View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by The University of Utah: J. Willard Marriott Digital Library

PAGANS AND PURITANS: PROTESTANT CLASSICAL TRANSLATION IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND

by

Andrew Robert Wells

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English

The University of Utah

August 2017

Copyright © Andrew Robert Wells 2017

All Rights Reserved

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of **Andrew Robert Wells**
has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Name	Role	Date Approved
Barry Weller	, Chair	**05/02/2017**
Richard Preiss	, Member	**05/02/2017**
Thomas Stillinger	, Member	**05/02/2017**
Dennis Kezar	, Member	**05/02/2017**
Michelle Wolfe	, Member	**05/05/2017**

and by **Barry Weller** , Chair/Dean of

the Department/College/School of **English**

and by David B. Kieda, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

Classical translations by devout English Protestants represent a valuable nexus for interpreting the effects of humanism and the Reformation in England. The Protestant reformers forced Europeans to reimagine their connection to the pagan past. Protestant translators with humanist training felt pressure to make their classical texts and authors useful for their readers' religious and moral lives, writing paratextual materials and departing from a literal rendering of the source text in order to create an imagined relationship with the past.

In my introduction I contrast Tertullian's rejection of and Augustine's accommodation of pagan material as echoed by humanists and reformers with renewed urgency throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Chapter 1 places Golding's 1567 text in its religious context, arguing that Golding risked censure from his fellow Puritans by bringing Ovid's epic into English. Golding avoided criticism by offering an allegorical reading of the poem through his prefatory materials, but was careful to show that Ovid had meant his poem to be read allegorically.

In Chapter 2 I examine the competing secular, religious, medieval, and early modern theories of translation that factor into Drant's 1566 book, *A medicinable moral*, which juxtaposes his verse translations of Horace's *Satires* and the book of *Lamentations*. I argue that Drant's text mixes medieval and early modern rhetorics and practices of translation in his version of the *Satires*, but uses a different set of strategies

when rendering the Bible.

Chapter 3 explores Hutchinson's adversarial relationship with her source text and its author. I argue that Hutchinson's preface to and translation of *De rerum natura* paint Lucretius as an enemy against whom she defines herself and proves her valor as a Christian author. However, Hutchinson approvingly echoes Lucretius' description of the divine nature in *Order and Disorder* to defend a Calvinist conception of God.

In my conclusion, I argue that the Roman source-text authors were also translators who navigated some of the same waters as their Renaissance counterparts. I end by turning to Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* for a kind of metafictional commentary on the stakes of humanist and Protestant translation in Renaissance England.

I dedicate this book to my wife, Ashley, without whom I could have never finished it.
Soli Deo Gloria.

…all mankind is of one author, and is one volume; when one man dies, one chapter is not torn out of the book, but translated into a better language; and every chapter must be so translated; God employs several translators; some pieces are translated by age, some by sickness, some by war, some by justice; but God's hand is in every translation, and his hand shall bind up all our scattered leaves again, for that library where every book shall lie open to one another.

John Donne, *Meditation XVII*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

Chapters

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. CONVERTING OVID: TRANSLATION, RELIGION, AND ALLEGORY IN ARTHUR GOLDING'S *METAMORPHOSES* 15

  2.1 Context: Protestant Opinions About Pagan Literature in the Tudor Period 19
  2.2 Context: Nationalism, Patronage, Dangerous Books, and Allegories 23
  2.3 Golding's Interpretive Apparatus 33
  2.4 Examples from the Text 34

3. TRANSLATION AS ENSLAVEMENT: THOMAS DRANT, HORACE, AND JEREMIAH 56

  3.1 Metaphors of Translation and the Medieval Tradition 61
  3.2 Conquest: Real and Imagined 65
  3.3 Drant's Captive Horace 69
  3.4 Drant's Deference to Jeremiah 75
  3.5 Roman Conquerors Conquered 82

4. USEFUL ENEMIES AND UNLIKELY WITNESSES: HUTCHINSON'S *DE RERUM NATURA* AS A SOURCE FOR *ORDER AND DISORDER* 88

  4.1 Lightning and Useful Enemies 93
  4.2 A Warning Against "carnall reason" 103
  4.3 Hutchinson Ties Her Doctrinal Enemies to Lucretius 109
  4.4 Bitter Medicine and "Poisoning" the Well 112
  4.5 "The Uncomfortable shadow of death" 119
  4.6 Unlikely Witness for the Trinity 124

5. CONCLUSION 139

  5.1 Shakespeare 143

5.2 Afterword 151

BIBLIOGRAPHY 153

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the help of Professors Tom Stillinger, Dennis Kezar, Richard Preiss, Michelle Wolfe, and most of all, my chair, Barry Weller. I also wish to thank the Stephensen-Canon Fellowship for supporting my research. I am grateful to my family and my God.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"What indeed does Athens have to do with Jerusalem?" Tertullian asked at the start of the third century of the Christian Era. He continued:

> What concord is there between the Academy and the Church? what between heretics and Christians? Our instruction comes from "the porch of Solomon," who had himself taught that "the Lord should be sought in simplicity of heart." Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic, and dialectic composition! We want no curious disputation after possessing Christ Jesus, no inquisition after enjoying the gospel! With our faith, we desire no further belief.[1]

This line of questioning has resonated throughout Christian history. Since Christians believe that God revealed all of the truths essential for salvation in the gospel of Jesus Christ, it has been hard for them to justify turning to non-Christian sources for enlightenment, art, or beauty. Following Tertullian's logic, rejection is the proper response to all learning that does not come from revelation. This fideism cuts Christians off from secular scholarship, even from curiosity itself, according to Tertullian.

And yet, despite Tertullian's pronouncement Christians did continue to be curious, they did continue to inquire, and they did desire something further, even after "enjoying the gospel." They tried to find ways to accommodate secular knowledge and reason to the lessons revealed in the Bible. A century after Tertullian, Augustine of

---

[1] Sydney Thelwall and Peter Holmes, *The Writings of Quintus Sept. For Tertullianus* (London: T. & T. Clark, 1884), 11: 445.

Hippo, himself a teacher of Roman rhetoric and a student of Greek philosophy, converted to Christianity and conceived of an avenue for accommodation between the worlds of Athens and Jerusalem.

In *De Doctrina Christiana,* Augustine wrote,

> Any statements by those who are called philosophers. . .which happen to be true and consistent with our faith should not cause alarm, but be claimed for our own use, as it were from owners who have no right to them. Like the treasures of the ancient Egyptians, who possessed not only idols and heavy burdens which the people of Israel hated and shunned but also vessels and ornaments of silver and gold, and clothes, which on leaving Egypt the people of Israel, in order to make better use of them, surreptitiously claimed for themselves….[S]imilarly all branches of pagan learning contain not only false and superstitious fantasies and burdensome studies…but also studies for liberated minds which are more appropriate to the service of the truth, and some very useful moral instruction, as well as the various truths about monotheism to be found in their writers. These treasures—like the silver and gold, which they did not create but dug, as it were, from the mines of providence, which is everywhere—which were used wickedly and harmfully in the service of demons must be removed by Christians, as they separate themselves in spirit from the wretched company of pagans, and applied to their true function.[2]

For Augustine, even though the gospel was perfect and needed no supplement, yet Christians were free to commandeer and repurpose anything they judged to be of worth from secular learning. Just as the Israelites had taken the gold out of Egypt as they fled to the Promised Land, Christians could appropriate any valuable teachings from the pagan world and "put them to a better use."

In the history of Western Christianity, Augustine's approach won the lasting victory, but Tertullian's question has echoed down through the centuries and forced each new generation to discover new ways to defend its use of secular learning.

My project begins by placing Tertullian's question and Augustine's response in

---

[2] Carol Harrison and R. P. H. Green, *Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 125.

the context of Renaissance England. For centuries, Medieval Christians had developed strategies for creating room in their culture for ancient pagan texts and ideas. These strategies were so successful that Tertullian's question almost went unasked as some ancient authors, like Plato and Aristotle, became almost as revered as the Biblical writers themselves. For example, in the *Summa Theologica*, Thomas Aquinas names or cites Aristotle over 150 times, but never mentions Tertullian by name.[3] The entire logic of this massive work is that a proper understanding of the world and all secular knowledge would lead to belief in the same truths as revealed in the Bible. Thus Athens and Jerusalem were almost two sides of the same coin.

However, the movement that came to be known as the Renaissance drastically altered the European relationship to the past. Although educated people throughout the Middle Ages had studied the texts of antiquity, the new humanist scholars of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries sought to recreate the glories of the ancient world through a renewed engagement with a more complete corpus of ancient writings. As Ada Palmer has written, their goal was to recreate the library of the great Roman statesmen and orators in order to recapture their virtues and accomplishments:

> Humanists believed that the written legacy of Greece and Rome would steep the reader in classical virtue. This was part of a program of elite education that fourteenth- and fifteenth-century humanists hoped would save Europe from corruption, strife, and warfare. Humanist education was supposed to produce virtuous men who would have absorbed in childhood the loyalty, nobility, courage, and patriotism that had made ancient Rome strong, and without which the modern world was, as Petrarch described it, wracked by corruption, petty ambition, and cowardly self-interest. The beauty of ancient rhetoric would arm authors and orators to inspire virtue in others, especially princes. This educational agenda promoted many avenues of scholarship, and helped humanists win patronage and support

[3] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1948), 1-3020.

from governments and princes[4]

The early humanist project of recovery succeeded in making corrected versions of Latin texts widely taught in schools, but it also introduced a more critical approach to the texts of the past. As highly as the humanists thought of the ancients, the new texts they uncovered sometimes exposed the ancients as flawed humans. For example, Petrarch was sorely disappointed in his hero Cicero when he found letters that seemed to show Cicero was a hypocrite who did not follow his publicly held principles in his private life.[5]

As the printing press made clean Latin texts available, it was easier for translators to make accurate vernacular versions which could be read by a much wider audience. This meant that the general population could access these texts without a teacher to guide them or training in how to "take the gold from Egypt." Scholars and religious leaders again expressed Tertullian's fear that anything beyond the gospel could lead to heresies.[6]

The other major movement which transformed Europe's relationship to the past was the Protestant Reformation, which ended the idea of a universal continuity in the Christian world that started with Christ and his original disciples.[7] Suddenly, ecclesiastical traditions became suspect as the reformers argued that the Bible was the only authority on all matters of doctrine and practice. The principles of *sola scriptura* and the priesthood of all believers meant that the Protestants worked to make the Bible

---

[4] Ada Palmer, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* (London: Harvard University Press 2014), 6.

[5] See M. E. Cosenza, trans., *Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910), 24.

[6] See Chapter 1 of this dissertation for examples of this anxiety in England.

[7] See Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning, and Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 11-73. Chapter 1, on Sir Thomas More's reliance on universal Christian continuity in building his own identity, is especially applicable.

available in the vernacular for as many people as possible. Producing and defending a vernacular Bible and translating important texts from European reformers were crucial activities for those committed to advancing the Protestant cause in England in the Tudor period.

To be good translators, these Puritans had to be excellent linguists, but the standard schoolroom texts from which they learned Latin were not religious, but literary, not Christian, but pagan. These writers grew up memorizing, translating, and imitating the Greek and Roman classics of Plato, Virgil, and Ovid in the original languages. As adults, these Puritan translators were driven by curiosity, economic pressures, and the desire to make these schoolroom texts safe for Protestant readers, to translate and moralize these works. The group of translators I am studying translated this secular literature at the same time they were publishing religious works. For example, Arthur Golding translated Ovid's racy *Metamorphoses* at the same time he was working on *De Scandalis*, John Calvin's treatise on offenses. Thomas Drant, a clergyman who preached against ostentatious apparel and chastised Queen Elizabeth I for being too soft on Catholics, produced the first English version of Horace's urbane *Satires*. Staunch Puritans and Republicans, John Brinsley, John Vicars, and James Harrington translated Virgil's works praising the Roman emperors. Lucy Hutchinson, whose husband was later executed for signing Charles I's death warrant, translated Lucretius' atheistic *De rerum natura*.

At first glance, it would seem obvious for Protestants to be among the leading translators of the era since translation was one of the great weapons of the Reformation. From the very beginning, Martin Luther, William Tyndale, and others waged war against

the Catholic establishment by translating the Bible into the vernacular. Kings and magistrates were so terrified by the new accessibility of scripture that they made translating, importing, or merely owing a vernacular Bible a capital offense. Even after England became Protestant and allowed the printing of English Bibles, the more fervent Puritans translated radical Continental theologians like Jean Calvin and Theodore Beza to push the Reformation further in doctrine and practice. This war of words helped spark the English Civil War, where the Puritans succeeded in overthrowing the king.

By making religious texts available to the masses, the Protestant translators showed great trust in their readers. Sir Thomas More expressed the Catholic position when he argued that "Hard it were…to find anything so plain [in the Bible] that it should need no gloss at all,"[8] but Tyndale answered that the Popes had used "false glosses which they have patched to the scripture in plain places, to destroy the literal sense, for to set up a false feigned sense of allegories, when there is none such."[9] Instead of writing commentaries, Tyndale and others wanted to put an unvarnished and literal translation into the hands of the common people.

As the Puritan translators branched out to secular texts, they were forced to make compromises on their principles of translation and interpretation. Instead of strictly literal, accurate translations, these authors rendered the plural pagan "gods" as the one Christian "God," changed "temples" to "chapels," and simply left out large sections describing violent or sexual behavior. These compromises reveal a darker view of their readers which we can map onto a political and theological shift away from the

---

[8] Thomas More, *A dyaloge of syr Thomas More knyghte* (London, 1529), xlii.

[9] William Tyndale, *The vvhole workes of W. Tyndall, Iohn Frith, and Doct. Barnes, three worthy martyrs…* (London: John Daye, 1573), 263.

enthusiasm of the early Reformation and towards the darker implications of the theology of election. Even if the classics were safe for those elected to be saved, they could act as an impetus to sin for everyone else.

These translators were active in a community of Protestants who were deeply skeptical of human reason and pagan literature. By translating pagan texts, they were at risk of attack from some of their Protestant allies whose focus on *sola scriptura* meant rejecting all secular literature.

John Calvin was especially critical of non-scriptural texts, and routinely connected the abuses of Catholicism with pagan idolatry. Calvin complained of about the Pope's practice of creating "commandments of men" without the warrant of scripture, "where religion (if religion it deserves to be called) is polluted with more numerous, and more absurd superstitions, than ever Paganism was. For what could human sense produce but things carnal and fatuous…?"[10] If human nature is totally depraved, human reason cannot be trusted. Calvin went so far as to suggest a pagan heritage behind certain Catholic rituals like anointing with oil. "They are attempting, forsooth, an ingenious device; they are trying, by a kind of patchwork, to make one religion out of Christianity, Judaism, and Paganism."[11]

English Protestants' hostility towards profane literature is also well documented. The most famous expression of antipoetic sentiment was Stephen Gosson's 1579 *The School of Abuse*, an attack on plays and poetry that was considered serious enough to provoke Phillip Sidney's response with his *Defense of Poesy*. Gosson argues that "the

---

[10] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans., Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin College, 1845), accessed December 20, 2013, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.pdf, 956.

[11] Ibid., 539.

whole practice of poets, either with fables to show their abuses, or with plain terms to unfold their mischief, discover their shame, discredit themselves, and disperse their poison in the world." Gosson singles out ancient poets for condemnation, writing that "Virgil sweats in describing his gnat; Ovid bestirreth him to paint out his flea: the one shows his art in the lust of Dido, the other his cunning in the incest of Myrrha, and that trumpet of bawdry, the Craft of Love."[12] Throughout his text, Gosson worries that the lively depiction of vice like that in the story of Myrrha would teach readers to sin.

My project seeks to explain how the translators I am focusing on not only managed to escape criticism from their Protestant allies, but were about to convert and marshal these ancient texts to help build a more Christian England. These fervent Protestants differed from Catholics and in their approach to translation, and not just on the question of translating scripture. Protestant translators were more nationalistic, out to prove that the English language was worthy of the sacred texts that they were translating. They wanted to show that England could be a great nation, distinct from Catholic, universal Europe.

My method of research includes carefully comparing the Renaissance translations with the original texts to find where the Protestant translators diverged from the sense of the original. I also look carefully at introductions, marginal notes, and other paratextual material to see how the translations are framed and explained. I express the strategies that Renaissance translators used in terms of a relationship between the translator and the author of the source text. The translators which this project examines metaphorically

---

[12] Stephen Gosson, *The school of abuse, containing a pleasant invective against poets, pipers, players, jesters, &c* (1579; repr., London: The Shakespeare Society, 1841), 10.

came face to face with authors from outside the Judeo-Christian tradition and found ideas and representations that were antithetical to Protestant doctrine. To make these authors' texts useful, translators transformed the character of the author and implied a relationship with that author that gave the translator an identity as well. In other words, translators defined themselves as they defined their relationships with their ancient authors.[13]

Before I introduce the topics for each chapter, I will pause to define the two key terms of the project: Protestant and translation. We now speak of "Protestant reformations" in the plural, and there has been much discussion about the origin and definition of the Puritan movement in England,[14] but it is clear that in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England there were three general religious movements. First, there were the Catholics who wanted to reconnect the English church to Rome, to the Catholic kingdoms of the continent, and to longstanding tradition. This group was increasingly

---

[13] This is related to Harold Bloom's thesis in *The Anxiety of Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), where he maps the relationship between new and old poets using Freud's Oedipus Complex as his guide. "Poetic history, in this book's argument, is held to be indistinguishable from poetic influence, since strong poets make that history by misreading one another, so as to clear imaginative space for themselves. My concern is only with strong poets, major figures with the persistence to wrestle with their strong precursors, even to the death." My study does not single out "strong poets" and does not see one master model for how later writers engage with earlier authors, but instead traces three distinct strategies.

[14] See, for example, Patrick Collinson, "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism," in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 157–69 and *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Peter Lake, "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke (Studies in Modern British Religious History, 13,* ed., Kenneth Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 80–97, and "Antipopery: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), 72–106; Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge University Press, 2002); Nicholas Tyacke, "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered," *Past & Present* 115, no. 1 (May 1, 1987): 201 –216, doi:10.1093/past/115.1.201 and "The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics, 1558–1642," *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 03 (2010): 527–50, doi:10.1017/S0018246X1000018X.

marginalized after the accession of Elizabeth I in 1558. Second were the Protestants who sought for a "via media," or middle way, that would lead to religious consensus and civil harmony. Finally, the Protestants of "the hotter sort," were those who pushed for greater changes and a further reformation of English society, church governance, theology, and practice. Although this tripartite division is somewhat reductive, the three authors I examine fit into the third category by almost any definition. Arthur Golding was a major translator of Calvin and Beza at a time when their writings inspired the hottest of the Protestants. Thomas Drant was a favorite of Edmund Grindal, the Bishop of London and later Archbishop of Canterbury who was fondly remembered by John Milton, and Puritans William Prynne and Richard Baxter. Lucy Hutchinson called herself a Puritan, and her husband was one of the signatories to Charles II's death warrant. Thus, the three translators I will examine are clearly among the Protestants who wanted to push the Reformation forward in England, however we label that group.

Golding, Drant, and Hutchinson are also quite clearly translators by any definition. As I discuss more fully in Chapter 2, translation was not systematically theorized in England until the later seventeenth century, particularly in the work of John Dryden. Thus, the translators I focus on in this study worked in a period that was much less self-conscious about translation than ours. However, Dryden's famous division of translation into "metaphrase" (word-for-word renderings), "paraphrase" (sentence-for-sentence translations), and "imitation" (free versions that barely count as translations) is still useful when considering what counts as translation in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. If we count Dryden's free imitation as translation, we could argue that texts like Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, and even

Paradise Lost could be called translations. We might also debate whether such literal and word-for-word translations as Jasper Heywood's version of *Hercules Furens* or Elizabeth I's *Consolation of Philosophy* should be read as literary works or mere linguistic exercises like the metaphrases Dryden disparages. However, the translations of Golding, Drant, and Hutchinson are faithful enough to be called translations, yet free enough to be interesting for literary analysts.

Dryden's theories of translation have, of course, not gone unchallenged in the last three centuries. Even a bare summary of the history of translation studies is beyond the scope of this work, especially because there has been an explosion of interest in the field and in the number of scholars in English departments focusing on translation theory and practice in the last 30 years.[15] Instead of a summary, I will merely cite Louis Kelly's observation that a "complete theory of translation…has three components: specification of function and goal; description and analysis of operations; and critical comment on relationships between goal and operations." Seminal statements of translation theory can be analyzed using Kelly's formula: St. Jerome claimed that "in the case of scripture, even the syntax contains a mystery," meaning that he sought to translate word-for-word in order to preserve the miraculous power of the scriptures. Cicero wrote that a good orator must avoid the word-for-word translation of an interpreter so he could produce moving

---

[15] See, for example, Peter Newmark and Eugene A. Nida, *Approaches to Translation* (Oxford: Pergamon), 1981; Mary Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1988); Douglas Robinson, *The Translator's Turn* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Kwame Anthony Appiah,"Thick Translation," in *Callaloo: A Journal Of African American And African Arts And Letters* 16, no. 4 (1993): 808-819; Lawrence Venuti, "Translating Derrida on Translation: Relevance and Disciplinary Resistance," in *Yale Journal Of Criticism: Interpretation In The Humanities* 16, no. 2 (2003): 237-262; Michael Cronin, "Globalization and Translation," in *Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 1*, 134-140. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins, 2010).

oratory.

For the translators featured in this project, the most important goals of translation have to do with the moral impact of the translated text on the reader. Golding, Drant, and Hutchinson are all concerned primarily with how the reader will incorporate the lessons of their texts into their Christian course of life. Each translator also makes some reference to their mode of translation, from Golding's promise to "make Ovid sing in English as he does in Latin" to Drant's statement that he has "not followed the vain of Latin propriety, but our own vulgar tongue" to Hutchinson's apology for "many errors" stemming from a hasty translation undertaken "in a schoolroom." However, in none of their statements do we find an extended critical reflection about how their operations relate to their stated goals as translators. Exploring the strategies they used to make their texts morally valuable for their readers is therefore one of the key goals of this project.

In Chapter 1, my reading shows that Arthur Golding went to great lengths to redeem the reputation of the work he translated and its author. Golding was so invested in presenting Ovid as a sage that went against Protestant conventions of literal reading to find allegorical explanations. He defended Ovid in his prefaces and marginal notes and misread certain episodes in the poem to make them more clearly teach moral and religious messages. I argue that Golding was invested in converting Ovid, in making the poet himself into a kind of proto-Christian and intentional allegorist. Golding was able to claim that Ovid's stories were based on the Bible, with Pandora 's Box representing the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden, and Deucalion's flood paralleling Noah's. By departing from a literal translation at crucial moments in the text, Golding could claim that he was uncovering the true theological, moral, and historical meaning of the poem.

Thus, Ovid becomes a friend to Golding, and lends him authority.

In Chapter 2, I examine how Thomas Drant makes more drastic changes to make Horace safe for Christians. He compares the changes he makes to the original with the violence enacted against the gentile captives at the hands of the Israelites in Deuteronomy 21: “I have done as the people of god were commanded to do with their captive women that were handsome and beautiful: I have shaved of his hair, and pared of this nails (that is) I have wiped away all his vanity and superfluity of matter.”[16] Just as the Israelites worried that beautiful pagan women could lead their people astray, Drant seems concerned that the beauty of pagan literature could seduce his readers. To avoid this dangerous enticement, Drant writes that he has “changed and much altered” his words. He cut off over 80% of Horace’s Satire 1.2, replacing the original discussion of the benefits of prostitutes with a hundred lines denouncing extravagant styles of clothing as the “nurses of pride and folly.”[17] Drant replaces Satire 1.5 entirely, writing his own poem about contemporary issues of church governance in an Horatian tone, thus making Horace into a kind of puppet through which he can speak.

In Chapter 3, I explore the work of Lucy Hutchinson, a Puritan noblewoman who was the first to translate *De rerum natura* and also the first English woman to write an original poetic epic, *Order and Disorder*. I described how Hutchinson turns Lucretius into an enemy, and then uses a series of rhetorical strategies to make him into what I term a “useful enemy,” which is an opponent who acts as a foil to help contrast truth and error, and who can become an especially credible witness for certain points that can be shown

[16] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall, that is, the two bookes of Horace his satyres Englished…The wailyngs of the prophet Hieremiah, done into Englyshe verse* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1566), A3v.

[17] Ibid., D1r.

to be universally recognized. For her target audience, Hutchinson's version of *De rerum natura* would be useful in refuting false ancient and modern philosophies, and even Lucretius' heresies could teach virtue by contraries, by showing the ugly consequences of error. Thus her translation is also an impetus to correction and creating—a move that is begun in her notes, arguments, and translational decisions and completed in her later original epic *Order and Disorder*. Lucretius becomes a dangerous "other" against whom Hutchinson can construct her own identity as a valiant Christian author.

In my conclusion, I reflect on the implications of these three models of engagement with ancient authors. Making the author of the source text into a doppelganger, a slave, or an enemy is out of sync with modern doctrines of translation that focus on fidelity to the source text. However, we can find many other Renaissance authors employing or reacting against these strategies. In my conclusion, I adopt a more expansive understanding of translation when looking at Shakespeare's and Milton's imitation of and response to ancient texts. In an era when the forces of the Renaissance and the Reformation worked in different ways to destabilize England's relationship to the past, authors were forced to come up with new answers to Tertullian's question about what Athens has to do with Jerusalem. At a time when interest in the original texts of the classical and biblical worlds was higher than at any other time in all of history since antiquity, we can find some of the most compelling answers from these Protestant translators who lived in both worlds.

CHAPTER 2

CONVERTING OVID: TRANSLATION, RELIGION, AND ALLEGORY IN ARTHUR GOLDING'S *METAMORPHOSES*

In 1567, the Puritan gentleman Arthur Golding published two strikingly dissimilar works: the first complete English version of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and a translation of Calvin's *De Scandalis*, a treatise on overcoming stumbling blocks to faith. Although Golding's reputation rests on the former, the latter is more representative of his prolific work as a translator. Scholars have puzzled over this famous "anomaly" in Golding's oeuvre for many years.[18] In the middle of his lifelong project of pushing the English

[18] Scholars have long puzzled over how Golding's translation of Ovid fits into his literary career and cultural moment. Golding's biography, titled *An Elizabethan Puritan*, notes: "It has been a surprise to many that so stern a puritan as Golding later showed himself to be, should have translated the Metamorphoses." Louis Thorne Golding, *An Elizabethan Puritan: Arthur Golding, Translator of Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and also the Sermons of John Calvin* (New York: R.R. Smith, 1937), 33. In the introduction to his edition of the translation, J. F. Nims wondered at the "odd collaboration…between [Ovid,] the sophisticated darling of a dissolute society…and [Golding,] the respectable country gentleman and convinced Puritan who spent much of his life translating the sermons of John Calvin." John Frederick Nims, "Ovid, Golding, and the Craft of Poetry," introduction to *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), xiv. In his 1978 treatment, Gordon Braden argues that the fact that "after Ovid, Golding never published another translation of pagan imaginative literature" shows that the project was "one of several interrelated failures of intention." Gordon Braden, *The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry: Three Case Studies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 12. Raphael Lyne, writing in 2001, sees "a degree of tension" between Golding and his subject matter. Raphael Lyne, *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English* Metamorphoses, *1567-1632* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 30. Gary G. Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz summarize the scholarly reaction to Golding through 2008 as one of "paradox." Gary G. Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz, "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: Myth in an Elizabethan Political Context," *Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 2.4 (September 2008): 557.

Reformation forward by translating over 30 works of continental reformers, what drew Golding to render Ovid's pagan treasure trove of racy and violent stories into English? And how did Golding justify his efforts to his fellow Protestants without causing a scandal to his reputation?

The answers to these questions show how Puritan writers were able incorporate pagan literature into their enterprise of building a Godly nation. Puritans approached ancient secular texts in the same way that they read the Bible, and Calvinist hermeneutics are a key to unlock Golding's translation. At the same time, examining Golding's translation provides insight into how Protestants dealt with difficult narrative passages in the Old Testament, and reveals a flexibility in Protestant interpretive practices that goes against their avowed principles of biblical exegesis. Several recent studies have placed Golding's translation in its historical and cultural contexts, arguing that his text was meant to teach readers how to bridle their passions, live virtuously, and warning them of the consequences of sin. In this chapter, I will extend this contextual reading towards biblical hermeneutics, arguing that Golding was as concerned with his readers' ability to properly interpret texts as he was with their virtuous behavior.[19] I will also argue that Golding was drawn to Ovid because the *Metamorphoses* was so difficult and dangerous.

---

[19] See Raphael Lyne, *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English* Metamorphoses *1567-1632* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 27-79; Liz Oakley-Brown, "Translating the Subject: Ovid's Metamorphoses in England, 1560–7," in *Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness,* ed. Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown (Trowbridge: Cromwell Press, 2001), 66-84; Liz Oakley-Brown, *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006), 1-30; Gary G. Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz, "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: Myth in an Elizabethan Political Context," in *Renaissance Studies,* 22.4 (2008): 557-575; Gary G. Gibbs and Florina Ruiz. "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: A Protreptic Endeavor for a Reformation Readership" in *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 41, no. 2 (2015): 119-148.

The project allowed him not only to showcase his ability to translate intricate Latin verse into accessible English, but to transform an infamous Latin poet into a great sage and to reinterpret a notorious text into a profitable work, safe for his Puritan audience.

The key to Golding's success was his ability to reimagine Ovid the poet, presenting him not as the lewd *praeceptor amoris*, "teacher of desire," but as a wise philosopher, an effective translator of the best stories, and a deliberate allegorist who reworked material from the Bible. Golding effectively created Ovid anew after his own image—the picture of a respectable, godly teacher, who could instruct through delightfully strange and varied stories. In his project of transforming Ovid, Golding recreated characters from the *Metamorphoses* into teachers, with Deucalion becoming an interpreter, Orpheus a moralist, and Athena a wise judge. By aligning Ovid's text with the Bible, reading it as an intentional allegory, and placing the onus of interpretation back on to his readers, Golding presented Ovid like a Protestant preacher might have expounded the Bible.

However, in his quest to redeem Ovid, Golding went against some of the key tenets of Protestant interpretive practice such as literalism, contextual analysis, and the belief that the Bible was easy for lay readers to understand. Martin Luther mocked monks who "allegorized everything, even a chamber pot,"[20] John Calvin warned against those who "craftily wrest the wordes of Christe"[21] to prove a point out of context, and William Tyndale railed against "false glosses"[22] which were not needed to understand plain

---

[20] Martin Luther, *Luther's Works: Volume 56, Table Talk*, ed. and trans., Theodore G. Tappert, gen. ed., Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 46.

[21] John Calvin, *A harmonie upon the three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1584), 263.

[22] William Tyndale, *A path way into the holy scripture* (London: 1536), D5v.

scriptures. Golding walked a fine line between over-using allegory in a way that Protestants associated with Catholicism, and offending his readers with immoral and pagan content.

A few caveats are in order. Of course, it is an anachronism to call Golding a "Puritan" at the time of his translation because the term was not used to describe fervent Protestants in 1567.[23] However, Golding's politics and theology affiliate him with "the hotter sort" or Protestants who would later come to call themselves Puritans. We should also dismiss the stereotype which would have these "godly" men and women unanimously eschewing pagan poetry along with all "cakes and ale"; they were often well-educated humanists who read Erasmus alongside Calvin.[24] However, there is good evidence to believe that if Golding had handled things differently, his translation could have hurt his reputation. Even the notorious Christopher Marlowe chose not to publish his translation of Ovid's *Amores* under his own name, and the playwright Thomas Heywood's translation of *Ars Amatoria* was first published out of the reach of English censors across the English Channel.[25]

Golding's anxiety about how readers would judge his text is apparent in the way he prefaced his translation. After publishing the first four books of the *Metamorphoses* in

---

[23] It was not until the 1590s that Puritans became a recognizable group after they were constructed by parody on the English stage, according to Patrick Collinson, "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism," in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 157–69.

