How to Hold Your Tongue: John Christopherson's Plutarch and the Mid-Tudor Politics of Catholic Humanism

Andrew Taylor
Churchill College, Cambridge

If Renaissance humanists pursued eloquence, those who wished to offer their learning and gift of tongues to the powerful did well to convince them of discretion's part in speaking appositely. Keeping one's mouth shut, or the disastrous consequences of failing to do so, is richly explored in Euripides's *Bacchae* and other plays. The Greek tragedian's sententious utterances on the subject were drawn upon by Plutarch when he composed his essay 'On Talkativeness' (*Peri adoleschias / De garrulitate*). Erasmus, who translated Euripides before moving on to Plutarch, drew heavily on *De garrulitate*, as well as the Book of Sirach and the Pauline Epistles, in developing his *Lingua* (1525). This owed its length, and possibly its popularity, to Erasmus's disproportionate treatment of the malicious tongue, a reflection of his recent troubles. His prefatory epistle identifies this diseased 'affliction of the unbridled tongue' as threatening 'the total ruin and destruction of the liberal arts, good morals, civic harmony, and the authority of the leaders of the church and the princes of the realm alike' (*Collected Works of Erasmus* [*CWE*] 29: 259-60). Plutarch, in *De garrulitate* as elsewhere in the *Moralia*, offered an appeallingly rich and urbane encounter with the works of classical antiquity, especially Greek. Moreover, the length of his moral essays, as with the individual lives in the *Vitae Parallelae*, made both the more attractive as works to package and present in translation to those of influence who might reflect on the counsel they offered, as well as on the interests of the learned donor. This essay explores the terms in which the English Catholic humanist John Christopherson (d.

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée
CRCL DECEMBER 2014 DÉCEMBRE RCLC
0319–051x/14/41.4/411

1558) offered Plutarch's *De garrulitate* to the Catholic princess Mary during the reign of Edward VI.

Christopherson was one of England's leading Hellenists. In 1546 he migrated from St John's College, Cambridge to become a founding Fellow of Trinity College. St John's, home of John Cheke, provided several further leading Hellenists from Cambridge's 'Athenian Tribe', including Trinity's first master, John Redman, and Robert Pember, Roger Ascham's teacher of Greek.[1] McConica long ago noted how humanist learning at St John's—the college of John Fisher—was far from the preserve of the 'Protestant interest in the English Reformation', and that although Roger Ascham (like Richard Brandisby, another friend of Christopherson's from Johnian days) would later gravitate with Cheke towards Protestantism under Edward, he sought sponsorship under Henry primarily from the 'learned, conservative clergy' (208). Peter Marshall has noted that even revisionist accounts of Henrician exile focus almost entirely on evangelicals, failing to register the number of Catholics who left the country, and treatments of the Edwardian period tend to continue the trend. Yet the writings in manuscript and print of Catholic humanists produced at home and abroad sustained learned networks around or connecting to Mary, the Catholic magnate, her wider household, and leading religious conservatives. At Corpus Christi College, Oxford, for example, the Reader of Greek and religious conservative John Morwen (Morrenus) offered to his patron William Roper, the husband of Thomas More's most erudite daughter, Margaret, Latin translations of works of St Basil and St Cyril (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 439). Roper's daughter Mary was tutored by Morwen and, as will be discussed later, dedicated her Greek learning to the defence of the old faith, as her celebrated grandfather had done (see Hosington). Morwen also translated a collection of Greek saints' lives and martyrdoms ('Martyrologii et Menologii ex graece pars quaedam, in qua horum, qui sequuntur Martyrum, vita et mors, continetur' (London, British Library MS Royal 13.B.x, f. 2^{r})).[2] In his long and rich letter of dedication to Princess Mary, probably written towards the end of Edward's reign, he celebrates the translation of the Greek ecclesiastical historian Eusebius by Mary Clarke (f. 4^{v}), as Mary Roper then was, and her inspiration for his own work. Clarke was seen by Morwen as an influential connection through which to approach Princess Mary, whose household, in which the Mass was celebrated in defiance of the king's policy, became a focus not only for the political opposition and traditional rites (Loades, *Mary Tudor* ch. 4, esp. 142), but also for the scholarly writing of Catholic humanism.

John Christopherson's compact Plutarch volume (Cambridge, University Library MS Dd.vi.56) is entitled 'Plutarchi Chaeronei philosophi libellus de futili loquacitate à Graeco in latinum per Ioannem Christofersonum conversus' (f. 1^{r}). The highly developed dedicatory epistle to Princess Mary (ff. 2^{r}-9^{v}) is followed by not only his Latin version of Plutarch's *Peri adoleschias* (ff. 10^{r}-51^{r}) but, rather more unusually, an edition of Plutarch's Greek: 'ΠΛΟΥΤΑΡΧΟΥ ΧΑΙΡΩΝΕΩΣ περὶ ἀδολεσχίας βιβλίον' (ff. 52^{r}-82^{v}). Mary, who was to succeed Edward VI in 1553, was only permit-

ted to resume use of her royal title following her father's death in 1547, which allows us to date the manuscript to the Edwardian years. Christopherson's epistle, details of which will be addressed later, interestingly echoes Plutarch's own discourse, while the inclusion of the Greek original foregrounds the act of translation and provides the Hellenized readership—that is, those learned humanists on whom Mary could draw for counsel—with the means immediately to appreciate his Latin version and recognize his ambitions and abilities as an editor of ancient Greek texts.

Robert Aulotte's enduring account of the tradition of the *Moralia* in the sixteenth century, *Amyot et Plutarque* (1965), despite his sustained interest in Plutarch's *De garrulitate*, merely noted the existence of Christopherson's translation. Jacques Amyot, the celebrated translator of Plutarch from Greek into French, made his first declaration of intent by dedicating his manuscript version of *De garrulitate*, entitled 'De la loquacité', to his patron, the bishop and secretary of state, Guillaume Bochetel in 1542; it appeared in revised form in his magnificent *Oeuvres Morales* (1572) as 'De trop parler'. Amyot himself belonged to a cosmopolitan humanist circle of editors and translators of Greek works who shared interests in Plutarchan texts and whose paths crossed as they hunted for manuscript sources through which to render their translations more authoritative, whether in Latin or, in Amyot's case, the vernacular.

Beyond the display of philological, literary and rhetorical competence, translation of Plutarch, *philosophus et historicus clarissimus*, provided a platform for the critic of royal policy, bringing the cloister and court ever closer (for sixteenth-century English translations, see Schurink). John Cheke, for example, offered his Latin translation of Plutarch's *De superstitione* to Henry VIII in the religiously uncertain 1540s, with an unusally long dedicatory essay which subtly applied Plutarch's discussion to those whose religiosity might mislead the king's desire for godly reform (see McDiarmid). Hadrianus Junius (Adriaen de Jonghe), who entered the service of the Howard family in 1544, pragmatically dedicated his edition of Plutarch's *Symposiaca problemata* (Paris: Jacobus Gazellus, 1547) to his new patron, the imperial ambassador in London François van der Delft (Franciscus Dilfius) in January 1547, shortly before the execution of his old one, Henry Howard, earl of Surrey. Christopherson's *De futili loquacitate* may be thought of participating in this *milieu*, perhaps even part of a longer campaign to contest Cheke's successes at Cambridge and his advancement at court: Cheke had been appointed the first regius professor of Greek in 1540, and became tutor to Prince Edward on 7 July 1544, to teach him 'of toungues, of the scripture, of philosophie and all liberal sciences' (London, British Library, Cotton MS Nero C.x, f. 11^{r}). From 1543 until Henry's death in 1547, Cheke offered the king a series of Latin translations of Greek works (including John Chrysostom, Maximus Abbas or *Asketikos*, Emperor Leo VI, and Plutarch) as fruits of Henry's enlightened sponsorship of Greek studies. Christopherson's composition of his Euripidean *Tragoedia Iepthe* during these years may then have constituted his bid for what seemed a likely vacancy at Cambridge (see Christopherson 1-3 and Paine 44-82). The play survives in two Greek texts and a Latin version, with the first two dedicated

