyot (1540) Bvi’
160 Plutarch, Life of Romulus (19).
that the legend was already being put to use by the pro-female authors of the English *querelle*.

Agrippa’s *De Nobilitate*, along with Clapam’s translation thereof, refers both to Veturia’s supplication of her son and to the intervention of the Sabine women. The episodes appear in the wake of Agrippa’s observation that (as Clapam puts it in his translation) ‘We rede of many other moste noble women, whyche by theyr wonderfull power and polycie, in moste extremyte, and whan there was no hope of helpe looked for, recouered theyre countrey, and restored it to wealthe ageyne’.  

On the next page, there follows a brief account of Veturia and Coriolanus: ‘Whanne Coriolanus with the Uolscians, had besieged Rome, & soo sharply assayled it, that the Romaynes were not able to defende them selues agaynste hym: an auncient woman Ueturia his mother, soo handled the mattier, that she ouercame his rage and furye, and reconciled hym ageyn to the Romaynes’.  

Though the episode had also been treated by Plutarch in the *Life of Coriolanus*, the identification of his mother here as ‘Ueturia’ (as found in Livy) as opposed to Volumnia (as in Plutarch) suggests that Agrippa had the Livian account in mind. There follows on the next page a summary of the intervention made by the Sabine women: ‘whan the Capytoll was taken by the Sabynes, and that in the myddes of the market place, they foughte moste cruellye hande to hande, with the sodayne runnynge of the women betwene bothe the hostes, the battayle cessed’.  

At least two of the historical exempla cited in Valerius’s speech had thus already made their way into the English *querelle*.

In the passage quoted above, Valerius lays out the ways in which the *matronae* have contributed positively to the public good. In the original, the substantive noun
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161 Agrippa (1542) Fii
162 ibid. Fii
163 ibid. Fiii
publicum and adjective publicus appear four times in this section of the speech, along with two key symbols of the Roman state, the Capitol and treasury. For Livy’s unequivocally positive phrase, ‘quidem semper bono publico’ (‘indeed always to the public good’), Thomas gives ‘all to the profyte of the common wealth’. Lest the significance of ‘the Capitoll’ is lost on the English reader, the glossary which suffixes the translation provides the following definition: ‘Capitoll, was the fortresse and chiefe place of Rome, where the Senate assembled in councell’.

Valerius then goes to some lengths to convey exactly how the law has fostered (yet further) inequality between the sexes. Touching on the law’s proscription of purple, he observes that:

```
Omnes alii ordines, omnes homines mutationem in meliorem statum rei publicae sentient: ad coniuges tantum nostras pacis et tranquillitatis publicae fructus non perueniet? purpura uiri utemur, praetextati in magistratibus, in sacerdotiis, liberi nostri praetextis purpura togis utentur; magistratibus in coloniis municipiisque, hic Romae infimo generi, magistris uicorum, togae praetextae habendae ius permittemus, nec id ut uiui solum habeant [tantum] insignem sed etiam ut cum eo crementur mortui: feminis dumtaxat purpurae usu interdicemus? et cum tibi uiro liceat purpura in uestrum stragulum uti, matrem familiae tuam purpuream amiculum non sines, et equus tuus speciosus erit quam uxor uestita?
```

For which Thomas gives:

```
All other degrees, and all men doe feele the amendement of our astate: our wyues onely shall not atteygne the fruite of our publike peace and prosperitee? we men weare purple embroidered, beyng magistrates and priestes: and our sonnes like wise weare gwnes of purple garded: the like wherof is permitted unto the magistrates of our Colonies, and to our burgeses enfranchedes: as here in Rome the basest sort of magistrates, euen the strete maisters, haue theyr gwnes garded. and not the quycke onely haue this preheminence, but the dead also may be burnt in purple: and shall we keep the use thereof onely from our wiues? And beyng laufull for the that art a man, to haue purple in the couruynge of thy bed: wilt thou not suffre the mother of thy house to weare a garment thereof?
```

The Latin original is densely packed with gendered language. Against homines (‘men’), uiri (‘husbands’), liberi (‘children’), and uiro (‘husband’), Livy sets coniuges […]
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164 Thomas (1551) Diii.
165 Livy (34.7).
166 ibid. Cviii.
nostras (‘our wives’), feminis (‘women’), matrem familiae (‘mistress of the household’), and uxor (‘wife’). This comes through in Thomas’s translation, which gives ‘men’ (x2), ‘sonnes’ and ‘man’ weighed against ‘wyues’ (x2) and ‘the mother of thy house’. Thomas’s English, making no grammatical distinction in terms of gender, looses the effect of Livy’s uiui (‘living men’) and mortui (‘dead men’), but the contrast between the sexes is still very much present. Valerius refers here to the fact that the sons of the Roman nobility were entitled to wear toga praetexta: ‘our sonnes like wise weare gownes of purple garded’. Thomas’s readers, inured to Henrician, sumptuary legislation, would be familiar with purple as the preserve of royalty. The 1510 act of apparel, as re-issued by Berthelet in 1543, decreed ‘that no person, of what estate, condicio[n], or degree that he be. use in his apparell any clothe of golde, of purpure coloure, or sylke of purpure colour, but onely the kyng, the queen, the kynges mother, the kynges chyldren, the kynges brothers and systers’.167 But as Elyot notes in his Dictionary of 1538 (also printed by Berthelet), the toga praetexta was the preserve of highborn, citizen males: ‘Praetexta, a longe garment myxte with purple silke, which was the vesture of noble mennes sonnes’.168 Along with the bulla (a locket worn by children), the praetexta functioned as a visual reminder of the inviolability of the magistrate and the young citizen male. As Florence Dupont remarks of purple as worn on the praetexta, ‘The important thing about purple was that [...] it marked out whoever wore it. It had no magical effect, yet it announced clearly that any attack on the person wearing it, be he magistrate or free-born child, was strictly forbidden’.169 By actively mentioning their exclusion from such clothing, Valerius implies that women too should be able to adorn themselves in similar symbols of protection.

167 Certayne Statutes and Ordinaunces, viii.
168 Elyot (1538) ‘P ante R’.
Valerius’s point that Rome’s female population should also enjoy ‘the fruite of our publike peace and prosperitee’ may also have struck a chord with the English reader of 1551. In March, 1550, a new peace had been brokered with France. In the following year, that is, in the same year that he set about translating Livy, Thomas was chosen as secretary for the embassy of William Par, marquess of Northampton (1513–1571), who was sent to France to negotiate a marriage between Edward and Elizabeth, daughter of Henri II (1519–59). This marriage would, it was hoped, solidify the recently established peace. There was then for Thomas’s readership the implication that under new, peacetime circumstances, both men and women should be able to express their worth on an aesthetic level from an equal footing.

Thomas himself was evidently inspired by Valerius’s demonstration of close, historical analysis. In the detailed prefatory material which introduces the speeches, Berthelet includes ‘The letter sent by mayster Thomas to the gentle woman, with the translaciouns that she desyre’. Here Thomas undertakes a very similar process of historical scrutiny, highlighting key moments in which the Roman people (much like Valerius’s *matronae*) came to the aid of the republic during the Carthaginian war. He lays an emphasis on their selflessness, praising a period ‘Wan almost euery man had rather perysshe priuately, than through his default the common wealth should susteine any preiudice. O, if we had no more but suche women now, as were than, I woulde thinke our worlde happie’.

At first glance, he seems to be indulging a moralisingly nostalgic view of the past, looking back to a golden age of virtue now lost. But Thomas’s desire – ‘O, if we had no more but suche women now, as were than’ – takes
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171 Hamilton.
172 Thomas (1551) aiv
173 ibid. av
on a very different tone in light of what his translation reveals about the women of Rome. Livy’s *matronae* can, when they feel that the quality of their lives is threatened, take to the streets to effect legislative change. Thomas’s complaint could thus be read as a call for a more politically engaged woman, one who is not afraid to exert influence in the public sphere.\(^{174}\)

In the context of the sixteenth century, the *Argument* was unusual for its inclusion of Valerius’s speech. Following the pro-female tracts of the Quattrocento, Thomas exploited the oration for its praise of women’s successful interventions in Roman, political life. By translating both speeches, Thomas redeemed the episode from a misogynistic reading popularised by Vives and showcased the positive contributions women had made to the republic.

**Conclusion. ‘I haue perfourmed my promise’\(^ {175}\)**

The *Argument* merged the learning of William Thomas, an innovative humanist who, throughout his lifetime, had an eye to continental literature and history, with the practical experience of one of the sixteenth century’s most prolific printers, Thomas Berthelet. As shown by a survey of his prints, Berthelet identified a market-demand for material which examined exactly what constituted ‘the women’s worlde’. These works, along with Thomas’s *Argument*, effectively laid the foundations for the English reception of the continental *querelle des femmes*.

\(^{174}\) ‘Public Sphere’ in the sense developed by Jürgen Habermas. For his discussion of public and private spaces in the Greco-Roman world, see Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Berger and Friedrich Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity, 1989) 3–5.

\(^{175}\) Thomas (1551) Av
It is commonly observed in feminist criticism that the Western literary and legal traditions have been dominated by male voices.\textsuperscript{176} Agrippa, in his treatise on female pre-eminence cited above, not only highlighted this fact, but imagined an alternative history written from a female perspective. As Clapam translates it, ‘If it had bene laufull for women to make lawes, too wryte histories, how gret tragedies (trow ye) wolde they haue writen of the inestimable malice of men, among whom many ben murtherers, theues, rauishers of uyrgins, periurers, robbers, burners of houses, traytours […]’.\textsuperscript{177} By translating the \textit{Lex Oppia} episode in its entirety, however, Thomas went some way in recovering the lost, female perspective to which Agrippa refers.

Thomas’s intervention notwithstanding, Livy’s account of the \textit{Lex Oppia} episode would continue to be read as a harangue against female excess. In the year following the publication of Thomas’s \textit{Argument}, the \textit{Tabula Concionum} which prefaced Michael de Vascosan’s (\textit{d.1576}) enormous, Paris edition of the \textit{AUC} described the law as being ‘passed against women’s extravagance’.\textsuperscript{178} In 1555, the narrative made an appearance in another English translation of a work by Vives, \textit{The Office and Duetie of an Husband}, again to support the idea of men’s natural authority over women.\textsuperscript{179} Jean de Marconville rehearsed Vives’s misogynistic reading of Livy in \textit{De la Bonte et Mauvaistie des Femmes} (1562), which refers to ‘La loy Oppie contre la curiosité et superfluité des habits des femmes’ (‘the Oppian Law against the affectation and excess of women’s


\textsuperscript{177} Agrippa (1542) Dviii

\textsuperscript{178} ‘lex Oppia […] quae lata fuerat contra mulierum luxuriam’. Livy (1552) Di

\textsuperscript{179} ‘ye Romaynes folowing nature, did neuer take the whole auctoritie of man from women. \textit{Liuius} usinge ye words of \textit{Cato}, dothe saye thus. Our forefathers would not, that women shoulde do anye thing without the auctoritye of man, submittinge them selues to their fathers, to theyr brothers & to their husbandes’. Vives, \textit{The Office and Duetie of an Husband}, trans. Thomas Paynell (London: John Cawood, 1555) Ni’\textsuperscript{4} Cf. Livy (34.2.11).
clothing’). In 1579, Marconville’s treatise was translated into English by John Alday as The Praise and Dispraise of Women, thereby solidifying the Vives reading of Livy in England.

However, Thomas was not the only Englishman to return from Italy with a fresh perspective on the querelle des femmes. Having completed a tour of Italy, the translator and (much like Thomas) alleged traitor, William Barker, returned to England in the early 1550s. Here he prepared an adaptation of Lodovico Domenichi’s (1515–64) La Nobilta delle Donne (1549), which he entitled A Dyssputacion off the Nobylyte off Wymen (1559). The Dyssputacion, which was first printed only in 1904, was dedicated to Elizabeth I (1533–1603). In the dedication, Barker makes special reference to the support he received from a patroness while a student at Cambridge, namely Anne Boleyn (1516–36). Domenichi’s text was itself drawing heavily on Agrippa’s De Nobilitate, and thus the classical examples of remarkable women present in Agrippa, Elyot, and Thomas also appear in Barker’s translation, including ‘the wymen of Sabyno’ and ‘Volumnia [who] sauid Rome’. Reworking Domenichi, Barker took the opportunity to praise contemporary Englishwomen of notable learning, among whom feature Margaret Roper, ‘the two Systers of the most noble prynce kynge Edward the Sixt’ (that is, Mary and Elizabeth), and Lady Jane Howard, fluent in ‘bothe greke and lattyne’. The parallels between the two translators do not end with their sympathetic portraits of womankind. Barker too would spend a sojourn in the Tower of London, in his case for compliance in a plot to instate Mary, queen of Scots, on the throne. Barker’s
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180 Jean de Marconville, De la Bonte et Mauvaistie des Femmes (Lyon: s.n. 1573) 141. First printed at Paris in 1562, de Marconville’s treatise appeared in a further eleven editions between 1564 and 1586.
181 For Barker’s combining travel and translation in the Dyssputacion, see Brenda Hosington, “‘A poore preasant off Ytalyan costume’: The Interplay of Travel and Translation in William Barker’s Dyssputacion of the Nobylyte of Wymen”, in Carmen Di Biase (ed.) 143–155.
183 Barker, 101.
184 Barker, 153–4.
ending was happier than Thomas’s, however, and he was released in 1574.185 Some eight years after the *Argument* was printed, Barker thus followed in Thomas’s footsteps by channeling his familiarity with Italian culture and literature into the English debate over women.

Only one copy of Thomas’s *Argument* remains. This might imply that the small, duodecimo volume proved so popular that it was literally read to pieces. Equally, this might also suggest that the translation was not considered worth preserving, that the intellectual milieu into which it was received was less than enthusiastic towards its presentation of women and the potential political influence they might wield within the state. Whatever the truth of its initial reception, it served as a bold intervention into the English *querelle des femmes.*

---

Chapter 5

‘Great plentie of straunge Histories’: William Painter’s Livy

Introduction

In 1566, Henry Denham (fl.1556–1590), sometime apprentice of Richard Totell (1528–1593), printed what was to become one of the most popular collections of prose fiction in the Elizabethan era,

*The Palace of Pleasure Beautified, Adorned and Well Furnished, with Pleasaunt Histories and Excellent Nouelles, Selected Out of Diuers Good and Commendable Authors.*

The *Palace* was compiled by William Painter (1540?–1595), ‘Clarke of the Ordinaunce and Armarie’ at the Tower of London. Painter gathered forty ‘histories’ or ‘nouelles’ (he used the terms interchangeably) from classical and contemporary authors alike, translated from Latin, French, and Italian.¹ Of these forty, the first five have their origins in the *AUC*, and more specifically in the first three books. Besides Livy, Painter turned to four other classical and imperial historians for the first volume: Herodotus, Quintus Curtius, Xenophon, and Plutarch.² In 1567, Nicholas England published Painter’s *Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure*. Once again Painter turned to Livy as a source,

¹ In the dedication, for example, Painter refers to ‘these histories (which by another terme I call Nouelles’). Painter (1566) *iii*.
albeit for one novel alone. Painter had originally intended to produce a third volume, though if this was ever printed, it has not survived.

Lorna Hutson has discussed the *Palace* alongside later examples of prose fiction in her work on narrative plot and representations of male friendship. In his study of travel writing, Andrew Hadfield argued that Painter’s choice of Livy, ‘an author of marked republican sympathies’ was ‘somewhat subversive’, citing Livy’s associations with Tacitus and the uses to which Machiavelli put the AUC. The most recent scholarly interest in Painter has, however, highlighted his Italianate subject matter at the expense of the classical. Abigail Shinn’s study focuses on Painter’s repeated invocation of the phrase ‘pleasure and profit’ throughout the *Palace*’s paratextual apparatus. Curiously, however, Shinn makes no attempt to explore the origins of this phrase in Horace’s *Ars Poetica* (where Horace explains that ‘omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci’), nor the implications that this might have for understanding Painter’s collection as a whole.

Neil Rhodes has suggested that by arranging his collection in such a way as to place the classical narratives first, and their continental analogues second, Painter betrayed his diminishing interest in the former: ‘The switch from classical material to Italian […] may seem abrupt, and there is no doubt that it represents a change in Painter’s interests

---

3 The first tome was printed again by Thomas Marshe in 1569 and 1575, the latter edition comprising six new novels. Then in around 1580, Marshe produced another edition of the *Second Tome*.


8 The poet ‘has won everyone’s vote who has mixed profit with pleasure’. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 343.
and his plans for the volume as a whole’. But if Painter truly lost interest in the classics, it is not clear why in the following year he gathered material for the Second Tome from Strabo, Pliny, Plutarch, Livy, Appian, Ovid, Valerius Maximus, Homer, Xenophon, and Homer. If anything, by dividing the collection into a kind of literary chronology, Painter drew attention to the inherent similarities between the old and new. Thus the legends of Lucrece and Virginia and their emphasis on female chastity, which Painter locates towards the beginning of the first Palace, are echoed in the later, Italianate narratives, as for example in The Duchesse of Sauoie and A Chaste Death. There remains then a great deal to be said of Painter’s treatment of the classics.

In an article on Thomas Heywood’s (c.1573–1641) The Rape of Lucrece (1608), Paulina Kewes identified ‘a third category of early Stuart Roman play’ besides those concerned with either the fall of the republic or with imperial Rome. This third category includes ‘dramas which draw upon a more distant, semi-legendary, Roman past; specifically, the period extending from the demise of the Roman monarchy into the early decades of republican rule’. This chapter demonstrates that it was in fact Painter, long before Shakespeare’s Coriolanus (c.1608) or John Webster’s Appius and Virginia (1654), who opened up this period of Roman history to a vernacular audience. Through his depiction of the Tarquins, Lucretia, Verginia, Appius, Mucius Scaevola, and Coriolanus, Painter essentially uncovered the narrative potential of this specific period in Rome’s legendary past. This chapter first explores the renown (and occasional infamy) which Painter’s collection enjoyed in the latter decades of the sixteenth century. The

10 These classical authors are cited among others in the list of ‘Authorities from whence these Nouels be collected: and in the same auouched’ prefacing the Second Tome. Painter (1567) ***ii.
11 Paulina Kewes, ‘Roman History and Early Stuart Drama: Thomas Heywood’s The Rape of Lucrece’, English Literary Renaissance, 32.2 (2002) 239–267 (244).
12 ibid. 244.
second section examines the role Painter played in popularising Livy’s account of the Lucrece legend. By returning to Livy, Painter placed a renewed emphasis on the republican hero, Lucius Junius Brutus, whose presence in the narrative had been all but forgotten by the vernacular tradition.

1. Reputation and Influence

Painter dedicated the first volume of the *Palace* to his employer, Ambrose Dudley (c.1530–1590), brother of Mary Sidney (1530x35–1586) and ‘Generall of the Queenes Maiesties Ordinaunce’. In the dedication, Painter speaks of the volume as thanks for his present employment. There is also a sense fostered here that this collection is acting as something of a wedding gift to mark the marriage of Dudley to Anne Russell (1548/9–1604). The *Second Tome* he dedicated to George Howard (b. before 1523, d.1580), who had been elected as master of the armoury in 1560.

Painter, preparing his gift for Dudley,

perused such volumes of Noble Authors, as wherwith my poore Armarie is furnished: And amongs other, chaunced on vpon that excellente Historiographer *Titus Luiuus* [...] By whome is remembered the beginning and continuation of their famous common wealth. And viewing in him great plentie of straunge Histories, I thought it good to select suche as were the best and principall, wherein
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13 Painter (1566) *2r*  
14 ibid. *ii*  
15 Dudley had married Anne in November of the previous year in what was ‘one of the grandest of the Elizabethan court marriages’. Towards the end of the dedication, Painter mentions the death of Robert Thomas, ‘the Maister Gonner’ during their wedding celebrations, who, when he let off a round ‘to honor *Hymeneus* bed, at Nuptiall night, a clap of that he neuer feared did ende his life’. Painter concludes the dedication ‘Beseching Almighty God [...] to make you bothe happie parentes of many children’. Simon Adams, ‘Dudley, Ambrose, earl of Warwick (c.1530–1590)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8143, accessed 19 Nov 2014]; Painter, (1566) c1r ‘Ibid., c1r’  
trauailing not farre, I occurred vpone some which I deemed most worthy the provulgation in our natie tongue, reducing them into such compendious forme, as I trust shall not appeare vnpleasaunt.\textsuperscript{17}

As with Anthony Cope, Painter set about to provide a ‘compendious’ version of Livy, that is, a version which was heavily abridged. Painter often excludes culturally and politically-specific elements of the original – the offices, customs and institutions which Bellenden took such pains to gloss are frequently omitted in the\textit{ Palace}. Instead, Painter whittles Livy down to the essentials of a given narrative. In the first novel, for instance, which reproduces the legend of the three Horatii, Painter does away with the legislative details of the original (the election of the\textit{ duumviri}, their charging of Horatius with\textit{ perduellio} and the role of the\textit{ lictor} are excised completely).\textsuperscript{18}

That Painter’s\textit{ Palace} enjoyed a wide readership is attested by the multiple attacks it provoked from authors alarmed by what they saw as its potentially harmful content. As Hadfield notes, Roger Ascham’s (1514/5–1568)\textit{ The Scholemaster} (1570) implicitly targeted the\textit{ Palace} in an extended attack of ‘fonde bookes, of late translated out of\textit{ Italian} into English, sold in euery shop in London’\textsuperscript{19}. Ascham laments that the authorities have not taken a more active role in censoring such material and describes the translation of Italian works in terms of a papist conspiracy:

\begin{quote}
when the busie and open Papistes abroad, could not, by their contentious bookes, turne men in England fast enough, from troth and right judgement in doctrine, than the sutle and secrete Papistes at home, procured bawdie bookes to be translated out of the Italian tongue, werby ouer many yong willes and wittes allured to wantonnes, do now boldly contemne all seuere booke that sounde to honestie and godlines.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{17} Painter (1566) *ii*.
\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Livy (1.26.5–7).
\textsuperscript{19} Roger Ascham,\textit{ The Scholemaster} (London: John Daye, 1570) 26\textsuperscript{r}. Cf. Hadfield (2007) 147.
\textsuperscript{20} Ascham (1570) 27\textsuperscript{r}.
Where formal defences of the Roman Church have failed, the Italianate novel succeeds. Significantly, Ascham makes no mention of the classical sources at work in these ‘fonde bookes’ – the most alarming elements for him have their origins in Catholic, and not pagan, Italy.

In August 1578, John Stockwood (d.1610), vicar of Tonbridge, delivered a sermon at St Paul’s Cross which echoed Ascham’s fear that these novels were distracting their readers from virtuous pursuits. First and foremost, he urges his congregation to keep themselves ‘vertuously occupied’ with the word of God. However, if we shall be rather delighted in reading of filthy books, as ye Baudis de Gall, the Amaudis, I trow it be, the great Pallace and the little Pallace of pleasure, with a number moe of suche filthy bookes, wherwyth this Churchyard swarmeth in this cleare light of the Gospell […] the Deuil of hell wil associate himselfe vnto vs, & creepe at the length so farre into our hearts, that he wyl roote out vs al care of vertue and godlinesse.

Stockwood points here to the bookshops surrounding St Paul’s – ‘wherwyth this Churchyard swarmeth’ – which were apparently enjoying a lucrative trade in ‘filthy bookes’. Indeed, the colophon of Painter’s first Palace states that ‘These bookes are to be solde at the long shoppe at the West end of Paules’. With ‘the great Pallace and the little Pallace of pleasure’, Stockwood refers to Painter’s collection but also to George Pettie’s (c.1548–1589) A Petite Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure (1576), written in homage to the original Palace. Stockwood describes these books as producing the same kind of malicious distraction as the playhouses, which were now attracting larger crowds than the Church: ‘Wyll not a fylthie playe, with the blast of a Trumpette, sooner call thyther a
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21 ‘Ten Sermons at Paules Crosse do not so much good mouyng men to trewe doctrine, as one of those bookes do harme, with inticing men to ill liuing’. Ascham (1570) 26
22 John Stockwood, A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse on Barthelmew Day (London: Henry Bynneman for George Byshop, [1578]) 147–148. Lest the reader miss the thrust of this passage, the phrase ‘Baudie bookes’ has been printed in the margin.
23 Painter (1566) final page.
thousand, than an houres tolling of a Bell, bring to the sermon a hundred?‘ To these
critical voices we might add that of Stephen Gosson (bap. 1554, d. 1625), whose Playes
Confuted in Fiuue Actions (1582) referred to the Palace, along with the Æthiopian
Historie (1569) and the Amadis de Gaule, as being ‘throughly ransackt, to furnish the
Playe houses in London‘.

As late as 1602, the Jesuit Robert Parsons (1546–1610) glanced scathingly at
‘the most pestilent English Pallace of Pleasure’, while in the following year Henry
Crosse included Painter’s work among ‘these pedling booke, which haue filled such
great volumes, and blotted so much paper, theyr sweete songs and wanton tales do
rauish and set on fire the vntempered affections, to practice that whereof they do
intreate’. Painter himself appears to have been wary of the morally dubious nature of
some of his sources. As he explains in the preface, ‘Certayne haue I culled out of the
Decamerone of Giouan Boccaccio wherein be contayned one hundred Nouelles, amongst
which there be some (in my judgement) that be worthy to be contemned to perpetuall
prison, but of them suche haue I redeemed to the liberty of our vulgar, as may be best
liked, and better suffred’. What crimes these novels have committed ‘to be contemned
to perpetuall prison’ Painter does not explicitly state, but he is most probably alluding to
their subject matter. It was perhaps in response to this moralising backlash that Painter
failed to produce a third collection of novels as he originally intended. Significantly, he
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24 ibid. 23–4.
D5v.
26 Robert Parsons, The Warn-Word ([Antwerp: A. Coninex], 1602) 67v; Henry Crosse, Vertues
27 Painter (1566) s.p.
had planned to fill the third installment entirely with Italianate novels, that is, the very kind to which Ascham took such objection.\textsuperscript{28}

Moralising invectives aside, Painter’s \textit{Palace} ‘was’, as Hutson notes, ‘the collection which had most influence upon the writers of prose fiction in the following decade’.\textsuperscript{29} To name only a handful, the anonymous \textit{Sackfull of Newes} (1573), George Pettie’s aforementioned \textit{A Petite Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure} (1576), \textit{The Forrest of Fancy} (1579) by an ‘H. C.’, the anonymous \textit{A Poore Knight his Pallace of Priuate Pleasures} (1579), George Whetstone’s \textit{Heptameron of Civill Discourses} (1582) all sprang up in the \textit{Palace}’s wake. Besides the title’s nod to Painter’s collection, George Pettie’s (c.1548–1589) \textit{Petite Palace} also referred directly to the original in the preface addressed ‘To the gentle Gentlewomen Readers’.\textsuperscript{30}

Of note in Painter’s choice of subjects is his interest in women. Of a total of forty novels collected in the first volume of the \textit{Palace}, thirty-two have women as a primary focus. As the preface explains, the reader will find in this collection not only ‘the great valiance of noble Gentlemen’, but also ‘the vertuous mindes of noble dames, the chaste hartes of constante Ladyes’ and ‘the milde suffrancel of wel disposed Gentlewomen’.\textsuperscript{31} Painter reveals an almost obsessive preoccupation with women’s chastity. To cite just two examples of many, ‘The novel of the Duchess of Savoy’ has been recorded ‘to the singular prayse and commendacion, of chaste and honest Ladies’, while the narrator of

\textsuperscript{28} The next volume was to include excerpts from ‘Bandello, specially suche (suffrable) as the learned Frenche man Francois de Belleforest hath selected, and the choicest done in the Italian. Some also out of Erizzo, Ser Gionnanni Florentino, Parabosco, Cynthio, Starporole, Sansouino, and the best liked out of the Queene of Nauarre, and other Authors’. Painter (1567) \textit{iii}v.

\textsuperscript{29} Hutson (1994) 94.

\textsuperscript{30} ‘I have christened them with the name of a Pallace of Pleasure. I dare not compare this worooke with the former Pallaces of Pleasure, because comparisons are odious, and because they containe Histories, translated out of graue authors & learned writers: and this contaneth discourses, deuised by a greene youthfull capacitie, and reported in a maner \textit{ex tempore}, as I my selfe for diuers of them an able to testifie’. George Pettie, \textit{A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure} (London: R. W[atkins], 1576) Aii:.

