An Elizabethan Translation of Tacitus: Lambeth Palace Library, MS 683

Introduction

Preserved at Lambeth Palace Library is a manuscript translation of the first book of Tacitus's *Annales* (Lambeth Palace Library, MS 683). The manuscript is a fair copy, written in an elegant italic hand on ruled paper across seventeen folio pages. Corrections have been made to the manuscript by both the scribe and another hand, presumably that of the author her- or himself. The translation has been bound in a limp vellum binding, bearing only the title 'An Essay of the Translation of ~~Livy~~ Tacitus 1st Booke of the Annals'. The title and its correction have been made in hands which differ from those found in the manuscript itself and may have been added at a later date. The manuscript lacks any prefatory material or dedication, but consists, as is explored below, of paper stock which gained prominence in the 1590s among the Elizabethan secretariat. Despite being one of only four extant early-modern translations of Tacitus into English, the Lambeth manuscript has yet to receive any scholarly attention.[1] This essay examines the fresh evidence which the Lambeth Palace Tacitus offers of early-modern engagements with Tacitus, locating the translation within the wider European and English contexts of Tacitean reception and scholarship.[2]

This essay first addresses the manuscript's provenance, discussing the translation's place in the collection of Archbishop Thomas Tenison (1636–1715), as well as positing the most likely candidate for its authorship with an appeal to its material aspects (paper stock, watermarks, and handwriting) and historical context. The essay then compares the style of translation adopted by the Lambeth translator with that of Richard Greenway, whose English version of the *Annales* and *Germania* was printed in 1598. The contrast of these translations

places in greater relief the stylistic choices made by each translator. As explored below, the Lambeth translator goes to some lengths to retain the density of Tacitus's prose as well as his celebrated brevity. So too the Lambeth translator follows the contours of the Latin syntax with remarkable commitment, even at the risk of obscuring the sense in English. Greenway is perhaps kinder to the reader. He expands for the sake of comprehension, departs from the sentence structure of the Latin original, and for the most part avoids the early-modern enthusiasm for cognates.[3] Greenway also appears to be more comfortable with specialist Latin vocabulary, whether tackling items of religious, political, or martial significance. In contrast, the Lambeth translator makes occasional slips of grammatical and lexical comprehension and at other moments omits words and phrases entirely. It is then somewhat of a paradox that the Lambeth translation, which reads in some ways as a first attempt, has been copied with such pains and in quite such an elegant hand by a professional scribe.

In a letter to Tacitus, Pliny the Younger (*c.*AD61–*c.*112) predicted that his friend's histories would prove immortal.[4] Pliny's confidence notwithstanding, only a small portion of Tacitus's works have survived. Of the *Historiae*, originally written in twelve books, only books 1–4 along with a section of 5 are extant. Of the sixteen books of the *Annales*, only books 1–6 and 11–16 have survived (and of these, books 5, 11, and 16 are incomplete). The early years of the sixteenth century proved to be of special importance, however, for Tacitus's preservation and wider transmission, especially with regard to the *Annales*. In 1509, Pope Leo X (1475–1521) purchased a manuscript from a monastery in Corvey, containing the first six books of the *Annales*. The manuscript, now preserved at the Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence, formed the basis for the 1515 edition prepared by Filippo Beroaldo the Younger (1472–1518). Between 1517 and 1608, Salvador Bartera counts at least seventeen commentaries on Tacitus, the earliest of which were concerned with questions of textual emendation and style.[5] In the second half of the sixteenth century, however, Tacitus

began to be valued especially as a political historian, whose account of the principate might serve, *via negativa*, as an example for the contemporary monarch or statesman. As the Flemish humanist, Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), puts it in the preface to his celebrated edition of 1574,

> You will find here adulations and accusations under tyranny, evils not unknown to this age: nothing genuine, nothing sincere, and no sure faith among friends […] many bitter and sad things for the reader, but let each of us think on the words of Thrasea, even as he was dying: 'Behold, young man, (and may the gods avert the omen) you have been born into a time when it is useful to fortify the mind with firm examples'.[6]

In July 1589, Lipisus published the *Politica*, 'a description and defence of centralised monarchy' which quotes from an impressive range of ancient sources, but most extensively from Tacitus. The *Politica* quickly became, as Jan Waszink notes, 'one of the central texts of political and stylistic Tacitism'.[7] Here Lipsius had an eye to the advice to princes tradition, offering lessons in state craft and practical government to the future monarch. As William Jones puts it in 'The Epistle to the Reader' prefacing his English translation of 1594, Lipsius 'sheweth what the Prince should be, what vertues he is especially to be endued withal, how he should make choise of good Counsellers, and officers: and to be short, after what sort he should behave, and establish him selfe in time of peace'.[8]

In 1589, Annibale Scoto, who served as valet to Pope Sixtus V (1525–90), prepared an explicitly political commentary on the *Annales* and *Historiae*. As he explains in the dedication to Sixtus, 'truly among those who have taught and elucidated the art of ruling states well with advice and examples, it is remarkable, most blessed Father, by how much Publius Cornelius Tacitus, pinnacle of Roman history and most majestic of authors, surpasses

and greatly excels all others'.[9] Scoto has prepared his commentary 'especially to speak to princes and courtiers', deliberately ignoring those elements which address 'grammar or the order of history'.[10] Some five years later, Pyramus de Candole similarly underlined Tacitus's value 'to all those who have cause to apply themselves to civil and state affairs' in the preface to his French translation, citing Polybius's remarks at the beginning if the *Roman History* concerning the importance of studying the past 'for a life of active politics'.[11] So too William Cornwallis in the first edition of his *Essayes* (1600) spoke of Tacitus's importance in terms of the affairs of state: 'Of history if you will have me showe you the best first, I must begin, and end with *Tacitus*, so grave a stile, so Judicial a Censure, and so piercing an eye into the designes of Princes, and States, never met in one man: he is so worthie, that I wish hee were as rare, for I holde no eye meete to wade in him, that is not at the helme of a State'.[12] With 'grave…stile', Cornwallis echoes the early commentaries and editions of Tacitus, which had consistently drawn attention to the *gravitas* of his prose. The title of the 1512 Venice edition had advertised Tacitus as 'Historici Grauissimi', while the Milanese jurist Andrea Alciato spoke of Tacitus's 'gravity of speech' ('sermonis grauitas').[13] So too the 1534 Aldine edition described his prose as 'dry and weighty' ('sicco, & gravi'), contrasting Tacitus's style with the 'soft and flowing speech' ('molli & diffluenti dictione') to which contemporary readers had become accustomed through Cicero and Livy.[14]

The first edition of Tacitus to appear from an English press was produced in neither Latin nor English, but Italian. In 1585, John Wolfe (*c*.1548–1601) published *La Vita di Giulio Agricola*, translated by Giovanni Maria Manelli and dedicated to Robert Sidney (1563–1626). As he explains in the dedication, Manelli has committed his translation to the 'protection of the Sidney gentlemen' because 'they especially penetrate and understand the prudence with which he has written'.[15] Six years later, Henry Savile completed his celebrated translation of Tacitus's *Historiae* and *Agricola*, published in Oxford by Joseph