(in Latin epistles) to William Parr, as Earl of Essex (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.1.37) and Cuthbert Tunstal (Cambridge, St John's College, MS 287.H.19); the Latin version was dedicated to Henry VIII (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 466). Christopherson similarly dedicated to Parr his Latin version of Demosthenes' *In Leptinem* (Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 3306) sometime between 23 December 1543, when Parr was made Earl of Essex, and 16 February 1547, when he acquired the title of Marquess of Northampton, a manuscript work of similar scale to that offered to Mary a few years later, although lacking the Greek original. Where Christopherson may have considered Parr a figure whose influence with the king could not be left unaddressed—he was both Queen Catherine's brother and broadly shared her interests in religious reform—in Tunstal, the Erasmian bishop of Durham and cousin of John Redman, we find a humanist far closer to Christopherson's more conservative religious commitments, whose influence was felt during the period of doctrinal retrenchment from 1539 onwards.

Both the English and Latin versions of Plutarch's (and Lucian's) works made by Henrician humanists owe a good deal to Erasmus's example. In Venice Erasmus had assisted the Cretan Demetrios Doukas in editing the Greek text of the Aldine *editio princeps* of the *Moralia* (1509), and he continued to work Plutarch into his ever-growing *Adagia* and *Parabolae* (a weighty twenty-four aphorisms from this essay) during his years in England, dedicating to Henry VIII in July 1513 his Latin translations of *How to Distinguish Friends from Flatters,* with *Advice on Health* going to the rising diplomat John Yonge on New Year's Day (January 1st) 1513, and *How to Profit from Your Enemies* to Thomas Wolsey on New Year's Day the following year. Erasmus's deepening friendship with Richard Pace fostered the Englishman's translation of Lucian as well as Plutarch for his collection printed in Rome in 1514 or 1515, during his period serving Cardinal Christopher Bainbridge, Henry's agent there. The collection was republished in Venice in 1522, when Pace added *De avaritia* (dedicated to Campeggi) and *De garrulitate* (dedicated to Tunstal). The letter to Tunstal recalls Niccolò Leonico Tomeo, the teacher of Greek and philosophy they shared ('nostro olim communi praeceptore'), who had cultivated a particular interest in Lucian and Plutarch: 'Thus, following the ancient custom', he continues, 'I dedicate to you, who are most learned in both Greek and Latin, this very weighty little book of Plutarch's on talkativeness, which I translated into Latin the day before' ('Ego igitur priscum secutus morem tibi, qui graece, simul et latine peritissimus es: Plutarchi de garrulitate gravissimum libellum, quem pridie latinitate donavi: dedico' (Pace 1522 f. ai^{v})). Leonico later commented on Pace's capacity for rendering the obscure comprehensible and noting passages that must remain difficult, continuing that Plutarch would have approved of Pace's corrections to his text. As Erasmus stated in his translation of Euripides's *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia in Aulis* (Paris: Badius, 1506), 'the very task of turning good Greek into good Latin is one that demands exceptional skill, and not only the richest and readiest vocabulary in both languages, but also an extremely sharp and alert intelligence' (*CWE* 2: 108, Ep. 188); for Pace, Tunstal is equipped to judge

his performance as translator, while his choice of treatises on the dangerous vices of greed and loquacity, the deceptions of flatterers and false friends, and advice on listening, speaks to the courtier-diplomat's lot in late-renaissance Europe. Leonico's esteem for Pace as a humanist was also raised considerably by his translation and emendation of Plutarch (Woolfson 108; Curtis 42).

But did Christopherson know of Pace's version? He states in his preface to Princess Mary, that, 'up to now, this little work has been known to few, only the learned in Greek literature' ('Antehac enim paucis his cognitus est libellus, eisdemque graecis literis eruditis' (f. 3^{v})). But consider Hieronymus Gemusaeus's important compilation of Plutarch's *opuscula* in Latin translation in 1541, essentially a reprinting of Cratander's Basel collection of 1530, which repeated the claim of being 'opera moralia, quae in hunc usque diem latinè extant, universa' (for the contents, see Becchi). Gemusaeus certainly bagged Erasmus's eleven translations among the forty-two —eight of Erasmus's were readily available in *Opuscula Plutarchi nuper traducta, Erasmo Roterodamo interprete* (Basel: Froben, 1514; reprinted 1518)—with Guarino's versions of *Parallela* and *De liberis educandis* being the oldest (translated 1411, first printed in 1471). But gathering translations by divers hands seems to have been a hit-and-miss affair: *De garrulitate* is not among them, despite the apparent availability of Pace's and also Pirckheimer's version, *Plutarchus Chaeroneus De compescenda Ira. De Garrulitate. De Curiositate. De iis qui sero a numine corripiuntur. De vitanda Vsura. Bilibaldo Pirckheymero Interprete* (Nuremburg: Peypus, 1523). Yet two others of Pirckheimer's do appear, but possibly from the earlier *Plutarchi...de his qui tarde a Numine corripiuntur libellus* (Nuremburg: Peypus, 1513) and *Plutarchus de vitanda usura, ex Graeco in Latinum traductus* (Nuremburg: Peypus, 1515), the latter reprinted probably in Germany in 1520 as *De vitanda usura libellus aureus*. As late as 1555, Naogeorgus (Thomas Kirchmeyer) recorded that his choice of seven Plutarchan works for translation had been motivated by the apparent want of Latin versions; again *De garrulitate* was among them. Here, with the gradual translation of all of Plutarch's *opuscula moralia*, what was available in print, or was known to be available, sometimes shaped the pattern of reception in haphazard ways. If translators claimed that theirs were the first versions, these professions must not have seemed too absurd or emptily rhetorical. But as the number of translations of a particular work increased, comparison of versions allowed a richer sense of the meaning of the original to be conveyed, encouraged reflection on how each version contributed to the understanding of the text, and implied the provisionality, limits and priorities of translation itself. Nevertheless, if Christopherson had hoped to see his version printed, he may have been put off by publication of Louis Roussard's in 1554 or Naogeorgus's in 1556.

