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Abstract

Laurence Humphrey was acknowledged in his own day as a leading Protestant intellectual, Oxford pedagogue, and Latinist. In posterity however, he has been predominantly defined by his involvement in the ‘vestiarian controversy’ of the 1560s. This thesis proposes a revised view, which takes into account the significant educational contexts and concerns with which Humphrey was engaged before, during and after his Marian exile in Zurich and Basel.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter One presents the fruits of new biographical research into Humphrey’s education and early adult life, his grounding in Protestant ideology, and the circumstances of his exile up until 1559. Relocated amongst the Rhineland’s finest scholar-printers, Humphrey immerses himself in the dual currents of European humanism and religion, a context that characterizes his earliest works.

Chapter Two argues that Humphrey’s 1559 Interpretatio Linguarum evidences an international network of reformed scholars using Graeco-Latin translation theory to inform the development of vernacular literary culture. In discussing contemporary writers and their translations, Humphrey’s Latin work reveals itself as an intellectually central text of English vernacular culture.

Chapter Three analyses the 1560 Optimates as an exposition of the pedagogical concept of the vir bonus, which Humphrey refashions for a new Elizabethan generation of English Protestant gentry.

Chapter Four reprises the biographical narrative by following Humphrey’s return to the educational environment of early Elizabethan Oxford. The period from 1560 to the mid-1570s sees the consolidation of Humphrey’s reputation as one of the leading reformist educators of his generation.

Chapter Five looks at the 1573 Vita Iuelli. Referencing a range of literary traditions, Humphrey presents Bishop John Jewel as the fulfilment of the ideals of reformed humanist education.

This thesis re-introduces Humphrey as an important figure in the merged intellectual, multi-lingual, reforming currents of humanism and religion that characterize the mid-Tudor moment.
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Transcription, Translation and Editorial Conventions

For the sake of clarity and conformity, the following conventions have been observed:

The punctuation, capitalization and spelling used in the original text of both manuscript and printed sources have been retained, except that the use of i and j, and u and v in Latin has been regularized.

Quotations in Latin follow the idiosyncrasies of the original citation, except that standard abbreviations and contractions (except ampersand) have been expanded, viz.

- ā has been printed -an or -am
- ū has been printed -un or -um
- q; has been printed -que, as appropriate, etc.

Quotations in Greek have been supplied with accents and breathings following modern practice.

Translations, placed within curved brackets, are my own, unless noted in the footnotes. These follow modern punctuation convention.

Place names have been Anglicized; names of persons are normally given in the original vernacular, except where common practice uses the Latin name.

Square brackets indicate where I have made an editorial insertion or comment.

Short titles are used after the first full citation of a work.

Signature numbers from early printed editions are cited with arabic numerals, except for prefatory material, for which lower case roman numerals are given if relevant.
Introduction

At the end of the sixteenth century, a young Oxford scholar dedicates to his two university tutors the manuscript copy of a Latin translation he has made from an English poem. In the conventional, self-deprecatory tone of the captatio benevolentiae of classical rhetoric, the young man acknowledges that his own literary endeavour falls short of the ideal. He describes his translation as

sibilo potius quam applausu dignum, alicubi mancum esse, neque nativam illam emphasin spirare, me non tam exacte idiotismos quam ille author anonymus in vernaculo idiomate, observasse. Neque id mihi assumo prae exili mea infantia, quum non sit mei ingenii aut judicii id praestare, quum non omnes (ut scitis) Humfredice transferre possimus, aut ea sequi pracepta quae doctissimus pater pastorum Oxoniensis praescrpsit.¹

(more deserving of a hiss than of applause, and maimed in various places; neither does it breathe with that innate emphasis, nor have I observed the specific properties of meaning as closely as that anonymous author conveyed properly in the vernacular. And I did not assume, by reason of my feeble lack of eloquence, since I distinguish myself neither in natural capacity or judgement, that I am able to translate everything (as you know) in a Humphrey-like way, or to follow those rules which the most learned father of shepherds at Oxford has prescribed.)

In acknowledging that he has not been able to capture every element of the original poem in his Latin version, the young scholar compares his own inferior achievement in translation to an ideal represented by ‘doctissimus pater pastorum Oxoniensis’ (‘the most learned father of shepherds at Oxford’), Laurence Humphrey. As an epitome of pious learning, with specific respect to that most essential of humanist scholarly skills, translation, Humphrey’s emblematic

¹ Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College Library, MS 595/547, fol. 3, ‘Poimenologia, que vulgo calendarium pastorum appellatur e versu Anglicano in latinum traducta’. The catalogue entry suggests a date of 1590 for the manuscript. However, a dating between 1584 and 1587 appears more likely, as this was the period during which John Dove, the scholar whose translation this is, took his B.A. and M.A., and both of his dedicatees held office at Christ Church College, Oxford. See Conclusion.
presence presides over the young scholar’s work. In his description, Humphrey stands both as a leading representative of reformed humanistic scholarship at Oxford and a pastorally minded churchman. ‘Doctissimus’ and ‘pater pastorum’, Humphrey is situated within the dual intellectual currents of European humanism and religious reform in England.

Laurence Humphrey was widely acknowledged in his own day as a leading pedagogue, an examplar of reformed humanist scholarship, whose career served the English church and one of Oxford University’s leading colleges. However, the reputation that subsequently formed over the centuries is predominantly derived from his involvement during the 1560s in the ‘vestiarian controversy’. Humphrey is known as a radical religious agent whose non-conformist activity ultimately limited a promising church career.  

This controversy, documented largely in the letters of Humphrey’s colleagues, has cast a long shadow that seems to have obscured other aspects of Humphrey’s reputation in his own time. It has perhaps obstructed consideration of Humphrey’s own published work, particularly with respect to his involvement in England’s educational landscape.

This may explain Humphrey’s absence from secondary literature addressing humanist writing in mid-Tudor England. Humphrey’s work, predominantly written in Latin, encompasses a broad range of genres that includes neo-Latin verse, editions of classical works, Greek to Latin translations of patristic writing, treatises on translation and nobility and religious reform, anti-Catholic polemical tracts, prefatory epistles, and biography. These published

---

writings suggest a much wider interest and expertise in literary pursuits than has generally been perceived. Yet, despite the longevity of his career, and the diversity of Humphrey’s literary activities, he has never been the subject of a published monograph, and reference to him and his works is often made only in passing.

**Review of secondary literature**

Thomas Freeman’s biographical entry for the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)* reflects the general balance of research on Humphrey within the secondary literature.\(^3\) The space given to his life prior to leaving Oxford in 1553/1554, and to his period of exile up until 1559, is less than that devoted to Humphrey’s involvement in the ‘vestiarian controversy’. Most of Freeman’s biographical account addresses Humphrey’s activity within the emerging Puritan movement in mid-Elizabethan England. Freeman presents a brief overview of Humphrey’s printed works, although he confuses the 1560 edition of Humphrey’s *Optimates* with its 1563 English translation, attributing one of the dedications that appears in the latter to the earlier Latin edition.

Other research on Humphrey’s life is relatively scant. It is in the area of ecclesiastical historiography that the fullest account of Humphrey has been given and, apart from Garrett’s useful register of Marian exiles, this typically concentrates on Humphrey’s activity from the late 1560s onwards.\(^4\) Whilst such a focus reflects the importance of religious controversy in the secondary literature,

---


it is notable that Humphrey’s printed works are not brought to bear in these discussions. For example, Patrick Collinson’s *Godly People* contains nine references to Humphrey, all of which relate either to Humphrey’s temporary non-conformism in the anti-vestiarian activity of the mid-1560s or to his disapproving response to the 1572/3 ‘Admonition crisis’. Likewise, it is perhaps indicative of the nature of Humphrey’s enduring reputation that Andrew Pettegree’s ‘Checklist of Latin Polemic Published by the Marian Exiles Abroad, 1553-1559’ cites only one of the works Humphrey issued from Basel: his *De religionis conservatione*. Pettegree explains the omission from his checklist of other Latin works by English authors ‘where they appear purely literary in character’ or ‘have no relevance to the English context’. Humphrey’s writing, situated outside the domain of recognized works of polemic, seems barely to be registered within this secondary literature.

As Brian Cummings reveals the centrality of the study of the literary culture of the Reformation in England, his important book also shows how Humphrey continues to be neglected. He mentions Humphrey only once, and this is with reference to the anti-Jesuit campaign in the 1580s. Janet Kemp’s 1978 unpublished PhD thesis presents her translation of Humphrey’s 1559 *De religionis conservatione*. She gives a political reading of this text, and a short biographical account of Humphrey’s life, and includes a

---

brief summary of some of his printed works. Her study does not take account of
the paratextual material in the De religionis conservatione, texts that include
Humphrey’s dedication to Francis Russell, second Earl of Bedford, and liminary
verse by Walter Haddon. As with other accounts of Humphrey’s activity in the
1560s and 1570s, Kemp’s discussion focuses predominantly on Humphrey’s role
as a religious reformer in the Elizabethan years and considers evidence for his
participation in the emerging Puritan movement in England.

J. W. Binns’s invaluable account of neo-Latin writing in Elizabethan
England represents an important starting point for understanding Humphrey’s
literary contribution. In his descriptive summaries of some of Humphrey’s works,
Binns highlights the breadth and erudition encompassed by this writing and
indicates that Humphrey’s participation within a wide range of literary genres
merits further study.9

These three accounts represent the only treatments of Humphrey that
discuss more than one of his texts. Whilst the other secondary material on
Humphrey will be considered more fully in the relevant chapters, a brief summary
here will serve to highlight how little has been written about his individual works.

G. P. Norton analyses Humphrey’s Interpretatio linguarum in terms of a
contrast with the ways in which translation is theorized in sixteenth-century
French writing.10 Norton’s discussion of the Renaissance philosophy of
translation precludes consideration of the specific circumstances in which the
Interpretatio linguarum was issued. His somewhat anachronistic reference to this

9 J. W. Binns, Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England (Leeds: Francis Cairns,
10 Glyn P. Norton, The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their
1559 work as having been ‘written by Lawrence Humphrey, Master of Magdalen College’ reflects his interest in the theoretical content of the text as opposed to its specific historical and social context.\textsuperscript{11} The textual and paratextual material that presents Humphrey’s work as a manual for practical use, as well as a work of pedagogical theory, is outside the scope of Norton’s treatment.

In his survey of the theory and practice of translation from classical antiquity to the end of the eighteenth century, Frederick Rener discusses some of the principal concepts of grammar and rhetoric found in the *Interpretatio linguarum*.\textsuperscript{12} Using textual sources drawn from a wide range of works over the period, Rener quotes from Humphrey’s text as he constructs a broad overview of the patterns of classical rhetoric over this long period of translation practice. Again, the breadth and nature of Rener’s treatment precludes consideration of the specific historical and intellectual contexts of Humphrey’s work.

This thesis contends that narratives of Humphrey’s life and considerations of his works to date have not yet taken significant account of the contexts of Humphrey’s education, of the position of exile from which his earliest Latin works were written and produced, nor of his return to Oxford. The social and intellectual context of Laurence Humphrey’s early life and his works comprises an untold part of the story of a generation of European humanists who were deeply concerned with educational and religious reform.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid. p.11.
The context of reformed humanist education

So how should we consider the works of Laurence Humphrey? Non-theological in much of their content, the earlier Latin treatises of this accomplished writer appear to have been read from the perspective of his later activity as an aspiring Elizabethan reformer. It seems that perception of Humphrey’s activity as a Protestant reformer has somehow precluded consideration of his place in the narrative of humanist education in England. I suggest that there are two aspects to address in the critical recovery of Humphrey’s life and works. The first concerns the relationship between religion and humanism in mid-sixteenth-century Europe. The second relates to the recovery of a distinct period in English mid-Tudor literary history.

The historiographical account of Humphrey has been based on the premise of a developing Protestantism that was in some way distinct from humanistic activity. In the field of education, however, the relationship between humanism and Protestantism can be described in terms of a ‘fundamental and lasting kinship’, exemplified by the reforms that took place in the schools and universities of sixteenth-century northern Europe. Ozment notes that, whilst differing views on church doctrine and human nature gave their educational programmes a different context, humanists and religious reformers together found the *studia humanitatis* a more appropriate tool for reform than the previously dominant, medieval scholastic tradition. Melanchthon’s new arts curriculum emphasized the value of linguistic accomplishment, including the study of Greek

---

and Hebrew, and the extensive use of dialectic and rhetoric, as the means of approaching scripture and classical antiquity, and for the higher study of theology, law and medicine. The classical languages, rhetoric and dialectic were considered essential for the good citizen as well as for the good theologian. At the core of the Wittenberg curriculum was a re-evaluation of Aristotelian philosophy, and other humanistic studies were promoted as necessary preparations for studying this reformed subject. For the northern reformers, ‘to study philosophy meant to study the whole of the arts curriculum, and such a study was necessary for all good Christians, be they statesmen or theologians’.¹⁴

The generation of Erasmus, Colet, Linacre and More promoted the study of classical languages and literature in the belief that the ancient Greeks and Romans had developed an ethical system compatible with broad Christian ideals.¹⁵ The dominant interest of humanists was classical texts and the Latin language, but they also found a vigorous morality ‘encoded in the fibre of language’.¹⁶ Identifying the notions of humanist and religious reform that emerge from vital Anglo-Italian connections, Anne Overell characterizes the context of early-sixteenth century education in terms of its inclusive concept of a ‘capacious Christian humanism’.¹⁷ Indeed, although it is in the field of education that aspects of humanism and reform most obviously combine, many of the intellectuals who

---

¹⁷ Anne Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c.1535 - c.1585* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 196. I follow Overell, p. 3, in her use of the term ‘reform’ to connote an ‘un-organised, un-institutional phenomenon’ and of ‘Reform’ to allude to the specific religious and social movement that is associated from the middle of the sixteenth century with the English Reformation.
pursued the new educational opportunities presented by the humanist agenda remained committed to traditional confessional loyalties:

In the early sixteenth century world, still not divided into confessional groups, many people felt no need to make stark choices. They hoped to have it all ways: to pursue their humanist study of the classics, the Bible and the Fathers, to remain in a purified church and receive its sacraments, whilst believing that their salvation came through grace and faith alone.\(^{18}\)

Some of the northern European reformers, however, adapted their education in *bonae litterae* to a more overtly propagandistic agenda. Whilst Erika Rummel observes the ecumenical approach seen in the educational writings and programmes of the ‘tireless champion of the humanities’, Johann Sturm, she points to the degree of ‘confessionalization’ evident in the educational ordinances established by some of the more radical reformers in German schools.\(^{19}\) Carrie Euler draws attention to the reception in England of a significant number of educational texts by the Zurich reformers, in particular Ulrich Zwingli and Heinrich Bullinger. Reformed theology was communicated through humanistic works that offered educational and pastoral advice in Latin and the vernacular. The popularity of the 1548 English translation of Zwingli’s 1523 treatise, issued as *Certeyne preceptes declaring howe the ingenious youth ought to be instructed and brought unto Christ*, is indicative of these northern European expressions of the principles of humanism combined with Reformed doctrine. In the complex publication and reception history of these mid-century humanist translations, Euler identifies a wider campaign of religious reform shared by Swiss and


English evangelicals.  

Overell notes how humanist linguistic skills made these kinds of translations possible. ‘The old humanist habits of turning to Europe and especially to Italy for learned opinion had been transmuted and turned towards distinctly Protestant objectives’. Euan Cameron identifies ‘little room for doubt that in the English case, humanist and Protestant impulses coincided and are indeed barely distinguishable’.

I suggest that Humphrey’s printed works, considered in the context of his experience as a Marian exile and a returning reformer, supply a relevant intellectual reference to a distinct moment in the relationship between humanism and religion.

Recognition of humanist influence on religious culture in England in the mid-Tudor years has been growing since at least the mid-1990s:

Mid-Tudor Protestant Humanism is a distinctive moment in the intellectual history of early modern England, interesting in its own right and as the way we get from the more widely studied era of More and Erasmus to the other more widely studied era of Sidney and Spenser; a phase of interaction of Reformation with Renaissance through which the classical heritage, undergoing continuous reinterpretation, came down to later writers including Milton.

Observing the coexistence of English humanism with other traditions, Shrank describes a historiographic tendency that draws stark ideological distinctions

---


between writers such as John Bale and John Leland. This propensity leads critics to cast Bale as the ‘strident’, ‘radical Protestant’, and John Leland as the ‘civic and literary humanist’. Instead, she argues, the distinction between these writers often has more to do with stylistic difference, as each of them applies characteristics of their humanist education, albeit in different styles, to a shared ambition of providing England with a reformed literary tradition.

Recognition of humanistic activity in the work of those predominantly considered from the point of view of their Protestantism is also apparent in the recent research on John Foxe as more than just a church historian. John King emphasizes the ways in which Reformation polemic shares its historiographical method with the exegesis of both pagan and patristic texts of antiquity: ‘[i]ndeed to a considerable degree, Foxe’s drive to return ad fontes is grounded upon humanistic textual scholarship and historiography’. Recent scholarly attention to the full range of Foxe’s works is challenging historiographical boundaries, and whilst this points to a growing recognition of the relevance of the exile period to Tudor writing in both Latin and English, there is as yet no major study of how the experience of exile shaped a major intellectual figure.

Humphrey’s writing reveals a background and interest in reformed humanist education that has until now been largely ignored – a consequence,

---


26 See the essays in the critical apparatus to *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011) <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [accessed 1 March 2012].

perhaps, of the same critical tendency to consider the development of Protestantism in England in terms that suggest its distinctiveness from humanistic activity. Discussion of the subject of mid-Tudor educational writing often jumps from John Cheke and Thomas Elyot to Roger Ascham and Richard Mulcaster. For example, Quentin Skinner follows his description of Elyot’s 1531 *The Boke named the Governour* with immediate reference to ‘the humanist educational writers of the next generation’, a group he identifies as Ascham, Peacham and Kempe, surprisingly making no mention of Humphrey at all.\(^{28}\) It is notable, too, that despite Ian Green’s acknowledgement of the significant role of Magdalen College, Oxford, in what he describes as the ‘emerging movement of Tudor Protestant humanism’, Humphrey’s name appears only in two brief references.\(^{29}\)

Despite his longstanding and significant involvement as scholar, fellow, absentee fellow, exile and President of Magdalen College, and despite such a large proportion of his published writing being focused on the central concerns of educational development in mid-Tudor England, Humphrey has been almost entirely excluded from this narrative. This thesis examines the place of Humphrey’s educational writings at the mid-sixteenth-century intersection between the European culture of humane learning and religious reform.

**The recovery of mid-Tudor literature**

Humphrey’s lifespan corresponds exactly to the period addressed by Pincombe and Shrank in their call for the recovery and exploration of the literary and


\(^{29}\) Ian Green, *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 207, 352.
intellectual culture of mid-Tudor England. In their recent expression of the need to foster research into an ‘era that was pretty much excluded from the canonical periods on either side of it’, they address the prejudices which have allowed mid-Tudor literature to be dismissed as ‘Drab’. 30 They identify the damage done to the perception of literature of this period, both by C. S. Lewis’s use of the derogatory epithet, and further, by rationalizations in pre-1800 English academic teaching provision. Challenging Lewis’s characterization, Pincombe and Shrank describe the 1560s as ‘a decade of unprecedented literary ferment, which remains hardly recognized, and certainly little charted’. 31

Whilst Pincombe and Shrank’s own project ‘The Origins of Early Modern Literature’ has begun to map the literary activity of this period in England, it is striking that Laurence Humphrey has so far been largely omitted. For example, he fails to appear in any of the forty-five essays that comprise the authoritative Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature. 32 It is hard to believe that this would be the case if Humphrey’s works, given the range of subjects they treat, had been written in English or printed in England. In 1990, Binns described the decline of Latin studies in the twentieth century as ‘catastrophic for the conduct of all serious literary and historical scholarship in Britain’. 33 He anticipated a risk that the ‘typical Anglo-Latin book’, embodying ‘wide-ranging humanistic and learned

30 Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank, ‘Doing Away with the Drab Age: Research Opportunities in Mid-Tudor Literature (1530-1580), Literature Compass, 7:3 (2010), 160-76 (p. 160).
interests’, and written in the ‘fluent and engaging new style of renaissance Latin’ would lose its central place in the study of mid-sixteenth-century writing.\(^{34}\)

The language and place of publication of Humphrey’s printed works mean that they are largely excluded from the *English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC)*. As the number of digitally available Latin works within the *Early English Books Online (EEBO)* collection expands, a wider selection of Humphrey’s writing is gradually becoming available. Six years ago, *EEBO* provided only two of his works: one was the only printed text that Humphrey wrote in the vernacular, his 1588 *A view of the Romish hydra and monster, treason, against the Lords annointed*; the other was the 1563 anonymous translation of Humphrey’s 1560 Latin work on nobility.\(^{35}\) Now we can view online editions of a further six works, although Humphrey’s earliest full-length treatise, the 1559 *Interpretatio linguarum* remains unavailable via *EEBO*.\(^{36}\) With the exception of the 1563 translation of Humphrey’s 1560 *Optimates*, there are no published translations into English of any of Humphrey’s Latin works.

The diversity of Humphrey’s printed works witnesses to an intellectual capacity that enabled him to participate in the central debates of sixteenth-century Europe. This individual’s remarkable life spanned the eras of Henrician,\

---

\(^{34}\) Ibid. p. xvii.

\(^{35}\) *A view of the Romish hydra and monster, treason, against the Lords annointed: condemned by Dauid, I. Sam. 26. and nowe confuted in seuen sermons to perswade obedience to princes, concord among our selues, and a generall reformation and repentance in all states: by L.H.* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1588); *The nobles or of nobilete: the original nature, dutyes, right, and Christian institucion thereof three booke. Fyrste eloquently wryt[n] in Latine by Lawrence Humfrey D. of Diuinity, and presidente of Magdaleine Colledge in Oxforde, late englished. Whereto for the readers commoditie [sic], and matters affinitye, is coupled the small treatyse of Philo a Iewe. By the same author out of the Greeke Latined, nowe also Englished* (London: Thomas Marsh, 1563), available via *Early English Books Online <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk>* [accessed 5 May 2006].

Edwardian, Marian and early Elizabethan rule. During this mid-century period he was continuously involved in contemporary religious and political reform, in scholarly life and literary circles, and continuously active within a highly influential network of court, church and university figures. As one of the most accomplished classical scholars of his generation, he became a powerful and important figure within state and church. If we are properly to recover the mid-Tudor moment, in all its aspects, then we must restore to view the life and intellectual world of Laurence Humphrey.

Methodology and chapter summary

This thesis places Laurence Humphrey in the tradition of reformed humanist education, and, by examining three of his major works in the social and intellectual context of his experience of exile and return, it aims to re-introduce this major figure to the field of English Tudor studies.

The thesis presents a two-part biographical account that explores the English and European contexts from which Humphrey wrote his earliest Latin works. Whilst this account yields some new biographical detail, the principal difference from the narrative of the *ODNB* is in its exploration of the intellectual concerns with which Humphrey was significantly engaged throughout the early part of his education and career.

Given that there is only one published English translation of just one of Humphrey’s works, and not a single critical edition, it is not within the scope of a thesis to consider his extensive body of writing in its entirety. Whilst I refer to much of Humphrey’s other writing to support my arguments, the thesis
predominantly focuses on three works in which Humphrey articulates his aspirations for a programme of reformed humanist education in England. Each of these works supplies evidence of an international scholarly community focused on critical intersections between reform and humane learning, as Humphrey attempts to shape the educational agenda of mid-sixteenth-century England.

I suggest that these three works are more central texts of this period than has been recognized. They each represent an important product of a mid-Tudor moment, shaped by the international, intellectual context of Humphrey’s Marian exile. The *Interpretatio linguarum* and the *Optimates* are works that were produced from a position of exile, written in Latin, and published in Basel as Humphrey anticipated his return to England. These pedagogical works supply an important (and missing) European dimension to the call for the recovery of mid-Tudor literature. My reading of the *Vita Iuelli* takes into account the context of Humphrey’s return to the educational landscape of Oxford University. It offers a new perspective on the development of Humphrey’s conception of reformed education through this period.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. The biographical account provides the contextual framework and comprises two chapters (Chapters One and Four). These locate Humphrey’s writing within the chronological narrative of his exile and return, identifying specific aspects of mid-Tudor intellectual life that shape his work.

Chapter One introduces the social and intellectual background of Humphrey’s life. It examines the context of his education, including the early support he received from his previously unidentified Buckinghamshire patron,
Anthony Cave, and Humphrey’s brief attendance at Christ’s College, Cambridge. Humphrey’s move to Oxford and his immersion in humanist learning and Protestant ideology at Magdalen College and its school supply further background for his earliest printed works. I explore how Humphrey locates the Latinate, intellectual culture of Magdalen College within the context of international, reformed humanist education.

The second half of the chapter addresses Humphrey’s part in the principled exodus by Protestant scholars following Mary’s accession. This period sees him relocate to the thriving, multi-lingual print-centres of humanist reform in Switzerland and Germany. My discussion contextualizes Humphrey’s involvement in scriptural and Graeco-Latin projects, identifying these with the broad, reformed agenda of a network of European evangelical humanists. The chapter closes with Humphrey’s decision to remain in Basel for a year following the accession of Elizabeth. During this time he issues three new Latin works, each of which indicates a purposeful redirection of his interests towards England under the new monarch.

Chapter Two focuses on the first of these works. It examines how, from the context of its production in Basel, Humphrey’s 1559 *Interpretatio linguarum* can be seen as an intellectually central text, providing a crucial context for English vernacular culture. I assess how this pedagogical manual on translation, a subject at the centre of reformed humanist interests, characterizes the intellectual landscape of mid-Tudor England from a pan-European perspective. In his discussion of translation into vernacular languages, Humphrey draws on classical and contemporary rhetorical traditions, and he cites recent French, Italian and
German works. At the same time, the *Interpretatio linguarum* supplies a unique perspective on England and the English. I investigate Humphrey’s roll-call of exemplary English writers and consider his engagement with a specific moment in mid-Tudor political, mercantile and literary endeavour, as he identifies the ‘modern literary classics’ of his day. This re-reading of the *Interpretatio linguarum* suggests ways in which reformed international learning was being brought to bear on mid-Tudor English intellectual life.

Chapter Three discusses Humphrey’s 1560 *Optimates*, another Latin work produced from the context of his time in exile, shortly before he returned to England. My reading explores the development of Humphrey’s humanist model of reformed and informed piety and civic duty, refashioned for a new Elizabethan generation of English Protestant gentry. Humphrey’s portrayal of his patron, Anthony Cave, offers a way into understanding his conception of the civic, humanist and religious virtues of the Protestant elite, figured in his concept of the educated *vir bonus*. In advocating a programme for the education of the reformed gentry in England, in which he recommends newly available works by international scholars alongside traditional classical texts, Humphrey details an educational approach in a way that has only really been recognized in Roger Ascham’s later English works. A strong theme of exile shapes the work and this reading of the *Optimates* considers Humphrey’s aspirations both for the educational landscape of England and for himself as he presents himself as an intellectual returning from exile with much to offer his country.

Chapter Four resumes the biographical narrative as Humphrey returns to England and to the educational environment of early Elizabethan Oxford. The
period from 1560 to the mid-1570s sees the consolidation of Humphrey’s reputation as one of the leading reformed educators of his generation. This chapter considers the ways in which Humphrey introduces his pedagogical approach to the next generation of scholars, from his position as President of Magdalen College. Surviving records of some of the students of this generation suggest the ways in which the statutory arts curriculum is interpreted specifically with reference to Humphrey’s reforming influence. The chapter also discusses the vernacular translation of Humphrey’s *Optimates*, a work published at the same time as the influential English edition of Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*. A number of eminent Latin stylists are drawn into developing religio-political controversies at this time, and these find expression in major humanistic editions. This narrative further supplies the intellectual and religious context from which Humphrey produces his next major humanistic work, the 1573 *Vita Iuelli*.

Chapter Five examines this most significant Latin example of life-writing produced in sixteenth-century England, a work typically considered in the tradition of Plutarchan biography. I take into account other possible models for the *Vita Iuelli*, and discuss how Humphrey draws on the European tradition of lives of learned men to present his original and influential account of the life of Bishop John Jewel as the fulfilment of his ideal of reformed humanist education. Where Chapters Two and Three examine Humphrey’s concept of the *vir bonus* as it applies to the humanist translator and the godly noble, Chapter Five considers Humphrey’s presentation of a model for the educated clergy. This reading of the *Vita Iuelli* also identifies the religio-political contexts of specific European controversies in which Jewel was engaged up until his death. Following the
important example of Joachim Camerarius’s biographical account of Melanchthon, Humphrey’s major work affords him an opportunity to further his own interests in an increasingly controversialized polemic. As the *Vita Iuelli* traces the arc of Humphrey’s own life, his narrative of the life of John Jewel also enables Humphrey to frame his own autobiographical account.

The thesis concludes with a brief survey of some late Elizabethan works that reveal Humphrey’s intellectual influence in his later life. I consider what became of the tradition of reformed humanism, and of Humphrey’s aspirations for his programme of education. In following this overall chronological structure, the thesis traces the development of Humphrey’s conception of reformed humanist learning from his earliest education to the end of his life, and draws out his participation in a specific moment of mid-Tudor Anglo-Latin humanist educational culture.
Chapter One: Laurence Humphrey’s early life, education and exile: 1527-1559

Introduction

In this chapter I examine Humphrey’s early grounding in the principles of the humanist tradition, his background of support by a wealthy Protestant magnate, and his education within the pioneering and often controversial academic setting of Magdalen College, Oxford. I consider how Humphrey’s formation as an outstanding classical and biblical scholar was shaped by the influence of a previous generation of reforming scholars and their interest in new teaching methods. Oxford also provided the intellectual backdrop against which Humphrey developed his Protestant views, encouraged by visiting continental reformers, especially Peter Martyr. The close and influential coterie of reformed English and European scholars introduced at Oxford would prove to be a vital practical and intellectual network in the years Humphrey spent on the Continent.

When Queen Mary’s accession made Humphrey’s departure from England a necessity, his competence in classical scholarship and close affiliations to a network of continental scholars afforded Humphrey the opportunity to exercise his intellectual agenda in new surroundings. Re-located to the setting of Switzerland’s leading print-shops, with their superior press technology, availability of paper, and a relatively open licence to print, Humphrey found a sympathetic environment from which he could articulate his views. Well-situated and equipped to apply his proficiency in the exegesis of classical, scriptural and patristic texts, Humphrey worked with his associates on translations and editions that collectively helped to frame the identity of the English Protestant church. It
was during this time that Humphrey also produced significant works addressing relevant and important subjects such as translation, education and the role of nobility.

My consideration of Humphrey’s own material takes into account the rhetorical programmes behind the selection, re-writing, editing and omission of information in his printed works. Indeed, throughout this thesis, Humphrey’s writing will be shown to demonstrate the purposeful, consistent fashioning of his own biography, indicative of his lifelong concern with the depiction of the reformers’ lives, devoted ‘studii literarum bonarum et divinarum’ (‘to the study of humane letters and theology’).\(^1\) Humphrey’s education, his exile, and his earliest appearances in print offer evidence of the ways in which the concept of reformed humanist education was presented and promoted by a generation of English writers.

**Early life in Buckinghamshire**

As is typical for the period, the evidence regarding Laurence Humphrey’s early life is relatively scant. It is largely from Humphrey’s own works that we deduce something of his childhood years, a fact not generally acknowledged in the other biographical accounts.\(^2\) Nothing has been uncovered regarding his parentage.

---

\(^1\) ‘Letter of the Ministers of the church of Zurich on behalf of the English exiles, signed by H. Bullinger, to the English’, Epistola CCCLIII, in *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation: written during the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary: chiefly from the archives of Zurich*, ed. by Hastings Robinson, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847), 2, 482-84. Cited from here as *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*.

\(^2\) For example, the accounts of Humphrey’s life cited by the seventeenth-century historians Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England*, 3 vols (New York: AMS Press, 1965), 1, 207, and Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: an exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford from 1500 to 1690*, ed. by P. Bliss, facsimile
Humphrey provides the information that he was born in Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire: ‘saepe tamen Angliam cogito, Buckingamiam, Novoportum ubi natus sum’ (‘I often think of England, of Newport in Buckingham where I was born’). He was born in 1527, the year in which Thomas Garrett arrived in Oxford with Tyndale’s banned English translation of the New Testament.

New research makes it possible to associate Humphrey’s early years in Buckinghamshire with the patronage of Sir Anthony Cave, a wealthy landowner, justice of the peace and wool merchant. A description by Humphrey in 1560 indicates this Buckinghamshire gentleman’s role and suggests their specific relationship. Humphrey refers to

clarissimus vir & ormatissimus Antonius Cavus piae memoriae, meus patronus ac tutor colendissimus: qui in provincia ac ditione Buckingamiensi pacis publicae ac iusticiae civilis praeses & administer.

(the most famous and magnificent gentleman Anthony Cave, of devout memory, my most beneficial patron and tutor, who was, in the county of Buckinghamshire, a commissioner, justice of the peace and steward.)

There is no entry for Anthony Cave in the ODNB, and no reference to him in any of the secondary literature regarding Humphrey other than one brief mention by Binns, who describes Cave as ‘otherwise obscure’. However, in another work, Humphrey’s translation from Greek to Latin of the Disputatio contra Marcionistas, a text then attributed to the early Christian Alexandrian scholar

---

2 The year of Humphrey’s birth is dated from his funerary memorial at Magdalen College, Oxford.
3 Laurence Humphrey, Optimates sive de nobilitate, eiusque antiqua origine, natura, officiis, disciplina, & recte ac Christiana institutione libri tres (Basel: Oporinus, 1560), II, sig. q1. Cited from here as Optimates.
Origen, his dedication is addressed: ‘ad generosissimum virum et clariss[imum] Equitem D. Antonium Cavum, Dominum & patronum suum’ (‘to the most excellent Sir Anthony Cave, his master and patron’). 7

The Caves were a well-connected, titled and wealthy family – landowners and justices in the country, merchants and lawyers in town, sheriffs and members of Parliament. In Barbara Winchester’s energetic description, they were ‘a powerful clan, foremost among the new men of the age, the nouveaux riches, the shrewd, rapacious, grasping gentry raised up by the Tudor dynasty’. 8 The third son of Richard Cave and Margaret Saxby, Anthony Cave became lord of the manor of Chicheley, a village two miles north-east of Newport Pagnell, where Humphrey tells us he was born. The property comprised a well-furnished house of nineteen bedrooms and various outhouses connected to Cave’s wool business. An inventory taken shortly after Anthony Cave’s death also includes nearby farm property Tickford, and a house and wool warehouses in Lime Street in London. 9

Anthony Cave was also a wealthy merchant of the Staple of Calais, the English trading company that controlled the export of English raw wool via its biannual wool fleets across the channel. Having been brought up by his uncle,

---

7 Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda, complectens ea maxime, quae ipse in novum testamentum est commentatus, ex quibus antehac nobis non editi, apparent iam commentarii in evangelium Ioannis, interprete Ambrosio Mediolanensi monacho, tum dialogi aliquot adversus Marcionistas, etiam nunc primum latine redditi per Laurentium Humfridum Anglum, 2 vols (Basel: Episcopius, 1571), 2, sigs 2Y4 – 2Y5v. Cited from here as Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda. The edition I consulted is held at Cambridge University Library, shelfmark 3.14.39. My thanks to Mr. Liam Sims, Rare Books Specialist, CUL for confirming these signatures.


9 Aylesbury, Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, Chester of Chicheley Register, MS D-C/3/52, ‘Inventory of all the goods and Cattells as well in England as beyond the seas movable and unmovable belonging unto Anthony Cave late of Chicheley in the Countie of Bucks esquire, deceased, the ixth daye of Septembre a.d. 1558’. The calendar to a 1528 letter from Richard Cave to Thomas Cromwell describes Cave asking for Cromwell’s good favour concerning the late priory of Tyckford, which is next to Chicheley, asking him to do something for his son Anthony Cave, ‘who wants a place in England, and would be very meet for a merchant’. Calendar Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. by J. S. Breuer, 21 vols (London: HMSO, 1872), 19, 2.
William Saxby (also a merchant of the Staple), Anthony had inherited from him a number of wool-houses and other property in Calais in 1517.\textsuperscript{10}

Cave’s significance to Humphrey is clear, albeit rather concealed by the position of the dedication – two-thirds of the way through the second volume of the Latin Origen – and by the fact that the work was not issued in print until 1571. Humphrey writes of their shared agenda of humanist scholarly endeavour, and he commends his patron for his ongoing efforts rescuing valuable texts from obscurity, so that such Graeco-Latin translations can be brought into print for the common good:

\begin{quote}
pergas tu felici quo coepisti pede literas provehere, vetustatem sepultam ex angulis & bibliothecis, quae multos bonos libros absorbent in Anglia, in apertum proferre, studio, consilio, diligentia, amicis efficite, ut tantus thesaurus non a tineis & muribus corrosus, non a situ & pulvere deformatus iaceat, sed a typographis impressus, a studiosis hominibus in omnium munibus ad communem omnium utilitatem teratur & versetur.\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

(may you happily continue to advance the scholarship that you have begun, to bring what was buried long ago out from those corners and libraries that swallow many good books in England; see that you carry these works out into the open, with eagerness, deliberation, diligence, so that such great treasure is not eaten away by grubs and rats, does not lie disfigured by neglect and dust, but is printed by typographers, is worn out and worked on by studious men in the service of all for the common good.)

Humphrey describes his patron’s activity in terms that signify his alignment with the reformed humanist movement. He praises Cave for bringing long-buried knowledge, in the form of neglected texts, out into the open. His vocabulary resonates with implicit criticism of monastic hoarding and scholarly decay, the domain of ‘old men and monks’ (to use Eisenstein’s phrase), contrasting with

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10} Winchester, \textit{Tudor Family Portrait}, p. 152. \\
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda}, sig. 2Y5\textasciitilde.
\end{flushright}
Humphrey’s emphatic assertion of the potential presented by print culture to serve ‘the common good’.  

Cambridge University records show that Humphrey attended Christ’s College, Cambridge as a pensioner for a short while, matriculating in November 1544. In a preface to an edition of Homer, Humphrey makes reference to his brief early education there, and to the classroom that had afforded him his first training in Latin and Greek: ‘saepe tamen Angliam cogito [...] saepe Cantabriam, ubi prima Latinarum & Graecarum literarum tyrocinia posui’ (‘I often think of England [...] I often think of Cambridge, where I served my first apprenticeship in Latin and Greek learning’). It is possible that Humphrey’s introduction to Christ’s College was through university endowments in which Anthony Cave was involved. A connection between the Cave family and Cambridge University is suggested in miscellaneous papers from the Chicheley estate archives, which describe endowments for pensioners at Christ’s College. A notebook describes the terms for some of these college pensions, specifying agreed college provision for scholars, lecturers and library keepers from specific parishes and counties.

Humphrey’s reference to his patron’s interest in education is further corroborated in papers that relate to the leasing of Chicheley parsonage in order to

---


13 Charles H. Cooper and Thompson Cooper, Athenae Cantabrigiensis, 3 vols (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1858-1913), 2, 80.


15 Chester of Chicheley Register, MS D-C/3/60, Miscellanea. This bundle includes a notebook apparently written in the 17th century, with ‘A rental of Xt’s Coll.’ written in the fly-leaf. The notebook includes: d. table of pensions with details of amount, ‘intent’, etc.; g. list of masters of Christ’s College, Cambridge 1505-1654; i. list of ‘Benefactors to the New Building begun 1637’; j. list of manors belonging to the coll. and improper parsonages.
pay a schoolmaster at the neighbouring village of Lathbury. There is also mention of a chapel in the churchyard being leased in 1553 by the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, Oxford, to Anthony Cave ‘for his free school’. It seems likely, from Humphrey’s 1557 dedication in the Latin Origen, that Cave’s patronage of Humphrey continued while he was in exile. Cave’s religious sympathies would be consistent with the tradition of fervent support for Protestantism shown by many of the Staple at Calais. It is also of note that Walter Haddon, the distinguished Protestant scholar who became President of Magdalen College in 1552, was one of Anthony Cave’s cousins.

These details inform Humphrey’s framing of his first tutor and patron as a member of the landed gentry who exercises his civic duty, in the provision of education to the poor and in the retrieval of neglected ‘boni libri’ for the benefit of reformed humanist scholarship. They suggest that Humphrey’s relationship with Cave revolved around a shared interest in humanist education, in the scholarly exposition of recently retrieved texts, and in the opportunities afforded by print culture. In Chapter Three, we see further how Cave’s persona informs Humphrey’s later depiction of the ideal, educated gentleman, as the embodiment

---

16 Chester of Chicheley Register, MS D-C/1/104, lease (damaged), dated March 1553.
17 The Victoria History of the County of Buckingham, ed. by William Page, 4 vols (London: Archibald Constable, 1905-1928), 4 (1927), 376. Page quotes from an account of the foundation of this school in a ledger book among the archives of Christ Church, Oxford. My thanks to Geoffrey T. Martin, Archivist, Christ’s College, Cambridge, who confirms that no reference to the Chicheley Estate is recorded in the archives at Christ’s College.
18 Susan Rose, Calais: An English Town in France 1347-1558 (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), p. 150, cites a 1545 letter to Anthony Cave that mentions the Diet of Worms and describes ‘the princes of the contry beinge turned from Pappists to Protestantes viz from the Devill to God’. She also notes that one of Cave’s nephews, Laurence Saunders, had been ordained in the English church, and died in the persecution of Mary’s reign, p. 146.
19 Winchester, Tudor Family Portrait, p. 25. Furthermore, from manuscripts of the 1540s, there are evident associations between the Buckinghamshire families of Anthony Cave and Robert Dormer, whose son Jasper would marry Laurence Humphrey’s eldest daughter Justina some forty years later. For example, Calendar Letters and Papers from the reign of Henry VIII, 19, 2 includes a list from a 1544 muster book noting the number of soldiers to be furnished together by Anthony Cave and Robert Dormer.
of reformed and politically engaged humanism, striving for *communis omnium utilitas*.

**Education at Oxford**

When Humphrey arrived at Oxford, the Master of Magdalen School was the Protestant theologian John Harley.\textsuperscript{20} Harley is thought to have come from Newport Pagnell too, and, as was common for the time, it may well have been their local association that brought Laurence Humphrey to Oxford.\textsuperscript{21} Humphrey’s name first appears at Magdalen College in 1547, the year in which Edward VI began his rule, although, given the intermittent nature of the school and college registers for this period, it is possible that Humphrey was attending the school prior to then. Harley had been Master there since 1542.\textsuperscript{22} Humphrey first appears in the registers as a demy, the undergraduate position that about thirty scholars occupied anywhere between the ages of twelve and twenty-five, receiving half a stipend and education at the school before proceeding to the College.\textsuperscript{23} His attachment to Magdalen College, although interrupted during the reign of Queen Mary, was to endure until his death in 1589.


\textsuperscript{22} Stanier, *Magdalen School*, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{23} A Register of the Presidents, Fellows, Demies and other Members of Saint Mary Magdalen College in the University of Oxford, from the foundation of the College to the present time, ed. by John Rouse Bloxham, 8 vols (Oxford: Graham, 1853-85), 4 (1881), 104. Cited from here as Bloxham, *Magdalen College Register*. 
Magdalen School was already the dominant grammar school in England, and the College’s reputation as one of the foremost homes of the new learning was very much linked to the provision of its unusual ‘feeder’ school, which fostered the newest methods of teaching Latin. In the drive for humanist ideals to be established in education, the teaching of Latin grammar in schools had been the subject of heated academic argument in the generation preceding Humphrey’s, and many of those involved had been educated at Magdalen College. In 1540, Henry VIII appointed ‘sundry learned men’ to judge between the various rival grammars, and William Lily, who had trained as a schoolmaster at Magdalen before being appointed as the first Master of the re-founded St. Paul’s School, won the day. From then on, his book was, by law, the only Latin Grammar that could be taught in schools.

Lily’s Grammar was a reference book intended to be supplementary to the reading of Latin texts, from which many of its illustrative examples were taken. Having produced most of the grammarians (as masters or pupils) in the debate, Magdalen School clearly led the way in ‘new learning’ at Oxford. Several of its masters supplied new material as revised editions of the Grammar were issued. Magdalen School was organized to ensure that no member should proceed to higher studies without first acquiring a proficiency in the humanities, and its

---

26 Stanier, Magdalen School, p. 41, notes that at Bruton Grammar School in 1519 it had been laid down that all scholars ‘were to be taught freely grammar after the form of Magdalen College, Oxford, or St. Paul’s School, London, and not songs or petite learning or English Reading, but to be made perfect Latin men’.
27 For example, Ian Green, Humanism and Protestantism, p. 152, notes the introduction of a limited amount of distinctively Protestant material, such as Latin verses on baptism and the Lord’s Supper to the 1549 edition.
growing renown earned it an enduring reputation as ‘the home of the Classical Renaissance in Oxford’. The College represented an influential setting for educational reform more often associated with the network of humanist scholars at St. John’s College, Cambridge.

It is likely that Humphrey studied a classical curriculum based on that set down for Ipswich school:

In the First Form the boys learned the eight parts of speech and the pronunciation of Latin [...] In the Second they learn to speak Latin and do easy sentences into Latin and write them out fair; for reading Lily’s ‘Carmen monitormium’, i.e. the De Moribus, and Cato’s Moralia are recommended. In the Third Form Aesop and Terence are read and Lily’s Nouns studied: in the Fourth, Virgil and Lily’s Principal Parts of Verbs. The Fifth are to read select letters of Cicero; the Sixth Form ‘seems to call for some history, whether Sallust or Caesar’. In the Seventh the boys read Horace’s Epistles or Ovid’s Metamorphoses or Fasti; they compose verses or letters, practising the turning of verse into prose and back again into verse, and learn by heart, just before going to sleep, passages to be said the next day. In the Eighth Class they study the science of Grammar proper in Donatus or Valla and deal with some set book thoroughly. Letters and compositions are to be practised.

From a manuscript book used at Magdalen School early in the sixteenth century, Nicholas Orme describes the typical multi-lingual compositions expected of students. They comprised prose passages in Latin and English, and featured colourful details of life and work at Magdalen – ‘another example of the activity and inventiveness which characterised the school at his time’. The compositions were set out to illustrate particular points of grammar, and it is notable that these ‘vulgaria’ resemble the exercises that Humphrey later sets out in order to

30 Stanier, Magdalen School, p. 45.
exemplify idiomatic differences between Latin and several European vernacular languages, in his 1559 *Interpretatio linguarum*.\(^{32}\) Greek had been added to the College curriculum at the order of Cromwell’s Visitors in 1535, although it was most likely taught at Magdalen School before then.\(^{33}\)

In the *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey recreates the scene of the Magdalen College schoolroom in the 1540s, and describes the grounding in humanist education that he received.\(^{34}\) Elsewhere, he emphasizes his enjoyment of Magdalen School, quoting from a mnemosynon of his own composition. In this scholarly exercise in verse Humphrey memorializes his teacher, describing John Harley as his ‘socius ludique magister’ (‘companion and schoolmaster’).\(^{35}\)

Following the Erasmian model, as set out in the 1513 *De ratione studii* for example, pupils were encouraged to memorize, repeat, analyse, recompose and imitate exemplary literary texts.\(^{36}\) They were taught Latin and Greek through the exercise of reciprocal translation, a practice that has become emblematic of reformed humanist scholarship. Humphrey commends Harley as ‘praestantissimus magistrum interpretandi’ (‘a most outstanding teacher of translation’), associating the characteristics of exemplary pedagogy ‘multis nominibus colendo, doctrina, pietateque commemorabili homine’ (‘with a man

---

\(^{32}\) See Chapter Two.

\(^{33}\) Stanier, *Magdalen School*, p. 46.


honoured and remembered by many for his duty, learning, and devotion’).\(^{37}\) He describes John Harley’s lessons in double translation:

\[
\text{itaque & amavit & observavit eius linguae idiotismum emblemata \& flosculos, [...] illaque peraeque ac Latina aut Graeca proponeret appositaque a suis exigeret.}^{38}\]

(Apparently, [Harley] loved and took good heed of the idiom, patterns and the ornaments of his language [...] and he would set these things out quite evenly either in Latin or Greek and put one in place of another.)

Humphrey emphasizes the attention that his proficient teacher paid to the vernacular as well as classical languages:

\[
\text{qui tantum abest ut patrium sermonem fastidierit, ut ei addiscendo nonminus studuerit quam aliis. [...] An enim peregrinari in exteriis linguis solum oportebit, \& domi ignorare vernaculam?}^{39}\]

(who, so far from disdaining the language of his country, in learning studied more than any other. [...] For indeed, ought one to travel alone among foreign languages, and remain unaware of the vernacular at home?)

In another endorsement of reformed educational practice, Humphrey refers to Harley’s teaching of notational technique. Erasmus had instructed his readers in annotation, suggesting the use of marks ‘that not only called attention to all significant turns of speech, moral sentences, and exemplary actions, but also indicated to which category the passage in question belonged’.\(^{40}\) Students learnt to compile systematic notebooks, in which they entered the most useful and distinctive facts, myths and metaphors they encountered.

Humphrey also identifies Harley’s exemplary teaching practice with his accomplishment in preaching, commending him for delivering a sermon in which

\(^{37}\) Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio} linguarum, III, sig. L7’.

\(^{38}\) Ibid. sig. L8’.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

he took the opportunity of Edward VI’s accession to preach anti-Papal doctrine, arguing for justification by faith alone.\textsuperscript{41} For this outspoken profession Harley was summoned to London and examined for heresy by the university authorities, before receiving the support of the new monarch and Protector Somerset. Humphrey portrays Harley – ‘praecceptorem olim meum observandissimum’ (‘once my most highly respected teacher’) – as someone who remained steadfast in the face of the controversial changes in religion that the close of Henry VIII’s reign brought about. In his 1573 account of this incident, Humphrey is evidently keen to associate the activity of scholars specifically at Magdalen with religious as well as educational reforming agenda. The association between the teacher’s oratorical style and his religious and moral probity is a characteristic identified in Roger Ascham’s \textit{The Scholemaster}.\textsuperscript{42} Humphrey’s depiction of this aspect of reformed humanism is explored in Chapter Three.

In this setting, Humphrey consolidated his academic proficiency in the classical languages, theology and philosophy, and accepted the rigours of academic discipline as his way of life. All scholars were required to speak in Latin when they were within the walls of Magdalen College and it is from this time that Humphrey is likely to have developed his facility for conversing in Latin, as well as reading and writing the language. Later, Humphrey implies that his familiarity with Latin outgrew that of his mother tongue. In a discussion of some idiomatic features of vernacular European languages, Humphrey refers to

\textsuperscript{41} Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuell}, sigs I3\textsuperscript{r} - I3\textsuperscript{v}. Humphrey’s account, written in the 1570s, appears to be the only surviving source for Harley’s controversial Lenten sermon preached in 1547.

his own vernacular language as ‘Anglica lingua quae mihi notior est’ (‘the English language which I know better [than German]’), and as ‘ea quam a matre didici’ (‘that which I learned from my mother’). These descriptions suggest that, whilst living in Switzerland and Germany, Humphrey’s habitual, everyday language was Latin.

With the accession of Edward VI in 1547, the Reform gained official support at Oxford, and began to take root in several of the colleges and especially at Magdalen. Richard Cox, Dean of Christ Church and tutor to the young king, and now Chancellor of the University, along with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, began their ‘uphill task of transforming Oxford into a protestant university’. It was one that exposed deep divisions between the ‘new Christians’, as their opponents derisively termed them, and the Catholics, and these differences were particularly keenly expressed at Magdalen College.

In 1548, John Harley left Magdalen to become chaplain to John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and tutor to his children. In the same year, Humphrey received his B.A. degree and was elected fellow of Magdalen College. Also in 1548, on the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, the Florentine humanist and reformer Peter Martyr Vermigli took up the position of Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. The Italian took his place as a member of a university that was in many ways proving to be firmly opposed to the Reform.

---

44 Claire Cross, ‘Oxford and the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary 1509-1558’, in McConica, The Collegiate University, pp. 120-43 (p. 133).
Under the endorsement of Cranmer, Martyr set out his reformed views and attacked those of his opponents, disseminating beliefs that provoked heated debate.\(^{46}\) Lecturing on Old and New Testament scripture, Martyr combined classical theories of interpretation with new methods drawn from humanism and Hebraism. Humphrey’s admiration for Oxford’s leading reformed scholar resounds in his account of these lectures, and in his specific suggestion of Martyr’s virtues:

\[\text{quis enim abesse poterat, qui virtutem, qui prudentiam, gravitatem, humanitatem, Pietatem, mirificam docendi et eloquendi facultatem amaret et admiraretur?}\]  

(For who could have stayed away, who loved and admired his wonderful ability to speak and to teach virtue, prudence, seriousness, kindness and piety?) Humphrey’s descriptions of Martyr’s sermons and lectures emphasize his exegetical prowess in the languages of Hebrew, Greek and Latin, demonstrating the ways in which a thorough grounding in classical, patristic and medieval literature could be deployed for a nation seeking religious change. As Overell observes, ‘humanism supplied context, vehicle and motive for religious reform’.\(^{48}\) Humphrey recounts a sermon that Martyr preached in St Mary’s, Oxford, before the Bishop of Lincoln, Richard Cox and other royal visitors, taking as his text the Gospel of John, and the Hebrew book of Haggai. Martyr’s first petition sought ‘ut magistratus bonas leges conferant, & in primis Scholas & Academias repurgent’ (‘that the magistracy implement good laws and above all reform the schools and universities’), and he described the latter as ‘radicem & partem Ecclesiae, ibi

\(^{46}\) A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli, ed. by Emidio Campi, Frank A. James III, and Torrance Kirby (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), pp. 2-4.  
\(^{47}\) Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. E4  
\(^{48}\) Overell, Italian Reform and English Reformations, p. 5.
Humphrey’s emphasis of Martyr’s reading of scripture by way of new interpretations of the church fathers highlights the serious impact of his humanist scholarship and evangelism on Oxford’s, and England’s, movement of reform.\(^{50}\)

In 1549, Martyr’s lectures on Romans and I Corinthians treated the three highly controversial topics of purgatory, clerical celibacy and the nature of the Eucharist. His critics reacted angrily and attempted to force him, unprepared, into a public debate. Their organized posting of vernacular posters evoked the deep-rooted hostility that existed amongst university and townspeople against this continental scholar, and against Cranmer’s Reformation.\(^{51}\)

MacCulloch has established the significance, for the English Reformation, of the network of Swiss, Dutch and English scholars that developed through the 1530s, the international book trade providing opportunities for these continental and English reformers to forge strong links. For example, letters from this time reveal Zurich’s renowned printer, Christopher Froschauer, acting as middleman between the Swiss evangelical Heinrich Bullinger, and Thomas Cranmer.\(^{52}\)

Arriving at Oxford at this time was a group of young Swiss scholars who added the weight of a new generation of reformers to the English Protestant cause. This included the nephew of Zurich’s renowned printer, also called Christopher\(^{49}\)

---

\(^{49}\) Humphrey, *Vita Juelli*, sig. F1r


Froschauer, and Heinrich Bullinger’s adopted son Rodolph Gualter.\(^{53}\) The younger generation of reformers were to become vital in terms of the intellectual and practical network they represented for Humphrey when he sought similar scholarly sympathy on the Continent, and it is likely that his enduring friendship with Gualter was established at this time.\(^{54}\)

These early Edwardian years in Oxford offered Humphrey much opportunity to develop his Protestant views. Magdalen College, in particular, had become ‘the cradle of puritanism within the university’, although this description risks masking the ongoing antagonism between the senior and junior fellows there.\(^{55}\) Owen Oglethorpe had been President of the College since 1536, and the developing Protestantism of Edward VI’s reign meant there was increasing opposition to Oglethorpe’s religious conservatism. Some of the younger fellows, who felt that the President was failing to embrace the required religious reforms, made violent protests against the mass in the college chapel. A celebrant was accosted during the Whit Sunday service, and, according to Humphrey’s later account, one of the more radical fellows, Thomas Bickley, ‘most unrevocently toke away the sacrament and broke it’. The priest was attacked and service books were damaged.\(^{56}\) Magdalen College was called to answer for its lack of discipline, a Visitation was undertaken and commissioners issued forty-four injunctions for the reform of college life. Surprisingly, these included an injunction that it dissolve its school, and divert funds supporting young choristers to the education


\(^{54}\) See Chapter Four.


\(^{56}\) This account is given by Wilson, *Magdalen College*, pp. 87-88, apparently taken from Fuller’s *Worthies*, which itself draws on Humphrey’s description in his *Vita Iuelli*, sigs K1’ - K1’.
of the older scholars of the College. On this point, however, Magdalen College united in protest, arguing for the necessity of its feeder school. The objection to its dissolution received support from the city, which also petitioned on the matter, and Magdalen School remained.\footnote{A Register of the Members of St Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, ed. by W. D. Macray, 8 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1894-1915), 2, 22-26; Bloxham, Magdalen College Register, 2, 109-13.}

\textit{Memorial verse in print}

This period sees Humphrey’s earliest printed composition – a neo-Latin poem in the first collection of obituary verse published in England, the \textit{Vita et obitus duorum fratrum suffolciensium} (‘The life and death of two brothers from Suffolk’).\footnote{Vita et obitus duorum fratrum suffolciensium, Henrici et Caroli Brandoni, ed. by Thomas Wilson (London: Richard Grafton, 1551), sigs E1’ – E3’.} Edited by the Cambridge pedagogue, Thomas Wilson, the volume brought into print the customary practice of posting multi-lingual funerary verses to church doors and tombs in commemoration of notable members of the university. In a variety of literary forms written in Latin prose and Latin and Greek verse, the volume commemorates the lives of Henry, Duke of Suffolk, and Charles Brandon, two young brothers who had caught a sweating fever at Cambridge University in 1551, and died within half an hour of each other.

Humphrey is one of a number of Oxford scholars whose consolatory verses appear as an appendix to those of the Cambridge contributors. The work contains biographical accounts of both brothers, the first written by Walter Haddon shortly before his appointment as Magdalen College President, followed by that of the Brandon brothers’ tutor, the scholar Thomas Wilson. Combining expressions of consolation for the death of the two boys with an account of their
studies at Cambridge, the work commemorates the young scholars both as exemplars of humanistic learning and ‘as Protestant protagonists endowed with saving faith’.\(^{59}\) Stressing their aptitude for languages, their close relations with their mother, Katherine, Duchess of Suffolk – who came to live with them in Cambridge – and the keen interest taken by the household in their education, the commemorative volume depicts a distinctly Protestant model of *pietas literata*. The boys’ Christian conduct is emphatically supported by their education in classical moral philosophy, and promoted by classical eloquence.

In an engaging description of the two brothers’ practice of reciprocal Greek, Latin and English translation, in exercises which they dutifully demonstrate to their mother before tea, Wilson exemplifies the ideal facility in classical and vernacular languages called for in the contemporary university scholar:

Dux Henricus, & frater Carolus, [...] dispositis vicibus & Latine & Anglice vertebant, ut quod Dux explicuisset e greco latine, id frater e greco in vernaculam linguam verteret, & vice versa, Carolus latine redderet, quod frater explicuisset Anglice. Tempore vero coenae, uterque matri labores ostendit suos ut illa testis esset & particeps progressionis utriusque.\(^{60}\)

(Henry the Duke and his brother Charles used to take turns to make reciprocal translations in Latin and English, so that that which the Duke translated from Greek into Latin, his brother turned from Greek into the vernacular language, and vice versa Charles translated into Latin that which his brother had translated into English. And when it was time to eat, each boy showed off his work to his mother, so that she might witness and share in each boy’s progress.)

The use of this passage in such a relatively short obituary volume again highlights the rhetorical strategy underpinning reformed accounts of translation between classical and vernacular languages, as we saw in Humphrey’s commendation of

\(^{60}\) Wilson, *Vita et obitus duorum fratrum suffolciensium*, sig. d3v.
Harley’s exemplary practice at Magdalen School. The Brandon boys’ linguistic accomplishments are shown as enabling the synthesis between classical learning and evangelical theology through which the history of the church and its scriptures could be newly understood and interpreted. The narrative account of the boys’ lives describes a commitment by the whole family, fully engaged with the agenda of religious and educational reform.

In the same year, Sir John Cheke, the eminent Cambridge scholar who had established a prominent role in the revival of Greek learning, collected and published Latin and Greek poems in memory of Martin Bucer. The Protestant reformer from Strasbourg had been welcomed to Cambridge and to the nearby home of Katherine, Duchess of Suffolk, and when he shortly became ill, she had helped nurse him. This collection starts with verses by the young Duke of Suffolk and his brother, whose deaths shortly followed that of Bucer.

Although Humphrey did not himself contribute to Bucer’s memorial volume, in the edition commemorating the Brandon brothers he emphasizes intellectual and religious affinities shared by the young English boys and Bucer. The structure of the commemorative volume itself demonstrates the kind of scholarly exercises undertaken at the university, particularly towards the end of the appendix, where the contributors are perhaps less likely to have a personal connection to the deceased boys. Humphrey’s contribution is entitled ‘Prosopopoeia Suffolciae Ducem Suffoliensiem & Carolum fratrum amissos lamentatis’, which emphasizes the formal literary device employed alongside the

---

61De obitu doctissimi et sanctissimi theologi doctoris Martini Buceri, Regii in celeberrima Cantabrigiensis academia apud Anglos publice sacrarum literarum praelectoris, epistolae duae (London: Reginald Wolf, 1551).
subject matter. Humphrey suggests that Charles, who had so recently mourned Bucer, now accompanied him in death:

Planxit ad magni cineres Buceri | Carolus parvus, pietate magnus | Nunc graves planctus mihi subministrat | Mortuus ipse. | Cum Bucer, Bucer, geminaret iste. 62

(He lamented the ashes of great Bucer | Little Charles, great in devotion | Now himself dead | He supplies my weighty lamentations | With Bucer, Bucer, let that boy be joined.)

Humphrey bestows a posthumous honour on, and suggests the confessional affinity of, the young Charles by linking him with the older celebrated Regius Professor of Divinity.

In addition to their commemorative role, these two volumes provided a setting in which the contributing scholars could identify themselves with the honourable deceased, and so reinforce their own standing and sympathies. The Brandon boys are portrayed as champions of the Reform, for example in Wilson’s account of how alert Henry was ‘to anything smacking of pharisaical religion’ at the university disputations he attended. J. F. McDiarmid cites from both volumes further strategic references to their faith that demonstrate the protagonists’ reformed credentials. 63

Noting the confessional emphasis in these portrayals, McDiarmid identifies the memorial volumes as embodying the Protestant humanists’ central vision, their ‘sense of the continuing value of classical learning in the conduct of life under divine grace’. Particular characteristics that are emphasized include Bucer’s energy as a Protestant debater, and his challenges against specific Catholic opponents. Whilst they reflect classical and neo-Latin influences along

---

Erasmian lines, these memorial volumes signal the newly emerging movement of a specifically English reformed humanism. This pattern is described as ‘the most notable development on the scene of mid-Tudor elite intellectual culture’. Chapter Two will show that this rhetorical strategy of alignment and affirmation is one Humphrey adopts some years later in his description of another noble Protestant family, as he expresses their shared commitment to *pietas literata* in terms of aligned scholarly and reformed credentials. The inclusion of Humphrey’s Latin verse in the volume commemorating the Brandon brothers signals the establishment of his academic reputation by 1551 within an emerging network of reformed university scholars.

