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PREFACE

The purpose of this dissertation is to throw light on the sixteenth-century English translations of De Officiis, one of Cicero's most popular and most influential works. The dissertation first surveys the history and reputation of the Latin treatise to 1600 and sketches the lives of the English translators. It then establishes the facts of publication of the translations and identifies the Latin texts used in them. Finally it analyzes the translations themselves—their syntax, diction, and English prose style in general—against the background of the theory and practice of translation in their respective periods.

I have examined copies of the numerous editions of the translations in the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Library of Congress, and the libraries of the Ohio State University and the University of Illinois. I have also made use of films of copies in the British Museum and the Huntington Library. I have indicated the location of the particular copies upon which the bibliographical descriptions in Chapter 3 are based. These descriptions are intended as an aid to bibliographers and librarians in cataloguing the translations. The particular items in the descriptions are such as will serve to identify copies lacking title pages and colophons. (I have found a number of erroneously catalogued copies in the course of my investigation.)
Research for this dissertation has made me appreciate anew the immense value to literary scholarship of the University Microfilms series of *Short-Title Catalogue* books. Unless there is a statement to the contrary, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English works cited in this study have been read on film.

I have altered the titles of early books to the extent of capitalizing the initial letters of major words; and where the titles are very long, a shortened form is given in the text or notes and the full title in the list of works consulted. The place of publication of these books is given only for those not printed in London. In the quotations cited herein, neither the long *a* nor the alternative *e* form common in black-letter type is reproduced. The raised hyphen is used for tildes, and the asterisk represents all signature symbols other than letters. In Latin quotations and titles, diphthongs in the source are written here as separate letters. With these exceptions, I have quoted both English and Latin texts just as they are printed. I have resisted the temptation in quotations to insert *sic* after every peculiar spelling and odd grammatical form.

In cases where there is no published translation for passages quoted from Latin authors, I have given the Latin in the text and my own translation in the notes.
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CHAPTER I
THE NATURE OF DE OFFICIIS
AND ITS HISTORY AND INFLUENCE TO 1600

I. The Nature of De Officiis

De Officiis was the last of Cicero's philosophical works to be written. He did not intend that this treatise should be his valediction to philosophy, but that it was quite fitting. Inasmuch as Cicero's genius lay in the fields of ethics and politics rather than any sort of metaphysical speculation, this book on the moral duties is the great and proper conclusion to his philosophic career. Near the beginning of the work he explains to his son why he has chosen to write on this subject:

But since I have decided to write you a little now (and a great deal by and by), I wish, if possible, to begin with a matter most suited at once to your years and to my position. Although philosophy offers many problems, both important and useful, that have been fully and carefully discussed by philosophers, those teachings which have been handed down on the subject of moral duties seem to have the widest practical application. For no phase of life, whether public or private, whether in business or in the home, whether one is working on what concerns oneself alone or dealing with another, can be without its moral duty; on the discharge of such duties depends all that is morally right, and on their neglect all that is morally wrong in life.
Moreover, the subject of this inquiry is the common property of all philosophers; for who would presume to call himself a philosopher, if he did not inculcate any lessons of duty?1

At a later point he reminds young Marcus that "while the whole field of philosophy is fertile and productive and no portion of it barren and waste, still no part is richer or more fruitful than that which deals with moral duties; for from these are derived the rules for leading a consistent and moral life."2

In De Officiis, then, Cicero wrote on the subject dearest to his heart, that part of philosophy than which "no part is richer or more fruitful." Although there seems to be no evidence concerning this treatise that "Cicero himself looked upon it as his masterpiece,"3 as the Loeb Library translator would have it, for him to do so would have been quite natural.

A glance at the De Officiis entry in the British Museum Catalogue will give an indication of the remarkable popularity of the book from the invention of printing up to at least the beginning of our own century. It was, furthermore, one of the relatively few works of Cicero known throughout the Middle Ages and early Renaissance and wielded a significant influence on some of the great minds of those times, as we shall presently see. James A. K. Thomson, in his Classical Influences on English Prose, says of De Officiis, ". . . This book, known to our forebears as Tully's
Offices, had a vast popularity from the Dark Ages to the nineteenth century. Its opinions entered into the general consciousness of Europe and have helped to form modern standards of conduct. H. E. P. Platt calls it "the source in great measure of European notions of what becomes a gentleman." Frederick the Great is reported to have pronounced it "the best work on morals that has been or can be written." The most lavish praise I have come upon for Cicero's treatise is that of two French critics and philologists of the mid-nineteenth century. In his Essai Bibliographique sur M. T. Cicéron (Paris, 1863), Pierre Deschamps says of it:

Ce livre à jamais célèbre, de Officiis, quelquefois aussi nommé Ethica, était tiré des philosophes grecs Panaetius et Hécaton; mais il se développa et fut si complètement défiguré sous la plume éloquente du maître romain, que l'on peut hardiment le présenter comme le corpus praecceptorum juris naturalis et moralis disciplinae le plus parfait et le plus sublime qui ait été jamais conçu par le génie de l'homme.

De tous les écrits de Cicéron, c'est certainement celui, qui resta à toutes les époques le plus populaire et le plus cultivé.

In the preface to Deschamps' book J. Janin speaks of "ce fameux Traité des devoirs, que l'on pourrait appeler l'Evangile de l'antiquité":

Ce Traité des devoirs, à l'heure où le fils de Cicéron étudiait aux écoles d'Athènes, fut envoyé par le père à son fils, comme un présent inestimable! En ce livre, presque divin, toute la morale est contenue, et désormais l'honnête homme y trouva son espoir, son exemple et son conseil! Rien ne suirait se comparer, parmi les œuvres humaines, à la vie, à l'action, à la gloire, à l'honneur du de Officiis, ce grand livre écrit au milieu des orages,
à la fin du monde romain, à l'heure où l'empire arrive portant dans ses flancs sanglants les Tibère, les Néron, les Domitien, toute la bande abominable de ces fous dont le délire est resté l'épouvante du genre humain!

Examined with considerably more detachment than these enthusiasts were capable of, De Officiis proves to be, if not presque divin, at least a thoroughly interesting book that can engage the attention even of an age that cares little for any sort of "rules for leading a consistent and moral life." The work takes the form of a letter to Cicero's only son, Marcus, a twenty-one-year-old student of philosophy at Athens. It is by no means, however, simply a book of rules for a young man; with only minor variations it might equally well have been addressed to Cicero's old friend Atticus, as were the almost contemporaneous De Amicitia and De Senectute. The treatise does indeed consist in large part of specific precepts indicating what is expected of the man of affairs in this or that particular situation. But the precepts are not baldly listed in catalogue form; they are carefully developed from general principles of moral behavior which themselves derive from Cicero's conception of the supreme good. As he explains to his son: "Every treatise on duty has two parts: one, dealing with the doctrine of the supreme good; the other, with the practical rules by which daily life in all its bearings may be regulated. The following questions are illustrative of the first part: whether all duties are absolute; whether one
duty is more important than another; and so on."9 Much of the first part of the book is given over to abstract discussion of moral behavior; thereafter, as each of the separate phases of the subject is introduced, general principles are first laid down, and then specific situations, drawn from daily life, mythology, and contemporary and ancient history, are cited as evidence.

For the reader who is not familiar with De Officiis, I shall give here a detailed analysis of its contents. The numbers in parentheses indicate chapters within the three books.

Book I

Marcus is exhorted to study both oratory and philosophy; the subject of duties introduced (1-2). Questions involved in a consideration of duty: the supreme and practical good, absolute and ordinary duty (3). Man differs from animals in having reason, speech, devotion to progeny, a desire to associate with others, yearning for truth, passion for order and rectitude (4). The sources of rectitude:

(a) apprehension of truth—wisdom
(b) proper regard for human society—justice
(c) greatness of a lofty soul—fortitude
(d) harmony and propriety of actions—temperance (5)

Apprehension of truth has the most intimate relationship with man's essential nature. But one must be able to discriminate between known and unknown and must not devote too much time and energy to worthless subjects (6).

The other three sources are concerned with justice and beneficence. Injustice is of two sorts: that done to others, that allowed to be done to others; philosophers are often guilty of the second (7-9). Cases involving contradictory principle. Fundamental principles: harm no man, serve the common good—these are sometimes altered by circumstances. One must honor his vows to enemies, obey the code of war (10-13). Beneficence must not work harm to the recipient; nor must we be too generous for our means;
and we must give to each only as he deserves (14). We must consider with care who will be the recipients of our assistance and what we shall give (15-16). In questions of relative importance of obligations, this order prevails: fatherland and parents (we are in debt to them), children and family in general (they depend on us), and congenial relatives. But real intimacy is to be found only in the perfection of friendship (17).

A lofty spirit is nothing if it is not guided by justice and devotion to the common good. It can easily be perverted (18-19). Courage and greatness of soul are best seen in indifference to external conditions and eagerness to do things most vital and useful though dangerous. It requires a belief that righteousness is the only good and absolute self-mastery over lust, fear, even joy, sorrow, anger (20). Desire for the simple life excuses no man from public duty (21). Achievements of peace are as great as those of war (22). The uprightness of the lofty spirit depends on moral rather than physical strength. A keen mind is as necessary as courage (23). Leaders must make the welfare of the citizens their chief concern and should be responsible for the whole state, not part. Forbearance and clemency are laudable in the great, but severity is sometimes necessary (25). There is no room for pride in times of prosperity. Some men with great souls have chosen not to be leaders but philosophers; others take the middle ground and retire to their estates (26).

Propriety is particularly related to this fourth division, temperance, but has to do with the three preceding also (27). Reason must always rule, appetite obey (28). Jokes and amusement must be subject to propriety (29). Propriety involves being true to one's own nature and temperament (30-31). In choosing a vocation we must consider Nature more than Fortune (32-33). Each age level has its obligations, as has each estate in society (34). Propriety involves the concealing of bodily functions (35), decorous physical deportment (36), appropriate speech—good voice, wit, taste, ability to reprove (37-38)—and a suitable dwelling place (39). Actions must be correctly timed and degree observed (40-41). Gentlemen can have only certain honorable professions—nothing menial or dishonest (42). Practical knowledge derived from service to men is higher than theoretical knowledge (43). Even great philosophers feel a debt to society—they train men who will be leaders (44). In any choice among duties, those originating in society come first.
Book II

Cicero must concentrate upon philosophy now that the Republic has fallen (1). The excellency of philosophy (2).

There is no distinction between expediency and uprightness except for purposes of discussion. No man is an island (3-4). The purpose of virtue is to win men as companions. Virtue consists of wisdom, temperance, and justice (5). Fortune is important in life, but so are one's personal efforts, especially in winning friends. Why men give gifts (6). The inadequacy of violence and force as a means to secure obedience (7-8).

Glory consists of the affections, trust, and respect that others have for one (9-10). The need for justice in one who seeks for glory, particularly among leaders (11-12). How young men may seek for glory (13). The possibilities for glory in oratory (14).

It is better to render some service to the needy than to give money (15). Elaborate gifts to the populace are usually wasted (16-17). Services for the needy are the most appreciated and best gifts (18-19). It is better to give aid and gifts to a needy man than to a rich one from whom one expects favors (20). The best gift leaders can give is compassion and honesty (21). The rich must not be robbed for the sake of the poor (22-24). On the choice between expediencies (25).

Book III

Cicero's forced leisure and his son's course of study (1-2a). Panaetius' discussion of duties (2b-3). The evil and impossibility of distinguishing between rectitude and expediency (4). It is contrary to Nature to wrong another (5). There is a common bond uniting all men; but occasionally a worthless man must be sacrificed for a good man (6). Nothing should be sought for its own sake save what is right and honorable (7). It is evil even to hesitate in choosing between the honorable and its opposite (8). Plato's myth concerning the concealment of evil (9). False expediency sometimes confuses men, particularly in cases involving friends (10). States often have wrong ideas about expediency (11). Some problems in which expediency appears to be in conflict with honor, and the opposing solutions of Diogenes and Antipater (12-16). Guile masquerades as wisdom in dishonest dealing (17). A case involving dishonesty and acquiescence in another's evil (18-19). Even when the reward is great there is no excuse for
villainy (20). Seeking for absolute power is the chief sin (21). Further cases in which expediency was thought to override honor (22). Some difficult questions of right and wrong (23-25). A great man, Regulus, and his great deed (26-32). Condemnation of those who make pleasure the highest good and pain the greatest evil; the recapitulation of the book; Cicero's charge to his son (33).

The excellencies of De Officiis are many, and for these it has been justly praised. The work also has its flaws, some of them serious. Cicero modeled his first two books on a discussion of duties by the Greek Stoic Panaetius and unfortunately carried over some of the faulty thinking of his original. Panaetius based the virtues out of which duties arise on certain primary impulses: the instincts for self-preservation, reproduction, social attraction, protection of offspring, and intellectual curiosity. But, as H. A. K. Hunt remarks, "Even if one were to admit the possibility of establishing a valid ethical theory upon such a basis—and this possibility may be doubted—surely the account of the impulses would have to be much more penetrating that this arbitrary classification. . . ."10 Furthermore, in their practical outworkings the primary impulses of Panaetius are at times in opposition, and Cicero does nothing to rectify the conflicts. The impulse of mutual concern and affection between man and man would require that all goods be held in common; yet the impulse to self-preservation would justify an individual's insistence upon private property. The altruistic principle is particularly stressed
in the first book and the concern for individual interests in the second; the two books are consequently at odds in some details. The same sort of discrepancy is implicit in the long discussion of decorum. On the one hand it is insisted that each man must be true to his own nature in all that he does; but on the other hand it is held to be necessary that one's conduct be regulated both by the common good and a considerable body of highly arbitrary rules of propriety. Hunt's judgment on this sort of discrepancy in the work is a valid one: "Admittedly neither he nor his sources were able (or felt the need) to overcome in theory the basic conflicts of man's 'individual' and 'universal' nature . . . . But it is probable that he and they were not aware of the fundamental nature of the conflict, did not feel the need to tackle it in theory, and thought that their plausible explanations of the reconcilability of 'individual' with 'universal' nature were adequate."

The inconsistencies in De Officiis are probably due in large part to the unsettled state of Cicero's life at the time he was composing it. The work was written in the fall of 44 B.C. Cicero had been in almost constant movement since the middle of that year in an attempt to keep out of the grasp of Mark Antony, who was furious with the aging senator's opposition to his policies and actions following the assassination of Caesar. Cicero laments to his son in the third book of De Officiis, "... As I am kept by force
of armed treason away from practical politics and from my practice at the bar, I am now leading a life of leisure. For that reason I have left the city and, wandering in the country from place to place, I am often alone."\textsuperscript{12} He beguiled the time by composing philosophic works. "... I have not strength of mind enough by means of silent meditation to forget my solitude; and so I have turned all my attention and endeavour to this kind of literary work. I have, accordingly, written more in this short time since the downfall of the republic than I did in the course of many years, while the republic stood."\textsuperscript{13} It is not surprising, considering the precarious state of his existence, his concern for pressing affairs of state, and the haste with which he had to write, that his last major work should fall short of perfection. On the other hand, it may be that the high moral tone and warm patriotism of the treatise resulted from an awareness in Cicero that his career was near its close and that he was here writing his valedictory address, not merely to his son, but to Rome and posterity.

II. The History and Influence of \textit{De Officiis} to the Invention of Printing

The influence and reputation of \textit{De Officiis} in the Middle Ages have been traced in an excellent long article by N. E. Nelson, "Cicero's \textit{De Officiis} in Christian Thought: 300-1300,"\textsuperscript{14} and need only be summarized here. Nelson remarks "Of the pagan treatises on morals which were
available during that period Cicero's *De Officiis* is one of the most important, for it exercised almost continuously an influence which was distinct from that of other pagan sources, and which helped to prepare Europe for the cultural change which we call the Renaissance.\(^{15}\)

Lactantius, the "Christian Cicero" (born c. 250), is the first of the Church Fathers to make extensive references to *De Officiis*. In his *Divinae Institutiones* he demonstrates for cultured pagans the inadequacies of pagan philosophers by summoning those philosophers to testify against themselves. With regard to what Cicero has to say in the treatise on duties, Lactantius, as would be expected, disagrees with some of the basic assumptions and many of the specific precepts, but he obviously retains much respect for this Roman who could write so nobly without the benefit of the Gospel's light. Says Nelson, "The first important meeting of Christian and pagan ethics was distinctly not friendly, though Lactantius was often more in accord than he is willing to admit with the pagan of whose charm he is so suspicious."\(^{16}\)

Whereas Lactantius attacked *De Officiis*, Ambrose (c. 340-397) brought it into the service of the Church. His *De Officiis Ministrorum* is Cicero's work Christianized for the benefit of the priests in the episcopate of Milan. Ambrose patterns his work on Cicero's, rejecting material of the original wherever he must, adapting it wherever he
can. Nelson remarks that one is amazed to discover "the quantity of pagan thinking which it was possible for Ambrose to imbibe and still walk in the narrow paths of fourth-century Christianity."\textsuperscript{17} De Officiis Ministrorum was so widely known and used that it is frequently difficult to tell whether specific post-fourth-century citations of Cicero's work derive from the original or from Ambrose.

Both Augustine and Jerome in the fifth century quote portions of De Officiis, but neither does so extensively. After them there are long centuries when, though the adaptation of Ambrose is frequently cited, the classical treatise is used very little. In the sixth century Martin of Braga wrote a Formula Honestae Vitae which depends much upon De Officiis. In the ninth century Hadoard, a librarian in the West Frankish Empire, copied into his Excerpta Ciceronis passages which give a "surprisingly adequate representation of the range of pagan moral ideas in the De Officiis."\textsuperscript{18} Scattered references to and quotations from the work can be found in writings of the tenth and eleventh centuries, but not until the twelfth was it again used so significantly as it had been before the fall of Rome.

Two popular and influential twelfth-century works derive in part from De Officiis. Moralium Dogma Philosophorum, a collection of quotations from pagan thinkers and moralists, is important for the humanistic conception of ethics it disseminated in the late medieval and early
Renaissance centuries. Who compiled the work is not certain; what is of much significance for our discussion is that it was written for the edification of the young prince who was to become Henry II of England. The structure of the tract parallels closely that of *De Officiis*, and much of the content of Cicero's treatise has been taken over and blended with materials from other classical writers. The *Moralium Dogma*, according to Nelson, was "quoted and paraphrased . . . by many important thirteenth-century writers,"¹⁹ and in the following centuries it was translated into a number of vulgar tongues; by 1514 at least five editions of it were in print. "This twelfth-century tract, then, played its part in preparing for the extensive influence of the *De Officiis* in scholastic thought of the thirteenth century, and for the still greater influence upon the ethical culture of the Renaissance."²⁰

An even more significant work that makes substantial use of the treatise on duties is the *Policraticus*, or *Statesman's Book*, of John of Salisbury. This very long work, the subtitle of which translates as *Privilgies of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers*, is "an encyclopedia of the culture of the age."²¹ In its wide range are included discussions of hunting, gambling, music, acting, omens and dreams, astrology, and flattery. But most important are the sections on politics—the relation of the ruler to the law, the administration of justice, the
responsibilities of the army, the justification of tyrannicide, and so on. It is particularly in his treatment of political theory that John is indebted to De Officiis. Cicero's emphasis upon the cardinal virtues of justice and temperance is reflected in Pollicraticus, as is his constant insistence that virtue andexpediency are identical. Among other specific points, John's justification of tyrannicide is taken directly from Cicero. Ambrose and the author of Moralium Dogma had side-stepped this troublesome and dangerous issue; John, speaking in behalf of the Church against that same Henry for whom Moralium Dogma had been written, cites Scripture and history to prove that at times it is right in the eyes of God for men to commit tyrannicide. In his discussion of Pollicraticus and De Officiis Nelson declares,

The influence of the De Officiis on John of Salisbury is significant, not only because the Pollicraticus was in itself an expression of the medieval mind at its best, but because the Pollicraticus was an influential book, widely read in the thirteenth century, by Helinand, Walter Burley, Vincent of Beauvais, and later by Geoffrey Chaucer, and it was still read and respected by important figures in the Renaissance.22

That greatest of minds of the next century, Thomas Aquinas, assimilated De Officiis along with the rest of classical literature extant at the time. Hans Baron says of Aquinas with regard to his use of Cicero's treatise:

In his Commentary on the Sentences as well as in his Summa Theologiae the chapters dealing with the importance of contemplation and active life
point to the Cicero of De Officiis as to the sole champion of active life, just as the Judge of Brescia had done a few decades before. By his claim that "iustitia" should be placed at the head of all the virtues, and that there was no excuse for any contempt of positions in the state and in the army, Cicero is in disagreement with all the authorities acknowledged by St. Thomas. But Thomas, the great scholastic philosopher, with his calm and well-balanced mind, does not consider Cicero's lonely championship a dangerous challenge to the traditional picture. It is easily absorbed into the vast synthesis of thirteenth-century culture.23

An indication of the high regard in which De Officiis was held by some contemporaries of Aquinas is the fact that it was used along with Aristotle's Ethics as a textbook in the arts faculty of Paris for the baccalaureate examination in moral philosophy.24

Quotations from our treatise can be found in a number of thirteenth-century religious writings much less important than those of Aquinas and in books on the education and duties of princes and lay magistrates. The De Regimine Principum type of writing derives mainly from Seneca and medieval works, but Cicero's treatise is a basic source of at least one important representative of this class, Giraldus Cambrensis' Liber de Instructione Principis. The works written by twelfth-, thirteenth-, and fourteenth-century Italian laymen for the instruction of civic authorities form an important body of early Renaissance literature. Small, vulnerable republics like Florence and Venice needed a highly capable, conscientious leadership, and it was
recognized that Cicero's *De Officiis* was a pertinent document in the training of such. Nelson notes, in this connection: "Authority depended, not on the loyalty and obedience of subjects, but on the ability of a responsible official to serve and win the approbation of his constituency. The *De Officiis*, a guide for politicians in republican Rome, could not fail to be recognized as a source of valuable advice on how to succeed in a free city." Three thirteenth-century Florentine men of affairs, Giovanni Nanni, Albertano da Brescia, and Brunetto Latini, wrote highly popular books and tracts drawn in both spirit and substance (in Latini's case via the *Moralium Dogma*) from the treatise on duties.

The ambivalent attitude of Petrarch toward Cicero is well known. He long had held the medieval view of the great Roman as a solitary sage, thinking and writing far from the noise of contemporary life. But then he discovered the lost *Letters to Atticus*, which reveals Cicero as being thoroughly involved in the intrigues and machinations of Roman governmental affairs, particularly after the assassination of Caesar. Petrarch was struck with despair at discovering his hero's desertion of the *vita solitaria*. "O spirit ever restless and perturbed," he laments to Cicero,

in old age—I am but using your own words—self-involved in calamities and ruin! what good could you think would come from your incessant wrangling, from all this wasteful strife and enmity? Where were the peace and quiet that befitted your
years, your profession, your station in life? What Will-o'-the wisp tempted you away, with a delusive hope of glory; involved you, in your declining years, in the wars of younger men; and, after exposing you to every form of misfortune, hurled you down to a death that it was unseemly for a philosopher to die? . . . Ah! how much better it would have been, how much more fitting for a philosopher, to have grown old peacefully in the country, meditating, as you yourself have somewhere said, upon the life that endures for ever, and not upon this poor fragment of life . . . .

Obviously, Petrarch's appreciation of De Officiis was limited by that work's insistence upon the preeminence of the active life; but there were portions of it that appealed strongly to him. The opening chapters of the third book, where Cicero speaks of Scipio's mental occupation during periods of seeming inactivity and of his own accomplishments in philosophy during his time of forced retirement, had throughout the medieval era been lifted out of context and cited as evidence of the superiority of the solitary life; Petrarch does not hesitate to use this passage to prove the same thing in his De Vita Solitaria. In this work also he mentions with approval Cicero's remark in the first book of De Officiis that some philosophers, by nature unequipped to stand the pressures of public life, withdraw to the country to enjoy solitude and the simple life. Another of Petrarch's works, the treatise written for Francesco di Carrara in 1373, is in large part founded upon De Officiis and is one of the channels through which the latter passed into Sir Thomas Elyot's The Boke Named the Gouernour.
And, finally, in one of his letters Petrarch makes direct comment upon Cicero's treatise; he rhapsodizes on its worth as a guide for youth: "Scripsit idem officiales libros ad Ciceronem filium . . . : o quanta refertos elegantia et gravitate! omnia preceptis salubribus plena sunt, nulla pars operis stimuli vacat quibus excitet iuvenilem animum et accendat ad imitandum saltem domestice glorie claritatem."30

So influential became De Officiis in the education of the youth of Florence, writes Hans Baron, that "soon after 1400, men of the old school complained that the young generation were beginning to gather from Cicero's De Officiis that 'happiness and virtue were bound up with position and reputation in political life.' They were forgetting the philosophic truth that the 'perfect life' is contemplation and inner peace."31 In the 1430's a Florentine citizen named Matteo Palmieri made an adaptation of Cicero's work, entitled Della Vita Civile, thus doing for men of his time what Ambrose had done for those of the preceding age. After the third decade of the fifteenth century the rediscovered De Oratore of Cicero became the standard of conduct for those engaged in the business of the state. But its message was no novel one; the civic spirit of ancient Rome had been kept alive through the Middle Ages and promoted in the early Renaissance by De Officiis.
III. The History and Influence of De Officiis from the Invention of Printing to 1600

De Officiis was one of the first classical works to be issued from the printing press. The printers Fust and Schöffer published an edition at Mainz in 1465; Ulrich Zel produced another at Cologne in probably the same year. The statement of Walter Miller, translator of the Loeb Library edition of the treatise, that Sweynheim and Pannartz issued De Officiis from their press at Subiaco in 1465 seems to be without foundation.32 The careful survey of Sweynheim-Pannartz books by McKerrow, Esdaile, and others lists no edition of this work until 1469, and that was printed at Rome rather than Subiaco.33

The multitude of editions of De Officiis published in Europe and England from the beginning of printing through the sixteenth century is amazing. The exact number cannot be known, but some indication of how large that figure must be can be obtained from a count of the British Museum's copies representing separate editions. The catalogue of that library lists more than seventy Latin editions published from 1465 through 1600. Somewhat surprisingly, in only seven of the seventy is the treatise published separately. It appears, of course, in the relatively few editions of the collected works of Cicero. In the great majority of remaining cases it is published together with some or all of the other four works of moral philosophy of this author: De Amicitia, De Senectute,
Paradoxa, and Somnium Scipionis. Other than the obvious fact that these works are related in subject matter, the economics of publishing may account for their frequently being issued in a single volume. The treatise on duties is longer than the other four put together, but by itself it makes up a fairly slim book that printers may have found unprofitable to produce and distribute.

De Officiis had been translated into four European vernaculars before Robert Whittinton englished it in 1534. The first German translation appeared in 1488, a second one in 1531. The treatise was put into French in about 1500 and into Italian twenty years later. The second German translation and the French and Italian ones went through a number of editions. At least two and perhaps four Spanish versions appeared before the middle of the sixteenth century. By the end of the century there were also translations in Dutch (1561) and Polish (1593). Judging from the British Museum Catalogue and counting both Latin and vernacular editions (including the English, with which we are here concerned), De Officiis may well have been published more frequently from 1465 through 1600 than any other single piece of classical literature.

Of all the early Latin editions of the work, none was so important as that of Erasmus. The treatise was a special favorite of his. In a letter which he intended to
serve as the preface to his 1501 edition, he tells his close friend James Tutor of his high regard for the ancient work:

In rebus autem humanis aut nihil omnino durabile, aut profecto literae sunt. In proximis igitur meis inambulationibus, quibus ob valetudinis imbecillitatem a cibo crebrius vt solitum acis (nam unus fere correptabas), tres illos M. Tullii de Officiis libellus vere aureos relegimus, incertum maiorene voluptate an fructu. Quos quoniam Plinius Secundus negat unquam de manibus deponi oportere, voluminis magnitudinem quoad licuit contraximus quo semper in manibus enchiridii vice gestari et, quod scripsit idem, ad verbum edisci possint. . . .35

Eighteen years later Erasmus wrote another letter to Tutor, which was printed along with the first as the preface to a new edition of De Officiis and Cicero's other treatises of moral philosophy. In this he tells his friend that De Officiis, De Amicitia, De Senectute, and the Paradoxa were among those books he was accustomed to carry about with him as he traveled from place to place so that he might have something with which to occupy his mind in times otherwise wasted. While reading these works, he says, he was constantly amazed at the excellence of the pagan ethic.

Sic subinde mecum inter legendum cogitabam: Hecceine ethnicus scribit ethnica, prophanus prophanis? At in praeceptis viuendi quanta aequitas, quanta sanctimonia, quanta synceritas, quanta veritas, quam omnia consentanea naturae, quam nihil fucatum aut somnolentum. Quem animum exigit ab his qui gerunt rempublicam! vt admirabilem illam et amabilem virtutis spetiem ponit ob oculos! quam multa, quam sancte, imo quam diuinitus tradit! de gratis etiam iuuandis omnibus, de tuenda amicicia, de immortalitate animorum, de contemptu earum rerum quorum gratia vulgus hodie, non dicam Christianorum sed theologorum etiam ac monachorum, nihil non et
facit et patitur. Pudebat interim nostrorum morum, qui sacris libris edocti, qui tantis et exemplis et praemiiis prouocati, doctrinam Evangelicam profitemur, nec praestamus. Describe nostris satrapis talem principem aut magistratum qualem describit Cicero, dispeream ni cum sua imagine vt delirus ridebitur. Quis nunc rempublicam nisi spe lucri aut honoris gratia capessit? Quis non ita gerit vt questum facere videatur, vt hostem agat eorum quibus debuerat etiam vite suae dispensio consulere.36

The effect of these and other passages in the prefatory letters is to turn the reader's attention to the historical personality of the ancient author. Erasmus, as Patrarch had done before him, came to know and love Cicero as an individual, as an exceptional man whose words are important because of the sort of person he was. No longer were the writings of this Roman merely a collection of sententiae and maxims; one studied the works closely in order to become thoroughly acquainted with the man and his way of life. Such an ideal put a premium upon the accuracy of the classical texts and brought textual criticism into new prominence.37

In his effort to make the elevated moral philosophy of De Officiis readily and completely available, Erasmus performed four services in his edition: (1) as we have seen above, he made the book physically small enough to be easily carried about (and, incidentally, to sell at a low price); (2) he wrote a helpful set of notes to replace the cumbersome commentary of earlier editions; (3) he worked out a new set of headings to indicate the natural divisions of
the treatise; (4) most important, he made an effort to achieve an accurate text of the treatise. In the 1501 letter to Tutor he says,

... Pro Petri Marsi commentis, vtinam exquisitis potius quam immanibus, crebras annotationculas asscripsimus, que velut asteriscī quidam commode ad omnem caliginem alluceant. Praeterea titulos illos quibus nescio quis opus illud intersecuit magis quam distinxit, partim vt oculos sustulimus, partim vt alienos alio traiecamus, mutauimus omnes atque vberiores argumentulorum instar reposuimus. Neque minimus in castigando sudor. Mendas offendimus (vt in opere tam trito) plurimas, dum notariorum inter scribendum hic compositionem perturbat, ille pro voce quae forte fugerat finitimam reponit, non illas quidem portentosas, sed tamen in tanto autore non ferendas. Eas omnes partim conferendis exemplaribus, in quibus incredible quanta dissensio, partim Tulliani characteris sagaci coniectura corruximus, vt hoc certe possim lectori spondere, nullum his exemplar propius ad archetypum accedere.

It is interesting to observe in passing that Erasmus' concentration upon De Officiis for his edition early in 1501 quite probably bore fruit a few months later in the first draft of his Enchiridion Christiani Militis. This important work is primarily an attack upon religious ceremonial and a plea for genuine faith that manifests itself in Christian charity. It was written, Erasmus said many years later, at the request of a devout woman for the edification of her husband, an irreligious, dissolute soldier. But it would be a mistake to put much importance in this belated explanation of the genesis of the work or, for that matter, in a literal translation of its title. According to Johan Huizinga, in Erasmus' time miles no
longer had the medieval meaning of "knight"; Huizinga translates the title as "The poniard of the Militant Christian."\(^{39}\) The book is concerned with the spiritual warfare in which every believer is involved, not with the conduct of a particular, actual soldier. The request from the pious wife served merely as the occasion for Erasmus to express something that very much needed to be said about contemporary Christianity. In large part the *Enchiridion* reflects the influence upon Erasmus of Jean Vitrier, a Franciscan divine of notably liberal tendencies who was much concerned with the reform of empty religious ceremonial. But the influence of *De Officiis* is also quite evident. Erasmus seems clearly to have been inspired by the Roman treatise on moral duties to analyze the standards of conduct of the Christian sixteenth-century as Cicero had done those of the pagan first century B.C.\(^ {40}\) The "enchiridion" of the title, with the double meaning *manual* and *poniard* or *hand sword*, Erasmus had already applied to *De Officiis* in the 1501 letter to Tutor, as we have seen above; he had made his edition of that treatise physically compact so it could "always be carried in the hand like a manual/sword."