Barnes and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth I (1533–1603). Savile's was not in fact the first translation of Tacitus to be dedicated to Elizabeth. In 1574, Ange Cappel had produced a French translation of the *Agricola*, also directed to the queen.[16] Savile prefaced his own translation with an historical supplement, *The Ende of Nero and Beginning of Galba*, which spanned the historical divide between the end of the *Annales* and the beginning of the *Historia*. Savile's translation has attracted extensive critical interest. Most recently, Mordechai Feingold has offered a revisionist account of the influential view, first posited by David Womersley, that Savile's Tacitus should be understood as speaking to the political ambitions of the Earl of Essex.[17] Feingold argues persuasively, however, that Savile's translation emerged from his close ties to both the Queen and to the Cecils, through whose influence Savile owed his positions at Merton and Eton Colleges respectively.[18]

Savile's Tacitus was followed in 1598 by Greenway's translation of the *Annales* and *Germania*, printed by Edmund Bollifant, who in the same year produced the first Latin edition of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* to appear from an English press.[19] Greenway modelled the presentation and structure of his Tacitus closely on Savile's precedent. Much like Savile, Greenway divides his translation into separate chapters with their own headings and includes marginal notes providing modern equivalents for ancient currencies and measurements.[20] The mise-en-page of the Greenway translation carefully mirrors that of Savile's Tacitus and there has clearly been some effort on the part of Bollifant to suggest a proximity to Savile's translation. Greenway has an eye to Savile's translation in his dedication to Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex (1565–1601), where he describes his own English Tacitus as 'verie much dimmed in respect of the historie alreadie in our toong'.[21] A second edition of Savile's Tacitus also appeared in 1598, produced by Edmund Bollifant for Bonham and John Norton, the same publishers responsible for Greenway's translation. From 1605 onwards, the translations by Greenway and Savile would be printed alongside one another, offering the

impression of a complete English Tacitus. Typically, Greenway's translation has suffered by comparison with Savile's. For David Womersley, Greenway's work was 'indifferent', while Alan Bradford refers to his 'inferior version of the *Annals*'.[22] As this essay explores, however, Greenway was an accomplished translator in his own right, alert to the complexities of Tacitus's idiom and syntax. Unlike the full-scale translations of Savile and Greenway, the Lambeth Tacitus includes neither chapter headings nor marginal comments, nor is there any indication that it was ever intended for publication beyond the fair copy now extant at Lambeth Palace Library. Before comparing the Lambeth and Greenway translations in detail, however, the following section considers the question of provenance and authorship.

1. Provenance, Paper Stock, and Authorship

The Tacitus translation is included among the Tenison Manuscripts in the catalogue prepared in 1720 by David Wilkins (1685–1745), Coptic scholar and sometime librarian at Lambeth Palace.[23] Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury (1636–1715), was an enthusiastic bibliophile and collector. While serving in St Martin-in-the-Fields in 1684, Tenison established London's first public library, to which he donated multiple printed and manuscript works from his own collection. Tenison played a fundamental role in the development of the library at Lambeth, bequeathing his vast collection to his successors. According to the catalogue of Tenison's personal library, which appears to have been drawn up following his death, Tenison also owned at least four printed versions of Tacitus,

including Lipsius's edition of 1574 and the English-language edition of 1604, which brought together the translations of both Greenway and Savile.[24]

The manuscript is juxtaposed in Wilkins' catalogue with the Bacon Papers, the jewel in the crown of Tenison's collection. The Bacon Papers boast a range of material relating to Elizabeth's court as well as the letters and documents compiled [!] by Francis Bacon's (1561–1626) elder brother, the intelligencer, Anthony Bacon (1558–1601). It is thanks to the Bacon Papers, and those of Sir George Carew [!], that, after the National Archives and the British Library, Lambeth Palace boasts one of the largest collections of State Papers from Elizabeth's reign. Even before Tenison's time, however, the library had established itself as an important collection for material of royal provenance. As Nicholas Cranfield notes, following the death of Archbishop Richard Bancroft (*bap*.1544, *d*.1610), Patrick Young, who had been acting keeper of the Royal Library since 1597, complained that Bancroft had sequestered to Lambeth at least 500 books from the royal collection.[25]

The antiquary Edmund Gibson (*bap*.1669, *d*.1748) prepared a catalogue of manuscripts during Tenison's lifetime, published at Oxford in 1692. These include, for example, copies of speeches delivered by both Savile and Elizabeth during the queen's visit to Oxford in 1592, originally bound together in what Gibson lists as 'MS 47':

> Oratio Henrici Savili habita coram Elizabetha Regina, Oxonii An. 1592. f. 98
>
> Oratio ejusdem Reginæ, Oxonii, Sept. 28. 1592. f. 100[26]

Savile's speech was published at Oxford in 1659, edited by Thomas Barlow (1607–1691).[27] A manuscript copy of this speech is also preserved in Bodleian MS Tanner 461. Elizabeth's oration survives in several copies, including a manuscript version now preserved at the Bodleian bound alongside her autograph translation of Cicero.[28] There are in fact a number of

items among the Bacon Papers which concern the interactions between Elizabeth and Sir Henry Savile, including copies of Elizabeth's letters insisting upon his appointment as Provost of Eton College.[29] Tenison was thus collecting a sizeable quantity of material on the Elizabethan court, especially concerning Elizabeth's interactions with her favourites.

Tenison appears to have been entrusted with Bacon's papers specifically for their publication. In 1679, Tenison compiled the *Baconia, or, Certain Genuine Remains of Sr. Francis Bacon*, which he prefaced with a detailed introduction to Bacon's works. As Tenison explains, he intends 'to offer to the World, in some tollerable Method, those *Remains* of his, which to that end, were put into my Hands'.[30] Indeed, the Bacon Papers now held at Lambeth contain multiple manuscripts of Bacon's composition, ranging from drafts of his treatise on the Queen's safety (1594) to his extensive correspondence with James I.[31]

The paper used for the Lambeth Tacitus points to a court context. The translation has been copied on paper which features the same watermarks throughout: a rampant lion and the initials 'G.B.', with a crossbow countermark. This paper proved to be especially popular with the Elizabethan secretariat in the 1590s. As Angela Andreani notes in her study of the Elizabethan signet office, 'the crossbow-initials paper stock emerges in 1595 linked to […] the growing secretariat of Robert Cecil'. The lion, initials, and cross-bow watermark, that is, the same watermark found in the Lambeth Palace Tacitus, 'has also a connection to Cecil via his secretary *scribe a*'.[32] These watermarks are also to be found among the Cecil Papers at Hatfield House, where they are used for warrants and correspondence, and in particular for the final drafts of official letters.[33]

There was, however, only one translator at court to whom an extract from Tacitus's *Annales* was ascribed during the period and who was using this paper both for her private correspondence and her translations, namely the queen herself. As John Clapham (1566–1619) records in the *Historical Observations on the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*:

> She took pleasure in reading of the best and wisest histories, and some part of Tacitus' *Annals* she herself turned into English for her private exercise. She also translated Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, and a treatise of Plutarch, *De Curiositate*, with diverse others.[34]

Clapham began writing his *Observations* in 1603 with the help of Robert Cecil (1563–1612), who had maintained his place at the heart of the Elizabethan court thanks both to the influence of his father, William Cecil (1521–98), Lord Burghley, and the favour which his wife, Elizabeth Brooke, had found with the queen. Intriguingly, two of the three translations mentioned by Clapham are now preserved at the National Archives and British Library, namely Elizabeth's rough and fair copy translations of Boethius and Plutarch.[35] As Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel note, 'Elizabeth produced her largest body of translations in the late 1580s and 1590s'.[36] This period saw her translations of a choral ode from the pseudo-Senecan *Hercules Oetaeus* (c.1589), Cicero's *Pro Marcello* (1592), Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (1593), Plutarch's *De Curiositate* (1598), via Erasmus's Latin intermediary, and the first 178 lines of Horace's *Ars Poetica* (1598). Elizabeth's rendering of 'some part of Tacitus' *Annals*' has thus far remained elusive, however.

In his history of Elizabeth's reign, William Camden (1551–1623) referred to Elizabeth's translation of Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum*, which he mentions alongside the translations of Horace and Plutarch.[37] Henry Savile had also alluded to the queen's translations of historiography in the material prefacing his English rendering of the *Historiae* and *Agricola*. As he explains in the dedication, the 'principal cause' for publishing his translation 'was to incite your Maiesty by this as by a foile to communicate to the world, if not those admirable compositions of your owne, yet at least those most rare and excellent

translations of Histories'.[38] According to Richard Greenway, Savile had no desire to undertake a translation of the *Annales* himself.[39] As Feingold suggests, 'one may even conjecture that Savile refrained from translating the *Annals* precisely because he was loath to compete with – or upstage – his sovereign'.[40]

The crossbow, G.B. initials, and rampant-lion watermarks, which feature in the Lambeth Tacitus, are also to be found in Elizabeth's rendering of Boethius, alongside paper produced by John Spilman (*d*.1626), England's first commercially successful papermaker.[41] The rampant lion and G.B. watermark with crossbow countermark are also to be found in Elizabeth's correspondence, including, for example, her autograph letter to James VI of January 1591–2, fair copies of letters prepared to be sent to Henri IV, and her letter to the Earl of Nottingham.[42] The recurrence of this paper stock both in Elizabeth's later translations and correspondence is certainly suggestive.

More pressingly, the corrections made to the Lambeth translation correspond with remarkable proximity to Elizabeth's late hand. In a letter to James VI of December, 1598, the queen remarked that: 'The argument of my letter, if it should have the theme that your messenger's late embassade did chiefly treat of, would yield such terror to my hand that my pen should scarce afford a right orthography to the words it wrote'.[43] But even without the provocation of disputes at the border or of James's ambitions regarding the succession, Elizabeth's 'orthography' was, to put it mildly, idiosyncratic and the queen's late autograph is a far cry from the ornate italic with which she wrote in her youth.[44] 'What seems to have happened', as Henry Woudhuysen suggests, 'is that at some point, probably due to the pressure of government and business, she developed a much more informal italic hand', and 'eventually the looser style of writing took over more or less completely'.[45] The same elements, however, which prove challenging for Elizabeth's modern editors (and indeed proved so even for her contemporaries) allow for the readier identification of her hand.[46]

The examples below compare the correcting hand at work in the Lambeth Palace manuscript with the queen's autograph as preserved in her translations of the 1590s, with special attention to the idiosyncrasies of her late hand (the extreme horizontal 'm', the untethered top stroke of her 'e', the break of the stem from lobe in 'd' etc.). The Cicero translation, bound in limp vellum and written on paper produced by John Spilman, is exclusively in Elizabeth's autograph. Elizabeth has made corrections throughout, deleting individual words and phrases and replacing them with alternatives, for the most part in superscript. Elizabeth's translation of Boethius, Horace, and Plutarch, are preserved in State Papers MS 12/289. Elizabeth translated these at a pace. As Quan Man Ha puts it in his introduction to the ACMRS edition of Elizabeth's Boethius, 'the queen seems to have "sight-read" the Latin, much as a pianist might "sight-read" a musical score'.[47] Various hands are at work in this volume, including Elizabeth's autograph and the secretary and italics hands of Elizabeth's scribes. R. E. G. Clerk identified the primary secretary hand responsible for the manuscript as that of Thomas Windebank, Clerk of the signet in 1568 and Clerk of the Privy Seal in 1598.[48]

Besides the corrections made by the scribe to small slips and repetitions in the Lambeth manuscript, there are a total of seven authorial changes made to the translation. For the most part, these involve, much like Elizabeth's corrections to the rough and fair copies of her translations, the deletion of a single word and its replacement in superscript. The following correction has been made on fol. 11^{r} of the Lambeth manuscript to the description of Germanicus's soldiers (Figure1). Having slaughtered their own men in their beds, the troops are seized by a fresh bloodlust:

> Desire to assayle the ennemy came into their cruell hartes, as a ~~quitting~~ *a* fury*es* *Calme* that otherwise could not their fellowes ghostes be appeased, but if their wicked brests receaued honorable woundes.[49]

The phrase 'piaculum furoris', suggesting 'the atonement of [their] madness', had originally been translated as 'a quitting fury', where 'quitting' is used in the sense of repaying or releasing a debt.[50] This has been changed in the fair copy to 'a furyes Calme', anticipating the desired effect of *piaculum* rather than the act itself. The almost horizontal stroke for 'm', with scarcely the suggestion of upward movement, is unusual. So too it is unusual to find the upper stroke of the secretary 'e' being used in synecdoche to represent the entire letter. The conjunction of these two elements in '–me' is, however, a familiar feature of Elizabeth's later hand. We might compare, for example, 'come' and 'came' on fols. 13^{r} and 43^{r} of the Boethius translation, which exhibit the same pairing of a horizontal 'm' and the crescent upstroke of an incomplete 'e' (figures 2 and 3).[51] The stark horizontal stroke for 'm' can be found throughout Elizabeth's later writings, as, for example, in 'com*m*e', in her letter of September 1596 to Henri IV, in which she uses the tilde in combination with the horizontal 'm'.[52] Of further interest in figure 1 is the detached up-stroke of the 'e' in 'fury*es*', which is found in another correction to fol. 1^{r} of Lambeth manuscript, where the author has inserted 'he' (figure 4). Though the detachment of the upper stoke from the lower is not uncommon in the secretary 'e' of the period, the extremity of the gap displayed in these examples is noteworthy. We might compare, for example, Elizabeth's 'e' in 'hope' and 'beget' on fol. 5v of the Cicero translation (figure 5).