These printed memorial editions indicate the scholarly attempts that were being made to strengthen the Reform at the universities. At the same time, Magdalen College continued to be disrupted by factions. A petition was made for the removal of its longstanding President and, despite some vigorous defences and substantial support from other senior fellows, Oglethorpe was forced to resign by August 1552. It is thought that John Harley was initially considered as his replacement at Magdalen. He was by then one of Edward VI’s ‘chaplains ordinary’ who undertook evangelizing tours of those parts of the country that were considered to be more resistant to the new religious dispensation. Instead, Walter Haddon, the distinguished Protestant scholar who had recently become master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, was controversially elected to become President of Magdalen from Michaelmas that year. It was now Haddon, along with Thomas Bentham and Thomas Bickley, who most actively urged the...
Protestant cause at the college in the early 1550s, and for a short period under his leadership Magdalen was considered to have achieved its own ‘local’ Reformation. Concurrent momentum is evidenced at a number of other Oxford colleges, most notably New College, where Thomas Harding proclaimed himself an ardent Protestant, and at Corpus Christi, where William Cole and John Jewel led Protestant factions.\(^{66}\)

**Early career at Oxford**

Humphrey, after proceeding to his M.A. in 1552, was elected lecturer in natural philosophy and, in the following year, lecturer in moral philosophy. Magdalen College at this time ‘set the pace in organised undergraduate instruction’.\(^{67}\) Its lectures in the two philosophies and in theology were delivered to scholars in the university at large, as well as to college members. Every member of the college was required to attend the public lectures in Greek and Latin, and scholars were examined on their content in the evenings.\(^{68}\)

Humphrey indicates the informal curriculum that could also be pursued by a graduate at one of these reformed colleges, as he describes John Jewel’s activity in the decade before Humphrey’s matriculation.\(^{69}\) He places Jewel’s learning emphatically within the reformed humanist tradition, citing his reading of the entire corpus of Erasmus’s works, and drawing comparisons between the two scholars’ exemplary practice. Jewel’s studies in dialectic, philosophy and mathematics are described as being aided by an extraordinary memory that saw

\(^{66}\) Cross, ‘Oxford and the Tudor State’, pp. 120-43 (p. 139).
\(^{68}\) McConica, ‘The Rise of the Undergraduate College’ in *The Collegiate University*, p. 61.
\(^{69}\) Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sigs C1’ - D3’.  

him memorize Horace ‘ut Erasmus puer Terentium’ (‘as Erasmus, when a boy, [memorized] Terence’).\textsuperscript{70} As a scholar at Merton College, and then a fellow at Corpus Christi, Jewel is depicted as highly skilled in the reading and imitation of Cicero, and in his exposition of the historians Suetonius, Polybius, and the late fifteenth-century Italian scholar and historian, Sabellicus. Humphrey points to Jewel’s skills in shorthand and annotation, and describes his marked-up copy of Livy ‘in quem etiam scripserat Indicem’ (‘in which he had even written an index’).\textsuperscript{71}

Indicating the religio-political alignment that could underpin the reformed humanist programme, Humphrey also cites a controversy regarding the teaching of Greek. He relates how the vicar of St Peter’s, Robert Serles (one of the men who gave evidence against Cranmer at the Archbishop’s trial), thwarted Jewel’s intention to teach Greek to his tutor John Parkhurst’s son, Anthony. Humphrey notes Serles’s objections to Jewel’s plan, ‘quam tum haereseos causam esse autumabat’ (‘which at the time he said was an opportunity for heresy’).\textsuperscript{72}

As he commends Jewel’s scholarship, Humphrey indicates the way in which scriptural material is to be read. In a scene that seems emblematic of the reformed approach to scholarship, he describes the comparative study of two vernacular Bible editions carried out by Jewel and his tutor, John Parkhurst. The two men read Tyndale’s translated New Testament alongside Coverdale’s competing English translation. Humphrey highlights Jewel’s linguistic proficiency, associating his identification of barbarisms with his rejection of

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid. sig. C3\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid. sig. C4\textsuperscript{v}.
Catholic doctrine: ‘in hac tenera aetate in latino sermone Barbarismos, in Romana Religione errores quamprimum deprehenderet’ (‘at this tender age he detected both barbarisms in Latin style and grammar and doctrinal errors in the Roman religion’).\textsuperscript{73}

After relating the scholarly training Jewel had received, Humphrey references Jewel’s own teaching of Virgil and Horace, and draws specific attention to the exemplary instruction he gave on Cicero’s treatises on rhetorical invention, the \textit{De inventione}, and his speeches \textit{Pro Marcello}, and \textit{Pro Plancio}. He contrasts this with Jewel’s private teaching of Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses} and other poets, as well as more Livy, conducted ‘in cubiculo’ (‘in his chamber’) at Corpus Christi.\textsuperscript{74}

Humphrey’s narrative of Jewel’s time at Oxford was not written until the 1570s and, as we shall see in Chapter Five, his account is deeply concerned with the fashioning of Jewel’s reputation in exemplary reformed humanist terms. Whilst the accuracy of this specific reading list is difficult to corroborate, it does indicate the range of materials and the approach to which these affiliated scholars were introduced at university, as they examined writings of antiquity and the church fathers through recently published editions.

\textit{Queen Mary’s accession}

As Protestantism began to take root within some colleges, the reforming policies of the government in relation to the universities were abruptly halted. On 6 July 1553, Edward VI died and was succeeded by Mary. Within a month of gaining

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid. sig. C3\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid. sigs D2\textsuperscript{v} - D3\textsuperscript{v}.
the crown, the Catholic monarch ordered the Chancellors to readopt their ancient statutes. Magdalen College, well-known for its evangelical disposition, was singled out for particular attention, and Haddon’s term as President of Magdalen was terminated on the decision of the Catholic Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner. As Visitor, Gardiner was charged with investigating the conduct of secular and spiritual business, and held the authority to interpret statutes, issue injunctions, deprive heads and fellows, and settle disputes among the members. In 1554, he restored Oglethorpe to the college presidency. The majority of the university resumed Catholic observance and those Protestants who remained and objected to this were soon punished.75 In September 1553, John Harley, who had been consecrated Bishop of Hereford in May that year, was imprisoned for leaving church at the elevation of the host – an event later presented by Humphrey as a landmark event in the history of religious controversy at Magdalen College.76

The arrest of divines, the order against preaching, the disuse of the English service, and the setting up of the mass indicated the rising tide of papal reaction. Protestants at the two universities faced a stark choice, either to embrace Catholicism or flee for conscience’s sake.77 For those without their own financial means, exile (voluntary or otherwise) was apparently one of the only safe options for survival. In London, ministers advised flight rather than conformity, and amongst the first to leave were the stranger congregations who had found religious shelter there a few years earlier. Some of the wealthier of London’s ‘godly’ also travelled to towns on the Continent where expatriate communities

75 Cross, Oxford and the Tudor State, pp. 139-42.
76 Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. 13v.
77 Duffy and Loades, The Church of Mary Tudor, p. 63.
were established. About one hundred Londoners, their wives and dependants went abroad rather than conform.  

From the universities, it is thought that one hundred and thirty-seven Protestant men went into exile on the Continent, of whom between fifty and sixty had received their education at Oxford. Peter Martyr, after a brief confinement, was issued with a passport on 19 September 1553, and he left England for Strasbourg and then Zurich. One week later, on 27 September 1553 (two months after Mary had been proclaimed Queen), Laurence Humphrey was granted leave of absence by Magdalen College to study abroad. Money was granted, with the proviso that he did not frequent ‘those places that are suspected to be heretical’, an admonition apparently not followed up by the scrutiny of the college authorities, since they may well have known of his whereabouts. Humphrey’s leave was renewed on 24 December 1554, and again on 15 June 1555, suggesting some sympathy amongst the fellows who remained at Magdalen, who apparently turned a blind eye to his exact whereabouts. A letter from Humphrey to the Magistrates at Zurich, some time in 1554, gives an indication of his plans for this leave of absence:

Cum ex Anglia, carissima patria nostra divinaeque veritatis luce nuper exornata, propter eandem exulemus, humiliter a vestra dignitate petimus, clarissimi consules, ut in hac celeberrima urbe vestro consensu, decreto, et protectione contra obmurmurantium et infestantium vim, si qui eiusmodi fuerint, freti ac muniti commoremur. Novit Dominus, propter quem nostra omnia reliquimus, quod nihil praeter illum quaeramus. Et propterea huc potissimum, ubi et sincerissime praedicatur, et purissime colitur, unanimes lubentesque accessimus. Quod cum ita sint, confidimus fore ut,
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80 Bloxham, *Magdalen College Register*, 4, 104-5.
quemadmodum religionis verae christianae acerrimi propugnatores estis, ita
nos, propter eandem eictos et certe sede destitutos, vestra auctoritate
tueamini.\(^82\)

(For since we are exiled from England, for the sake of that light of divine
truth by which our beloved country was recently distinguished, we humbly
request of your honour, most worthy magistrates, that we may be permitted
to stay in this most renowned city, relying upon and supported by your
sanction, decree and protection against the violence of those, should any be
found, who would oppose and harm us. The Lord, for whose sake we have
left everything of ours behind, knows that we seek for nothing besides
himself. And for this reason above all, we have unanimously and in willing
minds come to a place where he is most sincerely preached and most purely
worshipped. This being the case, we trust that, as you are most keen
defenders of the true Christian religion, so by your authority you will protect
us, who by reason of the same are exiled and homeless.)

Terming themselves ‘unanimes lubentesque’ (‘unanimous and ready in their
minds’), the twelve co-signatories emphasize the unity of their faith and situation,
a rhetorical emphasis that reinforces the reformers’ common interest in preaching
and purity of religion. They define the situation unequivocally in terms of the
exiles’ need to seek protection amongst ‘defenders of the true Christian religion’.

Of the group who co-signed this letter, five besides Humphrey had come
from Oxford University: John Mullins, Thomas Bentham, Michael Renniger,
William Cole and Thomas Spencer; three were from Cambridge, the Master of St.
John’s, Thomas Lever, James Pilkington, and Henry Cockroft. From outside the
universities were Richard Chambers, who acted as ‘oeconomicus’ or financial
agent to the group, Robert Horne, the former Dean of Durham (who had been
educated at Cambridge), and Margery Horne, his wife.

In his 1573 account of the life of John Jewel, Humphrey describes the
departure of the Magdalen scholars in terms of the devastation caused to this
leading reformed college. He refers to the ‘privatum ulcus Magdalenensium’

\(^{82}\) Epistola CCCLVI, in *Original letters relative to the English reformation*, 2, 487.
(‘private wound suffered by Magdalen College’) and portrays some of the college’s most renowned Protestant fellows in vivid, short descriptions that indicate their individual responses to the upheaval of the early part of Mary’s reign.\(^8\) Citing the Oxford scholars who were co-signatories to the 1554 letter to the Zurich magistrates, he aligns the sacrifice of those who went into exile with the fate of those who remained in England. Humphrey seems to key each individual to specific characteristics of the Protestant humanist movement, alternately drawing out aspects of pastoral care, scholarship, or courage under suffering, as examples of the reformed values they variously displayed. As he underlines their various achievements or attributes, Humphrey emphasizes their shared provenance at Magdalen College at this pivotal moment in the history of the English church. Assembled in this roll-call are John Foxe, John Harley, the martyred Julins Palmer, Walter Haddon, Thomas Bentham, Thomas Bickley, Henry Bull and Michael Renniger. Humphrey’s citation of these Magdalen luminaries evidently represents something of a digression from his account of John Jewel, who had not attended the College. As we shall see in Chapter Four, from his position as College President in the 1570s, Humphrey has strong motive to associate this extensive list of influential church figures with their earlier education at Magdalen College.

In sixteenth-century writing, those who left England and sought safety in Germany and Switzerland were consistently referred to as ‘exules’. Heinrich Bullinger observed in his diary that, on 5 April 1554, ten ‘exules studiosi Angli’

\(^8\) Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sigs I3\(^r\) – K1\(^v\) (sig. I3\(^s\)).
‘studious English exiles’) had arrived in Zurich. Humphrey, in his account of Jewel’s journey, uses the verb ‘exulare’ (‘to be in exile’) repeatedly. Christina Garrett has remarked that ‘perhaps no words more aptly describe the nature of the Protestant exodus at its inception, than those used by Humphrey to describe the flight of his friends from Magdalen – “voluntarium in Germania exilium”’. Garrett challenges the notion of Humphrey (as well as others) being an exile at all, suggesting that he left England voluntarily and therefore could not ‘properly’ be said to be an exile. Her stance perhaps owes something to a concern with restoring balance to the historiographical legacy of sixteenth-century Protestant polemic. Is the term ‘exile’, or even ‘voluntary exile’, appropriate for these individuals who left England a few months after Mary came to the throne but before the proclamation against foreigners?

But what exactly did Humphrey mean by a ‘voluntary exile into Germany’? Humphrey uses the phrase ‘voluntarium exilium’ only once. This is just ahead of his narrative of John Jewel’s departure from England in 1554 or 1555, in the third and central section of the biography, which he entitles ‘exilium & aliae persecutiones’ (‘exile and other persecutions’). In his account of the scholars from Magdalen College who went into exile, Humphrey names John Mullins, who had arrived in Zurich with Humphrey, along with Arthur Saul and Peter Morwen. He employs the phrase with reference to these three men in particular, describing them as ‘voluntarium in Germania exilium, turpi in Collegio remansom praeferentes’ (‘preferring voluntary exile to an unseemly [or

---

86 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sigs I2v - N1v.
foul or repulsive] staying behind in College’). Humphrey contrasts their exercise of choice in leaving Magdalen with the situation of Hugh Kirke and Luke Purefoy. The latter pair, Humphrey says, were formally expelled at Gardiner’s Visitation.

The evidence suggests that many Protestants who remained in England at this time were facing a dangerous risk. Jewel describes in a letter the very real ‘fear of fyer and fagot’, his experience of which presumably contributed to his famous recantation of faith. State papers reveal that Stephen Gardiner confided to the Spanish ambassador, Simon Renard, that he relied on their sense of fear to get religious opponents out of the country, without publishing any order or edict. ‘When he hears’, says Renard, ‘of any preacher or leader of the sect, he summons him to appear at his house, and the preacher, fearing he may be put in the Tower, does not appear, but on the contrary absents himself’. Joan Wilkinson, one of those who had fled London, made a will in 1556 in which she described herself as ‘in voluntary exile for the true religion of Christ’. The confident assertion of her faith alongside the phrase ‘voluntary exile’ suggests that the sixteenth-century phrase lacked the negative connotations that Garrett finds in Humphrey’s use of the phrase. It seems that Humphrey’s phrase represents a rhetorical attempt to differentiate between the limited choices that were available to some of the Magdalen College reformers. Humphrey’s use of the adjective ‘voluntarium’ does

---

87 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sig. K1f.
not explicitly extend to the circumstances of his own departure from Oxford and England, the arrangements and timescale of which remain unclear. Whether or not he would have termed his own exile a voluntary one is not explicit in any of his writings.

Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century commentary on this period has its own idiosyncratic view of the terminology in use. Garrett is at pains to describe the group as ‘self-exiled’, asserting that ‘the emigration, whatever the springs which fed it later, was inaugurated, we believe, as a voluntary movement, and directed to the fulfilment of a clearly conceived purpose’. Her description of the construction of ‘a legend of persecution and banishment’ has itself a somewhat partisan register as it attempts to counter-balance the undoubted Protestant bias in the sources. Garrett demonstrates her underlying judgement of this group whilst claiming ‘deference to truth’:

this must not be understood as said wholly in condemnation. These were fanatical pioneers in a new movement and, granting their premises, were men under compulsion. Suddenly confronted with the alternative of flight or reabsorption into the catholic majority, they contrived a ‘working fiction’ to meet their needs, as every dynamic minority has done either before or since. Only in deference to truth it should at last be recognized that it was a fiction and that by their seditious action abroad they very probably induced for others the persecution which in their own case was imaginary.

So, far from challenging the sense of ‘voluntary’, Garrett employed Humphrey’s own use of the phrase in question to suggest that that use of the term ‘exile’ itself is inappropriate. Belonging to a working fiction ‘thus the character of the exodus would in itself seem to preclude any possibility that flight had been either haphazard or precipitate’.

---

92 Ibid. p. 15.
93 Ibid. pp. 10-11.
Garrett also suggests that the date and description of this exodus by such a homogeneous group of scholars indicates that their withdrawal from England took place in accordance with a definite plan adopted by William Cecil before the proclamation against foreigners of 17 February 1554 and certainly before the deprivations of March. She describes a project heavily backed by English merchants, ‘men no doubt honest in their protestantism, but probably not uninfluenced by hopes of a secular future in which trade would be untrammeled’, when Mary’s intentions to restore the old faith and to marry Philip of Spain became known in the Autumn of 1553.94

A number of merchants and nobles were already contributing to a fund that supported some of those being educated at Protestant institutions. Humphrey cites John Jewel as a scholar who received stipends and benefactions at Oxford in the 1540s. He notes that James Curtop, former fellow at Magdalen College, and then Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, gave Jewel forty shillings a year for a period before Edward VI’s death.95 Likewise, Richard Chambers, who later acts as the oeconomus for the Marian exiles, is described as helping Jewel to buy theological books through a fund he administered, ‘a nobilibus & Londinensibus collecta’ (‘from the contribution of nobles and Londoners’). Humphrey records that anyone benefiting from this fund was required to subscribe to nine ‘articuli verae religionis’ (‘articles of the true religion’).96

It seems likely that the financial backing of such a group was really an extension of the support that had been offered to scholars during Edward’s

95 Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. D4v.
96 Ibid. sig. D4v.
This established pattern of patronage, where confessionally aligned individuals supported Protestant scholars at the universities, perhaps also recalls the above-mentioned family endowments, for example those made by the Cave family for specific scholars at Cambridge. Following Mary’s accession, financial support was evidently extended to English theology students abroad, and included Humphrey and his fellow exiles, in the company of Richard Chambers at Zurich.

The necessarily covert network of financiers who gave this support became known as the ‘sustainers’, although Usher warns against its being presented as a clearly delineated group, let alone, in Garrett’s word, a ‘committee’. 98 Little has survived to record the clandestine activities of the sustainers, although the threat of personal danger faced by those who contributed financial support has been documented. 99 John Strype, the early eighteenth-century historian, is usually credited with noting some of the provisions offered by members of the Merchant Taylor’s Company, and with uncovering the identities of landed gentry who were known to have provided material assistance. 100 Less noted is that Humphrey himself is the source for the names of the London merchants on Strype’s list – Richard Springham, John Abel, and Thomas Eton – who were identified later, at a safer time, in his 1573 Vita Iuelli. 101 Greenberg notes the great risks taken by these men, given that undertaking religious pamphleteering, or possessing and showing such materials

101 Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. Mi’.
during the mid-1550s was punishable with death in England. ¹⁰² These merchants were well placed to make the regular and dangerous channel runs transporting exiles, letters and books, as well as the vital documentary source material required by the exiles as they compiled their records of Protestant persecution. The importance of the support shown to the exile community is acknowledged in John Foxe’s 1556 apocalyptic comedy Christus triumphans, dedicated to the English merchants. ¹⁰³

The associations between sustainers, merchants, and exiles indicate the extensive network of families and individuals whose overlapping political interests and ideological views led them to support Protestants during this period. Their safe location, access to source material and a well-established, sympathetic printing industry enabled the exiles to develop a narrative of their experiences that resonated with providential meaning.

With heavy reliance on rhetorical effect, in his 1559 Interpretatio
linguarum, Humphrey expresses the English Protestants’ plight in a metaphor of the tormented Christ in exile. In his need to stay hidden, he is prevented from the exercise of pastoral duty: ‘pallam in lucem, in Ecclesias, in pulpita, in conciones ac coetus publicos ac in medium non prodiit’ (‘he did not come out openly into the light, into the churches, into pulpits, into meetings and into public gatherings in the community’). When the shepherd finds opportunity to address his sheep, his flock is depicted as ‘pusillum’ (‘abject’ or ‘puny’) and scattered throughout the country. ¹⁰⁴ Humphrey identifies Christ with the English Protestants even more

¹⁰⁴ Humphrey, De religionis conservatone, sig. a⁵r.
explicitly, in a reference to clandestine meetings in London and to the exiles’
furtive attempts to sustain their faith even as they left England:

interdum cum piis viris Londini, aut alibi in angulo quopiam mussitans:
nonnunquam fugatus, pavidus ac trepidus, solum mutare, & in alias terras
fugere compulsas: saepe in cruce, in flammis, inter tormenta dura & dira, ad
vos conciones quas potuit habuit. Cumq nidum apud vos nullum ubi caput
reclinaret, invenire posset, & se ad tempus ab imminente ictu subduceret,
cum loqui non permitteretur, saltem unum alterum interdum emissarium
& Apostolum subornavit: alias epistolam aut libellum quasi tabellarium &
nuncium cum mandato ablegavit.\textsuperscript{105}

(sometimes whispering with pious men in London or elsewhere in some
small secret place, frequently fleeing, fearful and terrified, forced to leave
his own country and flee into other lands, often on the cross, in flames, under
hard and dire torments he held whatever meetings it was possible to have
with you. Whenever he could find with you no nest where he could lay his
head and when for a while he would steal away from imminent danger, when
he was nor permitted to speak, at least he provided occasionally someone as
emissary and apostle. At other times he sent off a letter or book with his
command, like a courtier or messenger.)

Humphrey’s depiction of the exiled scholar is expressed in the loaded language of
suppressed religious activity. The banished Christ, prevented from speaking, and
therefore from the emblematic reformed activity of sharing the gospel aloud,
instead sends a message through his ‘emissarium & Apostolum’ (‘emissary and
apostle’). When this is not possible, he uses ‘epistolam aut libellum’ (‘a letter or
book’) to spread his word, ‘quasi tabellarium & nuncium’ (‘like a courtier and
messenger’). Humphrey asserts the significance of print and manuscript culture to
the Reform movement, in representing the most effective means of
communicating with the flock. It is striking that Humphrey’s framing of the
response to religious oppression is figured explicitly in terms of the exile’s
deployment of the written word, a symbol of reformed humanist practice.

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Ibid.} sigs a5\textsuperscript{r} - a5\textsuperscript{v}. 56
Exile in Switzerland

As we heard above, the pioneering reformer and chief pastor in Zurich, Heinrich Bullinger, recorded the arrival of the exiled group of scholars. They established themselves in a house belonging to the enormously successful and wealthy printer Christopher Froschauer, where they lived ‘simul fraterne & iucunde [...] & ordinaria pensa, quasi in Gymnasio’ (‘together gladly like brothers, with ordinary duties as if in a college’), according to both Humphrey’s and Bullinger’s later descriptions. For Humphrey, this was the critical context in which he was able to make known his literary and religious views in published works. For in Zurich, and then in Basel, he gained access to proficient and sympathetic scholar-printers. These men could be relied upon for hospitality and employment, as well as for religious toleration, and they provided the setting in which a ready access to sophisticated print-shops opened up the Latinate world of reformed humanist scholarship for the English exiles.

Froschauer (senior), the printer, was an established and keen partisan of the Protestant faith. His press had been an invaluable asset for Ulrich Zwingli as he sought to move Zurich’s citizens and magistrates towards adopting the Reform, and Froschauer’s printed editions register each stage of the ‘careful choreography’ of the Zurich Reformation. His press had issued Zwingli’s attack on papal mercenary service in 1522, the theses for the crucial public debate of 1523, and all of Zwingli’s subsequent theological writings. Froschauer had brought out a vast number of religious works (some five hundred of his total of nine hundred). He had published the annotated edition of the Latin Bible

106 Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. M1; Heinrich Bullinger’s Diarium, p. 46.
undertaken by Conrad Pellikan, as well as the first edition of the Bible in English in 1535 and the controversial English Coverdale Bible in 1550.\textsuperscript{108}

Froschauer’s nephew, also Christopher, was one of the Swiss scholars who had come to Oxford and been admitted to Magdalen College five years previously, and it is likely that Humphrey had taught him before he returned to his uncle’s press in Zurich sometime in 1552.\textsuperscript{109} The younger Froschauer was continuing his uncle’s radical mission, spreading Protestant doctrine through vernacular texts. He acted as an agent between the English reformers, merchants and their friends in Zurich, especially on the occasion of his visits to the Frankfurt fair.\textsuperscript{110}

Recalling the hospitality the exiles received in Zurich, Humphrey’s acknowledgement of Martyr’s arrival in Zurich asserts his position as their ideological leader:

\begin{quote}
Accessimis huc ante Pet[eri] Martyris adventum, Angli aliquot circiter duodecim in domo Christophori Froschoveri, Typographi diligentissimi et honestissimi.\textsuperscript{111}
\end{quote}

(We, some twelve of us English, before Peter Martyr’s arrival, reached the house of Christopher Froschauer, a very attentive and respectable printer.)

On his arrival, Martyr gave a speech in which he contrasted the darkness of divinity at Paris, Louvain, Salamanca, Bologna, and Padua, with the more enlightened setting that he saw in Zurich. He expressed his intention for his ‘weak

\begin{footnotes}
\item[109] \textit{A Century of the English Book Trade: Short Notes of all Printers, Stationers, Book-Binders, and others connected with it from the issue of the first dated book in 1457 to the incorporation of the company of stationers in 1557}, ed. by E. Gordon Duff (London: Bibliographical Society, 1905), pp. 48-49.
\item[111] Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuelli}, sig. I3\textsuperscript{r}.
\end{footnotes}
and slender learning’ to profit not only his Zurich audience but also to replace, wherever possible, the ‘tyranny of popery’ with godly and learned pastors.\textsuperscript{112} He celebrated the scholars’ freedom to practise biblical scholarship in Zurich, as they worked on patristic translations and issued the commentaries through which they could participate in reformed discourse. Patrick Collinson depicts an energetic and productive phase where ‘the future leaders of English Protestantism gathered their churches and enjoyed the rare and exhilarating experience of inventing and quarrelling over liturgies and church constitutions’.\textsuperscript{113}

Humphrey implicitly traces the accrual of reformed humanist credibility for the English exiles as they deepened their affiliations with this network of esteemed continental scholars. He acknowledges the welcome given by the Zurich magistrates, and emphasizes their exercise of humanitas as he recalls:

Tigurini Magistratus raram beneficentiam, D.Bullingeri, Pellicani, Biblianderi, Simleri, Wolphii, Lavateri, Zuinglii, Gesneri incredibilem humanitatem.\textsuperscript{114}

(the remarkable favour of the Zurich magistrates, the incredible kindness of Masters Bullinger, Pellican, Bibliander, Simler, Wolf, Lavater, Zwingli and Gesner.)

Humphrey aligns his English group with the tradition represented by Switzerland’s most eminent reformers, adopting the rhetorical strategy that underlies Peter Martyr’s own acknowledgement of the group, during his first visit to Zurich in 1542: ‘I tarried here with those that belonged unto me, I was so

\textsuperscript{112} Anderson, ‘Vista Tigurina: Peter Martyr and European Reform’, p. 187.
\textsuperscript{114} Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuelli}, sig. M1'.
delighted with the Godly, learned, and sweete communication which I had with Doctors Bullinger, Bibliander, Gualter, and Pellican of happie memorie’.115

It is striking that, in his description of their arrival in Zurich, Humphrey compares the environment into which they are welcomed to a school. The busy and purposeful community that comprises the thriving print business of his Swiss host, Froschauer, offers the English exiles a setting ‘quasi gymnasio’ (‘like a school’). Using a Latin term more associated with grammar school education than the ‘academia’ of university nomenclature, Humphrey implicitly acknowledges the schooling in reformed humanism that he and his associates receive from their colleagues in Switzerland and Germany. Humphrey highlights the significance of these English and European educational contexts as he frames his own biographical narrative.

One might ask to what extent these exiles viewed themselves as future leaders of English Protestantism, at a time when no obvious opportunity for toleration in England was evident. Mary Tudor had been queen for less than a year and there could have been no firm anticipation that her rule would last only a little over five years. A letter signed by Bullinger, requesting financial support in the name of the other English exiles, addressed to ‘certain Englishmen’, indicates a sense of purpose and optimism amongst the group regarding their activities in exile. Bullinger describes the English scholars as devoting themselves ‘studiis literarum bonarum et divinarum’ (‘to the studies of humane letters and theology’) from which ‘fructus uberrimus’ (‘the most abundant fruit’) would grow to be of

benefit ‘inclyto Angliae regno’ (‘to the renowned kingdom of England’).\textsuperscript{116} It is unclear whether or not a coherent strategy, underlying their optimism, existed amongst this homogenous group, just as the exact nature of their exodus remains obscure. Nonetheless, it is apparent that the exiled community to which Humphrey belonged was effective at presenting itself as a group whose ‘profectum in pietate et literis’ (‘progress in godliness and learning’) was able to continue under the protection of northern Europe’s most influential reformers.\textsuperscript{117} It was well placed to exploit its plight both through the printing press and the extensive network by which money, communications and writings were circulated for a common cause.

Further research has revealed a few more biographical details, which, when combined with evidence of the works Humphrey produced, demonstrate the access to a wide intellectual European network that his Rhineland setting afforded him. Humphrey apparently remained in Zurich until the autumn of 1555, at which point he relocated forty-five miles away to Basel. Home to one of Europe’s leading educational institutions and profiting from its position on some of Europe’s major trade routes, the town offered its reforming residents excellent opportunities for their continuing humanist scholarship supported by a sophisticated and sympathetic print industry.\textsuperscript{118}

Humphrey matriculated as a student at Basel University, and began a long and fruitful relationship with Jerome Froben, son of the most distinguished Basel

\textsuperscript{116} ‘The letter of the ministers of the church of Zurich on behalf of the English exiles in the city of Zurich in the time of the Marian persecution, to the English’, signed by Bullinger in the name of the rest, Epistola CCCLIII, in \textit{Original Letters relative to the English reformation}, 2, 482-84

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid. p. 483.

\textsuperscript{118} This contradicts the \textit{ODNB} account that Humphrey went to Basel before Zurich. Garrett, \textit{The Marian Exiles}, p. 193, cites Basel University’s \textit{Matrikel}, I, 1460-1568, fols 191-201.
printer, Johannes, and Jerome’s brother-in-law, Nicolas Episcopius. The Froben press had a reputation for issuing high quality books in the scholarly languages for the academic and ecclesiastical markets, not least by drawing on the prestige of its tradition of patronage of Erasmus.\textsuperscript{119} It was also renowned for its active participation in the printing of the Protestant Reformation. Jerome Froben had gone straight into the family business after graduating from Basel University, and shown himself to be very adept in the business and a scholar in his own right.\textsuperscript{120}

The account books for the business show that between September 1557 and May 1558, Humphrey worked at Froben’s press for twenty-seven weeks as proof-corrector, along with John Foxe, receiving payment for collating manuscript copies of Chrysostom for Froben’s new Latin edition.\textsuperscript{121} Humphrey later refers to his hospitable printer, ‘Hieronymus Frobenius, quem ut amicum & singularem meum in exilio patronum, amoris causa nomino’ (‘Jerome Froben, whom I name, out of affection, as my friend and singular patron in exile’).\textsuperscript{122}

Froben’s officina was evidently also a conducive setting for Humphrey and Foxe to cultivate their friendship, of which there is no evidence before this period. Foxe, who had been a fellow at Magdalen College during Edward VI’s reign, but before Humphrey’s time, had left Oxford in late 1545, it is thought on account of his ‘warm and outspoken Protestantism’.\textsuperscript{123} Arriving on the Continent in 1554, Foxe had spent time in Frankfurt and Strasbourg before travelling to

\textsuperscript{119} Pettegree, The Book in the Renaissance, pp. 71, 84-85, 275.
\textsuperscript{120} Contemporaries of Erasmus: a Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation, ed. by P. G. Bietenholz, 3 vols (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2003), 2, 58-61.
\textsuperscript{121} Mozley, John Foxe and his Book, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{122} Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. 2M1r.
Basel, specifically to work on the material he had begun compiling for what was to be his *Acts and Monuments*, ‘a gigantic project that would contribute more than any other source in creating the template of protestant historiography in the centuries to come’. A letter Foxe wrote to Grindal describes his frustration at such ‘tedious employment’ in reading and collating copies of the Chrysostom, work driven by his need for money that distracted from his larger project. Garrett cites Basel town archives that show that in 1557 the council rented to the Englishmen an old convent known as the Klarakloster.

**Fathers of the church**

At the same time, the first volume of John Bale’s *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae Catalogus*, previously printed in 1548, was being expanded and reprinted also at Froben’s press. Humphrey, writing a Latin poem in honour of Foxe for Bale’s book, describes Foxe (in Greek) as ‘σύνοικος μου και ομοτράπεζος’ (‘sharer in the same house and board with me’). In short biographical sketches accompanying a list of each writer’s titles, Bale testified expansively to an English literary tradition, eulogizing writers or works that were aligned with the reforming programme, and censoring others whose writing was not. The centuriate structure of his entries emphasizes the broadly chronological sequence of the religious conflict between England and Rome, with the two nations presented as major combatants in the struggle between good and evil since the time of Christ. Grabes has observed that learned readers would, from

---

125 Greenberg, ‘Community of the Texts’, p. 699.
their knowledge of classical military vocabulary, have recognized that these writers were being assembled by Bale in his *centuriae* as antagonists in the cultural, intellectual and religious battles of the times.\(^{128}\)

Modelling his work on Johannes Trithemius’s *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, Bale ‘intended the Catalogue to be nothing less than a history of the English Church and its people in biobibliographic form’.\(^{129}\) At the same time it demonstrated to the reformers on the Continent ‘the exceptional role of Britain in Church history with regard to the preservation of right religion’.\(^{130}\) In his appendix to the twelfth *centuria*, Bale’s revised edition cites seventy-one contemporary writers. One of the new entries in his survey of English writers records Laurence Humphrey’s rising reputation as a pre-eminent Oxford scholar, specifically highlighting his connection to Magdalen College, and acknowledging the impact he was making abroad. Bale specifies Humphrey’s prowess in terms that again align the keen practice of humanist scholarship with divine learning:

Laurentius Hunfredus, patria Buchingamius, ad meliores literas, & praecipiarum linguarum cognitionem vir natus, parentum industria ad Oxonium translatus fuit, hoc nomine, ne eius ingenii foelicitas inculta torpesceret. Ille vero incredibili inardescens erga literas alacritate, promptitudine, expectatione, tantum in Magdalenensi collegio profecit, ut humanarum artium acumen, ac rerum divinarum noticiam, etiam exquisitam, tanquam e pleno fonte demum exhauserit [...] Claret in Germania, praeferens omni auro susceptum pro Christi nomine praesens exilium.\(^{131}\)

( Laurence Humphrey, from the county of Buckingham, a man destined for better scholarship, and the knowledge of the foremost languages, was

---

\(^{128}\) Herbert Grabes, ‘British Cultural History and Church History for the Continent: John Bale’s *Summariwm* (1548) and *Catalogus* (1557-1559)’, in *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Andreas Höfele and Werner von Koppenfels (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), pp. 139-51.


\(^{130}\) Grabes, ‘British Cultural History and Church History for the Continent’, p. 143.

\(^{131}\) *Scriptorium illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus* (Basel: Oporinus, 1557), sig. 2Z3v.
translated by hard work to his parent Oxford, so that the fruitfulness of his natural disposition should not grow heavy and uncultivated. But truly burning with such incredible readiness, aptitude, expectation towards scholarship he made such progress at Magdalen College, that he would finally have drained dry, as if from an over-flowing stream, the keenest practice of the humane arts, and even the most refined concepts regarding divine matters [...] He flourishes in Germany, placing the present exile he has undertaken in the name of Christ ahead of every gain.)

Describing Humphrey’s commitment to translating the scriptural fathers, and the interest in morals and schooling that would have drawn him to such texts, Binns observes that ‘Humphrey lies in the mainstream of […] intellectual life, and it cannot be insignificant that amidst his numerous scholarly, theological, and literary activities, he found time to engage in the Latin translation of Greek patristic texts’.\(^{132}\) In Basel, Humphrey did more than ‘find time’ to make translations of these works, for the church fathers provided crucial source material with which Europe’s leading reformed scholars could advance their religious convictions and educational arguments, supported by the structures of diverse political authorities.\(^{133}\) Evidence of Humphrey’s involvement in a wide range of patristic works builds over this period, and his own prefaces serve to promote the reformers’ discovery, translation and publication of these newly available sources:

Quis nescit, nonnulla Augustini & Origenis & aliorum nuper his temporibus revixisse? Nec Chrysostomus statim ac simul proditi uno partu totus. Post Anianum, Trapezuntium, Aretinum, Erasmus & Brixius quasdam reliquias dissipatas restituerunt ac transtulerunt: post illos Musculus, Gelenius, Chekus noster quaedam addiderunt, & latine reddiderunt.\(^{134}\)

---


\(^{134}\) Laurence Humphrey, *Divi Cyrilli Alexandri Episcopi, commentariorum in Hesiaiam Prophetam libri quinques, nunc primum in Latinam linguam ex Graeci converti, Laurentio Hunfredo interprete* (Basel: Froben, 1563), sig. a3\(^{r}\). Cited from here as *Divi Cyrilli Alexandri Episcopi*. 
(Who does not know that some works of Augustine and Origen and others have recently returned to these times? Nor did Chrysostom re-emerge in entirety at one time. Then Erasmus and Brixius restored and translated certain scattered remains of Anianus, Trapezuntius and Aretino, and after these, Musculus, Gelenius and our Cheke added others, and translated them into Latin.)

In a later letter, Humphrey refers to his also having worked on ‘aliquot versiones D. Musculi apud Frobenium’ (‘some translations of Master Musculus at Froben’s press’), and that he ‘praelo praefui[t]’ (‘passed them through the press’).  
Wolfgang Musculus senior was influential both as a translator of patristic works and as a biblical exegete, and the work to which Humphrey refers is perhaps his important edition of the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, issued by Froben in 1557. Humphrey depicts the convergence of improved scholarly and bibliographic skills, supported by an increasingly proficient printing industry eager to explore the works of the church fathers:

Sapiunt enim nunc, ipso tempore multa docente, hominess, & Graecis literis reflorescentibus, in conquiendo diligentiore, ad convertendum aptiores, in excudendo politiores, ad legendum studendumque alacriores extituerunt.  

(For men now know, having learnt much themselves at this time, and with the re-flourishing of Greek learning, they are more diligent in seeking these works out, and more fit to translate them, more accomplished in printing, and keener in reading and studying.)

Humphrey commends the endeavour of the Swiss polymath, Conrad Gesner, as he famously worked to establish his ‘universal library’, a bibliography of all books, at this time:

---

135 ‘L. Humfredus ad [Abraham Musculus]’, Epistola CXX, Oxford, 3 March 1578, in The Zurich Letters, comprising the Correspondence of several English Bishops and others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, ed. by Hastings Robinson, Second Series 1558-1602 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), p. 183. Cited from here as The Zurich Letters, Second Series. Humphrey also describes enjoying Musculus’ hospitality at his house in Berne at this time.

136 Eusebi Pamphili Episcopi Caesareae Palaeostinae, ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem (Basel: Froben, 1557).

137 Humphrey, Divi Cyrilli Alexandri Episcopi, sig. a3v.
Cyrilli vero adhuc multa delitescunt in pulvere, quorum Nicephorus &
Volateranus & alii meminerunt, & extare Graece non pauca eiusdam in alios
prophetas in Bibliothecis Italicis Gesnerus, homo per omnes officinas
librarias oculis lynceis instar sedulae apis volitans & oberrans, testatur. 138

(Indeed many of Cyril’s texts have lurked in the dust until now, which
Nicephorus and Volateranus and others recall, and Gesner, a man flying to
and fro and buzzing through all book shops with sharp-sighted eyes like a
diligent bee, witnesses that some of the other prophets survive in Greek in
the Italian libraries.)

Bale’s Catalogus, testifying to the reformers’ interest in interpreting patristic
writers, affirms Humphrey’s rising reputation as a scholar in the reformed
humanist tradition. It refers to ‘epigrammata doctissima sine certo numero’
(‘numerous scholarly epigrams’) written by Humphrey, and cites his above-
mentioned 1557 Latin translation, the Disputatio contra Marcionistas, a work
attributed to Origen. 139 More likely, these were three texts of the fourth-century
theologian Adamantius, whom Humphrey (or whoever had set him the task) had
mistaken for Origen. 140 The title page of the second volume claims Humphrey’s
Latin version of this dramatized debate against Marcionism – the movement
attributed to second-century bishop, Marcion of Sinope – as the first available
anywhere, although it would not appear in print until 1571. 141 Humphrey refers to
his translating the text from Greek source material ‘ex Frobeniano codice
manuscripto’ (‘from a manuscript codex of Froben’s’). 142

In this prefatory epistle, Humphrey expresses the value he saw in the
circulation of patristic writings, as he emphasizes the opportunity that these newly
printed works present:

138 Ibid.
139 Bale, Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus, sig. 2Z3’.
140 The early Christian theologian was also known as Origenes Adamantius.
141 Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda, sig. 2Y4’.
142 Ibid. sig. 2Y5’. 
An igitur nos antiquitatem doctam & sanam, non in lapide & aere incisam, sed in libris impressam, non mutam & elinguem sed loquentem & spirantem?  

(Therefore shall we neglect ancient and sound knowledge, not carved in stone and air, but printed in books, not silent and speechless, but eloquent and breathing?)

Humphrey criticizes what he suggests is the ‘praepostera & insana’ (‘backwards and insane’) neglect of the church fathers, describing them as ‘religionis [...] nostrae columnas & principes viros auctoritate summos, antiquitate venerandos, doctrina praestantes’ (‘pillars of our religion and foremost men in authority, respected in antiquity, outstanding in learning’). He calls for their works to take their place in the curricula at universities and schools ahead of the profane works of classical literature:

Optarem sane non in concionibus solum apud populum, sed in scholis etiam ac gymnasiis non tantum specum Platonis, aut Meteora Aristotelis regnum occupare: sed Homilies Chrysostomi, Gregorii, Basilii Magni orationes locum aliquem obtinere, cum non solum metaphoris, similibus, proverbiis respersi & referti sint, sed in omni genere doctrinarum & scientiae.

(Certainly I should prefer, not only in sermons amongst the people, but even in the universities and schools, to occupy the kingdom not so much with Plato’s Cave, or Aristotle’s Meteora, but to obtain somewhere the Homilies of Chrysostom, of Gregory, the speeches of Basil the Great, since not only are they sprinkled and packed with metaphors, similes and proverbs, but they excel in every kind of doctrine and learning.)

This powerful statement encapsulates Humphrey’s conception of reformed humanist education, aptly expressed within his own erudite Latin translation. The works of the patristic fathers are to be taught alongside, and even take priority over, those of classical antiquity, not only for their teaching in grammar and rhetoric but for the value of the doctrine and learning they contain.

---

143 Ibid. sig. 2Y4⁵.
144 Ibid. sig. 2Y5⁵.
145 This reference is to Plato’s Republic Book VII, in which he sets out his allegory of the Cave.
Humphrey describes the opportunity for these crucial works to bear fruit, made possible by printed editions of new translations and editions:

Et quanquam sua lingua non circumsonent omnes Doctores Ecclesiastici, quod optabile est, tamen beneficio Divino & quorundam Typographorum pia industria tandem suo nos ore & idiomate omnes prope alloquuntur, & indies magis ac magis, spero, efflorescent & emergerent, si studio inflammatiore ad ea emenda & discenda animi studiosorum exardescent.146

(And although not all the church fathers resound in their own language, which is desirable, yet with divine favour, and the devout hard work of certain printers, at last they are all addressing us in their voice and near idiom, and more and more I hope, they will begin to blossom forth and emerge, if the minds of the studious are inflamed with enthusiasm to amend and become acquainted with them.)

In a letter dated June 1559, written to Bullinger in Zurich from Basel, Humphrey implies that at that time he was again living in the same place as John Foxe.147 In the latter half of the 1550s, Oporinus employed Foxe, gave him lodging, and saw a number of his works through the press. These included Foxe’s 1556 play, Christus triumphans, his Ad inclytos ac praepotentes anglia proceres [...] supplicatio, a plea for toleration addressed to the nobility of England, and a series of one hundred and fifty rules for aiding the memory, both printed in 1557.148 As with Froben, Oporinus’s home represented a place of refuge for the exiled scholars, and reading for his press a means of livelihood. He had been educated at Strasbourg and, on returning to Basel, had gained experience as a print corrector for Johann Froben, Jerome’s father. Having established a distinguished academic career at Basel University, Oporinus was appointed Professor of Latin and then of Greek, until changes in university regulations regarding qualifications led to his departure and the subsequent establishment of

---

146 Origenis Adamantii operum pars secunda, sig. 2Y5v.
148 Mozley, John Foxe and His Book, p. 90.
his own enormously successful print business. Oporinus’s academic reputation ensured that it was a mark of distinction to have one’s work published by him. In the 1540s he had extended support towards such luminaries as Sebastian Castellio, who had issued an edition of Xenophon, re-edited his Dialogi sacri, and printed his famous Latin translation of the Bible there in 1551. In 1543, Oporinus had printed Andreas Vesalius’s great medical treatise, the De humani corporis fabrica, a work described as ‘the greatest single contribution to the medical sciences’. 

Humphrey highlights the enormous influence of this Basel press, describing Oporinus as a man ‘qui arte sua religionis causam plurimum promovit, & gradu artium insignitus, & re vera insignite doctus’ (‘who by his skill advanced much for the cause of religion, both outstanding in the pace of practical skills, and learned in plain spoken truth’). He relates an anecdote about Oporinus and Caelius Secundus Curio, Professor of Rhetoric at Basel University, pointing to his own friendship within this network of distinguished academics. It seems very likely that Humphrey received support and a livelihood from Oporinus, similar to that of Foxe, developing what would be a fruitful relationship with this erudite printer.

---

151 Saunders and O’Malley, ‘Introduction’ to The Illustrations from the Works of Andreas Vesalius, p. 19.
152 Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. 2M1r.
Geneva connections

Other traces of Humphrey’s movement in exile indicate that he left Basel to visit Geneva at least twice. Humphrey gives an account of the time he spent in the company of the Stafford family, expressed in terms of their exemplary reformed practice of vernacular evangelism. This Protestant family, having prospered at the court of Edward VI, had fled England on Mary’s accession and arrived in Geneva in March 1555. Their group of eleven included two children, Elizabeth and Edward, Stafford’s sister Jean, and their cousin Elizabeth Sandys. Sir William Stafford, who was married to his cousin Dorothy (née Stafford), was admitted as a member of the English Congregation at Geneva in 1556, and a third child, John, was baptized there, with Jean Calvin standing as godfather. In his 1559 Interpretatio linguarum, Humphrey refers to William Stafford’s practice of making vernacular translations of Calvin’s French sermons:

\[\text{Genevae cum esset Evangelii causa profugus & peregrinus, saepenumero Conciones D. Calvini e gallico in nostrum idioma, quod ipse vidi, solitus est convertere.}\]

(When he was exiled and a foreigner at Geneva on account of the Gospel, many times he used to translate the sermons of Calvin out of French into our idiom, which I myself saw.)

Humphrey’s construction of this nobleman’s reformed scholarly credentials is discussed in Chapter Two, but for now the biographical detail is of note. William Stafford died in Geneva and was buried on 5 May 1556, which evidently places

---


155 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, sig. N8’.
Humphrey in Geneva sometime earlier. Following Stafford’s death, his widow was involved in a dispute with Calvin, who attempted to keep the family in Geneva by claiming custody of her son, John. Dorothy Stafford succeeded in petitioning for the right to leave, however, and was granted burghership in Basel on 3 November 1557.156 Again this detail from the Basel archives allows us to add dates to the narrative of Humphrey, who describes being given the role of tutor to Dorothy’s elder son Edward. His description of teaching Latin to the young, French-speaking noble boy represents the only evidence we have of Humphrey’s employment as a tutor in Basel, and it further fills out his description of the period in which he lived as if ‘in gymnasio’. Humphrey presents his activity in terms of that of the reformed pedagogue, guiding his young Protestant charge through the exercises of reciprocal translation that occupied such a fundamental place in the programme of humanist education. As we shall see in the following chapter, Humphrey’s account of his contact with the Stafford family informs his call for the reformed education of the gentry as they return to England under a new monarch. It is striking that Humphrey’s descriptions of their scholarly practice contain many of the same elements as the construction of a religious ideal that we saw in the 1551 memorial volume to the Brandon brothers. It too can be seen as embodying the Protestant humanists’ central vision, in its promotion of the value of classical and sacred learning for those living under divine grace.

Humphrey made another visit to Geneva in 1558, at which time he married the twenty-one year old Joan Ingforbie or Inkfordby. Her funeral

monument testifies to their wedding in Geneva, and to a thirty-year marriage that
yielded twelve children. She was the daughter of Andrew Inkfordby, a
Protestant merchant from Suffolk. Foxe’s 1576 edition of the *Acts and
Monuments* records that ‘Andrewe Yngforbye, his wife and daughter’ were driven
out of Ipswich on account of their religion during Mary’s reign. Otherwise no
record of their names appears on any of the lists of Marian exiles. On 28 April
1558, in the company of one Robert Blackman, Humphrey was admitted into the
English Congregation at Geneva. Previous research has found no demonstrable
connection between Humphrey and the production of the Geneva Bible.

However, manuscripts in Magdalen College archives include a letter written by
Humphrey to Anthony Gilby, a ‘celebrated puritan […] with whom he held a
friendly correspondence’. Gilby, educated at Christ’s College, Cambridge
(where Humphrey had spent a short time), and an exile in Geneva, was certainly
one of the collaborators in the production of the English translation of the Bible
with annotations, printed in Geneva in 1560.

---

157 The black marble monument to Humphrey’s wife, located in the organ loft at the Church of St
Mary the Virgin at Steeple Barton, Oxfordshire, was erected by their daughter, Justina. The
memorial reads ‘Here lieth the bodie of Joane Humfrey, daughter of Andrew Inkforbie, wife of
Laurence Humfrey, Doctor in Divinity. She was born at Ipswitch in Suffolke, maried beyond the
seas at Geneva, had seaven sons and five daughters: lived a wife thirtie yeares and widdow
twentie three. She died the 27 of August in the yeare of our Lord God 1611 beinge seventie four
yeares old’. I am grateful to Christine Edbury, of the Bartons History Group, for her help in
locating this memorial, which had been moved from its original site during Victorian restorations.

158 ‘The names of such as fledde out of the Towne, and lurked in secrete places’ in *The
Ecclesiastical History, contayning the Actes & Monumentes of thinges passed in every kinges time,
in this Realme, especially in the Churche of England principally to be noted* (London: John Day,
1576), sig. 5R3. I am grateful to Thomas Freeman for drawing my attention to this reference.


160 Oxford, Magdalen College Library, MS 437, fol. 9. J. R. Bloxham’s manuscript note
accompanies letters he transcribed from the Baker MS collection now at Cambridge University
Library. See Chapter Four.

161 *The Bible and Holy Scriptures conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament. Translated
according to the Ebrue and Greke, and conferred with the best translations in divers languages.
With moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places, and other things of great importance
as may appeare in the Epistle to the Reader* (Geneva: Rouland Hall, 1560).
Humphrey’s time in Geneva, it is likely that he spent time with this group of scholarly English Protestants as they compiled their important work. As we shall see in Chapter Two, Humphrey’s discussion, in the *Interpretatio linguarum*, of specific phrases in New Testament editions implies close scholarly scrutiny of the Geneva Bible commentary and Beza’s recent Latin edition. It seems likely that Humphrey returned to Basel towards the end of 1558, since his first child, a daughter named Justina, was born there in that same year, as the inscription on her tombstone shows.162

Humphrey’s work on the writings of antiquity continued through this period. Also in 1558, an edition of the Greek text of Homer’s *Odyssey* and *Iliad* was published, accompanied by selections made by Hadrian Junius from the commentary of the Byzantine commentator Eustathius. Humphrey contributes the prefatory epistle to this edition, addressing it ‘ad Praesidem & ad humanissimos & doctissimos Gymnasii Magdalenaei socios, apud Oxonienses’ (‘to the President and most humane and learned fellows at Magdalen School, in Oxford’).163 Humphrey draws attention to his location and his associates:

> Basileae cum sim, in urbe celeberrima, & Academia, pfefforib.[sic] doctissimis artibusque liberalissimis affluente, divina providentia & consilio, apud humanissimos & benignissimos viros Frobenium & Episcopium, in honestissimo loco.164

---

162 This contradicts the *ODNB* account that Humphrey’s firstborn was a son, John, born in 1562. The inscription reads ‘Anglia mi patria est, Anglique fuere parentes: | At natale solum est inclyta Basilia. | Humphredo proles et matri prima Johannae, | Justina his iaceo nomine Dormeri’. (England is my homeland, and my parents were English | But the land where I was born is renowned Basel | First born offspring of Humphrey and my mother Joan | With whom I lie, named Justina Dormeria). The Dormer family monuments were removed to Rousham Church in 1851. Justina’s reads ‘obit Anno Dni 1627, mensis Iulii 6, aetatis suae’. My thanks to Christine Edbury, of the Bartons History Group, for her help in locating this memorial.


164 Ibid.
(since I am in Basel, in that renowned city and university abounding in the most learned and skilful and generous of experts, in admirable knowledge and advice, amongst the kindest and friendliest men Froben and Episcopius.)

Binns has suggested that Humphrey’s part may have been little more than to ‘see through the press an earlier edition of these works’. However, Humphrey does author the prefatory epistle to this edition, addressed to his colleagues at Magdalen College.

Humphrey’s epistle, written in Latin, represents an archetypal product of mid-sixteenth-century reformed humanist endeavour. It cites classical authority alongside contemporary European scholarship and is directed with purpose to a specific English readership. Humphrey reminds his colleagues of his affection for ‘vestra Oxonia, […] Collegium vestrum Magdaleneum ubi altus, doctus et educatus sum’ (‘your Oxford, your Magdalen College where I was nourished, instructed and educated’). He emphasizes the specific educational purpose of the college ‘ex quo principes viri, Cardinales, episcopi, Reipublicae decora, Ecclesiae lumina prodierunt’ (‘from where the foremost men, cardinals, bishops, the graceful lights of the church should come forward’). Humphrey expresses his hope that the edition of Homer will be as well received as more exotic findings from India or Africa, figuring the book in the person of its author, ‘caecus senex, longum iter emensus’ (‘a blind old man, who has journeyed a long way’), again via the celebrated setting of Basel. In his description of the way in which the classical text has travelled, unhindered by mortal danger or geography, we can anticipate Humphrey’s later calls for greater achievement in England’s

167 Ibid. sig. *2*. 
intellectual culture, through increased support for a developing print industry that might in time match what he had found in Basel.\textsuperscript{168}

Humphrey celebrates the far-reaching influence of classical literature and of foreign languages in general, citing ancient authors whose works can be seen as no longer fixed to one location having dispersed throughout the world. Underlining the fundamental value that such classical works brought to intellectual endeavour, Humphrey presents the four cornerstones of a university education as the means by which institutions can enable the future leading lights of the church to fulfil their promise. Without scholarship in Greek works there could be ‘nec philosophorum praecepta, nec Grammaticorum normae, nec Dialecticorum acumen, nec Theologorum arcana’ (‘neither philosophical laws, nor grammatical rules, nor the device of dialectical discussion nor the secrets of theology’).\textsuperscript{169} In this dedication, articulated in the only form available to him at this time, in a prefatory letter written on the Continent and addressed to his English readership at Magdalen College, Humphrey encapsulates the primary ambition of mid-Tudor reformed humanist education: ‘to develop wise and pious men who could serve the state’.\textsuperscript{170}

Humphrey’s choice of dedicatee suggests more than a backward glance at his Magdalen career, as he sets out his views on the importance of the study of classical languages for contemporary scholars and for their progress beyond the university lecture halls. Humphrey’s own fellowship at Magdalen College had

\textsuperscript{168} See Chapter Two.
\textsuperscript{169} Humphrey, ‘Epistola de Graecis litteris’, sig. *3’.
been treated as vacant since the college elections of July 1556.\(^{171}\) It is notable that, despite the contemporary resistance to those seeking religious reform in England, Humphrey describes his educational plans with reference to his current displacement and to his long-standing involvement with Magdalen College. It is conceivable that news of Mary Tudor’s ailing health had reached him by the time of writing, and that he expected an imminent return to England.

At the same time, his personal prospects for further support from his Buckinghamshire patron came to an end with the death of Anthony Cave on 9 September 1558. Cave, who had been in poor health throughout his life, makes no mention of Humphrey in his will, perhaps unsurprisingly given his vast network of family ties.\(^{172}\) There are several memorials to Anthony and his family in the parish church at Chicheley, which is dedicated to St. Lawrence.\(^{173}\) Cave’s local power and influence are further symbolized in the relatively unusual and ornate form of his cadaver memorial, publicly affirming a status and position in his community fully in line with Humphrey’s descriptions of his patron.\(^{174}\)

On 17 November 1558, Queen Mary died. Her demise had been anticipated in England, and Elizabeth acceded to the throne on the same day. Some of the exiles departed for home at once, reaching their native land before the close of the year. Others made preparations for their return, sending before

---

\(^{171}\) Wilson, *Magdalen College*, p. 109, notes that the vacancy was filled by another fellow at these elections.

\(^{172}\) Aylesbury, Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, File Ref D-C/1 ‘Inventory of all the goods and Cattells as well in England as beyond the seas movavle and unmovable belonginge unto Anthony Cave late of Checheley in the Countie of Bucks esquire, deceased, the ixth daye of Septembre a.d. 1558’; Cave’s last will and testament, London, The National Archives, MS PROB 11/43, makes no mention of Humphrey.

\(^{173}\) There is a brass of Cave and his wife, dated 1558, in the church at Chichel, a rubbing of which is held at London, British Library, MS Additional 32490, fol. 8.

\(^{174}\) E. Ettlinger, ‘Folklore in Buckinghamshire Churches’, *Folklore*, 78:4 (1967), 275-92. Cave’s monument was erected in 1576 by his wife Elizabeth.
them odes and essays, congratulating their new queen and expressing hopes for England under the new monarch. Along with John Foxe, Humphrey was to remain in Basel for almost another year, working on three important tracts, which would provide the means for him to present himself as a heavyweight Protestant intellectual with much to offer an England under a Reformed monarch. Humphrey’s texts, although produced on the Continent and expressed in the lingua franca of international scholarship, demonstrate his resolute intention to return home. When considered in the context of his recent loss of a benefactor and of his need for patronage, Humphrey’s work from this period indicates a purposeful redirection of his scholarly attention.

The first of Humphrey’s three works to be issued in 1559 was from the Basel officina of his ‘singular friend and patron’ Jerome Froben. This was the Interpretatio linguarum: seu de ratione convertendi & explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos, libri tres. Humphrey’s dedication is dated 3 February 1559, the edition being issued in the following month. Humphrey describes the work as being redirected from its intended destination of Strasbourg to London, following Humphrey’s dedicatee Thomas Wroth as he returned home from exile.175

Humphrey’s next work suggests a similarly pragmatic regard for his future. Dedicated to Queen Elizabeth in July 1559 (that is, only four months after he had written his dedication of the Interpretatio), the Optimates sive de nobilitate is also addressed to all noblemen in England from Humphrey’s position

175 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, sig. a8’. See Chapter Two.
in Basel. Humphrey’s dedicatory epistle is dated 20 July 1559, but it would be another 8 months before it was issued by Oporinus, an indication of the many demands on this distinguished printer, whose religio-political reputation at this time is further indicated by the inclusion of his name in Pope Paul IV’s 1559 *Index of Prohibited Books*. Employing more than fifty workers and sometimes calling on other Basel printers to keep abreast of the vast number of volumes he had undertaken to print, Oporinus himself exclaimed at the ‘ingenium lucubrationum cumulus’ (‘the huge heap of night work’) that filled his office.

As John Foxe hurried to bring his Latin edition of the *Rerum ecclesiae gestarum* through Oporinus’s press, the busy last few months of 1559 also saw the distinguished printer make time for a much shorter work by Laurence Humphrey, the *De religionis conservatione et reformatione vera* (‘On the preservation and true reformation of religion’). In his dedicatory preface, Humphrey makes a somewhat conventional apology that nevertheless suggests the haste with which it was published: ‘me non materia, quae amplissima est, sed tempus, quo nunc excludor, deficere (‘it is not material, of which there is a great abundance, that fails me, but time, by which I am now hindered’).

The dedication, dated 30 August, appears after the main body of the text, perhaps another indication that it had been seen through the press rapidly, and that the

---

176 *Optimates sive de nobilitate, eiusque antiqua origine, natura, officiis, disciplina, & recte ac Christiana institutione libri tres* (Basel: Oporinus, 1560). Cited from here as *Optimates*. The date of publication is given on the final page of the third volume, ‘Anno Salutis humanae MDLX. Mense Martio’ (‘March 1560’).
178 Fisch, ‘The Printer of Vesalius’s *Fabrica*’, p. 248, cites complaints from Hadrian Junius and others regarding the long delays in Oporinus’s printing of their manuscripts.
179 *De religionis conservatione et reformatione vera: deinque primatu Regum & magistratum, & obedientia illis ut summis in terra Christi vicariis praestanda, liber* (Basel: Oporinus, 1559).
180 Humphrey, *De religionis conservatione*, sigs b6- b7.
printing of this work took priority over Humphrey’s *Optimates*. The end page of
the *De religionis conservatione* records that it was issued by Oporinus in
September 1559. The urgency of Humphrey’s tone echoes that of prefaces written
by John Foxe, as he likewise hastened to publish his *Germaniae ad Angliam
gratulatio* and the second Latin edition of his *Rerum ecclesiae gestarum*, before
both men returned to England.\(^{181}\)

However, the altered print order of Humphrey’s two treatises and the
indications of haste in Humphrey’s dedication also suggest that there was another
reason for this urgency, which will be discussed in Chapter Three. As with the
*Interpretatio linguarum* and the *Optimates*, the *De religionis conservatione*
demonstrates the purposeful manner in which Humphrey concluded and directed
a major work to a prospective patron before leaving Basel. These treatises, treated
in the following two chapters, are concerned with England’s intellectual and
cultural links to the rest of Europe, and the educational agenda of reformed
humanism. From his position on the international stage of reformed thinking,
supported by such a scholarly and prestigious press, Humphrey was able to
articulate powerful criticism of English society under Mary, and express his
hopes for change under Elizabeth. These publications herald the resumption of
Humphrey’s participation in intellectual, religious and political life in England.

\(^{181}\) John Foxe, *Germaniae ad Angliam, de restituta evangeli luce, gratulatio* (Basel: Oporinus,
1559). Mark Greengrass and Thomas S. Freeman, ‘The *Acts and Monuments* and the Protestant
Continental Martyrologies’, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or *TAMO* (HRI Online
Conclusion

A lively contemporary anecdote neatly captures the multi-lingual, multi-vocational, multi-connected setting to which Humphrey and his associates belonged in Basel at the moment just before he returned to England. In a letter written to Heinrich Bullinger, dated 2 August 1559 (a few months after Humphrey issued his *Interpretatio linguarum*), John Foxe describes an incident in which a mislaid package of letters, written by English merchants to the exiles, had been discovered by a Basel merchant.182

The German-speaking manager, ‘praefectus et quaestor’, of the merchant’s business initially mistakes the letters as being written in Italian, ‘suspicians esse Italice scriptas’. He requests translation assistance from a visiting Italian acquaintance of the local Protestant printer, Pietro Perna, ‘Italus quidam, vir honestus, Petri Pernae sororius’ (‘a certain honest Italian, the husband of Pietro Perna’s sister’), who had arrived at the house ‘ob literas nescio quas’ (‘by reason of some letters’).183 Finding himself unable to read the letters since they were in English, ‘etsi nesciret Anglice’, the Italian however recognizes Foxe’s name on one of them and so summons him to the merchant’s house. Foxe describes going there ‘assumpto mecum Laurentio nostro’ (‘in the company of our friend Laurence’), ‘et hypodidascalo quodam Basiliensi qui interpres esset’ (‘as well as a certain under-school master of Basel to act as interpreter’). The manager explains that ‘literas illas iampridem reiectas in angulo nuper reiectas fuisse a servulo’ (‘the letters must have fallen into a corner and had just been

183 Pietro Perna was an Italian printer of Protestant histories, who himself had arrived in Basel as a follower of Peter Martyr Vermigli and served his apprenticeship with Oporinus before setting up his own press in 1558. Bietenholz, *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 2, 58-61.
retrieved by one of the serving boys’). Some of these, including ones addressed to Bullinger and to the Swiss polymath Conrad Gesner, had already been passed on via a Basel bookseller, Peter Maclaine. Foxe describes opening his own letter and finding it to be written by the English merchant, John Abel, part of a bundle that he and Bullinger had realized were missing.

The episode – itself described in a Latin letter written by an Englishman in Basel to a Swiss reformer in Zurich – strikingly reveals the mid-century cultural intersections between European vernacular languages and Latin. It portrays the close-knit community of scholar-printers, exiled nobility, spouses, children, preachers, book-sellers, tutors, and merchants, and the environment in which the reformers were able to advance their interests in ‘religio Christiana et literatura humana’ (‘Christian religion and humane letters’).184 This account of Humphrey’s early education and period of exile, much of which derives from his own reconstruction of his biographical narrative, demonstrates the relevant social and intellectual contexts from which Humphrey articulated his views on humanist education for the reform of society in England.

184 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, sig. a2r.
Chapter Two: Humphrey’s 1559 Interpretatio linguarum

Introduction

A young English boy, less than ten years old, sits with his tutor in a house in Basel, translating a letter from English into clumsy Latin, replicating the idiom of his mother tongue in his rudimentary translation. His exercise finished, the boy is shown a different version of the letter, this time produced in a Ciceronian style, comprising linguistic features characteristic of the most elegant Latin. With his tutor’s help, the boy compares the two translations sentence by sentence, and he learns the ways in which Ciceronian Latin differs from his initial English-style attempt, gaining a deeper understanding of both languages.

So Laurence Humphrey describes, in his Interpretatio linguarum, the lesson he gave to Edward Stafford, the young son of an exiled English noble, who had been entrusted to his scholarly care in Basel.\(^1\) In a scene that points to many aspects of mid-sixteenth-century humane learning, Humphrey presents, both emblematically and literally, an exemplary exercise in Latin imitation. Using an adaptation of a well-known letter from Cicero to Tiro, he demonstrates how the earliest lessons in translation can be taught. He shows how the boy’s innate knowledge of his mother tongue is used to inform his growing understanding of the Latin language. The pupil is guided between the classical and vernacular languages by his scholarly tutor, working up his proficiency in grammar, rhetoric and translation.