A few sentences later he returns to the sword image and expands upon it: "Quapropter te hortor, mi charissime Iacobe, vt hunc pugiunculum semper in manibus gestites; breuem quidem illum, sed non Vulcaniis armis aut Homericus Achilles aut Aeneas Vergilianus munitor. Nam et fortius
est cum viciis quam cum viris congradi, et ut rectissime
scrisit ille, ὃπλον μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπετή βροτοῖς,
quod homines nullis armis melius armentur quam virtute.⁴¹

The influence of De Officiis was as widely diffused
in the Renaissance by means of the Enchiridion as it had
been in the Middle Ages by means of De Officiis Ministrorum,
Moralium Dogma Philosophorum, and Policraticus. Erasmus's
treatise reached an audience almost as large as that of
De Officiis itself. It is said to have been published in
more than seventy Latin editions in the sixteenth century
and to have been translated into eight modern languages
before 1590.⁴²

At the close of his panegyric on De Officiis in the
second letter to Tutor, Erasmus makes the pronouncement,
"Ego vero dignos censens quos et omnibus in ludis praelegant
adolescentiae litteratores et sibi legant relegantque
senes...."⁴³ It is impossible to say whether the old
men of the time acted upon this judgment, but certainly the
schoolmasters of Tudor England did. De Officiis was part
of the English grammar school curriculum throughout the
sixteenth century and on into the seventeenth. Ample
evidence of this can be found in T. W. Baldwin's monumental
William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke,⁴⁴ the index
to which lists more than sixty page references under "De
Officiis." In curriculum after curriculum drawn up by the
pedagogues and educational theorists, this treatise is
included among the works of moral philosophy to be mastered by the youths of England. Bishop Richard Fox, Sir Thomas Elyot, Laurence Humphrey, Walter Haddon, John Sturm, and Roger Ascham commended it. Sir John Cheke had his young pupil Edward VI read and reread De Officiis and copy out edifying sententiae and definitions. Elyot in The Boke of the Gouernor would have the student take up moral philosophy in his seventeenth year, but Edward studied the treatise on duties at the age of eleven, in his fifth year of schooling. Baldwin notes that moral philosophy was introduced into the fifth and final form at the Bury St. Edmund's grammar school in 1550 and remarks, "Presumably its introduction to the school curriculum followed the experimental use on Edward." In the second half of the century De Officiis was regularly taken up in the final years in English grammar schools. "In the curricula," says Baldwin, "De Officiis is in the last form in six out of nine mentions known to me, next to the last in two, and one lower in only one. It is in upper grammar school in all cases. It is thus one of the last studies of upper grammar school. . . ." 

Baldwin believes that while the older boys were reading De Officiis in Latin the younger ones were getting it through the English translations. His evidence is, first, that John Bretchgirdle, the preacher-schoolmaster who baptized Shakespeare, willed his "tullies ofices in Englyshe" to a six-year-old boy in 1565; and, second, that
two boys entering the second form of Eton in 1560 were provided with "Marcus Tullius' Offices," which from the appearance of the title Baldwin supposes to be "an English translation, if so Whittinton's or Grimald's, suggesting that the boys at Eton used this translation in the second form for moral training." It seems questionable to me that the facts make possible such an inference, and even more questionable that they allow Baldwin to conclude thus: "Apparently, this is the reason so many editions of the English translations of the work were used." Perhaps the translations were used in the grammar schools; but this cannot be proved on the basis of such slim evidence as Baldwin cites.

Some hint of the nature of the encounter between schoolboy and "Tully's Offices," whether in Latin or English, can be gathered from a remark of Henry Peacham in The Compleat Gentleman; he has just cited a passage from Cicero which testifies to that worthy's integrity of mind:

Whereto I might adde that tale of Gyges ring in his Offices, which booke let it not seeme contemptible unto you, because it lyeth tossed and torne in every Schoole: but bee precious, as it was sometime unto the old Lord Burghley, Lord high Treasurer of England, before named; who, to his dying day, would always carry it about him, either in his bosome or pocket, being sufficient (as one said of Aristotles Rhétoriques) to make both a Scholler and an honest man.
It is interesting to have this testimony concerning Burleigh's opinion of the value of our treatise; for, while the schoolmasters and pedagogues amply praised it, there is little available evidence concerning what non-academics thought of the work. Furthermore, it is practically impossible to point to this or that element in Tudor thought and literature and say that it derives immediately from *De Officiis*. We do know that parts of the second and third books of Elyot's *The Boke of the Gouernour* were drawn directly from this treatise and that the Renaissance idea of decorum in the drama was based in part upon Cicero's discussion of the subject in the same place. It may be too that the work influenced Spenser's treatment of the cardinal virtues in *The Faerie Queene*. But little more than this can be claimed. Baldwin points out that a number of items in Shakespeare's plays may have been taken from *De Officiis* but that there is no proof whatever they in fact were. "These things and many more in Shakspere could have come from that source, but the ideas and phrasings of them in *De Officiis* had been so absorbed by the age that it is very difficult to distinguish between original and derivative." It is impossible to measure the influence of a work that generations of schoolboys had had pressed upon them as a guide for a man in his relations with other men, a guide second in worth only to the Scriptures.
IV. The English Translator's Discussion of De Officiis

Robert Whittinton's 1534 translation of De Officiis opens with a Latin poem dedicating the work to Henry VIII and an "Exhortacyon" to the readers concerning the merits of Cicero's treatise. The quite undistinguished poem, extravagant in its praise of the King, is of interest here simply for the lines in which its author professes a patriotic motive in making his translation:

*Officia in linguam Ciceronis clara Britannam Traduxi gentis pro utilitate tuae.*

(sig. a2v)

The lengthy "Exhortacyon," unbroken by any paragraphing and padded with long quotations from De Officiis and other ancient sources, falls into five main divisions.

It begins with a discussion of the constructive uses of leisure, based upon Cicero's praise of Scipio in that regard; this prepares the way for praise of "Tully" for composing the treatise on duties in a time of enforced leisure. Then, to lay the foundation for a pronouncement on the relevance of this work to all men, Whittinton turns to a consideration of human psychology.

*For god hath gyuen unto us not onely a body/ commen and indyfferent to us almoste with rude beestes/ but also a soule endued with reason/ whiche soule is not ferre dyfferent fro the nature of aungell: for by reason we perceyue/ understande/ and remembre. whiche ornament of reason amonge all creatures here mortall onely is gyue to man.*

(sig. a6v)
Animals may excel man in some physical respects, but man possesses reason and so rules over creation. There are some individuals, unfortunately, who are concerned more with the beastly element in themselves than the angelic; examples of these Whittinton draws from classical and Scriptural sources. If we are to avoid the fate of such persons, he says, "we muste brydell these sensuall affections/ and submytte our selfe to reason the cheife guyde of nature/ and bende all the powers of our mynde to the studye of morall sapyence. . ." (a8r).

We would expect at this point to be ready for a statement on the pertinence of De Officiis, but Whittinton must first sharpen his focus upon the audience for whom he intends his translation—young men. A passage from the Book of Proverbs gives him an opening:

But for as moche as there be thre thynges (as Salomon saythe) harde to be knowne/ The way of a shyppe in the see. The way of a soule in the ayer. The way of an edder in a roude tyrle. The fourthe thynge is that Salomon confesseth that he knewe not/ the way of a yonge man in his growynge age. Not withstandyng to this last inconuenyent Tully semeth to prouyde synguler remedye. . . .

(sigs. a8r-b1r)

By means of long quotations from Cicero, Whittinton shows that young men must be subject to the guidance of their elders; that when they stand at the parting of the ways they, like Hercules, must choose the way of "hye and a rough ascente" (b1r); and that there are "two pathes in
the way of vertue," the martial and the civic, the second by no means inferior to the first.

Before he can finally concentrate his attention upon De Officiis Whittinton must undertake a long, completely extraneous survey of Cicero's treatment of the four cardinal virtues; but he comes at last to the work itself. He explains, first, why he has translated it:

The fynall cause wherfore I toke in hande this noble monument to be translate in to my natyue and englysshe tonge is this: I se many yomge persones/ and rather all for the most parte that be any thyng lettered/ of whome some scantly can skyll of letters/ very studyous of knowledge of thynges/ and be vehemently bente to rede newe workes/ and in especyall that be translated in to the vulgare tonge.

(sig. b3r)

Unfortunately, some of them get hold of the wrong sort of books--"vayne tryfles and playne follye"--and are disappointed to find that they are deriving little of value from their studies. For them Whittinton has prepared his text:

Wherfore studyous and gentyll reders I exhorte you/ and in especyall you the youthe that be of noble bloode/ whiche of nature shulde haue a flamynge desyre/ not to serche out the tytle of noblyte of your elders/ but rather by lyke or els more excellent vertue to amplifie and admaunce the fame of your noble progeny/ to take this noble monumët of Tully/ and to embrace it (as they say) in your louynge armes/ to turne it/ rede it/ and peruse it thorowe and by watchynge candell (as they says) with moste vygylant study to kepe it in memorye. . . .

(sig. b4r)
There follows a passage of high praise for De Officiis, parts of which Whittinton's genuine enthusiasm at this point raises considerably above the pedestrian level of the bulk of his prose. The "Exhortacyon" closes with Whittinton's humble apologies for "these my poore lucubracions in translatynge." The remaining front matter in the work consists of a brief sketch of Cicero's life and a summary of the content of the three books of the treatise.

At the head of Grimald's translation, first published in 1556, stands a brief dedication to Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, and a preface of about the same length as Whittinton's. In the dedication Grimald says that he has recently had the opportunity to take up some of his old university studies, in the course of which he has rediscovered Cicero's "bokes that of duties be written." So impressed has he been with the potential of this work to fashion the whole man that he has felt compelled to put it in a form that his unlatined countrymen can avail themselves of. Note the patriotic element here:

I laied to my helping hand: eneavouring, by translation, to do likewise for my contri- mene: as Italiäs, Frëchmë, Spaniardes, Dutchmë, & other foreins haue liberally done for theyrs. So, chiefly for our unlatined people I hauemde this latine writer, english: & haue now brought into light, y from them so longe was hidden & haue caused an aunclët wryting to beecome, in a maner, newe agayne: and a boke, used but of fewe, to wax cömon to a great meany. . . .

(sig. *3r-v)
He goes on to ask the Bishop to be patron of the translation so that "the common people" will "more hyely esteeme the thing" and so that "whē our English youth shall beholde them once authorised by so reuerend a father in god: no doute, they will be the rather in loue with them: and will counte it pleasaunt paines taking, here to enriche themselues . . ." (*4r-v).

In the preface Grimald takes a leaf from Whittinton's book and bases his claim for the relevance of De Officiis to contemporary life on the peculiar characteristics of human psychology. He touches upon the animal-angel dichotomy in man that Whittinton makes so much of, but turns to the Platonic concept of the tripartite soul for his major argument. There are in man three parts or natures or powers (it is not clear precisely how Grimald conceives of them): the "vitall parcell," which he shares with plants and animals; and reason, which he alone "in this worlde here beneath" (*6r) enjoys. The goal of the first is the maintenance of the body; of the second, pleasure; of the third, "science, and knowledge of trouth." The three parts must be kept in balance, else a man "shall not leade a life all euē, and streyght, but hoked, and croked: nor easie, and quiet, but miserablie distempered" (*8r). It is precisely here, says Grimald, that moral philosophy, particularly as embodied in De Officiis, can be of service to a man, for it will teach him the principle of balance and order in the
human personality. Once he has come to know himself and to regulate his life, the individual must understand that society consists of three levels of men paralleling the three parts or powers in the individual: the meanest sort attend to servile duties, the middle rank are concerned with "affaires, and sciences more liberall," and the nobility rule over all. Here again, De Officiis is ready at hand as a guide, for Cicero shows all kinds of men "what thei haue to do, thorough out their life: according to theyr age, trade, and estate: with respect to the circum­ stauces of times, places, and persones" (**1V).

After briefly surveying the contents of De Officiis, Grimald launches into an extended eulogy of the treatise. Other writers, he says, have dealt with the subject of this work, but none has matched Cicero's treatment. Rulers, householders, parents, doctors, divines, lawyers, philosophers, orators, rhetoricians, and schoolmasters—all can find something of value in this book. To make "these richesse, & treasures of witt, and wisdome" (**5V) widely available, Grimald has translated the work into English. The job was done once before, he admits, but it might as well not have been. "None other traslatiō in our toug haue I seen, but one: which is of all men of any lerning so well liked: y thei repute it, & count it as none: yet if ye list to cōpare this sōmwhat w y nothing: peraūsture this somwhat will seeme somwhat y more" (**5V). (The comparison he
suggests here we shall make in a later chapter, along with an analysis of the criteria he proposes for judging the merits of a translation.)

Grimald goes on to mention the sorts of persons who will profit from reading his translation closely in conjunction with the original. Because this passage gives an interesting picture of the state of contemporary learning and some indication of the way in which the classics were studied in the schools, I shall quote it in full.

Neuerthelesse, such as bee exquisite in bothe the languages alreddy: may (and that w some profit, & pleasure) trye, what I haue done, & what they can do, all under one: if, layeng my traslatiõ aparte, they will set the latine before thë, & so assay theyr owne veine. Eythre they shall like themselves the better: when they conferre it with my poore workmëship: orels perchauce conne me the more thank, for attempting, folowing, & accomplishing of this enterprise. Be it so, one hathe neyther the latine, nor the english eloquence: yet, by the benefite of nature, sythe a më may do much: namely if he therto adioyne use, & exercise: here is for him occasiõ bothe to whet his wit, & also to fyle his toug. For allthough an English më hath his mother toung: & can talk apace, as he lerned of his dame: yet is it one thing to title tattle, I wott not how, or to chatter lake a iaye: & an other, to bestowe his wordes wiselye, orderly, pleasantly, & pythiely. Such as haue english mealty well, & but a smattering, or small taste in y latine: which noumber is great, among the scholars of this realme: may hereby fall into such acquaynt- aunce, and familiaritie with this most excellent latine man: that neither shall his deuise seme hard, not his art obscure, nor his style straunge. I dare well saye, if this worke happe into a good students hand: hee will not think it ynough to runne ouer it once: as we fare with trifles, and toyes: but aduisedly, and with good leasure, thre, or foure, or five times, he will reade it, and reade it, and reade it againe: first, by the principall points, by the definitiõs, and the diuisions: to
see, what is treated, how farreforthe, in what order, and with what varietie: then, to mark the precepts, reasons, conclusions, & commō places: after, unto the sayd places to referre all the stories, with the verses poeticaill: finally, as well in the english, as the latine, to weygh well properties of wordes, fashions of phrases, and the ornaments of bothe. Moreover, many clerks haue I knowne, eare this: which could conceiue, & understand full well: whose toung neuerthelessse in utteraunce, and use of speche, was in a maner maymed: yea and sōme, that could also speake latine redlyly, and wellfauordly: who to haue done as much in our language, & to haue hādeled the same mater, would haue bene half blāk.

Grimald concludes the preface by reminding his readers that though young men can be led to the waters of moral philosophy, they cannot be forced to drink thereof. Or, to use his own metaphor, if you talk to the young of virtues and manners "ye do but sing the deaffe a song" (**7v). But the difference between virtue and vice must somehow be learned, Grimald says, and there is no better way to accomplish this than by the careful study and assimilation of Cicero's "three books of duties."

As is evident from the quotations above, Grimald intended that his translation be used by English youth as a means to learn both good morals and good Latin. But it also seems evident that he had a wider audience in mind than young scholars. Recall that in the dedicatory letter he says he has made the translation so that others might profit from the work as he has, and that he wanted to do for his countrymen what foreign translators have done for
theirs. "So, chiefly for our unlatined people I haue made this latine writer, english," he remarks; thus a book known to but a few people shall "wax cōmon to a great meany . . ." (*3r-v). If the Bishop of Ely will endorse the work, the common people—including "our English youth"—will the more highly esteem it. In light of these statements it is curious that Baldwin should say, "Though Grimald did not plan his translation specifically for grammar school, yet he envisions only youth as using it. . . ."58 That Wittinton's intentions were this narrow is clear (despite his professing to the King, "Traduxi gentis pro utilitae tuae"). But Grimald has a larger view. He saw the contribution that such a work as De Officiis could make to the nation. He was conscious of the coarseness of life and manners in his time, even among the substantial classes of people, and of the need for a rule of conduct less exalted, more practical than the Gospel. He felt, furthermore, that Englishmen were capable of perceiving their social deficiencies and that they would take advantage of the guidance Cicero's treatise has to offer.

Our mē, understanding, what a treasure is amonge them, for the fashioning of their life: and beeing by nature most of all other nations giuē to ciuitie, & humanitie: whē thei shall be aided, & directed by these perfite precepts: may, in all pointes of good demeanour, become people perellesse.

(sig. *3v)
There is no way to determine the matter, but it would be interesting to know to what extent non-academics— the "unlatined people" outside the schools— were responsible for the continuing demand that brought about the publication of edition after edition of Grimald's translation in the late sixteenth century.
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in the 1520 edition of the treatise: Officia Ciceronis rursus accuratissime recognita per Erasmum Roterodamum, una
et alijs, quod catalogum reperies in proxima pagella. Cui accessit Somnium Scipionis, & Graeca traductio Theodore
Gazae in Senectutem & Somnium (Basel). Here and in following passages from Erasmus, I have made use of Allen's text
to avoid the confusion of the frequent abbreviations in the original. In the 1520 edition this letter is dated 1498;
but on the basis of internal evidence, Allen feels confident that it was written in 1501 and was intended to appear
in the first edition, which was then being readied for printing. The translation of this passage is as follows:
"In human affairs either nothing is at all lasting or literature is. Therefore, in the late walks which I was
accustomed to take after meals on account of delicate health (as you know, since you were about the only one who
strolled with me), we read over those three truly golden books of Tulliy's De Officiis—whether with more pleasure
or profit, I cannot say. Since Pliny the Elder insisted that this work should never be allowed out of one's hands,
I have reduced the size of the volume so that it might be carried about as a manual and— as Pliny wrote— learned by
heart." This final sentence brings immediately to mind the practice of the printer-scholar Aldus Manutius of publish­
ing the classics in low-cost pocket editions. H. Noel Humphreys, A History of the Art of Printing (London, 2nd
issue, 1868), p. 114, says of Aldus, "It is probable that a great portion of his celebrity and popularity arose from
his being the first to relieve the reading public from the infliction of those ponderous folio volumes,— huge and
cumbrous books which must eventually have severely taxed the courage of the bravest student,— replacing them with the
neat and convenient "Octavo," which it is a real pleasure to handle; and this result was accomplished mainly by means of
the compact and small Italic type in which his "Virgil" was printed. The issue of a classic in this convenient size,
instead of the usual bulky and stately form, was a daring innovation; but one which became at once attractive." The
Virgil was published in 1501, the year to which Allen assigns the above letter of Erasmus. It would be interesting to
know whether Aldus and Erasmus arrived at the idea for pocket-sized editions independently or through the influence
of one upon another.
"While reading it I repeatedly asked myself: What—does a pagan write this to pagans, a profane man to the profane? But in his precepts for living, how great fairness, piety, pureness, and truth! How all things are in accord with nature, how free all is of artifice and sloth! What character it demands of those who are involved in government! How clearly he sets before our eyes that wonderful and lovely form of virtue! How frequently, how religiously—indeed, how divinely—he speaks about helping men freely, about securing friendship, about the immortality of souls, about the contempt of those things for the sake of which there is nothing that the common crowd (not to mention theologians and monks) will not do and suffer. It makes one ashamed of our customs that we who profess the Gospel doctrine, instructed as we are by the sacred Scriptures and inspired by such examples and rewards, should not excel. Describe to our governors such a prince or magistrate as Cicero describes—I would be amazed if he were not ridiculed as being crazy. Who now freely supports the commonwealth except for hope of gain and honor? Who does not behave as if he were making complaint, as if he were the enemy of those whom he ought to defend at the cost even of his life?"

36 Allen, IV (1922), 66.

37 See Walter Rüegg, Cicero und der Humanismus (Zurich, 1946), p. 76, for a discussion of this point.

38 Allen, I, 356-57. "Instead of the lengthy comments of Peter Marsus—would that they were more excellent than lengthy—I have added a large number of brief notes, which helpfully cast a light in the darkness just as certain small stars do. In addition, I have changed all those headings by which someone had chopped up this work rather than divided it; some which were worthless I have discarded, some which were out of place I have moved. I have inserted fuller headings, rather like little arguments. No less effort have I put into correcting the text. I have found many errors that crept in during transcription, as is to be expected in any work so widely used. Here is a break in the coherence, there the substitution of a related word for an exact one which is lost. Not that the errors are crucial—but in the work of such an author they are intolerable. Partly by a comparison of the manuscripts (among which there is unbelievable disagreement) and partly by conjecture with regard to Tully's brilliant style, I have corrected these things. I can now assure the reader that no edition approaches nearer to the original than does this one."

[Peter Marsus, whose annotations Erasmus belittles here, was an Italian scholar of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Editions of De Officiis embodying his notes appeared from the early 1480's far into the next century.]

Rüegg urges strongly that De Officiis was the primary inspiration for the composition of the Enchiridion (pp. 78-79).

Allen, I, 357. "Wherefore, I urge you, my dearest James, always to carry this "little dagger" in your hands. It is indeed small, but the weapon of neither Homer's Achilles nor Vergil's Aeneas was more mighty. For it is more courageous to contend with vices than with men. And, as someone has rightly said, 'Virtue is man's mightiest weapon,' for men can be armed with no better weapon than virtue."


Allen, IV, 67. "Indeed I judge it sufficiently worthy for the schoolmasters in all the schools to read before the boys and for old men to read and reread."

Urbana, 1944.

See Baldwin on each of these: Fox, I, 103-5; Elyot, I, 209-10; Humphrey, I, 317; Haddon, II, 586; Sturm, I, 288; Ascham, II, 585-86.

Baldwin, I, 227-30.

I, 299-300.

II, 586.

II, 374.

Ibid.


55 II, 598.

56 Full bibliographical descriptions of the English translations are given in Chapter III. Quotations here are from the 1534 edition of Whittinton and the 1556 edition of Grimald: signature references are given in the text.

57 See the extensive treatment of this idea in Lodo- wyck Bryskett, A Discourse of Ciuill Life (1606).

58 II, 583.
I. Robert Whittinton

Whittinton was born at Lichfield, evidently about 1480, and received his earliest education in the school of St. John's Hospital there. He continued his training at the Magdalen College School at Oxford under the famous grammarian John Stanbridge. Anthony à Wood indicates that Whittinton went on at Oxford to study on the university level, but at what college Wood could not say. In 1513, as we learn from one of the registers of the University, Whittinton supplicated the congregation of regents for laureation in rhetoric. The notice of the supplicat and the results it achieved are transcribed thus by C. W. Boase:

13 Apr. 1513. Wyhttyndon or Wyntynton (Robert), capellanus et scolaris artis rethorice sup. quatenus studium 14 annorum in eadem arte et informatione puerorum 12 annis sufficiat ut possit hic laureari. Hec est concessa sic quod componat C carmina et sumat gradum in proximo actu; disp. 3 July 'ut utatur serico vel tartaro in suo capicio,' 4 July insignitus est laurea, and admitted B.A.

This brief notice supplies some very important information about Whittinton. First, it allows us to say that, if in 1513 he had studied rhetoric for fourteen years and taught it for twelve, and if he was approximately
seven years old when he began his education, he must have been born around 1480. Equally important, the notice gives us a good idea of the nature and extent of Whittinton's education. What exactly was implied in the act of "laureation" has been variously argued. Perhaps the earliest interpretation of Whittinton's supplicat is that of Anthony à Wood in the Athenae Oxonienses; he paraphrases the register entry as follows:

In the beginning of the year 1513, (5 Hen. 8) he supplicated the venerable congregation of regents, under the name and title of Rob. Whytingdon a secular chaplain, and a scholar of the art of rhetorick, that whereas he had spent 14 years in the study of the said art, and 12 years in the informing of boys, it might be sufficient for him that he might be laureated. This supplication being granted, he was (after he had composed 100 verses, which were stuck up in public places, especially on the doors of St. Mary's church,) very solemnly crowned, or his temples adorned with a wreath of laurel, that is, doctorated in the arts of grammar and rhetoric, July 4, the same year. At the same time also he was admitted to the reading of any of the logical books of Aristotle, that is, to the degree of bach. of arts, which was then esteemed equal with the degree of doctor of grammar and rhetoric.4

Thomas Warton, in his History of English Poetry, agrees with Wood in relating laureation to grammar and rhetoric, though he puts the emphasis on grammar, "which included rhetoric and versification."5 A recent biographer of John Skelton takes issue with this view. H.L.R. Edwards argues that "though it could be treated metaphorically, the term poet laureate had developed a definite technical usage. In Skelton's day it was the name given to a graduate in the faculty of rhetoric."6 Though the two were naturally
interrelated in practice, rhetoric and grammar were distinct courses of study at the universities. The candidates for the grammar degree were examined "in the making of Latin verses and composition, and in their knowledge of Latin authors and the parts of speech"; at their inception they were presented with the insignia of their office, the rod and birch. Rhetoric was a more prestigious field of study. Edwards says:

In general, ... rhetoric stood for the more advanced study of Latin literature. And as the Renaissance increased the prestige of "eloquence," some attempt was made, at Oxford, to recognize this by admitting a new distinction, borrowed from the Continent: that of Poet Laureate. The qualifications were in many ways similar to those for the grammar degree; but, one imagines, a higher standard altogether would be demanded of the laureate. And instead of the rod and birch, successful candidates were publicly crowned with a laurel wreath. That they belonged to the faculty of rhetoric is certain: Bulman and Whittinton both claim it, and the poet Hawes, in his Pastime of Pleasure, introduces Lady Rhetoric alone of the arts as wearing "a garland of the laurel green."

Whittinton was inordinately proud of his academic honors. He was careful to indicate on the title-pages of all his grammars that he was "laureatus," and he early took to himself the grandiose title "Protovates Angliae," which, according to Wood, "was much stomached by Will. Horman and W. Lilye, and scorned by others of his profession, who knew him to be conceited, and to set an high value upon himself, more than he should have done." In his translations, which
began appearing in the early 1530's as the editions of his grammars were tapering off, Whittinton styled himself simply "Poete Laureate."

The entry in the Oxford register says that Whittinton was "capellanus." Wood, as we have seen above, interpreted this to mean "secular chaplain"; in so doing he was responsible for obscuring the important fact that Whittinton was in sacred orders. No modern biographer until A. B. Emden in A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500 (published in 1959) indicates that he was a priest. Drawing his information from ecclesiastical registers and state papers, Emden lists the following as the preferments Whittinton held in the period between 1514 and 1536: vicar of Mancetter, Warwickshire; rector of Bedhampton, Hants; rector of Drayton Parslow, Bucks; canon of St. Mary's and prebendary of St. James's, Warwick. The calendars of state papers contain other significant information about Whittinton's ecclesiastical career, not reported by Emden. A significant entry in the 1545 volume of The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, Foreign and Domestic reads:

The final title given to Whittinton here, King's chaplain, was probably an honorific one, as it is today, and does not mean that the holder was Henry's private priest. About the other titles there is no problem. Whittinton had by this time, at the age of approximately sixty-five, resigned his canonship in St. Mary's Church at Warwick, but still held the rectorships of Drayton Parslow and Stoke on Trent, the latter position one that Emden fails to credit to him. The parochial records of Staffordshire assembled by Walter N. Landor show that "Robert Whityngton" was rector of Stoke on Trent from March of 1538 until his death "c. 1552-3"; his successor was not instituted until September of 1553 but seems to have taken over his duties in April of that year. Lipscomb's history of Buckinghamshire, in a list of rectors of Drayton Parslow, indicates that "Robert Whittingham" was instituted as incumbent in April of 1523; no terminal date of his incumbency is given, but his successor was instituted in November of 1553. We can probably conclude from these records that Whittinton died near the beginning of the (civil) year 1553, at a little more than seventy years of age. This confirms the assertion of John Bale in 1548 that Whittinton was still living at that time, an assertion that has generally been ignored by modern writers on Whittinton.

Obviously Whittinton could not have performed the ecclesiastical duties of his last years very faithfully,
if at all. And it is highly doubtful that he was any more faithful in the discharge of duties in church positions he held in the second and third decades of the century, for his teaching and publishing activities would have kept him in London a great part of that time. We know almost nothing of Whittinton's teaching career. His supplicat of 1513 indicates that by then he had been instructing boys for twelve years. His Vulgaria, published in 1520, describes London scenes and events (most notably, a spectacular entrance of French ambassadors into the city in 1518) and seems clearly to have been compiled for London schoolboys. Evidently on the strength of this evidence alone, Emden says that Whittinton was "headmaster of a school in London, possibly S. Anthony's School, Threadneedle Street, by 1518. . . ." Even more questionably Emden remarks that he was "possibly headmaster of Lichfield Grammar School, founded by Wm. Smith . . ., bp. of Coventry & Lichfield, 1495, in connexion with S. John's Hosp." We do know that Whittinton served for some time as schoolmaster of the "henchmen" or court pages; payments to him in that capacity of five pounds each quarter from Christmas of 1528 to March of 1530/31 are recorded in the excerpts from the "Household Book" of Henry VIII printed by the Camden Society. Perhaps he held this preferment as early as 1521, for he remarks in one of his grammars printed in that year that typographical errors will be found
in the work because he has been engaged in business at court—"aulica negotia." He may have kept the post until 1547, for in May of that year a new schoolmaster was appointed by Edward VI. It may be that Whittinton obtained his ecclesiastical preferments through his connections at court. Cardinal Wolsey—like Whittinton, a former student of John Stanbridge, and for a time Informator of the Magdalen College Grammar School—was perhaps his patron; in 1519 Whittinton presented to Wolsey a manuscript book containing panegyrics on the King and the Cardinal, along with verses in praise of Sir Thomas More, John Skelton, and Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. He must have known personally Sir Francis Bryan, who was Master of the Henchmen from 1526 to the end of Henry's reign; in 1547 Whittinton dedicated his set of Senecan translations to Bryan. As Beatrice White, in her edition of the Vulgaria, remarks concerning Whittinton's "aulica negotia," "... It is a thousand pities that he, usually so vainglorious, did not boast more explicitly of his 'courtly business.'" Upon first looking at this grammarian's list of original works in the Short-Title Catalogue (which fill more than four columns), one wonders that the man had time away from writing books and reading printer's proof for any other sort of duties, either ecclesiastical or academic. Cried the great bibliographer Thomas Frognall Dibdin, "Oh, rare Robert Whittinton! how shall I attempt to describe the
innumerable impressions of thy almost unnumerable grammatical works?! Betake thee, gentle reader, to the *Typ. Antiq.* vol. ii. p. 172 &c. where not fewer than thirty pages are devoted to them as productions from the press of Wynkn de Worde alone, beginning as early as 1513. Again from page 449, there are five pages containing an account of such as were printed by Pynson, beginning with the date of 1515."\(^25\) Whittinton's grammatical works are scarcely innumerable, though the "impressions" of them may well be. Not counting the *Vulgaria*, there are listed in the *STC* ten basic works, each on a separate aspect of grammar (one must say "basic" because some of these were enlarged, diminished, or otherwise altered in their successive editions). These works as a whole can well be called tracts, most of them having no more than between eight and thirty or so leaves. Inasmuch as some of their titles contain references such as "liber primus," "liber tertius," "prima pars," and so on, it can be assumed that the author considered the separate tracts as parts of a single grammar. Beatrice White has attempted to reconstruct the master plan. "That Whittinton aimed at a "Corpus grammaticale," she says, "seems clear from a perusal of his books, but what form this was to take it is difficult indeed to determine. He seems to have planned a vast, comprehensive grammar in two parts, Accidence with Syntax, and Prosody. The indications of this plan are to be gleaned from the title-pages of his books,
but it is a disturbing fact that the second part of his grammar appeared before the first, and the second and third books of the first part before the first book." Such confusion as the fragmentation and disorder of Whittinton's grammar may have produced among his contemporaries did nothing to hinder the sale of the individual parts. His tracts were among the works most in demand at the shop of the Oxford bookseller John Dorne, according to his daybook for the year 1520.27

Whittinton's publication of his Vulgaria in 1520, just a year after William Horman's appeared, brought to a boil a simmering antagonism between him and rival grammarians. He had earlier attacked William Lily, Headmaster of St. Paul's School, in a series of invectives nailed to the door of the school and signed "Bossus." In 1521 Lily published these invectives and his own replies in Epigrammata Guil. Lillii Angli, subtitled Antibossicon. Horman, former Headmaster of both Eton and Winchester and now Vice-Provost of Eton, brought out another Antibossicon in the same year;28 he attacked Whittinton personally, in much the same scurrilous fashion Lily had done, and sneered at the quality of his Latin.29 Though Whittinton was scarcely humbled by the exchange (a year or two later he began putting the phrase "Humiliabit Calumniatorem" on his title-pages), the judgment of history has been that the
palm went to his foes. Thomas Fuller's sketch of Whittington is usually cited in this connection:

ROBERT WHITTINGTON, born at Lichfield, was no mean Grammarian. Indeed, he might have been greater, if he would have been less; Pride prompting him to cope with his Conquerors, whom he mistook for his Match. The first of these was Will. Lillie, though there was as great difference betwixt these two Grammarians as between a Verb defective and one perfect in all the Requisites thereof. The two other were William Horman and Alderege, both eminent in the Latin Tongue: but some will carp at the best, who cannot mend the worst line in a Picture; the humour of our Whittington, who flourished 1530.