\textsuperscript{31} Painter (1566) *iii*. 
novel forty-one, concerning ‘A ladie falsely accused of adulterie’, asks, ‘Is the number of chaste women so diminished, that their renowne at this daie, is like a Boate in the middes of some tempestious sea, wherevnto, the mariners dooe repaire to saue themselfes?’ Very occasionally Painter includes a narrative touching on adultery committed by a husband. Typically, however, when Painter treats the subject of sexual mores and misdemeanors, the focus is almost always on women.

Though Painter dedicated the first volume to Dudley, he also took the opportunity to single out two noteworthy women:

Who is he that more condignley doth deserue to be possest in a Palace of Pleasure, than he that is daylie resiant in a pallace of renowned fame, guided by a Queene adorned with most excellent beautie and shape, indewed and garnished with great learning, passing vertues and rare qualities of the minde. To whom (I say) may constancie of Ladyes, and vertuous dedes of Dames, more aptly be applied, than to him that hath in his possession a Lady and Countesse of noble birth [...] whose curteous and countesse like behauior glistereth in the court amongs the troupe of honorable Dames: and for her towarde disposition, first preferred by the Quenes Maiestie, into her secrete chamber, and after advancd to be Countesse of your noble Earledome.

Elizabeth had succeeded to the throne eight years before. Whereas Cope had highlighted his monarch’s achievements in war (including conflicts at which Henry had not even been present), Painter points to Elizabeth’s ‘most excellent beautie and shape’, whose ‘passing vertues’ are echoed in the ‘vertuous dedes of Dames’ which are featured throughout the Palace. Before her marriage to Dudley, Anne Russell had been appointed as a maid of honour to Elizabeth, and quickly became a favourite of the queen. The marriage of Russell to Dudley had also received the enthusiastic blessing of Elizabeth.

32 ibid. *iii*; Eeiv*; Ffiii*
33 As, for example, with the forty-second novel, which treats the polygamy of Didaco. Cf. Painter (1566) Ji.2–Mmii*
34 ibid. *iv*–v.
Discussing the reception of the English *querelle des femmes*, Linda Woodbridge notes that ‘[t]he influence is most prominent in prose fiction. This genre was strongly orientated towards women readers’. And as Woodbridge observes, many of the stock figures of the debate – Lucrece, Veturia, Zenobia, Sybilla, and the Amazons – reappear in the two volumes of Painter’s *Palace*. In fact, almost fifty years following its initial publication, the *Palace* would be cited in the second wave of the English *querelle*. In 1617, an author styling themselves as ‘Ester Sowernam’ produced *Ester hath hang’d Haman*, a pro-female response to Joseph Swetnam’s *The Arraignment of Lewde, Idle, Froward, and Unconstant Women* (1615). Of Swetnam’s sources, Sowernam remarks that ‘alas, seely man he obiecteth nothing but what he has stolne out of English writers, as *Euphues*, the Palace of Pleasure, with the like, which are as easily answered as vaynly obiected’. Swetnam’s examples may well have been obtained from sources other than Painter’s *Palace* and John Lyly’s (1554–1606) *Euphues* (1578), but this nod to Painter is at least indicative of how the *Palace* was being read in certain quarters, namely as a collection of noteworthy women.

Another clue to the *Palace*’s initial reception is found in one of its first imitations, George Pettie’s *Petite Pallace*. As noted, its preface is addressed specifically to ‘gentle Gentlewomen Readers’. ‘R.B.’, the author of this preface, has apparently submitted the collection to be published because ‘I thought I could not any way do greater pleasure or better seruice to your noble sexe, then to publish them in print, to your common profit & pleasure’. So too ‘The Letter of G.P. to R.P.’ which follows this address and styles itself as private correspondence between George Pettie and a close friend, touches on the

36 Woodbridge, 114.
37 ibid. 114.
38 Sowernam (1617) 32.
39 Pettie, Aii’
subject of women. Here in a self-conscious nod to R.B.’s enthusiastic praise of women, Pettie urges his friend to give womankind a wide berth:

 [...] doe but follow this aduise: if you bee free, that you come not into bondes: if you bee bound, vt te redimas captum quam quas minimo: for trust me, the broad blasphemy of Pigmalion, and the sodain Apostacie, or rather right concuersion of Alexius, haue setled me in this fayth, that I thinke him Terque quaterque beautum, qui a consortio mulierum se cohibere potest.\[40\]

This advice, peppered with Terence and Virgil and allegedly given in the strictest confidence, must surely have raised a few eyebrows among the work’s ‘gentle Gentlewomen readers’.\[41\] As Lorna Hutson observes, this second epistle ‘creates the fiction of the whole book as the record of an intimate textual exchange between men, proof of their amicitia, which has accidentally slipped into public view’.\[42\] The two voices of Pettie’s preface develop a kind of flirtatious tension between two radically opposing views of womankind, perhaps attempting to harness the commercial potential of such friction as enjoyed by literature on both sides of the querelle.

Of the five narratives Painter chose from Livy for the first volume of the Palace, four include women in central roles. The first novel sees Horatius returning triumphantly to Rome having dispatched the three Curiatii brothers, thereby saving the commonwealth. As he enters the city, he meets his sister, who had been betrothed to one of the three brothers now dead: ‘cognitoque paludamento sponsi quod ipsa confecerat, soluit crines et flebiliter nomine sponsum mortuum appellat’.\[43\] Painter subtly adjusts Livy’s description to bring it line with the erotic bent of his later, continental narratives. Painter describes Horatius’s sister as ‘knowyng the Coate armure of her paramour, borne uppon her brothers shulders, which she wrought and made with her owne handes: She

\[40\] The Latin reads: ‘ransom yourself out of captivity at the cheapest price you can’ and ‘three and four times blessed, who can restrain himself from the company of women’. Ibid. Aiii:

\[41\] Cf. Terence, Eunuchus, 74–75; Virgil, Aeneid, 1.94.


\[43\] ‘Having recognised her fiancé’s military cloak, which she had made herself, she let her hair loose and tearfully called her dead fiancé by name’. Livy (1.26.2).
tore and rente the heare of her hedde, and moste piteously bewailed the death of her
beloued.” In the original, Horatia unbinds her hair as a token of mourning – ‘soluit
crines’ – which in Painter becomes ‘She tore and rente the heare of her hedde’, a picture
of the grief-stricken lover more akin to Virgil’s Dido who, in Henry Howard’s
(1516/17–1547) translation, ‘Her comly brest thrisre or foure times she smote / With her
own hands and tore her golden tresse’. With ‘paramour’, Painter adds an erotic element
to Livy’s sponsus, that is, ‘betrothed’. Edward Hall had juxtaposed ‘paramour’ with
‘concubine’ in his Chronicle (1548), while the word was used of an adulterous lover in
The Deceyte of Women (c.1557). In Painter’s fourth novel, Coriolanus’s mother, his
wife, and a host of Roman matronae manage to dissuade Coriolanus from taking
revenge on his homeland. In Painter’s version, the account ends with the Roman people
erecting a permanent monument commemorating the women’s intervention: ‘The
Romanes disdained not to attribute to women, their due praise. For in memorie of this
deliiuerie of their Countrie: Thei erected a Temple, Fortunae Muliebri, to womens
fortune’. In the second and fifth novels, Painter reworks the legends of Lucrece and
Virginia. As is explored below, by turning to Livy, Painter re-introduced a political
element to the Lucrece narrative which had been softened by the vernacular tradition.
Painter also takes from Livy the legend of Mucius Scaevola, the Roman hero who,
disdaining the threats of his captors, thrust his own hand into the fire intended for his
torture. Even here, however, the Roman maiden Cloelia receives a special mention, and
the novel ends with a description of how she rescued the Roman hostages. The first
volume of the Palace thus reveals a special interest in noteworthy women, and Painter’s

44 Painter, Aiii
45 Virgil, Certain Bokes of Virgiles Aenæis, trans. Henry Howard (London: Richard Totell, 1557) fiv
46 Hall, LLLii; Anonymous, The Deceyte of Women (London: W. Copland for Abraham Vele,
c.1557) fii
47 Painter (1566) Civ
48 ibid. Civ
extracts from Livy are no exception. The following section explores Painter’s treatment of Lucretia in particular, and how his reworking of this episode broke from previous vernacular versions of the legend.

2. Painter’s *The Rape of Lucrece*

Of the five narratives which Painter reproduces from Livy in the first volume of the *Palace*, two depict major governmental change at Rome. In both instances, these changes are triggered by the sexual assault or attempted sexual assault of a Roman woman. In the *Palace*, these narratives are reproduced as *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Appius Claudius and Virginia*. This section explores how Painter, by following Livy’s account, reinvested the Lucrece legend with a political edge that had been subduced by its reception in English vernacular literature. It seems likely that Painter, through his popular collection of novels, suggested to subsequent authors the rich, narrative gains to be gleaned by returning to Livy’s version of events.  

In Livy, the Lucretia episode forms the climax of the first book, following a lengthy catalogue of misdeeds inflicted on the Roman people by Tarquinius Superbus. Enumerating these misdeeds, Livy associates the royal with the morally suspect. It is the ‘regias nurus’ (‘royal daughters-in-law’) that the young princes find in drunken debauchery, while Brutus declaims against the ‘regiam iniuriam’ (‘royal offence’), ‘scelus regium’ (‘royal crime’) and ‘superbia ipsius regis’ (‘pride of the king’). The Roman people, who have been practically enslaved in menial labour, are described as

---


50 Livy (1.57.9); (1.59.1); (1.59.3); (1.59.9).
‘regno infestos’ (‘hostile towards the monarchy’). In the chapters preceding Lucretia’s rape, Livy describes Tarquin’s dismantling of the governmental framework at Rome and his establishing of an autocratic system of rule: ‘Hic enim regum primus traditum a prioribus morem de omnibus senatum consulendi soluit; domesticis consiliis rem publicam administravit; bellum, pacem, foedera, societates per se ipse, cum quibus uoluit, iniussu populi ac senatus, fecit diremitque’. With Tarquin’s misconduct in full focus, the rebellion instigated by Lucius Junius Brutus and the foundation of the Roman republic easily become the most pressing elements of the narrative. The significance of Lucretia’s rape for Livy lies in its role as a means of instigating political change.

Familiar as we are with Shakespeare’s Lucrece (1594), it is hard to imagine a protagonist more central to the narrative. However, it was to Brutus, founder of the Roman republic and ‘liberator urbis’ (‘liberator of the city’) that Livy awarded the other leading role. Having feigned stupidity to avoid the wrath his uncle (an example of cunning which won the praise of Machiavelli and may well have prompted Hamlet’s ‘antic disposition’), Brutus exploits Lucretia’s rape to harness the outrage of the Roman people. In terms of structure, Livy uses Brutus as a bridge between books one and two. The first book closes with Brutus’s liberation of the city and the election of the first consuls, Brutus and Collatinus. The second book begins with the personal sacrifices

---

51 ibid. (1.57.2).
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Brutus was willing to make to maintain the republic, namely the execution of his sons, who were plotting to restore the monarchy.56

Painter was one of the earliest English writers in the vernacular to privilege Livy’s version of events, including its emphasis on Brutus. In the Legend of the Good Women, Chaucer had been concerned with Lucretia more as a moral paragon than as an instrument of political change. As Chaucer explains at the beginning of his account,

Nowe mote I sain thexilyng of kynges
Of Rome, for her horrible doynges,
Of the laste kyngne Tarquiniius
As saith Ouid, and Titus Lyuius
But for that cause tel I nat this storye
But for to praysen, and drawen in memorye
The very wyfe, the very Lucresse

Though Chaucer refers here to both Ovid and Livy, it is primarily Ovid’s account which he follows. Here, for example, his ‘mote I sain thexilyng of kynges’ picks up the formula with which Ovid begins his own account in the Fasti, ‘Nunc mihi dicenda est regis fuga’.58 Chaucer goes on to reproduce the details of Tarquin’s exile as provided by Ovid, echoing the poet’s ‘dies regnis illa suprema fuit’ with ‘Ne neuer was there kyng in Rome toun / Sens thylke day’.59 However, although in Ovid’s version the episode is used to explain the Regifugium (a religious rite held on 24 February), in Chaucer’s version, the holiday belongs to a beatified Lucrece: ‘she was halden there / A saynt, and euer her day yhalowed dere / as in her lawe’.60 John Gower (d.1408) also included the legend in the Confessio Amantis, and again looked to Ovid as his primary source. He too was interested in Lucrece as a model of chastity and beauty, and in his version, ‘in the worde

56 Cf. Livy (2.3–5).
57 Geoffrey Chaucer, The Woorkes of Geoffrey Chaucer (London: John Kingston for John Wight, 1561) ccv\(^r\).
58 Ovid, Fasti, II.685.
59 ibid. II.852; Chaucer (1561) CCVI\(^r\).
60 Chaucer, CCVI\(^r\).
nor in dede / Her lacked nought of womanhede’.\(^{61}\) Gower briefly refers to the exile of the Tarquins and nods to the establishing of ‘better gouernance’. However, here Tarquin’s ‘tyranny’ carries distinctly figurative undertones: ‘And all the towne began to crye: / Awey awey the tyranny. / Of lechery and couetyse’.\(^{62}\) In *The Fall of Princes* (completed around 1438), a reworking of Laurent de Premierfait’s (c.1360–1418) French language version of Boccaccio’s *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium*, John Lydgate (c.1370–1449/50?) cited the rape of Lucrece on three separate occasions. Though he described the exile of the Roman kings as a consequence of the rape, he made no reference to the revolution at Rome nor to Brutus’s role within it.\(^{63}\)

In Tudor England, Lucrece was most often remembered as a model of the ‘good woman’. Elizabeth I would be described as outstripping Lucrece by Lodowick Lloyd (fl.1573–1607) in *The Pilgrimage of Princes* (1573) – ‘Such Lucrece raigne in England now, as neuer earst was sene’ – while Henry Howard had dubbed ‘maistresse R.’ a second Lucrece in his *Songes and Sonettes* (1557).\(^{64}\) Both Juan Luis Vives in the *De Institutione* and John God in *A Discourse* (1570) honed in on the portrait of Lucretia patiently awaiting her husband’s return and busying herself late into the night with weaving.\(^{65}\)

Sixteenth-century readings of the legend were heavily influenced by St Augustine’s treatment of Lucretia in the first book of his *City of God*.\(^{66}\) Augustine himself was an avid reader of Livy. As Gabriel Harvey notes towards the end of his

\(^{61}\) Gower (1532) 170v.

\(^{62}\) ibid. 171v.

\(^{63}\) ‘For which cause by recorde of writinge / Was there neuer in Rome the cyte / After that day no man crownyd kynge’. John Lydgate, *The Falle of Princis* (London: Richard Pynson, 1494) giiv.


annotated copy of the *AUC*, ‘I haue seene few, or none fitter obseruations, or pithier discourses vpon diuers notable particulars in Liuie, then sum special chapters in Augustines excellent bookes De Ciuitate Dei’. 67 There Lucretia appears following a discussion of ‘Christian women who have been raped while prisoners’. 68 Augustine makes no mention of the expulsion of kings or of the new Republic. 69 Rather, the legend is exploited for its ethical dilemma: ‘Si adulterata, cur laudata; si pudica, cur occisa?’ (*if she was an adultress, why was she praised? If chaste, why killed?*) 70 Lucretia, he concludes, took her own life through a combination of shame and pride, which, for Augustine at least, is hardly surprising, given that she was ‘Romana mulier, laudis auida nimium’ (*a Roman woman, too eager for praise*). 71 It was to this interpretation that the religious reformer William Tyndale (c.1494–d.1536) appealed when he gave his rather ungenerous account of Lucrece in *The Obedience of a Christen Man* (1528): ‘Lucrece beleued yf she were a good huswife and chast / that she shulde be most glorious / and that all the worlde wolde geue her honoure / and prayse her. She sought her awne glory in chastite and not Gods. […] Which pryde god more abhorreth the whoredome of any whore’. 72 Tyndale’s *Obedience* was printed regularly throughout the sixteenth century, appearing in a total of eight versions, thereby helping to cement the Augustinian gloss on Lucretia’s suicide. 73 The question of Lucretia’s death also became, as William

67 Harvey’s Livy, Z5r, image 1141. For Harvey’s use of Augustine, see Jardine and Grafton, 44.
69 Augustine does, however, refer to the expulsion of the kings in the third book. Cf. Augustine, 3.15.
70 Augustine, 12 (1.19).
71 ibid. 12 (1.19).
73 *The Obedience* was printed again in 1535, 1537, 1548 (three editions) and 1561. It was subsequently included in *The Whole Workes of William Tyndale*, printed in 1573 by John Daye.
Weaver has noted, a stock example in ‘the rhetorical exercises and textbooks of Elizabethan grammar schools’.74

On at least one occasion, however, Lucretia was cited in a distinctly political context. In 1550, Roger Ascham joined Sir Richard Morison in Germany, who was then ambassador at the court of Charles V.75 Two decades later, John Daye (1521/2–1584) published some of Ascham’s experiences of Charles’s court as A Reporte and Discourse written by Roger Ascham, of the Affaires and State of Germany (1570). As suggested by the epistles which preface the Reporte, Ascham was a committed student of Livy and looked to the historian as a stylistic model. The first letter, addressed to Ascham from fellow courtier John Astley (c.1507–1596) and dated 19 October, 1552, recalls ‘our fendly fellowshyp together at Cheston Chelsey, and here at Hatfield her graces house: our pleasant studies in reading together Aristotles Rethorike, Cicero, and Liuie’.76 Both Astley and Ascham had been tutors to the young Elizabeth and were among her retinue at Cheshunt and Hatfield House.77 Astley’s description of their joint study of Livy is not unlike that provided by Gabriel Harvey of his reading the AUC with Philip Sidney (1554–1586) in around 1567, as explored by Jardine and Grafton.78 Both Ascham and Sidney were reading Livy in the lead up to diplomatic missions; Ascham, before his journey to the German court to serve as Morison’s secretary, and Sidney before his delegation to Rudolph II (1552–1612).79 In his reply to Astley, Ascham reveals his

76 Roger Ascham, A Reporte and Discourse (London: John Daye, 1570) ii
79 ‘Hos tres Liuij libros, Philippus Sidneius aulicus, et ego intimè contuleramus, qua potuimus politica analysi ultro, citroque excussos: paulo ante suam Legationem ad Imperatorem Rodolphum II.’ (‘The courtier Phillip Sidney and I compared these three books [i.e. the first three books] of Livy in detail,
intention to document his experiences in Germany – ‘Here is stuffe plenty to furnish well vp a trimme history’ – and he too recalls their reading of the AUC: ‘When you and I read *Liuie* together if you do remember, after some reasonyng we concluded both what was in out opinon to be looked for at his hand that would well and aduisedly write an history’. Caesar is to be admired for his verisimilitude, Polybius and Philippe Commines (c.1446–c.1511) for their interpretation of historical events, Thucydidies, Homer, and Chaucer for their lively descriptions of persons and places. For style, however, there can be only one model:

The stile must be alwayes playne and open: yet sometime higher and lower as matters do ryse and fall: for if proper and natural words, in well ioyned sentences do lyuely expresse the matter, be it troublesome, quyet, angry or pleasant, A man shal thincke not to be readyng but present in doyng of the same. And herein *Liuie* of all other in any toung, by mine opinion carieth away the prayse.

But beyond style, the content of Ascham’s *Reporte* deliberately alludes to Livy’s history. At one moment, Ascham discusses the misconduct of Pedro Álvarez de Toledo (1484–1553), viceroy of Naples. Ascham cites cite two leaders of resistance at Rome, both named Junius Brutus. In the first instance, Marcus Junius Brutus (c.85–42 BC), the most renowned of Caesar’s assassins, is implicitly evoked in a description of the viceroy’s judicial reforms, wherein ‘judgements were allotted not as law appointed, but as the Uiceroy listed’. Such abuse, Ascham explains, led to the assassination of Caesar: ‘euen those that dyd helpe him to plucke down *Pompey*, dyd after kill him for pulling down the lawes’. The second allusion, this time to the first Brutus, is more explicit:
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The whole body of the kyngedome of Naples was so distempered inwardly with his misorder, with a little outward occasion it would easely haue burst forth into a foule sore. A lesse matter then the rauishyng of Lucrece, A meaner ayde then the helpe of Brutus, was thought sufficient to haue stirred up this inward grudge to open reuenge.\textsuperscript{84}

Before any rebellion could take hold, however, fate intervened and the viceroy died of natural causes. Lucretia, and significantly also Brutus, are explicitly used here in relation to regime change, while the viceroy is cast as a second Tarquinius Superbus. For at least one member of the Elizabethan court then, Lucretia represented a catalyst for political upheaval. It is no coincidence that this politicised reading of the legend was performed by a devoted reader of the \textit{AUC}.

\section*{3. Lucretia’s Suicide}

In Livy, Lucretia’s rape is dealt with quickly and euphemistically.\textsuperscript{85} In his account, Livy bypasses the more common expressions for rape – \textit{vim adferre, uitiare, rapere} – with the exception of the verb \textit{stuprare}, literally ‘to defile’ – and refers in periphrasis to Lucretia’s ‘amissa pudicitia’ (‘lost chastity’), ‘rem atrocem’ (‘dreadful thing’), ‘regiam injuriam’ (‘royal insult’) and ‘scelus regium’ (‘royal crime’).\textsuperscript{86} He treats the rape at one step removed with a military lexicon – ‘uicisset’ (‘he had conquered’), ‘uictrix’ (‘conqueress’), ‘expugnato decore muliebri’ (‘having overcome her woman’s honour’) –

\textsuperscript{84}ibid. Diii\textsuperscript{r}.-r.

\textsuperscript{85}`Quo terrore cum uicisset obstinatam pudicitiam uelut uictrix libido, profectusque inde Tarquinius ferox expugnato decore muliebri esset […]’ (‘Once his lust had, through this terror, overcome her steadfast chastity like a conqueror, and once savage Tarquin had departed, having taken her womanly beauty by force…’) Livy (1.58.5).

\textsuperscript{86}Livy (1.57.10); (1.57.7); (1.57.6); (1.59.1); (1.59.3). ‘Ibi Sex. Tarquinium mala libido Lucretiae per uim stuprandae capit’ (‘there the wicked desire to defile Lucretia through force seizes Sextus Tarquinus’) (1.57.10). Livy uses \textit{stuprare} again in this sense with the same, gerund construction in his account of Verginia, ‘Ap. Claudium uirginis plebeiae stuprandae libido cepit’ (‘the desire to defile a plebian maiden seized Appius Claudius’) (3.44.2).
which Painter reproduces in translation as, ‘She vanquished with his terrible and infamous threat. His fleshly and licentious enterprise, ouercame the puritie of her chaste harte, which done he departed’. 87 This martial imagery would, incidentally, resurface repeatedly in Shakespeare’s *Lucrece*, suggesting another point of contact between Shakespeare and Livy’s version of the legend. 88

Following her attack, Lucretia sends word to her father, Lucretius, and to her husband, Collatinus, that they should return to Rome immediately. They arrive at Collatio with Publius Valerius and, crucially, Lucius Junius Brutus. Here, as Painter translates it, ‘thei founde her sittyng, verie pensife and sadde, in her chamber’. 89 Lucretia makes the men swear that Sextus Tarquinius will be punished before outlining her reasons for taking her own life: ‘Vos’, inquit, ‘uideritis quid illi debeatur: ego me etsi peccato absoluo, supplicio non libero; nec ulla deinde impudica Lucretiae exemplo uiuet’. Cultrum, quem sub ueste abditum habebat, eum in corde defigit, prolapsaque in uolnus moribunda cecidit’. 90 For which Painter gives:

I praie you consider with your selues, what punishment is due for the malefactour. As for my parte, though I clere my self of the offence, my body shall feele the punishemente: for no vnchast or ill woman, shall hereafter take example of Lucrece. Then she drew out a knife, whiche she had hidden secretly, vnder her kirtle, and stabbed her selfe to the harte. Whiche doen, she fell doune grouelyng vpon her wounde, and so died. 91

As noted above, it is this moment which St Augustine singled out for discussion in the *City of God*, a fact of which Livy’s sixteenth-century readers were well aware. The *T. Liuii Patauini Conciones* (1532), a collection of speeches gathered from the *AUC* and
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87 Painter, Bi
88 Cf. Shakespeare, *The Rape of Lucrece* (433–445); (463–483); (719–720); (1170–1173).
89 ibid. Bii cf. Livy (1.58.6).
90 ‘You yourselves will take care of what is owed to that man: for my part even if I acquit myself of fault, I do not absolve myself of punishment. No unchaste woman will live hereafter by Lucretia’s example. She thrust a knife, which she had hidden beneath her clothes, into her heart, and, falling onto her wound, she sunk down dying’. Livy (1.58.10).
91 Painter, Bii
printed at Paris, were concerned first and foremost with Livy’s literary and rhetorical worth. Livy is celebrated ‘non tam uerborum copia, quam sententiarum grauitate atque dignitate’ (‘not so much for his abundance of words, as the gravity and authority of his opinions’) along with his ‘pene diuinam in concionando facultatem’ (‘almost divine skill at making speeches’). But when Périon comes to comment on Lucretia’s short speech to her kinsmen, his thoughts are dominated not by matters of style, but rather by Augustine’s interrogation of her suicide: ‘Augustinus, atque eum secuti Theologi, Lucretiam adulterio quidem absoluunt: caeterum hoc ipso peccasse fatentur, quod conscientia pudoris amissi, si uiueret, sua culpa, se ipsa interfecerit, quem nemini suo se iure interimere liceat’. Périon then proceeds to quote Augustine’s interpretation of Lucretia’s guilt at length. Gabriel Harvey also referred to St Augustine in his reading of this section, where he notes in the margin, ‘cuius casus arguté disputatus ab Augustino, libro I. de ciuitate Dei, caput I.9. Si adultera, cur laudata? Si pudica, cur occisa?’ Harvey’s choice of casus and disputatus is significant, picking up, as they do, the legal overtones of the Augustine passage: ‘Vos apello Leges iudicé sqve Romani’. Despite the weight of this tradition, Painter in the above follows Livy closely and does not appear to have been moved by Augustine. If anything, he locates the moral culpability more obviously with Tarquin by giving ‘malefactour’ in the above for Livy’s simple ‘illi’ (‘that man’). Later in the same volume, however, Painter offers a Christian reworking of Lucrece’s resolve that ‘no vnchast or ill woman, shall hereafter take example of Lucrece’ with novel forty-one, A Lady Falslie Accused. Here a chaste wife successfully rebuffs unwanted advances and presents herself as a positive example for womankind: ‘I rejoyse

92 Livy (1532) aaii’ The collection would be reprinted in 1535 at Antwerp by Joannes Steelsius.
93 ‘Augustine, and the Theologians, absolve Lucretia of adultery: but in this they admit that she sinned, because, in the knowledge that if she lived she would do so in the knowledge of her lost chastity, she killed herself, though no one can justly kill himself’ Livy (1532) 16.
94 ‘whose case is examined clearly by Augustine in the first book of the City of God, chapter 19. If she was an adultress, why was she praised? If chaste, why killed?’ Harvey’s Livy, 28; image 50.
95 ‘I call on you, Roman laws and judges’. Augustine, 11 (1.19).
in resistaunce of the assaultes of loue, and of death to guarde and kepe my chastitie pure and inviolable. And may serue for example to euery honourable Ladie, beyng assailed with such strong and mightie aduersaries, to kepe themselves honest'.

In translating Livy, however, Painter followed the thrust of the Latin original.

In vernacular versions of the Lucrece narrative predating the Palace, this is typically where the meat of the narrativ ends. By translating directly from Livy, however, Painter rediscovered the narrative potential of Lucius Junius Brutus.

4. Painter and Brutus

Valerius Maximus presented Brutus as a kind of second Romulus; whereas Romulus had founded the city, Brutus established its freedom. Tacitus similarly described Brutus as the founder of Roman liberty at the beginning of the Annales: ‘Urbem Romam a principio reges habuerent; libertatem et consulatum L. Brutus instituit’. But Brutus did not enjoy anywhere near the same kind of popularity as Lucrece in Tudor England. St Augustine had condemned Brutus for exiling his friend and fellow consul, Collatinus, a reading with which at least some sixteenth-century readers would have been familiar. In the few instances where Brutus makes an appearance in early Tudor literature, the fact that he was responsible for toppling the monarchy at Rome was sometimes forgotten altogether. Thus Miles Huggarde (fl.1533–1557) included Brutus first and foremost in a

96 Painter (1566) Hhivv.
97 ‘L. Brutus, gloria par Romulo, quia ille urbem, hic libertatem Romanam condidit’ (‘Lucius Brutus, whose renown is equal to that of Romulus, in that Romulus founded the city, but Brutus founded its freedom’). Valerius Maximus, 5.8.1.
98 ‘The kings held sway over the city of Rome at first; Lucius Brutus established freedom and the consulship’. Tacitus, Annales, 1.1.
99 Cf. Augustine, 3.16. Harvey points to this passage at the beginning of Livy’s second book. Harvey’s Livy, p. 31; image 53.
list of ‘notable menne among the Romaynes’ who fought ‘for the cause of their princes’.  