Two additional changes are made to fol. 2^{r} of the Lambeth manuscript, where Tacitus describes the events at Rome in the wake of Augustus's death (figures 6 and 7):

> But at Rome Consuls fathers, gentlemen, fell all in bondage. As euery one was greatest so falsely ~~hyde~~ *heeded* they to frame their countenance, least to ioyfull at Princes deathe or to sory for others beginning they shoulde ~~seame~~ *shewe* the*m*, mixed teares, ioye, complainte and all with flatterie.[53]

Here 'heeded' translates 'festinantes', while 'shewe' has no direct equivalent in the Latin, but is implied by the context.[54] The 'w' in 'shewe' is distinctive. It can readily be compared with similar examples in Elizabeth's autograph, as, for instance, the 'w' in 'won' in the Horace translation, and the same letter in 'workes' in the Cicero translation (figures 8 and 9).[55] The 'd' in 'heeded', in which the lobe is detached from the stem, can be found in another correction to the Lambeth manuscript, when the repentant troops beg Germanicus to recall his wife and son (the young Caligula) to the camp:

> This sayde, confessing all reproched was true, they beseached that […] the legions foster *child* might return, and not be giuen pledge to French.[56]

The detached stem in 'd' here (figure 10) may be compared with similar examples in Elizabeth's Boethius, as in 'ruddy' (figure 11) or the first 'd' in 'kindeled' in the Cicero translation (figure 12).[57]

Much like the corrections which Elizabeth makes to her late translations, each of the changes in the Lambeth Tacitus is to an individual word or phrase – there is no sustained reworking of complete sentences or passages. This we might expect of a fair copy, but Elizabeth adopts a similar approach in both the rough and fair copies of her translations. So too the queen and the Lambeth translator make sporadic use of the caret to insert corrections

(compare, for example, the caret in figure 4 with the insertion of 'his' in superscript on fol. 70^{v} of the Boethius translation in figure 13).

We may also compare the scribal hand responsible for the Lambeth Tacitus with those of Elizabeth's secretaries. Intriguingly, there is a single page in Elizabeth's translation of Boethius (fol. 16^{r}) featuring a hand which does not correspond with any other at work in the manuscript. The first three lines of this page are written in the queen's distinctive autograph. The rest of the page, however, has been transcribed by an italic hand, *currente calamo*, which is far closer in form to the scribal hand responsible for the Lambeth Tacitus than it is to Windebank's italic as preserved in the rest of State Papers MS 12/289. This is an admittedly small sample, but the same hand can in fact be found in the fair copies of royal correspondence of the 1590s. The scribal hand of the Lambeth manuscript can thus be compared with that found, for example, in a letter to James VI of December 1593 preserved in State Papers 52/51 (figure 14), where the ornate majuscules, ligatures, and descenders complement those those used by the Lambeth scribe (figure 15).[58] This scribe was also using the same paper found in the Tacitus manuscript, featuring the rampant lion and 'GB' initials watermark, with crossbow counter-mark.[59] It appears then that this secretary, working with a very specific paper stock, was at times employed to produce fair copies of foreign correspondence, and at others, to produce fair copies of the queen's translations.

Elizabeth was clearly in the habit of commissioning fair copies of her translations to be undertaken. British Library Royal MS 17 A XLIV preserves a fair copy of Elizabeth's rendering of Plutarch's *De Curiositate* written in Windebank's hand. As with the Lambeth Tacitus, the manuscript has been drawn up with ruled margins and is copied entirely in a fair italic. It includes a single correction from Elizabeth, where she has scored through 'thought' and replaced it with 'care' in superscript.[60] As Mueller and Scodel note of the Boethius translation preserved in State Papers 12/289, there is also an 'abortive fair copy' preserved

towards the end of this manuscript, spanning fols 100[r]–102[v].[61] So too Windebank appears to have been instructed to complete a fair copy of the Horace translation, though this has not yet been found. As he explains in the endorsement which suffixes Elizabeth's autograph translation, it was 'written with her own hand, and copied by me for her Ma*ies*tie the iiiith of Noue*m*ber 1598. And at that day I delyuered it vnto her own hands'.[62] The fair copy of the Tacitus translation thus complements the queen's approach to her later translations more generally.

There are also stylistic similarities between the Lambeth Palace Tacitus and Elizabeth's later translations. It will be of use to compare some of the more prominent stylistic features of the Lambeth translation with those identified as characteristic of Elizabeth's style by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel in their critical editions of the queen's translations. As Mueller and Scodel note of her Cicero, 'Elizabeth's style in translating *Pro Marcello* is characteristic in its […] frequently close modeling of phrasing on that of her Latin source', a method which occasionally results in 'awkwardness or obscurity'.[63] Alessandra Petrina adds in a similar vein of the *Pro Marcello* that 'Elizabeth's translation is scrupulously adherent to the syntax and word-order' of the Latin original.[64] This approach is also to be found in the Lambeth Tacitus, where the translator models the English prose closely on the syntax of the Latin original. In the following passage, Tacitus describes the final death knell for the Roman republic during Augustus's concentration of authority:

> Domi res tranquillæ, eade*m* magistratuu*m* vocabula. iuniores post Actiacu*m* victoriam, etia*m* senes pleriq*ue* inter bella ciuium nati, quotusquisque reliquus, qui remp. vidisset? Igitur verso ciuitatis statu, nihil usqua*m* prisci & integri moris, omnis exuta æqualitate, iussa principis aspectare[65]

(At home all matters were calm, and the titles of the magistrates' offices remained the same. The younger generation had been born after the Battle of Actium, and most of the old men, amid the civil wars. Of those who remained, who had seen the republic? Therefore, once the condition of the state had been transformed, and there remained nothing of the ancient and honest practice, everyone, equality cast aside, began to look to the prince's orders)

Which the Lambeth translator reproduces with:

At home all things quiett. The voices of Magistrates agreed. After the Actiague victory yong men, Moste old men since the ciuill warre were borne, what one was left then, that had seen this common wealthe. Wherefore the state of the city turned, nothing remained of olde and sounder condition, all leauing equalitie, obeyed the princes will.[66]

And Greenway:

All was quiet in the citie; the old names of the magistrates unhchanged; the yoong men borne after the victorie at Actium, and the greatest part of the old, during the ciuill wars: how many were there which had seene the ancient forme of gouernment of the free Common-wealth? Thus then the state of the citie turned upside, there was no signe of the olde laudable customes to be seene: but contrarie, equalitie taken away, every man endeauored to obey the prince[67]

The Lambeth translation is remarkably terse. In both Latin and Ancient Greek, the verb 'to be' is frequently omitted and understood implicitly, an effect which the Lambeth translator has reproduced here. Greenway expands for the sake of comprehension, giving 'All was quiet in the citie', whereas the Lambeth translator has the staccato 'At home all things quiett', preserving the word order of the original. With the phrase 'eade*m* magistratuu*m* [erant] vocabula', that is, 'the names of the magistrates were the same', Tacitus explains that Augustus, even as he assumed complete sovereignty, retained the old republican nomenclature. Greenway is alert to this sense, offering 'the old names of the magistrates unhchanged', while the Lambeth translator reads the phrase instead as signalling the acquiescence of Rome's chief magistrates: 'The voices of Magistrates agreed'.