Whittington was as industrious a translator as grammarian; from 1532 to 1547 he published six translations besides the Offices, the one with which we are primarily concerned. The first to appear was that of Erasmus's De Civilitate Morum Puerilium, englised as A lytell booke of good manners for chyldren. Published first by De Worde in 1532, it was reprinted by him in 1534, Byddell in 1540, Walley in 1554, and Bourman at some uncertain date. Whittington was at his best in translating this charming little etiquette book for page boys; it would not be surprising if other editions of it should be uncovered. Cicero's De Officiis and Paradoxa were probably the next works Whittington put into English, both having been finished before September of 1534. We shall examine the first in later chapters and shall return to the second and its interesting problems after glancing at the other translations.
Two editions of Whittinton's *Tullius de Senectute*

Bothe in latyn and Englysshe tonge were published by Byddell, one in 1540, the other at an unknown date. Like the *Offices* this translation is preceded by a Latin address to Henry VIII, who is now not only "fidei defensorem," as in the *Offices*, but "Anglicanae ecclesiae in terris supremū caput." The final three translations are of short treatises that Whittinton supposed to have been written by Seneca. Actually, the originals of *A Frutefull worke of Lucius Anneus Seneca, Called the Myrrour or Glasse of Maners and wysedome and A Frutefull worke of Lucius Anneus Seneca named the forme and Rule of Honest lyuynge* are by the sixth-century Archbishop of Braga, St. Martin; only the third translation, *Lucii Anni Senecae ad Gallionem de Remedii Fortuitorum. The remedyes agaynst all casuall chaunces*, is from a genuine Senecan original. The details of publication of these three works are not clear. The *Forme and Rule* was first printed in 1546, then redone in 1547 along with the other two. Each of the three is an independent work with its own title-page; but the dedication and preface of the 1547 *Myrrour or Glasse* serve for all three. In the course of the preface, addressed to Sir Frances Bryan, Whittinton remarks:

... I haue taken payne in studye to translate thre bokes of the sayde Seneca. The fyrst of maners. Seconde of the fourme of honest lyfe. Thyrde of remedies of all casuall chaunces and haue adioyned the texte of the latin, with the
translaclon in Englysshe, to \( \frac{1}{\text{j}} \) entent that nat
onely scole maysters, teachers, & reders folowynge
\( \frac{1}{\text{j}} \) olde tradicion of expart & excellent lerned men,
maye instructe theyr scolers in good and honest
maners in bothe tongues Englysshe and latn, but
also all other \( \frac{1}{\text{j}} \) be lettred (whiche in thys our
tyme be verye studyous of knowlege) by,oft redynge
of these vertuous workes: maye folowe \( \frac{1}{\text{j}} \) trade of
morall wysedom, whiche is the nexte meane to
amplyfye & encresse the cõmen welthes...

Whittinton clearly implies that he translated the three
works as a unit. Perhaps he did; or perhaps he says he did
at the instance of the printer, Middleton, who may simply
have had a surplus of copies of the 1546 Forme and Rule and,
in order to use them up, in 1547 printed with the same
format the other two works and a small additional batch of
the Forme and Rule with the 1547 date. Thus the three,
bibliographically independent, would have become a single
collection of moral treatises dedicated by Bryan.36

Whittinton's translation of Cicero's Paradoxe was
printed by John Redman for Robert Redman at an unknown
date. William Herbert in his edition of Ames's Typographi-
cal Antiquities assigns the publication to the year 1540,
but gives no reason for doing so.37 If the work was printed
only once and that as late as 1540, it had certainly lain
about a considerable time after having been translated.
Near the end of "The prologe of the paradoxe" Whittinton
tells of his plans for the work:

And to cõclude for asmoche as I haue of late trans-
late out of the latten tonge in to englysshe my
natyue tonge/ for singler zele tnat I haue to the
common welthe of this my countrey the .111. bokes
of Tullies office/ whiche I entende shortely to put forthe in printe. I haue also translate this **paradoxe**/ a worke dependynge and to be annexed to the sayde bokes of the office/ for asmoche as the disputacion is this worke is had aboute (in a maner) lyke preceptes and morall sapience. Wherfore gentill reders I exhorte you with fauour to accept this my lytle lucubrations and studyes/ though breue in quantite/ yet fruitful and sentetious with pytthy wisdome. And if I may pceyue your favorable myndes towards this little worke/ in shorte space you shall haue in prynte/ not only this translation in our englysshe tonge/ but also the texte of Tully in latten loyned to the same/ with the three bookes of his office/ in lyke maner .

(sigs. A4v-A5r)

The following conclusions can be drawn from this passage.

(1) By the time this preface was written, both De Officiis and **Paradoxe** had been translated but not yet printed. Thus the Paradoxe, as he called his version, was completed and the prologue composed sometime before September 30, 1534, publication date of the Offices. (2) This prologue was intended for an exploratory publication of the Paradoxe in English only; whether Whittinton meant for this publication to be in print or in manuscript is not clear. If the readers like the work before them, he says, they shall "haue in prynte/ not only this translation in our englysshe tonge/ but also the texte of Tully in latten. . . ." This could mean that the English translation before them is in manuscript, and that if it is favorably received it will be put into print along with the Latin. Or it could mean that the translation is already in print and that if it is well received it will be reprinted with the Latin added. (3) We know that the Paradoxe was not printed with the De Officiis
translation in 1534. If the undated edition of the Paradoxe we now have was published after that date, its prologue was quite inappropriate. One is immediately tempted to conclude that this undated edition is Whittinton's original exploratory work, published before September, 1534. The difficulty with this conclusion is that John Redman is not known to have been printing in the early 1530's; what few works we have from his press are dated about 1540. It may well be, of course, that our edition is copied from the original manuscript or printed edition and was indeed published in 1540, inappropriate prologue and all.

It remains to make a judgment of Whittinton's prose style when he is not under the bondage of translation. Unfortunately we have very little of his original English prose upon which to base such a judgment. The English sentences in his Vulgaria are, on the whole, unrelated or only loosely related and are of no help in an investigation of larger syntactical units. We are left with only the prefatory material in his printed translations, and even some of this will not serve the purpose.

The most extensive of the prefaces is that to the Offices, at which we looked in the preceding chapter. But that piece of writing appears in both English and Latin, and it is not clear which was the language of original composition. The fact that one sentence in the Latin is
not found in the English would seem to indicate that the former is the original and that in translating it Whittinton simply overlooked a sentence. Furthermore, there are thoroughly Latinate constructions in the English, for example, the unmitigated ablative absolute: "Fynally two honestyes purposed/ he disputeth whether is more honest" (sig. b7r); "These two wayes cōsydred/ Hercules chase the way of vertue . . ." (sig. blr). On the other hand, it might be argued that the omission of the sentence in the English is merely a copyist's or printer's fault, that the Latinate constructions are the natural product of the mind of a pedantic schoolmaster, and that in a number of places there are completely adequate English sentences where the Latin is faulty or incomplete (e.g., in the first of the two sentences cited above there is no equivalent in the Latin of "he disputeth"). It well may be that the two versions mutually influenced one another. At any rate, we cannot safely go to the prefatory material of the Offices for an example of Whittinton's original prose.

Only the Paradoxe and Myrrour or Glasse of his other translations contain any kind of front matter; in both there are "prologues" in English only. We have looked at passages from both earlier, but as a basis on which to judge specifically his prose style I shall give here the part of "The prologe of the paradoxe" not quoted previously.

For asmoch as the noble scholers of \( ^{1} \) philosphers/ Socrates & Zeno named stoici/ lefte this
notable sentens. Men be generate in to this world bycause of men/ to thende that one man may pfite an other man. The very excellent philosopher morall/ prince of oratours fountayne of eloquens/ & father of laten tonge/ Marcus Tullius Cicero/ moued with this sayinge and folowyng in all his workes the opinions of the sayd philosophers called Stoici/ euer pretendyng and procuryng the common welthe of his natyue countreye/ compyled this fruteful worke/ called in the greke tonge Paradoxa/ in laten soundyng/ preter opinionem/ and in our englysshe tonge/ cōtrary to the vulgar opinion. For bicause Tully dyd excerpte and toke out of the aboue sayd philosophers/ certen quicke sentens/ which semed to the multitude and the common people maruaylous sayinges/ straunge and contrarye to theyr opinion.

In whiche worke the sayd Tulli reproueth vices and avauunsethe vertues/ and by disputation and probable argumentes declareth the abusion of the lyuyng of certayne persons/ which leadde by blynde errour out of the ryghte way/ exteme things is that be most vicious & of villanous reproche/ to be vertues of hye reputation. Fro the whiche errour he by subtyle reasons and pythyse persuasions/ studiethe in this worke to reduce the myndes of men to vertue/ & so to conducte them to thende of pfet felicite/ which by y opinio of the schole of Zeno & Chrisipp philosophers, remaineth only in vertue. And in this worke Tulli sharply inuehyth againe certayn psones/ for theyr detestable vices that he noted in them/ beinge in his tyme/ as agayne Lucius Catalina/ Marcus Anthoni/ Marcus Crassus/ and Publius Clodius. Also he extolleth vertue by exple of valyant men/ as Quintus Mutiu Scuola/ Caius Fabricius/ Caius Scipio/ & Publi Scipio/ Marc Regulus/ Cal Marius/ Luci Minuti/ Marcus Curius/ with other nobles of immortall fame and memorye.

Accustomed to a logical system of punctuation, the modern reader finds the arbitrary pointing of this passage more than a little confusing. But once over that obstacle, he discovers that the above passage does make sense, that the sentences cohere, and that the thought progresses in fairly orderly fashion. The whole first paragraph comprises what
would be by modern standards only one sentence, which can be paraphrased thus: Inspired by the doctrine of the Stoics that man is born to serve man, and moved by a sense of duty to the common good, Cicero compiled this book called (because its precepts excerpted from the philosophers contradict popular opinion) *Paradoxa* in Greek, and so on. Typically, Whittinton's sentence is cluttered; one almost loses sight of its subject, "Marcus Tullius Cicero," and its verb, "compyled." The phrase "moued with this sayinge and folowyng . . ." is redundant, repeating in part the information of the opening clause. And what verb is modified by the final, "For bicause" clause is not apparent on first reading. But the sentence is at least complete. There is no anacolouthon to disappoint the expectancy raised by the opening "For asmoch as."

The faults of "The prologe of the paradoxe" are those that occur whenever anyone attempts to write Latin in English. The relative *which* at the beginning of sentences is forced to serve as both connective and demonstrative, as the Latin relative pronoun does: "In whiche worke," "Fro the whiche errour." The multiplicity of appositives and modifiers obscures the principal subjects and verbs. In the attempt to keep qualifiers near their referents, which is necessary in English but not in Latin, important elements are subordinated and emphasis is not achieved. Relationship between sentences is rarely left implicit; the
cumbersome machinery of the synthetic language is carried
over wholesale into the analytic, and the writing is
freighted with unnecessary correlative conjunctions and
conjunctive adverbs.

The preface to the "Senecan" translations offends
even more in these respects than does that to the Paradoxe.
I have quoted a portion of this earlier in the chapter, but
consider the following sentence, which embodies the major
stylistic tendencies of the author.

And for as muche as I consider in you gentyll maister
Bryan, bysde manyfolde vertues that you haue a
syngler zeale and delyte in workes that be pytth, and
polytke, touchyng moral wysdome ever glad (as y
noble ma of Imortall laude and fame Moecoenas) to
sette forwarde suche antique monumetnes of vertue
and good lernynge berynge special fauour, nat only
by your beneficell report to suche whiche be study­
ouis to sette forthe good and vertuous workes most
necessary to the knowledge of morall wysedome, wherof
ensueth the asuancement of comen welthes, but also
to promote suche into the fauoure of our most re­
doubted & bountyfull prynce kyngge Henry y viii. In
lyke maner as Moecoenas was wonte to doo with hys
souerayne Augustus Caesar y puissaunt prynce, I am
bolde to dedicate this my poore lucubrations
of the translacion of these thre morall workes,
traducte out of the monumetnes of y noble philosopher
Seneca, to thende that these workes goynge forth
under the recognysaunce of your name, maye the bet­
ter be accepte to al gentyll reders that hathe
delyte in morall wysdome, & nat onely that, but
also all other persôs that be of cankerde & enuyous
stomake, whose maner is to deprauae y studyous workes
of other menne, without cause, but onely of theyr
malencoly mynde repleted with venym of intoxicate
malyce, lyke unto a curre dogge that barkes at euer
waggyng of a strawe, shall y rather refrayne theyr
barkynge by deprauacion agaynst these morall monu­
mentes, put forth under the tuicion of your name. . . .

(sigs. A6r-A7r)
The punctuation of this unwieldy passage is so chaotic that it must have offended even an age that demanded little of punctuation as a device for achieving clarity. Upon close examination it becomes apparent that the independent clause begins in line 15: "I am bolde to dedicate this my poore lucubrations of the translacion of these thre morall workes, traducte out of the monumentes of y noble philos-opher Seneca." Everything preceding this constitutes a causal clause; everything following, a purpose clause. At only one point is logical syntax violated: the phrases following the correlative conjunctions in lines 7 and 11 are not grammatically parallel; "nat only by your benefi- ciall report" should be balanced by something like "but also by your promotion of such" rather than "but also to promote suche." Much more serious than this, however, is the fact that, except in the broadest sense, the sentence is formless and aimless. Within the overarching causal and purpose clauses forward motion is lost as each successive element sinks lower in sub-dependence and departs further from the center of meaning.

The diction of Whittinton's modicum of extant original prose is Latinate, though not oppressively so. It is interesting to note the combination of Latinate and Saxon words in such a passage as "malencoly mynde repleted with venym of intoxicate malyce, lyke unto a curre dogge that barkes at every waggynge of a strawe." The most notable
characteristic of Whittinton's diction is the pairing of synonyms. Tautology was a habit of mind with him, as it was with many of his contemporaries. Along with his balancing of correlatives it gives his sentences a sort of rocking effect; witness, for example, the first sentence from his prologue to Seneca:

For asmuch as very many thynges be wrytte & put in preceptes notably of singler wise men both to good maners, & to the ordre of manes lyfe whiche shulde styre& enflame us quyckely to the ryghte respecte of lyuynge, conduced & led bothe by auctoryte of very excellent men. Also by notable examples, natwithstandynge (I can nat tell by what meanes) we waxe dull and deef, & in so many & so great disciplynes of lyberall scyence, we nothynge profytinge, nodde & nap, by a sluggysshe dulnes.

Some of his doublets constitute almost pure tautology: "nodde & nap," "honoure & fame," "p sperous & welthy," "standeth & is set in," "voyde & vayne" are all from the second page of this same prologue. Other doublets, while not quite synonyms, are a result of the same tendency; in using phrases like "zele and delyte" or "pytthy and polytike," Whittinton is simply satisfying the demands of a favorite rhythmical pattern. And though he occasionally pairs Latinate and native works, as in "lucubrations and studyes" and "excerpte and toke out," he has no deliberate plan, like that of Sir Thomas Elyot, to aid in the comprehension of unfamiliar terms by combining them with native equivalents.
II. Nicholas Grimald

Grimald was born in approximately 1520 at Leighton-Bromswold, Hunts, of substantial yeoman stock. At the age of fifteen, having shown great promise in such education as his native village could provide, he went off to the University of Cambridge; five years later he took the B.A. degree from Christ's College. In 1541 with the financial aid and encouragement of the prebendary of Leighton-Bromswold, Gilbert Smith, he went to Oxford to continue his studies. In the next year he was incorporated B.A. at Oxford and was made a probationer-fellow at Merton College, from which he was graduated with the M.A. degree in 1543/44. Grimald next appears in the academic records in 1546/47 as being appointed a "senior or theologian" by Dr. Richard Cox at the newly reopened Oxford college, Christ Church, with the responsibility of reading lectures in rhetoric. He evidently remained in this position until early in 1552, when he was licensed to preach at Eccles, near Manchester. One year later he was in London, having been chosen by Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, to be his chaplain. Such was his prowess as a preacher that in 1553 Ridley selected him to address the public synod of bishops, meeting in London.

Associated with the outspoken Protestant Ridley as he was, Grimald inevitably found himself in difficulty upon the accession of Mary Tudor in 1553. Ridley, along with
his friends Archbishop Cranmer and the famous preacher Latimer, was imprisoned and subjected to various ecclesiastical examinations and trials for about two years. Grimald was in communication with the Bishop during much of this time. L. R. Merrill, the modern biographer and editor of Grimald, puts such a construction upon the few facts available concerning his subject's activities in this period as would warrant calling him the "Judas of the Reformation." It is clear that Grimald requested of Ridley copies of everything the latter wrote while in prison, and that these fell into the hands of the authorities. The Bishop, loth to believe evil of his chaplain, supposed that a messenger was responsible rather than Grimald. Early in 1555 Grimald himself was cast into prison, first in Oxford, then in London. Ridley wrote to a friend that Grimald was sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered, but then was for some reason set at liberty; "I fear," said the Bishop, "he escaped not without some becking and bowing (alas) of his knee unto Baal." If Grimald recanted to save his life, that is one thing; if, however, upon recantation he informed on his friends and then continued to spy on them—as John Strype says he did—that is quite another thing.

Objection has been made to Merrill's harsh view that John Bale, the rabid reformer, spoke highly of Grimald in 1556 (and even though Bale was abroad during these troubous
times, he would have heard of any such monstrous perfidy on
the part of a friend); that John Foxe, never one to over­
look the cruelty and deceit of the Catholic party, accused
Grimald only of inconstancy and weakness in the face of
death; and that the Puritan poet Barnaby George wrote a
highly laudatory epitaph on Grimald containing not a trace
of censure. In support of his view Merrill cites an
undated set of verses ironically entitled Carmen in Laudem
Grimald, which he translates as follows:

You meet everybody at the cross-roads, the
churches, the theatres,
That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.
You have praised few, but many have you branded
with infamy,
That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.
A grammarian, a rhetorician, a detractor, a
crier, a poet,
That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.
Since you do all things with a desire for trans­
itory praise,
May the gods give you praise, but brief praise,
O Grimald.

Admirers of Grimald might well wish that these lines had
never been written; they do indeed portray the man, in
Merrill's words, "as a self-seeker and a toady." But
this is all that can be said of them; they cannot be used,
as Merrill does, to imply anything about Grimald's actions
during the Marian persecution. The verses actually sound
like something a jealous academic would write about a per­
sonal enemy; they sound, in fact, like the sort of thing
that had passed between Whittinton and his antagonists
decades before.
Of the public life of Grimald after 1555 nothing is known. Foxe says that he died about the time of the coronation of Elizabeth.\(^52\) He had certainly died before May, 1562, since by that time Barnaby Googe had written the epitaph on Grimald that appeared a year later in *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes. Newly Written up by Barnabe Googe.*

Death respects no station and no rank, says the poet; death snatches away the "hie sharpe wytte sect" along with the rest of mankind.

For yf that wytt, or worthy Eloquens,  
Or learyng deape, coulde moue hym to forbeare,  
\(\text{O Grimaold then, thou hadste not yet gon hence} \)

But heare hadest sene, full many an aged yeare.  
Ne had the Muses loste so fyne a Floure,  
Nor had Minerva wept to leaue the so,  
If wysdome myght haue fled the fatall howre,  
Thou hadste not yet ben suffred for to go,  
A thousands doltysh Geese we myght haue sparde,  
A thousands wytles heads, death might haue found  
And taken them, for whom no man had carde,  
And layde them lowe, in deepe obllrious grounde,  
But Fortune fauours Fooles--as old men saye  
And lets them lyue, and take the wyse awaye.

\(^{(sigs. E4v-54)}\)

Everyone interested in the career of Nicholas Grimald owes a great deal to his friend John Bale for publishing a list of Grimald's literary works,\(^53\) even though we know it is at times inaccurate and very often vague. Since the titles are given in Latin, we usually cannot tell whether the many works no longer extant were in Latin or English, a most unfortunate gap in our knowledge of this humanist. But Bale's list is sufficient to indicate the amazingly wide range of Grimald's learning and interest. Merrill has
conveniently grouped the titles according to the type of literature, and I need only touch upon them here.54

Of poetry Bale cites several volumes now lost, including one of Old Testament songs, a metrical version of the Psalms, and the Georgics of Virgil; the second and third of these are specifically said to be in English. Merrill suggests that two other volumes, Carmina et Epigrammata and Cantiones Rythmicae, may have contained the forty English poems of Grimald that went into the first edition of Songes and Sonettes, published in June, 1557, a year after Bale's account was written.55 (I shall discuss these poems in chapter six in connection with the diction of Grimald's translation of De Officiis.)

Two of the eight plays Bale attributes to Grimald have survived, and important plays they are. Both are in Latin. Christus Redivivus, a tragi-comedy written when the author was only twenty-years old and had just arrived at Oxford to begin study toward the Master's degree, is notable for its departure from the classic sort of drama one would expect a student of the humanities to employ in dealing with so elevated a subject as the resurrection of Christ. The play has a huge cast of characters, including not only Biblical personages, but four soldiers of the Miles Gloriosus type, Alecto the Fury, and an individual to serve as chorus. In his preface to the play Grimald defends the mixture of high and low elements and discusses the necessity
of suiting the diction to the levels of the characters, in accord with the principle of decorum. Christus Redivivus was published in Germany in 1543. The second extant drama, Archipropheta, a tragedy based on the life of John the Baptist, was presented by Grimald to Dr. Richard Cox as evidence of his scholarly ability. Composed in the mid-1540's and published in Germany in 1548, this play is important as being one of the first tragedies known to have been written in England.

Grimald translated several of the classics besides De Officiis. It is sometimes difficult to tell from Bale's list whether particular works are translations, commentaries, or paraphrases (Grimald seems to have composed all three in the case of Virgil's Georgics). And it is impossible to know whether his translations from the Greek, including those of Hesiod's Works and Days, Plato's Crito, and Xenophon's Cyropedia (in eight volumes), are into Latin or English. The Latin works he translated or commented upon are the letters of Cicero and Horace, Terence's Andria, and Virgil's first Eclogue. He also wrote a commentary on the Psalms and one on frequently disputed passages of the Bible. We may suppose that a number of these works were prepared in connection with Grimald's lectures in rhetoric; Bale says specifically that the Cicero and Virgil items were. And undoubtedly the volume entitled Rhetorica in usum Britannorum--"A Rhetoric for the Use of the British"--
was an outgrowth of his Oxford lectures. This last is one of Grimald's works that we could most wish had been preserved.

We should note, before going on to consider Grimald's prose style, that he has been seriously proposed as the editor of the miscellany in which his English poems were published, Songes and Sonettes or, as it is now popularly called, Tottel's Miscellany. George F. Nott, in comparing this miscellany with certain sixteenth-century manuscripts of poetry for his edition of Wyatt and Surrey (1815-16), was the first scholar to observe that the poems in the printed collection had been edited to achieve metrical regularity. Throughout the work, Nott said, someone had labored "to reduce as much as possible the lines to the Iambic measurement of five equal feet."57 Edwin Arber in his 1870 edition of Songes and Sonettes suggested that Grimald was the most likely candidate for the editorship. Since the major change in the second edition of the miscellany was the omission of thirty of Grimald's poems and the addition of thirty-nine poems by other authors, and since Grimald at the time was having business dealings with the printer of the work, Richard Tottel, relative to the De Officiis translation, Arber felt that Grimald must have been "if not the Originator . . . the chief Editor of this Collection of Poetry upon a plan then new to English
The most recent editor of *Songes and Sonettes*, Hyder Rollins, rejected Arber's view and proposed that Tottel himself was the first editor, or at least the guiding spirit, of the collection. Inasmuch as nine of the ten poems of Grimald's that remained in the second edition were translations and wholly impersonal, Rollins supposed that Grimald had objected to Tottel about the publication of his verse and that the personal pieces were removed. The ten remaining poems were revised for the second edition in the same way that those of Wyatt and Surrey and the unknown authors had been for the first edition and were again for the second. It is not likely, Rollins felt, that Grimald would modernize his own poems.

A carefully reasoned reply to Rollins's view was written by H. J. Byrom, maintaining that Grimald is indeed the best candidate for the editorship. He argues that Tottel did not have, and Grimald did, the education in poetics necessary to make the sort of revisions that the poems in the miscellany underwent. Tottel, furthermore, was extremely busy in his printshop in 1557, doing twice his usual number of books that year. Grimald's own poems in the first edition embody the principles of metrical regularity that were applied extraneously by the editor to the poems of Wyatt, Surrey, and the others. As for the changes made in his ten remaining pieces in the second edition, they are of the sort that an author might well
make in his own work. 60 Byrom concludes his article with a statement of the sort of person the editor of Songes and Sonettes had to be: "... A student of contemporary poetry is indicated, whose habit was to treat the form of a poem as something distinct from its substance and whose interest was in the movement and balance of the verse rather than in the appreciation of poetical experience: in short, such a scholar-poet, translator, and 'improver' of other men's verses as we know Grimald to have been." 61 Shortly after Byrom's article appeared, conclusive evidence that Grimald was indeed an improver of other men's verses was found by Miss Ruth Hughey, who determined through handwriting that it was Grimald who emended the first nine poems in Wyatt's autograph manuscript (Egerton MS. 2711). 62

The only extant original prose of Grimald's by which to make a judgment of his prose style is the dedication and preface to his translation of De Officiis. Fortunately, unlike the case with Whittinton's translation, there is no reason to doubt that this front matter was composed in English rather than Latin.

The kinds of writing in the prefatory sections of the Duties run the gamut from methodical exposition to emotional declamation. Throughout, Grimald is careful to suit form to purpose. At the beginning of the preface, where he is laying the groundwork for an elaborate statement
on the tri-partite nature of the individual and society, he restricts himself to short clauses and a minimum of subordination.

All things in the world (good reader) be made for some use, & end: which end is more worth, than all, that doth service therunto: and where both the end is good, & whatso serves therto: there whole doing is likewise good. In us the best end is, to use ourselves well, and worthily: who in the order of natural things are of the best, and worthiest kind. For what is there, that can use itself: onlesse it bee enourmed with reason, and understanding? Dume creatures, and inuslesse of other bee used: but themselves can they never use. (sig. *5?)

But when he launches into praise of Tully and his book, Grimald multiples and lengthens his clauses and measures out his involved parallelisms in pleasant cadences.

Wherfore, not without maruailous greate pleasure, espoyeng: either in priuate life, to atttein quietness, and contentation: or in officebearing, to winne fame, & honour: or in euerie estate, bothe to auoyde disorder, and enormitie, and also to keepe a right rule, & commendable behauiour: this boke playnly is myrroure of wisdom, fortres of iustice, the master of manliness, the schoole of temperance, the iewell of complinesse: I wished, many mo to be parteners of such sweetnesse, as I had partly felt myself: & to declare, that I met nolesse, thå I wished: I laied to, my helping hand: endeuouring, by translation, to do likewise for my contriemne: as Italïas, Frëchmë, Spaniardes, Dutchmë, & other foreins haue liberally done for theyrs. (fol. 3r)

This sentence is long, complex, and replete with correlatives and corresponding elements, yet completely logical
and syntactically precise. The parallelism can best be seen schematically:

Wherfore, not without maruailous greate pleasure,
espyeng y
either in priuate life, to attein quietnesse
and contentation:
or in officebearing, to winne fame
& honour:
or in euerie estate, bothe to auoyde disorder
and enormitie,
and also to keepe a right rule,
& . . . behauiour:

dthis boke playnly is y myrrour of wisdom,
y fortres of iustice,
the master of manlinesse,
the schoole of temperance,
the iewell of comelinesse:

I wished, many mo to be parteners
of such sweetnesse,
as I had partly felt myself:

& to declare, that I mët
nolesse thå I wished:

I laied to, my helping hand:
endeuouring, by translation, to do
likewise
for my contriemène:
as . . . foreins have liberally done
for theyrs.

Near the beginning one almost expects this sentence to fall into the patterns that John Lyly was later to capitalize upon. But only part of the Lyly formula is here: isocolon and parison--equality of members and correspondence of form in those members. Nowhere does Grimald indulge in those other essential elements of Euphuistic style: paramcion--similar sounds in parisonic elements--and syllabic antithesis.

In the paean of praise to De Officiis near the end of the preface, Grimald makes skillful use of the rhetorical
question and repetition in addition to parallelism and balance. The emotion of his rhetoric mounts in waves, each wave a unit of three or four sentences with either a recurring phrase or a common pattern—first a piling up of rhetorical questions, then repetition of a final phrase, then repetition of an initial word, and so on. The whole passage is worthy of quotation here, but I shall quote only the beginning and a few other clauses.

How finely, & fealty be y poets verses allaged? With what a discreti15 ar some auncient writers reproved? With what subtilitie, & fynesse of wit be certein côtrouersies debated? Either of y chief philosophie, or of all humanitie what pointe is ther lacking? Aristotle artificialiie hathe written of maners: but, what for the lightsommesse, & eloquent handling of y treatise, what for y latine tong, which we do use more than y greeke: Tullie is aboue him. Panet19 wrote of dutiefull demeanour: but though his worke in some points was Tullies pattern: yet in all points, by all their iudgemets, ye euer saw the both: Tullie is aboue him. Xeno the Stoik wrote of dutie: but saeing diuers Grekes, who ar Tullies inferiours, wer as good as he: certesse Tullie is aboue him. Posidonius, a Rhodiane, meddled with the same mater: but nothing to Tullius. So did Hecato: but nothing to Tullius. And many other mo of later time: but, lorde, how farr be thei from Tulli9? Tullius, in his graue yeres, after he hadd herde a number of lerned men: after he had redde the most approued authors: after he had endyted so many volumes: and his style was woxen ripe, his witt sage, his lernig full, his iudgemët perfet: enterprised to drawe this draught, & made it of such excellence: as we may well woder at in viewing, & yet not attein in folowing. Tullius hauing done many glorious acts. . . . Tullius out of the Greeke authors. . . . Tullius to Marcus, his wellbeloued sonne. . . .

(sigs. **2v-3v)

The encomium to Cicero and his book surges along for pages on this level of rhetoric and comes at last to a conclusion
with Erasmus's statement of wonder that so morally excellent a work could have been written by a pagan. The ordering of thoughts in the whole passage, the prose rhythm, the strategy for securing the assent of the audience—all these testify to Grimald's great familiarity with the practice in the art of rhetoric. He is thoroughly in command of his stylistic devices; his parallelisms do not degenerate into asymmetrical coordination, and anacoloutha rarely mar his involved constructions. Only once, in an effort to keep a recurring phrase at the beginning of a sentence, does he let his syntax get out of hand: "Tullies duties when Cesar Augustus had redde ouer, still standing on his feete: as he againe deliuered them to his neiew, of wh5 he had thě: Eloquent (quoth he) was this man . . ." (sig. **4^).

While many of his usages are derived from Latin, these do not violate English idiom. Whittinton, as we have seen, sorely wrenches his English on the rack of Latin: Grimald, while he borrows from Latin where English is deficient, does not forget that he is writing English and that native idiom must be served.

In the preface Grimald denounces translations "uttered wynkhorne termes, & not with usuall words,"63 and it is a fact that in his original prose one finds mainly "usuall words," both native and long established imported ones. But some of his words—e.g., "contentation," "contrarietie," and "disconuenience"—smack of the inkpot,64
and the NED cites Grimald's as the first use of "sensiuue" and the only use of "fleshfondinges." It is interesting that on one page he writes the Latinate "perdurable," on the next two pages native synonyms, "euerlasting" and "euerduring." "Fleshfondinges" and "euerduring" are also examples of one of Grimald's pronounced linguistic habits—compounding new words out of native elements; others of the same sort in the prefatory pages are "litleworthye," "lightsomnesse," "herehence," "wellbeknowne," "wellfauordly," and "miseased." Grimald rarely indulges in Whittinton's favorite construction, paired synonyms. A tautological grouping of nouns occurs only once in these pages: "decked, adourned, & beautified"; of adjectives, like "hoked, and croked" and "immortall, & perdurable," there are occasional examples.
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to the Marquis. That Grimald was doing this sort of emending is certain (see below, note 61); but there is no evidence other than Bale's attribution that he did so for the 1549 printed edition of Wyatt's Psalms. For a thorough investigation of the relation of the printed text to contemporary manuscript versions, see Ruth Hughey, The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry (Columbus, 1960), I, 45-50; II, 212-45.


60. "The Case for Nicholas Grimald as Editor of 'Tottell's Miscellany.'" MLR, XXVII (1932), 125-43.

61. Page 143.

62. "The Harington Manuscript at Arundel Castle and Related Documents," The Library, XV (1935), 415-16, 427-29, 442-43; see also the more recent discussion of the matter in Hughey, The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry, II, 127-32, 189-91. It should be noted, however, that Miss Hughey raises a question which must be taken into account by those proposing Grimald as editor of Songes and Sonettes. Grimald had a special preference for doubled vowels, a peculiarity evident in his own poems in the miscellany and in his emendations of Wyatt's nine poems in the Egerton manuscript (and in one stanza of a tenth, copied into the manuscript by Grimald). "It is curious," writes Miss Hughey, "if Grimald is to be considered the editor of the Miscellany, that the very notion of spelling which he so carefully put into this part of the Egerton MS. 2711, and which Tottel observes for Grimald's own poems, should be so completely ignored by Tottel in these particular poems of Wyatt's" ("The Harington Manuscript . . .," The Library, op. cit., p. 428).

63. Sig. **6r.

64. Sigs. *3r, **2r, *8v.

65. Sigs. **1r, *8r.
66 Sigs. *7\textsuperscript{r}, *7\textsuperscript{v}, *3\textsuperscript{r}.

67 Sigs. *3\textsuperscript{v}, **2\textsuperscript{v}, **4\textsuperscript{r}, **4\textsuperscript{v}, **7\textsuperscript{v}, **8\textsuperscript{r}.