[24] See Margo Todd, *Puritanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 53-96.

[25] For Marlowe, see David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (New York: Henry Holt and Company) 100; for Heywood, see M. L. Stapleton, ed., *Thomas Heywood's Art of Love: The First Complete Translation of Ovid's Ars Amatoria* (University of Michigan Press, 2000).

1565, Golding apparently received enough backlash to pen two long introductory poems explaining and defending the moral value of his work: the "Epistle" to his patron, the Earl of Leicester, and the preface entitled "To the Reader." He also penned a warning for the title page: "With skill heede and judgment this worke must be read, / For else to the Reader it standes in small stead."[26] This kind of cautionary couplet was rare in early modern books,[27] so it is remarkable that Golding would put a warning similar to a censor's or a polemicist's on his title page, especially compared to Golding's other title pages, where he puffs his productions in the conventional manner.[28] From what we can reconstruct of the cultural attitudes of his historical moment, his fears about the text's reception were not unfounded.

2.1 Context: Protestant Opinions About Pagan Literature in the Tudor Period

As classical translations proliferated in the mid sixteenth century, many authors denigrated the value of profane literature in England. Poetry was called bawdy, wanton,

---

[26] *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation 1567,* ed. John Frederick Nims (New York: Macmillan, 1965), 1.

[27] In one work of religious polemic, the author asked readers to "Judge not before / Thou know mine intent, / But reade me throughout, / And then say thy fill" (Martin Chemnitz, *A discoverie and batterie of the great fort of unwritten traditions* [London: Thomas Purfoot, 1582], 18), and treatise of hermetic mysticism earned a censor's handwritten note, "*caute legendum*" (quoted in Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age* [New York: Routledge, 1979], 72).

[28] For example, he writes on the title page to Justinus' *History* that it is "a worke conteynyng...great plentie of moste delectable hystories, and notable examples, worthie not onelie to be read but also to be embraced and followed of all menne." Arthur Golding, *Thabridgment of the histories of Trogus Pompeius* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1564), A1v. He advertises another as, "a worke very pleasant and profitable," Arthur Golding, *The history of Leonard Aretine concerning the warres between the Imperialles and the Gothes* (London: Rouland Hall, 1563), A1v; and calls another, "a woorke very needefull and profitable." Arthur Golding, *A little booke of Iohn Caluines concernynge offences* (London: H. Wykes, 1567), A1v. He even hedges his bets on the *Metamorphoses* title page by writing that it is "a worke very pleasaunt and delectable."

effeminate, and worthless. Stephen Gosson's famous 1579 treatise, *The School of Abuse*, was an attack on plays and poetry that Philip Sidney took seriously enough to respond to in his *Apology for Poetry*. Gosson argues that "the whole practice of poets, [is] either with fables to show their abuses, or with playne termes to unfold their mischeefe, discover their shame, discredite themselves, and disperse their poison in the world."[29] Gosson singles out Ovid for condemnation, writing that "Ovid bestirreth him to paint out his flea…his cunning in the incest of Myrrha, and that trumpet of bawdrie, the Craft of Love."[30] Throughout his text, Gosson warns that vividly narrated tales of vice, like Myrrha's liaison with her own father, would teach readers to sin. Sidney responds in the *Apology* by claiming that poetry rewards its upright characters and punishes its villains, thus moving readers to act virtuously. However, even in his full-throated defense of imaginative literature, Sidney does not cite Ovid for examples of such inspirational tales, and admits that there were some who abuse poetry and "please an ill-pleased eye with wanton shows of better hidden matters."[31]

Gosson was not alone in his mistrust of poetic abuses. For example, the influential humanist Thomas Elyot expressed concerns about Ovid's morality in particular, in *The boke named the Gouernour* (1531). He writes that students can find worthy lessons in almost all Latin literature, even in "Ouidius, that semeth to be most of al poetes lasciuious, in his mooste wanton bokes, hath ryghte commendable and noble sentences."[32] Elyot damns Ovid with the faint praise that there are at least a few worthy

---

[29] Stephen Gosson, *The school of abuse, containing a pleasant invective against poets, pipers, players, jesters, &c* (1579; repr., London: The Shakespeare Society, 1841), 4.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry: Or the Defense of Poesy* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), 104.
[32] Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the Gouernour* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537), 48.

aphorisms in his works, though these are clearly the exception and not the rule.

Of course, philosophers have fretted about poetry since Plato. Elyot echoed ancient lines of attack against poetry 1540, but added a Christian twist:

> I could never rede that…Poets were called to any honorable place… [T]heir invencions consisted in leasynges, or in sterynge up of wanton appetytes, or in pourynge oute, in raylynge, theyr poison and malice. For with theyr owne godes and goddesses wer they so malaparte, that with theyr aduoutries [adulteries] they fylled great volumes.[33]

Elyot's onslaught against poetry's falseness, dangerous passions, and blasphemy applies especially well to the *Metamorphoses*, which parodies its own penchant for stories about lascivious gods in Book 6, where Arachne weaves a tapestry overflowing with depictions of divine rapes. And Ovid himself was banished from Rome just as poets were cast out in Plato's *Republic*.[34] But when Elyot says that ancient poets were flippant with even "theyr owne godes and goddesses," he is in the awkward position of saying that pagan poets should have been more reverent towards their gods, while at the same time denouncing those gods as false and imaginary.

Like Elyot and Ascham, many Protestants were particularly frightened by the specter of pagan idolatry haunting classical texts. They often accused their Catholic adversaries of adopting practices from the pagans. For example, John Calvin habitually connected the corruptions of Catholicism with paganism, complaining that the Catholic "religion (if yet the same be worthy to be called religion) is defiled with moe and more vnsauorie [unsavory] superstitions, than euer was any Paynime [Pagan] wickednesse. For

---

[33] Thomas Elyot, *The Defence of Good Women* (London: Tomae Bertheleti, 1545), Bv-Br.

[34] In fact, Jean Luis Vives explicitly wrote that Ovid was worse than the poets Plato banished. See Liz Oakley-Brown, *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006), 29.

what could the witt of men brede but al thynges carnal and foolishe and such as truely resemble theyr authors?"[35] Other reformers constantly equated things like shrines for saints, priestly vestments, and statues in churches with pagan idols.

In 1566, just a year before Golding published his complete edition of the *Metamorphoses*, the pastor John Barthlet dedicated a book to Golding's patron, Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, where he traced the pedigrees of various heresies. In that work, Barthlet claims that the Popes had imposed rules that destroyed the good intentions of the Franciscan Order: "In place of folowing the rule of the gospel, they must folowe the Popes explication. In steade of such edifying and pure Sermons, they muste preach Legende lies, *Ouidius Metamorphosis*, an ouerworne Gospell or Epistle in Latine, and Canonicall houres."[36] Barthlet uses Ovid's work as a shorthand for the false, the trivial, and the useless, and places it the company of the Latin liturgies that Protestants loathed.

Barthlet condemns another group of heretics in Ovidian terms by calling them "Metamorphistes" for believing in transubstantiation. Barthlet echoes the title of Ovid's poem so he can link the absurdity of gods transforming into bulls, swans, or showers of gold with what he thought was the farce of God's "miraculous worke to make the bread his body and the wyne his bloude" in the Eucharist.[37] The term "Metamorphistes" primarily functions to disparage the supposed fiction of transubstantiation, but it also works the other way, tainting the Latin classic as nothing more than "hocus pocus."

Indeed, other prominent Protestants had already linked the doctrine of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist with the name of Ovid's poem. John Hooper, a Protestant

---

[35] Thomas Norton, trans., *The institution of Christian religion, vvrytten in Latine by maister John Caluin* (London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richarde Harison, 1561), I1r.
[36] John Barthlet, *The pedegrewe of heretiques* (London: Henry Denham, 1566), 73.
[37] Ibid., 57.

bishop later burned by Mary I, wrote in 1547 that “it is the devill’s sophistrie wherewith he robbith the vnlearyd people” to teach that “the wordes (as they call them) of the consecracion…hoc est corpus meum, are to make a metamorphosin of the breade.”[38] Clearly, the link between Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and the Protestants’ most despised Catholic doctrine was only implicit, but it was closely related to the broader question of how English Protestants should protect the “vnlernyd” from Latin sophistries.

The fear that the uneducated class (or to use the early modern term, “the simple sort”) was vulnerable to pagan doctrines is especially relevant to a translator, who by definition takes a text previously available only to the learned and presents it to the masses. Golding was nervous enough about the pagan deities in his translation to include “To the Reader” as a separate introduction for “the simple sort” who he worried would be “offended…When in this booke the heathen names of feyned Godds they see.”[39]

2.2 Context: Nationalism, Patronage, Dangerous Books, and Allegories

Arthur Golding clearly felt the antipoetic and antipagan pressure exerted by the Protestants in his circle. So why did he forge ahead with the translation despite the

---

[38] John Hooper, *An answer vnto my lord of wynthesters [sic] booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls sophistrye wherwith he robbith the vnlernyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter* (Zurych: Augustyne Fries, 1547) K3v.

[39] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, “To the Reader,” lines 1-2. Years after publishing the *Metamorphoses*, Golding lent his own voice to the chorus condemning pagan literature by translating the attack on ancient poets that Theodore Beze appended to his 1550 closet drama *Abraham Sacrifiant*. Beza tells his contemporary poets that "it would become them better to sing a song of God then to…counterfet the furies of the auncient Poets, to blase abroad the glory of this world…or to buzie them selves rather in overturning then in turning of thinges.” Theodore Beze, *A tragedie of Abrahams sacrifice* trans. Arthur Golding (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1577) A3r. Golding’s translation project is damningly close to Beze’s description of a modern poet who imitates the works of the ancients, especially considering Ovid's incessant “overturning of things” and his boast at the end of the poem that “all the world shall never / Be able for to quench my name” (Nims edition, lines 15.990-1).

potential backlash he faced? The evidence suggests that he was motivated by patriotism, financial considerations, and the potential glory of succeeding in such a difficult endeavor. Inspired by the political nationalism under the Tudor monarchs, authors and educators felt they could improve the English commonwealth by translating classical texts into English.

The benefits of translation were so great, that Jasper Heywood, Golding's younger contemporary, writes that he had "disdaind not sometime to leaue euen the studye of the diuine scriptures" to work on "the translating of Latine, or other Bookes of other languages, into our mother tong, [which] doth…profite the common wealth…and especially to the profit of our native country."[40] The patriotic rhetoric employed by these translators focused on giving profit to their nation, but translation involved personal profits as well, and Golding's interests lined up with this cultural project.

Nobles vying for attention could benefit from the prestige a groundbreaking translation would bring to them and often supported translators directly. The most prolific patron was the earl of Leicester, who attracted dedications from Thomas North, James Sanforde, Robert Peterson, William Blandie, Timothy Kendall, and several from Arthur Golding.[41] Golding's half-sister married the powerful John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford, and Arthur Golding clearly sought out Leicester's patronage in order to strengthen his family's ties to ruling aristocrats. Leicester may have helped him to secure a position as

[40] Jasper Heywood, *Senecaa's Hercules furens* (London: Henrye Sutton, 1561), A2v-A2r.
[41] Brenda M. Hosington, "Commerce, Printing, and Patronage" in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English vol. 2: 1550-1660,* ed. Gordon Braden, Robert Cummings, and Stuart Gillespie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 54-55.

the tutor to Golding's nephew, the ward of Leicester's political ally William Cecil.[42] Indeed, Golding places his preface to the 1565 edition of the first four books of Ovid's epic "at Cecil House."[43] In that preface, Golding flatters Leicester's patriotic sponsorship of new translations, writing that Leicester was "wont to encourage them [translators] to proceed in their painful exercises attempted of a zeal and desire to enrich their native language with things not heretofore published in the same."[44] Golding writes that "if it may please you [Leicester] to take" the translation as a gift, "I account my former travail herein sufficiently recompensed and think myself greatly enforced to persevere in the full accomplishment of all the whole work."[45] Golding implies that Leicester's approval is all he needs to finish the project, but the language of remuneration in this dedication suggests that the relationship involved material as well as intellectual support.[46]

To argue, as I have, that Golding bought into the nationalistic project of bringing the classics into English is not to answer the question of why he chose Ovid. Indeed, Golding had already translated some of the writings of Julius Caesar, and he could have moved on to Livy, Cicero, or another historian or philosopher. But the *Metamorphoses* was uniquely tempting because it was arguably the best-known and most influential

---

[42] John Considine, "Golding, Arthur (1535/6–1606)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10908, accessed April 6, 2016.

[43] *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, trans. Arthur Golding, ed. Madeleine Forey (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 4.

[44] Ibid., 23, lines 12-15.

[45] Ibid., 25-27.

[46] Oakley-Brown more thoroughly explains the political climate surrounding Cecil, Calvin, Leicester, and Golding in England in the 1560s. See Oakley-Brown, "Translating the Subject: Ovid's Metamorphoses in England, 1560–7," in *Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness*, ed. Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown (Trowbridge: Cromwell Press, 2001), 69-70.

classical work read in England. It was an important part of the curriculum at most grammar schools, and even Elyot recommended that students study it despite its lasciviousness.[47] William Webbe spoke for the consensus when he placed Virgil first in the Latin pantheon with Ovid being "the second in dignity…a most learned, and erquisite Poet. The worke of greatest profitte which he wrote, was his Booke of *Metamorphosis*."[48] However, Webbe, writing in 1586, might have had Golding's "safe" version in mind when he lavished praise on Ovid, commenting that "though [the *Metamorphoses*] consisted of fayned Fables for the most part, and poeticall inuentions, yet beeing moralized according to his meaning, and the trueth of every tale beeing discouered, it is a worke of exceeding wysedome and sounde judgment."[49] Thus we see that despite the canonical status of the *Metamorphoses*, it was not an obvious or uncontroversial choice for Golding. As I have demonstrated, especially to the Protestants who regularly referenced Ovid as trivial, worthless, or even as a teacher of sin, the *Metamorphoses* was not the logical option for Golding to tackle. So what drew him to translate the text?

I argue that Arthur Golding was drawn to translate the *Metamorphoses* not because it was the logical option, but because it was so prestigious and so difficult. Golding compares his translation effort to a chariot race, a contest between heroes in the epic tradition. After translating all fifteen books of Ovid's poem, Golding writes that "At length my chariot wheele about the mark hath found the way, / And at their weery races end, my breathlesse horses stay."[50] The metaphor implies competition, effort, and the

[47] Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the Gouernour* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537), 30.
[48] William Webbe, *A discourse of English poetrie* (London: John Charlewood, 1586), C1r.
[49] Ibid.
[50] *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation,* ed. John Frederick Nims, 405, "Epistle," lines 1-2.

glory of victory. It is as if Golding has conquered the dangers of the *Metamorphoses*, and returns to share his hard-won spoils.

Golding encourages his readers to follow his example in testing themselves against the difficulties of Ovid's text. As they put in the effort to interpret it properly, they will feel the same satisfaction he does.

> The readers therefore earnesdly admonisht are too bee
> Too seeke a further meaning than the letter gives too see.
> The travell tane in that behalf although it have sum payne
> Yit makes it double recompence with pleasure and with gayne.
> With pleasure, for varietie and straungenesse of the things,
> With gaine, for good instruction which the understanding brings.[51]

The pain and travail of interpretation are necessary to gain the pleasure of overcoming the temptations of the text. Golding writes that it is possible that "Some naughtie persone seeing vyce shewd lyvely in his hew, / Dooth take occasion by and by like vices too ensew."[52] However, true Christians will have the fortitude to escape these baits of sin. Golding ends this last preface with an allusion to Odysseus' willful, yet failsafe, exposure to the normally deadly song of the sirens.

> If any stomacke be so weake as that it cannot brooke,
> The lively setting forth of things described in this booke,
> I give him counsell too absteine untill he bee more strong,
> And for too use Ulysses feat ageinst the Meremayds song.[53]

Even in this final metaphor, Golding calls Odysseus' trick to safely hear the siren's song, a "feat," again suggesting a great accomplishment. He challenges his readers to be equal to the heroic feat of understanding his text or suffer the shame of having weak stomachs.

In essence, Golding justifies translating and reading a potentially dangerous book

---

[51] Ibid., 420, "Epistle," lines 541-546.
[52] Ibid., 427, "Epistle," lines 143-144.
[53] Ibid., 428, "Epistle," lines 215-218.

with the same arguments that Milton would use in his *Areopagitica*. Milton also uses the metaphor of a race and appeals to a literary hero's temptations:

> I cannot praise fugitive and cloister'd vertue, unexercis'd & unbreath'd, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortall garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat…. [This is] the reason why our sage and serious Poet *Spenser*, whom I dare be known to think a better teacher then *Scotus* or *Aquinas*, describing true temperance under the person of *Guion*, brings him…through the cave of Mammon, and the bowr of earthly blisse that he might see and know, and yet abstain.[54]

The idea that both Milton and Golding expressed is rooted in the Calvinist doctrine that taught that properly responding to the Bible was a mark of election. Calvin wrote that "Hierusalem is to be seuerally knowen from Babylon, and the Church of Christ from the conspiracie of Satan, by that difference wherewyth Chryste hath made them different…He that is of God (saith he) heareth the Words of God."[55] In other words, those who properly listen and follow the words of the Bible are saved while those who respond negatively to the same words are reprobates. For example, "Among a hundred to whom the same discourse is delivered, twenty, perhaps, receive it with the prompt obedience of faith; the others set no value upon it, or deride, or spurn, or abominate it."[56] This diversity of response is not limited to hearing a sermon, and is especially manifest in how well readers of the Bible can interpret difficult, allegorical passages. Calvin argues that reprobates are not converted by the Bible because

> to those whom God is not pleased to illumine, he delivers his doctrine

[54] John Milton, *Selected Prose,* ed. C. A. Patrides (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 213.

[55] Thomas Norton, trans., *The institution of Christian religion, vvrytten in Latine by maister John Caluin* (London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richarde Harison, 1561), 13.

[56] John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1845), 783. http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.pdf

> wrapt up in enigmas, so that they may not profit by it, but be given over to greater blindness. Hence our Savior declares that the parables in which he had spoken to the multitude he expounded to the Apostles only, "because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given," (Mt. 13:11).[57]

The elect do not suffer from this blindness, and are blessed to understand parables, allegories, and the mysteries of the word of God.[58]

Just as he applied other Protestant exegetical ideas to the way he approached his translation, Golding made Calvin's litmus test into his own. In his prefaces, Golding repeatedly warns the readers that they are responsible for interpreting the text. If they are offended or incited to sin, the fault lies with them. He writes that he is "ryght well assurde there is no Christen wyght / That can by fondnesse be so farre seduced from the right."[59] Being taken in by Ovid's text means that readers are not true Christians. Others who condemn the book or demand that it be burned are too foolish to understand Ovid's true meaning:

> These persons overshoote themselves, and other folkes deceyve:
> Not able of the authors mynd the meening too conceyve.[60]

We have seen how Golding's translation had the nationalistic appeal of bringing a major work into English, offered Golding the rewards of Leicester's patronage, and provided him a way to prove himself and his readers against a difficult linguistic and moral test. But there were still risks involved in the project, especially if Golding were to

---

[57] Ibid., 784.

[58] Frank Kermode's book *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative* (London: Harvard University Press, 1979) traces this idea from the New Testament up through modern literary criticism, arguing that knowing the correct interpretation has always functioned to separate the insiders from the outsiders.

[59] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 406, "Epistle," lines 53-54.

[60] Ibid., 427, "Epistle," lines 145-151.

overuse allegorical readings. Modern literary scholars Gary Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz have claimed that Golding dodged censure by employing a "traditional allegorical approach."[61] Certainly, there was a long tradition of reading the *Metamorphoses* allegorically, but Golding's method was different in important ways from the medieval method. Pierre Bersuire in *Ovidius Moralizatus* in 1340 and the anonymous author of *Ovide Moralisé* around the same time allegorized the text according to the biblical four-fold exegesis, explaining its literal, moral, allegorical, and anagogical senses.[62] Significantly, the first edition of *Metamorphoses* in English was Caxton's 1477 translation of one of these French versions, which gives Ovid's narrative only in paraphrase, and overwhelms the story with commentary. While Golding probably did not have access to Caxton's version, he was familiar with heavily allegorized interpretations including the notes in the Latin text from which he translated.[63] However, as tempting as it might have been to explain away the immorality in the *Metamorphoses* allegorically, following the traditional medieval method would have meant going against Golding's Protestant convictions and humanist training.

Along with their focus on direct access to the authoritative Word (*sola scriptura*), Protestants insisted on its strict literal interpretation (*solus sensus literalis*). In Luther's commentary on Galatians, he condemns "the idle and unlearned Monks and the

---

[61] Gary G. Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz, "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: Myth in an Elizabethan Political Context," *Renaissance Studies,* 22.4 (2008): 563.

[62] Dante Alighieri, in his letter to Cangrande della Scala, famously applied the fourfold exegesis of scripture to his own work, endowing his poem with some of the seriousness of scripture. See Albert Russell Ascoli, *Dante and the Making of a Modern Author* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 110.

[63] Madeleine Forey, introduction to *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, trans. Arthur Golding, ed. Madeleine Forey (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), xix.

Schooledoctors…which taught that the Scripture hath foure senses: the literall sense, the figuratiue sense, the allegoricall sense, and the morall sense, and according to these senses they have foolishly interpreted almost all the wordes of the Scriptures."[64] Luther associates the complex method of fourfold exegesis with Catholicism ("monks") and scholasticism ("Schooledoctors"). He even specifically condemned this interpretive technique when it was applied to Ovid's epic, writing that "At first allegories originated from stupid and idle monks. Finally they spread so widely that some men turned Ovid's *Metamorphoses* into allegories. They made a laurel tree Mary, and Apollo they made Christ."[65] Such condemnations from the great reformer would have been troubling for a Protestant and humanist like Golding.

And Luther was not alone in his denunciation of allegorical exegesis. William Tyndale wrote in *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, "that the scripture hath but one sense, which is the literal sense. And that literal sense is the root and ground of all, and the anchor that never faileth, whereunto if thou cleave, thou canst never err or go out of the way."[66] Here, Tyndale equates straying from the literal sense into an allegorical reading with straying from the sanctioned "way," into forbidden paths of sin. Earlier in his treatise, Tyndale specifically mentions Ovid as an example of the improper practice of allegorical exegesis. He mocks those who "prove a point of the Faith as well out of a fable of Ovid or any other poet, as out of St John's Gospel or Paul's Epistles"[67] and tells

---

[64] Martin Luther, *A commentarie of M. Doctor Martin Luther vpon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Galathians* (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1575), f. 210.

[65] Quoted in M. L. Stapleton, "Devoid of Guilty Shame," *Modern Philology* 105, no. 2 (November 2007): 272. http://users.ipfw.edu/stapletm/docs/MP2007SpOv.pdf

[66] William Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christian Man,* ed. David Scott Daniel (London: Penguin, 2000), 164.

[67] Ibid., 160.

his readers that such stories are "of no greater value than a tale of Robin Hood."[68]

These statements from Tyndale would seem to indicate that there was no room for an allegorical reading of the *Metamorphoses* in English Protestant culture, but there was a loophole in the insistence on literal interpretation: If the text was written as an allegory, it can be read as such. Tyndale writes that

> allegory is as much to say as strange speaking, or borrowed speech: as when we say of a wanton child, 'This sheep hath maggots in his tail, he must be anointed with birchen salve;' which speech I borrow of the shepherds…. All fables, prophecies, and riddles, are allegories; as Aesop's fables, and Merlin's prophecies; and the interpretation of them are the literal sense.[69]

Setting aside his glib reference to the corporal punishment of children, we see that Tyndale believes that an allegorical interpretation of texts designed to be read allegorically—like Jesus' parables—is actually the literal sense of that text.[70] This distinction between attaching a false interpretation to a straightforward text and finding the literal meaning behind an allegorical text is important to our understanding of Golding's interpretive apparatus. In his cultural context, he needed to show that he was not imposing a false meaning onto his translation, but finding the morals that Ovid had intentionally placed there. Thus, it is inappropriate to simply label Golding's method a "traditional allegorical approach"; Golding's Protestant approach to allegory was very different from the long-established medieval method.

---

[68] Ibid., 159.

[69] Ibid., 163.

[70] Barbara Lewalski gives a representative example of this kind of exegetical strategy in the words of James Durham who wrote, "There is a great difference betwixt an Allegorick Exposition of Scripture, and an Exposition of Allegorick Scripture: the first is that, which many Fathers and School-men fail in, that is, when they Allegorize plain Scriptures and Histories." Quoted in Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 122.

2.3 Golding's Interpretive Apparatus

In refashioning Ovid into an author that intended the *Metamorphoses* to allegorically represent moral teachings from Biblical history, Golding argues that certain truths are so self-evident that even pagans knew them. He speculates that Ovid's "mynd did beare / Him witnesse that there are no Gods but one,"[71] and seems to equate poetic inspiration with prophetic power. In this sense, Golding gives credence to the Latin practice of calling poets *vates* or prophetic bards.

Golding also claimed that Ovid had direct access to the Hebrew Bible. Ovid "seems according to the sense of scripture to proceed,"[72] Golding writes, and generalizes that all of the ancient "Poets tooke the ground of all their cheefest fables out / Of scripture."[73] By claiming that Ovid was guided by scripture, Golding could deflect the criticism that only scripture was worth reading and that secular literature was a foolish distraction.

However, as a poet, Ovid retold the Bible obliquely, transforming its teachings into tales. According to Golding, Ovid and other Roman poets "shadowing with their gloses went about / To turne the truth to toyes and lyes."[74] Besides the pejorative connotations of "toyes and lyes," Golding's use of the word "gloses" is also negatively charged. In context, "gloses" refers to the fabulous tales that overlay the plain truths in the *Metamorphoses*, but Golding is also echoing Protestant condemnations of Catholic glosses, or interpretations of scripture. Although Sir Thomas More had argued that "Hard

---

[71] Ibid., 416, "Epistle," lines 393-94.
[72] Ibid., 417, "Epistle," line 416.
[73] Ibid., 420, "Epistle," line 530.
[74] Ibid., 420, "Epistle," lines 530-31.

yt were…to fynd enythyng so playn [in the Bible] that yt shoulde nede no glose at all,"[75] Tyndale responded with the standard Protestant attack against Popes that had used "with false gloses which they haue patched to the Scripture in playne places, to destroy the litterall sence for to set vp a false fayned sence of allegories, when there is none such."[76]

However, Golding turns these "shadowing…gloses" into strengths in "To the Reader," where he compares such intentional allegories with the pleasing colors of paintings.

> For as the Image portrayd out in simple whight and blacke
> (Though well proportiond, trew and faire) if comly colours lacke,
> Delyghteth not the eye so much, nor yet contentes the mynde
> So much as that that shadowed is with colours in his kynde:
> Even so a playne and naked tale or storie simply told
> (Although the matter bee in deede of valewe more than gold)
> Makes not the hearer so attent too print it in his hart,
> As when the thing is well declarde, with pleasant termes and art.
> All which the Poets knew right well…[77]

Thus Golding sets up the reader to see the stories as elaborations on moral and biblical truths which Golding will retranslate in their simplicity, presenting a converted and reformed Ovid, someone whom even fervent Protestants could "saufly use without desert of blame."[78]

2.4 Examples from the Text

In order to see how Golding went about reforming Ovid in the body of his translation, we will look at a series of examples where Golding has departed from a strict literal rendering of the Latin text to prove that Ovid's poem was a hidden retelling of the

---

[75] Thomas More, *A dialogue syr Thomas More knyghte* (London: J Rastell, 1529), X2r.
[76] William Tyndall, *Works* (London: John Daye, 1573), 263.
[77] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 428, "To the Reader," lines 119-127.
[78] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 415, "Epistle," line 337.

Bible.

The first book of the *Metamorphoses* clearly offers Golding the easiest material to work with. He spends over a third of his prefatory material drawing parallels between the creation, the four ages of man, and the universal flood with similar stories in Genesis, preparing the reader to see Ovid's text through a biblical lens. To make good on his claim that "partly in the outward phrase, but more in verie deede, / [Ovid] seems according to the sense of scripture to proceede"[79] in his introduction, Golding modifies the "outward phrase" as well as the order of Ovid's account of the creation. Where the Latin reads *cesserunt nitidis habitandae piscibus undae, / terra feras cepit, volucres agitabilis aer* [80] [In Stanley Lombardo's elegantly literal 2010 translation: "…The sea allowed itself / To swarm with glistening fish, the land became / A wild kingdom, and the air teemed with wings"],[81] with Ovid's text ascending up a hierarchy from fish below to beasts on land to birds in the air, Golding's version reads "The waters next both fresh and salt he let the fishes have. / The suttle ayre to flickring fowles and birdes he hath assignde. / The earth to beasts both wilde and tame of sundrie sort and kinde."[82] Golding's padded lines invert Ovid's order so that the poet agrees with the biblical account where fish and the fowls are created on the fifth day, and land animals follow on the sixth. This slight departure from the Latin is nonetheless significant because Golding's translation more clearly portrays Ovid as actively encoding Genesis into his poem.

---

[79] Ibid., "Epistle," 417, lines 415-16.

[80] Ovid, *The Metamorphoses 1-8*, ed. and trans. Frank Justus Miller, rev. G. P. Goold, 3rd ed. Loeb Classical Library 42 (1916; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), lines 1.74-75.

[81] *Ovid: Metamorphoses*, trans. Stanley Lombardo (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2010), 7, lines 1.74-76.

[82] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 5, lines 1.84-86.

Golding also expands Latin phrases to make Ovid agree with the Bible. Golding promises in his Epistle to show how "when he [Ovid] comes to speake of man, he dooth not vainly say / (As some have written) that he was before all time for ay, / Ne mentioneth mo Gods than one in making him."[83] Golding is building Ovid's Christian credibility again by contrasting him with ancients like Plato who wrote in the *Phaedrus* that humankind had always existed. In the next few lines of the Epistle, Golding quotes his own translation to prove that Ovid's portrayal of human creation was an allusion to the Judeo-Christian account.

> Howbeit yet of all this while, the creature wanting was,
> Farre more devine, of nobler minde, which should the residue passe
> In depth of knowledge, reason, wit, and high capacitie,
> And which of all the residue should the Lord and ruler bee.[84]

The Latin text for this section:

> *Sanctius his animal mentisque capacius altae*
> *deerat adhuc et quod dominari in cetera posset*.[85]

Lombardo's translation:

> Still missing was a creature finer than these,
> With a greater mind, one who could rule the rest[86]

Here Golding expands on his source text considerably, focusing on the dignity of man with words like "divine," "nobler," "knowledge," "reason," and "wit" expanding considerably on the Latin terms "*sanctius*" and "*capacius*." While "*capacius*" could connote a more capable mind, the ideas of "knowledge" and "reason" are Golding's additions, and "divine" transforms the ideas of setting apart and consecration associated

[83] Ibid., 417, "Epistle," lines 417-19.
[84] Ibid., lines 1.87-94.
[85] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, lines 1.76-77.
[86] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 7, lines 1.77-78.

with "*sanctius*" into an idea reminiscent of man created "after the image of God."[87] Here Golding is changing his translation into the theological idiom of Protestant culture that stressed the affinity between God and prelapsarian man. Indeed, he goes beyond the text of the Bible (which does not mention the "reason," "wit," or "nobility" of Adam and Eve) and reads the Calvinist interpretation of the story back onto Ovid's poem. Golding's next lines reflect the more direct influence of Calvin on his translation:

> And where all other beasts behold the ground with groveling eie,
> He gave to Man a stately looke replete with majestie.
> And willde him to behold the Heaven wyth countnance cast on hie,
> To marke and understand what things were in the starrie skie.[88]

Calvin had approvingly cited the Latin behind these lines in his *Institutes* in order to prove that man was created in the image of God.[89] However, when Thomas Norton translated the *Institutes* in 1561, he did not include Ovid's name next to the quotation or mark it in the margin. However, Golding seems to have noticed and echoed Norton's phrasing: "where al other lyuynge creatures doo grouellyngwise beholde the grounde, to man is geuen an vpright face, and he is commaunded to loke vpon the heauen, and to aduaunce his countenaunce towarde the stares."[90] The Latin text offers no warrant for the groveling that both Norton and Golding alliterate with "ground."