As Mueller and Scodel observe, 'there is much vigorous colloquialism in Elizabeth's translations'.[68] So too there are frequent colloquial turns of phrase in the Lambeth Palace Tacitus. After Augustus's death, there are mutterings among the people that 'cupidine dominandi concitos per largitionem veteranos', for which the Lambeth translator gives 'for desire of rule he had garboiled the olde soldiers by gyftes', while Greenway offers the plainer: 'he had stirred up the old souldyers by gifts and bribery, through ambition and desire of rule', where he expands on 'cupidine' with the doublet, 'ambition and desire'.[69] This is one of only few extant examples of 'garboile' used as a verb in English; more typically, it appears as a noun synonymous with 'tumult' or 'brawl'.[70] Describing Germanicus's popularity with the Roman people, Tacitus explains Germanicus's enduring loyalty to Tiberius: 'quanto summæ spei propior, tanto impensius pro Tiberio niti', for which the Lambeth translator gives 'the neerer he to hope the nare to Tiberius he stacke'.[71] 'Nar', as used for the comparative of 'near', was already considered archaic in the second half of the sixteenth century. Thus 'E. K.', who compiled the glosses which accompanied Spenser's (*c.*1552–1599) *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579), felt compelled to define 'narre' as 'nearer'

for the benefit of the contemporary reader.[72] Elizabeth, however, uses 'narre' twice in her rendering of Boethius translating 'propior' (closer) and 'propius' (more closely) respectively.[73] In Tacitus, the rebel Segestes is 'ingens visu' ('huge to see'); in the Lambeth translation, 'goodly to look on'; for 'mulierculam', the Lambeth translator has 'sely woman' (we might compare 'Saely Smithe' and 'Sely shame' in Elizabeth's Horace).[74] At another moment, the Lambeth translator describes Tiberius as 'plucking up his mynde' after receiving a shock, reworking Tacitus's absolute phrase, 'collecto animo'. At the same moment, Greenway has the plainer 'gathering his sprits to him'.[75] After the mutiny of the German soldiers, the Lambeth translation describes how 'Germanicus entrring the campe bad Plancus be brought him, and pluckt him to his owne seate', translating Tacitus's 'ingressus castra Germanicus, perduci ad se Plancum imperat, recipitq*ue* in tribunal' ('having entered the camp, Germanicus orders Plancus to be led to him and takes him onto the tribunal platform').[76] 'Pluck', in both its literal and figurative senses, had long been a favourite of Elizabeth's. As early as February 1553, she wrote in a letter to her brother, Edward VI, 'like a shipman in stormy wether pluckes down the sailes tarijnge for bettar winde, so did I, most noble Kinge, in my vnfortuna[te] chance a thurday pluk downe the sailes of my ioy'.[77] Similar examples may be drawn from her late translations.[78] The Lambeth translation thus displays Elizabeth's 'penchant for deep-rooted colloquial vocabulary from the native English word stock'.[79]

Both Greenway and the Lambeth translator typically reproduce 'respublica' as 'commonwealth'. The Lambeth translator, however, frequently introduces 'common' where Greenway prefers other variants. Thus for the phrase 'publicis vtilitatibus', the Lambeth translator offers 'common good', whereas Greenway has 'publick benefit'.[80] In the Lambeth manuscript, 'ærerio' becomes 'common purse', while Greenway offers 'the publikce Treasury'.[81] So too the phrase 'in commune' becomes 'for common good' at the hands of the

Lambeth translator, in contrast with Greenways yet more literal 'in common'.[82] There is a similar stylistic preference for 'common' in this sense in Elizabeth's translation of the *Pro Marcello*. Thus for Cicero's 'bene de re publica', Elizabeth has 'comen Good', while for the phrase 'communi salutate', she also offers 'Comen good'.[83] As with Elizabeth, the Lambeth translator also reworks certain items of technical lexis in periphrasis, as, for example, with 'childish cloakes' for 'puerili prætexta', for which Greenway offers both a transliteration and a literal rendering: 'prætext or infants garments'.[84] We might compare Elizabeth's 'Long Robe' for Cicero's 'togae'.[85]

It is not difficult to imagine why the *Annales* appealed to Elizabeth as an exercise for translation, especially when we consider the wider context of Tacitus's reception in the sixteenth century. As Jan Waszink notes, Lipsius [!] presented Tacitus's histories as 'defending the superiority of monarchy as a form of government', reading 'the *Annales* [as] useful for the education of future monarchs'.[86] Elizabeth was no fledgling prince, but nevertheless may well have been attracted to the Lipsian reading of Tacitus, which gained such traction in the sixteenth century, as a supporter both of absolute monarchy and of the view that the ruler should implement her or his power fully, effectively, and even ruthlessly, but always to the end of 'public peace and safety'.[87] Elizabeth most probably undertook her translation of Tacitus's *Annales* in the early 1590s, alongside her translations of Cicero and Boethius. Elizabeth's interest in Tacitus may have been nurtured by Henry Savile who, upon his return to England in 1582 following his tour of Europe, had served as the queen's tutor in Greek, and whose English rendering of the *Historiae* and *Agricola*, as we saw above, drew attention to the queen's own translations of history. The most likely avenue of the manuscript's transmission to Tenison's collection, and subsequently to Lambeth Palace, is Francis Bacon. Preserved among the Bacon papers at Lambeth Palace Library is a copy of

Robert Devereux's letter to Bacon of August 1593 concerning his desired appointment as Attorney General:

> I spake w*i*th the Queene Yesterdaie and on wedensdaie […] I tould her that I sought for you was not so muche for your good thoughe it were a thinge I would seeke extreamly and please my self in obtayninge as for her owne ho*nour* that those excellent translatons of hers might be knowne to them who could best iudge of them.[88]

In this particular suit, Essex was unsuccessful. It is not unreasonable to conjecture, however, that, during his service under Elizabeth as prosecutor and the subsequent favour he found under James I, Bacon not only accessed Elizabeth's translations but received at least one of them into his possession.

There is a compelling proximity between Elizabeth's late hand and the corrections which have been made to the Lambeth Tacitus. The more idiosyncratic features of Elizabeth's autograph are to be found in these additions, including the extreme detachment of the upper and lower strokes of 'e', the detachment of the stem from the lobe in 'd', and the highly unusual combination of the horizontal 'm' and single upper stroke of the secretary 'e' in '-me'. So too the hand of the scribe responsible for the Lambeth Tacitus complements that of the scribe responsible for folio 16^{r} of the Boethius translation and the fair copies of Elizabeth's correspondence with James VI. This scribe was using the same paper stock on which the Lambeth Tacitus is written, featuring the rampant-lion and G. B. initials watermarks, with crossbow counter-mark. The same paper can be found in Elizabeth's translation of Boethius and in her private correspondence. To this we may add the stylistic echoes between Elizabeth's later translations and the Lambeth Tacitus: the preference for

colloquial lexis, the omission of words and phrases found in the original, and close reproduction of the Latin syntax. It does not seem unreasonable to conclude then that the Lambeth manuscript is in fact the 'part of Tacitus' *Annals*' to which John Clapham refers in his history of Elizabeth.