68 Sig. *5\textsuperscript{v}.

69 Sigs. *8\textsuperscript{r}, *7\textsuperscript{r}.
CHAPTER III
THE HISTORY OF PUBLICATION
OF THE TRANSLATIONS

I. Whittinton's Offyces

The Short-Title Catalogue lists two editions of Whittinton's translation, one published in 1534 and one in 1540; in certain earlier bibliographies of ancient English books two other editions are said to exist. George Steevens and Richard Farmer in their "Ancient Translations from Classic Authors" (published in the 1778 Johnson-Steevens edition of Shakespeare's plays) note that the Offyces appeared in 1533, 1534, 1540, and 1553. Except for the uncritical L. W. Brüggemann, no later bibliographer perpetuates the report of the last of these, probably because of the obvious confusion with the early editions of the Grimald translation. But the report of the 1533 edition has persisted; such a printing is listed in three works published by the Bibliographical Society: E. G. Duff's Hand-Lists of English Printers, 1501-1556, Henrietta Palmers' List of English Editions and Translations of . . . Classics Printed before 1641, and Eloise Pafort's "A Group of Early Tudor School-Books." None of these works gives the location of a 1533 copy of the Offyces. No library that I know
of claims to possess such a copy. Inasmuch as none has been found by William A. Jackson in his extensive research for the forthcoming new edition of the STC, it can almost certainly be concluded that the 1533 edition is a bibliographical ghost.

I have examined two copies of each of the two actual editions of the Offices and photographic reproductions of two other 1534 copies. This number is insufficient, of course, for reconstructing the bibliographically "ideal" copies of the two editions. The descriptions that follow are based on the British Museum's copy of the 1534 edition with pressmark C.21.a.9 and on the Folger Library's first copy of the 1540 edition, but I have checked these descriptions against the other copies and found them equally applicable.

A. The 1534 edition

[Within a four-piece floral border] The thre
books of Tullyes | offices/ bothe in latyne | tonge
& in englysshe/ | lately translated | by Roberte |
Wynyn=| ton | poete laurcatal. | [device and three dots]
[Colophon] Imprinted at London in Flete strete/|
by Wynyn de Worde. The yere of our Lorde god .M.D.
xxxiiij. the | xxx. day of September. | [De Worde's device
(McKerrow num. 46)]
8o. a-b 5 , *2, A-x 8 [-08, R8; signed in fives;
D5 misprinted "D4"], 186 leaves, unnumbered. Latin
text on versos; 26 lines [no headline or signature or catchword line], 112 x 73 mm. English text on rectos; number of lines varies.

a1r, title page; a1v-3r, dedicatory Latin poem; a3v-b8r, preface; b8v, blank; *1r-2r, errata list; *2v, Latin poem on printers; A1r, title page of "first part"; A1v-x8r, text; x8v, colophon and printer's device.

All Latin in italic except for roman capitals of first lines of titles and subtitles; all English in black-letter. Reduced type at bottom of v1r, x3r, and x5r.

[Title page immediately preceding the text]
[Within a four-piece floral border] C The thre bookes
of Tullius | offyce bothe in latyn tongue | and englysshe/
late trans=|lated and dyligently | corrected by Robert |
Whytynton lau=|reat poete. | [device and three dots]
C The fyrst parte. | Cum priuilegio regali.

The inclusion of a second title page in this work is curious. The phrase "The fyrst parte" clearly does not refer to the first of the three books of the treatise, for in the preface and headings these are always called "books," not "parts." The explanation, I think, lies in something we touched upon earlier. In the preface to Whittinton's "exploratory publication" of Cicero's Paradoxon, it will be recalled, he told his readers that if the work before them
were well received they would shortly "haue in prynte/ not only this translation in our englysshe tonge/ but also the texte of Tully in latten ioyned to the same/ with the thre bookees of his office/ in lyke manner. . . ." I propose that right up until some point during the actual printing of the Offyces Whittinton intended to include the Paradoxe in the volume as a second part. The printer probably began his work with sig. Al7, making that the title page for the first part. In the course of the printing it developed for some reason that there was to be no second part—perhaps De Worde decided that it would make the book too long. If the change in plans came late enough, the first sheet with its inappropriate title page would have already been run off, and thus we would have the book with a first but no second part.

Not all extant copies of the 1534 edition have the two leaves containing the errata list and the Latin poem on the unhappy state of printing in England. This may be because during the printing of the book Whittinton was indeed out of London—as he implies he was in the note at the head of the errata ("nobis a praelo, et trutina procul absentibus")—and did not discover the errors and insist that an errata list be inserted until after part of the edition had already been bound. The leaves are certainly not omitted from some copies for the reason Elise Pafort gives—that "these errata leaves were meant for the
uncorrected text printed in 1533 by De Worde and were mistakenly bound up with the 1534 edition. "11 Even if there were a 1533 edition this is in error. For none of the 1534 copies that I have examined—those with or those without the leaves in question—embody the corrections indicated in the errata list. The list belongs in the copies in which it is found and should be in those that lack it.

Whittinton's attack on printers in the poem following the errata list must have come as a terribly unkind cut to Wynkyn de Worde, who had been publishing the grammarian's books for some twenty years. English printers, Whittinton laments, ruin carefully written books by their negligence; they waste their time turning out trash. There are, alas, no Frobens or Alduses in the land. Why are learned works held in so little estimation? because of the indolent, sluggish printer.

Eiusdem VWhitintoni pumex in calcographi mendas.

Perlautas epulas parat obsonator edendas
  Sed coquus has perdit, dum male condit eas
  Sedulitate olitor quicquid grato inserit horto
  Rictu euertendo porca lutosa terit
  Calcographi crebris ignaui incuria mendis
  Nostrae operaes fructus, sic terit, atq; decus
  Expansam cernens sic zoilus esse fenestram
  Calcographi mendas, detonat esse meas,
  Officit iste manu minus haud, quam zoilus ore
  Sunt parili studio, sint pariliq; uice,
  Indoleo nostrae patriae sic deesse Frobenos
  Atq; Aldos praeli sedulitate probos,
  Rarus Aristarchus praeesto est, sed Monus ubiuis.
  In uice Quintillij Rhinoceros uel adest
  Rarus Moecoenas, phoenice et rarior, eius,
  Obstupuit chiragra larga benigna manus
  Languet Aristophanis manus hinc, uigilansq; laterua
  Antiqua & daphnes decidit inde coma.
Suffoeni ampullis, & dente Theonis agresti
Nunc syculis gerris omnia praela calent
In morem excurrunt mendici, compita circum
His caupona iociis, uncta popina strepit,
Tam uili in precio cur docta uolumina restant
Calcographus causa est desidiosus, inaers.12
(sig. *2v)

Upon examination of the book itself and the items in
the errata list, one questions the justness and indeed the
honesty of Whittinton's charge. Of purely mechanical
faults--letters inverted or off their feet, uneven margins,
and so on--there are surprisingly few for a book that is
complicated by the necessity for frequent abbreviation and
suspension of letters. Of the ninety-five items in the
errata list, only one involves the English text: the word
"theues" occurs for "paynes," a seemingly fantastic mistake
when one considers the context (perhaps Whittinton mistook
the "laboribus" of the text as "latronibus"). It is true
that many of the errors listed from the Latin text seem to
have been the result of slips of the typesetter's hand
(e.g., "Iudicio, pro iudico," sig. *2r) or of misreading
the copy (e.g., "Aqua, pro a qua diuisim," *1r). But others
indicate that the copy itself was at fault; the substitution
of "eratio" for "elato," "quod" for "qui," and "userxiret"
for "insuruiret" (all listed on sig. *1v) scarcely seems to
be the sort of error a typesetter would make. One wonders
whether De Worde may have had cause to say amen to the
complaint of another printer of the time in a note to his readers:

This table of Cebes . . . was translated out of latine into english by sir Frances Poyngz, at the request of his brother sir Antony Poyngz, which transacion is woorthy of high commendacion. And if any faute be therin, I knowe well, it is mistakyng, for my copie was somewhat combrouse, what for the enterlinyng and yll writyng.¹³

Whittinton would have done well to proofread the English text of the finished work as nervously as he did the Latin, for the English abounds in faulty readings that he would surely not have allowed to pass unmentioned in the errata list had he noticed them at all. There is some dittography: e.g., "for lyke as beauty of the beautye of the body . . ." (sig. F5ⁱ). In one interesting case Whittinton seems to have retranslated a clause in an attempt to catch the proper nuance and then failed to delete the rejected reading: "what is that thynge whiche therfore is not to be fledde for dyshonestye/ What is that thynge whiche therfore is not to be fledde bycause utterly it is not dishonesty" (R1ⁱ). There are many omissions in the English text, a fact one discovers either from a comparison with the original or from the illogic and lapses in sense in the translation. Note, for example, these faulty passages, in which I have supplied from the Latin the missing elements:

Whiche housholde goodes [should be] well gotten/
and by no leude lyuynge nor odyous.

(sig. F2ⁱ)
But [if] any man is somewhat more upright/... he hydeth & dissymuleth the appetyte of his pleasure for feare of his honesty.

(sig. P3r)

But we must endeuer vs the more leest the mouynges [of the mind] go fro the course of nature. ... 

(sig. H4r)

Whether this sort of thing is due to hasty translating, unclear copy, or careless typesetting it is impossible to say. There is one class of omissions, of negative particles, that I credit to Whittinton rather than the printer; for Whittinton frequently has other difficulties with negative constructions in the Latin. And it does not seem reasonable that the typesetter should have had a particular blindspot for the little word not. I shall take up the matter of the negatives in detail in a discussion of Whittinton's misreading of the Latin in Chapter 5.

The most significant omission in the English text is an intentional one. It occurs in the second book, where Cicero has just stated that the orator should never stoop to accusing an innocent man in court. But, he goes on, there is nothing morally wrong with defending a guilty man, though he be both wicked and godless.

Nec tamē ut hoc fugiendū est, ita habendū est religioni contrarium, nocentem aliquando, et nefariū, impiumq; defendere. Vult hoc multitudo, patitur cōsuetuā, fert etiam humanitas. Iudicis est semper in causīs uerum sequi, patroni nonnumquam uerisimile, etiam si minus sit uerum, defendere. Quod scribere, praesertim cum de philosophia scriberem, non auderem, nisi idem placeret grauissimo Stoicorum Panaetio. Maxime autem & gloria paritur, & gratia defensoribus. ... 

(sigs. M7v-8v)
This legal casuistry was evidently too much for someone's scruples and Tully had to be overruled. The Latin has not been tampered with, but the English translation simply ignores the crucial negative in the first sentence and omits the next two sentences completely.

Not withstandynge as this shulde be fledde/ so the contrarye to the remorcie of conscyence is to be hadde/ that is to defende somtyme a wronge doer/ and a wycked and a cruell man. Whiche I durste not write (specyally whan I wrote of phylosophye) excepte that opynyon hadde pleased Pauencius of the schole of Socrates. A man of great grauyte and specyally glorye and fame/ and fauoure suffereth it in suche as defende. . . .

(sigs. M8\textsuperscript{r}-N1\textsuperscript{f})

It appears that Whittinton originally translated this passage honestly and that the alteration was made after it was set in type. The words "of great grauyte and specyally glorye and fame/," which make up the last line on sig. M8\textsuperscript{r}, are meaningless in context and seem to be simply padding to fill out a line after those preceding were reset. (Even so, the final line lacks a half-inch of justification.) It may be that the original, offensive passage caught a proofreader's eye, and (with Whittinton not there to object, if we can believe his remark at the head of the errata list) De Worde cautiously decided that the change had to be made.

This instance prompts one to wonder to what extent De Worde altered Whittinton's copy in other respects to bring it into line with the editorial practices of his house. How does the finished work differ from what it
would have been if Whittinton had printed it himself, as Caxton did his translations? Is the punctuation, for example, that of the original copy or of some editor in the printshop? The question is a significant one, for at times the pointing is highly misleading. Consider these passages:

Nor empyre shulde be desyred/ and rather not to be accept somtyme. Also somtyme to be lette we shulde be voyde of all passyons of mynde/ bothe fro couetyse/ drede/ also fro dolour. . . .

(sig. D8r)

That there Is great power In fortune vpon bothe sydes/ both to good fortune and also to yuell. What is he but he knoweth whan we vse her good blaste and fauour/ we be conveyed to the effecte of our desyre.

(sig. Ll7)

In the first of these the phrase "Also somtyme to be lette" is cut off by a period from the clause to which it belongs and is run on without a break into the next sentence. The same is true of the clause "What is he but he knoweth" (that is, Who doesn't know) in the second passage; and here the excision reduces the foregoing clause to a meaningless fragment. We cannot, of course, expect to find our modern system of logical punctuation in a book published in the sixteenth century. But a general system does prevail throughout most of the Offyces, with the virgule indicating minor syntactical breaks and the period the end of sentences.14 And it is this general practice that is violated in passages like the above. Those readers of the book who knew no Latin must certainly have been led away
from Cicero's meaning by such punctuation in the English text. Whether Whittinton or the printer is responsible for it we cannot determine without seeing the author's copy. Whittinton was certainly capable of violating the sense of the Latin, and some of the mispointings seem to be the sort that only the translator himself could make. On the other hand, it is clear that De Worde had a standard of punctuation according to which he may have altered Whittinton's text. An examination of De Worde's work shows that right up until his death in 1535 he eschewed the comma in favor of the virgule, while other printers in the early 1530's were using both of these marks or the comma exclusively. It is significant that in those of Whittinton's translations printed by someone other than De Worde and his successor, Byddell, the comma is employed freely. Redman uses it interchangeably with the virgule in the Paradoxe; Middleton uses it to the exclusion of the virgule in the Senecan translations. Whittinton himself may or may not have used the virgule. But we know at any rate that it was not uncommon for De Worde to alter the original punctuation in his books; and thus we must suppose that the faulty pointing of the Offyces may have been as much the responsibility of the printer as of Whittinton.

One other significant weakness in the book may perhaps be charged to the printer rather than the translator. There are in De Officiis many quotations from other writers; in
the *Offyces* these are not distinguished from Cicero's own words by any sort of typographical device or convention. This is not a serious problem when the quoted material is introduced by a formula such as "the poete Ennius writeth thus" (sig. E7r), though even here one sometimes cannot tell where the quotation closes. But consider in the following passage how difficult it would be for the unlatined reader to recognize that Cicero is citing fragments of certain laws (which I have underlined):

> Of all judgementes these wordes be moste excellent/ that it is well done when the better way is made in a cause of arbytrement bytwene a man & his wyfe/ also when the moste egall way is take bytwene hon­nest men in a cause of faythe & trust. What then? may any parte of fraude be in that thynge that is better or more egall: or whan it is sayd/ It is well doone bytwene honest m®/ any thing can [i.e., can anything] be done by disceyte or by malyce[?] (sig. S6r)

Earlier in the third book Cicero presents a brief dialogue between Diogenes and Antipater, representatives of two opposing schools of thought, and intersperses his own comment. With no typographical aid such as altered or reduced type or physical separation of the quotations from Cicero's words--and sometimes even with no tag-lines to distinguish the speakers--this section in Whittinton's translation is thoroughly confusing. Here is a passage in which all three speakers take part:

> Diogenes wol answere peraduëture this wyse. It is one thyng to concele & an other to holde thy tonge ... it is not necessary for me to tell the what so euer is profytable for the to here.
yes veryly it is necessary/ for thou doest knowe that there is a company knyt amongst men by nature. I remembre it well he sayth: but is this company suche that no mā may haue any thyng of his owne? whiche if it be so/ a man shulde sell nothyng but it shulde vs gyue. Thou doest se in al this disputacion that this is not sayd/ though this be not honest not withstandyng for as moche as it is profytable I woll do it/ but so to be prɔfytable that it be not inhonest. (sig. S2r)

This same sort of confusion is evident near the end of the treatise where Cicero and some hypothetical opponents argue concerning the wisdom of Regulus' decision to sacrifice his life rather than obtain the release of prisoners for the enemy (V7r-X3r). Cicero makes subtle points in these discussions, but in this translation they do not come through. Nicholas Grimald and his printer, Tottel, were careful not to repeat the error of the Offyces with respect to quoted material and dialogue. By the interpolation of tag-lines where none exist in the Latin, the manipulation of spacing, and the judicious use of type faces, they were able to avoid one of the major weaknesses in Whittinton's and De Worde's work.

B. The 1540 edition

[Within a border (McKerrow num. 28)] € Thē thre bokes of Tulliú lingysh, bothe in latyn and englysh, late translated and dylige=|tly corrected by Rο=|bart Whytyn ton laureat poete. € PRIMA PARS. | Cum priuilegio regali.
In the second edition of Whittinton's translation, the dedicatory poem and the preface are omitted. W. C. Hazlitt has remarked concerning this, "It was a constant practice on the part of our old publishers to suppress introductory matter in second or later issues, and the fact of Whittinton being dead in 1540 may have had something to do with it in this case." As we have seen earlier, Whittinton was far from dead in 1540; but he probably did not have the close relationship with the printer, John Byddell, that he must have had through the years with Wynken de Worde. We can imagine that he was offended by the loss of his elegant verses to the King and the elaborate "exhortacyon" to the reader.

With the preliminaries omitted, what had been the secondary title page of the 1534 edition became the chief and only title page of this edition. Byddell's substitution of "PRIMA PARS" for the original "The fyrst parte" did not make it any more appropriate in 1540 than it had been in 1534.
The body of this edition is reprinted page for page—almost line for line—from the earlier one. If Whittinton had cause to be unhappy with the printing in the first edition, he had good cause to be furious with that in the second. For all the errors of the first are faithfully repeated in the second. Byddell obviously set the type from a 1534 copy that lacked the errata leaves. He copied in capital letters so prominent an error as "ET" for "TE" in the very first line of the text: "QVANQVAM ET MARCI PILI . . . ." He even followed the first printer's error of repeating the signature notation "D.4." where "D.5." should be. Like the 1534 edition this one has reduced type at the bottom of sigs. VI^ and X3^ in order to squeeze in the complete translation of the Latin on the facing pages; but the necessity for reduced type at the bottom of six. X5^ in the first edition is avoided in the second through abundant abbreviation and suspension in the last few lines.

II. Grimald's Duties

The STC lists eight editions of Grimald's translation, published in 1553, 1556, 1558, 1568, 1574, 1583, 1596, and 1600(?). Other bibliographies cite a total of five more, published in 1555, 1558 (a second edition in that year), 1588, 1590, and 1610(?). On the basis of an examination of the evidence presented in these bibliographies, of the catalogues of major libraries, and of as many copies
of the translation as possible, I have concluded that eight editions of the work were published, not all of them in the years listed in the STC.

Joseph Ames in his *Typographical Antiquities* seems to have originated the report that the first edition of the *Duties* appeared in 1553. Ames says that the title of this edition is the same as that of the 1558 edition.\(^7\) This cannot be the case, for the 1558 title indicates that "the latine is adirowned" to the English translation, and since in the 1556 edition the Latin is not included it would hardly have appeared in any published before that. The STC in its 1553 entry notes that the Bodleian Library possesses fragments of a copy of this edition. In response to my recent inquiry about the matter, Mr. David M. Rogers of the Bodleian staff informs me that the supposed 1553 fragments are actually from a much later edition and have simply been miscatalogued.

Steevens and Farmer in their "Ancient Translations from Classic Authors," written several decades after Ames's work, comment on his report of a 1553 edition of the *Duties*: "Ames says 1553; perhaps by mistake."\(^8\) The doubt they cast on this date as being that of the first edition would be more significant if they themselves did not give an even more dubious one--1555. No other bibliographer that I am aware of gives this date for a Grimald edition; like their
1553 date for the last printing of Whittinton's Offyces, it seems to be without foundation.

There is likewise no sound evidence for the existence of 1588 and 1590 editions. H. B. Lathrop lists them both in his Translations from the Classics from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620, but gives no source for his information. Ames before him cites a 1590 edition and says it was printed by Thomas East. East, we know, did print a 1596 edition and another, undated one; perhaps it is the latter to which Ames assigns the date 1590. W. T. Lowndes's Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature mentions a 1590 edition, but gives no catalogue in which a copy of it was ever offered for sale. Nowhere in Book Auction Records or Book-Prices Current is a 1588 or 1590 copy reported to have been sold, and no library catalogue that I have seen lists a copy of it.

The same is true of the 1610(?) edition. Lathrop gives this date without the question-mark, but the work with which the report of this edition probably originated—W. C. Hazlitt's Collections and Notes, 1867-1876—gives the date as "Circa 1610." The title Hazlitt transcribes for this edition is actually that of the undated one printed by East for which the STC proposed the date 1600. Certainly 1610 is not correct, for by that time Thomas East was dead.

Of each of the genuine editions I have examined at least two copies from several libraries. The descriptions
that follow are, as before, of particular copies rather than ideal ones, but what is said here about a copy of any given edition has proven to be valid for all the other copies of that edition I have examined.

A. The 1556 edition

[Within a border (McKerrow num. 30)]

Tullius Ciceronis tres bokes of duties, to Marcus his sonne, turned oute of laine into englishe, by Nicols Grimalde. [two dots in parentheses]

Cum privilegio ad impri mendum solum. Anno domini 1556.

[Colophon]

Imprinted at London in Fletestrete within Temple barre, at the signe of the hand & starre, by Richard Tottel. Cum privilegio ad impri mendum solum. [leaf]

8°. *-**8, A-V8 [signed in fives irregularly], 176 leaves, ff. [16] + 149 [see below for errors] + [11]; 29 lines + headline and catchword line, 112 x 72 mm.

In black-letter type throughout except for running-titles (lower-case roman), quotations (italic), and first lines of all other titles (capital roman).

Running-titles of text: versos, "Ciceros first boke"; rectos, "of Duties."
Unlike Whittinton's _Offyces_, Grimald's _Duties_ as first published contained only the English, not the Latin text of _De Officiis_. The margins of the text of the translation are liberally supplied with sidenotes. Most of these simply indicate the subjects under discussion, but some contribute information not in the text, particularly about persons and places alluded to by Cicero. This suggests that these notes were written by Grimald himself, not some editor in Tottel's shop. Further evidence of this is that word compounds of the sort peculiar to Grimald (e.g., "outfynding," "sobermode," "foolelarge," and "self-boste") occur in the margins at points where there is nothing in the text to suggest those particular forms to an editor.

The very full alphabetical index at the end of this edition was compiled directly from the marginal notes. So mechanically and unreasonably is this the case that it is doubtful that Grimald is responsible for the index. Some items that make sense where they occur in the margins are meaningless in the index: e.g., "Thinges," "Going," "Wise," "more Honest." A few of the longer entries are rewritten
to put the significant words first: e.g., "Owner of a ship, what he may do"; but many others are lifted directly from the margins and are of no value whatever in an alphabetical index: e.g., "Why he spendes his vacant time in philosophie," "How he will teache." Admittedly, indexing standards of the mid-sixteenth century were not so rigorous as our own, but we can justifiably doubt that the scholarly Grimald would have been satisfied with the "Table" that appears in his book.

Whoever it was that compiled the index, he obviously became quickly aware of the errors in foliation in this edition. The confusion begins in the sixties. "Fol. 60" and "Fol. 62" each occur twice; since there are no "Fol. 61" and "Fol. 63," the indexer simply made silent corrections for items entered from those pages. "Fol. 64" also occurs twice, but here the slack is not taken up--there is a "Fol. 65" and thus no possibility for correction in the index. The foliation continues regularly from this point, one number less than the actual count, through "Fol. 89"; then it jumps to "Fol. 100" and proceeds in order through "Fol. 158," nine numbers more than the actual count. The indexer, of course, had to follow the erroneous numbering to the end.

Aside from the foliation, this first edition is a carefully printed, well-constructed piece of work. Typographical errors are very infrequent, and the print is
clear and evenly imposed. Quoted material is clearly set off from Cicero's own words by italics and spacing.

Before leaving the first edition we should say something of the man to whom Grimald dedicated it: Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely. Thirlby (born c. 1506) was in 1556 at the peak of a notable career. Early in his manhood as a brilliant scholar at Cambridge he had won the esteem of Archbishop Cranmer, and through him had gained the favor of Henry VIII. In the 1530's he was made a member of several important royal commissions. In 1540 when Henry erected Westminster Abbey into an episcopal see, he appointed Thirlby its first bishop. Throughout this decade Thirlby was occupied with state as well as ecclesiastical affairs, serving as a member of the Privy Council and as ambassador to the Emperor Charles V. During the reign of Edward VI, he came under suspicion for Catholic tendencies. In 1550 he surrendered the bishopric of Westminster to the King (who immediately dissolved it, thus making Thirlby the last as well as the first Bishop of Westminster) and was then appointed to the vacant see of Norwich. He served on various of Edward's commissions and was again appointed ambassador to Charles V.

Under Mary, Thirlby's anti-Reformation tendencies came to the fore and earned him due reward. He was translated from Norwich to Ely by the Queen. She appointed him one of the special ambassadors to make her obedience to the
Pope. On the death of the Lord Chancellor, Gardiner, Mary would have given the office to Thirlby had Philip not objected. Early in 1556 the Bishop took part, with much apparent sorrow, in the degradation of his long-time friend and patron, Archbishop Cranmer; a few months later he assisted in the consecration of Cranmer's successor, Reginald Pole. In 1558 he was sent on a commission to France to negotiate for the restoration of Calais and to conclude peace; he was thus engaged when Mary died.

Because of his Catholic commitment Thirlby very quickly fell from favor under Elizabeth. He refused to take the oath of supremacy and in 1559 was deprived of his bishopric. For his continuing anti-Protestant preaching, he was in 1560 sent to the Tower and shortly thereafter excommunicated. He was kept in the Tower for several years and then released in the custody of Archbishop Parker, with whom he lived until his death in 1570.

It would be interesting to know the nature of Grimald's relation to the Bishop of Ely in 1556. He addresses him as "the right reverend father in god, & his singular good lorde, Thomas, Bisshop of Elie, one of the King, & Quenes Maisties most honorable priuie Counsell," but he does not mention any personal connection between Thirlby and himself. Because Grimald signs himself at the end of the dedication "Your humble oratour," Edward Arber supposes that he was the Bishop's chaplain. This need not be the
case at all. The NED indicates that the use of "orator" in
the complimentary close of dedicatory addresses and formal
requests for patronage was a convention; it cannot be used
as evidence that Grimald was Thirlby's chaplain.

What is most interesting about this dedication is
that it continued to appear in the later editions of the
Duties right on through 1596; only the final, undated one
omits it. It may be that the Catholic bishop was soon for­
gotten after Elizabeth came to the throne, but one would
think that the reference in the headnote of the Duties to
"the King, & Quenes Maiesties"—Philip and Mary—would have
offended many potential readers and buyers of the book.

B. The first 1558 edition

[Within a border (McKerrow num. 30)]

Tullius Ciceroes thre booke of duties, to Marcus
his sonne, turned out of Latine into englishe, by
Nicolas Grimaid. Whereunto the latine is
adjoined. Cum privilegio ad impri-

Anno domini. 1558.

[Colophon] Imprinted at London in Fleete strete
within Temple barre at the signe of the hande and
starre, by Rychard Tottil. The xiiiid. day of Apryll.
Anno. 1558. Cum privilegio ad impri-

8°, *-*8, A-X8 [signed in fours and fives irregu-
larly], 184 leaves, ff. [16] + 168 [no errors]; English
Early in 1558 Tottel set the type for a new edition of Grimald's *Duties*. Perhaps his stock of the first edition was just then running out. Or perhaps he was only then able to get around to the job; the preceding two years had been particularly busy ones in his shop. In the new edition he decided to include the Latin with the English. This would allow the reader who knew Latin to act readily upon a suggestion Grimald had made in the preface:

... Such as bee exquisite in bothe the languages alredy: may (and that w some profit, & pleasure) trye, what I haue done, & what they can do, all vnder one: if, layeng my traslatiō aparte, they will set the latine before the, & so assaye theyre owne veine. (sig. **6v-V)

The idea of introducing the Latin into the book may have originated with Grimald, but, as I shall show in the next chapter, it is dubious that he was responsible for choosing
the particular text of *De Officiis* that Tottel made use of this edition.

Printing the translation and the original in parallel columns (rather than on facing pages, as in Whittinton's work) meant that the marginal notes had to be discarded. The index was likewise omitted, thus making the new edition with its added Latin only two signatures longer than the earlier one. The dedication and preface of the second edition are reprinted page for page from the first.

C. The second 1558 edition

[No title page available]

[Colophon] Imprinted at London in Fleeete strete within Temple barre at the signe of the hande and starre, by Rychard Tottill. The .xiiiij. day of Apryll. Anno. 1558. Cum privilegio ad impri-

Identical with the first 1558 edition in format, collation [signed in fours except for D5, S5], page measurements, and foliation [except for misprints: fol. 46 is "48," 48 is "46," 49 is "4," 95 is "94," 108 is "105," 111 is "12," 119 is "116," 122 is "222," 127 is "117," 141 is "14"].

Contents, type-faces, and running-titles as in the first 1558 edition.
The only published mention of this edition by a modern writer is in an obscure list at the end of H. B. Lathrop's *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620*, where Lathrop indicates that the Library of Congress has a 1558 copy of the *Duties* unlike others with that date. Upon examination the book proves to be indeed from a completely different setting of type than that of, say, the Folger Library's copy of what I have called above "the first 1558 edition." What is puzzling is that the colophon of the volume gives exactly the same date—April 14, 1558—as the one in the Folger copy. Just a year earlier Tottel had published apparently simultaneous editions of another work: two distinct settings of *Songes and Sonettes* bear the date July 31, 1557 in their colophons. It will be instructive here to examine the case of that better known work for the light it can throw on the 1558 editions of the *Duties*.

It has been suggested by at least one nineteenth-century bibliographer that there were two editions of *Songes and Sonettes* dated July 31, 1557; early in the present century W. W. Greg proved this to be so. Greg called it a case of "duplicate setting":

Duplicate setting . . . was a recognized custom where a large number of copies were required. Notable examples are the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. in 1549, and Erasmus' 'Paraphrase of the New Testament' in 1551; but a close examination would probably reveal its occurrence in a large number of works. The custom was most likely due to some trades' union regulation for the benefit of
compositors. It was not, so far as I am aware, till nearly thirty years later that an ordinance of the Company limited the number of copies to be printed from one setting to 1250 for ordinary works; but the ordinance very possibly did nothing more than give binding force to a generally recognized custom. This would necessitate any work for which a large number of copies were required being set up several times over in rapid succession, and it would be quite likely that if sufficient type were available two settings might be worked off simultaneously. It is even possible that it might be set up in duplicate sheet by sheet and worked. That the second edition of Tottel's Miscellany is a case of duplicate setting I have no doubt. 32

Hyder Rollins, in the introduction to his edition of Songes and Sonettes, demonstrates that the two settings were not produced from a common original, but that one was printed from the other. He also shows that, while the two much more closely resemble one another than either does the first edition, there are some significant differences between them. And since the variations in the particular setting he has determined to be third in order are not of the sort an editor would introduce while the printing was in progress, Rollins supposes that the third may not have been issued simultaneously with the second, despite the identical dates in the colophons.

Indeed, C may be later than July 31, 1557. It was reprinted from B, and the date of July 31 in its colophon may possibly be only a mechanical reproduction of the colophon of B. If some time intervened between the actual printings of B and C, it would be easier to account for the changes in C from the readings of B to those of A. 33
The situation here is almost exactly analogous with that of the two 1558 settings of the *Duties*. The Library of Congress copy so closely resembles the Folger copy that the incautious eye discerns no difference between them (except perhaps for the garbled foliation of one of them, and that is the sort of thing that could have been corrected while the printing of a single edition was in progress). A more careful examination reveals that, while any given page of the two copies contains the same material, there are a great many variations between the two in spelling; there are also a number of substantive differences between them that indicate beyond a doubt that the edition represented by the LC copy was derived from the edition represented by the Folger copy.

This can most simply be demonstrated from the nature of the differences between the Latin texts printed in the two editions. As I shall show in detail in the next chapter, there are many discrepancies between the Latin that appears in both these editions and that from which Grimald made his translation. These are more than mere misprints; the translation and printed Latin are obviously in different textual traditions. But in the LC edition a beginning has been made at rectifying the situation; at a number of points the discrepant Latin apparent in the Folger edition has been brought into line with the English. On sig. *R4v*, for example, the Folger edition prints the phrase "vt Penae* apud
patres nostros" and the supposedly equivalent English, "as did Petronius, in our fathers daies." "Penaaggregate" is from one manuscript tradition, "Petronius" from another. In the LC edition the "Penaaggregate" of the Folger has been changed to "Petronius." For another instance of the same sort, on sig. M5R the Folger edition has the name "Manlio" in the Latin but "Marcus Aquilius" in the English, a translation of the "Aquilio" that appears as a variant reading in some texts; again the LC latin has the corrected reading. A number of omissions and misprints of the one edition are remedied in the other. On sig. ClV of the Folger edition, the Latin text lacks the words "sententia est" required by the English phrase "That is a noble sayeng." On sig. GlV it lacks the "non" called for by the English "some other in the same quarell ought not." On sig. IlR it has "imitanda" instead of "mutanda" for "changed." In all three cases the correction has been made in the LC edition. At least one substantive change has been made in the English: Grimald's "quiet" (otium) on sig. E2V is altered to "hatred" to suit the "odium" of this text.

Whoever it was that found the errors in the first 1558 edition and corrected them for the second, he overlooked more than he found; at least another score of discrepancies between the English and Latin can be discovered. Unquestionably, however, more than a cursory reading of the book was necessary for him to make the corrections he did.
Because of this I doubt that a proofreader in Tottel's shop is responsible for the changes in the second edition--at least, he certainly did not check through the proofs and make the alterations there on the spot. If there is reason for Rollins to think that one of the July, 1557, settings of Songes and Sonettes was printed at some time after the other, there is as much cause to suppose that this is the case with the 1558 settings of the Duties. As Rollins says, the dates may be identical simply because of the "mechanical reproduction of the colophon" in making the reprint. Because there is no evidence other than the colophons that the type was set for the two printings at even approximately the same time, I prefer to call them two distinct editions—the second and third of this work—rather than two settings of the same edition.