Plutarch and Christopherson Abroad

Soon after Edward's accession in 1547, which brought with it the rapid protestantizing of the English Church, Christopherson left for Louvain on extended academic leave funded by Trinity College. Henry's religious policy, especially following the executions of John Fisher and Thomas More in the mid-1530s, had already driven some Catholic scholars abroad, with a community deepening established connections with Louvain in particular; the learned Morean circle around John Clement was a significant presence there. Christopherson's close friend Richard Brandisby, a buyer of Greek books in Cambridge in the 1520s, matriculated at Louvain in 1538, advancing his studies with Petrus Nannius, professor of Latin at Busleiden's *Collegium trilingue*. The friendship between Christopherson and Nannius would inform Christopherson's foreign sojourn, with Christopherson supplying Nannius with one (copied in Venice) of the three Greek manuscripts from which he produced his monumental Latin translation of the works of Athanasius (Basel: Froben and Episcopius, 1556). In Nannius's *Symmiktōn, sive, Miscellaneorum decas una* (Louvain: Servatius Sassenus; Leiden: apud Godefridum et Marcellum Beringos, fratres, 1548), dedicated to the English diplomat William Paget, we find a touching record of Nannius's reading of Plutarch's *Life of Sulla* in Greek with his friend Brandisby, who is, as Nannius's epistle makes clear, the connection between them (15). Yet such studies were not pursued for their own sake, however excellent Plutarch was seen as both philosopher and historian. Erasmus had established the mastery of the Greek orators, historians, and poets as preparatory to the handling of the New Testament and the Greek writings of the early church, a matter captured in, for example, the adage 'Illotis manibus' (1.9.55 'with unwashed hands'): 'Either proverb [i.e. with 'Illotis pedibus ingredi'] will properly be used of those who plunge into some undertaking full of self-confidence or ignorant of what they ought to know; for instance, anyone who assumes the office of a prince with no equipment of virtue of wisdom or experience of affairs, or sets out to interpret Holy Scripture untaught and unpractised in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew and indeed the whole of Antiquity, without which it is not only foolish but impious to undertake to treat the mysteries of theology' (*CWE* 32: 212).

Christopherson's major scholarly achievements were his translations of four works by Philo Judaeus published in 1553 (epistle dated March; reprinted 1555), and the *Historiae ecclesiasticae* of Eusebius and the subsequent Greek historians of the early church (1569, 1570, with several reprintings), a work left unfinished at his death (Taylor 88-90). Details of these larger works need not detain us here, but what should be emphasized is how Christopherson's translations of the Greek ecclesiastical historians depended not simply on Estienne's *editio princeps* (1544), nor his versions of Philo merely on Turnèbe's (1552), but rather, in both cases, on the collation against these printed works of the various manuscript witnesses he scrutinised in Venice and perhaps elsewhere during this period (see Philo b2^{r}; Taylor 83). In his translation of Philo he complains strenuously about the sundry errors in both Greek editions.

Christopherson's inclusion of the Greek of Plutarch's *Peri adoleschias* in the manuscript presented to Mary may thus be seen as a small but significant representation of these larger editorial activities.

In pursuit of Amyot's source for his French translation of Plutarch's *Peri adoleschias*, Aulotte compared the Greek editions published by Aldus (1509) and Froben (1542) and found around twenty differences (Aulotte, *Amyot* 141). Mapping the most significant of those onto Christopherson's edition (which is in his fine Greek hand) indicates that it is far closer to the Froben edition, but not quite identical, suggesting that Christopherson revised the printed text in the light of one or more manuscript witnesses.[3] In the prefatory dedication to Trinity College of his translation of four Philonic works Christopherson handsomely thanks Henry Scrimgeour, a Scotsman who had studied with Budé and Ramus in Paris before moving on to Bourges to pursue Civil Law, for having helped him to a Philonic manuscript from the Marciana (or a copy of it) for collation. Although other figures mentioned in that preface—Pietro Francisco Zini and the influential patrician Pietro Contarini (nephew of Cardinal Gasparo Contarini, d. 1542)—suggest a possible connection with Cardinal Pole, it is Scrimgeour's associations in Venice that bear most directly on the matter of Plutarch.

At Bourges in the early 1540s Scrimgeour was acquainted with Amyot, the professor of Greek, as well as Edward Henryson, another Scottish humanist studying law there. Just as Amyot thought sufficiently highly of Scrimgeour to recommend him as his replacement as tutor of the sons of Guillaume Bochatel, the statesman to whom Amyot had presented his 'De trop parler' in 1542, so Henryson became Greek tutor to Ulrich Fugger in 1547. In 1548, Scrimgeour and his pupil Bernadin Bochetel arrived at Padua for study, with Scrimgeour's work on his edition of Justinian's *Novellae* placing him in Venice for considerable periods, where he used the influence of Jean de Morvilliers, Guillaume Bochetel's brother-in-law, bishop of Orleans, and French ambassador to Venice between 1546 and 1549, to gain access to the important Bessarian codex there (Durkan). Amyot was in Italy between 1548 and 1552, initially with Morvilliers, before quitting Venice for Rome at the end of the summer 1550, returning to the Republic as assistant to the new ambassador, the Cardinal of Tournon (see Billault 221-22; Aulotte, *Amyot* 159). The Marciana's borrowing records show, despite the frustrating gap between 1549 and 1551 (a critical period), that Morvilliers borrowed on 20 July 1548 Justinian's *Novellae*, Philo Judaeus, and Plutarch's *Moralia*, leaving a silver cup as deposit.[4] The Marciana holds three manuscripts containing the *Peri adoleschias* (Gk 249 (X), 250 (Y), and 511), the first two of which are still considered by modern editors among the ten most important witnesses. As previously noted, Christopherson had a keen interest in the Philo manuscript, but in this Venetian, and specifically Markan, setting we find him among humanists working on Plutarch: Scrimgeour, Amyot and Henryson. Could it be the influence, direct or otherwise, of Amyot, that recommended the *Peri adoleschias* as a text fit for approaching a potential patron? Amyot obviously thought highly of

that essay, and its translation had served him well. In 1566 Amyot enlisted Bernadin Bochatel, by then Bishop of Rennes, in attempting to retrieve from Scrimgeour his Greek manuscript of the *Opuscula* of Plutarch (Durkan 19), which suggests that it could have been close to Christopherson for a time.

For his part, Henryson was persuaded by Fugger, for whom Scrimgeour acquired many Greek manuscripts, to translate Plutarch's *Septem sapientum convivium*, probably in 1551 when it was published. Back at Bourges teaching Roman law from 1553, Henryson published his translation of *Plutarchi commentarius stoicorum contrariorum* (Lyons: Rovillius, 1555), the notes to which acknowledge Scrimgeour's assistance in emending the Basel edition: 'Reliqua sunt aut facilis emendationis, aut deploratae depravationis, nisi succurrat, qui potest, eis et caeteris Plutarchorum operum mendis alter penè parens meus Henrycus Scrymierius nostras' (G3^{v}). Moreover, it seems unlikely to have been a coincidence that at Bourges in 1552 (the prefatory epistle is dated 16 April 1552), Louis Roussard was working up his translation of *De garrulitate*, which was published with his version of *De esu carnium* ('On eating meat') in 1554 (Roussard).

Admittedly, the argument is mostly circumstantial; Christopherson nowhere discusses his editorial work on the text of Plutarch, or complains explicitly about the printed edition, as he does in his Philo. Yet his inclusion of his Greek edition tacitly asserts this, and he had as good a reason to seek the authority of manuscript sources when pursuing Plutarchan translation along text-critical lines. Although Froben's 1542 Greek edition was, relative to the Aldine, 'multis mendarum milibus expurgata' ('purged of many thousands of mistakes'), Xylander (Wilhelm Holtzman, 1532-76) later made clear in the prefatory essays to his text and translations published in the 1570s, that the Froben edition hardly remedied the deeper textual problems. Moreover, Aldus had not had access to Bessarion's manuscripts in the Marciana at Venice and so the base text corrected by the Cretan Demetrios Doukas for the Aldine *editio princeps* of the *Moralia* (1509) was, as its proof-reader Erasmus complained, 'a copy which was corrupt in many places, nor was there any supply of ancient copies within my reach' (*CWE* 9: 303, Ep. 1341A; *ASD* IV-4, *Apophthegmatum libri I-IV*: 11-12): Doukas's thirteenth-century manuscript was Milan, Ambrosianus C 195 inf. (= gr. 881) (see Sicherl 357-59). It seems unlikely that Christopherson at Cambridge was unaware of the inadequate state of the Greek text, whether in the Aldine or Froben imprint, a deficiency anyway keenly impressed by those he met in Venice who could at last draw on the Markan treasures.