2. Style and Method of Translation

Tacitus presented some special challenges for the early-modern translator. As 'A. B.' remarks of the historian in the preface to Henry Savile's translation, 'But he is harde. *Difficilia quæ pulchra*: the second reading over will please more then the first, and the third then the second.'[89] Even Andrea Alciato (1492–1550), one of Tacitus's earliest champions, referred to his prose as 'thickets of thorns', a description which was echoed by Giorgio Dati (1506–1563) in the preface to his Italian translation of the *Annals* (1563), where he speaks of the historian's 'thorniness'.[90] As Salvador Bartera notes, Tacitus, 'unlike Virgil and Ovid, Cicero or Livy, was never a popular school text, and never became canonical in school curricula'.[91] There was then something strikingly novel about Tacitus for the early-modern reader who had been raised on a curriculum of Ciceronian prose. Roger Ascham (1514/15–1568), who had served as the queen's tutor between 1548–1550, recommended 'Tullie, Terence, Cæsar, and Liuie' for the young student, but makes no mention of Tacitus as an instructional exemplar.[92] Ascham in fact refers to Elizabeth's 'double translating' of Cicero 'every afternone, for the space of a yeare or two'.[93] Tacitus, however, does not seem to have featured in the queen's early education.

Tacitus was celebrated (and occasionally censured) for his brevity of expression. As Pasquale puts it in the dedication to Charles Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy, in Tacitus one finds 'no lavish *copia* of words, no paltry, suspect, or superfluous opinions'.[94] With 'copia', Pasquale draws a distinction between the precision of Tacitus's style and Erasmian *copia*, that is, the abundance of lexical and thematic material which the learned man was expected to glean through his reading and reproduce in his own writing.[95] So too Bernardo Davanzati (1529–1606), in the preface to his translation of the first book of the *Annales*, described Tacitus as 'perhaps the most concise author there is'.[96] By the 1590s, Tacitus's brevity was proverbial. Thus in June, 1597, Sir Robert Cecil wrote to Lord Deputy Burgh in Ireland to assure him that 'Her Majesty is exceedingly well satisfied with your purposes [and] your endeavours in particular'. The prose of Burgh's dispatches, however, apparently left something to be desired: 'Yet I must add this, that your style to the rebel is held too curious, and that you do in all your writings a little too much imitate the succinctness of Tacitus, which for a man to write to a Council is not held so proper'.[97] If Tacitus's observations regarding the *arcana imperii* were now considered to be of indispensable use to the statesman, then his written style was not. By 1600, however, William Cornwallis could confidently express his preference for Tacitus' 'concise stile' to the 'superfluous' abundance of Cicero's prose.[98] The following section compares in detail the methods of translation adopted by Elizabeth and Greenway, examining their responses to Tacitus's 'thorniness' and brevity alike. Elizabeth makes the preservation of Tacitus's concise style her priority, reproducing the Latin with remarkable terseness, while Greenway, writing with an eye to publication, makes greater efforts to elucidate the thornier passages of Tacitus's prose. First, the translators' treatment of political idiom and lexis is considered in their reworking of Tacitus's descriptions of the state following the death of Augustus, and secondly, their

translation of martial lexis and direct speech in their rendering of the mutiny in Germany and its quelling by Germanicus.

The first book of the *Annales* records the steady dissolution of plebeian influence in the creation and passing of legislation at Rome, as well as the gradual centralisation of power in the emperor. In the following example, Tacitus describes Tiberius's transfer of the people's role in the election of magistrates to the senate:

> Tum primùm è campo comitia ad patres translata sunt. nam ad eam diem, & si potißima arbitrio principis, quædam tamen studiis tribuum fiebant. neq*ue* populus ademtum ius questus est, nisi inani rumore: & senatus largitionibus, ac precibus sordidis exsolutus, libens tenuit, moderante Tiberio, ne plures quàm quattor candidatos com*m*endaret, sine repulsa & ambitu designandos[99]
>
> (Then for the first time the elections were transferred from the Campus to the city fathers. For up until that day, even if the most important matters were decided by the emperor, certain things nonetheless came about through the endeavours of the tribes. Nor did the people lament the removal of their right, except with empty talk, and the senate, freed from sordid bribes and requests, willingly maintained it, while Tiberius observed his bounds, not recommending more than four candidates, who were to be nominated without rejection or corruption)

For which the Elizabeth gives:

> Then first the Elections, from people to fathers were turned. for until that day though weightiest causes accorded to Princes will, yet some as *the* tribes wolde. Nether did

> the people grudge of the priuiledge broken, but by vaine brutes. The senate wonne by giftes and lewde desires willing he heald. Tiberius keeping his boundes to aske but foure chosen, and they appointed without repulse or sute.[100]

And Greenway:

> That was the first time that the election of Magistrates was taken from the people, and transferred to the Lords of the Senate. For although until that daie all matters were swaied as best liked the Prince: yet some things were left to the favour and voices of the Tribes. Neither did the people but with a vaine rumour complaine, that their right was taken from them; and the Senators seeing themselves delivered of manie bribes and unseemly suites, were well contented to accept the authoritie: Tiberius so moderating the matter, that he commended onely fower competitors, which should be elected without sute or feare of repulse.[101]

Elizabeth's translation is arrestingly terse, even to the point of obscurity. Greenway, in contrast, expands for the sake of clarity, giving over twice as many words as the Latin original. Elizabeth appears to have missed the sense of 'exsolutus', that is, 'freed' or 'discharged' – Tacitus is suggesting here that the senators found a certain relief in no longer being obliged to beg and bribe their way to the highest positions of state. With 'wonne', the queen implies that Tiberius has himself bribed the senators for their silence. 'Patres', frequently used in classical and late Latin of the senators, is translated literally by the Elizabeth as 'fathers', while Greenway offers 'Lords of the senate', a translation which would be taken up by Philemon Holland in his translation of Livy. [102]

Following the death of Augustus, there is much debate among the commons as to whether Rome's first prince since the Tarquins has ultimately been a force for good:

> multa Antonio vt interfectores patris vlcisceretur, multa Lepido conceßisse: postquam hic secordia senuerit, ille per libidines pessum datus sit, non aliud discordantis patriæ remedium fuisse, quàm vt ab vno regeretur. Non regno tamen, neque dictatura, sed principis nomine constitutam Rempub*licam* mari Oceano, aut amnibus lonqinquis saeptum imperiu*m*: legiones, prouincias, classes, cuncta inter se connexa: ius apud ciues, modestiam apud socios, vrbem ipsam magnifico ornatu[103]
>
> (He had yielded a great deal to Anthony, and a great deal to Lepidus, in order to take revenge on his father's murderers: after Lepidus had grown senile with indolence, and Antony had hit rock bottom through his lust, there was no other remedy for the homeland, at odds with itself, than being ruled by one man. The republic was settled not with a kingdom, or dictatorship, but under the name of 'prince'; the empire was encircled with the ocean sea, or far-off rivers; the legions, provinces, fleets, everything was connected with one another: law was with the citizens, respect shown to the allies, and the city itself magnificently adorned)

For which Elizabeth gives:

> much he gave to Anthonie to revenge his fathers deathe, muche to Lepidus. But after the one by sluggy age, the other by wicked lust went to wracke; no other remedy for troubled state but Ones rule. No raign yet nor dictator. but by Princes title the commonwealth was gouerned. The empire bounded by Ocean sea, or large Riuers.