> *Pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram,*
> *os homini sublime dedit, caelumque videre*
> *iussit et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus*.[91]
> And while other animals look on all fours on at the ground

[87] Genesis 1:27 (GNV).

[88] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 6, lines 1.96-100.

[89] See Liz Oakley-Brown, "Translating the Subject: Ovid's Metamorphoses in England, 1560–7" in *Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness*, ed. Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown (Trowbridge: Cromwell Press, 2001), 69-70.

[90] Thomas Norton, trans., *The institution of Christian religion, vvrytten in Latine by maister John Caluin* (London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richarde Harison, 1561), 52-53.

[91] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, lines I.84-87.

> He gave to humans an upturned face, and told them to lift
> Their eyes to the stars…[92]

Golding's key expansions here are the phrase "stately looke replete with majestie" and the term "understand" by which he implies what his introduction overtly states—that we are "to lift our eyes…of mind / To heaven…to learn to know / And knowledge him that dwelleth there."[93] Again, the changes to the text here stress the dignity of mankind before the Fall and the importance of understanding the will of heaven.

Later in Book 1, Golding changes not just the order or connotations of the original, but adds specifically Christian terms to the narrative in his treatment of the flood passage. In Ovid's Latin, Jove explains that he must destroy all of the families of the earth because "*qua terra patet, fera regnat Erinys. / In facinus iurasse putes. Dent ocius omnes / quas meruere pati (sic stat sententia) poenas*" (I.241-3) [Erinys, the wild Fury, / Reigns supreme to the ends of the earth. You would think / They were sworn in blood to a life of crime! Let them all / Pay quickly the price they deserve—this is my edict."[94]]. The offense for which mankind will be destroyed here involves swearing falsely, but the Judeo-Christian notions of sin or disobedience to God's will are absent. Golding renders this passage thus,

> …......in all the Earth is none,
> But that such vice doth reigne therein, as that ye would believe,
> That all had sworne and solde themselves to mischief us to grieve.
> And therefore as they all offend: so am I fully bent,
> That all forthwith (as they deserve) shall have due punishment.[95]

His translation gives a much more Judeo-Christian explanation for God's decision to

---

[92] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 7, lines 1.85-87.
[93] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 418, "Epistle," lines 463-65.
[94] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 12, lines 1.248-51.
[95] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 11, lines 1. 281-85.

flood the earth, rendering "*Erinys*" as "vice," and expanding the idea of falsely swearing into the charged Christian idiom "solde themselves to mischief" with its implication of the need for redemption, or a buying back. Golding justifies a Christian reading by making Ovid into an intentional allegorist who "All these things [the main ideas of the flood] the Poet here dooth show / In colour, altring both the names of persons, tyme and place."[96] Seeing past the outward appearance, Golding explains the truth hidden underneath.

At the end of the flood narrative, Golding dramatizes his quest for hidden meanings by remaking Pyrrha and Deucalion into godly interpreters. Golding sympathetically imagines himself in the action of this narrative about interpretation, giving himself a textual precedent for his hermeneutic technique. In the story, Deucalion and Pyrrha receive a cryptic message instructing them how to repopulate the world. They are forced to translate the meaning of the gods' message just as Golding worked to decipher Ovid's epic. The goddess they pray to tells them "Depart you hence: Go hille your heads, and let your garmentes slake, / And both of you your Graundames bones behind your shoulders cast."[97] Deucalion and Pyrrha puzzle over this pronouncement, "The doubtfull wordes wherof they scan and canvas to and fro."[98] In the Latin, the verb is "*volutant,*"[99] meaning to turn over in one's mind. Golding imagines a textual experience of scanning and canvasing as a Renaissance translator might have done. At first, Pyrrha takes the message literally, and is "afraide hir Graundames ghost to hurt / By taking up

---

[96] Ibid., 418, "Epistle," lines 490-91.
[97] Ibid., 15-16, lines 1.452-53.
[98] Ibid., 16, line 1.460.
[99] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, line 1.389.

hir buried bones to throw them in the durt."[100]

Deucalion allays her fears by intuiting that the literal meaning is not the true sense. Just as Protestants allowed for an allegorical reading of a parable, Deucalion solves this riddle, reasoning,

> Well, eyther in these doubtfull words is hid some misterie,
> Whereof the Gods permit us not the meaning to espie,
> Or questionlesse and if the sence of inward sentence deeme
> Like as the tenour of the words apparantly doe seeme,
> It is no breach of godlynesse to doe as God doth bid.
> I take our Graundame for the earth, the stones within hir hid
> I take for bones, these are the bones the which are meaned here.[101]

In this example, Deucalion's thought process mirrors Golding's when the latter searches Ovid's words with a conviction that there is "hid some misterie" in these "doubtfull words." Translation scholar Matthew Reynolds has recently pointed out this sympathy in Golding, who is "especially sensitized to characters who are in a similar position" to his.[102] Reynolds focuses on the relationship between Deucalion's parsing of the text of the oracle and Golding's process of translation, seizing on the "verbal trick" whereby "'Stones' mean 'bones' because the two words rhyme."[103] However, I believe that the connection between Golding and Deucalion has less to do with linguistic translation than the explanation of concealed meaning. The words themselves are easy to translate, but their significance is harder to interpret. It is important to note that the passages about hidden meanings, including the phrases "sence of inward sentence" and "tenour of the words apparently doe seeme" are Golding's interpolations where the Latin

---

[100] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 16, lines 1.457-58.

[101] Ibid., 16, lines 1.463-69

[102] Matthew Reynolds, *The Poetry of Translation: From Chaucer and Petrarch to Homer and Logue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 297.

[103] Ibid.

only reads "*aut fallax…est sollertia nobis*" [unless my wit is false].[104] Golding's additions here refashion Deucalion, and by extension Ovid, into an interpreter of intentional allegory.[105]

The examples we have looked at so far—the creation, the flood, and the repopulation of the world—all have clear biblical analogues and involve material that Golding easily reworked in a Christian mold. The wisdom and order of God's creation, the punishment for sin with the flood, and the rewards for piety with the blessings to Deucalion may not be obvious in the original, but Golding's subtle changes in order, connotation, and emphasis make these episodes into a parallel that proves that Christian truths were universal.

However, as I have demonstrated, Golding's Protestant contemporaries who read Ovid focused more on the episodes of absurdity, violence, or eroticism, which fit Gibbs and Ruiz's description of "an 'Anti-Bible'—the record of a people without God's covenant"[106] from which readers can only learn by way of warning. But scholars like Gibbs and Ruiz forget that Judeo-Christian scripture is also full of negative examples that function as warnings that would have resonated with Ovid's stories for a reader like Golding. For every story like the rape of Philomela in Ovid, we can find the rape of Dinah in Genesis 34 or the rape and dismemberment of the Levite's concubine in Judges

[104] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, line 1.391. My translation.

[105] Golding can get away with these Christianizations because he believes the Bible is the basis of the story. The reason Ovid did not call Deucalion "Noah" was because he was "following ay / The fables of the glorying Greekes (who shamelessly did take / The prayse of all things to themselves)" and thus set Noah's flood "Eyght hundred winters" later to coincide with a major flood in Greece. *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 419, "Epistle," lines 498-502.

[106] Gary G. Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz. "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: Myth in an Elizabethan Political Context." *Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 2.4 (September 2008): 557-575.

18. To parallel the story of Myrrha, we have the story of Lot's daughters in Genesis 19. For the story of Hercules and Megara, we could turn to Samson and Delilah in Judges 16. In this vein, the Protestant preacher Andrew Willet compiled a list of examples, from "theeves [who] shall be cut off as Achan was" in Joshua 7, to "All hypocrits and false harted and dissembling Christians [who] maye be warned also by the feareful examples of *Ananias & Saphyra, Act.*5. who for their hypocrisie were slayne by the mouth of *Peter.*"[107] Thus, Ovid's text becomes more of a parallel Bible than an Anti-Bible, and approaching it as such invites insights into how Protestants dealt with troublesome passages in their scripture.

In order to read the text as a parallel Bible, Golding was forced into interpretations that sometimes went against the contextual meanings of the episodes, just as some Protestants wrested scriptures to prove a point of doctrine and thus committed the interpretive "violence" that Calvin warned against. To justify his readings, Golding transformed the characters and narrators within the poem, portraying them in more understandable ways. One striking example is the way that he transforms Orpheus, the narrator of Book 10, into a moralist. Golding's method of reading a clearer moral onto the story of Myrrha's incest with her father mirrors the way that Protestants explained the morally ambiguous stories of the Old Testament.

Golding follows Ovid's lead by containing the infamous narrative of Myrrha and her father in a textual barrier of condemnation to preempt the reader's outraged response. Ovid already has Orpheus give a warning before starting the story, which Golding's translation intensifies. The Latin reads,

---

[107] Andrew Willet, *a fruitful and godly sermon preached at Paules crosse…Vpon the 5. Chapter of the prophesie of Zacharie* (London: R. Bourne, 1592), E4v.

> *dira canam; procul hinc natae, procul este parente*
> *aut, mea si vestras mulcebunt carmina mentes,*
> *desit in hac mihi parte fides, nec credite factum,*
> *vel, si credetis, facti quoque credite poenam.*[108]

In Lombardo's translation

> My song is dire. Daughter, stay away; and fathers, too.
> Or if my songs charm you, do not believe this story;
> Believe instead that it never happened,
> But if you do believe it, believe the punishment too.[109]

Orpheus balances the responsibilities of the narrator and the audience in this caveat: just as the narrator repeatedly tells the audience to flee or disbelieve the story, he highlights the enchanting power of his song, which is so potent that the audience will stay after all. Golding transforms Orpheus into a moral teacher, and shifts the emphasis away from the poet's charming power.

> Of wicked and most cursed things to speake I now commence.
> Yee daughters and yee parents all go get yee farre from hence.
> Or if yee mynded bee to heere my tale, beleeve mee nought
> In this beehalfe: ne think that such a thing was ever wrought.
> Or if yee will beeleeve the deede, beleeve the vengeance too
> Which lyghted on the partye that the wicked act did doo.[110]

Even though Golding has ample space in his long lines, he leaves out any translation of *Mulcebunt,* the adjective meaning sweet, charming, which shows the intoxicating power of prurient poetry. Golding interpolates condemnatory adjectives to strengthen the warning: "Wicked and most cursed," and "wicked acts," and his choice of "vengeance" for "*poenam*" heightens the biblical resonance of the passage by aligning it with such scriptural commonplaces as "vengeance is mine, I will repay"[111] instead of using the

---

[108] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, lines 10.300-03.
[109] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 276, lines 10.334-37.
[110] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 285, lines 10.327-32.
[111] Romans 12:19 (GNV).

legal term “penalty.”

When Golding makes Orpheus’s denunciation less ambiguous than it is in the original, he is following the example of Protestant commentators on the Bible. For example, the commentary on the story of Lot’s daughters’ incest with their father in the Geneva Bible shows a similar pattern to Golding’s moralization. Without this commentary, the text in Genesis relates the incident without any obvious moralization, explaining that Lot’s daughters were motivated by a desire to maintain the family line, not by forbidden lust like Myrrha. “the elder [daughter] saide unto the yonger, Our father is old, and there is not a man in the earth, to come in unto us after the maner of all ye earth. Come, wee will make our father drinke wine, and lie with him, that we may preserve the seede of our father.”[112] This conspiracy between two female characters is reminiscent of Myrrha’s incestuous scheme, which she hatches with her nurse, but Lot is oblivious to his role in making his daughters pregnant, in contrast to Myrrah’s father who agrees with the nurse to sleep with an unseen maiden in the dark.

After forming their plan, Lot’s daughters “made their father drinke wine that night, and the elder went and lay with her father: but he perceiued not, neither when she lay downe, neither when she rose up.”[113] This pattern repeats the next day, and soon both daughters become pregnant, eventually giving birth to sons. We are told that their sons, Moab and Ben-ammi are the progenitors of the Canaanite tribes of the Moabites and Ammonites “unto this day.”[114] This etiological twist is reminiscent of many of Ovid’s explanations that rhetorically signal the end of most episodes, and often take the place of

[112] Genesis 19:31-32 (GNV).
[113] Genesis 19:33 (GNV).
[114] Genesis 19:38 (GNV).

a moral to the story. Similarly, the Bible passage does not overtly condemn Lot's daughters, though the association of Lot's daughters with the wicked peoples of Canaan that the Israelites would later drive out does imply that their actions were sinful.

Even so, for Protestant readers like Golding, the lack of local and specific judgment calls for clarification, and in the Geneva Bible, several marginal glosses provide the interpretive containment of the story. We read that "unless [Lot] had been drunk, he would never have done that abominable act," but the commentary does not completely absolve Lot from his sin: "Thus God permitted him to fall most horribly in the solitary mountains, whom the wickedness of Sodom could not overcome."[115] Even the Biblical narrator's etiological note about the Ammonites is moralized in the commentary, and the Geneva Bible notes that Ben-ammi means "son of my people: signifying that they rejoiced in their sin, rather than repenting of it."[116] With this example from the Bible that Golding and his fellow Protestants read from in mind, it is clear that Myrrha's incest would not be understood as a sin only conceivable among a people "without God's covenant," to borrow Gibbs and Ruiz's phrase. Lot and his daughters were born into the Abrahamic covenant, yet they still committed incest. From the text in Genesis, it is not entirely obvious that their actions are sinful, but commentaries like the notes in the Geneva Bible supply the necessary moralization. Golding's expansion of Orpheus' warning transforms the narrator into something like a Protestant commentator on the Bible.

Whereas Golding followed Ovid's lead in condemning Myrrha, he departs from the poet in his treatment of the story of Arachne's competition with Athena from Book 6.

[115] Ibid., p. 24 (GNV).
[116] Ibid.

Golding reads the story from Athena's perspective, condemning Arachne's pride and stubbornness in ignoring warnings of divine vengeance to come. Golding has the pagan goddess stand in for God and says the story of Arachne, will

> …also show that long it is ere God begin
> To pay us for our faults, and that he warnes us oft before
> To leave our folly: but at length his vengeance striketh sore.
> And therefore that no wight should strive with God in word nor thought
> Nor deede. But pride and fond desire of praise have ever wrought
> Confusion to the parties which accompt of them do make…[117]

However, Golding's commitment to this moralization causes him to misread the way Ovid makes Arachne the more sympathetic character. Even Golding's contemporaries understood Arachne to be the protagonist in the story. For example, despite defending the principle of poetic justice, whereby vice is punished and virtue rewarded in literature, Sir Philip Sidney saw Arachne as the victim in the contest. In *Arcadia*, he wrote that the queen Gynecia's eyes were "full of the same disdainefull scorne, which *Pallas* shewed to poore *Arachne*, that durst contend with her for the prize of well weauing."[118] Sidney sympathizes with the "poor" defenseless girl, and instead of condemning her for pride, criticizes Athena for her disdain and jealousy. However, Golding shows no sympathy for Arachne in the body of his translation or in his interpretation in the preface.

Besides the structure of the narrative, Golding also misses the ways that Ovid tacitly compares himself with Arachne by connecting his poetry with her weaving. In the first lines of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid asks the gods to inspire him to "spin a poem that

---

[117] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 250, "Epistle", lines 126-131.

[118] Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (London: John Winder, 1590), 214.

extends / From the world's first origins down to my own time."[119] In Latin, the word for this spinning is "*deducite*" in line 4, which is a word Ovid repeats as he sets up the competition between the girl and the goddess in Book 6 as they spin ancient stories with treads of gold: "*illic et lentum filis inmittitur aurum / et vetus in tela deducitur argumentum*."[120]

Golding's version of the invocation in Book 1 has the poet as that "my verse may to my time, his course directly runne"[121] creating a metaphor reminiscent of his 1567 Epistle which compares the task of translation to a chariot race from which "at their weery races end, my breathless horses stay."[122] Perhaps because he failed to notice Ovid's image of a poet as a spinner from Book 1, Golding does not perceive that the stories Arachne weaves are very close to Ovid's motifs in the first five books, focusing on the plight of women suffering divine rape. The gods that Athena depicts sitting in august justice and wisely doling out boons and punishments to mortals are largely absent from the *Metamorphoses*, though they seem to reappear in Golding's prefatory materials. In Ovid's text, however, the gods are mostly found fighting amongst themselves, satisfying their lusts, and taking out their anger on morals. Golding misses the connection between the book he is translating and the artwork that Arachne creates.

Instead of making Arachne a sympathetic character or an avatar for the poet, Golding emphasizes how Arachne's pride is sinful in his translation. Rather than having Arachne boast that if she loses in competition with Athena "*nihil est, quod victa*

---

[119] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 5, lines 1.3-4. In Latin: "adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi / ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen!"

[120] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, lines 6.68-69.

[121] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 3, lines 1.3-4.

[122] Ibid., 405, "Epistle," lines 1-2.

recusem!"[123] ["There is nothing I wouldn't forfeit if I lose"[124]], Golding writes "I will refuse no punishment,"[125] adding in the language of Biblical judgement and penalties instead of terms of wagering and forfeiture. When Athena, disguised as an old woman, asks her to "*temeraria, dictis /supplice voce roga: veniam dabit illa roganti*."[126] [humbly beg her pardon / For what you said. She will pardon you if you ask"[127]], Golding uses the more Christian term "forgiveness" in his translation. Furthermore, when Athena reveals herself and the Nymphs bow to her glory, the Latin says "*sola est non territa virgo*"[128] ["Arachne alone was unafraid"[129]]. Golding writes "The Maiden only unabasht woulde naught at all relent,"[130] heightening Arachne's pride and stubbornness.

In Ovid's text, Athena seems ridiculous when she loses the weaving competition. After she sees Arachne's tapestry, we read that

> *Non illud Pallas, non illud carpere Livor*
> *possit opus: doluit successu flava virago*
> *et rupit pictas, caelestia crimina, vestes,*
> *utque Cytoriaco radium de monte tenebat,*
> *ter quater Idmoniae frontem percussit Arachnes*.[131]

In Lombardo's translation:

> Neither Pallas, nor Envy personified,
> Could carp at that work. The golden virago,
> Incensed at Arachne's spectacular success,
> Ripped the fabric apart with all its embroidery
> Of celestial crimes. And, as she had in her hand
> A shuttle made of Cytorian boxwood,

---

[123] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, line 6.25.
[124] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 147, line 6.31.
[125] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 137, line 6.31.
[126] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, lines 6.32-33.
[127] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 148, lines 6.38-39.
[128] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, line 6.45
[129] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 148, line 6.54.
[130] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 137, line 6.56.
[131] Ovid, ed. and trans. F. J. Miller, lines 6.129-33.

She used it to box Arachne's ears.[132]

However, Golding fails to notice the humor of the scene where the goddess of wisdom throws a temper-tantrum after losing the contest. Because Golding is committed to reading Arachne's punishment as just, he is forced to invent a justification for Athena's angry outburst, since ignoring textual context and imposing an interpretation onto the text was considered bad form, even in Biblical interpretation. For example, Martin Luther voiced the importance of sympathetic, literary readings of the Bible, when he wrote that, "When I was a monk I was a master in the use of allegories… I allegorized everything, even a chamber pot, but afterwards I reflected on the histories and thought how difficult it must have been for Gideon to fight with his enemies in the manner reported."[133]

The key change in Luther's reaction to the Bible is to an historical, literary reading, examining the emotional states of the characters instead of flattening them out into signs pointing to a higher set of meanings. As Jerome Friedman notes, "Luther's sentiments were those of an increasing number of scholars exhibiting renewed interest in the literal and historical sense of Scripture. In this case, Luther saw Gideon as a man with a mission, and although God may have stood at Gideon's side, he could appreciate both the fear and the anxiety that the ancient leader must have felt."[134] Golding too must have noticed the pettiness of Athena in Ovid's text, which was worse than envy personified. Therefore, he expands the text to give him grounds for reading Athena's reaction as a just

---

[132] *Ovid*, trans. Lombardo, 151, lines 6.143-49.

[133] Martin Luther, *Luther's Works: Volume 56, Table Talk*¸ ed. and trans. Theodore G. Tappert, gen. ed. Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 46.

[134] Jerome Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony: Sixteenth-century Christian-Hebraica in the Age of Renaissance Nostalgia* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1983), 128.

expression of divine wrath.

> Not Pallas, no nor spight it selfe could any quarrell picke
> To this hir worke: and that did touch Minerva to the quicke.
> Who thereupon did rende the cloth in pieces every whit,
> Bicause the lewdnesse of the Gods was biased so in it.[135]

In Golding's version, it was not petty jealousy that angered Athena, but righteous indignation and hatred of blasphemy. This addition of the word "because" allows Golding to understand Arachne to be justly punished. In light of Calvinist polemics against idolatrous images, Golding's reading would have seemed especially appropriate.[136]

After Athena strikes Arachne with the weaver's shuttle, the girl hangs herself in despair. In an act of mercy, Athena transforms her into a spider so that she can continue weaving forever. Golding reads this and other transformations of humans into animals as metaphorical punishments in which a character is so debased that he or she is not worthy to be human. Golding's interpretation of Arachne's story sheds light on how Protestants understood this ancient metaphor.

In both the 1567 Epistle and the preface "To the Reader," Golding explains that humans must follow reason and virtue or else they will act like beasts. He says that Ovid shows this idea through the many transformations that take place in the poem: they are metaphors for the beastly actions taken by the characters. In this interpretation, even when the gods transform themselves into animals, they are condemned by Ovid. Golding writes that

> …if wee suffer fleshly lustes as lawlesse Lordes too reigne,

---

[135] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 140, lines 6.161-164.

[136] See Gary G. Gibbs and Florinda Ruiz, "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: A Protreptic Endeavor for a Reformation Readership," *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 41, no. 2 (2015): 130.

> Than are we beastes, wee are no men, wee have our name in vaine.
> And if wee be so drownd in vice that feeling once bee gone,
> Then may it well of us bee sayd, wee are a block or stone.
> This surely did the Poets meene when in such sundry wyse
> The pleasant tales of turned shapes they studyed too devyse.[137]

Arthur Golding drew upon an ancient commonplace that has survived to this day: reason is what separates us from the animals, and if we can't control ourselves, we are no better than the beasts. Golding writes that Ovid's transformations literalize the metaphor of humans as Aristotle's "rational animals"[138] because we can read each transformation in the poem as the moment when the character's bodies manifest what has happened already to their souls. For example, at the end of the Philomela episode, Tereus is transformed into a fierce hoopoe bird because of the inhuman rage he felt after he was tricked into eating his own son's flesh. Swinish Elpenor and his gluttonous shipmates are transformed so that their physical shape matches their porcine character, and the lustful "Jove became a bull…for his trull."[139]

In Golding's interpretation, metaphorical transformations have a slightly different resonance when read as punishments from God. Instead of spontaneously or purposely turning into an animal, Golding sees several characters changed as recompense for their sins. In these situations, the transformation is externally imposed. This explanation works better for episodes like Acteon's or Arachne's. Though they were not acting like a deer or a spider, they were changed into those animals as a poetically appropriate form of punishment.

English Protestants could understand the metaphor of a man transformed into a

---

[137] Ibid., "To the Reader," lines 111-116.
[138] In, for example, Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics,* rev. ed. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934), 1.13.
[139] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 425, "To the Reader," lines 95-96.

beast by reference to their own Bibles. Commentators and editors pointed out the many times when scripture compares sinners to beasts. From the proverb calling the fool “a dog [that] returns to its vomit,”[140] to Jesus, calling Herod “that fox” in the Gospel of Luke,[141] the Bible offered preachers numerous examples to make the point that humans must practice virtue to avoid becoming like animals.

However, in addition to these metaphors, the Bible contains at least one story that might have been uncomfortably close to one of Ovid’s miraculous transformations. In the fourth chapter of Daniel, king Nebuchadnezzar, despite being warned against pride in a dream, boasts about “this great Babel that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power and for the honor of my majesty.”[142] In punishment for not acknowledging the power of God, we read that “The very same hour…he was driven from men, and did eat grass as the oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown as eagles *feathers*, and his nails like birds *claws*.”[143] Later in the chapter, we read that after living as a beast for seven years, Nebuchadnezzar repented and was able to return to his throne.

The Hebrew text is ambiguous about whether the king was physically transformed into an animal or not, but the editors of the Geneva Bible point out in a marginal gloss that we should understand “Not that his shape or form was changed into a beast, but that he was either stricken mad, and so avoided man’s company, or was cast out for his tyranny, and so wandered among the beasts, and ate herbs and grass.”[144] The Protestants

[140] Proverbs 26:11 (GNV).
[141] Luke 13:32 (GNV).
[142] Daniel 4:27 (GNV).
[143] Ibid.
[144] Notes to verse 27 (GNV).

who edited the Geneva Bible were suspicious of claims of magic, which they associated with Catholicism and superstition, so they dismissed the notion that God literally transformed the king into an animal.[145]

Most Protestants followed the editors of the Geneva Bible in reading Nebuchadnezzar's transformation allegorically. In 1612, the Puritan divine Thomas Taylor may have had Golding's text in mind when he read Nebuchadnezzar's transformation figuratively:

> And hence proceeded those poetries of metamorphoses, not that either beasts or birds, or trees were changed into men, or men into these, but…that men more and more degenerated from themselues, and became daily neerer the beasts in properties, qualities, and practises, although they retained still the shape and place of men. Like Nebuchadnezzar, who was not changed into the shape of a beast (as some haue thought) although God could haue done that; but his vnderstanding together with his kingdome was taken from him, and *he driuen from men, ate grasse, as the beasts did, till his vnderstanding* (he saith not his shape) *was restored him*.[146]

I have argued that Golding used scriptural exegesis as the model for his reading of Ovid, but in this example, we find a clergyman using literary examples to justify his reading of the Bible.

This metaphor of men becoming beastly through moral degeneration was applied back to proper reading practices by influential Flemish theologian Andreas Hyperius. He used the example of Nebuchadnezzar to describe what would happen if Christians did not

[145] Of course, many readers read this episode literally instead of allegorically. French humanist Pierre Boaistuau wrote about lycanthrope in his encyclopedic *Theatrum mundi* where he used the example of Nebuchadnezzar to prove that werewolves "shoulde not seeme straunge or fabellous to those that haue red in holy scripture the pitifull Metamorphosie of *Nabuchodonosor,* who was transformed into an Oxe, the space of seauen yeares, for to bring him to the knowledge of his God." Pierre Boaistuau, *Theatrum mundi or rule of the world*, trans. John Alday (London: H. Denham, 1566), M5r.

[146] Thomas Taylor, *A commentarie vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titus* (London: Cantrell Legge, 1612), 250-251.

read the bible daily. Just as Roger Ascham had worried that reading the wrong books could make Englishmen "diabolo incarnato," Hyperius warned that neglecting the daily reading and meditation of scripture would cause Christians to become like brute beasts.

> if so be we had no Bookes of holy Scripture at all? verily I beleeue we would not so muche as thinke of *GOD,* or of any thing belonging vnto *GOD,* all our life long: neyther should we liue in any better estate, than that wretched *Nabuchadnezar,* who as we may reade in Daniel. 4. kepte companye for certayne yeares with brute Beastes…[147]

As I have argued throughout this article, Golding's fellow Puritans might have condemned his translation as a book that could make readers forget about God and live as brute beasts just as Hyperius warns. However, Golding converted the *Metamorphoses* into something close to one of the "Bookes of holy Scripture" that warned readers against the consequences of beastly behavior and inspired them to follow human and even godly virtues.

Golding successfully transformed the poem's characters like Deucalion, Orpheus, and Athena into models of correct interpretation. He transformed Ovid from an infamous banished poet who fit Puritan's description of a teacher of sin into a poet philosopher and a teacher of virtue. He transformed the *Metamorphoses* from a dangerous book into "a worke very pleasaunt and delectable" for all who had the "skill, heede, and judgement" to understand it.[148]

By understanding these transformations or conversions, we solve the riddle of Golding's decision to translate Ovid, we find the loophole in the Puritan rule of literal interpretation, and we see how Protestants approached the Bible from a new perspective.

---

[147] Andreas Hyperius, *The course of Christianitie,* trans. John Ludham (London: Henry Bynneman, 1579), 26-27.

[148] *Ovid: Golding Translation,* ed. Nims, 2.

By showing that the literal sense of Ovid's work, or the meaning that Ovid intended his readers to take from his poem, was Christian and moral, Golding was able to circumvent the criticism that may have come from fervent Protestants. He is able to present objectionable material embedded in an interpretative framework that drew Christianity out of paganism and moral lessons out of ribald stories, all while avoiding the charges Protestants leveled against allegorical interpretation. Golding went to great lengths to prove that Ovid intended for his poem to appear to be "outwardly most pleasant tales and delectable histories," but "fraught inwardly with most pithy instructions and wholesome examples, and containing both ways most exquisite cunning and deep knowledge."[149]With Protestant debates about biblical exegesis in mind, we can begin to understand why Golding chose to translate the *Metamorphoses*, why he included so much paratextual material, and why he departed in the ways he did from a literal reading of the Latin text. He became not so much a moralizer of the *Metamorphoses* as the converter of Ovid himself.

This essay has argued that Golding's surprising success in translating Calvin and Ovid at the same time shows the flexibility of Puritans in interpreting ancient texts. They approached sacred and secular literature in much the same way, and were willing to sometimes compromise their hermeneutic principles to make sure readers took away the right lessons. Golding's ability to transform character like Deucalion, Athena, and Orpheus into godly interpreters and judges was the key to his success at recreating Ovid in his own image, equally at home with the *Metamorphoses* and with Calvin's sermons.

---

[149] Ibid., 405, "Epistle," lines 5-9.

CHAPTER 3

TRANSLATION AS ENSLAVEMENT: THOMAS DRANT, HORACE, AND JEREMIAH

In 1566, the Protestant preacher, Thomas Drant, completed the first English translation of Horace's *Satires*. He published his translation in a strange little book titled *A Medicinable Morall*, which paired the *Satires* with a verse translation of *The Book of Lamentations*, traditionally written by the Old Testament prophet Jeremiah. While I make no claims for the high literary merit of either translation, the book is a cultural artifact that rewards a closer examination.[150] How could the urbane Epicurean poet Horace fit with the stern Old Testament prophet who inspired the bitter invective of the Jeremiad? How did Tudor translators approach the pagan and biblical texts that formed the backbone of their culture? This chapter will examine Drant's prefaces and translations to try solve the puzzle of *A Medicinable Morall* and shed light on some of the theories of translation which battled for supremacy in sixteenth-century England.