\(^1\) Laurence Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, seu de ratione convertendi & explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos, libri tres (Basel: Froben, 1559), III, sigs N3\(^{\text{v}}\) - N4\(^{\text{v}}\).
Furthermore, the scene is couched in terms of the family’s exemplary, reformist credentials. The boy is the son of the late Sir William Stafford, a Protestant noble who had left England for Strasbourg on the accession of Queen Mary, and had died in Germany. Humphrey describes the father as an example ‘nobilitate generis pietatisque verae illustrati, cum Christo iam in coelo triumphantis’ (‘of true respectability, well-known for his devotion, who now rests with Christ in the glory of heaven’). Upon his move to Basel, the boy has been entrusted to Humphrey’s tutorship by his widowed mother, Dorothy Stafford; ‘a matre vidua sanctissima & nobilissima foemina mihi tum in disciplinam tradito’ (‘delivered into my instruction by his mother, the most devout widow and noblest woman’). Humphrey’s expression of Dorothy Stafford’s devotion to faith, her family and her son’s education offers evidence of the commitment of the whole family to an educational approach fully engaged with the reforming agenda. It also recalls the emblematic presence of Katherine Brandon within the memorial volume to her two sons, discussed in Chapter One. The young student represents Humphrey’s aspiration for a new generation of well-educated, reformed scholars who would return to England to fulfil the hopes of their predecessors.

Despite the acknowledgement it receives in current reference works on early modern writing, as ‘the major Humanist work on translation in the sixteenth century’, Humphrey’s book has received very little critical treatment. Yet, as is apparent from its title alone, *Interpretatio linguarum, seu de ratione convertendi*

---

3 Ibid.
4 Adams, *ODNB*, ‘Stafford, Dorothy’. Humphrey’s pupil is probably the Edward Stafford who became English Special Ambassador in 1579.
& explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos, libri tres (‘The interpretation of languages, or, on the method of translating and explicating both sacred and profane writers, in three books’), Humphrey’s is a work singularly relevant to some of the most significant concerns of sixteenth-century reformed humanism. It was designed to help those who were teaching young scholars how to translate, its broad template demonstrating Humphrey’s concern with the practical application of his methodology.

This Latin pedagogical manual offers evidence of the way in which the reformed international scholarly community thought about translation as they shaped the intellectual agenda. That translation occupied a primary place in the intellectual activity of sixteenth-century Europe is well established. Proficiency in translation was a fundamental requirement for the practical engagement with the vast range of scriptural, patristic and classical texts available in print in their original forms. As the means of accessing the writings of the ancient world, translation, interpretation and textual exegesis were activities possessing moral as well as didactic purpose. The dual branches of divine and humane learning were inextricably linked, and in the techniques of humane learning, the reformers recognized the form of scholarship that would enable them to produce translations of scripture through which the vera religio could be revealed. The application of wisdom and eloquence to scriptural translation was inextricably linked to questions of translative fidelity, a concept central to reformed humanism.

When considered from the perspective of the specific setting and moment of its production, the Interpretatio linguarum has much to reveal. The circumstances of its issue from Froben’s Basel press, Humphrey’s dedication to a
wealthy exiled Protestant as he returns home, and the implications for the book having been written in Latin, all suggest that a historically contextualized reading of the *Interpretatio* is relevant to the study of mid-Tudor humanist education.

‘Our Translator, now returning home to you in England’

As many of the exiled nobles planned their return to English political life, Humphrey wrote his dedicatory preface for the *Interpretatio linguarum*, emphasizing the shared experience of the time spent abroad. He recalls the initial arrival of his group of English exiles in Germany and describes their sense of vulnerability at finding themselves in a country whose vernacular language they didn’t know: ‘quod qui peregrinantur, linguae ignari, sciunt & nos apud Germanos nonnihil sensimus’ (‘which those who live in foreign parts, ignorant of the language, know and which we felt somewhat amongst the Germans’).⁶

From its dedicatory epistle, it is apparent that Humphrey is presenting the *Interpretatio linguarum* as something other than a work of theoretical exegesis. He affirms his alignment, through the shared experience of exile and connected educational and literary interests, with politically engaged and well-connected companions. The dedication, written as Humphrey lived and worked at the busy press of his friends Jerome Froben and Nicolaus Episcopius, is dated 3 February 1559. Humphrey addresses his preface to Sir Thomas Wroth, at the suggestion, he states, of two other influential associates Edwin Sandys and Sir Francis Walsingham.⁷ These individuals had, like Humphrey, fled England on account of religion following Mary’s accession. Whilst details of their respective activities

---

⁷ Ibid. sigs a⁸v - a⁸r.
abroad are scant, they were involved with the religio-political networks of influential nobles and Protestant sympathizers who found safety and support aligning with their scholarly interests in the cities of Padua, Strasbourg, Zurich and Basel. The connection between Humphrey and the nobles to whom he refers evidently lies in this period of exile.

Following his imprisonment in the Tower and at the Marshalsea between July 1553 and April 1554, Edwin Sandys, Cambridge scholar and Vice Chancellor, had spent the period of Marian rule in Antwerp, Strasbourg and then Zurich. The skills he developed in Hebrew scholarship whilst at Strasbourg saw him translate the books of Kings and Chronicles for the Bishops’ Bible. In exile, Sandys also played an active part in both rounds of ‘The Troubles of Frankfort’. Walsingham, having escorted his three young cousins to Basel in the autumn of 1555, had, like Humphrey, matriculated at the university there. By the end of the year he was enrolled as a student in civil law at Padua University, and was appointed consilarius or spokesman for the English students there, a position he retained until April 1556. Although Walsingham’s involvement in the conspiracies of 1555 and 1556 is not precisely known, he is suspected to have had some role in the Englishmen’s likely plan to overthrow Queen Mary, their

---

8 Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations*, pp. 10-13 and 125-44, traces the Italian exile of Englishmen who had already established connections with Italian reformers at the court of Edward VI.


11 The Dennys had been in Padua in autumn 1554, together with Walsingham’s future brother-in-law Tamworth, and it is perhaps likely that he also had been with them then.
thwarted conspiracy known as the Dudley plot. After this time, Walsingham is thought to have returned to Basel.\textsuperscript{12}

Wroth, like Sandys, had been educated at St. John’s College, Cambridge, before gaining a place as gentleman of the Chamber and a knighthood on Edward VI’s accession. He was acknowledged as one of the young King’s intimate advisors, known to have been with him when he died. A committed evangelical, Wroth had been implicated in the second rising of Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk, early in 1554. He had fled England for Padua (via Strasbourg and Basel), arriving in July 1554.\textsuperscript{13} He is known to have travelled with John Cheke when the two men returned to Strasbourg in the summer of 1555. When Cheke was kidnapped or arrested under false pretences, in May of the following year, Wroth managed successfully to evade the messenger sent from England to recall him. Perhaps not coincidentally, this was also the month in which Humphrey found his fellowship at Magdalen withdrawn.\textsuperscript{14}

The timing of Wroth’s move to return to England from Germany appears to have taken Humphrey somewhat by surprise as he prepared this book:

\textit{Spero autem te, Interpretem nostrum, quem peregrinantem peregrinus eras recepturus, nunc in Angliam domum ad te redeuntem, limine tuo non ejectum.}\textsuperscript{15}

(But I hope that you would not throw from your shore our Translator, whom, when you were a foreigner, you were about to receive as he travelled abroad, and now is coming to you on your return home to England.)

\textsuperscript{12} Adams, Bryson and Leimon, \textit{ODNB}, ‘Walsingham, Sir Francis’.
\textsuperscript{14} See Chapter One.
\textsuperscript{15} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, ‘Praefatio’, sig. a8\textsuperscript{f}. 
Humphrey personifies the volume as a translator who, unexpectedly redirected from Strasbourg to London, now follows Thomas Wroth as he returns home from exile. Boutcher describes the context of elite reception by which imported translations were often promoted in mid-sixteenth-century England, ‘presented in printed dedications to particular patrons […] as naturalized or captured strangers needing welcome, rehousing, and protection’.\(^\text{16}\) Emphasizing his own separation from home with the repetition of ‘peregrinamentum peregrinus’, Humphrey solicits the kind of reception for his book that the noble exiles had received on the Continent.

Humphrey emphasizes Wroth’s evident commitment to scholarship during his time in exile, before acknowledging that the altered circumstances will place new demands on the nobleman.\(^\text{17}\) He acknowledges a distinction between the manner in which Wroth might have received his book in exile, at a time when he had much opportunity for scholarly study, and the way in which Humphrey now hopes it will be of use back in England. Humphrey acknowledges that the period of exile has afforded Wroth an unusual opportunity to devote time and energy to scholarship that his obligations on returning to England will deny, a suggestion consistent with some of the other exiles’ expressions of longing, years later, for a setting that was so conducive to learning.\(^\text{18}\)

Humphrey redirects his educational aspiration to the younger generation of nobility as they return to England. He anticipates the requirement for a


\(^{17}\) Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, ‘Praefatio’, sig. a8r.

\(^{18}\) For example, Adams, Bryson and Leimon, ODNB, ‘Walsingham, Sir Francis’, and Collinson, ODNB, ‘Sandys, Edwin’, cite examples in which nostalgia for the time spent in Switzerland is expressed.
programme that reflects the humanist pedagogical tradition, characterized as an informal and intimate teaching relationship within the noble household that would be mediated by exemplary humanist texts.\textsuperscript{19} Now, he states, he is recommending the \textit{Interpretatio linguarum} for Wroth’s well-educated sons, as well as his daughters, who he says are less versed in, but still familiar with, the classical languages, ‘filiae iam Latinae & Graecae literaturae non experti, neque ignarae’ (‘though not yet expert in Latin and Greek writing, nor are they ignorant’).\textsuperscript{20} Such detail raises the question of whether Humphrey’s time on the Continent afforded him first-hand knowledge of the scholarship of any of Wroth’s seven sons and seven daughters. At least one of Wroth’s children, a boy named Gerson, was born in Strasbourg, and later naturalized to England by an Act of Parliament.\textsuperscript{21} Humphrey’s reference, at the end of this volume, to his tutoring Edward Stafford in Basel, perhaps suggests that Humphrey would have made more of the fact if any personal relationship with Wroth’s young family had been established during their time in exile.

Nevertheless, Humphrey acclaims the scholarship of the Wroth family via the renowned linguistic capabilities of other elite families. He adopts the rhetorical strategy of referencing an influential and connected network of English nobles to promote the book’s value as a product of scholarly, and specifically reformed, endeavour. Humphrey recalls the late Lady Jane Grey’s renowned skills in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and offers accolades of the daughters of Anthony Cooke, specifying in particular their accomplishment in Greek – a

\textsuperscript{19} Boutcher, ‘Pilgrimage to Parnassus’, pp. 110-47.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. sig. a8’.
probable reference to the translations of patristic writers for which Cooke’s daughter, Mildred (William Cecil’s wife), was known. As would be expected in a eulogy to *pietatis femina*, Humphrey pays tribute to Queen Elizabeth as the most linguistically proficient of this group of learned women, commending her thorough grasp of French, Italian, Latin and Greek, ‘ut non solum eas teneat, sed loqui, & transferre sciat’ (‘such that she not only understands them, but knows how to speak and translate them’). He cites Elizabeth’s Greek-to-Latin translations of two speeches of Isocrates, and her vernacular translation from French to English of Margaret of Navarre's 1531 text, a work printed in 1548 as *A godlie meditation of the Christian soule*. As the rhetorical means by which Humphrey aligns his conception of godly scholarship with the Queen’s own translation activity, his eulogy also provides a conventional opportunity to flatter the new monarch as he anticipates his return to England.

Humphrey’s emphasis on these exemplars of female scholarship is further explained by his reference to the education of Wroth’s daughters, and indicates a more inclusive application for his work than has previously been acknowledged. Humphrey offers the *Interpretatio linguarum* as a manual for both the more proficient and the less advanced in language study, specifically including the study of vernacular languages in his work, ‘quod ita temperare studui, ut provectioribus & rudioribus inserviret: ideoque de vulgaribus linguis quaedam admiscui’ (‘which I have endeavoured to observe in due proportion, so that it

---

might be of service either to the more advanced or the less educated; that is, I blended in at the same time certain things about vernacular languages’).  

As well as providing a methodology for practising translation, Humphrey suggests that his book may serve a further purpose, in the teaching and learning of languages. It is for this reason, he states, that he has included two works in their original language along with his Latin translations, ‘quae ego non ad interpretandum solum, sed ad discendum docendumque linguas praeceipuas aliquid opis spero allatura’ (‘which I do not do solely for translating, but because I hope they will bring about some means for the teaching and learning of these important languages’). The first is the Old Testament book of Obadiah, which Humphrey presents ‘omnium & nostrorum quoque temporum effigiem’ (‘as a pattern for us all and for our times’). He sets out the short text in Hebrew, followed by his Latin translation and a textual discussion. Calvin’s Latin commentary on Obadiah was published in the same year, and Humphrey’s choice of this text is perhaps significant for its powerful expression of hope for a people in exile, again highlighting the context from he writes. The second exercise in translation is the De officio Iudicis (‘Concerning the duty of the judge’) of the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, Philo Judaeus. Humphrey proposes that Philo’s Greek text, as well as his own Latin translation and explanation, will be useful both for elucidating the language, and as a mirror for female piety, wisdom and

---

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 The book of Obadiah presents the classic prophetic vision of judgement and hope. Jerusalem has fallen; Edom and the other nations seem to be victorious, but the nations will be judged, and Judah and Israel will be restored; a powerful vision of hope for a people in exile.
learning. In his expression of the humanist belief in the unique potential for historical exemplars to effect moral teaching, Humphrey emphasizes the treatise’s specific function in the edification of women; study of Philo in this case addresses the *pietatis femina*. In this way, Humphrey underlines his book’s function as a teaching manual suitable for the noble, reformed, scholarly household, including its educated women.

Drawing on a vast range of textual sources – biblical editions, classical texts, works of the patristic writers and of contemporary commentators – Humphrey sets out his methodology for the production of both scriptural and secular, or profane, translations. He states that he has attempted to embrace the ‘*universum artificium*’ (‘the whole craft’), in order to show by what ‘*via*’ (‘route’) and ‘*ratio*’ (‘procedure’) both sacred and profane writers can be translated. Underpinning his scholarly exercise is *utilitas*, the inherent practical value that Humphrey perceives in translation:

> Denique nulla vitae pars aut functio hac interpretandi arte vacare potest: sive populum doceas ut concionator, sive Scripturas interpreteris ut Theologus, sive tradas artes, ut Professor: sive iuventutem informes, ut Ludimagister: imo si teipsum erudias, haec semper utilis est, nunquam otiosa.  

(Finally no aspect or function of life is exempt from the art of translation, whether you instruct the people as a preacher, or you interpret the scriptures as a theologian, or you teach the arts as a professor, or you instruct young people as a schoolmaster. Indeed even when you are teaching yourself, this is always useful, never idle.)

As Humphrey asserts the value and breadth of the *ars interpretandi*, he aligns skills in preaching and theological exegesis with the reformed humanist teaching of translation taking place in universities and schools. He dignifies translation as

28 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, III, sig. Q1′.
29 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, I, sig. b2′.
30 Ibid. sig. a5′.
the central resource in man’s ability to find ‘foelicitas’ (‘happiness’, ‘fulfilment’ or ‘prosperity’), through the interdependent literary activities of divine and humane learning:

Duae sunt res potissimum [...] in quibus elaborare solemus, & quae in summo nos foelicitatis fastigio collocant, Religio & Literatura.\footnote{Ibid. sig. a2r.}

(There are two very important matters [...] with which we are accustomed to exert ourselves to the utmost, and which establish our position in the uppermost rank of fulfilment, Theology and Humane Letters.)

Articulating the primacy and relevance of the close study of Greek, Latin and Hebrew language and literature, Humphrey describes the opportunity he sees for reformed scholars and for the returning exiles. By translating scripture and the classics ‘fideliter, apte, proprie’ (‘faithfully, duly and properly’), they can fulfil their purpose in glorifying God, building the Church, converting the ‘infidel’, and furnishing the schools and universities.\footnote{Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. N1v.}

\textit{‘With these scholarly exercises’: Early practice in translation}

Throughout the \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, Humphrey stresses the importance of teaching appropriate methods of translation to children from the earliest opportunity. Using the customary Erasmian trope of the artist’s wax, he expresses the relative ease with which the young child acquires scholarly skills, ‘dum tenerae sunt, & molles & instar cereae ad fingentis manum ductiles & tractabiles’ (‘while they are young, & pliant, malleable and manageable like the model of wax to the touch of a hand’).\footnote{Ibid. sig. M8v.} The tutor is to guide his student using ‘his

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{31} Ibid. sig. a2r.} \textsuperscript{32} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. N1v. \textsuperscript{33} Ibid. sig. M8v.}
tyrociniis’ (‘these first exercises’), a term associated with the early lessons of a humanist education.\textsuperscript{34}

The octavo volume comprises six hundred and thirty-six pages in three parts. Humphrey draws on an encyclopedic breadth of textual sources to elaborate and reinforce his points. His multi-lingual book, with Greek, Hebrew and Italic fonts as well as contemporary French vocabulary interspersed amidst the main Latin text, models the multi-lingual practice Humphrey recommends.

In the first book, Humphrey places his discussion within the tradition of classical theory, drawing from the major speculative texts on translation of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Horace. He considers some of the difficulties associated with definitions of translation and interpretation and sets out his arguments in support of multi-lingual expertise and his theoretical approach to translation.\textsuperscript{35} Humphrey’s schematic division develops the Quintilian model of rhetorical analysis, in which ‘oratio’ (‘speech’) is conceived as the product of the joined forces of the ‘ars’ (‘skill’) and the ‘artifex’ (‘craftsman’). In this two-part methodology, the first concerns the ‘interpretatio’ (‘the translated text’), and Humphrey examines the traditional constituents of \textit{plenitudo}, \textit{proprietas}, \textit{puritas} and \textit{aptitudo}, concepts rooted in Aristotelian and Augustinian language theory, along with their corresponding deficiencies. He posits that the fulfilment of these characteristics results in the most successful translation, a transfer of all elements of the original text. The second part is concerned with the ‘artifex’, and

\textsuperscript{34} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. K6'. Thomas Cooper, \textit{Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae tam accurate congestus, vt nihil penē in eo desiderari possit, quod vel Latinē complectatur amplissimus Stephani Thesaurus, vel Anglice, toties aucta Eliotae Bibliotheca: opera & industria Thomae Cooperi Magdalensis} (London: Henry Denham, 1565), defines ‘tyrocinium’ (from Livy and Budé) as ‘the first exercise in learning’.

\textsuperscript{35} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sigs b1'-c6'.
Humphrey presents a treatment of the ‘interpres’ ('translator') as a practitioner of virtuous agency, drawing on the Christian humanist concept of the *vir bonus*.

The book’s functionality is indicated by a number of organizational features, the most notable of which is the indexed diagram that Humphrey uses to set out his scheme. Spread over three pages at the end of book one, the printed ‘diagramma’ has a somewhat crude appearance, but nevertheless provides a visual arrangement of the structure of Humphrey’s discussion in a form unusual for its time. Indexed to appropriate page numbers, the ‘brevis descriptio’ ('short description’) as Humphrey also terms it, illustrates the structure of his bi-partite methodology for translating, the first branch indicating the qualities of *interpretatio*, the second those of the *interpres*.

Norton notes that Humphrey’s presentation is suggestive of the methodized approach to distinctions between grammar and dialectic that the French scholar Peter Ramus, had made in the 1540s. With this innovative, ‘Ramist-inspired’ diagram, Humphrey presents the work as an easily navigable manual of reformed humanist education. He highlights his book’s originality, ‘hac praevertim aetate, qua omnes bonae artes effloresce coeperunt, qua tot clarissimi & in omni disciplinarum genere principes viri extiterunt’ ('especially in this age, in which every liberal science has begun to flourish, and in which so many distinguished leading men are outstanding in every kind of learning').

The ‘diagramma’ is followed by ‘autorum catalogus’, an index of the writers cited in the first book, and an index of linguistic terms, which Humphrey

---


calls ‘synopsis verborum explicatorum’. These indexes orientate the student around the appropriate topics, demonstrating the volume’s facility as a tool to be handled in the study and practice of translation.

In contrast, book two, entitled ‘De ratione imitandi’ ('On the method or scheme of imitation'), supplies neither a summary nor an index, and as a navigable work it lacks the facility for rapid reference of the first volume. Humphrey considers the question of what, who and how to imitate, citing examples from New and Old Testaments and the patristic writers, followed by a survey of classical exemplars, such as Homer, Hesiod, Cicero, Horace, and Virgil. Humphrey provides the tutor with material to guide his pupil through exercises in imitation. A Greek passage of Plato’s *Apology*, a Latin excerpt from Cicero’s *Tusculan Letter*, and an A-Z mnemonic, from Cicero's translation of Plato’s *Timaeus*, exemplify the way the student can be taught synonymous Greek and Latin phrases. Humphrey concludes his section on ‘imitatio poetica’ with a summary of his reformed ethos for translating:

Nam hos primos esse statuo: Christum in re Christiana, in oratione libera & latina Ciceronem, in conscribendis Hexametris carminibus Virgilium: nec excludo caeteros, sed hos principes autores imitatione exprimendos potissimum censeo.

(For I think that these are foremost: Christ in Christian matter, Cicero in free and Latinate speech, Virgil in writing hexameter verses. Nor do I omit others, but I am of the opinion that these principal writers are chiefly to be expressed in imitation.)

---

38 Ibid. sigs o5‴ - p1‴.
39 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, II, sig. p2‴.
40 ‘Ciceroniania imitatio Graecorum in Rhetoricis’ (II, sigs u3‴ - u6‴), then ‘Ciceronis in Libris de Philosophia Imitatio’ (II, sigs u6‴ - x5‴), 3 pages of Greek text of ‘Plato in Apologia Socratis’ (II, sigs x5‴ - x6‴), followed by ‘Ciceronis in Prima Tusculana imitatio & interpretatio’ [including numerous scriptural references] (II, sigs x6‴ - B5‴).
41 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, II, sig. C2‴.
Throughout the book, Humphrey emphasizes that practice in translation is the means ‘quomodo Interpres, ali, creari, educari, confirmari’ (‘by which the translator is nourished, produced, educated and confirmed’) in his role.\textsuperscript{42} His descriptions draw on the oratorical training set out in Cicero’s \textit{de Officiis} and the \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium}, here modified with extra examples of linguistic exercises, ‘quae sunt Interpretis propria quodammodo & peculiah’ (‘which are specific and peculiar to the translator’).\textsuperscript{43} The scholar’s ‘publica’ practice of textual exposition and reading aloud in schools is contrasted with his ‘privata’ discipline, the habit of private study and consolidation by which he hones his skills.

Humphrey introduces his third book as ‘progymnasmatum et exemplorum sylvulam continens’ (‘containing exercises and a little crop of examples’).\textsuperscript{44} Signposting the arrangement of the exercises with subtitles, Humphrey sets out the ‘exercitationum genera’ (‘types of exercises’) that will enable the translator to avoid typical faults and absorb the phrasing, wording and the range of expressive resources in the languages he studies.\textsuperscript{45} Underlining the importance of reciprocal translation between classical and vernacular languages, he shows how linguistic proficiency is to be achieved through these analytical exercises. Through practice, the scholar gains an understanding of all the characteristics of a language, its

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid. sig. C5\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid. sig. C4\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{44} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. D5\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{45} Pars I (sigs D7\textsuperscript{v} - I7\textsuperscript{r}) comprises ‘Admonita seu regulae convertendi’ (‘warnings or rules for translating’), as Humphrey goes through rhetorical tropes and indicates the common faults and problems. Pars II (sigs I7\textsuperscript{v} - M6\textsuperscript{v}) sets out ‘exercitationum genera’ (‘types of exercises’). Pars III (sigs M6\textsuperscript{r} - O3\textsuperscript{v}) is titled ‘Exemplorum & progymnasmatum sylvula’ (‘little crop of examples and exercises’).
‘idiotismus’. Humphrey expands on the concept by reference to the adverbs ‘vere, proprie & fideliter’:

Idiotismus dicitur, qui in omnibus linguis conspicitur. Romani Latinitatem, Hellenismum Graeci, Atticismum Attici, Iudaei Hebraismum vocant, quum scilicet quaeque res suo nomine signatur vere, proprie & fideliter.46

(It is called idiotismus, which is seen in every language. Romans call it ‘Latinitas’, the Greeks ‘Hellenism’, the Attics ‘Atticism’, the Jews ‘Hebraism’, where indeed everything is truly signified by its own name, properly and faithfully.)

Again underlining the context from which he writes, Humphrey describes the fulfilment of the student’s scholarly ambition using the figure of the successful ‘officina’, the workshop. The well-equipped craftsman produces speech that is ‘fabricata et formata’ (‘fully formed and fashioned’).47 Having the appropriate words or phrases to hand will facilitate a keen and judicious translation and the student’s ‘iudicium’ (‘scholarly judgement’) will form through repetition and practice.48

Throughout his examples and exercises, Humphrey reiterates the importance of the method of practice, reciprocal rehearsal and writing in both classical and vernacular versions. This is the way in which knowledge is enriched and expanded in orthodoxy and copia. Such practice has been more commonly recognized as receiving its central treatment in Roger Ascham’s The Scholemaster but, as is apparent here, it is afforded still more detailed and significant treatment in the Interpretatio linguarum.

Humphrey’s discussion of the philological and idiomatic relationships between the ‘principes linguae’ (‘the foremost languages’) of Latin, Hebrew and

---

46 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. d5r.
47 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, III, sig. L1r.
48 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. d8r.
Greek, and the ‘linguae triviales’ (‘vernacular languages’) of German, English, French and Italian, again highlights the international, interlingual context of this pedagogical manual. He authorizes the practice of double translation in a description of the scholarly habits of a recent generation of the finest reformed humanist practitioners:

Quod nuper doctissimi viri hoc modo luserunt: Erasmus, Budaeus, Longolius, & ante illos Angelus Politianus, qui Graece Latineque ad amicos scripsisse fertur epistolas, saepeque ad Volaterranum, ut ipse quoque meminit. Quare iuventutem statim his tyrociniis instituti ab ineunte aetate operaepretium fore arbitror, quod Latine expresserunt e Graeco, rursus graece idem reddant, quo utriusque linguae facultatem hac sua assiduitate comparent.49

(Since recently the most learned men amused themselves in this way: Erasmus, Budaeus, Longolius and before them Angelus Politianus, who is said to have written letters to his friends in both Greek and Latin, and often to Volaterranus, which he himself also mentioned. For which reason I have steadfastly established in these exercises that I think worthwhile for young men from the earliest age, so that they translate back into Greek again, that which they expressed in Latin out of the Greek, by which practice, with careful persistence they might match together their faculty in each language.)

Identifying the importance of reciprocal translation in humanist scholarly tradition, through the exemplary practice of Erasmus and his contemporaries, Humphrey suggests its use for the study and translation of sacred as well as profane texts. He recommends a multi-lingual catechism, in general terms, as a useful text for teaching languages, both to provide a necessary moral guide to young students, and to balance their study of profane authors:

Hodie piu quidam huic rei in Catechismis vertendis operam dederunt, ut puertitia non prophanis solum poetarum fabulis assuefieret, sed cum linguarum noticia rerum sanam doctrinam pietatemque consociaret.50

(Today certain godly men have performed the task of translating the catechism, so that young people do not only become familiar with the

50 Ibid.
profane tales of the poets, but associate linguistic details with sound learning and devotion.)

In recommending texts that will increase the student’s facility in each language, Humphrey cites the multi-lingual editions of Calvin’s *Catechism*, ‘ab ipso Latine & Gallice breviter ac dilucide ad pietatem teneris mentibus instillandum compositus, ab illis in Germanicam, Italicam, Hispanicam, Anglicam, Graecam, Hebraicam etiam fere’ (‘briefly and clearly composed by him in Latin and French for the instilling of devotion in tender minds, and translated into German, Italian, Spanish, English, Greek and even Hebrew by others’). He aligns his proposed linguistic practice with a symbolic text of reformed religion.

The majority of Humphrey’s book is occupied with practical exercises and examples in translation. Collectively they indicate a work produced as a practical guide to translation. Its content is consistent with its physical form as a small manual – easily handled by the tutor as he encourages his scholar in these linguistic exercises. Intended for practical application in teaching, the *Interpretatio linguarum* belies its reputation in the literature as a rather inaccessible theoretical exegesis on Graeco-Latin translation theory. Humphrey highlights the importance of the multi-lingual and international context to the educational methods he applies to translation.

**Rhetorical style manuals**

The *Interpretatio linguarum* draws on an encyclopaedic range of classical and pedagogical works, through which Humphrey recommends the scholarly

---

51 Ibid.
exercises that lead to better translation. His treatment also articulates an important intellectual rationale for the linguistic innovation that was taking place in England in the mid-Tudor period.

Framed by classical translation theory, engaging with contemporary European translations, and guiding the student towards vernacular practice and examples, the *Interpretatio linguarum* points to context of the sixteenth-century style manuals. Based on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and *Institutio oratoria*, Latin textbooks such as Erasmus’s 1516 *De copia*, Mosellanus’s 1521 *Tabulae de schematibus et tropibus*, and Susenbrotus’s 1540 *Epitome troporum ac schematum* were being read and adapted to expand possibilities of expression in both Latin and vernacular. By the mid-sixteenth century, there had been several attempts to translate these Latin style manuals in accord with the needs of the English. Peter Mack has shown that vernacular accounts of tropes and figures, such as Richard Sherry’s 1550 *Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* and Thomas Wilson’s 1553 *The Arte of Rhetorique*, and works issued later than Humphrey’s, such as Henry Peacham’s 1577 *Garden of Eloquence* and Angel Day’s 1586 *English Secretary*, are versions of a single archetext: the Renaissance English style manual. These manuals use the same set of rhetorical figures, with minor variations, as critical tools for describing contemporary styles and comparing them with their antecedents.\(^{52}\) In 1550, Sherry claimed that his translation of the figures of rhetoric into English would help not only pupils who lack first-class teachers but all those who would understand better what was written in their native language, ‘because that in it we sonar perceive if there be any faute in our

\(^{52}\) Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp. 84-93.
speaking, and howe everye thynge eyther rightly hangeth together or is darkelyye, ruggishly, and superfluously wrytte[n]’.  

Mack identifies this genre of writing with the vernacular works on logic that were being produced around the same time. Wilson’s 1551 *Rule of Reason*, for example, becomes part of the international project that made ‘the tools of learning available to those who had not studied Latin and Greek’. Mack describes such vernacular works being ‘presented as part of a wider process of making textbooks of learned subjects available in English, which will assert the dignity of the English language and contribute to its future development’. However, he also notes that Wilson’s careful summary of the whole of logic made his work especially suitable for the use of students who wished to confirm their understanding of Latin texts, that is, who needed a crib. Mack suggests that these English manuals, as well as helping those who had no Latin, were used to reinforce the understanding of those ‘within the circle of Latin learning’. He notes that vernacular manuals comprising the whole of rhetoric or the whole of logic were probably used in conjunction with Latin textbooks at university. The new manuals offered scholars an intellectual bridge between classical and vernacular rhetorical culture in England at this time.

The *Interpretatio linguarum*, treating contemporary translation practice from the context of classical theory, and directing the student towards vernacular examples, not only offers another example of an Anglicized rhetorical manual, but provides an explicit intellectual rationale for the international project Mack
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deduces from the manuals in the vernacular. Remarkably however, in Mack’s influential discussion of these books, Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum* fails to elicit a single reference.

One example of a particular rhetorical trope indicates a resonance between the vernacular style manuals and Humphrey’s work that has been neglected until now. In his discussion of the extent to which the Renaissance Latin style manual was adapted to suit the English language, Mack observes that certain of the rhetorical figures established in Latin style manuals had ‘no possible application in English, yet they appear in some of the English style manuals’. A somewhat uneasy relationship between these Latin and English works is suggested by the treatment of *anatiptosis*, a figure sometimes termed *enallage*, that involves the alteration of grammatical features such as case, gender, number, mood and tense. Mack notes that the English versions of its definition appear to be translated directly from Susenbrotus’s *Epitome troporum ac schematum*, first printed in 1540. He observes that Sherry, however, struggled to find English examples for his definition of *enallage* in his *Schemes and Tropes*, and that the example offered in English by Henry Peacham was ‘certainly not acceptable’. George Puttenham refers explicitly to the dilemma of considering a trope that is effective in Latin, but not in English:

Enallage. Or the Figure of exchange: Your figures that worke *auricularly* by exchange, were more observable to the Greekes and Latines for the bravenesse of their language, over that ours is, and for the multipicite of their Grammaticall accidents, or verball affects, as I may terme them, that is to say, their divers cases, moodes, tenses, genders, with variable terminations, by reason whereof, they changed not the very word, but kept the word, and changed the shape of him onely, using one case for another, or
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tense, or person, or gender, or number, or moode. We, having no such varietie of accidents, have little or no use of this figure. They called it *Enallage*.\(^{57}\)

Such comments support the notion that the English manuals were used as guides to the reading of Latin authors and for Latin composition, as well as to assist writers in the rhetorical use of English.

In his own treatment of this trope, Humphrey considers its application in both vernacular and classical languages. His description contains a lot of grammatical detail, and conveys the tone of the teacher testing and consolidating his pupil’s facility in a range of languages. Using a verb in the first person plural – ‘experiamur’ – Humphrey suggests trying out the rhetorical device in a number of ways and in various languages:

\[
\text{experiamur itaque quam varie possit res tractari enallacticos: quibus & coacti verborum inopia utamur, \\
& varieta re exornemus dictionem.}\(^{58}\)
\]

(and let us put to the test how diversely the matters of *enallactici* can be dealt with. Since, having been constrained by a poverty of words, we might practise and equip speech with variety.)

He notes that *enallage* comprises three parts, the description of which leads him to take examples from different languages:

\[
\text{Enallagen trifariam posse fieri video, cum sit aliqua mutatio, aut modice vocem quampiam deflectendo, aut cum pars orationis commutatur, aut cum novatur qualitas.}\(^{59}\)
\]

(I see that *enallage* can comprise three parts, in each of which there is an alteration, whether deviating in case or voice, or where the part of speech is changed, or a property given a new form).

Humphrey amplifies his description with reference to English idiomatic practice, as well as that of Latin and Hebrew. In detailing specific linguistic differences

\(^{57}\) George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589), sigs V1\(^v\) - V2\(^v\).

\(^{58}\) Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, III, sig. F7\(^v\).

\(^{59}\) Ibid.
between languages, he draws out the range of stylistic choices that confront the translator. He expresses the detail of English idiom in Latin:

Non navigabis nisi explorare; Anglice transferre commodius poterit alia parte orationis. Sic enim loquitur vulgus, Ne naviges nisi certior sis, scilicet, de periculo, aut de tempestate, aut de via. Sed de his partibus tam verbo quam nomine, deinque istis particulis iam in qualitate latius.60

(‘You will not sail without careful investigation having been done’. In English it is better to translate [this sentence] using a different part of speech. For so it is said in the vernacular, ‘you should not sail unless you are more certain, of course, about the danger, or about the weather, or about the route’. But, by using these parts of speech – a verb rather than a noun, and then those particles – you achieve a broader quality.)

Humphrey’s treatment of enallage encapsulates one of the ways in which the Interpretatio linguarum bridges classical and vernacular literary cultures. Whilst assuming his reader’s proficiency in Latin, Humphrey enables his student to mine the detail of classical rhetoric in the production of either Latin or vernacular – and here, specifically English – literary work. The work seems very much aligned with contemporary examples of both Latin and English style manuals, and indicates a rather more fluid dynamic between neo-Latin and English literary endeavour than has previously been suggested. It is one also supported by the notion of the English style manuals being used for the reading of Latin authors and for Latin composition, as well as being ‘guides to rhetoric for people who only wanted to read and write in English’. It is evident of Humphrey’s Interpretatio linguarum, as much as of the English rhetorical style manuals, that ‘they were part of the process of absorbing the perceived advantages of Latin into English’.61 Humphrey’s work provides an intellectual

60 Ibid. sig. F8v.
rationale that is only implicit or partially expressed in the vernacular translations and style manuals of this time.

*Using ‘the elegant propriety and power of words’*

Humphrey promotes the reformed ethos behind his teaching of translation by reference to earlier educational practices, ‘malignis & infelicibus patrum temporibus, quum nemo linguas docere, nemo discere sine haereseos suspicione auderet’ (‘in the malign and unfortunate times of our fathers, when no one would teach languages, no one would dare to learn without suspicion of heresy’). He criticizes the practice in some schools of teaching children a crude verse-to-prose method of translation and, taking an excerpt from Homer’s *Iliad*, he exemplifies the fault in a hypothetical, blunt Latin prose translation. Including the original Greek allows Humphrey to point out specific textual features, again indicating the book’s intended use as a practical tool for teaching. He complains that this method results in students who turn good Greek into bad Latin, and he indicates the problems ‘hiuisca & squalida interpretatio’ (‘of this kind of grubby translation’).

Humphrey also disparages those who teach word-for-word translation, blaming this practice on sophists, those who are ignorant, and ‘scotistas’ (‘the followers of Duns Scotus’). He charges them with generally despising ‘bonas artes ac omnem humanitatem’ (‘learning and all liberal knowledge’). In a polemic denouncing the scholastic method, he attributes to it the ‘corruptela omnium
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hartium’ (‘corruption of all learning’) and the ‘impurus & horridus’ (‘impure and rough’) speech that flowed into the schools. The consequence of this decline, he says, is the scholastics’ blind reliance on ‘multis commentariis’ (‘numerous commentaries’); such lengthy tomes required because they had lost the ability to understand the original text.\textsuperscript{66} Underlying Humphrey’s criticism is the relation between humanist learning and reformed theology, and the significance of knowledge in the sacred languages for the evangelical drive \textit{ad fontes} – to the biblical and patristic sources. As McConica notes:

a return to Scripture and the early sources of Christianity would provide a sovereign remedy for contemporary decay [...] Its impact lay in the wide appeal to educated men who hoped to bring about the restoration of integrity in religion and public life.\textsuperscript{67}

Considering fault at the other extreme, Humphrey describes an approach to translation that is too liberal, figured as an excessive slavishness to Ciceronian style at the expense of the meaning of the original text. Again, Humphrey observes recent practice in which such stylistic licence has been taken, and he criticizes the renowned French scholar, Joachim Périon for his failure to represent his Greek source, Aristotle, as he imitates elegant Latin style.\textsuperscript{68} Jill Kraye notes similar objections to translations of Périon and Denys Lambin expressed by the French humanist Marc-Antoine Muret.\textsuperscript{69}Whilst it was acceptable for Cicero to use certain vocabulary, for example, when defending a Stoic position in his \textit{Tusculan Disputations}, it was considered inappropriate for Lambin and Périon, in

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid. sigs c2 V - c3 V.
\textsuperscript{68} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. c5 V.
their translations of Aristotle, to employ Ciceronian vocabulary that was foreign
to Aristotle’s meaning in the *Ethics*. Humphrey acknowledges Périon’s stylistic
prowess whilst criticizing his ill-considered use of vocabulary, exclaiming
‘utinam tam vere & fideliter vertisset quam vertit ornate’ (‘would that he had
translated as truly and faithfully as he does elegantly’). Humphrey’s use of the
adverb ‘fideliter’ here seems to combine a technical sense of ‘fidelitas’ with
regard to relationship of the translated text to its original, with the more ethical
connotation of the characteristic of ‘fidelitas’ in the translator.

The confessional divide was beginning to underpin arguments regarding the
*proprietas* of specific words, and Humphrey scatters his discussion with examples
of deficiencies that are loaded with anti-Catholic sentiment and accusations of
paganism. He emphasizes that scriptural translation calls for different stylistic
approaches from those required in literary translation, in order to fulfill the virtues
described. Deficiencies in the practice of *proprietas* are expressed in terms of
false religion or superstition:

videndur sunt igitur vicina, ut superstitio & religio audacia fortitudo, &
propinqua vitia, quae speciem virtutus imitantur fallacitur.

(Moreover there are proximate and neighbouring faults to be seen, as with
superstition and strong presumption in the practice of religion, which falsely
imitate the corresponding virtue.)

Humphrey expresses the objections he has to the excessive Ciceronianism in
some scriptural translation. He identifies the French writer who, thinly disguised
as Nosoponus, had attracted Erasmus’s scorn in his *Ciceronianus*, Christopher
Longueil. Humphrey describes Longueil’s deployment of Ciceronian style in
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terms of his failure to exercise the officium appropriate to a scriptural translator. Longueil is criticized for privileging Ciceronian vocabulary and style at the expense of the achievement of proprietas in the translated text:

Evangelium Ciceronianum conatus est obtrudere: & sacrosanctum Dei verbum ad Ciceronianam eloquentiae paganitatem revocare, cum potius ad Dei verbum omnia dicendi instrumenta, & omnis Ciceroniana ubertas esse conferenda: ut iuvet, non corrigat, serviat, non dominet, suo loco sequatur non praesit, denique illustret, non tenebras offundat, aut inviolabilem eius sanctitatem minutiis humanae facundiae adulteret.\(^{72}\)

(He tried to force a Ciceronian style on the Gospel, and to apply a pagan Ciceronian eloquence to the sacrosanct word of God. When instead, all the instruments of speech and all the Ciceronian richness should have been brought to the word of God, so that it should be of use, but not corrective, that it should be obedient not bear rule, it should follow in its place not take the lead, and finally that it should illuminate not throw shadows, or defile inviolable sanctity with the smallness of human speech.)

The clause ‘inviolabilem sanctitatem adulteret’, emphasizes Humphrey’s stance that the translator’s stylistic choices for scriptural translation are underpinned by his moral responsibility.

So, it is by advising against the methods represented by these two extremes – on the one hand, a translation that assumes a rather crude word-for-word approach, and on the other, one that takes too much licence – that Humphrey approaches the concept of the ideal interpretatio. He situates this within the classical convention of the media via, ‘quae utriusque particeps est, simplicitatis sed eruditae, elegantiae sed fidelis’ (‘of which each part comprises simplicity as well as learning, elegance as well as faithfulness’).\(^{73}\) Graeco-Latin translation theory, authorized in the main by Ciceron’s own exemplary and fidelis practice, is the basis upon which Humphrey advocates his ethical and judicious

\(^{72}\) Ibid. sig. c2r.
\(^{73}\) Ibid. sig. c7v.
approach to translation. Humphrey expounds the qualities of a properly translated text in the language of temperate morality, ‘frugalis, aequabilis, temperata, nec sordes amans nec luxuriam, sed mundum apparatum’ (‘frugal, moderate, temperate, loving neither filth nor excess, but a clean apparel’). This foreshadows his depiction of the ethical persona of the translator.

As Humphrey wrote the *Interpretatio linguarum*, a large group of English scholars, including his associates Thomas Sampson and Anthony Gilby, were working on ‘the first complete study guide to the Bible in English’, the English Geneva Bible, printed in April 1560. Protestant translators, in particular, were concerned to emphasize cultural differences between the ‘primitive’ church and the Catholic church, and in their scriptural editions, they constantly emphasized the careful tracing back to source material, *ad fontes*.

Again, the shared context of these works and the controversies surrounding scriptural exegesis are evident in Humphrey’s discussion. He celebrates the accomplishment he sees in these vernacular editions, whilst emphasizing the importance of their lineage from the original language: ‘de Graecis fontibus Novum Testamentum in omnium Christianarum gentium linguis derivatum hodie videmus’ (‘today we see the New Testament derived from Greek sources into the languages of every Christian country’). As these scholars lay the foundations for vernacular translations, the textual exegesis in which they are engaged relies on their detailed linguistic understanding of Hebrew, Greek and Latin scripture.
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Humphrey indicates these newly pressing linguistic demands as he calls for further establishment of Hebrew scholarship in contemporary English education:

\[ \text{de Hebraea lingua opus est pluribus dicere, quia tum negligitur a pluribus, tum ignoratur: sed immerito male audit lingua sanctissima. Nemo sine ea in novo aut vteri Instrumento interpretando cum laude aliqua versari potest. Tot Hebraismus plena sunt omnia.}^{77} \]

(On the Hebrew language there is more of a task to say, since it is either being neglected by many, or unknown, and undeservedly, this most sacred of languages is scarcely heard. No one is able to make a worthy translation of either the New or Old Testament without it. They are altogether so full of Hebraisms.)

In the loaded language of religious controversy, Humphrey blames those who resist the development of language skills. He denounces ‘stulta opinio eorum, qui indoctos esse volunt, qui pulpita & cathedras in Ecclesiis occupant, & linguarum peritos esse clamant haereticos’ (‘the stupid opinion of those men, who want to be unschooled, who occupy the pulpits and chairs in the Church, and frequently cry out that those who are experts in languages are heretics’).\(^78\) It is on account of this specific decline in schools and universities, he asserts, ‘in quibus hae linguae, praeertim Hebraica sine honore, sine splendore cultuque iacent & squalescunt’ (‘in which these languages, particularly Hebrew, are cast down and grown stiff’), that young men are inadequately prepared for ecclesiastical responsibilities.\(^79\) Reflecting the local opportunities that were afforded to the English exiles in the company of Europe’s leading Christian Hebraists, Humphrey urges that Hebrew texts should be studied by day and night: ‘textus itaque Hebraicus diurna est ac nocturna manu terendus’.

\(^{77}\) Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. k7r.
\(^{78}\) Ibid. sig. k5r.
\(^{79}\) Ibid. sig. m3r.
Humphrey describes the ethical duty of the translator in terms of his trying to achieve the ‘enargeia’ of the original scriptural text, enacting its inherent spiritual quality in order to move the reader as if hearing God Himself. Humphrey warns his reader that scriptural metaphors are invested with a sense of the sacred that needs to be protected as they are brought into a new language: ‘quas praeteriri aut mutari dilutius & ieunius nolim’ (‘which I would not want to be omitted or to be made weaker and more barren’). He considers the figurative value of phrases such as ‘to go before the face of the Lord’, ‘the way of peace’, and ‘the darkness and the shadow of death’.

In one example, Humphrey describes the linguistic confusion that has arisen in a verse from Luke. Where Christ is figured as ‘Oriens ex alto’ (‘Oriens from on high’) with reference to a corresponding phrase in the Old Testament Hebrew, in some recent Latin translations Humphrey notes that the figure has been turned into a different trope; one drawn from the Hebrew meaning ‘branch of a tree’. Both metaphors are found elsewhere in scripture, and Humphrey explores the textual tradition of each. He challenges Theodore Beza’s use of the latter figure in his influential 1556 Latin New Testament, and suggests that confusion between two similar Hebrew words has led to the use of Greek and then Latin words for ‘shoot, or branch’, rather than ‘Oriens and the rising sun’. Beza, following St. Jerome, has adopted the Latin word ‘germen’, a shoot that springs up, rather than capturing the connotation of the rising sun. In the 1560 English New Testament issued by Humphrey’s contemporaries in Geneva, the translation favours the trope of Oriens, and, following Tyndale, the figure appears in the vernacular as
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'dayspring from on high’. Beza’s interpretation is noted in the commentary as an alternate version. Humphrey expounds on the metaphor of Christ as Oriens, suggesting what this etymologically ‘fidelis’ translation conveys:

Postremo, Oriens ex alto, pulcherrimo tropo dicitur Christus, sol nimirum quidam & lux orien ex edito, ut illucescat caecis hominum cordibus, tenebras mentium nostrarum plusquam stella aut lucifer dispellat, & in umbra mortifera, ac caligine degentibus appareat.  

(Finally, Christ is called ‘Oriens from on high’, in the most beautiful trope, without doubt; a certain sun and light rising from on high, as he illuminates the hearts of blind men, and dispels the darkness of our minds more than a light-bringing star, and he becomes visible in the death-dealing shades, and passing gloom.)

In the same way, Humphrey defends choices in Latin editions of the Bible, where Greek or Hebrew terms are seen to retain their ‘pristinam dignitatem’ (‘former merit’), rather than being translated into Ciceronian Latin:

Quid obstat quominus Evangelium dicamus now & Christum & Baptismum? Ut scilicet omnia Romana sint & Ciceroniana? [...] Ut tamen Christiane, ut Christus maneat Christus, Evangelium Evangelium, fides, Baptismus, & scriptis omnium pervagata, & animis nostris insita, & scholis ac pulpitis celebrata, suo loco maneant, pristinamque dignitatem obtineant.

(What stops us from saying ‘Evangelium’ and ‘Christus’ and ‘Baptismus’? That evidently all things shoul...d be Roman and Ciceronian? [...] But rather, in the style of Christ, let ‘Christus’ remain ‘Christus’, ‘Evangelium’ ‘Evangelium’, ‘fides’, ‘Baptismus’, and with the whole common scripture, innate in our hearts, and much-used in schools and pulpits, let them remain in their own place, and maintain their former merit.)

In discussing Latin Bible translation, Humphrey notes that the retention of the word ‘Amen’ represents a borrowing from the Hebrew original, along with the words ‘Osanna’, ‘Sabbaoth’ and ‘Alleluia’. He defends their use on the grounds of
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85 Ibid. sigs c2 - c3.
'in consuetudine posita, & vulgo usitata’ (‘finding their place in habit, and by common usage’).  

In 1576, the Puritan scholar Laurence Tomson would issue his revision of the Geneva English New Testament, many of the amendments in which were based on Beza’s revised Latin edition of 1565. In his prefatory letter to the 1576 edition, Tomson describes the method taken by this generation of reformist translators:  

Now as we have chiefly observed the sense, and laboured alwaies to restore it to all integritie: so have we most reverently kept the proprietie of the wordes, considering that the Apostles who spake and wrote to the Gentiles in the Greke tongue, rather constrained them to the lively phrase of the Ebrewe, then enterprised farre by mollifying their language to speake as the Gentils did. And for this and other causes we have in many places reserved the Ebrewe phrases, notwithstanding they may seeme somewhat hard in their eares that are not well practised and also delite in the sweet sounding phrases of the holy Scriptures [...] Moreover, whereas the necessitie of the sentence required any thing to be added (for such is the grace and proprietie of the Ebrewe and Greke tongues, that it can not but either by circumlocution, or by adding the verbe or some word be understand of them that are not well practised therein) we have put it in the text with another kinde of letter, that it may easily be discerned from the common letter.  

The concept of *proprietas* offers fertile ground to an increasingly controversialized textual debate. Later in the century, these examples would figure in complaints by English Catholics as they challenged the introduction of English neologisms in Protestant scriptural translations, and defended their use of ‘apt renewals’, words that were understood as having a valid, if unpractised, meaning in the translated language. Foster Jones quotes the preface to one Remish translation of the Old Testament:  
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87 Daniell, *The Bible in English*, pp. 351-57.  
Again, for necessitie, English not having a name, or sufficient terme, we either kepe the word, as we find it, or only turne it to our English termination, because it would otherwise require manie wordes in English, to signifie one word of an other tongue...Briefly our Apologie is easie against Protestants; because they also reserve some words in the original tongues, not translated into English: as Sabbath, Ephod, Pentecost, Proselyte and some others. The sense whereof is in dede as soone lerned, as if they were turned so nere as possible into English. And why then may we not say Prepuce, Phase, or Pasch, Azimes, Breads of Proposition, Holocaust, and the like? Rather then as the Protestants translate them: Forskinne, Passeover, The feast of sweete breaides, Burnt Offerings, et cetera? 89

The Catholic translators responded to the charge of intentional obscurity by pleading both the inadequacy of the English language and the practice of Hebrew borrowings evidenced in these earlier, reformed translations.

Humphrey expresses his envy of the easy induction to the language of the Old Testament that he sees amongst the Jewish community, where eight- and nine-year-old boys, are soon ‘summis nostris Doctoribus doctiores’ (‘more learned than our best scholars’). 90 He promotes recent scriptural translations and lexicons produced by renowned reformers and Hebraists Sante Pagnini, Sebastian Münster and Konrad Pellican. His quotes and longer citations suggest the proficiency in Hebrew that he himself gained during his time in exile. 91 References to Johannes Forster’s recently published Hebrew lexicon underscore the importance of the reformers’ direct engagement with original texts as opposed to commentaries. Forster’s emphatically titled work captures the value placed in

90 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. 15v.
91 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. k8v. The Italian scholar, Sante Pagnini, had translated the Old Testament and produced a Hebrew lexicon; Sebastian Münster was the German annotator of the Hebrew to Latin Bible printed by Froben in 1535, and Konrad Pellican had produced an Old Testament commentary and Hebrew grammar, whilst supervising the teaching of Hebrew at the Zurich seminar. He was succeeded in 1556 by Peter Martyr. G. Lloyd Jones, The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: a third language (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), pp. 182-202.
the reformers’ return ad fontes: *Dictionarium hebraicum novum, non ex rabbinorum commentis, nec nostratium doctorum stulta imitatione descriptum, sed ex ipsis thesauris sacrorum bibliorum, & eorumdem accurata locorum collatione depromptum* (‘A new Hebrew dictionary, not copied from the inventions of the rabbis, nor from the foolish imitation of our native doctors, but drawn from the very treasures of sacred scriptures, and by the accurate collation of those same Biblical passages’). Forster’s lexicon is presented as a resource for an explicitly reformed approach to linguistic study. In the introduction, Forster complains that rabbinic commentaries ‘are controlling the work of translation and explanation’ and he expresses astonishment at the feeble-mindedness of Christian colleagues who embrace such commentaries without discernment. From his citations it is evident that Humphrey has access to this recent edition, issued in Basel by Froben in 1556.

As he urges the teaching of Hebrew, Humphrey sums up his overarching method for instruction in translation:

*Proinde minima Hebraeorum pincta debent esse cognita: ne cogant fidere aliis commentis commentatorum, sed elementa puerrilia degustet, lectione observet, memorie imprimat, exercitatione confirmet.*  

(Appropriately, the smallest points of Hebrew ought to be learnt, so that they do not assume the commentaries of other commentators to be faithful; but let him taste the elements in youth, observe them by reading, imprint them to memory, consolidate them in practice.)

The study of original sources, begun at the earliest possible age, is to be supported by frequent reading aloud, memorising and practice, and Humphrey

92 *Dictionarium hebraicum novum, non ex rabbinorum commentis, nec nostratium doctorum stulta imitatione descriptum, sed ex ipsis thesauris sacrorum bibliorum, & eorumdem accurata locorum collatione depromptum* (Basel: Froben, 1557).


presents his methodology by way of contrast to those who neglect ‘elegantem
verborum proprietatem & vim’ (‘the elegant propriety and power of words’). 95

The ‘fidus interpres’ and his ‘officium’

Humphrey’s treatment of translation is shaped by the classical convention
established in Horace’s Epistola ad Pisones, his ars poetica, and followed by
Quintilian: the traditional scheme of ars and artifex. Having categorized the four
virtutes assigned to the translated text, Humphrey sets out the corresponding
properties that are brought to bear in the person of the translator: natura, doctrina,
fides and diligentia. Treating the requisite officia or duties of the translator in
terms of these four qualities, he adapts and amplifies the traditional conception,
such as that set out for Quintilian’s orator. Humphrey’s discussion is conceived in
terms of the via media, in which, for example, the translator’s ‘felix natura’
(‘productive disposition’) occupies the central space between a ‘mediocris’
(‘ordinary’) or ‘inepta’ (‘inept’) natura. 96 According to Humphrey, the
translator’s natura derives from an intrinsic talent, whilst the other attributes are
to be acquired through education and practice.

Doctrina, the translator’s understanding and knowledge of specific subjects,
comprises two aspects: ‘cognitio rerum’, that is, knowledge of the subject being
translated, and ‘orationis politura’, the essential elements of the trivium conceived
with respect to translation. 97 Humphrey describes the co-dependent relationship
between proficiency in languages and knowledge of the liberal arts, figuring them
as jointly productive of the fruit of a humanist education:

95 Ibid. sig. c1r.
96 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sigs i2r - i7r.
97 Ibid. sigs i7r - m3v.
Artes illum prudentem reddent, linguae disertum: illae pectus multiplici cognitione & rebus tanquam horreum messibus complebunt: hae linguam polient: efficient illae ne imprudens, levis, imperitus dicatur, hae ne in dicendo exu ccus, siccus, sterilis habeatur: ex quibus omnis sylva atque copia eloquendi ducenda est.98

(Liberal arts render [the translator] knowledgeable, languages render him eloquent. The former will fill the heart with manifold learning, like a storehouse, with things that have been harvested, the latter will polish speech; the former will bear fruit so that nothing imprudent, trivial, unskilled is spoken, the latter so that nothing dried up, parched or fruitless is used in speech. From which every crop and abundance for eloquence is to be drawn.)

Maintaining that the most important precondition for becoming a translator is a thorough knowledge of the classical languages, Humphrey challenges the view put forward ‘ab hominibus fronte & pallio sapientibus’ (‘by men, wise with respect to their frown and cloak’ [i.e. in appearance only]). He claims that these so-called experts suggest that, as vernacular translations become more available, the foremost languages of Latin, Greek and Hebrew have become ‘inutiles’ (‘useless’).99 On the contrary, he asserts, it is his proficiency in ‘linguas praeclarissimas’ (‘the foremost languages’) that supplies the chief means for the translator to fulfil his duty. Humphrey addresses his crucial argument to an international body of reformed translators:

Nec sine his interpres noster sive Germanus sit, sive Italus, sive Anglus, sive Gallus, sive Hispanus, satagere suarum partium, officioque suo satis respondere poterit.

(Nor without these, is our translator, whether he is German, or Italian, or English, or French, or Spanish, able to carry out his part, and respond sufficiently to his duty.)100

It is notable that in using the verb ‘respondere’, Humphrey here suggests the translator’s ‘officium’ in terms of his vocation, literally a calling to civic

98 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. k3v.
99 Ibid. sig. l2v.
100 Ibid.
responsibility to which the ‘fidus’ (‘faithful’) translator responds. Conal Condren notes how a common promotional rhetoric of office is shared across contested intellectual activities in this period. The language of office, together with the question of the persona required for office-holding, is shown to comprise ‘a whole sphere of responsibilities, rights of action for their fulfilment, necessary attributes, skills and specific virtues, highlighted by concomitant vices and failures’.\textsuperscript{101} Humphrey’s rhetoric has the effect of elevating the office of translator beyond the concept of the skilled \textit{artifex}.

As Humphrey further explores the persona of the perfect translator, he articulates a development of Cicero’s \textit{vir bonus} in terms of the figure of the reformed humanist orator, identifying the ideal translator with the perfect rhetorician. After considering \textit{natura} and \textit{doctrina}, the third section addresses the translator’s \textit{fides}. The Horatian concept of the \textit{fidus interpres} negotiates between a literal fidelity to original words (\textit{ad verbum}) and an acceptable rendering of overall meaning (\textit{ad sensum}).\textsuperscript{102} Humphrey here associates the ethical characteristics of the translator with those of the text that is rendered \textit{fideliter}: ‘\textit{[f]ideliter vertit, qui convertit ut debet, & quo decet animo}’ (‘he renders it faithfully, who translates as he ought and in a spirit that is fitting’).\textsuperscript{103} The verbs ‘debet’ and ‘decet’ underline the translator’s moral responsibility. The text is to retain its integrity through the fidelity of the translator: ‘nam fides postulat ut

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{103} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. m5’.
\end{flushright}
sententiam non mutilet, sed ut totam ponat ac sincere’ (‘for faith demands that he does not mutilate the meaning, but that he sets it down entire and sincerely’).\textsuperscript{104}

The \textit{vir bonus} is to distinguish himself, with respect to \textit{fides}, by his selflessness. He avoids the blinding effects of emotion, the pursuit of fame, and personal gain that stand in the way of his fulfilling his duty:

Contra fide bona praestat officium suum, qui utilitatis publicae avidior est atque privatae, qui ad gloriam Christi, non ad suam ostentationem labores suos refert, qui aliorum legentium spectat emolumentum.\textsuperscript{105}

(He, who is more eager for public and private \textit{utilitas}, fulfils his office in good faith; who to the glory of Christ, assigns his efforts not for his own vain display, but has regard to the profit of others.)

Associating his conception of the translator as an agent of virtuous exercise with the humanist ideal of the rhetorician, Humphrey sets out the ethical integrity of the \textit{vir bonus} as a necessary prerequisite for the \textit{fidus interpres}:

fidum seu fidelem voco interpretem virum bonum. Is nec affectum sequetur suum, nec laudem quaeret, nec suum commodum.\textsuperscript{106}

(I call the translator a trustworthy or sincere \textit{vir bonus}. Let him follow neither his own emotion, nor let him seek praise, nor his own profit).

As Rener points out, Humphrey is the only theoretician on translation known to refer explicitly to this tradition of the \textit{vir bonus}.\textsuperscript{107} Condren notes that a pervasive notion of office and persona gave a particular structure and character to the vocabulary of moral approbation and critique. The promotion of any persona was couched in the same general terms of defence and commendation, a positive register of rights, liberties, duty, rule and service to the office and often to those protected by it.\textsuperscript{108}

According to Humphrey, both the fulfilment of the translator’s ‘officium’ and its failure are defined with respect to the translator’s proficiency in languages:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Ibid. sig. m6\textsuperscript{o}.
\item \textsuperscript{106} Ibid. sig. m5\textsuperscript{o}.
\item \textsuperscript{107} Rener, \textit{Interpretatio: Language and Translation}, p. 237.
\item \textsuperscript{108} Condren, ‘The persona of the philosopher’, p. 67.
\end{itemize}
Linguis enim suum officium facit, linguis quod facit acceptum fert, linguis si careret, interpretis quoque titulo careret & nomine. 109

(For with languages he performs his office; that which he does with languages brings him credit, and if he lacks languages he also lacks the title and name of interpreter.)

Demonstrating the risks inherent in a less than thorough grasp of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, in a section classified in the ‘diagramma’ as ‘ignoratio linguarum’, Humphrey cites some Latin ‘howlers’ by great medieval scholars such as Thomas Aquinas and Hugo Carrensis, Cardinal of Saint-Cher. In his choice of examples, Humphrey again criticizes the tendency of scholastic translators to obfuscate terms. Their mistake, he claims, is born of an ignorance of the classical languages.

As Condren observes, ‘the stress on the persona of the good rhetorician or poet became rich with confessional implications and could sometimes be used to re-specify the nature and significance of theology’. 110 One of Humphrey’s examples illustrates a confessionalized encounter between reformed humanism and Catholic scholasticism. In a discussion of the terms ‘dulia’ (‘veneration paid to angels and saints’) and ‘latria’ (‘worship proper only to God’), Humphrey employs a rhetorical approach that Calvin uses to undermine Catholic doctrine. In his Institutes, Calvin had pilloried the scholastic (and Catholic) distinction between ‘dulia’ and ‘latria’, declaring that sacrilege occurred whenever observances of piety were transferred to someone other than God. 111 Humphrey complains:

Hinc frivolae tot ac tam vanae scholasticorum distinctiones subnatae sunt, Benedico tibi, ac te, dulia & latria, quas absurdas differentias, nec

109 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. k3v.
111 Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 1.11.11; 1.12.2-3; 2.8.16.
invenissent unquam, nec inventas adeo pertinaciter tutati fuissent, si linguas vel summis digitis attigissent.\footnote{112}  

(From these trifles, so many empty distinctions of scholasticism are brought up, ‘I praise you, and you, with dulia and latria’, what senseless distinctions, which would neither have ever been made, nor, having been made, actually been protected stubbornly, if they had any grasp of languages.)

In his discussion of the third characteristic of the translator, his \textit{fides}, Humphrey expands the notion to ‘\textit{fides et religio}’, the former applying to all forms of translation, the latter suggesting moral obligation in the case of scriptural texts.\footnote{113}  

The adjective ‘\textit{religiosus}’ translates as ‘scrupulous’, ‘godly’, or ‘of good conscience’, and by applying it here, Humphrey extends the definition of the specifically Christian translator beyond the classical notion of the virtuous citizen. Initially, he defines \textit{religio} with reference to the translator’s ability to fulfil his duty ‘\textit{scienter}’ (‘knowledgeably’), suggesting its meaning of scrupulousness. Next, however, he specifies the godly practice of the translator in relation to his devotion:

\textit{Religiosus est qui precatur & orat, & tremit, diffidens sibi, fisus Deo: metuens & implorans auxilium ab eo qui dat, & nemini exprobat}.\footnote{114}  

(Godly is he who prays and entreats, and quakes, mistrusting himself, trusting in God; fearing and begging for help from he who gives, and who is reproached by no man.)