> Regions, prouinces, Navy, linked in themselues. lawe to citizens, modesty to associates. The citie royally adorned.[104]

And Greenway:

> Some sayd […] that he had yeelded in many things to *Antony*, and to *Lepidus* in like maner, because he would reuenge his fathers death. For seeing the one grew carelesse with age, and the other wasted with lasciuiousnes, there was no other meanes left to redresse all discords in the common-wealth, then to bring her under obedience of one alone, who shoulde governe; neverthelesse not as King or Dictator, but as Prince. The Empire he had bounded with the Ocean, and other Riuers far off: the Legions, Provinces and Navie, were linked and knit in peace and unitie: iustice was ministered in the cities: the allies intreated with modestie: the citie beautified with sumptuous building[105]

As so often, Elizabeth does away with the verb 'to be' altogether, creating the staccato phrase 'no other remedy for troubled state but Ones rule'. The description of Rome as 'magnifico ornatu' echoes Augustus's boast, as recorded by Suetonius, that he had taken a city made of stone, and left it in marble.[106] Here Greenway has 'the citie beautified with sumptuous building', while Elizabeth offers 'the citie royally adorned'. Elizabeth's preference for royal vocabulary can be identified elsewhere. Reworking Tacitus's account of Tiberius's election of consuls, the she gives 'king' for 'principe', while Greenway has the cognate 'Prince'.[107] So too Elizabeth reworks 'initiis Tiberij' as 'Tiberius new raigne', while Greenway has the less obviously charged 'Tiberius entering to the government'.[108] Similarly for Tacitus's 'principe*m* longa experientia, eundemq*ue* seueritatis […] summum', Elizabeth gives 'a

Prince of long experience, Souueraign of correction', where 'Souueraign' translates 'summum', literally 'the supreme [man]'.[109] Rather than taking 'principem' as a substantive adjective, suggesting 'prince' or 'ruler', Greenway understands the word in its root sense of 'first' or 'foremost', reworking the same moment as a verbal phrase: 'being by long experience skilfull, and carrying with him power to punish'.[110]

Tacitus devotes a significant portion of Book One to recounting the mutinies of A.D. 14 and to Germanicus's pacifying of the German armies (*Annales* 1.16–52). The examples that follow are taken from Tacitus's description of the revolt in Germany and its quelling by Germanicus. These passages present special challenges for the translator, from the specificities of martial lexis to the the syntactical complexities of indirect speech. The rebellion of troops further afield has a special resonance with the final decade of Elizabeth's reign, which saw the Nine Years' War or Tyrone Rebellion, when Elizabeth's sometime ward, Hugh O'Neill (*c*.1550–1616) organized resistance with a coalition of Irish, Scottish, and Old English forces against the English administration and New English settlers. The episode reaches a climax with Germanicus' speech to the rebellious troops. Rebuking their audacity and reminding them of the valour that becomes the Roman soldier, Germanicus manages to restore order to the camp. Germanicus first explains his reasons for removing his wife and child from the camp:

> Non mihi vxor, aut filius, patre & Rep. cariores sunt: sed illum quide*m* sua maiestas, imperium Romanu*m* ceteri exercitus defendent. coniuge*m*, & liberos meos, quos pro gloria vestra libens ad exitium offerrem, nunc procul à furentibus summoueo, ut quidquid istuc sceleris imminent, meo tantu*m* sanguine pietur: néue occisus Augusti pronepos, interfecta Tiberij nurus, nocentiores vos faciat.[111]

> (Not even my wife or son are dearer to me than my father and the Republic: but his own majesty will protect my father, and the other armies will defend the Roman Empire. My wife and children, whom I would willingly offer up to death for your glory, I am removing far from raging men, so that whatever crime they threaten, my blood alone will expatiate, lest the death of Augustus's great grandson, and the murder of his daughter-in-law, make you guiltier still).

For which Elizabeth gives:

> My wiffe to me, nor sonne more deare then father and common wealthe. but him, his own maiesty, the other armyes, the common wealth shall defend. My wiffe and children whom for your honnor willingly to death I have offered, fare now I remoue from raging people, that what mischief so euer happe with my bloode alone be quenched. that nether Augustus nephew slaine nor Tiberius daughter in lawe killed, may increase your guilte.[112]

And Greenway:

> Not my wife, or sonne, are deerer unto me, then my father and the Common wealth: but him, his owne Maiestie; the Empire, the other armies shall defend. I do now remove my wife and children (which nevertheless I would willingly offer unto death, were it to your glory and honor) from the sight of raging mad men: that all your lewd actions be purged with my bloud only; least if you should murder *Augustus* nephewes sonne, and *Tiberius* daughter in law, you should become guiltie of moe hainous crimes.[113]

Elizabeth glosses both *respublica* ('republic') and *Romanum imperium* ('the Roman Empire') as 'common wealth', whereas Greenway differentiates between the two with 'Common wealth' and 'Empire'; once again, Greenway appears more sensitive to the lexical nuances of Tacitus' Latin. Elizabeth closely reproduces the word order of the original, even to the point of obscuring the meaning in English, omitting the verb 'to be' in the first sentence. Greenway, however, is perhaps kinder to the reader, bringing the verbs forward ('I do now remove…'; 'be purged…') to complement the structural norms of the English sentence. Greenway is also alert to the force of 'pro-' in *pronepos,* offering 'nephewes sonne', the sense of which Elizabeth appears to have missed, giving simply 'nephew'. Greenway reproduces the conditional force of 'offerem' with 'I would … offer', while Elizabeth simplifies the grammar here with 'I have offered'.