Drant's preface explains that his goal is to help the Christian reader overcome

---

[150] This pairing of a complete classical with a substantial biblical translation is rare if not unique in the history of English literature. Authors such as William Painter included short excerpts of Greek and Latin texts next to stories from the Bible as part of miscellanies like the *Palace of Pleasure* published in 1566, but I have failed to find a translation of an entire classical text in the same book with a biblical translation. It would be strange to imagine Tyndale having a book of Cicero's published with his *New Testament*, or William Adlington including a version of *The Book of Ezekiel* with his translation of *The Golden Ass*.

fleshy appetites, sins, and vices. Because the wages "of synne is deathe: and because we are all lothe to dye, it were wel done we should marke some lessons auailable, and restoratiue to lyfe….Sinne [must] be cropped, and [it is] a tryumphante conqueste to houlde her downe."[151] He writes that his fellow Englishmen may unwittingly fall into sin because "the more parte of vice is couered and…fewe or none…doo attempt to deuest or plucke of her vaile of hypocrisie."[152] As an antidote, Drant offers his book, starting with Horace, who, he writes, "was excellent good in his time…chiefly one that with sharpe satyres and cutting quippies, coulde wel displaie and disease a gloser [i.e., hypocrite]."[153] As a foil to the cutting character of Horace, Drant offers "The holy Prophete Ieremie [who] dyd rufully and waylingly lamente the deepe and massie enormities of his tymes, & earnestly prognosticate and forspeake the sorie and sower consequents that came after…." Drant concludes, "Therfore as it is mete for a man of god rather to wepe then to iest: and not vndecent for a prophane writer to be iestyng, and merie spoken: I haue brought to passe that the plaintiue Prophete Ieremie shoulde wepe at synne: and the pleasant poet Horace shoulde laugh at synne [for] Not one kynde of musike deliteth all passions: nor one salue for all greuances."[154]

However, even though Drant sets up these two translations as two halves of *A Medicinable Morall*, most scholars of English literature and translation focus only on the first half, and particularly on a striking metaphor from Drant's preface where he

---

[151] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall, that is, the two bookes of Horace his satyres, Englyshed…The wailyngs of the prophet Hieremiah, done into Englyshe verse* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1566), A3r.

[152] Ibid.

[153] Ibid.

[154] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, A3v.

compares the process of translation to enslavement. Drant writes that he did "as the people of god wer commanded to do with their captive women that were hansome and beautifull: I have shaved of his hair, & pared of his nayles (that is) I have wyped awaye all his vanitie and superfinitie of matter."[155]

Taking this figure of a translator conquering and harshly subjugating the text as a starting point, I will attempt to put the image of enslavement back into its textual and cultural context, and use the rhetoric of conquest and enslavement as a key to solve the puzzle of *A Medicinable Morall*.

To begin, let us look to the scripture Drant cites when he says he will do "as the people of god wer commanded to do": Deuteronomy Chapter 21. "When thou shalt go to warre against thine enemies…and thou shalt take them captives, And shalt see among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, & woldst take her to thy wife, Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house, and she shal shave her head, and pare her nailes, And she shal put of the garment that she was taken in, and she shal remain in thine house…."[156]

In referencing these verses, Drant picks up a commonplace that had been applied to translation since the time of Saint Jerome. Responding to Tomagnus, a Roman orator in letter 70, Jerome defend his practice of citing pagan sources in his writings. Jerome claims that several biblical authors had quoted or conversed with Greek philosophers and poets, and maintains that he can do the same. Citing Deuteronomy 21, Jerome writes,

> Is it surprising that I too, admiring the fairness of her form and the grace of her eloquence, desire to make that secular wisdom which is my captive

[155] Ibid.

[156] *Geneva Bible*. Trans. William Whittingham, Thomas Gilbey, and Anthony Sampson, (Dayton, Ohio, Greyden Press: 1998), 185.

> and my handmaid, a matron of the true Israel? Or that shaving off and cutting away all in her that is dead whether this be idolatry, pleasure, error, or lust, I take her to myself clean and pure and beget by her servants for the Lord of Sabaoth? My efforts promote the advantage of Christ's family, my so-called defilement with an alien increases the number of my fellow-servants.[157]

In the introduction to her book, *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics*, Carolyn Dinshaw explores the implications of this passage. Instead of the traditional model of the female soul of the text hidden under a dark veil of allegory, Jerome writes that the essential wisdom lies beneath exterior beauty which attracts converts, but must be curtailed. Dinshaw writes that "The text's wisdom and truth are the key to the increase and multiplication of the faithful; the warrior takes the alien from her people, has her unclothed and reclothed in a ritual preparation for the nuptuials, and transforms her from alien seductress to fecund wife."[158] Indeed, the Geneva Bible's note for this passage explains that the stripping and shaving "signify that her former life must be changed before thei could be joined to the people of God."[159]

By referencing these verses about bringing a captive woman "home to thine house," Drant imagines the process of translation not only as conquest but also as domestication. The captive woman is literally domesticated as she is brought into the "*domus*," or house of her captor and future husband. In his preface to the translation, Drant promises to similarly make Horace's Latin text at home in English:

He writes,

> I haue englished thinges not accordyng to the vain of the Latin proprietie,

[157] Qtd. in Carolyn Dinshaw, *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 23.

[158] Carolyn Dinshaw, *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 23.

[159] Deuteronmy 21:13 GNV

> but of our own vulgar tongue.[160] I haue interfarced (to remoue his obscuritie, and sometymes to better his matter) much of myne owne deuysinge. I haue peeced his reason, eekede, and mended his similitudes, mollyfied his hardnes, prolonged his cortall kynd of speches, changed & muche altered his wordes, but not his sentence: or at leaste (I dare say) not his purpose.[161]

Free to depart from "the vain of the Latin," Drant writes that he has improved the poems as he made them at home in English. He claims such authority over the text that he can stuff in ("interfarce") many of his own words and ideas. While modern readers would see a contradiction between "I haue…changed & muche altered his words, but not his sentence [i.e., sense]" Drant's statement fits with some of the traditional ways of translating in Tudor England. Together with the striking metaphor of enslavement, Drant's paradoxical claim about changing words but maintaining meaning beg for an explanation.

This chapter will use these two statements in Drant's preface as a jumping off point to explore issues of agency and compulsion in Drant's translation of Horace and Jeremiah. I will put the image of enslavement in context, examine how closely Drant's practice as a translator follows his theory, and trace a series of surprising reversals in the text where conquerors are conquered and slave masters are themselves enslaved. I will argue that the rhetoric of translation as captivity breaks down for Drant as he shifts from identifying with the conquerors to the conquered, and comment on how the notion of conquest fits with the larger trends in translation and reception in sixteenth-century England.

---

[160] Of course, Drant's other claim to literary fame is as the author of a set of rules for quantitative English verse that Edmund Spenser referenced in a letter to Gabriel Harvey.

[161] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall,* A4r.

3.1 Metaphors of Translation and the Medieval Tradition

Theories of translation have always been closely tied to metaphors. When we write of a faithful translation, a free translation, or a confident translation, we are using metaphors. Modern readers may ignore the implications of these metaphors because rapid and accurate translation is taken as a given in today's globalized literary culture. The fact that many modern readers ignore the theoretical stakes of translation is best explained by Lawrence Venuti's thesis in *The Translator's Invisibility*: We have come to expect a translation so fluent that we feel we are looking straight through the English words and into the mind of the original author. The translator's goal is to make the readers forget that the translator even exists.[162]

But the translator's goal has not always been such a fluent and transparent translation. Sixteenth-century translators in England did not explicitly define or defend theories of translation; instead of searching for statements, therefore, modern readers must deduce precepts from the metaphors translators included in their prefaces, dedicatory letters, and marginalia. Translators spoke of putting jewels in new cases, of digesting a text, dressing it in new clothes, or teaching it to speak English.

Often, more digging is required to understand the theory behind the metaphor. As Massimiliano Morini has argued in his book *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, translators who used the same language to describe their work often understood the idea of translation very differently, and these understandings evolved throughout the sixteenth century. For example, the metaphor of dressing a text in new clothes is pervasive from medieval times up through the seventeenth century, but the meaning of the body that was

---

[162] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 1-35.

being preserved and the value of the old and new clothes changed significantly. For translators in the medieval tradition, the new clothes of the vernacular were plain and shabby compared to the rich robes of classical languages, and they saw the body of the text as the "sense" or the "sentence," which represented the wisdom, life, and value of the original. This essence of the original was not strictly tied to its specific wording. Morini observes that, in the manuscript culture of the Middle Ages,

> Medieval translators might have no clue as to the provenance of a text, the borders between text and non-text (commentary, notes, apocrypha), and its paternity; furthermore, they could have had blurred, damaged, or incomplete manuscripts at their disposal, which they would have to fill up themselves in translation.[163]

To apply this observation to the metaphor of clothing, we could say that, for the medieval translator, the original text itself was not a clearly defined body. The fuzzy borders of the manuscript, the lack of a governing author, and gaps in the text meant that the "sense" they tried to dress in new language was not the meaning of each word and sentence, but the spirit of an amorphous original. The lack of a sharply delineated source gave translators license to cut or add material more freely than later authors.

Thus, in medieval translations, the original text was often treated as a storehouse of stories from which translators freely added and subtracted material. Medieval translators added commentary, expanded or eliminated incidents, and changed plots, characters, and descriptions to meet their needs. These were all part of the outward attire of the texts, and could be changed without harming the body of the original sense. Translators often apologized for the poverty of their vernacular, but did not express regret for departing from the literal meaning of the original. Chaucer's transformed versions of

---

[163] Massimiliano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2006), 6.

Boccaccio's tales, Malory's casual treatment of "the French book," and the heavily moralized *Ovide Moralise* all exemplify the medieval approach.

On the other hand, medieval translators treated scriptural and philosophic texts much more reverently. Their respect for the ancient secular and religious authorities meant that some texts could only be expounded and not freely rewritten. Indeed, the Bible itself could not be translated at all, for, as Jerome said "in the case of the holy scriptures, where even the syntax contains a mystery."[164] For the books of scripture, no new clothing was conceivable, for fear that the new garments would injure holy bodies of these texts.

Thus, medieval translation practice became split between texts they treated reverently and texts they rewrote freely. Ancient authors like Aristotle were considered close to scripture in their inviolability, but storytellers from Ovid to Boccaccio were mined for content to rewrite. As Rita Copeland has written, medieval translational practice "defines its ideological relationship with antiquity in terms of continuity or of an organic and inevitable lineage."[165] The close connection ensured a level of reverence and respect for the ancient authors. Copeland rightly points out that "in the interests of such continuity, medieval [translation and] criticism cannot propose to outdo and supplant the revered *auctores*."[166]

For an example of this tradition, consider John Lydgate, probably the most prolific and one of the last of England's medieval translators. Lydgate lived at a time of

---

[164] Qtd. in Massimiliano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2006), 31.

[165] Rita Copeland *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 106.

[166] Ibid.

great controversy about the first major English translation of the Bible, started by Wycliffe and completed by John Purvey and others when Lydgate was a young man. However, Lydgate never translated any part of the Bible himself, following the longstanding tradition of avoiding biblical translation that gained the force of law in 1401. Instead, he loosely translated and greatly expanded stories from neo-Latin sources like Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum Illustrim*. Even when Lydgate referred to his texts as translations, he expresses no regrets for his transformations of the original.

For example, when writing about his revisions to Guido delle Colonne's *Historia destructionis Troiae*, Lydgate writes that he will simply skip describing the pagan rites of the Trojans:

> That in sothenesse if I should not lette,
> To tell all the rytes and the gyse,
> That there were made in theyr paynim wise,
> And the costes of his buryinge,
> It should be all to longe a taryinge,
> Ceryously theron to abyde.
> Wherfore as nowe I let ouerslyde,
> Their paynim rites supersticious.[167]

The fifteenth-century Lydgate is free to simply skip over anything he did not feel was necessary without any anxiety. Indeed, in his prologue, Lydgate writes as though he is composing instead of translating, invoking Mars and Calliope to help him in his song long before he mentions the text's original author.[168]

In contrast to the medieval feeling of freedom, sixteenth-century translators were forced to confront texts in fundamentally new ways. Several factors contributed to this shift in sensibility. Early humanists like Petrarch invented the idea of a dark age between

---

[167] John Lydgate, *The ancient historie and only trewe and syncere cronicle of the warres betweixte the Gecians and the Troyans* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1555), X6v.

[168] Ibid. A6v.

the glories of the ancients and the rebirth of learning they hoped to spark. Humanists recovered and corrected new texts, always striving to reconstruct the original in its purity. This striving after perfect texts combined with the later invention of the printing press helped establish the idea of authorship and the book as an organic whole instead of a piece of the tapestry of a shared culture and provided a clear distinction. Finally, the Protestant Reformation made the English feel that they should break with the ancient and universal customs of Christendom and find a new foundation in the texts of the Bible, which were outside of the classical tradition.[169]

Many of these forces of cultural change converge in *A Medicinable Moral*, in a way which crystalizes a moment of flux in Tudor translation theory and practice. When Drant writes that he has “changed and much altered his words…but not his sentence,” he is expressing a medieval attitude. However, when he writes that he has treated Horace like a captured woman, he is expressing the new, Protestant dynamic of competition and rejection.

3.2 Conquest: Real and Imagined

To put Drant’s aggressive treatment of Horace in historical context, it is useful to consider the political and religious wars and upheavals that swirled around and swept through England in the Tudor period. The English were developing a national identity largely by defining themselves against outside groups as Henry VIII broke with Rome, the Protestants broke with the Christian tradition, and Elizabeth I broke the alliance with Spain.

---

[169] See Massimiliano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2006), Chapter 1.

In the years preceding Drant's translation, real cases of invasion, conquest, and slavery filled the pages pouring out of the printing houses. Many English writers envied the oversea empires that Spain and Portugal were securing, and wrote about importing and translating foreign texts as a first step for England to achieve similar success. For example, in 1555, Richard Eden translated Peter Martyr d'Anghiera's *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India*, and billed his text as a kind of how-to manual for English adventurers. On his title page, Eden writes that he translated the text so that "…the diligent reader may…learne many secreates touchynge the lande, the sea, and the starres, very necessarie to be knowen to al such as shal attempte any nauigations, or otherwise haue delite to beholde the strange and woonderfull woorkes of God and nature."[170] Part of this imagined project of conquest would be the enslavement of the native populations, which Eden justifies as being a kind of favor to the indigenous peoples.[171]

In addition to dreaming of conquering territory, there were many English writers who used the rhetoric of slavery and conquest to warn that the Catholic Church or the continental kingdoms might dominate England if its people were not wary. John Bale wrote that the corrupt church of Rome had "ofte changed [i.e., usurped] the great monarchie of the Romyshe emppre, from the Romanes to the Grekes, from the Grekes to the french men, from the frenche men to the Germanes, and now wolde they translate it from the Germans to the Spannyerdes. They haue in a maner, made all the christen

---

[170] Richard Eden, *The decades of the newe worlde or west India…Wrytten in the Latine tounge by Peter Martyr of Angleria* (London: Guihelmi Powell, 1555), A1r.

[171] "Theyr bondage is suche as is much rather to be desired then theyr former libertie…[for] the Spaniardes as the mynisters of grace and libertie, browght vnto these newe gentyles the victorie of Chrystes death wherby they beinge subdued with the worldely sworde, are nowe made free from the bondage of Sathans tyrannie…." Ibid., B4v.

prynces their captiue slaues til now of late yeares."[172] He warned England to stay true to Protestantism so that England could stay free from political domination by the Catholic Church or their puppet states.

As this passage from Bale demonstrates, the rhetorics of translation and conquest were often mixed. Bale uses "translate" in the broader sense, meaning to carry something across from one place to another, and he was possibly writing a dark parody of *translatio imperii*, the doctrine that God had favored empires in succession, from Greece, to Rome, to France, to Germany. Instead of this succession of blessed kingdoms, Bale imagines a lineage of *imperii* plagued by Catholic machinations. Other Protestant authors used the related idea of *translatio studii* to argue that England could be the next great center of learning as wisdom spread from east to west.

Thomas Elyot encouraged his countrymen in *The boke named the Gouernour* to push forward the work of *translatio studii* through linguistic conquest. He wrote,

> that lyke as the Romanes translated the wisedome of Grecia in to their citie…we may, if we liste, bringe the lernynges and wisedomes of them both in to this realme of Englande, by the translation of their warkes; sens lyke entreprise hath ben taken by frenche men, Italions, and Germanes, to our no litle reproche for our negligence and slouth.[173]

He argues that the best way to transport the wisdom of Greece and Rome is to make English translations of their works, and he chides the English for doing less of this conquest than the other European nations.

Later, the other great schoolmaster of the Renaissance, Roger Ascham, similarly

---

[172] John Bale *The apology of Iohan Bale agaynste a ranke papyst anuswering both hym and hys doctours, that neyther their vowes nor yet their priesthode areof the Gospell, but of Antichrist* (London: John Day, 1550), CXLII.

[173] Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the Gouernour* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537), 48.

encouraged translation, praising "Chauser, Th. Norton…my Lord of Surrey, M. Wiat, Th. Phaer, and other Gentlemen, in translating Ovide, Palingenius, and Seneca." Ascham hoped that the English would capture foreign wisdom without ever leaving their island. He wrote that Hobby's translation "doth trimlie teache [when] aduisedlie read, and diligentlie folowed, [so well that] but one yeare at home in England, would do a yong ientleman more good, I wisse, then three yeares trauell abrode spent in Italie. And I meruell this booke, is no more read in the Court, than it is, seying it is so well translated into English by a worthie Ientleman Syr Th. Hobbie."[174] Ascham praises Hobby for bringing the riches of Italian wisdom into the English court almost as if he had brought back Italian booty to share after a successful raid on Rome.

However, Ascham complains that these conquerors of foreign wisdom had failed to import proper poetic forms like quantitative verse into English.

> …we Englishmen likewise would acknowledge and understand rightfully our rude beggarly ryming, brought first into Italie by Gothes and Hunnes, whan all good verses and all good learning to, were destroyd by them: and after caryed into France and Germanie: and at last recyved into England by men of excellent wit in deede, but of small learning, and lesse judement in that behalf.[175]

In Ascham's judgement, even stylistic choices like verse form were political, and it is clear that while Ascham wanted England to ransack ancient and modern wisdom through translation, he still idealized the Latin civilization and wanted England to be under the sway of the rule of Roman eloquence. He wanted to make English poetry more Roman instead of the other way around.

Thomas Drant followed the advice of educators like Elyot and Ascham by

---

[174] Roger Ascham, *The scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teaching children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong* (London: John Daye, 1570), 20.

[175] Ibid., 60.

translating Horace's *Satires* into English to enrich the language with the wisdom of Rome, but he refused to submit English to Roman style as we have already seen in his preface. Drant also echoed John Bale's words when he added his voice to the Protestants warning against Catholic infiltration, as we will see in his radical rewriting of Horace's fifth satire.

3.3 Drant's Captive Horace

In his promise to "english thinges not accordyng to the vain of the Latin proprietie, but of our own vulgar tongue," Drant commits to shun Latinate diction and syntax, and his translations are thoroughly domesticating, full of monosyllables, alliteration, and the idioms of Tudor England.

Indeed, writing that he has "mollyfied his [Horace's] hardnes," Drant imagines the role of a translator as a protector of his native language from foreign influence and violence. Other translators similarly worried that a source text could damage English if it was not thoroughly domesticated in diction, syntax, and idiom. In 1556, Nicholas Grimald wrote in a preface to his translation of Cicero that "if it [the translation] be uttered with ynkhorn termes, & not with usuall words: or if it be phrased with wrested, or farrefetched fourmes of speche: not fine, but harsh, not easye, but harde, not natural, but violent it shall seeme to be."[176] Drant was willing to do violence to Horace to prevent Horace doing violence to him. As we shall see, Drant makes good on his promise by translating the *Satires* into English with nativist diction, syntax, and poetic form.

After stripping Horace of his "vanitie" as the Israelites stripped their captive

[176] Nicholas Grimald, *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bokes of duties to Marcus his sonne, turned out of latine into English* (London: Tomas Este, 1600), CC6r.

women, Drant promises to present the *Satires* "all in their new Englyshe liuerey." In the body of the translations, Drant follows these precepts. Confining our survey to only the first poem in the collection, Satire 1.1, we find a wealth of examples of this domestication. Drant expands Horace's "*agricolam*" to "The chubbyshe gnof that toyles and moyles / and delueth in the downe."[177] When Horace writes of a little ant retiring to her den "*simul inversum contristat Aquarius annum*" (As soon as Aquarius turns the year gloomy), Drant baptizes the ant and elevates her to the gentry:

> Then Ladye Pismyer stirrs no where
>   shees claspde in closset deepe.
> Shee keepes her Chrystenmasse in caue
>   and there they make bone cheare.[178]

Finally, in the Latin text, Horace asks, "*quid iuvat inmensum te argenti pondus et auri / furtim defossa timidum deponere terra?*" (What pleasure is it for you, trembling to deposit an immense weight of silver and gold in the earth dug up by stealth?). Drant transforms the question into something a Protestant preacher might say, complete with a condemnation of idolatry and an English proverb about the Devil dancing in an empty pocket:

> What vayles it the[y] so quakinglye
>   to grubbe and grip the moulde,
> And there in hucker mucker hyde
>   thy Idalle God thy goulde?
> If that thou spende and sparple it
>   no dodkin wyll abyde:
> The deuille may daunce in crosslesse purse
>   when coyne hathe tooke his tyde.[179]

In addition to domesticating the diction, idioms, and rhythms of the Latin

---

[177] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, B2v.
[178] Ibid., B3r.
[179] Ibid.

throughout his translation, as we have seen, Drant more drastically alters his source material in his translations of the second and fifth satires from Book 1.

The original Satire 1.2 begins with a series of short, comic examples of men who went to extremes in their appetites, spending, or dress. We hear of the singer Tigellius who was so profligate that "The guild of girl flute-players, the quacks who sell drugs, / The beggars, the jesters, the actresses, all of that tribe / Are sad: they grieve,"[180] their loss of patronage. Horace contrasts this character with the greedy miser Fufidius who charges high rates of interest even to his friends and will not part with his coins even for his own comfort. We then meet a trio of extremists, Maltinus with an over-long coat, the sweet-smelling Rufillus, and the odiferous Gargonius. Horace sum up these cases with the sentence "*nil medium est*" (line 27): there is no mean.

Horace's pronouncement sets up his main topic—that men need to find a mean between extremes in sexual matters. Rather than chasing after married women or frequenting the brothels, men should satisfy themselves with any available partner to avoid causing a scandal. Horace's Epicurean dismissal of sexual morality apparently offended the clergyman Drant enough that he cuts out lines 28-134 from his translation and replaces them with 38 lines warning against following the latest fashions in clothing.

Drant exerts his control over Horace not only to remove the offensive material, but also to replace it with his own contemporary commentary. Drant does not mark his departure from the original in the text, but moves seamlessly from translation to addition. The way Drant treats Horace in this section parallels the metaphors in his preface. Drant

[180] A. S. Kline, "Horace: the Satires Book I Satire II," *Poetry in Translation,* http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/HoraceSatiresBkISatII.htm (Accessed April 2017).

has shorn off, pared back, and “wiped away” part of the text which he deemed “vanitie,” and so thoroughly domesticated the text that he can ventriloquize Horace to rail against German styles of beards and the “vestures” of “Those curiouse croustinge courtly dames.”[181]

In his new interpolated ending to the poem, Drant echoes his metaphor of the enslaved woman from the preface, railing against

> Fashions, in nottynge of the heare,
> in parynge of the nayles,
> In Otho, and mustacho beardes,
> thus fashions neuer fayles.[182]

Here, instead of imagining a beautiful woman stripped of her clothes and hair, Drant seems to worry that the English are making themselves slaves to fashion. Both men and women have been changing their hair and nails willingly to conform to the styles of vanity. It is significant that Drant mostly argues against foreign fashions, showing that he does not want the English to suffer this kind of foreign invasion and domination from the continental cultures. Drant calls fashions “noorses of pryde, and follye,” and it is easy to imagine him wanting to shave off the knotted hair and those mustacho beards to wipe away all vanity from his compatriots. Only after this erasure of foreign trappings would they be ready for sanctification as true citizens of the English commonwealth.

In all of his pronouncements against fashion, Drant does not follow Horace and advocate for a mean between extremes, but instead points to the Christian dualism of body and soul, the inner and outer man.

---

[181] The word “croustinge” is apparently a nonce word as it does not exist in the *OED* and brings up no other hits in an EEBO search. The sense seems to be related to women being encrusted with jewels or other decoration, which Drant thought immodest.

[182] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, D1r.

> Noe outward things doth better vs,
> no not our noble kynde:
> Not pearles, or golde: but pearlesse giftes
> be praysed in Godlye mynde.[183]

Thus, Drant not only changes Horace's subject from sexual to sartorial matters, but also simplifies the message from advocating balance to rejecting vice. In his 2000 article "Thomas Drant's Rewritting of Horace," Neel Mukherjee points out this flattening out of Horace in Drant's work: "While Horace's 'aurea mediocritas' is in constant, dynamic dialectics with everything around it, Drant's translation forecloses any possibility of movement and accommodation by its intolerant overtones. Horace has yielded to Horatianism."[184]

Drant is even more polemical in his translation of Satire 1.5, which he completely replaces with his own poem. Drant acknowledges that he has dismissed the original in the title, calling it "THE FIFTE SATIRE, whiche the Poet had written of his iorneying to and fro, wholye altered by the translator." The original text, historically known as the "Iter Brundisium" tells the story of the poet's journey to Brundisium in the company of Virgil, Maecenas, and others as part of an embassy between Mark Antony and Octavian in 38 BC. Horace's Latin text is chatty, humorous, and light, focusing on the poor quality of the inns the travelers stayed in and relating their friendly banter. Drant begins his "wholye altered" version of the poem by dismissing the value of Horace's gossipy tale before launching into his dialogue into the serious issue of the Vestiarian controversy concerning the wearing of the white surplice. Before moving into this controversy, Drant writes

---

[183] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, B5r.

[184] Neel Mukherjee, "Thomas Drant's Rewriting of Horace," *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 40, no. 1 (2000): 1-20.

> Frende Horace thoughe you maye me vse
>   as to translate your verse,
> Yet your exployte I do refues,
>   at this tyme to reherse.
> Not euery tricke, nor euery toye,
>   that floweth from your braine,
> Are incident into my pen,
>   nor worthie of my paine.[185]

Even though Drant imagines Horace in the subject position "using" him to translate his verse, it is clear that Drant feels free to refuse to translate and even to disparage Horace's words as unworthy of the effort of translation. Addressing Horace directly, Drant acknowledges that he has an obligation to his author, but an obligation he refuses to fulfill. Drant's language here feels flippant, perhaps mirroring the tone of Horace's original, but it is not the medieval casualness that let Lydgate simply "overslyde" material without referencing his author, Guido delle Colonne. Indeed, Horace was closer to the *auctores* that medieval translators revered than their contemporaries they freely rewrote. Furthermore, by calling his poem "the fifth satire" instead of giving it its own title outside of the numbering of Horace's book, Drant acknowledges that he is dealing with a unified whole, a text that forms a complete body. This conception of a book as a distinct entity is a legacy of the humanist recovery, correction, and publication of classical texts, and contrasts the fuzzy boundaries between text and paratext that were prevalent in the medieval period. Drant here tacitly concedes that a translator should know his text and move through it piece by piece, but he seems to justify his choice to dismember that body of text to promote his Christian values.

The content of Drant's "wholye altered" fifth satire is a conversation between two Catholics who are trying to destroy the English church. One speaker, called Commodus,

[185] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, D7v.

is trying to destabilize the church from within by pretending to be the most zealous Protestant, railing against vestiges of superstition like the clergy's white surplice. By making a mountain out of this molehill, Commodus hopes to sow contention and weaken the church to the point that the English will give up on the project of reform and return to the Roman faith. The message to Drant's contemporaries is clear: let us not play into the hands of foreign agents by bickering amongst ourselves. This satire becomes another echo of Drant's nationalistic rhetoric advocating the conquest of others and avoiding being dominated by them.[186]

3.4 Drant's Deference to Jeremiah

It is clear from these examples that, in practice, just as in his famous metaphor, Drant treats Horace as a captive, subjected to his own whims. However, in the second half of his book, Drant's translation of the *Book of Lamentations*, the relationship between source and translation is nearly reversed. Instead of making Jeremiah a slave whose hair can be shorn and whose words can be "much altered," Drant imagines himself mastered by the biblical writer. He places himself in a subservient position, as a translator who needed to stay faithful to his original author. He writes that he has been careful to preserve the purity of the text: "That thou mightiest have this ruful parcel of scripture, pure and sincere, not swarved or altered: I laid it to the toughstone, the native tongue, I waied it with the *Chaldie Targum*, and the *Septuaginta*."[187] By comparing the oldest versions of the *Book of Lamentations*, Drant claims to be able to deliver a translation

---

[186] See Neel Mukherjee, "Thomas Drant's Rewriting of Horace," *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 40, no. 1 (2000): 1-20.

[187] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, D7v.

"not…altered" even though it has changed languages. We may even call this the promise of a "slavish" translation.

In contrast to his comments about preserving the English language from the pressures of Latin in his translation of Horace, Drant writes that Jeremiah's Hebrew has even exerted violence against the language of his translation. He claims that he "desired to iumpe so nigh with the Hebrue, that it doth ere while deforme the vayn of the english: the proprieties of that language, & ours, being in some speches so muche dissemblable."[188] Drant promises a literal translation, full of Hebraisms because his version will be ruled by the language of the original. This is a far cry from "I have altered much his words…but not his purpose."

Indeed, this focus on reproducing the linguistic and rhetorical qualities of the original is clearly the progeny of humanist theories about texts and translations. Morini traces the origin of this doctrine of translation to Leonardo Bruni, whose 1426 treatise *De interpretation recta* states that "the translator must understand the virtues, as it were, of the original composition and reproduce them correspondingly in his tongue…the best translator will turn his whole mind, heart, and will to his original author, and in a sense transform him[self], considering how he may express the shape, attitude and stance of his speech, and all his lines and colors."[189] Bruni's emphasis on attention to the figures of speech, the rhythms, sounds, and structures of the original distinguish his approach from the medieval tradition of preserving only the vague "sense" or "spirit" of the original.

However, Bruni was writing about secular translation, and reproducing the effects

---

[188] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, G6r.

[189] Qtd. in Massimiliano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2006), 9-10.

of the great Greek orators. It would have been unthinkable for him to apply such a rhetorical understanding to scripture or write that a translator could “transform himself” into the original author. Even such a faithful rendering as Drant promises in his preface would have been unthinkable in England before King Henry VIII’s break with Rome and subsequent licensure of the vernacular Bible. Medieval translators and their early Tudor successors would not have dared to render an entire book of the Bible in the vernacular, much less in verse. However, after the Protestant Reformation, translators did bring their humanist training to bear on biblical texts. Drant’s claim that he referenced the original languages of the Old Testament is also clearly part of the humanist philological tradition. Reading the Bible and preaching in the vernacular were still contested issues in the 1560s when Drant chose to translate *The Book of Lamentations*.

In his preaching, Drant repeatedly attacked the Latin liturgy and the vulgate Bible. In a sermon preached in 1570, he criticized priests who spoke a liturgy in a language they did not even know. As Peter Medine has written, “One of [Drant’s] principal charges…is against the obscurantism of the Roman rite: ‘ye chant ye wot not what, ye pray ye wot not what, ye prattle ye wot not what.’ Citing Jerome's view that ignorance of Scripture is the ignorance of Christ, he dismisses as corrupt Latin editions of the Bible issuing from Louvain.”[190] Later in the sermon, Drant inveighs against those who would “mumble up much quantitie of Psalmes in a couert toung” equating Latin with a secret language of sin. In a sermon published in 1572, he offers the vernacular Bible as the proper source of

---

[190] Peter E. Medine, "Thomas Drant," in *Sixteenth-Century British Nondramatic Writers: Third Series*, ed. David A. Richardson (Detroit: Gale, 1996), accessed July 25, 2017, http://byui.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://go.galegroup.com.byui.idm.oclc.org/ps/i.do?p=LitRC&sw=w&u=byuidaho&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CH1200002743&asid=915664e00b252b1767396f4ac3008233.

powerful rhetoric: "Nay, let him perfectly and with judgment read the works of Moses, of Job, of David, of Solomon, of Isaiah, of Micah.... For by the faithful and close imitation of these men is gotten a true and godly kind of eloquence."