The translator’s faith provides the motivating and strengthening force of his moral obligation. Divinely inspired, it initiates the process that sees him apply courage and diligence in his work and avoid the corruption of false superstition and counterfeit opinion:

\textit{Fides enim ignem divini amoris inflammat, amor gignit admirationem, admiratio incendit alactritatem & diligentiam}.\footnote{115}  

\footnote{112} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. l3’.
\footnote{113} Ibid. sig. m5’.
\footnote{114} Ibid. sig. n1’.
\footnote{115}
(Faith ignites the flame of divine love; love breeds a sense of wonder; wonder sets alight a courage and diligence.)

Later, in his catalogue of exemplary English translators, Humphrey refers to the scriptural translator as the ‘civis bonus’ ('the good citizen'), who deserves the highest honour because he transmits ‘non modo sacrum corpus Bibliorum, sed veterum Theologorum monumenta, & historias ecclesiasticas, ac Christianae antiquitatis memoriam’ ('not only the sacred body of Bibles, but the monuments of the old theologians, and ecclesiastical histories, and the memory of Christian antiquity'). Humphrey asserts that the successful translation of scripture, the faithful rendering of the person of Christ in the New Testament, is the ultimate fulfilment of the translator’s office: ‘optimum ducem sequemur, nec unquam aberrabimus, ac munus optimorum interpretum officiumque praestabimus’ ('let us follow the best leader, nor shall we ever wander away, and we will make good the duty and office of the best translators').

Humphrey’s completes his modelling of the devout translator with his treatment of the fourth virtus required, diligentia. The disciplined exercise of the translator’s skill and faith is figured as the ‘comes & ancillula’ ('companion and handmaid') to religio. Practising diligentia, the translator becomes ‘sedula et industria’ ('persistent and assiduous'). He reflects upon the text before making his translation, his careful preparation reducing the need to edit or add to his work. Humphrey cites numerous examples of diligentia with reference to Chrysostom, Augustine, Erasmus and Beza, and he commends Sebastian Castellio’s
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116 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, III, sig. L7v.
117 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, II, sig. p5v.
118 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, I, sig. n2v.
pains taking efforts as he applied his erudition in multi-lingual idiom to biblical translation. Humphrey’s reference here is noteworthy, as Castellio had been strongly censured in the 1550s for his independent Latin and French Bible translations. Humphrey emphasizes the sensitive nature of this exegetical labour, noting that for many years Castellio worked on his translations discreetly at home.\textsuperscript{119}

As Humphrey defines the translator’s \textit{officium} in terms of his exercise of the virtues of \textit{doctrina}, \textit{fides}, \textit{religio}, and \textit{diligentia}, he extends the translator’s moral agency beyond that of the classical \textit{vir bonus}:

\begin{quote}
Quod ergo Quintilianus in suo Oratore exigit, ut sit \textit{vir bonus}, id ego multo magis etiam postulare debo in interprete, ut sit religiosus.\textsuperscript{120}
\end{quote}

(Therefore that which Quintilian ascertained in the case of his \textit{Orator}, that he should be a \textit{vir bonus}, how much more ought I to require of the translator, that he should be godly.)

Humphrey presents a new conception of the \textit{fidus et religiosus interpres} by asserting his ethical status and humanist credentials. In doing this he elevates the role and responsibility of the sixteenth-century translator to that of a divine office.

\textit{Travelling to the gates of Rome}

Humphrey exemplifies the persona of the \textit{fidus interpres} in his discussion of exemplary translators. He notes the linguistic challenge as they draw on traditions of classical rhetoric to establish vocabulary within new areas of knowledge:

\begin{quote}
Sunt quae iure quodam suo vendicant artes, militaris, medica, iuris prudentia, nautica, quibus sua vocuabula sunt, quae quodammodo in disciplinae suae possessione videntur consistere.\textsuperscript{121}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid. sigs n7\textsuperscript{f} - n7\textsuperscript{v}, Daniell, \textit{The Bible in English}, p. 611.

\textsuperscript{120} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. n1\textsuperscript{f}.

\textsuperscript{121} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. K4\textsuperscript{v}. 
(There are some arts – of war, medicine, jurisprudence, and nautical matter – which, in customary practice, promote their own vocabulary, and seem to depend in a measure on the possession of their own knowledge.)

As in the case of scriptural translation, the sixteenth-century notion of *proprietas* was closely related to arguments regarding the use of neologisms, borrowings and apt renewals. Describing recent practice, Humphrey introduces a figure who is emblematic in his discriminating exercise of *proprietas* – the man who, as we saw in Chapter One, had been closely associated with reformed humanism and Graeco-Latin literary prowess in England, Sir John Cheke. Rhetorically, the siting of Cheke in this prime exemplary position underlines Humphrey’s call for proficiency in the ‘linguae praeclarissimae’ to benefit English intellectual culture.

Cheke was an enormously admired intellectual, former tutor to Edward VI, the first Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, and secretary to William Cecil, and he had died in politically sensitive circumstances just two years before the *Interpretatio linguarum* was issued. Cheke’s activity under Mary’s reign had seen him involved in Northumberland’s uprising and subsequently imprisoned, before receiving licence to travel abroad. In 1554, he travelled from Strasbourg to Padua, via Basel, in the company of Thomas Wroth. At Padua University in 1555, Cheke delivered the lectures on Demosthenes that he had begun in Cambridge. It was here that he drew out the analogy of the Greek orator’s warnings about the rise of Philip II of Macedon, specifically at the time of Queen Mary’s marriage to Philip of Spain. Cheke encouraged a political interpretation that would be further emphasized in the first English translation of
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122 Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations*, p. 86, notes how Edward VI’s accession ended John Cheke’s need to shelter behind very guarded reform opinions which had been evident in the long preface to his Latin translation of Plutarch’s *De superstitione* (1545 or 1546). After 1547 he began to show his reform colours, initiating contact with humanists in the print shops of the city of Basel.
Demosthenes by Thomas Wilson, one of those attendant at Cheke’s lectures in Padua.\textsuperscript{123} In the turbulent spring of 1556, Cheke was kidnapped and forcibly returned to England, where his treatment under imprisonment led to his recantation of his faith.\textsuperscript{124} He died in September 1557, the event here represented by Humphrey as a recent, symbolic loss to English reformed scholarship.

Citing his now little-known Greek-to-Latin translation of the Byzantine Emperor Leo VI’s \textit{De bellico apparatu} (‘On preparing for war’), Humphrey details Cheke’s important intellectual contribution in establishing a specific and useful vocabulary for previously unfamiliar military terms. The scholar’s vast linguistic knowledge and judicious use of \textit{proprietas} enabled him to re-deploy classical Latin words as ‘apposita novata’ (‘apt renewals’), and Humphrey quotes specific examples that demonstrate how masterfully he fulfilled the requirements with regard to the translation’s \textit{virtutes}. Humphrey also promotes Cheke’s use of important humanist works in establishing and authorizing new vocabulary.\textsuperscript{125} He cites Raffaello Maffei’s encyclopaedic \textit{Commentariorum rerum urbanorum libri XXXVIII} (‘thirty-eight volumes of notes on urban affairs’), its third edition issued from Froben’s Basel press in the same year as Humphrey’s \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}.\textsuperscript{126}

Cheke’s introduction of new military terminology is consistent with the well-known recommendations for translation set out in his prefatory epistle to Thomas Hoby’s translation of Castiglione’s \textit{Il Cortegiano}. It is notable that Hoby

\textsuperscript{125} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. K4’.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Commentariorum urbanorum Raphaelis Volaterrani octo et triginta libri} (Basel: Froben and Episcopius, 1559).
was completing his work at Padua in the company of Cheke and Wilson between 1554 and 1555, although it was not issued in print until 1561. As is now well-established, Cheke was not advocating a blanket avoidance of borrowings when he suggested that the vernacular ‘be written cleane and pure, unmixt and unmangled with borowing of other tunges’, but that he urged great care in the introduction of neologisms and borrowings:

... if she [the language] want at ani tijm (as being unperfight she must) yet let her borrow with suche bashfulness that it mai appeer, that if either the mould of our own tung could serve us to fascion a word of our own, or if the old denisoned wordes could content and ease this neede we wold not boldly venture of unkwown wordes.127

In the Interpretatio linguarum Humphrey suggests a similar qualification to the use of borrowing and re-inventing, urging careful consideration to ‘usitata’ (‘familiarity’), ‘gratia’ (‘pleasantness’) and ‘commoditas’ (‘aptness’):

licebit etiam, si caetera adiumenta deficiant, aliquando graeca aut Hebraica interspergere, modo usitata, modo gratiam habeant, modo aliqua commoditas maior invitetur.128

(It is permitted now, if all other means of aid are lacking, to intersperse with either a Greek or Hebrew word, so long as it is familiar, so long as it is agreeable, and so long as it invites a greater aptness of expression.)

Humphrey’s commendation of Cheke’s response to this translative challenge also recalls the practice associated with the linguistic reforms that had been carried out through the 1540s and 1550s. As their shared projects advocated the reformation of English speech, scholars such as Cheke, Wilson and Smith promoted ‘their protestant vision of a unified, obedient nation’.129 Humphrey’s description of Cheke’s exemplary text indicates the way in which the context of Graeco-Latin

128 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, III, sig. F3v.
129 Shrank, Writing the Nation in Reformation England, p. 189.
translation theory informs both the debate and the authorizing of contemporary Latin and vernacular reformed practice.

Humphrey also refers to the extraordinary breadth and range of printed works available in translation in German, French, Italian and Spanish; works ‘quibus vel religionis nostrae sanctimonia ac puritas, vel morum disciplina, vel naturae subtilitas, vel Mathematicarum obscuritatum scientia continetur’ (‘in which the sacredness and purity of our religion, or the knowledge of manners, or the subtleties of nature, or knowledge of obscure Mathematics is contained’). It is evident, not least from his wide-ranging citation of classical and contemporary editions, that Humphrey’s location in Basel afforded him access to a range of scholarship only to be found in one or two places in Europe. He acknowledges the wealth of material that is available in foreign vernacular editions:

Habent enim illi praestantissimos in omni re scriptores in populari lingua diserte ac ornate sermocinantes, ut nihil tam sit remotum ac longinquum, quod non illis iam domesticum ac proprium, nihil tam absconditum & abstrusum, quod non familiare, ac commune etiam vulgo cum doctis videatur. 

(For they have on every subject the most outstanding writings written distinctly and elegantly in the common language, so that there is nothing, no matter how remote and strange, that is not now domestic and proper, nothing so obscure and abstruse that does not now seem as familiar in the vernacular as in the learned languages.)

As he registers the achievements of these vernacular translations, Humphrey describes their transformative effect on society: ‘ex quibus & ipsi doctiores, & cives prudentiores, & lingua cultior & elegantior redditur’ (‘from which they [the

---
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translators] themselves become more learned, citizens become wiser, and the language is rendered more cultured and elegant’).\textsuperscript{132}

Humphrey commends those who strive to understand the distinct characteristics of the Italian, French and Spanish languages, particularly with respect to their shared linguistic descent from Latin: ‘varient tamen, ita ut alia ab alia, sermonis proprietate & phrasi, discerni a peritis & internosci queant’ (‘yet they vary, so that one from another, in propriety of speech and phrasing, they can be distinguished between and discerned by the skilfull’).\textsuperscript{133} Citing specific works that mediate between the linguistic characteristics of vernacular languages and Latin, Humphrey recognizes their value to the wider intellectual community: ‘libri profecto sunt utiles non solum eius gentis hominibus, sed exteris quoque’ (‘indeed the books are useful not only to people of their own country, but also to foreigners’).\textsuperscript{134}

Humphrey’s Italian example, the \emph{Eleganze della lingua toscana, e latina}, is an extensive dictionary of Tuscan words with short explanatory discourses in Italian followed by a Latin translation.\textsuperscript{135} It is usually attributed to Aldo Manuzio the younger, although, first published in 1556 when Aldo was nine years old, the book was probably put together for Aldo’s instruction by his father Paolo:

\begin{quote}
Emisit enim nunc libellum Paulus Manutius vir bonis literis & linguarum scientia non mediocri eruditus, de Italicae linguae & Latinae elegantia: in quo utriusque flosculos aliquot collegit, sua Latina Latine, id est, apte,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{133} Humphrey, \emph{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. h2v.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid. sig. h3v.
\textsuperscript{135} Eleganze insieme con la copia della lingua toscana, e latina, scielte da Aldo Mannuccio: utilissime al comporre nell’ una e l’ altra lingua (Venice: Aldo Manuzio, 1556).
commode, pure interpretans, non saepe ad verbum, quia discordaret & hiaret sermo, sed ad eam attemperans, in quam transtulit.\textsuperscript{136}

(For now Paulo Manuzio, a learned man, extremely erudite in the knowledge of writing and languages, issued his little book concerning the Italian language and elegance of Latin, in which he collected some little flowers of each one, interpreting his Latin in a Latin way, that is aptly, suitably, purely, not always to the word, because the speech would be out of harmony and stiffen, but in due measure to that which he translated.)

From his citation of this Papal printer, it is evident that Humphrey by no means excludes references to Catholic figures in his citation of exemplary translators. Rather, he appropriates Manuzio to a broad reformed humanism, acknowledging him as a \textit{vir bonus} with respect to his Ciceronian learning and his services to the Tuscan vernacular.

Humphrey next cites Mathurin Cordier’s 1536 \textit{De corrupti sermonis emendatione} (‘On reforming the corruption of speech’), a work ‘in quo vitiatam loquendi consuetudinam, & in depravatum Gallicae iuventutis morem castigat’ (‘in which he criticized the youth of France in their erroneous practice and distorted manner of speaking’).\textsuperscript{137} Cordier was a Protestant theologian who had become a close associate of Calvin and Beza, and in 1559 was living in Geneva. Humphrey describes him as ‘bonus et tersus scriptor, & linguarum doctus’ (‘a good and neat writer, learned in languages’).

As his German example, Humphrey mentions Anton Schor, who had issued a treatise called \textit{De ratione discendae docendaeque lingae Latinae} (‘On the method for teaching and learning the Latin language’).\textsuperscript{138}


\textsuperscript{137} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. h3\textsuperscript{i}.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{De ratione discendae docendaeque lingae Latinae & Graecae, libri duo}, Antonio Schoro autore (Strasbourg: Rihelius, 1549).
Reprehendit praeterea Antonius Schorus piae memoriae, vir Graece & Latine peritus, quosdam Germanolatinos, qui in scholis Romanis nimium patrisarent, & suae Germaniae vocabula non satis germe in familiari colloquio & quotidiano sermone infarcirent.\(^{139}\)

(Besides, Anton Schor, of blessed memory, a man skilled in Greek and Latin, reproved certain German-Latinos who had been too fathered in the Roman schools and lacked sufficient German vocabulary in their familiar and colloquial speech.)

Celebrating these recently published bi-lingual works, Humphrey emphasizes the value that detailed philological knowledge of classical languages brings to the development of European, including English, vernacular writing:

Non enim debet Latina lingua a matris lacte fugi, aut a nutricibus domesticis & patriis, sed foris ad tempus peregrinandum Romae, & a Cicerone eiusque alumnis & aequalibus petenda & combibenda haec cognitio est.\(^{140}\)

(For the Latin language ought not to mean fleeing from the mother’s milk, or from domestic and paternal nourishment, but this knowledge is to be sought and learnt from Cicero, and his nurslings and contemporaries, in order to travel abroad at the appointed time to the gates of Rome.)

\textit{A catalogue of translators}

As he celebrates these European works, Humphrey also raises concerns regarding England’s intellectual landscape. He expresses dismay at what he says are the frustrated efforts of English translators; their generation is at risk of being denied a place in cultural memory, vulnerable to ‘edax, & aeternitati inimica oblivio’ (‘the devouring and damaging forgetfulness of eternity’).\(^{141}\) He establishes that a more successful tradition once thrived, and cites works by previous generations recorded in Bale’s chronological survey of English writers (the revised edition of which he himself had worked two years earlier): ‘In Anglia multos olim

\(^{139}\) Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sig. h3’.

\(^{140}\) Ibid.

\(^{141}\) Ibid.
interpretes floruisse, Illustrium Scriptorum Catalogus docet’ (‘the Catalogue of Illustrious Writers teaches us that many translators once flourished in England’).\textsuperscript{142} Explicitly aligning his own construction of an English translation tradition with this re-worked edition of Bale’s substantial history, Humphrey also follows its strategy – one ‘given impetus by the need to establish a glorious past on which to found the English nation, which was being fashioned not only as a country reliberated from the tyranny of Rome to enjoy its ancient laws and customs, but also as a nation with a venerable literary tradition’\textsuperscript{143}

Humphrey contrasts England’s former literary glory with the recent decline in works being translated into the English language, and suggests that this is a critical moment of opportunity for his country’s intellectual life. Specifically, he calls for the revival of a vernacular translation culture, so that writers might wield their intellectual influence in the interest of the common good:

(optarem in tanto tamque foelice ingeniorum & doctissimorum hominum proventu, nobile hoc studii genus reviviscere, cuius utilitas & privatim singulorum est, & publice etiam universorum.)\textsuperscript{144}

(I would wish that, in so fruitful a crop of clever and most erudite men, this excellent kind of endeavour, the value of which for individuals is private, might come to life again publicly as well, for the whole body of state.)

Humphrey calls for recognition of the translator’s \textit{utilitas}, the benefit he can bring to both individual and the state. In his appeal for renewed national endeavour, Humphrey privileges the role of vernacular culture whilst dignifying the activity of scholarly translation.

To testify to this pivotal moment in English literary history, Humphrey introduces individual translators, commenting on specific works they have

\textsuperscript{142} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. L3'.
\textsuperscript{143} Shrank, \textit{Writing the Nation in Reformation England}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid.
produced, and promoting the intellectual, religious, and material value of their works. His ‘Catalogus interpretum’ (‘catalogue of translators’) represents a descriptive and politically slanted roll-call of recent and contemporary English intellectual endeavour. Humphrey’s descriptions comprise short passages redolent of the classical rhetorical exercise of the *chreia*. Comprising brief statements recalling something that someone said or did aptly, these exercises were used to teach language composition. Structuring his catalogue of translators as a rhetorical exercise of this kind, Humphrey further underlines the pedagogical context of the *Interpretatio linguarum*.

As he singles out specific texts and individuals, Humphrey emphasizes the loss of those who have died recently, particularly scholars of distinctly Protestant sympathies. He suggests the devastating intellectual suppression under Queen Mary’s reign. His earlier allusion to Cheke’s death, a reference to his being ‘beatae memoriae’ (‘of blessed memory’), initiates the pattern in which Humphrey here draws attention to the recent loss of literary figures.

Whilst avoiding the stronger polemical tone of contemporary Protestant apologetic, Humphrey’s roll-call seems closely aligned with Bale’s and Foxe’s commemorations of those who shared intellectual and religio-political sympathies. These writers could see that the decisive domains, within which [...] competition was to be carried out, were learning and (especially since the advent of print culture) writing on the one hand, and the struggle over the ‘right religion’ on the other [...]. What they therefore tried to prove was that Britain had a long and glorious tradition to show in both these areas.
In a number of his references, Humphrey emphasizes details that relate to the translators’ involvement in English political life. As he associates each translator’s personal sacrifice with their contribution to intellectual culture, we see Humphrey’s modelling of the selflessly motivated figure of the *vir bonus*, in the persona of the *fidus interpres*.

Humphrey promotes innovative vernacular works as they emerge from the classical tradition, first celebrating literary translations from Latin into English. At the head of his catalogue of translators is Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Humphrey cites his translations of Cicero, Virgil and the Psalms. In reference to Surrey’s translation of books two and four of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, which he had written ‘Rythmo Anglico’ (‘in the English meter’ [i.e. blank verse]), Humphrey gives particular emphasis to the originality of the vernacular poetry, ‘soluta oratione pariter ac metrica foelicissimus’ (‘most fortunately unrestricted by rules of composition and meter’).148 His celebration of Surrey evidences contemporary recognition of this poet, as a writer ‘who took the humanist concern with *imitatio* to its highest and farthest reaches’.149 Humphrey’s commendation of Surrey’s work is a call for recognition of the literary impact made by this innovative, influential poet. He further promotes Surrey’s work by reference to the internationally esteemed Dutch scholar, Hadrian Junius – Surrey’s achievement is acknowledged ‘iudicio etiam praeceptoris sui externi hominis sed eruditissimi Hadriani lunii’ (‘in the opinion not of only of his own teacher but also of the most
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148 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, III, sig. L3; Henry Howard, *Certain bokes* [i.e.II and IV] of Virgiles *Aeneis turned into the English meter* (London: Richard Tottell, 1557). Surrey’s poetry had circulated widely in manuscript and was issued in print a decade after his death.

erudite of foreign men’). As he describes how Surrey’s poetry has been received, ‘cum plausu ac admiratione omnium qui viderunt’ (with the approbation and admiration of everyone who sees it’), Humphrey uses the passive construction ‘convertisse dicitur’ (‘he is said to have translated’), indicating perhaps that he himself had not seen the work. Sessions notes a ‘shared […] exuberant sense’ among these contemporaries, that Surrey’s work was ‘new, original, completely modern, and capable of changing his English world, especially the language it spoke’. Humphrey’s acknowledgement of this literary pioneer, situated at the head of his ‘Catalogus interpretum’, is emphatic.

Humphrey’s commendation of Surrey’s scriptural translations strikes a more political note, with reference to the nobleman’s death:

Idemque in Psalmis aliquot Davidis, in Ecclesiaste Solomoniis alisquie pluribus suae artis poeticae specimen reliquit, plura & absolutiora daturus, si non florentem aetate & doctrina, capitalis sententia medio in cursu perculisset.152

(And likewise he left behind in some of the Psalms of David and in the Ecclesiastes of Solomon and in many others proof of his poetic skill, and he would have given more perfect examples, if mortal judgement had not struck him down in mid-flow as he flourished in life and learning.)

Humphrey eulogizes Surrey’s late contemporary, Sir Thomas Wyatt, citing the poet’s vernacular translations of the Psalms, rendered ‘eleganti & eloquenti oratione’ (‘in elegant and eloquent speech’), which Wyatt ‘rhythmis Anglicis conficiendis elaboravit’ (‘laboured to accomplish in the English meter’). He also commends both poets for bringing the Italian lyric form into

---

150 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, III, sig. L4 Fol.  
151 Sessions, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, p. 22.  
152 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, III, sig. L3v Fol.  
153 Ibid. The edition was published as Certayne Psalmes chosen out of the Psalter of David commonly called the vii penytentiall Psalmes, drawen into the Englyshe meter by Sir Thomas Wyat (London: Thomas Raynald and John Harryngton, 1549).
English, acknowledging the influence of Dante and Petrarch, and he quotes John Leland’s verse praise of these English and Italian poets, before returning to recommend other poetry.\footnote{154}

Humphrey aligns civic engagement with intellectual endeavour again as he rosters Edmund Sheffield, ‘qui Nordovici fortissime in commotione rusticorum occubuit’ (‘who died so courageously in the uprising of the countrymen of Norfolk’). In his description, Humphrey affords equal emphasis to the political nature of Sheffield’s death and to his translations of Italian sonnets.\footnote{155} He cites Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, and Lord Protector in Edward VI’s reign, who was executed in 1552, and commends his translation of Calvin from the French. Seymour had produced \textit{An Epistle both of Godly Consolacion and also of Advertisement} in 1550, during his imprisonment in the Tower of London. Again, Humphrey devotes as much text to the description of Seymour’s scholarly occupation in captivity as he does to the translated work. He emphasizes the \textit{vita activa} of this politically engaged translator, whilst giving prominence to Seymour’s exemplary practice as a \textit{fidus interpres} who found commendable consolation in translating Calvin’s letter during his imprisonment.\footnote{156}

Humphrey’s brief reference to ‘Taplaeus’ has until now been obscure. It is most likely a typographic variant of the name Taualegus, also Tablaeus, the Englishman David Talley (or Tolley). Talley was a respected physician and Oxford scholar in the reformed humanist tradition, whose printed works include contributions to the reformed Greek Grammar (written in Latin), which was

\footnote{154}{Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, signs L3\textsuperscript{v} – L4\textsuperscript{r}.}
\footnote{155}{Ibid. sig. L4\textsuperscript{r}.}
\footnote{156}{Ibid. sig. L6\textsuperscript{r}.}
dedicated to Prince Edward in 1546. Humphrey does not specify a particular translation of his, but emphasizes his recent death: ‘Basileae mortuus, Taplaeus, etiamsi in lucem non exierit’ (‘passed away in Basel, Talley, he no longer goes forth into the light’). Again, he adopts a more moderate tone than Bale’s, avoiding the heavily confessionalized descriptions that typify his associate’s *Catalogus*. Bale describes Talley as ‘medicus Anglus malleus papistarum’ (‘English medic and scourge of the papists’).

Humphrey’s list re-establishes and authorizes an English intellectual tradition as he commends these scholarly and politically engaged translators. As he articulates the loss of these literary figures, he emphasizes the value of their intellectual endeavour to the collective good, to the commonwealth; ‘praecclare namque merentur de repub[lica] qui patria lingua Autores difficiles & obscuros explicare conati sunt’ (‘for splendidly they, who endeavoured to make clear in our native language difficult and obscure writers, serve the commonwealth’).

Timely and local context gives further nuance to Humphrey’s catalogue of translators. In 1558, the distinguished Cambridge scholar, Thomas Wilson, had been arrested whilst in Rome, and charged with heresy on the pretext at least of the Protestantism of ‘this booke of Rhetorique, and the Logike also’. He was

---

159 Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Bryantiiae catalogus* (Basel: Oporinus, 1557), sig. 2X4v.
161 It is thought that the Crown’s discomfort at Wilson’s role as advocate in a matrimonial dispute being heard in Rome had prompted his recall. Wilson’s refusal to return probably gave rise to his arrest. Susan Doran and Jonathan Woolfson, ‘Wilson, Thomas (1523/4–1581)’, *ODNB*, online
convicted and imprisoned, and, notably, was still captive in the Inquisitorial prison in Rome when Humphrey was writing the *Interpretatio linguarum*. One year later, in a reissued edition of his *Arte of Rhetorique*, to which he added further anti-papal material, Wilson emphasized how he had feared for his life at this time.  

Here Humphrey extols Wilson, who in 1551 had edited the volume of obituary verse that brought Humphrey’s writing into print for the first time, as we saw in Chapter One. He acknowledges how the scholar has led the way with his translations on logic and rhetoric, and he calls for vernacular translations of Aristotle’s other works:

> Et si optimi & doctissimi viri Thomae Vuilsoni opera in differendi & dicendi faculgate tradenda Anglis, utilis fuisse visa est: quid vetat, quo minus Ethica praecepta, & Politica, quorum illa privatam singulos docent, haec república in universum bonis legibus ac institutis decorant, & temperant, in sermonem Anglicanum traducantur?  

(And since the work of that good and most learned man Thomas Wilson seems to have been useful in handing over to the English a capacity for the spreading abroad of speech, what prevents the rules of Ethics and Politics, of which they instruct individuals in private, from adorning this republic in general with good laws and principles, and moderating it, from being translated into English?)

In fact, the explanations of logic and rhetoric that Wilson gave in his above-mentioned books were highly politicized texts. Shrank observes that ‘on his pages, classical learning is not merely rendered into English; it is “brought across” (“trans-latum”) and relocated in an English context’. Nuancing his translation along confessional lines, Wilson seizes ‘every opportunity for ridiculing the papacy’, for example in teaching the parts of logic through allusions

---

to key doctrinal controversies.\textsuperscript{164} Using religiously loaded vocabulary in a work ostensibly on rhetoric, Wilson challenges Catholic doctrine on divine presence in the sacrament, papal authority, and worshipping images and saints. Humphrey’s \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, in similar ways to Wilson’s \textit{Rhetorique}, proves to have previously unacknowledged religio-political undertones.

The ‘Catalogus interpretum’ builds a reading list of the finest English scholarship on classical and contemporary writing. It celebrates the breadth of intellectual material that had been produced out of the reformed educational programme, whilst simultaneously highlighting the damage done by the recent interruption to learning in England. Humphrey’s encomium can also be read as a pragmatic piece of promotional discourse addressed to those with the means of bringing these and other works to a larger readership. He considers texts that have not yet been translated into English:

\begin{quote}
Quid enim obstat, quo minus totus Cicero Anglice cum Anglis loquatur? Cur Livii historia, cur Platonis opera, & Aristotelis, lingua nostra non sonarent?
\end{quote}

(For what stands in the way of the whole of Cicero speaking in English amongst the English? Why do the histories of Livy, why do the works of Plato and Aristotle not resound in our language?)\textsuperscript{165}

Humphrey refers to the current generation of translators whose efforts especially deserve recognition by their nation, as they seek ‘to translate into their mother-tongue authors whose language is difficult and obscure’.\textsuperscript{166} Humphrey identifies the ‘immensam utilitatem’ (‘great practical worth’) to the reforming commonwealth that this generation of translators represents.\textsuperscript{167} His call for an

\textsuperscript{164} Shrank, \textit{Writing the Nation in Reformation England}, pp. 185-87 (p. 185).
\textsuperscript{165} Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. L6’.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid. sig. L4’.
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid. sig. M1’.
expansion in intellectual trade – through new translations – resonates with the language of new mercantile opportunities and recent exploratory efforts:

Nam in patriam linguam transferre quae sunt extraria, non minus doctorum hominum est quam Mercatorem res ac merces exoticas quae domi non sunt, invehere.  

(For it is no less for scholarly men to translate into the native language things that are foreign, than it is for merchants to bring in exotic goods and payments that are not found at home.)

Just as merchants are commended for the discovery and acquisition of material goods through their overseas endeavours, the English translators are praised for their efforts in importing products of intellectual worth. Their work augments England’s linguistic wealth and introduces new, valuable technical knowledge.

Humphrey brings to his readers’ attention the recently published work of an English cosmographer and alchemist, Richard Eden. The translator’s lack of renown is suggested by Humphrey’s mistake in giving his name as Joannes, probably a repetition of Bale’s inaccurate reference to Eden in his Catalogus. Humphrey’s citation suggests some ways in which this trope, commonplace in its identification of linguistic with material wealth, reflects the practically aligned interests of this intellectual coterie.

The Eden family background was in the wool-producing areas of East Anglia and trading metropolis of Antwerp, its Protestant leanings evident in the lives of George and Thomas Eden, respectively father and uncle of Richard. Like Humphrey’s patron, Anthony Cave, they were wealthy merchants of woollen broadcloths who had easy access to the reforming ideas in northern Europe and London. Richard Eden attended Christ’s College, and then Queens’ College,

---

168 Ibid. sig. L2r.
169 Ibid. sig. L4v.
Cambridge in the 1540s, where his tutor was Thomas Smith, and his circle included Cheke and Ascham.\textsuperscript{170}

As the Duke of Northumberland encouraged a group of London merchants, including George and Thomas Eden, to fund voyages to seek new export markets outside Europe, he recruited scholars to promote this commercial activity by publishing English accounts of these navigation and mercantile endeavours.\textsuperscript{171} Appointed secretary to Sir William Cecil in 1552, Eden joined the network of scholars, and produced his first printed work as part of this programme of documented support for the new mercantile exploits. His translation of part of Sebastian Münster’s \textit{Cosmographiae universalis} was published under the title \textit{A treatyse of the newe India with other new founde landes and islandes}.\textsuperscript{172}

The work that Humphrey cites is Eden’s \textit{The Decades of the newe worlde or west India, conteyning the navigations and conquests of the Spanyardes}, printed in England in September 1555.\textsuperscript{173} Eden had adapted the 1530 \textit{De orbe novo decades} compiled by Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, the Italian chronicler appointed by Charles V at the Spanish court, to which he added other translations

\textsuperscript{170} Eden disappears from the college registers in 1537 and reappears as a commoner of Queens’ College, taking a BA in 1538 and MA in 1544. Hadfield, \textit{ODNB}, ‘Eden, Richard’.

\textsuperscript{171} Gwyn, ‘Richard Eden’, p. 22, notes that the royal appointments of Cambridge scholars William Buckley, the mathematician, Clement Adams, the cartographer, and the geographer, John Dee, are likely to represent a deliberate policy on Northumberland’s part.

\textsuperscript{172} \textit{A treatyse of the newe India with other new founde landes and islandes, aswell eastwarde as westwarde, as they are knowne and found in these our dayes, after the description of Sebastian Munster in his boke of universall cosmographie: wherin the diligent reader may see the good successes and warde of noble and honeste enterpryses, by the which not onely worldly ryches are obtyayned, but also God is glorified, [and] the Christian faythe enlarged. Translated out of Latin into Englishe by Rycharde Eden} (London: E. Sutton, 1553).

\textsuperscript{173} \textit{The Decades of the newe worlde or west India, conteyning the navigations and conquests of the Spanyardes, with the particular description of the moste rych and large landes and ilandes lately found in the West Ocean perteyning to the inheritaunce of the Kings of Spayne. Wrytten in the Latine toungue by Peter Martyr of Angleria, and translated in Englysshe by Rycharde Eden} (London: William Powell, 1555).
from the Spanish historian Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo.\textsuperscript{174} He presented his English translation of the achievements of Spanish navigators in the year following the marriage between Philip of Spain and Queen Mary. Yet his work, emphatically dedicated to the King and Queen, and ostensibly seizing an opportunity to record for posterity the significance of the union between England and Spain, failed to protect him from accusations of dissent. Within two months of the book’s publication, Eden was charged with heresy. Whilst it is likely that Gardiner’s death at the end of October prevented the accusation being followed up, Eden lost his job at the Treasury and is thought to have left the country. His whereabouts between the end of 1555 and 1559 are unknown.\textsuperscript{175}

So what lies within this publication that failed to satisfy Eden’s opponents that he posed no threat to the Catholic monarchy? And why does Laurence Humphrey present it as an important example of literary success in England? On Edward VI’s death, Northumberland’s failure to replace Mary with his daughter-in-law, Jane Grey, had put Eden in a politically precarious position. His 1555 *The Decades of the newe worlde* perhaps represents Eden’s attempt to reconcile work that supported English imperial ambitions with the religious and political allegiances of the new regime.

Various readings of Eden’s work suggest either his promotional support or his subversive critique of England’s alliance with Spain. Whilst his editorializing celebrates Spanish exploits, the stories that Eden translates complicate his


apparently laudatory text, exposing Spanish cruelty and unruliness. Claire Jowitt speculates on the possibility that Eden was a Protestant spy, and describes his work as ‘a carefully encoded critique of the uneasy English political situation of the 1550s’. Andrew Hadfield argues that the complex political tensions underpinning the translation explain a deliberately ambiguous approach as Eden appeals for civil unity. Michael Householder suggests that recent debate surrounding Eden’s political motives is ‘unlikely to be resolved conclusively’, and argues that the ambivalence in Eden’s translation indicates the contradictory ways such texts were received and applied by different readers in a troubled and unstable political climate. Whatever his intent, Eden’s translation evidently failed to establish him as a thoroughly sincere supporter of the Crown, given that its issue was followed soon after by his removal from office.

In March 1562, Eden wrote to Cecil, thanking him for his financial support in the production of a forthcoming English translation of Pliny. In its celebration of a work newly translated into the vernacular and of the fruitful intellectual opportunities there were in the development of the English language, his letter seems to answer Humphrey’s call:

And whereas the Master of Savoye tolde me that your Honour sumwhat Doubted that the booke coulde not be translated into the Englysshe toonge, I assure you Honour that this I Dare saye without arrogancie, that to translate the variable historie of Plinie into our toonge, I wolde be ashamed to borowe so muche of the Latine as he Doethe of the Greke, although the Latine toonge be accompted ryche, and the Englyshe indigent and barbarous, as it hathe byn in tyme past, muche more then it nowe is, before it was enriched

and amplyfied by sundry bookes in manner of all artes translated owt of Latine and other toonges into Englysshe.¹⁷⁹

Eden references his earlier translation as he describes the way in which English linguistic wealth has accrued. He promotes the practice of translation again along the same lines as Humphrey, indicating that these new vernacular works were appreciated for the expertise they brought in navigation and cosmography, expanding technical language and English intellectual culture in general:

Exercise also maketh suche woordes familier, which at the first were Difficulte to be understode. ffor children at the first (as saith Aristotle) caule all men fathers. But shortly after by exercise, caule them by there names. And I have learned by experience, that the maryners use manye Englysshe woordes which were as unknowen unto me as the Chaldean toonge before I was conversant with them. It maye therfore suffice that the woordes and termes of artes and sciences be knowen to the professours therof, as partely by experience, and partely by the helpe of dictionaries describing them. Per proprium, genus, et differentiam, as the logitians teache.¹⁸⁰

Eden’s work is indicative of the collaboration between academics, those of the merchant community and of the court, at a time of new and urgent endeavour in the fields of both mercantile and linguistic exploration. D. M. Loades notes that ‘the need for trade between nations, the forging of new relationships [...] gives its own potency to the concept of mediation between different languages’.¹⁸¹ The importance of trade at this time, along with the development of new commercial organizations such as the Muscovy company, gives weight to Humphrey’s own call for ‘cum omnibus & optimis hominibus ac rebus commercium’ (‘trade with

¹⁷⁹ Eden’s letter is transcribed in The First Three English Books on America, Being chiefly translations, compilations, &c., by Richard Eden, from the writings, maps, &c., of Pietro Martire, of Anghiera (1455-1526) Sebastian Münster, the cosmographer (1489-1552) Sebastian Cabot, of Bristol (1474-1557) with extracts, &c., from the works of other Spanish, Italian, and German writers of the time, ed. by Edward Arber (Birmingham: Turnbull and Spears, 1885), pp. xliii-xliv.
¹⁸⁰ Ibid.
every good man and matter’). By placing Eden in his ‘Catalogus interpretum’, and invoking a work that stood both for and at the forefront of new mercantile endeavour, Humphrey aligns the interests of reforming English intellectuals and merchants.

Humphrey articulates the cultural and material value that he perceives across the wide range of English translations, for example, commending a translation of Euclid’s *Geometry* by Richard Cavendish. He cites Nicholas Udall’s involvement in translating Erasmus, citing *The Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the New Testament* and his *Apophthegmes*, before mentioning Udall’s important Latin textbook modelled closely on the idiomatic usages of Terence, the 1534 *Floures for Latine Spekynge*. Humphrey mentions only one woman in his catalogue of translators, Katherine Parr, referring here to her patronage of Udall’s group of scholars who had translated the 1548 vernacular edition of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases*. Humphrey’s exclusion of female writers from his catalogue, and their confinement to the dedicatory epistle, supports the suggestion that his earlier citation of the *pietatis femina* as a translator functions predominantly as a prefatory trope providing context for his praise of Elizabeth.

Humphrey recalls the works of Thomas Elyot, citing his *Titus and Gysippus*, a translation based on Boccaccio’s *Decameron*, which Elyot also paraphrased in his 1531 *Boke named the Governour*. In this work Elyot issues his own rallying cry for the translation of classical works into English:

---

184 Ibid. sig. L6r.
185 Ibid. Humphrey cites Udall’s 1542 translation of Erasmus’s *Apophthegmata.*
that like as the Romaynes translated the wisedome of Grecia into theyr citie, we maye, if we lyste, bringe the lernynges and wysedomes of theym bothe into this realme of Englande, by the translation of theyr warkes.¹⁸⁶

Humphrey cites Elyot’s *Dictionarium Latinoanglicam*, and praises the expanded edition produced by his Magdalen College associate, Thomas Cooper (who had accompanied John Foxe in exile).¹⁸⁷ Humphrey particularly commends Cooper for his bridging of humanistic and religious scholarship, describing him as ‘nec literarum magis laudibus quam religionis studio clarus’ (‘shining with great praise as much for his zeal in religion as in humane letters’).¹⁸⁸ Conventionally, Humphrey regrets the lack of space to commend more recent work before mentioning another associate from Magdalen College, Peter Morwen. Citing Morwen’s Latin translation from Hebrew, of Josephus’s history, *de Bello Judaico*, Humphrey says he hears that it is thought ‘fructuosum omnibus suis, & utilem patriae susceisse’ (‘to have performed its fruitful task for everyone and for the profit of his country’).¹⁸⁹

Humphrey’s catalogue of translators, expressed within his own exemplary model of learned scholarship, and promoting the wide expansion of subject matter and literary form in mid-Tudor England, demonstrates a reformed humanist agenda centred on a practical, purposeful pedagogy. As Humphrey offers his bibliography of the finest practitioners in England, its exhortatory intent becomes evident. Presenting his book as a symbol of English scholarship, in the context of international intellectual culture, Humphrey entreats his country to welcome

---

¹⁸⁷ Cooper was later to be the author of the *Thesaurus linguae romanæ et britannicae* (London: Henry Wykes, 1565).
¹⁸⁹ Ibid. sig. L⁷r.
'Interpretem nostrum [...] nunc in Angliam domum ad te redeuntem’ (‘our translator [...] now returning home to you in England’). In discussing recent and active English writers and their specific translations, despite being published from Basel and written in Latin, the *Interpretatio linguarum* reveals itself as an intellectually central text of English vernacular culture, demanding a significant place in the narrative of the recovery of mid-Tudor writing.

**‘Exemplum Anglicum’: Vernacular translations and exercises**

As we have seen, Humphrey takes many opportunities throughout the *Interpretatio linguarum* to express the value of translating into the vernacular languages, asserting the benefit to the country’s linguistic wealth, as well as a broader cultural and intellectual value:

Sic hi linguas, ingenia, animos suorum civium liberaliter ornant & collocupletant: unde eorum sermo vernaculus plenior & auctior fit, mentesque incultae ac rudes praeclaris externorum sapientum ac sophorum documentis erudiuntur.  

(Thus they honestly adorn and enrich the languages, the wits, the minds of their citizens; from where their vernacular speech is fuller and greater, and their uncultivated and rough minds are educated in the writings of the most outstanding wise and clever foreigners.)

At the end of the book, Humphrey addresses the subject of German, English, French and Italian vernacular idiom, drawing on the work of a number of European scholars. Although the *Interpretatio linguarum* is dedicated to English nobility and primarily directed towards English educational practice, Humphrey’s discussion of the ways in which a more elegant and proper Latin style might be

---

190 Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, ‘Praefatio’, sig. a8r.
achieved through imitation in a range of European languages indicates that he anticipates a readership beyond England.

In his discussion of German idiom, Humphrey acknowledges his own lack of proficiency in the language, excusing himself from the role of teacher in a vernacular language in which he was so recently a pupil. He offers instead an exercise set out by the Strasbourg scholar Anton Schor in his above-mentioned treatise on teaching and learning the Latin language. Humphrey describes Schor’s exercise ‘in quo quomodo a Germanismis Latinitas separanda sit, edocuit, observata utriusque differentia & proprietate’ (‘in which he taught how the Latin tongue should be distinct from the German style, with each difference and propriety observed’). The Latin passage, modelled on one of Cicero’s letters to Tiro, reveals Shor’s glossing of linguistic and stylistic differences between Latin and German.

In Schor’s edition, a version of the letter is written first in Ciceronian Latin, then in ‘Latina Germanice’ (‘a Germanic style of Latin’) and then in the German vernacular. Schor’s exercises are offered in response to the problem of a German language perceived to be corrupting an elegant and proper Latin style. Schor laments a decline in classical linguistic proficiency in Germany that Humphrey now describes with reference to England: ‘accedunt & Scholae, quae omnes artes & scientias incititia linguae, novis & ineptis valde vocabulis involuerunt, & obscurant’ (‘and the schools assent, as they wrap up every art and science in ignorance, and greatly obscure them with a new and inept

192 Ibid. sig. N1v.
193 De ratione discendae docendaeque linguae Latinae & Graecae, libri duo, Antonio Schoro autore (Strasbourg: Rihelius, 1549), sigs 5r - 7v.
vocabulary'). Humphrey uses Schor’s Latin letter, without the vernacular German gloss, adding his own comments on distinctive linguistic features of the Latin and noting some syntactical similarities between English and German. He avoids elaborating on the finer linguistic details of German, citing the classical maxim that advises against teaching someone who possesses greater knowledge than the teacher: ‘sus Minervam docet’ (‘the sow teaches Minerva’).

Humphrey follows Schor’s approach in his next example. He adapts another of Cicero’s letters, and draws out the specific linguistic features by which Ciceronian Latin differs from the English vernacular, this time ‘non ut ante Latina germanice, sed anglica Latine’ (‘not as above in the German-style Latin, but in English-style Latin’). Humphrey describes in detail how he had recently used this exercise to teach Ciceronian Latin to a young noble boy, Edward Stafford – the exercise described at the beginning of this chapter. Humphrey emphasizes the inexperience of the boy, not yet ten years old, who had never read the Cicero letter before. Quoting part of the boy’s translation, Humphrey shows how his Latin reproduces English idiom in a variety of ways. The exercise enables Humphrey to demonstrate what might be expected from other scholars as they practice more advanced exercises ‘propter aetatem meliora’ (‘on account of their greater age’). Just as Schor had demonstrated with his German-Latin example, Humphrey here draws out the contrasts between English idiom and Ciceronian style. He concludes by recommending the exercise as a way to halt the decline in Latin amongst more senior scholars in England: ‘ne senes in linguae Latinae

---

194 Schor, *De ratione discendae docendaeque linguae Latinae & Graecae*, sig. ***2f*.
196 Ibid. sig. N1*.
197 Ibid. sigs N3*-N5*. 
Humphrey next takes an example from a French book, again with the caveat that he is no less a stranger to this language than he is to German. His selected text comes from a collection of portraits accompanied by short biographical passages, issued by the French humanist printer Guillaume Rouillés in 1553. Vernacular and Latin editions of the work had been printed in the same year, and Humphrey cites the title of the French edition, the *Promptuaire des Medalles*. Humphrey’s description of the exercise of translation between Latin and vernacular language is framed in terms of the reformed scholarly credentials of the Stafford family. Describing the scholarly activity he had himself observed in Geneva, Humphrey cites the English translations of Calvin’s sermons that Henry’s father, William had produced ‘Genevae cum esset Evangelii causa profugus & peregrinus’ (‘when he was exiled and a foreigner in Geneva on account of the Gospel’). As we saw above, William’s youngest son, John (brother of Humphrey’s young pupil, Edward), was Jean Calvin’s godson, and Humphrey highlights the family’s reformist and scholarly activity both in Geneva and in England. His description allows him to extol another senior member of the family, Henry Lord Stafford, son of the Duke of Buckingham, who ‘in
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198 Ibid. sig. N5‘.
199 Ibid. *Prima pars Promptuarii iconum insigniorum a seculo hominum, subiectis eorum vitis, per compendium ex probatissimis autoribus desumptis* (Lyon: Rouillés, 1553); *La premiere partie du Promptuaire des Medailles des plus renommees personnes qui ont este depuis le commencement du monde: avec brieve description de leurs vies et faicts, recueillie des bons auteurs* (Lyon: Rouillés, 1553).
bibliothecam se totum abdere dicitur, alter Cato, librorum omnium quos nancisci potest, helluo avidissimus’ (‘as another Cato, the most avid devourer of every book that can be found, is said to have buried himself altogether in his library’). Humphrey cites Henry Stafford’s English translation of a Latin enquiry into regal and ecclesiastical power, and mentions its later editing by Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford. This work was an emphatically Protestant vernacular translation from the Latin and one of the important texts that had paved the way for Henry’s break with Rome.

By invoking the specific translations of such an emphatically reformist and distinguished English family, and indicating the way in which they enriched their learning through the multi-lingual resources they shared in Geneva, Humphrey demonstrates ways in which reformed international learning could be brought to bear on English intellectual life. In his promotion of these, and the works of the ‘Catalogus interpretum’, Humphrey’s pedagogical work can itself be seen as a response to the call to establish a more international intellectual trade for the benefit of English life, and specifically, ‘ad aedificationem Ecclesiae & Reipublicae’ (‘for the building of church and state’). In later chapters, I consider the extent to which Elizabethan England welcomed this response.

---
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Conclusion

Humphrey’s treatment represents an important intellectual rationale for the linguistic innovation that took place in England in the mid-Tudor period. A contextualized reading of the Interpretatio linguarum reveals it to be a work central to reformed humanist interests, addressed to a wide, inclusive readership of scholars, students, men and women both in England and on the Continent. Humphrey marvels in its originality and applicability, as he demonstrates the ways in which increasingly available classical and scriptural texts, if thoroughly understood and properly explicated, might be used to inform new learning.

With his consideration of the persona and officium of the fidus interpres, Humphrey elevates the role and responsibility of the translator, who is newly conceived as the devout, reformed vir bonus, working for the common good. Humphrey elaborates the persona of the translator, exemplifying both his civic engagement and his intellectual contribution by means of a literary register of the finest contemporary English writers.

Humphrey presents his book as a practical pedagogical manual in how to teach young scholars to translate. In his discussions of scriptural translation he asserts the newly recognized importance of the study of Hebrew to reformed humanist scholarship. Although more moderate in tone than the contemporaneous works of Foxe and Bale, in its appeals for the teaching of translation to incorporate reformed European texts such as Calvin’s Catechism, the Interpretatio linguarum stands alongside contemporary works of Protestant apologetic.
Humphrey’s description of teaching Latin to a young English boy demonstrates the way in which his exemplary Latin translations, produced in the idiomatic style of different vernacular languages, could enact Humphrey’s recommended multi-lingual education. The young student represents a reformed model of ‘sanam doctrinam pietatemque’ (‘sound learning and devotion’), a pattern Humphrey offers to a new generation of educated, reformed scholars. The family’s Protestant credentials are emphatically signposted by the evangelical translations in which Edward Stafford was engaged in Geneva, and after his death, by the devotion to faith, family and scholarship depicted in the figure of his widow. The purposeful redirection of the volume from its intended destination within a scholarly circle in Germany to a specific noble household in England signals Humphrey’s own shift in perspective, as he prepares to reclaim his place in the educational landscape of England.
Chapter Three: ‘So informed, that it may be reformed’ – Humphrey’s 1560 *Optimates*

**Introduction**

In August 1560, some months after his return to England, Laurence Humphrey wrote to his friend John Foxe that he had received some copies of the *De nobilitate* from his printer and friend in Basel, Oporinus. These were copies of Humphrey’s Latin treatise, entitled *Optimates sive de nobilitate*, a work issued from Oporinus’s press in 1560, eight months after Humphrey had written the dedication from Basel. This work has been variously labelled a ‘courtesy book’, an exposition on the ‘Puritan ideal of nobility’, an ‘attempt to support the aristocracy against the attack of critical and hostile plebeians’, and a ‘belated humanist treatise’. M. M. Knappen described Humphrey’s work as ‘a gesture in the direction of the rising class of Protestant landlords, soliciting their cooperation in the great work of reformation which yet lay ahead’. J. W. Binns judged it ‘the standard work on nobility in the English renaissance’.

However, Humphrey’s work remains relatively neglected in this field. There is no full study of the *Optimates*, and it receives only a passing reference in

---

2 Laurence Humphrey, *Optimates sive de nobilitate, eiusque antiqua origine, natura, officiis, disciplina, & recte ac Christiana institutione Libri tres* (Basel: Oporinus, 1560). For its date of issue and date of Humphrey’s dedication see Chapter One.
many recent works on humane learning in the mid-sixteenth century. 6 Many of the studies of English educational theory typically move straight from a discussion of the works of Elyot, Starkey and Castiglione that were in circulation by the 1530s, to consideration of the issues connected with Ascham’s *The Scholemaster*, a work not printed until 1570. For example, ‘after 1530, [...]’ English humanist pedagogical theory reflected the experience of educating royal children in the 1520s. In an early draft of *The Scholemaster*, Roger Ascham praised Elizabeth for her expertise in Greek and in “ridingge most trymli”’.7 Quentin Skinner follows his description of Thomas Elyot’s *The Boke named the Governour* with immediate reference to ‘the humanist educational writers of the next generation’, a group he identifies as Ascham, Peacham and Kempe, surprisingly making no mention of Humphrey at all.8 Many accounts of the role of humanism in English political thought have likewise been seen to ‘break off at the middle of the sixteenth century’.9

The thirty-year hiatus in the production of English vernacular educational treatises seems to have obscured the European Latin discourse that continued through the middle of the sixteenth century. Andrew Pettegree has drawn attention to the pitfalls of interpretive work that focuses too narrowly on books that were published only in England, or in English, at this time. He highlights a need to acknowledge the historiographical contexts of our vast and growing range of bibliographical resources, or otherwise risk narrowing our conceptions of what might constitute a ‘national bibliography’ in this period. He argues that, although England had the lowest proportion of books published in Latin or Greek of any European print zone in the sixteenth century, lower even than Hungary, Poland or Denmark, its relative under-development in the print industry did not entail a lack of access to the full range of literature being produced elsewhere. European discourse continued to interact with English intellectual culture at this time, via the nation’s booksellers if not so much through its printers. As Binns has stated, most of the Latin books read by English scholars at this time would have been written by foreign authors and issued on continental presses. Furthermore, as Shrank notes, whilst English humanism, or Bale’s ‘new learntynge’, asserted the worth of the vernacular, and invested in vernacular publications, it was Latin ‘both as a model and a medium’ that continued to dominate the mid-century learned mindset.

12 Shrank, Writing the Nation in Reformation England, p. 13.
As we have seen, Humphrey was able to express his aspirations for educational as well as religious reform within a range of works, including his dedicatory prefaces and translations. In articulating key concepts of the humanist tradition with respect to the gentry, writers drew on a vast range of classical sources. New editions and translations of classical works, and contemporary European treatises offered their readers studies on the nature of monarchy, the state of the commonwealth and the ideal virtues for public and private service.\(^{13}\) In works that were specifically relevant to the English gentry, whilst not necessarily in the English vernacular, writers developed their ideal of the _vita activa_ of the informed, educated gentleman, fulfilling his civic responsibility.

This chapter considers Humphrey’s _Optimates_, a treatise in which he uses the literary genre of _specula principum_ to argue for the political, religious and educational reformation of the landed gentry in mid-sixteenth-century England. Humphrey himself explicitly situates his three-volume Latin treatise on nobility within an ongoing tradition in which contemporary writers across Europe were interpreting and adapting classical literary texts in order to question the role that nobility should fulfil in the sixteenth century. This was a central theme of humanist discourse, closely linked to theories of education being developed throughout early modern Europe.

Making explicit his response to some of the Latin works on nobility that had emanated from presses in Venice, Lisbon and Naples between the 1520s and the early 1550s, Humphrey adumbrates an intellectual context and a conception of national cultural identity that reflects the multi-lingual cultural space inhabited

\(^{13}\text{Peltonen, Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, pp. 19-24.}\)
by sixteenth-century authors, readers and printers. Expressing a strong sense of his recent experience as an exile, he combines classical moral philosophy both with humanist theories of virtue and learning and with scriptural teaching, to re-draw the image of the English in terms of an explicitly reformed ideology. The reading he recommends for the education of a young nobleman includes newly available works of reformed writers and scriptural texts. With his promotion of recent works, Humphrey draws on the legitimacy and authority of a reformed, European humanist movement, whilst setting out a vision for his country’s nobility to fulfil their duty and enable their own country’s reform.

‘Nor has he returned as a simple, plain man’: The returning exile

As indicated in Chapter One, the publication of the *Optimates* followed that of the third treatise Humphrey wrote towards the end of his time in Basel, the *De religionis conservacione et reformatione vera*. When seen in the context of their issue from Basel, both these works show Humphrey articulating his response to the emerging political situation in England, as he anticipates his return home. Issued after Elizabeth’s accession, the *De religionis conservacione* is a call for unity amongst those working to achieve the Act of Settlement under their new monarch. The work is dedicated to Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, the outspoken supporter of evangelical reform who had returned from Switzerland in 1557 and had been sworn into Elizabeth’s privy council in November 1558. A leading regional magnate during Edward’s reign, Bedford had been Sheriff of

---

15 Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England*, p. 308, states that the treatise was written in the time of Queen Mary, but its content indicates that Elizabeth had succeeded to the throne by the time of writing.
Buckinghamshire and then Member of Parliament for Buckinghamshire between 1547 and 1552. From 1552 he was Lord Lieutenant for the county, notably during the period that Humphrey received support from his Buckinghamshire patron, the magistrate, Sir Anthony Cave. After leaving England, Bedford had spent the winter of 1556 in Zurich under the tutelage of Henry Bullinger, and it is likely that it was during this time that Humphrey established his relationship with his future patron.

As one of the few peers who had consorted with Continental reformers in the last reign, and a forthright supporter of a return to the Edwardian religious regime, Bedford was a hugely influential political figure for the returning exiles. 16

In May 1559, John Jewel wrote to Henry Bullinger that Bedford,

rogavit me [...] qua maxime re posset tibi aliisque tuis fratribus et symmisticis gratum facere. [...] Ego vero nihil tibi tuisque fore gratius, quam si religionem Christi studiose ac fortiter propagaret, et papistarum insolentiam imminueret. Quod ille et recepit se facturum, et certe facit, quantum potest.17

(has lately asked me in what way he could most oblige both yourself and your other brethren and fellow ministers. [...] I told him, that nothing could be more acceptable to yourself and your friends, than for him to promote the religion of Christ studiously and boldly, and repress the insolence of the papists. This he promised that he would do, and he certainly does as far as lies in his power.)

Bedford’s support of Humphrey’s De religionis conservatione was evidently one of the ways in which the exiles sought ‘the advancement of the general protestant cause to which their friends in England were testifying with their lives’. 18

---

Humphrey uses his treatise to herald the return to England of ‘Christum verum cum vera religione’ (‘the true Christ with true religion’). He makes an extraordinarily assertive identification between the figure of the returning English exile and that of Christ, as he sets out the major elements of the reforming agenda:

Neque redit ut homo simplex & nudus, sed ut potens ac forti Deus: non solus, sed comitatus: non ut saluet tantum, sed ut salutem, gratiam, misericordiam, liberam verbi pradicationem, conscientiae tranquillitatem & gaudium, Evangelium ac Testamentum suo consignatum sanguine, ut omnes coeli thesauros offerat & aperiat.¹⁹

(Nor has he returned as a simple, plain man but as a powerful and strong God; not alone but accompanied; not only to save but to offer and reveal all the treasury of heaven – salvation, grace, mercy, free preaching of the Word, peace of conscience and joy, and the Gospel and Testament sealed with his blood.)

Humphrey commends the initial legislation that had, after much debate and amendment, been passed in Queen Elizabeth’s first Parliament of 1559. He places rhetorical emphasis on the achievement of such agreement representing a unified consent amongst nobles, clergy and the people:

Hinc res acta est palam, & transacta in Senatu ac confessu omnium ordinum, Nobilitatis, cleri, plebis astipulatione, omnibus partibus, candidissimo suo puncto, consentientibus.²⁰

(the matter was settled openly and transacted in Parliament and in the assembly of all ranks, by agreement of the nobles, clergy and people with the consent of all parts to this most favourable point.)

As Humphrey commends Bedford’s role in the ongoing reform, he expresses his hope for a ‘wiser and more mature’ outcome:

Qua in re, dum Spiritus sanctus divino instinctu, sacrosancto Scripturae oraculo, & novis atque felicissimis R.M. auspiciis et ductu, velificatione

---

¹⁹ Humphrey, *De religionis conservatione*, sig. a6v.
²⁰ Ibid. sig. b7r.
mutata, consiliis posterioribus (quae saniora & maturiora esse solent) acta antegressa corrigitis.\textsuperscript{21}

(While, in this matter, at the instigation of the Holy Spirit, by the declaration of sacred scripture, by the new and most fortunate guidance and command of her Majesty, with a change in direction, you are reforming previous acts with later ones (which usually are wiser and more mature).)

A. N. McLaren has emphasized the acute need for apologetical works such as Humphrey’s \textit{De religionis conservatione} at this time. Elizabeth’s position at the outset of her reign was significantly weaker than her sister Mary’s had been. She was the last of her line, ‘a position that exacerbated what she identified as the “inconstancy of the people of England”, their tendency to mislike the present government and have their eyes fixed upon that next person that is next to succeed’.\textsuperscript{22} Also, although Elizabeth had gained the throne as the candidate of a Protestant interest in England, McLaren notes that this interest was by no means as entrenched or widely popular as historians have tended to assume, and that it did not include significant elements of the nobility. Thirdly, there was Elizabeth’s position as a female regnant. She had come to power in the wake of a reign that had, according to contemporary view, demonstrated the dire consequences of that identity, and it had cast doubt on the legitimacy of monarchical authority itself.

A number of controversial works that dealt with issues of the monarchy and the question of resistance in the case of ungodly rulers had been issued during the Marian exile. In 1556, John Ponet’s \textit{A Short Treatise of Politic Power} had been published in Strasbourg.\textsuperscript{23} 1558 had seen the issue from Geneva of

\textsuperscript{21} Humphrey, \textit{De religionis conservatione}, sig. b7\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{23} Ponet, who died before the book was issued, had been Bishop of Winchester under Edward, and had fled England after the failure of Wyatt’s rebellion, in which he had taken part. Interestingly, Hadfield, ‘Peter Martyr, Richard Eden and the New World’, p. 13, notes that in his 1556
Christopher Goodman’s *How Superior Powers Ought to Be Obeyed*.24 Also published in Geneva, in the same year, was John Knox’s *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women, The Appellation of John Knox from the Cruel and Most Unjust Sentence Pronounced against him by the False Bishops and Clergy of Scotland*. All three of these works advocated the use of active resistance in the case of ‘ungodly’ rulers, extending Calvinist and Lutheran theories of the right of lesser magistrates to protect the people against the superior to a theory of armed resistance against the ruler.25 Knox’s proposal for political action, reiterated in his 1558 *Appellation*, comprised ‘truly radical stuff and, had it ever been adopted, would have swept away English constitutional law and custom, the rule of women, dynastic monarchy and the possibility of anyone but an enthusiastic Calvinist male sitting on the throne’.26 On Elizabeth’s accession these works had the effect of significantly heightening the political tension. Published on the Continent, with ‘ghastly and quite unprovidential timing’ such provocative material risked seriously damaging the nascent reforming efforts of the returning exile group.27

In explicit response to these inflammatory works, Humphrey’s *De religionis conservatione* represents a timely and contrasting attempt ‘to position Elizabeth as a godly prince (princess) and, perhaps more importantly, to present
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24 Christopher Goodman, *How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their Subjects: and wherein they may lawfully by Gods worde be disobeyed and resisted. Wherein also is declared the cause of all this present miserie in England, and the onely way to remedy the same* (Geneva: Crispin, 1558).


the existing social order as redeemable through reformation’. Humphrey articulates the critical issue addressed by the Protestant reformers, with respect to supremacy of the monarch:

\[
\text{ad obedientiam redeo, quam in re Christiana & religione, praestandum regibus censeo, etiamsi Papae autoritas & assensio non suffragetur.}^{29}
\]

(I come back to obedience, which, in Christian matters and religion, I think is to be shown to kings even if the authority and assent of the Pope does not support it.)

Having made clear that England now enjoys the rule of a godly monarch, he raises the (by then) hypothetical question of obedience to an ungodly ruler, which in the reign of Mary had provoked the active resistance theorists:

\[
\text{Quaerendum est, liceat ne subditis illum qui gubernaculis assidet, impium & idololatram regali solio deturbare, & ita rege sublato, Christi regnum ac religionem propagare?}^{30}
\]

(The question is whether it is permissible for subjects to cast down from his regal throne the one who is in charge of the government, because he is impious and idolatrous, and so with the king removed should they promote the reign and religion of Christ?)

Humphrey’s response to this question is that violence towards a monarch is unacceptable and unlawful, and he urges that the existing social order is redeemable through reformation. His appeal against the atmosphere of political unrest contains careful rhetorical attempts to mitigate these recent inflammatory publications. Describing the reformed doctrine as ‘mite, placidam, Evangelicam, et veram’ (‘mild, gentle, evangelical and true’) he refers to the controversial authors as ‘quorundam bonorum virorum, pietate & doctrina non

---


29 Humphrey, *De religionis conservatione*, sig. c4v.

30 Ibid. sig. c7v.
vulgari’ (‘certain good men, devout and uncommonly learned’), suggesting even that his version of the situation will set the record straight regarding their ‘libellos’ (‘little books’), whose ‘verba duriuscula’ (‘somewhat harsh words’) have been misread. Humphrey attempts to mitigate the damaging material even further by suggesting that these works have been misconstrued, remarkably claiming that the authors themselves would agree with his own account of their writing:

\[
\text{tamen eos consentire mecum existimo, si qui autores sunt, iidem etiam mentis suae interpretes adhibeantur.}^{31}
\]

(however, if those authors were summoned to be translators of their own minds, I think they would agree with me.)

With this statement, Humphrey appropriates the role of \textit{interpres} to himself in a way that resonates with the moral responsibility expressed through the office of the \textit{vir bonus}, as set out in the \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}. He attempts to mitigate the political damage caused by these writers through his own, ‘more faithful’, interpretation of their words.