It was not until the latter half of the sixteenth century that authors in England paid any real attention to Brutus. The author of the *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* (1579) styled himself as ‘Stephanus Iunius Brutus’, a nod to both revolutionaries. He was interested in this episode not for the tragedy of Lucretia, but for the legal precedent it established: ‘Brutus tribunus celerum, & Lucretius præfectus vrbi, adversus Tarquinium Superbum populum convocant: cuius authoritate regno pellitur. Quin & bona eius in fiscum rediguntur. Vnde satis apparat, ipsum, si præhensus fuisset, secundum leges publicas procul dubio mulctatum fuisse’. The author then lists the catalogue of the Tarquin’s misdeeds as recorded by Livy. In *Julius Caesar* (1599), Shakespeare twice recalls Brutus’s namesake, and has him appear in person towards the end of *Lucrece* (1594). In 1584, John Wolfe (*b.* in or before 1548, *d.* 1601) was responsible for the first appearance of Machiavelli’s *Discorsi* from a London press, in which Brutus was repeatedly singled out for praise. For Machiavelli, civil servant of the Florentine republic, the expulsion of the kings was essential for the development of the Roman state: ‘I judge that it was necessary either that the kings be extinguished in Rome or that

---

100 Miles Hoggarde, *The Displaying of the Protestantes* (London: Robert Caly, 1556) fvi.
101 ‘Brutus, commander of the king’s bodyguard, and Lucretius, the city deputy, called the people together against Tarquinius Superbus, on the authority of which he was banished from the kingdom. Indeed his goods were delivered into the public purse. Whence it appears clearly enough that, had he been laid hold of, without a doubt he would have been beaten according to the laws of the state’. *Stephanus Iunius Brutus, Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* (Edinburgh [Basel]: T. Guarinus (?), 1579) 200. Cf. Livy (2.5.1–2); (1.59.7–11).
102 ‘Cause verò narrantur hæ: quòd morem tolleret, quo rex senatum consulere solebat, quòd suo arbitrio pacem bellùmque faceret, quod foēdera, inconsulto populo, senatùque, iniret: quòd leges, quarum custos esse debuerat, violaret; in summa; quòd foēdus inter rege et quirites, vt antè retulimus, sancitum negligēret’. (‘These causes are recounted: that he removed the custom, by which the king was wont to consult the senate, that he made peace and war according to his own judgment, that he entered into treaties without having consulted the people or the senate, that he broke the laws of which he should have been the guardian; finally, that he disregarded the agreement established between kings and the Roman people’). Brutus, 200-01; cf. Livy (1.49.7).
103 ‘O, you and I haue heard our fathers say / There was a Brutus once that would have brooked / Th'eternal devil to keep his state in Rome / As easily as a king’. (*Julius Caesar*, 1.2.159–162); ‘Shall Rome stand under one man’s awe? What, Rome? / My ancestors did from the streets of Rome / The Tarquin drive when he was called a king’. (ibid. 2.1.52–4).
Rome in a very short time become weak and of no value’. Machiavelli frequently shares his admiration of Brutus, whether praising his ruthless maintenance of Rome’s newly acquired freedom, or his crafty simulation of madness. ‘From his example’, Machiavelli explains, ‘all those who are discontent with a prince have to learn’.

In Livy, Lucretia’s husband and father are overwhelmed by shock in the immediate wake of her suicide. It is Brutus who seizes the opportunity for action:

Brutus illis luctu occupatis, cultrum ex uolnere Lucretiae extractum manante cruore prae se tenens, ‘Per hunc’, inquit, ‘castissimum ante regiam iniuriam sanguinem iuro, uosque, di, testes facio me L. Tarquinium Superbum cum scelerata coniuge et omni liberorum stirpe ferro igni quacumque dehinc ui possim exsecuturum, nec illos alium quemquam regnare Romae passurum.

For which Painter gives:

as thei were bewailing the death of Lucrece, Brutus plucked the knife out of the wounde, whiche gushed out with abundance of blood, and holdyng it up saied. I swore by the chaste bloode of this bodie here deade, and I take you the immortall goddess to witnesse, that I wil drue out and extirpate out of this Citie, bothe L. Tarquinius Superbus, and his wicked wife, with all the race of his children and progenie, so that none of them, ne yet any others shall raigne nay longer in Rome.

Painter’s Brutus swears by Lucretia’s ‘chaste bloode’, toning down the superlative of Livy’s ‘castissimum […] sanguinem’, perhaps remembering the ‘chast bloud’ of Chaucer’s account or Ovid’s ‘castumque cruorem’. So too Shakespeare’s Brutus swears ‘by this chaste blood so unjustly stained’. The spilling of Lucrece’s ‘chaste blood’ became something of a literary cliché. Thus in Edward the Third (1596) (which

---

104 Machiavelli, 47 (I.16).
105 ibid. 213 (III.2).
106 ‘While they were occupied with grief, Brutus, holding the knife before him, which he had drawn from Lucretia’s wound, flowing with blood, said ‘by this blood, most chaste before the royal insult, I swear, and you, gods, I take as witness, I will pursue with vengeance Lucius Tarquinius Superbus, as well as his infamous wife and all his stock, with the sword, flame, and whatever force I am able, and will not allow them or anyone else to reign in Rome’. Livy (1.59.1). Cf. Shakespeare, Lucrece, 1807–1848.
107 Painter (1566) Bii6.
108 Chaucer, CCXXVv; Ovid, Fasti II.841.
109 Shakespeare, The Rape of Lucrece, 1836.
appears to have drawn from Painter’s forty-sixth novel, *The Countesse of Salesburie*),
the countess rebuffs the king’s advances with the following threat:

> Either sweare to leaue thy moste vnholie sute,
> And neuer hence forth to sollicit me,
> Or else by heauen, this sharpe poynted knyfe,
> Shall staine thy earth, with that which thou would staine:
> My poor chast blood, sweare Edward sweare,
> Or I will strike and die before thee heere.\(^{110}\)

Here ‘staine’ is suggestive of Shakespeare’s ‘unjustly stained’, while the Countess’s insistence that Edward be bound by oath – ‘sweare, Edward, sweare’ – recalls Lucretia’s ‘Sed date dexteras fidemque’, or, as Painter translates it, ‘gieue me your handes, and trouthe’.\(^{111}\) Edward’s reply asks us to think of Lucrece’s multiple literary incarnations:

> Arise true English Ladie, whom our Ile
> May better boast of then euer Romaine might,
> Of her whose ransackt treasurie hath taskt,
> The vaine indeuor of so many pens\(^{112}\)

That the author of *Edward the Third* could reasonably expect the audience to recognise the figure of Lucretia behind these lines is indicative of the narrative’s popularity in the latter years of the sixteenth century.

Exploiting the physical evidence – ‘elatum domo Lucretiae corpus in forum deferent’ – Brutus stirs up the citizens of Collatia: ‘Mouet cum patris maestitia, tum Brutus castigator lacrimarum atque intertium querellarum auctorque quod uiros, quod Romanos decret, arma capiendi aduersus hostilia ausos. Ferocissimus quisque iuuenum cum armis uoluntarius adest; sequitur et cetera iuuentus’.\(^{113}\) For which Painter gives:


\(^{111}\) Livy (1.58.7); Painter (1566) Bii'

\(^{112}\) ibid. E'

\(^{113}\) ‘They were moved both by the father’s sorrow and by Brutus, who reproved their tears and idle laments and caused them to take up arms against those who dared to treat them as enemies, as
‘Wherevpon Brutus perswaded the Romanes, that thei should cease from teares, and other childishe lamentacions, and take weapons in their handes, and shewe themselues like men. Then the lustiest and moste desperate persones within the citie, made themselues preste and readie, to attempt any enterprise’. Brutus’s readiness to seize and exploit the moment attracted the attention of Gabriel Harvey, who remarked next to these lines that:


Over a century later, Nathaniel Lee (1645x52–1692) would make this harnessing of opportunitas a primary feature of his portrayal of Brutus in Lucius Junius Brutus; Father of his Country (1681). Thus Lee makes his Brutus remark towards the beginning of the play, ‘Occasion seems in view; something there is / In Tarquin’s last abode at Collatine’s’.116

As so often in moments of civil disturbance in Livy, the people of Rome rush into the forum – ‘ex omnibus locis urbis in forum curritur’ (‘they rush into the market from every place in the city’) – and there they hear Brutus speak. In Painter this appears in a heavily condensed form:

[...] the people out of all places of the citie, ran into the market place. Where Brutus complained of the abominable Rape of Lucrece, committed by Sextus Tarquinius, wherevnto he added the pride and insolent behauior of the kyng, the

behoved men, and Roman men at that. The boldest of the young men were present of their own volition with arms; the rest of the youth followed on’. Livy (1.59.4–5).

114 Painter, Biiv.

115 ‘Courage has little strength without opportunity, and so too opportunity without courage. Brutus is the keenest leader in pursuing opportunity and an outstanding author of new affairs. Remarkable deeds in every part, very worthy of note, especially where the execution responds with magnificent success. It is not safe to wake a sleeping lion or dog, and the office shows the man’. Harvey’s Livy, 29, image 51.

116 Nathaniel Lee, Lucius Junius Brutus; Father of his Country (London: Richard and Jacob Tonson, 1681) 4.
myserie and drudgerie of the people, and how thei, which in tyme paste were made of men of warre, Arificers and Labourers. These and suche like he called to the peoples remembrance, whereby thei abrogated and deposed Tarquinius, banishyng him, his wife, and children.\textsuperscript{117}

Livy makes a point of highlighting Brutus’s transformation at this point, though this detail is omitted by Painter.\textsuperscript{118} Painter also removes a reference to the murder of king Servius and to Tullia’s trampling of her father’s corpse, focusing instead on the harms inflicted on the Roman people as a whole.\textsuperscript{119} In a rare moment of expansion, however, Painter builds on Livy’s ‘liberatorem urbis laeta castra accepere’ (‘the camp gladly received the liberator of the city’) with ‘The campe receiued Brutus with greate ioye and triumphe, for that he had deliuered the citie of such a tiraunte’.\textsuperscript{120}

Conclusion

It is difficult to say how Painter’s reincorporation of Brutus’s role in the revolution at Rome was received upon publication in 1566. In the following year, Sir Geoffrey Fenton (c.1539–1608) followed in the footstep of Painter with his \textit{Certaine Tragicall Discourses} (1567). In the preface to this collection, he outlines the utility of reading history for women, and evidently has an eye to the first novels of Painter’s \textit{Palace}: ‘And to a woman, what stoare of examples are there to instructe her in her dutie,

\textsuperscript{117} Painter, Bii’–Biii’
\textsuperscript{118} ‘Ibi oratio habita nequaquam eius pectoris ingeniique quod simulatum ad diem fuerat’ (‘There he delivered a speech not at all of the heart and nature which he had counterfeited up until that day’). Livy (1.59.8).
\textsuperscript{119} ‘Indigna Ser. Tulli regis memorata caedes et inucta corpori patris nefando uehiculo filia, inuocatique ulores parentum di’ (‘He recalled the undeserved slaughter of king Servius Tullius and how his daughter rode over her father’s body in the execrable carriage, and invoked the gods as avengers of parents’). Livy (1.59.10).
\textsuperscript{120} Livy (1.60.2); Painter, Biii’
eyther for the married, to kepe her fayth to her husband with LVCRETIA, or the unmaried to defende her virginitie with Virginya’.\textsuperscript{121} Clearly we are in the realm of women’s personal morality, and Fenton at no point discusses these women as catalysts for political change. In fact, on the same page, Fenton identifies the study of history as a means of reinforcing traditional structures of power: ‘to the priuat person, antiquitie giues choice of admonicions, for obedience to his superiors, with charge to applie and employe all his care for the commoditye of his countreye’.\textsuperscript{122} By turning to Livy’s account of the Lucretia legend, however, Painter very much reincorporated questions of regime change and popular resistance, as embodied by the figure of Brutus. In Painter’s version, Brutus is given a prominent, narrative placing which he lacked in the accounts of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate. In the chapter that follows, we will see how Painter returned to this period of Roman history in the \textit{Second Tome} to uncover the parts played by two female king-makers, Tanaquil and Tullia, in solidifying the Tarquinian regime at Rome.

\textsuperscript{121} Geoffrey Fenton, \textit{Certaine Tragicall Discourses} (London: Thomas Marshe, 1567) ii\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{122} ibid. ii\textsuperscript{v}.
Chapter 6

Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* and Livy’s Legendary Rome

Introduction

Shakespeare’s Scottish play has some thoroughly Roman touches.¹ This chapter focuses on *Macbeth*’s (1606) relationship with the AUC, one of its most important though relatively unexplored intertexts.² The play is infused with a period from Rome’s legendary past, which witnessed the rise and fall of the Tarquins, the dynasty spanning from the reign of Tarquinius Priscus to the overthrowing of Tarquin the Proud. Livy’s account of the Tarquins makes itself felt in *Macbeth* in two distinct but complementary ways. The Macbeth narrative as Shakespeare received it was already strongly imbued with the AUC. When Hector Boece wrote his national history of Scotland, the *Scotorum Historia* (1527), he turned to Livy to fill the historical blanks in Scotland’s past. The Macbeth episode was no exception, and Boece modelled his Maccabeus closely on Livy’s Tarquin the Proud. Raphael Holinshed (c.1525–1580?), relying on Boece’s *Scotorum Historia* and John Bellenden’s Scots translation thereof for his *Historie of Scotland*, thereby incorporated these distinctly Livian elements into his own account of


Macbeth’s reign. Shakespeare, using Holinshed as his primary source for *Macbeth*, thus rehearsed a portrait of tyranny which was ultimately inspired by Livy’s Tarquin. The second (and similarly unexplored) means of transmission involves a new source for consideration: William Painter’s *Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure*. By translating Livy for his novel the *Two Roman Queenes*, Painter highlighted the roles played by two female king-makers, Tanaquil and Tullia, in establishing and edifying the Tarquinian dynasty at Rome. Here Painter placed a firm emphasis on women’s interventions in state politics and identified ‘cruelty’ and ‘ambition’ as the two most important themes of his narrative. It was Painter’s interpretation of Livy, this chapter argues, that alerted Shakespeare to the dramatically satisfying prospect of a wife who not only encourages her husband with an appeal to his masculinity, but readily participates in the crimes she would have her husband commit.

1. Livy and the Making of Scottish History

As the studies by David Norbrook, Sally Mapstone, and most recently Mary Floyd-Wilson have shown, *Macbeth* exhibits an extremely rich and intricate relationship with historiography. The matter of *Macbeth*’s historical sources is particularly complex since three of the major accounts of Macbeth’s reign available to Shakespeare – those of Hector Boece, John Bellenden, and Raphael Holinshed – were already imbued with

---


Livy’s History of Rome. As noted in chapter one, Boece’s Scotorum Historia consisted of seventeen books of Scottish history, which John Bellenden translated at the behest of James V. Thomas Davidson printed a heavily revised version of this translation at Edinburgh at some point between 1535 and 1540, entitled The Hystory and Croniklis of Scotland. Between finishing the original translation and preparing a new version for the printing press, Bellenden produced his translation of the first five books of Livy. Intriguingly, the revised Croniklis bears witness to Bellenden’s newly acquired familiarity with the AUC, as is explored below. Raphael Holinshed used both the Scotorum Historia and Bellenden’s Croniklis for his Historie of Scotland, which served Shakespeare as the primary source for the play. This section traces for the first time the transmission of the Livian elements of Macbeth’s tyranny from Boece to Shakespeare.

Boece covers Maccabeus’s murder of Duncan and his ‘moronic confidence in prophecies that he didn’t understand’ in book 12 of the Historia. As Hadas and Godshalk observed, Boece modelled Maccabeus’s wife closely on Livy’s Tullia. But this was by no means Boece’s only point of contact with Livy. The accounts of Macbeth’s usurpation which predate Boece said little of his actual reign. John Fordun’s (d. in or after 1363) Chronica Gentis Scotorum was more interested in the respective flights of Malcolm and Macduff to England and Malcolm’s testing of Macduff’s loyalty, a focus which was rehearsed by John Mair in the Historia Majoris Britanniae (1521). To supplement his version, Boece turned to Livy’s Tarquinius Superbus.

---

7 For Holinshed’s use of Boece and Bellenden, see Summerson, 75.
8 The description of Maccabeus’s ‘stultam fidutiam in fatis non intellectis’ is found in the Scotorum Historiae Index which prefaces the Historia. Boece (1527) ui.
9 Hadas, 255–6; Godshalk, 240–1.
Tarquin the Proud, seventh and last king of Rome, came to the throne by murdering his father-in-law, Servius Tullius. He swiftly decreased the senate’s size and significance by executing opposing factions, and established an autocratic system of rule with the royal palace at its heart.\textsuperscript{11} He set the people of Rome to digging sewers and embellishing the Circus, making stonemasons of warriors, a humiliation to which, as explored in the previous chapter, Lucius Junius Brutus appealed when rallying support for his rebellion.\textsuperscript{12} As we saw in chapter five, following his son’s rape of Lucretia, the Tarquins were driven into exile.\textsuperscript{13}

The details Boece provides of Maccabeus’s reign in the wake of Banquo’s assassination – his confiscation of property, his paranoia, his murder of other noblemen, as well as his gathering of henchmen – match precisely Livy’s description of Tarquinius Superbus in the wake of Servius’s murder.\textsuperscript{14} These details were subsequently incorporated by Holinshed.\textsuperscript{15} Boece also adopted Livy’s habit of mirroring specific characters. Boece’s Duncan is placed in deliberate opposition with his cousin Maccabeus at the beginning of Book Twelve, and the two are described as ‘Diuersissimis […] ingeniis’ (‘of very different natures’).\textsuperscript{16} Duncan is ‘mitis […] ac clemens’ (‘meek and mild’), much as Livy had dubbed Tarquin’s brother and polar opposite, whom Tarquinius similarly dispatches, a ‘mitis ingenii iuuenem’ (‘a young man of a meek nature’).\textsuperscript{17} Conversely, Boece’s Maccabeus is ‘seuerus’ (‘grave’) and ‘strenuus’ (‘vigorous’), and shows great potential as a general – ‘Maccabæum præstantissimum bello ducem futurum’ (‘Maccabeus was to be a most outstanding

\textsuperscript{11} Livy (1.49.7).
\textsuperscript{12} ibid. (1.59.9).
\textsuperscript{13} ibid. (1.60.1–3).
\textsuperscript{14} See Boece (1527) CCLX; cf. Livy (1.49.4–5).
\textsuperscript{16} Boece (1527) CCLV
\textsuperscript{17} ibid. (1527) CCLV’ Livy (1.46.5).
general in war’) – which also happened to be the one saving grace of Livy’s Tarquinius.\(^{18}\) As Livy puts it, ‘Nec ut iniustus in pace rex, ita dux belli praauus fuit; quin ea arte aequasset superiores reges ni degeneratum in aliis huic quoque decori offecisset’.\(^{19}\) Boece harnessed this tone of regret and suggestion of squandered potential in his initial description of Maccabeus: ‘& nisi ingentem fortitudinii crudelitatem natura immiscuisset, ad res insignes gerendas natus videri poterat’.\(^{20}\) Holinshed reproduced the contrast in his version and thus Shakespeare too set ‘brave Macbeth’, ‘Valour’s minion’ (1.2.16); (1.2.19), against Duncan, who, although he is not the pacifist king found in Boece,

Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office, that his virtues,
Will plead like angels, trumpet–tongued, against
The deep damnation of his taking–off.\(^{21}\)

\((1.7.17–20)\)

In Livy’s account, Tarquinius has no authority with which to cement his rule other than brute force: ‘neque enim ad ius regni quicquam praeter vim habebat’.\(^{22}\) He therefore exploits fear as a means of control: ‘eo accedebat ut in caritate ciuium nihil spei reponenti metu regnum tutandum esset’.\(^{23}\) Maccabeus similarly finds little hope of inspiring his subjects’ *caritas*, that is, ‘respect’ or ‘affection’, and in Boece’s version, fear gives rise to mutual loathing: ‘Etenim vbi se Maccabeus terrori esse, a cunctisque se metui intellexit, vicissim & ipse cunctos metuere incepit. Eaque de re in omnes pariter

\(^{18}\) ibid. (1527) CCLVr.

\(^{19}\) ‘Though an unjust king in peace, he was not a poor general in war. To be sure, he would have equaled the previous kings in that skill had his degeneracy in other things not also thwarted this glory’ Livy (1.53.1).

\(^{20}\) ‘And had not nature mingled immense cruelty with his strength, he would have seemed born to do remarkable things’. Boece (1527) CCLVr.

\(^{21}\) Holinshed’s Makbeth is a ‘valiant gentleman’ in contrast to Duncan, who is ‘soft and gentle of nature’. Holinshed, *Ovi*’, column 2, lines 20–1; 24–5.

\(^{22}\) ‘Indeed he had no right to rule except force’. Livy (1.49.3).

\(^{23}\) ‘It happened that since there was no hope of winning the citizens’ affections, his rule had to be defended through fear’. Livy (1.49.4).
This climate of fear and mistrust, carried over into Holinshed, ultimately resurfaces in Shakespeare’s play. As Ross describes it,

I dare not speak much further,  
But cruel are the times when we are traitors  
And do not know ourselves; when we hold rumour  
From what we fear, yet know not what we fear,  
But float upon a wild and violent sea,  
Each way and none.

(4.2.17-22)

Boece’s *Historia* describes Maccabeus reverting to his natural *crudelitas* (‘cruelty’) through the fear that he too will become a victim of regicide: ‘Agitabant eum furiae (quod sit in Tyrannis & per scelus respublicas occupantibus) nec id eum non metuere perpetuò sinebant, quod ipse alteri fecisset’. The same anxiety had tormented Livy’s Tarquinius in the wake of Servius’s murder: ‘consicius deinde male quaerendi regni ab se ipso aduersus se exemplum capi posse, armatis corpus circumsaepsit’. Both authors link this anxiety to usurpation – ‘per scelus respublicas occupantibus’ (‘those who seize possession of a commonwealth through crime’), ‘male quaerendi regni’ (‘obtaining a kingdom through ill means’) – while Boece’s generalisation – ‘quod sit in tyrannis’ (‘as happens with tyrants’) – asks the reader to think of past examples beyond the immediate narrative. The idea of establishing a criminal precedent which will rebound upon the perpetrator can most obviously be heard in Macbeth’s reflection that ‘we but teach / Bloody instructions which, being taught, return / To plague th’inventor’

---

24 ‘Indeed when Maccabeus understood that he was an object of fear, and that he was feared by everyone, he himself in turn started to fear everyone. From this rose an implacable hatred of everyone’. Boece (1527) CCLXv.
25 ‘and euen as there were manie that stood in feare of him, so likewise stood he in feare of manie, in such sorte that he began to make those awaie by one cauillation or other, whom he thought most able to worke him anie displeasure’. Holinshed (1587) Piii, column 1, lines 31–6.
26 ‘The Furies vexed him (as happens with tyrants and those who seize possession of a commonwealth through crime) nor did they allow him not to fear constantly the crime which he had committed against another’. Boece (1527) CCLIXv.
27 ‘Aware that an example of obtaining a kingdom through ill means could be taken from his own actions, he surrounded himself with armed men’. Livy (1.49.2).
The *Furiae* (‘Furies’) to which Boece refers here were also a recurring feature of Livy’s account of Tarquinius and Tullia, appearing on three separate occasions. The fear and paranoia suffered by Livy’s Tarquin and Boece’s Maccabeus were reproduced in Holinshed, and thus Shakespeare’s Macbeth, following Duncan’s murder, is visited by ‘restless ecstasy’ and suffers ‘the affliction of these terrible dreams / That shake us nightly’ (3.2.24; ibid. 20–1).

There is another, more subtle detail which links Boece’s Maccabeus to Livy. Having fled to England, Macduff tells Malcolm of the tyrant’s ‘imperiis […] plusquam Manlianis’ (‘more than Manlian orders’). Titus Manlius Torquatus, stern to a fault, appears in Books Seven and Eight of Livy’s history, in which he orders the execution of his son for disobeying a consular edict. As Livy describes it, ‘Manlianaque imperia non in praesentia modo horrenda sed exempli etiam tristis in posterum essent’. Boece is once again supplementing his Scottish history with Livy’s legendary Rome, while the comparative ‘plusquam’ (‘more than’) actively encourages a comparison between Maccabeus and his Roman analogue. Though this comparison was not reproduced in Holinshed, it nonetheless provides another example of Boece’s dependence on Livy.

As Sally Mapstone and Henry Summerson have noted, Holinshed used both Boece’s Latin *Historia* and Bellenden’s vernacular translation for the *Chronicle of Scotland*. There are certain tantalizing clues, however, that suggest Shakespeare may have consulted Bellenden’s translation independently. Bellenden offers three key

---

29 Cf. Livy (1.47.7); (1.48.7); (1.59.13).
30 Holinshed speaks of ‘the pricke of consience (as it chaunceth euer in tyrants, and such as atteine to anie estate by vnrighteous means) caused him euer to fear, least he should be serued of the same cup, as he had ministred to his predecessor’. Holinshed (1587) Pii”, column 2, lines 28–32.
31 Boece (1527) CCXLIX.
32 ‘Manlian orders were not just horriific in the moment but were also a bitter example for the future’. Livy (8.7.22).
33 Mapstone (1998) 161; Summerson, ‘Sources’, 75.
descriptions of Macbeth which, though they have no equivalent in Boece or Holinshed, nonetheless resurface in Shakespeare’s play. He refers to Makbeth as ‘ane bloody monster bot ony mercy’ and ‘sa bludy monstoure’, which can be heard in Macduff’s promise to display the tyrant as ‘our rarer monsters are’ (5.10.25). It is only in Bellenden that Macbeth is referred to as a ‘fleschoure’, the Scots word for ‘butcher’. As Bellenden’s Macduff complains to Malcolm, ‘thy pepyl ar murrdist in al partis as ṃis bludy fleschoure taikis in heid’. While this description is most obviously echoed in Malcolm’s ‘this dead butcher’ (5.11.35), the impulsiveness suggested here may also have coloured Macbeth’s ‘the very firstlings of my heart / shall be the firstlings of my hand’ (4.1.163-4). Bellenden also offers an arresting description of Makbeth bloodying his hands: ‘At last quhen he had gottin gret proffet be slauchter & proscription of his noblis, he began to put his handis mair pairtly in thai r blud’. Again, this image has no equivalent in Boece or Holinshed, but nonetheless recurs throughout Macbeth. Certainly there were copies of Bellenden’s Chroniklis circulating in England in the years preceding Macbeth. In his preface to the Description of Scotland, William Harrison (1535–1593) explained ‘how profitablie and compendiouslie John Bellenden archdeacon of Murrey his [i.e. Boece’s] interpreter hath turned him from Latine into the Scotish toong, there are verie few Englishmen that know, bicause we want the books’. This suggests paucity, but not a complete absence. Both Harrison and Holinshed had recourse to Bellenden’s translation. Abraham Fleming (c.1552–1607), general editor of the 1587 edition of the Chronicles, was also familiar with Bellenden and argued persuasively that Grafton’s (c.1511–1573) Chronicle had relied on Bellenden’s Scots as opposed to

34 John Bellenden, The Hystory and Croniklis of Scotland (Edinburgh: Thomas Davidson, c.1538) Lii”; Llvi
35 ibid. Llvi
36 ibid. Llvi
37 Cf. Macbeth (2.2.57–61); (3.2.49); (5.1.33–7); (5.1.48–9).
38 William Harrison, The Description of Scotland, in Holinshed, Aii
Boece’s Latin.39 Some five years following the composition of Macbeth, John Speed (1551/2–1629) cited ‘Bellenden the Scot’ as a source in The History of Great Britaine (1611).40 It is possible then that Shakespeare too had access to Bellenden’s translation.