Domestic Application: The Prefatory Letter

For Gemusaeus the richness and abundance of Plutarch constituted an entire philosophical library: Pliny's variety, great as it is, falls short of material useful to the statesman, he avers, while Aristotle, although he pursues all branches of philosophy

acutely and abundantly, is nevertheless abstruse and difficult for the reader, and thus inhibits the movement from thought to action (a2^{r-v}). Erasmus had earlier encouraged recognition of how the form of Plutarch's moral teachings in the *opuscula* facilitated personal application: 'Socrates brought philosophy down from heaven to earth: Plutarch brought it into the privacy of the home [*cubiculum*] and into the study [*conclave*] and the bedroom [*thalamos*] of the individual' (*CWE* 11: 104, Ep. 1572). In contrast with Plutarch's *Vitae*, the essays of the *Moralia* offered more general application through which to mediate the relationship with potential patrons within humanistic ideas of *amicitia*.

Christopherson's dedicatory epistle to Princess Mary, however, opens an almost vertiginous gulf between his humble petition and the elevation of the addressee, suggesting, beyond matters of rhetorical decorum, other kinds of distance from which Christopherson approached his potential royal patron. Mary's eminence makes him extraordinarily fearful in writing to her ('facit ut ad te scribere instituo non mediocriter pertimescam' (f. 2^{r-v})), yet her virtue (in both piety and learning) prompts him to offer his work, however diffidently and modestly, even though he is not well known to her (et maxime quidem eò quòd minime tibi cognitus sim' (ff. 2^{v}-3^{r}). Nevertheless, towards the end of the letter he carefully states that, although there are many extremely learned men wishing her well, no one desires this more than him ('Et quanquam multi perquam eruditi viri sunt, qui tibi omnia exoptant bona: tamen si optata perficerentur, nemo me in optando superior existeret' (f. 8^{r})). When he acknowledges that the attention he calls to his work competes with the distractions of some serious business encumbering the princess, in the context of her piety, this gestures towards the personal cost of Mary's obstinate observance of outlawed Catholic ritual, despite the warnings of the King's Council and futile requests of Edward himself (see Loades, *Mary Tudor* ch. 6): even under Edwardian Protestantism, 'to be in Mary's service was to live as a Catholic. Service and sanctity were inextricably bound' (Whitelock and MacCulloch 271).

Mary was proclaimed queen on 19 July 1553. Before long Christopherson had closed the distance separating him from his most important patron. In his *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion*, a response to the Kentish uprising led by Thomas Wyatt the Younger issued by the queen's printer John Cawood on 24th July 1554 on the eve of Mary's marriage to Philip of Spain, he styled himself 'her grace's Chapleyne, and dayly oratour' or confessor, and acknowledged her support in a time of need:

> And yf it so come to passe, that my laboure not onlye be allowed of youre grace, as I doubte not, but also worke in the readers hartes thereof suche an effecte, as I wishe it may, then shal I think that I haue receaued a worthy recompence for myne endeauour. For neyther gayne, for whyche (God knoweth) I passe not, nor commendation, for whyche I loke not, moued me hereto, but only the harty affection, that I owe to my countrye, and my bounden duetie vnto your highnes, who of youre bountefull goodnesse where as I was destitute of all ayde and succoure, hath so liberally prouided for

> me, that nowe I maye withoute care serue God go to my booke, and do my duetie in that vocation, to which God hath called me. (a.viii^{r-v})

On 18th April 1554 he had been installed Dean of Norwich, England's second city (on the Marian restoration there, see Houlbrooke), having the previous year already replaced the ousted Protestant William Bill as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, an appointment in the gift of the Crown. His staunch Catholicism would have recommended him to Mary, as would his Edwardian retreat to Louvain (Loades, 'Marian Episcopate' 48) and its fruit, the Philo he dedicated to Trinity in the spring of 1553. This calling 'to my booke' (studies) in 1554 no doubt anticipated the publication of his Latin translation of *Historiae ecclesiasticae* and possibly plans for other scholarly editions of the works of Christian antiquity. News of his Eusebius had already reached Margaret Clarke (née Roper, subsequently Basset) during Edwardian days, either through personal connections in Mary's household (possibly extending to the circles of John Clement and William Rastell at Louvain) or his Philo, leading her to break off from her own Latin version, as she recorded in her dedication to Princess Mary of the Latin version of the first book and the English version of the first five books:

> I for these consyderacions [the inadequacy of Ruffinus's version] and dyuers other, enterprysed also to translate the same storye owt of greke in to latyn, and had made an end of the fyrst booke, I was theruppon ymmedyately for a very trewth enfourmed y^{t} a greate learned man had the whole translacion therof fully fynysshed all readye, Whereuppon I (as me thought was mete) lefte of thys my foresayd entrepryse (London, British Library, MS Harley 1860, f. 8^{r}; qtd from Goodrich 326-27)

It is intriguing to consider how early in Edward's reign news of Christopherson's Eusebius might have come to Mary Clarke if it did not derive from his Philo or related news from Louvain.

Christopherson's dedicatory letter moves from registering Mary's troubles to the themes of Plutarch's treatise: not only do those in high public office need to learn when to be silent (*silere*), but also always to employ in handling policy others who have strength, not for the rash and exercised tongue, but whose hearts are filled with the wisest thoughts. Needless to say, he decorously denies self-promotion: 'I do not offer this little work to your Highness to attain some gift or salary' ('Neque istud opusculum tuae amplitudini offero, quo aliquid praemii aut mercedis assequar' (f. 7^{v})), he states, but rather to show his zealous inclination towards her. Earlier he had noted that the praiseworthy counsellor is customarily one who avoids rushing into vast vacuities ('ad magnas...inanitates ruit') by applying the brakes to his tongue ('et linguae suae quasi frena iniicere' (f. 4^{r-v})). In projecting his qualities of discretion, he takes up the theme that 'every discourse must be accommodated to the nature of the business' ('Ad rei naturam sermo quisque accommodandus est') to complain against the prevalent lack of decorum in both public and private discourse: 'everything that is full of words is empty of wisdom and judgement ('verborum plena esse omnia,

prudentiae et consilii inania' (f. 5^{v})). This extends to manners at the tables of the great, where the intrusive discussion of religious and state business stifles diverting conversation ('ubi facetiae maxime regnare debent, sermo de rebus seriis, ut pote de religione, de maximis Reipublicae negotiis infertur' (ff. 5^{v}-6^{r})). Those shaped by the best instruction, he concludes, are given to speaking 'indeed rather reluctantly and unwillingly' ('aegrius quidem et invitius'), as Plutarch's *Peri adoleschias* will teach.