D. The 1568 edition

[Within a border (McKerrow num. 97)]  
MARCUS Tullius Ciceroes three booke of duties, to Marcus his sonne, turned out of latine into English, by Nichol: Grime: alde. Whereunto the latine is adjoyned. Cum privilegio, Anno Domini. 1568.

[Colophon]  
Imprinted at London in Fletestrete within Temple Barre at the signe of the hand and Starre by Rycharde Tottel. 1568.

8°. *-**8, A-8 [signed in fours except where text crowds bottom of page], 184 leaves, ff. [16] +
168 [no errors]; number of lines per page varies in both texts, max. 116 x 71 mm.

Contents as in the first 1558 edition. Dedication, preface, and English text in black-letter, except that most quotations are in roman; Latin text in roman, with some quotations in capital roman. Running-titles of text: versos, "de Officiis"; rectos, "Liber .I. [.II., .III.]."

This is a page-for-page reprint of the second 1558 edition. It embodies the corrections in the Latin text of that edition and contributes a few new ones. I shall list in the next chapter the ones of these that are significant in identifying the Latin text from which Grimald translated, but here we can note that on sig. A8v what was misprinted "incognitis" in the 1558 editions is corrected to "cognit"is," and on sig. P6r what was "ad" is now properly "id." On sig. S3r "Lectoria" in the Latin and "Lectorian" in the English replace what was a discrepant "Latoria" and "Flectorian," respectively.

E. The 1574 edition35

[Within a border (McKerrow num. 97)] MARCVS

Tullius Ciceroes three bookes of dueties to Marcus his sonne, turned out of la= tine into Eng= lishe, by N= cholas Grim= ale. Wherrunto the latine is adioyned. Cum privilegio. Anno Domini. 1574.
Contents as in the first 1558 edition. Dedication, preface, and English text in black-letter, except that most quotations are in roman; Latin text in roman, with some quotations in capital roman. Running-titles of text: versos, "de Officiis"; rectos, "Lib. I. [II., III.]" [beginning of third book marked "Lib. II." up through XI\(^4\)].

That this is a page-for-page reprint of the preceding edition is clear from the fact that a number of errors introduced into the 1568 edition are here reproduced. On sig. 17\(^v\), for example, what had been in the second 1558 edition "which \(\ddot{y}\) most profitable" became in 1568 "whiche \(\ddot{y}\) most unprofitable"; the latter reading appears in the 1574 edition. This printing follows the 1568 on sig. 87\(^r\), where the ampersand is omitted from the second 1558 edition's clause "That among good men good dealing ought to be, \& without deceuings." And on sig. X\(^8\) it agrees with
its immediate predecessor in changing "bogged," in the
clause "whom he slew, being bogged by him," to "dogged."

It is difficult to say why the dates in the title
and colophon of this edition should differ. Perhaps the
type-setting was begun at the end of 1574 and completed in
the next year; or perhaps it was done in the period between
January 1 and March 25, so that the "1574" represents the
legal year and "1575" the calendar year. Or, of course,
the discrepancy may have been due merely to carelessness.

F. The 1574 re-issue of the second 1558 edition
[Title page as in the 1574 edition]
[Colophon as in the second 1558 edition]

I have knowledge of only one copy of this re-issue,
and that by means of film and the report of a person who
has examined the original for me at the Huntington Library.
The original title leaf of the second 1558 edition has been
cut out and another, from the 1574 edition just described,
has been attached to its stub. It is strange that Tottel
waited so long to issue the remainder of that 1558 edition.
There is no way to know how many volumes the re-issue con­
sisted of; perhaps the Huntington volume is one of only a
handful of already-bound copies of the earlier edition
still on Tottel's hands in 1574, which he decided to alter
and put on sale with the genuine 1574 edition. The
Library of Congress copy of the second 1558 edition, since
it lacks a title leaf, may itself have been issued in 1574
along with the copy in the Huntington Library. But that it
was printed after the first 1558 edition and before the
1568 one is plain from the state of its Latin text.

G. The 1583 edition

[Within a border (McKerrow num. 97)] • MARCVS
Tullius Ciceroes three booke of duties to Marcus
his sonne, tourned out of Latine into English,
by Nicolas Grimald. Whereunto the Latine is
adjioned. • Cum priuilegio. Anno Domini. 1583.

[Colophon] • Imprinted at London in Fletestrete
within Temple barre at the signe of the hand and
Star, by Richard Tottell. 1583.

8°. *8, **2, A-X8 [signed in fours and fives
irregularly; *2 is "A. ij"; 05, D5, and M5 are all
"A.v"; 04 is "N.iiii"], 178 leaves, ff. [10] + 168
[foliation of sigs. H, I, K, R, and X is chaotic];
number of lines per page varies in both texts, max.
119 x 69 mm.

*1r, title page; *1v-2v, dedication; **1r-8v,
preface; A1r-X8r, text [X8r, colophon]; X8v, blank.

Dedication, Latin text, and most quotations in
English text set in roman; preface and English text
in black-letter; some quotations in Latin text in
italic. Running-titles of text: versos, "de Officcis";
rectos, "Liber .I. [.2,.3.]."
With this edition the preliminaries are no longer printed in the pattern set in the first edition; the dedication and preface are squeezed into seventeen pages instead of the usual twenty-nine. But the text of the treatise is a page-for-page reprint of that of the 1574 edition. The following are among the alterations introduced into that edition and continued in the present one: "churle" for "hurle" (sig. E3v); "ouer leaped" for "ouer scaped" (O7v); "so manye" for "so maye" (E4r); and frequently "free" for the old word "sere" (e.g., L4r, L6v, Q3v).

H. The 1596 edition

[Marcvs Tullius Ciceroes | three bookes of duties to | Marcus his soune tourned out of Latine into | English, by | Nicolas Grimald. | Wherevnto the Latine is adioyned. | Imprinted at London by | Thomas Este. | 1596.]

[Colophon] & Imprinted at London by | Thomas Este, dwelling in Aldersgate streete | 1596.

8°. *8, **2, A-X8 [signed in fives], 178 leaves, ff. [10] + 168 [foliation of sigs. H and I is chaotic; fol. 129 has "Fol. 122"]; number of lines per page varies in both texts, max. 119 x 69 mm.

Contents as in the 1583 edition. Dedication and Latin text (including quotations) set in roman; preface
and English text (including quotations) in black-letter. Running-titles of text: versos, "de Officijs"; rectos, "Liber .I. [.2.,.3.]."

The rights to Grimald's Duties passed to Thomas East (also spelled Este) on the death of Richard Tottel in 1594. East's 1596 edition is a reprint of the 1583 edition, though not the virtual page-for-page copy that the earlier printings were of their predecessors. The following are some of the changes original with the 1583 edition that are perpetuated in this edition: "nor Faith" for "nor no faith" (sig. B3ª); "spoken" for "faithed" (B2ª); "gives" for "yeue" (E2ª); "adultery" for "adoutrye" (G8ª); and "Mautie" for "hawte" (Q2ª).

I. The undated edition

[Within a rule within a border within a rule]

MARCVS | Tullius Cicero, his | three Bookes of DUTIES
to | MARCVS his SONNE, | turned out of Latine into|
English, by Nicholas | Grimald. | Whereunto the Latine |
is adioyned. | [device] | LONDON: | Printed by Thomas Este.
[No colophon]

8°. A-Yª [signed in fours], 176 leaves, ff. [8] + 167 + [1] [fol. 18 is "28"] 33 lines + headline and catchword line, 119 x 69 mm.

A1ª, title page; A1ª, blank; A2ª-8ª, preface; B1ª-K6ª, first book; K6ª, blank; K7ª-P8ª, second
book; P8\textsuperscript{v}, blank; Q1\textsuperscript{r}-Y7\textsuperscript{r}, third book; Y7\textsuperscript{v}-8\textsuperscript{v}, blank.


That either this edition was reprinted from the 1596 or the 1596 from this is clear. The two have in common: one significant reading quite unlike that in earlier editions, as well as several minor variations. On sig. H3\textsuperscript{r} of the 1583 edition there is this sentence:

Caesar was sawced wyth mirth and mirrie conceites, Catullus unckle exceed all.

In 1596 it is changed:

But Cesar who was unckle to Catullus beeing sawced with mirth & mirrie conceits, exceeded all.

The undated edition has the altered reading:

But Caesar who was uncle to Catullus being sawced with mirth & merry conceits, exceeded all.

The spelling here suggests that the 1596 reading preceded that in the undated edition; the "unckle" and "mirrie" of the former derive directly from the 1583 edition. More definite evidence of the precedence of the 1596 edition is that it is nearly a page-for-page reprint of the 1583 edition, following closely the form established in the first 1558 printing. The undated edition, on the other hand, breaks with what has been standard form. It not only omits the dedicatory address but reapportions the text to the pages in different amounts.
The STC suggests 1600 as the date of this final printing of the *Duties*, and W. C. Hazlitt "circa 1610." I have been unable to make the date any more specific. Probably the 1596 edition would not have been exhausted much before 1600; since East died in 1609, there is about a ten-year period in which the final edition could have been published. The paper in the Ohio State University copy of the edition bears three different watermarks, but since none of them appears in Briquet's *Les Filigranes* or other such works they are of no help in arriving at a date for this edition.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III


2 A Supplement to the View of the English Editions, Translations and Illustrations of the Ancient Greek and Latin Authors, with Remarks (Stettin, 1801), pp. 91-92.

3 Part I (London, 1895), W. de Worde section, p. 20.

4 (London, 1911), p. 34.

5 The Library, 4th series, XXVI (1946), 254-55.

6 I have this information from Miss Dorothy E. Mason, Reference Librarian at the Folger Shakespeare Library, who is assisting Mr. Jackson in the preparation of the new STC.

7 On University Microfilms reel 12, the supposed 1540 copy of the Offyces is actually a 1534 copy.

8 I have used a Xerox reproduction of the British Museum's 1534 copy.

9 The bibliographical conventions in these descriptions are those promoted by R. B. McKerrow in An Introduction to Bibliography (Oxford, 1927) and to some extent those of Arundell Esdaile in The Student's Manual of Bibliography (London, 1931). I have also kept in mind the strictures of Fredson Bowers in Principles of Bibliographical description (Princeton, 1949). In accordance with McKerrow's suggestions, dots are used under words in title page and colophon transcriptions to indicate black-letter type, the asterisk is used to represent all signature marks other than letters, and the sign C is used to represent all paragraph marks, whatever their form. References to McKerrow in the transcripts of title pages are in his and F. S. Ferguson's Title-page Borders Used in England & Scotland, 1485-1640 (London, 1932); references to McKerrow in the transcripts of colophons are to his Printers' & Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland, 1485-1640 (London, 1913).

10 Sig. A5³.


12 "Polished Verses of the Same Whittinton on Typographical Errors. The caterer provides sumptuous foods for dining, but the cook ruins them when he prepares them badly. Whatever the kitchen-gardener carefully grows in the
pleasant garden, the muddy hog ruins with its ravening mouth. By abundant errors the carelessness of the sluggish printer ruins in the same way the fruit and grace of our work. Zoilus, perceiving that the errors provide him ample occasion, thunders that they are my own. This printer causes scarcely less damage by hand than Zoilus does by mouth—the two are equal in zeal and in function. I grieve that men who excel in painstaking at the press—the Frobens and the Adluses—are lacking in our land. An occasional Aristarchus [a good critic] is evident, but Momus is everywhere; instead of Quintilian, the Rhinoceros [i.e., one who turns up his nose] is here. Maecenases are rare—more rare than the Phoenix; his bountiful, kindly hand has been numbed by gout. The hand of Aristophanes is inactive also; the everburning lamp of antiquity flickers, and the leaves of laurel fall. At present every press is busy with the bombast of Suffenus [a bad poet], the crude attacks of Theon [a satirical poet], and Sicilian trifles. These things go forth in the manner of beggars round about the crossroads; the taverns and greasy cook-shops resound with this nonsense. Why are learned works held in so little estimation? because of the indolent, sluggish printer."

The Table of Cebes the Philosopher (London, 1535), printed by Thomas Berthelet.

No thorough study of sixteenth-century punctuation has yet been made, but several general theories have been advanced. Percy Simpson, Shakespearean Punctuation (Oxford, 1911), argues that punctuation in the drama follows the dictates of elocutionary emphasis. R. M. Alden, "The Punctuation of Shakespeare's Printers," PMLA, XXXIX (1924), 557-80, insists that Simpson's theory is not reflected in actual practice. Charles Fries, "Shakespearean Punctuation," Studies in Shakespeare, Milton, and Donne, Univ. of Michigan Publications: Language and Literature, I (New York, 1925), 67-86, proposes that Shakespeare's pointing was based upon syntax and logic. Walter J. Ong, "Historical Backgrounds of Elizabethan and Jacobean Punctuation Theory," PMLA, LIX, pt. 1 (1944), 349-60, says that in classical rhetorical theory pointing was "a device serving primarily the exigencies of breathing in discourse" and that sense punctuation developed both in conjunction with and in opposition to breath punctuation. Hilary Jenkinson, "Notes on the Study of English Punctuation of the Sixteenth Century," RES, II (1926), 152-58, argues that the pointing practices of late medieval archivists must be taken into account, particularly in connection with writing that was not intended to be read aloud. One of Jenkinson's remarks should be kept in mind by everyone working in this field: "What we have to examine is a period in which there is practically no general standard of
punctuation (at most the idea of such a thing is beginning to shape itself vaguely in men's minds) and in which individuals may or may not have standards of their own. If they have, these standards will be set by the exigencies of their individual cases, the dramatist desiring to make himself clear to his interpreter, the letter-writer acting upon a half-conscious generalisation as to the average intelligence of letter-readers, the conveyancer in general not troubling about the matter at all or deliberately evading responsibility by using no punctuation" (p. 156).

A remarkable early sixteenth-century book on punctuation is cited in Typographical Antiquities, ed. Herbert, I (London, 1785), 301-2; ed. Dibdin, II (London, 1812), 203-6. Herbert lists it with Pynson's productions, Dibdin with De Worde's. The following passage demonstrates that the unknown author had a definite and quite modern theory of punctuation: "Therebe fiue maner poyntys/ and diuisiouns most vsed with cunynge men: the which/ if they be wel vsid: make the sentens very light/ and esy to vnderstod both to the reder/ & the herer. & they be these: virgyl/ com/ parëthesis/ playnt poynt/ and interrogatif. A virgyl is a sclder stryke . . . be tokynyng a lytyl/ short rest without any perfetness yet of sentens. . . . A come [i.e., our colon] is with tway titils thiswyse: betokynyng a lenger rest: . . . A playne point is with won titil thiswyse. & it cumeth after the ende of al the whole sëtens betokynyng a lôge rest. . . . we haue made these rulys in englisshes [sic]: by cause they be as profitable/ and necessary to be kepte in every mother tüge/ as i latin" (Herbert, I, 301-2).


16I have examined passages on each quire of this edition to make certain that it is a completely new setting and not merely a re-issue of the 1534 Åheets.

17Ed. William Herbert, II (1786), 808.


19Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, num. 35 (Madison, 1933), p. 327.


22Loc. cit.

This description is based on a copy in the Huntington Library, num. 60720, of which I have a Xerox reproduction.

Sigs. A4v, A6v, C2v, G6r.

This summary of Thirlby's life is based on the account in the DNB. The Bishop is also of some importance for aiding a German paper-maker, Remegius, in setting up a paper-mill in England in the mid-1550's. Thomas Churchyard alludes to this in his Spark of Friendship (1588), sig. Dlf. See the mention of the mill in McKerrow, Introduction to Bibliography, pp. 98-99.

This description is based on a copy in the Folger Library (copy one).


This description is based on a copy in the Library of Congress, num. 26.3/5481.


Tottel's Miscellany, "The Library, 2nd series, V (1904), 27.


This description is based on a copy in the Huntington Library, num. 20690, which I have examined on film.

This description is based on a copy in the Folger Library (copy one).

This description is based on a copy in the Huntington Library, num. 60726, which I have examined on film.

This description is based on a copy in the Huntington Library, num. 20689, which I have examined on film.
This description is based on a copy in the Huntington Library, num. 20832, which I have examined on film.

This description is based on a copy in the Ohio State University Library, num. PA 6308/ D507/ 1600.
CHAPTER IV

THE LATIN TEXTS OF THE TRANSLATIONS

In his Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica Thomas Tanner says of Whittinton, "... Transtulit in Anglicum sermonem Officia Ciceronis. Latina correxit et una edidit."¹ Whittinton himself gives no indication that he has paid any special attention to the state of the Latin text of the work, though perhaps a phrase on the title-page of the "fyrst parte" can be taken to mean that: "The thre bookes of Tullius offyce bothe in latyn tongue and englysshe/ late translated and dyligently corrected by Robert Whytynton laureat poete." It is not clear here what has been "dyli-gently corrected" and whether indeed the phrase is anything more than a convention. When we examine the Latin of the Offyces we find that it is neither an original edition nor the text of any one of the contemporary popular versions of De Officiis, but a composite put together from various sources.

Of the numerous section headings in the Latin of this work, the majority are taken word for word from the De Officiis as edited by Benedict Brugnolus earlier in the century,² a lesser number are from Erasmus edition,³ a few are from some third source (or are original with the editor),
and a few are combinations of any two of these. The text itself is on the whole close to Erasmus', though it is by no means a reprint. At one point it agrees with Brugnolus' version in omitting a long section found in some medieval manuscripts of De Officiis but not in others; Erasmus includes this particular section. At another point it omits lines found in both Erasmus and Brugnolus and in all the major ancient manuscripts. But at the classic cruxes in De Officiis this version usually follows Erasmus' choice of variants. Perhaps Whittinton or whoever else prepared the Latin of the Offyces (it may well have been reprinted from some earlier edition that I have not seen) used the Erasmus text as a base and altered it as he proceeded to suit his critical tastes.

It is interesting to note that on the very first page of the Latin in Whittinton's work an alien phrase has been inserted; the words "id est, non parum uidebitur, sicut Teren. in Heaut." are plainly not Cicero's. This phrase is lifted from a commentary on De Officiis by J. Badius Ascensius, printed in the Brugnolus edition along with other commentaries on the work. Whittinton, or the editor of his text, may have put the gloss in the margin or between the lines to illuminate a difficult passage, and there it was picked up by a copyist or typesetter and inserted directly into Cicero's treatise. This minor error is further evidence that whoever was responsible for the Latin
text of the Offyces did his work with the standard editions of De Officiis open before him.

More curious than the derivation of the Latin is its relationship to the English text. Clearly Whittinton was translating from an original in many respects unlike that printed in the Offyces. The sub-titles are the most obvious indications of this. Any number of examples can be adduced, but consider the following few. Near the beginning of the book is a heading in the Latin taken directly from Brugnolus: "Fundamenta iustitiae quae sint" (sig. B3v). The corresponding heading in the English, "Truthe is the foundacyon of iustyce by his ryght defynicion," is a translation not of Brugnolus but of Erasmus: "Fides iusticiae fundamentû ab etymologia." This pattern of Brugnolus in the Latin and Erasmus in the English occurs as often as does the direct translation of the headings printed on the facing pages. Less frequently, but even more confusedly, the English is from the Latin of both Erasmus and Brugnolus while the printed Latin is from some third source. On sig. Rlv the heading in the Latin is, "Praeceptum ne quid ducamus utile, quod cum turpitudine coniunctum est." The English heading on the facing page is, "Here Tully declareth that no thynge is profytable that cometh out of iniurye and malyce and that no comodyte be it neuer so great though it be vnpunysshed at all lybertie/ shulde mowe vs that we shulde not dygresse/ no not a iote fro honesty/ without the whiche
honesty all is but naught and leude." Now this is not at all a translation of the Latin that appears opposite it, but of the headings at this point in Brugnolus ("Nihil est utile quod ab iniustitia & malitia proficiscitur")\textsuperscript{9} and Erasmus ("Ne qua nos commoditas quantaeis cū summa etīā impunitate conjuncta pmoueat, vt uel tantillū ab honesto recedamus, sine quo nihil non perniciousu").\textsuperscript{10} More than once Whittinton is not careful to achieve unity in these combinations. Note the anacoluthon in this fusion of a prepositional phrase from Brugnolus and a noun clause from Erasmus: "Of those thynges aboute the whiche a bolde and valyaunt stomacke is exercysed/ and that chefe force resteth in contempt bothe of prosperitye and aduersyte . . ." (sig. D7\textsuperscript{r}).

If we take a cue from the headings and compare the Latin and English texts themselves, we find the same sort of discrepancy between the two. Though not nearly so frequent or noticeable as in the headings, the lack of agreement between the texts must have been a stumbling block to the elementary grammar students who used the book. Not every discrepancy, of course, is to be explained as resulting from Whittinton's having translated a different text than the one printed in the Offyces; as we shall see in the next chapter, he frequently simply blundered or was careless. But it is certain that at some points the text he was working from was at variance with the one in his book.
There is no equivalent in his English, for example, of the phrase mentioned above as having been interpolated into the printed Latin from a commentary. Several proper names in this Latin are unlike those in his original: "Paulo," "Dionysium," and "Manilio" have as their respective equivalents in the English, "a lytell space," "Dromisius," and "Maulus." Further discrepancies are these:

- sexto & trigesimo
- humanitate corporis
- inusitata
- quaererem
- ageretur

As was the case with the section headings, no single pattern obtains here. Whittinton does not, say, consistently print Brugnolus and translate Erasmus. Indeed, the Latin from which he worked seems to have been as eclectic as the printed Latin; one is no more in a particular textual tradition than the other.

We are led to wonder from all this whether Whittinton had anything to do with preparing or even selecting the Latin text that appears in the Offyces. It is clear from the preface to the Paradoxe, as we have seen, that at some point before the Offyces was published he had decided to include the original with the English. But inasmuch as that preface was written after the translation of De Officiis had been completed, inclusion of the Latin may have been an afterthought. Perhaps Whittinton left the
whole matter of the Latin up to the printer, who may have copied whatever text of De Officiis was at hand with utter disregard for discrepancies between it and Whittinton's English.

The first edition of Grimald's Duties, it will be recalled, contained only the English of Cicero's treatise; not until the second edition was the Latin added. But just as in the case of the Offyces, the Latin is obviously not that from which the translation was made. There are many disagreements between the two texts at points where, as one discovers from a critical edition of De Officiis, variant readings are possible; at these points Grimald has made one choice of variants while the printed Latin gives another. Following is a list of such discrepancies; the left-hand column gives the printed Latin reading, the right-hand the English at that point and the Latin from which it was actually translated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tameś [omitted]</td>
<td>so great [tantum], sig. Kl¹</td>
<td>sawced [conditus], H3²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manlio</td>
<td>Marcus Aquilius [M. Aquilio], M₅¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petae⁰ [omitted]</td>
<td>Petronius [Petronius], R⁴⁴</td>
<td>Well, he sayde, servaut, and briber [Bene ministrum et prebitorem], M₇¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latoria</td>
<td>Plectorian [Plectoria], S₃⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fatigādi is</td>
<td>bonished [castigandi], S₃⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Helij, &amp; T. Gracchi</td>
<td>f y madde foole [insanus], V²⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cum ipsius intereat</td>
<td>Caius Gracchus [C. Gracchi], N₈⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; iucūdum maioribus</td>
<td>[omitted], O₇⁴</td>
<td>parentes [parentibus], G₃⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This list has been compiled from a comparison of the English and Latin at various points in the second edition rather than from a complete collation of the texts; but it is representative so far as I am aware. I have omitted from it only those few discrepancies in which for one or the other of the readings I can find no textual tradition. What is significant about the list is that all the readings in the left-hand column can be found in Erasmus' 1520 text of De Officiis; all those in the right-hand column can be found in the 1543 text edited by Robert Estienne (or Stephanus). Clearly Grimald translated from Estienne, while the printer copied the Latin of Erasmus. It is inconceivable that so careful and conscientious a scholar as Grimald would countenance the printing of the alien Latin text with his translation. Presumably Tottel or someone in his employ made the unfortunate selection for the first 1558 edition.

In the second 1558 edition, as we have noted earlier, the Latin was altered at some points to bring it into line with Grimald's English. Without, again, having made a thorough collation of the Latin texts of the two 1558
editions, I have found about a score of corrections in the second. Only four of these involve discrepancies in the above list (the first four in the list); the others are rectifications of misprints and omissions in the Latin. And on sig. E2\(^{v}\) the English word "quiet," which is not appropriate in context, is changed to "hatred" to suit the "odium" of the text. I said in the last chapter that it is unlikely that a mere proofreader could have made these corrections under the circumstances that simultaneous or nearly simultaneous setting of the two 1558 editions would have imposed. But it is equally unlikely that Grimald is responsible for them, for he would surely have done something about the many remaining discrepancies, some of them more serious than those corrected for the second 1558 printing.

In the latter editions of the Duties a few further rectifications of the disagreements between English and Latin are made. In the 1568 edition, for example, the second four Latin readings in the above list are changed to agree with the English. Even as late as the final edition the process goes on; the last discrepancy in the list is set right in East's printing of the work.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV


3 Officia Ciceronis rursus accuratissime recognita per Erasmum Roterodamum, Vna cu alijs . . . Cui accessit Somnium Scipionis, & Graeca traductio Theodori Gazae in Senectutem & Somnium (Basle, 1520). I have examined this edition at the Folger Library and possess a filmed copy of it.

4 Sig. C3v, just after "quam fidem hosti datam fallere."

5 Sig. E6v, just after "nunc gloria claret." No manuscript variants are given in the Loeb Library text at this point.

6 The gloss in the commentary reads thus: "Non poenitebit. i. non par videbitur. Poenitere a penuria dicitur, autore Gellio in hac significacione sim ante Ciceronem usus fuerat Teren. dicens. Me quantum hic operis fiat, poenitet, idest parum videtur, quod a servis fit." Gellius's comment on "poenitere" or "paenitere" is in Noctium Atticarum, XVII, 1. Terence used the word in Heauton Timouromenos, I, 20.

7 Sig. B6v in Brugnolus.

8 Sig. b3r.

9 Sig. V2v.

10 Sig. r4v.

11 Sigs. G7r, L4r, M8r.

12 Paradoxe, sig. A5r.

14 Most of these corrections are written in a contemporary hand in the margins of the Folger Library's "copy one" of the first 1558 edition. It would be interesting to know whether this was done independently of the second 1558 edition (possibly before it was published) or by a comparison of the texts of the two editions. One can almost fancy that he recognizes Grimaldi's peculiar letter "r" in some of the corrections.
CHAPTER V

THE METHOD AND NATURE OF
WHITTINTON'S TRANSLATION

I. The Contemporary View of the Art
of Translation

Translation was a topic of great general interest
when Whittinton set to work on De Officiis in the early
1530's. Tyndale's New Testament, first published in
Germany in 1526 and now being smuggled in great numbers
into England, stirred controversy on all levels of society;
while More and Tyndale debated its merits in lengthy trea­
tises, its growing popularity among the common people gave
the authorities great cause for alarm. Other important
translations appeared in the late 1520's and early 1530's.
About fifteen of Erasmus short works, most of them religious
in nature, were turned into English. An increasing
number of the classics were translated at this time; H. B.
Lathrop lists ten such works that appeared from 1530 through
1535, as against only four from 1520 to 1525.

But with all this activity and widespread interest in
the matter, there was surprisingly little discussion in
print of any aspects of translation other than diction. The
More-Tyndale controversy was primarily concerned with
Tyndale's renderings of certain theologically crucial words. Tyndale and Coverdale in the prefaces to their editions of the Bible made some perceptive but only brief remarks on the nature of the English language and the necessity for idiomatic translation. In the bulk of the popular publications mentioned above one looks in vain for discussion by the translator of his craft. In all but Sir Thomas Elyot's works, such comments as we find concern the inadequacy of the English language and the need to coin new words for new ideas. These comments we shall examine when we look into the diction of the Offyces.

Thomas Elyot himself, of course, was much interested in the English vocabulary; but he was also aware of the larger problems of translation. He understood, for example, that the translator is obligated to render both the meaning and spirit of his original and, if he does depart from the text, to inform the reader where and why he has done so. In the preface to The Education or Bringinge up of Children (1530?) Elyot explains why he has at times expanded upon his source and at other times deleted material:

... I haue not onely vsed therein the office of a translatour, but also haue declared at lengthe dyuers histories, onely touched by Plutarch: to thent nét that difficultie of vnderstandinge shall not cause the matter to be to you fastidious, as it often tymes hath hapened to other. Also of pourpose I haue omitted to translate some parte of this matter, conteyned as well in the Greke as in the Latin/ partly for that it is strange frome the experience or usage of this present tyme, partly that some vices be in those tonges reproved,
whiche ought rather to be vnknowen, than in a vulgare tonge to be expressed.  

Elyot was also well aware of the necessity of understanding the idiom of the source language and of translating into the idiom of English. Now it was an ancient custom for translators to say that they rendered "sense for sense, not word for word," But this was very often a mere formula, one that even the most literal translators mouthed, usually as a sort of apology for their mutilations of the original. Elyot shows, however, in the preface to A Swete and Deuoute Sermon of Holy saynt Ciprian (1534) that he understood the real meaning of "sense for sense."

I haue translated this lyttell boke: not superstitiouslye folynge the letter, whiche is verely elegante, and therfore the harder to trâslate into our langage, but kepyng the sentence and intent of the Autour I haue attemted (not with lytell study) to reduce into english the right phrase or forme of speakyng, used in this treatise. . . .

But Elyot, alas, was ahead of his time. Most translations of the early 1530's were done by men who naively supposed that any Englishman who knew Latin could translate it into English. It was as simple as that. This certainly seems to have been the view of Robert Whittinton, as evidenced both by the absence of any comments of his own on the art of translation and by the method of translation implicit in his works. Nowhere in the prose or verse prefaces to his translations does he have anything to say about his craft. He several times states his reason for rendering the classics in the vulgar tongue--to make available
to English readers a fund of moral wisdom for the good of their souls—but he never mentions specific problems or says anything to suggest that he was in any way aware of the difficulties inherent in the act of translation. He does not even claim to have rendered "sense for sense, not word for word," and on this score, at least, he is deserving of praise, particularly in connection with the work under consideration here. For few English translations have been less idiomatic and more literal than Robert Whittinton's *Offyces*.

II. The General Characteristics of Whittinton's Method of Translation

As a sample passage from the *Offyces* to be examined closely in conjunction with the Latin, the first sentence from the work will serve as well as any. I shall give first the Latin, then the English. Since the Latin text in the *Offyces* is full of abbreviations and contractions which it would be of little value and some confusion to reproduce, I shall here and elsewhere in this chapter and the next give the text of the original from the Loeb Library *De Officiis*. Wherever there is reason to suppose that the Latin from which Whittinton actually translated differs from the Loeb version, I shall point that fact out (something that would be necessary even if the text printed in the *Offyces* were given here, as we saw in the last chapter).

Quamquam te, Marce fili, annum iam audientem Cratippum, idque Athenis, abundare oportet
praecceptis institutisque philosophiae propter
summam et doctoris auctoritatem et urbis, quorum
alter te scientia augere potest, altera exemplis,
tamen, ut ipse ad meam utilitatem semper cum
Graecis Latina coniunxi neque id in philosophia
solum, sed etiam in dicendi exercitacione feci,
idem tibi censeo faciendum, ut par sis in utriusque
orationis facultate.

(Loeb, p. 2)

Though thou my sonne Marcus/ a yere nowe
herynge Cratippus/ and that in Athenes muste nedes
habounde in preceptes and rules of phylosophye
bothe for the synguler authoritie of thy reder/
also of the cytie of Athenes/ werof the one maye
encrease the with lernynge/ the other with examples
of good maner: not withstandynge like as I to my
profyte at all tymes dyd ioyne latyn tongue with
the greke/ and that not onely in philosophye/ but
also in exercyse of oratory crafte/ I iudge the
same to be doone upon thy parte/ so that thou
mayste be lyke experte in the facultie of bothe
tongues.

(sig. A2r)

Whittinton's method becomes immediately apparent.
He proceeds through the Latin phrase by phrase, in some
clauses word by word, carrying over into English both the
general structure of the sentence and all the smaller con­
stituent elements. In the translation, as in the Latin,
there is a loose-jointed concessive clause, an independent
clause that is itself periodic ("not withstandynge . . . I
iudge the same to be doone upon thy parte"), and a brief
purpose clause. Whittinton departs from his text three
times, twice interpolating explanatory phrases ("of Athenes"
and "of good maner"), and in the opening clause upsetting
the balance of the correlatives "et doctoris . . . et urbis"
by placing "bothe" before rather than after "for the
synguler authoritie of." And it might be noted that he
understands "Latina" to be "latyn tongue," though its plural form calls for something like "Latin studies."

This rambling, complex sentence is typical of perhaps four-fifths of the sentences in the Offyces. Where the meaning of the Latin is clear and the form allows the material to be carried over bodily into English, Whittinton is able to make an adequate rendition. But let there be a passage in which the sense is obscure or in which the Latin structure does not immediately suggest an English equivalent, and Whittinton loses his grip on the material and turns out work deserving of the scorn in which Grimald was to hold it. Quite often there are lapses that result not from any difficulty in the original, but from patent carelessness on Whittinton's part or, at times, from what seems simply a perverse insistence upon doing the wrong thing.