Humphrey travelled back to England from Basel sometime at the end of 1559, possibly in the company of John Foxe. December saw the consecration of a large number of their associates: Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Cox as Bishop of Ely, Edmund Grindal of London, Edwin Sandys of Worcester, Thomas Bentham of Coventry, and John Jewel of Salisbury.\(^{32}\) As Humphrey confidently asserts the return of Christ to England, he makes no small claim for his and his associates’ own anticipated return: ‘Nec ipse solum rediit,

\(^{31}\) Ibid. sig. g2\(^v\).
\(^{32}\) Collinson, \textit{Godly People}, pp. 63-64. James Pilkington was Bishop elect of Winchester at this time, although Horne was appointed Bishop the following February.
sed reditum cum ipso exclusis patefecit’ (‘Nor does he [Christ] return alone, but he makes way for the return of those exiled with him’).  

The *De religionis conservatione* marks the end of the exile era for Humphrey and his compatriots, and reveals the redirection of his interests to the situation developing in England. It is this period that also sees Humphrey and other returning exiles respond to the need for a new education for the nobility of England, a situation treated with urgency by many of those interested in widespread intellectual reform.

*A mirror for the nobility*

As Humphrey sought to mitigate the ill-timed work of Ponet, Goodman and Knox with his *De religionis conservatione*, the exiled scholar and former tutor to Lady Jane Grey, John Aylmer, offered his own conciliatory response from Strasbourg. Written in response to Knox’s inflammatory *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, Aylmer’s *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects* is, like Humphrey’s treatise, also dedicated to Bedford.  

Aylmer’s Protestant apologetic has been seen as expressing the notion of England as a mixed monarchy, a development of the conception that had been initiated in the reign of the minor King Edward VI. In his work, the mixed monarchy is conceived as a godly body politic, with the queen representing one of the constituent elements, along with the lords and the commons. Following Mary’s reign, the mixed monarchy offered the reformers a political configuration ‘in
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33 Humphrey, *De religionis conservatione*, sig. a6v.
34 John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects*, agaynste the late blowne Blaste, conserninge the Government of Women, wherin be confuted all such reasons as a straunger of late made in that behalfe, with a briefe exhortation to Obedience ([London: John Day], 1559). This edition has a false imprint that says it was printed in Strasbourg.
which the virtue of the male political nation could be seen as constraining, with
God’s oversight, and the interest of England’s imperial identity, the tyrannical
proclivities of a female ruler’. In presenting his argument for obedience to a
female monarch, Aylmer posited the necessity of a wider participation in
government, and for the increased role of its counsellors:

This move then allowed, even forced, men to reassess the legitimacy of
competing distinctions of status, specifically among men who might be
considered ‘fellows’ and ‘brothers’ in Christ – and potentially as countrymen
and patriots. Here we can see the genesis of the contest over definitions of
nobility which acquired political significance in Elizabeth’s reign and
continued into the reigns of her Stuart successors.

McLaren suggests that the Optimates was ‘clearly designed to be more widely
accessible’ than the De religionis conservatione, her view based on an erroneous
assumption that Humphrey dedicates his Latin work both to Queen Elizabeth and
to the ‘Christian Gentlemen’ of the Inner Temple. In fact, as Chapter Four will
show, the dedication to the gentlemen of the Inner Temple appears only in the
later translated edition of 1563; in this English edition the new dedication follows
the vernacular translation of Humphrey’s original dedication to Elizabeth.
Humphrey dedicates his 1560 Latin Optimates to Queen Elizabeth alone.

In his preface, Humphrey aligns his concept of a mixed monarchy with that
of Aylmer. He suggests that Elizabeth’s governorship consists of setting a moral
example, a pattern of godly virtue:

\[ \text{ut M.[ajestatis] T.[uae] antiquae dignitis exemplar, veteris splendoris imaginem, ac columnen verae Nobilitatis proponerem: ut in foemina habeant viri Nobiles quod discant, quod aemulentur, quod admirentur.} \]

\[ 35 \text{McLaren, Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I, p. 236.} \]
\[ 36 \text{Ibid. p. 5.} \]
\[ 37 \text{Ibid. p. 121.} \]
\[ 38 \text{Humphrey, Optimates, ‘Praefatio’, sig. a2’}. \]
\[ 39 \text{Ibid. sig. b4’}. \]
The queen’s role is to symbolize God’s superintendence and enact a pattern of moral virtue, exemplifying the qualities of ‘iusticia’ (‘justice’), ‘doctrina’ (‘learning’), ‘religionis cura, propagatio, amplificatio’ (‘fervent zeal, love and furthering of religion’), and ‘egregia & excelsa in dolos’ (‘excellent and lofty courage’). Wisdom and learning are the two chief aids by which others can aspire to the queen’s pattern of nobility, which Humphrey defines as

Nobilitatem [...] veram, non simulatum, illustrem & claram [...] quae iusta est, & religionis amans, & literarum studiosa: quae fortis est, ac spiritu principali ad res gerendas incitata.  

(The true, unfeigned, bright nobility, [...] which is just, loving to religion, and studious of learning, and which is strong and with a royal disposition urged to action.)

Elizabeth’s moral virtue is expressed in terms of her exemplary learning. She represents the paradigm of a godly, humanist education. Humphrey urges that, in acting as a Christian model for the nobility, she will be able to complete the reformation and help to achieve the spiritual reclamation of the nobility:

dubitandum ne est, ti, si quae adhuc reliquiae haereant, si quae vel in ritibus vel in moribus claudicatio ac titubatio remaneat, omni ope, cura, consilio, festinatione, provisurum, vigilaturam, emendaturam?  

(For is there any doubt, that if any remnants hold fast, or if any limping or stuttering remain either in rites or manners that you will, with all help, care, counsel, and speed, provide for them, withstand them and reform them?)

In his rhetorical question, Humphrey makes an implicit assumption of Elizabeth’s agreement, a rhetorical strategy that further suggests her alignment with his conception of religious and social reformation.

---

40 Ibid.
41 Ibid. sig. b1r.
42 Ibid. sig. b5r.
Humphrey explicitly situates his three-volume Latin treatise within a tradition in which classical literary lessons were learnt alongside the printed teachings of the *vera religio*, in order to bring about a reformed nobility. He cites Plato writing about nobility, and mentions the opinions of ancient philosophers, such as Anacharses, Socrates, Pittacus, Agesilaus, and Cambises, according to classical account. However, Humphrey notes the limitations of these precedents for his purpose. The classical authors of Stoa, Academy and Lyceum are able to convey only a limited part of what is required:


(They speak the truth, but not all of it. And indeed they teach a part, but that which is the most important, they do not touch. For it is one thing to be a Christian noble, another to be a heathen noble. The Stoa, Academy and Lyceum taught one thing, but the seat of Moses, the Gospel of Christ, the Letters of the Apostles another.)

The emphatically Protestant emblems of Moses’ seat, Christ’s Gospel and the Apostolic letters emphasize Humphrey’s privileging of reformed, godly learning over classical culture, and differentiate his *Optimates* from other contemporary treatments on the topic. Humphrey proposes the adaptation of classical and humanist models in accordance with a specifically Anglo-centric and reforming purpose. Despite being written in Latin and published in Basel, the *Optimates* is aligned with Protestant works that call for religious, political and social reform at the beginning of the 1560s.
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43 Ibid. sigs a4v - a5r.
44 Ibid. sig. a5r.
Humphrey differentiates his *Optimates* from prior works that address the education of princes, and suggests the need for a book that specifically considers the education of the nobility:

Extant quidem libri de doctrina ac institutione Principum: [...] tamen cum sit alia Regis, alia Nobilis, alia domini, alia subditi persona: una & eadem in hasce duas non semper apte cadet praeciptio.\(^{45}\)

(Indeed there are already books concerning the teaching and upbringing of princes. [...] But, since the person of a prince is one thing, that of a noble man another, one, the person of a lord, another of a subject, the same precept cannot always aptly serve these two estates.)

Acknowledging the many writers who have joined the debate on this topic, he cites three European treatises that generally fall outside the historiography of works on nobility for this period in Tudor studies. Humphrey underlines the humanistic association between elegant style and moral probity, depicting two of these recent commentators as falling short of the ideal. The third represents a successful route along the literary *via media*.

The first reference is to Luca Gaurico, the Italian Astrologer, Roman Catholic bishop and mathematician who had died in 1558.\(^{46}\) Humphrey describes Gaurico’s harsh literary style as being detrimental to his content: ‘De Nobilitate vera scripsit quaedam Lucas Gauricus, vere quidem, sed aliquanto acerbius & licentius, & impolitius’ (‘Luca Gaurico wrote something of true nobility, but rather bitterly and licentiously, and rudely’).\(^{47}\) Humphrey is probably referring to Gaurico’s 1552 *Tractatus Astrologicus* (‘Astrological Treatise’), a collection of genitures and commentaries on contemporary politics, learning and religion,

\(^{45}\) Humphrey, *Optimates*, I, sig. c5r.

\(^{46}\) Bietenholz, *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 2, p. 80.

\(^{47}\) Humphrey, *Optimates*, I, sig. d3v.
drawn up for Pope Julius II.\textsuperscript{48} He compares Gaurico’s criticism of the nobility to an owl who accuses the sun for its brightness, whilst failing to acknowledge the weakness of its own sight. Gaurico’s edition has been described as ‘gossipy’ and Humphrey quotes an example of Gaurico’s condemnatory tone.\textsuperscript{49} He observes that Gaurico’s unrestrained style of criticism reflects badly on the author: ‘est enim sui similis in reliquis, ut non minus hic licenter in sermone, quam illi in vita, peccare videatur’ (‘for he [Gaurico] is like all the rest, since he seems to offend no less licentiously in his speech, than they in their lives’).\textsuperscript{50}

According to Humphrey, it is only by expressing criticism in a refined, ‘politus’ rhetorical style that moral correction can be properly taught. He makes clear the humanistic identification between literary proficiency and moral responsibility, and figures Gaurico as assaulting the state of nobility with his harsh literary style: ‘Gauricus autem his verbis graviter & acriter nobilitatem invadit’ (‘but Gaurico invades nobility heavily and fiercely with these words’).\textsuperscript{51} Humphrey’s polemic is perhaps further explained by Gaurico’s reputation as a controversial anti-Lutheran writer, and Roman Catholic astrologer. Using astrological calculations to associate Luther’s date of birth with specific moral failings, Gaurico had drawn Melanchthon and other Protestant scholars of astrology into polemical exchanges that fashioned Luther as either a ‘demagogically false or heroically true’ prophet of Christianity.\textsuperscript{52}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[48]{Lucae Gaurici Geophonensis, Episcopi Civitatensis, Tractatus Astrologicus (Venice: Curtius Troianus, 1552).}
\footnotetext[50]{Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, I, sig. d4’.}
\footnotetext[51]{Ibid. sig. d3’.}
\end{footnotes}
Echoing his discussion of the *vir bonus* in the *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey emphasizes the importance of the writer’s exercise of duty and fidelity in his attempts to reform the ruling class: ‘non ex petulantia accuset, sed ex officio & fide redargua’ (‘let him not accuse them out of petulance, but refute them out of duty and faithfulness’).⁵³ He compares Gaurico’s stylistic failings to his own more humane style: ‘a me autem germana Nobilitas se nec convicio nec asperiori verbo in tota oratione laesam, facile [...] animadvertet’ (‘but let him easily notice that nobility is not damaged by so much as a taunt or bitter word throughout my whole speech’).⁵⁴ Humphrey suggests that only a benign style of pedagogy can achieve effective correction of pupils’ morals. His claim prefigures Roger Ascham’s description of the effectiveness of the physically restrained teacher, in contrast to the harsh beatings advocated at some schools. As Boutcher has shown, Ascham’s proposal to teach exemplary texts of Sturm and Cicero in a physically humane way represents the ideal humanist pedagogical method, analogous to the way in which the stylistically exemplary text could supplant the coarse Latinity of earlier (or rustic) teaching.⁵⁵

Humphrey contrasts Gaurico’s harsh stylistic approach with the more refined work of the Portuguese humanist, Jerónimo Osório da Fonseca, noting that his treatment of civil nobility had been written ‘politius & modestius’ (‘more civilly and modestly’).⁵⁶ The work to which he refers is the *De nobilitate civili libri II, eiusdem de nobilitate Christiana libri III*, a treatise which would later be translated into English by William Blandie and issued as *Five Bookes of Civill*.

---

⁵⁴ Ibid. sig. d⁴r.
and Christian Nobilitie from the press of Thomas Marshe in 1576.\textsuperscript{57} It was first printed in Latin at Lisbon in 1542, after which time it had become commonplace in England to recognize in Osório another Cicero.\textsuperscript{58} Roger Ascham, writing to Lord Paget in 1553, observed that Osório’s 1549 work \textit{De gloria} placed him at the head of the European literary roll call of Ciceronian stylists:

\begin{quote}
Nec video iam cur plus aut Italia in Bembo et Sadoleto, aut Gallia in Longolio et Perionio, aut Germania in Erasmo et Joanne Sturmio, quam Lusitania nunc in uno Osorio gloriari possit.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

(Nor can I now see why Italy can boast more in Bembo and Sadoleto, or France in Longueil and Perion, or Germany in Erasmus and Johann Sturm, than Portugal now can in their one and only Osório.)

The same acknowledgement of Osório’s literary style would be repeated by Ascham two years later, in the letters to Sir William Petre and Cardinal Pole that accompanied Osório’s \textit{De nobilitate civili et Christiana}.\textsuperscript{60}

In his article on Portuguese scholarship in Oxford in the early modern period, Thomas Earle describes Osório as one of the best known Portuguese humanists of his day, whose work was acclaimed in England before Elizabeth’s reign, and whose predominantly Latin works survive in many Oxford libraries.\textsuperscript{61} Humphrey’s citation likewise reflects Osório’s established reputation, and suggests that he assumes his reader is aware of the work mentioned. Yet, as Earle

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{57} Rosenberg, \textit{Leicester, Patron of Letters}, p. 173, notes its status as valuable literary property as found in the ‘cum privilegio’ of Blandie’s title page, as well as in the publication of a later Latin edition at London in 1580.

\textsuperscript{58} Osório, Jerónimo, \textit{De nobilitate civili libri II, eiusdem de nobilitate Christiana libri III ad Ludovicum Principem clarissimum Emmanueulis Lusitaniae Regis filium} (Lisbon: Luis Rodrigues, 1542) and \textit{De gloria libri V ad Joannem tertium Lusitanae Regem} (Lisbon: Francisco Correa, 1549).


\textsuperscript{60} Binns, \textit{Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England}, p. 273.

\end{flushleft}
complains, Osório and his works have remained in relative obscurity in studies of
this period.

Osório’s reputation in England at this time is an important context for
Humphrey’s work. In 1555, the Spanish diplomat Antonio Agustín, accompanied
by his associate from the University of Bologna, the Frenchman Jean Matal, had
been sent to England by Pope Julius III, in order to use the occasion of the
marriage between Mary Tudor and Philip of Spain to aid attempts to re-establish
Catholicism in England. In the eight months he was there, Agustín often met with
Cardinal Pole, who frequently expressed his own deep admiration for Osório’s
work. In fact Pole mooted a project for his own nephew by marriage, Francis
Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon – that of translating Osório’s De nobilitate and the
De gloria into English – ‘so that with this he might acquire the ability to express
himself with copia, elegance and noble grace’. In his account of this episode,
Léon Bourdon notes that the translation project in fact never came to fruition.
However, that the intention was declared does indicate Osório’s high standing
amongst the noble elite and reformist, in this case Catholic, intellectuals of
England in the 1550s. Bourdon also observes that Osório’s work was so much in
the ascendancy, and Elizabeth’s predilection for his writing so well-known, that
Johann Spithof, the agent in England for Denmark, and a keen correspondent of
Roger Ascham, used a 1552 edition of Osório’s De nobilitate, prefaced by his
own letter of dedication, to recommend himself to the Queen in 1559.

62 Léon Bourdon, ‘Jerónimo Osório et les humanists anglais’, in L’Humanisme portugais et
l’Europe: Actes du XXIe Colloque international d’études humanistes, Tours, 3-13 juillet 1978, ed.
by Jean-Claude Margolin and José V. de Pina Martins (Paris: Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian,
Centre Culturel Portugais, 1984), pp. 263-333 (p. 268).
63 Osório, Jerónimo, De nobilitate civili, libri II. Eiusdem de nobilitate Christiana libri III
(Florence: Torrentinus, 1552).

\begin{quote}
De re aulica Augustinus Niphus librum edidit, ubi magis philosophus esse studuit, quam aulicus: de inde ad hoc, quo de loquimur, parum accomodate: licet ad id quod ipse voluit, satis apte fortassis dixerit.\footnote{Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, I, sig d3’} \\
\end{quote}

(Augustinus Niphus issued a book on the subject of the court, in which he studied more how to be a philosopher, than a courtier. And this has little purpose on the subject of which we speak, although perhaps for that which he wanted he spoke aptly enough.)

The distinction that Humphrey makes between ‘philosophus’ and ‘aulicus’ suggests that he finds Nifo fails in not addressing the pragmatic capabilities of a humanist, despite acknowledging that Nifo perhaps had not intended to do so. Nifo’s work is notable for his cynical treatment of the subject of flattery, expressing views that are at odds with Humphrey’s proposals regarding the advice to be offered a monarch:

\begin{quote}
Once the prince has deliberated and made a decision, writes Nifo, he should allow no one into his presence but flatterers. His decisions must be regarded as laws; and those who oppose them must be recognized as enemies detracting from his majesty. A ruler who wishes to maintain authority will
\end{quote}
never allow anyone to proffer advice uninvited. Thus flatterers, who praise their prince’s decisions, advance his authority. They show his subjects what they should believe.\textsuperscript{67}

Humphrey explicitly presents his \textit{Optimates} in response to these recent European discussions and their writers, against the traditional background of classical treatments on this subject. Whilst dedicating it to Elizabeth I, he directs his work to her subjects: ‘Speculum autem propono utriusque Nobilitatis verae & vanae, in quo se contemplantur’ (‘here I present them, a mirror of either nobility, the true & false, wherein they may clearly see themselves’).\textsuperscript{68}

\textit{‘The eyes and ears of the monarch’: Advice for the body politic}

Although framed for the press as a congratulatory acknowledgement of the new monarch, in the rest of its subject matter the \textit{Optimates} is very much addressed to the nobility and a nation perceived to be in crisis. Humphrey refers

hoc misero & perdito decursu temporum, quo omnia optima corrumpi solent: etiam haec res egregia pristinam suam integritatem amiserit.\textsuperscript{69}

(to this wretched and unfortunate decline of the times, where all the best are accustomed to be corrupted, and even this excellent cause has lost her pristine integrity.)

Humphrey accuses his generation of a collective failure to consider and discuss the function and duty of nobility, and argues that such intellectual neglect has contributed to a decline in the social and political effectiveness of this group. He calls on his generation of nobles to draw on the teaching of antiquity – both classical and scriptural – in order to reconsider their status, and to recover their function and duty in response to the general civic malaise. In this way they will

\textsuperscript{67} Anglo, \textit{Machiavelli}, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{68} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, I. sig. d5\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid. sig. d4\textsuperscript{v}. 
be able to nullify the threat of war, or of social disintegration, which he suggests has emerged in Mary’s reign. The anonymous *Institucion of a Gentilman*, printed in 1555, likewise describes a stratum that is ‘sore decayed, I faine to greate ruine: wherby suche corruption of maners hathe taken place, that almost the name of gentry is quenched’. 

In defining the crucial part that governors and magistrates are to play in the welfare of the kingdom, Humphrey depicts the nobility as its vital organs. He figures the English nation as a sick body in need of healing, particularly with respect ‘in corde aut stomacho quam in pedibus’ (‘to the heart or stomach rather than the extremities’), as he describes what is at stake:

\[
\text{quod illae partes corporis citius laedantur, & nobiliores habeantur: hae magis contemptibiles, minus periculo obnoxiae videantur.} \]

(for these [the former] parts of the body are more quickly hurt and regarded as more noble, whilst the latter are seen as more contemptible and less liable to danger.)

The task of healing these components is an urgent priority, ‘ut qui reliquam partem salvam esse cupit, eum necessario medicina his adhibere in primis oporteat’ (‘since whoever desires the safety of the other parts, must of necessity first minister to these’). It is notable that Humphrey’s metaphor of the body politic specifies the nobility as the head of the Commonwealth, the ‘capita Rerumpublicarum’, as well as its heart and stomach. It suggests Humphrey’s rhetorical participation in the reformers’ successful repudiation of the royal title of Supreme Headship, and its amendment to that of Supreme Governor.

---

70 *The Institucion of a Gentilman* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1555), sig. *3r*.
71 Humphrey, *Optimates*, I, sig. c3r.
72 Ibid. sig. c4r.
Like Aylmer, Humphrey describes the commonwealth as divided into nobles and commons: ‘quarum una principes viros & maioris notae ac census homines, genere & dignitate praestantes continet’ (‘one part of which contains the principal men of greater part and substance, surmounting far the other in living and lineage’). The other comprises the ‘mediocrium & infirmorum ac popularium’ (‘the inferior multitude, the mean and baser sort’). Whilst conceding that ‘etiamsi omnium in Christo unum’ (‘all are one in Christ’), Humphrey appeals to classical precedent to argue that ‘generis differentia’ (‘differences of degree’) are a constant feature of civil society. In expressing this conception of the political order, Humphrey is able to define the unique potential for political influence that he sees in the nobility. They ‘tractant publica negotia’ (‘conduct their public business’) in a manner that is beyond the reach of the monarchy:

Reges quoque cum plebe nihil habent commercii: sed hi miscent se cum illis, & horum iussu ac nomine publica tractant pro suo arbitratu negotia.

(Also, princes have no business with the common people, but these [i.e. the nobility] mix with them and under the instruction and in the name [of princes], they conduct their public business according to their own judgement.)

Humphrey privileges the role of the nobility, even as they act under instruction and in the name of the monarch, describing this political reach in terms of veins spreading throughout the body. Taking the Aristotelian conception, he specifies the conciliar role of the nobility within the body politic:

& oculi Regum & aures sunt, ut videat, audiant ac provideant ea quae non sibi modo usui futura sunt, sed aliis utilia & salutaria.

73 Humphrey, Optimates, I, sig. f2v.
74 Ibid. sig. d7v.
75 Ibid. sig. c5v.
76 Ibid. sig. c4v.
(they are both the eyes, and ears of the monarch, to see, hear, and foresee those things that are not only profitable to themselves, but are also valuable and wholesome to others.)

The problem of counsel was a well-established humanist topic. Thomas Elyot’s works have been seen as highly politicized responses to his perception ‘that Henry VIII’s honest old advisors were being replaced by a cabal of reformers’. His 1531 *The Boke named the Governour* described a commonwealth in which the king takes the nobility into his political confidence. By praising chivalric pursuits for governors, Elyot made it clear that by both birth and schooling, the aristocracy were the monarch’s natural advisers.

As sixteenth-century treatments moved from their consideration of the education of princes to address more specifically the role of advisers at court, there developed what has been termed ‘a significant change in the rhetoric of “counsel”’. Elyot’s works highlight this movement; in the space of two years, he produced and saw printed no fewer than four texts that focus explicitly on the nature of princely government and responsibilities of counsellors. They ‘challenged or at least attempted to counter-balance’ the evangelical counsel offered by Henry’s closest reformist ministers’. As evidence of Elyot’s ‘obsessive concern with good and bad counsel’, Walker cites his 1533 *The Doctrinal of Princes* (a translation of Isocrates’ oration to Nicocles of Salamis on the responsibilities of kingship), followed by two editions of *Pasquil the Playne*, and a dialogue called *Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man*, in which the

---

archetypal good counsellor Plato debates with Aristippus, here fashioned as the voice of flattery.

In *A Dialogue between Pole and Lupset*, a manuscript in circulation from around 1532, Thomas Starkey proposed that kings (however well educated) were to be ‘temperyd & brought to ordur’ by others, nominally a council of learned aristocrats. Shrank contrasts the way in which, in the 1540s, Bernadino Ochino could depict counsel as confidential advice requested by the monarch, to be followed or ignored, whilst by the 1560s, Elizabeth’s ministers saw it as the means by which policy was made: ‘For Cecil [...] counsellors shape policy, not the queen’. New notions of counsel were adjusting the relative weighting between the monarch’s will and counsellors’ judgement in ways that gradually increased the political status of the Privy Council.

Aylmer’s attempts to legitimate a Protestant queen have been seen as transformative for the problem of counsel. In his *Harborowe*, he suggested that in the case of Mary Tudor, it was her counsellors’ confessional alignment that had contributed to the depraved nature of her reign. In contrast, he called for advisers who could fulfil their godly role, and implied that this reorientation offered the prospect of greater equality of political virtue between the Monarch and her counsellors. McLaren notes that by the mid-sixteenth century, advice had taken on a providential significance, and ‘godliness’ began to be privileged as a key element in determining who should be called to counsel the queen.

---

80 Ibid. p. 97.
81 Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation* England, p. 189.
In the *Optimates*, Humphrey expresses this developing concept of counsel powerfully. He urges the Queen to choose her advisers with caution, furnishing her court ‘viris iusticiae, pietatis, eruditionis laude commendatis’ (‘with men famous for esteem of justice, godliness and learning’). Humphrey charges the godly nobility, once reformed in their own faith, to exercise a spiritual as well as civil duty as they make their advances to princes:

\[
\text{sic confitendum est Nobilibus: & reges, quibus subsunt, modis omnibus ad Christianum doctrinam allicerent, vocarent, ducerent, traherent: adversarius etiam rationes [...] refellerent, calumniasque refutarent.}
\]

(so must noblemen confess, call, lead, and allure by all means, their monarchs to Christian doctrine [...] and confute and reprove contrary tales and slanders.)

A few years later, Thomas Smith would be even more explicit. In the *De republica Anglorum* he suggests that female rule is tolerable only if ‘such personages never do lacke the counsell of such grave and discreet men as be able to supplie all other defaultes’.

Humphrey also gives new emphasis to the role of the printed book, which he privileges alongside the nobility as counsel to the monarch. As he calls for Elizabeth to banish mock-courtiers, counterfeit nobles, blasphemers, money merchants and bribe-takers from the court, he urges that she act, ‘cum bonorum authorum & nobilium virorum consilio, tum exemplo tuo’ (‘on the advice of good authors and noble men, and then of your own example’). In asserting the primary place that the works of good writers are to occupy, Humphrey sets up a theme that resonates throughout the *Optimates*. Able to inform and advise its

85 Humphrey, *Optimates*, II, sig. n4’.  
reader in an apparently impartial and yet influential way, the printed book is afforded a unique status. Books can reveal the necessary, hard truths that even the closest of advisers are reluctant to admit. It is notable that Humphrey’s emphasis on the advisory function of ‘good authors’ disappears in the 1563 English translation of *Optimates*. The (anonymously translated) vernacular edition instead urges the queen to act ‘both by your grave counsaylours advyce, and other Nobles, and your owne president’, making no mention of Humphrey’s ‘bonorum authorum’. Its different emphasis, making the distinction between privy counsellors (rather than books) and other nobles, is again suggestive of the shifting nature of mid-century rhetorics of counsel.

Humphrey challenges the culture of flattery at court, offering the printed word as a more honest mode of advice:

aria ubi adulationi aures pateficiunt, ibi monitioni & veritati fores occludi solent. Ergo suos morbos, quibus implicati & impediti sunt, non videbunt fere, nisi publice traducantur, ut legant, & legendo intelligant, ex libria scriptis qui vagantur passim, & libere obambulant, ac verum dicere non erubescunt.

(For where the ears are open to flattery, there the gates are usually closed to warning and truth. Therefore they do not usually see the diseases in which they are wrapped and entangled, unless these are openly printed; so that they read, and by reading, gain understanding from written books that wander abroad and roam freely, and are not ashamed to tell the truth.)

He suggests that the collective failure to consider and discuss the function and duty of nobility has resulted in a general reluctance by some in influential positions to criticize those who fall short in their responsibility. Humphrey depicts the absence of this kind of advice as a failing that has contributed to the

---

89 Humphrey, *Optimates*, I, sig. c5. 
decadence of this privileged class. He relates the account of Demetrius Phalereus, the first head of the ancient library of Alexandria, who, according to classical tradition, urged the Egyptian King Ptolomy I to read all writers who had written about royal administration so that he could find out ‘quorum amici Regum nonauderent, nec solerent admonere’ (‘what his friends neither dared, nor used to warn him’). Books are figured as unrestricted, undaunted in conveying their message.

Elsewhere, Humphrey personifies the book as an intimate adviser, assuming the role traditionally occupied by a trusted individual. He uses a commonplace account of Alexander the Great to do this. In order to draw on his teaching by day and night, Alexander appoints Homer as his partner and privy counsellor. Humphrey emphasizes the privileged role of the author as ‘socium omnium consiliorum’ (‘companion of all his counsels’), his ‘ducem’ (‘guide’) and ‘omnium itinerum comitum’ (‘the companion of all his journeys’). The printed book occupies the most trusted role, partnering the leader at every point of the day and night:

Homerum lectitavit saepissime, & in sinu portavit, in bello, in pace, in somno habuit socium omnium consiliorum, seu ducem potius, ac omnium itinerum comitem: & puvillo subiecit, ut cui interidiu invigilasset, noctu indormisceret.91

(Very often he used to read Homer, & kept him in his lap both in wartime and in peace. In sleep, he made him the companion of all his counsels, or rather his guide, and the companion of all his journeys. And he put him under his pillow, so that he might wake up to him by day, and sleep on him by night.)

90 Humphrey, Optimates, III, sig. y5r.
91 Ibid. sig. y4v.
Humphrey’s emphasis on the advisory role of the book turns a conventional account into something new. It differs, for example, from Thomas Elyot’s treatment. Elyot uses the scene to detail specific examples in Homer’s *Odyssey* and *Iliad* from which the military leader draws value:

For by the redynge of his warke, called Illiados, where the assembly of the most noble grekes againe Troy is recyted, with their affaires, he gathered courage and strength againe his enemies, wysedome and eloquence for consultations and perswations to his people and army. And by the other warke, called Odissea, whiche recounteth the sondry adventures of the wyse Ulisses: he by the example of Ulisses, apprehended many noble vertues, and also lerned to eskape the fraude and deceyftfull imagynations of sondry & subtile crafty wittes.  

In contrast, Humphrey’s personification emphasizes the book’s active advisory role. Figuring the book as ‘dux’, a guide, or even leader, Humphrey privileges print culture within the mid-sixteenth-century intellectual domain.

Although the *Optimates* was dedicated in celebration of a new queen, the lack of reference to Elizabeth within the main body of the first book and the perspective from which Humphrey writes contribute to a different impression. They indicate that it was begun before Humphrey could anticipate his return to England, before Queen Mary had died. Humphrey repeatedly emphasizes the freedom of the printed word, implying a contrast with the restrictions on people at that time. The context of his recent experience in exile perhaps informs his vocabulary, as he depicts the ease with which books ‘vagantur’ and ‘libere obambulant’ (‘wander’ and ‘walk about freely’), whereas his freedom to travel is limited, for example, by the need for licences and by the suspicions of customs officers. Books are figured as unrestricted, undaunted in conveying their message.

---

92 Elyot, *The Boke Named the Gouernour*, sigs D5’ - D6’.
Humphrey again emphasizes the power of print culture and the freedom of books to travel, in a reference to a printed edition of Livy. He describes the book in terms of its author’s living presence, ‘hunc iam in libris spirantem nostri facilius domi possunt invisere’ (‘whom, still breathing in his books, our men are able to see more easily at home’). He celebrates the capacity for the printed book to bring its ancient author back to life, and to travel freely to its readers in their domestic setting. As we saw in Chapter Two with the *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey likewise gives prominence in the *Optimates* to the value that reformed humanist learning brings to vernacular culture.

That Humphrey’s works are linked by a central pedagogical conception is further indicated by the inclusion of another work in the *Optimates*. Just as he appended Philo’s *De officio Iudicis* to the *Interpretatio linguarum* for the dual purposes of teaching language and offering a mirror of studious piety, Humphrey here presents the Greek text and his Latin translation of Philo Judaeus’s *De nobilitate*. He explains his decision to include Philo’s text, ‘quo autem maiorem fidem faciat, & maiorem authoritatem habeat oratio’ (‘by which my speech may gain greater credibility, and hold greater authority’), and figures it as ‘comitem et quasi Theseum’ (‘a companion and fellow Theseus’). He also presents the work ‘simplicissime in gratiam studiosorum ac nobilium puerorum [...] ut cum linguae cognitione pietatem imbibant’ (‘most simply for the use of studious and noble young gentlemen [...] so that with the knowledge of the language they may drink down godliness’). Philo’s work takes its argument from scripture, in particular

---

93 Humphrey, *Optimates*, III, sig. y5v.
95 Ibid. sig. b2v.
from the book of Genesis.\textsuperscript{96} With this suggested exercise in reciprocal translation between Latin and Greek, Humphrey offers the \textit{Optimates}, as he did the \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, as a practical manual to guide young men in their studies. Again, Humphrey asserts the central tenet of reformed humanist education: the acquisition of virtue is made possible through the exercise of scholarly, and in this case, godly, reading.

\textit{‘They do not want nobility abolished, but improved’}

In line with classical tradition, Humphrey urges the godly noble to cultivate a range of virtues, the practice of which will be demonstrated by the gentleman’s \textit{vita activa}. Where Roman moralists and rhetoricians interrogated the qualities on which the preservation of civic life could be said to depend, in the form of the four cardinal virtues – justice, fortitude and temperance and wisdom – Humphrey recasts them in the image of reformed Christian virtue. He draws on Ciceronian and Erasmian traditions as he differentiates his treatise from previous treatments. As a specific precedent, he cites Erasmus’s 1535 \textit{Ecclesiastae}, his essay on the office of Christian preaching, rather than the earlier works on the education of princes or the lay nobility.\textsuperscript{97} Humphrey also authorizes his work via Cicero’s \textit{De oratore}:

\begin{quote}
Quanquam vero haec etiam ipsa quaedam aliis quibusdam hominibus magna ex parte adaptari queant: tamen ut in Ecclesiastae formando Erasmus, in Imperatore & Oratore Cicero, quasdam virtutes enumerant non semper his proprias, sed cum aliis communes: ita nos praescribemus, auspicante Deo, & adsignabimus quaedam vitae nobiliter & patricie instituendae praecepta, quae si non omnino, tamen maxime ad Nobiles pertinere videantur.\textsuperscript{98}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{96} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, sigs A1\textsuperscript{r} - A7\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{97} Erasmus, \textit{Ecclesiastae, sive de ratione concionandi} (Basel: Froben & Episcopiocius, 1535).
\textsuperscript{98} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, II, sigs m5\textsuperscript{v} - m5\textsuperscript{v}.
(Which, even if for the most part they may also be applied to others, yet, just as Erasmus in shaping a preacher, and Cicero an emperor and orator, describe certain virtues not always specific to those but common to others, so will we (God willing) prescribe and assign certain precepts for instructing life nobly and honourably, which if not entirely, at least seem mostly pertinent to nobles.)

Whilst recognizing the wider relevance that these treatises hold, Humphrey indicates that his own discussion is concerned with those ‘proprias virtutes’ (‘specific virtues’) that most apply to the nobility.

Humphrey expresses the need for the noble man first to be established on the route to duty and wisdom through the devout practice of his faith, which he describes in the vocabulary of reformed religion, as ‘verus & incorruptus Dei cultus, ac syncera Religio’ (‘the true unstained worship of God and sincere religion’). The noble man is to be seasoned ‘from birth’ with a knowledge of Christ, who is himself identified as ‘religiose nobilis’ (‘a godly noble’).99 He is warned against transferring worship towards images and saints, and encouraged ‘legendo & scrutando’ (‘by reading and searching’) to see Christ ‘nec alienis fidant oculis aut iudiciis’ (‘not by crediting others’ eyes or judgment’), but acquiring ‘verae religionis examen solidum & solum’ (‘the sound and only proof of the true religion’) through his ‘divinorum oraculorum lectio & interpretatio’ (‘reading and translation of divine scriptures’).100 Humphrey’s detailing of these godly and studious activities, and his emphasis on translation in particular, again indicates the pedagogical conception shared by this work and the *Interpretatio linguarum*.

99 Ibid. sigs m6v - m8f.
100 Ibid. sigs m8r - n1r.
The nobleman’s *officia* are described as firstly owing to God, then to his country, to the common people and to other nobles. Discussion of the fourth *officium* provides an opportunity for Humphrey to comment on domestic political upheaval. Indicating the international context in which his work is written, Humphrey says that he would prefer to avoid mentioning the ‘patriae meae Angliae vulnus’ (‘the sore of my country England’), but that reference to recent events is pertinent to ‘utilitatem ipsorum’ (‘the welfare of those [countrymen]’):

> Cupio domestica dissidia domi solum innotescere: sed cum ipsa vi & acerbitate sua prodant se & erumpant, non possum ego, huc me amore quodam certe & conscientia vocante, omnino reticere.101

(I wish our domestic conflicts were known only at home. But since, of their own force and bitterness they publish and exhibit themselves, I, called by a certain love and conscience, cannot be altogether silent about them.)

By way of this *praeteritio*, Humphrey rhetorically invokes the writer’s own sense of duty to condemn the executions of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset – ‘leviculam de re, ac rei vana suspicione comprehensum, ac truncatum’ (‘imprisoned for a trifle, a light suspicion, and beheaded’) – and his brother, Thomas Seymour, at the hands of the Duke of Northumberland, a man he describes as effective in battle, but mad with civil ambition.102 Humphrey uses this example to align his narrative with other accounts of Protestant apologetic, as he emphasizes how the events that followed the change of religion signalled a moment of decline in the nobility. In contrast, he suggests the range of attributes required in the nobility for their proper conduct in civil life.

Humphrey sets out his discussion with vivid illustrations of how these attributes relate to individual morality and public life. Following classical
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101 Ibid. sig. p3v.
102 Ibid. sig. p4v.
tradition he focuses on the virtue of *humanitas*, conceived in terms of its three principal characteristics: ‘Philosophi beneficientiam dicunt, & benignitatem seu liberalitatem’ (‘philosophers call it benevolence, beneficence and liberality’). Humphrey’s treatment of ‘liberalitas’, defined in Thomas Cooper’s Anglo-Latin thesaurus as ‘[l]iberalitie: bountie: honest intreatyng and dealyng: freenesse in geuyng or bestowyng’, is particularly striking in its detail and length. Humphrey cites the recent exemplary practice of his late patron, the Buckinghamshire magistrate Anthony Cave. Depicting an ideal of the Christian gentleman, Humphrey describes Cave’s occupation of the ‘tertium locum’, the via *media*, in terms of the combination of his external honour and his practice of internal virtues. He details the provision made by Cave, who privately ensured

> ut imbecillis, viduis, orphanis, senibus provideretur: nervosi homines & validi laboribus addiceruntur: itaque nullus fere in eo comitatu repertus esset, qui ociosus vagaretur.

(that the weak, the widowed, orphans, and elderly were provided for, and that strong and able men were compelled to labour. So that, throughout the county, almost no one could be found roaming around unemployed.)

As he delineates the various offices that this member of the landed gentry fulfilled, Humphrey describes Cave’s status within the godly nobility as an achievement of virtuous agency, ‘ingenio, prudentia, diligentia’ (‘by wit, prudence, and diligence’), rather than of inheritance. Humphrey’s conception of
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the godly noble here recalls his portrayal of William Stafford in the *Interpretatio linguarum*, another ‘example of nobility and pious devotion’.

Cave’s generosity towards the poor is held up as a model of private virtue. He is shown as encouraging others in the exercise of their own *vita activa*, as he helps them find useful employment. Humphrey juxtaposes the exemplary personal charity of his patron, ‘privatum hoc’ (‘this private practice’) with the ‘publicum & memorabile institutum’ (‘public and notable ordinance’), put in place in London in the reign of Edward VI:

> ubi amplissima domo, stipendiis, praefectis, ministris, omnibusque rebus necessariis constitutis atque adhibitis, in numeru pauperum multitudo alebatur: valentiores laborabant: aegri, claudi, surdi ac caeci curabantur: pueri multi, alii ad artes, alii ad litteras ac studia vocabantur: ut posteris temporibus aut Ecclesiae servirent, aut reipublicae.

(where in a large room with wages, masters, servants, & all other necessaries allowed, & administered, an innumerable multitude of poor were fed. The healthy laboured, the sick, lame, deaf and blind were cared for, many children were called, some to occupations, some to learning and studies, so that in later times, they might serve either the church, or the commonwealth.)

So, in Humphrey’s depiction, it is in exercising responsibility for the useful employment or occupation of ‘hominum errantium et inertium’ (‘wandering and inactive men’) that the landowner in his shire, city or country can be identified as noble. Humphrey, perhaps recalling the educational opportunities that Cave’s patronage had afforded him, emphasizes the public benefit to both church and commonwealth in this exercise of duty towards the disadvantaged young. Heal and Holmes describe sermons preached at the assizes at this time, in which the gentry were likewise encouraged to fulfil their responsibilities as magistrates:
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Some gentlemen justices obviously paid careful attention to the speeches, charges, handbooks, eulogies and sermons. In their commonplace books they reflected on magistracy as a duty and on the duties of magistracy...[and] these texts do speak to the gentry’s own sense of the role of magistracy, and in particular, to their strong sense of the responsibility of public office.  

As he develops his conception of the godly gentleman, Humphrey encourages recognition of the ‘fluid social category composed of men who hold office because of their personal virtue’.  

The next form of liberality called for in the gentry is again strongly suggestive of Humphrey’s first-hand experience. As he describes the need for nobles to give financial support to the learned, he recollects those of ‘aureum seculum’ (‘a golden age’),

Qui primum scholas fundarunt, & academias, collegiiis structuris, salariis constitutis, ac praemiis propositis tum studiosis ad discendum, tum professoribus ad docendum: quibus ad vehementer studendum alacriterque proficiendum allici homines solent, & excitari.  

(who first founded schools, and universities, appointing stipends, and privileges, both for the studious to learn and for professors to teach; by whom men used to be drawn and provoked eagerly and readily to study and accomplishment.)

He laments the onset of ‘aenea & ferrea aetas’ (‘a bronze and iron age’) in which ‘praedones sunt quam patroni literarum’ (‘those who ought to act as patrons of learning are instead destructive’). Citing the forced dispossession of lands and livings from wardens and rectors of colleges, Humphrey criticizes those ‘artifices [...] regii diplomatis patrocinio adiuti’ (‘artificers [...] aided by the protection of royal letters patent’), who seek private gain in their dealings with scholarship, and who abolish rather than create educational foundations. In contrast, Humphrey

112 Humphrey, *Optimates*, II, sig. q3.
requires of nobles that they do even better than their forebears, and urges them to offer patronage ‘in doctos homines generosa manu’ (‘with a generous hand towards scholarly men’). He describes how praiseworthy it is ‘bibliothecas quoque librorum bonorum copia instruere’ (‘also to furnish libraries with a plentiful store of good books’). In the dedicatory preface to his 1557 edition of Origen, Humphrey had commended Anthony Cave’s careful collection and preservation of books. Here, he applauds the Fugger family for its bibliophilic practice, describing this line of Augsburg merchants in terms of the classical tradition of Ptolemaic patronage in Alexandria.

Humphrey terms the next group of recipients who are worthy of liberality, ‘Dei sanctos’ (‘God’s saints’). He describes them as those ‘qui pietatis causa laborant, & in carcere detinetur, ullo ve modo afflictantur’ (‘who suffer for religion, and are imprisoned, or otherwise afflicted’). Evidently this group has personal resonance for Humphrey and again he emphasizes their need for practical support. Employing anti-Catholic rhetoric, he denounces what he depicts as wasteful expenditure: ‘in ornandis imaginibus superstitiose religiosi: in missis, reliquis, indulgentiis, & peregrinationibus susciendiis, divisque vestiendi illiberaliter’ (‘on decorating with the images of superstitious religion; taking masses, relics, indulgences, and pilgrimages to strange places; and dressing unworthily in opulent clothing’). Humphrey places the expense of these emphatically Roman Catholic practices in direct opposition to the needs of the vulnerable.

113 Ibid. sig. q3v.
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115 Ibid. sig. q4r.
Implying an analogy between the superior practice of hospitality and of religion, compared to former times, Humphrey commends recent example. He cites the English reputation for hospitality, as the ‘peregrinorum [...] admiratores maximi’ (‘chief honourers of strangers’). England, under Edward VI, had provided a haven for an embattled and controversial international Protestant community, and opportunities afforded to such learned strangers as Bernado Ochino, Peter Martyr Vermigli, John á Lasco and Martin Bucer, as official church advisers, reflected the importance of this tradition. Humphrey describes ‘Germani & Angli novi’ (‘new Germans and English’) as surpassing their forebears in hospitable practice, and suggests their example to nobility at large:

    sic Nobilium est providere, ut his de habitatione accommodent, domos, usum civitatum, Ecclesias aperiant, subsidio iuvent, & Evangelii causa profugi, ipsorum auxilio egeant.

(for thus the nobility ought to make provision to give them somewhere to lodge, to open their homes, make available the use of the city and Churches, and to offer succour and assistance if religious exiles need their help.)

Humphrey’s use of the phrase ‘Evangelii causa profugi’ (‘exiles on account of the Gospel’) becomes an important locution for the returning exiles, as they rhetorically construct their narrative of exile and return.

However, in Humphrey’s view, a different form of hospitality is being practised to a fault by the English court, to the extent that his countrymen have become ‘alienis magis saepe & ingeniis & mercibus & hominibus capiantur quam suis’ (‘delighted more often by foreign wits and merchandise than by their
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Whilst commending hospitality to foreigners, Humphrey warns against the neglect of ‘sua bona domi’ (‘their own goods at home’). He cites the extravagance displayed in entertaining princes and ambassadors, and suggests that such resources be spent on the returning exiles.

This section of Humphrey’s discussion in the *Optimates* later appears appended to the treatise *De scriptorum britannicorum paucitate, et studiorum impedimentis oratio* (‘A speech on the shortage of British writers and impediments to learning’), the first part of which was delivered by Nicholas Carr, Cambridge Professor of Greek, shortly after Elizabeth’s accession. Calling for the restoration of learning at the University after the disruptions of Mary’s reign, Carr’s themes resonate with those of Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum* and the *Optimates*. Dana Sutton notes that Carr, using cautious circumlocution, indicates his concerns regarding the deficient relationships between tutors and students at Cambridge. Carr suggests that a major reason for their mutual disdain is the current enthusiasm for things foreign, to the extent that native scholarship and literature are held in low esteem, and he indicates that this also serves to explain the scarcity of books written by Englishmen. He urges that the students cultivate more devotion to their masters, and masters show more concern for their students’ welfare. Carr’s text was edited and published posthumously in 1576 by Thomas Hatcher, Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University. Hatcher appended Humphrey’s complaint concerning the neglect of ‘sua bona domi’ at the head of a
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number of other chosen excerpts, indicating that Humphrey’s criticism of 1560 continued to hold a particular resonance in the mid-1570s.\textsuperscript{123}

In case his specific exhortation is failing to reach home, Humphrey summarizes the duty of the noble towards religious exiles: ‘ut illis victus necessarius subministetur, in collegia admittantur, annuis donentur stipendiis’ (‘that he would furnish them with a necessary living, that they would be admitted to fellowships, and granted yearly stipends’).\textsuperscript{124} In 1560, the year in which the *Optimates* is first published, it is precisely this form of patronage that Humphrey is seeking for himself. He explains his hesitation to mention living exemplars of this virtue, addressing his appeal in general to the wealthy families who shared the experience of exile during the Marian reign:

\begin{quote}
hortari malo, ut secum in dies certent, ut cum eorum non pauci in Germania peregrini fuerint, quid sit peregrinum esse experientia intelligent: sensum illum humanitatis magis ac magis, affectumque misericordiae induant, ut peregrinos & de via lassos, & ope destitutos, ac patriae finibus expulsos recreent, illorumque inopiam suis copiis consolentur & refocillent.\textsuperscript{125}
\end{quote}

(I prefer to exhort them to contend with themselves daily, since not a few of them came to Germany from foreign parts and therefore understand by experience what it is to be a stranger, that they would more and more assume that sense of humanity, and disposition of compassion, so that they might console and revive strangers, worn out by travel, and destitute of aid, and restore with their plenty those who have been banished from their country’s borders.)

Humphrey reinforces his request by citing the recent example of the late Henry Grey, Marquess of Dorset and Duke of Suffolk, ‘qui doctos exules liberaliter sustentavit’ (‘who liberally sustained many learned exiles’).\textsuperscript{126} With timely invocation of his country’s tradition of political support for evangelical exiles,

\begin{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{124} Humphrey, *Optimates*, II, sig. q7\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid. sig. q7\textsuperscript{v}.
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Humphrey appeals to the gentry to demonstrate their ‘sensum humanitatis’ specifically in the form of patronage to England’s own returning ‘strangers’. Such an appeal would be associated with figures such as the Earl of Leicester and the Earl of Bedford, to a lesser extent Lord Burghley and the Queen, and, in general, with the families of Marian exiles such as the Nowells and the Staffords. The impact of connections between foreign exiles and English nobles has been established as one of the real contributions of the Marian refugees to the age of Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{127} It endured through the last quarter of the century ‘in the hands of patrons and prelates who claimed inheritance of that tradition’, figures such as the earls of Essex, Southampton, and Pembroke, and the archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot. Hasler, identifying the development by the 1590s of a more sophisticated and better informed diplomatic and espionage system, notes that these networks were founded upon contacts and information acquired abroad during the Marian diaspora.\textsuperscript{128}

In the third book of the \textit{Optimates}, Humphrey considers the specific duties of the nobles towards themselves, discussing the classical ideals of personal virtue – temperance, continence and prudence. Citing numerous examples of extravagance in noble life, Humphrey continually directs his reader to consider the office and function of nobility from the perspective of its need to reform. In vocabulary often associated with religious reforming agenda, Humphrey elaborates on his aim:

\textsuperscript{127} Boutcher, ‘New Documents on John Florio’, p. 45; Overell, \textit{Italian Reform and English Reformations}, pp. 189-211.

Non ut nobilitatem extinctam cupiant, sed emendatam: & ut doceatur, & ita doceatur, ut corrigatur: ita corrigatur, ut non sit necesse tollere.¹²⁹

(not to want nobility to be abolished, but improved, so that it may be better informed; and so informed, that it may be reformed; and so reformed, that it need not be brought down.)¹³⁰

The chief targets of Humphrey’s criticism are those who fail to take up the vita activa, the primary sign of their offence lying in their rejection of education:

Primum enim peccant in eo, quod artes negligent, literasque contemnant, omniumque rerum optimarum praeclarissima studia deserant.¹³¹

(First they offend since they neglect arts and despise learning, and betray all the noblest knowledge of all the best matters.)

He argues that, as stronger beasts bear greater burdens, so the nobility ought to work all the harder; being born into privilege is not an excuse to live an idle life. As Humphrey presents his book as a suitable guide, he reiterates the suggestion that all nobility pursue an educational programme hitherto perceived as beneath them.

An educational programme for the nobility

Humphrey sets out his proposed ‘reforming’ programme of education, so that the young noble, following such instruction, might fulfil his ‘divina et humana officia’ (‘spiritual and civil duties’). Notably, whilst his education is to be acquired within the noble household under the supervision ‘diligentis magistri’

¹²⁹ Humphrey, Optimates, I, sig. e1v.
¹³¹ Humphrey, Optimates, I, sig. k5v.
(‘of a careful tutor’)\textsuperscript{132}, its model is that of the humanist ‘liberali officina’ or free school:

Quo autem haec sciat & possit efficere, domi tanquam in liberali aliqua officina se fingat, antequam ex hac quasi schola emittatur in publicum, antequam divina cum aliis in Ecclesia religiose, & humana erga singulos et universos officia recte administret.\textsuperscript{133}

(But so that he knows how and is able to do this, let him fashion himself at home as in some free school, before he is sent off from here as if from school into public life, before he administers scrupulously, with others, his spiritual duties to the church, and his civil duties towards each and every one.)

The \textit{Optimates} is revealed as a product of a specific moment, as Humphrey builds a curriculum along the lines of that of a grammar school, whilst depicting the domestic setting, and the guidance of a personal tutor in particular, as most suitable for the noble scholar. Within a few years, vernacular texts on the subject would evidence the growth in demand for education of the gentry within the school setting.\textsuperscript{134}

Humphrey describes the ideal type of teacher, ‘nec rudem nec irreligiosum, sed doctum & pium’ (‘neither coarse nor irreligious, but learned and godly’), whose own erudition enables him to teach beyond the rudimentary lessons.\textsuperscript{135} In contrast he demands that ‘elementarii illi praeceptores arcendi sunt a familiis Nobilium’ (‘those who are only elementary teachers must be banished from the noble house’), their instruction associated with a rather crude teaching of grammar. The other sort to be driven away is described as ‘vel pravorum dogmatum fautor, vel superstitionis magister’ (‘the author of some unsound

\textsuperscript{132} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y3\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid. sigs r6\textsuperscript{v} - r7\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{134} Green, \textit{Humanism and Protestantism}, pp. 20-34.
\textsuperscript{135} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y2\textsuperscript{r}.
dogma, or teacher of superstition’). Almost as an aside, Humphrey suggests the educational opportunity that could be extended to women of the noble household too:

\[\text{Nec puto erubescet vir doctus id facere in propinqua vel nobili virgine, quod Aristoteles fecit in Philippi filio, ut ipse librariorum vilitate initia traderet literarum.}\]

(nor do I think the learned man will blush to do for his sister or a noble virgin, that which Aristotle did for Philip’s son, since he lacked the elementaries, teaching him his letters himself.)

Humphrey indicates that education is not yet universally prized amongst the nobility, complaining ‘ut studiosum esse, censeat esse dedecorosum’ (‘that [the nobleman] thinks it reproachful to be termed studious’). Bryson notes that for every member of the elite who prided himself on his learning there were many more who regarded academic skills with suspicion or downright contempt and who stuck by the traditional values of inherited wealth and real (or assumed) lineage. It was still five years before Thomas Smith’s articulation of the importance of the association between education and gentle status:

\[\text{Whosoever studieth the laws of the realme, who studieth in the universities, who professeth liberal sciences, and to be shorte, who can live idly and without manuall labour, and will bear the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman, he shall be called master [...] and shall be taken for a gentleman.}\]
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Smith echoes Humphrey in suggesting a conception of nobility that includes men other than ‘those whom their blood and race doth make noble and knowne’.\footnote{Smith, \textit{De republica Anglorum}, p. 70.}

Gentility does not run in the blood; it is a state that can be achieved by education, a fact to which Smith owed his own social rise.

With vivid imagery, Humphrey compares the uneducated youth to an actor who is in costume but poorly prepared for his role, an object of scorn rather than appreciation:

\begin{quote}
Et quam ridetur histrio optime personatus, regem aliquem in scena agens, si in gestu peccet, sithulce pronunciet, si vocem emitat acerbissimam, si agat partes suas indecore, ut non sit digna tali persona actio? \footnote{Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. x8r.}
\end{quote}

(And isn’t some well-dressed player ridiculed, when he plays the part of a king on stage, if he fails in his gesture, speaks with a gaping mouth, emits harsh sounds, if he plays his part improperly or with some action unworthy of such a part?)

Humphrey implies that the noble must be educated in order to exercise his ‘proprias virtutes’, his moral responsibility, as well as to convey the external trappings of his position. He urges the nobility to recognize their obligations as a godly estate in the commonwealth and to take on the office they hold by birth, as an enactment of their virtuous calling. Humphrey describes his vision in a description that seems to capture the over-arching agenda of reformed humanism and its distinctive combination of classical and Christian teaching:

\begin{quote}
hoc lectissimo ordine rectis ac Christianis opinionibus imbuto, & ad incorruptam antiquitatis normam emendato: & Reges suis praefuturus salubrius, & Ecclesiasticae rei administros munus suum ornatus fidelius & plebem officiis omnibus necessariis perfunctur a diligentius: ac totam Rempublicam demum spirare, vivere ac convalescere posse firmius. \footnote{Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, ‘Praefatio’, sig. a4v.}
\end{quote}

(with this chosen order having been seasoned with right and Christian opinions, and reformed both by the uncorrupted rule of antiquity, monarchs
should more soundly govern their subjects, ecclesiastical ministers more faithfully perform their charge, and the people execute their necessary offices more diligently, and the whole common wealth, will be able to breath more strongly, live and recover.)

In his reassessment of the historiography of humanism in mid-Tudor England, Warren Boutcher describes a methodological problem regarding the study of humane learning – that actual documentation of humanistic activity in private households, schools and colleges is relatively scant. Whilst the fact that an institutionalized arts course existed has been established, the evidence for it ‘does not tell us how this formal programme was informally interpreted and supplemented at the point of delivery and application, in personal, tutorial and advisory contexts’.¹⁴⁴ I suggest that Humphrey’s volume provides an informal interpretation of the arts course for private study at home, albeit one articulated by someone who would soon become part of the university establishment. That said, of course, new programmes of education often remained mere blue-prints and, as Bryson observes, many writers complained of the tendency of young gentlemen to continue to prefer hunting, gambling, drinking and fashion to the solid achievement of virtue and learning.¹⁴⁵

Humphrey’s adaptation of the formal arts course also highlights the major cultural movement towards social mobility, figured as ‘the crowding together of old nobility/gentry and old money, new nobility/gentry and new money, and the aspiring middling and poorer sorts’. Boutcher characterizes this development in

the mid-1550s as an ‘intensifying relationship between humane learning and the intimacies and fluid hierarchies of household service’. \(^{146}\)

Following the approaches recommended, for example, in Erasmus’s 1512 *De ratione studii*, Elyot’s 1531 *The Boke named the Governour*, and Sturm’s 1549 *Nobilitas literata*, Humphrey suggests the order in which young men are to be introduced to specific classical authors. In accordance with Quintilian’s vision of the *studia humanitatis* in Book X of his *Institutio Oratoria*, proficiency in grammar and rhetoric is to be followed by mastery in poetry, history and moral philosophy. \(^{147}\) He then extends and adapts the traditional humanist reading list. As he proposes specific scriptural and reformed works to supplement established works of classical antiquity within these genres, Humphrey offers a new curriculum for the godly, noble household. His advocacy of reformed writing situates the *Optimates* within a European movement whose reach into England is more usually associated with works such as Bale’s *Catalogus*. Humphrey’s *Optimates* evidences a cultural process that is both humanist and Protestant.

Starting with the most accessible forms of epistles and dialogues, Humphrey proposes that the conventional early reading of Cicero’s *Cato*, or *Laelius*, the popular textbook of manners in Latin rhyming couplets dating back to the third century, should be accompanied by colloquies written by Erasmus and by the contemporary German bible translator, Sebastian Castellio, ‘quae maxime pietatis & bonorum morum semina tenellis ingeniolis inserant’ (‘that they might especially sow the seeds of piety and virtue in their tender hearts’). \(^{148}\) Castellio’s *Dialogi sacri*, printed in 1543 in French and Latin, were biblical dialogues based
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on the Old and New Testaments, offering accounts of scriptural history from his reformed point of view.\footnote{Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer, ‘Catholic and Protestant Textbooks in Elementary Latin Conversation’, in Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe, ed. by Emidio Campi et al (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2008), pp. 341-73.}

In his dedicatory epistle to the dialogues, Castellio explains why he has chosen biblical material for introductory Latin classes. Both he and his predecessor at the Genevan Collège de Rive, Mathurin Cordier, were concerned that, when teaching elementary Latin, it had long been necessary to have recourse to books that were not conducive to religious instruction. Castellio mentions the works of the Roman playwright Terence, describing them as ‘sticky as pitch’ in their tenaciousness, texts ‘which either contributed almost nothing of benefit to religious discipline, or were even detrimental to it’.\footnote{Mahlmann-Bauer, ‘Catholic and Protestant Textbooks’, p. 366.} Castellio fears that, even when the primary focus is on the linguistic aspect of Terence, its morally equivocal content will inevitably stick in the minds of the students. Mahlmann-Bauer notes that Castellio probably alludes to Sturm’s Strasbourg gymnasium, where Terence’s comedies were included in the curriculum. As an alternative, Castellio offers his \textit{Dialogi sacri} to provide simultaneous training in both Latin conversation and proper moral conduct. He goes on to explain that his Latin translation is based on the original Greek text, and its sentence structure adapted to the native vernacular of the students. By following this vernacular word order, he acknowledges that his dialogues lack elegance. Castellio’s explanation recalls the multi-lingual exercises and attention to vernacular idiom set out by Humphrey in his \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}. 
It is striking, however, that Humphrey here follows his own recommendation of Castellio’s *Dialogi sacri* with that of Terence’s Latin comedies. Privileging the status of the ‘bonus praeceptor’, Humphrey asserts that the potentially corruptive influence of Terence can be mediated by the ‘faithful diligence of the teacher’, who will mitigate the risk of moral detriment by balancing the reading of Latin comedy with other books:

\[
\text{si quid insit obscoeni, fidelis diligentia boni praeceptoris medeatur: & aliiorum librorum lectio tanquam pharmacum pellat quicquid inest toxicum.}^{151}
\]

(if there is any obscenity within, let the faithful diligence of the good teacher remedy it, using other books as medicine to expel it.)

Humphrey further authorizes his inclusion of Terence, an author not recommended by Elyot for example, by citing Cicero’s appreciation of his literary style. The privileging of literary style over morally questionable content, he says, is a practice also authorized by Chrysostom with respect to Aristophanes. Despite his promotion of an educational programme that combines the study of profane and sacred works, Humphrey indicates an unwillingness to compromise the teaching of elegant classical style from the finest models. The contemporary works of reformed humanists such as Castellio do not provide the stylistic example that Humphrey’s pedagogical ambitions demand, but they do complement the classical material taught.

John Morgan suggests that Humphrey’s retention of classical authors such as Terence indicates his ‘insecurity about erecting a wholeheartedly Christian curriculum’. He argues that Humphrey perhaps ‘felt that, as yet, there was not a suitable vernacular godly literature to recommend’, and figures the next eighty

\[\text{151} \text{ Humphrey, *Optimates*, III, sig. y3}^{\text{r}}.\]
years of puritan effort as dedicated to filling that gap. However, Morgan’s characterization implies a divergence from classical literature that Humphrey does not propose in the *Optimates*. Humphrey consistently asserts the combined value and importance of both profane and sacred writing as he sums up the rationale behind his explicitly reformed and humanist education: ‘ita maiorum antiquam rationem imitabitur, & pie ac Christiane Nobilis efficietur’ (‘in this way he will imitate the ancient method of his ancestors, and become a godly and Christian noble’). Nicholas Carr, in his above-mentioned speech delivered at Cambridge at this time, alludes to a group within the University who consider theology to be the only subject worthy of study. He argues that the study of scriptural texts must take place by way of classical teaching in humanistic disciplines, emphasizing that these subjects have their own intrinsic contributions to make to the welfare of the commonwealth. The assertion of the combined importance of classical and scriptural works seems typical of this mid-Tudor moment.

Humphrey calls for the early study of Greek alongside Latin, and he recommends Joachim Camerarius’s *Arithmologia ethica*, a Greek grammar produced by the German theologian and recently printed at Basel. Between 1540 and 1560, instruction in Greek was not nearly as intensive and thorough as in Latin, and whilst Greek was taught in some grammar schools in England, it was only offered to the most able pupils in the higher forms, and then through the
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medium of Latin textbooks. As Humphrey introduces Camerarius’s manual to the English youth’s curriculum for the first time, he explains its value: ‘parvus liber, sed brevibus praecceptis magnam clare & numero doctrinam continet’ (‘the book is small, but it comprises great learning brilliantly expressed in brief precepts’).

Humphrey follows the Erasmian call for trilingual education by recommending that pupils learn Hebrew too, remarking that those universities, schools and teachers who oppose this study are ‘praepostere’ (‘backward’). Advocating the reading of Hebrew scripture at an early age, Humphrey iterates the call he made in the Interpretatio linguarum. His proposal for its instruction was, as we saw in Chapter Two, perhaps more realistic in the scholarly setting he found in Basel, and within Jewish communities on the Continent, than in England in 1560. Again Humphrey emphasizes the importance of ‘diligentis magistri fida & aperta & docta explicatio’ (‘the faithful, open and learned explication of a careful teacher’) for ‘his difficilioribus’ (‘these more troublesome studies’).