Christopherson's letter also seems to imitate the literary manner of Plutarch discussed by Erasmus in the dedication to Alexius Thurzo of his versions of *De cohibenda ira* and *De curiositate* in his *Plutarchi Chaeronei Libellus perquam elegans* (Basel: Froben, 1525), which included the Greek:

> It was certainly no easy task to convey the subtlety of Plutarch's language and reproduce those recondite expressions which he called up from the secret stores of every author and every discipline and put together in his work. The result was not so much a composition as a patchwork [*non orationem sed centonem*], or better still, a mosaic [*musaicum opus*] composed of the most exquisite pieces [*emblemata*]. All this was easy enough for him since his mind was stored with literary works of every kind, but it is very difficult for the translator to discover what he borrowed and from what source, especially as we no longer possess many of the authors from whose meadows he picked the blooms for the weaving of his garlands. But this is not the only difficulty: there is also something terse and abrupt [*concisum quiddam et abruptum*] about his writing which sends the reader off suddenly in new directions. (*CWE* 11: 104; Allen VI: 71-72, Ep. 1572)

Christopherson's own epistolary mosaic includes fragments from St James's teaching: those who are disposed to speak become slow to listen (James 1:19): 'Sed fit iam, nescio quo modo, ut omnes contra D. Jacobi praeceptum ad loquendum propensi, ad audiendum valde tardi existant' (f. 6^{r}). He seems to have 1:26 in mind as well: 'si quis autem putat se religiosum esse non refrenans linguam suam sed seducens cor suum huius vana est religio' ('And if anyone think that he is religious, not bridling his tongue, but seducing his own heart, his religion is vain'). Euripides follows in offset quotation marked in the margin as *carmen* in iambic trimeter: 'Tua lingua motu lubrico praeceps ruit' ('Your tongue rushes headlong with its perilous movement', f. 6^{v}), seemingly a paraphrase of *Bacchae* 386-88:

> Ἀχαλίνων στομάτων,
> ἀνόπου δ' ἀφροσύνας
> τὸ τέλος δυστυχία
>
> Of unrestrained mouths,
> and of lawless folly
> is disaster the end

It is tempting to think that ἀχαλίνων στομάτων ('unbridled mouth') prompted recollection of James's χαλιναγωγῶν γλῶσσαν ('bridled language'), the Latin 'lingua' translating both γλῶσσαν and στόμα (mouth as the organ of speech). Philo, moreover, was fond of this association of bridle and tongue (Allison 356, n. 66). But these

quotations from St James and Euripides (also present in Plutarch's *Peri adoleschias* at 503D), just as Christopherson's brief consideration of the tongue as *plectrum*, are found within a few pages of one another at the start of Erasmus's *Lingua* (1525), and, as he says there, '[Euripides] could not have conveyed more vividly a loose and rambling tongue, thoughtlessly blurting out anything without giving firm consideration to what is appropriate and useful and what is not' (*CWE* 29: 267-71; *ASD* IV-1: 243-47).

At this point Christopherson trenchantly berates those who have thrown aside the traditions of learned piety:

> Et cum verba suo more fundere occeperint, ita sine ratione, sine mente ruunt, ut vel in summis religionis nostrae mysteriis quid temere et inconsyderate effutiant, non omnino laborent. In quos illud Euripidis apposite dici potest: *Tua lingua motu lubrico praeceps ruit*. Sed nulla verbis insidet prudentia. Totos dies garrire, aures hominum offendere, veritatem oppugnare, pietatem et virtutis studium evertere non desinunt. Carni libertatem et licentium largiri: nequitiae fenestram aperire: sensus hominum blanditiis titillare: cuiusque voluptati inservire: ad voluntatem loqui student: ita vt merito ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι (sic enim loquitur Paulus) appellari debeant. (f. 6^{r-v})

> 'And when they, in their usual manner, have begun to pour forth words, they so run on without thought that they are entirely untroubled about what they blurt out blindly and thoughtlessly on the highest mysteries of our religion. That saying of Euripides can be applied appositely against them: 'Your tongue rushes headlong with its perilous movement'. But no wisdom dwells in these words. All day long, they do not leave off prating, offending the ears of men, attacking the truth, turning aside from piety and the study of virtue. They are eager to condone the liberty and dissoluteness of the flesh, to open the window of iniquity, to tickle the senses of men with flatteries, to be devoted to everyone's pleasures, and to speak according to their will, so that they ought to be called *anthrôpáreskoi* ['man-pleasers': Colossians 3:22, Ephesians 6:6], for thus Paul speaks.'

Christopherson here purposefully projects, if only briefly, his biblical reference into the Greek of the New Testament. This no doubt reflects his own Erasmian humanistic commitments, how his Greek learning could be applied to the most important of texts, but we also know that Mary, whatever her abilities as a Greek scholar, possessed a Greek New Testament and an Aristophanes in Greek, acquisitions or gifts which suggest an engagement with, or at least recognition of, advanced humanist pedagogy. Mary had also earlier been piously involved in the project of translating Erasmus's Latin *Paraphrases on the New Testament* into English, taking on John (with perhaps some support) for the *First Tome or Volume* (1548) (see Pollnitz). That Greek New Testament and Aristophanes were with John Hopton when he made his will. Hopton was appointed Bishop of Norwich on 28 October 1554, six months after Christopherson had become Dean of the cathedral there, and both were energetic restorers of Catholicism. In his will, Hopton stressed that these Greek books (as well as a Bible) should be restored to the queen (*ODNB* 'John Hopton'), and it may be that he acquired them while serving (and celebrating Mass) as Mary's private chaplain under Edward, a position Christopherson would fill upon Mary's accession.

From Plutarch Christopherson learned to vary the humour of his examples, and

he soon shifts from his religious complaint to a sharp, ironic anecdote involving Isocrates, very much as Plutarch does in Aristotle's reply to a chatterer (*adoleschos*) who presumes, 'Poor philosopher, I've wearied you with my talk', 'Heavens, no! I wasn't listening' (503B). Christopherson's witty parallel has Isocrates tell a certain *loquax* called Careon that he has to pay twice for instruction, once for the art of speaking, and again for that of keeping quiet. This anecdote is rather more recondite, so Christopherson may have culled it from Stobaeus's *Florilegium*, 36.25, within material gathered under the heading 'Peri adoleschias', or 'De garrulitate' in the Latin translations, a natural place for a Hellenist to search for material on this theme.

Although the lines from *Bacchae* also appear under this heading in Stobaeus, they were far more accessible in Aulus Gellius's *Noctes Atticae*, 1.15.17, in the chapter entitled 'Quam inportunum vitium plenumque odii sit futili inanisque loquacitas, et quam multis in locis a principibus utriusque linguae viris detestatione iusta culpata sit' ('What a tiresome and utterly hateful fault is vain and empty loquacity, and how often it has been censured in deservedly strong language by the greatest Greek and Latin writers'), and as the first word of *Noctes Atticae*—'Plutarchus'—signals, Gellius had many debts to the Greek. Christopherson seems to allude to this heading in his letter, when he asserts, 'Quàm amens res sit, et quam temeraria, futilis in homine loquacitas ex ista Plutarchi commentatione satis emergit'. Perhaps his choice to render 'Peri adoleschias' as 'De futili loquacitate' was a Gellian touch, although Erasmus also calls Plutarch's work this in *Lingua*. The word *garrulus*, although classical, is not Ciceronian, and Christopherson avoided using it for *adoleschos*, unlike Pirckheimer, who, it seems, purposefully alternates between *garrulus* and *loquax* in translating that Greek word. Moreover, Gellius's scope and manner in 1.15 seem much closer to Christopherson's dedicatory epistle. Particularly pertinent is Gellius's application of those Euripidean verses, which, 'ought not to be understood as directed only at those who spoke impiously or lawlessly, but might even with special propriety be used of men who prate foolishly and immoderately' ('non de his tantum factos accipi debere, qui impia aut inlicita dicerent, sed vel maxime de hominibus quoque posse dici stulta et immodica blaterantibus' (1.15.17)); talkativeness is the enemy of eloquence.