The transmission of Boece and Bellenden is complicated by the fact that multiple and significant changes were made to Bellenden’s translation before its publication at the Edinburgh press. As Sally Mapstone has shown, these changes are especially apparent in Malcolm’s interview with Macduff, which would form IV.3 of Shakespeare’s play.41 What I would like to argue here is that this scene is also of central importance in understanding Livy’s presence in Macbeth as well as Shakespeare’s recurring interest in the rape of Lucrece. In Bellenden’s Croniklis, Malcolm’s alleged lust provokes a strong reaction from Macduff:

First for immoderat lust the abhominabyl fontane of all vicis, quhilk ragis in me with sic vndantit renʒeis, þat gif I were maid king of scottis I suld deflore virginis & matronis in sic maner, þat my intemperancie suld be mair importabyl to ßow than the bludy tyrannie of Makbeth. To þis answerit Makduf, that is an euyll falt. For mony nobyll princis & kyngis bene disherist & tynt baith thair lyfe and kyndomis for the samyn.42

This dialogue was subsequently reproduced by Holinshed with little alteration.43 It is not unreasonable to assume that Bellenden added the reflection (not present in the Latin of Boece’s Historia) that ‘mony nobyll princis & kyngis bene disherist & tynt baith thair lyfe and kyndomis’ through ‘immoderat lust’ after translating the Lucretia episode himself. In Bellenden’s version of Livy’s first book, Lucretia’s rape by Sextus

---

39 Holinshed, 298, column 1, line 73 – 299, column 1, line 24.
42 Bellenden (c.1538) Lvi
43 ‘First, such immoderate lust and sensualitie (the abhominable fountaine of all vices) followeth me, that if I were made king of Scots, I shoulde seeke to defloure your maids and matrones, in such wise that mine intemperancie shuld be more importabyl vnto you, than the bloudie tyrannie of Makbeth now is’, to which Makduff replies: ‘This suerlie is a verie euill fault for manie noble princes and kings haue lost both flues and kingdomes for the same’. Holinshed (1587) Pi


Tarquinius spurs the people ‘to confound and aluterlie distroy þe auctorite of kingdomes’. Intriguingly, Bellenden’s contemporary, Sir David Lyndsay, singled out Lucretia as a lesson for James V in his ‘Exhortatioun to the Kyngis Grace’. Here, addressing James directly, he remarks, ‘I beseik thy Maiestie serene, / From Lychorie thow keip thy bodie clene’. Much like Bellenden’s Macduff, Lyndsay reminds James of the potentially disastrous consequences of ‘Lychorie’ for both king and kingdom:

Tak kent, how prydfull Tarquyne tynt his croun,
For the deforsying of Lucre, the schene,
And was depreyit and baneist Romes toun.

And, in dispyit of his Lycherous leuyng,
The Romanis wald be subiect to no kyng
Mony long ȝeir, as storyis doith recorde,
Tyll Iulyus, throw verteous gouernying
And Princelie curage, gane on thame ryng,
And chosin of Romanis Empriour and lord.

The example of Tarquin and Lucrece was then a familiar one at the court of James V when Bellenden came to revise the *Chroniklis*. Bellenden’s glancing back to ‘nobyll princis & kyngis’ of the past who forfeited their kingdoms through ‘immoderat lust’ may well have been prompted by his newly acquired familiarity with the first book of Livy.

In his reworking of the exchange between Malcolm and Macduff, Shakespeare preserves Macduff’s admonition:

Malcolm: But there’s no bottom, none,
In my voluptuousness. Your wives, your daughters,
Your matrons, and your maids, could not fill up
The cistern of my lust

[...]

44 Bellenden (1901–3) I.126.
45 The ‘Exhortatioun’ suffixes ‘The Dreme of Schir Dauid Lyndesay’, a satirical poem which remembers the turbulent years of James’s minority. Lyndsay, I. 3–38.
46 ibid. I.37.
47 ibid. I.37.
Macduff: Boundless intemperance
In nature is a tyranny. It hath been
Th’untimely emptying of the happy throne,
And fall of many kings.

(4.3.61–70)

Shakespeare had previously invoked Livy’s example of ‘boundless intemperance’ with Macbeth’s description of ‘withered murder’, which ‘with Tarquin’s ravishing strides, towards his design / Moves like a ghost’ (2.1.52–6). As David Norbrook notes, ‘There is heavy irony in Macbeth’s comparison of himself to Tarquin, whose rape of Lucretia led to the fall of the Roman monarchy’.\(^ {48} \) But there is also a metapoetic quality to Macbeth’s words here, glancing back to Shakespeare’s narrative poem of 1594, a moment Shakespeare would revisit again in Cymbeline.\(^ {49} \) For Shakespeare then, as with Bellenden, the memory of the Lucrece legend intruded onto the later narrative.

There is another nod to the Lucretia episode in the exchange between Malcolm and Macduff. As we saw in the previous chapter, following the rape of Lucretia, Brutus stirred the people of Collatia to take up arms against Tarquinius with an appeal to their manhood. Livy’s description of Brutus bears repeating: he is a ‘castigator lacrimarum atque intertium querellarum’ (‘reprover of tears and idle laments’), who reminds the crowd ‘quod uiros, quod Romanos decret’ (‘what behoved men, and Roman men at that’).\(^ {50} \) Boece borrowed from this moment in Livy to make Macduff a second Brutus, who urges Malcolm to take up arms against a tyrant with a very similar emphasis on

---

\(^ {48} \) Norbrook, 101.

\(^ {49} \) Having emerged from the trunk in Imogen’s bedchamber, Iachimo remarks: ‘Our Tarquin thus / Did softly press the rushes ere he wakened / The chastity he wounded’. Shakespeare, Cymbeline (2.2.12–14).

\(^ {50} \) ibid. (1.59.4).
action over lamentation.\textsuperscript{51} For this, Bellenden gave: ‘thir cruelties dayly done to ws suld not be lamentit be effeminat pepyll, bot erar reuengit be vailȝeant campionis’.\textsuperscript{52} This appeal to manhood, however, was not reproduced in Holinshed. Nevertheless, the question of masculinity and the (in)appropriateness of grief became central concerns for Shakespeare when reworking this episode for the stage. Once again, a second Brutus encourages his interlocutor to take up arms against a tyrant:

Malcolm: Let us seek out some desolate shade, and there
Weep our sad bosoms empty.

Macduff: Let us rather
Hold fast the mortal sword, and like good men
Bestride our downfall birthdom.

(4.3.1–4)

Here the memory of Brutus’s ‘quod uiros […] deceret’ can be heard in Macduff’s ‘good men’, picked up again towards the end of the scene with Malcolm’s ‘this tune goes manly’ (4.3.237), while Macduff’s refusal to ‘weep our sad bosoms empty’ rehearses Brutus’s role as ‘castigator lacrimarum’. As Mastrocinque has noted, there is another echo of Livy’s Brutus in Malcolm’s final exhortation to Macduff, ‘Be this the whetstone of your sword. Let grief / Convert to anger: blunt not the heart, enrage it’ (4.3.230–1).\textsuperscript{53}

Whether Shakespeare was prompted to deploy this idiom of grief and manhood by Livy or via his Scottish imitators is difficult to say. Shakespeare had in fact already channeled this aspect of Livy’s Brutus in \textit{The Rape of Lucrece}, wherein the republican hero ‘check[s] the tears in Collatinus’s eyes’, saying ‘Courageous Roman, do not steep thy heart / In such relenting dew of lamentations’ (\textit{Lucrece}, 1828-9). When Shakespeare came to read the exchange between Malcolm and Macduff in Holinshed, he was perhaps

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} ‘tamen non negligendae essent patriae tam deflendae mulierculis quidem, sed tibi ac nobis vindicandae calamitates’ (‘however the misfortunes of our homeland should not be bewailed by little women but avenged by you and us’). Boece (1527) CCXLII‘
\item \textsuperscript{52} Bellenden (c.1538) Livi‘.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Cf. Mastrocinque, 311.
\end{itemize}
prompted to return to this moment in the Lucretia narrative by the Livian runnels at work elsewhere in *Historie of Scotland*, as detailed above.

However, this scene does not develop as a straightforward endorsement of Livy’s emphasis on action over grief. Livy’s Brutus swiftly puts an end to the mourning of Lucretius and Collatinus. At no point do the Macduffs of Boece, Bellenden, or Holinshed mourn the slaughter of their families. Shakespeare, however, uniquely offers Macduff the opportunity to verbalize his loss. As Malcolm puts it, ‘Give sorrow words. The grief that does not speak, / Whispers the o’erfraught heart and bids it break’ (4.3.210–1). When Malcolm tentatively rehearses the Livian appeal to manhood – ‘dispute it like a man’ – Shakespeare’s Macduff retorts, ‘I shall do so; / But I must also feel it as a man (4.3.222–4), and subsequently inverts Livian masculinity when he exclaims ‘O, I could play the woman with mine eyes’ (4.2.233). Macduff ultimately rouses himself to action, but not before he has taken time to ‘remember such things were / That were most precious to me’ (4.3.223–4). Shakespeare thus establishes a space for the verbalization and acknowledgment of grief where none was offered in the source texts. Once again, the most obvious analogue here is *The Rape of Lucrece*. Though words had failed Lucrece in Ovid’s account – ‘ter conata loqui ter destitit’ (‘three times she tried to speak, three times she stopped’) – Shakespeare’s heroine was allowed to speak fluently not only on her own behalf but also on Hecuba’s. Standing before a wall hanging depicting the fall of Troy, Lucrece’s gaze is drawn to ‘despairing Hecuba’ (*Lucrece*, 1447). She finds fault with the artist for denying Hecuba the opportunity to put words to her distress: ‘And therefore Lucrece swears he did her wrong, / To give her so much grief, and not a tongue’ (*Lucrece*, 1462–3). In this light, the fact that Shakespeare’s Lucrece is able, unlike her classical predecessor, to verbalize her grief

---

54 Ovid, *Fasti* (2.823).
reads as an implicit criticism of the source text. There is a similar effect at work in *Macbeth* 4.3, where friction arises between the assumptions of the original (namely that immediate action is of more importance than mourning) and the insistence of the new narrative that Macduff’s grief should be adequately expressed. Though Macduff will later allow his actions to speak for themselves – ‘I have no words; / My voice is in my sword’ (5.11.6-7) – in this scene at least he is encouraged to ‘give sorrow words’ where his previous literary and historical incarnations were not.

The primary sources for Holinshed’s depiction of ‘the outrageous crueltie of Makbeths misgournance’ were thus strongly imbued with Livy’s account of the Tarquins.\(^5\) When composing a national history of Scotland, Boece relied on the *AUC* as both a stylistic template and a means of supplementing historical fact. He did not, however, have a great deal to say regarding Maccabeus’s wife, though this description too had its origins in Livy:

\[
\text{Instigabat quoq uxor eius cupid\'a nominis regij, impotentissimaque morae, vt est mulierum genus procliiue ad rem aliquam concipiendam, & vbi conceperint nimio affectu prosequendam. Saepeius itaque virum [...] acerrimis dictis incitat, ignauum ac timidum appellant.}^6\]

Besides the more general model of a wife compelling her husband to seize the throne, Boece carries over Livy’s use of ‘instigare’ as well as Tullia’s accusation of cowardice, giving ‘ignauum ac timidum’ for Livy’s ‘ignauia’.\(^7\) For Boece’s Latin, Bellenden gave the following in the print edition of the *Chroniklis*:

\[
\text{Attour his wyfe impacient of lang tary (as all wemen ar) specially quhare thay are desirus of ony purpos, gaif hym grete artation to persew þe thrid weird, þat}
\]

\(^{55}\) Holinshed (1587) Piv, column 1, lines 3–4.

\(^{56}\) ‘His wife, desirous of the royal name and completely incapable of delay, also goaded him on, as it is with the race of women when, inclined to desire something, they have started to pursue it with too much desire. And thus she often stirs her husband with the harshest of words, calling him idle and cowardly’. Boece (1527) CCLVIII\(^{\text{r.}}\).

\(^{57}\) Livy (1.47.1–7).
scho micht be ane quene, calland him oft tymes febyl cowart & nocht desyrus of honouris, sen he durst not assailʒe þe thing with manheid and curage.58

Here ‘febyl cowart’ picks up Boece’s ‘ignauum ac timidum’. The phrase ‘nocht desyrus of honouris’, however, is a new addition which recalls Livy’s ‘facile persuadet […] cupido honorum’, originally used of Tanaquil’s persuading Lucumo to relocate to Rome.59 So too Bellenden adds the idea of Makbeth lacking ‘manheid’. Bellenden had similarly juxtaposed ‘manheid and curage’ in his translation of Tullia’s chastising of Tarquinius in the first book: ‘gif þy Ingyne is ereckit in more curage, þan belt þe with manhede to cum esely to þi purpoiß’.60 Once again, Bellenden’s translation of Boece appears to have been informed by his reading and reworking of Livy.

Holinshed condenses this description, explaining that ‘speciallie his wife lay sore upon him to attempt the thing, as she that was verie ambitious, burning in vnquenchable desire to beare the name of a queene’.61 George Buchanan’s (1506–1582) account is similarly terse, and the influence Lady Macbeth exerts on her husband is summarised in one line.62 As we will see, it was Livy’s Tanaquil, Tullia, and ultimately Lady Macbeth, who employed this particular line of argument to the greatest effect.

58 Bellenden (c.1538) Liiiρ
59 Livy (1.34.7); Bellenden (1901–3) 80.
60 ibid. 102.
61 Holinshed, Piι, column 1, lines 54–7.
62 ‘Animus etiam per se ferox prope quotidians conuitijxs vxoris (que omnium consiliorum ei erat conscia) stimulabatur’ (‘His spirit, bold in its own right, was stirred through the almost daily importunities of his wife, who was privy to all his plans’). George Buchanan, Rerum Scotorum Historia (Edinburgh: Alexander Arbuthnot, 1582) 73<sup>r</sup>
2. William Painter’s *Two Roman Queenes*

It has long been acknowledged that Shakespeare’s Lady Macbeth bears a striking resemblance to Livy’s Tullia, the ambitious wife of Tarquinius Superbus who bullies her husband into murdering the king of Rome and seizing his throne. To this we should add that there are in fact two female king-makers in the first book of Livy’s history. As well as the ruthless Tullia, there is also her relatively benevolent yet equally cunning predecessor, Tanaquil, who helps secure the throne for her husband, Lucumo, and subsequently for her son-in-law, Servius. William Painter gathered these two women neatly together in *Two Roman Queenes*, the sixth novel of *The Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure* (1567), in which he drew particular attention to their ‘ambition’ and ‘crueltie’. Although the historical accounts of Macbeth’s reign in Boece, Holinshed, and Buchanan offered the model of a wife provoking her husband to regicide (accounts which were themselves ultimately drawing on Livy), Livy’s history sees women not only encouraging their would-be kings but doing so with appeals to their masculinity. This section suggests that by singling this episode out and laying a heavy emphasis on the roles of these ambitious women within it, and by framing the narrative in a such a way as to draw attention to the twin themes of ambition and cruelty, Painter alerted Shakespeare to the dramatically satisfying prospect of a queen who actively engages in the crimes she would have her husband commit.

Painter is yet to be discussed in relation to *Macbeth*. Typically when Livy is mentioned as a potential source for Shakespeare, it is Philemon Holland’s (1552–1637) full-scale translation of 1600 that is cited.63 The critical attention surrounding Painter in

---

63 In his entry for Livy, Stuart Gillespie refers to the translations of Anthony Cope and Philemon Holland. Gillespie cites Painter only in relation to Shakespeare’s *Lucrece*. Stuart Gillespie,
relation to Shakespeare has most often centered around his Italianate narratives. For example, he most probably consulted Painter’s novel on Giletta of Narbon for *All’s Well* (1606–7). However, as explored in the previous chapter, Painter was also concerned with classical history, deploying material from the first three books of Livy’s history to form five novels at the beginning of the original *Palace*. When Shakespeare has an eye to Livy – as, for example, in *Coriolanus*, *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus* – it is to these first three books of Livy that he turns. Painter revisited the first book of Livy’s history for *The Second Tome* with his *Two Roman Queenes*, providing something of a prequel to his *Rape of Lucrece*.

For Baldwin, it was ‘fairly certain’ that Shakespeare became acquainted with Livy while a schoolboy. Baldwin based this on a comparative study of curricula offered at multiple grammar schools in England, all of which prescribed the study of the *AUC*. It is likely that Shakespeare returned to Livy through his own private reading. In 1589, Edmond Bollifant produced the first edition of Livy to be printed in England, *Titi Livij Patauini Romanae Historiae Principis, Libri Omnes*, based on an edition published by Sigmund Feyerabend (c.1528–1590) in the previous year. But Livy had long since been printed across Europe in smaller volumes, often focusing on a specific decade or even a particular book. Indeed, the first three books with which Painter and Shakespeare were particularly interested had been singled out for publication as independent volumes.


64. Kenneth Muir refers to Painter almost exclusively in relation to the Italian narratives, with the exception of *Timon*. Kenneth Muir, *The Sources of Shakespeare’s Plays* (London: Methuen and Co., 1977) 38; 105; 170; 218.


68. These schools included Westminster, Ruthin, Harrow, Thame, Shrewsbury, Durham, Blackburn, and Sandwich. Baldwin, 2.573.
as early as 1517.⁶⁹ In terms of English language translation, Painter’s *Palace* was more readily accessible than Holland’s immense, folio edition on a purely financial level. Both volumes of the *Palace* were valued together at 2s6d in 1567, the first volume at 12d in 1570, and *The Second Tome* at 18d in 1613.⁷⁰ It is true that Shakespeare had access to at least one of the larger, folio translations (North’s Plutarch, valued at 9s in 1599 and 10s in 1602), but Painter’s *Palace* was nevertheless the cheaper route to reading Livy in English.⁷¹

In *The Second Tome*, Painter offered a very specific interpretation of the Tarquinian dynasty, one which put a great emphasis on women and the corruptive potential of ambition. Unlike the figures of Virginia and Lucrece, who already enjoyed some renown in English literature prior to their appearance in Painter, Tanaquil and Tullia had prompted next no literary interest.⁷² Two years after the *Second Tome*’s first appearance in print, Tullia was cited as ‘that infamous tirannesse’ in Edward Fenton’s (*d*.1603) *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature* (1569), a translation of Pierre Boaistuau’s (1517–66) *Histoires Prodigieuses* (1560).⁷³ Here in a chapter entitled ‘A Wonderful Historie of Crueltie’, we are told that Tullia ‘surpassed all the rest in crueltie, for she caused hir father to be killed, to the end that she might inherite his realme’.⁷⁴ She was

---

⁶⁹ In 1517, Jakob Thanner printed the first book of the first decade, which, judging by the title, was probably intended for use in the schools: ‘tenerae aique Inopi Juentuti peculiariter dicatus’ (‘dedicated especially to the tender and helpless youth’) (Leipzig). Later in 1553, Balthazar Arnoulet printed *Le Premier et Second Liure de la Premiere Decade*, trans. Jacques Gohory (Lyon). In the same year, Juan May and Bartolomé de Robles printed the first three books as three distinct volumes. In 1579, Christophe Plantin printed the first book alone, while in the same year Nicolas Chesneau focused on the first pentad, producing *Les Cinq Premiers Liures de l’Histoire Romaine* (Paris), another edition of which appeared in 1580.

⁷⁰ These figures are based on information compiled by Private Libraries in Renaissance England (Folger Shakespeare Library), accessed online: [http://plre.folger.edu/](http://plre.folger.edu/). PLRE numbers Ad4.96; 85.24; 159.21.

⁷¹ ibid. PLRE numbers 154.30; 155.3.


⁷⁴ ibid. 128c.
similarly remembered for her ‘unnaturall and unreuerent crueltie’ in Thomas Fortescue’s
title (b. in or before 1545, d.1602) *The Foreste or Collection of Histories* (1571), an English
version of Pedro Mexía’s *Silva de Varia Lecion* (1540). Tullia would also appear as a
primary character in Thomas Heywood’s *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608), which opens with
Tullia confiding her royal aspirations in her husband:

> To be a Queene I long, long and am sicke
> With ardence, my hot appetite’s afire,
> Till my swolne feroor be deliuered
> Of that great Title Queene.

Painter was the first, however, to fully explore Tullia’s literary potential for vernacular
literature.

The importance of establishing Painter’s translation as a potential source for
*Macbeth* lies not only in illuminating the texts which were available to Shakespeare, but
also in tracing Tudor literature’s recurring interest with women who step beyond what
were understood to be their natural bounds. Painter opened up these figures to a wider
audience and encouraged his imitators to experiment with similarly impressive or
monstrous women, women who would ultimately reappear in plays like *Macbeth, King
Lear,* and *Coriolanus.*

The section of Livy’s first book (1.34–54) which Painter reworks as the *Two
Roman Queenes* sees Lucumo’s advancement in a strange city, his fortification of Rome,
and his foundation of the Great Games (*Ludi Magni*). Meanwhile Servius’s rise to power
is a rags-to-riches tale of a boy from humble beginnings who manages to become king
of Rome. Both men clearly have their narrative appeal, but Painter deliberately chose to
focus on Livy’s women. Tanaquil, dissatisfied with her husband’s social position in

---

75 Fortescue produced this version via Claude Gruget’s translation of Mexía, *Les Diverses Lecons* (1552).
*Tarquinii*, urges him to relocate to Rome. There Lucumo becomes an advisor to the current king, Ancus, and subsequently king himself. Following Lucumo’s murder, Tanaquil encourages her stepson, Servius Tullius, to seize the throne. Tullia, the youngest daughter of Servius, is spurred on by Tanaquil’s example and persuades her husband to murder her father and take the throne for himself.

The context in which Painter’s *Two Roman Queenes* appears in the *Second Tome* lends particular emphasis to women taking an active role in politics. As with the first volume of the *Palace*, Painter again reveals an interest in noteworthy women, and, as Helen Hackett observes, begins to address female readers directly in the moralising conclusions appended to many of the novels. To the recurring themes of chastity and lust, however, Painter now introduces the idea of female government. The first novel of the *Second Tome* discusses the Amazons, an ancient race of female warriors who forswore the company of men with the exception of procreation. As the preface explains, ‘In the Nouell of the AMAZONES, is displaied a strange and miraculous porte (to our present skill) of womens gouernment, what states they subdued, what increase of kinddome, what combats and conflicts they durst attempt contrarie to the nature of that sexe.’ The attention paid here to gender-specific behaviour and its subversion is worth noting – the idea of what a woman, or indeed a man, ‘durst attempt contrarie to the nature’ of his or her sex would become a preoccupation of Shakespeare’s, as in Macbeth’s ‘I dare do all that may become a man; / Who dares do more is none’ (1.7.46–7). It is no coincidence that Painter’s interest in ‘womens gouernment’ emerged in the first decade of Elizabeth’s reign. There is more than a touch of the ‘advice to princes’ topos at work in Painter’s description of the fifteenth novel: ‘Queene ZENOBIA, what

---

78 Painter (1567) ***i*"
the noble Gentle women, (whom the fates ordaine to rule) ought to do, how farre their
maganimitie ought to stretch, and in what boundes to conteine their soueraintie’.79
Painter reinforces this impression in the novel’s introduction, where we read that
‘although she was a gentle queene, yet a christian princesse so worthie of imitation, as
she was for hir virtues & heroical facts of immortal praise’.80 And then there was the
question of a suitable marriage for a female monarch. The stories of Euphimia and the
Duchess of Malfi show, as Painter explains, ‘what match of mariage Ladies of renowne,
and Dames of Princely houses ought to choose’.81 In 1567, a union between Elizabeth
and the Catholic Archduke Charles of Austria was still very much a possibility.82
Painter’s Second Tome revealed then a special interest in women in positions of political
influence.

The second instalment of the Palace not only displays women behaving in
remarkable ways, but also has them speak for themselves. In novel 28, A Lady of Boeme,
the chaste heroine explains to her husband:

In deede I confesse my self to be a woman, and you men do say that womens
hearts be faint & feeble: but to be plaine with you, the contrary is in me, my heart
is so stout and ambitious, as paraduenture not meete and consonant to power and
abilitie, although we women will finde no lacke if our hearts haue pith and
strength enough to beare it out.83

Here the sentiment, vocabulary, appeal to the heart, and carefully balanced contrast all
suggest a striking (though hitherto unexplored) resonance with Elizabeth’s speech at
Tilbury: ‘I know I haue ye body butt of a weake and feble woman, butt I have ye harte

---

79 ibid. ***i.
80 ibid. Aaiii
81 Painter (1567) Aaiii For a reading of Painter’s Duchess of Malfi ‘as a contribution the debate on
the question of female rule inaugurated at the end of Mary’s reign’, see Hadfield, 155–159.
93.
83 Painter (1567) EEEeiii
and stomack of a kinge [...]’. Later in the same volume, Painter’s Duchess of Malfi insists that ‘I bear a Princely heart’. Without suggesting that Leonell Sharpe (bap.1560, d.1631) had a copy of Painter’s Second Tome open before him when he recalled Elizabeth’s words over thirty years after the event, Painter clearly opened up an idiom for talking about women in extraordinary positions performing extraordinary actions. This idiom was subsequently appropriated by prose fiction, plays, and even, according to Sharpe at least, a speech by Elizabeth I.

It was among these noteworthy women that Painter located Tanaquil and Tullia, serving as examples of female conduct via negativa: ‘The two Romane Queenes do point (as it were) with their fingers, the natures of Ambition and Crueltie, and the greedy lust (hidden in that feble sexe) of soueraintie’. The ‘Ambition and Crueltie’ identified here are central to Painter’s reworking of the original. The Latin ambitio in its root sense suggests ‘a going around’, and was used of canvassing or soliciting votes. It could also be used in a secondary sense of ‘corrupt practices in seeking honours’, and by further extension ‘desire for advancement’. In early modern English, however, ‘ambition’ was used in an almost exclusively negative sense, though Francis Bacon (1561–1626) acknowledged its practical application. Painter brings out the themes of ‘Ambition’ and ‘Crueltie’ again in ‘A Summarie of the Nouels ensuing’. Here we are introduced to ‘The maruelous courage & ambition of a gentlewoman called Tanaquil’ and ‘hir
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84 BL MS Harley 6798, f.87, accessed online: http://www.bl.uk/learning/timeline/item102878.html
85 Painter (1567) Uviii
86 ibid. Aaii
87 OLD, s.v. ‘ambitio’, 1a.
88 ibid. S.v. ‘ambitio’, 1d; 4.
89 Edward Hall’s Chronicle, for example, speaks of ‘ambicion and auarice’ and ‘blynde and insaciable ambicion’, while Thomas Becon’s The Reliques of Rome (1563) refers to Pope Boniface III’s ‘ambition and Lucifer like pride’. Francis Bacon was more generous, describing ambition as ‘an humor that maketh men actiue, earnest, full of alacrity and stirring’. Hall, EEi; FFii; Thomas Becon, The Reliques of Rome (London: John Day, 1563); Ci’ Francis Bacon, The Essaies (London: John Beale, 1612) 131.
persuasions and pollicie to hir husband, for his aduancement to the kingdome’.

Tanaquil and her royal aspirations are then matched with ‘the ambition of one of the two daughters of Seruius Tullius, the sixt Romane King, and hir crueltie towards hir owne naturall father’.

In his closing remarks to the Two Roman Queenes, Painter draws attention to his previous treatment of the Tarquins in the first Palace. Once again, ‘ambition’ is brought to the fore:

This Tarquinius was the father of hym, that rauished the noble Ladie Lucretia: the lamentable historie wherof, is recited in my former Tome, by the ende of whiche stocke, remembred in that historie, and beginning is described in this Nouell, may be gathered, what fruits Ambition and lothsome lust bring forth.

Though ‘lothsome lust’ had indeed been a primary theme of Painter’s Lucrece, the focus on ‘Ambition’ is a new addition to the Second Tome. In his final review of this early Roman dynasty, Painter describes women as acquiring and edifying the kingdom, and men as losing it. Tarquinius Priscus, as Painter tells it, ‘by the ambicious will of his wife aspired and atchieued the Kingdome, whiche was by the sundrie deuice of Tullia mainteined, and by the libidinous desire of Sextus Tarquinius, the sonne of Superbus the xvj. Romane King ended, and the whole race expelled & euerlastingly banished out of that Citie’.

When it comes to Macbeth, ‘ambition’ is explicitly cited in three instances, two of which carry clearly pejorative undertones. Macbeth refers to his ‘Vaulting ambition, which o’erleaps itself / And falls on th’other’ (1.7.27-8), while Ross speaks of ‘Thriftless ambition, that will raven up / Thine own life’s means’ (2.4.28–9). Its first

---

90 Painter (1567) *iv*.
91 ibid. *iv*.
92 ibid. *iv*.
93 ibid. *iv*.
appearance, however, is in the mouth of Lady Macbeth, who inverts the early modern standard by presenting ambition as an essentially desirable trait: ‘Thou wouldst be great, / Art not without ambition, but without / the illness should attend it’ (1.5.17–19).