Humphrey claims authority for his educational programme generally by following Erasmus and Sturm in considering what the ancient nobility read. He cites a number of classical works not featured in Elyot’s curricular proposals, for example, Seneca’s tragedies and Plautus’ comedies, which he promotes as ‘propter rei & carminis & dictionis gravitatem lectione dignissimi’ (‘most worthy of reading on account of the verse and gravity of style’). In line with his distinctive adaptation of the classical curriculum, Humphrey’s recommendations
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for the study of Greek oratory position the traditional exemplars of Isocrates and Demosthenes alongside Christ and the apostles, ‘quorum scripta principem locum ac primum atque ultimatum teneant’ (‘whose writings occupy the first, last and chief place’).\textsuperscript{161}

Instruction in rhetoric and logic, described as necessary ‘ad exacuendum ingenium, et ad efformandam methodum’ (‘to sharpen the talk, whet the wit, and imprint order’), is to be given via the works of Aristotle, ‘dicendi & differendi magister’ (‘a teacher both of speaking and reasoning’). Maintaining his emphasis on the education of younger scholars, Humphrey suggests Erasmus’s \textit{Copia de verborum} as a necessary ‘praeludia’ (‘preamble’) to the \textit{Rhetoric}, to make the student’s speech ‘plenior et ornator’ (‘both more plenteous and pleasant’).\textsuperscript{162}

\textit{Knowledge of ‘words and matter’}

Summarizing his reading programme, Humphrey restates the distinction between knowledge of ‘words’ and ‘matter’, articulated before in his discussion of \textit{doctrina} in the \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}.\textsuperscript{163} The works he has cited already are to instruct the noble scholar in ‘verborum cognitionem’ (‘the knowledge of words’); next comes ‘rerum scientia’ (‘the knowledge of matter’).\textsuperscript{164} As he introduces each humanistic subject, Humphrey again suggests specific scriptural texts to be taught alongside classical or contemporary works. For example, for moral instruction, he says that the Greek speeches of Isocrates and the Latin works of Cicero and Erasmus should be introduced alongside Hebrew texts of Deuteronomy and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[161] Ibid. sigs y3\textsuperscript{v} - y3\textsuperscript{v}.
\item[162] Ibid. sig. y4\textsuperscript{v}.
\item[163] Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, I, sigs i7\textsuperscript{v} - m5\textsuperscript{v}.
\item[164] Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y4\textsuperscript{v}.
\end{footnotes}
Ecclesiastes, ‘ut ex illo legem ac mandata Dei, ex hoc vanitatem mundi discat, ineunte adolescentia’ (‘so that he learns, in early adolescence, about God’s law and commandments from the one, and about the world’s vanity from the other’).\textsuperscript{165} In addition to these, the young pupil is advised to get to know Solomon’s Proverbs and the Psalms. Humphrey is aware that he is reforming the reading list: ‘huius praecepti in pueritia educanda, quod novum fortassis videtur, sed inutile videri non debet’ (‘the teaching of this precept for the education of youth, while perhaps it seems new, yet ought not to seem without value’).\textsuperscript{166}

For the young man’s instruction ‘rei familiaris administrationem’ (‘in the matter of household administration’), or \textit{oeconomia}, Humphrey suggests that the scholar complements his reading of Xenophon and Aristotle with Paul’s Letters to the Ephesians and to Timothy. Humphrey’s scriptural recommendations implicitly offer a parallel to the times; these scriptural texts advocate resistance to false teachers and apostates, through the teaching of salvation by grace through faith.

As he cites ‘ea quae de Nobilitate scripta sunt’ (‘those who write about Nobility’), Humphrey follows Elyot in recommending Plutarch, and Erasmus’s \textit{De institutione principis Christiani}, and he supplements these with the more recent humanist treatise by Sturm, his 1549 \textit{Nobilitas literata}. Humphrey also cites the work he has translated and appended to the \textit{Optimates}, Philo’s \textit{De nobilitate}, and the above-mentioned treatises by Jeronimo Osório and Luca

\textsuperscript{165} Ibid. sig. y4r.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid. sigs y4v - y5r.
Gaurico. The young noble man is to read them ‘ut se in hac quasi tabula aspiciat’ (‘so that he may see himself as in a copy’).  

For the study of history, he recommends the Greek historians Plutarch, Appian and Thucydides. Works by the first-century Romano-Jewish historian Josephus, as well as the Old Testament books of Genesis, Exodus, Judges and Kings provide Hebrew material. Again, Humphrey’s Greek and Hebrew recommendations represent innovative proposals. Of the Roman historians he suggests Caesar, who is ‘non minus in narrandis bellis quam in gerendis laudatus’ (‘no less honoured for the narration than the achievement of his conquests’), and Livy. Here, Humphrey again extends the traditional humanist curriculum to accommodate the work of a recent reformist historian, as he recommends Johann Sleidan, the author of the official history of the German Protestant movement, whose work had been printed in 1555. The prolific Italian humanist historians, Paolo Giovio and Pietro Bembo, are also recommended reading. Humphrey emphasizes the need for the youth to remain well-informed about his own country’s history, ‘ne hospes sit in sua patria, cum foris peregrinetur non infeliciter’ (‘lest he become a stranger at home, as he travels pleasantly in foreign parts’).

In contrast with the educational programmes articulated by Elyot, in The Boke named the Governour, and by Sturm, in his suggested curriculum for the Werter brothers, Humphrey avoids specifying an appropriate age at which the student should encounter specific texts. This reflects, perhaps, the adaptable
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approach that would have been required for educating noble offspring in exile. Likewise, Humphrey refrains from detailing the amount of time to be spent on these studies. He explains that his recommendations are driven by practical demands, to help the youth acquire necessary skills: ‘quia Nobilem doceo, qui omnia non solet legere. Sed haec Nobilem hunc nostrum logicum efficient’ (‘since I teach a nobleman, who is not accustomed to read everything. But this shall make our noble a good reasoner’). Humphrey’s comment prefigures Hubert Languet’s advice to Philip Sidney, in suggesting that ‘education should be provided pragmatically to fit the student’s position in life, devoting what was only a ‘brief time’ to ‘the most necessary studies, by which he meant those things ‘which it is improper for men of high degree not to know, and which may both adorn and shield you in the future’.

Humphrey summarizes the practical exercises that underpin the programme of reading, requiring

\[ut\text{ in varias linguis transferat, orationes componat, epistolas scribat,}
\text{declamet, autores explicit, historias \& apophthegmata recitet, fabulas dilatet}\
\text{\& agat, gnomas ac proverbia lepidissima \& insigniora memoriter teneat.}\]

(that he translate into diverse languages, compose speeches, write letters, declaim, expound authors, recount histories and apophthegms, extend and amplify tales, learn rules and most pleasant and notable proverbs by rote.)

In delineating the pragmatic ends of his educational approach, Humphrey invokes the diplomatic and ambassadorial role that a nobleman will be expected to play:

\[formulas\ text{ quasdam loquendi, salutandi adventantes, excipiendi hospites,}
\text{legationes obeundi, gratias agendi, confabulandi in mensa, petendi, hortandi,}
\text{aliaque themata politica et utilia cognoscat, \& in numerato habeat.}\]

\footnote{170 Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y4'.}
\footnote{172 Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y6'.}
\footnote{173 Ibid. sig. y7'.}
(so that he knows, and has in ready store, phrases for speaking, for greeting all-comers, entertaining guests, and meeting ambassadors, giving thanks, conversing at table, for making demands, persuasions, and other politic and useful themes.)

Humphrey’s descriptions consistently emphasize both the pleasure derived from and the usefulness of each humanistic subject, the emphasis on the latter criterion often associated with the French reformer Ramus’s adaptations of the arts curriculum. Boutcher notes that European educational reforms at this time were taking into account growing demands for the acquisition of applied skills as well as more general ‘culture’.

Humphrey highlights the ‘fructum’ (‘satisfaction’) of mathematics, comprising arithmetic and geometry, and specifies its ‘utilitas’ (‘usefulness’), particularly in terms ‘ad aedificiorum situm ac structuram nonnihil adiumenti’ (‘of its means of help for the siting, framing, and construction of buildings’). Likewise, the study of geography is described as supplying both pleasure and profit and is contrasted with astrology, for which geography was sometimes a preparatory subject. Astrology provokes Humphrey’s censure on account that he sees it studied with disproportionate enthusiasm. He describes the subject as being so widely credited ‘ut Deo propemodum diffusi’ (‘as almost to discredit God’). Indicating an ambivalence about the relationship between religion and astrology, Humphrey says that he is not condemning the art, but nor does he want to promote a study that ‘satis ubique praeconum est’ (‘is everywhere sufficiently praised’).

---


175 Humphrey, Optimates, III, sig. y6r. 1559 had seen two popular almanacs of the famous French astrologer, Nostradamus, translated into English soon after their first publication in France.
Humphrey’s next reference, to works by Calvin, seems to have led T. W. Baldwin, in his survey of sixteenth-century education, to suggest that this reading programme is defined by a radical Calvinist perspective.\textsuperscript{176} It is notable, however, that Humphrey’s citation of Calvin’s works appears only with reference to the scholar’s private reading. After setting out his reformed humanist curriculum by subject, Humphrey refers to other writers, both Christian and pagan, who might be suitable ‘privatae lectioni’ (‘for choosing in private’). He says that he will pass over these examples, but not before citing Calvin’s \textit{Catechisms} and his \textit{Institutions of Christian Religion}, whose author he describes as ‘nostrae aetatis princeps’ (‘the chief of our age’). Humphrey also refers briefly to the availability of other commentaries, ‘in quibus & nostri & veteres multi excellunt’ (‘in which many writers of our time and of antiquity excel’).\textsuperscript{177}

Humphrey approaches this culmination of his innovative curriculum via the classical example of Alexander Severus, the third-century Roman Emperor, ‘qua brevi forma, nostrorum studiorum summa omnis comprehenditur’ (‘in which brief figure the whole sum of our studies is contained’).\textsuperscript{178} Taking his account from a late classical collection of biographies, the \textit{Scriptores historiae Augustae}, Humphrey depicts Severus as a model of studious devotion and an exemplary, well-informed leader.\textsuperscript{179} After describing the classical works that Severus studied, he recalls the anecdote in which he was said to share his most private space with

\textsuperscript{177} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y6\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{178} Ibid. sig. y6\textsuperscript{v}.
his favoured, personified authors – in this case literal representations in small statue or pictorial form:

Is enim a nostra religione prorsus non abhorruit, sed in larario ac secretiore adyto praetere Alexandraum Magnum, & Apollonium, Christi etiam simulacrum habuit, & Abrahamum.\footnote{Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y6v.}

(For he was not altogether averse to our religion, but in his private closet and secret chancel, besides the image of Alexander the Great and Apollonius, he also had that of Christ and Abraham.)

Severus is depicted as a learned scholar whose studious proficiency culminates in his making his own approach to Christianity in private. Humphrey’s recommendation for the scholar’s private reading of religious texts suggests an educational programme in line with that seen in the school curricula of Johann Sturm, the German reformer. Sturm’s curricular recommendations omit reference to the reading of catechisms at school:

Although Protestant piety was, with classical learning, a goal of education, humanism was not sacrificed to religious indoctrination; for Sturm, like other pre-Reformation humanists, regarded pagan wisdom as a harbinger of rather than a challenge to Christian morality.\footnote{Barbara Sher Tinsley, ‘Johann Sturm’s Method for Humanist Pedagogy’, \textit{Sixteenth Century Journal}, 20:1 (1989), 23-40 (p. 23).}

In resisting promoting confessional material in the scholar’s tutored reading, Humphrey indicates an approach to reformed humanist education in line with Sturm’s ethos. In his 1549 \textit{Nobilitas literata}, Sturm wrote, ‘\[r\]eligio enim sanctam, & eloquentia iucundam, & ambae coniunctae salutarem efficiunt hominum inter se societatem’ (‘religion makes the society of men holy, and eloquence makes it pleasant, and both joined together cause it to be wholesome’).\footnote{Johann Sturm, \textit{Ad Werteros fratres, Nobilitas literata} (Strasbourg: Rihelius, 1549), sig. B7v.} According to Humphrey, the combination of classical and
scriptural works will provide an education in style and content – the ‘knowledge of words’ and the ‘knowledge of matter’.

Humphrey indicates the goal of his reformed curriculum in what he terms a ‘colophon’, an end-note to his printed text. Having distinguished the noble scholar’s private study of devotional texts from the mainstream humanist curriculum followed with his tutor, Humphrey proposes that he ‘sit in tota via & in omnia studiorum genere Theologum’ (‘should be in his whole life and in every kind of study a theologian’). Humphrey articulates his ambition that, just as in antiquity, the ‘caput artium atque arcem studiorum’ (‘end of education and the castle of knowledge’), was philosophy,

sic ego in hoc cursu studiorum, quem Nobilis meus conficit, cum initia ac carcares ubi incipiat, tum metam ad quam tendat, volo esse Theologiam.183

(so in this course of studies, which my nobleman fulfils, I want theology to be the beginning and the starting point from where he sets off, and the end for which he strives.)

The scholar’s education, initiated through this mainstream humanist curriculum – one adapted to combine classical with scriptural and recent works of reformed scholarship – under the care of a diligent and faithful tutor, culminates in theological fulfilment. This will enable him to fulfil his office of nobility: ‘to administer scrupulously, with others, his spiritual duties to the church, and his civil duties towards each and every one’.

**Conclusion**

Humphrey’s written works locate him within the movement of reformed humanism, prior even to his appointment to a university position. He argues that a

183 Humphrey *Optimates*, III, sig. y7r.
serious and informed Christian piety should be developed amongst the landed classes through a highly specific programme of humanist education within the noble household. Humphrey’s perspective as an outsider again shapes works that are addressed from a specific situation to a nation perceived to be in crisis. He expresses the values of those returning from their positions in exile to reform their country educationally, politically and religiously. As in the *De religionis conservatione*, Humphrey, in the *Optimates*, addresses an audience of elite men, instructing them in their rights and responsibilities in the godly commonwealth. Strong statements regarding the power of the printed book challenge the space occupied by individual advisers, as Humphrey suggests that carefully chosen printed texts have the potential to present a more honest and objective form of advice.

Humphrey constructs the image of the godly nobleman through his exploration of duties and virtues. His description of the ways in which the nobility might exercise the virtue of *liberalitas* towards the learned Marian exiles anticipates his own and his associates’ return to England, when many of them would seek positions as tutors in noble households. Humphrey balances his construction of the godly nobleman on the one hand, with a portrayal of the ideal ‘magister’, or ‘praeceptor’ on the other, and suggests their mutually beneficial relationship in both private and public terms. Guiding his charge through the best classical, scriptural and reformed writing, the tutor represents the ideal means by which the young noble can be brought to accomplish his ‘divina et humana officia’. In return, he is to receive financial support and literary patronage as he fulfils his own *vita activa*. Humphrey’s pedagogic discourse in the *Optimates*
extends the treatment in the *Interpretatio linguarum*. In the earlier work, he personifies the exemplary reformed text as the godly tutor or translator, working for the noble household, and offers himself as an exemplum in his godly instruction of Edward Stafford in Basel. In the *Optimates*, Humphrey extends his depiction of the ‘doctus piusque praeceptor’ to suggest the ideal form of education for young nobles in early Elizabethan England. The *Optimates* is explicitly addressed to the education of the landed elite in private homes, rather than that in a free or grammar school.

Humphrey’s work adapts the genre of courtesy books, of books on nobility, and presents the concept that reformed humanist learning can remedy an afflicted commonwealth. Patrick Collinson has described the ‘recruitment of the class of country gentry, or at least of a sizeable and energetic section, to a serious, informed puritan piety’ as ‘the most significant political achievement of the English Reformation, and one accomplished very largely in Elizabeth’s reign’.\(^{184}\) Whilst, by the 1560s, the process of recruiting country gentry to an informed puritan piety still had far to go, the *Optimates* reveals Humphrey’s involvement with this agenda. By drawing on and recommending humanist, as well as classical texts, he was already reflecting and reinforcing the images and legitimizations of noble status that were central to the humanist programme.\(^ {185}\) By the later sixteenth century, the distinguishing mark of the gentleman could be seen to be not only the possession of wealth and leisure, but the upbringing and inculcation of virtues required for government: ‘gentlemen were defined as governors, and

---

\(^{184}\) Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 54.

true gentility as the quality and capacity to govern’. The *Optimates* shows Humphrey setting the civic, humanist and religious virtues of the Protestant elite at the centre of his vision of the reformed commonwealth of England. By relating the classical traditions of Cicero and Quintilian to works of near-contemporary European examples, such as Osório and Gaurico, and by preceding better-known works on the same theme, the *Optimates* claims its position as a more central and pivotal text than has previously been acknowledged.

Humphrey’s reformed humanist programme balances secular and scriptural works for the nobleman’s moral and linguistic education. His citation of Protestant devotional works for private study suggests his ambition that the reformed humanist curriculum culminates in the noble scholar’s private study of theology. Addressing the fluid educational setting of the noble household, Humphrey’s informal interpretation of the arts course anticipates the flexible educational programmes that would be provided to sons of noble families at Magdalen College in the 1560s.

In the next chapter, Humphrey’s pedagogical ambitions for the education of the most influential stratum in society inform his return to England. I consider ways in which he puts his proposed educational agenda into action at Magdalen College and its school, and how the translated edition of his *Optimates* reveals the relevance of his writing beyond Oxford.

---

Chapter Four: ‘Wholly an Englishman’ – Humphrey’s return

Introduction

Humphrey chose not to return quickly to England and involve himself in the religious settlement of Elizabeth’s first Parliament, as many of his associates had. Instead, using the opportunities presented by international print culture, he worked in accordance with the view that the pen was his most effective weapon. His decision to remain in Basel through the first year of Elizabeth’s reign allowed him to articulate his hopes for England through purposeful, erudite and carefully directed printed works. He continued to be involved in writing, teaching, and seeing his and others’ work through two major presses.

Humphrey appears not to have been publicly involved in the controversies amongst English reformers in the Rhineland, nor to have undertaken an active role in the English congregation at Geneva (let alone become involved in the troubles at Frankfurt). Indeed his work from this time can be seen as characteristically conciliatory in its approach. His attempts to mitigate some of the damaging effects of more radical reformers on the Continent indicate Humphrey’s hopes for a unified church in England. The question of how to educate a nation for reform dominates Humphrey’s writing, which he directs towards the class of society that he considered had the most significant role to play.

Returning to occupy two of the most influential positions at Oxford University, Humphrey became closely involved with the intellectual endeavour and output that represented a highpoint of reformed Oxford humanism, supported

1 Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, passim; Garrett, The Marian Exiles, passim.
by the informal and formal patronage of England’s most influential statesmen and of his former associates in exile. At Magdalen College, with its recently established tradition of progressive reform, Humphrey was uniquely placed to offer personal and ideological support towards the young generation of Protestant nobles and sons of reformers. Humphrey took the opportunity to introduce his reformed pedagogical approach to the lay students who would be taking their places as magistrates, as well as to the next generation of clergy. He placed a new emphasis on the learning of Hebrew, and brought the study of rhetoric into a sharper collegiate focus. Surviving records of some of the students of this generation demonstrate how the statutory arts curriculum was interpreted specifically with reference to Humphrey’s reforming influence, and indicate that his work was being used informally more widely in the university.

The period from 1560 to the mid-1570s witnesses Humphrey’s involvement in carefully directed editions of patristic writers, rather than in the early Elizabethan exchanges of religious polemic. It also sees the vernacular translation of his treatise on nobility, a publication that coincides with the issue of the English edition of Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*. Both works are symbolic of the reformers’ calls for a wider education to reach those less proficient in the classical languages, for example, at the Inns of Court. The vernacular translation of Humphrey’s *Optimates* coincides with parliamentary calls for further educational reform through the free schools and the universities.

As Humphrey’s generation of reformers responded to demands for more radical changes within their church, they strove to present a united response to the Catholic challenge. Following his involvement in internal church controversy,
with regard to vestments and church ornaments, Humphrey can be seen to moderate his own views, reasserting himself at the centre of the church establishment. This is apparent above all in his 1573 publication of the *Vita Iuelli.*\(^2\) This work reveals the development of Humphrey’s pattern of reformed scholarship, first expressed in the *Interpretatio linguarum* with respect both to lay and church scholars, and then in the *Optimates* with respect to the godly noble. In the *Vita Iuelli,* we see Humphrey’s depiction of the life of one of England’s leading churchmen, a pedagogical exemplum for future generations of clergy.

**Educational crisis in England**

Jennifer Loach has suggested that the task of restoring doctrine and learning to Oxford was unattractive to most Protestants who had fled under Mary’s reign. She characterizes the leading intellectuals at Oxford throughout the first two decades of Elizabeth’s reign as being ‘involved either in discreet self-preservation or the defence of the 1559 settlement against catholic jibes’\(^3\) For those who had enjoyed the stimulating and productive scholarly environments of the Rhineland, the contrast they found at Oxford was striking. John Jewel, writing to his friend and former fellow exile at Strasbourg, Peter Martyr, in March 1559, noted:

> Oxonii a tuo discessu duae praeclarae virtutes incredibiliter auctae sunt, inscitia et contumacia: religio et spes omnis literarum atque ingeniorum funditus perit.\(^4\)

---


\(^3\) Loach, ‘Reformation Controversies’, p. 383.

(two famous virtues, namely ignorance and obstinacy, have wonderfully increased at Oxford since you left it: religion and all hope of learning and talent is altogether abandoned.)

A month later he complained of ‘interim de scholis, et cura literarum magnum ubique silentium’ (‘a profound silence everywhere respecting schools and the encouragement of learning’). In May 1559, John Parkhurst, who himself had attended Magdalen College School, advised Heinrich Bullinger against sending his son ‘ob ingenii cultum capessendum, ad Academiam Oxoniensem’ (‘to improve his education at the University of Oxford’), explaining ‘nam adhuc spelunca est tenebrarum, tenebrionum, latronum’ (‘it is as yet a den of thieves, of dimness, and of those who hate the light’). He describes a setting where ‘pauci [...] evangelici, plurimi papistae’ (‘few evangelists [...] and many papists’) could be found. Parkhurst’s advice is reiterated by Jewel in the same month:

Academiae nostrae ita afflictae sunt et perditae, ut Oxonii vix duo sint, qui nobiscum sentiant, et illi ipsi ita abiciet et fracti, ut nihil possint. [...] Vix credas tantam vastatatem afferri tam parvo tempore. [...] tamen non possum esse auctor hoc tempore, ut iuvenes vestros aut literarum aut religionis causa ad nos mittatis, nisi eosdem remitti velitis ad vos impios et barbaros.7

(Our universities are so depressed and ruined, that at Oxford there are scarcely two individuals who think with us. [...] You would scarcely believe that so much desolation could have been effected in so short a time. [...] I cannot at this time recommend you to send your young men to us, either for the sake of learning or religion, unless you would have them sent back to you wicked and barbarous.)

One year later, in May 1560, another letter from Jewel to Martyr expresses his ongoing frustration at the lack of progress at the universities, complaining that

---

Oxford in particular is ‘sine bonis literis, sine lectoribus, sine studio ullo pietatis’ (‘without learning, without lectures, without any regard to godliness’). Ten days later, confirming the failure of plans for Martyr to return to Oxford, Jewel further laments, ‘interea tamen ibi omnia ruunt et pessum eunt: collegia enim nunc illa plena puerorum sunt, inanissima literarum’ (‘everything there is falling into ruin and decay; for the colleges are now filled with mere boys, and completely empty of learning’).

In a letter to John Foxe three months later, Humphrey captures in rueful tone what he had found in England:

Ego totus Anglus iam factus sum, meipsi profecto defetiscor: ita otio in dies consenesco postquam hoc infelix et desidiosus solus Anglicus attigi.

(I have now become wholly an Englishman, and certainly am becoming weary myself; day by day I grow old in idleness, ever since I touched this unhappy and indolent English soil.)

Whilst Elizabeth's accession had been greeted with euphoria in evangelical quarters, ‘it soon became plain that there was to be no return to the hectic drive for further reform that had marked Edward VI's last months’. The reformers’ disappointment at what they found in Oxford echoes the concerns expressed in Cecil’s ‘Considerations to Elizabeth’s first Parliament’, specifically with regard to education. In his (unsuccessful) call for the formal requirement of university education for the upper nobility, alongside support for university education of the ‘poorer sort’, Cecil recorded:

---

that an ordinance be made to bind the nobility to bring up their children in learning at some university in England or beyond the sea from the age of twelve to eighteen at least; and that one-third of all the free scholarships at the universities be filled by the poorer sort of gentlemen's sons.12

Humphrey as Magdalen College President

There is no reference to Humphrey’s return to Oxford University until his appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity in 1560, this position having been held open for more than a year as Bedford attempted to arrange Peter Martyr’s return.13 John Mason, the diplomat and Privy Councillor who had been Chancellor of Oxford University prior to Mary’s accession, had been re-elected to the position in 1559. By late 1561, however, the resistance of the University to the agenda of religious reform was still of major concern. In his Visitation of the university that year, the Bishop of Winchester, Robert Horne, had found three of his four colleges – New College, Trinity and Corpus Christi – still largely hostile to the Elizabethan church. In contrast, Horne reported that he found Magdalen College ‘conformable’, although his description is somewhat at odds with the recorded refusal of its incumbent President, Thomas Coveney, to leave Magdalen College after being deprived of his office by Horne as Visitor. Coveney’s appeal to Elizabeth that he should be allowed to stay on as President was unsuccessful.14

Perhaps responding to Humphrey’s direct appeal for patronage in the De religionis conservatione, Bedford soon exerted his influence on Humphrey’s

13 Anderson, ‘Vista Tigurina: Peter Martyr and European Reform’, p. 183, explains Martyr’s decision to remain in Zurich where ‘in the midst of its community of scholars he could monitor both England and Poland’.
behalf. In his capacity as High Steward of Oxford, Bedford wrote to Cecil, setting out his support for Horne’s dismissal of Coveney and recommending Humphrey for the position of President of Magdalen College.15 He enclosed a letter written by Richard Chambers, in which Chambers suggested that ‘the Queen’s special letters may be obtained for Mr. Humphrey to be directed to the Fellows’, with reference to the problem of Humphrey’s no longer holding a fellowship there. Bishop Horne also wrote to the fellows telling them to proceed to the election. As we have seen, Horne, Russell and Chambers had been fellow exiles, and all are known to have been in Geneva in 1558 when Humphrey was there. After an initial problematic round of voting, and despite the three other candidates for the presidency being men of higher standing in the college, Humphrey was, in the next round, elected unanimously.16 He took office as President of Magdalen College in December that same year. In response to the religious tensions surrounding the new Elizabethan settlement, and in recognition of the increasingly important role the universities held in educating a reformed clergy, government involvement in university affairs had greatly increased.

The Master of Magdalen School at this time was Thomas Cooper, the Oxford pedagogue who, on Elizabeth’s accession, had resumed his former position. In the Interpretatio linguarum, Humphrey celebrates his colleague’s intellectual impact and achievements as ‘interpres felicissimus’ (‘a most fruitful

16 The three other candidates were Thomas Bickley, John Mullins and Michael Reneger. Bickley had been Dean of Divinity in 1551 and Vice-President of Magdalen College in 1553; Mullins had been Dean of Divinity in 1553; Reneger had been lecturer in Natural Philosophy in 1551. Both Mullins and Reneger had been fellow exiles with Humphrey (and Chambers), being co-signatories of a letter to the Magistrates of Zurich requesting protection in exile. Williams, ‘Elizabethan Oxford: State, Church and University’, pp. 406-7.
translator’), work that included his revised edition of Thomas Elyot’s Latin-English dictionary.¹⁷

Occupying the most influential position within the college at Oxford most associated with reformist activity, Humphrey was now ideally situated to work towards fulfilling the educational ambitions expressed in his recent *Optimates*:

> qui Nobilem vel doctiore, vel meliorem facit, hoc profecto agit, non et unus aut pauci saniores reddantur, sed ut multi ac respublica melius valeat, & integre habeat. ¹⁸

(whoever makes a nobleman a more learned or a better man is able to bring about not that only one or a few can become more healthy, but that many, indeed, the whole Commonwealth, may be the better and more sound.)

As Kearney observed, ‘for thirty years from 1560 the figure of Laurence Humphrey dominated Oxford life and with him the social ideal of the godly gentleman’.¹⁹

There is evidence that Humphrey attracted to Magdalen College and its school a number of scholars whose families had come to know him in exile. In 1560 the wealthy merchant John Bodley was bringing into print the first edition of the ‘remarkable, accurate, informative, forward-looking’ Geneva Bible, its first edition welcomed into England under the authority of a special licence from Queen Elizabeth.²⁰ His son, Thomas Bodley, recorded that ‘it was not long after, that I was sent away from thence [Geneva] to the University of Oxford, recommended to the teaching and tuition of Doctour Humfrey, who was shortly after chosen the chiefe Reader in Divinity, and President of Magdalen Colledge;

---

¹⁷ Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum*, III, sigs L7v - L8r.
¹⁸ Humphrey, *Optimates*, I, sig. c4v.
²⁰ Daniell, *The Bible in English*, p. 347.
there I followed my studies. Thomas Bodley became an exceptional Hebrew scholar, his early education in Geneva having afforded him the opportunity to attend the lectures of leading Continental scholars such as Anthony Chevalier, Philip Beroaldus, Jean Calvin and Theodore Beza. Humphrey’s own involvement in Bodley’s scholarly achievements, and specifically his exhortations towards the collection, preservation, and scholarly examination of recently re-discovered texts, could be seen to have exercised lasting influence on his protégé. After distinguished university and diplomatic careers, Thomas Bodley would go on to establish the nation’s leading library by the end of the sixteenth century.

Irena Backus has suggested that Humphrey was also responsible for placing another of the offspring of the Geneva Bible translators at Magdalen College, Anthony Gilby’s son. This was likely the eldest son, Goddred, who had been in Geneva during the exile period. In 1561, Goddred published English translations of Cicero and Calvin, although his promising scholarship for the Protestant cause was cut short by his death that same year. Lawrence Tomson, best known for his English translation of L’Oiseleur’s edition of Beza’s Latin New Testament and translations of Calvin’s sermons, is also recorded as attending Magdalen College at this time. His later correspondence with Anthony Gilby and Francis Hastings indicates the shared religious affinities they are likely

---

to have developed at Magdalen.\textsuperscript{25} New research indicates the attendance of sixteen-year-old Buckinghamshire scholar Edward Purefoy. Registered as a demy at Magdalen in 1570, he was the son of Humphrey’s former Magdalen associate and fellow Marian exile, Luke Purefoy.\textsuperscript{26} Magdalen College evidently proved an opportune setting for the reinforcement of networks established in the Marian exile.

Whilst the incomplete nature of the Magdalen College registers makes it difficult to identify these individuals with certainty, a number of sons of Protestant gentlemen can be associated with Humphrey’s pedagogical influence. All four of the Earl of Bedford’s sons came under Humphrey’s tutelage at Magdalen College, before continuing their education in extended travels through Europe, as was conventional.\textsuperscript{27} Both Francis and William Hastings, the younger brothers of Henry, third Earl of Huntingdon, were entrusted to Humphrey’s care at Magdalen College, indicating their family’s enduring commitment to Protestant learning. William joined Magdalen School in 1561, before proceeding to the College as a demy in 1567.\textsuperscript{28} He would become an erudite theologian and one of the most reliable political supports for the puritan ministers in Parliament throughout the Midlands and in Somerset. Francis Hastings proceeded to Gray’s


\textsuperscript{27} J. H. Wiffen, \textit{Historical Memoirs of the House of Russell}, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1833), 1, 506, notes ‘of William, the fourth son of the earl, it will be sufficient for the present to observe, that after leaving Magdalen College, Oxford, where he was educated, with his brothers, ‘at the feet of that excellent divine, Dr. Humphreys’, he spent some years in his travels, through France, Germany, Italy, and Hungary’.

\textsuperscript{28} Bloxham, \textit{Magdalen College Register}, 4, passim.
Inn after his time at Oxford. Granted the manor of Market Bosworth in Leicestershire by his brother Henry, Francis would become very closely associated with Anthony Gilby, Humphrey’s friend and the preacher who had received preferment from the Earl of Huntingdon at Ashby-de-la-Zouch. With Huntingdon’s patronage, Ashby Grammar School was established in the 1560s, gaining a reputation as one of the leading centres of reformed learning, its statutes requiring the reading of Calvin’s *Catechism* and Castello’s *Dialogi sacri*. It is thought likely that Anthony Gilby was the school’s first master.

Henry Cotton, the fourth son of Sir Richard Cotton, attended Magdalen College from 1566. He graduated B.A. in 1569, proceeding M.A. in 1572, and was appointed Bishop of Salisbury in 1599. Charles Merbury, who is recorded as taking his B.A. in 1570, refers to his being tutored at Oxford by Laurence Humphrey. Whilst Merbury’s name does not appear in any of Bloxham’s registers, other biographical records suggest he studied at Magdalen College in the late 1560s and early 1570s. He is recorded as entering Grey’s Inn in 1571.

Statutory regulations required the gathering of matriculation records across the university for the first time in 1565, a response in part to the government’s concerns regarding those who opposed the Reform and its

---

32 Charles Merbury, *A briefe discourse of royall monarchoie, as of the best common weale: Wherein the subject may behold the sacred Majestie of the Princes most Royall Estate* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1581), sig.*3r.
influence at the Oxford colleges.\textsuperscript{34} Whilst the perceived increase in the numbers of gentlemen attending the universities from the mid-Elizabethan years onwards is to an extent an illusion created by the introduction of these matriculation registers, the impression that there was a real influx of prosperous commoners at this stage seems well-evidenced.\textsuperscript{35} With this caveat, McConica, in a study of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, has demonstrated the pattern of steady recruiting to the foundation from landed families that took place through these decades.\textsuperscript{36} Although wealth and heredity continued to be the basis of aristocratic dominance in society, changing cultural values meant that more of the English nobility were choosing to send their sons to the universities and the Inns of Court, following some time spent at grammar school or its private household equivalent. In 1565, when in the midst of the ‘vestiarian controversy’, Humphrey appealed ‘to be spared of the extremity of losing his living’ and, according to Archbishop Parker, cited his commitment to ‘divers noblemen’s sons’ as his reason for not appearing in London to answer for his nonconformity.\textsuperscript{37} This indicates as typical the level of responsibility held by tutors towards these young noblemen.

Humphrey’s influence on the intake of scholars at Magdalen School is also notable. Between 1564 and 1591, the period of Humphrey’s presidency, the average age of appointment for choristers increased from eleven and two-thirds to fifteen and a half years, and the average age of resignation increased from fifteen and three-quarters to twenty years. From this data, Stanier has concluded that, on

\textsuperscript{34} McConica, ‘The Collegiate Society’, p. 730.
\textsuperscript{35} Heal and Holmes, \textit{The Gentry in England and Wales}, p. 263.
\textsuperscript{36} McConica, ‘The Collegiate Society’, p. 690.
Humphrey’s demand, the endowments of the choristers were being used not so much to provide skilled young musicians, but to open more gateways for older scholars – presumably the ‘poorer sort of gentlemen’s sons’ cited in Cecil’s ‘Considerations to Parliament’. Stanier notes that the change in intake was not a gradual one, again suggesting Humphrey’s decisive intervention. In the years 1561 to 1563, twenty of the twenty-seven demies appointed were not yet sixteen years old; from 1564 to 1569, of the thirty-six demies appointed, only three were under sixteen, and eighteen were seventeen years old or more. Whilst the early collection of statutory records is patchy, Cooper’s Visitation as Bishop of Winchester in 1585 also shows that at Magdalen College for the period that Humphrey was President, both commoners and battelars were admitted far in excess of the number statutorily allowed, admissions for which Humphrey was responsible. This seems to have been one way in which Humphrey responded to the decline in standards that had so dismayed the returning exiles on finding the colleges ‘filled with mere boys, and completely empty of learning’.

Humphrey’s recruitment of pupils was not limited to his English associates. Amongst the large number of Humphrey’s protégés were the sons of those German and Swiss reformers who had developed close relationships with the English during exile. The arrival of these scholars meant the English reformers could reciprocate some of the hospitality they had received on the Continent. Rudolph Gualter the younger describes the material support he received from Humphrey, in a letter written to his relative Josiah Simler from Magdalen College:

38 Stanier, *Magdalen School*, p. 94, notes that under President Bond, who succeeded Humphrey, the age of appointment dropped back to eleven or twelve years.
Inter omnes tamen elucet singularis D. Humfredi et Coli benevolentia [...] D. Parkhurustus enim me ita Humfredo commendavit, ut omnes sumtus mihi conferat, ab ipso recepturus: unde sine ulla patris expensa hic posthac vivere possum, quod hactenus ob sumtuum incertitudinem fieri non potuit’.  

(The special kindness of Masters Humphrey and Cole outshines all the rest [...] Master Parkhurst has so recommended me to Humphrey that he has taken upon himself the charge of all my expenses, which he is to receive from him again, so that from now on I shall be able to reside here without any cost to my father, which I have until now been unable to do on account of the uncertainty of my expenses.)

Humphrey was also responsible for the placing of Swiss Protestant students at Broadgates Hall. These included Wolfgang Musculus, the grandson of the distinguished reformist commentator who had offered Humphrey hospitality in Berne.  

According to seventeenth-century historian, Anthony Wood, at this time Humphrey ‘did [...] stock his college with a generation of non-conformists’, sewed the seeds of Calvinism, and showed such zeal against the Catholics that he earned the epithet ‘papistomastix’ (‘scourge of the papists’). Wood’s description has perhaps informed the enduring reputation of Magdalen College in these years as a ‘Puritan seminary’, a characterization that fails to reflect the broad range of scholars who came under Humphrey’s pedagogical care. In fact, the presence of the sons of Swiss reformers appears to have consolidated the influential relationships with Humphrey’s former associates in exile, and it was these men

---

42 Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, I, sig. 2N4’.
who urged moderation and advised against schism in Humphrey’s response to the ‘vestiarian controversy’.⁴⁴

Also attracted to the College under Humphrey were some of the offspring of former Magdalen fellows who had attended during Edward VI’s reign. Amongst this cohort is Francis Perrot, the thirteenth child of Simon Perrot, a former fellow of Magdalen College, recorded as demy in 1577. Bloxham notes that Francis Perrot was the godson of Sir Francis Hastings and of Laurence Humphrey’s wife Joan, a relationship that further points to Humphrey’s likely association with Hastings’s programmes of reformed education in Leicestershire.⁴⁵

The needs of such a diverse group of scholars required an adaptable approach to education, and as we shall see in the Conclusion to this thesis, there is evidence to suggest that Humphrey supported a flexible interpretation of the arts curriculum. Some scholars proceeded to degrees after receiving rigorous training in disputation and a widening humanist curriculum, whilst others, either belonging or in attendance to the noble class, would spend a much shorter period of study, perhaps followed by a time abroad, or at one of the Inns of Court. Humphrey’s pupils at this time evidently comprised a range of young men, including those who would formerly have been expected to be educated in noble households, the sons of the ‘middling sort’ of gentry, (many of whom would themselves go on to teach), as well as the next generation of clergy.

With the returning reformers’ emphasis on the importance of preaching, Humphrey made adaptations to the College chapel that would afford greater

⁴⁴ The Zurich Letters, Second Series, passim.
⁴⁵ Bloxham, Magdalen College Register, 4, 403.
opportunity for edifying messages to be delivered from the pulpit. Magdalen College accounts demonstrate the haste with which Humphrey removed ‘idolatrous’ artefacts from the college, including his selling of plate and vestments acquired during Mary’s reign, the removal of niches for sculptural figures in the chapel, and other acts to ‘cleanse’ the chapel of its furnishings.\textsuperscript{46}

As the first married President of the College, Humphrey also aroused controversy when he installed seats in the chapel for his wife and family in 1562. This symbolic assertion of the ‘communal and public nature of marriage’ was Humphrey’s response to the drive that had seen clerical marriage as a state entailing deprivation of benefices under Queen Mary, and a controversial issue throughout the Henrician and Edwardian reigns.\textsuperscript{47} In August 1561, Queen Elizabeth’s injunction prevented married clerics from living with their wives and families on college or cathedral grounds. As President, Humphrey made additions or improvements to his lodgings between 1562 and 1563 and again in 1568, although it is not clear what the specific nature of the accommodation for his wife comprised.\textsuperscript{48} Bjorklund has shown how the publication in 1567 of Matthew Parker’s \textit{A Defence of priestes mariages} (amongst other treatises that drew on scriptural and patristic scholarship in support of clerical marriage), indicated ways in which reformers continued to engage in this controversy during the early years of Humphrey’s presidency.\textsuperscript{49}
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In what can be seen as a direct response to the educational requirements expressed in his *Interpretatio linguarum* six years earlier, Humphrey instituted two additional lectureships at Magdalen College, the first in Hebrew and the second in Rhetoric. These appointments were no doubt influenced by the time he had spent in Zurich, in the company of such Hebraists as Bullinger, Bibliander, Pellican, and Martyr, and as would be expected, the appointees for these posts were strong supporters of the Reform. Thomas Kingsmill, who came from a staunchly Protestant Hampshire family, held the Hebrew lectureship from 1565 until 1569, when he resigned to take up the Regius Chair. Next, Thomas Brasbridge, a scholar of divinity and medicine, and a pupil of Peter Morwen, Humphrey’s fellow exile in Zurich, took on the vacant position of Hebrew lecturer for one year. At Humphrey’s instigation, the young Flemish Protestant divine John Drusius was employed at Magdalen College from 1572 to teach Syriac, Aramaic and Hebrew. McConica has noted that various lectureships from this time onwards supplied Magdalen College with a range of teaching unequalled in Oxford (apart from Christ Church, perhaps); a provision he acknowledges to be one of Humphrey’s achievements as President. Magdalen was the only Oxford college in the sixteenth century to support so serious a study of languages.

---

50 McConica, ‘The Rise of the Undergraduate College’, p. 56.
51 Taught Hebrew by Drusius, Thomas Bodley contributed Hebrew verse in 1573 to Humphrey’s *Vita Iuelli*, sig. 2N4r.
52 McConica, ‘The Rise of the Undergraduate College’, p. 56.
‘Due thanks on hym that first wrate such a worke’

Humphrey’s prominence in England’s educational landscape in the early 1560s is further indicated by the publication of the first translation into English of his Optimates in 1563. Dedicated to the gentlemen of the Inns of Court, this edition was issued with the title: The Nobles or Of Nobilitye: the original nature, dutyes, right, and Christian institution thereof three bookes.\footnote{The Nobles or Of Nobility: the original nature, duties, right, and Christian institution thereof three books. Fyrste eloquentlye writte in Latine by Lawrence Humfrey (London: Thomas Marsh, 1563). Cited from here as The Nobles.} It was printed in London by Thomas Marsh in the same year that Marsh published a second edition of the controversial and previously censored A Mirrour for Magistrates, a work that had encouraged evangelical Protestants following the collapse of the Edwardian reformation, and expressed opposition to the political courses of action in which Marian magistrates were engaged.\footnote{Scott C. Lucas, A Mirror for Magistrates and the Politics of the English Reformation (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009), p. 135.} Knappen characterized The Nobles as a work that sought the participation in the Reformation of the emerging class of landed Protestants.\footnote{Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 177.} It is evident why an English translation of Humphrey’s work would have been considered a useful gift to the gentlemen of the Inns of Court. Offering a combination of intellectual training and social opportunity, the Inns of Court represented an attractive route after, or as an alternative to, university education.\footnote{Heal and Holmes, The Gentry in England, p. 272; Jayne Elisabeth Archer, ‘Education, religion, politics, and the law at the early modern Inns of Court’, in The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court, ed. by J. E. Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 25-31.}

Familiarity with the language and conventions of the common law was an increasingly important element in the education of many young men.

As we saw in Chapter Three, Humphrey’s work sets out in detail his proposal, now offered in the vernacular for those lacking a thorough grounding in
Latin, that the class of English gentry, ‘this chosen order’, might be ‘seasoned wyth right and christian opinions, & reformed by the uncorrupted squier of antiquity’. The translation is dedicated ‘to the ryghte honourable and worshipfull [sic] of the Inner Temple’, young men who were likely to have received some earlier education from tutors within private households, or at one of the grammar schools, or briefly at university, before proceeding to one of the Inns of Court. A prefatory verse offers the translator’s rather arch opinion that their lack of application to Latin prevents these gentlemen from reading Humphrey’s work in the original:

Yf thou lasye yet neglect the payne |
To Latium hence to travayle, there to see: |
Embrace at home yet as he best deserveth.

The publication of Humphrey’s work in the vernacular situates it in an emerging pattern of English editions and prefatory verses that offered pedagogical services to the ‘unlatined’. Nicholas Grimald had written in the preface to his 1556 vernacular edition of Cicero’s De officiis, that he wanted his translation ‘used but of fewe, to wax common to a great meany’ so that Englishmen might compete with other nations in ‘civilitie and humanitie’. As we saw in the previous chapter, both The Nobles and Humphrey’s original Latin edition preceded better-known works of Protestant apologetic, for example, Thomas Smith’s De republica Anglorum.

There is no evidence that Humphrey himself was involved in seeing the English edition through the press. In fact, given Humphrey’s standing in 1563, it

59 Ibid. sig. B4r.
60 Ibid. sig. C4v.
61 Nicholas Grimald, Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bokes of duties, to Marcus his sonne, turned out of Latine into English (London: Tottel, 1556), sig. C3r.
is likely that the printer Thomas Marsh would have referred in print to any participation that the original author had in its translation or issue. Humphrey’s name is given as the author of the original Latin Optimates, along with mention of the distinguished positions he now occupied at the University: ‘D. of Diuinity, and presidente of Magdaleine Colledge in Oxforde’. Within the work, the title of the first volume also suggests that someone other than Humphrey had translated it, introducing the work as ‘D.HUMFREYES fyrste Booke of Nobilitye’. Three liminary verses preface the translated edition, which is dedicated to the gentlemen of the Inner Temple. One of the verses is headed by the initials ‘A.B.’. Vergil Heltzel convincingly suggests the identity of this writer as Arthur Broke, himself a member of the Inner Temple. The ODNB entry for Broke does not refer to any involvement in the translated edition of Humphrey’s work, but notes his admission to the Inner Temple, ‘in an essentially honorary capacity’. The ‘Renaissance Cultural Crossroads’ project records only Broke’s 1562 English translation of The Tragicall History of Romeus and Juliet. However, his involvement in other reformed works is evident in the English

64 McLaren, ‘Reading Sir Thomas Smith’s De Republica Anglorum’, p. 929, is mistaken in stating that Humphrey’s 1560 Optimates sive de Nobilitate was ‘dedicated both to the queen and to the Christian Gentlemen of the Inner Temple’. The latter group is addressed only within the translated edition of The Nobles.
65 Virgil B. Heltzel, ‘A Poem by Arthur Broke’, Shakespeare Quarterly, 22:1 (Winter, 1971), 77-78. I have not been able to identify the V.P. who contributes the second liminary verse. The first verse appears to have been written by the translator of the work, who leaves no initials.
translation he made of an anonymous Huguenot scriptural work.\textsuperscript{68} This, and his prefatory verse in \textit{The Nobles} were printed posthumously.\textsuperscript{69} In the commendatory sonnet that prefaces \textit{The Nobles}, Broke suggests:

\begin{quote}
Due thanks on hym that first wrate such a worke |
And hym that nold in Latin let it lurcke.\textsuperscript{70}
\end{quote}

Broke’s verse supports the argument that separate men had been involved in the writing of the Latin and the translating of the English version of the \textit{Optimates}. His rhyming couplet implies that Humphrey, as ‘hym that first wrate such a worke’, had not also produced the translation. Broke’s couplet also suggests that he himself was not the translator of this work. Whilst the identity of the translator remains unknown, the English preface does indicate that he was ‘a Templar’ – like Broke, a member of the Inner Temple:

\begin{quote}
But, if lyke reason forde like lawe, sith sundrie Pamphlets soughte and found succour in ladyes lappes, in lordes armes, in the Queenes bosom: well maye a Templar hope, to roost in the Temple, under the rooffe of your honours and worshyppes names.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

It perhaps also explains the translator’s tone of amused criticism regarding his fellow Templars’ lack of proficiency in Latin.

Both McLaren and Shrank have worked on the assumption that Humphrey translated his own work into English in 1563.\textsuperscript{72} McLaren acknowledges only the 1563 edition, referring to it as ‘Laurence Humphrey’s 1563 work, \textit{Of Nobility}’, as if it were the original. Shrank repeats the error in a passing reference to Humphrey, writing that ‘in 1563, the year before Smith began compiling his \textit{De}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{68} The agreemmente of sondry places of scripture, seeming in shew to jarred, serving in stead of commentaryes, not onely for these, but others lyke, translated out of French and nowe fyrst publyshed by Arthure Broke (London: Harryson, 1563).
\textsuperscript{69} Heltzel, ‘A Poem by Arthur Broke’, p. 78; Andrew King, \textit{ODNB}, ‘Brooke, Arthur’.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{The Nobles}, ‘Preface’, sig. C4’.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid. sig. B3’.
\textsuperscript{72} McLaren, ‘Reading Sir Thomas Smith’s \textit{De Republica Anglorum}’, pp. 911-39.
republica Anglorum, Lawrence Humphrey published The Nobles, or Of Nobility’. Freeman, citing only the 1560 Latin edition of the Optimates, makes no reference at all to the 1563 translation in his account of Humphrey in the ODNB. However, like McLaren, he mistakenly transfers the dedicatees of the 1563 English edition, ‘the “Christian Gentlemen” of the Inner Temple’, to Humphrey’s 1560 Latin work.

The title page in the English edition of The Nobles makes the reason for this bibliographical confusion apparent. The text is introduced as:

Fyrste eloquentlye writte in Latine by Lawrence Humfrey D. of Divinity, and presidente of Magdaleine Colledge in Oxforde, late englised. Whereto for the readers commodititye [sic], and matters affinitie, is coupled the finall treatyse of Philo a Jewe. By the same author out of the Greeke Latined, nowe also Englished.

As we saw in Chapter Three, Philo’s treatise had been translated from its original Greek into Latin by Humphrey (‘the same author’), and printed (along with the Greek text) in his 1560 edition. That too had then been translated into English for the 1563 edition, although again this is unlikely to have been done by Laurence Humphrey.

The fact that Humphrey’s original text was written at least three years earlier than Shrank states, and from a somewhat different political context, perhaps leads us to question her interpretation of Humphrey’s own ‘objectives’ in the 1563 work. She suggests that it supplies evidence of a ‘reactionary note’ in

---

73 Shrank, Writing the Nation in Reformation England, p. 171.
74 Freeman, ODNB, ‘Humphrey, Laurence’.
76 The Nobles, sigs 2A1’ - 2A4’.
Humphrey, one which Smith’s 1565 *De republica Anglorum* in contrast ‘fails to strike’.77

What might, however, be more pertinent as a polemical context for the English translation of Humphrey’s *Optimates*, is the exchange concerning kingship and Protestant reformation that was being conducted by two of the leading Latin stylists in Europe, Walter Haddon and the now Bishop of Silva, the above-mentioned Osório da Fonseca. As we saw in Chapter Three, Osório, with his work on Christian nobility, *De nobilitate civili libri II, eiusdem de nobilitate Christiana libri III*, had been acclaimed in the mid-1550s as Portugal’s Sturm or Erasmus. However, in the three years between the publication of Humphrey’s Latin *Optimates* and its issue in the vernacular, Osório’s reputation in England had begun to shift. The developing controversy illustrates ways in which religio-political conflict was increasingly bound up with considerations of exemplary Latin style.

Having been widely acknowledged for his achievements in writing about civil nobility in the most elegant Ciceronian style, a ‘scriptor elegans et bonus’ in Humphrey’s words, Osório had now become a fly in the ointment of the English reformers. Léon Bourdon tracks this development through the Portuguese writer’s evolving friendship with Roger Ascham. In 1561, Ascham had been moved to send Osório a copy of the letter he had written to Cardinal Pole six years earlier, in which Ascham described Osório’s *De nobilitate* with fulsome praise, and included some excerpts for Cardinal Pole to appreciate. Osório replied in a long and equally courteous letter that Ascham’s encouragement had stimulated his

77 Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England*, p. 171.
desire to address a long letter to Queen Elizabeth, but that he suspected that she would not welcome his message kindly. His statement proved astute.\textsuperscript{78} In 1563, Osório published his promised Latin epistle, in which he urged Queen Elizabeth to return England to Catholicism. Having circulated freely around the English court in manuscript form, printed Latin editions of Osório’s letter appeared in the same year issued from presses in Louvain and Venice, and from Paris in Latin and French.\textsuperscript{79} Bourdon remarks that Osório’s letter ‘occupies a place at the forefront of religious polemic at the time of the Reformation, arousing a controversy which continued for many years and which historians of the Anglican church, even today, are unable to avoid echoing’.\textsuperscript{80} 

Walter Haddon, the eminent Cambridge scholar, former protégé of Thomas Smith, and (like his friend Ascham), former tutor to Queen Elizabeth, was the obvious candidate to respond to Osório’s polemical attack on the English church. Like Osório, Haddon was acknowledged as one of the most able Latinists of his day, well placed to address those ‘who are ensnared by Osorius’ facility of style and who can therefore be led into doctrinal error’.\textsuperscript{81} William Cecil commissioned Haddon’s refutation, and the resulting printed tract, \textit{Pro reformatione Anglicana epistola apologetica}, also appeared in French and

\textsuperscript{78} Bourdon, ‘Jerónimo Osório et les humanists anglais’, p. 271, hypothesizes that this suggests Osório’s spontaneous intention to write his polemical letter to Queen Elizabeth, rather than its later instigation by the cardinal-infant Dom Henrique.


\textsuperscript{80} L’épître d’Osório à Elizabeth occupa une place de tout premier plan dans la polémique religieuse du temps de la Réforme, suscitant une controverse qui se poursuivit pendant plusieurs années, et à laquelle les historiens de l’Eglise anglicane ne peuvent, aujourd’hui encore, se dispenser de faire écho’. Bourdon, ‘Jerónimo Osório’, pp. 272-73.

\textsuperscript{81} Binns, \textit{Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England}, pp. 272-76 (p. 276).
English in the same year. Haddon would be engaged in this controversy until his death in 1572.\textsuperscript{82}

Roger Ascham, in his posthumously printed \textit{The Scholemaster}, refers to the controversy stirred up by his former friend, making a rather plaintive request for Osório to find distraction in safer works of classical translation and ‘not to write anything of his owne for a while’:

If Osorius would leave of his lustines in striving against S. Austen, and his over rancke rayling against poore Luther, and the troth of Gods doctrine, and give his whole studie, not to write any thing of his owne for a while, but to translate Demosthenes, with so straite, fast & temperate a style in latine, as he is in Greeke, he would become so perfit and pure a writer, I beleve, as hath bene fewe or none sence Ciceroes dayes.\textsuperscript{83}

Mike Pincombe has revealed the resonance between Ascham’s criticism of Osório’s ‘lustines of nature’ and his characterization of Osório’s Roman Catholic religion and Latin style.\textsuperscript{84} Humphrey likewise refers to the potential threat represented by the celebrated stylist, ‘qui sibi musica luscinia videtur, dum adversus nostra Sacramenta, nostram Ecclesiam, nostram fidem, nostros proceres, ferales & funestas voces emittit’ (‘who himself seemed to be a musical nightingale, even as he let loose his deadly and destructive words against our sacraments, our Church, our faith, our leaders’).\textsuperscript{85} In listing the most celebrated Latin stylists of the sixteenth century a few years later, Gabriel Harvey acknowledges Osório’s renowned Ciceronian style, whilst also disparaging


\textsuperscript{83} Roger Ascham, \textit{The Scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to understand, write, and speake, the Latin tong} (London: John Day, 1570), sig. N4\textsuperscript{r}.

\textsuperscript{84} Mike Pincombe, \textit{Elizabethan Humanism: Literature and Learning in the later Sixteenth Century} (Harlow: Longman, 2001), pp. 73-75 (p. 74).

\textsuperscript{85} Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuelli}, ‘epistola nuncupatoria’, sig. *3′.
aspects of his rhetorical influence on young scholars.\textsuperscript{86} It is perhaps also worth noting here that, in his preface, Ascham describes the setting for the conception of \textit{The Scholemaster} (itself modelled on the mise en scène of Ciceronian dialogue), as an after-dinner discussion held in Cecil’s chamber in 1563, the year in which Osório’s letter was published.

These writers express the requirement of an education in Latin style aligned with acceptable religious opinion. The teacher’s exercise of ‘fidelis diligentia’ is the means by which he guides his reader through material that yields stylistic influence, whilst ensuring he resists any ‘damaging’ religio-moral stance. The practice recalls Humphrey’s advice regarding the teaching of Terence: ‘fidelis diligentia boni praeceptoris medeatur: & aliorum librorum lectio tanquam pharmacum pellat quicquid inest toxicum’, which the 1563 edition translates as, ‘let the trustie diligence of the teacher remedy it, usinge sounder authors, as tryacle to expelle it’.\textsuperscript{87} Crucially, however, it is now applied to recent writing by humanist Catholic reformers such as Osório. It is likely that the translated edition of Humphrey’s work, with its explicit emphasis on reforming the Christian nobility in England, represents the deployment of one of these ‘sounder authors’ in a timely response to Osório’s provocation of the English church.\textsuperscript{88} In Chapter Five, we see Humphrey specifically locating his criticism of Osório’s writing within the context of the Portuguese scholar’s acrimonious exchanges with Haddon.

\textsuperscript{86} Binns, \textit{Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England}, pp. 272-76 (p. 276), cites Harvey’s 1577 \textit{Ciceronianus} and 1577 \textit{Rhetor}.

\textsuperscript{87} Humphrey, \textit{Optimates}, III, sig. y3\textsuperscript{r}. \textit{The Nobles}, III, sig. y3\textsuperscript{r}.

\textsuperscript{88} Whilst there is no evidence for the exact month in which \textit{The Nobles} was published, Haddon’s printed response to Osório’s manuscript letter to Elizabeth was issued in January 1563, which makes it likely that the original inflammatory letter preceded the issue of \textit{The Nobles}. 
Whilst, by the 1560s, the process of recruiting country gentry to an ‘informed puritan piety’ still had far to go, these developments suggest the manner in which reformed scholars and patrons were mediating, in new, confessionally aware ways, between international Latin discourse and the vernacular. Whilst expressing some unease about the increased use of the vernacular within the educational settings of university and the Inns of Court, and within the scholarly households of the nobility, they simultaneously acknowledge the need to extend programmes of reformed pedagogy beyond those who were capable of deep immersion in classical scholarship.

In the *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey expressed this through his inclusive discussion of the ways in which vernacular and classical languages might be taught. In the *Optimates*, he places his Latin treatise within a context in which contemporary writers are questioning the role of nobility and their education, and he suggests that the interpretation of classical literary examples should take place via humanist texts. As we saw in Chapter Three, Humphrey also articulates the limitations of traditional classical exemplars, as he promotes the study of Christian works. Likewise the vernacular edition, in conveying some criticism regarding its readers’ apparent laziness in Latin, evidences the way in which reformed learning was being made available to a broader generation of lay scholars. In this it can be seen to anticipate the most frequently discussed didactic manual of the sixteenth century, the full title of which expresses the increasingly insecure position that classical scholarship occupies: *The scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to understand, write, and speake, the Latin tong, but specially purposed for the private brynging up of youth in gentlemen*
and noble mens houses, and commodious also for all such, as have forgot the Latin tongue.  

‘Regard for the common people of our land’

Neil Ker has noted the reformist tenor of the books that were supplied to Magdalen College library at this time. In 1562, Humphrey purchased six centuries of the Magdeburg Centuriators and seven volumes of biblical commentaries by Calvin, Musculus and the French Protestant reformer, Augustin Marlorat (Marloratus). We also see the purchase of an enormously important vernacular work. In 1563, the College paid its former fellow, John Foxe, for an English edition of his Acts and Monuments. Foxe presented the volume with a manuscript letter addressing Humphrey and the fellows of Magdalen College:

Intelligo enim quid veteri scholae, quid charis consodalibus, quid demum universo Magdalenensium ordini ac caetui, sed praecipe quid ipsi imprimis charissimo collegiarchae, viro ornatissimo, D. Laurentio debeam, cui quot quantisque sim nominibus devinctus nullo modo oblivisci aut praeterire potero. Praeter [...] quod quum historiae huius bona magnaque pars Oxoniensem hanc vestram attingat Academiam, unde, ceu ex fonte, prima non solum initia sed et incrementa sumpsit ac sumit quotidie foelix haec et auspicata reformatae per orbem Christianum religionis propagatio [...] Hoc unum dolet, Latine non esse scriptum opus, quo vel ad plures emanere fructus historiae, vel vobis iucundior eius esse posset lectio. Atque equidem multo id maluissem. Sed huc me adegit communis patriae ac multitudinis aedificandae respectus, cui et vos ipsos idem hoc condonare aequum est.  

(For I realize what I owe to my old school, to my dear college companions, what in short I owe to the whole rank and file of the men of Magdalen, and especially to its beloved president, the most splendid man, Doctor Laurence, to whom I am devoted in so many ways I will never forget nor omit to mention. Besides [...] a good and large part of this history touches this your University of Oxford, from where, as from a spring, it assumed not only the

---

89 Ascham, The Scholemaster, ‘Title page’.  
happy and auspicious first beginning of the reformation but even its daily increase brings the growth of the religion throughout the Christian world. [...] This one thing pains me, that the work is not written in Latin, by which either the fruit of its history might spread to many people, or that it might be more pleasant to your reading. And indeed I would have much preferred this, but a regard for the common fatherland and for the edification of the masses drove me to the vernacular, for which it is right that you yourselves pardon the same.)

Following his acknowledgement of the significance of Magdalen College to the English Reformation, Foxe calls attention to the intersection between Latin and vernacular culture. He emphasizes the relationship between the scholarly lingua franca that had served Humphrey and his fellow exiles so well within their influential European networks, and the vernacular language that he posits is the necessary means by which they could continue to edify their fellow Englishmen. The Basel edition of Foxe’s work in Latin, undertaken by Henry Pantaleon following Foxe’s departure, was issued on the same day that Foxe’s English version was brought out in London. It is striking that Foxe describes the combined demands for Latin and vernacular versions of texts at precisely the moment that the English translation of Humphrey’s *Optimates* is published.

Foxe’s regard for the needs of the *communis patria*, as well as for his scholarly readers at Magdalen College, is echoed in a publication of Humphrey’s in the same year. In January 1563, from his position in Oxford, Humphrey uses the occasion of the opening day of Parliament to dedicate another of his works to Queen Elizabeth: his Latin translation of St. Cyril of Alexandria’s Greek

---

commentaries on Isaiah.93 The edition was printed by Froben and Episcopius in Basel, and Humphrey mentions that he had produced his translation there some years earlier. A Latin verse addressed to the reader was contributed by Jacob Hertel, the South German Hebrew scholar and reformist pastor who was active in Basel.94 This volume represents the last time Humphrey issued work from outside England, his move to English printers pointing not only to his relocation, but also to the developing proficiency, particularly in printing Latin and Greek editions, of the London presses.95 It also marks the end of the era of Humphrey’s association with the senior partners of his usual Basel press; Jerome Froben died in March 1563, and his associate Nicolaus Episcopius in the following year.96 A later report from the Spanish Ambassador suggests that it was specifically this edition of the Divi Cyrilli commentaria in Hesaiam prophetam, dedicated to Elizabeth in 1563, which brought condemnation from the Holy Spanish Inquisition.97 Humphrey’s Divi Cyrilli commentaria is cited in the 1584 Spanish Index of Prohibited Books.98

93 Laurence Humphrey, Divi Cyrilli commentariorum in Hesaiam prophetam libri quinque, nunc primum in Latinan linguam ex Graeca conversi (Basel: Froben & Episcopius, 1563). This contradicts Kemp’s suggestion, p. 85, that the work was printed in 1559 by Oporinus.
95 Pettigree, The Book in the Renaissance; John Parker, Books to Build an Empire: A Bibliographical History of English Overseas Interests to 1620 (Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1965).
98 Index des Livres Interdits, ed. by J. M. de Bujanda, 10 vols (Sherbrooke and Geneva: Droz, 1996), 6, 102 and 430. Bujanda also notes Humphrey’s inclusion in the 1571 Index d’Anvers, 7, 540 and the 1564 Index de Rome, 8, 626.
The work is dedicated to Elizabeth ‘Oxonoiae primo die Parliamenti’ (‘from Oxford, on the first day of Parliament’). 99 By drawing attention to its issue on the opening day of Parliament, Humphrey makes clear that this work of reformed humanism is directed towards the English political establishment. He sets out the pattern for the church and spiritual life he is proposing, to coincide with an (ultimately unsuccessful) parliamentary bill regarding ecclesiastical reform. Problems between nations and in religion, he suggests, stem specifically from the ill-judged decision of leaders to prioritize war over learning. Humphrey cites the examples of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar as leaders who had achieved less than they might on account of the distraction and financial drain of engaging their people in military action. 100

Addressing the Queen and her Parliament on the same day in January 1563, the Speaker Elect, Thomas Williams, articulated his dismay at the state of education in England. Williams’s speech, which also refers to both Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, echoes the language of Humphrey’s dedicatory letter. Williams decries the way in which the state of poor schooling was contributing to the current dearth of schoolmasters, this problem leading, in turn, to ‘decay’ at the universities. England is described as a country terrorized by three monsters – necessity, ignorance and error:

Necessity is grown amongst our selves, so that no Man is contented with his Degree, though he hath never so much […] I dare say a hundred Schools want in England, which before this time have been. And if in every School there had been but an hundred Scholars, yet that had been ten thousand; so that now I doubt whether there be so many learned men in England, as the number wants of these Scholars […] The second Monster is her Daughter Ignorance; for want of ten thousand Scholars, which these Schools were the

99 Humphrey, Divi Cyrilli Commentarium in Hesaiam prophetam libri, sig. a3v.
100 Ibid. sigs a2v - a3v.
bringers up of, and want of good School-masters, bringeth Ignorance […]
The Universities are decayed, and great Market Towns, and others without
either School or Preacher.  