However, even though Drant's preface to *Lamentations* promises the kind of "faithful and close imitation" that he preached about, Drant does not follow the Hebrew text as literally as he says he will. Although he refrains from interpolating his own material, Drant does not alter his prosody or syntax to conform to the Hebrew. Not only does he impose rhyme and meter on the Hebrew verse, but Drant also fails to make any significant concessions to the Hebrew word order or sonic effects. In fact, he ignores the most remarkable feature of the poetry of *Lamentations*—that four of the five chapters are alphabetic acrostics with the first letter in each verse corresponding to a letter in the Hebrew alphabet. Instead of following this pattern, Drant's poetic style in the translations of *Lamentations* is virtually identical to the couplets of his translation of Horace, marked by frequent alliteration, a heavy caesura after the first distich, and clear endstops. His engagement with Hebrew seems limited mostly to spellings like "Jehoudah" for "Judah," and "Tsyon" for "Zion."

Moreover, even though Drant was educated at Cambridge where Hebrew was taught, he seems to have taken his notes on the Hebrew from the glosses in the Geneva Bible rather than the original text. For example, consider this passage from the first chapter juxtaposed with Drant's poem.

HOwe sytts the Citie desolate, so populous a place? The ladye of so many landes,	1. How doeth the citie remaine solitarie that was ful of people? She is as a widow: and nacions and princesse among the

becumde in wydowes case.	provinces is made tributarie.
The Princes of the prouinces,	2. She wepeth continually in the night, &
her tribute nowe muste paye,	her teares runne downe by her chekes:
Full sore wepte she, full sore wepte she,	among all her lovers, she hathe none to
all nyght her longe decaye.	comfort her: all her friends have delt
Alongst her cheekes, the furrowyng	unfaithfully with her, & are her enemies.
teares,	3. Judah is caryed away captive, because
from watrishe eyes dyd rayne:	of affliction, and because of great
Of all her louers, nowe not one,	servitude: she dwelleth among the
to comforte her in payne,	heathen, & findeth no rest: all her
Her frendes thynke muche to visite her,	persecuters toke her in the streites. 4. The
her frendes are turnde to foes,	ways of Zion lament, because no man
Jehoudah, captiue ledde away	cometh to the solemne feasts: all her gates
a captiue for the woes.	are desolate: her Priests sigh: her virgins
And slauerie she brought men to)	are discomfited, and she is in heaviness.
she takes no kynde of reste:	Her adversaries are the chief, and her
Mongste pagans, where she makes her	enemies prosper: for the Lord hathe
bode,	afflicted her, for the multitude of her
with foes she is oppreste.	transgressions, & her children are gone
The stretes of Syon mourne and wayle,	into captivitie before the enemie.[192]
because there nowe is none,	

[192] Lamentations 1:1-4. GNV

That cums and goes to see their feast, as heretofore haue gone.[191]	

The language of Drant's poem closely follows that of the Geneva translation, and some of Drant's content seems to come from the glosses in the Bible. The note next to verse 4 in the Geneva Bible reads, "As they used to come up with myrth and joy," explaining why it would be so depressing for the citizens of Jerusalem to see no one coming up to solemn feasts. This note appears to be the source for Drant's phrase "as heretofore haue gone," a phrase without a direct analogue in the Hebrew text.

Not only does this passage show how Drant borrows from the Geneva Bible's notes, but its content and imagery mirrors Drant's metaphor of translation as enslavement. Describing a real conquest, Jeremiah personifies Jerusalem as a widowed woman who is carried away captive and forced to dwell among a strange new people.

Perhaps Drant did not think it ironic to trumpet his enslavement of Horace in the same book where he relates lamentations for a conquered city. Or perhaps he justified his conquest of Horace as warranted because of the Roman poet's real vanity or defects. Indeed, in appealing to Deuteronomy 21, Drant imagines Horace as a lawful captive, someone whom God delivered into his hands just as the Israelites had a right to enslave and marry captive women because God had commanded them to recapture the promised land of Canaan. Even in the book of *Lamentations*, Jeremiah does not claim that Jerusalem's defeat and enslavement was unjust. On the contrary, the Israelites deserved punishment because of their wickedness, even if that retribution seemed tragically

---

[191] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, B1v.

disproportionate to their crimes.

The text of *Lamentations* explains that Israel's fall was a result of their sins, and the first description of their offence comes in the passage we have just read. In verse 3, the Geneva Bible tells us "Judah is caryed away captive, because of affliction, and because of great servitude." Affliction and servitude do not seem to be reasons for punishment and seem awkward paired with the word "because." The Hebrew preposition here can be transliterated as "mê," and occurs with both "affliction" and "great servitude" in the original text. It has several meanings and can be translated as "because," "under," "after," and "away from." Modern translations of the Bible like the New American Standard Bible eliminate the word "because," translating the verses as "Judah has gone into exile under affliction And under harsh servitude."[193]

However, after choosing to translate the preposition as "because," the editors of the Geneva Bible have a different approach explain the reasoning of this verse. They write in a marginal note that Israel's punishment is "For her crueltie toward the poore and oppression of servants." In other words, the Geneva Bible shows the poetic justice of God's punishment—the Israelites were cruel to servants and thus are forced into cruel slavery. Drant seems to follow this note, writing that Judah has become "a captive for the woes / and slavery she brought men to." For the crime of enslaving others, Israel became a captive.

Perhaps this explains why Drant can compare Horace to an enslaved woman in the same book in which he translates the "rueful" story of the captured women of the chosen people. If Israel was punished for cruelty towards their own servants, perhaps the

[193] Lamentations 1:4 NASB.

Romans should be punished for being harsh taskmasters. And who had the Romans conquered? The Jews and the English.

3.5 Roman Conquerors Conquered

Of course, the Roman Empire did not exist when Jeremiah lamented for the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem, but Rome's later domination of the Jews was clearly on Drant's mind as he wrote *A Medicinable Morall*. In the headnote to his translation of *Lamentations*, Drant makes a curious mistake writing that "The argument tend[s] moste to the ruine of the cite, as it was destroyed by Uespatian and Titus Romaynes, and theyr souldiours." Drant seems to confuse the 586 BC Babylonian sack that Jeremiah lamented with the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 led by Vespasian and his son Titus.

Considering the breadth and depth of Drant's knowledge of the Bible, not to mention his claims to have referenced the "the *Chaldic Targum*, & the *Septuaginta*" in his translation, it is odd that he would get his chronology so wrong.

Possibly Drant did not make an error, but deliberately chose to treat Jeremiah's words as prophecy instead of history. Drant was apparently thinking not in chronological time, but in typological time, where the lament for Jerusalem applies equally to the Babylonian siege, the Roman destruction, and the future battle of Armageddon. It is traditional to read *Lamentations* as a warning against sin, but when Drant connects the *Lamentations* with the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, he is also bringing a historical event not narrated in the Bible into typological time.

By shifting the signification of *Lamentations* in time, Drant opens up the hermeneutic possibilities. To understand Protestant interpretations of the Babylonian

captivity, we turn to Johann Carion, an important Protestant millenialist regarded by some as a prophet.[194] In his *Three Bokes of Cronicles*, Carion summarized and extracted morals from the stories of history, beginning with the creation of Adam and Eve. His descriptions of the stories of the first and second destructions of Jerusalem are similar. In both cases, he wants his readers to beware of sin, lest the same calamities come upon them.

Concerning the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC, Carion wrote,

> the citie of Ierusalem was destroied, the temple that God caused to be buylded, was burnt, the best of the people of the Iewes, was caried awaye to Babylon into bondage, [therefore] this example ought [to] earnestly admonyshe vs, that God wyl not spare other kyngdomes and princes, but that he wyll greueously punyshe synne, seynge he hath vsed so greate rigour agaynst this kyngdome, the whiche he hym selfe dyd set vp.[195]

Writing of the Roman sack of Jerusalem in AD 70, Carion remarks,

> And it is aboue all thynges to be ouerloked in this hystorye, that yf God vsed no mercy towarde thys people in punyshynge them for their wyckednesse, whome he called hys peculiar people, whyche also was come of so holy fathers: He shall muche lesse spare the Heythen. And God in threatenynge thys, declareth also in the same example the shewe of mercy and Godly beneuolence: namely, that we do not doubt that after that the Iewysh kyngdom is ouerthrowen, we that are Gentyls, are truely the chosen people and Gods chyldren, yf we do truly beleue in Christe.[196]

At the end of this second passage, Carion explicitly compares the plight of the Jews to that of the Christians, who have become the chosen people by virtue of their faith in Christ.

Drant similarly compares England to Jerusalem as he prefaces his text, and asks

---

[194] See Robin Barnes, "Reforming Time," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Protestant Reformations*, ed. Ulinka Rublack (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 77-78.

[195] Johannes Carion, *The thre bokes of cronicles, whyche Iohn Carion (a man syngularly well sene in the mathematycall sciences) gathered wyth great diligence of the beste authors…Gathered by Iohn Funcke of Nurenborough* (1550), xix.

[196] Ibid., xcij.

his countrymen to remember that God's "hande, that hath destroyed the greater, [Jerusalem] can easily confound the lesse [England]." If England is the New Jerusalem, then perhaps an English conquest of a Roman text could serve as a proxy for a Jewish victory over their Roman conquerors.

Or perhaps Drant was treating the Roman Horace badly in revenge for the Roman occupation of England centuries before. Sean Keilen, in his book *Vulgar Eloquence,* writes that Tudor scholars had begun to discount the story that their nation had been founded by Brutus in the early days of the Roman nation. Keilen writes,

> …Reformation antiquaries discovered that the traces of a Roman presence in early Britain told a story that differed sharply from the celebratory legends of Geoffrey of Monmouth: a story in which a foreign empire conquered Britain, enslaved its population, and occupied it as a colony for nearly half a millennium…. [W]hen history obliged English poets to regard themselves as the victims of the Roman Conquest, rather than the rightful heirs of classical Latin culture, it also required them to redefine their long acquaintance with Roman literature in a radical way.[197]

Thomas Drant is an early example of a Tudor translator radically redefining the traditional relationship with a classical text, but he was not the only one to call for harsh treatment of the Roman conquerors. Philemon Holland in the preface to his 1601 version of Pliny the Elder writes that the English should "endeavor by all means to triumph now over the Romans in subduing their literature under the dent of the English pen, in requital of the conquest sometime over this Island, atchieved by the edge of their sword." This kind of rhetoric became more common towards the end of the sixteenth century, when authors in English developed more confidence in the value of the vernacular. Drant's

---

[197] Sean Keilen, *Vulgar Eloquence: On the Renaissance Invention of English Literature* (London: Yale University Press, 2006), 2. Keilen goes on to argue that English writers found a new beginning on which to build in the Mediterranean myths that predated the Roman Empire, but I would argue that Drant's work shows how poets created a new foundation for English literature in the texts of the Bible.

metaphor of enslavement is clearly a version of this theme, and may have been prompted by the content of his work centering on the conquest of Jerusalem.

Many English writers connected England with Israel, and the Jeremiad became a genre unto itself. In 1558, an anonymous author published a treatise titled *The Lamentation of England*, which warned against "dyssemblyng bysshoppes, and clergy who…go about to betraye this noble realm of England, in to the hands off the prince of spain…which if it come to passe, this noble and fre contre shalbe brought in to most vyle bondage, and slauery, the which I besech allmychty god to defende yff it be his holy wyll and pleasure."[198] We see from the fifth Satire that Drant was worried that foreign Catholic infiltrators might overthrow the English church and make England subservient to the Pope. Perhaps Drant's aggression towards Horace was another way of attacking Rome.

The important reformer Hough Latimer explicitly warned England to avoid bringing God's wrath upon themselves as the Israelites had done.

> GOD…visited the Israelites by his prophets, but because they wold not heare his Prophetes, he visited them the second tyme, and dispersed them in Assiria and Babilon. Iohn Baptist likewise and our Sauiour Christ visited them, afterward declaring to them Goddes will: and because they despysed these vysitours, he destroyed Hierusalem by Titus and Uespasianus… We haue now a fyrst visitation in England, let vs beware of the second. We haue the minisiracion of his worde, we are yet well, but the house is not cleane swept yet. [199]

Drant's book *A Medicinable Moral* is similarly intended as a warning to the people of England to hold fast to true religion and keep themselves from God's wrath.

In the end, despite all his connections to statements of English independence,

---

[198] Anonymous, "The Lamentation of England" (London: 1558), 2.

[199] Hough Latimer, *The seconde [seventh] sermon of Maister Hughe Latimer which he preached before the Kynges Maiestie* (London: 1549), I2v.

Drant is not only content with mastering Horace; he also wants to control his reader. Drant places the reader in the position of a slave who has lost his own will when it comes to reading *Lamentations*. With regard to Horace, Drant writes that "thou maist reade a prophane writer, if thee lyste, and yf he be prophane, thou mayst chuse thee." However, in contrast "towardes the diuine writer, there is no dispence or franchise, but if he be diuine, thou oughtest to reade hym, neither canst thou chuse thee."[200]

Perhaps this rhetoric of conquest and submission is inevitable for translators. Rita Copeland has written, "As a necessarily interlingual project [translation] is predicated on cultural difference, on the recognition of cultural and linguistic disjunction…[t]ranslation can scarcely be theorized without reference to conquest as a component of rivalry, or aggressive supremacy."[201] Indeed, the Romans themselves provide the foundation for this rhetoric of competition. It is therefore in some ways fitting that Drant would treat Roman literature the same way that the Romans treated Greek culture. Seneca the Elder wrote of this competition, arguing that "Roman oratory has to set alongside or even above the haughty Greeks."[202] Copeland cites Horace as providing one of the key statements of the Roman rhetoric of conquering through translation. that "The replicative principles of translation are not founded on a dream of patriarchal continuity or evolutionary progress, but on a historical agenda of conquest and supremacy through submission, or in Horace's famous words, "*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio*"

---

[200] Thomas Drant, *A medicinable morall*, B1v.

[201] Rita Copeland, "The Fortunes of 'non verbum pro verbo': Or Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," in *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages,* ed. Roger Ellis (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 15-35.

[202] Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae,* trans. Michael Winterbottom (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1978), 7.

(Captive Greece captured her savage victor and brought arts to rustic Latium).[203]

However, Copeland's reading of this passage seems to miss Horace's affectionate tone towards Greece and the irony he sees in the way the Greek culture prevailed even when Greek armies were defeated. The year after Drant's *Medicinable Morall*, he published a translation of these same lines from Horace's *Ars Poetica*, but he misses the paradox in Horace's Latin. Drant translated this as "The conquerd Greece, her victor Rome / with poems did delyte, / And brought artes into Italie, / a realme unciuil quyte." Here he makes the subjected nation merely entertain her captor, missing the irony of *capta…victorem cepit*. Drant again fails to engage with Horace's "dynamic dialectics," and flattens out Horace's account into one of simple domination of one country by another.

However, as we have seen through his engagement with *The Book of Jeremiah*, Drant could pass F. Scott Fitzgerald's famous test of a first-rate intelligence, for he had "the ability to hold two opposed ideas in mind at the same time and still retain the ability to function." Indeed, Drant's *Medicinable Morall* embodies numerous opposed ideas while still functioning rhetorically as a multipronged warning against sin. Drant's prefaces and practice represent competing theories of translation, and the book as a whole is a microcosm of lingering medieval attitudes, humanist theory, the doctrines of scriptural translation, and Renaissance antipathy towards the Romans who had conquered them so long ago. The complex set of hierarchies that Drant imagines could have only come from the culture of his time as translators rejected the rhetoric of continuity with the classical past and found a new foundation for themselves in the vernacular Bible.

---

[203] Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 31.

CHAPTER 4

USEFUL ENEMIES AND UNLIKELY WITNESSES: HUTCHINSON'S *DE RERUM NATURA* AS A SOURCE FOR *ORDER AND DISORDER*

Lucy Hutchinson, the Puritan noblewoman, was the first author to translate all six books of Lucretius' materialist epic, *De rerum natura* into English. Clearly, translating such a long and difficult poem required great effort and deep engagement. We would normally expect a translation project of this magnitude to be a labor of love for the translator, especially for a gentlewoman like Hutchinson who was busy raising ten children and had no financial incentive to publish her translation. A translator's preface full of praise for the work and its ancient author, along with exhortations for careful reading and understanding is what we anticipate finding.[204]

But if we are looking for these things in Hutchinson's preface to her translation, we would be sorely disappointed. Instead, Hutchinson appends a dedicatory letter in her own hand to her relative Lord Anglesey to act as a preface for the fair hand copy she presented to him. In the letter, Hutchinson condemns her own translation, writing that she lacked "good fortune to choose a worthy subject," and had "translated it only out of

[204] Indeed, as Ada Palmer points out in her important book *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance*, each manuscript and print edition of *De rerum natura* was prefaced by an apologetic biography or list of quotations from highly esteemed ancient authors recommending Lucretius' work.

youthfull curiositie, to understand things I heard so much discourse of at second hand."[205]

Interested in the conversations she overheard about philosophy, Hutchinson translated Lucretius, but claims she "did not employ any serious studie in" the project, "for I turned it into English in a roome where my children practizd the severall qualities they were taught, with their Tutors, & I numbred the sillables of my translation by the threds of the canvas I wroght in, & set them downe with a pen & inke that stood by me."[206] In the idealized domestic imagery of this explanation, Hutchinson presents herself engaged in the female art of needlework while "superficially" jotting down her translation, painting herself as such a bad poet that she needed the aid of the canvas to count up the ten syllables of each line of her iambic pentameter couplets. Almost as if she was a student working on a Latin translation lesson, Hutchinson places herself with her children and their tutors in the schoolroom of the house. Even though already an adult, Hutchinson casts these efforts as youthful misadventures, and writes that as she later reflected on Lucretius' teachings and compared them with the truths taught in the Bible, she came to feel "all the contempt that is due upon [her] author,"[207] and to "abhor[e] all the Atheismes & impieties"[208] of her translation. She warns readers, "let none, that aspire to eternall happiness, gaze too long, or too fixedly on that Monster [of error]…least he draw infection in att his eies…."[209]

In contrast to this warning, Hutchinson lauds the content of her other major poetic

---

[205] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Dedication: "To the Right Honorable Arthur Earle of Anglesey Lord Keeper of His Majesties Privie Seal & One of His Majesties Most Honorable Privie Councell" (hereafter "Dedication"), Lines 37-38.

[206] "Dedication," Lines 43-47.

[207] "Dedication," Line 52.

[208] "Dedication," Line 36.

[209] "Dedication," lines 190-194.

work, an epic retelling of the *Book of Genesis* titled *Order and Disorder: Or the World Made and Undone Being Meditations upon the Creation and the Fall; As it is recorded in the beginning of Genesis*. In the preface to *Order and Disorder*, she writes that her poem has benefited her and could also help her reader: "If any one…be as much affected and stirr'd up in the reading, as I have been in the writing, to admire the glories and excellencies of our great Creator…it will be a success above my hopes."[210] She alludes to her earlier translation in the preface to *Order and Disorder*, expressing regret that "the vain curiosity of youth had drawn me to consider and translate the account some old poets and philosophers give of the original of things,"[211] clearly a reference to Lucretius' book on the nature of things. She states that *Order and Disorder* began as a personal project to "reclaim a busy roving thought from wandering in the pernicious and perplexed maze of human inventions."[212] Writing this biblical poem gave her "recourse to the fountain of Truth, to wash out all ugly wild impressions, and fortify my mind with a strong antidote against all the poison of human wit and wisdom that I had been dabbling withal."[213] It was her comparison of the shallow wisdom of the world with the supernatural knowledge of God that helped her come to "disdain the wisdom fools so much admire themselves for"[214] and she warns her readers to follow her example or else they will risk "hug[ging] their philosophical clouds" and losing the "true and living God."[215]

---

[210] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder*, ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), "Preface" (Hereafter "Preface), 4.
[211] "Preface," 3.
[212] Ibid.
[213] Ibid.
[214] Ibid.
[215] Ibid.

Taken together, these two prefaces comprise a kind of spiritual autobiography for Hutchinson. Her journey from ignorance to knowledge, from pride and ambition to mature humility, in short her conversion from sin to grace, hinges on her rejection of Lucretius and all authors "not yet translated from darkness into light by supernatural illumination."[216] By eschewing secular philosophy, Hutchinson claims she has reformed herself and been converted to truth through the revealed word of God.

Several prominent critics have agreed with Hutchinson's narrative. At first glance, the order of Hutchinson's major poetic works suggests a prototypical Christian narrative of sin and repentance. Hutchinson's journey from Lucretius to Genesis seems to follow this familiar storyline. Reid Barbour has called *Order and Disorder* "penance for the Lucretius," and David Norbrook writes that the biblical epic was "penitence" for her earlier translation."[217] Stephen Greenblatt writes that Hutchinson only "reluctantly sent her translation to Anglesey" and might have destroyed it if it had not been for her "principled opposition to censorship" or because it was "strangely difficult to destroy" due to her connection to the manuscript forged during the writing process in the room with her children's tutors.[218] Greenblatt paints a picture of a conflicted Hutchinson who might not know why she cannot discard a poem she found to be so dangerous.

However, why would she have undertaken the expense of having a scribe produce a manuscript of the first five books while writing out the sixth book and 186 marginal notes in her own hand if she was so reluctant to send her translation in the first place?

[216] "Dedication," lines 72-73.

[217] Reid Barbour, introduction to *Order and Disorder*, by Lucy Hutchinson, ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), xviii.

[218] Stephen Greenblatt, *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2011), 259-260.

Why would she have closed her letter to Anglesey with "I leaue it [the dedication] in your booke…for any novice who by chance might prie into it" if she had not imagined a larger audience than her noble kinsman?

The truth of Hutchinson's relationship to Lucretius is more complicated and more interesting than the story she tells us in the two prefaces. Instead of regretting and feeling guilty about her translation, as the terms "penance" and "penitence" imply, I argue that she was proud of her accomplishment, and left evidence of her victory over Lucretius strewn throughout *Order and Disorder*.

Instead of being a worthless detour on her road to truth, I argue that Hutchinson believed her path through Lucretius' words and doctrines was a useful, and even necessary, stage in her journey to grace. Lucretius plays a key role in Hutchinson's creation of her own story as a Christian and as an author. Although she casts him as an enemy, he is a useful enemy, a foe to overcome in order to prove her Christian valor. Both her translation of *De rerum natura* and *Order and Disorder* are records of her struggle with Lucretius and the way she gains victory over him by appropriating and subverting his poetry and doctrines.

The traces of this conflict mark the pages of both of her poetic works. By showing her readers her battle with Lucretius, she presents herself as a "true wayfaring Christian," one "that can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better."[219]

However, as I sketched the story of Lucy Hutchinson's engagement with

---

[219] See John Milton, *Selected Prose,* ed. C. A. Patrides. (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 213: "I cannot praise a fugitive and cloister'd vertue, unexercis'd & unbreath'd, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortall garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat."

Lucretius, I discovered another role that the Roman materialist played in her poetry and in her self-fashioning as an author. She uses him as an ally in her struggle against other doctrinal foes in the debates about Christian doctrine that were raging throughout the seventeenth century. Lucretius thus becomes an unlikely witness, a doctrinal opponent whose admission of certain points carries more weight than the testimony of a friend because it is so unexpected. Hutchinson uses Lucretius' ideas and echoes his words on the most unlikely topic—the nature of divinity—to help her establish the truth of her Calvinist understanding of the character of God against seventeenth-century doctrinal opponents.

This chapter will explore how Hutchinson strategically uses images and ideas from Lucretius in *Order and Disorder*. First I will examine her subversion of Lucretian images of lightning in Canto 5 of *Order and Disorder*, demonstrating how Hutchinson left evidence of her victory over Lucretius. Next, I will look at how she echoes Lucretius' key descriptions of the gods in her own vision of the Trinity, and how Lucretius becomes an unlikely witness for the *deus absconditus* doctrine, the Calvinist idea that God is hidden and unknowable by the human mind and inaccessible to the powers of reason.

4.1 Lightning and Useful Enemies

In the fifth canto of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson dramatizes the aftermath of the Fall of Adam and Eve. God descends and renders his judgements, cursing Adam and Eve so sorely that they both fall into despair before comforting each other with the promise of salvation. Throughout Canto 5, Hutchinson uses the imagery of lightning as a

metaphor for God's judgements cast down from heaven. After decreeing that Eve will be ruled by her husband and have pain in childbirth, and that Adam will live by the sweat of his brow, the narrator explains the purposes behind these judgments.

> In all these Sentences we strangely find
> Gods admirable love to lost mankind;
> Who though he never will his word recal,
> Or let his threats like shafts at randome fall,
> Yet can his Wisdome order curses so
> That blessings may out of their bowels flow.[220]

Here the narrator acts as an interpreter, finding surprising meanings in a text that seem contrary to the sense of the words of the curse. This hidden meaning assures us that God still loves humankind, and that his judgements are not random, like shafts of lightning falling haphazardly. The syntax of the poetry here mirrors the careful ordering which the narrator ascribes to God's wisdom. After the semicolon, we read a relative pronoun (who) followed by a subordinating conjunction (though) followed by two coordinating conjunctions (or, yet) before we finally get to the main subject "Wisdom," and it takes one more line to reach the promised "blessings." The whole convoluted sentence stretches over six lines, yet is grammatically sound and easily understandable if we have patience to read to the end.

Hutchinson repeats the image of lightning when Adam exhorts Eve not to despair and wish for death.

> Doth Heaven frown? Above the sullen shrouds
> God sits, and sees through all the blackest clouds
> Sin casts about us, like the misty night,
> Which hide his pleasing glances from our sight,
> Nor only sees, but darts on us his beams
> Ministring comfort in our worst extreams.

---

[220] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder*, ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), Canto 5, lines 193-198.

> When lightnings flie, dire storm and thunder roars,
> He guides the shafts, the serene calm restores...
> He still new good from every evil brings.[221]

The counter-intuitive blessings God has hidden in his curses are expressed in the imagery of this passage, where Adam contrasts apparent darkness and storm with unseen light and calm. Adam starts by equating God with the sky by using the common metonym "Heaven" and personifying Heaven as frowning. Eve has been taking this figure too literally and has thought that God is angry because the sky is dark. However, in the next lines, Adam shows the folly of confusing the natural world with God himself.

Hutchinson uses enjambment and symmetrical, balanced clauses to show this contrast in the form of her lines. Instead of her usual strong endstops, her sentences surprise the reader with what lies beyond the line breaks. This mirrors the experience of Eve, who cannot see what God is doing above the clouds until Adam reveals it. "Doth Heaven frown? Above the sullen shrouds / God sits, and sees through all the blackest clouds / Sin casts about us, like the misty night…." The surprise of finding God sitting above the clouds, which were equated with His face in the first half of the line, is emphasized by the spondee of "God sits" and the strong caesura after that first foot of the line. This effect is repeated in the next line, when instead of an endstop after "clouds," we discover the phrase running over the break and learn that the dark clouds we thought were God's face do not emanate from him at all, but are spread about by Sin.

After writing that God can see us and send his beams to us even when all seems dark, Hutchinson presents the more dramatic image of a storm. In the neatly balanced couplet of lines 517-518 ("When lightnings flie, dire storm and thunder roars, / He guides

---

[221] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder*, ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), Canto 5, lines 511-530.

the shafts, the serene calm restores"), she divides each line into two halves which present parallel clauses contrasting the wild flight of lightning with the image of God guiding its shafts and the roar of thunder with the calm that God brings after the storm. Again, the main point is that we can find hidden meaning in apparently negative signs, and blessings can come from curses.

Finally, in the last verse paragraph of the canto, which served as the conclusion for the version of the poem she published anonymously in 1579, Hutchinson returns once again to images of lightning.

> With these most certain truths let's wind up all,
> Whatever doth to mortal men befall
> Not casual is, like shafts at randome shot,
> But Providence distributes every lot,
> In which th' obedient and the meak rejoyce,
> Above their own preferring Gods wise choice:
> Nor is his providence less good than wise,
> Tho' our gross sense pierce not its mysteries.[222]

Here, for the third time in the canto, Hutchinson contrasts the randomness of lightning shafts with God's providential ordering of the things that happen in our lives. Once more, Hutchinson plays with the syntax of the lines to have the reader discover God's grace after some initial confusion. The reader might reasonably expect the phrase "Above their own…" to come before a noun, and the word "preferring" seems to supply such a noun, which we could take to mean "preference" or "preferment." The sense of "preferment" or "advancement" fits with the idea of rejoicing in the lot we have been given instead of ambitiously seeking for more. However, when we read "God's wise choice," we understand that "preferring" was a verb, and the adjective "own" pairs with

[222] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder*, ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), Canto 5, lines 674-680.

"God's" in modifying the word "choice." Just as only the obedient and meek can see the hand of Providence in events like thunderbolts, only patient readers can make sense of these final lines.

When Hutchinson repeats these images of lightning, we may assume that she is simply borrowing biblical motifs to dramatize the orthodox Christian belief that God's hand upholds nature and guides human history. However, it is notable that each time she refers to lightning, it is in the context of possible human misinterpretations, in instances where God's meaning is "strangely" found. Why would she feel the need to refute the idea that lightning bolts, and by extension God's acts, are not merely random events? After all, a lightning strike has traditionally been seen as an act of God. Even Lucretius' fellow Epicurean, the poet Horace, wrote that a thunderclap from a clear sky made him rethink his course after being "parcus deorum cultor et infrequens"(Sparing and but perfunctory in my devotions).[223] Who would argue instead that thunderbolts are shot at random?

A clue lies in the citation next to line 517. The biblical verses she cites from Job, Chapter 37 describe thunder as "the noise of [God's] voice, and the sound that goeth out of his mouth."[224] The verses also describe God's purposes in sending storms: "Also by watering he wearieth the thick cloud: he scattereth his bright cloud: And it is turned round about by his counsels: that they may do whatsoever he commandeth them upon the face of the world in the earth. He causeth it to come, whether for correction, or for his land, or for mercy." In other words, God controls the weather to punish or bless his

---

[223] Horace, *Odes* 1.34. trans. David Ferry (New York: Macmillan, 1998). Even today, insurance policies sometimes categorize fires caused by lightning strikes as uncovered "acts of God."

[224] Job 37:4 GNV.

people, even if it is hard for mortals to understand his designs. This is the case of Job, a righteous man whose sheep were destroyed by "fire…from the heaven" and whose children were killed by "a great wind."[225] The verses Hutchinson cites in the margin of *Order and Disorder* about thunder come one chapter before God speaks "out of the whirlwind" to rebuke Job and his interlocutors for complaining about his injustice in punishing Job.[226]

However, although Job and his friends argue about why God has punished him, they do not entertain the idea that Job's misfortune was the result of chance. Hutchinson's source for the idea of "shafts at random shot" is not biblical, but classical. Reading *Order and Disorder* side by side with Hutchinson's translation of *De rerum natura* makes this clear. Lightning was one of Lucretius' favorite images. He used it as a metonym for the random actions of nature, and employed lightning strikes as a limit case for testing Epicureans' lack of fear of the gods.

In the first book of *De rerum natura*, Lucretius introduces Epicurus as a hero who stood up for truth against the superstitious errors of his day.

> When humane life on earth was much distrest,
> With burth'nsome superstition sore opprest,
> Who from the starry regions shewd her head,
> And with fierce looks poore morals menaced,
> A Greeke it was that first durst lift his eies
> Against her, and oppose her tirannies;
> Whose courage neither heav'ns loud threatnings quelld,
> Nor tales of Gods, nor thunder bolts repelld,[227]

Lucretius imagines Epicurus physically lifting his eyes up against the personified monster

[225] Job 1:16-19 GNV.
[226] Job 38:1 GNV.
[227] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Book 1 Lines 61-68.

of superstition in order to introduce his teachings in the most dramatic way possible. The sound of thunder and the flash of lightning bolts are figured as the quintessential weapons which the gods might use against impious mortals, yet Epicurus did not lose heart.