Relatively infrequently in the Offyces are there passages in which Whittinton has completely misread the Latin. A few such are amazingly bad. Witness the following:

He saythe well who so euer saythe that he hath not restored the money that he had by borrowyng/ also he that sayth that he hath not the money that he shulde restore/ and also he that gyueth thankes for the money that he hath borowed.9

(sig. 02r)

It tells us a great deal about Whittinton that he could have allowed such gibberish to remain in his copy. He seems at times to have felt no obligation to reproduce the sense of
the original but only to compile English equivalents of its phrases.

A more serious class of errors, because it is both more elemental and more pervasive, is Whittinton's mistranslation or omission of negatives in the Latin text. I find a score of places where he completely changes the direction of Cicero's statement by doing violence to the negative. Even if his text was corrupt and lacked or confused the negatives, he should have been aware of many of these errors; for he makes Cicero contradict himself. Notice the following faulty readings, in which I have inserted omitted negatives:

Whan my mynde coulde [not] do nothynge [i.e., could not remain inactive]/ I occupyed it in [rather, having been occupied in] this exercyse fro the be- gynnynge of youthe/ I thought it was very honest that I coulde put awaye all greuaunce if I returned my selfe to phylosophy. . . .

(sig. K3^r)

It is not fyttynge or mete that he that is [not] subdued with drede/ shulde be subdued with couetyse. . . .

(sig. D6^r)

The trewe and polytyke manlynesse of herte/ dothe iudge that to be honest that moste foloweth nature/ to stande in dedes/ and [not] in glory and fame. . . .

(sig. D6^r)

Wherfore we muste bothe pardone theym that [do not] take ypon them to gouerne gommentys/ whiche of excellente wytte haue applyed them selues to lern- ynge. . . .

(sig. E1^r)

It is difficult to account for the frequency with which Whittinton made such errors. He may simply have had a
blind spot with regard to negatives, particularly in situations where the negatives are doubled in the Latin, as in the first two examples above.

We saw in the first sentence of the text of the *Offyces* that Whittinton interpolated two brief original phrases into his otherwise literal translation. There are not a great many instances of this in the work. Whittinton sometimes expands where Cicero has been concise (the interpolation is bracketed):

But bothe to burne and to cutte/ [that is to say to distroy yyces past and restrayne other that myght ensue]/ so we shall come seldome to this maner of correctyon. . . .

(sig. H6r)

Suche that ruleth cōmen welthes can by no meanes soner allure the beneuolence of a multytude than by abstynence & contynence/ [by abstaynyng fro other mens good/ and cōtynence in moderatnesse of their owne affectyons].

(sig. 06r)

He explains an allusion:

And get your prayse of Salmaces without bloode or swette/ [that is to say with wanton pleasure with lyght women].

(sig. D5r)

Or he tosses in a gratuitous English proverb:

. . . What is it els but to take fro these men their propre good & to gyue them to other/ [as who say to robbe Peter & clothe Paule].

(sig. P1r)

His religious bias is evident in the following sentence,
where a distrust of the unguided pagan conscience has led him to add unwarranted material:

... Let the juryer remerbe that he taketh god to be wytnesse/ that is to say in my opynion/ his owne conscience [adioyned to goddes wyl]. . . .

(sig. R6r)

One wonders what compelled Whittinton to insert glosses in passages like these, which are really quite clear in themselves, while he let pass without comment others where the Latin is genuinely obscure and sorely in need of elucidation. At a few points his interpolations are worse than superfluous—they are wrong. Consider these two sentences, in the second of which he supplies the word "Alexander":

I se that Phylyppe kynge of Macedonye was excelled in valyaunt actes and in fame/ by his sonne Alexander/ but in softenesse and gentylnesse I se that he excelled his sonne. And so the one alwayes [Alexander] Magnus/ the other many tymes vyllayne of leest reputacyon.

(sig. Flf)

The Latin of the second sentence here is "itaque alter semper magnus, alter saepe turpissimus." Now the one who was always "magnus" was obviously Philip, not Alexander, for the father excelled his son in "softenesse and gentylnesse." Whittinton was probably lured by the "magnus" into making an "Alexander the Great" connection; he was not, at any rate, concentrating upon the direction Cicero's argument takes here.
III. The Syntax of the Offyces

We saw in Chapter 2 that what little of Whittinton's original prose remains is thoroughly Latinate, that characteristic Latin constructions like the ablative absolute are an inherent feature of his prose style. Inevitably such Latinisms abound in his translation. Probably the most characteristic syntactical feature of the prose in the Offyces is the use of the relative pronoun as a connective-demonstrative to hook one clause to another. Notice the frequency with which the construction occurs in this passage:

Those me iudge no lawe/ no companye of men in amyte to be with the cytezyns/ for the commen welthe sake/ whiche opynyon dothe scatre a sonder all the felow-shyppe and vnyte of a cyte. They that saye that regarde of cytezyns is to be had/ and denye the respecte of straungers/ they dyuorse and separate the commen companye of mankynde/ whiche withdrawn/ bountifulnesse/ lyberalyte/ goodnesse/ and iustyce be vtterly take away/ whiche thynges if they take awaye/ they also are to be iudged agaynst goddes immortall/ for they subuerete amonge men all vnyte of good company. Of the whiche vnyte the bonde is moste strayte/ so that it is thought to be agayne nature that one man shulde take from an other man bycause of his owne profyte/ rather than to suffer al incom-modytees/ ye eyther exteryour of the body/ as pouertye/ exyle/ or els of the soule/ whiche thynges be without iustyce. . . . (sigs. Q6r-7r)

This use of the relative is common fifty years earlier in Caxton's translations,¹⁰ and it occurs frequently in Grimald's version of De Officiis some twenty years later. Until English translators of the Latin learned to resist the attraction of the relative and developed a more general use
of the demonstrative pronoun and demonstrative adjective in place of it, their translations would inevitably have a strong Latinate cast.

The undomesticated ablative absolute does not occur frequently in the Offices, but it is always troublesome when it does. Witness these instances of the construction:

But there be many discyplynes/ whiche the endes of myseryes and felycites purposed do perueret all offyce and good maner. . . .

For the more swaruynge and craftyer that a man is/ in so moche he is had in hate and more suspycion/ the good opinyon of honesty take[n] away.

And for that cause the cyte left a parte/ I walkyng in the coutrey am oft scole a lone.

That Whittinton was not unaware of the possibility of translating absolutes as temporal, conditional, causal or other sorts of clauses is plain from the fact that he occasionally did so; in the following sentence, for example, he rendered the phrase "hasta posita" quite satisfactorily as a temporal clause:

For Sylla was bolde [to say] when his speare was pytched downe/. . . that he solde his prises gotten by lawe of armes.

The truth is that one way of translating these phrases was as acceptable to him as the other. To a man steeped in Latin, ablative absolutes—whether in Latin or English—have temporal, conditional, causal, or some other significance depending on their context, and it is superfluous to
make that significance explicit. Whittinton forgot that he was making a translation for those who had little or no Latin and needed guidance precisely on such points as this.

Two other syntactical features of the Offyces, asymmetrical coordination and anacoluthon, are more serious faults than the literally translated ablative absolute, for they violate logic as well as English idiom. Asymmetrical coordination, or faulty parallelism, is really a special form of anacoluthon, the abandonment of one type of construction for another grammatically different. There are relatively few anacolutha in the Offyces that do not involve parallelism. In the following instance of such we are able to see precisely how Whittinton fell into difficulty. I shall give the Latin for comparison.

Sed, ut laudandus Regulus in conservando iure iurando, sic decem illi, quos post Cannensem pugnam iuratos ad senatum misit Hannibal se in castra redituros ea, quorum erant potiti Poeni, nisi de redimendis captivis impetravissent, si non redierunt, vituperandi.

But as Regulus was to be praysed in keping his pmesse by othe/ so these .x. mē/ whom sworne after the batayle of Canne cyte/ Hānyball sent to the senate cōdycionally/ that they shulde returne in to the tētes of the whose prisoners they were/ except they myght haue optayned that the ḥsoners might be raunsomed/ & if they had not returned it had be to thē reproche.

(sigs. X4v-5v)

In his usual fashion Whittinton proceeds through the Latin phrase by phrase. But the Latin here inevitably plays havoc with such a method, for the subject and verb of the
independent clause ("sic decem illi . . . vituperandi") are separated by a three-clause modifier of the subject and a conditional clause. By the time Whittinton has worked his way through the modifier, he has forgotten "so these .x. mē" at the beginning of what is supposed to be the main clause, and so tacks on the conditional clause with a gratuitous ampersand and develops a new independent clause out of "vituperandi." He either did not re-read the sentence once he had composed it, or if he did he was not bothered by the anacoluthon. Or possibly he was simply unable to cope with the problem of turning the one complex Latin sentence into two manageable English ones. Whittinton is so frequently guilty of carelessness, however, that one hesitates to attribute blunders of this sort to ignorance.

Any Latin prose that employs balanced constructions to the extent that Cicero's does is dangerous ground for a translator with a tendency toward asymmetrical coordination. Every occurrence of correlative conjunctions like cum . . . tum, et . . . et, and non solum . . . sed etiam puts Whittinton's powers of English composition to the test—a test he often fails. His habit of translating phrase by phrase is the basic reason for the faulty parallelism. By the time he takes up the second member of a correlative grouping in the Latin he has forgotten how he rendered the
first. A case in point is a passage we have examined earlier in connection with the omission of negatives:

Quapropter et iis forsitan concedendum sit rem publicam non capessentibus, qui excellenti ingenio doctrinae sese dediderunt, et iis, qui aut valetudinis imbecillitate aut aliqua graviore causa impediti a re publica recesserunt. . . .

Wherfore we muste bothe pardone theym that [do not] take vpon them to gouerne commentyes/ whiche of excellente wytte haue applyed them selues to lernynge/ also to them that eyther by weakenesse of sycknesse/ or by some other greuous cause letted/ haue departed fro the gouernaunce of the commenty. . . .

(sig. El?)

Whittinton begins well here with "we muste bothe pardone theym" as a translation of "et iis forsitan concedendum sit." The "bothe" should follow "pardone" instead of preceding it, since there is to be only one verb with correlative objects. But at least he has avoided a literal "it must be conceded to them" rendering of the future periphrastic verb. When he comes to the second of the correlatives, however, he forgets that he has translated the periphrastic verb freely, and so englishes this "iis" as "to them" to satisfy the "it must be conceded" sense of the governing verb. Thus the anacoluthon. I might add that elsewhere Whittinton almost always translates verbs of the future periphrastic conjugation in the awkward "it must be" fashion. Here he was for once freer, but was, unfortunately, unable to maintain his freedom.
One other example of asymmetrical coordination will be instructive. The Latin text is not necessary for an appreciation of the problem in this passage.

In every deed to be taken in hands thre points are to be kepte. Fyrst the appetyte shall obey to reason/ than the whiche nothyng is more accordyne to obserue offfyce and honesty. Seconde that it may be consyddred howe great a thyng e it is that we woll brynge to passe/ so that nether more nor lesse charge and laboure be take than the cause requyreth. Thyrdye is that we beware that suche thynges that pertayne to a lyberall fashyon and honour muste be moderate.

(sig. H3r)

The first of the correlative members here is an independent clause introduced by an adverb. The second is a noun clause, a fragment of a sentence, introduced in the same way. The third is a noun clause complementary to what in the other members is an adverb. This annoying asymmetry could have been avoided by inserting "that" before the first member and deleting "is" before the third. Notice, incidentally, the clumsy "it may be consyddred" in the second of the correlatives (a literal translation of "animadvertatur"); how much simpler and smoother would have been "we consider," paralleling "we beware" in the third one.

Much that is pleasing in Whittinton's translation results directly from the parallelism and balance of Cicero's Latin. "For though the lawes be drownede by mayne power of some men/ though lyberty be made to quake . . . ," he writes, directly following Cicero (sig. L4r). Or again, "By that counsayle of lerned men the lawes of Athenes/ by
that counsayle the good ordre and lawes of our elders be observed & kept" (E3r). But for the most part, Whittinton, with his pedestrian method of creeping from phrase to phrase of the original, benefitted little from the plentiful opportunities for graciousness of style that Cicero's text afforded him.

To complete the picture of Whittinton's response to the problems of translating from a synthetic to an analytic language, I shall list and illustrate several minor syntactical features of the Offyces. In citing passages from the work, I shall underline the pertinent words.

1. Pleonastic pronoun (the insertion of a pronoun as subject of a verb for which a noun subject is also given):

   But those ryche men that iudge them selfe honorable & fortunable/they woll not be bounde by any benefyte done to them. . . .

   (sig. O2r)

   That credence may be gyue to vs it may be brought to passe by two meanes. . . .

   (sig. L8r)

   Therefore bothe it is necessary to a man solytary and lyuynge in the countrey the opinyon of iustyce. . . .

   (sig. M3r)

The pleonastic pronoun is a Latin figure of speech, used to give particular emphasis to the subject of a verb; the original of the first quotation above embodies it (qui se locupletes . . . ii ne obligari"). But the construction is foreign to English idiom except in impassioned rhetoric where a long series of modifiers separates subject and
verb, which is not the case in the first quotation. The second and third quotations illustrate Whittinton's inability to conceive of a clause or phrase as subject of a verb. There are no pleonastic pronouns in the original at these points. Whittinton simply insists on translating the synthetic verbs as pronoun and verb, thus producing the redundancy.

2. Redundant *that* in indirect discourse:

Therefore I thinke that Panecius where as he sayd that men are wonte to doute in this comparyson/ *that* he iudged the selfe same thynge that he sayde. . . .

(sig. Q2r)

Me thinkes that not onely [with] the Medys (as Herodotus saythe) but also with our elders/ *that* well manerde kynges were electe and ordayned for the entent to kepe and obserue iustyce.

(sig. M4r)

As though the redundant *that* were not sufficiently confusing, the first of these passages has a pleonastic "he" before the "iudged" ("Panecius" is its subject), and the second suffers either from anacoluthon or merely careless omission of a word.

3. Misplaced sentence elements:

So this in the forme of man crueltye and woodnesse of a beeste tyraunt muste be separote lyke wyse fro the body (as who saye) of mankynde.

(sig. Q8r)

Therfore that thynge that is euydent & open/ and that not onely for helthe and sauegarde/ but also is of great value bothe for rychesse and power/ let vs enhance: It and embrace it. . . .

(sig. L4r)
In the first passage Whittinton's misplacement results from following the Latin word-order too closely; obviously, "in the forme of man" modifies and should follow "tyraunt." In the second and third passages the word order of the original provides no excuse for what Whittinton has done. It is a mystery why "is of great value" in the second does not follow "power," as it does even in the Latin. And in the third there is no explaining why the underlined clause should intrude between "thyng" and its predicate, "is not so great." The actual predicate of "vauntage" is "may seme very great profyte"; the "it" is pleonastic.

4. Adjective following noun: (a) Noun not previously modified: "Marcus Cato aged" (sig. C2r), "rychesse plentyous" (C6r), "wasters prodygall" (N3r), "a wytnesse not meane" (X1r), "nature not vycious" (G7r); (b) noun previously modified: "a vertuous man and perfyte" (C6r), "a bolde stomake and an hardy" (C6r), "enuyous persones & leude" (E3r), "a great folower of Arystotle and copyous" (K3r). There is, of course, no error involved in placing the adjective after the noun; in fact, so far as modern taste is concerned it lends an attractive quaintness and antiquity to Whittinton's prose. It is worthy of note simply because it is out of the ordinary and it does occur very frequently in the Offyces.
In using this inverted form Whittinton is sometimes following the Latin word-order: "a bolde stomake and an hardy" is in the original "fortis animus et magnus." At other times he improvises: "rogatiunculas" becomes "prety questyons & mery" (sig. V2r).

IV. The Diction of the Offyces

At the time Whittinton was preparing his version of De Officiis, diction was the one facet of the art of translation that was being extensively discussed in print. A great part of the controversy stirred up by Tyndale's New Testament involved vocabulary. It was for the use of words such as "seniors," "congregation," and "love" in place of the customary "priests," "church," and "charity" that Thomas More attacked Tyndale in the Dialogue Concernynge Heresyes (1528) and Confutacyon of Tyndale's Answere (1532). "And then must he with his translation make us an English vocabulary too," More complained of his opponent. More opposed Tyndale's argument of the necessity for using fresh, new theological words to break through men's indifference with his own noble defense of custom as the standard by which to define the meaning of words.

The same concern for the English vocabulary and its adequacy or inadequacy for expressing ideas begins to be evident in the secular writers and translators at just this time. Sir Thomas Wyatt, in the dedication to his translation of one of Plutarch's works, laments that his native
tongue lacks "the plentuousnesse and faire diuersyte of language" of the Greek. The anonymous author of The Myrroure of Oure Lady (1530) complains, "For there ys many wordes in Latyn that we haue no propre englyssh accordynge thereto. And then such wordes must be turnyd as the sentence may beste be vnderstondyd. And therfore though I laboure to kepe both the wordes and the sentence in this boke as farre as our language wyll well assente: yet some tyme I folowe the sentence and not the wordes as the matter asketh."16

But the most important remarks upon and efforts in behalf of English diction at this time are those of Sir Thomas Elyot. Concerned about the "insufficiencie of our owne langage," he made it one of the purposes of The Boke Named the Gouernour (1531) to fill the gaps in the native vocabulary with words borrowed from other tongues. He speaks of that purpose in the preface to one of his later works:

His highnesse benignely receuyng my boke/ whiche I named the Gouernour, in the redynge thereof some perceyued that I intended to augment our Englysh tongue, wherby men shulde as well expresse more abundantly the thynge that they conceyued in theyr hartis (wherfore language was oderneyd) hauynge wordes apte for the pourpose: as also interprete out of greke, latyn/ or any other tonge into Englyssh, as sufficiently/ as out of any one of the said tongues into an other. His grace also perceyued/ that through out the boke there was no terme new made by me of a latine or frenche worde, but it is there declared so playnly by one mene or other to a diligent reder that no sente is therby made derke or harde to vnderstande."17
Throughout The Gouernour Elyot does indeed exhibit a continuing concern for words. He halts the progress of his discussion time and time again to make definitions. As R. F. Jones says, this "most deliberate and conscientious neologizer of the period" was "as much interested in putting into circulation words of true signification as he was in introducing them for his own needs."  

One other contemporary statement on neologism should be cited here. This occurs in Thomas Lupset's work, A Treatise of Charitie, published a year before Whittinton's Offyces. Lupset has just said that charity is not an English word:

```
. . . How be it whan we be driuen to speake of thynges that lacks the names in our tonge, we be also driuen to borowe the wordes, that we haue not, sometyme out of latin, sometyme out of greke, euen as the latin tonge doth in like necessitie borowe & take of other. And though now at fyrst heryng, this word standethe straungelye with you, yet by vse it shall waxe familiar, specially when you haue it in this maner expressed vnto you.  
```

Although there is evidence of linguistic naivté in this comment, there is at least an awareness of the inadequacy of the English vocabulary and some sense of the difficulties involved in rectifying that inadequacy.

It is precisely here that Whittinton differed from his renowned contemporaries. He neologized continually in the Offyces, but he did so out of no sense that the current store of English words was insufficient, that native
equivalents were lacking for those words he carried over virtually intact from Latin. Just as he had no theory of translation, he had no theory of diction, no idea of the limitations of words, not even the linguistic good taste to avoid ugliness. One deduces that he would have been surprised to be charged with inhornism, surprised indeed to know that the fault existed. He was totally unself-conscious and uncritical in his translating; he englished the words before him by association rather than by any sort of principles.

Direct transliteration of Latin words is the most notable linguistic feature of the Offyces. In the following passage, all of the underlined words are anglicized forms of words in the original:

And principally of those thre partes wherof I spake before/ let vs consydre the preceptes of beneuolēce which is won specially oy benefytes. Secode by good wyl & beneuolēce is moued/ ye tho ryches be not redy at hate. The loue of a multytude is moued with fame and opynion of lyberalyte and of bountyfulnesse/ of iustycye & trewe dealynge/ and of all other vertues whiche pertayne to gentynesse and facultye of good maners.

(sigs. L7⁻-8⁲)

It is not that all or even most of these transliterations are inappropriate in this particular passage. Nor are they all by any means coinages of Whittinton; some of them antedate their occurrence here by centuries. It is just that cognates are not always adequate translations of Latin words; any translator who responds so positively and so frequently
to the form of the words in his original cannot be counted upon to give the sense its due. And any considerations of verbal beauty and grace perforce go by the board.

If Latinism is the most characteristic feature of Whittinton's diction in the Offyces, the use of paired synonyms runs a close second. The practice is an ancient one in English, occurring as early as the Anglo-Saxon translation of Bede's chronicle. It is one of the things that marks the prose of a generation before Whittinton; almost every sentence of Caxton's contains a set of synonyms. Probably the piece of English literature most notable for this sort of tautology is Lord Berners's preface to his translation of Froissart's chronicle (1523-25), of which these are the opening sentences:

What condygne graces and thankes ought men to gyve to the writers of historyes, who with their great labours, have done so moche profyte to the humayne lyfe? They shewe, open, manifest and declare to the reder, by example of olde antyquite, what we shulde enquire, desyre, and folowe; and also, what we shulde eschewe, avoyde, and utterly flye: for whan we (beynge unexpert of chaunces) se, beholde, and rede the auncyent actes, gestes, and dedes, howe and with what labours, daungers, and paryls, they were gested and done, they right greatly admonest, ensigne, and teche us howe we maye lede forthe our lyves.

By the time this passage was written, the use of grouped synonyms was diminishing. One finds very little of it in More and Tyndale. Lord Berners himself employs it only rarely in the actual translation of Froissart; the overpowering tautology of the preface is a conscious device for
ornamenting that brief piece, not a characteristic feature of his prose style.

There are a great many doublets in the writings of Sir Thomas Elyot. The construction was particularly useful to him in his program of introducing and defining new words. He very frequently combined his neologisms with familiar synonyms for the benefit of his less learned readers. But this does not account for all the doublets in his works. In many cases both of the words in his sets are native or at least long established foreign terms. With Elyot the pairing of synonyms was as much a habit of mind as it was a conscious device.23

We can be sure that doublets are a habit of mind with Whittinton; whether he ever uses them consciously is a question. In Chapter 2 we saw that his original prose is marked by doublets, and it comes as no surprise to find them in the Offyces. They occur with such frequency as to be a major characteristic of his style. Sometimes he seems hag-ridden by the compulsion to repeat himself. In the following two passages, each of the underlined sets of words is a doublet upon a single Latin word:

Than if so be this wysdome is chefe . . . it is necessarye that that offyce and honesty that is deduced of company and felowshyp is chefe & princy-pall: for the knowledge and contemplacion of nature is meymed & without an hande in a maner & but begon/ if no acte or execucion of thynges that folowe not. This acte and execucyon is specially percyued in the defence of profytes of men.  

(sig. 16r)
All suche thynges somtyme ryse vp and apere eyther by close iudgemet of men/ or els in secrete voyces and fauour shewed in grauntynge offyces and authorltes. The byttes and grudge of lyberty lost be more sharpe and greuous than of lybertye retayned and kepte. Therfore that thyng that is euydent & open/ and that not onely for helthe and sauegarde/ but also is of great value bothe for rychesse and power/ let vs enhance it and embrace it.

As can readily be seen, none of the first words in these doublets are such as require definition. In some cases the meanings of the two terms are almost identical ("retayned and kepte," "chefe & princypall"). Even when the two are not so closely synonymous ("helthe and sauegarde," "byttes and grudge"), we feel that Whittinton is aiming for a general effect and has in mind no well-defined difference in meaning between the words. In a handful of cases scattered throughout the book Whittinton seems aware that his transliterations require some elucidation and so attaches familiar synonyms to them. Here are the resulting doublets with their Latin originals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Original</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satietate</td>
<td>saciety and tedyousnesse (sig. N4f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male facta</td>
<td>malefactes and yuell dedes (N6f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inchoatam</td>
<td>inchoat and begon (P7f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discepectationibus</td>
<td>discepectacyon and trauers (H4f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erumnosis</td>
<td>eurûnous &amp; paynfull (b1f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hilaritas</td>
<td>hylarite &amp; mery countenaunce (G1f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morositatem</td>
<td>morosyte/ yuell to please (E8f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adolescentia</td>
<td>adolescence &amp; growyng age (G5f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluptate</td>
<td>voluptie &amp; pleasure of body (X6f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probandi</td>
<td>approbate and alowed (F6f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtilitas</td>
<td>stylyte and quiddyte (MI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the first seven words in this list, "inchoat," "hylarite," and "morosyte" are credited by the NED to Whittinton as
first user; "saciete" and "malefactes" are found in other works published in 1533 and 1534; and "disceptacyon" and "eruinous" are not in the NED. The leading words in the last four doublets had been used by English writers before Whittinton's time, but he seems to have felt that they were obscure and required definition. The second term of the final doublet, "quiddyte," would appear to have been little help in suggesting the meaning of the first term, "substyl-yte"; the NED lists no instance of the use of "quiddyte" before 1539.24

One wonders what impelled Whittinton to employ doublets in cases where definition of the first term in the set was unnecessary. Why did he give a synonym for a particular English word in one place and not in another? Perhaps in making his translation he sensed some subtle prose rhythm that demanded more syllables than a word-for-word rendering of the original made available. That there was nothing inherent in the Latin to trigger the synonym response is clear from passages in De Officiis translated in one way in the text of the Offyces and another way where they are quoted in the prefatory "exhortacyon" to the reader. Following is the Latin of one of these passages and Whittinton's two English versions of it, the first version from the text, the second from the preface. I
have underlined the English doublets that represent single words in the original.

I. P. Scipionem . . . dicere solitum . . . numquam se minus otiosum esse, quam cum otiosus, nec minus solum, quam cum solus esset. Magnifica vero vox et magno viro ac sapiente digna; quae declarat illum et in otio de negotiis cogitare et in solitudine secum loqui solitum, ut neque cessaret umquam et interdum colloquio alterius non egeret. Ita duae res, quae languorem afferunt ceteris, illum acuebant, otium et solitudo.

. . . Scipio . . . was wonte to say that he was neuer in lesse quyetnesse and rest/ than wha he was quiet and at reste/ nor lesse solytarye than whan he was soole alone. A laudable and a noble sayeng and accordynge to so great a man/ and so noble a man/ whiche declareth that he bothe in quyetnesse and rest dyd study of busynesse/ also in his solytarynesse whan he was soole/ that was wonte to talke with hymselfe/ so that he was not vnoccupyed at any tyme: and somtyme he shulde not nede the comunycacyon of an other man. And so two thynges which bringeth greuaunce to other men quycoken hym/ that is quyetnesse and solytarynesse.

(sig. P4^)

. . . [Scipio] was wonte to saye . . . that he was neuer lesse vnoccupyed than whan he was quyete/ nor lesse solytarye than whan he was soole alone. A notable sentence/ and accordynge to so noble a man/ whiche sheweth that he in tyme of quyetnesse was wonte to studye of busynesse/ and whan he was soole alone/ he was wonte to comune and talke with hym selfe/ so that he was neuer ydle. And somtyme he had no nede of the comunycacyon of an other man. And so two thynges/ quyetnesse and soolnesse that bringeth dulnesse to other men/ made hym quycke.

(sig. a4^)

The second translation, that from the preface, is in every way superior to the first. Whittinton was in an expansive, tautological mood when he englished the text at this point. It contains four bulky and repetitious doublets not called for in the Latin—three for "otiosus" and "otium," and one
for "magnifica." There is also a clumsy expansion upon "solitudine" (unless perhaps the "whan he was soole" following "solytarynesse" is a mistranslation of "solitum," which he goes on to re-translate properly as "was wonte"). The second version has but one unwarranted doublet, "comune and talke." Ironically, it has no equivalent for the Latin words "ac sapiente," which would have supplied the second half of a justifiable doublet. The difference between the two versions cannot be accounted for on the grounds that Whittinton for some reason made it a point to be more concise in the preface than in the text. For in the other passages from the treatise which he translated twice (there are seven besides the above), tautology occurs as frequently in the one version as in the other. There is simply no principle apparent in his use of doublets in translation; probably the whim of the moment and not principle at all determined his choices in this respect.

In a work notable for its slavish transliteration of the original, it is refreshing to come occasionally upon (1) phrasal English translations of single Latin words and (2) English equivalents of Latin proverbial expression. In regard to the first, we are not particularly surprised to find "barbarum" rendered as "cruell bocherly knaue" (sig. L4r) or "gladiatores" as "men of fense" (N5r)—though in both cases we might wonder why Whittinton did not make use of the easy transliteration. But we are surprised to find
individual words in the original expanded into more complex English phrases, as in the following instances:

- **longius** so far as persons banysshed (sig. F6\(^F\))
- **plausus** ioye with clappynge of handes (F4\(^F\))
- **optimi** suche as be good & honest (E7\(^P\))
- **circulis** companyes that sytteth in roude cercles (H4\(^F\))
- **theatra** stage places made for spectacles & playes (N5\(^F\))
- **porticus** places or yles to walke in at parues (N5\(^F\))
- **pellicatus** ielousy and kepynge of an harlotte (L4\(^P\))
- **colonis** forayne & out dwellers that had their fredom in Rome (Vl\(^F\))
- **iacet** lyeth in the dytche (X7\(^P\))
- **foro** the consistory of the lawe (P5\(^F\))
- **foro** the open course where lawe is kept (T4\(^F\))

Some of these renderings are awkward and uninformed, as those for "circulis" and "porticus," and few of them are sophisti­cated. But how much more pleasant they are than the typical "morosyte" or "substylte and quiddyte." If this sort of expansion were the rule rather than the infrequent exception in the Offyces, the work might rank as a really important early Tudor translation, one of some general interest even today.

In a few cases Whittinton has injected English proverbs into his text, either as expansions of or substi­tutions for Latin proverbial expressions. When Cicero accuses dishonest philosophers of crafty finagling and shifting of position, Whittinton reads for "tergiversanter" "they tourne catte in panne" (sig. X7\(^P\)) an expression current at least as far back as Wycliffe's time. Of Callicratidas, who ruined everything at the end of the Peloppponesian War
("vertit ad extremum omnia"), Whittinton remarks that "he set al vpon vi. and .vii." (E6^), a proverb found in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and still current. For the Latin saying "nec tumultuantem de gradu deici," which the Loeb Library translation gives as "ruffled and thrown off one's feet" (p. 81), Whittinton substitutes "as a man more frayde than hurte to be cast downe the stayre" (E5^), the portion "more frayde than hurte" being an old English proverbial expression.
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6 Samuel K. Workman, Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose (Princeton, 1940), pp. 74-83, shows in detail how widely and inappropriately the formula was used. "None of the translators," he says, "fifteenth century or early sixteenth, French or English, really meant anything by their talk of sentence for sentence. The emphasis of their apologies is on the 'rude' abilities of the translator. They were not expressing an attitude concerning the reproduction of style, but simply a commonplace of humility" (p. 83).
7 Sig. A3r-v. For evidence that Elyot was preaching what he practiced rather than repeating a mere formula, see the analysis of his translations by J. R. Wortham, "Sir Thomas Elyot and the Translation of Prose," Huntington Library Quarterly, XI (1948), 219-40.

8 Ed. and trans. Walter Miller (Cambridge, Mass., 1956 [first pub. 1913]).

9 To mitigate Whittinton's offense somewhat, it must be admitted that this is a difficult passage in the original. Grimald's translation is logically correct though scarcely lucid: "This surely was in place, whosoeuersaid it: Money who haueth in hand, hath not payde: & who hath paide, haueth in minde: but thakes both who hath paide, haueth in mide: & who haueth in minde, hath rendered." It may be helpful to compare the Loeb translation: "A man has not repaid money, if he still has it; if he has repaid it, he has ceased to have it. But a man still has the sense of favour, if he has returned the favour; and if he has the sense of the favour, he has repaid it" (p. 243).


11 Workman speaks of the relative rareness of these illogical constructions by the end of the fifteenth century; "Sentences thus illogically composed continue to appear well after the end of the fifteenth century. By that time, however, and for at least twenty years before 1500, the tendency appears to have greatly lessened. Thirty-four pages from John Fisher's Treatise concernynge the Seuen Penytencyal Psalmes, published in 1509, show no instances of anacoluthon whatever, and only three of asymmetrical coordination. Fisher often used the synthetic verb, but only twice in the pages is the subject ambiguous. In about six thousand words from the latter pages of Robert Fabyan's Chronicles, published in 1516 but written by 1504, there are only two instances of anacoluthon, two of asymmetrical coordination, and three of the ambiguous synthetic verb. More significant, a London chronicle written about 1485 shows, in about the same length, only one instance of anacoluthon, three of asymmetrical coordination, and none of the ambiguous synthetic verb. The London chronicle is a significant example not only because of its early date but because of its obscurity; it is found only in manuscript and is likely to have been the work of an average writer of the time" (pp. 40-41).
There is an anacoluthic "est" in the Latin of the third correlative member.

Confutacyon of Tyndale's Answere, sig. r2v.

The heart of More's defence of custom is this sentence: "And I saye that this comen custume and vsage of speche is the onely thynge, by whyche we knowe the ryght and proper sygnifycacyon of any worde/ in so mych that yt a worde were taken oute of laten, french, or spaynishe, & were for lakke of vnderstandynge of the tonge from whense yt cam, vsed for a nother thynge in englysshe then yt was in formare tonge: then sygnyfyeth it in england none other thyng than as we vse yt and vnderstande therby, what so euuer yt sygnifye any where elles (ibid., sig. p3v).