Translation

Christopherson's prefatory discourse, in addition to offering the commonplace of Plutarch's wisdom and eloquence, confesses that these qualities prompted him to reread the Greek thoroughly. Those who know Greek properly are very few, he avers, and so his Latin version brings the Greekless the treatise's fruitful guidance for a wise and untroubled life ('ad vitam prudenter et secure transigendam' (f. 3^{v})). Although it is fitting, as Christopherson states, that a treatise on the vices of loquacity should itself be brief and avoid prolixity, his attempt to supply eloquence and embellishments to match Plutarch's original tends to make his version more expansive, even as he aims

to give the reader a Plutarch speaking Latin purely and clearly ('pure et significanter loqui' (f. 9^{v})). Christopherson outlined the duties of the translator in the long and unfinished 'Prooemium' to his translation of Eusebius's *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*:

> quatuor potissimum videntur requiri, vera sensus sententiaeque explicatio, latinitas, numerus, et ea, quam dixi, sermonis perspicuitas. Primum ad fidem, secundum ad delectationem, tertium ad aurium iudicium, quartum ad intelligentiam solet accommodari....Eloquentia non est illa inanis et prope puerilis verborum volubilitas, quae saepe in populo insolenter se venditat, sed diserte et copiose loquens sapientia, quae in prudentum animos cum suavitate illabitur. (Quoted from Geneva, 1612, 4^{v}-5^{r})

> 'four things in particular seem to be required; a true explanation of sense and meaning, good latinity, harmony, and that perspicuity of speech which I have spoken of. The first is usually held to be relevant for fidelity, the second for delight, the third for judgment of the ears, the fourth for understanding.…For eloquence is not that empty and almost puerile verbosity which offers itself for sale insolently among the people, but wisdom speaking eloquently and copiously which glides into the minds of the prudent with sweetness.' (Tr. Binns 135-36)

The qualities of *elegantia* and *ornatus* do not necessarily map tidily onto *sententiae* and *copia*. Here, as elsewhere, *gravitas* and *amplitudo* seem to have justified translation *numerose*, in a rhythmic, harmonious, or measured manner. In his dedication to William Parr, earl of Essex of his Latin translation of Demosthenes' *In Leptinem* (Cambridge, University Library MS Add. 3306), Christopherson stated that his preparation for translating Demosthenes had been the reading of Cicero's orations in order to present the Greek orator speaking faultless Ciceronian Latin ('tentareque volui quo pacto Demosthenes ad consuetudinem Ciceronis pure et latine loqui videretur. Atque ad hunc conatum, maximum mihi subsidium ex Ciceronis orationibus diligenter perlegendis comparavi' (f. 4^{r})). Similarly, for his translating of the Greek ecclesiastical historians he states he followed 'Caesar, Sallust, and now and then Livy, Cicero's narrations too, which are the most elegant by far, so that with all these I made this single history at last speak Latin' ('Secutus quidem certè sum historicos Latinos omnium praestantissimos, Caesarem, Salustium, et interdum Livium, narrationes quoque Ciceronis, quae sunt longè elegantissimae, ut horum omnium adiumentis hanc unam historiam Latinè tandem loquentem facerem' (Philo ci^{v})). His accommodation of a Greek author to a specific model of Latin eloquence could, however, begin to jeopardise the stylistic particularity (if not the sense) of the original.

Such 'cultural translation' was not uncontested. Naogeorgus, in his *Plutarchi... Libelli septem, in Latinum conversi* (1556), which included *De garrulitate*, stated:

> Pari elegantia et gratia reddere non potui, non solum ideo quòd longè praestet in his: verùm etiam quòd longius à Graeco digredi noluerim, verterimque astrictius. Non enim paraphrastes esse studui (quod nonnulli solent) sed interpres. (5)

> 'I have not been able to translate with matching elegance and grace, not only because he [Plutarch] excels by far in these, but also because I did not wish to deviate too far from

> the Greek, but translate more concisely. For I strove to be not a paraphrast (as many are accustomed to be), but a translator'.

Erasmus's expansiveness as a translator of Plutarch, which reflects his desire to render the full sense and implication, sometimes by using two synonyms or equivalents for one Greek word or phrase, has been termed Ciceronian (Rummel 80-81); ironically Christopher Longueil (Longolius), one of the targets of Erasmus's *Ciceronianus* (1528), criticised Erasmus's version as paraphrastic. Xylander still felt the need to attack rigidly Ciceronian standards in the 1570s: 'I care less for the fastidiousness of those who approve nothing but the Ciceronian, clean and refined and, by some means or other, at length polished. I toiled for clearness, where nothing ought to be translated too antiquely' ('Quo minùs curo eorum morositatem, qui nisi Ciceronianum, tersum politumque et nescio quo tandem instrumento limatum nihil probant. Ego perspicuitati operam dedi, qua nihil debet esse antiquius interpreti' (αiiii^{r})).

Comparison of Christopherson's treatment of the opening sentences of Plutarch's *Peri adoleschias* with Roussard's immediately confirms the Englishman's expansiveness:

> *Plut*: Δύσκολον μὲν ἀναλαμβάνει θεράπευμα καὶ χαλεπὸν ἡ φιλοσοφία τὴν ἀδολεσχίαν. Τὸ γὰρ φάρμακον αὐτῆς, ὁ λόγος, ἀκουόντων ἐστίν, οἱ δ' ἀδόλεσχοι οὐδενὸς ἀκούουσιν· ἀεὶ γὰρ λαλοῦσι.
>
> 'It is a troublesome and difficult task that philosophy has in hand when it undertakes to cure garrulousness. For the remedy, words of reason, requires listeners; but the garrulous listen to nobody, for they are always talking.'
>
> *Chr*: Ardua plane et difficilis est illa quidem curatio, quam in futili loquacitate medenda suscipit Philosophia. Oratio enim, quae est illius propria medicina, ad auditores solet accommodari. At qui paulo sunt loquaciores, nihil omnino audire volunt. (f. 10^{r}; 35 words)
>
> *Rous*: Difficilem sanè et periculosam rem curandam, garrulitatem, philosophia suscepit. Oratio enim remedium illius, audientibus adhibetur. Garruli verò neminem audiunt: nam perpetuo garriunt. (a3^{r}; 22 words)

Almost any short section of Christopherson's translation reveals the greater length of his handling of Plutarch's Greek, expansion often drawing out what Plutarch has tersely implied. For example, where Plutarch (506B) draws on the example of complete physical and mental self-control of Odysseus (most eloquent, but also most silent) for his own men—τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ των ἑταίρων ('Such also were many of his companions')—Christopherson underlines the specific application to the restraint of the tongue: 'Multi etiam illius socii in silentii munere penè similes extiterunt' ('Also many of his companions arose resembling him closely in the gift of silence').