In the self-deprecatory tone customarily required by the formality of an
Elizabethan parliamentary session, Williams, a lawyer, member of the Inner
Temple, and MP for Exeter, employs language redolent of Humphrey’s reforming
humanism. He refers to himself ‘as one amongst the Romans chosen from the
Plough to a place of Estimation, and after to the Plough again; even so, I a
Countryman, fit for the same, and not for this place’, before accepting the honour
of his appointment as Speaker to the House of Commons. 

Humphrey regularly uses prefatory and epistolary writing to assert
reformist credentials. In a 1566 letter written to Bullinger, Humphrey
congratulates his Swiss mentor for his recently published commentary on Daniel.
A work of textual exegesis, theological thought and historical interpretation,
Humphrey describes it as ‘lucubratio’ (‘the product of nightly study’), and thanks
Bullinger for the personal reference he makes in the preface to Humphrey and to
his fellow exiles.  
The reinforcement of scholarly networks through prefatory commendations, seen in Humphrey’s first exercise in print (the memorial volume
for the Brandon brothers), would remain an important feature of Humphrey’s

101 ‘The noble Conqueror Alexander, in the beginning of his Reign, used the same; but leaving that
Order, and having no regard to his living, was destroyed; which like Example was seen by that
notable and Valiant Warrier Julius Caesar’. ‘Journal of the House of Lords: January 1563’, in The
Journals of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1682), pp. 57-68; online edn,
102 Ibid; Stanford Lehmberg, ‘Williams, Thomas (1513/14–1566)’, ODNB, online edn, January
Oct 2011].
103 ‘Humfredus ad Bullingerum’, Epistola LXVIII, Oxford, 9 February 1566, in The Zurich
Letters, Second Series, p. 151; Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. 2H3, again cites the ‘Praefatio’
addressed to Jewel by Bullinger, in Daniel sapientissimus Dei propheta, qui a vetustis polyhistor,
id est, multisclius est dictus, expositus Homilis (Zurich: Froschauer, 1565), sig. 2a2’.
humanistic activity at Oxford. Works such as Humphrey’s erudite translations of the patristic fathers, and the English edition of his *Optimates*, stand alongside better known works of Protestant apologetic, such as the English edition of *Acts and Monuments*, as carefully deployed ‘occasional’ texts. Collectively, they express unease about the state of learning and about the increased use of the vernacular at university in this mid-Tudor moment, whilst extending the programme of reformed education to the landed elite.

As we have seen, Humphrey’s intellectual contribution itself owed a great deal to his educational grounding at Magdalen College and its school – the setting in which, as Foxe stresses in his presentational preface, a specifically English reformation was rooted. This period sees the establishment of Humphrey’s reputation as a successful college president and the consolidation of his reputation as one of the leading writers of his generation. It has perhaps been somewhat obscured by his later, more enduring reputation as a radical religious agent.

*The ‘vestiarian controversy’*

In their refusal to wear the surplice and the special outdoor dress that had been prescribed for the clergy in the 1559 injunctions, Laurence Humphrey, and the dean of Christ Church, Thomas Sampson, articulated their conscientious objection to vestments. Queen Elizabeth had already taken a middle position in religious affairs and indicated that she intended to discourage immoderate reformers who refused to compromise on the question of clerical attire. Archbishop Parker, with the backing of the Council, initiated proceedings to bring

---

104 See Conclusion.
105 See *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, Letters CLXXV, CLXXVI, CLXXXI, CLXXXII.
the men to book, and Sampson was deprived of his position. Humphrey, subject instead to the Visitor’s jurisdiction, retained his position as President.106

In August 1566, the formal occasion of the Queen’s visit to Oxford University saw her refer to the controversy. In a ‘lively diary-style’ contemporary account of Elizabeth’s visit to the University, Corpus Christi student Miles Windsor recorded that, on being officially received by Humphrey in his scarlet robes, the Queen remarked, ‘me thinkes this gowne & habite becommethe you verie well & I mervayle that you ar so straighte laced in this poynte but I come not nowe to chyde’.107 Siobhan Keenan cites Elizabeth’s similarly acerbic tone in response to the formal welcome given by another Magdalen fellow, Thomas Kingsmill, in which he apparently ‘tactlessly praised the Queen for appointing Humphrey’.108 Rosenberg notes a ‘Calvinist tone’ in his commendation of Elizabeth ‘for having recalled the followers of Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer from exile’.109 Elizabeth reportedly replied to Kingsmill, ‘you would have done well, had you had good matter’, before remaining in her rooms the following day, pointedly missing the morning and afternoon sermons in Christ Church and the first play.110 In fact, Kingsmill had already demonstrated his own propensity for

106 Freeman, ODNB, ‘Humphrey, Laurence’, provides a thorough summary of Humphrey’s involvement in the events leading up to and during the vestiarian controversy. John Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker: Archbishop of Canterbury, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821), 1, 368, keen to cast Humphrey as the radical so uncompromising in his opposition to vestments, recorded that in 1565 he found it advisable to retire for a time to the house of Anne Warcup, the wealthy ‘sustainer’ who had sheltered John Jewel before he left England.
108 Siobhan Keenan, ‘Spectator and Spectacle: Royal Entertainments at the Universities in the 1560s’, in The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight, pp. 86-103 (p. 98).
110 Keenan, ‘Spectator and Spectacle’, p. 98, cites Nichols’s Progresses, 1, 209.
provocation along religious lines; some years earlier as a fellow at Magdalen College he had been disciplined for shaving his head in mockery of the tonsure.  

Given his position at Magdalen College as Humphrey’s first appointed lecturer in Hebrew, it seems more likely that Kingsmill’s ‘tactless’ speech would have been made purposefully and provocatively, and was very likely in line with Humphrey’s own reforming stance.  

The fact that the few extant letters from, to, and regarding Humphrey were written during this specific period, and that they generally refer to the ‘vestiarian controversy’, appears to have skewed the rather more moderate reputation that Humphrey held at the time. In his summary of research on the English Reformation, Peter Marshall notes that the description of those who were pressing hardest for further reformation of the liturgy and structures of the church, conventionally called Puritans in contradistinction to Anglican defenders of the Elizabethan establishment, now looks unconvincing. ‘The vast majority of English churchmen saw themselves simply as Protestants and, moreover, as part of the Reformed family of European churches’.  

During the same Royal Progress, Humphrey delivered his own lecture to the Queen, for which he received high praise. He was also given the opportunity to present her with a prayer in Latin verse. Humphrey's holding of this honour at a time of such acknowledged theological controversy suggests that his position as an asset to the

---

establishment outweighed his standing as an obstacle to the Elizabethan religious settlement.\footnote{Humphrey’s ‘precatio’ was published in 1575, appended to his Oratio ad serenissimam Angliæ, Franciae, & Hyberniæ Reginam Elizabetham (London: Henry Binneman, 1575). The same ‘precatio’ is also published in his Vita Iuelli.} Whilst short shrift may have been given to Humphrey and his sympathizers during Elizabeth’s visit, not long after, the Royal Commissioners did act to ensure religious order at Oxford University, clamping down on colleges that continued to retain superstitious monuments.\footnote{Keenan, ‘Spectator and Spectacle: Royal Entertainments at the Universities in the 1560s’, p. 101.}

Diarmuid MacCulloch has highlighted the risk that the well-worn narrative concerning the ‘vestiarian controversy’ in England masks ‘the fact that during the 1560s all Protestants realised that their chief enemy was still Rome’. He describes ‘the bulk of propaganda organised by Archbishop Parker’, and the defence of the Church of England’s position against its Catholic critics, instigated by William Cecil and undertaken by Bishop Jewel in his Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae, as primarily directed against papistry.\footnote{Diarmiad MacCulloch, The Later Reformation in England: 1547-1603 (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), p. 30.} Humphrey’s interests certainly appear to have turned away from the ‘vestiarian controversy’ by the late 1560s, as he directed his attention to college and university responsibilities. In 1566, Humphrey wrote to Leicester complaining of the decay of vera religio in Corpus Christi College, and, in the summer of 1568, he joined Robert Horne in ‘purging that college of Catholic fellows and securing the election of William Cole as President’.\footnote{Freeman, ODNB, ‘Humphrey, Laurence’.

However, despite Humphrey’s ‘unimpeachable reformed credentials and his mentoring of the godly’, evident tension had started to develop between him
and the younger generation; men such as the Christ Church scholar, John Field, who were determined on radical Puritan reform. In a letter to Bullinger in June 1568, Grindal reported that when further controversy had arisen over the vestments in London, Humphrey’s and Sampson’s refusal to support the opposition led to their being denounced by the new nonconformists as ‘semipapistas’ (‘semi-papists’), whose preaching was to be avoided. Nevertheless, Collinson’s case for seeing Puritans not as members of an oppositional movement but merely as the ‘hotter sort’ of Protestants, whose attitudes and aspirations were in many ways close to the mainstream at this time, is compelling.

Admonitions and additions

By the end of the 1560s, Humphrey’s published works included tracts on the reformation of religion, on translation, and on the role and education of the nobility, as well as his translated editions of the patristic commentators. For ten years Humphrey had held the presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford, the setting for unusually intense theological debate and controversy. Rosenberg has described Humphrey’s extreme position on the vestments issue as a career-limiting obstacle, citing the unsuccessful application he made in 1565 to John Jewel for a benefice in the diocese of Salisbury. Freeman has drawn attention to the persistent financial pressure that Humphrey’s resistance to

---

118 Ibid.
121 Rosenberg, Leicester Patron of Letters, p. 129, notes that Humphrey again followed Cooper’s footsteps when he became Dean of Gloucester in 1571, his ‘stubborn nonconformity’ said to have obstructed his advancement to prelacy.
vestments would have put him under throughout the 1560s.\textsuperscript{122} It has also been suggested that Humphrey’s involvement in the vestment controversy thwarted his initial attempt to be elected Vice Chancellor at Oxford University, despite the personal support of the new Chancellor, the Earl of Leicester, the ‘most influential single figure in Elizabethan Oxford’\textsuperscript{123} Leicester first recommended that Humphrey replace the incumbent Vice Chancellor, John Kennall in 1567. In the election, however, Humphrey’s colleague and Master of Magdalen School, Thomas Cooper, won.\textsuperscript{124} Leicester had earlier censured the University for rejecting his nominees and, following Cooper’s appointment, he began instruction on changes in the appointment process. After 1570 the Vice Chancellor was invariably nominated by the Chancellor.\textsuperscript{125}

The following years, however, see Humphrey consolidating his position at Oxford. In 1571, following Leicester’s second nomination of him, and Cooper’s move to the bishopric of Lincoln, Humphrey was successfully appointed Vice Chancellor of Oxford University.\textsuperscript{126} In the same year, both Oxford and Cambridge Universities were incorporated, and all the privileges, possessions and liberties of the universities were ratified. Authority that had once rested upon royal charters was now founded securely upon statute. Following these changes, the Vice Chancellor, who acted as head of the Chancellor’s court, had the widest

\textsuperscript{122} Freeman, \textit{ODNB}, ‘Humphrey, Laurence’.
\textsuperscript{123} Williams, ‘Elizabethan Oxford: State, Church and University’, pp. 401-23, notes that Leicester would preside there until his death in 1588.
\textsuperscript{124} Stanier, \textit{Magdalen School}, pp. 233-34, notes that prior to this, in 1559, Cooper had resumed his position of Master of Magdalen College School, one that he had resigned during the last years of Mary’s reign.
\textsuperscript{125} Williams, ‘Elizabethan Oxford: State, Church and University’, p. 406, notes that Leicester ordered that nothing should go before convocation unless approved by the Vice Chancellor, the proctors, the heads of house and doctors.
\textsuperscript{126} Humphrey had presided over Leicester’s own election to the Chancellorship seven years earlier. \textit{Register of the University of Oxford}, ed. by C. W. Boase, and A. Clark, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885-89), 2, i, 240.
powers over members of the university and over the town that had been seen since they were instituted. His court had jurisdiction in minor criminal and in civil cases; it could punish breaches of the peace and immorality; it dealt with testamentary disputes and offences against university and college regulations; it heard cases of libel and defamation; it enforced the ecclesiastical laws, and it decided suits for debt. Humphrey took on this senior role, fully supported by the Chancellor, the Earl of Leicester. The changes resulted in the growth of authority for heads within their own colleges, and represented a strengthening of the government’s influence throughout the University, as it worked through the heads of houses to enforce its policies. The encouragement towards noble families to place their sons at the university was one of the factors that had contributed to this changing power base at Oxford. The interest of courtiers and landed gentry in the education of their sons and in the advancement of their protégés exposed both Oxford and Cambridge to the demands of royal and lay patronage. As the Crown’s influence increased, the power within each university became concentrated in fewer hands.  

Accordingly, Humphrey’s reputation shifted significantly from his role as one of the more radical agitators within Protestant controversies to that of a major establishment figure, a moderating reformer and an influential agent in the problematic negotiations between church and state. In 1571, Humphrey was appointed Dean of Gloucester, again following the path of Thomas Cooper. 

---

In 1572, Humphrey wrote to his friend Anthony Gilby, by then established in preferment at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire, thanking him for some ‘good counsel’ on some matter, and describing a recent volume he had produced:

…yet we must pray that God may open the Queen’s Majesty’s ears to hear of a reformation, for that there is the stay; and openly to publish such admonitions as are abroad, I like not, for that in some points and terms they are too broad and overshoot themselves. A book I gave indeed as a present of mine office and the cognisance of the University, a Greek testament with my additions of collections to stir up her Majesty to peruse the book and to reform by it the church, as in certain sentences, I have there declared and in a word or two using orations touched the copy whereof I sent you.129

The Admonition was a notorious piece of polemic that had been delivered in the guise of an address to Parliament, issued by the radical Puritan reformer, John Field, amongst others. It was the most outspoken text that had yet been published by Protestants against Protestants in England, and is described as ‘polemic of the highest order, measured and serious, but with shafts of infectious satire’.130 Expressing ‘the radical presbyterianism which Thomas Cartwright had been teaching in Cambridge’, it lambasted the Elizabethan bishops, describing their government as ‘antichristian and devilish and contrary to the scriptures’.131 As a result of its publication, Field and his associate, the London curate Thomas Wilcox, were imprisoned. Humphrey visited them, and made it clear that this was in order to articulate his opposition to their decision to issue the inflammatory Admonition.132

130 Collinson, Godly People, p. 120.
Humphrey’s letter to Gilby highlights the rhetorical strategy by which he suggests the Queen can be persuaded to reform the church. Exercising the virtue of his officium as Vice Chancellor, and in the persona of the fidus interpres in the Interpretatio linguarum, and the doctus piusque praeceptor in the Optimates, Humphrey presents an annotated copy of the Greek New Testament. He has added discourse of his own as a means of guiding the Queen to action. Humphrey’s optimistic assignment of the annotated book to its privileged advisory role recalls his personification of the book, in the Optimates, as an intimate adviser, companion and privy counsellor. Conveying his distinctive version of reformed humanism, Humphrey’s decorous approach, via a carefully presented occasional gift, contrasts strikingly with the provocative publication by the authors of the Admonition. Describing the approach he has made to Queen Elizabeth as he attempts to influence religious change, Humphrey explicitly distinguishes his advice from the polemics of the likes of Field. The juxtaposition of their methods indicates the difference between Humphrey and the radical extremes of religious reform, the new movement that would become Presbyterianism. Humphrey would continue to urge further reformation, but ‘as a subject and orderly, without breach of peace’.

Another record of books purchased at Oxford University at this time further demonstrates Humphrey’s standing and pedagogical influence. Coming from an area of south-west England where Francis Russell, the Earl of Bedford’s
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133 See Chapter Three.
134 My research has not found the annotated Greek New Testament presented by Humphrey, nor the copy he provided to Gilby. Of the four editions of the Greek New Testament found in the British Library (including one bound in green velvet bearing the arms of Queen Elizabeth), none fits Humphrey’s description.
135 Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS. Mm.1.43, fols. 431-32, cited by Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, p. 120.
influence was strong, two Cornish brothers, Matthew and Richard Carnsew came up to Broadgates Hall in the 1570s. Their extant manuscript diary records some of the materials they purchased, and suggests ways in which scholarly activity under the private supervision of reformed tutors supplemented the statutory curriculum.

The reformist content of the Carnsew reading list shows itself fully aligned with the programme recommended by Humphrey in his *Optimates*, particularly with regard to the works of the Jewish commentators. These had become increasingly important in Bible study and translation, although they remained outside the statutory curriculum.\(^\text{136}\) The brothers list their reading of ‘juishe history’, as well as of Sturm and Sleidan, alongside the more traditional classical works. They record translating parts of the New Testament, and buying a Latin psalter. Given the intermittent and short period of two years that the diary covers, it is notable that Humphrey is mentioned twice. The Carnsew brothers record their attendance at a sermon he delivered in 1572, and at one preached by Thomas Kingsmill. They also note their own purchase of ‘Dr. Humphrey’s book’.\(^\text{137}\) This tantalizing reference does not divulge whether it was the *Interpretatio linguarum*, perhaps purchased to assist their practice of translation between classical and vernacular languages, or the *Optimates*, with its relevant setting out of the exemplary pattern for education of Protestant scholars such as themselves.

The boys also register their purchase of vernacular sermons by John Foxe, and write that they translated these into Latin. This is clear evidence that they were reading texts chosen for their reformed credentials as well as their style, in


\(^{137}\) The manuscript diary is PRO SP 46/15, fols 212-20, cited by McConica, ‘The Collegiate Society’, pp. 697-700.
the manner advocated by Humphrey in his earlier works. It is likely that these supplementary materials were recommended by their tutor and no doubt drew on a teaching tradition within the staunchly Protestant Broadgates Hall itself. Also of note is the record by the Carnsaw brothers that they read ‘the books set forth by the purytyanes to the parliament’, very likely the above-mentioned controversial first and second *Admonitions* of 1572.

Laurence Humphrey’s career, whilst perhaps temporarily hampered by his radical stance in the ‘vestiarian controversy’, nonetheless afforded him opportunities to further academic, political and religious reform through his own and others’ works. In 1571, John Jewel, one of the first bishops to have been appointed by Elizabeth on her accession, died at the age of forty-nine, following several months of ill-health. Over the next two years, Humphrey compiled and wrote a weighty account in Latin of the life of his former Oxford contemporary and fellow exile, the late Bishop of Salisbury, the 1573 *Ioannis Iuelli Angli, Episcopi Sarisburiensis Vita et Mors*. Described by Humphrey as a *vita humana*, the writing of the life of John Jewel demonstrates Humphrey’s continuing commitment to the cause of the English humanist reformation through the most influential means at his disposal. As we see in the following chapter, in this idealized life Humphrey presents a third exemplary model; having addressed the translator and the noble, he turns to the clergyman.

**Conclusion**

The works discussed in my account of this period exemplify Humphrey’s move from the wide, yet often neglected, context of reformed continental scholarship
towards the centre of English intellectual and literary life. The proficiency in Latin and Greek that Humphrey had acquired at Magdalen College and its school had crucially enabled him to flourish in the intellectual and social settings of Zurich, Basel and Geneva. Drawing on the close affiliations he developed with scholarly reformers and printers, and their shared pedagogical agenda, Humphrey articulated how his own reformed programme of education could benefit the next generation of influential young men in England. Humphrey’s printed works of the late 1550s, written and printed within a setting of religious and political controversy, and from the chief publishing centre of Europe, demonstrate the vital link between the Continental and English scholarly outlooks on the most pressing issues of his day. He continually expressed his confidence in the value of works of scriptural and patristic textual exegesis, and of developing a programme of reformed humanist education for the increasingly laicized community at Magdalen College. Having articulated in print how a noble class that had suffered decline might learn to exercise its Christian duty, Humphrey’s activity through the 1560s illustrates the ways in which his pedagogical influence was exercised in practice. His call for the issue of vernacular translations of the most exemplary classical and contemporary texts finds a response in the issue of his own and others’ important works.
Chapter Five: ‘Biting with his friends’ teeth’ – Humphrey’s 1573 Vita Iuelli

Introduction

Humphrey’s Vita Iuelli is credited by J. W. Binns with being ‘by far the most interesting example’ of the genre of humanist Latin biography to appear in sixteenth-century England.1 Whilst plausible, this eulogy perhaps conceals the fact that there were relatively few examples of Latin life-writing actually produced in sixteenth-century England! So it is remarkable that the Vita Iuelli, written in Latin and explicitly engaged in contemporary religious controversy across the Continent, has not been located within the broader genre of ‘life-writing in Reformation Europe’, for example in Irena Backus’s recent work.2 Widely disseminated, it became the authoritative work on Bishop Jewel’s life and role within the church and is an enduring source for biographical detail about Jewel and his contemporaries. Gary Jenkins’s 2006 monograph on John Jewel presents a useful assessment of his theological legacy and draws on the Vita Iuelli for much biographical source material. However, Jenkins fails to take account of the specific context in which Jewel’s ‘first biographer’ wrote, and seemingly equates Humphrey’s rhetorical composition with the recording of factual biography.3

3 Jenkins, John Jewel and the English National Church, p. 2.
Humphrey wrote the dedicatory epistle for his *Vita Iuelli* on 23 September 1573, two years to the day after Jewel’s demise. Dedicated to Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London, the work signals Humphrey’s own ascendancy and agency within the Protestant establishment, by means of a portrait of Bishop Jewel for posterity. It also provides a setting for Humphrey’s own engagement with contemporary and very specific theological arguments. The inclusion of various non-biographical materials suggests that the biographical portrayal of the individual was perhaps not the exclusive focus of this work.

As examples have shown throughout this thesis, the *Vita Iuelli* is also a work in which Humphrey articulates his conception of reformed humanist education. Through his portrayal of the activities and works of a broad, international network of reformers, Humphrey delineates his vision of the ideal educational programme for England in the 1570s.

**Exemplary lives of eminent men**

The *Vita Iuelli* reveals the influence of classical, biblical and patristic traditions of life-writing, and of medieval hagiography, as well as more contemporary European examples. Humphrey was in a position to draw on a wide range of literary models for the writing of lives. By the middle of the sixteenth century, a broad category of literary work was rapidly evolving, through printed editions of funeral orations, homilies, annals, chronicles, memorial poetry and martyrrologies, as well as translations of classical ‘lives’. All these comprised, to an extent, the writing of lives of individuals. This ‘genre of humanist Latin biography’, if it can
even be called that, was at the most an unstable or fluid one. Indeed Mayer and Woolf have noted that the word ‘biography’ was itself not in use in England until the mid-seventeenth century. Humphrey himself conveys the plurality of the genre of life-writing at this time, when he refers to his *Vita Iuelli* at various points as a *vita humana*, a *commemoratio*, an *historia*, a *narratio* and a *tragicocomoedia*. Each of these terms is suggestive of a recognized tradition of writing, and Humphrey also offers his work as presenting something new.

Humphrey’s approach to life-writing has been described in summary as a revival of Plutarchan biography. We may take this to mean that Jewel’s has been written as an exemplary life, portrayed through the delineation of the subject’s character, as revealed by carefully selected episodes from history. In the first century CE, Plutarch had stated, in his account of the life of Alexander the Great, that ‘it is not histories that I am writing, but lives’. The Plutarchan model of biographical writing is, following Mayer and Woolf’s definition, ‘designed to immortalize the character, rather more than the deeds, of either individuals or groups of individuals’.

Humphrey would have been familiar with the Greek editions and Latin translations of Plutarch’s *Lives* that had started to appear in print in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, although the first translation of Plutarch into English, made by Thomas North from a French edition, was not issued until

---

5 Freeman, *ODNB*, ‘Humphrey, Laurence’.
These contemporary editions of Plutarch’s *Lives* articulate the belief in the unique potential for historical exemplars to effect moral teaching – a central assumption of mid-Tudor humanism:

> examples are of more force to move and instruct, than are the arguments and proofes of reason, or their precise precepts, because examples be the very formes of our deedes, and accompanied with all circumstances [...] examples tende to the showing of them in practise and execution, because they doe not only declare what is to be done, but also work a desire to do it, as well in respect of a certain naturall inclination which all men have to follow examples.  

In the programme of educational reform set out in his 1560 *Optimates*, Humphrey had reiterated this position, recommending that the young noble scholar read ‘Plutarchi fere omnia, ut se in hac quasi tabula aspiciat’ (‘almost all of Plutarch’s works, so that he might behold himself in them as a copy’).

Humphrey’s attraction to the Plutarchan model is suggested by the narrative structure of his account of Jewel’s life. Plutarch’s *Lives* are ordered chronologically, without the thematic divisions favoured by his Roman near-contemporary Suetonius. In his chronological account, Humphrey delineates Jewel’s character as consistently exemplary; indicated by his paternal name, then in the earliest signs of virtue in his childhood, throughout his maturity, and in the closing stages of his life.

However, the *Vita Iuelli* is also the product of a specific time and circumstance, and Humphrey’s inclusion of historical material suggests
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12 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sig. *B3*.
influences from models besides Plutarch. In examining the 1549 *Lives of Illustrious Men*, written by the Italian humanist Paolo Giovio, T. C. Price Zimmerman has drawn out some of the features that differentiate a Plutarchan model from what he terms ‘humanist biography’.\(^{13}\) Identifying an emerging shift of focus from character to history, Zimmerman recognizes only a ‘vague’ reliance on Plutarchan classical precedent in the case of such mid-sixteenth-century humanists as Giovio. In contrast, ‘humanist biography lets subjects be defined by the history in which they had been involved, with a resumé of personal characteristics and traits subjoined’. He describes this as a subtle but important difference, having the effect of making the history paramount.\(^{14}\) This shift does seem applicable to Humphrey’s work, especially given the range of paratextual material that helps to make up the *Vita Iuelli*.

Other classical patterns provided the template for the Christian biographical collections of late antiquity, most notably in the works of St. Jerome, the church father who wrote the foundational *De viris illustribus* (‘On the Lives of Illustrious Men’), and Diogenes Laertius, whose third century ‘Lives of Eminent Philosophers’ adapted the Suetonian model.\(^{15}\) Patricia Cox notes that the early fourth-century church historian, Eusebius, used biographical writing as a ‘vessel for *apologia*’ in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Combining panegyric, polemic, theology and history, Eusebius’s account of the life of Origen was based

on an earlier ‘apology’, a work that both summarized Origen’s life and presented
a defence of his theology.\textsuperscript{16}

Drawing on these ancient traditions of exemplarity, Humphrey invokes
the long literary lineage of those who have modelled virtuous behaviour
specifically for ‘studia hominum’ (‘the learned studies of men’):

Xenophon Cyrum, Plato Socratem, Cicero Crassum, Curtius Alexandrum
magnum, Isocrates Nicoelem, alius Alexandrum Severum, alii alios
Imperatores, et literatos homines depinxerunt, ut studia hominum proposita
effigie incenderent.\textsuperscript{17}

(Xenophon portrayed Cyrus, Plato Socrates, Cicero Crassus, Curtius
Alexander the Great, Isocrates Nicoles, another Alexander Severus, other
men other Emperors, and they portrayed learned men, so that they might
kindle men’s learning with the image before them.)

Humphrey identifies these exempla as pedagogical works that reveal the best
form of studies by portraying an ideal outcome in the lives of learned men. He
elaborates on the notion of the affective relationship between generations of
depicted subjects. Each subject follows the example of one who had been praised
before him. Humphrey’s distinctive combination of classical and Christian
examples notably includes the second-century bishops, Irenaeus and Polycarp:

Puta Achillem Homericum Alexander & Scipio imitari voluerunt, Irenaeus
Polycarpm, Polycarpus Ioannem Evangelistam, ut & hic verum esse possit
illud Hesiodium, Vicinus vicinum aemulatur. Hisce ego rebus adductus,
statui aliquid de vita & obitu Ioannis Iuellis scribere, ne una cum humato
corpora, sancti viri obruatur memoria, ut nos hoc sive pietatis sive amoris
officium defuncto praestemus, alii formam & faciem hominis
praestantissimi, quasi in tabula descriptam propius aspicere & admirari
possint.\textsuperscript{18}

(For instance, Alexander and Scipio had wanted to imitate Homeric Achilles,
Irenaeus Polycarp, Polycarp John the Baptist, so that (to the extent that this
can be true) that one [Homer] imitates Hesiod, neighbour emulates

\textsuperscript{16} Patricia Cox, \textit{Biography in late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man} (Berkeley and London:

\textsuperscript{17} Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuellis}, sig. B2v.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
neighbour. So, influenced by these, I decided to write something of the life and death of John Jewel, so that the memory of this holy man is not subsumed along with his buried body, as we discharge our duty either out of devotion or of love, but so that other eminent men can observe and admire the form and character of a man just as if, in the tablet, they are closer to the one described.)

Humphrey invokes a combination of classical, patristic and biblical traditions of imitation in order to position his own work. As Daniel Woolf observes, ‘one must be cautious in postulating these literary forms as discrete and self-contained, since there are plentiful examples of overlap and cross-fertilization’.\textsuperscript{19} It is noteworthy that here, as in the \textit{Interpretatio Linguarum} and the \textit{Optimates}, Humphrey emphasizes the role of the biographical account in delivering these models. He celebrates the text’s unique potential to bring the exemplary ‘formam & faciem hominis’ closer to a new generation of ‘praesentissimi’ (‘eminent men’).

Referencing biblical narrative, and implicitly identifying Jewel with the Old Testament hero Samson, Humphrey elaborates on the edifying aspect of his ‘historica commemoratio’ (‘historical memorial’). His emphatic justification of this work is that the \textit{Vita Iuelli} will be of use in a practical sense:

\begin{quote}
Profuerit quoque nobis haec historica commemoratio, cum inde exempla ad vivendum et moriendum sumimus. Ut enim Sampsonus ex mortui Leonis cadavere mel exuxit: ita nos e monumentis et narrationibus huiusmodi quod nobis ex usu sit colligere possimus.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

(This historical memorial will profit us, since we will gain examples of how to live and how to die. For just as Samson extracted honey from the cadaver of the dead lion, so we are able to gather from records and narratives of this kind that which is useful to us.)

\textsuperscript{19} Woolf, ‘Biography’, p. 129.  
As Humphrey describes the research he has undertaken to write Jewel’s life, he discusses his use of source material in the context of the tradition of patristic writing:

Utque olim Chrysostomus optavit aliquem fuisse qui nobis Apostolorum historiam diligentissime traderet, non tantum quid scripserint, quidve dixerunt, sed ut sese per omnem vitam habuerint, quid & quando comederint, quo ierint, quid diebus singulis gesserint, & in quibus partibus vixerint, quam introierint domum, quo navigauerint, ubinam applicuerint, ubi vincti fuerint, quod omnia illorum eximia quadam utilitate referta esse cognovit.21

(Once, Chrysostom wished that there had been someone who had diligently passed on to us the history of the apostles; not only in order to know what they had written, or what they had said, but how they managed themselves through their whole life; what and when they ate, where they went, what they had done each day, and in which regions they lived, whose homes they went to, where they travelled, where they came to, where they were surrounded, everything exceptional or useful about these men.)

Humphrey closely paraphrases Chrysostom’s complaint, expressed in his *Homilies on Paul’s Letter to Philemon*, that he lacks vivid historical detail about the apostles’ daily lives. The passage in Chrysostom continues:

For if only seeing those places where they sat or where they were imprisoned, mere lifeless spots, we often transport our minds there, and imagine their virtue, and are excited by it, and become more zealous, much more would this be the case, if we heard their words and their other actions. [...] For when a man leads a spiritual life, the habit, the walk, the words and the actions of such a one, in short, all that relates to him profits the hearers, and nothing is a hindrance or impediment.22

Humphrey invokes the tradition of the patristic commentaries on scripture to convey the humanistic principal that moral virtue can be inculcated through the reading of virtuous examples. He offers his account of Jewel as his best attempt to capture his subject’s exemplary characteristics, whilst suggesting that the
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practical limitations regarding his literary endeavour are comparable to Chrysostom’s:

Ita utinam mihi contigisset, omnia etiam intima, etiam infima huius viri facta, Apothegmata, totius vitae cursum pervidere, ut possem eum omnibus membris & numeris particulatim expingere. Tum enim & Academicum hominem, & elegantem oratorem, & venustum scriptorem, & pium Ecclesiastem & venerandum praesulum omnes facile cernerent.23

(In the same way, would that everything could have reached me; every profound thing, even the lowest deeds of this man, his wise sayings, in order to discern the whole course of his life, so that I should paint him with every single part exactly to the life. For then everyone would easily discern the man as an academic philosopher, an elegant orator, a winning writer, as well as a devout ecclesiast and reverend prelate.)

In Humphrey’s distinctive description, Jewel successfully combines the multifaceted attributes of the academicus, orator, scriptor, ecclesiast and praesul. Humphrey evidently has more contextual knowledge of Jewel’s life than Chrysostom would have had for his subjects, and he is really suggesting the parallel for its historiographical and Christian associations. The biographical anecdotes that Humphrey chooses to relate about Jewel are carefully selected to develop a wholly consistent depiction of his subject as a learned humanist scholar and virtuous church leader:

Venio autem ad hanc historiam pertexendam, non spe assequendi quod cupio, aut fiducia exequendi quod nequeo, sed animo narrandi quantum scio, & voluntate efficiendi quantum valeo. Grandes materias ingenia parva non sustinent, ut perscite Hieronymus.24

(But I approach this history that ought to be comprehensive, not in the hope of attaining to that which I desire, nor with a confidence that I can relate that which I don’t know, but of a mind to narrate as much as I do know, and the inclination to produce as much as I can. ‘Small wits cannot grapple large themes’, as Jerome perceived.)

23 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sigs B2v – B3r.
24 Ibid. sig. B3r.
Here, Humphrey quotes another church father, St. Jerome. In 396 CE, Jerome had written a consolatory letter to his old friend, Heliodorus, on the loss of his nephew Nepotian. Offering comfort to his grieving friend, Jerome contrasts the concepts of pagan despair or resignation with those of Christian hope and faith in the afterlife. His letter opens with the maxim: ‘small wits cannot grapple large themes but venturing beyond their strength fail in the very attempt; and, the greater a subject is, the more completely is he overwhelmed who cannot find words to unfold its grandeur’.  

25 As with the Chrysostom commentary, Humphrey’s reference to Jerome’s letter to Heliodorus is a careful choice, very much in keeping with the major themes of the *Vita Iuelli*.

Manuscript collections of writings on the occasion of the death of prominent figures had been customarily compiled across Europe since the Middle Ages. These obituaries were understood to serve a broad hortatory purpose; the model life could be considered as a whole and offered for emulation. In the decades before Humphrey wrote his *Vita*, the Lutheran reformers of Wittenberg recorded and celebrated the lives of their contemporaries chiefly in sermons and orations prepared for funerals. Their manuscripts were subsequently printed in volumes encompassing funerary verse and consolatory epistles as well as the orations.  

26 As we saw in Chapter One, by the early 1550s, this practice had made its way to the English printing press, in the form of the *Vita et obitus duorum fratrum suffolciensium, Henrici et Caroli Brandoni*. Edited by the Cambridge Protestant scholar, Thomas Wilson, this volume comprised the first collection of
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Latin obituary verse to appear in print in England. In acknowledging its context in broader European humanist practice, one of the contributors to the Brandon brothers’ volume cites as precedent a verse that had appeared in print in Paris some years earlier on the occasion of Erasmus’s death.\(^\text{27}\)

As noted earlier, Humphrey was one of the Oxford scholars who had contributed neo-Latin verse to the Cambridge edition in honour of the deceased brothers. Preceding the *Vita Iuelli* by twenty-two years, the memorial volume combines consolatory letters and commemorative verses with an account of the brothers’ lives. In the same year, the pre-eminent reformist professor, John Cheke, had collected and published Latin and Greek prose and poetry written on the death of the hugely influential reformer from southern Germany, Martin Bucer. The volume begins with letters, addressed by John Cheke to Peter Martyr Vermigli, and by Nicholas Carr to Cheke, that reflect on Bucer’s life and death.\(^\text{28}\)

In these memorial volumes, the established pattern of classical humanistic exemplarity, previously articulated in works such as the pedagogical writings of Erasmus, is adapted for an emphatically reformist purpose. The concept of the Christian humanist’s *vita activa* is developed through the descriptions of a godly life directed by scripture, supported by moral philosophy and expressed through classical *eloquentia*. Bucer and the Brandon brothers are depicted as ideal models of the programme of a reformed humanist education, endorsed by the international network of reformed scholars who contribute their verses and letters. Vivid and engaging descriptions reveal the subjects’ studiousness and


demonstrate their Christian piety through the bonds of familial love and *amicitia*, whilst the occasion of their deaths provides a contemporary topic onto which to map distinctly Protestant ideals. These 1551 volumes point to the evolution of a model for a specifically English tradition of Protestant biographical writing.

In both form and content, the *Vita Iuelli* recalls those earlier Protestant memorial volumes and becomes part of this emerging pattern – one still developing in the writing of reformers across Europe, by way also of classical and patristic precedents. Humphrey acknowledges the value that is generally perceived in historical accounts of military leaders, and he suggests that the practical worth in the writing of lives of men who are illustrious for learning (‘doctorum hominum’) is less well recognized:

Nam si bellatoribus utile est, stratagemata, acta, victorias fortissimorum regum et ducum intueri: cur non etiam e re nostra futurum iudicabimus, hanc doctorum hominum imaginem expressam & eminentem in libris contemplari?  

(For if it is useful for those participating in war to consider the strategems, deeds, victories of the bravest kings and leaders, why then will we not judge in the same way that for the future we can behold, within books, the resemblance and outstanding image of learned men?)

It is noteworthy that, as we saw in the *Interpretatio linguarum* and the *Optimates*, Humphrey again emphasizes the *uiilitas* of the printed book in conveying these learned examples to a new generation of readers.

Humphrey presents Jewel as an exemplar of the Christian humanist scholarly life, and specifically of the English Protestant ideal. In the dedicatory epistle, he expresses his intention for his life of Jewel to be held up as a *speculum*, a mirror:

Primo, speculum esse potest studiosorum & Academicorum [...] Secundo, speculum est Theologorum [...] Tertio, speculum est omnium mortalium.  

(Firstly, it can be as a mirror to those devoted to learning and to academic philosophers [...] secondly as a mirror to theologians [...] Thirdly as a mirror to all mortals.)

Jewel’s pious erudition is presented as an encouragement to Protestant endeavour and to reformed learning. In 1561, Melanchthon’s account of the lives of three reformers, Martin Luther, John Oecolampadius, and Ulrich Zwingli, originally written in Latin in 1532, was translated into English by Henry Bennet and printed in London. Using the same figure, Bennet refers to the ‘many urgent causes’ for issuing his vernacular work, which he describes as ‘thys Christian history, or rather myrour of Christian life’.

**The polemical context of the Vita Iuelli**

That Humphrey’s *Vita Iuelli* comprises far more than a factual account of his subject is structurally evident from the range of material that frames and intersperses the narrative of Jewel’s life. The 1573 octavo edition, which was issued with royal privilege from the London press of the Protestant printer John Day, comprises three hundred and forty pages of printed roman and italic type. Paratextual material, comprising Latin, Greek and Hebrew contributions from more than thirty individuals, represents one-fifth of the printed pages in the first edition. Each of these inclusions is typographically sign-posted, often printed in italic font and afforded a positioning on the page that highlights its significance.
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30 Ibid. ‘Epistola nuncupatoria’, sigs ¶4’ - ++1’.
Reproductions of letters between the reformers, of Jewel’s speeches, and his associates’ prayers and poems, collectively contribute to the depiction of Jewel as an outstanding exemplar of humanist piety and devotion for the Protestant church, and Jewel’s status is defined and reinforced by these examples of ‘humanist rituals transferred into reformation culture’. The additional epigrams, eulogies and other material contributed by a large network of individuals help to demonstrate how his virtuous qualities were fulfilled in his roles as bishop and church administrator.

The diversity of this additional material alongside the apologetic content of Humphrey’s biography suggests influence from other contemporary models of life-writing, especially works of ecclesiastical and literary history. These include such enormous projects as the German annals of church history, dubbed the *Magdeburg Centuries*, the early Latin editions of John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, and other compilations produced on the Continent such as John Bale’s *Catalogus*.

The writing of ecclesiastical history has been well established as an enormously significant, purposeful activity throughout this period. Such major collaborative works have been seen as revealing the over-arching Protestant ‘scheme’; that is, one that was characterized by an uncovering of those traces in the past that could support the narrative of the persecuted *vera religio* and justify its revolt against the Catholic church. As Norman Jones notes, these Protestant scholars ‘made it their business to collect and study the records of the medieval
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past in order to create a potent polemical tool’. David Womersley describes how in the mid-sixteenth century ‘the historical culture of the whole continent was suffused with religious ideology’. Historical writing became a battleground between Protestant and Catholics, as each church sought the sanction of the past.

The specific moment at which the Protestant scheme was imported into England has been described as ‘nothing less than a complete reconceptualizing of the national past’. In 1544, Bale had indicated the scope of the task with which the Reformation confronted English historians: ‘I wolde wyshe some lerned Englyshe manne [...] to set forth the Englyshe chronicles in theyr right shape’. As the Marian exiles returned to England after 1558, Foxe rose to Bale’s challenge by providing an ecclesiastical history that went back to Saxon times. His *Acts and Monuments* was intended to replace earlier chronicles, which were condemned by Protestant scholars on the double charge of incompetence and ungodliness. A year before he issued Humphrey’s *Vita Iuelli*, John Day had seen through the press Archbishop Parker’s *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae* (‘On the Antiquity of the Church of England’), another work that attempted to consolidate the concept of a continuing Protestant theology thoroughly rooted in the original principles of the Anglo-Saxon church. Writers such as Foxe, Bale,

---

Leland and Parker recognized that the battle for *vera religio* was also a battle for antiquity.\(^{38}\)

As Humphrey introduces his work, he draws explicitly on Greek literary tradition, and merges classical historical legacy with the very recent example of Bale’s *Catalogus*. He asks rhetorically:

\[\text{Cum Homerus suum Achilles & Ulysses praedicarit, Hesiodus Deorum suorum genealogias descripterit, Balaeus noster illustrium scriptorum in Britannia Centurias ediderit, aliqui alios summis laudibus extulerint, cur nomen Iuelli nosra culpa in hoc albo non recensebitur, cuius scripta causae communi plurimum ponderis et splendoris addiderunt, & qui Ecclesiae nostrae decus & ornamentum extitit?}\(^{39}\)

(Since Homer made his Achilles and Ulysses publicly known, Hesiod portrayed the genealogies of his Gods, our Bale edited the Centuries of Illustrious Writers in Britain, and others extolled other great men with praise, why should the name of Jewel not be made in regular mention on this white page through my account, whose writings have added much in the way of weight and splendour to common purpose, and who stands out as the glory and distinction of our church?)

Humphrey aligns his life of Jewel with classical accounts of heroes and gods. At the same time, he presents the *Vita Iuelli* as *historia*, with its emphasis on recent history rather than the medieval past, and signals his participation within the emerging contemporary historiographical scheme for a Protestant England.

In 1566, Joachim Camerarius issued his account of the life of Philip Melanchthon, the renowned evangelical reformer and teacher at the University of Wittenberg, who had died six years earlier. The *De Philippi Melanchthonis* was written in Latin and published in Leipzig.\(^{40}\) Preceding Humphrey’s *Vita Iuelli* by


\(^{39}\) Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, ‘Epistola nuncupatoria’, sigs +3\(^\prime\) - +3\(^\prime\).

\(^{40}\) *De Philippi Melanchthonis Ortu, Totius Vitae Curriculo et Morte, Implicatas Rerum Memorabilium Temporis Illius Huminumque mentione atque indicio, cum expositionis serie cohaerentium: narratio diligens et accurate Ioachimi Camerarii Papeberg* (Leipzig: Ernstus Voeglin Constantenis, 1566).
six years, this biographical work has been identified as utilizing the Protestant scheme in a new way. Timothy Wengert’s engaging analysis of Camerarius identifies the rhetorical and polemical motives behind his *De Philippi Melanchthonis*, and establishes the specific historical context of its publication.\(^{41}\) Wengert shows that Camerarius not only presented his work as an exercise in rhetoric, a demonstration of how to describe the life of someone with the stature of Melanchthon. It was also a piece of polemic specifically directed at Melanchthon’s detractors, in the midst of the highly-charged atmosphere of intra-Lutheran theological battles over the role that the deceased Melanchthon would play in the theology of his students. Furthermore, Wengert notes that the main point of Camerarius’ *narratio* becomes clear near the end, when, after describing the vitriolic behaviour of Melanchthon’s opponents, he appeals to the powers-that-be to take measures to suppress them. Because this work was the first and, at least until the nineteenth century, practically the only important account of the life of Melanchthon, it has continued to exercise a tremendous influence on later depictions of him. Its value as a biographical account has masked the polemical function of the work.

It seems that the *Vita Iuelli*, still a major historical source, has been subject to a similar posterity. W. M. Southgate, in his 1960s analysis of Jewel’s doctrinal teaching, acknowledged that ‘except when otherwise specified, the Latin

\(^{41}\) Timothy J. Wengert, ‘“With Friends Like This…”: The Biography of Philip Melanchthon by Joachim Camerarius’, in *The Rhetorics of Life-Writing in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Mayer and Woolf, pp. 115-31.
life of Jewel by Laurence Humphrey is the source of information for the years before Oxford and a major source for the years which followed’ [my italics].

From its title page onwards it is evident that the *Vita Iuelli*, like the contemporaneous *De Philippi Melanchthonis*, is more than an extended eulogy of the leading churchman of his generation, and more than a historical record of religious controversy. It is also an emphatic, purposeful piece of polemic, directed at specific individuals in the midst of the theological rows over the role that Jewel and his legacy would have in the culture of the English church. As it draws on these biographies of learned men, and the particular example of Camerarius’s life of Melanchthon, the *Vita Iuelli* proves to be an important example of the reformed European biographical tradition emerging in the mid-sixteenth century.

**The staging of Jewel’s life**

As Humphrey sets out the structure of the *Vita Iuelli*, he refers to the work as a ‘tragicocomedie’ in five Acts, adding ‘sic enim vita humana recte dici potest’ (‘for so a *vita humana* can rightly be called’). The use of the term indicates another European literary tradition that had adapted classical precedent – that of the ‘Christian Terence’ plays. Also known as ‘academic’ or ‘sacred’ dramas, tragi-comedies were written for moral and religious edification, and performed at universities across Europe. This dramatic form had flourished in Germany and the Netherlands since the end of the fifteenth century, although, as Herrick notes, by the mid-sixteenth century ‘tragicomoedia was a term that [still] defied satisfactory
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explanation’.\(^{44}\) In 1543, the English playwright Nicholas Grimald referred to his *Christus redivivus* (‘Christ Renewed’) as a ‘tragicae comoediae tractatio’ (‘treatment of tragi-comedy’).\(^{45}\) Written and performed at Brasenose College soon after he arrived at Oxford from Cambridge University, Grimald’s work was received as a new kind of drama. It contrasted with the more traditional scriptural themes and Senecan dramatic conventions of previous works seen in England.\(^{46}\)

In 1556, when John Foxe issued his Latin play, *Christus triumphans* (‘Christ Triumphant’) from Basel, he described himself as a ‘poeta novus’ offering the audience a ‘novam rem’.\(^{47}\) J. H. Smith argues that Foxe’s work is another example of tragi-comedy, breaking new ground with regard to the usual rules of comedy, and particularly re-pointed for Protestant polemical ends.\(^{48}\) It is noteworthy that, soon after becoming President, Humphrey asked Foxe to stage a production of this play at Magdalen College.\(^{49}\)

In describing the *Vita Iuelli* in these dramatically resonant terms, and from an academic seat that would have afforded him a close view of these new dramas, Humphrey seems to be offering his own staging, as it were, of the heated Protestant controversies of the 1570s, dramatized around the narrative of events in Jewel’s life.

---

46 Herrick, *Tragicomedy*, p. 30, cites further European examples published around this time.
49 Smith, *Two Latin Comedies*, p. 34, cites Foxe’s reply to Humphrey late in 1561, London, British Library, Harleian MS 416, fol. 140. There is no evidence as to whether a performance took place at Oxford.
The Terentian pattern for tragi-comedy follows a conventional structure and Humphrey introduces his biographical narrative in the form of its five ‘acts’. Traditionally, the protasis, occupying acts one and two, introduces most of the principal characters and sets up the action of the play. The epitasis, developing the action, runs throughout acts three and four and into act five, leading to the catastrophe, which occupies the last two scenes of act five.

Humphrey’s first ‘act’ comprises a brief account of Jewel’s family background and his boyhood in Devon, the narrative taking up only five pages. He offers relatively little information about Jewel’s early education, although he notes the several Devon schools attended and the names of Jewel’s schoolmasters. Humphrey’s main emphasis is on the relationship between the promising young scholar and his teacher at Barnstaple, Walter Bowen. This is expressed in terms of their mutual regard, ‘amore et honore’ (‘with love and respect’), and Jewel’s lasting gratitude.50

The second part of the narrative is entitled ‘Academica’ and comprises Humphrey’s fifty-page depiction of Oxford University in the reign of Edward VI, as he describes Jewel’s studies at Merton and then at Corpus Christi College.51 As we saw in Chapter One, as Humphrey describes the educational landscape at Oxford, he develops his portrayal of Jewel as the ideal reformed humanist scholar. Again, he suggests the ideal relationship between scholar and tutor, and delineates the persona of the ‘doctus piusque praeceptor’, as depicted in the Optimates. Humphrey’s conception of the exemplary tutor is relocated to the university setting as he describes John Parkhurst’s mentoring of Jewel at Merton

50 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sigs B3r - C1v (sig. C1r).
51 Ibid. sigs C1v - I2v.
College, and relates his own experience in John Harley’s schoolroom at Magdalen College.

Humphrey emphasizes Jewel’s proficiency in both classical and vernacular languages, in particular Italian, pointing to the interest in modern language studies that was emerging in Oxford in the 1570s. Citing Jewel’s innovative memory aids, his annotative practice, and renowned oratorical skills, Humphrey depicts Jewel in terms that reveal both his education in reformed humanist subjects and in the preaching and exegetical skills required in his ecclesiastical vocation. He describes Jewel’s use of personal commonplace books and a highly effective system of short-hand notes and indices, marked up with ‘literulis quibusdam novis & peculiaribus’ (‘certain novel and peculiar little letters’).

In associating Jewel’s graphical practice and use of commonplace books with his renowned and extraordinary memory, Humphrey also underlines the importance of these practical exercises of exemplary scholarship to Jewel’s pastoral role.

In describing the university tuition given to young nobles by John Jewel in the 1550s, Humphrey promotes the informal strategies for education of the lay gentry that he continues to support at Magdalen College as he writes the *Vita Iuelli*. He cites ‘multi nobilium Generosorum et Mercatorum filii’ (‘the many sons of renowned well born men and merchants’) and mentions specific families by name. Throughout his narrative, Humphrey recounts Jewel’s biography in ways that promote and reinforce his own programme for reformed humanist
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52 Ibid. sig. 2H1v.
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54 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sig. D2v, cites the family names Gilford, Fettiplace, Townsend, Curson, More, Dolman, Denton, Hickford, Walby, Prynne, ‘et aliis’ (‘and others’).
education at Oxford in the 1570s. Paratextual material in this section includes excerpts from an address Jewel had given at Corpus Christi in honour of the deceased benefactor Richard Foxe, and a sermon he preached at St. Mary’s Church. These excerpts carry the pedagogical undertones of the *Interpretatio Linguarum* and the *Optimates*, as Humphrey provides textual examples in demonstration of his argument.

The third part of the narrative, comprising thirty pages, addresses Jewel’s time in exile in Frankfurt, Strasbourg and Zurich. Again, paratextual material is used to support Humphrey’s account of this time and, as we saw in previous chapters, Humphrey’s narrative enables him to frame his own autobiographical account of the experience of exile, as he reveals that of John Jewel.

In the fourth act, Humphrey describes Jewel’s return to Elizabethan England, his appointment as Bishop of Salisbury, and his ecclesiastical activities. This ‘act’ comprises more than one hundred and fifty pages and, as we see later, it provides the context and the setting for Humphrey’s own engagement in ongoing religious controversy. Again, paratextual material occupies a substantial part of this section. It includes Jewel’s correspondence with European reformers, excerpts from a range of printed works, and a paraphrase of his important ‘Challenge Sermon’.

In the fifth act, as he sets out his account of Jewel’s ‘death and the final catastrophe of his life’, Humphrey emphasizes Jewel’s courageous resistance amidst declining health, and his determination to continue preaching despite his frailty, completing the narrative account of Jewel as a paradigm of Christian

---

55 Ibid. sigs F3r - I1v.
virtue. Contemporary resonance is given to the Terentian dramatic form by Humphrey’s use of the word ‘catastrophén’, as he stages ongoing confessional controversy with Jewel’s detractors.⁵６

Likewise, the protagonists are introduced in a way that suggests the setting out of characters in a play. John Jewel is established as the subject of the life being written, as one would expect for a vita humana, and the title page declares that, along with the account of his vita et mors, the work offers a defensio of Jewel’s ‘true doctrine’ and a refutation of arguments put forward by certain detractors. However, whilst the title identifies John Jewel as chief protagonist, and Laurence Humphrey as the author, it is typographically centred on five antagonists with whom Jewel had been engaged in ongoing theological

Figure 1. Title Page from Humphrey’s 1573 Vita Iuelli

⁵₆Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. B3r.
controversy. These adversaries are identified individually in an aligned block of type, which draws the eye away from the more varied upper case italic and lower roman type of the subtitle and publication information below (see figure 1). From a first glance at this title page it is evident that Humphrey is calling to account the arguments of Jewel’s detractors, who are listed by name: Thomas Harding, Nicholas Sanders, Alan Cope, Jerónimo Osório of Lisbon, and Arnold Pontacus, the Catholic prelate from Bordeaux. Humphrey casts Jewel’s eulogized, posthumous presence directly alongside this group of antagonists, major opponents of the Protestant cause. The staging of an account of contemporary controversy alongside the *vita humana* seems to afford it equal, arguably even greater significance than the biographical narrative, and enables Humphrey to dramatize his work in relation to specific and recent religious controversies.

**Contexts and controversies**

Throughout the 1560s, one of Jewel’s tasks as Bishop of Salisbury had been to meet the ‘challenge from abroad’ – the vocal opposition of the English Roman Catholic exiles to the church in England and to him as its chief apologist. Central to Jewel’s theological position was the insistence that it was the Church of England rather than the Church of Rome that had remained faithful to tradition. He articulated this in his renowned ‘Challenge Sermon’, first preached at Paul’s Cross in November 1559, and then at the court of Queen Elizabeth, and again at Paul’s Cross in March 1560. Jewel maintained that the Catholic church had directly contravened patristic authority, and that attempts to defend its position ‘nullum verbum ex tota sacra scriptura, nullum exemplum primae Ecclesiae,
nullum Patrem, nullum Doctorum antiquum proferre possunt’ (‘were able to offer not a word from the whole of sacred scripture, nor an example from the primitive church, nor from the fathers, nor from the ancient scholars’).\textsuperscript{57} Having returned from exile only eight months earlier, Jewel had been consecrated Bishop of Salisbury in January that year. His important sermon ‘became in Spring 1560 the introductory chapter and thesis of what was to be a vast corpus of apologetic and controversial writing extending over the next decade’.\textsuperscript{58}

The significance of Jewel’s theological position is accentuated by the textually central place that Humphrey affords the ‘Challenge Sermon’. Positioned half-way through the three hundred and forty pages of the first edition of the \textit{Vita Iuelli}, its presentation has the effect of making the sermon the pivotal point in both Humphrey’s work and in the account of Jewel’s life.\textsuperscript{59} Additional typographical emphases – the indented title, the use of italics for the date and place at which it was first delivered, and italics for the opening scriptural passage – further signpost the importance of this critical sermon.

Surveying the sermons of mid-century preachers such as Edmund Grindal, Alexander Nowell, John Scory, James Pilkington, and Edwin Sandys, the nineteenth-century historian, Charles Webb Le Bas, noted that Jewel’s ‘Challenge Sermon’ produced the ‘greatest public sensation of all of the addresses made by Protestant reformers in this year’\textsuperscript{.60} However, whilst the 1560 sermon was ‘considered the germ of his subsequent controversial writings’, in 1562 Jewel published a treatise that would overshadow his original challenge, his \textit{Apologia}

\textsuperscript{57} Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuelli}, sig. Q2\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{58} Southgate, \textit{John Jewel and the problem of doctrinal authority}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{59} Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuelli}, sig. P1\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{60} Charles Webb Le Bas, \textit{Life of Bishop John Jewel} (London: Rivington, 1835), p. 91.
ecclesiae Anglicanae. Writing to John Foxe, Jewel refers to this work ‘de mutata religione et discessione ab ecclesia Romana’ (‘concerning the change of religion and the separation from the Roman church’). The first English edition of Jewel’s Apologia appeared later that same year, followed by Lady Ann Bacon’s highly acclaimed translation, a work revised by Archbishop Matthew Parker and issued in 1564, that became the official English edition. Humphrey’s positioning of the ‘Challenge Sermon’ provides context for, and weight to, his account of the – by then – renowned Apologia and the rapid exchange of printed polemic that followed Jewel’s massive work.

In 1564, Thomas Harding issued from Louvain an ‘Answer to Jewel’s Challenge’, which appeared in England in late spring. Harding, the Devon-born scholar and Cambridge divine who had been deprived of his preferment under Elizabeth, was by this time an active leader in the early attempts to reconcile the English church to Rome. He worked alongside Nicholas Sanders, another of the group of English Romanist exiles at Louvain. In the Vita Iuelli, Humphrey makes much of the observation that Harding’s role overseas represented a relatively recent turn in his religious sympathies, as he depicts Harding’s recent activity within the English Protestant establishment. Expressing apparent wonder at Harding’s antagonism towards Jewel, Humphrey draws on the narrative of Harding’s change of religious allegiance. A Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University under King Henry VIII, Harding had also held the position of Chaplain to the Duke of Suffolck, a role that involved, according to Humphrey, his

63 An Apologie or answere in defence of the Churche of Englanede, with a brieve and plaine declaration of the true Religion professed or used in the same (London: Reginald Wolf, 1564).
frequently instructing Lady Jane Grey with the ‘salutaria consilia e divino codice’
(‘the divine truths of scripture’). With rhetorical irony, Humphrey points to
Harding’s former eloquence on behalf of the evangelical cause:

Ille ille Hardingus, qui sub Edouardo Rege mirifice & magnifice protestatus est, Concionatus est, iuratus est contra Papam: qui Tridentinos patres ut illiteratos Pontificulos, Oxoniae pro Concione derisit, [...] qui Purgatorii pictas flamas & papyraceos parietes sarcastice nominavit: qui Romam sentinam Sodomicam, Missam massam Idololatricae, & mysterium iniquitatum esse dixit. Qui & domum in Collegio suo Novo, non novo more aut corrupte, sed Evangelice & pie Scripturae partes exposuit.  

(This is he, Harding, who, under King Edward, protested, preached and swore against the Pope; who, in the pulpit at Oxford, mocked the Fathers of Trent as illiterate and paltry priests; [...] who lavished all his powers of sarcasm in describing the painted flames and paper walls of purgatory; who called Rome a scum-filled Sodom, and the Mass a heap of idolatry, and a mystery of iniquity; who both at home, and at New College expounded parts of scripture, not in a new or corrupt manner, but evangelically and devoutly.)

As he recounts Harding’s apostasy, Humphrey rhetorically reverses the customarily characterization of ‘new religion’, so frequently used to undermine the reforming Protestants’ claims to an authoritative doctrine. He figures Harding’s Roman Catholicism as the newfangled religion:

Ille versa rerum vice, mox novum Christum, novum Evangelium, novam legem, novum contra Evangelicos anathema nunciat: Ille verbo & scripto quod dextra aedificat, mox sinistra destruit.  

(This is he, who, on the turn of affairs, found a new Christ, a new Gospel, a new Law, a new anathema against the evangelicals; who demolished with his left hand what he had built up with the right.)

Humphrey derides Harding’s sudden change of confession, and suggests the lack of diligencia, the scholarly virtue emphasized in the Interpretatio linguarum, in Harding’s hasty re-interpretation of scriptural texts:
Ille inquam ille Hardingus, novo hoc Papismi enthusiasmo derepente inflatus, quasi septem dierum spatio omnia doctorum, Conciliorum, Latinorum, Graecorum volumina peragrasset, ex hac Patrum lectione se mutatum profitetur, & alios convertere vel potius pervertere studuit, ipsumque.  

(This is the man, who now appears inflated with a new and sudden enthusiasm for Popery; who professes that the study of the Fathers had both converted himself, and made him anxious for the conversion of others, as if travelling through every learned teacher, preacher, Latin and Greek writer, and the perusal of the Fathers were a work of seven days!)

Together with Nicholas Sanders, Harding had been appointed Apostolic delegate to England by Pope Pius V in 1566. He provided the principal liaison with the papacy, and was responsible for the execution of orders from Rome concerning the English and their problems.  

Humphrey further undermines his adversary in terms of a failure in his oratorical practice, contrasting Harding’s performance with the Ciceronian ideal of rhetoric. Deploying the humanist conception that associated rhetorical shortcomings with moral failure, he mocks Harding’s voice and delivery, lampooning his apparently exaggerated gesticulations and facial expressions. He denounces Harding as guilty of personal betrayal and appalling hypocrisy:  

Ille Iuelli in ministerio socius, ipsum Collegam suum, Devoniensem suum, amicum & fratrem suum, id est, alterum se virulento libro proscindit: eum, non Sacerdotem, ipse iisdem sacris & eodem tempore & ab eodem credo Ordinario initiatus: non Episcopum, cuius tamen canonicae electioni in Capitulo Sarisburiensi ipse tum Praebendarius interfuit, & suum calculum addidisse fertur.  

(He, who was once Jewel’s associate in the ministry, now seeks, in his malignant book, to rip apart his former colleague, his fellow Devonian, his friend and brother, his other self; proclaiming the man with whom he was ordained to be neither Bishop nor Priest; and saying this, although he,  
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Harding, had himself, as Prebendary, been party to the election, and is said to have given his vote on that occasion.)

The grounds for the long and bitter engagement between Jewel and Harding are clearly, if unevenly, set out. As a twentieth-century commentator on Jewel put it, ‘for the next six years he [Jewel] was to be mainly occupied with the one man and his writings’. Over this period, Harding and Jewel published their subsequent defences and counter-attacks in a major project of editorial issue and re-issue. A generation later, it was acknowledged that those two combatants led the field of ‘valiant confuters’ through which Protestant and Catholic were opposed in the early Elizabethan church:

Harding, and Jewell, were our Eschines, and Demosthenes: and scarcely any language in the Christian world, hath afforded a payre of adversaries, equivalent to Harding, and Jewell; two thundring and lightning Oratours in divinity.

Jewel’s comprehensive 1567 Defence of the Apology is described as ‘one of the most complete pieces of controversy in the world’. Such was the lasting importance of the controversy and of Jewel’s articulation of the doctrine of the English Protestant church that, in 1609, Archbishop Richard Bancroft required ‘every parish in England’ to purchase an edition of Jewel’s works, at the time dubbed ‘a Jewell and Hardinge’.

---

As he describes this sustained dispute in detail, with careful citation of letters, sermons and speeches, Humphrey highlights its enduring significance to the Protestant cause. In a vivid simile, he points to the ongoing energy in the controversy, continuing as it does beyond the demise of both Jewel, in 1571, and Harding, the following year:

Nuper autem famosi libri quasi sturni aut infaustae aves horrendo stridore, magnó agmine provolarunt, contra hunc singularem veritatis assertorem garrientes.  

(But recently, defamatory books have been flying around like starlings or ill-omened birds, with a terrible screeching, in a great flock, chattering against this singular defender of truth.)

The motif sees Humphrey positioning Jewel as the devout protector of his country’s strong, and apparently unified, Protestant religion in opposition to the superstitious and scattered disturbance represented by the Catholic complaint. In his account, Humphrey also takes up the controversy, and actively promotes the ongoing project of anti-Catholic challenge. He identifies the wider circle of detractors, whilst discrediting them as poorer imitators of Jewel’s main adversaries:

Evolarunt etiam et alii transmarini cuculi eandem raucam Sanderi vocem imitantae et vanissimam cantilenam occinentes, et inprimis ille graculus Burdegalensis Pontacus, declarans et denuncians, Iuellum esse Haeresiarcham, Superintendentem, Pseudoepiscopum, hunc magna volumina mendacis refertissima bis scripsisse.