Painter’s continual marrying of ‘Ambition and Crueltie’ is significant to Shakespeare’s characterisation of Lady Macbeth – it is precisely in the pursuit of greatness that she prays to be filled with ‘direst cruelty’ (1.5.42). In terms of personal ambition, although Lady Macbeth is engaged with her husband in a partnership which Julian Symons described as a ‘folie à deux’, she is also concerned with her own, personal objectives.95 She is promised ‘greatness’ of her own (1.5.12), refers to ‘my fell purpose’ (1.5.45) and ‘my dispatch’ (1.5.67), and speaks of herself as acting independently of her husband (1.5.72). As we will see, Painter’s version of Livy laid a strong emphasis on women’s ‘ambition’ and its concomitant ‘illness’.

From the outset of the Two Roman Queenes, it is women who accelerate and maintain the narrative action. Tanaquil, Etruscan by birth, encourages her husband Lucumo to relocate to Rome, ‘where she thought […] that hir husband being stout and valiant, should attaine some place of resiance.’96 ‘Thus’, Painter notes, ‘ambition and desire of honour easily doeth persuade any devise’, translating Livy’s ‘facile persuadet ut cupido honorum’.97 Painter expands Livy’s ‘cupido’ with a doublet, offering the literal translation ‘desire’ but also including what he has established as one of the primary themes of this novel, ‘ambition’. The laws of primogeniture were not at work in early Rome, a fact upon which Tanaquil eagerly seizes; any man, even a stranger, could hope to be elected as king, were he of sufficient merit.98 Nevertheless, Lucumo ensures

96 Painter (1567) Kiv\textsuperscript{v}.
97 ibid. Kiv\textsuperscript{v}; Livy (1.34.7).
98 Livy (1.34.6).
that the two sons of the current king are absent from Rome before attempting to curry
favour with the people: ‘sub tempus uenatum pueros ablegauit. Isque primus et petisse
ambitiose regnum et orationem dicitur habuisse ad conciliandos plebis animos
compositam’. Here the adverb ‘ambitiose’ need only suggest ‘by canvassing’; in fact, it
is this very moment in Livy that the OLD cites for this sense of ‘ambitiose’. Painter,
however, appears less comfortable with the prospect of a stranger sidestepping two
potential heirs to the throne: ‘When the daye was come he sente the yonge children
abroade a hunting, and then ambitiose presumed to demaunde the kingdome, being
the first that euer attempted the like’. Painter complements the negative undertones of
the English ‘ambitiose’ with ‘presumed’ and ‘demaunde’ – what Lucumo undertakes
in Painter’s version smacks of usurpation. Painter thereby invests his narrative with a
colouring which is not immediately apparent in the original. Carrying this emphasis on
ambition into his account of Seruius’s reign, Painter describes how ‘the hatred conceiued
in desire of Ambitious gouernement, made all things vnstable and vnfaithfull amongs
domestical frends,’ where the phrase ‘Ambitious gouernement’ expands on Livy’s
simple ‘regnii’. In his conclusion to the Two Roman Queenes (which is entirely
Painter’s addition and has no equivalent in Livy) he remarks:

So mete an example for those, that breath & long after the rights, titles, &
kingsdomes of other, as may bee read in any Author. For although the Spring
appeare very fresh and lustie, of some degenerate grifft planted vpon some
auncient stock, yet the fruite moste commonly in taste eateth somewhat sower,
and the rellishe in mouthe not altogether so pleasaunt, as that which bothe in
saile and stocke is duely planted.

---

99 ‘When the time came he sent the boys away to hunt. He is said to have been the first to seek the
kingship by canvassing and by having delivered a speech written to win over the hearts of the plebs’. Livy (1.35.2).
100 Cf. OLD, s.v. ‘ambitiose’, 1b.
101 Painter (1567) Li
102 ibid. Liv‘; Livy (1.42.2).
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Painter thus reshapes Livy’s account as a moralising exposition on the dangers of usurpation.

Tanaquil goes beyond simply encouraging her husband, and at one point successfully averts what might otherwise have unfolded as a crisis for the state. Following Lucumo’s murder at the hands of two assassins hired by Ancus’s disinherited sons, Tanaquil immediately acts to secure the commonwealth’s stability. Lest news of the king’s death travel abroad, she shuts the palace gates and summons her stepson, Servius:

‘Tuum est,’ inquit, ‘Serui, si uir es, regnum, non eorum qui alienis manibus pessimum facinus fecere. Erige te deosque duces sequere qui clarum hoc fore caput divino quondam circumfuso igni portenderunt. Nunc te illa caelestis excitet flamma; nunc expergiscere uere. Et nos peregrini regnauimus; qui sis, non unde natus sis reputa. Si tua re subita consilia torpent, at tu mea consilia sequere.’

For which Painter gives:

If thou be a man of thy hands (O Servius) the kingdom is thine and not theirs, which thus cruelly by the hands of other haue committed this abominable facte. Wherefore put forth thy selfe, and the Gods be thy guide: for they did portende this noble head to the Gouernour of this citie, at such a time as they circumfused the same with fire descendyng from aboue. Let that heauenly flame excite thy courage. Be thoroughly awaked. We being straungers sometyme haue raigned. Thinke and consider what thou art, & not from whence thou camest. If the strangenesse of the case doe affray thee, my counsel from time to time shall relieue thee.

For Livy’s ‘si uir es’, Painter gives the idiomatic ‘If thou be a man of thy hands’. The phrase was used to suggest a man of bravery or strength, and thus Arthur Golding (1535/6–1606) refers to ‘Maurice a goodly yong gentleman and a tall man of his handes’

104 ‘The kingdom is yours, Servius’, she said, ‘if you are a man, not theirs who have committed the worst of crimes through other men’s hands. Rouse yourself and follow the gods as your guides who revealed that your head, once enveloped in divine fire, would be renowned. Now let that heavenly fire rouse you; now awake indeed. We, foreign ourselves, have reigned; think on who you are, not where you were born. If your own stratagems grow numb in this crisis, follow mine’. Livy (1.41.3).
105 Painter (1567) Liii’
in his translation of Leonardo Bruni’s (1369–1444) *De Bello Gotthorum* (1503).\(^{106}\) It is this emphasis on being a man which echoes so strongly in *Macbeth*. Tanaquil’s staccato ‘si uir es’ is heard in Lady Macbeth’s ‘Are you a man?’ (3.4.57). The difference in Shakespeare is that now her husband has an opportunity to reply: ‘Ay, and a bold one, that dare look on that / Which might appal the devil’ (3.4.58–9). Here Shakespeare combines a Livian emphasis on manhood with a very Senecan sentiment, namely daring the yet undared.\(^{107}\) At the opening of *Thyestes*, for instance, the ghost of Tantalus predicts that his progeny ‘inausa audeat’, or, as it appears in Jasper Heywood’s (1535–1598) translation of 1560, ‘shall dare / vnuentred ylls to doe’. This combination of Livian manhood and Senecan audacity surfaces again in Macbeth’s ‘What man dare, I dare’ (3.4.98). Tanaquil’s juxtaposition of the idea that manhood can be proved by action and her emphasis on assuming a new and implicitly improved identity – ‘Thinke and consider what thou art, & not from whence thou camest’ – are recalled in Lady Macbeth’s:

\[
\text{When you durst do it, then you were a man;} \\
\text{And to be more than what you were, you would} \\
\text{Be so much more the man} \\
\text{(1.7.49–51)}
\]

Once again, Shakespeare combines Livy’s emphasis on being a man with Seneca’s preoccupation with daring.\(^{108}\) Immediately following this appeal to manhood, Lady Macbeth delivers her inversion of motherly care. Of her nursing infant, she remarks,

\[
\text{I would, while it was smiling in my face,} \\
\text{Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums} \\
\text{And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn}
\]


\(^{108}\) Cf. Macbeth’s ‘Look on’t again, I dare not’, which is again juxtaposed with a rebuke from Lady Macbeth, ‘Infirm of purpose!’ (2.2.50).
As you have done to this.

(1.7.56–59)

This image has its origins not in Painter, but another source which has hitherto gone unremarked in relation to *Macbeth*. Sir Geoffrey Fenton revealed a similar interest in women behaving contrary to the expectations of their sex. In *A Yong Lady in Mylan*, Pandora, ‘a seconde *MEDEA*’, resolves to abort her unborn child having been abandoned by its father.\(^{109}\) She, like Lady Macbeth, is concerned with the fulfilling of a pledge, however terrible: ‘arme your selues, (Oh my handes) with corage, and shrinke not to bee the mynisters of the punishment which my tongue hath pronounced’.\(^{110}\)

Having forcefully induced labour with the help of her maid, she literally enacts the deed that Lady Macbeth only imagines:

[Pandora] not worthy any longer to beare the name of a woman, procedinge to thende of her enterprise, takes vp her sonne with her bloodye and murderinge hands, whom without all compassian, and contrary to the order of a christian, she beates with all her force againste the walles, painting the postes and pauements in the chamber with the bloddde and braynes of the innocent creature newe borne.\(^{111}\)

In Lady Macbeth’s upbraiding of her husband, then, Shakespeare gathers Livy’s emphasis on manliness, Seneca’s preoccupation with daring, and Fenton’s attention (via Belleforest’s Bandello) to grim detail.\(^{112}\)

In the extract from Painter above, Tanaquil includes herself as a partner in Lucumo’s reign with ‘regnauimus’, for which Painter gives ‘We […] sometime haue raigned’. Though Livy’s Tanaquil urges Servius to follow her advice in this specific

\(^{109}\) Fenton (1567) Hvvi

\(^{110}\) ibid. Kv^\textsuperscript{v}–vi.

\(^{111}\) ibid. Kv^\textsuperscript{v}.

\(^{112}\) There is also a biblical resonance in the dashing of a child. Compare the Geneva Bible’s Psalm 137: ‘O daughter of Babél […] Blessed (shal he be) that taketh and dasheth thy children against the stones’. William Whittingham, Anthony Gilby and Thomas Sampson, *The Bible and Holy Scriptures* (Geneva: s.n. 1562 [1561]) ttv
moment of crisis – ‘at tu mea consilia sequere’ – Painter suggests that Tanaquil will be serving in an advisory role throughout his reign: ‘my counsel from time to time shall relieue thee’. Painter’s Tanaquil is to remain a fixture on Rome’s political scene. Following this exhortation, Tanaquil addresses the people, assures them of the king’s imminent recovery (though he is lying dead), calms the crowd and thereby deftly facilitates the succession of Servius. As Livy has Tarquin the Proud remark, Servius reigns ‘muliebri dono’ (‘through a woman’s gift’). Painter’s Tanaquil might therefore be described as a ‘dearest partner of greatness’ (1.5.10) more readily than the queens of Bœce, Holinshed, and Buchanan.

Tanaquil’s readiness to offer counsel resurfaces in Shakespeare’s play. Lady Macbeth is, in the first two acts of the play at least, privy to her husband’s dealings (she is the only character besides Banquo to have knowledge of Macbeth’s encounter with the witches). She offers advice as readily as Tanaquil, whether to suggest the best means of concealing one’s intent (1.5.61–64), planning the minutiae of Duncan’s murder (1.7.61-72), or rallying her distracted husband with a string of imperatives. Even after she has been excluded from Macbeth’s plans to dispatch Banquo – ‘Be innocent of the knowledge, dearest chuck, / Till thou applaud the deed’ (3.2.46–7) – Macbeth must still rely on his wife to improvise during a potentially disastrous episode. While her husband addresses the ghost of Banquo, Lady Macbeth reassures her guests, ‘Sit, worthy friends. My lord is often thus, / And hath been from his youth’ (3.4.52–3; cf. 3.4.95–7), and swiftly intercedes to cut Ross’s interrogation short (3.4.116). It is Lady Macbeth, and

113 Livy (1.41.4–5); Painter (1567) Lii–iv
114 Livy (1.47.10).
115 Macbeth writes to his wife following this encounter. Macbeth (1.5.1–13).
116 Lady Macbeth rallies her husband in the scene immediately following Duncan’s murder: ‘Consider it not so deeply’ (2.2.28); ‘Go get some water / And wash this filthy witness from your hand’; (2.2.44–5); ‘Go, carry them, and smear / The sleepy grooms with blood’ (2.2.47–8); ‘Give me the daggers’ (2.2.51); ‘Retire we to our chamber’ (2.2.64); ‘Get on your nightgown […] Be not lost / So poorly in your thoughts’. (2.2.69–70).
not her husband, who dismisses the thanes (3.4.117–19). The authority Lady Macbeth assumes here in a moment of intense stress may well have been suggested by that of Livy’s Tanaquil in the extract above.

Livy mirrors Tanaquil with Tullia, the youngest daughter of Servius. Servius, in an attempt to solidify his reign, gives his two daughters in marriage to the sons of Lucumo, Lucius (later Superbus) and Arruntus.\(^\text{117}\) Tullia finds herself dissatisfied with her husband, who was, Livy explains, ‘mitis ingenii iuuenem’, or as Painter puts it, ‘of a quiete & gentle disposition’.\(^\text{118}\) Her sister’s husband, however, manages to attract her attention: ‘Angebatur ferox Tullia nihil materiae in uiro neque ad cupiditatem neque ad audaciam esse; tota in alterum auersa Tarquinium eum mirari, eum uirum dicere ac regio sanguine ortum’.\(^\text{119}\) As Painter translates it,

The yonger daughter being the wife of Aruns, the sharper shrew, and fiercer of nature, seeing that hir husband was nothing giuen or pliant to match with hir vngracious deuice or ambicious stomack, attempted hir brother, whose condicion was correspondent to hirs, and sayd vnto him, that he was a man in deede, and one worthie to be accompted to be borne and procede of the bloud royall.\(^\text{120}\)

Painter’s Tullia requires a husband not only invested with his own sense of ambition (‘giuen’) but who can also be swayed by her desires (‘pliant’). In Livy, Tullia merely remarks that Lucius Tarquin is truly a man (‘eum uirum dicere’); in Painter, she is bold enough to say it to his face (‘and sayd vnto him, that he was a man in deede’). Painter casts his Tullia in the image of the forthright Thalestris, the Amazon queen of his first novel, who dared to woo Alexander the Great, if not to marriage, as Tullia does with

\(^{117}\) Livy (1.42.1).
\(^{118}\) Livy (1.46.5); Painter, Mi’.
\(^{119}\) ‘Savage Tullia was distressed that there was no material in her husband for either lust or daring. She was completely diverted to the other Tarquin, was in awe of him, said he was a man and sprung of royal blood’. ibid. (1.46.5).
\(^{120}\) Painter (1567) Mi’
Tarquin, then at least to ‘carnal copulation’. To Livy’s description of Tullia, Painter adds her ‘vngracious deuice’ and ‘ambicious stomack’. ‘Device’ in its primary senses suggests ‘planning’ but also ‘inclination’ or ‘desire’, thereby picking up Livy’s ‘cupiditatem’. It could also be used in a negative sense to imply ‘scheming’ or ‘machinations’, as for example, when John Bradford refers to ‘the deuelishe deuice of certayne heretikes’. This is another key element which the Lady Macbeths of Scottish historiography lack: a willingness and faculty to participate in the crimes they would have their husbands commit. As Livy says of Tullia, ‘initium turbandi omnia a femina ortum est’, for which Painter gives ‘al things began to be disquieted through the attempt of that vngracious woman.’ This willingness to engage in the planning and enacting of crime surfaces again in the first murders the couple undertake. In Livy, it is left implicit that Tullia and Lucius orchestrate the deaths of their respective spouses; in Painter, this is made explicit: ‘To be shorte, they two deuisd the meanes, that Arruns his broth, and the elder Tullia hir syster were slaine’. Similarly, Livy later explains that the mode of Servius’s murder was planned by Tullia herself: ‘Creditur, quia non abhorret a cetero scelere, admonitu Tulliae id factum.’ This forward planning can be heard in Lady Macbeth’s enigmatic words to her husband before Duncan’s ‘fatal entrance’ to the castle at Inverness:

He that’s coming
Must be provided for, and you shall put
This night’s great business into my dispatch
Which shall to all our nights and days to come
Give solely sovereign sway and masterdom.

(1.5.65-69)
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126 ‘It is believed that, since she didn’t shrink from other crimes, this was done at Tullia’s suggestion’. Livy (1.48.5).
Lady Macbeth plays an active role in planning and carrying out the desiderata of Duncan’s murder: ‘I have drugged their possets’, she explains, and ‘laid their daggers ready; / He could not miss ’em’ (2.2.6; 11–12). She ultimately reveals, however, a reluctance to engage with the deed she has so enthusiastically encouraged: ‘Had he not resembled / My father as he slept, I had done’t’ (2.2.12–3). Unlike Tullia, who readily tramples her father’s corpse beneath her carriage, it is Duncan’s resemblance to Lady Macbeth’s father which, at the last moment, prevents her from fully rehearsing the cruelty of her classical predecessor.127

Tullia cajoles her newly acquired husband into action: ‘iam enim ab scelere ad aliud spectare mulier scelus. Nec nocte nec interdiiu uirum conquiescere pati, ne gratuita praeterita parricidia essent’.128 Much like Tanaquil, Tullia appeals to Tarquin’s being a man:

Si tu is cui nuptam esse me arbitror, et uirum et regem apello; sin minus, eo nunc peius mutata res est quod istic cum ignauia est scelus. Quin accingeris? […] di te penates patriique et patris imago et domus regia et in domo regale sohium et nomen Tarquinium creat uocatque regem. Aut si ad haec parum est animi, quid frustraris ciuitatem? Quid te ut regium iuuenem conspici sinis? Facesse hinc Tarquinios aut Corinthum; deuoluere retro ad stirpem, fratri similior quam patri.’

His aliisque increpando iuuenem instigat, nec conquiescere ipsa potest.129

Painter collapses these two distinct passages from Livy into the following:

The wicked woman ceased not dayly to animate and prouoke hir husband from one parricide to an other. And amongs all hir wicked talke and cruel instigations,

---

127 Cf. Livy (1.48.7).
128 ‘Now the woman looked from one crime to another. Neither night nor day did she allow her husband to rest, lest the past parricides were for naught’. Livy (1.47.1–2).
129 ‘If you are he to whom I think I am married, I call you both husband and king; if not, my condition has been changed for the worse because your crime is mingled with cowardice. Why aren’t you preparing yourself? Your father’s household gods and your father’s image and the royal palace and the royal throne in the palace and the name of Tarquin make and declare you king. But if you don’t have spirit enough for this, why do you play the state false? Why do you allow yourself to be seen as a royal youth? Go away to Tarquinii or Corinth; sink back to your stock, more like your brother than your father.’ With these and other words she stirs up the young man with her chiding, nor is she herself able to rest’. Livy (1.47.3–6).
she vsed these words: ‘If thou be that man unto whom I thinke I am married, then I wil cal thee both husband and King: But if thou be not he, then the alteration is chaunged to the worse, and crueltie is matched for cowardise. But why doest thou not put thy selfe in a readinesse? [...] The familiar Gods, and the Gods of thy country, the nobilitie of thy father, and thy royal bloud, thy stately seate within thine own house, and thy name Tarquinius, doe create and make thee Kyng. But if in all these occasions thou dost wante stomacke, why dost thou make the whole Citie conceyue a false opinion of thee? Why dost thou not shewe thy selfe to be the sonne of a King? Auoide hence I say, and goe to the Tarquinians, or to Corinth, retire again to thy first linage: thou dost rather resemble thy brothers effeminate heart, than the valiant stomacke of thy father.’

As we saw above, Boece, Holinshed, and Buchanan drew their descriptions of Macbeth’s wife from this moment in Livy. Here Painter translates the Latin *scelus*, which Elyot’s *Dictionary* defined as ‘a myscheuous dede’, first with the more specific ‘parricide’, then with ‘crueltie’, alluding to one of the primary themes introduced in the novel’s argument. Painter expands Livy’s phrase ‘fratri similior quam patri’ with ‘thou dost rather resemble thy brothers effeminate heart, than the valiant stomacke of thy father’, putting masculinity, and an implicit lack thereof, into greater focus. The attention Tullia pays to ignauia (‘cowardise’) surfaces in Lady Macbeth’s upbraiding of her husband:

Art thou afeard
To be the same in thine own act and valour
As thou art in desire? Wouldst thou have that
Which thou esteemest the ornament of life,
And live a coward in thine own esteem,
Letting ‘I dare not’ wait upon ‘I would’,
Like the poor cat i’t'h’adage?

(1.7.39–45)

To this we might add Lady Macbeth’s ‘My hands are of your colour, but I shame / To wear a heart so white’ (2.2.62-3), and ‘Fie, my lord, / fie, a soldier, and afeard?’ (5.1.34–

---

130 Painter (1567) mi-v.
5), which again centre around charges of cowardice. Painter’s ‘readinesse’, located here in a speech underlining the importance of Tarquin’s masculinity in opposition to his ‘brothers effeminate heart’, is also echoed in Macbeth’s ‘manly readiness’ (2.3.132).

Painter’s Two Roman Queenes drew special attention to the roles of Tanaquil and Tullia in establishing the Tarquinian dynasty at Rome. Tanaquil successfully placed not one but two kings on the Roman throne, and managed to settle the state in a moment of intense crisis. Tullia’s interventions, however, brought a tyrant to the throne, setting in motion a series of abuses which would ultimately lead to her own exile. Hers is the ‘Vaulting ambition, which o’erleaps itself / And falls on th’other’ (1.7.27-8). Painter’s Palace, a popular work in its own right, may well have alerted Shakespeare to Tanaquil and Tullia, both of whom can be identified not only in the harangues Lady Macbeth offers her husband, but in the proactive role she takes in the first half of Shakespeare’s play.

3. Macbeth and historical self-consciousness

As with Shakespeare’s plays more generally, there is a metatheatric vein running through Macbeth. In the case of Macbeth, however, this goes hand in hand with an historical self-consciousness. This is not the obsessive self-consciousness which underpinned Titus Andronicus, but it nonetheless asks that we think of the play in terms of its literary and historical precedents. Following the appearance of Banquo’s ghost (a

---

132 Macbeth, after he has been presented with his new title, remarks ‘Two truths are told, / As happy prologues to the swelling act / Of the imperial theme’ (1.3.126-8). Lady Macbeth refers to ‘the fatal entrance of Duncan’ (1.5.38), alluding both to his arrival at the castle and to his entrance onto the stage. In Macbeth’s ‘tomorrow’ speech, he refers to the ‘poor player / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage’ (5.5.23–4).
feature which itself borrows from Seneca), Macbeth speaks in terms of outstripping past horrors:

Blood hath been shed ere now, i’th’olden time
Ere human statute purged the gentle weal;
Ay, and since too, murders have been performed
Too terrible for the ear. The time has been,
That, when the brains were out, the man would die,
And there an end. But now they rise again
With twenty mortal murders on their crowns,
And push us from our stools. This is more strange
Than such a murder is.

(3.4.74–82)

The comparative ‘more strange’ has a similar function as those comparatives which litter Titus – both plays look to the past almost with a sense of competition.133 The idea of events ‘more strange’ than those of the past had been introduced by the Old Man’s dialogue with Ross:

Threescore and ten I can remember well,
Within the volume of which time I have seen
Hours dreadful and things strange, but this sore night
Hath trifled former knowings.

(2.4.1–4)

This ‘more strange’ will be echoed by Macbeth at the close of the same scene: ‘Strange things I have in head that will to hand, / Which must be acted ere they be scanned’ (3.4.138–9). With ‘acted’ and ‘scanned’, Shakespeare once again plays with the metapoetic. ‘Acted’ was used frequently of stage plays (and often in the formulae advertising print editions of these plays, e.g., The true tragedie of Richard Duke of York […] as it was sundrie times acted by the right honourable the earl of Pembrooke his

---

133 Thus Aaron explains that ‘Lucrece was not more chaste / Than this Lavinia’ (Titus, 2.1.109-10); Marcus upon seeing his mutilated niece remarks: ‘A craftier Tereus, cousin, hast thou met’ (2.4.41). Later Titus states that ‘worse than Philomel you used my daughter,/ And worse than Progne I will be revenged’ (5.2.193-4). In grief, Titus outstrips Livy’s Verginius: ‘I am as woeful as Virginius was,/ And have a thousand times more cause than he / To do this outrage’ (5.3.49-51).
seruants), while ‘scan’ in its root sense suggests the analysis of verse.\textsuperscript{134} There is then a metapoetic quality to Macbeth’s shedding of blood; it is presented as a self-conscious re-enactment of historical and literary precedents. Some ten lines before the extract above, Lady Macbeth had invoked the idea of telling and re-telling a given narrative: ‘O, these flaws and starts, / Imposters to true fear, would well become / A woman’s story at a winter’s fire / Authorized by her grandam’ (3.4.62–65). Lady Macbeth has fables in mind, but then the boundaries between the historical and the fictional were not always keenly distinguished in early modern England.

The *hysteron proteron* at work in ‘Ere human statute purged the gentle weal’ – presumably the state was not ‘gentle’ until it was ‘purged’ – is representative of a wider play with chronology at work throughout *Macbeth*. Having read her husband’s account of the weird sisters, Lady Macbeth remarks ‘Thy letters have transported me beyond this ignorant present, and I feel now / The future in an instant’ (1.5.55-7). Here it is a written account of a spoken prophecy that allows Lady Macbeth to glance ahead, whereas the pageant of Stuart kings produced by the witches (4.1.128–139) replaces the written accounts of Banquo’s succession in Boece, Bellenden, and Holinshed. Time is something which can either be ‘beguile[d]’ (1.5.62), ‘mock[ed]’ (1.7.81) or forcibly bent to one’s will (1.7.51-52). Ultimately, however, Macbeth finds time unbiddable:

\begin{verbatim}
She should have died hereafter.
There would have been a time for such a word.
Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
To the last syllable of recorded time
\end{verbatim}

(5.5.16–20)

With ‘recorded time’, Macbeth nods to historiography. ‘Recorded’ was used in the period almost exclusively of the written word, and most especially in relation to

\textsuperscript{134} OED, s.v. ‘scan, v.’, 1a.
chronicles, histories, and scripture. Christopher Fetherston in *A Dialogue agaynst Light, Lewde and Lasciuious Dauncing* (1582) speaks of ‘the auncient histories wherein are recorded the factes of our forefathers’, while Richard Cosin (1548?–1597) in his *Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation* (1592) refers to ‘examples recorded in historie’.\(^{135}\) Macbeth’s citation of Tarquin, detailed above, is equally suggestive of historic reiteration from written sources.

*Macbeth* thus appeals to the idea of historiography just as historiography had appealed to the theatre. In his *De Utilitate Legenda Historiae*, Simon Grynaeus (the same Grynaeus who in 1527 had discovered five books of Livy’s fifth decade), asked: ‘Quid enim uel iucundius uel utilius cogitari potest, quàm in humanae uitae theatro (quod illa partibus omnibus mire instructum habet) sedentem, periculis aliorum, sine suo periculo, cautum sapientémque fieri [?]’\(^{136}\) William Painter harnessed the same metaphor in the first volume of the *Palace*. In his dedication to Ambrose Dudley, he asks, ‘To whom may be giuen a Theatre of the world, and stage of humaine miserie, more worthily, than to him that hath with comely gesture, wyse demeanor, and orderly behauiour, bene an actor in the same?’\(^{137}\) Painter reproduced the metaphor in the *Second Tome*, where he describes the collection as ‘a Stage and a Theatre, for shew of true Nobilitie, for proofe of passing loialtie, and for triall of their contraries’.\(^{138}\) Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, replete with self-conscious allusions to its origins in


\(^{136}\) ‘What can be thought of that is sweeter and more useful than sitting in the theatre of human life (for which history has in all parts wonderful preparation) and becoming cautious and wise through other people’s hazards (without hazarding oneself)?’ The *De Utilitate* prefaced Michael de Vascosan’s 1552 edition of Livy. Livy, *T. Livii Patauini Historiae Romanae Princeps Decades Tres Cum Dimidia* (Paris: Michael de Vascosan, 1552) Aii

\(^{137}\) Painter (1567) *iv*.

\(^{138}\) ibid. *iii*
contemporary and ancient historiography, thus emerged from a wider blurring of the historical, fictional, and theatrical.