Here, to close, is a comparison with Naogeorgus's and Pace's versions of parts of 508C-D:

> Ὀρθῶς οὖν Φιλιππίδης ὁ κωμῳδιοποιὸς φιλοφρονουμένου τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτὸν Λυσιμάχου [πρὸς ἑαυτὸν[5]] καὶ λέγοντος, 'τίνος σοι μεταδῶ τῶν ἐμῶν;' 'οὗ βούλει,' φησί, 'βασιλεῦ, πλὴν τῶν ἀπορρήτων.' τῇ δ' ἀδολεσχίᾳ καὶ ἡ περιεργία κακὸν οὐκ ἔλαττον πρόσεστι· πολλὰ γὰρ ἀκούειν θέλουσιν, ἵνα πολλὰ λέγειν ἔχωσι· καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἀπορρήτους καὶ κεκρυμμένους τῶν λόγων περιιόντες ἐξιχνεύουσι καὶ ἀνερευνῶσιν, ὥσπερ ὕλην παλαίαν τινα φορτίων τῇ φλυαρίᾳ παρατιθέμενοι, εἶθ' ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες τὸν κρύσταλλον οὔτε κατέχειν οὔτ' ἀφεῖναι θέλουσι·
>
> 'Philippides, the comic poet, therefore, made the right answer when king Lysimachus courteously asked him, "What is there of mine that I may share with you?" and he replied, "Anything you like, Sire, except your secrets." And to garrulousness is attached also this vice no less serious than itself, inquisitiveness. For babblers wish to hear many things so that they may have many things to tell. And they go about tracking down and searching out especially those stories that have been kept hidden and are not revealed, storing up for their foolish gossip, as it were, hucksters' wares; then, like children with a piece of ice, they neither hold it or are willing to let it go.' (Tr. W.C. Helmbold, Loeb edition)

Christopherson's version of this passage (ff. 29^{v}-30^{r}) is considerably longer than Naogeorgus's (150), 86 words compared with 67. Although Christopherson and Naogeorgus handle most of the first sentence with similar efficiency and verbal closeness to the Greek, in the rendering of Philippides' reply to Lysimachus we find hints of Christopherson's rhythmic expansiveness in his handling of the phrase 'except secrets' (πλὴν τῶν ἀπορρήτων): 'praeter arcana mentis tuae consilia', as against Naogeorgus's slightly shorter, but far terser 'modò ne quid secreti'. Similarly, for the following sentence, Naogeorgus offers Latin *ad verbum*, Pace similarly, while Christopherson overwrites the balanced phrasing of the original, placing before 'multa audire volunt' the restated subject of the sentence, and after it dilating the purpose clause (ἵνα/ut) through a contrasting (and baggier) passive grammatical construction using the gerund 'loquendum'.

> *Plut*: πολλὰ γὰρ ἀκούειν θέλουσιν, ἵνα πολλὰ λέγειν ἔχωσι·
>
> 'For they wish to hear many things, so that they have many things to relate'
>
> *Nao*: Multa enim audire volunt, ut multa dicere habeant,
>
> *Pace*: multa enim audire volunt, ut multa loquenda habeant
>
> *Chr*: Qui enim loquaces sunt, multa audire volunt, ut multa illis ad loquendum suppetere possint.
>
> 'Truly those who are babblers, they wish to hear many things, so that for them there can be many things in store for speaking.'

In the final part of the passage Christopherson, Naogeorgus and Pace all follow the Greek closely, although employing different diction:

> *Plut*: εἶθ' ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες τὸν κρύσταλλον οὔτε κατέχειν οὔτ' ἀφεῖναι θέλουσι·

'then, like children, they wish neither to hold nor to let go of ice'

Nao: deinde, quaemadmodum pueri glaciem neque tenere neque dimittere volunt:

Pace: Postea sicut pueri glaciem, nec retinere, nec dimittere volunt.

Chr: Quinetiam sicut pueri glaciem nec continere nec dimittere volunt.

Yet despite the number of occasions where Christopherson translates no less tersely *ad verbum* than Pace or Naogeorgus, or indeed Roussard, his version is the longest overall by far owing to its 'Erasmian' rhetorical and expansive qualities. In this sense it might be thought of less as a crib for Plutarch's Greek, and more as a version which gently asserted its own eloquence over that of the original.

In translating Plutarch, much was at stake for the humanist seeking to impress his peers. Command of the original's meaning had to be projected, and an elegant Latin equivalent sensitive to the original's style found in order to convey successfully the rhetorical and literary force of the Greek; Plutarch's rich use of other writers made his essays a particular challenge. However, when a translator turned to the Greek texts of Christian antiquity and its tradition, literary and religious politics combined in particularly challenging ways. Christopherson's abilities and goals as a translator of Philo, and especially of Eusebius, deserve further consideration, and not merely in comparison with the equally long-running, terse Latin version dedicated to Edward VI by the Lutheran Wolfgang Musculus (Basel: Froben and Episcopius, 1549) (see Taylor 92-94): Christopherson's 'Prooemium interpretis...in Eusebium' and its relationship to his practice in translating Eusebius can also be compared with the works published by his Protestant rival Laurence Humphrey, the *Interpretatio linguarum* (1559) and his translations of Philo, Cyril and Origen. Edward Godsalve, who wrote a preface to Christopherson's translations of the Greek ecclesiastical historians in 1559, no doubt in the hope that he would be able to see them through the presses the year after his master's death, rhetorically questioned whether it was possible to know if Christopherson had been more eloquent or more faithful in fulfilling the duty of a translator, thus echoing the terms of the 'Prooemium': 'fideliter, Latinè, dilucidè, numerose exprimere' (1612: ††5v). Here 'numerose' tends to mean harmoniously, relating to prose rhythm, but also abundantly and variously, which informs the ways in which Christopherson sought the other qualities of fidelity, good Latin and clarity.

However modest the Plutarchan manuscript Christopherson dedicated to Princess Mary during the Protestant years of her brother's reign, it testifies richly to the learned sophistication and ambitions of a prominent English humanist, whose religious commitments and scholarly abilities were called upon by the new Catholic queen. Princess Mary had provided a focus for such humanistic bids for recognition and preferment by those who themselves were experiencing exclusion or marginalization, and with the decline in Edward's health all too clear in the spring of 1553, her possible accession could well have been in Christopherson's mind when he fashioned

this Plutarchan approach. Unlike Erasmus, however, who set the pattern for offering elegant Latin translations of Plutarchan *opuscula* to those of power and influence in the English church and state, Christopherson's reward—Master of Trinity College, then Dean of Norwich, and finally Bishop of Chichester in 1557—precluded the completion of his Latin version of Greek ecclesiastical historians by the time of his death in 1558, shortly after the passing of both Mary and Cardinal Pole. As Claire Cross has observed, 'The form of humanism fostered by Pole might well have put down lasting roots in the universities had the queen secured a Catholic succession' (76), and it would be over a decade before Christopherson's *magnum opus* went to the presses in Louvain.

Notes

1. For all these figures, see *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [*ODNB*], 61 vols (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).

2. The lives are those of Artemius, St Hilarion, Avercius, James the Apostle, Aretha, St Marcianus, Demetrius, Anastasia the Roman, Zenobius and his sister (Zenobia), Abramius, and Epimachus.

3. 505C: πέλοντα προσάγεσθαι (1509, p. 419) against μέλλοντα προσάγεσθαι (1542, p. 422). Christopherson, f. 59^{v}: μέλλοντα προσαγησθαι. 503C, Christopherson, f. 54^{v} [note *Noctes Atticae* 1.15.17] ἀχαλίνων γαρ ὀυκ ὀικημὰτων, ἀλλὰ στομάτων τὸ τέλος δυστυχίαν, ὁ Ευριπιδης φησὶν, cf. ἀχἀλίνων [*sic*] γὰρ οὐ ταμιείων οὐδ' οἰκημάτων (1509). Another difference indicated by Aulotte, who admits it is a more slender argument: ὡς εκεινοι, φιλὶππου (1542) against ὡς εκεινοι· φιλὶππου, cf. Christopherson, f. 77^{v}: την αποφασιν, ὡς εκεῖνοι φιλιππου γραψαυτος.