(And there are many cuckoos from over the sea, imitating the voice of that Sanders, and repeating his worthless gabble. Especially that jackdaw, Pontacus of Bordeaux, declaring Jewel to be an heresiarch, a mere
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superintendent, a pseudo-bishop, and asserting that twice he had put forward bulky tomes stuffed with lies.)

Humphrey figures Harding as an old, aggressive mastiff, whose ‘bite’ could be forceful compared to other, lighter-weight opponents, whom he undermines as mere ‘catulos latrantes’ (‘snarling puppies’).⁷⁹ Given that Humphrey was writing after Harding’s death, his descriptions evidently attempt to undermine the credibility of continuing Catholic opposition.

Eventually, in 1585, the entire Jewel-Harding controversy was re-printed in Latin, the lengthy title of this edition suggesting the enormously laborious typographical effort that such an endeavour required.⁸₀ The 1585 edition also included Humphrey’s *Vita Iuelli*, a fact that demonstrates how Humphrey’s account had itself become part of the controversy.

Concurrent with this controversy ran another well-documented dispute between Walter Haddon and Jerónimo Osório, described in more detail in my previous chapter. Its agenda resembles that of the Jewel-Harding exchange, and whilst Humphrey’s treatment of this dispute in the text of the *Vita Iuelli* is brief, his placing of Osório on the title page demonstrates its relevance. In a strikingly similar pattern to that of Jewel with Harding, Haddon was engaged in this...

---

⁷⁹ Ibid. sig. 2C1r.
controversy with Osório until Haddon’s death in 1572. Afterwards, it was Humphrey who urged John Foxe to complete Haddon’s final reply to Osório.81

The list of adversaries on Humphrey’s title page indicates a third polemical exchange, highlighting the contemporary controversies between English Catholics and Protestants that were being played out in printing houses across Europe. In 1566, the Catholic theologian and polemicist Nicholas Harpsfield, writing under the name of his friend Alan Cope, published from Antwerp his thousand-page Dialogi sex contra summi pontificatus, monasticae vitae, sanctorum, sacrarum imaginum oppugnatores, et pseudomartyres (‘Six dialogues against pseudo-martyrs and the assailants of the Papal primacy, monastic life, and veneration of saints and images’).82 As noted above, Cope is one of the adversaries identified on the title page of the Vita Iuelli. He had been a contemporary of Jewel’s since their boyhood in Devon and of Humphrey’s at Magdalen College, Oxford. A Roman Catholic ecclesiast, Cope had been elected Senior Proctor of Oxford University in 1558. However, unable to practise his faith openly following Elizabeth’s accession, he resigned his preferments and fled to Flanders. He entered the University of Louvain where he matriculated in 1563 and was known to be in Flanders in 1570. Cope allowed his name to appear as author of the Antwerp-published Dialogi sex in order to deflect further aggravation towards Harpsfield, who had written the work whilst imprisoned in the Tower of London.83

---

82 Dialogi Sex contra summi pontificatus, monasticae vitae, sanctorum, sacrarum imaginum oppugnatores, et pseudomartyres, Alano Copo Angli editi (Antwerp: Christopher Plantin, 1566).
Each part takes the form of a dialogue between Critobulus, a German, and the English Irenaeus, to challenge anti-Catholic works. Five of the six dialogues specifically take issue with Jewel’s *Apology*. As well as denouncing Jewel, they censure the Protestant historians Johann Sleidan and John Bale, and attempt to undermine the above-mentioned *Historia ecclesiae Christi*, the work also known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*. Cope/Harpsfield’s lengthy sixth dialogue is concerned with denying persecuted Protestants the status of martyrs. It brands as ‘pseudo-martyrs’ a number of the figures who were celebrated in Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*.84

Just as the identification of Jewel’s adversaries on the title page gives prominence to specific controversies, another summary list highlights specific disputes and emphasizes the ongoing controversial Protestant agenda of the 1570s. Immediately after the title page is a list of ‘loci communes & praecipui in hoc opere’ (‘commonplaces and matters of special importance in this work’).85 These prioritize the most significant arguments within the work.

In calling them ‘loci communes & praecipui’, Humphrey also flags a relationship to ‘the first book on protestant theology’, Philip Melanchthon’s pioneering work in rhetoric, the *Loci communes rerum theologiarum seu hypotyposes theologicae* (‘Commonplaces of theological matters, or theological figures’), printed in 1521. Melanchthon’s book examines Ciceronian and Aristotelian methodologies for organizing examples for dialectic and logical argument, the *loci* method, and in using these significant terms, Humphrey is

85 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sig. +1.
against staking out reformed intellectual territory. Humphrey’s first two *loci communes*, ‘exhortatio ad studia literarum’ (‘an exhortation to learned studies’) and ‘exhortatio ad religionem [sic]’ (‘an exhortation to religion’), recall his division, in the *Interpretatio linguarum*, of the two principal branches of knowledge: theology and humane letters.

Another of these *loci*, the ‘tractatio de latria & dulia’ (‘a treatment on *latria* and *dulia*’), demonstrates Humphrey’s own engagement in specific doctrinal arguments at this point in his career. As we saw in Chapter Two, in his 1559 *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey drew on a rhetorical strategy in Calvin’s *Institutes* to undermine what he considered were over-subtle linguistic distinctions within Catholic doctrine regarding veneration and worship. At stake beneath these detailed linguistic arguments, was the battle for divine authority as revealed through scriptural sources. Calvin had denounced as sacrilegious the scholastic, and Catholic, distinction between *dulia* (that is, veneration paid to angels and saints), and *latria* (worship proper only to God). In the 1570s, around the time that the *Vita Iuelli* was issued, Gabriel Harvey’s hand-written annotations in his copy of Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum* highlight the text quoted here in the *Vita Iuelli*, a passage taken directly from the 1559 work.

Harvey’s marginalia indicate an informed awareness in England of the contemporary controversy at the University of Louvain regarding theological teaching methods – the choice between ‘the traditional scholastic one or one more

---

philological and historical after the manner of Erasmus’. It is quite possible that Cope was also involved in these arguments at Louvain, which apparently offered a rich vein for ridicule by Humphrey. In the *Vita Iuelli*, Humphrey’s treatment of the Catholic distinction between *dulia* and *latria* runs to twenty-one pages. Printed marginal annotations pick out the main elements of the dispute, initially summarized as ‘distinctionis de Latria & Dulia enervatio adversus Alanum Copum’ (‘the senselessness of distinctions of *latria* and *dulia*, against Alan Cope’). Humphrey quotes directly from the fifth dialogue between Critobulus and Irenaeus, including the section in which Humphrey’s own condemnation of the idolatry implied by the linguistic distinction (as the ‘frivolous and empty’ definitions by ‘de-tongued illiterate Scholastics’) had itself been singled out by Cope/Harpsfield. Humphrey’s personal reason for citing this specific exchange is evident from the scornful passage in the fifth dialogue of Cope/Harpsfield’s text:

> Vides denique, quos elingues, & illitteratos Scholasticos scribat Humfredus noster frivolam hanc & vanam invenisse, & pertinaciter defendisse Duliae & Latriae differentiam.

(You see, finally, that those so-called tongue-less, illiterate scholastics, of whom Humphrey wrote, have found and very firmly defended this apparently frivolous and empty distinction of ours between *dulia* and *latria*.)

---
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The lack of reference to Jewel throughout this extended section suggests that Humphrey is here using the setting of the *Vita Iuelli* to retaliate specifically against recent criticism of his own treatment on this doctrinal question in the *Interpretatio linguarum*, and to further his own arguments against the *dulia/latria* distinction.

Humphrey’s use of paratextual apparatus positions this important literary work of reformed humanism within an increasingly controversialized context. As he draws attention to these highly charged and concurrent theological disputes, it is apparent that Humphrey is deploying the *Vita Iuelli* against Jewel’s and his own opponents, using the sharpest weapon at his disposal, printed rhetorical polemic. This memorial volume is not only the channel by which Jewel’s apologetic for the Reformed English church can be sustained and defended, it is the means by which his Catholic adversaries are taken on following his death.

In a later work, Humphrey acknowledges the cross-confessional, mid-century European trend, in which memorial volumes are deployed with polemical intent by both Catholics and Protestants. In the 1580s, Humphrey was commissioned to compose Oxford University’s answer to a sensational Catholic publication. Edmund Campion, having recanted his Protestantism and become a Jesuit priest, had in 1581 privately published and distributed his *Rationes decem*, or *Ten Reasons Proposed to His Adversaries for Disputation*, in which he explained his return to Rome and exhorted his fellow countrymen to do

---

likewise.\textsuperscript{95} By the time Humphrey wrote the first part of his formal response to the \textit{Rationes decem}, Campion had been executed, and the aftermath of vehement polemic and propaganda that had followed his death prompted Humphrey to exclaim:

\begin{quote}
Id vere dicere possum mortui Campiani Manes quam viventis Rationes plus mihi exhibuisse molestiae: non tantum quia doctrinae suae virus abiens post se reliquit, ut Bonasus animal fugiens reddit fimum cuius contactu velut aliquo igne aduruntur insequentes: sed multo magis quia eius amici illum consepultum refodiunt, illius patrocinium suscipiunt, Epitaphium, Anglice, Gallice, Latine decantant. Dictum olim, [...], mortuos non mordere, \& tamen Campianus in ore suorum mordet mortuos.
\end{quote}

(I can truly say that the ghost of the dead Campion has given me more trouble than the \textit{Rationes} of the living. Not only because he has left his poison behind him, like the fabled Bonasus, which in its flight burns up its pursuers with its droppings, but much more because his friends dig him up from his grave, defend his cause, and write his epitaph in English, French and Latin. It used to be said, ‘dead men do not bite’, and yet Campion dead bites with his friends’ teeth.)

Humphrey’s rather disingenuous complaint, about the deployment of polemic in the name of someone already deceased, serves to highlight his own rhetorical strategy within the \textit{Vita Iuelli}.

In another example of confessionally driven rhetorical strategy, Humphrey cites the ‘articuli verae religionis’ (‘the articles of the true religion’), to which Richard Chambers had asked the young men in exile, who were the recipients of his financial aid, to subscribe. Humphrey lists these articles in his description of the support offered to the exiles.\textsuperscript{97} They include the Protestant denial of papal power, the rejection of transubstantiation as impious and of the propitiatory mass as blasphemy, the statements that justification is not dependent on good works

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Edmundi Campiani decem rationes (Henley: Stonor Park, 1581).
\item Humphrey, \textit{Vita Iuelli}, sigs D4’ - E1’.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
and that the doctrine of purgatory is superstitious. Finally, they affirm the belief in the use of the vernacular in religious services. All but one of these articles (the one on justification), also make their appearance among the challenge points when Jewel preaches at Paul’s Cross in November 1559, and are reiterated by Humphrey in his account of the sermon.²⁹

As Humphrey positions the *Vita Iuelli*, as a defence of Jewel’s reputation and a rebuttal of his detractors’ criticisms, with the specific aim that it will enable Jewel’s own works to stand for posterity, he also tries to pre-empt possible charges of writing too positive a life of Jewel. Denying that he has composed an ‘apotheosis’, the act of canonization of a saint, he remarks that such eulogistic works ‘enim vel palponum vel Paparum sunt privilegia’ (‘are the privileges of flatterers or Papists’).²⁹ His reference to the tradition of written ‘Lives of the Saints’, the hagiographies of medieval writers, conveys the negative connotation that was attached to the genre by the mid-sixteenth century. Humphrey explains his interest in asserting the veracity of his account, ‘ut omnibus appareat, me dum virtutes praedico, hominem celebrare, non Deum consecrare voluisse’ (‘so it is clear to everyone, that when I refer to his virtues, I want to celebrate the man, not immortalize him as a God’).²⁰ His confessionally nuanced rejection of ‘mortalis Apotheosin’ and ‘sanctos canonizo’ demonstrates, once more, Humphrey’s careful mediation of the legacies of these biographical genres.

²⁹ Ibid. sigs Q² - Q³v.
²⁹ Ibid. ‘Epistola nuncupatoria’, sig. +2v.
²⁰ Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sig. B³r.
**Networks of reformed humanist scholars**

As we have seen throughout this thesis, Humphrey uses the *Vita Iuelli* to signal the context of international scholarship within which he articulates his conception of reformed humanist education. He repeatedly draws on the strong legacy of leading reformed scholars, for example by including and directly quoting letters written by Calvin, Martyr and Melanchthon to the English exiles in Zurich and the congregation at Frankfurt. Each of these letters urges perseverance in the face of the adversity of exile, and their cumulative effect is to present a paradigm for the virtuous reforming leader – qualities which Humphrey can then ascribe to Jewel.

The interconnectedness of this circle of reforming scholars and clergy was undoubtedly strong and reciprocal, and, like Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum*, the *Vita Iuelli* can be considered an example of a kind of roll-call of influential European reformers. Initiated through their shared scholarly projects – teaching, translations and printed editions – and strengthened by the shared experience of exile, these networks are consolidated by reciprocal expressions of each other’s literary credentials along conventional classical lines. Humphrey describes, with some affection, the background to some of his associates’ Latinized nicknames, another mark of their shared scholarly experience. Having observed the aptness of Jewel’s surname, indicated from birth (by his paternal name), as ‘gemma rara & pretiosa’ (‘a rare and precious jewel’), he gives the account of how Philip Melanchthon was designated his classicized surname by his great-uncle, the renowned Hebrew scholar, Johann Reuchlin. Melanchthon’s German family

name ‘Schwarzerd’ (literally meaning ‘black earth’) is translated to its Greek equivalent as Reuchlin symbolically acknowledges his great-nephew’s scholarly prowess. In the same tradition, Humphrey informs us, Reuchlin sometimes went by the name ‘Capnio’, the Graecized form of his own German surname, meaning ‘little smoke’. In recounting this anecdote, Humphrey implicitly identifies with the shared values and interests of these prestigious European reformers. This precedent also enables him to draw a comparable alignment between himself and the scholar-printers of Basel. He recounts the provenance of the pair of names, Oporinus and Chimerinus, the Latinized versions adopted by the printers Johann Herbst and Robert Winter. Humphrey again points to the reformed humanist context as he explains how they took their classicized names from an epigram by the Roman poet, Martial. It begins ‘si daret autumnus mihi nomen, Oporinos essem’ (‘if autumn were to give me my name, I should be Oporinus’).

As a rhetorical device, Humphrey’s anecdotal explanation suggests an experience of scholarly amicitia, shared between well-connected networks of ideologically affiliated sympathizers. They also add colour to the description of the intellectual setting to which Jewel, with the value-laden, and apparently self-fulfilling characteristics of his own name, belonged.

As he recounts Jewel’s experience on the Continent, Humphrey’s cataloguing of fellow exiles likewise seems aimed at a strengthening of those networks which had been forged in the sympathetic communities of Frankfurt, Strasbourg and Zurich – cities where Jewel had at various stages lived. Humphrey highlights individuals who have since gained leading positions in the English

---

102 Humphrey, Vita Iuelli, sig. B3v.
103 Ibid. sig. B4v.
establishment – religious, governmental or educational – under Queen Elizabeth, and suggests the patronage circles around them. He identifies associates of the noble classes in terms of their dutiful, reformed exercise in office, emphasizing virtues of diligence, moral purity and *utilitas*. Of the group at Frankfurt, he cites the distinguished appointment of Sir Francis Knollys, ‘nunc Regiae Maiestatis Consiliarius & Thesaurarius’ (‘Privy Counsellor and Treasurer to Her Royal Majesty’), and mentions his eldest son, Henry Knollys, as ‘virtute & animi dotibus non infimus’ (‘renowned in virtue and intellectual gifts’), along with other offspring. He cites Doctor Sanford, Robert Crowley, and Robert Horn, elected Bishop of Winchester, alongside David Whitehead and Thomas Lever, depicting them collectively as they ‘una cum reliquis Symmistis, diligenter, sancte, utiliter ministrarunt’ (‘ministered diligently, devoutly, and usefully alongside the Privy Counsellor [Knollys]’).\(^{104}\)

Of the group who had been at Strasbourg, Humphrey cites Alexander Nowell, appointed as Dean of St Paul’s, mentioning him alongside Arthur Saul, then Chaplain to Sir Nicholas Bacon, and William Cole, who was President of Corpus Christi College as Humphrey wrote the *Vita Iuelli*. With these eminent men, Humphrey also identifies the ‘Angloargentinenses’ (‘Anglo-Strasbourgers’): John Cheke, Richard Morison, Anthony Cooke, Peter Carew, Thomas Wroth, John Ponet, Edmund Grindal, Edwin Sandys, and Thomas Eton. He highlights the financial support provided by this London merchant, describing Eton as ‘hospes communes profugorum’ (‘host to the community of exiles’).\(^{105}\)

\(^{104}\) Ibid. sig. L4\(^e\).
\(^{105}\) Ibid. sigs L4\(^f\) - M1\(^f\).
That Humphrey’s list serves a purpose beyond the biographical is suggested by his also taking the opportunity to identify groups of exiles who were based in Geneva and Basel, despite Jewel’s not having lived there. Acknowledging John Bale’s record of exiles, Humphrey makes a point of identifying Dorothy Stafford, now serving in Queen Elizabeth’s bedchamber. In the *Interpretatio Linguarum*, he had portrayed Stafford’s devout support of her son’s reformed humanist education whilst in exile in Geneva and Basel. Humphrey also cites Katherine (formerly Brandon), Duchess of Suffolk, and her second husband, Richard Bertie, who had found refuge in Germany and Poland. He invokes, as another example of *pietatis femina*, the friendship at Cambridge between the Duchess of Suffolk, ‘genere, religione, exilio nobilitata foemina’ (‘a woman renowned in birth, religion, exile’), and Martin Bucer. In his account of Jewel’s final illness and death, Humphrey describes his good humour in the face of personal suffering, and compares the gracious manner with which Jewel responded to the bitter attacks of his adversaries to that of Martin Bucer. He recounts the episode in which Katherine Brandon had given Bucer a gift of a cow and a calf to support his family. Bucer’s enthusiastic visits to these animals prompted his adversaries to spread rumours that he saw them so often they must be evil spirits from whom he gathered material for his divinity lectures. Humphrey reports Bucer’s jocular response to this piece of confessional polemic:

> En, inquit, hi sunt praeceptores mei, a quibus ea quae doceo, didici: qui tamen nec Latine, nec Grece, nec Hebraice, nec Germanice, nec ulla alia lingua mecum sermones conferre possunt.

---

106 See Chapter Two.
108 Ibid. sig. 2L2v.
109 Ibid. sigs 2L2v - 2L3r.
(Hah, he said, these are my tutors, from whom I have learnt what I teach others: and yet they can speak with me neither in Latin, nor in Greek, nor in Hebrew, nor in German, nor in any other language.)

In this brief account, Humphrey signals the scholarly, multi-lingual, European credentials of this model of reformed humanism, emphatically supported by the patronage of a devout and learned noblewoman. By the mid-1570s, these individuals represented some of the most influential and well-resourced patrons attached to the Elizabethan establishment and Humphrey’s depiction of this network of associated scholars and nobles reinforces the patronage circles on which he and his associates relied.

One of the prominent paratexts with which Humphrey introduces the *Vita Iuelli* is a Latin epigram on the subject of *historia*. This twenty-line verse was composed by the scholar and diplomat, Daniel Rogers. Its title, ‘[a]d Historiam, de vita & morte Iohannis Iuelli, studio Laurentii Humfredi, Doctoris Theologi, Epigramma’ (‘an epigram to history, concerning the life and death of John Jewel, through the endeavour of Laurence Humphrey, Doctor of Theology’), emphasizes the author’s, as much as the subject’s, literary and theological credentials.\(^{110}\) Rogers’ epigrammatic verse is striking in that it mentions Humphrey by name three times, the same number as it does Jewel, who is after all the subject of this *historia*. In contributing this prominent epigram, as well as two further Latin poems, and one Greek to the appended collection of memorial verse, Rogers occupies a substantially larger space in the *Vita Iuelli* than other contemporary writers. This perhaps indicates his particularly close affiliation with the departed or the author as well as his alignment with the tradition of reformed humanist

education. Daniel Rogers came from a well-connected, continental Protestant family. On the execution of his father under Queen Mary, he had returned to his birthplace of Wittenberg in 1557, where he was taught by his father's old friend, Philip Melanchthon. He also studied with Johann Sturm and Hubert Languet. On Elizabeth’s accession, Rogers took his M.A. at Oxford University before being appointed tutor and steward to the household of the English ambassador in Paris, Sir Henry Norris. He later became an agent for Francis Walsingham, (who replaced Norris as French ambassador in 1570), and was to be linked to his patronage network for the next twenty years.  

A considerable number of other European associates are cast in supporting roles by their multi-lingual verse contributions. Their educational and cultural affiliations are expressed in the honour they pay collectively to this Protestant luminary. Concluding the \textit{Vita Iuelli}, this group comprises Thomas Wilson, John Wallis, Alexander Nowell, Thomas Bickley, William Cole, Herbert Westfaling, Giles Laurence, Adam Squire, Arthur Yeldard, Tobias Mathew, Edward Craddock, Oliver Withington, Martin Culpeper, Thomas Bodley (who provides Latin and Hebrew contributions), Laurence Bodley, Thomas Norton, John Reynolds, P. L. Viller of Paris, George Buchanan, Daniel Rogers (again), Cardan Mignot of Rouen, Jean Brosser of Vendome, France, M. Delafaius of France, Robert Rollus, Henry Cotton, Rudolph Gualter of Zurich, T.G., Henry Knyvet, Robert Onflous, Samuel Cranmer, and John Foxe.  

The presence of these contributing scholars, most of whom have a connection with Magdalen College, acts as a form of shorthand, much as the list

of recommended translators did in Humphrey’s *Interpretatio Linguarum*. They enable the *Vita Iuelli* to interweave itself with the works of these other European reformed writers, indicating the momentum behind a general movement of Protestant apologetic. As we shall see in the Conclusion to this thesis, shared intellectual, literary or religious ideals are being conveyed through numerous publications at this time.

Humphrey also refers to the close circle of Jewel’s friends from whom he had obtained source material for writing the *Vita Iuelli*. Specifically he mentions John Parkhurst, who had been Jewel’s tutor at Merton College, Oxford. Having returned from Zurich, Parkhurst was the first bishop to be elected under Elizabeth I, and Humphrey here emphasizes his preferment as ‘Episcopus Norvicensi’ (‘Bishop of Norwich’).\(^\text{112}\) The friendship that Humphrey describes between Jewel and his former tutor is further suggested in a letter, written as Humphrey was gathering his sources for the *Vita Iuelli*. Writing to Rudolph Gualter in March 1572, Parkhurst mentions that Humphrey had already written to him twice:

asking and entreating me that (as he [Jewel] was formerly my pupil, and always very close to me) I should send him a thorough account of what I know of him. In order to gratify a friend and to discharge a just debt to the spirit of my dearest Jewel, I have written many but not all things. These I shall send to Oxford in a couple of days. I can tell more of Jewel than the whole of England.\(^\text{113}\)

Another friend who provides Humphrey with biographical detail is the Greek scholar Giles Lawrence, a former associate of Jewel’s at Corpus Christi College. Lawrence had preached Jewel’s funeral sermon and he contributes Greek verse to

\(^{112}\) Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, ‘Epistola nuncupatoria’, sig. +4v.

the *Vita Iuelli*. The third source Humphrey mentions is John Garbrand, the Protestant clergyman and scholarly son of the Oxford bookseller, Garbrand Harkes. With Jewel’s support in the 1560s, Garbrand had received a succession of prebends in the Diocese of Salisbury, and he was the executor of Jewel’s will. In 1583, Garbrand issued an edition of Jewel’s sermons in which he also recommends Humphrey’s *Vita Iuelli*.

As we have seen, the descriptions of Jewel’s scholarly activities, and his references to teachers, associates, colleagues and pupils at Oxford and across Europe, collectively enable Humphrey to frame and promote his conception of the ideal of reformed humanist education.

**Conclusion**

In his 1559 *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey had referred to the purpose of translating and disseminating *historia*, ‘cuius cognitio iucunda, est, explicatio fructuosa’ (‘the knowledge of which is to be pleasing and its analysis productive’). Jewel’s life, as portrayed by Humphrey, can be viewed as a biographical attempt to please and be productive, depicting an exemplar of pious erudition, and ‘providing the English ministry with an archetypical guide in bringing happiness to those whose souls they guarded’.

---

116 *Certaine sermons preached before the Queenes Maiestie, and at Paules crosse, by the reuerend father Iohn Ievvel late Bishop of Salisburie. Whereunto is added a short treatise of the sacraments, gathered out of other his sermons, made vpon that matter, in his cathedrall church at Salisburie* (London: Christopher Barker, 1583), sig. ¶2r.
But Humphrey also compiled and wrote the *Vita Iuelli* in order to engage in specific controversies with Jewel’s detractors and to defend Jewel’s theology. Humphrey’s mediation of the many literary genres has perhaps contributed to the reputation of this work as ‘a rambling, disorderly, and imperfect narrative, though written in a cordial and zealous temper’.\(^{119}\) By considering both the range of literary traditions on which it is modelled, and the immediate context for the *Vita Iuelli*, we can see that Humphrey’s work represents not so much a biography, as a piece of religious controversy, purposefully constructed with all the rhetorical tools at Humphrey’s disposal, carried out on biographical terrain. The *Vita Iuelli* supplies clear evidence of the confessionalization of reformed humanism at this moment in English literary endeavour, in the wake, specifically, of Harding’s attacks on Jewel.

As he holds up the exemplary life of Jewel as a mirror for imitation, Humphrey depicts the archetypal embodiment of the ideal Protestant, whose listed qualities suggest the fulfilment of English ambitions for the reformed humanist educational programme:

> Exemplar ministrorum Iuellus est a nobis hoc loco propositus, sed ille animo optime constitutus, secunda fama foelix, ingenio praestans, literarum opibus cumulatus, maximis optimorum civium suorum studiis et gratia beatus, decessit.\(^{120}\)

(We have before us, in Jewel, the exemplar of faithful ministry. But he, who was blessed with a mind admirably constituted, happy in a commanding renown, eminent in intellect, rich in literary resources, honoured with the love and esteem of the best men of his own country, has passed away.)

The *Vita Iuelli* afforded Humphrey an excellent opportunity to portray Jewel as ‘an academic philosopher, an elegant orator, a winning writer, as well as a devout

---


\(^{120}\) Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, ‘Epistola nuncupatoria’, sig. 1r.
eclesiast and reverend prelate’. It also enabled Humphrey to further his own interests in reforming humanism, as he constructed Jewel’s and to a great extent, his own, Latin biography.
Conclusion

This thesis has placed Laurence Humphrey in the narrative of northern European reformed humanist education that originated in the era of Erasmus and Luther. Considering three important works in the context of the biographical narrative of Humphrey’s education, his exile and return, it has revealed him to be a significant but neglected writer whose literary contributions address the breadth of humanist and theological interests.

The first three chapters situated Humphrey’s two works of humanist pedagogy in the crucial context of his early education and exile. Chapter One described the multi-lingual, intellectual culture with which Humphrey was engaged at Oxford and on the Continent in the 1550s, identifying the settings from which Humphrey articulated his views on humanist education for the reform of society in England. Chapter Two argued that Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum* provided an important intellectual rationale for mid-Tudor reformed literary activity. Presenting a new conception of the devout, reformed translator, the *vir bonus*, working for the common good, Humphrey exemplifies the persona of the translator in terms of his civic engagement and intellectual contribution. Humphrey demonstrates how classical and scriptural texts, if thoroughly understood and properly explicated, might be used to inform new learning, and he celebrates the linguistic innovation that is taking place in mid-sixteenth-century English writing.

Chapter Three examined Humphrey’s proposals in the *Optimates* for a highly specific programme of humanist education within the noble household.
Advocating a curriculum of the best of classical, scriptural and reformed works, his pedagogical approach calls for education to be acquired via the finest examples of literary style and ethical content. Humphrey’s perspective as an exile again shapes his work, as he addresses a nation perceived to be in crisis. He calls for a re-examination of the values of those ‘optimates’, the ‘best of men’, urging them to seek reform for their country under a new monarch.

Chapter Four assessed Humphrey’s educational influence in the early Elizabethan era as a counter-balance to the well-worn account of his involvement in that period with non-conformist religious activity. My discussion demonstrated the importance of Magdalen College and its school as an influential educational setting for the coupling of humanist scholarship and reformed religious ideology throughout the sixteenth century, beyond the Edwardian years with which it is usually associated. The narrative also considered intellectual and social contexts from which the vernacular translation of Humphrey’s *Optimates* and other important humanist works were produced.

Chapter Five presented a reading of an important literary work that has so far barely featured in the secondary literature on mid-Tudor writing, the *Vita Iuelli*. Humphrey used the humanistic apparatus of this biographical volume – including paratextual material from a wide and influential network of international scholars – to promote his version of reformed humanist education, and he set out his idealized model for humane and sacred learning at Oxford University in the mid-Tudor years.

Whilst reiterating the pedagogical approach that underpins both the *Interpretatio linguarum* and the *Optimates*, the *Vita Iuelli* is a different product
from Humphrey’s two earlier works. This chapter also showed how he purposefully deployed a literary, humanistic work to intervene in contemporary religio-political disputes. Whilst different from the openly polemical writing of the kind his opponents were producing, the *Vita Iuelli* reflects the more controversialized context within which Humphrey was writing in the 1570s.

Chapters One to Three showed Humphrey placing his own pedagogical works in a tradition that attempted to accommodate the study of both profane and sacred texts, whilst avoiding the more confessionalized programmes put in place in mid-century Germany. The *Optimates* reveals an emerging pattern in which Humphrey was starting to use stylistic criticism to undermine the religious credibility of the writing he discussed. This work adumbrates the religio-political deployment of humanist works in the 1570s when, from a network of renowned international Ciceronians, England’s most celebrated Latin stylists were drawn into controversial religious territory in response to the Catholic challenge to Elizabeth.

As we saw in Chapters Four and Five, humanist scholarship was put into the service of religious polemic with some ambivalence. In the preface to his 1577 English translation of Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the Protestant scholar Meredith Hanmer explicitly resisted the notion that other recent editions of Eusebius might reflect their translators’ confessional bias. Hanmer expresses his agreement with Edward Godsalve’s censure of an earlier translation by Wolfgang Musculus (the edition in which Humphrey was involved, as we saw in Chapter One). In doing this, Hanmer draws attention to the fact that the Roman Catholic Godsalve’s criticism of the Protestant reformer Musculus’s translation
could have, but had not, been driven by his different religious stance: ‘[t]hough
the reporter be partill being of a contrarie religion, yet herein I finde his
judgement to be true’. In the same vein, Hanmer commends another edition of
Eusebius produced by the late Catholic translator, John Christopherson, whilst
noting that ‘(as for his religion I referre it to God and to him selfe, who by this
time knoweth whether he did well or no)’.¹ Hanmer’s careful assertions that these
translated editions were to be considered on their own merit, independently from
their authors’ denominational inclinations, highlight the unease that surrounded
works of reformed humanism at this time. Humphrey’s own works over the
period demonstrate a shift in the expression of the alignment of his humanist and
theological interests, as he moved from promoting his conception of reformed
humanist learning, to more defensive expressions of Reformed, that is, a more
confessionally explicit variety of, humanist education.

It is natural to ask in this conclusion what Humphrey’s influence was in
the years after the Vita Iuelli and what became of the tradition of reformed
humanism in the 1580s. Little has been written about Humphrey’s literary
contribution from the context of his position at Magdalen College during this
period. The received narrative of his later life gives prominence to the schism that
opened up between Humphrey and a younger generation of radical Puritans in the
1570s, and to his involvement in the anti-Catholic campaigns sponsored by the
church establishment.² Despite several attempts by some of the younger fellows
to challenge their President (a traditional pattern, if we refer back to Magdalen
College in the 1550s), these disruptions were temporary and Humphrey’s

¹ Meredith Hanmer, *Auncient Ecclesiasticall Histories of the First Six Hundred Yeares after Christ*
(London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1577), sig. *4r*.
² Freeman, *ODNB*, ‘Humphrey, Laurence’. 
authority at Magdalen College prevailed during this latest period of religious tension. Until his death, Humphrey presided over a college that, with its particular focus on language teaching, evidently represented an attractive setting for scholars seeking a broad humanistic training, in preparation for an increasingly wide range of career paths.

In a Cambridge lecture published in 1577, the young Professor of Rhetoric, Gabriel Harvey, indicates Laurence Humphrey’s standing as Oxford’s leading orator. Harvey ranks him alongside the exemplary rhetoricians of antiquity and recent times:

Ego Lycurgum Spartae; Demosthenem Athenis; Ciceronem Romae; Venetiis Manutium; Ramum Parisiis; Argentorato Sturmiium; Smithum Cantabrigiae; Humfredum Oxoniae; singulis fere nobilissimos Civitatibus singulos dedi praeclarissimos Oratores.\footnote{Gabriel Harvey, \textit{Rhetor, vel duorum dierum Oratio, De Natura, Arte, & Exercitatione Rhetorica} (London: Henry Binneman, 1577), sig. K4.}

(I assign Lycurgus of Sparta, Demosthenes of Athens, Cicero of Rome, Manutius of Venice, Ramus of Paris, Sturmius of Strasbourg, Smith of Cambridge, Humphrey of Oxford, the most notable of almost all citizens and the most renowned orators.)

As Harvey situates the classical orators within their landmark locations of Sparta, Athens and Rome, he identifies those ancient seats of learning with contemporary centres of northern European reformed scholarship: the cities of Venice, Paris, Strasbourg, Cambridge and Oxford. Likewise, the finest figures of the golden age of classical oratory are identified with Europe’s leading reformist scholars, whom Harvey nominates as (Paolo) Manuzio, Peter Ramus, Johann Sturm, Thomas Smith and Laurence Humphrey. Harvey gives prominence to a group of reformed humanist scholars in which Humphrey’s standing is emphatic. Harvey seems to be identifying quite precisely a generation of men who were educated during the
early humanist reformation of scholarship and pedagogy.\textsuperscript{4} It is also notable that Harvey here identifies Manuzio with Venice rather than with Rome, even though the Papal printer had spent the longer part of his career in the latter city. It perhaps recalls Humphrey’s own appropriation of Manuzio to a broad reformed humanism, as we saw in Chapter Two, acknowledging him as a \textit{vir bonus} with respect to his scholarship in the Tuscan vernacular.

Harvey’s careful placing of emphasis on northern European reformed centres, and the association that he makes between the leading examples of classical literary tradition and of contemporary scholarship indicates that, at Cambridge in the 1570s, the study of the finest examples of classical writing was taking place by way of this specific generation of reformed humanist scholarship.

Below, I shall briefly consider some other material that suggests how Humphrey’s work was received in these decades, and how he used his firmly established reputation to endorse new and important works of the period. Throughout the 1580s, Humphrey was regularly involved in the intellectual commendation of work coming through the press of the first official printer to Oxford University. His provision of prefatory material for a number of important pedagogical works further demonstrates Humphrey’s standing in a recognized tradition of reformed humanist education.

Following the appointment in 1584 of the bookseller Joseph Barnes as printer to Oxford University, the first volume issued from his press was John Case’s \textit{Speculum moralium quaestionem in universam ethicen Aristotelis} (‘The

\textsuperscript{4} Manuzio, Ramus, Sturm and Smith were all born within eight years of each other, and Humphrey’s addition to the group puts them within twenty years of each other.
mirror of moral questions according to the ethics of Aristotle’).\(^5\) Humphrey’s contribution of Latin liminary verse occupies a dominant position in the volume. Alluding to the rapid issue in print of this second of two important works by Case, Humphrey describes the author as mounting the stage once more, in a new costume.\(^6\) Dedicated to the Earl of Leicester, the *Speculum moralium* signals Case’s firm acceptance within the network of writers receiving patronage from the Oxford University Chancellor.

The previous year, Case had issued his *Summa veterum interpretum in universam dialecticam Aristotelis* (‘Commentary on the ancient translators according to the dialectic of Aristotle’ [his *Organon*]). The work sets out how to respond ‘ad omnia genera quaestionum, quae in literis Sacris sunt’ (to all kinds of questions which are found in sacred writing’), by applying Aristotelian logic to scriptural interpretation.\(^7\) Case draws on Humphrey’s reputation to authorize his work, in the dedicatory epistle. It is Humphrey, Case says, who made him aware of Leicester’s good opinion and likely support of him:

\[\text{enim audivi per Doctorem Humfredum summum doctissimumque virum, inter caetera negotia (de quibus cum Academiae nostrae nostrae praefectis egeris) te singularem mei curam ac mentionem habuisse.}\(^8\)

(For I have heard from Doctor Humphrey, that most distinguished and learned of men, besides other business (concerning which you were conducting with the leaders of our University), of your singular regard and account of me.)

Humphrey had used the same convention to promote his *Interpretatio linguarum* in the 1550s, his dedication to Thomas Wroth authorized by the recommendations

\(^6\) Case, *Speculum moralium*, sig. ¶¶2v.
\(^8\) Case, *Summa veterum interpretum*, sig. 2v.
of Sandys and Walsingham. Humphrey’s position as referee for Case’s work demonstrates how far his career and reputation had carried him.

Echoing a familiar theme of reformed humanism, much of Case’s epistle is devoted to a plea that Leicester continues in his care for the university where, according to Case, the study of liberal arts is threatened.⁹ Peter Mack notes the position that Case’s work occupied in the undergraduate syllabus, representing a compromise between the traditional Aristotelian syllabus and the reformed humanist dialectic associated with Agricola, Melanchthon and Ramus.¹⁰

In the *Speculum moralium*, Humphrey’s neo-Latin poem emphasizes the limits of the study of Aristotelian logic with respect to living a Christian life, and to achieving the *summum bonum*:

> Finis Aristoteli fixus non ultima meta est, |
> Progredere ulterius, ni miser esse velis. | |
> Nosse Deum Patrem Christumque, haec vita beata est, |
> Hoc solum summum salvificumque bonum. ¹¹

(Aristotle’s fixed end is no final finishing post,
You should go further, if you do not wish to be unhappy.
To know God the Father and Christ, this is the happy life,
this is the only saving and principal goodness.)

Humphrey sets out rules for the student to consider whilst studying Aristotle, which include an explicit statement of justification by faith not works, a concept central to reformed theological tradition:

> Fac operare: operum meritis ne adscribe salutem, |
> Sola Fides, & non Ethica, iustificant. ¹²

(Do works, but do not ascribe salvation to good works.
Faith alone, and not ethics, provides justification.)

---

As we saw in Chapter Two, in 1559 Humphrey had personified his Interpretatio linguarum as an interpreter who would guide the scholar through his pedagogical work. Here, addressing the reader with the imperative, ‘consule Casaeum’ (‘consult Case’), he figures the printed edition as a tutor who can supply the necessary guidance when Aristotelian teachings contradict Christian theology:

Hiis ubi Aristoteles vester contraria scrisit, |
Consiule Casaeum, Gratia sitque Deo. [13]

(When that Aristotle of yours writes things to the contrary,
consult Case and be thankful to God.)

Humphrey’s statement also recalls the importance he gave to the influence of print culture in his Optimates. As we saw in Chapter Three, here he again emphasizes the unique status of the published book as it steers the student within the appropriate boundaries. Humphrey’s promotion of the work’s religious utility, in commendatory verse at the head of Case’s edition, offers further support for Schmitt’s argument against the traditional view of Case’s confessional alignment. Schmitt suggests that Case, far from being a suspected Catholic, ‘as most interpreters following Wood’s misinterpretation of the historical evidence have assumed’, was instead a trusted friend to theologians and ecclesiasts of undoubted loyalty to the Crown and to the emerging and distinctive ideals of Anglicanism. [14]


---

chapter is summed up in one elegiac distich, each distich beginning with a successive letter of the alphabet. Humphrey wrote the prefatory ‘admonitio ad studiosus’ (‘suggestion to the studious’) to this edition, in which he laments that ‘nostri Christiani’ (‘our Christians’) neglect scriptural reading, choosing instead to pursue ‘prophanas literas singulari studio & unice’ (‘profane learning with singular and sole study’). He attributes the perceived general decline in morality to this ongoing ‘scholarum abusus’ (‘abuse of the schools’):

Etenim patrum nostrorum memoria irrepsit foedissimus scholarum abusus, & adhuc apud nos multis in locis invalescit, nempe quod nostri Christiani prophanas literas singulari studio & unice confectantur: scilicet ut cum Gallo Aesopico in sterquilinio verrant, quo tandem aliquando gemmam, si Diis placet, non satis nitidam nec solidam reperiant.\(^{16}\)

(And in fact, within the memory of our fathers, the foulest misuse of the schools insinuated itself, and still amongst us in many places grows stronger, truly because our Christians consume profane learning with singular and sole study; just as, in Aesop, the cock sweeps into the dunghill any other jewel, even if it is pleasing to God, and finds it neither bright or nor solid enough.)

Humphrey demonstrates reflexively how the humanist’s knowledge of profane literature, such as Aesop’s fable of the cock and the dunghill, could be put to use to encourage the reading of scripture. Lamenting the absence of Christian writing in the programmes of reformed humanist education he has laboured to establish, Humphrey’s argument in this edition of Shepery recalls his proposal in the \textit{Optimates} that sacred learning take its place ahead of classical culture.

Humphrey specifically identifies the newly popular works of Ovid, Catullus and Martial as obstructive to the study of ‘sacros libros’ (‘sacred

\[^{16}\textit{Summa et synopsis Novi Testamenti}, \text{sig. A2'}\].
books’). He denounces their privileged place in the school curriculum as ‘praeposterum & prophanum’ (‘perverted and profane’):

Cur autem sacra in hoc Christiano paedagogio prorsus omittantur, & prophana solum in manibus puerorum tractentur, equidem causam nullam vel probabile hactenus potui invenire. Quod si antiqui Patres, Prophetes, Apostoli, Iudaei & Christiani hodie reviviscerent, & hunc docendi in scholis praeposterum & prophanum morem viderent, sacra de manibus deponi, prophana sumi, Ovidios, Catullos, Martiales, homines Atheos & obscoenos, Christianis auribus solos obtrudi, [...] si Christi Testamentum, & omnes sacros libros quodammodo explodi cernerent: talem profecto, in Christianismo paganismum mirarentur & obstupescerent.¹⁷

(But why sacred writing is utterly omitted from this Christian pedagogy, and only profane put into the hands of children, indeed I have been able to find no credible reason so far. Since if the ancient Fathers, Prophets, Apostles, Jews and Christians were to come to life again today, and see this perverted and profane manner of teaching in schools, the sacred writings put down from their hands, the profane taken up, Ovids, Catulli, Martials and Godless and obscene men, thrusting only these into Christian ears, [...] If they were to see the Testament of Christ, and all sacred books rejected in a certain manner, actually they would wonder and be numbed at such paganism in Christianity.)

Humphrey figures the neglect of godly learning as a perversion of the examples set by the tradition of the ancients. He invokes the pattern established by humane learning, ‘ab exemplo omnis antiquitatis’ (‘from the example of every ancient’), to support his argument for the inclusion of scriptural material:

Etenim hac in re & in Dei iussa violamus, & ab exemplo omnis antiquitatis recedimus, & sit ut non modo in studiis, prophanis simus & illoti, verum etiam impuri & iniquitati in tota vita & moribus.¹⁸

(For indeed in this we even violate the law of God, and we withdraw from every example of antiquity, & it is not only in scholarship, we have become profane and foul, truly even impure and iniquitous in our whole life and ways.)

In loaded terms, Humphrey denounces the curriculum of exclusively secular works, and describes the moral consequences of pursuing it. Where previously he

¹⁷ Summa et synopsis Novi Testamenti, sigs A2r - A2v.
¹⁸ Ibid. sig. A3v.
had used the adjective ‘prophani’ to denote non-religious writing, here he applies the word in a pejorative, ethical sense, associating it with the word ‘illoti’ (‘unwashed’), a word that carries connotations of religious impurity.

Concern over the neglect of sacred, relative to profane, works finds expression in other humanist editions produced from Leicester’s intellectual network. In 1585, the above-mentioned Meredith Hanmer re-dedicated his 1577 English translation of Eusebius’s history to Leicester, reiterating the complaint about the extent to which the curriculum was taken up by secular works:

It is to be wished, if not all, at least wise that some parte of the time which is spente in reading of such bookes (although many of them containe notable matter) were bestowed in reading of holy Scripture, or other such writinges as dispose the minde to spirituall contemplation.\(^{19}\)

Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine have suggested that the Ramist method used by the Elizabethan humanist, Gabriel Harvey, signals ‘the final secularisation of humanist teaching – the transition from “humanism” to the “humanities”’.\(^{20}\) In her discussion of Harvey’s study of dialectic, Jardine outlines the development of Harvey’s conception of the pragmatic orator as ‘a successful public figure and ‘man of action’ as distinct from the classical figure of the virtuous vir bonus.\(^{21}\) However, annotations that Harvey made in his copy of the 1559 *Interpretatio linguarum* suggest a more nuanced conception of reformed humanist teaching at this time, as they highlight the passages that discuss the

---

\(^{19}\) Hanmer, *Auncient Ecclesiasticall Histories*, sig. *3*.


‘munus’, the ethical duty or office of the translator. They demonstrate Harvey at work early in his career, accessing classical authors via mid-century currents of intellectual thought, and evidence his use of the Interpretatio linguarum as he prepared the lectures on rhetoric that he delivered in 1575. Harvey’s use of space in the margins and blank pages of the printed volume, and his citations of specific passages in works by Ramus, Sturm, Joachim Périon, and Denys Lambin, indicate that these annotations accrued over a number of iterative readings. Harvey’s marginal notes juggle between the two languages of his trade, Latin and Greek, actually rehearsing the transition between synonyms and comparable phrases according to the method recommended in the Interpretatio linguarum.

This rising Cambridge graduate enacted a form of short hand, as it were, for the pedagogic approach set out by Humphrey.

Harvey also annotated Humphrey’s discussion of the terms ‘dulia’ and ‘latria’, his rhetorical undermining of a point of Catholic doctrine described in Chapter Two. As we saw in Chapter Five, Humphrey drew on this linguistic

---

22 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum. Harvey’s annotated edition is in the Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge, pressmark III.18.74.
23 Harvey’s autograph and elaborate monogram, the inscribed date of 1570, and annotations suggest an initial reading by the scholar in this year. Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, Wren Library, pressmark III.18.74, sig. a1†. In 1570, twenty-year old Harvey would have been graduating from Christ’s College, Cambridge, on the verge of being elected fellow at Pembroke Hall. See Jason Scott-Warren, ‘Harvey, Gabriel (1552/3–1631)’, ODNB, online edn <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/12517> [accessed 15 March 2011].
24 V. F. Stern, Gabriel Harvey, His Life, Marginalia and Library (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), provides convincing criteria for the identification of Harvey’s hand. The close study I have made of the marginalia suggests that there are four relatively distinct ‘versions’ of Harvey’s handwriting in this volume. Intra-textual references corroborate this view. Harvey cites Sturm’s 1538 De amissa dicendi ratione, chapter 17, sig. ii, in Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, Wren Library, pressmark III.18.74, III, sig. R8†. He also references the printed edition of Ramus’s 1557 lectures on Cicero’s De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Joachim Perion’s 1540 exposition on translation, the De Optimo Genere interpretandi Commentarii, and Denys Lambin’s 1558 translation of and commentary on Aristotle’s Nichomachean Ethics and Lambin’s 1567 translation of Aristotle’s Politics.
25 Humphrey, Interpretatio linguarum, Wren Library, pressmark III.18.74, I, sig. 13†.
distinction again as he furthered his own doctrinal dispute in the *Vita Iuelli*. The ongoing controversy behind this verbal distinction is underlined (literally and metaphorically) by the annotative attention that Harvey affords it; the period during which he marked up the *Interpretatio linguarum* coincides with the disputes at the University of Louvain regarding theological teaching methods.

Harvey’s multi-lingual annotations in Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum* suggest the relevance and value that Humphrey’s work held for his contemporaries, specifically as a product of reformed humanist education. In Chapter One we saw Humphrey place his teacher, John Harley, in the tradition of reformed humanist education, in his description of the notational practices taught at Magdalen School. Where, in the *Interpretatio linguarum*, Humphrey recreates the scene of the schoolroom as he explains how to mark up a text, Harvey employs what could be termed a mimetic annotation. He draws his own ‘cut-throat line’ through the middle of Humphrey’s description of the teacher’s demonstration: ‘ut asteriscis variisque notulis signaverit, atque elegantiores voces linea minuta per medium transfixas quasi iugulaverit’ (‘as he marked out with asterisks and various marks, and thrust small lines through the middle of more elegant words as if he were cutting their throat’) [my strike-through replicates Harvey’s hand-drawn line]. Just as Humphrey indicated the way in which the classical pedagogic tradition had been adapted by reformed humanists such as John Harley, Harvey’s manuscript annotations evidence the continuation of this tradition, as he developed his own scholarly practices in the course of becoming

26 Humphrey, *Vita Iuelli*, sigs S4r – X2r.
the ‘arch-humanist of the Elizabethan Age’. And as we saw in Chapter Five, Humphrey was celebrating the exemplary annotative practice of John Jewel in the *Vita Iuelli* at around the same time that Harvey was marking up his copy of the *Interpretatio linguarum*.

In 1559, Humphrey’s *Interpretatio linguarum* was a pragmatic means for him to present himself as a heavyweight Protestant intellectual with much to offer England under a Reformed regime. Harvey’s marginalia, which provide evidence of Humphrey’s text being read alongside the commentaries of other influential reformed scholars, and which suggest its use as an intellectual reference tool for his teaching of reformed translation in 1570s Cambridge, help to afford it a notable place in the narrative of humanist education in England.

Two other examples can serve to show the continuing importance of Humphrey-influenced translation as a didactic tool within the university curriculum, whilst indicating the way in which different versions of reformed humanist learning were gradually developing. Charles Merbury’s *A Brief Discourse of Royal Monarchie* (1581) has been described as a work that demonstrates the ‘nexus between the ideology of the Protestant state, learned strangers, and the study of modern languages’. In his account of the role that the teaching of modern languages assumed in the 1570s and 1580s, Boutcher describes how the multi-lingual aspect of an alternative humanistic curriculum was directed towards social and political success, as evidenced in Merbury’s work which ‘could hardly be more pragmatic and occasional’. Merbury prefaced

---

29 Boutcher, ‘New Documents on John Florio’, p. 51.
his translation of Jean Bodin’s *Six livres de la Republique*, with a letter ‘To The Reader’, in which he acknowledges his education at Magdalen College:

> calling to minde how I had otherwhiles bestowed some time in Oxford (under the governement of my learned Tutor maister Doctor Humfry) in the studies of humanitie.\(^{30}\)

Although Humphrey’s status as the author of the *Interpretatio linguarum* is not explicitly invoked, it is striking that Merbury introduces his vernacular work, a translation from French to English, with reference to Humphrey’s intellectual authority. In the same preface, Merbury describes as a rehearsal for this printed work an earlier translation he made of Aristotle’s *Ethics*, a text that he says he put aside after showing it to a few friends in private:

> A treatise, although not altogether to be dispised (as none such of that matter being to my knowledge written in this our English tongue:) yet because I desired not as then to bring my name in question unto the worlde.\(^{31}\)

Merbury’s mention of this earlier (unpublished) translation of a classical text emphasizes his own grounding in humanist learning, and he uses these scholarly credentials to promote his new, vernacular work.\(^{32}\) Merbury invokes the stamp of Humphrey’s intellectual credibility, and of his emblematic status within the pedagogical tradition of Graeco-Latin translation, in order to present a pragmatic, humanistic work of vernacular translation.

Around the same time, in a Latin manuscript translation of Spenser’s 1579 *Shepheardes Calendar*, Humphrey’s symbolic presence invokes a different

---

\(^{30}\) *A briefe discourse of royall monarchie, as of the best common weale: Wherein the subject may behold the sacred Majestie of the Princes most Royall Estate. Written by Charles Merbury Gentleman...Whereunto is added by the same Gentleman. A Collection of Italian Proverbes, In benefite of such as are studious of that language* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1581), sig. *3r*.

\(^{31}\) Merbury, *A briefe discourse of royall monarchie*, sig. *3r*.

\(^{32}\) Ibid. Merbury uses the Latin ‘summum’ and ‘civile bonum’ in his description of Aristotle’s works.
version of humanism. As we saw at the beginning of the Introduction to this thesis, John Dove, an Oxford scholar who took his B.A. in 1584, dedicated his translation to his two tutors, William James and Martin Heton, respectively Dean and Sub-Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Dove acknowledged the shortcomings of his own work in comparison to the ideal he saw established in Humphrey’s ‘praeccepta’ (‘precepts’), an implicit reference to the *Interpretatio linguarum*, evidently the standard methodological work on translation in use at Oxford. His prefatory remarks indicate that Humphrey’s work was being read in the context of the reformed practice of verse translation from English into neo-Latin. As we saw, Dove coined the adverb ‘Humfredice’ (‘in a Humphrey-like way’) to describe the way translation should ideally be carried out. Whilst the conventions of the dedication required the young scholar to concede that he had not accomplished this standard in his own work, Dove authorizes his literary verse translation by reference to Humphrey’s pedagogical method.

Invoking the poem’s religious allegory, in his ‘calendarium pastorum’, Dove suggests that his dedicatees will recognize themselves in the poem’s ‘orthodoxi pastores’ (‘orthodox shepherds’):

> quum non sitis Morelli, non Davides, non Palinodi, et pseudo-apostoli; sed Algrindi, sed Pierci, et Thomalini, orthodoxi pastores, qui hic scaenice oculis vestris subiiciuntur.\(^{35}\)

\(^{33}\) The only known extant manuscript of this translation is held at Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College Library, MS 595/547. The title page reads ‘Poimenologia, que vulgo calendarium pastorum appellatur e versu Anglicano in latinum traducta’. Dove’s manuscript is described by Leicester Bradner, ‘The Latin Translations of Spenser’s “Shepheardes Calendar”’, *Modern Philology*, 33:1 (Aug, 1935), 21-26.

\(^{34}\) Martin Heton was the youngest son of the Protestant sustainer, George Heton, the merchant who had offered substantial support to the Marian exiles. He was to succeed Humphrey both as Vice-Chancellor at Oxford and Dean of Winchester and in 1600 was consecrated Bishop of Ely. Brett Usher, ‘Heton, Martin (1554–1609)’, *ODNB*, online edn, January 2008 <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.ion.ac.uk/view/article/13138> [accessed 14 June 2012].

\(^{35}\) Gonville and Caius College Library, MS 595/547, fol. 1.
(since you would not be the Morells, the Davids [i.e. the Diggon Davies], Palinodes and false apostles; but the Algrinds, Pierses, Thomalins, orthodox shepherds, who are staged here before your eyes.)

John King suggests that contemporary readers of the *Shepheardes Calendar* would have assumed an interpretation in terms of the general conflict between ‘two formes of pastoures or Ministers, or the protestant and the Catholique’, and recognized its association with the immediate political context. The organization of the Jesuit Mission to England during 1579, the year of publication, made Catholic priests and laity controversial subjects for Protestant satire. Dove’s distinction between the characters of ‘pseudo-’ and ‘orthodox’ pastors in the poem, and his explicit identification between his tutors at Christ Church and the godly shepherds suggest that he shared this interpretation. Dove’s manuscript translation of the *Shepheardes Calendar* ‘reflects and disseminates the evangelical, forward Protestantism of the late 1570s and early 1580s’, identified by Boutcher with reference to John Florio’s 1578 *Florio his firste fruitez*. Dove’s characterization of Humphrey as ‘doctissimus pater pastorum Oxoniensis’ (‘most learned father of shepherds at Oxford’), makes explicit the relationship between a seemingly theoretical treatise on translation and the ideology of a reformed, and as Boutcher has shown, mutating Protestant humanist programme.

Both Merbury’s and Dove’s prefaces witness the growing application of European vernacular languages, and modern literature, to informal and individualized versions of the formal arts curriculum. These programmes were mediated by the relationships between individual scholars and their tutors, aligned by a shared ideology such as that suggested here between Dove, James and

---

Heton, and presided over by the emblematic presence of Laurence Humphrey.\(^{38}\) Humphrey emerges from these references not only as a pastorally minded churchman, but also as a representative of openness to the developing humanist scholarship at Oxford University.

As in the case of Ascham’s involvement in the Osorian controversy in the 1570s, Humphrey’s established status as one of the pre-eminent Latin stylists of his generation led him to be called to the polemical battle. The period in which Spenser’s *Shepheardes Calendar* was being used as a model for literary translation at Oxford coincides with Humphrey’s own printed challenges against the Jesuit campaign. ‘No longer a purely pastoral attempt to attempt to provide instruction, counsel, and sacramental grace to English Catholics, [...] the mission had become a full frontal, public challenge to the Elizabethan state’s construal of the Catholic issue in terms of secular obedience and treason’\(^{39}\). As we saw in Chapter Five, Humphrey’s Latin treatises, requested by university convocation, represent the formal response from Oxford University to Edmund Campion’s *Rationes decem*.\(^{40}\) Lake and Questier characterize the respondents to this campaign as ‘men of business’ and ‘forward agents of the Protestant cause’. They were connected to the Elizabethan establishment not so much through ecclesiastical office but through links of patronage that attached them to leading figures in the regime.\(^{41}\)

\(^{38}\) Boutcher, ‘Humanism and Literature in Late Tudor England’, pp. 243-68.


\(^{41}\) Lake and Questier, ‘Puritans, Papists, and the “Public Sphere”’, p. 625.
Notwithstanding the conventional reluctance required by the captatio benevolentiae, Humphrey indicates some ambivalence about the polemical ends to which his scholarship is put. He describes his reluctance to engage ‘in has effervescentes & contentiosas scholas’ (‘in these boiling and vehement disputations’), preferring ‘alia studia amoeniora’ (‘other, more pleasant studies’). Acting in obedience to the persistent requests of those whom he does not wish to displease, Humphrey’s eventual agreement to write the work, he states, comes from his belief that the Jesuit mission threatens the English commonwealth.42

In 1587, Humphrey contributed liminary poetry to the obituary volume commemorating Philip Sidney. The edition was addressed to Leicester by William Gager, and contains verses by Humphrey’s former Magdalen pupil William Camden, Matthew Gwinne, and others. Emphasizing the status of these contributing writers, Gager refers to the many tributes he has had to leave out, citing verses written in Hebrew, Greek, French, and Italian, as well as Latin. This printed tribute consolidates the humanist tradition of published memorial verse that emerged at the beginning of Humphrey’s career, the convention initially established in print in the volume that honoured the Brandon brothers, discussed in Chapter One.

In the same year, this intellectual network endorsed another work by Case, the Sphaera civitatis (‘The Sphere of the Commonwealth’).43 Expounding Aristotle’s Politics, one of the central Aristotelian texts studied in Protestant universities, the Sphaera was to become one of Case’s most popular textbooks,

---

being reprinted frequently in Germany, if not in England. Again the volume reveals Humphrey’s guiding influence in an important pedagogical work, as his verse situates God at the head of a text that he says will steer Case’s readers towards a ‘sanctum ac sacrum politeuma’ (‘holy and sacred commonwealth’). Ironically citing Case’s supposed failure to invite him to contribute prefatory poetry, Humphrey offers his self-conscious, symbolic endorsement of this important volume:

Non petis a nobis versus Casaee modosve, |  
Recte: non possum scribere, febricitans.45

(You do not ask me for verses or meters, Case,  
Rightly so, for I cannot write them, suffering from a fever as I am).

By then, Humphrey’s liminary verse was valued for the promotional authority that his name alone could endow. Humphrey’s leave of absence from Magdalen College indicates that the President’s health was in fact failing, and he died on 1 February 1589.46

Having been incumbent for twenty-eight years, Humphrey had been the longest serving President of Magdalen College since its foundation, a record that would be un-broken until the end of the eighteenth century.47 As we have seen, Magdalen College cannot truly be characterized as a ‘puritan seminary’ in the early Elizabethan years but, under Humphrey’s presidency, it evidently promoted the widening programmes of language teaching and intellectual endeavour that characterize the emerging pattern of advanced, international Protestantism.

Humphrey’s immediate legacy was a college that prepared generations of

44 Schmitt, John Case and Aristotelianism, p. 87.  
45 Case, Sphaera civitatis, sig. ¶¶5.  
46 Bloxham, Magdalen College Register, 4, 132.  
47 Index of Magdalen College Presidents < http://www.magd.ox.ac.uk/college/history/presidents > [accessed 20 February 2010].
scholars for increasingly international, multi-lingual roles in both state and church establishments. In his 1607 account of the entertainment performed for James I at Oxford, Isaac Wake mentions Humphrey (along with Foxe) as a leading light of the University.\textsuperscript{48} Hugh Kearney identifies Humphrey’s enduring educational legacy in John Milton’s expressions of the ideal of ‘a gentlemanly Puritan education from the age of twelve to twenty in which all the arts and sciences could be acquired in a leisured manner’.\textsuperscript{49} Kearney also suggests the Hartlib circle as possible heirs to Humphrey’s educational conception. Kenneth Fincham acknowledges another aspect of Humphrey’s enduring influence in the form of an effective example for the pastoral, evangelical episcopate in the Jacobean period. He suggests that the reception and broad dissemination of Humphrey’s \textit{Vita Iuelli} helped to establish and sustain the tradition of the devout and erudite ecclesiast.\textsuperscript{50}

Whilst pointing to Humphrey’s intellectual standing in the 1580s, Case’s above-mentioned Latin commentaries on Aristotle perhaps also serve to highlight the lack of response to Humphrey’s call for English translations of Livy, Plato, Aristotle and Cicero in his own lifetime.\textsuperscript{51} Although by the end of the sixteenth century a number of English translations of Livy were available, it was not until the late seventeenth century that English editions of Plato, Aristotle, or all of Cicero’s works were produced.\textsuperscript{52} Likewise, in the sixteenth century, England

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{48} Isaac Wake, \textit{Rex Platonicus: Sive, de potentissimi principis Iacobi Britanniarum Regis, ad illustrissimam Academiam Oxoniensem, adventu, Aug. 27. Anno. 1605. Narratio ab Isaaco Wake, publico Academiae eiusdem Oratore, tum temporis conscripta, nunc vero in lucem edita, non sine authoritate Superiorum} (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1607), sig. F1\textsuperscript{v}.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Kearney, \textit{Scholars and Gentlemen}, p. 102.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Kenneth Fincham, \textit{Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I} (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 275-76.
\item \textsuperscript{51} See Chapter Two; Humphrey, \textit{Interpretatio linguarum}, III, sig. L6\textsuperscript{v}.
\end{itemize}
made no major contribution to the publication of patristic texts, but would emerge as a crucial setting for their production throughout the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{53}

Humphrey’s conception of reformed humanist learning was articulated at a pivotal moment in the narrative of mid-Tudor education. Morgan notes that the reform of the universities ultimately produced ‘little lasting progress towards the purification and eventual godliness of all knowledge’, largely because of the increasingly diverse ends to which education was directed.\textsuperscript{54} Whilst an emerging pattern of secularization in university education can be seen by the end of the century, a number of grammar schools promoted confessionalized, vernacular curricula, for example requiring the reading of works such as Alexander Nowell’s \textit{Catechism}, a work issued by authority only after Queen Elizabeth’s objections to its radical Calvinism had been overcome.\textsuperscript{55} In 1599 the Puritan John Brinsley, a graduate of Christ’s College, Cambridge, was appointed Master of Ashby Grammar School in Leicester. It was the school that had been set up thirty years earlier under the patronage of Humphrey’s former pupil at Magdalen College, Francis Hastings, and his friend in exile Anthony Gilby.\textsuperscript{56} Brinsley came to be recognized as one of the leading educational theorists of the age and issued a number of practical manuals.\textsuperscript{57} In his 1612 \textit{Ludus literarius}, Brinsley recommends the daily exercise of reciprocal translation from Latin and English editions of the New Testament. Brinsley’s advice to ‘the younger sort of Teachers’ is that pupils read their translations out loud, whilst others are encouraged ‘to looke on their owne Testaments, English, Latine, or Greeke, or to

\textsuperscript{53} Haugaard, ‘Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth-Century England’, 37-60.
\textsuperscript{54} Morgan, \textit{Godly Learning}, p. 307.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid. pp. 180-86.
\textsuperscript{56} Fox, \textit{A Country Grammar School}, pp. 17-18.
\textsuperscript{57} Ian Green, \textit{Humanism and Protestantism}, p. 289.
harken’, as a means of ensuring ‘they may get Religion and Latine together’. In so doing, he was working within the reformed pedagogical tradition in which Laurence Humphrey has been shown to be a central figure.

58 John Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius, or, The Grammar Schoole; shewing how to proceede from the first entrance into learning, to the highest perfection required in the Grammar Schooles, with ease, certainty and delight both the Masters and Schollars; onely according to our common Grammar, and ordinary Classical Authours* (London: Thomas Man, 1612), sigs 2L3r and 2L4r.
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