Conclusion

In the play’s final moments, Macbeth cites a classical model only to reject it: ‘Why should I play the Roman fool, and die / On mine own sword?’ (5.10.1-2). Nevertheless, Macbeth has been made to repeat the actions of his classical forbear, Tarquin the Proud. When writing their national histories of Scotland, Boece and Bellenden supplemented their portraits of Scotland’s past by incorporating material from Livy’s history of Rome. Through Holinshed’s reproduction of these Livian elements, Shakespeare inherited a usurper whose tyranny had been modelled closely on Livy’s Tarquinius Superbus. Through Painter’s Second Tome, Shakespeare was alerted not only to the dramatic potential of this moment in Roman history, but more specifically to the possibility of a queen who engages in the crimes she would have her husband commit. But Shakespeare also made significant departures from his source texts. In the exchange between Malcolm and Macduff, Shakespeare took the opportunity to interrogate Livy’s appeal to masculinity which had been rehearsed uncritically by Boece and Bellenden. Shakespeare’s Macduff insists that manhood involves a capacity for grief and the expression of emotion, while Macbeth’s rebuttals to his wife constitute a dissenting voice not found in the Latin, Scots, and English source texts. The extraordinary confluence of histories at work in Macbeth is an element to which the play itself draws attention, making repeated allusions to written history and the reiteration of historical
precedents. The Scottish play thus boasts, under closer scrutiny, a rich and complex relationship with Livy’s legendary Rome.
Chapter 7

Philemon Holland’s Livy: The Bacchants and the Jesuits

Introduction

In the closing years of the sixteenth century, Philemon Holland (1552–1637) completed the first, full-scale translation of Livy into English. The immense, folio volume of almost 1500 pages was printed by Adam Islip in 1600 and again in 1659 as *The Romane Historie*. This was the first of eight translation projects undertaken by Holland, six of which took classical authors as their focus: Pliny (1601, reprinted in 1634 and 1635), Plutarch (1603, reprinted 1657), Suetonius (1606), Ammianus Marcellinus (1609), and Xenophon (1632). Holland also produced an English translation of William Camden’s (1551–1623) *Britannia* (1586), published in 1610, as well as a Latin version of John Speed’s (1551/2–1629) *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine* (1611–2), appearing in 1616. Holland relied on multiple sources for his version of the Livy, appealing to what was now a substantial canon of textual and literary criticism surrounding the *AUC*. His translation thus represents over a century of Livian scholarship in Europe and the British Isles.

Holland has attracted some detailed critical interest. Francis Matthiessen included a chapter on Holland’s translations of Livy and Suetonius in his pioneering study of Elizabethan translation.¹ More recently, Massimiliano Morini has examined Holland’s lexis in the Livy translation, while Peter Culhane analysed the historical context from which Holland’s Livy emerged, as well as the peritexts appended to the

---

This chapter is also concerned with the poetry and scholarship which framed Holland’s Romane Historie. Unlike Culhane’s article, however, this chapter explores the prefatory material written in Latin and Greek, and uncovers the clues to be found here in terms of Holland’s sources. The second half of the chapter focuses on Holland’s treatment of the Bacchanalia episode, one of the most infamous scandals of the Roman republic. Through an appeal to contemporary, religious vocabularies, Holland established a dialogue between the events of the Bacchanalia and Elizabethan accounts of the Jesuit seminary priests.

Holland, a schoolmaster and physician, was celebrated throughout the seventeenth century for his translations. John Taylor (1578–1653) gave Holland a special mention in ‘The Praise of Hemp-Seed’ – ‘Philemon Holland (famous for translation) / Hath (with our owne tongue) well enricht our nation’ – while William Winstanley (d.1698) referred to Holland as ‘the Translactor General of his Age’, notable for the ‘Gigantick bigness’ of his translations. Not all of Holland’s readers, however, were equally impressed. In the Pallas Armata (1683), a collection of military essays which drew from ancient and modern examples alike, Sir James Turner (b.c.1615, d. in/after 1689) took issue with Livy’s descriptions of warfare. To illustrate the gaps in Livy’s technical knowledge, he quoted not from the Latin, but from Holland’s translation: ‘To avoid prolixity, and that I be not at the trouble to give you Livy’s words, first in Latine and then in English, I shall giue you the story as it is translated by Philemon Holland, (except where he mistakes) and then shew the errours of that

---


description of a Legion’. As indicated with the caveat ‘except where he mistakes’, Turner by no means accepted Holland’s translation uncritically, and at one moment accuses Holland of translating ‘very viciously’. More generally it was agreed, however, that ‘our Holland had the true knack of Translating’.

1. Metaphors of Translation

In the material prefacing the *Roman Historie*, Holland develops two distinct metaphors for discussing his translation, one of citizenship, and the other of childbirth. The citizenship metaphor speaks of Livy as a foreign national finally being granted leave to reside permanently in England, while the childbirth metaphor casts Holland and Livy as parents to a newborn child, that is, to an English translation.

Holland dedicated his translation of Livy to Elizabeth. On the reverse side of the title page, Islip has recycled a woodcut of the queen which appeared three years earlier in Thomas Talbot’s (c.1535–1595x9) collection of royal portraits (figure 6).

---

4 James Turner, *Pallas Armata. Military Essayes of the Ancient Grecian, Roman, and Modern Art of War* (London: M.W. for Richard Chiswell, 1683) 84. Turner thus anticipated the modern, critical consensus that Livy lacked firsthand experience of warfare. Cf. Ogilvie, 2: ‘Nor is he likely to have served in the army. His accounts of fighting betray the ignorance of the amateur’.

5 Turner, 85.


On the opposite page, we find Holland’s dedication to his ‘most Worthie and Powerfull Empreße’, by whom the translation was (according to Holland) warmly received. Here he describes the Historie as ‘the first fruits of a few–yeers studie’, suggesting that, though completed by 1600, he had initially undertaken the project several years before. Holland speaks of Livy as a foreign national to whom Elizabeth is expected to grant the rights of a native citizen, appealing to her ‘accustomed clemencie shewed to aliens’:

T. Livius: who having arrived long since & conversed as a meere stranger in this your famous Iland, & now for love thereof learned in some sort the language, humbly craveth your Majesties favour, to be ranged with other free-denizens of that kind: so long to live under your princely protection, as he shall duly keepe

---

8 In the dedication to James I (1566–1625) which prefaces his translation of Plutarch, Holland explains that he was ‘more animated to enterprise the same, by the former experience that I had of a Princes benignity in that behalfe: what time as I consecrated my English translation of the Romane Historie written by Titus Livius, unto the immortall memory of the said Noble and Renowned Queene’. Plutarch, The Philosophie, commonlie called, The Morals, trans. Philemon Holland (London: Arnold Halffield, 1603) ¶2.

9 Holland (1600) Dedication ‘To the Most High and Mightie Monarch, Elizabeth’, s.p.
his owne allegeance, and acquaint your liege subjects with religious devotion after his manner, with wisdome, pollicie, vertue, valour, loyaltie; and not otherwise.\textsuperscript{10}

As Irene Scouloudi notes, the disadvantages of being a stranger in sixteenth–century England (namely paying higher taxes and restrictions on bequeathing real property) could be mitigated ‘in one of two ways, either by securing a Patent of Denization or an Act of Naturalization’.\textsuperscript{11} The Patent was obtained through the crown, whereas the Act could be acquired through Parliament. The term ‘free-denizen’, which Holland employs above, was used specifically of those who had secured a Patent of Denization via the crown.\textsuperscript{12} The phrase ‘religious devotion after his manner’ is intriguing. Holland implies that Livy’s emphasis on the fulfilling of religious duty, albeit pagan, is nonetheless worthy of emulation. John Bellenden had developed a very similar idea in the ‘proloog’ to his translation of Livy. For Bellenden too, Livy provided a detailed account of ‘religious devotion’,

\begin{verbatim}
Throw quhilk apperis to ane doctryne
To ws þat has þe trew relligioun,
To mak ws fervent in þe law divyne
And for offence to dred punycioun,
Sen sic vane faith and superstitioun
Preservit þe pepill (quhen it was deuly servit)
Fra every vengeance þat þare syn deservit.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{verbatim}

If a pagan people could achieve such greatness despite lacking ‘þe trew relligioun’, then how much more can be expected of a Christian nation? Bellenden’s translation almost certainly did not make it south of the border, but the two translators nevertheless presented Livy’s depiction of ‘religious devotion’ as of some import to Christian readers.

\textsuperscript{10} ibid. Dedication, s.p.
\textsuperscript{12} ibid. 9.
\textsuperscript{13} Bellenden (1901–1903) I.4.
Holland returns to the denizen metaphor in the preface addressed ‘To the Reader’. Of Livy’s reception among the nations of Europe, Holland remarks,

they seem to strive no lesse (who may endow with most ample franchises and free burgeoisie) than those seven citie[s] in old time who every one chalenged to themselves, the birth of the poet Homer. Since then, he hath thus long been desirous to crosse the seas into this noble Iland, not as a travailer to soiourne for a time, in the Court onely or the Vniversities; but to remaine here still both in citie and country, and thereto hath learned our language indifferently; let it now appeare this nation of ours (like to reap as great fruit from his acquaintance as from any other) is readie also to receive and embrace him as friendly as the rest.\(^{14}\)

Holland refers to the tradition that multiple cities of Greece claimed Homer as their own.\(^{15}\) There is similar cultural capital at stake, he suggests, in the appropriation of Livy.

There is a different metaphor at work in Holland’s prefatory verse, entitled ‘Ad Anglicam Livianæ Historiæ Versionem, Interpretis Prosopopoea’ (‘The Translator’s Personification to the English Translation of Livy’s History’). Here he casts the translation as his child, and himself as the expectant mother: ‘Nate (decem decies sensi fastidia menses, / Longa nimi; matri dum graue pondus eras) / Quid lucem refugis’?\(^{16}\)

The author’s address of his work as a child has classical roots. In the first book of the Epistles, Horace bids his liber (‘book’) to venture into the public where it will be manhandled by the crowd, though he insists it was not brought up this way: ‘non ita nutritus. fuge quo descendere gestis’.\(^{17}\) So too Ovid had bid farewell to his ‘parue […]

\(^{14}\) ibid. ‘To the Reader’, s.p.
\(^{15}\) For this tradition, see Cicero, Pro Archia Poeta (8.19) ‘Homerum Colophonii civem esse dicunt suum, Chii suum vindicant, Salaminii repetunt, Smyrnaei vero suum esse confirmant, itaque etiam delubrum eius in oppido dedicaverunt: permulti alii praeterea pugnant inter se atque contendunt’. (‘The Colophonii say that Homer is their citizen, the Chii claim him as their own, the Salamanii demand him, in truth the Smyrnaei confirm that he is theirs, and thus they have dedicated a shrine to him in their town: many others besides fight amongst themselves and struggle over him’).
\(^{16}\) ‘My child (ten times have I undergone ten months, a too lengthy weariness, while you were a considerable weight for your mother), why do you flee the light?’ Holland (1600) s.p.
\(^{17}\) ‘You were not brought up this way. Flee whither you long to sink’. Horace, Epistles (1.20.5).
The trope of an author teasing a work into the open air had long been in use in Neo-Latin poetry on the continent. Thus in the ‘πρόσφθεγμα ad Librum’ (‘address to the book’) which prefaced the De Præsumptionibus (1594), Jacobus Menochius had harnessed the same phrasing as Holland employs above: ‘Exi nec lateas libelle fœlix, / Lucem quid refugis?’ In the previous century, the Hungarian humanist Janus Pannonius (1434–72) had posed the same question in his address ‘Georgii Thabiasii ad libellum’ (‘to the little book of Georgius Thabiasius’): ‘Prodi parve libelle, quid moraris? / Quid lucem refugis?’ With ‘decem […] menses’ (‘ten months’), ‘matri’ (‘mother’) and ‘pondus’ (‘weight’), however, Holland describes his labours of translation in terms of pregnancy, and a lengthy one at that (‘longa nimis’).

Having established the translation as his child (‘nate’; he later addresses his work as τέκνον), Holland styles Livy as the work’s father and himself as a ‘rustic nymph’, a nod to his home in Coventry:

Horridulum peperit si rustica Nympha; paternum
Te genus aut virtus nobilitare potest.
Nempe Decus Patavi genuit te Livius ingens:
Sume animum, tanto es qui genitore satus.

Though born of a rustica Nympha, the translation is expected to take pride in its paternal heritage. Horace had expressed a similar concern with genealogy in the epilogue cited above, where he imagines that the work will advertise his humble beginnings: ‘me

---

18 ‘Parve (nec invideo) sine me, liber, ibis in urbem […] vade, sed incultus, qualem decet exulis esse’ (‘Little book, you will go without me into the city (I do not begrudge you) … Go, but unadorned, as befits an exile’). Ovid, Tristia, 1.1–3.
19 ‘Go forth, happy little book, don’t hide, why do you flee the light?’ Jacobus Menochius, De Præsumptionibus, Conjecturis, Signis, & Indicijs Commentaria (Turin, s.n.: 1594) s.p.
21 ‘Even if a rustic nymph bore you, uncouth as you are, either your father’s stock or honour is able to ennoble you. For huge Livy, the glory of Padua, begat you. Take heart, you who are begotten of such a great father’. Holland (1600) s.p.
libertino natum patre et in tenui re [...] loqueris’.\textsuperscript{22} With ‘Livius ingens’, Holland invokes Martial’s description of Livy’s immense bulk, which could scarcely squeeze into his library.\textsuperscript{23} Given the context of procreation and childbirth, however, as well as Holland’s description of himself as a ‘rustic nymph’, Holland is perhaps making a bawdy pun on ‘Livius ingens’ (‘huge Livy’). While Martial had used the phrase in metonymy for the written history, here the translator uses ‘Livius ingens’ of the penis, an impression which is reinforced by the reproductive associations of ‘satus’, from \textit{sero}, ‘to sow’, and thereby ‘to beget’.

Holland’s description of himself as \textit{rustica Nympha} nods primarily to his home in Coventry, but also suggests something of Livy’s alleged provincialism. In the eighth book of the \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, Quintilian proscribed the use of foreign words and dialect from the orator’s speech: ‘hic non alienum est admonere ut sint quam minime [verba] peregrina et externa’.\textsuperscript{24} Quintilian then recalled a comment made by the historian and poet, Gaius Asinius Pollio on Livy’s style, ‘et in Tito Liuio, mirae fecundiae viro, putat inesse Pollio Asinius quandam Patauinitatem’.\textsuperscript{25} Holland alludes to this observation in his preface to the reader, though curiously he ascribes the comment not to Pollio but to contemporary critics: ‘For the forme of his style, I referre the readers to the sound & staied iudgement rather of \textit{Quintilian}, who compareth him with Herodotus, Thucydides, & the best Greeks; than to the fantastical conceits of some Criticks of our time, who seeking \textit{nodum in scirpo}, have dreamed of I wot not what Patavinitie in

\textsuperscript{22} ‘You will say that I was born to a freedman father and in slight means’. Horace, \textit{Epistulae} (1.20.20–21).
\textsuperscript{24} ‘It is not inapposite to recall here that one’s words, as far as possible, should not be foreign or strange’. Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria} (8.1.2).
\textsuperscript{25} ‘And even in Titus Livy, a man of wondrous eloquence, Pollio Asinius thought there was a certain Patavinitie’. Quintilian (8.1.3).
him.' \(^{26}\) Holland has probably encountered the accusation second hand, but it is possible that he wished to liken himself as ‘rustica Nympha’ to Livy’s alleged *Patavinitas*.

Holland sustains the birth metaphor by invoking three goddesses associated with childbirth, – ‘Lucina’, ‘Εἰλεϊθυια potens’ and ‘dia Diana’ – and carries the image into the four lines of Greek hexameter which follow the Latin:

\[
Σὺ δὲ χαρίζεσθαι (τὸ γὰρ έις ὀιωνος ἀριστος) \\
Τέκνον, σή πατρίδι σπούδεο, πολλά καμών: \\
ως τάχα σοι τε χάρις, καὶ μοι μέγα χάριμα γένοιτο; \\
tῷ κε πόνους τλαίη ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος ἄνήρ. \(^{27}\)
\]

Here the translation is tied to the ‘πατρίδι’, that is, to the fatherland, while the ‘ἄλλος ἄνήρ’ (‘other man’) invoked here is presumably the reader, who is expected to undertake a new set of labours (‘πόνους’), that is, reading the translation. Hidden in the classical languages, and thereby limited to a smaller, learned readership, Holland developed another metaphor to describe his relationship with the finished translation. In this image, which ultimately draws on Horace, the translator and author are cast as a parental team, with the translation, as child, asked to take pride in its father’s illustrious heritage.

The metaphors of citizenship and childbirth prefacing Holland’s translation thus presented Livy’s history as something to be naturalised into its new environment. Holland’s inclusion of the verse above was perhaps prompted by the example set by Antoine De La Faye’s (1540–1615) French language translation of 1582. De La Faye, doctor of theology at Geneva, had included four sonnets in the introduction to his

\(^{26}\) Holland (1600) ‘To the Reader’, s.p. For Quintilian’s comparison of Livy to Herodotus, see Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* (10.1.101).

\(^{27}\) ‘And you, my child (for this is the one best sign for the future), rejoice in zeal for your fatherland, accomplishing many things: so that benefit may come swiftly to you, and great joy to me; and let another man for his part brave the challenges that fall to him’. Holland (1600) s.p.
Histoire Romaine (a title which Holland echoes with his Romane Historie). However, whereas all four of these sonnets were written in the French vernacular, Holland’s bilingual verse functioned as a firm statement of his classical learning. As the following section explores, this is not the only echo of De La Faye to be heard in Holland’s Livy.

2. Holland’s Sources

Holland had recourse to a series of European works on Livy when preparing his English translation. He alludes to some of these in the paratextual apparatus appended to the Roman Historie, as is explored below. The range of material at work in Holland’s translation speaks of the energy with which he approached the project, appealing to a century of Livian scholarship and textual criticism.

At one moment in the preface, Holland states explicitly that he knew of two French versions of Livy. Though he does not go so far as to name them, there are certain clues in the paratextual apparatus that suggest he was familiar with the version by De La Faye. Having introduced the virgin goddess Diana in the Latin section of the ‘Interpretis Prosopopoea’, Holland turns to his dedicatee, the virgin queen:

Quid si πολυμαθής, quid si πολυγλωττός, & orbis
Mirandum Decus, hæc ELIZABETHA tenet,
Quæ tuit Patavinus, transtulit inde
Teutonus, Hetruscus, Gallus, Iberus, Arabs?
At patrias mavult audire & reddere voces,
Quæ patriæ princeps, alma parensquæ sua est.30

28 Antoine De La Faye, s.p.
29 ‘above other nations they [the French] have given him most friendly entertaintment, and twise enfranchised him among them’. Holland (1600) s.p.
30 ‘What if the polymath, what if the polyglot, and wondrous ornament of the world, Elizabeth, posses these things, which the Paduan produced, and then the German, Italian, Frenchman, Spaniard, and Arabian translated? She who is the prince of her homeland and its nourishing mother prefers to hear and to utter the speech of her homeland’. Ibid. s.p.
Holland thus nods to the established translations of Livy into German, Italian, French and Spanish. With ‘Arabs’, he picks up on current rumour that the *AUC* existed in its entirety in an Arabic translation, a tantalising prospect to which Holland was probably alerted by De La Fay. Lamenting the loss of the Livy’s books, De La Fay expressed his hope for their recovery:

i’espere qu’vn iour ce qui default estre suppleé, en attendant que le bris de ce naufrage se ramasse: dont on dit certaines pieces estre en Italie, les autres en Allemagne, d’autres en Dannemark, d’autres ailleurs. Comme il me souvient qu’estant à Padoue, & deuisant avec les hommes sçauans de ceste ville-la […] le docte & excellent vieillard Paul Iu. Crasso disoit auoir receu nouuelle que dedans la Golote en Barbarie toute l’histoire de T. Liue s’estoit trouue entiere escrte en langue Arabique.

According to Paul Junius Crasso, a professor at Padua, the lost books of Livy’s history were simply waiting to be uncovered in La Goulette, Tunisia. This hope was rehearsed in 1621 by Thomas van Erpe (1584–1623) in the *Orationes Tres, de Linguarum Ebrææ, atque Arabicae Dignitate*. It was most probably from De La Fay that Holland learnt of the Arabic Livy.

As with De La Fay, Holland shared his expectation that the lost books would be discovered. In a notice ‘To the Reader’ which follows his translation of book 45, he

---

31 Holland refers to these other translations again in the preface ‘to the reader’: ‘of late time, his spirit (which yet liveth in his writings) hath made voyage by Florence into the same Fraunce and Spaine: and hath passed into Arabi a one way, and Almaine ano ther’. Holland (1600) s.p.

32 ‘I hope that one day this defect will be supplemented, while we wait for the debris of this shipwreck to amass: of which they say certain pieces are in Italy, others in Germany, others in Denmark, others elsewhere. As I recall when I was at Padua and conversing with the learned men of that town […] the learned and outstanding old man Paulus Iunius Crassus said that he had received word that the entire history of Titus Livius was found in La Goulette in Barbary, written entirely in the Arabic tongue’. De La Fay, *A6*’

33 Having explained that a vast quantity of Greek and Latin texts have been translated into Arabic, which would have otherwise perished, van Erpe turns to the lost decades of Livy: ‘scitote viros fide dignissimos, omnes apud eos extare Titi Livij libros perhibere, etiam eos, inquam, quorum jacturam totus dolet orbis Latinus’ (‘Rest assured that men, very worthy of trust, assert that all the books of Titus Livius are extant among them, even those books, I say, the loss of which the entire Latin world laments’). Thomas van Erpe, *Orationes Tres, de Linguarum Êbrææ, atque Arabicae Dignitate* (Leiden: Ex typographia Auctoris, 1621) 54.
remarks that ‘Some hope there is, that they are but mis-cast and laid out of the way. For like as within these hundred yeerres some fragments of the storie were discovered in Magunce: and the last five booke(s) now extant, found by Simon Grinæus in the Librarie at a monasterie over-against the citie of Wormbs, and dedicated by Erasmus of Roterdam unto Charles, the son of William lord Montjoy […] so wee are not to despaire of the rest’. Here Holland refers to two major discoveries made in the first half of the sixteenth century, the circumstances of which are discussed in chapter one. Judging by his familiarity with the details of these discoveries, it is not unreasonable to assume that Holland had recourse to these two, early editions of Livy when preparing his own version of the history.

Besides repeating De La Faye’s allusion to a complete, Arabic Livy, there is another clue that Holland was using the *Histoire Romaine*. It appears that Holland was also inspired by de la Faye’s approach to translation. In the material prefacing the *Histoire*, De La Faye describes the process of collating multiple versions of the Latin original:

> i’ay tasché d’auoir plusieurs exemplaires, pour tirer de l’un ce que ie ne pouuoy de l’autre. I’en ay eu vn fort vieil de Milan, vn de Venise, vn de Basle, vn de Cologne, deux de Paris, vn de Lion, & vn de Francfort. Et mesm e i’ay eu la premiere Decade escrite à la main en parchemin, que m’a presté M. Germain Coladon docteur és Droits.

In comparing these copies, De La Faye accommodated for differences between the manuscripts by applying his own editorial discretion: ‘Tellement que i’ay suyui tantost

---

34 Holland (1600) 1234.
35 See chapter one, pp. 12–13.
36 ‘I have endeavoured to acquire several specimens to draw from one that which I could not from the other. I had a very old copy from Milan, one from Venice, one from Basel, one from Cologne, two from Paris, one from Lyon and one from Frankfurt. I even had the first decade written by hand on parchment, which Monsieur Germain Coladon, doctor of law, lent to me’. De La Faye, ‘preface aux lectuers’, s.p.
l’vn tantost l’autre, selon qu’il m’a semblé le meilleur’.\textsuperscript{37} Holland too, as he explains, applied a similar vigour to his project, consulting multiple copies of the \textit{AUC}. He did not, however, restrict himself to Latin copies of the history and thus describes himself as ‘endeavoring by conference especially of the select copies of Latin, yet not rejecting other translations (such as I had some little skill in) to come as neere as possibly I could, to the true meaning of the Author’.\textsuperscript{38} Much like Bellenden almost seventy years before, Holland appealed to continental translations as a means of perfecting his own. He would employ the same method again when translating Plutarch. As the title of the 1603 edition states, the work was \textit{Translated out of Greeke into English, and conferred with the Latine translations and the French}.

In drawing together the various strands of criticism on Livy for his own, English edition, Holland paid considerable attention to archaeological evidence. For this he relied again on a series of continental editions and translations. Holland was the first of Livy’s translators in English to express an interest in Livy’s biography: ‘This T. Liuius then, was borne at Padua, in the yeere 694 after the foundation of Rome, when L. Afranius and Q. Cæcilius Metellus Celer were Consuls. He flourished all the time of \textit{Augustus Caesar}, and died in the fourth yeere of \textit{Tiberius}. By which account, hee lived full LXXVI. yeeres: as appeareth by an auncient Epitaph upon his tombe at Padua, (where it is thought hee died) […]’.\textsuperscript{39} A reproduction of this ‘auncient Epitaph’ is then included, with an English translation, placed underneath a portrait of Livy:

\begin{flushright}
\textit{To The Reader}, s.p.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{37} ‘I followed this one, then that one, as much as either seemed to me to be the best one’. Ibid, s.p.

\textsuperscript{38} Holland (1600) s.p.

\textsuperscript{39} Holland (1600) ‘To The Reader’, s.p.
Figure 7. Portrait of Livy from Holland’s Romane Historie.

TITUS LIVIUS PATAVINUS,
Cuius invicto calamo, invicta Romanorum
facta scripta sunt.

TITE LIUIE OF PADUA,
Who wrote long since with peerleße pen,
The facts of Romanes, match-leße men.

This is essentially a compressed version of the epigraph included in the 1518, Mainz edition, as seen in chapter one. In the 1518 edition, Carbach had explained how the epitaph appeared in its original context, namely beneath a bust of Livy. By juxtaposing

---

40 See chapter one, p.16.
41 ‘Patavii in Palatio Maiori sub imagine T. Livii hoc positum epitaphium’ (‘This epitaph was placed beneath a bust of Titus Livius in Padua’s larger palace’). Livy (1518) s.p.
an abridgment of the epitaph with a likeness of Livy, Holland and Islip thereby reconstructed something of its original appearance. The reproduction of this epitaph in the *Romane Historie*, combined with Holland’s reference to Erasmus’s dedicatory epistle, strongly suggests that Holland had recourse to this copy for his own translation.

Holland and Islip produce another epitaph directly before the translation, entwined with olive branches:

![Figure 8. The Epitaph from Holland’s *Romane Historie*.](image)

**THE EPITAPH.**

V.F.
TITVUS LIVIUS
LIVIÆ T.F.
QUARTÆ L.
HALYS
CONCORDIALIS
PATAVI.
SIBI ET SVIS
OMNIBVS.
OBIIT III. TIBERII
CAESARIS ANNO.
NATVS LXXVI.
ANNOS.

SIBI ET SUIS
This is a condensed version of the epitaph which prefaces De La Faye’s translation. Here ‘L.’ almost certainly stands for libertus (‘freedman’), which explains the possessive Livie – the Titus Livius mentioned here was a former slave of Livia, fourth daughter of a certain Titus (‘Liviae Titi Filiae Quartae’), from whom both his daughter and her slave took their names. Titus Livius the freedman was perhaps a priest of the goddess Concordia (‘Concordialis’) and bore the surname ‘Halys’, a name nowhere else associated with Livy the author. Nevertheless, for Holland, De La Faye, and presumably some of their readership, the epitaph functioned as an appealing insight into the historical Livy.