In Book 2, Lucretius explains why Epicurus did not need to fear a lightning strike of retribution for his impiety: even though the gods do exist, they are unconcerned with human actions, and would be unable to control the vast operations of the weather even if they did care about rewarding and punishing mortals. Therefore, the drama of Book 1 is somewhat ironic because Epicurus did not have to be brave to defy the thunder bolts of heaven as he knew that there was no one there to resent his defiance. This is far from God who "guides the shafts" in *Order and Disorder*.

Hutchinson takes the opportunity to accentuate Lucretius' impiety in her translation. Late in Book 2, Lucretius describes the enormity of the universe and asks a series of rhetorical questions about who could possibly control everything. Lucretius ridicules the idea of the gods using the elements to reward or punish mankind, because their lightning strikes often hit their own shrines and miss the guilty, who escape storms unscathed. In her translation of this passage, Hutchinson turns Lucretius' general questions into specific challenges against the sovereignty of the Christian God by echoing biblical language. In *Order and Disorder*, she refutes Lucretius' "impious" doctrines. Here is the Latin original followed by Hutchinson's translation, with Cyril Bailey's prose translation in a footnote.

> *Quae bene cognita si teneas, natura videtur*
> *libera continuo, dominis privata superbis,*
> *ipsa sua per se sponte omnia dis agere expers.*
> *nam pro sancta deum tranquilla pectora pace*
> *quae placidum degunt aevom vitamque serenam,*
> *quis regere immensi summam, quis habere profundi*

> *indu manu validas potis est moderanter habenas,*
> *quis pariter caelos omnis convertere et omnis*
> *ignibus aetheriis terras suffire feracis,*
> *omnibus inve locis esse omni tempore praesto,*
> *nubibus ut tenebras faciat caelique serena*
> *concutiat sonitu, tum fulmina mittat et aedis*
> *saepe suas disturbet et in deserta recedens*
> *saeviat exercens telum, quod saepe nocentes*
> *praeterit exanimatque indignos inque merentes* [228]

Hutchinson's translation:

> Nature, if this you rightly vnderstand,
> Will thus appeare free from the proud command
> Of soveraigne power, who of her owne accord
> Doth all things act, subiected to no lord.
> The Gods doe in eternall calmnesse rest
> Their holy liues with quiet pleasures blest.
> What power allmightie, sitting at the helme
> Can guide the reins of such a boundlesse realme?
> What God can turne heavens orbes, and feed those fires
> With the thick vapors fruitful earth expires?
> Whose presence can at once fill every place?
> Who can with black mists darken heavens face,
> And shake the clouds with thunders lowd report
> With dreadfull lightnings trouble his own court,
> Whence the disturbed God in rage retires,
> And darts at morals his consuming fires,
> Which, oft ill aym'd the innocent destroy
> While wicked men their guilty lives enjoy?[229]

Hutchinson departs from a literal translation at several points to emphasize Lucretius'

---

[228] "And if you learn this surely, and cling to it, nature is seen, free at once, and quit of her proud rulers, doing all things of her own accord alone, without control of gods. For by the holy hearts of the gods, which in their tranquil peace pass placid years, and a life of calm, who can avail to rule the whole sum of the boundless, who to hold in his guiding hand the mighty reins of the deep, who to turn round all firmaments at once, and warm all fruitful lands with heavenly fires, or to be at all times present in all places, so as to make darkness with clouds, and shake the calm tracts of heaven with thunder, and then shoot thunderbolts, and often make havoc of his own temples, or moving away into deserts rage furiously there, plying the bolt, which often passes by the guilty and does to death the innocent and undeserving?" *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, ed. and trans. Cyril Bailey, rev. edn. 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949).

[229] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Book 2, lines 1118-1125.

blasphemy. Instead of writing that Nature is "quit of her proud rulers…without control of the gods," she writes that Nature is free from "soveraigne power…subjected to no lord." While the editors of the 2012 edition of Hutchinson's translation see a political resonance in Hutchinson's choice of "lord" for "*dominis*,"[230] I would argue that Hutchinson would have naturally followed the plural dative form of the Latin "*dominis*" and "*dis,*" and chosen "lords" if she were alluding to earthly rulers. However, by making "*dominis*" into a singular "lord," she seems to be anticipating the Christian God, the Lord of Nature.

Indeed, a few lines down from "lord," Hutchinson transforms Lucretius' "*quis*" meaning "who" into "What power allmightie" turning Lucretius' general question into a blasphemous challenge to the Christian God's omnipotence. Lucretius' next repetition of "*quis*" becomes "What God," and the question "*quis…omnibus inve locis esse omni tempore praesto,*" (who can be in all places at all times?) becomes a challenge to the Christian God's omnipresence: "Whose presence can at once fill every place?" Hutchinson phrases the rhetorical questions so that the obvious answer for the Christian reader would be "God can" instead of the answer "no one can" that Lucretius clearly anticipated.

Finally, Lucretius returns to images of lightning in Book 6. He argues that people are likely to worry superstitiously that storms are caused by the gods, and explains that the movement of atoms explains the true origins of these phenomena. Hutchinson summarizes this passage by writing that Lucretius, "with his vsuall Atheisme…seekes to fortifie his friend against any impression of the terror of God that might arise from thunders or any wonderous worke of God in heaven or earth." Again equating Lucretius'

---

[230] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 577.

denial of active providence with atheism, Hutchinson makes him sound like an enemy of the Christian God, using the phrase "wondrous work of God" from Job 37:14 but has no analogue in *De rerum natura*.

As we have seen, when Hutchinson borrows images of lightning from *De rerum natura* to use in *Order and Disorder*, she transforms them from the epitome of randomness to the symbol of God's mysterious, yet Providential, ordering of the universe. In the imagery of her biblical epic, Lucretius plays the role of a useful enemy, an opponent to correct and defeat gloriously, just as he did in her prefaces.

Stephen Greenblatt famously described the utility of such an "other" in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning.* He writes that "[s]elf-fashioning is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile. This threatening Other—heretic, savage, witch, adulteress, traitor, Antichrist—must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed."[231] In order to establish truth against the backdrop of Lucretius' error, she reinvents him as a heretic, an Antichrist, and a bewitched fool, and argues that reading him is an effective warning against "the insufficiency of humane reason" and the misery it produces.[232] Greenblatt writes that "One cannot preach Christ without preaching Antichrist; one cannot achieve an identity without rejecting an identity,"[233] and this is the narrative that Hutchinson enacts in her prefaces. Of her translation project, she acknowledges that she "reaped some profit by it, for it shewd me that sencelesse superstitions drive carnall reason into Atheisme."[234] In other words, Lucretius taught her

---

[231] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning, and Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 9.

[232] "Dedication," line 167.

[233] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning, and Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 159.

[234] "Dedication," lines 151-153

a valuable lesson, not by leading her part way down the paths of truth, but by warning her to turn back from the path of error, which ends in atheism and despair.

4.2 A Warning Against "carnall reason"

When Hutchinson writes that she benefited from translating *De rerum natura* primarily by seeing the stark consequences of following human reason, she is engaging with a major controversy in Christian thought. Ever since the second-century apologist Tertullian claimed that reason was antithetical to faith, boasting "I believe because it is absurd" (*credo quia absurdum est*), some Christian thinkers have discounted the value of philosophy and written against the power of the human mind to discover truth. This tradition was powerfully revived in the Reformation by Martin Luther and Jean Calvin, who argued against free will and expressed skepticism about human knowledge and reason. As theological historian Jason E. Vickers writes, "In an effort to ensure that salvation would remain wholly a matter of divine grace and mercy, Luther and Calvin had made the absolute transcendence of God and the epistemic poverty of human being with regard to the knowledge of God and of salvation touchstones of Protestant theology."[235] Thus Protestantism in general and Calvinism in particular taught that fallen humans could not understand the ways of God through their own reason or the evidence of nature. Unless God revealed himself through supernatural grace, he remained completely hidden from the world. This concept of the "*deus absconditus*" or "hidden God" was a key idea that grew out of the doctrines of predestination and total depravity.

Hutchinson follows Calvin's teaching closely when she rejects Lucretian

---

[235] Jason E. Vickers, *Invocation and Assent: The Making and Remaking of Trinitarian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 40-41.

doctrines in her prefaces. She writes that her translation can be useful because Christians "may vsefully be permitted to consider the productions of degenerate nature, as they represent to vs the deplorable wretchednesse of all mankind, who are not translated from darknesse to light by supernaturall illumination."[236] Without being born again through the grace of God, Lucretius was doomed to suffer the consequences of his own degenerate nature and live a life of error and wretchedness. Speaking of all secular philosophers, Hutchinson writes that "This is the best account I can giue of the best of them, [they] toyld themselues in vaine to search out Truth, but wandred in a Maze of Error, & could neuer discover her by Natures dimne candle, which proud only an Ignis fatui to lead them into quagmires & precipices."[237]

Even if Hutchinson included Lucretius among the best of the philosophers, she could not have expected him to find truth through his own efforts. The light he followed was the deceptive will-o'-the-wisp of fallen nature, and his instruments of sight were defective. For Hutchinson's Christian readers, Lucretius' doctrines about the mortality of the soul, the absence of providence, and the foolishness of religion were so obviously wrong that Hutchinson could use the Roman poet's conclusions to attack his method of inquiry, which was to use reason and observation to dispel superstition and establish the truths of Epicurus.

Hutchinson may have felt increased urgency to make Lucretius a watchword against relying on human reason because of the debates about epistemology that pitted Puritans against Anglicans in the seventeenth century.

As chronicled in Vickers' *Invocation and Assent*, the debate about reason arose as

---

[236] "Dedication," lines 69-73.
[237] "Dedication," lines 79-83.

Anglicans sought to justify doctrines in the face of Catholic criticism. As Anglicans turned to scripture to establish their points, their Catholic opponents were equally quick to cite verses to prove them wrong. Catholics pointed to the authority of the Pope and the weight of the church and its ancient traditions to establish their reading of scripture, and asked by what standard Protestants could definitively interpret the Bible. In Vickers' summary, "Luther, in responding to this question, appealed to the conscience of the individual believer…Calvin took another route: he developed and used his famous doctrine of the inner witness of the Holy Spirit. According to this doctrine, the Holy Spirit confirms in the mind and heart of each individual that Scripture is the Word of God." However, both of these solutions, "as Catholic theologians never tired of painting out, [were] arbitrary, if not question-begging."[238]

As a new defense against the contention that Protestant doctrines lacked any real grounds, Archbishop William Laud and others emphasized the role of reason in properly understanding the Bible. Transubstantiation, for example, was patently false because it was not clearly taught in scripture and defied logic, with bread and wine becoming flesh and blood without changing in appearance, and the body of Christ multiplying to thousands of pounds of communion wafers each year. Laud contended that the Bible was sufficiently clear and human reason sufficiently enlightened to guide any honest seeker to the truth.[239]

---

[238] Jason E. Vickers*, Invocation and Assent: The Making and Remaking of Trinitarian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 35.

[239] For example, Laud wrote that "God did not give this admirable faculty of reasoning to the soul of man for any cause more prime that this, to discover…the way to Himself, when and howsoever it should be discovered." In other words, Laud trusted reason enough to believe that it could guide humans to understand the most important truths. Laud believed that the human mind could follow the many "probable arguments, both from the light of nature itself and human

William Laud's godson William Chillingworth extended the defense of reason as a rule of faith sufficient to guide Christians to the saving truths of the Bible. In *The Religion of the Protestants*, published in 1638, he wrote,

> [Scripture is] sufficiently perfect and sufficiently intelligible in things necessary, to all that have understanding, whether learned or unlearned…For to say, that… God obliges men, under pain of damnation, not to mistake through error and human frailty, is to make God a tyrant; and to say, that he requires us certainly to attain that end, for the attaining whereof we have no certain means; which is to say, that, like Pharaoh, he gives no straw, and requires brick, that he reaps where he sows not; that he gathers where he strews not…that he will not accept of us according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not.[240]

The tyrannous God that Chillingworth describes is clearly a caricature of the Calvinist conception of *deus absconditus*, whose truths are inaccessible through human reason. Instead, Chillingworth argues that God provides humans with all the resources necessary to choose to believe in Christ and be saved.

It is easy to see how Calvinists would feel that Chillingworth's doctrine diminished God and his omnipotence. Instead of being unfathomable, God becomes easy to understand, even without the light of divine revelation through the Holy Spirit. Knowledge of God becomes like any other kind of knowledge, learned through the clear sense of the Bible, the examples of history, and the workings of nature. Furthermore, Calvinists argued that Laud's Arminianism made humans the masters of their own salvation instead of God saving and damning whom he chooses according to his immutable will. Because humans could freely choose to believe the doctrines they

---

testimony," that proved the divinity and right interpretation of the Bible. Laud's confidence in "the light of nature" stands in stark contrast to Hutchinson's metaphor of the "Ignis fatui" which led philosophers "into quagmires and precipices." William Laud, *A Relation of the Conference*…. (London: Richard Badger, 1639), 88-90.

[240] William Chillingworth, *The Religion of the Protestants: a Safe Way to Salvation* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1638), 129-130.

understood in the scriptures, the key acts leading to salvation were entirely in their power to control.

As if these problems were not enough to anger Calvinists like Lucy Hutchinson, Catholics soon began pointing out that a Protestant group had denied the doctrine of the Trinity by following the principles that Laud and Chillingworth supported as a sure rule of faith: the text of the Bible as interpreted by human reason. This group was the Socinians, whose doctrines were becoming better known in England in the mid-seventeenth century. As Vickers writes,

> Catholic theologians insisted that Protestants must, like the Socinians, assess the Trinity on the same grounds on which they had rejected transubstantiation. From the standpoint of Catholic Counter-Reformation propagandists, the conclusion to be drawn was clear. On submitting the Trinity to reason, Protestants would discover they could reject the Trinity along with transubstantiation and join ranks with the Socinians; or they could discard the Protestant rule of faith and return to the Catholic Church, where the Trinity was secure. In short, Protestants would now have to choose between Rome and Rakow [the headquarters of the Socinian Polish Brethren].[241]

One of the earliest supporters of Socinianism in England was John Biddle, an English schoolteacher who was imprisoned by Parliament for his beliefs in 1646. While in prison in 1647, Biddle published *Twelve Arguments drawn out of the Scripture wherein the commonly-received opinion touching the deity of the Holy Spirit is clearly and fully refuted*. In this tract, Biddle uses the language of Biblical literalism and logical reasoning to defend the idea that God is not a Triune being made up of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons of one essence. "I finde my self obliged, both by the principles of Scripture and of Reason, to embrace the opinion I now hold forth" Biddle

[241] Jason E. Vickers, *Invocation and Assent: The Making and Remaking of Trinitarian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 66.

writes, that "The Holy Spirit is distinguished from God" and thus not identical with God.[242] He then answers the orthodox Christian defense of the Trinity:

> Neither let any man here think to flie to that ignorant refuge of making a distinction between the Essence and Person of God…For this wretched distinction…is not onely unheard-of in Scripture, and so to be rejected…but is also disclaimed by Reason.[243]

In his argument against the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Biddle uses the guiding principles of Laud and Chillingworth: that the scriptures clearly contain the truth about the God's attributes, and that we are to understand them through reason. Because the human mind cannot conceive of two persons of one essence without imagining two Gods, then the traditional doctrine of the Trinity cannot be correct.

As we have seen from her dismissal of "carnall reason" in the preface to *De rerum natura*, Lucy Hutchinson was clearly aware of and hostile to the Laudian confidence in the human mind to discover saving truths. She was also probably familiar with the basic tenets of Socinianism by the 1650s when she was translating Lucretius and definitely knowledgeable about them when she published *Order and Disorder* in 1679. Her husband was a Member of Parliament in 1648, when Henry Vane successfully defended Biddle's freedom of conscience in the House of Commons and secured his release on bail. Also in 1648, Parliament passed a law called the "Ordinance for the punishing of Blasphemes and Heresies," which mandated punishment for atheism, Socinianism, and other false teachings.[244]

---

[242] John Biddle, *XII arguments drawn out of the Scripture wherin the commonly-received opinion toughing the deity of the Holy Spirit is clearly and fully refuted* (London: 1647), A8v.
[243] Ibid.
[244] C. A. J. Coady, "The Socinian Connection: Further Thoughts on the Religion of Hobbes" in *Religious Studies* 22, (1986): 277-80. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20006281.

Lucretius gave Hutchinson two weapons to use against the heresies of Socinianism. First, because they relied on reason to discover truth and rejected most mystical explanations, Hutchinson could hold up Lucretius as an example of the errors that following reason produces. As one of the wisest and most fervent advocates for the power of reason to discover truth and guide human affairs, Lucretius makes an excellent limit case for proponents of reason. The fact that even the best logical thinker fell into such errors, she argued, is proof that human reason is hopelessly flawed.

Secondly, Lucretius, despite all his flaws, seemed to Hutchinson to accept a higher and more mysterious conception of divinity than the Socinians, who rejected the Trinity on the basis of its unreasonableness. Thus, as we will see, Hutchinson could shame her contemporary Christians by showing that even a foolish pagan philosopher like Lucretius knew more about the nature of divinity than they did.

In both of these ways, Hutchinson makes Lucretius into an even more useful enemy. We have already seen how she casts him as a foe to overcome, an "Other" against whom to define herself and her authority. Now, we will trace the ways that she ties her contemporaries to Lucretius, effectively "othering" them, and how she uses Lucretius' position as an enemy to use his witness for the Trinity with special claims for credibility.

4.3 Hutchinson Ties Her Doctrinal Enemies to Lucretius

In the preface to *De rerum natura* Hutchinson explicitly links her doctrinal enemies with the errors of pagan philosophy, writing that "all the Heresies that are sprung up in Christian religion, are but the severall foolish & impious inventions of the old contemplatiue Heathen reviud, & brought forth in new dresses." To show that a doctrine

like the Laudian confidence in reason was dangerous, Hutchinson linked that doctrine with Lucretian impiety. Linking competing Christian teachings with Lucretius also protected Hutchinson from criticism that she was introducing dangerous ideas by translating *De rerum natura*: if his doctrines were already revived, she could not be guilty of bringing them back. In fact, Hutchinson's metaphor of old doctrines "reviud, & brought forth in new dresses" recalls common Renaissance tropes about translation as a process of resurrection or re-dressing a foreign text. Hutchinson thus implies that heretical Christians have translated the ideas of *De rerum natura* already, and that seeing the naked text in her translation could help deceived Christians recognize the error of such teachings.

Indeed, Hutchinson wrote that her study of ancient philosophers furnished her with cautionary examples.

> My Philosophers taught me, by their own instance, that unregenerate, unsactified reason makes men more monstrous by their learning, then the most sottish brutish idiots…This gave me a dreadfull prospect of the misery of lapsed nature…I saw the insufficiency of humane reason (how greate an Idoll soeuer it is now become among the gowne-men) to arriue to any pure and simple Truth.[245]

When Hutchinson writes that the "gowne-men," or clergy, had made human reason a great idol, she is clearly referring to the Laudian churchmen who trusted reason to guide faith, and may even be hinting at the Socinians who followed reason to disastrous conclusions.

Hutchinson attacks the clergy for relying on secular learning in their teachings when she writes, "I must say I am not much better satisfied with the other fardel of Philosophers, who in some pulpits are quoted with devine epithetes." Instead of giving

---

[245] "Dedication," lines 157-169.

weight to human reason and drawing authority from ancient philosophers, Hutchinson advocates for the Christians to follow the light of revelation found in the Bible.

In the preface to *Order and Disorder*, she writes that by

> comparing that revelation, God gives of himself and his operations, in his Word, with what the wisest of mankind, who only walk'd in the dim light of corrupted nature and defective Traditions, could with all their industry trace out, or invent; I found it so transcendently excelling all that was humane, so much above our narrow reason, and yet so agreeable to it being rectified, that I disdained the Wisdome fools so much admire themselves for; and as I found I could know nothing but what God taught me, so I resolv'd never to search after any knowledge of him and his productions, but what he himself hath given forth.[246]

Here Hutchinson writes that the Bible reveals a divine nature that is unsearchable by the "narrow reason" of the unregenerate human. God's incomprehensibility is evidence for Hutchinson that he is wondrous and transcendent. Yet Hutchinson follows Calvinist doctrine by writing that this *deus absconditas* can be understood by reason, if that reason has been "rectified" by the grace of God. In other words, God is hidden from natural understanding like that possessed by the "wisest of mankind," but he is knowable by his elect.

For Hutchinson, therefore, it is a sign of God's favor to reject false doctrines like those taught by Lucretius. Thus, her translation itself is a kind of test. If readers follow her in interpreting *De rerum natura* as a warning against sin, they will show themselves to be chosen by God. If, on the other hand, they agree with Lucretius' teachings, or his method of using reason to find truth, they will be guilty by association.

---

[246] "Preface," 3.

4.4 Bitter Medicine and "Poisoning" the Well

In order to show the consequences of Lucretius' errors, Hutchinson attacks his character and finds evidence of his miserable life. By demonstrating his misery, Hutchinson can implicitly criticize the "gowne-men" she linked with him in her introductions. If he suffered a terrible fate in consequence for his sins, perhaps they will as well. Hutchinson makes the case against Lucretius through explicit invective in her letter to Anglesey and in her marginal notes to the translation, undermining his credibility and turning him into a caricature of error.

Ada Palmer, in her important book, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance*, traces the ways early editors packaged the first manuscripts and print editions of *De rerum natura*. In most manuscripts and every print edition before 1600, the first thing readers encountered was a laudatory preface focusing on the biography of Lucretius. Because editors had so few legitimate sources of information on Lucretius' life, these vitae are highly speculative. One of the earliest and most widely cited comments on Lucretius comes from St. Jerome's translation of Eusebius' lost *Chronicon*: "*Lucretius poeta nascitur, qui postea amatorio poculo in fuorem versus, cum aliquot libros per intercalla insaniae conscripsisset, quos postea emendavit Cicero, propria se manu interfecit, anno aetatis quadregesimo tertio*." (Lucretius the poet was born, who was driven mad by a love potion, and having written some books in the intervals of his insanity which Cicero later corrected, killed himself in his forty-fourth year.")

Based on this brief statement and a few other quotations from classical grammarians and poets, editors constructed narratives that defended Lucretius. Cicero's involvement was often cited as an endorsement of Lucretius' moral character; the love

potion was blamed on his foolish wife, who was given the name Lucilia; the madness was reimagined as the divine mania or *furor* of the inspired *vates* or bard; and the suicide was read as a noble escape from a corrupt era in the tradition of Cato.[247]

In the Latin text Hutchinson used for her translation, the editor, Daniel Pareus, grandson of respected Protestant theologian David Pareus, included two laudatory biographies from earlier editors (and rivals) Obertus Gifanius and Denys Lambin. Gifanius portrays Lucretius as a long-suffering sage who had been given the disastrous potion as a young man. In Palmer's translation, Gifanius writes that Lucretius "would have become a great man had he come to a mature age with his wits intact, rather than dying young and entangled in youthful error." In Palmer's judgement,

> This interpretation embellishes Jerome's story with protracted tragedy and is suggestive of the classic scholar's melancholy. Even Jerome's plain *propria se manu interfecit* is turned into a romantic final curtain as long-suffering Lucretius "borne by his own hand, left life as if exiting a theater." This narrative…prompts one to imagine that, had young Lucretius been educated with texts as moral as his own *De rerum natura*, he might have escaped the philter, illness, and errors that destoyed him and lived to produce, instead of a single poem, a corpus to rival those of Ovid and Cicero.[248]

Denys Lambin's biography, by contrast, downplays the poet's madness, refusing to quote Jerome's Eusebius passage on the philter, *furor*, and suicide. Lambin presents these elements as unsubstantiated theories and adds his own from unattributed sources. Thus, "there may not have been a suicide, or a love potion, but if there was, then Lucretius' wife was, like the poet, innocent, and the potion was not the suicide's central

---

[247] See Ada Palmer, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* (London: Harvard University Press, 2014), Chapter 3.

[248] Ibid., 167-168.

motive. Tragic melancholy, lost friendship, and the fallen morals of degenerate Rome were too much for such a noble soul."[249] Lambin also differentiates Lucreius from the Epicurean doctrines he taught, arguing that Lucretius was a wise student of nature who summarized several ancient philosophers including Epicurus in a beautiful poem that attacks superstition but is not atheistic.[250] The reader is safe because Epicurus' foolish doctrines are so obviously false that we must laugh at his madness (*rideamus licet Epicuri deliria*), and will not be persuasive for the Christian reader.[251]

The striking thing about Hutchinson's preface is the way it ignores the plaudits from both Gifanius and Lambin to create an image of Lucretius as a dangerous madman. Perhaps because both biographers read Lucretius' suicide as a noble act of self-sacrifice, Hutchinson never mentions it in her preface or notes. She also does little to separate a wise Lucretius from a foolish Epicurus or to play up Lucretius' attacks on pagan superstition. Hutchinson does not see Lucretius being redeemed by association with such esteemed sages as Cicero, but instead taints the whole world of ancient philosophy by association with Lucretius. On the other hand, despite Lambin's doubts about the stories of the philter and Lucretius' resulting madness, she takes both as matters of fact. Hutchinson writes that he was a "Lunatik"[252] and says that "nothing but his Lunacy can extenuate the crime of his arrogant ignorance."[253] However, rather than giving him an excuse for his offenses against the truth as she implies, when Hutchinson calls Lucretius a lunatic, it only makes him into a more alien and threatening enemy against whom to

---

[249] Ibid., 178.
[250] Ibid., Chapter 4.
[251] Ibid., 185.
[252] "Dedication," line 66.
[253] "Dedication," lines 133-134.

contend. It offers Hutchinson a convenient way to refute his claims about living a happy life or being at peace in the face of death. Hutchinson imaginatively fleshes out Lucretius' madness and finds evidence in the text to prove it.

For example, faced with a missing line in Book 1, Hutchinson blames the defect in her source text on the insanity of its author. "Here is one of the Poets abrupt Hiatus" she writes in the margin, explaining that "he was mad with a Philtrum his wife gaue him and writ this booke but in the intervalls of his phrenzie."[254] Here she follows Gifanius' biography which takes Jerome's account at face value, but ignores Gifanius' sense of tragedy.

By blaming a lacuna in the Latin text on a potion, Hutchinson undermines Lucretius' credibility, and lessens the chance that the reader will be charmed by his spell. Just as she had done with images of lightning, when Hutchinson employs the language of poisons and potions, she is subverting a Lucretian image.

In Book 1, Lucretius conceives of his task as baiting "The verges of the cup with honie" that contains "a bitter potion" so that "While the outward sweetnesse doth their lips invite, / They may receiue their cure with their delight."[255] The sweetness of his poetry will help the reader swallow the difficult but beneficial doctrines of Epicureanism.

However, Hutchinson pictures Lucretius' materialism not as a medicine but as a poison. She imagines her letter condemning Lucretius as "as an antidote against the poison of it, *for any novice who by chance might prie into it*" (my emphasis).[256] Just as Hutchinson's "youthfull curiositie" had led her into a "wanton dalliance with impious

---

[254] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius,* ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 79.

[255] Ibid. Book 1, lines 943-946.

[256] "Dedication," lines 198-199.

books," she worries that a young person might peep into Lucretius and be tempted by his atheism. She contrasts her thorough warning with the danger of "the Encomiums giuen to these Pagan Poets and Philosophers, wherewith Tutors put them into the hands of their pupils, yet unsettled in the Principles of Devine Truth, [which] is one of the greate means of debauching the learned world."[257] The power of this magic potion to produce madness parallels Hutchinson's anxiety about the poison of the poem.[258] However, Hutchinson writes that she is prepared with antidotes, including her letter to Anglesey, her marginal notes, and the gospel truths she teaches in *Order and Disorder*.

Indeed, as we have seen, Hutchinson imagined her biblical poem as a cure for the poison of pagan philosophy. The process of meditation and writing gave her opportunity to "fortify [her] mind with a strong antidote against all the poison of human wit and wisdom." The scriptures and the influence of the Holy Spirit helped her to overcome the toxic doctrines she had studied and translated years earlier.

Hutchinson believed that others could similarly benefit from wrestling with an enemy like Lucretius. In her preface to *De rerum natura*, Hutchinson writes that Lord Anglesey has the "skill to render that which in it selfe is poysonous, many ways useful and medicinall."[259] In contrast to her warnings to vulnerable young scholars, Anglesey is a stand-in for her ideal readers, who will not only be immune to the evil doctrines of Lucretius, but will transform them into something useful. Hutchinson's preface imagines

---

[257] "Dedication," lines 86-90.

[258] Lambin also sought to defuse the fear that Lucretius' sweet poetry would trick readers into accepting Epicurus' false philosophy by quoting Cicero's description of Epicurus' teaching strategy: "if we have a stable knowledge of things, and stick to that model, which is virtually fallen from heaven so we may understand things,…we will never be swayed from sense by anyone's rhetoric" See Ada Palmer, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* (London: Harvard University Press, 2014), 180.

[259] "Dedication," 199-201.

different possible audiences for her work and, for mature readers, conceives of instructive and beneficial ways that the poem could be read. The condemnations of *De rerum natura* in the dedication were meant only for certain types of novice readers, but for her target audience Hutchinson's translation would be useful in refuting false philosophies, both ancient and modern. Even Lucretius' heresies would be instructive in that they teach virtue by contraries, and show the ugly consequences of error.

For Hutchinson, the utility of a book is not so much its contents as the qualities the reader brings to it.[260] She might have found precedent for teaching differently based on the spiritual maturity of the audience in Paul's epistle to the Corinthians where he writes that he fed them "with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it" (1 Cor 3:2). Thus, for unelect readers, even the traditionally inspiring waters of Helicon are treacherous pools where they may "loose their liues, and fill themselves with poison, drowning their spiritts in those pudled waters, and neglecting that healing spring of Truth."[261]

The ambivalent potential of the poem to act as poison or medicine depending on who reads it should inform how we understand Hutchinson's dedication and translation.

[260] This is similar to Milton's argument in *Areopagetica*—that bad books are a test for the faithful. They neither create nor destroy virtue, but only reveal it. Milton writes that even if we "banish all objects of lust, shut up all youth into the severest discipline that can be exercis'd in any heritage, ye cannot make them chaste that came not hither so." In other words, a good Christian cannot be made, or unmade by a book, but can only have their mettle tested by one. Stanley Fish argues that Milton's appeal to the doctrine that "to the pure all things are pure" clashes with his high praise for books as the embodiments of "reason itself…the Image of God, as it were…that ethereall and fift essence…an immortality rather then a life." Fish argues that this discrepancy reveals Milton's goal to disorient the reader in a way that is "salutary, for in the process of being disoriented the reader is provoked to just the kind of labor and exercise that is necessary to the constitution of his or her own virtue." Stanley Fish, *How Milton Works* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 204.

[261] "Dedication," lines 187-189.

Critics like Barbour and Norbrook miss the importance of this distinction. For her, no text is so pure that it is safe from wrong interpretation, or so corrupt that it cannot be put to good use. However, she warns that readers can "wrest and pervert" even "the sacred Scriptures from their genuine meaning,"[262] so it is not surprising that she does not trust most readers with Lucretius.

Focusing on different audiences is also consistent with her published "Preface" to *Order and Disorder*. There she anticipates that her poem will be "obnoxious to the censures of two sorts of people: first those that understand and love the elegancies of poems…and second…[those] who seeing the common and vile abuse of poesy, think Scripture profaned by being descanted on in numbers."[263] She worries about those who would judge her project as either too plainly didactic or too dangerously poetic. Hutchinson's preface to the Lucretius translation seems mostly for the benefit of those severe critics who think even a religious poem would be unworthy.

Hutchinson was not the first translator of Lucretius to address different types of readers in prefatory remarks. She followed the example of John Evelyn, whose 1656 publication of the first book of *De rerum natura* she apparently knew.[264] Evelyn addressed "three sorts of Persons; the *Learned*, the *Ignorant,* the *Scrupulous*,"[265] the latter two categories loosely corresponding to Hutchinson's "novice who by chance might prie into" her text. To the scrupulous reader, Evelyn concedes that "*Lucretius*…be not suddenly understood of all" and admits that among all ancient poets and philosophers

---

[262] "Dedication," lines 97-98.
[263] "Preface," 5.
[264] "Dedication," lines 8-12.
[265] John Evelyn, *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus De rerum natura* (London: Gabriel Bedle), 3.