4. H. Omont, 'Deux registres de prêts de manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Saint-Marc à Venise (1545-1559)', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole de Chartes*, 48 (1887), 651-86 (entries 89-94, p. 666). See entry 105 (p. 668) for the borrowing of Justinian on 7 August 1551 by Odet de Selve, who was then ambassador (1551-52).

5. Most manuscripts read πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ (rather than just καὶ), and this reading is included in the early editions. In the last line of the quotation the addition of δύνανται before κατέχειν by Helmbold, following J.J. Reiske, has been omitted, as it does not appear in Christopherson's manuscript or sixteenth-century editions.

Works Cited

Allen, P.S. *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1906-58. Print.

Allison, Dale C., Jr. *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. Print.

ASD = Erasmus, Desiderius. *Opera omnia Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1969-. Print.

Aulotte, Robert. *Amyot et Plutarque: La Tradition des Moralia au XVIe Siècle*.

Geneva: Droz, 1965. Print.

---, ed. *Plutarque en France au XVIe siècle: trois opuscules moraux traduits par Antoine Du Saix, Pierre de Saint-Julien et Jacques Amyot*. Études et commentaires 74. Paris: Klincksieck, 1971. Print.

Becchi, Francesco. "Le traduzioni latine dei *Moralia* di Plutarco tra XIII e XVI secolo." *Plutarco nelle traduzioni latine di età umanistica: Seminario di studi, Fisciano, 12-13 luglio 2007*. Ed. Paola Volpe Cacciatore. Napoli: M. D'Auria, 2009. 11-52. Print.

Billault, Alain. "Plutarch's *Lives*." *The Classical Heritage in France*. Ed. Gerald Sandy. Leiden: Brill, 2002. 219-35. Print.

Binns, J.W. *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age*. Leeds: ARCA, 1990. Print.

Borch-Bonger, F. de. "Un ami de Jacques Amyot: Henry Scringer." *Mélanges offerts à Abel Lefranc*. Paris: Droz, 1936. 362-73. Print.

Christopherson, John. *Iepthe* [and William Goldingham, *Herodes*]. Ed. Christopher Upton. Renaissance Latin Drama in England, 2nd ser. 7. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1988. Print.

Cioranescu, Alexandre. *Vie de Jacques Amyot d'après des documents inédits*. Paris: Droz, 1941. Print.

Cross, Claire. "The English Universities, 1553-58." *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Eds. Eamon Duffy and David Loades. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 57-76. Print.

Curtis, Catherine. "Richard Pace on Pedagogy, Counsel and Satire." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1997. Print.

CWE = Collected Works of Erasmus. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1974-. Print.

Durkan, J. "Henry Scrimgeour, Renaissance Bookman." *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 5.1 (1971-87): 1-31. Print.

Gemuseus, Hieronymus. *Hieronymus Gemusaeus in Plutarchi Chaeronei philosophi et historici clarissimi opera moralia, quae in hunc usque diem latinè extant, universa*. Basel: Isingrin, 1541. Print.

Goodrich, Jaime. "The Dedicatory Preface to Margaret Roper Clarke Basset's Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*." *English Literary Renaissance* 40 (2010): 301-28. Print.

Hosington, Brenda M. "Translation in the Service of Politics and Religion: A Family Tradition for Thomas More, Margaret Roper, and Mary Clarke Basset." *Between Scylla and Charybdis: Learned Letter Writers Navigating the Reefs of Religious and Political Controversy in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Jeanine de Landtsheer and Henk Nellen. Leiden: Brill, 2011. 93-108. Print.

Houlbrooke, Ralph. "The Clergy, the Church Courts and the Marian Restoration

in Norwich." *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Eds. Eamon Duffy and David Loades. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 124-48. Print.

Loades, David. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989. Print.

---. "The Marian Episcopate." *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Eds. Eamon Duffy and David Loades. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 33-56. Print.

Marshall, Peter. *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

McConica, James Kelsey. *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1965. Print.

McDiarmid, John F. "John Cheke's Preface to *De Superstitione*." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48.1 (1997): 100-120. Print.

Nannius (Nanninck), Petrus. *Συμμίκτων, sive, Miscellaneorum decas una*. Louvain: Servatius Sassenus; Leiden: apud Godefridum et Marcellum Beringos, fratres, 1548. Print.

Naogeorgus (Kirchmeyer), Thomas. *Plutarchi… Libelli septem, in Latinum conversi, cum antea versi non essent…Thoma Naogeorgo Straubingensi interprete*. Basel: Joannes Oporinus, 1556. Print.

Pace, Richard. *In hoc codice hec oposcula continentur. Plutarchi Quomodo poterit quis ab inimicis aliquid commodi reportare. Eiusdem De modo audiendi. Ex Luciano De monactis philosophi vita. Apollonii theanei Epistola consolatoria ad valerium imperatorem. / R. Paceo interprete*. Rome: Jacobus Mazochius, 1514-15. Print.

---. *Plutarchi Cheronæi Opuscula: de garrulitate; de auaritia; quomodo poterit quis ab inimicis aliquid commodi reportare; ejusdem, de modo audiendi; ex Luciano, Demonactis philosophi vita. Omnia per eximium R. Paceum Angliæ oratorem elegantissime vera*. Venice: Bernardinus de Vitalibus, 1522. Print.

Paine, Douglas. "Academic Drama at Cambridge, c. 1522-1581." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2008. Print.

Philo. *Philonis Judaei scriptoris eloquentissimi gravissimique libri quatuor: quorum primus est De mundi fabricatione quae est a Moyse descripta; secundus, De decem praeceptis, quae capita legum sunt; tertius, De magistratu seu principe deligendo; quartus, De officio iudicis, iam primum de Graeco in Latinum conversi, Joanne Christophorsono Anglo, interprete*. Antwerp: Ioannes Verwithaghen, 1553. Print.

Pollnitz, Aysha. "Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII: Princess Mary, Katherine Parr and the Paraphrases of Erasmus." *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 123-37. Print.

Roussard, Louis. *Plutarchi Chaeronei philosophi clarissimi liber de garrulitate. Eiusdem de esu carnium orationes duae, Lodovico Russardo interprete*. Lyon:

Sebastianus Gryphius, 1554. Print.

Rummel, Erika. *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985. Print.

Schurink, Fred. "Print, Patronage, and Occasion: Translations of Plutarch's *Moralia* in Tudor England." *Yearbook of English Studies* 38 (2008): 86-101. Print.

Sicherl, M. *Griechische Erstausgaben des Aldus Manutius*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1997. Print.

Taylor, Andrew W. "Humanist Philology and Reformation Controversy: John Christopherson's Latin Translations of Philo Judaeus and Eusebius of Caesarea." *Tudor Translation*. Ed. Fred Schurink. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 79-100. Print.

Whitelock, Anna and Diarmaid MacCulloch. "Princess Mary's Household and the Succession Crisis, July 1553." *The Historical Journal* 50.2 (2007): 265-87. Print.

Woolfson, Jonathan. *Padua and the Tudors: English Students in Italy, 1485-1603*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1998. Print.

Xylander (Holtzman), Guilielmus. *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia…Id est, varii libri…omnes de graeca in latinam linguam transscripti summo labore, cura, et fide: Guilielmo Xylandro Augustano interprete*. Basel: Thomas Guarinus, 1570. Print.