Tho. Wyatis Translatyon of Plutarckes Boke/ of the Quyete of Mynde (1527), facsimile in the Huntington Library Publications (Harvard, 1931), sig. a2r.

Quoted by R. F. Jones, op. cit., p. 70.

Of the Knowledge Whiche Maketh a Wise Man (1533), sig. A3r-v.


Sig. Elr.


See Aurner, pp. 55-56.


At a few points Whittinton employs a variation of the doublet, substituting "called" for the usual "and", e.g., "the age of discrecyon called iuventas" (sig. M5r) and "honest sauynge called parsymonye" (P2r) to represent the Latin "iuvanes" and "parsimonia," respectively. It is almost as though we were hesitatant about thrusting the bald transliteration upon the reader. In view of his usual practice, one wonders why he should be.
The second version is also syntactically superior. Note that in the first version the coordination of "et in otio . . . et in solitudine" is obscured by the redundant "that" in the clause "that was wonte to talke with hymselfe." In the second, the simple expedient of placing "was wonte" before both of the coordinate infinitives provided the parallelism lacking in the first. The translation of the final sentence in the second version is more economical than that of its counterpart; instead of following the loose word order of the Latin, Whittinton here set "quyetnesse and soolnesse" in apposition to "thynge" and thus avoided the anticlimactic last clause of the other version.
CHAPTER VI

THE METHOD AND NATURE OF
GRIMALD'S TRANSLATION

I. The Contemporary View of the Art
of Translation

In the twenty-two years between the publication of
Whittinton's and Grimald's translations, significant
advances were made in England in the development of a
theory of translation.\textsuperscript{1} There still was no English
man who had so large a view of the art of translation as did
Estienne Dolet, the great French humanist and printer.
But the publication of Dolet's tract \textit{La Manière de Bien
Traduire d'une Langue en Autre} in 1540 (with several more
editions in that decade) must have stirred the thinking of
English men of letters on the matter. Dolet was himself
an eminent translator of Cicero and spoke with authority
when he set forth his famous five rules for the translator:

1. He must understand perfectly the sense and
matter of his author.
2. He must understand perfectly both the language
of the original and the one into which it is
being put.
3. He must not translate literally word for word,
but pay due regard to the idioms of both
languages.
4. He must use words actually belonging to the
modern language, not mere modernized forms of
the classical words.
5. He must attempt to achieve harmony and rhythm.\textsuperscript{2}
Apparently no English edition of Dolet's work was ever published. But that it was known in England would seem to be indicated both by echoes of the five rules in the prefaces to mid-century translations and by the increased sophistication of the translators as they discuss their craft.³

The most notable of English theorists in the field before Grimald published his Duties was Nicholas Udall. In the preface to his English edition of a portion of Erasmus' Apophthegmata (1542), Udall gives an indication of what was to be a new emphasis in English translation: the achievement of beauty of language in addition to accuracy. "I haue labored," he says, "to discharge the duetie of a translatour, that is, kepying and folowyng the sense of my booke, to interprete and turne the Latine into Englyshe with as muche grace of our vulgare toung, as in my slendre power and knowelage hath lyen."⁴ He does not believe, one learns from later remarks, that English is capable of expressing completely the grace and subtlety of Latin and Greek; but he does not belittle his native tongue, and he insists that beauty be one of the considerations in translating into the vulgar.

Udall's most important remarks on translation are those made in the several dedications and prefaces to the English version of Erasmus' paraphrases on the New Testament (1548-49), for which he served as general editor and
translated the paraphrase on the book of Luke. Although his addresses to the King and to the Dowager Queen Katherine Parr are repellent for their unctuous flattery and servile self-depreciation, various passages in them offer evidence of their author's remarkable insight into the problems of translation, his large-mindedness regarding opposing ideals of literary style, and his firsthand acquaintance with the trials peculiar to men of letters, translators in particular. He has a well developed sense of style and can appreciate any writing that is appropriate to its subject:

First I woulde not haue euerye reader to require in euerye wryter to bee like his owne witte, or conueighaunce, or stile or phrase of speaking: but rather to consider that euerye man hath a veine of his owne eyther by imitacion so confirmed, or by long vse so rooted, or of desire to bee plain and clere, so grown into an habite: that he cannot otherwise wryte then he dooth. Some wryters hate breuitee, and some thinke all long thynges to bee tedious, and yet is neyther of these twoo sortes to be reproud, so the matier be good, the making fyne, the termes apte, and y stile flowing without curiositee or affectacion.

Although he feels that in translating the Bible one must be more rigorous than with other works and use some "scrupulositee," Udall in general prefers free translations to close ones. He also prefers an ornate style, like that of his author, Erasmus; but he stresses that for the English edition the translators haue of purpose studied rather to wryte a plain style, thã to vse their elegauncie of speche, partly because there can not I al poyntes be expressed in y English toungue y grace y is in y latine, . . . and partely because there was a speciall
This passage serves as a timely reminder to us of the sort of audience for whom all these early translations were made. Along with all his other problems, the conscientious translator into the vulgate had to be certain that his finished work could be understood by unsophisticated and probably poorly educated readers. This required, among other things, that he recast into simple English form periodic Latin sentences, "whiche by reason of so many members, or parentheses or digressions as haue come in place, are so lōg, that onlesse they had been somewhat diuided, they would haue been to hard for an unlearned braine to conceiue, muche more hard to conteine and kepe it still." 10

Nicholas Udall was no English Dolet: his discussion of the art of translation is neither complete nor systematic. But he assuredly had a larger view of the matter than any Englishman before his time, including Sir Thomas Elyot. I have found thinking like his in the prefaces to only a few other mid-sixteenth-century translations. Edmonde Becke, at the head of his English edition of another of Erasmus' works, Two Dyaloges Wrytten in Laten by the Famous Clerke D. Erasmus of Roterodame (1549), states succinctly the three main reasons why slavish literalness should be avoided
in translation: that the sense of the original may be clear, that the English may be graceful, and that the idiom of both languages may be observed.

But what diligence I have employed in the translation hereof I refer it to the judgment of the learned sort, whiche cōferryng my translation with the laten dialoges, I dowte not wyl condone and pardone my boldnesse, in that I challenge [i.e., claim] the semblable lybertie whiche the translators of this tyme justlie challenge. For some here tofore submyttyng them selve to servytyde, haue lytłe respecte to the obseruacyō of the thyng which in translacyō is of all other most necessary and requisite, that is to saye, to ren­dre the sence & the very meanyng of the author, not so relygyouslie addicte to translate worde for worde, for so the sence of the author is oftentimes corrupted & depraued, and neyther the grace of the one tonge nor yet of the other is truely obserued or aptlie expressed. The lerned knoweth y every tonge hathe his peculyer proprietie, phrase, maner of locucion, enargies and vehemēcie, which, so apt­lie in any other tōg can not be expressed.11

And in the preface to the translation of yet another Erasmus original, The Praise of Folie (1549), Sir Thomas Chaloner explains that he has not rendered literally the many Greek proverbs in the work, but has approximated their sense in the English: "And where the proverbes woulde take no englishe, I aduentured to put englishe proverbes of like weight in their places."12 There is a sense of freedom in remarks like this and in the translations to which they are prefixed that would have been alien to even Thomas Elyot fifteen years earlier. Not that Udall and Becke and Chaloner are any less "faithful" to their originals than their predecessors had been (each is willing that the "learned sort" should compare his version with its source). They
simply are more fully aware, first, that attention must be paid to the "genius" of the English language as well as of the Latin, and, second, that translation must proceed in larger units than mere words and phrases if the total meaning of the original is to be represented in the English.

It is more than coincidental that it is the translators of Erasmus who were so fully aware of the possibilities and limitations of the art in which they were engaged. The works of that immensely sane man seem to have had a salutary effect on everyone who handled them. His views on translation, as on so many other matters, were distinctly enlightened. While of course he had nothing to say about the specific problems of translating into English, the principles he suggests in connection with his labors in Latin and Greek were of value for translators working in any language. He did not leave a large body of commentary on the subject, and what is extant is not systematic. It is found mainly in letters to his friends prefixed to his editions of the classics. Erasmus stressed particularly the necessity of knowing thoroughly the two languages involved in any translation project and of rendering the idiom of the original by the idiom of the second language. Dolet undoubtedly derived his five rules from his own experience as a translator, but he could have found them implicit in remarks of Erasmus published several decades earlier. In view of Erasmus' early popularity in England, it is
surprising that it took his ideas so long to filter down through English scholarship and finally appear in the translators' statements of theory prefixed to their works.

We come now to Grimald's discussion of the art of translation in "The preface to the reader" in his Duties. This passage is quoted and commented upon in at least four modern studies dealing with Tudor translations. But not one of them points out the significant fact that everything Grimald says about bad translation practice has reference to the earlier version of De Officiis—Whittinton's Offyces. Here is the passage:

These richesse, & treasures of witt, and wis­dome, as Cicero trasported oute of Greece into Italie: so haue I fetched from thence, & conueied thē into England: and haue caused also Marcus Tullius (more, thā he could do, whē he was alieue) to speake English. Maruailous is the mater, flow­ing the eloquence, ryche the store of stuff, & full artificiall the ending: but how I, in our maner of speche, haue expressed thesame: the more the booke bee perused, the better it may chaue to appere. None other traslatiō in our toūg haue I seen, but one: which is of all men of any lerning so well liked: ἢ thei repute it, & count it as none: yet if ye list to cópare this somwhat ἢ y nothing: peraušturer this somwhat will seeme somwhat ἢ more. Howbeit looke, what rule the Rhetorician giues in precept, to bee obserued of an Oratour, in telling of his tale: that it bee short, & with­oute ydle wordes: that it be playn, and woute derk sense: that it bee prouable, and withoute anye swaruing from ἢ trouth: thesame rule should be used in examining, & iudging of traslatiō. For if it be not as brief, as the verie authors text requireth: whatso is added to his perfite style, shall appeare superfluous, & to serue rather to the making of sōme paraphrase, or commentarie. Thereto, if it bee uttered ὡ ynkhorne termes, & not with usuall words: or if it be phrased ὡ wrasted, or farrefetched fourmes of speche: not fine, but harsh, not easye,
but harde, nor naturall, but violent it shall seeme to bee. Then also, in case it yeeld not the meaning of the author: but eyther folowing fansie, or misledde by errour, forsakes the true pattern: it can not bee approved for a faithfull, & sure interpretation: which ought to be take for y greatest praise of all. These points as I haue studied to pfourme: so where I haue not allwaies atteined vnto them: I shall desire you, gentle reader, gentely to cōsider bothe the excelence of the author, who is a perfitt oratour: and also the greatnesse of y mater, which is profonde philosophie.

(sigs. **5v-6r)

The placement of the reference to Whittinton's work is most significant here. Grimald first raises the subject of his own method of englishing the treatise, alludes slightingly to the earlier version and suggests comparison of that with his own, and then goes on to show the requisite qualities of a good translation and what results if these are lacking.

It might be argued that the first of these qualities, brevity, is certainly a characteristic—even a vice—of Whittinton's translation. And I must concede that in this point Grimald may well have been looking beyond Whittinton's work to those early English translations in which the originals were so greatly expanded upon. But recall the plethora of doublets, the phrasal renderings of single Latin words, and the original interpolations (particularly the misleading ones) in Whittinton's Offyces. All of these things would have been sufficient in Grimald's eyes to warrant the charge that they "serue rather to the making of some paraphrase, or commentarie." There is little question that in listing the other two desirable qualities,
naturalness of expression and accuracy of meaning, Grimald was aiming a blow directly at his predecessor's work. The chief characteristics of the 1534 translation are inkhornism and the violation of English syntax—the latter, I take it, being what Grimald refers to in the words "phrased \* wrasted, or farrefetched fourmes of speche." And repeatedly, as we have seen, Whittinton distorted the sense of Cicero's treatise, sometimes grossly; assuredly, his work "can not be approued for a faithfull, & sure interpretation." We cannot know whether Grimald's dissatisfaction with Whittinton's inferior version of De Officiis drove him to attempt a better one himself; but it seems clear that Whittinton's lamentable method of translation in the Offyces led Grimald to consciously work out and articulate his own method.

It is interesting that Grimald should go to the art of rhetoric for his principles of sound translation rather than to continental authorities like Dolet or Erasmus. Grimald's second and third principles sum up Dolet's five rules, but his insistence on brevity finds no equivalent there. The phrasing of this requirement—"that the English be "as brief, as the verie authors text requireth"—puts it in direct opposition to Nicholas Udall's pointed declaration "that if any interpretour should in some places bee as brief in the Englishe traslacion as the autour is in the Latin: he should make thereof but a derke piece of weorke."15 But Grimald's position on this does find support in Erasmus,
II. The Method of Translation and the Syntax of the Duties

In Chapter 5 we examined the first sentence of Whittinton's translation to determine his basic method of translation. It will be well to consider the corresponding passage in Grimald's work for the same purpose. Since the Estienne text, from which Grimald translated, reads exactly the same at this point as the Loeb text which I have quoted earlier (p. 142), I shall not repeat the Latin here.

Al though you sone Marke, hauing now a yeare herd Cratippus, & ᾧ in Athenes, must needes flowe full of rules, and lessons of philosophie: bicause of the passing great excellencie bothe of your teacher, & of ᾧ citie: whereof the one may store you with knowledge, the other ᾧ ensamples: yet as myselfe, to mine owne furderaunce, haue euermore joyned the latine with the greke: and haue done ᾧ, not onely in philosophie, but also in the prac­tise of oratorie: I think it mere [i.e., mete] for you to doe thesame, that alike you may be in ᾧ redinesse of bothe the kindes of eloquence.

(sig. Al²)

Plainly Grimald has followed the original in the structure of his sentence: a long concessive clause containing subordinate clauses of a lower order, the independent clause ("I think it mete for you to doe thesame"), and a result clause. Now Whittinton followed the Latin structure in precisely the same way. But there are significant differences between the two translations. Whittinton interpolates two phrases and misplaces the correlative adverb
"both;" Grimald interjects no new elements and carries over into English the precise logical relationships of the Latin. It is the sort of thing Whittinton does here that Grimald refers to in his prefatory remarks on faulty translation; and he himself, indeed, follows his own precepts not to expand upon or depart from the original.

We noted in the last chapter that Whittinton's handling of the first sentence is typical of his method in four-fifths of the translation and that in the remaining fifth he commits errors more serious than the minor lapses of the first sentence. In Grimald's case, the handling of the first sentence is typical of practically the whole of the Duties. His translation is literal, compressed, and syntactically precise. Perhaps we would do better to call the translation close rather than literal, for it certainly is not the latter in the sense his predecessor's is. This will be particularly evident when we consider Grimald's diction in contrast with Whittinton's; but it is evident enough when we compare the two men's characteristic renderings of Latin passages which do not translate into English quite so automatically as does the one given above. Take, for example, this sentence from the Latin and Whittinton's reading:

Nec verum est, quod dicitur a quibusdam, propter necessitatem vitae, quod ea, quae natura desideraret, consequi sine aliis atque efficere non possemus, idcirco initam esse cum hominibus communitem et societatem. . . .

(Loeb, pp. 160-62).
Nor that is trewe that is sayd of some me for
the necessyte of our lyfe/ bycause we coulde not
get without the ayde of other/ and bringe to
effecte suche thynges as nature wolde desyre/
therfore they say that this company and conversacyon
is had with other men.

(sig. I8r)

The obscurity in Whittinton's sentence results from his fol-
lowing, in all but the two central clauses, the word order
of the original. In the portion "bycause we coulde not get
without the ayde of other/ and bringe to effecte suche
thynges as nature wolde desyre" he has, indeed, modified the
Latin order, placing the object of the infinitives and its
modifier after the infinitives. But he has not made the
crucial adjustment, a rearrangement of the elements in
indirect discourse so that the infinitive at the end of the
Latin sentence and its subject accusatives are translated
just after the "is said of some men" at the beginning of
the English sentence. The reader does not discover the
most important part of what "is said of some men" until he
gets to the end, and by then he has lost the direction of
the thought. Notice that Whittinton has had to insert
"therfore they say" as a new introduction for the indirect
discourse in the dangling final clause.

Observe Grimald's handling of the same passage:

Neither is it true, which is sayd of some: that
this common knott, and felouship is hadde among me,
euen for necessite of life: bycause woute other, we
might not gett, & bring to passe those thinges, 
\(\frac{1}{2}\) nature dooth desire. . . .

(sig. H6v)
Not beguiled by the Latin word order, he has recast the middle clauses (in a better order than Whittinton did—note the placement of the "sine aliis" phrase in both) and brought the overarching indirect discourse into line with the requirements of English syntax.

Grimald nods only occasionally in the construction of his sentences; and then he usually slips into a Latinism. At one point, where the original reads "Itaque Athenienses, quod honestum non esset, id ne utile quidem putaverunt totamque eam rem," he follows too closely: "Therefore the Atheniæs, the thing, that was not honest, did not conte profitable at all" (sig. F6r). Grimald is obscure at a few points, either because he preserves the Latin order or because he insists upon heeding his own precept to be "brief, as the verie authors text requireth." The following sentence, though it is syntactically complete, suffers from a number of structural defects:

For giving place to manie in the knowledge of philosophie, if I take vpon me that, which is an orateurs propertie, aptlie, orderlye, and finelie to speake: bicause I haue passed my tyme in that studie, I seeme, after a certeine sorte, as in mine owne right, to calenge it.

(sig. A1v)

First, the form of the English sentence does not represent adequately the antithesis Cicero intends between philosophy and oratory. The initial participial phrase could well have been elevated to an independent clause and the next clause begun with an adversative conjunction: "For I give
place to many . . . but if I take upon me . . . ." Second, the "because" clause is ambiguous in its reference; it should have been removed from its Latin position to the end of the sentence, a position which would indicate clearly to the English reader that the clause modifies "seeme," not "take." Finally, the principal clause, "I seeme, after a certaine sorte, as in mine owne right, to calenge it," with its transplanted Latin idiom and timid punctuation, is practically senseless and completely forceless. Grimald here has simply not made the effort to work out a meaningful, idiomatic English equivalent.

Anacoluthon and asymmetrical coordination, those major syntactical vices of Whittinton's Offyces, do not occur in the Duties. The one specific Latinate construction the two have in common is the relative-demonstrative use of the pronoun which. Grimald avoids Whittinton's other favorite Latinism, the literally translated ablative absolute. Where Whittinton has stark absolutes—"And for that cause the cyte left a parte . . .," (sig. P4v)—Grimald has clauses or phrases—"For that cause leaving the citie . . ." (N5v).

II. The Diction of the Duties

Such comment on diction as is extant from the period between 1534 and 1556 indicates that a reaction developed in mid-century against the free-wheeling neologizing of the
Roger Ascham counsels in the dedication to Toxophilus (1545), "He that wyll wryte well in any tongue, musste folowe thys councel of Aristotle, to speake as the cōmon people do, to thinke as wise men do: and so shoulde every man vnderstande hym, and the iudgement of wyse men alowe hym. Many English writers haue not done so, but vsinge straunge wordes as latin, french, and Italian, do make all thinges darke and harde." Thomas Wilson attacks those who "Latin their tongues" and "pouder their talke with ouersea language"; to illustrate his point he quotes a letter replete with fantastic coinages. Religious writers were particularly concerned to avoid casting any stumbling block in the way of the understanding of the common reader and insisted upon the necessity of using plain language. William Turner, in the preface to a 1548 translation by Robert Hutton of a Latin work on theology, rejoices that the book is written in the

moste playn & vsed wordes y be in englād y men of all shyres of Englād maye the more easyse perceiue the meanynge of the boke. Some nowe a dayes more sekynge their owne glorye than the profyte of the readers: write so frenche Englishe and so latine that no man excepte he be both a latine man, a french man and also an englyshe man: shal be able to vnderstande their writinge whose example I woulde dissuade all men to folowe.

But with all the criticism of the use of "inkhorn terms" and "overseas language" in English, there were also defenders of a sane program of neologism. Nicholas Udall insisted upon the right of translators to "ampliate and
enryche their native language," provided that the innovations be appropriate and intelligent.

So that if any other doe innowate & bryng vp a woord to me afore not vsed or not heard, I would not displayse it: and that I doe attempte to bring to vse, an other man should not cauill at. . . . I see no man is so barrain, but he is hable with some woord or other to helpe garnishe his mother tougue, with other lyke sayinges procedyn from humanitee and fauour to encourage suche as are studious. And what if one labour to enryche his coûtreys language, as Tullie glorieth that he did amplifie the Latine toungue, is he therefore to be blamed, and not rather to be commed?24

Thomas Wilson, despite his sharp denunciation of foreign affectations in English speech, realizes that his native tongue is deficient in some ways and approves borrowing from Latin and Greek. But care must be taken in this: "The Folie is espied, when either we will vse such wordes, as fewe men doe vse, or vse them out of place, when an other might serve much better."25

In this survey of mid-century views on diction I have purposely left Sir John Cheke's views until last, first because he and Grimald had similar views on the subject, second because Cheke's remarks on diction in his well-known letter to Thomas Hoby were not written until 1557, a year after the Duties appeared, and not published until 1561 (at the head of Hoby's translation of Castiglione's II Cortegiano).26 Cheke insists first and foremost that English "shold be written cleane and pure, unmixt and unmangeled with borowing of other tunges . . . .", an opinion Ascham and Wilson had undoubtedly imbided from him in their early years
at Cambridge. At such times as a writer finds the English vocabulary to be wanting, he may borrow from foreign tongues only after he has exhausted two other possibilities: "... Let her [i.e., English] borrow with such bashfulnes, that it mai appeer, that if either the mould of our own tung could serve us to fascion a woord of our own, or if the old denisoned wordes could content and ease this neede, we wold not boldly venture of unknown wordes." R. F. Jones defines Cheke's fashioning new terms in the "mould of our own tung" as "the formation of terms, in a manner analogical to the nature and composition of the word for which a translation or an equivalent was being sought, by compounding, by the addition of prefixes or suffixes, or by using a word in a different sense or as a different part of speech from its usual meaning or accepted nature."27 By "old denisoned words" Cheke seems clearly to mean obsolete English words that might be revived to fill the gaps in the English vocabulary. Jones suggests that the phrase refers rather to "current terms of long standing";28 but the whole point of Cheke's remark, it seems to me, is to tell what a writer should do when no current term is available to express a particular idea.

Cheke had already put his principles of diction to work before he formally stated them in the letter to Hoby. His translation of the Gospel of Matthew and part of Mark,29 made sometime in the 1540's (probably as a result of his
dispute with Bishop Gardiner concerning Latin words retained in English versions of the Bible) is studied with original word formations constructed from native elements. There are very many compounds: "groundwork," "freshman," "wind-shaken," "helimp," "gainrising," and so on. Some of these are part-by-part translations of Greek compounds: for example, "foraier," "outcalled," "frosent," and "gainbirth." Words like "mooned," "nigheth," "smallfaithed," and "outpeople" are examples of enallage—the use of words in parts of speech not common to them. Cheke was by no means thoroughgoing in his effort to use only established English words: terms like "corban," "extremity," "flux," "legion," "margarite," "phantasm," "eunuch," and "synagog" are transliterations of Latin and Greek. For most such words he gave the classical originals and their definitions in notes to the text. Herbert Meritt, in an attempt to make a true assessment of a translation for which some immoderate claims have been made in the past, remarks, "Certainly Cheke made an effort to use what he felt to be native material, and in this he seems to have done considerable planning"; but, concludes Meritt, "any intention on his part to saxonize the Gospels was carried out, as far as his translation goes, with a considerable amount of moderation."30

"Old denisoned wordes" had by mid-century become the stock in trade of English poets. Chaucer increased steadily
in popularity as printed editions of his works multiplied, and a great many of his words that were no longer current in popular speech passed into poetic diction. Sir Thomas Wyatt had early come under Chaucer's influence, and, as Veré Rubel says, "Aided by Pynson's edition of Chaucer, which appeared opportune in 1526, he was able to evolve a poetic diction that was new because it was deliberately old."32 Following Wyatt's lead, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and the numerous "courtly makers" of the early Tudor period both took over old terms from Chaucer and his contemporaries and developed their own archaisms. By the time their poems saw print in Songes and Sonettes in 1557, the archaizing tendency in English poetry had been firmly established.

The fashioning of new words in "the mould of our own tung" had been practiced by English poets long before Cheke suggested it. Chaucer compounded a great many new terms from English elements; and to a lesser extent he employed familiar words in other than their customary parts of speech. Both compounding and enallage are frequent in the poetry of Skelton, Barclay, and, more importantly, Wyatt. There is considerable enallage in Surrey's work, but only occasional compounding. Neologisms of both sorts are scattered through the poems of the lesser writers in Tottel's collection.33
The diction of the forty poems of Nicholas Grimald in the first edition of *Songes and Sonettes* has been discussed in several places, most notably by Veré Rubel. She shows that Grimald used few Latinisms or French terms that were not already familiar to English ears. But his archaisms, some of them Northern in origin, are frequent and often extreme; Miss Rubel cites four such words meaning "man": "freke," "goom," "renk," and "seg." A number of Grimald's archaisms occur first in poems of Wyatt and Surrey; but many others are his own revivals. The most fascinating feature of this man's poetic diction is his word compounding. Some of the compounds strike the eye simply because their elements are printed as single words: for example, "allhayle," "deathdaye," "nightyde," "primetide," "hertgripyng," "hertpersyng" and "snowwhite." But others are notable for their compression and vividness, particularly the substantives: for example, "preyseeker," "fingerfeit," "sobermood," "studiemates," "fireflame," and "heavensman." Most frequently the compounds in Grimald's poetry are adjectives. Those in "Swanfeeder Temms" and "dartthirling death" have the quality of Old English kennings. The one in "peeple-pestered London" is all the more poetically effective for its alliteration. "Naamkouth" (well-known) and "ylswading" (ill-suading, tempting to evil) are archaisms; "forepointed" (before appointed) involves elision; "allmirthfull" is a parasynthetic combination. Most of the
adjectives consist of adverbs plus participles or adjectives: for example, "welcovered," "welblest," "overmeek," "over ferse," "fulfatted," "longgathered," "bestbeloved," "farstryking." Only a few of the compounds are verbs, one notable example being "gaynstrive" ("In case yet all the fates gaynstrive us not").

Against the background of the contemporary discussion of the English vocabulary, and of the diction of Grimald's poems, we are better able to judge the nature and merits of the diction in the Duties. Grimald's explicit statement on the sort of language required for a translation bears repeating: "Therto, if it bee vttered yynkhorne termes, & not with vsuall words: or if it be phrased wrasted, or farrefetched fourmes of speche: not fine, but harsh, not easye, but harde, nor naturall, but violent it shall seem to bee" (sig. **6r).36

It comes as no surprise that Grimald, like his fellow humanists, denounces inkhornism. But since one man's "ynkhorne termes" are another man's "vsuall words" in much of the mid-century discussion of diction, the denunciation means little in itself. By turning through the pages of the Duties one can readily see that Grimald is preaching in his preface what he has actually practiced in his text. The proportion of Latinate words is significantly small in this translation from the Latin. Grimald does not take Whit-tinton's easy but treacherous path of transliteration
whenever a current English term is not immediately at hand to represent the sense of the Latin. There are, of course, many Latin words for which transliterations are the natural and perfectly satisfactory English equivalents, and we do not feel that the sense of the original is in danger of violation when Grimald renders "natura" as "nature," "fortuna" as "fortune," "philosophia" as "philosophy," and so on. Yet even in handling this sort of words he is more critical than Whittinton. Where the latter translates the phrase "iustitiam, fidem, liberalitatem, modestiam, temperantiam" as "iustyte/ fydelyte/ lyberalyte/ moderance/ and temperaunce" (sig. G7r), Grimald weighs each of the Latin words and rejects some of the possible transliterations: "iustice, faithfulnesse, liberalitie, sobermoode, & tēperaunce" (F8r).

Grimald transliterates almost all the terms for Roman offices and institutions; "praetor," "consul," "censor," "tribunus," "aedilis," "dictator," "dictatura," and "senatus" are carried over into English with alteration of only the Latin terminations. For some reason he translates rather than transliterates "scriba" ("Secretarie," sig. K3r) and "questor" ("Treasurer," K3r). The first letter of all these titles is consistently capitalized.

There are a number of words in the Duties borrowed from the French with little adaptation; but all had been used in English before their appearance here. According to
the NED, "fijnesse" (B2^V), "certesse" (B6^V), "affiaunce" (B6^V), "haute" (as noun, A7^r; as adjective, 05^r), "semblablie" (E2^V), "largesse" (L7^V), "aduouterie" (G2^V), "toile" (Q6^r), "liuerie of seisine" (Q5^V), and "couine" (Q3^r) all had been naturalized by the time they appeared in the Duties.

Just as Grimald indulges little in Latinate and "overseas" diction, he avoids archaism in his translation. It is difficult, of course, for the modern reader to know what words in an ancient piece of writing were archaisms at the time of its composition. If the NED lists no occurrence of a particular word for a considerable period before the publication date of the work in which it is found, we suppose it to be an archaism. But, as everyone knows, it is dangerous to argue from silence in the NED. Besides, the word may have fallen into disuse in one section of the country and been very much current in another; it qualifies then as a localism rather than an archaism. There are a handful of words in the Duties which the modern reader might suppose to have been obsolete by the mid-sixteenth century; consider "kerne" (soldier, K1^r), "niefes" (female servants, F4^v), "sere" (separate, E7^r), "stale" (stratagem, F3^r), "bogged" (provoked, T1^v), "wening" (understanding, K5^v), "iwis" (certainly, M5^r), "sithens" (since, F7^r), and verb forms like "pight" (pitched, K2^r) and "strake" (stuck, P3^v). According to the NED, all of these words are used in
other books at about this time or later; but not enough instances are recorded to judge whether they were considered to be old-fashioned and were employed for that quality. "Freke" (man, warrior, S3r), a term dating at least from the time of Beowulf, and "yeeue" (give, D6v) seem from the NED to have been out of currency in the sixteenth-century except in poetry; and they both occur in the Duties in lines translated as poetry. The other seemingly obsolete words, like those listed above, may not have been at all archaic to readers in the 1550's. For Grimald, the careful scholar, had a theory of diction for prose ("vsuall words") as well as for poetry. The fact that he uses these old terms in his translation might be good evidence for their continuing currency in his own time.

The most important and interesting feature of Grimald's prose diction, as of his poetic, is his compounding of new words. The practice was a passion with the man; he seems to have fabricated new words from old ones effortlessly, perhaps unconsciously. All the following compounds from the Duties are credited by the NED to Grimald as first or only user:

- aloneliuer (sig. K6v)
- cornmerchaunt (Q1v)
- dispraiseworthie (Q2r)
- foreconceiue (D7v)
- forestudied (L2r)
- fæsmen (L7v)
- hotebrained (D8r)
- leagfrendes (R6v)
- landstriues (M8v)

- othemaking (S5r)
- officefelow (M7r)
- pleasableness (E2v)
- sobermoode (C3v)
- stoutheart (D2r)
- sightcourts (I8r)
- suttlewitted (I3r)
- threeparted (N8r)
- ungreffulnesse (01r)
Grimaldi's use of the following preceded the first or only entries in the NED:

- meankeping (G7v)
- meanekeper (L7r)
- misreporters (K5v)

roomethinessse (G7r)
wheybered (F6v)
stayedesse (Q3v)

And the following compounds were not entered in the NED, possibly because they were felt to be nonce words:

- alonewandering (H6r)
- bygoers (G7r)
- belliserruer (H3r)
- citiecauses (D5v)
- citiematers (D5v)
- citicounsell (D6v)
- citiattribute (N4r)
- corndole (M5v)
- euilltimmered (P8v)
- feateconceited (P2v)
- fleshgiftes (L6v)
- grouddilth (H3v)
- homemanhod (D7r)
- wyldebraines (G3r)
- youthstate (L2r)
- willforges (Q3r)

homegoodes (E4v)
homedeedes (K1v)
logefested (L7v)
overseeing (Dlv)
partmakers (D2r)
partieboundes (M1v)
overregarding (M5r)
nyedwellinges (M1v)
newetownes (R6v)
pruiestolne (N1r)
sacekowne (P6r)
salestaue (K2r)
shapeturn (R3v)
feneshowes (L6r)
houseseller (Q5r)

A word must be said about the fact that these compounds and the scores of others in the Duties are printed almost without exception as single words. There would, of course, be nothing unusual about terms like "cimatters," "willforger," or "homegoodes" if they were given as two words. The question is whether their present form results from the whim of the typesetter rather than the intention of the author. Since the compounds occur with regularity as single words throughout both this long translation
(including both its marginal notes and index) and Grimald's forty poems in Songes and Sonettes, it is almost certain they appeared in that form in the author's copy. No typesetter would take it upon himself to alter so consistently copy that had these terms written some other way. Some of the compounds, furthermore, would not represent the sense required by the Latin if they were resolved into their elements. "Newetownes" does not mean quite the same thing as "newe townes"; only the combined form carries the meaning of the Latin "colonis." Grimald's "sobermood" ("modestia") cannot be printed as "sober mood," nor his "alonewandering" ("solivaga") as "alone wandering." The very fact that these terms are welded together into units gives them a certain vividness and clarity and Grimald's "prose" a marked flexibility and economy that printing them as two words would not provide.

To make evident the wide variety in the compounds that flowed from Grimald's fertile imagination, I have in the following list classified some of the more interesting ones according to the parts of speech of the whole and the parts of speech of the constituent elements.