This interest in archaeological evidence resurfaces in the extensive critical material with which Holland suffixes his translation, and most especially in his Chronologie. In the notice ‘To the Reader’ which introduces this section, Holland observes that although Livy’s history is ‘passing well penned otherwise’, when it comes to ‘the calculation of dates & times, which they call Chronologie (a singular light to give direction in a storie) he is somewhat defective and unlike himselfe’. By 1600, there had been multiple attempts to remedy this shortfall. The 1531 Basel edition of Livy, which had been the first to feature the five, newly discovered books, also included Heinrich Glarean’s (1488–1563) Chronologia sive Temporum Supputatio in omnis T. Liuij

---

42 ‘While living, Titus Livius Halys, freedman of Livia (fourth daughter of Titus) and priest of Concordia at Padua, made this for himself and all his kin. He died in the fourth year of Tiberius’s reign aged seventy-six’. Holland, s.p.
43 De La Faye, s.p.
44 Holland (1600) 1264.
Decadas.\textsuperscript{45} The Chronologia set out in table form, as Erasmus explained, ‘temporum ordinem, bellorum species, ac personarum nomina, in quibus hactenus mira confusio, scribarum ac sciolorum uitio inducta.’\textsuperscript{46} Echoing the metaphor used by Andrea Bussi to introduce Livy’s first appearance in print, Erasmus describes Glarean’s chronology as a constellation by which to navigate the ocean of Livy’s history and a thread to negotiate this historical labyrinth.\textsuperscript{47} Holland was clearly familiar with the Chronologia, referring to ‘the annales gathered by Henry Glareanus’, but this was not the only account to which he had recourse.\textsuperscript{48} As Holland notes, ‘Verrius Flaccus, who lived under Augustus Caesar […] collected a catalogue of the chief rulers of Rome’.\textsuperscript{49} This catalogue was, according to Holland, carved onto marble and kept ‘within the Capitoll for a perpetuall memorie to posteritie’, and eventually discovered in the first half of the sixteenth century: ‘in the time of Paul the third, Pope of Rome, the fragments of the said stones were digged out of the ground betweene the Roman Forum and the broad street Via Sacra; brought forth also & laid abroad in the capitol to the view of the world’.\textsuperscript{50} These inscriptions were prepared for publication by the philologist and historian, Carlo Sigonio (1523/4–84), and in 1550 were issued at Modena by Antonio Gadaldini.\textsuperscript{51} Sigonio subsequently appealed to these marbles (as well as numismatic evidence) for the 1555,


\textsuperscript{46} ‘The order of time, the appearance of wars and the names of persons, in which there has hitherto been astounding disorder, introduced through the mistakes of scribes and sciolists’. Livy (1531) A2\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{47} ‘Quod si hæc [absit] cynosura, ceca prorsus est pelago nauigatio: & nisi hoc adsit filum, inextricabilis error inuoluit lectorem etiam eruditum in his rerum gestarum labyrinthis’. (‘For if this Ursa Minor were absent, it would be blind sailing on the ocean, and if this thread were not here, a tangled knot of error would envelop even the learned reader in this labyrinth of deeds’) ibid. A2\textsuperscript{v}. Andrea Bussi had described the history as ‘intactum pelagus atque inexpertum’ (‘an ocean untouched and untried’). Livy (1469) 2\textsuperscript{v}. Cf. Chapter one, p.21.

\textsuperscript{48} Holland (1600) 1264.

\textsuperscript{49} ibid. 1264.

\textsuperscript{50} ibid. 1264.

\textsuperscript{51} Carlo Sigonio, Regum, Consulum, Dictatorum, ac Censorum Romanorum Fasti, Una Cum Actis Triumphorum (Modena: Antonio Gadaldini, 1550).
Aldine edition of Livy.\(^{52}\) In doing so, he anticipated Francesco Robortello’s (1516–67) collation of Livy’s dates with the Capitoline marbles.\(^{53}\) Holland cites both Sigonio and Robertello in the introduction to his own *Chronologie*, as well as Bartholomeus Marlianus, whose *De Origine Urbis Romae* had prefaced the enormous 1552, Paris edition of Livy, prepared by Ascensius’s son-in-law, Michel de Vascosan (*d.* 1577).\(^{54}\)

Given the emphasis Holland’s Livy placed on archaeological evidence, it is perhaps not surprising that a copy came into the hands of the antiquary John Aubrey (1626–1697) (Bodl.B1.15Art). Aubrey, whose *Monumenta Britannica* ‘remains the foundation text of modern archaeology’, not only devoted an entry to Holland in his *Brief Lives* but quoted Holland’s description of the 1531, Basel edition of Livy (cited above) in his entry for Erasmus.\(^{55}\) Aubrey has unfortunately left no annotations on his copy of Holland other than his signature, but his ownership thereof nonetheless points to the appeal the edition might have add for a readership with antiquarian interests.

3 (i) The Bacchanalia

The events of the Bacchanalia, recorded in book 39 of Livy’s history, constitute one of the greatest sexual and religious scandals known to the Roman Republic. As Holland

---

\(^{52}\) As Sigonio explains, ‘fretus […] lapidipus praeterea uetustis, et maxime consularibus Capitolinis, numisqve argentis quo in monumentorum genere incorruptam maxime latere ueritatem’ (‘I relied moreover on ancient marbles, and most especially on those consular marbles from the Capitol, and on silver coins, in which kind of record very much lies the uncorrupted truth’). Livy (1555) A3r.


puts it, ‘never was there in Commonweale either so great and dangerous a maladie, or touching more persons, or reaching to farther matters of greater consequence’. The cult was brought to Etruria, Livy explains, through a ‘Graecus ignobilis’ (‘Greek of humble birth’), and from there spread to Rome ‘uelut contagione morbi’ (‘like a contagious disease’). According to Livy, the Bacchanalia, along with its alleged criminal activity, was brought to the attention of the consul, Postumius, in an episode which P. G. Walsh has compared to a ‘soap opera’. A young man named P. Aebutius is pressured into joining the rites by his mother, Duronia, and step-father, T. Sempronius Rutilus. Aebutius tells his lover, Hispala, a freedwoman and ‘scortum nobile’ (‘renowned prostitute’) of his intention to join the cult. Hispala, appalled by the prospect, manages to persuade Aebutius to steer clear of the Bacchic rites. Having refused to join the cult, he is forcibly ejected from his home. Finding refuge with his aunt, Aebutius is encouraged to share the details of the Bacchanalia with the consul. Postumius gleans more information from Hispala, who had been initiated while still a slave, and shares his findings with the senate. Alarmed by the apparent threat which this cult poses to both private and public security, the senate launches an investigation. Postumius delivers a speech to the people of Rome outlining the crimes encouraged by the Bacchanalia – rape, murder, and the forging of wills – following which a great many priests and initiates

56 Holland (1600) 1032. Cf. Livy (39.16.2): ‘numquam tantum malum in re publica fuit, nec ad plures nec ad plura pertinens’.
57 Livy (39.8.3–9.1).
59 Livy (39.9.2–4).
60 ibid. (39.9.5).
61 ibid. (39.10.1–11.2).
62 ibid. (39.11.3).
63 ibid. (39.12.1–14.3).
64 ibid. (39.14.4–10).
attempt to flee the city, while others take their own lives.\textsuperscript{65} Those who took oaths but did not participate in any crime are merely imprisoned; those who swore an oath and also participated in criminal activities are sentenced to death.\textsuperscript{66} Aebutius and Hispala meanwhile are awarded honours by the senate for acting as informants.\textsuperscript{67} As Erick Gruen notes, the persecution with which these rites were met at Rome was ‘strikingly uncharacteristic’ of Roman attitudes to foreign religious practice.\textsuperscript{68} Typically ‘the Romans tolerated what seemed to them harmless and drew the line whenever there seemed to be a threat of possible harm’.\textsuperscript{69} It was because the cult was understood to pose a direct threat to the state that the senate took such extreme measures to punish its priests and initiates.

Holland’s translation of this episode is coloured by the religious tensions at work in late Elizabethan England. The idea of a foreign religion which differs starkly from the official religion of the state and poses a threat to the stability of the commonwealth offers a striking parallel to contemporary responses to Catholicism and, more specifically, to Jesuit seminary priests. The two decades preceding Holland’s translation had seen an impressive corpus of literature, both controversial and legal, concerned with the seminary priests and their missions in England. As this section explores, Holland’s religious lexis is steeped in the language of these tracts, proclamations, and controversies, thereby bringing the early modern reader closer to Livy’s account of religious discord. Having emphasised the parallels between the religious struggles of early modern England and those of Rome in 186BC, Holland highlights a key way in which the official, state response of the Roman senate to an undesirable religious

\textsuperscript{65} ibid. (39.15.1–17.5).
\textsuperscript{66} ibid. (39.18.3–5).
\textsuperscript{67} ibid. (39.19).
practice fundamentally differed from that of the Elizabethan government. Whereas England required unquestioning allegiance to the Protestant Church, the Roman senate, as we will see, left space for the continued celebration of the Bacchic rites, albeit with some very strict desiderata.

In 1568, William Allen (1532–1594) established the English College at Douai, responding to the ‘Catholic diaspora’ following Elizabeth’s purge of the universities.  

Allen was convinced that a change of government in England was required to enable the restoration of the old religion. As Duffy notes, ‘his blueprint for the reconversion went beyond writing and training priests: it included removing Queen Elizabeth and implementing a sternly Catholic political regime’.  

In April 1580, the Jesuit Robert Parsons (1546–1610) embarked on a mission to England, during which he established a secret printing press and arranged clandestine meetings with English recusants. Parsons left England only after the detection and capture of Edmund Campion (1540–1581) in July, 1581.  

In the same year, Elizabeth passed ‘An Act to retain the Queen’s Majesty’s Subjects in their Due Obedience’, which implemented a fine of twenty pounds per mensem for any subject who refused to attend a Protestant service.  

This was followed in 1585 by ‘An Act against Jesuites Semynarie Priestes’, commanding the exile of all seminary priests from England and its territories within forty days. The Act targets those priests ‘made in the Portes beyonde the Seas, by or according to the Order and Rietes of the Romishe Church’, who ‘dayly doe come and are sente, into this Realme of Engelande and other the Queenes Majesties Dominions of Purpose, […] not onely to withrawe her

---

71 Duffy.  
Highnesse Subjectes from their due obedience to her Majestie, but also to stire up and move Sedition Rebellion and open Hostilitie within her Highnesse Realmes and Dominions’. Any such priest entering England after this period of forty days, the Act continues, ‘shall for his Offence be adjudged a Traytor, and shall suffer lose and forfaite as in case of High Treason’. These edicts were duly enforced. As Eamon Duffy notes, ‘Of the 471 seminary priests known to have been active in Elizabeth’s reign, at least 294, 62 per cent, were imprisoned at some time or another; 116 were executed, 17 died in gaol, and 91 were banished’.

The anxiety surrounding Jesuits was still a pressing concern in 1600 when Holland’s Livy first appeared in print. In this year, Matthew Sutcliffe (1549/50–1629) produced A Briefe Replie (1600) in response to Robert Parsons’ pro-Catholic A Temperate Ward-Word (1599). Here Sutcliffe suggested that ‘the whole scope of Seminarie priestes and their consorts is, first to make a number in England, to put the popes Bull in execution; next to bring in the pope and Spaniards; which cannot bee done without the utter desolation of the lande’. Here the ‘popes Bull’ refers to the excommunication of Elizabeth by Pope Pius V on 25 February 1570. Regnans in excelsis not only marked Elizabeth out as a heretic, but absolved her citizens of the allegiance they owed their monarch.

Much like the Jesuit missions in England, the Bacchanalia was considered to be a danger to the state. In Holland’s translation, Postumius warns that although the conspiracy has hitherto kept itself to ‘particular and privat mischeefs’, now ‘the evill encreaseth, and the maladie spreadeth further daily, and by this time is growne so much, as it will not containe within the private fortune and condition of particular persons, but

75 ibid. 706.
76 Duffy.
77 Matthew Sutcliffe, A Briefe Replie (London: Arn. Hatfield, 1600) 115.
threateneth the very main State of the Commonweale’.78 So too the severe measures introduced by the Elizabethan government have a clear parallel in Livy’s narrative. As Livy explains, of those many hundreds of individuals implicated in the scandal, more were executed than were imprisoned.79

Before examining Holland’s religious lexis in detail, it is worth noting that the word Bacchanalia was being used in the sixteenth century independently of Livy to suggest religious hypocrisy. In his second Satire, Juvenal targeted philosophers who, though they preached virtue, were nonetheless living dissolutely, and more specifically, were enjoying receptive anal intercourse (‘castigas turpia, cum sis / inter Socraticos notissima fossa cinaedos?’).80 As Juvenal explains towards the beginning of the poem, ‘Curios simulant et Bacchanalia uiuunt’ (‘they pretend to be Curios, but live like Bacchants’).81 Here Manius Curius Dentatus, consul in 275BC, is invoked as a symbol of traditional, Roman morality, contrasted with the Bacchanalia, a foreign cult by then synonymous with debauchery. As early as 1551, Thomas Becon (1515/13–1567) had harnessed this line from Juvenal in an attack of Catholic rites in A fruitful treatise on fasting: ‘Againe at night albeit the popish fasters eat no meat, yet make thei such a drinking, as might iustli seme a costious kinde of bannketting. […] O abhominable mockers of christen abstinence. Theese are those Epicures, whych as þe Poet saith, Curios simulant et Bacchanalia uiuunt’.82 The same line was put to work in relation to Presbyterian ministers and their calls for reform in John Bridges’ (1535/6–1618) enormous Defence of 1587, while Thomas Nashe deployed it (bap.1567, d.c.1601) in his

78 Holland (1600) 1033; cf. Livy (39.16.3).
79 ‘Plures necati quam in uincula coniecti sunt’ (‘more were killed than were thrown into chains’). Livy (39.18.5).
80 ‘Are you chastising foul acts, despite being the most notorious ditch among the Socratic catamites?’ Juvenal (2.9–10).
81 Juvenal (2.3).
82 Thomas Becon, A Fruitful Treatise on Fasting (London: John Day, [1551]) Dv"v—."
*Myrror for Martinists* (1590): ‘*Curios simulant, et Bacchanalia uiuunt*: they do outwardly pretend religion, and inwardly intend subversion: promise and proclaime that they restore ancient perfection, but they performe nothing but the idle conceites of their own fansies’. Long before Holland undertook his translation then, the Bacchanalia was being used in relation both Catholics and Protestants alike in charges of moral hypocrisy.

3 (ii) The Bacchants and the Jesuits

From the beginning of book 39, Holland has an eye to contemporary religious controversy. Here the ‘The Breuarie’ prefacing this book promises ‘the beginnings of riotous and dissolute life brought in by the Asian armie’. This is the moral decline to which Livy had alluded in his *praefatio*. As Holland translates it, ‘as their discipline began by little and little to shrinke, let him [the reader] marke how at the very first their behaviour and manners sunke withall: and how they fell more and more to decay and ruine, yea and began soone after to tumble downe right even untill these our daies, wherein wee can neither endure our owne sores, nor salves for the cure’. The emergence of Bacchic rites at Rome is a vivid example of this ‘riotous and dissolute life’: ‘Bacchanalia, sacrum Graecum et nocturnum, omnium scelerum seminarium, cum ad ingentis turbae conurationem peruenisset, investigatum et multorum poena sublatum est’. For this Holland gives,

---

86 ‘The Bacchanalia, a Greek rite conducted at night, a hotbed of every crime, which when it had become a conspiracy of a great multitude, was discovered and eradicated with the punishment of many’. *Periochae*, XXXIX.
The Bacchanales (a Greekish feast and celebrated in the night season, the very seminarie and nourse-garden of wickedneße, being growne to this enormitie, that therein was contrived a conspiracie and complot of a mightie multitude) were now visited and searched into by the Consull, and put downe with the punishment of many persons.87

Holland carries over the root sense of *seminarium*, that is, a nursery for trees, with ‘seminarie and nourse-garden’. In the context of ‘conspiracie’, however, ‘seminarie’ takes on a new resonance, suggesting a college for the training of priests, and, more specifically, the college at Douai which prepared Catholic priests for proselytizing missions in England. The word ‘seminary’ appears in this sense in the preface to Anthony Marten’s (c.1542–1597) translation of Pietro Martire Vermigli’s (1499–1562) *Loci Communes* (1580). Introducing the work of this celebrated Protestant exile to Elizabeth, Marten describes how ‘The sonne of perdition’ (which might refer equally to the Pope as to Satan) works against the English Church,

> by conueing in that secret seminarie of sedition, which closelie and craftilie entering into this realme, vnder pretense of long praier, deuowe widowes houses, lead captiue simple women, and other sillie seduced soules; trauell by land and sea to make proselytes double woore the children of hell than they themselues: and do so rob your Maiestie of your subiects, God of his creatures, Christ of his members, the people of their saluation […]88

With the image of ‘simple women’ led captive, Marten nods to Paul’s words at 2 Timothy (3.6.), for which the Geneva Bible gives, ‘of this sorte are they that crepe into houses, and leade captiue simple women laden with sinnes, and led with diuers lustes’.89

It is possible that Marten also has in mind those Catholic women who played an active

---

87 Holland (1600) 1023.
89 Whittingham, QQii'
role in housing and hiding the Seminary Priests in England.\textsuperscript{90} Holland’s description of the cult as ‘the very seminarie and nource-garden of wickedneße’ may well then have suggested something of the college at Douai, which Marten refers to here as ‘that secret seminarie of sedition’.

When introducing the Bacchanalia, Livy stresses first and foremost that these rites were a foreign importation to Rome, and secondly that they were practiced in secret and at night (in contrast to Roman state religion, which was by its nature a public affair):

‘Graecus ignobilis in Etruriam primum uenit nulla cum arte earum quas multas ad animorum corporumque cultum nobis eruditissima omnium gens inuexit, sacrificulus et uates, nec is qui aperta religione, propalam et quaestum et disciplinam profitendo, animos errore imbueret, sed occultorum et nocturnorum antistes sacroroum’\textsuperscript{91} For which Holland gives:

There was a certeine Grecian of base degree and condition, who came first into Hetruria; a man not endued with any of those artes, whereof that nation (of all others most learned) hath brought many unto us, as well for the erudition of our minds, as the trimming of our bodies: but a sacrificing priest he was, and a divining wisard withall. Neither was he one that made outward profession of teaching men, and thereby getting a living openly, and so by an overt shew of religion possessed their heads and minds with feare and horror; but the knowledge he had forsooth of certeine hidden and secret sacrifices.\textsuperscript{92}

The relationship between Rome and Greece expressed here has a clear parallel with that of early modern England and Italy. Greece, though she had lent her conqueror rich cultural and literary traditions, nonetheless introduced some less than desirable


\textsuperscript{91} A low-born Greek first came into Etruria with none of the many arts which that most accomplished of all nations has introduced to us for the refinement of our minds and bodies: but a sacrificing priest he was, and so by an overt shew of religion possessed their heads and minds with fear and horror; but the knowledge he had forsooth of certain hidden and secret sacrifices. Livy (39.8.3–4).

\textsuperscript{92} Holland (1600) 1027.
imports. Elizabethan England had a similarly ambivalent relationship with Italian culture. The furtiveness suggested in the extract above by ‘certeine hidden and secret sacrifices’ (this emphasis on secrecy continues throughout Livy’s account) bears comparison to contemporary descriptions of Catholic missionaries. In the same year that Holland’s Livy appeared in print, Francis Savage described the clandestine methods employed by proselytizing Catholics in *A Conference Betwixt a Mother a Devout Recusant, and her Sonne a Zealous Protestant* (1600). At one moment, the mother asks her son how a Catholic might forswear the Roman Church ‘without plaine periury’, to which the young man replies,

they [the Catholics] tread in the steps of the olde Valentinian heretiques worthily taxed by Tertullian, of whom that learned father saith: *Aditum priùs cruciant, they first torment their schollers, at their entrance ne discipulis quidem propriis antè committant quàm suos fecerint, they commit not their misteries and doctrine, no not their ouane disciples, before they haue made them their owne. Habent artificium quo priùs persuadeant quàm edoceant: they haue a tricke of legerdemaine, first to perssvade before they teache*. Even so nowe our Iesuits and seminarie priests when they seeke to reconcile any to their mother the Church of Rome, they take them sworne vpon the sacrament of the altar, that they shall euer cleaue fast to that synagogue, & renounce all our doctrine & church assemblies. And before they haue thus made them their owne, and fettered their consciences with a vowe, they do not open their packet of Romish wares vnto them.6

Savage is quoting here from the first chapter of Tertullian’s (*c*.160–c.240) tract *Adversus Valentinianos*. Intriguingly, in this passage Tertullian compares the furtive practices of the Valentinians to those of another ancient cult, ‘illa Eleusinia, haeresis et ipsa Atticae superstitionis’ (‘the Eleusinian Mysteries, that heresy of Attic Superstition’). By aping

---

93 Cato had used this line of argument in his speech against the repeal of the *Lex Oppia*. As William Thomas translates it, ‘now the more that the good fortune of our common wealth dayly increaseth, and that our Empyre is enlarged, we beeyng entred into Greece and Asia, countries replenished with al delicious thyngis [...] the more do I feare, least those thynges haue rather taken vs, than we thaim’. Thomas (1551) Cf. Horace, *Epistulae*, 2.156–7.


95 For the emphasis on secrecy, cf. Livy (39.8.8); (39.9.1); (39.10.5).

96 Francis Savage, *A Conference Betwixt a Mother a Devout Recusant, and her Sonne a Zealous Protestant* ([Cambridge]: John Legate, 1600) 78–79.
the rites of the Greek mystery religion, the Valentinians ‘Eleusinia Valentiniana fecerunt, lenocinio sancta, silentio magna, sola taciturnitate caelestia’ (‘have made Valentinian mysteries of Eluesinian ones, holy things of pimping, great things of silence, and heavenly things of mere taciturnity’). 97 Though Savage does not explicitly mention the Eleusinian Mysteries in his account, the furtiveness and oaths of allegiance described here, associated by Savage with proselytizing Catholics, offer compelling parallels with Livy’s account of the Bacchanalia, in which the initiates were similarly ‘iureiurando obligati’, or, as Holland translates it ‘obliged by oth’. 98

Having learnt of the cult through the testimonies of Aebutius and Hispala, Postumius shares his findings with the senate: ‘Patres pauor ingens cepit, cum publico nomine, ne quid eae coniurationes coetusque nocturni fraudis occultae aut periculi importarent, tum priuatim suorum cuiusque uicem, ne quis adfinis ei noxae esset.’ 99 As Holland puts it, ‘the LL. of the Senat were surprised with exceeding great feare, as well in regard generally of the commonweale, least those conspiracies, nightly meetings and conventicles, might import some secret complot of mischiefe and daunger: and also for doubt in particular, that some of their owne friends or familie should to bee accessarie and culpable’. 100 Coniuratio appears no fewer than seven times in Livy’s account of the Bacchanalia, which, as Briscoe argues, would have carried strong associations of the Catiline conspiracy for a Roman readership. 101 For the early modern reader, Holland’s ‘conspiracies’, ‘conventicles’, and ‘secret complot’ would more immediately have suggested the Jesuit missions in England and further afield. Certainly the literature

98 Livy (39.18.3); Holland (1600) 1034.
99 A great fear seized the senate fathers on behalf of the public, lest those conspiracies and nocturnal assemblies were bringing in any hidden deception or danger, but then also personally in turn for their kin, lest anyone related to them were at fault’. Livy (39.14.4).
100 Holland (1600) 1031.
101 John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 38–40* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 250. For coniuratio, cf. Livy (39.8.1); (39.8.3); (39.14.4); (39.15.10); (39.16.3); (39.17.6); (39.18.3).
concerning Catholics in the British Isles published in the decade preceding Holland’s translation placed a firm emphasis on ‘conspiracy’.\(^\text{102}\) In a speech delivered before the French Parliament in July 1594 and printed in an English translation in the same year, Antoine Arnauld (1560–1619) had combined classical and contemporary ideas of coniuratio in relation to the Society of Jesus.\(^\text{103}\) Having accused the Jesuits of ‘kindle[ing] the fire of sedition in al the chiefe townes of the Realme’, he asks, ‘What tongue, what voice is sufficient to expresse the secrete Counsails, the most horrible conspiracies, more dangerous than the conspiracie of Cataline, which were holden in their Colledge in S. James streete, and in their Church in S. Antoines streete?’\(^\text{104}\) Arnauld’s polemic, translated into English some six years before the appearance of Holland’s Livy, had thereby associated the Jesuits with a classical precedent of conspiracy.

Holland’s use of ‘conventicle’ above (he later refers to the ‘conventicle of conspiratours’) is also worthy of note. In its root sense, the word suggested any meeting or assembly. However, conventicle had come to be used in the early modern period specifically of illicit religious gatherings.\(^\text{105}\) To this we might add its particular application to the Council of Trent. Thus Thomas Bilson (1546/7–1616) refers to the ‘Tridentine Conuenticle’, while John Bridges in his Defence described how ‘the late Trident Conuenticle had falsly burdened the Protestant Churches’.

\(^\text{102}\) Thus, for example, in 1593, Robert Waldegrave (c.1554–1603/4) printed A Discouerie of the Vnnatural and Traiterous Conspiracie of Scottisch Papists, which spoke of ‘this our common enemie, within our awin bowels, whose unnaturalness, barbaritie & hie attempt, can be matched with no example domestick or forrain that we read off’ (Edinburgh) 3r. This was published in the same year at London in an English language version: A Discouerie of the Vnnatural and Traiterous Conspiracie of Scottisch Papists (London: R[j]chard F[field] for Iohn Norton, 1593).
\(^\text{103}\) Arnaud’s speech was originally printed at Paris as Plaidoyé Pour l’Université de Paris, Demanderesse Contre les Jesuites Defendeurs (Paris: Mamert Pattison, 1594).
\(^\text{104}\) Antoine Arnauld, The Arrainment of the Whole Society of Iesuits in France (London: Cherles Yetseweirt, 1594) Aii’; CI’
\(^\text{105}\) Holland (1600) 1032; cf. OED, s.v. ‘conventicle, n.’, 1a, 3, 4a.
\(^\text{106}\) Thomas Bilson, The True Difference Betweene Christian Subjection and Vnchristian Rebellion (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1585) 37; John Bridges, 1034.
harnessed by Holland, the English *conventicle* thus enjoyed multifaceted religious associations, especially in relation to the Counter-Reformation.

In his speech to the Roman people, Postumius betrays his fear as to the number of those who may have become embroiled in the Bacchic rites: ‘Nullas adhuc uires coniuratio, ceterum incrementum ingens urium habet, quod in dies plures fiunt’, which Holland reproduces as, ‘This conventicle of conspirators is yet of no great force, howbeit it gathereth much strength, in regard that they multiplie still, & their number is every day more than other’. 107 According to Hispala’s estimate, there were initiates enough to form an entirely separate state. 108 These concerns were not without foundation. In his summary of the punishments enforced by the consuls, Livy notes (as Holland translates it) ‘that there were found in this conspiracie of both sexes one with another above seven thousand’. 109 This alarm over the number of conspirators involved again bears comparison with official and literary responses to the infiltration of seminary priests into Elizabethan England. According to the *Declaration* of 1591, the heads of the Jesuit colleges had assured Phillip II (1527–1598) that ‘if nowe he will once againe renewe his warre this nexte yeere, there shall be found ready secretly within our Dominions, many thousands (as they make their accompt for their purpose) of able that will bee ready to assist such power as he shall set on land’. 110 Though the *Declaration* plays down the claim that there are ‘many thousands’ of recusants willing to help with a Spanish invasion – this count has been made ‘for their purpose’ – it is nevertheless representative of a very real anxiety over the actual number of Catholic priests on English soil. The English translation of Arnaud’s speech against the Jesuits also revealed

107 ‘The conspiracy does not yet have any strength, but it does have a huge increase of strength, because they are growing more day-by-day’. Livy (39.15.10); Holland (1600) 1032.
108 ‘The number and multitude there assembled, is exceeding great, and growne now to be another bodie of a people’. Holland (1600) 1031; cf. Livy (39.13.14).
109 Holland (1600) 1034.
110 *Declaration* (1591) A4r.
an alarm over the rapid growth of Jesuits in France: ‘it is a straunge thing to see, how this wicked race borne to the ruine and desolation of mankind, hath multiplied in a few yeeres: being growen from the number of three soore persons, which was their first foundation, vnto ten thousand’. The speculation over the number of potential conspirators involved in the Bacchic rites may well have suggested another parallel with the Jesuits for Holland’s early readership.

3 (iii) Sexual Opprobrium

Besides posing a threat to the state, the Bacchanalia is also described as a source of sexual debauchery. When relating the details of the Bacchanalia to the consul, Hispala draws special attention to the sexual violations fostered by the cult: ‘Ex quo in promiscuo sacra sint et permixti uiri feminis et noctis licentia accesserit, nihil ibi facinoris, nihil flagitti praetermissum. Plura uirorum inter sese quam feminarum stupra esse; si qui minus patientes dedecoris sint et pigiores ad facinus, pro uictimis immolari’. For which Holland gives:

Since which time that these sacrifices and ceremonies were thus divulged, and men and women intermingled togethcr, and the licentious liberty of the night time also to help all forward, there is no act so wicked, no fact so filthie, but there it is committed: and more sinfull and unnatural abuse there is, of mankind with one another, than there is of women. If any are either unwilling to suffer this foule filthiness, or bestirre themselves more dully in the beastly action and performance of that villanie, such presently are to be killed and sacrificed as beasts.