"there is none exempt of the most gross and absur'd Fictions, apparent Levities, and horrible Impieties imaginable."[266] Notwithstanding these flaws in pagan texts, Evelyn argues that "the best of *Christians* were…capable to derive from them benefits."[267] Even though Hutchinson disparaged Evelyn's enthusiasm for Lucretius,[268] her dedication seems to agree that "the best of Christians" like Anglesey will find something useful in the text.

Evelyn even goes so far as to say that it is easier to find good lessons in *De rerum natura* than bad ones. "[A] Spider [will] swell up his bag with *poyson* onely," he writes, "when with half those pains, he may with the industrious *Bee,* store and furnish his *Hive* with so much wholesome and delicious Honey.[269]" Hutchinson does not agree that the flowers of Lucretius are merely neutral, but she seems to agree that the character of the reader is the most important factor in determining the effects of reading *De rerum natura*. Her translation will reveal the character of her readers, just as her personal wrestling with Lucretius proved her Christian courage.

4.5 "The Uncomfortable shadow of death"

Hutchinson's decisions as a translator and her marginal notes function both as antidotes for immature readers and as examples of the responses of a mature Christian. In other words, when she writes "horribly impious" in the margin, she is protecting a reader

---

[266] Ibid., 8.

[267] Ibid., 8.

[268] "Dedication," lines 8-12. Hutchinson writes that her translation brings her "shame… ('though a masculine Witt hath thought it worth printing his head in a lawrell crowne for the version of one of these books)"

[269] John Evelyn, *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus De rerum natura* (London: Gabriel Bedle), 9.

against conversion to Epicureanism, but she is also proving her own valor in defending orthodoxy and providing an example for others. Along with the personal invective in the preface, Hutchinson uses marginal comments to demonstrate how to conquer Lucretius by turning his arguments against him.

Just as she subverted Lucretius' images of lightning and poison against him and undermined his claims to rationality by calling him mad, Hutchinson targets Lucretius' calm in the face of death to turn another strength into a liability. Although Lucretius' stated goal for his entire project is to persuade his friend Memmius to live a happy life free from irrational fear, Hutchinson tries to show that his philosophy does not cure the fear of death, but produces it. She claims that those who are "alienated from the knowledge of God" live their lives under "the vncomfortable shadow of death."[270] Proving that Lucretius feared death is one of Hutchinson's most difficult tasks since he constantly proclaims his tranquility in life and calm in the face of death.

The clearest examples of Hutchinson's strategy of showing Lucretius' fear of death are found in Book 3. "The subject of this booke," the gloss tells us, is the "strength of reason to expel / That plague of humane life, the feare of hell."[271] In this book, Lucretius argues for the mortality of the soul, and reasons that if our souls dissolve at our death, we are insensitive to any pain or distress after we die. Furthermore, we should not fear this state of nonexistence because no one worries about the similar state that comes before our birth. Towards the end of the book, a passage offends Hutchinson

---

[270] "Dedication," lines 165-166.

[271] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Canto 3 lines 41-42.

enough to interject again in the margin to condemn Lucretius. "How much this poore deluded bewitch mad wretch striues to put out the dimme light of nature which while he contends against he acknowledges."[272] The passage next to this extraordinary string of epithets concerns those who deny the existence of an afterlife, yet still worry about their bodies rotting, burning, or being torn by beasts. Here is the Latin text followed by Hutchinson's translation and a more literal rendering.

> *scire licet non sincerum sonere atque subesse*
> *caecum aliquem cordi stimulum, quamvis neget ipse*
> *credere se quemquam sibi sensum in morte futurum;*
> *non, ut opinor, enim dat quod promittit et unde*
> *nec radicitus e vita se tollit et eicit,*
> *sed facit esse sui quiddam super inscius ipse.*[273]

Hutchinson's text:

> A secret error [which] lurketh in their brests,
> Which, though they contrarie beliefes may feigne,
> Perswades them they some sence in death reteine
> That something beyond humane life extends,
> And a part of them the mortall bound transcends.[274]

A literal translation:

> Know well: he rings not true, and that beneath
> Still works an unseen sting upon his heart,
> However he deny that he believes.
> His shall be aught of feeling after death.
> For he, I fancy, grants not what he says,
> Nor what that presupposes, and he fails
> To pluck himself with all his roots from life
> And cast that self away, quite unawares

[272] Ibid., 205.

[273] *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, ed. and trans. Cyril Bailey, rev. edn. 3 vols. (Oxford, 1949).

[274] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Book 3 Lines 952-954.

Feigning that some remainder's left behind.[275]

Hutchinson accentuates the negative valence of "subesse / caecum aliquem cordi stimulum" by naming what could literally be translated as "beneath / some unseen goad for their hearts" as "A secret error [which] which lurketh in their brests." Calling this pricking an "error" makes Lucretius denounce belief in the afterlife even more directly. Furthermore, these people do not simply "deny" (*neget*) that they believe something remains after death; instead they "contrarie beliefes may feigne." A person may reasonably deny something without realizing it is secretly true, but the language of pretending to believe otherwise introduces the idea of perfidy**.** Feigning to believe in a religious doctrine would have been especially damning for a committed Puritan like Hutchinson who refused to give even pro forma allegiance to creeds she did not believe. Finally, Hutchinson simplifies Lucretius' convoluted syntax, which mirrors the stammering equivocation of the doubting Epicureans he is describing. She makes that belief sound less like the fear that the dead body will feel pain as it is torn by vultures, and more like a belief in the survival of an immortal soul "a part of them [that] the mortal bound transcends."

In her marginal comment, Hutchinson plays up the idea that when Lucretius senses the "secret error," of belief in the afterlife, he is really sensing the universal light of natural truth, which teaches that life extends beyond the grave. Calling the idea that the soul is immortal the "light of nature" instead of "inspiration of the Holy Ghost," "conscience," or even "the light of truth" shows that Hutchinson is reading Lucretius against himself. Throughout the poem, Lucretius praises nature and the benefits of

---

[275] William Ellery Leonard, trans., *T. Lucretius Carus of the Nature of Things, a Metrical Translation* (London: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1916), 124.

learning her secrets. Here Hutchinson claims that far from discerning the secrets of nature, Lucretius has actually bewitched himself into ignoring them. The fact that even the teacher of Epicureanism "acknowledges" that some people cannot escape the feeling that there is an afterlife is further proof of the truth of Christian doctrine.

A few pages later, Hutchinson makes this antithetical reading of Lucretius personal, arguing that he is not only fighting against natural wisdom, but also trying to justify himself from his own horrible fate. "That the plagues of hell are but allegories of the miseries of this life" Hutchinson's marginal gloss summarizes, followed directly by the ad hominem observation that "Many a wicked soule who would ease it selfe with thinking soe will find it otherwise."[276] In this passage, Hutchinson seems to make a caustic joke; that even as we read the translation, the author of *De rerum natura* is currently burning in the real Hell that he argued was only a fable. Because she had linked her doctrinal enemies with Lucretius, this comment could also act as a warning for the Socinians, who did not believe in Hell, but believed that the wicked are annihilated at death.[277]

---

[276] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Page 211.

[277] In *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson returns to the language of *De rerum natura* Book 3 to refute Lucretius more directly. She grants that death is a dissolution of the body into its constituent atoms, but proclaims that God will miraculously gather them together again in the resurrection:

> When men out of the troubled air depart,
> And to their first material dust revert,
> The utmost power that death or woe can have
> Is but to shut us pris'ners in the grave,
> Bruising the flesh, that heel whereon we tread,
> But we shall trample on the serpents head.
> Our scatter'd atoms shall again condense,
> And be again inspir'd with living sense

4.6 Unlikely Witness for the Trinity

Given how stridently Hutchinson attacked Lucretius throughout her poems, and how she cites certain ideas or images like lightning or bitter medicine and subverts them, it would be surprising to see her cite him approvingly. However, in reading both prefaces and *Order and Disorder*, I find Hutchinson engaging with Lucretius in just such a positive manner. This encounter is surprising and has been underexplored by scholars. In the coming pages, I will argue that, far from rejecting all of Lucretius' teachings about the divine nature, Hutchinson latched onto his description of a distant and untroubled divinity and approvingly echoed his words in *Order and Disorder*. She used Lucretius as an "unlikely witness"—an enemy, whose concession of certain points carries special credibility—for a Calvinist understanding of the divine nature against the arguments of the Socinians.

The passage on the nature of divinity that captured Hutchinson's attention is found in the opening lines of Book 1. Coming directly after Lucretius' famous invocation to Venus, these lines act like a recantation of Lucretius' prayer that the goddess bring peace to Rome, because for Epicureans, prayers were worthless and the gods never intervened in mortal affairs. The six-line sentence that describes the true nature of the gods reads like a creed from an Epicurean catechism. Indeed, scholars believe this formulation was Lucretius' translation of a Greek Epicurean maxim. Here is the version from the beginning of Book 1, along with the Loeb translation:

omnis enim per se divum natura necessest *immortali aevo summa cum pace fruatur* *semota ab nostris rebus seiunctaque longe;* *nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,* *ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,* *nec bene promeritis capitur nec tangitur ira.*[278]	"…all the nature of the gods enjoys life everlasting in perfect peace, sundered and separated far away from our world. For free from all grief, free from danger, mighty in its own resources, never lacking aught of us, it is not won by virtuous service nor touched by wrath."

The key points here are the peace of the gods, to which the Epicurean sage aspires, and their distance from humanity. Because they are so far from the human or material world, and because they have no need of anything besides themselves, it would be pointless to worry about pleasing or angering them. All the sacrifices and rituals of religion are meaningless at best and dangerous at worse, as in the sacrifice of Iphigenia, which Lucretius condemns a few lines later.

For many Renaissance readers, this passage describing the gods was the most blasphemous section of the whole poem because it denies that God loves us or cares about our right and wrong behavior. Hutchinson's contemporary and fellow translator of *De rerum natura*, John Evelyn, wrote of this passage, "Be this [Epicurus' theology] our Faith, and farewell all Religion."[279] Even the relatively sympathetic commentator Charleton dubbed this the first of the many "contraprovidential Arguments of the Secretary of Hell, *Epicurus*, whom Lucretius followed into Hell in these very lines."[280]

In the Dedication, Hutchinson similarly condemns the idea that God does not play

[278] *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, ed. and trans. Cyril Bailey, rev. edn. 3 vols. (Oxford, 1949).

[279] Qtd. in Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 473.

[280] Qtd. in Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 473.

an active role in human life. She writes

> ’tis a lamentaion and horror, that in these dayes of the Gospell, Men should be found so presumptuously wicked, to studie and adhere to his [Lucretius’] and his masters [Epicurus’] ridiculous, impious, excrable doctrines, reviving the foppish casuall dance of attoms, and denying the Soveraigne Wisdome of God in the greate Design of the whole Vniverse and eury creature in it, and his eternall Omnipotence, exerting it selfe in the production of all things, according to his most wise and fixed purpose, and his most gratious, euer actiue Providence, vpholding, ordering and governing the whole Creation…[281]

However, in neither Hutchinson’s translation nor in her marginal notes to Book 1 does she emphasize the hellish nature of Lucretius’ statement on the divine nature. The comment in the margin reads simply “A description of the devine Nature.”[282] Absence of evidence of Hutchinson’s disapproval may not be evidence of absence, but Lucretius’ lines on the nature of deity are repeated almost exactly in Book 2 and echoed again in Book 5, and Hutchinson comments both times that the opinion is “impious.” This makes the fact that she refrains from condemning a similar passage here is all the more conspicuous.

We find our first clue as to why Hutchinson might be amenable to Lucretius’ account of the gods from Book 1 in the Argument to that book, where Hutchinson writes in her own voice.

> The Poet Venus invocates and sings
> To Memmius, the original of things
> To Gods vntroubled quiet attributes
> To superstition heinous crimes imputes[283]

This argument does not summarize what the poet actually does; throughout the poem,

---

[281] “Dedication,” lines 135-144.

[282] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 21.

[283] Ibid., 17.

Lucretius teaches that the universe is composed of eternal and indestructible atoms falling and swerving through an infinite void instead of arguing for God as the origin of the universe. The wording of Hutchinson's Argument recalls the doctrine of God as the Unmoved Mover, the First Cause of all things whose "quiet" remains miraculously "untroubled" by the process of creation.

Indeed, in both the Argument and the body of Book 1, Hutchinson chooses terms with positive connotations when rendering Lucretius' statement on the gods. The phrase "Gods untroubled quiet" not only changes Lucretius' plural "*divom*" to a single God, but also reads the divine quiet not as indifference, but as tranquility. Her translation of these lines also render Lucretius sympathetically.

> The devine nature doth it selfe possesse
> In immortallitie, and everlasting peace,
> Remoovd farre off from mortall mens affairs,
> Neither our sorrows, nor our dangers shares,
> Rich in it selfe, of us no want it hath,
> Nor moved with merits, nor disturb'd with wrath.[284]

Hutchinson's version, while staying close to the literal sense of the Latin, transforms the feeling of this description significantly. Hutchinson echoes "immortality" with "everlasting" in a line that recalls the parallelism of many verses of the Bible. Compare, for example, 1 Timothy 6:14-16. "Our Lord Jesus Christ…Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen."[285]

Besides Christianizing Lucretius' "devine nature" by making it the originator of

---

[284] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Book 1 lines 55-60.

[285] 1 Tim 6 GNV.

the universe, Hutchinson's translation recalls specifically Protestant theology which condemned the Catholic teaching about the merit of works in gaining salvation and the church's storehouse of merit earned by Christ and martyred saints.[286] The divine nature as rendered by Hutchinson in this passage has no "want" or lack of acts from us, but is "rich in it selfe." The implication is that God would only save men through unmerited grace, the *sola gratia* doctrine of Protestantism. Hutchinson could have easily chosen a different rendering of Lucretius' "*promeritis*": Thomas Elyot's dictionary translates the root "*Promeritum,*" as "desert, pleasure or seruyce done."[287] The dictionary also defines the root "*Meritum,*" from which the English word "merit" is derived as "a benefytte or pleasure, a deserte good or ylle."[288] However, instead of using a word like "desert," or "service," Hutchinson chooses the theologically charged "merits."

Furthermore, Hutchinson's wording for the last phrase, "nor disturb'd with wrath" accentuates the negative connotation of the Latin "*nec tangitur ira*" (nor touched by ire). By choosing "disturbed" rather than "touched," she presents an emotion like anger as troubling and unworthy of the divine nature. In her letter to Anglesey, she had inveighed against those who would "feigne a God liable to Passion, impotence and mutability."[289] In contrast, Hutchinson writes that Lucretius and his fellow Epicureans "thought they had treated more reverently of Gods, when they placd them aboue the care & disturbances of humane affaires, and set them in an vnperturbed rest and felicity." Even though the

---

[286] For one representative example, see the nonconformist divine Henry Ainsworth: "the Antichristians teach us a justification by faith and works togither; by Christs merits, Saints and Popes merits, & their owne." Henry Ainsworth, *A reply to a pretended Christian plea for the anti-Chistian [sic] Church of Rome* (1620), 9.

[287] Thomas Elyot, *Bibliotheca Eliotae: Eliotis librarie* (London: 1542), E1v.

[288] Ibid. Page X6r.

[289] "Dedication," line 7.

Epicureans had erred in making the gods inactive, Hutchinson concedes that they had been trying to be reverent.

The extent to which Hutchinson plays up the Christian resonance of this passage from Book 1 is more apparent when contrasted with her contemporary John Evelyn's version. Although Evelyn was a defender of Lucretius and wrote that his doctrine "perswades to a life the most exact and *Moral,*"[290] he renders the Lucretian deities as uncaring towards humans and neutral about human action.

> *Gods* in their nature of themselves subsist
> 'Tis certain, nor may ought their peace molest
> For ever, unconcern'd with our affairs
> And far remote, void of or grief or cares,
> Need not our service, swim in full content,
> Nor our good works accept, nor bad resent:[291]

In contrast to this passage, Hutchinson's phrasing, "remoovd farre off from mortall mens affairs" elevates God without making him uncaring the way Evelyn's "unconcer'd with our affairs" does. Furthermore, the lack of a possessive pronoun to match "wrath" in her phrase, "nor disturb'd by wrath" leaves open the possibility that God is not disturbed by the emotion of anger within himself instead of him not being disturbed by human wrath. Evelyn, by contrast, makes clear that the gods are not bothered by our bad actions any more than they accept our good works. In Hutchinson's hands, God has not lost his role as the moral judge of human actions, but merely does not experience human emotions.

Given that Hutchinson's translation and marginalia often heighten Lucretius' impiety to turn him into an enemy, it is somewhat surprising to see her treat this description of the gods so favorably; it is almost shocking that she echoes Lucretius'

---

[290] John Evelyn, *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus De rerum natura* (London: Gabriel Bedle, 1656), 9.

[291] Ibid., 17.

words when describing God in *Order and Disorder*.

In Canto I, near the beginning of her account of the creation, Hutchinson names God as the author of the universe. She writes that "[the] first eternal Cause, th'original / Of being, life, and motion, God we call."[292] This echoes her Argument to Book 1 about God as the "original of things." A few lines later, she describes the nature of God and the unity of the Trinity:

> One uncompounded, pure Divinity,
> Wherein subsist so the mysterious three
> That they in power and glory equal be;
> Each doth himself and all the rest possess
> In undisturbed joy and blessedness."[293]

The phrasing of the final couplet particularly recalls Hutchinson's Lucretius, where "The devine nature doth it selfe possesse / In immortallitie, and everlasting peace…nor disturb'd by wrath." Hutchinson's language in *Order and Disorder* emphasizes the self-sufficiency of God who processes himself completely and is thus free from any possible disturbance. The mystery of the Trinity recalls the concept of the Lucretian deities who are "Remoovd farre off from mortall mens affairs" and thus inaccessible to our senses.

In David Norbrook's otherwise excellently annotated 2001 edition of *Order and Disorder* there is no comment on these remarkable echoes where the Puritan poet uses an atheist's words to describe God.[294] In his 2012 edition of *De rerum natura*, he highlights the connection, but withholds much interpretation. He writes that the lines about the quiet

---

[292] Lucy Hutchinson*, The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*, ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), line 70

[293] Ibid., line 95.

[294] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder,* ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 9.

distance of the Gods were what "bothered most of Hutchinson's contemporaries, whose belief in the providence of God to create, govern, sustain, redeem, and destroy the world was profound. Denial of this providence, rather than of divine existence per se, was widely labelled as 'atheism,' before the term 'deism' came to supplant it in this sense." By contrast, Norbrook writes, "Hutchinson's version of the divine nature according to Epicurus retains a dignity that does not go so far as to vitiate those human efforts to beseech it; she later echoed her own 1.55-6 in describing the Trinity, *Order and Disorder* 1.93-4."[295]

Norbrook's reaction is remarkably understated. Hutchinson reacted in the margins to many of Lucretius' "atheistic" passages, but for this one, she not only neglected to condemn it, she effectively endorsed it by borrowing its phrasing at the moment of explaining the mystery of the Trinity. That is like the Pope citing Richard Dawkins' words approvingly in a homily about the Holy Spirit. Engaging with the mystery of the Trinity is a difficult problem for a theologian, and an even more daunting one for a poet to represent or explain, so it is astonishing that Hutchinson would turn to Lucretius to find her words and concepts at this moment in her poem.

Hutchinson not only cited this formulation in *Order and Disorder*, but she paraphrased herself once again in her theological work *On the Principles of the Christian Religion to Her Daughter.* She writes:

> God hath his being in and of himselfe, and is to himselfe and all his creatures all-sufficient, and was eternally blessed, dwelling and delighting in himselfe, before he made the world, or any creature; neither stood he in need of any of the creatures which he hath made, nor deriveth any glory from them, but is, both to himselfe and all his creatures, a fountaine of all

[295] Lucy Hutchinson, *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius,* ed. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 473.

> being, life, and glory. He is the first cause and the ultimate end of all things.[296]

Hutchinson's doctrine is orthodox here, but her language is reminiscent of the Lucretius translation. When she writes that God "neither stood…in need of any of the creatures which he hath made, nor deriveth any glory from them" we can see how the line "Rich in itself, of us no need it has" is a positive description of the divine nature. This self-sufficient and lofty God is the origin of all creation, just as Hutchinson's Argument to *De rerum natura* Book 1 argues.

Later in her treatise to her daughter, Hutchinson describes God as not only self-sufficient, but untroubled by human actions and free from emotion.

> That blessednesse wherein God eternally enioys himselfe, is not capable of any disturbance or interruption from the creature; and whereas God is sayd sometimes in Scripture, to be angrie, to grieve, repent, or the like, these are but phrazes accommodated to weake humane capacity, when God changes his administrations to men, according to the immutable and unchangeable councell of his owne will; for if God were liable to those passions, he could not be God; and therefore wee must take heed of cleaving to any litterall sense which derogates from the devine perfection of God, and is inconsistent with his nature.[297]

Hutchinson is so convinced that God's nature is exempt from passion that she is willing to disregard direct statements in the Bible to the contrary. She is willing to take any passages metaphorically if they seem "inconsistent" with her conception of the nature of God. How she became so sure about this conception is not clearly explained in the text, but I argue that she is defending Calvinist theology and using Lucretius as an unlikely witness for the truth.

What are we to make of Hutchinson's sympathy with Lucretius' description from

---

[296] Lucy Hutchinson, *On the Principles of the Christian Religion Addressed to Her Daughter and on Theology* (London: Longman, Hutst, Rees, Orme, & Browne, 1817), 14.

[297] Ibid., 18.

Book 1 and the fact that she echoes her translation in her later works? The answer, I believe, can be found in the context of Book 1. In the *De rerum natura* Book 1, the description of the divine nature is almost unconnected to its textual surroundings, abruptly entering after Lucretius' invocation to Venus and before his introduction of Epicurus.[298] When these lines reoccur in Book 2, they set up the passage we have already examined, where Lucretius argues that nature rules herself "subjected to no Lord." Thus, Hutchinson eschews Lucretius' peaceful Gods when it means they will not or cannot providentially create or guide the universe, but echoes it in her later works when she wants to emphasize the self-sufficient, noncontingent nature of the Trinity.

The logic behind this selectivity is clear when we remember the central feature of the Protestant conception of God—his high omnipotence. Against the hated Catholic doctrines of good works, the seven sacraments, and the storehouse of merit, all of which elevated the role of individuals and the church in salvation, the Reformers established a God who could not be influenced by priests, pilgrimages, or alms for the poor. Luther and Calvin's God only granted salvation by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone. As Calvinism was codified in the seventeenth century, it came to include the denial of free will, the total corruption of all human actions and productions, and the double predestination of the elect to salvation and the reprobates to damnation.

Protestants argued that humans would be more humble and grateful if they understood that they had not earned their salvation. Instead of boasting of their own good

---

[298] In fact, scholars have argued for centuries about whether these lines were originally a quotation from Book 2 by a scribe who put them in the margin to show that Lucretius' prayer to Venus must be read metaphorically. According to this theory, the lines were later incorporated into the body of the text by mistake. See *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, ed. and trans. Cyril Bailey, rev. edn. 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949), 601.

works, Protestants wanted humankind to glorify God for his unmerited and amazing grace. Hutchinson hinted at this idea in *Order and Disorder* a few lines after she echoed Lucretius on the "undisturbed joy and blessedness" of the Trinity. Just like Lucretius' self-sufficient gods, the Trinity had no need of humankind, but for Hutchinson, the gratuitousness of humanity proves the grace of God.

> [God] from Eternity himself supplied,
> And had no need of any thing beside,
> Nor any other cause that did him move
> To make a World, but his extensive Love,
> It self delighting to communicate;
> Its Glory in the creatures to dilate[299]

The conception of God that Hutchinson presents in these lines seems to start with Lucretius' distant, self-contained divine nature, and add the Christian idea that God made the world for love. Her adjective "extensive" modifying "love" may reflect the Latin root "*extendĕre*" meaning "to stretch out." If God did not start from such a high and distant place, this outstretching of his love without "any other cause" would not be as miraculous. With this logic in mind, we can see why Hutchinson might have been drawn to Lucretius' dignified, high, and inaccessible God. In her later book on theology addressed to her daughter, she writes, a "poore fleshly finite creature cannot ascend up to that inaccessible, incomprehensible light, wherein God dwells, to see or consider him as he is absolutely in himselfe…"[300]

Hutchinson repeatedly emphasizes in *Order and Disorder* that God is as high and independent of humans as Lucretius' gods, but that, in his amazing mercy, nevertheless

---

[299] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder*, ed. David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), Canto 1, lines 129-134.

[300] Lucy Hutchinson, *On the Principles of the Christian Religion Addressed to Her Daughter and on Theology* (London: Longman, Hutst, Rees, Orme, & Browne, 1817), 8-9.

chooses to create, guide, and redeem the world. Whereas Lucretius told his followers not to pray to God because they were so high and distant that they did not need our sacrifices or prayers, Hutchinson said that, we should thank God all the more because he has no use for our good deeds.

Thus, Hutchinson is able to define a vision of divinity that meets her doctrinal needs. She appropriates his language about distant gods to teach the Calvinist doctrine of God too great to be understood by reason, as the Socinians would argue, and too great to be bought off by good works, as Protestants accused Catholics of believing.

Her emphasis on divine repose may have also given her a special weapon against Socinianism concerning the doctrine of the Sabbath. The Socinians were also famous for their rejection of the law of the Sabbath, which they believed was done away with in the New Testament along with the other Jewish holy days. The influential Puritan preacher William Twisse wrote in 1641 that "the Anabaptists and Socinians, as vile heretickes as *Ebion* and *Cerinthus,* and *Apollinaris,* for their blood have gone so farre, as not onely to overthrow the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, but the sanctifying of the Lords day also."[301]

Puritans refuted the Socinians by arguing that the Sabbath was a moral law established since the creation of the world and not simply a ceremonial law that was swept away by the new covenant of Grace instituted by Jesus Christ. Hutchinson describes God's rest on the seventh day of creation in the third canto of *Order and Disorder*, and again echoes Lucretius' picture of the gods resting in perfect peace. In Canto III, Hutchinson writes,

---

[301] William Twisse, *Of the morality of the fourth commandement as still in force to binde Christians* (London: John Rothwell, 1641), 9.

> Nor is this Rest sacred to idleness,
> God, a perpetual Act, sloth cannot bless.
> He ceast not from his own celestial joy,
> Which doth himself perpetually employ
> In contemplation of himself, and those
> Most excellent works, wherein himself he shows;[302]

In the margin next to the line "In contemplation of himself and those / Most excellent works," Hutchinson cites Proverbs 8:22 and 30-31. She cited these same verses in Canto 1 when she echoed her Lucretius translation.

In all these examples, the model of the useful enemy and unlikely witness can best explain Hutchinson's surprising habit of variously condemning, appropriating, and approvingly echoing Lucretius' words and doctrines.

How could Hutchinson have rationalized using Lucretius as an unlikely witness for the true doctrine of the divine nature? The doctrinal foundation underlying Hutchinson's belief that the elect could safely use Lucretius again comes from the Apostle Paul, who taught that Christians were free from the Law of Moses and could thus safely partake of meats used in pagan sacrifices. One of the key verses that supports this idea of Christian freedom is Titus 1:15 "Unto the pure all things *are* pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving *is* nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled."[303] Paul had given precedent for understanding that "Christian liberty" to apply to using pagan literature in teaching the gospel because Paul often quoted pagan poets and philosophers in his teachings.

In the same chapter of Titus Paul cites a pagan philosopher, whom he makes into

---

[302] Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder,* ed., David Norbrook (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), Canto 3 lines 537-542.

[303] Titus 1:15 GNV.

what I have termed an "unlikely witness." Paul writes of the Cretans that "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, the Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true."[304] Paul establishes his point about the Cretians, not by citing scripture or revelation from the Holy Spirit, but by quoting the words of a pagan philosopher, Epimenides. The Geneva Bible's gloss on this verse shows the Protestants' anxiety with their favorite apostle calling a pagan a prophet, and explains that Paul calls "Epimenides, [who was] a philosopher or poet…a Prophet because the Cretians so esteemed him."[305] The Geneva editors are careful to point out that Epimenides is not a true prophet even though Paul uses that title. They are saying in effect that Paul has used Epimenides as a "useful enemy," an outside witness who has special credibility because he comes from within the group.

Paul does not seem worried about citing Epimenides' "liar's paradox" because in the logic of the chapter, "God's elect"[306] can handle unclean things without fear, while the "reprobate" is defiled by everything: "Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled."[307]

Paul most famously used "impure" pagan authors as useful enemies in his sermon on Mars hill, recorded in Acts 17. To an audience that includes "certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoicks," Paul attempts to prove the divine fatherhood of God by citing "certain also of your own poets [who] have said, 'For we are also his

---

[304] Titus 1:12-13 GNV.
[305] Ibid., note to verse 13.
[306] Titus 1:1 GNV.
[307] Titus 1:15-16 GNV.

offspring.'"[308] Similarly to the epistle to Titus, Paul condemns the people for not only failing to believe his doctrine, but for ignoring a witness from their own country.

Just as Paul enlisted useful enemies and unlikely witnesses from the pagan world to spread the gospel of Christ in his day, Lucy Hutchinson transformed Lucretius into a foil against which to construct her own identity as a writer. The puzzle of the Lucy Hutchinson translation is neither that a good Puritan carefully read Lucretius, as Christian humanists had justified reading him for 200 years, nor that a Calvinist would have hurled abuse at Lucretius, as "Epicurean" had been a byword for centuries. The real mystery is why Hutchinson would engage so deeply with the most controversial points of Epicurean doctrine, why she discarded the apologetic biographies of Lucretius, and why she echoes Lucretius so often in *Order and Disorder*. I have argued that the useful enemy/unlikely witness model explains each conundrum. She engages with the worst parts of Lucretius to show her victory over his most pernicious lies. She paints a bleak picture of him in order to make him a worthier enemy. She echoes him to subvert his images, appropriate his language, and redeem his half-truths. She uses his talk of the Gods as an unlikely witness against the Socinians. In her prefaces, marginalia, and in *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson succeeded in her task of translating the ancient author "from darknesse to light."

---

[308] Act 17:18-28 GNV.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This project has traced the intersection of two radically different cultures: the poets of Rome's Golden Age and the English Protestants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Ovid, Horace, and Lucretius come from a pagan empire torn by civil wars yet nearing the height of its power as ruler of the known world. Golding, Drant, and Hutchinson come from a kingdom that was struggling to find its religious identity and trying to establish itself as a player on the international stage while facing internal divisions, which would lead to its own civil war. I have argued that each English translator imagined a different relationship with his or her Roman author in order to justify the translation project in a culture that both revered the classical world and was newly skeptical about human traditions and productions.

However, my focus on the differences between the Roman poets and their first English translators has perhaps obscured their similarities. Both sets of writers represent two generations of citizens who lived during times of political instability and civil war. But more than the political or contextual similarities, both groups wrote in a similar literary moment. The Romans as well as the English authors we have examined were all translators, bringing prestigious works from old poets into a vernacular they were striving to establish as a language for serious poetry.

Lucretius is self-consciously a translator in *De rerum natura*. He writes that he is rendering Epicurus' doctrines into sweet Latin poetry to evangelize his countrymen, giving them the bitter but healthful medicine of Epicureanism in a cup sweetened with honey. Lucretius complains about the poverty of Latin in much the same way English translators complained 1500 years later as they were establishing their vernacular as a literary language.