Substantives:

noun (attrib.) + noun: grōūdtilth (H3v), fense-showes (L6r), youthstate (L2r)
noun (objec.) + noun: spousebreache (K1v), belli-seruers (H3v), promes-breaker (S6v)
adverb + gerund: outfynding (A3v), ouer-seeking (D1v)
Not all of Grimald's compounds are combinations of two words. Very many of them are formed of single words with prefixes or suffixes attached. Grimald was particularly given to the formation of nouns by the addition of -nesse to adjectives: for example, "ablenesse" (B2v), "haynousnesse" (B7v), "bountiefulfesse" (C1v), "voidnesse" (D5v), "dastardlinesse" (D5v), "pleasablennesse" (E2v), "measurablennesse" (E7v), "roomethinesse" (G7v), "wylinesse" (Q7v). So frequent is the repetition of these words at some places in the Duties that they draw attention to themselves; note this passage: "And we must be free . . . from hertsicksnesse, and voluptuousnesse, & angrinesse: that we may have
quietnesse of minde, and voidnesse of care: the which may bring bothe stedfastnesse, and also a worthie estimacion" (D3V).

Somewhat less common than nouns formed from adjectives plus -nesse are adjectives formed from nouns plus -full; examples are "reprochefull" (F8V), "wealfull" (M4V), "faourfull" (M5V), and "pleasurefull" (C7V). At least four times Grimald uses the colloquial allto-prex, meaning "completely" or "soundly," with verbs or participles: "allto behold" (H4V), "allto shakn" (I8V), "allto stirred" (K4V), and "allto frayed" (K6V).

Many of Grimald's compounds were undoubtedly current in contemporary speech and thus were readily available to him as he sought for equivalents of the Latin words before him. Others sprang from his well-developed poetic imagination--bold, effective words, though not necessarily expressing the exact sense of the Latin; such are "shapeturn" (for "convertat," R3V), "sightcourts" (for "theatra," L3V), "officetelg" (for "collega," M7V), "peoplepleasers" (for "populares," M7V), and "fense of [i.e., off]," (for "repellit," Q8V). But there is an interesting third class, compounds formed by translating Latin compounds or phrases part for part. (We saw this sort of thing in Cheke's "forsaier," "outcalled," "forsent," all
coinages in his New Testament.) Following are notable examples from the **Duties**, with their Latin:

- leagbreakers (B8r) - foedifragi
- overseeking (D1v) - nimia cupiditas
- bygoers (G7r) - praetereuntibus
- forestudied (L2r) - praemeditatum
- fenseshowes (L6r) - gladiatorum muneribus
- cornedole (M5v) - frumentario largitio
- landstrues (M3v) - agrariae contentiones
- threeparted (N3r) - tripertita
- alonewandering (H6r) - solivaga
- ciitematers (D5v) - urbanas res
- cititribute (N4f) - urbana vectigalia
- thorousight (E7v) - perspicax
- homemanhod (D7v) - domesticae fortitudines
- homedeedes (K1v) - domesticae
- foreconceiuie (D7v) - praecipere
- citicounsell (D6v) - consilio urbano

Perhaps one of the most difficult tasks to accomplish in translating from artfully written language like Cicero's is to find equivalents in English for the tropes or "figures of words" in the original. There is much less opportunity for this than for reproducing the figures of speech that involve repetition, parallelism, balance, and so on. Latinist as he was, Grimald was completely aware of word play in the Latin, and occasionally he was able to approximate it in his English. By manipulating affixes he several times is able to match the effect of Cicero's paronomasia (the same word or similar words used in opposing senses). Where the Latin says of Scipio, "nunquam se minus otiosum esse, quam cum otiosus, nec minus solum, quam cum solus esset . . . .," Grimald translates, "That he was neuer more leasurelesse, thã whã he was leasurefull: and neuer lesse alone, than when he was all alone" (sig. N5r). The effect
of "leasurelesse . . . leasurefull" is quite like that of "minus otiosum . . . otiosus"; and of course the "lesse alone . . . all alone" matches the "minus solum . . . solus." In his translation of the phrase "si antea fuit ignotum, nuper est cognitum" as "if afore it was vnknowne, since alate it is well knowne" (I8v), he both approximates the paronomasia of "ignotum . . . cognitum" with "vnknowne . . . well knowne" and introduces the nicely paired "afore . . . alate" for the unmatched "antea . . . nuper" of the original. In another place he reproduces the balance of "vel secundas ad res vel adversas" with paired compounds: "either for welfare, or euillfare" (I6w).

As we noted earlier, Grimald's Duties, while not literal in the sense that Whittinton's Offyces is, is a close translation of Cicero's Latin, so much so that it could still serve as a crib for a schoolboy struggling through the original for the first time. Rarely does Grimald depart from his policy of one English word for one Latin, except to make such concessions as are necessary in translating from a synthetic to an analytic language. I find only one doublet in the whole work, in contrast with the multitudes in Whittinton's: "agri cultura" is rendered "groudtilth and trimmyng" (sigs. H3v, I4r). The few other instances of expansion are these:

- Coniunctionis (coming together for engēdrīgs sake (sig. A5r))
- micando (at the Italian play with the fingers, called Tocco (R7v))
digladiari
to be at daggers drawing (B3^)
pubescret
he waxed wheyberded (F6^)
sensim dissuere
stitch after stitch to rip (F7^)
adulari
to bee clawed with flaterie
(E4^)
arquitectura
casting of buildinges (H3^)
amens
not well in his wit (R4^)
se eo obstrinxerit
hath embrued himself in such blood (R4^)
tergiversantur
they fall to their shifts (T3^)
publicanis
farmers of our customes (R6^)

The first of these is clearly a circumlocution to avoid an indecorous sexual reference; the second is an explanatory expansion for uncosmopolitan English readers. It is interesting to observe the imagery in the others. The metaphor in the third (a phrase the NED credits to Grimald as first user) was obviously suggested by the root of the Latin verb. The beard in the fourth, on the other hand, has no source in the original. It is a little curious that Grimald did not construct compounds for the Latin of all these phrases rather than resort to periphrasis. A word like customsfarmers for "publicanis" would have been perfectly in order in this translation--the word "tollfarmers," in fact, does appear elsewhere (sig. H3^).

IV. Grimald's Debt to Whittington's Offyces

Earlier we have noted the slighting terms in which Grimald refers to Whittington's translation. Learned men count the earlier work as nothing, he says; "yet if ye list to copare this somewhat <w>nothing: perauëture this somewhat will seeme somewhat <w>more." A comparison of the two versions will indeed reveal that the second is superior
to the first in every way. But it will also reveal that from beginning to end the second borrows readings from the first. Now, of course, it is inevitable that two nearly contemporaneous, close translations of the same original will show many similarities, even if the later translator has not seen the work of the earlier. There is only one way in English to render some Latin words and phrases. Thus, when Whittinton has "For we be all drawen and led to the desyre of knowledge" (sig. B2r) and Grimald has "For we be all drawne, & led to a desire of knowledge" (A8r), it is not at all necessary to suppose that the second reading has been derived from the first; for such a translation of the Latin "omnes enim trahimur et ducimur ad cognitionis . . . cupiditatem" is pretty much inevitable.

But having excluded from consideration all such automatic similarities, we are left with a considerable number of identical readings that can only have resulted from the direct influence of Whittinton's translation upon Grimald's. Consider the following passage in the Latin and the two English versions:

Hoc igitur cognito dicendum est, quonam modo hominum studia ad utilitates nostras allicere, atque excitare possimus.

(Loeb, p. 186)

Therefore this knowen/ I must speake by what meane we may allure and styre the myndes of men to our profytes. . . .

(Offyces, sig. L2r)
This then knowne: wee muste declare, by what means we maye allure, and styre vp mennes good wills to our profits.  

(Duties, sig. 17r)

The notable thing here is Grimald's use of Whittinton's rendering of "allicere" as "alure" and "excitare" as "styre," neither of which is the inevitable translation of the Latin. ("Profytes" for "utilitates" is standard with both men.) Also interesting is the fact that Grimald follows Whittinton in carrying the ablative absolute at the beginning of the sentence over literally into English, a thing he very rarely does in the Duties. But the differences between the two readings are significant too. Grimald rejects his predecessor's "speake" as a translation for "dicendum" and "myndes of men" for "studia"--here and almost everywhere else he makes just so much use of Whittinton as suits his purpose. One notable instance in which Grimald allows Whittinton to influence him for the worst involves the literal translation of a Latin idiom. Grimald has this sentence:

And when the twoo Decij, or ½ two Scipides be vouch'd for mālie mē: orel's when Fabritius, or Aristides be allledged as iust: neither of them for manlinesse, nor of these for iustice the example is brought, as of perfite wisemen.  

(sig. 02r)

The Latin for the last clause is "[Nec] aut ab illis . . . fortitudinis, aut ab his iustitiae tanquam a sapiente petitur exemplum." The paired "illis . . . his," a common Latin idiom, should be translated something like "the
former . . . the latter." Grimald's unfortunate and uncharacteristic "of them . . . of these" is patterned directly upon Whittinton's reading: "eyther an example of manhode is take (as of a wyse man) of them or els an example of iustyce of these" (sig. Q2⁹).

Almost all of the more than coincidental similarities in the two translations involve matters of diction rather than syntax--Grimald was not at all attracted to Whittinton's unwieldy Latinate sentence patterns. Following is a list of significant identical words, none of which is the standard translation of the Latin term. Along with the Latin I give both Whittinton's and Grimald's forms (in that order), since sometimes even the spelling of the first is adopted in the second.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Word</th>
<th>Whittinton's Form</th>
<th>Grimald's Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>praetermissum</td>
<td>overscaped (A5⁹)</td>
<td>overscaped (A3⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distrahatur</td>
<td>[tossed] to and</td>
<td>[haled] to and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fro (A6⁹)</td>
<td>fro (A4⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praetermissa</td>
<td>overslypped (A6⁹)</td>
<td>overslipped (A5⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nobilitatum</td>
<td>auaused (A8⁹)</td>
<td>auaunced (A5⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lis</td>
<td>trauers (D4⁹)</td>
<td>trauers (C8⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyrum</td>
<td>compace (F1⁹)</td>
<td>commepasse (E4⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parta</td>
<td>well gotten (F2⁹)</td>
<td>wellgotten (E4⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participes</td>
<td>parte_takers</td>
<td>partakers (F2⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antecellimus</td>
<td>surmount (G1⁹)</td>
<td>surmounte (F2⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venustatem</td>
<td>amyablenesse</td>
<td>amiablenesse (F2⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensim</td>
<td>fayre and softly</td>
<td>faire &amp; softlie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G7⁹)</td>
<td>(F7⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrimonio</td>
<td>lyuelode (G7⁹)</td>
<td>liuelod (P8⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submissum</td>
<td>underlynge (H1⁹)</td>
<td>underling (G1⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obiurgationes</td>
<td>chydynges (H6⁹)</td>
<td>chyding (G5⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>villarum</td>
<td>maner places</td>
<td>manourplaces (G7⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H6⁹)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrepant</td>
<td>iarre (I2⁹)</td>
<td>iarre (H1⁹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sciente</td>
<td>connynge man</td>
<td>conning man (H1⁹)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It must be emphasized again that Grimald borrows carefully; he never takes over large blocks from the earlier translation. One wonders at times what his principle of selection was. A number of words in the above list are precisely the sort that he himself coins throughout his book--note "suilltimberd," "largegiuig," "handy-craftsmen," "amiablenesse," and so on. He rejects almost all of Whittinton's transliterations; "dictature" and "arbytrement"
are interesting exceptions. Perhaps in some cases Grimald did what almost every lesser translator has certainly done at one time or other—gotten the phrases of the first version so thoroughly set in his mind that no other words seemed to serve as well.

V. The Poetry in the Duties

There are nineteen poetry quotations in De Officiis, ranging in length from one to eight verses, taken primarily from Quintus Ennius ("the father of Roman poetry"), Euripides, and Lucius Accius (a contemporary of Cicero). Grimald translates three of the nineteen as prose, and to the other sixteen adds one verse translation of a prose passage. These seventeen poetry fragments in the English, with from one to eight lines each, total a little under fifty lines (it is difficult sometimes to say what constitutes a line). In some cases Grimald renders line for line; in others he expands upon the Latin. There are three meters in the English verse: iambic pentameter, iambic heptameter ("fourteener"), and an irregular iambic-anapestic tetrameter.

Iambic pentameter occurs in three single verses and in one passage of three lines. The one-line items are not particularly notable; note the internal rhyme in the third:

Well, let them hate, allwhy while they stand in feare:

His childrens graue the parentself now is:

(sig. E6v)

(ibid.)
In worde I sware, but hert vnsworne I bare.
(sig. S7r)

The other pentameter passage, rendered from two Latin lines, consists of a couplet and an extra line. The internal rhyme of the second line is annoying, but the third line is superior.

If breach of lawes, a man shall vndertake:
He must themboldely breake, for kingdoms sake:
In eche thing els, looke you regarde the right.
(sig. R4r)

Four of the fragments are in fourteeners. Three of these are line-for-line translations of the Latin; notice that in the second and third the seven-foot line is printed as two lines of four and three feet, a common practice at the time.

The man, that gentilie showed the way vnto the wandering wight,
Dothe as if he a candle shoulde at his owne candle light,
That nathelesse it light himself, when lighted is the other.
(sig. C5r-v)

One wight ther is, that hath our welth restored by delayes:
For he before all rumours did our safetie sette alwaies:
Wherefore, in lenger course of time, the greater is his praise.
(sig. (E1v)

O heauenly Faith, tye to thy wings the othe of Ioue also.
(sig. S5v)
The fourth of the passages in fourteeners is not a line-for-line rendering of the original. I give both the Latin and the original.

Cuius ipse princeps iuris iurandi fuit,
Quod omnes scitis, solus neglexit fidem;
Furere assimulare, ne coiret, institit.
Quodni Palamedi perspicax prudentia
Istius percepset malitiosam audaciam,
Fide sacratae ius perpetuo fallaret.

(Loeb, p. 374)

For all the conscience of that othe
he passed not a flye,
which he himself procured first:
  ye wotte, as well as I,
He could put on a fained face,
  and fare, as he wer madde:
And not to go with them, he wrought
with all the wyles he hadde.
His slye boldnesse but that Palamede
by deepe policie did spye:
The sacred lawe of solem othe
  the freke wolde still denye.

(Sigs. S2v-3r)

The material of the first two Latin lines is rearranged in the first two English lines (the prosodic lines, that is, not the divided ones). Note the slangy "passed not a flye"--appropriate for the speaker here, Ajax the warrior--for "neglexit fidem." The third Latin line is translated by Grimald's third and fourth, the fourth and fifth Latin lines by his fifth. The next to the last line in the English, "His slye boldnesse but that Palamede by deepe policie did spye," contains sixteen rather than fourteen syllables; two tri-syllabic feet are substituted for the standard
bi-syllables. The "solemn othe" of the final line (for "fidae sacratae") is taken from Whittinton's version.

Eight of the poetic fragments have tetrameter lines, with either iambic or anapestic feet or both. One triplet is purely iambic:

    Hast thou thy faithed promise broke?
    My faith I nother gaue, nor giue
    To any faithlesse, while I liue.
    (sig. S5r)

Two couplets are almost wholly anapestic:

    To the robe aboue armes let glorie belonge,
    And the laurel yeeue place to the oratours tonge.
    (sig. D6r)

    The wiseman his wit verie vaine he may call,
    If profit he can not himself therwithall.
    (sig. Q4r)

This couplet alternates iambs and anapests:

    A goodlie great spoile at Salmacis wonne.
    Without anie blood, or swette was it donne.
    (sig. C8r)

Three other couplets have iambs and anapests irregularly combined, giving the verse a halting effect.

    O auncient house, alas, we may see
    How vnlike a lorde hath lordship on thee.
    (sig. G7r)

    whom they feare, him they hate allwaies the most:
    whom anie man hateth, he wisheth him lost.
    (sig. I8r)

    Good deedes, in case they bee euill placed,
    Euill deedes I counte, and clene disgraced.
    (sig. M1r)

The last of the tetrameter fragments to be considered is the longest verse passage in the book and poetically the
most worthy. King Pyrrhus of Epirus speaks to a messenger from the enemy camp about the ransoming of prisoners:

No golde do I craue, no price offer mee:
No hucsters of warre, warremen as we bee,
With dint for our life fight we, not with golde.
Whether you for to raign, or me the ladie wolde
Chaunce tryie we by force. This answer eke bare:
Whose manhod the happe of batell will spare,
Their freedome I purpose to fauour also.
Them giue I, them take: the goddes will it so.

(sig. B8v)

The rhythm of this passage is wonderfully effective. There is a basic anapestic movement, but the fatal sing-song of that measure is avoided by skillful substitutions and by manipulation of caesura. The sequence of feet in the first three lines is identical: iamb, anapest, spondee, and anapest. Then comes the variation of the fourth line with its extra foot. The anapestic movement of lines 5-7 is brought up short by the initial amphybrach of line 8. The identical rhyme in the last couplet is not pleasant to modern ears; but the last line—like the fourth, containing an extra foot—makes an extremely effective conclusion to the poem. In a mere eight lines Grimald captures both the dignity and defiance of the warrior king. One appreciates the accomplishment even more when he realizes that the English is a line-for-line translation of the Latin.

One final poetic fragment is difficult to classify. At first glance it appears to consist of three tetrameter lines and one trimeter, all of them iambic. But the last two
lines almost certainly constitute a single seven-foot line.

Aboute the seeking of the crowne
many euyll, and faithles bee:
But fewe good men, in such a case,
a man shall lightly see.

(sig. R5v)

The fact that the second line is tetrameter raises the expectation that the fourth will be also, and the trimeter comes as something of a letdown. In composing such a brief bit of verse (based on a single Latin line), Grimald was, of course, under no obligation to employ a standard rhythmic pattern. But one is curious about his intention here.

What judgment can be made of the poetry in the Duties? Since the individual Latin fragments are so brief, Grimald's ability as a poet had not much opportunity to make itself evident. All in all, the verses seem to be of the same quality as those of his in Songs and Sonettes—workmanlike, sometimes ingenious, but not particularly inspired. But then, what Hyder Rollins says of Grimald's contributions to the miscellany is true of his verses in the Duties—they "should be judged as metrical translations from Latin rather than as poems."37 The one thing that is of importance and interest in connection with this small body of poetry is that the anapestic rhythm and tetrameter line of a considerable portion of it do not occur in any of Grimald's forty pieces in the first edition of Songs and Sonettes. The anapest is probably to be
found in the one and not in the other because of the peculiar associations of that foot and because of the dissimilar reading-publics for whom the two works were intended. In discussing the anapest in his History of English Prosody, George Saintsbury speaks of "the attraction of the rhythm for the natural man." He points out that in the late medieval period the anapest replaces the trochee as the "ground swell," the underlying rhythmic character, of the revived alliterative verse: and in the doggerel that comes from the clash of this and the broken-down decasyllable of the fifteenth century it is one of the most prominent features, and even forms.

In the same year that Songs and Sonettes appeared, Tottel published Thomas Tusser's Hundreth Good Pointes of Husbandrie, a handbook of advice for farmers, written largely in anapests. The fact that this foot was used in such a work shows, in Saintsbury's words, "not merely that the metre was quite familiar to the writer, but that he knew it would be familiar to the homely class of readers for whom he was catering, and whom he knew so well." I suggest that Grimald used the "lolloping" anapest in the Duties for the same reason that Tusser did--its appeal to the audience for whom he intended his book: namely, "English youth" (sig. *4f), the "unlatined" (*3f), and the "cōmon people" (*4f). The poems in Songs and Sonettes were intended for an audience of accomplished gentlemen, individuals who would have considered anapestic verse as common and
indecorous. Probably the absence of the tetrameter line from Grimaldi's contributions to the miscellany can be explained in the same way. He may have felt that the longer lines of five, six, and seven feet more nearly approximated the stately classical hexameter. Tetrameter's association with the common ballad form would make it inappropriate in poetry intended for cultivated ears, but quite satisfactory for the relatively untutored readers for whom the Duties was translated.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1 See the studies cited in the first note to the preceding chapter for their treatments of translation theory and practice in this later period.

2 No copy of Dolet's tract is available to me. I have paraphrased these rules from the English of R. C. Christie, Etienne Dolet: The Martyr of the Renaissance, 2nd ed. (London, 1899), pp. 356-57. The rules are given in French by Eric Jacobsen, Translation: A Traditional Craft, Classica et Medieaevalia, Diss. VI (Copenhagen, 1958), p. 139. Jacobsen says that while Dolet's rules "sound like a good working recipe for a liberal and sensible translator... Dolet's own practice is both shocking and sobering." He quotes one passage of unsatisfactory illustrative translation from La Manièrre and remarks that it "suggests a wholesome skepticism towards the conclusions of those scholars who profess to study the history of translation via prefaces &c, neglecting the salutary countercheck of practice" (p. 140).

3 In general, mid-century translations are better done than those of twenty years before. It cannot be claimed that this is a result of Dolet's rules, of course. I am here concerned simply with the increase in self-consciousness among English translators with regard to their craft: Dolet's rules may well have served to focus the earlier fuzzy thinking on the subject.

4 Preface to the King, sig. B4v.

5 The First Tome or Volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the Newe Testamente (1548).

6 At one point Udall complains that besides the trials the translator undergoes in common with all men of letters (centering in a lack of income), he has a peculiar difficulty: "... The labour itself is of itself a more peinefull and a more tedious thyng, then for a man to wryte or prosecute any argumente of his owne inuencion. A man hath his owne inuencion readie at his owne pleasure without lettes or stoppes to make suche discourse as his argumente requireth: but a translatour must of force in manier at euerie other worde staigh and suspenede bothe his cogitation and his penne to looke vpon his autour, so that he might in eguall tyme make thrise so suche, as he can bee hable to translate" (sig. B4v). Because the work is so difficult and so unrewarding, Udall says, many good books go untranslated.

8Ibid., sig. *5⁵.

9Preface to the reader, sig. B⁷⁵.


11Sigs. A²⁵-³⁵.

12Sig. A⁴⁵.

13See The Epistles of Erasmus, ed. and trans. F. M. Nichols, I (London, 1901), 356-57, 392, 395-97. Erasmus writes to Richard Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, about a Latin translation he has made of Lucian's dialogue, Toxaris: "This dialogue will be read with more pleasure as well as profit by one who observes the appropriateness of its language to the persons who take part in it. The speech of Menesippus has a flavour entirely Greek; it is smooth, lively and witty. That of Toxaris breathes a Scythian spirit, simple, rough, serious and stern. This difference of diction, a diverse thread purposely followed throughout by Lucian, I have endeavoured to reproduce" (p. 392).


16Epistles, p. 397.

17Because it has a typographically clearer text than the Estienne edition, I shall hereafter quote from the Loeb edition when the Latin is required. I shall call attention to any substantive difference between the texts.

18Both Whittinton's and Grimald's Latin texts have "istam" in place of this text's "initam."

19Here, for once, Whittinton has a better reading than Grimald, for he has placed the direct object after the verb in the normal English word order: "Therfore the Athenienses judged that not to be profytable that was not honest . . ." (sig. R³⁵).
20 R. F. Jones, op. cit., is particularly helpful here in that he reprints the comments on diction of numerous translators of this period. For a general discussion, see the chapter entitled "The Renaissance, 1500-1650" in A. C. Baugh, A History of the English Language, 2nd ed. (New York, 1957), pp. 240-305.


23 The Sum of Diuinitie, sig. A2v.


28 Ibid., p. 121.

29 The Gospel according to Saint Matthew and Part of the First Chapter of the Gospel according to Saint Mark Translated into English from the Greek, with Original Notes, by Sir John Cheke . . ., ed. James Goodwin (Cambridge, 1843).

30 "The Vocabulary of Sir John Cheke's Partial Version of the Gospels," JEGP, XXXIX (1940), 455. On p. 450 Meritt surveys the unwarranted claims made for this translation by earlier scholars.

31 See the early chapters in Veré Rubel, Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance from Skelton Through Spenser (New York, 1941), particularly "Attitude of the Early Tudor Writers Toward Chaucer."

32 Ibid., p. 47. Miss Rubel indicates that Wyatt was also influenced by the discussion of archaic words in Il Cortegiano.

33 Ibid., passim.
Ibid., pp. 83-95. See also the notes to Grimald's poems in Tottel's Miscellany, ed. Hyder Rollins, II (1929), and in L. R. Merrill, The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald, Yale Studies in English, num. 69 (New Haven, 1925). For my analysis of Grimald's poetic diction, I have used the texts of his poems as reprinted in Merrill's work.

Page 84.

In connection with the use of "vsuall words" in this translation for the "cōmon people," it is interesting to note this remark by Cicero in the De Officiis itself: "Wherfore we speake so in this place, as the cōmō sorte doo: that we shall some one sort manlie, some other good men, some other prudent. For with the peoples wordes, and vsuall termes we must treate, when we speake of the comon peoples opinion . . . (Duties, sig. K5r).

Tottel's Miscellany, II, 79.

II (London, 1908), 420.

Ibid., p. 419.

I (London, 1906), 326.
"Most conscientious, most diligent, and most stupid of translators," H. B. Lathrop calls Robert Whittinton. "This laborious, schoolmasterly person had enormous loquacity and the best will in the world, enough Latin to write grammatical verses that scan to the finger, good confidence, and a grave Dogberry mind."\(^1\) Perhaps it is the appeal of these very human qualities that causes one who has come to know the man to wince at the charge of stupidity. But how to deny it? Certainly his *Offyces* is all but unreadable today; and to judge from the genuine merit evident in the writing of some of his contemporaries, the prose in this work must have been considered substandard even in the 1530's. Quite apart from its stylistic faults, it can never have been judged an adequate translation of this important treatise. True, it went into a second edition, but as we have seen this was under circumstances that make us suspect the judgment of the printer.\(^2\)

One is tempted to plead extenuating circumstances in Whittinton's case. He did, after all, compose his *Offyces* for youthful readers; the verbal translation was
intended as an aid for young Latin scholars. Cannot T. W. Baldwin's remark in justification of the timidity of Elizabethan translations apply as well to Henrican ones?

These translations quickly primed the Latin pump by giving the boy a parrot's vocabulary of good Latin sentiments with which to start pouring forth his own vast lack of ideas. Thus Elizabethans used these vernacular translations to get for themselves a constantly better grip on the fine points of the Latin. Incidentally, we should remember this aim in judging of their translations; they were hardly ever intended to be either literal or literary translations in the modern sense. They were rather equivalent translations; what Palsgrave called ecphrasis. Well, if Whittinton's Offyces were of such a nature as to make it helpful in the elementary study of Latin, its unliterary qualities could be forgiven. But, as one of my earlier chapters should have made abundantly clear, this translation would have been a positive detriment if read for such a purpose. Pity the young scholar who had to depend upon a translation that scarcely qualifies as English and very inadequately represents the soundness of Cicero's thinking and the excellence of his prose. Baldwin says in another place, "Most schoolmasters were intensely interested in preventing their students from using English at all, rather than in teaching them to use it well. English was for the most part an unavoidable evil to be tolerated no more than absolutely necessary; Latin was the thing." Certainly the schoolboy using the Offyces would have had reason to believe that for this particular schoolmaster and translator English was "an unavoidable evil." Latin was
indeed "the thing" in his eyes, but what he communicated through his English was something less or something other than the sense of Cicero's original. Roger Ascham complained in the Scholemaster (1570) about the sort of Latin a schoolboy would learn from Whittinton's and Horne's Vulgarias: "A childe shall learne of the better of them, that, which an other daie, if he be wise, and cum to judgement, he must be faine to vnlearne againe." The charge was equally true—probably more true—of the Offyces. The student who learned his Tully from Whittinton would have had a great deal of unlearning to do if he were to make any further progress in Latin studies.

Except for Grimald's slur upon it in the preface to his Duties, no contemporary references to Whittinton's book have survived. Its ghost lingered on in the words and phrases Grimald borrowed from it, but the work dropped out of sight after the publication of the second edition and was soon forgotten. Such was not the fate of Grimald's Duties. The major evidence of its continued significance, of course, is that it was so frequently reprinted right up to the end of the century. But there is also evidence of its influence on other translators of Cicero. John Dolman, in the dedication to Bishop Jewell of his English edition of the Tusculan Disputations (1561), comments that it is fitting to put his book under the protection of a prelate, inasmuch as "the first attempte, of the same parte of
philosophye, translated by maister Grimoald, passed forth under the protectio of one of that honourable vocation, to the which also, it hath pleased god, after sondry troubles, to call you."\(^6\) He also alludes to "lady Philosophye (as mayster Grymoalde termeth her)."\(^7\) There are several echoes of statements from the preface to the Duties in Dolman's own preface and dedication. More importantly, the prose in the Tusculan Disputations seems to have been influenced by the neat, concise style of Grimald's work. "Like Grimald," says Lathrop, "he translates idiom for idiom, with a sincere effort to render the sense, but without sacrificing naturalness of expression to an anxious care to reproduce the very words of his original, and without expansion or striving to raise his style by artificial means."\(^8\)

The influence of the Duties is also apparent in Thomas Newton's 1577 edition of Cicero's works of moral philosophy\(^9\) (excluding De Officiis, which Newton seems to have felt had been translated once and for all by Grimald). Newton's translations are close and accurate but neither elevated nor particularly graceful—all of which is true of Grimald's work as well. Several years earlier Newton had published a separate edition of De Senectute, in the preface to which he attacked Whittinton's translation of that work in some of the same phrases Grimald had used about the Offyces: "... That translation beareth but the countenance of one, being none in dede to any purpose, being
taken of the learned for noone at all, sithens neuer a page
almost is answerable to the latine texte, I will not say,
scātly any sentence."\textsuperscript{10}

Richard Brinsley, the famouse early seventeenth-
century pedagoge, published a new edition of the first
book of \textit{De Officiis} in 1616, with the translation and
paraphrases and summaries arranged in parellel columns.\textsuperscript{11}
For the second and third books of the treatise he recommends
the use of Grimald's translation, though he wishes the
Latin were not printed alongside the English (he preferred
to have the scholars translate into English from one book
containing only the original and back into the Latin from
another book--like his own--containing only the vernacular).\textsuperscript{12}
In the dedication of his edition he rhapsodizes on
the qualities of \textit{De Officiis} as Grimald does--and in almost
identical words. He lifts whole passages from the prefatory
pages of the \textit{Duties}, without, of course, giving credit to
his source.

Portions of Grimald's translation turn up in one
of the most popular books published in Tudor England--
William Baldwin's \textit{Treatise of Moral Phylosophye}, first
printed in 1547 and reprinted more than fifteen times by
1651. This book is a topically arranged collection of the
sayings of ancient sages and philosophers. The original
work by Baldwin was re-edited and enlarged several times
by Thomas Paulfreyman and by Baldwin himself.\textsuperscript{13} In the
1557 edition there appear for the first time quotations in the vernacular from De Officiis; the English is that of the Duties only slightly altered. There are more than a dozen such passages in Baldwin's book; here is the longest one, first from Grimald, then the Treatise:

And therefor lette the feeding, and apparail-ling of the bodie be referred to helth, and strength, not to voluptuousness. And thereto if we will consider, what an excelence, and a dignitie ther is in nature: we shall vnderstande, how fowle it is to ouerflowe in ryotte, and liue deliciouslie, and wantonlie: and how honest it is, to leade our life sawinglie, chastelie, sagelie, and soberlie.

(sig. F2r)

Let thy feedinge and apparaillynge of thy body, be altogether referred to helth and strength, and not to voluptuousnes. For if we wyll consider what an excellencié and dignitie ther is in our nature: we shall quickeley perceiue, howe foule a thinge it is to ouerflowe in ryot, and to lyue deliciouslyse and wantonly: and to the contrarie how honest a thyng it is to leade our lyues warely, chastly, sagely and soberly.

(sig. F8v-G1r)

The changes in the second passage are negligible. One wonders whether they were made after a comparison with the Latin in an attempt to be thoroughly accurate, or simply to give the translation an appearance of originality. It is a nice irony that in some of these quotations in the Treatise, the original word choices are not those of Grimald or Baldwin or Paulfreyman, but of the much maligned Robert Whittinton.13

All things considered, Nicholas Grimald's Duties was a superior translation in the sixteenth century and is
still a readable and enjoyable one today. The man had a thorough knowledge of the language, literature, and history of Rome, a sense of the genius of English prose and of the language as a whole, and the intelligence and enthusiasm the task of translating this lengthy work of Cicero's demanded. Robert Whittinton, unfortunately, as we know from his translation if in no other way, had only the enthusiasm.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1 Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620 (Madison, 1933), p. 56.

2 See Chapter 3, pp. 96-97.

3 William Shakspere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke (Urbana, 1944), II, 453-54. John Palsgrave's Ecphrasis Anglica in Comediam Acolasti is a far freer representation of the Latin than either Whittinton's or Grimald's translation. It is virtually the record of a schoolmaster's classroom explication of Fullonius's play.

4 Ibid., I, 182.


6 Sig. *2r-3v.

7 Sig. *5r.


9 Fourre Seuerall Treatises.

10 The Worthy Booke of Old Age (1569), sig. *4r.

11 The First Book of Tullies Offices.

12 R. W. Brinsley, A Consolation for our Grammar Schooles (1622), sig. I4r.

13 See the analysis of the difference between Baldwin's and Paulfreyman's concepts of what this book should be in Lathrop, op. cit., pp. 74-79.

14 Compare, for example, the passage in the Duties beginning at the bottom of sig F8r, "It is therfore . . .," with its equivalent in the Offyces, sig. G8r, and in the Treatise, sig.: R2r-v. In the passage given above, "apparayling" is borrowed from Whittinton's "apparayle" (Lat., "cultus"); see the Offyces, sigs. F8r-G1r.
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