111 Arnauld, Biv-V. ‘Cir. 112 ‘From that point when it came to be that the rites were common and men were mixed with women and with all the licence of the night, there was no crime, no shameful deed left undone. There was more debauchery among the men with other men than with women, and if anyone was less than willing to submit to shamefulness or was rather reluctant to commit crime, they were sacrificed as a victim’. Livy (39.13.10).
113 Holland (1600) 1030–31.
Here Holland’s lexicon of sexual opprobrium – ‘filthie’, ‘sinnfull and unnatural abuse’, ‘foule filthiness’ and ‘beastly action’ – carries distinctly Biblical overtones. In the first chapter of Romans, Paul explains that God abandoned his people when they fell to false worship. As the Geneva Bible puts it,

> For this cause God gaue them vp unto vile affections: for euen their women did change their natural vse into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men left the natural vse of the woman; and burned in their luste one toward another; and man with man wrought filthiness, and receiued in themselues such recompense of their errour, as was mete.\(^\text{114}\)

Holland’s ‘unnatural abuse’ is the inverse of Paul’s ‘natural vse’, both of which phrases appear in passages dealing with homosexual desire. There is in fact no equivalent to Holland’s ‘unnatural’ in Livy’s Latin (for Livy, the issue is sexual licence more generally, whether this be homosexual or heterosexual). So too Holland’s translation of *dedecor*, that is, ‘dishonor’ or ‘shame’, as ‘foule filthiness’ echoes Paul’s ‘filthiness’. Holland would tap into this biblical lexicon towards the end of the episode, giving ‘wicked and abhominable filthiness’ for Livy’s ‘sceleribus libidinibusque’.\(^\text{115}\) Holland’s ‘beastly action’ (he also refers to the Bacchants’ ‘beastly filthiness’) appeals to a contemporary idiom of sexual perversion.\(^\text{116}\) In *Th’overthrow of Stage-Plays* (1599), John Rainolds (1549–1607), addressing the issue of boy players in women’s clothes, remarked that,

> we shall perceiue that hee, who condemneth the female hoore and male, and, detesting speciallie the male by terming him a *dogge* […] might well control likewise the meanes and occasions whereby men are transformed into dogges, the sooner, to cutt off all incitements to that beastlie filthines, or rather more than beastlie.\(^\text{117}\)

\(^{114}\) Whittingham, LLv\(^c\)

\(^{115}\) Holland (1600) 1033; Livy (39.16.11).

\(^{116}\) Holland (1600) 1034.

\(^{117}\) John Rainolds, *Th’overthrow of Stage-Plays* ([Middelberg: Richard Schilders], 1599) 11.
Here Rainolds makes a connection between ‘beastliness’ and Deuteronomy’s description of the male prostitute as ‘dog’. Holland would use ‘beastly’ of a male prostitute later in book 39, where he gives ‘that beastly filth and baggage’ for Livy’s ‘scorti’ (‘prostitute’). Livy implies that the male initiates of the Bacchanalia have been rendered effeminate by abandoning themselves to excess. As Postumius comments of the initiates, ‘Know ye therfore first and formost, that the most part of them are women (and from thence is sprung the source of all this mischeefe.) Then are there men indeed, but such as for all the world resemble women, so effeminate they are: such I say, as have abandoned themselves as well to be abused as to abuse others’. Here Holland expands on Livy’s ‘simillimi feminis mares’ (‘males most similar to females’), introducing ‘effeminate’, a word which John Marston (bap.1576, d.1634) had associated with (male) homosexual desire in his seventh satire: ‘Yon effeminate sanguine Ganimede, / is but a Beuer, hunted for the bed’. Holland thus puts homosexual desire and its condemnation into greater focus in his translation.

Accusations of sexual licence were a common slur hurled at Catholics by the authors of Protestant controversies. John Field (1544/5–1588) produced A Caveat for Parsons Howlet (1581) as a response to the Robert Parson’s Certayne Reasons Why Catholiques Refuse to Go to Church (1580). Of the Catholic clergy, Field remarks, ‘As for adultery, where reigned it more, then amongst those contemners of mariage [...] Were not all their Cloisters, Abbeyes, and Nunneries, very stewes and brothel houses?’

118 Cf. Deuteronomy, 23.17–18.
119 Holland (1600) 1051; Livy (39.42.12).
120 Holland (1600) 1032.
God has abandoned the Catholics, he argues, ‘not onelye to spiritual whoredom, but to bodily, that their Colledges, Abbeys, Nunneries, and religious houses, should be infected eyther with vnnatural and vntimely murthers, or with liuing bastards and dead bones, or els they should be filthy Gomorians and sodomites, that leauing the naturall vse they should commit unspeakable wickedness’. Field, much like Holland, has an eye to Paul with the phrase ‘naturall vse’. As Alan Bray notes in his study of homosexuality in early modern England, ‘it was the Jesuits above all who came to embody in popular mythology the identification of Popery with homosexuality’. Thus in his third satire, ‘Redde, age, quæ deinceps risisti’ (‘Tell me what you were laughing at again and again’), John Marston implies that male prostitution has been introduced (or at least encouraged) by English Jesuits:

O nowe yee male stewes, I can giue pretence
For your luxurious incontinence.
Hence, hence, yee falsed, seeming, Patriotes,
Returne not with pretence of saluing spots,
When here you soyle vs with impuritie,
And monstrous like filth, of Doway seminary.

Marston’s seminary priests, much like Livy’s Bacchants, are the harbingers of sexual excess. This satire, published just two years before Holland’s Livy, suggests that the equation of male, homosexual relations with the practices of the seminary priests was still very much at work when Holland came to translate the Bacchanalia episode. Once again Holland’s religious lexis appears to have been inflected with contemporary anxieties concerning the infiltration of English seminary priests.

---

122 John Field, *A Caveat for Parsons Howlet* (London: Robert Waldegrave for Thomas Man and Toby Smith, [1581]) Dv4v-
3 (iv) Religions Old and New

The contrast between new, foreign rites and the traditional, state religion of Rome plays a key part in Livy’s depiction of the Bacchanalia. Having shared the details of the cult with the senate, Postumius delivers a speech to the people outlining what he understands to be the imminent threats to public and private security. When introducing the oration, Livy makes a point of describing the ‘sollemne carmen precationis’, or as Holland glosses it, ‘the solemne praier which magistrates are wont to use as a preamble’, implicitly contrasting this traditional and orthodox rite with the sensational account of the cult that follows.\(^\text{125}\) Postumius carries this contrast into the exordium of his speech:

Nulli umquam contioni, Quirites, tam non solum apta sed etiam necessaria haec sollemnis deorum comprecatio fuit, quae uos admoneret hos esse deos quos colere, uenerari precarique maiores uestri instituissent, non illos qui prauis et externis religionibus captas mentes uelut furialibus stimulis ad omne scelus et ad omnem libidinem agerent.\(^\text{126}\)

For which Holland gives:

Never in any of your assemblies, ô Quirites, was this solemn praier unto the gods, either so meet or convenient, or so requisite and needfull as in this, to advertise and put you in mind, that those be the true gods indeed whom your auncestors ordained, that you should honour, serve, worship and pray unto, and not these who pricke & provoke (as it were) with goads of furies, your spirits and minds transported and carried away with faulse and strange religions, to commit all wickidnesse, mischeefe, and filthie lust.\(^\text{127}\)

In terms of Holland’s approach to translation more generally, it is worth noting his repeated expansion of a single word in Livy into doublets. As Massimiliano Morini has remarked of Holland’s style, ‘Eloquence is identified with abundance, the good orator is

\(^{125}\) Livy (39.15.1); Holland (1600) 1032.

\(^{126}\) ‘Never, Romans, has this public prayer to the gods in any assembly been not only so fitting but also necessary, which is of the kind to remind you that these are the gods whom your ancestors ordained for you to worship, revere, and supplicate, not those who with perverse and foreign superstitions have driven captive minds as though by furious goads to every crime and to every lust’. Livy (39.15.2–3).

\(^{127}\) Holland (1600) 1032.
the loquacious one: two or three words will do where one would suffice’. Thus for ‘apta’, Holland gives ‘meet or convenient’, for ‘necessaria’, ‘requisite and needfull’, for ‘agerent’, ‘pricke and provoke’, while he expands the phrase ‘captas mentes’ with the ‘your spirits and minds transported and carried away’. For ‘prauis et externis religionibus’, Holland has ‘faulse and straunge religions’. Holland thus translates prauus (that is, ‘crooked’, and thence ‘wrong’) as ‘faulse’, a translation he repeats when he comes to Postumius’s observation that ‘nothing is there in the world, that deceiveth more under faire semblance, than false religion’. The phrase ‘false religion’ proved extremely popular in sixteenth-century religious controversies, not least with regard to the seminary priests. Thus in A Watchword to all religious, and true hearted Englishmen (1598), Sir Francis Hastings (c.1546–1610) lamented that the Pope ‘sendeth his pupills abroade amongst vs, to draw christians from Gods truth, to his false religion’. With ‘straunge religions’, Holland picks up the literal sense of Livy’s ‘externis’, but also adds a sense of something unfamiliar or abnormal. Laurence Humphrey (1525x7–1589) had employed the word in this sense in A View of the Romish Hyrdra (1588): ‘A straunge Religion doubtlesse, that teacheth men to murther Princes and Monarches of the world’. Holland thereby textures Livy’s account with contemporary concerns over what constituted ‘true’ or ‘false’ worship. At another moment, Holland actually expands a rather simple phrase in Livy – ‘illo uno sacrario’ (‘that one shrine’) – to incorporate

128 Morini, 92.
129 Holland (1600) 1033; cf. Livy (39.16.6–9): ‘Nihil enim in speciem fallacius est quam praua religio’ (‘nothing is more deceitful in appearance than corrupt superstition’).
131 Laurence Humphrey, A View of the Romish Hydra and Monster, Traison, Against the Lords Annointed (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1588) 13.
these anxieties, giving ‘this one ungracious chappell and place of counterfet holinesse’.

At another level, however, Postumius’s glance to the past and the religious rites which ‘your ancestors ordained’ might be read with an eye to the Roman Church. Both Robert Parsons and William Allen had placed an emphasis on the antiquity and heritage of the Roman Church in their apologies for English Catholics. Thus Parsons, for instance, in his *Certayne Reasons Why Catholiques Refuse to Go to Church* (1580) argued that of those religions currently extant in England, ‘the Catholicks are the first, the auncientest, the more in number, and the most beneficial to al the rest (having begotten and bred vp the other, and deliuered to them this Realme, conserued by Catholicke religion, these thousand yeares and more)’. This resonance between traditional Roman religion and the Catholic Church is suggested again at a later moment in Postumius’s speech. Here he assures the Roman people that although they may harbour concerns over the dissolution of religious rites, ‘of this scrupulositie discharged yee are, by an infinite number of Pontificall decrees’, where ‘Pontificall decrees’ translates Livy’s ‘decreta pontificum’. Pontifical for an early modern reader could not help but suggest the Roman Church. The sometime Catholic priest turned Protestant polemicist Thomas Bell (b.c.1551, d. in or after 1610) targeted ‘pontifical pride’ in *The Survey of Popery* (1596), while the author of the *Historia de Donne Famose* (1599) spoke contemptuously of the ‘ponitifcal monarchy & yoke’ and ‘Ponitifcall vncomelies and shame’. ‘For how many a time and often’, Postumius continues,

---

132 Livy (39.16.2); Holland (1600) 1032.
133 Robert Parsons, *Certayne Reasons Why Catholiques Refuse to Go to Church* ([East Ham: Greenstreet House Press], 1580) 3iiiv+ William Allen refers elsewhere to Catholicism as ‘our ancient religion’. William Allen, *An Apologie and True Declaration* ([Rheims: Jean de Foigny], 1581) Bi
134 Holland (1600) 1033; cf. Livy (39.16.7).
in the daies of our fathers and grandfathers, hath commission beene graunted to the Magistrates, To restraine and forbid expressly all forraigne sacrifices and straunge liturges? [...] to abolish all other order and manner of sacrificing, but according to the Cannon, forme, and order of Rome? For they judged (wise men as they were, and deeply seene in all divine and humane laws) nothing so forcible to ruinate and overthrow religion, as when divine service is celebrated after some straunge and forraine fashion, and not according to the auncient custome of the place.\textsuperscript{136}

Holland’s ‘according to the Cannon, forme, and order of Rome’ makes a tricolon of Livy’s ‘more Romano’, which may also have suggested the old faith to Holland’s early modern audience.\textsuperscript{137} Though Holland’s religious lexicon hitherto identified the Bacchic rites with the Jesuits, he now opens up the possibility of reading Roman state religion with an eye to Catholicism.

With this is mind, it is intriguing that in Livy’s account, though those initiates who have participated in criminal activity are severely punished, the rites themselves are not in fact forbidden. As Holland translates it,

Moreover, if any person made some consience of this religion, and held it for a devote, solemne and necessarie institution, and withall protected before the Pretour of the citie, that he could not lay away the same without prick, remorse, and clogge of consience: then the said Pretour was to put the cause in question before the Senate, and if the Senate (assembled in no lesse frequencie than one hundred) would allow and permit the same, then might the partie solemnize that devotion and divine service: provided always, that there were not above five persons present thereat, to assist him, nor any common silver to be used in the ministerie, nor Offer-master, nor Priest.\textsuperscript{138}

Here Holland has introduced ‘conscience’ for Livy’s \textit{religio} (‘religious reverence’) and \textit{piaculum} (‘an act requiring atonement’). Intriguingly, both Robert Parsons and William Allen had appealed to the idea of conscience in relation to religious obligation in their apologies for English recusants. In the dedication to Elizabeth which prefaced his \textit{Certayne Reasons}, Parsons spoke of the dilemma facing English Catholics, who must

\textsuperscript{136} Holland (1600) 1033; cf. Livy (39.16.8–9).
\textsuperscript{137} Livy (39.16.9).
\textsuperscript{138} Holland (1600) 1034; cf. Livy (39.18.9).
either ‘renounce God by doinge that, which in iudgemente and conscience they doe condemne: or els sustayne such intollerable molestations, as they can nor beare’. So too almost twenty years later in *A Temperate Ward–Word* (1599), Parsons wrote that Catholics ‘for consience refuse to go to Church’, and remembered Henry VIII’s former ‘iudgement and conscience in matters of the Catholique truthe’. In his apologies of the 1580s, William Allen had similarly complained that English Catholics were denied ‘freedom of conscience’, that is, the liberty to worship as they understood to be morally and religiously fit. It is exactly this sense of religious obligation to which Holland appeals above. Holland’s conclusion to the Bacchanalia episode thereby leaves space for religious tolerance, albeit a tolerance which is carefully and strictly circumscribed with some very particular desiderata (the congregation must not reach more than five worshippers, money is not to be gathered in a central fund, nor is any official priest to be appointed). We might recall here Holland’s promise to Elizabeth that, as part of his duties as a free denizen, Livy will ‘acquaint your liege subjects with religious devotion after his manner, with wisdome, pollicie, vertue, valour, loyaltie’. Clearly Holland saw that there were lessons to be gleaned from Livy’s depiction of the religious.

Livy’s account of the Bacchanalia, which Holland translated by liberally incorporating the religious language of the late Elizabethan era, thereby offered an alternative to the unflinching hostility of the Protestant government towards English recusants.

---

139 Parsons (1580) ʒiii
141 Allen (1581) 13v; William Allen, *An Admonition* ([Antwerp: A. Conincx], 1588) A4v
Conclusion

When preparing the first, full-scale translation of Livy into English, Philemon Holland drew from an impressive corpus of Livian scholarship produced across Europe, from the earliest editions of Livy published in Germany to De La Faye’s French language translation of 1582. Holland’s *Romane Historie* thus represents the fruits of over a century’s critical study of the *AUC*. In the material which prefaced the enormous translation, Holland developed two metaphors to introduce his version of the history. The first presented Livy as a stranger to England hoping to secure a Patent of Denization from the crown, while the second cast Livy and Holland in a kind of parental partnership giving birth to a new translation. Both metaphors suggest something of the way Holland viewed the source text, namely as something to be naturalised and adopted into its host nation. By appealing to contemporary, religious lexicons in his reworking of the Bacchanalia episode, Holland fostered a resonance between Livy’s initiates and late Elizabethan depictions of seminary priests. His translation left room, however, for a kind of religious tolerance and ‘freedom of conscience’. Livy’s history was thereby made to comment, once again, on the most pressing political concerns of the day.
Conclusion

Fælix illa demum Respublica quae habet Interpretes. [...] Hispanias ego fortunatas esse iudico, Italiam item & Galliam & cæteras regiones qui Caesarem, Liuium, Ciceronem, suo domestico sermone legunt.¹

Thus wrote the translator and Protestant exile Laurence Humphrey in his Interpretatio Linguarum (1559), a treatise in three books on the theory and practice of translation. The implicit contrast he draws between the English and other nationalities of Europe, who are able to read the classics ‘in their own language’, is not strictly fair. By 1559, England had seen vernacular translations of both Livy and Cicero alike, and also of Caesar, albeit through a French intermediary.² Nevertheless, Humphrey’s remarks complement the habit of early modern translators to look to the continent for precedents of vernacular translation. As the findings of this thesis suggest, the translation of Livy in the British Isles during this period was intricately connected to popular trends in European thought and scholarship.

For John Bellenden, translating the first five books of Livy into Scots meant harnessing the cultural prestige associated on the continent with the translation of classical history. By dedicating his translation to James V, he followed in the footsteps of the Benedictine monk Pierre Bersuire, who had dedicated his French Livy to Jean le Bon. To complete the project, Bellenden used an edition of Livy produced at Paris by

¹ ‘Happy indeed is that commonwealth which has translators. I judge Spain to be blessed, and Italy, and France likewise, and the other regions which read Caesar, Livy, and Cicero in their native language’. Laurence Humphrey, Interpretatio Linguarum: seu De Ratione Convertendi & Explicandi Autores tam Sacros quàm Prophanos, Libri Tres (Basel: Froben and Episcopius, 1559) A5v.

² Cicero had been printed in English translation as early as 1481, while Caesar’s Commentaries were printed in 1530, translated from a French version. See Cicero, The Polytyque Book Named Tullius De Senectute (London: William Caxton, 1481); Julius Caesar, Julius Caesars Commentaryes (London: William Rastell, 1530).
Jodocus Badius Ascensius, incorporating Ascensius’s textual emendations and glosses. He also relied on the proto-dictionaries developed by the Italian philologists Ambrogio Calepino and Niccolò Perotti, pioneering reference works which allowed him to grapple with the semantic complexities of the Latin original. Bellenden’s Scots version of Livy was thus mediated through continental advances in classical scholarship.

In early Tudor England, Anthony Cope followed European precedents by focusing on the Second Punic War. In Cope’s translation, Livy’s Carthaginians, renowned for their duplicity and deceit, bear a striking resemblance to the Scots of early Tudor literature, a resonance which Cope reinforced by drawing on contemporary lexicons of diplomacy. William Thomas, returning from his sojourn in Italy, introduced a way of reading the *AUC* to England which had been developed during the Quattrocento. Thomas’s Livy, in contrast to Cope’s military historian, offered a pro-female perspective in the *querelle des femmes*, thereby engaging in a wider discussion of women’s educative and social potentials.

William Painter juxtaposed Livy with a collection of continental authors in his two volumes of *The Palace of Pleasure*. His selections from the *AUC* showcased a series of remarkable women, including Lucrece and Virginia, who would later emerge as figures on the Jacobean stage. His focus on two, female king-makers, Tanaquil and Tullia, provided Shakespeare with the model of an ambitious and proactive queen which underpinned his characterisation of Lady Macbeth.

Philemon Holland was the first English translator to offer a panoramic view of Livy with his translation of 1600, encompassing every book then known to exist. Holland’s Livy drew on the most recent developments in historical and antiquarian research on the continent, some of which he reproduced in English translation. Holland reworked the Bacchanalia episode, one of the greatest religious and sexual scandals
known to republican Rome, with an eye to contemporary anxieties concerning the
migration of seminary priests. He also offered his early modern readership a model of
religious tolerance (albeit limited) inspired by Livy’s account.

Certain moments of Livy’s history evidently prompted greater interest than
others. The self-contained narratives of the first decade, e.g. the rape of Lucretia and the
death of Verginia, proved especially popular in vernacular literature, while the events of
the Second Punic War, as recorded in the third decade, were discussed and debated
throughout the century. The fourth and fifth decades, however, which covered Rome’s
growing strength in the Hellenistic world, received relatively little attention. Tellingly,
Harvey’s annotations on his copy of the AUC, which saturated the margins of the first
and third decades, slowed considerably when he came to these latter books.

Livy’s popularity, we are told, declined towards the end of the sixteenth century,
when a new kind of humanistic thought, embodied by the works of Seneca and Tacitus,
took the place of an outdated model, as represented by Cicero and Livy.\(^3\) Tacitus,
according to this view, outstripped Livy in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries
as the classical historian \textit{du jour}.\(^4\) The idea that Tacitus rose in popularity at the expense
of Livy was cemented by Peter Burke’s essay on the printing of ancient historians.\(^5\)
Burke’s thesis was based on figures provided by a nineteenth-century study by Franz
Ludwig Schweiger.\(^6\) These figures, however, are very much in need of updating. Burke
suggested, for example, that the total number of editions of the AUC produced between

1450 and 1700 totalled 160. Yet the data compiled for the *Universal Short Title Catalogue* suggests that well over 300 editions were produced between 1469 and 1600 alone. Following the traditional view, however, Maréchaux has recently identified ‘Livianism’ as ‘in vogue between 1480 and 1560’. Livy’s favour apparently ‘declined and did not last: the disciples of the *Respublica litterata* in France and northern Europe in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries conducted a re-evaluation of Livy, and their criticism of the historian suggests an about turn’. Maréchaux refers to Justus Lipsius’s (1547–1606) preface to his edition of Tacitus as ‘the final, fatal blow’ to Livy’s popularity. However, between Lipsius’s edition of Tacitus in 1574 and Philemon Holland’s landmark translation of 1600, eighty further editions of Livy were printed across Europe. By way of contrast, in the same period, seventy editions and commentaries were printed for Tacitus. By 1605, Francis Bacon could still refer to Livy as ‘the best Historiographer’. As noted above, another edition of Holland’s Livy appeared in 1659, and as late as 1686, a new, English translation of Livy was printed in London. The matter of Livy’s decline and Tacitus’s rise is not as tidy as some scholars have wished to suggest, and this has wider implications for the understanding of the period’s political history.

But what did Lipsius’s preface actually say? He has, he explains, often come away from reading Livy ‘non semper melior aut vitae casus instructior’ (‘not always better or more prepared for life’s fortunes’). Unlike Livy, Tacitus refrains from

---

7 Burke, 160.  
8 Maréchaux, 446.  
9 *ibid.* 449.  
10 This count includes editions of the history, translations, and collections of the *contiones*.  
13 *ibid.* 4.
parading Rome’s victories over Hannibal, or ‘Lucretia’s showy death’ (‘speciosam Lucretiæ necem’), or any of the prodigies and portents which pepper Livy’s narrative.\textsuperscript{14} These complaints, however, were not unique to the latter decades of the sixteenth century. In his introduction to one of the earliest editions of Tacitus, Andrea Alciato (1492–1550) remarked that ‘præ Tacito sordescet Liuius’ (‘compared with Tacitus, Livy is vile’). Here he went on to express his preference for Tacitus’s pithy lessons to the ‘longas prodigiorum narrationes’ (‘lengthy narration of omens’) and ‘procurataque a pontificibus portenta’ (‘monstrosities expiated by pontiffs’) to be found in Livy.\textsuperscript{15} Clearly, however, Alciato’s comments had no great impact on the enthusiasm with which Livy was received in the early decades of the sixteenth century. Lipsius’s criticism of Livy should no more be taken as a wider rejection of the AUC than the comments of Alciato.

It is worth noting that Lipsius took the opportunity to compare Tacitus favourably not only with Livy, but also with Caesar and Sallust. It was not uncommon for an early modern editor to praise his particular author at the expense of others. In the dedication to his 1609 Polybius, for example, Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614) spent five pages contrasting Polybius with the other ancient historians, insisting that ‘è cunctis verò illius [disciplinae] scriptoribus, qui vestustatem pertulerunt, Polybius præcipue notus ac familiaris esse debet’.\textsuperscript{16} The contrast Lipsius draws between Tacitus and the other Roman historians has more to do with marketing his particular edition than has hitherto been appreciated.

\textsuperscript{14} ibid. 3.
\textsuperscript{15} Tacitus, \textit{P. Cornelii Taciti Libri Quinque} (Milan: s.n. 1517) ai
\textsuperscript{16} ‘Indeed of all those writers of that discipline, who have conveyed antiquity to us, Polybius especially should be known and familiar’. Polybius, o’–oii’; o’
Lipsius evidently had more time for Livy elsewhere. Tacitus was his historian of choice for the *Politica*, but he also drew multiple examples from the *AUC*.\(^\text{17}\) As Jan Wasnink has observed, Lipsius placed Livy above Tacitus in terms of eloquence and style (if not didactic merit) in his *Notae* to the *Politica*.\(^\text{18}\) Lipsius also paid considerable attention to the emendation of Livy’s text, as is demonstrated by the multiple textual problems he tackled in the *Epistolarum Quaestionum Libri V* (1577).

‘English interest in Tacitus’, it has been suggested, ‘originated in the 1580s’.\(^\text{19}\) The translation of Tacitus into English was, it is true, comparatively late when compared to that of Livy. The versions produced by Sir Henry Savile (1549–1622) and Richard Greenway (*fl.* 1598) were printed in 1591 and 1598 respectively. But Tacitus had been cited in English, printed literature as early as 1529.\(^\text{20}\) At one moment, he was commended as a storehouse of examples for the politicians of tomorrow, and at another, he was used in a defence of female government.\(^\text{21}\) As this thesis has explored, Hector Boece relied heavily on Livy for the *Scotorum Historia*, but he also had frequent recourse to Tacitus. What is now needed is a more nuanced understanding of Tacitus’s reception in the British Isles, one which pushes the dates of interest earlier than has previously been attempted and explores the ways in which Livy and Tacitus were actually being read in conjunction.\(^\text{22}\)

---


\(^\text{20}\) Tacitus first made an appearance in a printed work in Richard Hyrde’s translation of Vives’s *De Institutione*. See Vives (1529) Hii°; Pi°; Siv°.

\(^\text{21}\) Thomas Elyot referred to Tacitus as ‘an exellente oratour, historien, and lawiar’ in the *Gouernour*, while John Leslie appealed to Tacitus’s Boudica in his defence of Mary, Queen of Scots. Elyot (1529) 55°; John Leslie, *A Defence of the Right Highe, Mighty and Noble Princesse Marie* (London [Rheims]: Eusebius Dicaeophile [J. Foigny], 1569) Rii°.

\(^\text{22}\) Thomas Brown’s translation of Johannes Sturm’s *Nobilitas Literata* (1549), for example, recommended that Livy and Tacitus be read in conjunction. See Johannes Sturm, *A Ritch Storehouse*, trans. Thomas Brown (London: Henrie Denham, 1570) 8°.
This thesis has demonstrated the impact of Livy’s history of Rome on the vernacular literatures of the British Isles throughout the sixteenth century. The chapters on Cope and Thomas have explored the relationship between print culture and vernacular humanism, highlighting the key role played by Thomas Berthelet in publishing English translations of classical texts. Similarly, chapters one and two have highlighted the continued importance of the printer, Jodocus Badius Ascensius, to the development of vernacular translation in Scotland. This thesis has also illuminated some of the cultural and literary exchanges between England and Scotland during the period, including the dissemination of Scottish historiography (as seen in chapter six), and the reinforcing of popular stereotypes (as seen in chapter three). Chapter six contributes to current scholarship on Macbeth, shedding new light on Shakespeare’s engagements with classical antiquity. At the heart of this thesis lies the importance of thinking about reception in multilingual terms; by taking into account the Latin original and its vernacular incarnations, as well as their continental precedents and Neo-Latin scholarship, a fuller picture of Livy’s influence begins to emerge. No study can be exhaustive, but this thesis has opened up new areas for discussion with regards to the reception and adaptation of classical history.

Livy enjoyed a rich and complex afterlife in the sixteenth century. As we have seen, the AUC was continually reshaped and reworked in English translation to meet a series of very specific cultural and political desiderata. For some readers at least, this was not so much an afterlife at all, but rather another lively moment in Livy’s immortal fame. As Timothy Kendall (fl.1572–1577) puts it in his collection of epigrams,

\begin{quote}
For Liuie late a Tome I gan ordaine,
‘What meanest thou?’, Apollo said, ‘refraine:
Such maner things become the dead (quod he)
But Liuie liues, and still aliue shalbe.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{23} Timothy Kendall, \textit{Flowers of Epigrammes} (London: John Kingston, 1577) 72
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