> I know how hard it is in Latin verse
> To tell the dark discoveries of the Greeks,
> Chiefly because our pauper-speech must find
> Strange terms to fit the strangeness of the thing[309]

Lucretius also emphasized the religious and didactic value of his poem. He became an evangelist for what has been called by David Sedley "fundamentalist Epicureanism."[310] His fierce attacks against the "superstitious" religion of his day are just as strident as Drant's and Hutchinson's invective against Catholics and schismatics.

Horace similarly imagined his great poetic achievement to be the introduction of Greek poetics into Latin. He wrote, "*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*" (I first brought Aeolian verse /to Italian measures).[311] He also wrote in one of his Epistles that "*Hunc [sc. Alcaeum] ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus / volgavi fidicen*" (Him, [Alcaus] never before sung by other lips, I, the lyrist of Latium, have made known).[312] Horace's vision of translation was not a carrying across of content, the wisdom of Greece, but instead form and literary style. He invented or popularized several

---

[309] William Ellery Leonard, trans., *T. Lucretius Carus of the Nature of Things, a Metrical Translation* (London: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1916), 5.

[310] David N. Sedley, *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 62.

[311] Quintus Horatius Flaccus, *The Odes of Horace: A translation by David Ferry*, trans. David Ferry (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1997), 254.

[312] Ibid., 99.

Greek stanza forms from Sapphics to Alcaics, and brought Roman poetry into conversation with Greek genres like the invitation poem or the Alcaic pastoral.

Finally, Ovid brought both narrative and philosophical content into Latin in his works. He reworked a host of Greek material from Homer, Sappho, and Callimachus to furnish the material for his lyric and epic works. He also incorporated Greek philosophy in his poetry, most famously in Pythagoras' speech in Book 15 of the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed, it is true what Arthur Golding wrote about Ovid's epic:

> For whatsoever hath bene writ of auncient tyme in greeke
> By sundry men dispersedly, and in the latin eeke,
> Of this same dark Philosophic of turned shapes, the same
> Hath Ovid into one whole masse in this booke brought in frame.[313]

We can see from this brief survey that these three Roman poets were engaged in a nationalistic project of translation in much the same way as their first English translators. They sought to establish Latin as the language of philosophy and literature, and, in the case of Lucretius, worked to propagate religious doctrines in their translations. However, other than these comments by Golding, the translators I have engaged with in this project fail to see their Roman authors as translators at all. Perhaps Drant's and Hutchinson's adversarial relationships with their authors blinded them to the parallels. Further study of this question is warranted.

In the second part of this conclusion, I would like to connect my analysis of these three translators with the larger literary scene in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. The pervasive influence of both the Reformation and the humanist educational system meant that nearly every writer in these two centuries had to deal with some of the

---

[313] *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation 1567,* ed. John Frederick Nims (New York: Macmillan, 1965), "Epistle," lines 4-7.

same cultural forces as the translators profiled in this project. English authors employed many of the same strategies for imagining their relationships with the past that Golding, Drant, and Hutchinson did. Some used Golding's model of creating parallels between themselves and the ancient authors they imitated. For example, Edmund Spenser set out to become the English Virgil, following the revered Roman poet's path from pastoral to epic as he moved from *The Shepherd's Calendar* to *The Faerie Queene*. Others subjugated their source-text authors as Drant had done to Horace. For instance, George Herbert and John Donne followed the Renaissance tradition of love poetry, but ultimately discarded the parts *eros* and transformed the genre into a vehicle for *agape* in devotional poetry. Finally, other authors followed Hutchinson's model by treating the ancient authors as enemies to conquer gloriously. No one did this with more power than John Milton, who appropriated the heroes and tropes of the epic tradition and applied them to the devils in *Paradise Lost*.

There were also authors who created different narratives about their relationships to the great writers of the past. Some sought to learn from the ancients as an apprentice might learn from a master before surpassing him. Christopher Marlowe fits this model, following Ovid's and Lucian's examples before surpassing them with bawdy, irreverent love poems and resounding war poetry, respectively.[314]

Finally, some authors dramatized the struggles around the issues of translation in their works. These meta-fictional or meta-translational works provide insight into how readers and audiences understood the stakes and arguments surrounding classical translation in this period.

---

[314] See David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber, 2004), Chapter 6.

5.1 Shakespeare

Shakespeare reflects on the competing claims of the humanist and Protestant responses to the classics several times in his *oeuvre*. For example, in Sonnet 55, he translates the first five lines of Horace's Ode 3.30 into the first two quatrains of his poem:

> *Exegi monumentum ære perennius*
> *Regalique situ pyramidum altius,*
> *Quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens*
> *Possit diruere aut innumerabilis*
> *Annorum series et fuga temporum*.[315]

Here is Shakespeare's rendering:

> Not marble, nor the gilded monuments
> Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme;
> But you shall shine more bright in these contents
> Than unswept stone, besmear'd with sluttish time.
> When wasteful war shall statues overturn,
> And broils root out the work of masonry,
> Nor Mars his sword nor war's quick fire shall burn
> The living record of your memory[316]

However, instead of expressing awe that Horace's boast for poetic immortality has come true, Shakespeare effaces the name of his source-text author. Shakespeare also changes the role of the poem from a monument to the author to a memorial for the beloved. Finally, in the closing couplet, Shakespeare invokes the superior power of the resurrection that will bring real immortality to the Christian faithful. The poem preserves memory only "till the judgement that yourself arise" as a living soul. In this brief example, we can see Shakespeare using both classical translation and Christian doctrine side-by-side, with Christianity getting the last word. However, the competing rhetorics of

---

[315] Quintus Horatius Flaccus, *The Odes of Horace: A translation by David Ferry*, trans. David Ferry (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1997), 254.

[316] All Shakespeare quotations are from William Shakespeare. *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works,* ed. Richard Proudfoot *et al*. (Singapore: Cengage, 2001).

pagan and Protestant voices do not always sit so harmoniously in Shakespeare's works.

Shakespeare engages with controversies surrounding the value of humanist educational practices in his play *Titus Andronicus*. Shakespeare seems to play the devil's advocate with Golding's model of the ancient author as a friend, dramatizing the worst fears of the Protestants who warned that pagan fiction would teach readers to sin. I argue that he shows that old poems can be dangerous if they are read selectively instead of holistically.

Titus Andronicus can be seen as a part of Shakespeare's humanist education as he translates and imitates parts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* into English and onto the stage. In book six of Ovid's epic we read that Tereus was married to Procne as part of a treaty between Thrace and Athens. However, he later burns with lust for her sister, Philomela. After raping her, he cuts out her tongue to keep her from revealing his crime. However, even though she is imprisoned in a different part of the palace, Philomela manages to weave a tapestry depicting the rape and sends it to Procne. The two women plan their revenge, and Procne kills her son and feeds his flesh to Tereus. When Tereus realizes he has eaten his own son, he charges at the two women in a rage, and all three of them are transformed into birds, with Philomela becoming the melancholy nightingale.

In Shakespeare's version, it is the Gothic princes Chiron and Demetrius who rape and dismember an innocent girl, Lavinia, Titus' daughter. They go one step further than Tereus and cut off her hands as well as her tongue. Still she eventually manages to tell her father the identities of her attackers and he traps and slaughters them, baking them into pies to feed to their colluding mother Tamora before killing her and Lavinia, and suffering death himself in the play's bloody climax.

We can read Shakespeare's rendition of Ovid's tale into English as a grand expansion of a schoolroom exercise because translation was a central aspect of grammar school education. Instead of the older system of immersion advocated by Elyot, where students and teachers spoke Latin to each other, in Shakespeare's day, students learned from a textual, translation-based curriculum, popularized in Roger Ascham's *The Schoolmaster.*

Ascham claims that his method of double translation would produce "of good vnderstanding [of] the mater," especially in the younger grades, students only read short excerpts, and were not encouraged to comprehend the whole story. Historian David Riggs, writes that when the student of grammar

> finally did begin to read literary texts, he was actively discouraged from thinking about what they meant. A standard school text of Terence's comedies published in 1574 advises teachers never to consider the work as a whole. "For we do not present Terence to this end, that thence youth may learn to write comedies, but rather for seeking there the true and native nature and form of Latin speech."[317]

In fact, besides the emphasis on learning good Latin, encouraging students to focus on short excerpts of texts was also supposed to help them learn good morals, because even frivolous comedies or dangerous tales of violence and bawdry could contain beneficial bits of wisdom. Elyot wrote that "by comedies good counsaile is ministred" and that even "Ouidius, that semeth to be moste of all poetes lasciuious, in his mooste wanton bokes hath righte commendable and noble sentences." Elyot then quotes lines from Ovid's manual of seduction, the Ars Amatoria to prove his point such as, "time is medicine" and "flee thou from idleness and always be stable."[318]

---

[317] David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber, 2004), 39.
[318] Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the Gouernour* (London: 1531), 48.

This style of reading that ignores the broader story to focus on “noble sentences” was supposedly good for grammar school students learning by translation, but it precluded the full understanding needed to interpret a work of literature as a whole. In contrast to this excerpting way of reading texts, properly interpreting a whole work was actually another meaning of the word “translate” in early modern England. In Elyot’s Latin dictionary, he defines “interpretare” as “to interprete, expoune, or translate, also to iuge or esteem.”[319]

This proper interpretation and judgement was crucial to arguments that defended the study of literature as worthwhile. In Sir Philip Sidney’s *Apology for Poetry*, he wrote that when reading literature for moral instruction “a man should see virtue exalted, and vice punished…[and]…if evil men come to the stage, they ever go out (as the tragedy writer answered to one that misliked the show of such persons) so manacled, as they little animate folks to follow them.”[320] However, even if a story is ruled by “poetic justice” where villains fail and the right prevails, how can readers get the moral of the story if they only read it piecemeal, searching out “right commendable and noble sentences”?

Sidney complains about such grammar school students and quotation hunters, writing,

> Truly, I could wish (if at least I might be so bold to wish, in a thing beyond the reach of my capacity) the diligent imitators of Tully and Demosthenes, most worthy to be imitated, did not so much keep Nizolian paper-books of their figures and phrases, [but rather] as by attentive translation, as it were, devour them whole, and make them wholly theirs.”[321]

---

[319] Thomas Elyot, *Bibliotheca Eliotae: Eliotis librarie* (1542), 152.

[320] Philip Sidney, *The Apology for Poetry*, in *The Early Modern Period*, ed. Constance Jordan and Clare Carroll. Vol. 1B of *The Longman Anthology of British Literature*, ed. David Damrosch (New York: Longman, 2006), 1007.

[321] Ibid., 1025-1026.

Here, the word "translation" means the opposite of the grammar school practice. Instead of focusing on changing noble sentences into English, Sidney wants his ideal scholars to carry across the true spirit of the ancient authors whom they have digested whole.

In *Titus Andronicus*, these two kinds of translation, out-of-context grammar school sentences, and the careful interpretation of the whole work act as opposite poles that pull characters towards wisdom or foolishness, hope or disaster, comedy or tragedy.

The play's villains consistently follow the grammar school approach to literature, and thus miss the morals of the stories they read and reenact. Just as Shakespeare takes the inspiration of his plot from Ovid, so do the play's villains. The Gothic queen Tamora's henchman and lover Aaron plots with her to attack Lavina, saying that her husband Bassianus must die, and that "his Philomel must lose her tongue today, / thy sons make pillage of her chastity."[322] Taking his lesson material from Ovid, Aaron says of Chiron and Demetrius that he "was their tutor to instruct them."[323]

Just as the grammar school students learned parts of Ovid without being taught to explore the overall meaning, Chiron and Demetrius seem only to learn that a rape victim's hands should also be cut off to stop any chance for tapestry making. We may scoff at the idea that this laughably bad reading is supposed to stand metonymically for interpretations Shakespeare wanted to criticize, but in missing the meaning of the story, the evil princes are in the company of many of Shakespeare's contemporaries, including his favorite translator of the *Metamorphoses*, Arthur Golding. As we have seen, Golding was often so intent on making Ovid into a fellow moralizer that he misread the narrative force of episodes in the poem in favor of tidy moralizations. Golding seems to break the

[322] 2.3.43-44.
[323] 5.1.98.

story up into an odd set of short lessons in the interpretive preface he appended to his translation. He wrote that,

> The tale of Tereus, Philomele, and Prognee dooth conteyne
> That folke are blynd in thyngs that too their proper weale perteyne,
> And that the man in whom the fyre of furious lust dooth reigne
> Dooth run too mischeefe like a horse that getteth loose the reyne.
> It also shewes the cruell wreake of women in their wrath
> And that no hainous mischiefe long delay of vengeance hath.
> And lasly that distresse doth drive a man too looke about
> And seeke all corners of his wits, what way too wind him out.[324]

While Golding's set of morals does contain judgement against lust and warns of vengeance, it also seems to take a detached and proverbial approach, remarking on "women in their wrath" and the way that distress can be the mother of invention. Even if Chiron and Demetrius had read Golding's version, they might not have noticed the painful pathos of the tale, the way Ovid empathizes with the suffering, artistic Philomela instead of praising the ingenuity of their attacker or the inventiveness of their revenge.

But of course, the play's villains go much further in their misreadings than Golding does. For example, in the scene where Aaron tutors the princes and instructs them to attack Lavinia in the forest, Demetrius roughly quotes a few Latin lines from Seneca's *Hippolytus* to justify his lustful desires. "Sit fas aut nefas, till I find the stream / To cool this heat, a charm to calm these fits, / Per Stygia, per manes vehor"[325] which roughly means "Be it right or wrong…I go through Stygian shades." In other words, he says he is in hell until he can fulfil his desire. The line is one Seneca gives to Phaedra who laments that she is in hell because of her unquenchable desire for her step-son. If

---

[324] Arthur Golding, "To the Reader," in *Metamorphoses*, ed. Madeleine Forey, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), lines 135-142.

[325] William Shakespeare, *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works,* ed. Richard Proudfoot *et al*. (Singapore: Cengage, 2001), 2.1.133-135.

Demetrius had read the end of the play, he would have seen that this lust causes Phaedra to betray her step-son to an unjust death and then kill herself in despair. But because Demetrius is a poor student, he fails to take the right lesson from the story.

Even after they have committed their crime and tricked the emperor into blaming Titus and his sons, Chiron and Demetrius are still unable to properly translate the meanings of events in the play. Titus, who has by now found out who raped his daughter, sends them the gift of a dagger wrapped in a scroll. The words of the scroll come from the opening lines of Horace's Ode 22 and read "Integer vitae, scelerisque purus, / non eget Mauri jaculis, nec arcu."[326] They could be translated as "The man who has a pure life and is free from crime does not need the Moor's arrows or the bow." However, instead of realizing that Titus is sarcastically pointing out their guilt, Chiron simply identifies the source of the quotation "O, tis a verse in Horace, I know it well. / I read it in the grammar long ago."[327] Since he is a Goth, it is historically possible that Chiron would have read Horace in a grammar book, but clearly, for Shakespeare's audiences, this line would make them think of Renaissance schoolrooms, where Horace's works were standard curriculum. The irony in Chiron's statement "I know it well" is that even though he may know the literal translation, he cannot translate and interpret the meaning properly. Aaron, in an aside instantly realizes Titus' true intent, but the princes miss the message and laugh about the old man sending them a present as a reward for how "kindly" they used his daughter.

In contrast to the almost comically bad interpretations of the play's villains, Lavinia and Titus are able to read Ovid's *Metamorphoses* sympathetically and interpret

[326] 4.2.20-21.
[327] 4.2.23-24.

its stories holistically. In a tremendously meta-theatrical moment, Lavinia turns the leaves of a copy of Ovid's poem on stage, until she finds the inspiration for her own story. When she shows her father, he says, "This is the tragic tale of Philomel, / And treats of Tereus' treason and his rape— / And rape I fear, was the root of thy annoy."[328] By identifying with the story, Lavinia and Titus respectively are able to express and translate the truth about her attack. Titus realizes that she was "ravished and wronged as Philomela was, / forced in the ruthless, vast, and gloomy woods."[329] He exclaims "Ay, such a place there is where we did hunt / (O had we never never hunted there!) / Patterned by that the poet here describes, / by nature made for muthers and for rapes."[330] In reading the story, Titus sees how the events, and even the location of the poem, have been translated into life. Titus then becomes a schoolmaster, and teaches Lavinia how to write the names of her attackers in the sand, according to the stage directions, having her guide his staff "with feet and mouth."

However, despite this moment of clarity, Titus, in his real or feigned madness, later loses his ability to interpret holistically. We are told he "takes false shadows for true substances,"[331] and he takes Ovid's line "Terras Astraea reliquit"[332] too literally, searching in hell or in the sky for the goddess Justice, who has left the earth. Titus ends the play by reenacting Procne and Philomela's story by feeding Tamora her sons' flesh, just as Tereus had been tricked to consume his own son.

On one level, Shakespeare's play seems to give ammunition to his contemporaries

---

[328] 4.1.47-49.
[329] 4.1.51-52.
[330] 4.1.55-58.
[331] 3.2.79-80.
[332] 4.3.4.

who warned against teaching young students such dangerous pagan tales because he shows characters who take the wrong lessons from literature, finding only inspiration to outdo the depravity about which they had read. But if that is the message that we take from the play—that literature leads to copycat crimes—then we will be guilty of the same mistranslation of meaning as Chiron and Demetrius. Instead, if we take the play as a whole, we will see that Shakespeare outdoes Ovid in giving a clear moral judgement in the play. Whereas both Tereus and his victims suffer the same fate of being transformed into birds, at the end of *Titus Andronicus*, Titus' son becomes emperor, pronounces judgement against Aaron, and condemns Tamora's body to be unburied and torn by dogs, fulfilling the laws of poetic justice that Sidney championed. Taken in its entirety, the play surely "little animates folk to follow" in the footsteps of its villains.

By reading the play as Shakespeare's critique of the humanist educational system, we can get a glimpse of what Shakespeare thought about literary interpretation and the dangers of mistranslation. The message of *Titus Andronicus* is, in the end, an injunction to read carefully, which is not so different from Golding's warning on his title page: "With skill heede and judgment this worke must be read, / For else to the Reader it standes in small stead."[333]

5.2 Afterword

This project has explored differences, anxieties, and distortions, the ways in which Protestant translators worked from a defensive crouch to justify their literary activities. These translators denigrated the authors of their source texts, distorted their

---

[333] *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation 1567,* ed. John Frederick Nims (New York: Macmillan, 1965), 1.

works, and preached doctrines contrary to those they found. But I hope I have also shown how these translators worked to bridge cultural divides. By the very act of translation, they acknowledged a culture other than their own and made that culture more accessible to those without education in Latin. Each translator can be seen as a kind of teacher, sharing knowledge and providing an interpretive framework to their readers. This project is similarly an attempt to open up neglected texts and impart understanding. It seems only fitting to end with John Donne's famous metaphor of translation as the process that brings all humans together and lets them read one another with perfect understanding.

> …all mankind is of one author, and is one volume; when one man dies, one chapter is not torn out of the book, but translated into a better language; and every chapter must be so translated; God employs several translators; some pieces are translated by age, some by sickness, some by war, some by justice; but God's hand is in every translation, and his hand shall bind up all our scattered leaves again, for that library where every book shall lie open to one another.[334]

---

[334] John Donne, *Meditation XVII,* in *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*, ed. Charles M. Coffin (New York: Modern Library, 2001), 322.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ainsworth, Henry. *A reply to a pretended Christian plea for the anti-Chistian [sic] Church of Rome*. 1620.

Anonymous. “The Lamentation of England.” London, 1558.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Thick Translation." *Callaloo: A Journal Of African American And African Arts And Letters* 16, no. 4 (1993): 808-819.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*, 3 vols. Translated by fathers of the English Dominican Province. Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics. 1948.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Rev. ed. Loeb Classical Library. 1934.

Ascham, Roger. *The scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teaching children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong*. London: John Daye. 1570.

----. *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham*. Edited by John Allen Giles. London: John Russell Smith, 1864.

Bale, John. *The apology of Iohan Bale agaynste a ranke papyst anuswering both hym and hys doctors that neyther their vowes nor yet their priesthode areof the Gospell, but of Antichrist.*

Barnes, Robin. "Reforming Time." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Protestant Reformations,* edited by Ulinka Rublack, 57-80. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Barthlet, John. *The pedegrewe of heretiques.* London: Henry Denham, 1566.

Beze, Theodore de. *A tragedie of Abrahams sacrifice.* Translated by Arthur Golding. 1577. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO.* PDF e-book.

Biddle, John. *XII arguments drawn out of the Scripture wherin the commonly-received opinion toughing the deity of the Holy Spirit is clearly and fully refuted.* London, 1647.

Bloom, Harold. *The anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Braden, Gordon. *The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry: Three Case Studies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Braden, Gordon, Robert Cummings, and Stuart Gillespie. *The Oxford History of Literary Translation*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Bruni, Leonardo. *The historie of Leonard Aretine concerning the warres….* Translated by Arthur Golding. London: Rouland Hall, 1563. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

Calvin, Jean. *A harmonie upon the three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke.* London: Thomas Dawson, 1584. PDF e-book.

----. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. London: Reinholde Vvolfe and Richarde Harison, 1561. *EEBO.* PDF e-book.

----. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1845. PDF e-book . http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.pdf

----. *The sermons of M. John Calvin upon the fifth booke of Moses….* Translated by Arthur Golding. London: Henry Middleton, 1583. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

Carion, Johannes. *The thre bokes of cronicles, whyche Iohn Carion (a man syngularly well sene in the mathematycall sciences) gathered wyth great diligence of the beste authors…Gathered by Iohn Funcke of Nurenborough.* 1550.

Chemnitz, Martin. *A discoverie and batterie of the great fort of unwritten traditions.* London: Thomas Purfoot, 1582.

Chillingworth, William. *The Religion of the Protestants: a Safe Way to Salvation*. Oxford Leonard Lichfield, 1638.

Coady, C. A. J. "The Socinian Connection: Further Thoughts on the Religion of Hobbes." *Religious Studies* 22, no. 2 (1986): 277-80. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20006281.

Collinson, Patrick. "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism," in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576-1649.* Edited by David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Considine, John. "Golding, Arthur (1535/6–1606)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Online edition. Edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed February 10, 2017,

http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.utah.edu/.

Copeland, Rita. “The Fortunes of ‘non verbum pro verbo’: Or Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian.” In *The Medieval Translator. The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages.* Edited by Roger Ellis, 17-32. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1989.

----. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Vol. 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Cosenza, M. E. *Petrarch’s Letters to Classical Authors*. Chicago, 1910.

Cronin, Michael. "Globalization and Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 1*, 134-140. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins, 2010.

Dinshaw, Carolyn. *Chaucer’s Sexual Poetics*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Donne, John. *Meditation XVII.* In *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*. Modern Library Classics. Edited by Charles M. Coffin, with an Introduction by Denis Donoghue. New York: Modern Library, 2001.

Drant, Thomas. *A medicinable morall, that is, the two bookes of Horace his satyres, Englyshed accordyng to the prescription of saint Hierome. The wailyngs of the prophet Hieremiah, done into Englyshe verse.* London: Thomas Marshe, 1566. PDF e-book.

Eden, Richard *The decades of the newe worlde or west India…Wrytten in the Latine tounge by Peter Martyr of Angleria* London: Guihelmi Powell, 1555.

Elyot, Thomas. *Bibliotheca Eliotae: Eliotis librarie*. London, 1542. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

----. *The boke named the Gouernour* London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

----. *The Defence of Good Women.* London: Tomae Bertheleti, 1545. PDF e-book.

Evelyn, John. *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus De rerum natura*. London: Gabriel Bedle, 1652.

Fish, Stanley. *How Milton Works*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

Forey, Madeline. Introduction to *Ovid’s Metamorphoses the Arthur Golding Translation*

by Arthur Golding, xi-xviii. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2002.

Friedman, Jerome. *The Most Ancient Testimony: Sixteenth-Century Christian-Hebraica in the Age of Renaissance Nostalgia.* Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1983.

Geneva Bible. Translated by William Whittingham, Thomas Gilbey, and Anthony Sampson. Dayton, Ohio: Greyden Pr. 1998.

Gibbs, Gary G. and Florinda Ruiz. "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: Myth in an Elizabethan Political Context." *Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 2.4 (2008 Sept): 557-575.

----. "Arthur Golding's Metamorphoses: A Protreptic Endeavor for a Reformation Readership."*Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 41, no. 2 (2015): 119-148.

Golding, Arthur. *Thabridgment of the histories of Trogus Pompeius*. London: Thomas Marshe, 1564. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

----. *The history of Leonard Aretine concerning the warres between the Imperialles and the Gothes*. London: Rouland Hall, 1563. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

----. *A little booke of John Caluines concernynge offences*. London: H. Wykes, 1567. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

Golding, Louis Thorne. *An Elizabethan Puritan: Arthur Golding, Translator of Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and also the Sermons of John Calvin*. New York: R.R. Smith, 1937.

Gosson, Stephen. *The school of abuse, containing a pleasant invective against poets, pipers, players, jesters, &c.* London: Reprinted for the Shakespeare Society, 1841.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning, and Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

----. *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern.* New York: W. W. Norton, 2011.

Grimald, Nicholas. *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bokes of duties to Marcus his sonne, turned out of latine into English*. London. 1556.

Harrison, Carol, and R. P. H. Green. *Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1999.

Heywood, Jasper. *The First Tragedy of Lucius Anneus Seneca, intitled Hercules furens.* London: Henrye Sutton, 1561. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO.*

PDF e-book.

Hooper, John. *An answer vnto my lord of wynthesters [sic] booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls sophistrye wherwith he robbith the vnlernyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter.* Zurych: Augustyne Fries, 1547. PDF e-book.

Horace. *The Epistles of Horace: Bilingual Edition*. Translated by David Ferry. New York: Farrar, Staus, and Giroux, 2001.

----. *The Odes of Horace: A translation by David Ferry*. Translated by David Ferry New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1997.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Order and Disorder*. Edited by David Norbrook. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

----. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*. Edited by Reid Barbour and David Norbrook. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

----. *On the Principles of the Christian Religion Addressed to Her Daughter and on Theology.* London: Longman, Hutst, Rees, Orme, & Browne, 1817.

Justinus, Marcus Junianus. *Thabridment of the histories of Trogus Pompeius…* Translated by Arthur Golding. London: Thomas Marsh, 1564. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

Kermode, Frank. *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative.* London: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Keilen, Sean. *Vulgar Eloquence: On the Renaissance Invention of English Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Kline, A. S., trans. "Horace: the Satires Book I Satire II." Poetry in Translation. http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/HoraceSatiresBkISatII.htm (Accessed April 2017).

Lake, Peter. "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice." In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England : Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* Vol. 13 of *Studies in Modern British Religious History,* edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 80-97. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.

Latimer, Hough. *The seconde [seventh] sermon of Maister Hughe Latimer which he preached before the Kynges Maiestie*. London, 1549.

Laud, William. *A Relation of the Conference….* London: Richard Badger, 1639.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Lockwood, Tom. "Arthur Golding." In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English,* Vol. 2, 443-446, edited by Gordon Braden, et al. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Lucretius. *Of the nature of things.* Translated by W. E. Leonard. New York: Dutton, 1950.

----. *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*. Edited and translated by Cyril Bailey. Revised edition, 3 volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949.

Luther, Martin. *A commentarie of M. Doctor Martin Luther upon the Epistle of Paul to the Galathians.* London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1575. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EBBO.* PDF e-book.

----. *Luther's Works: Volume 56, Table Talk.* Edited and translated by Theodore G. Tappert. General editor Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Luxon, Thomas H. *Literal Figures: Puritan Allegory and the Reformation Crisis in Representation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Lydgate, John. *The auncient history and onely true and syncere chronicle of the war betwixte the Grecians and the Troyans….* London: Thomas Marsh. 1555. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

Lyne, Raphael. *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English* Metamorphoses, *1567-1632*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Milton, John. *Selected Prose.* Edited by C. A. Patrides. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985.

More, Thomas. *A dialogue syr Thomas More knyghte.* London: J Rastell, 1529.

Morini, Massimiliano. *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*. New York: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.

Mukherjee, Neel. "Thomas Drant's Rewriting of Horace." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 40, no. 1 (2000): 1-20.

New American Standard Bible. Grand Rapids: World, 1995.

Newmark, Peter, and Eugene A. Nida. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1981.

Nims, John Frederick. "Ovid, Golding, and the Craft of Poetry." Introduction to *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation.* New York: Macmillan, 1965. xiii-xxxix.

Norton, Thomas. *The institution of Christian religion, vvrytten in Latine by maister Jhon Caluin.* London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richarde Harison, 1561.

Nuce, Thomas. *The ninth tragedie of Lucius Anneus Seneca called Octavia. Translated out of Latine into English, by T.N. student at Cambridge*. London: Henry Denham, 1566. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EEBO*. PDF e-book.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2006.

----. "Translating the Subject: Ovid's Metamorphoses in England, 1560–7." In *Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness*, edited by Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown, 48-84. Trowbridge: Cromwell Press, 2001.

Ovid. *The Metamorphoses 1-8*, Loeb Classical Library vol. 42, edited and translated by Frank Justus Miller, rev. G. P. Goold, 3rd ed. 1916; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.

----. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Arthur Golding. Edited by Madeleine Forey. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. PDF e-book.

----. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Stanley Lombardo. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2010.

----. *Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation*. Edited by John Frederick Nims. New York: MacMillan, 1965. PDF e-book.

Palmer, Ada. *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance*. London: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Reynolds, Matthew. *The Poetry of Translation: From Chaucer and Petrarch to Homer and Logue.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Riggs, David. *The World of Christopher Marlowe*. London: Faber, 2004.

Robinson, Douglas. *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Sedley, David N. *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Seneca the Elder. *Controversiae*. Translated by Michael Winterbottom. New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Sidney, Philip. *The Apology for Poetry*. In *The Early Modern Period*, edited by Constance Jordan and Clare Carroll. Vol. 1B of *The Longman Anthology of British Literature*, edited by David Damrosch. New York: Longman, 2006.

Shakespeare, William. *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works.* Edited by Richard Proudfoot *et al*. Singapore: Cengage, 2001.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1988.

Staphylus, Fridericus. *The Apologie of Fridericus Staphylus….* Translated by Thomas Stapleton. Antwerp: John Latius, 1565. Text Creation Partnership digital edition. *EBBO*. PDF e-book.

Stapleton, M. L. "Devoid of Guilty Shame: Ovidian Tendencies in Spenser's Erotic Poetry." *Modern Philology* 105.2 (2007): 271-299.

Thelwall, Sydney, and Peter Holmes. *The Writings of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus*. Vol. 11. London: T. & T. Clark, 1884.

Todd, Margo. *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Twisse, William. *Of the morality of the fourth commandement as still in force to binde Christians*. London: John Rothwell, 1641.

Tyacke, Nicholas. "The Puritain Paradigm of English Politics, 1558–1642" *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 03 (2010): 527–50, doi:10.1017/S0018246X1000018X.

----. "The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered" *Past & Present* 115, no. 1 (May 1, 1987): 201 –216, doi:10.1093/past/115.1.201.

Tyndale, William. *The Obedience of a Christian Man.* Edited by David Scott Daniel. London: Penguin Classics, 2000.

----. *A path way into the holy scripture.* London, 1536. PDF e-book.

----. *The vvhole workes of W. Tyndall, Iohn Frith, and Doct. Barnes, three worthy martyrs….* London: John Daye. 1573.

Venuti, Lawrence. "Translating Derrida on Translation: Relevance and Disciplinary Resistance." *Yale Journal of Criticism: Interpretation In The Humanities* 16, no. 2 (2003): 237-262.

----. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Webbe, William. *A discourse of English poetrie.* London: John Charlewood, 1586. PDF e-book.

Willet, Andrew. *a fruitful and godly sermon preached at Paules crosse…Vpon the 5. Chapter of the prophesie of Zacharie.* London: R. Bourne, 1592. PDF e-book.

Yeats, Frances A. *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*. London: Routledge, 1979.

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.