Germanicus appeals to the soldiers' sense of martial pride and the reputation of the Roman military, invoking the memory both of Augustus and of his father, Nero Claudius Drusus:

> Neque enim dij sinant, vt Belgarum, quanqua*m* offerentium, decus istud, & claritudo sit, subuenisse Romano nomini, compreßisse Germaniæ populos. Tua diue Auguste cælo recepta mens, tua pater Druse imago, tui memoria iisdem istis cum militibus, quos iam pudor & gloria intrat, eluant hanc maculam, irasq*ue* ciuiles in exitium hostibus vertant.[114]
>
> (May the gods forbid that the Belgians, though they offer as much, should have that glory and fame, to have come to the aid of our Roman reputation, and to have suppressed the German nations. May your spirit, divine Augustus, received into the

> heavens, may your image, father Drusus, may the memory of you among those self-same soldiers, into whom a sense of shame and glory now enters, wash clean this stain, and turn the rage of fellow citizens into the destruction of the enemy)

For which the Elizabeth gives:

> The Gods forbidde, that the Belgicks though they offered it should have the honnor and glory to have repressed the German people, and saved the Roman creditte. Thy soule o Augustus to heaven received. O father Drusus thy image, thy memory, wash away from these soldiors (whome shame and pride hath possessed) this spotte and turne the civille warres to ennemyes ruyne.[115]

And Greenway:

> The gods forbid, that the Belgians, though offering themselves, should carry away the credit and the honor of succouring the Romanes, and brideling the Germans. Let thy soule, Augustus of sacred memorie, received into heaven, thy image father Drusus, and the remembrance of thee, together with these souldiers whome shame and glory do enter into, wipe away this blot, and convert this privat rancor, to the destruction of the enemie.[116]

Here Elizabeth ignores the epithet ‘diue’, though in the same speech she translates ‘Diuus Iulius’ and ‘Diuus Augustus’ as ‘Holy Julius’ and ‘Worthy Augustus’ respectively.[117] It is not immediately clear then why the epithet has been omitted in this instance, but is perhaps indicative of the haste in which the original translation was undertaken. As Mueller and

Scodel note of Elizabeth's *Pro Marcello*, the work is 'characteristic in occasionally leaving short phrases untranslated or in locally mistaking the sense or grammar – both, likely results of the speed with which she characteristically translated as queen'.[118] Greenway offers, as he does elsewhere, the phrase 'of sacred memorie' for 'diue', thereby following Savile's treatment of the same. Thus, for example, Savile had given 'Prince Nerva of sacred memory' for 'diui Neruæ', and 'Augustus of sacred memory' for 'diui Augusti'.[119] As so often, Elizabeth successfully preserves something of Tacitus's asyndetic style, reproducing 'tua … imago, tui memoria' with 'thy image, thy memory', whereas Greenway expands: 'thy image father Drusus, and the remembrance of thee'.

Having successfully shamed the Roman troops into submission, Germanicus appraises the centurions in a passage which is dense in specialist military lexis:

> Centurionatum inde egit. Citatus ab imperatore, nomen, ordine*m*, patriam, numerum stipe*n*diorum, quæ strenue in prœliis fecisset, & cui erant donaria militaria, edebat: si tribuni, si legio, industria*m*, innocentiamq*ue* adprobauerant, retinebat ordines: vbi auaritiam, aut crudelitate*m*, consensus obiectauissent, soluebatur militia.[120]

> (He then revised the list of centurions. Called up by the general, each of them gave his name, company, nationality, the extent of his service, the feats which he had vigorously performed in battle, and military decorations, if boast them he could. If the tribunes and legion approved his diligence and innocence, he kept his rank: where consensus accused him of greed or cruelty, he was dismissed from service)

For which Elizabeth gives:

> Then called he the centurions. the cited by the Generall. tolde his name, his rancke, his country, number of payes, what stowtly don in fielde, and what military giftes he had receaued. If the Tribunes or legions approued his diligence and innocency he returned his place. If common voice obiected auarice or cruelty, he was cashiered.[121]

And Greenway:

> This done, he tooke a survey of the Centurians: who being called by the Captaine, told their names, degrees, and country, what payes they had received, and how many yeares: what exploits they had done in seruice, and with what donatives rewarded. If the Tribunes and legions approved their valour and integritie, they kept their roomes: if by common consent, covetousnes, or crueltie were laid to their charge, they were cassirde.[122]

Both translators reproduce 'tribuni' and 'legio' with 'tribunes' and 'legions', loan words which had been present in English since the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries respectively.[123] Elizabeth uses the remarkably concise 'the cited' as a substantive adjective to offer a literal translation of 'citatus', which Greenway expands with a relative clause: 'who being called by the Captaine…'. *Centurionatus* in its primary sense suggests 'the office of a centurion', but carries also a secondary, very specific meaning, namely the 'revision of the list of centurions'.[124] Elizabeth simplifies the specialist sense, offering the more general 'then called he the centurions'. Greenway, on the other hand, appears to be more alert to this technical sense of *centurionatus* and gives 'he tooke a survey of the Centurians'.

It is not only the valour and dexterity of Germanicus to which Tacitus draws attention in the first book. Germanicus's wife, Agrippina, is equally adept when it comes to the calming of unruly troops:

> Peruaserat interim circumuenti exercitus fama, & infesto Germanoru*m* agmine Gallias peti, ac ni Agrippina impositum Rheno pontem solui prohibuisset, erant qui id flagitiu*m* formidine auderent. sed femina ingens animi, munia ducis per eos dies induit, militibusq*ue* vt quis inops, aut saucius, veste*m* & fomenta dilargita est. Tradit C. Plinius Germanicorum bellorum scriptor stetisse apud principiu*m* pontis laudes & grates reuersis legionibus habente*m*.[125]
>
> (Meanwhile the rumour had spread that the army was surrounded, and that Gaul was under attack by a violent army of Germans, and if Agrippina had not forbidden that the bridge built over the Rhine be broken, there were those who would have dared that disgrace through fear. But this woman of great spirit took on the office of a general for that time, and bestowed upon the soldiers clothing and bandages, such as each of them was in need or was wounded. Gaius Pliny, who wrote on the German wars, records that she stood at the head of the bridge, giving praise and thanks to the legions as they returned)

For which Elizabeth gives:

> Fame ranne in the meane tyme how besieged was the army, and that a mightie and wicked company of Germans were marching toward France. And but that Agrippina forbad the Rhynes bridge to be broken, there were that durst for feare, attempted so

> lewde a facte. But she a woman of great courage playde the Captaine for that tyme, and bestowed on the soldiors as euery man needed or was wounded, bread and clothes. Plinius a writer of the German warre saythe, that she stoode at the bridges end to give lawde and praise to the returning legions.[126]

And Greenway:

> It was noised abroad in the meane season, that the legions were besieged; and that the Germaine host was entering Gallia. And if *Agrippina* had not hindered the pulling downe of the bridge over Rhene; some through feare would have ventured so lewde an action. Who being a woman of a great courage, tooke upon hir some daies the office of a Captaine: relieved the soldiers, as they had most need, with apparel and medicine. *C. Plinius* a writer of the Germaine warres, recounteth; that she went to the ende of the bridge and there staied, praising and thanking the legions as they returned.[127]

In Greenway, Agrippina greets the returning soldiers, 'praising and thanking' them for their service, carrying over Tacitus's 'laudes & grates'; Elizabeth here translates and expands 'laudes' with 'lawde and praise', ignoring 'grates' altogether. For the phrase 'veste*m* & fomenta' ('clothes and bandages', which Tacitus balances here with 'inops, aut saucius' ('[those] without or wounded'), Elizabeth offers 'bread and clothes', missing the specialist sense of *fomentum* as used of a poultice or dressing, for which Greenway offers 'medicine'. As so often, however, Elizabeth's style successfully conveys Tacitus's brevity and for 'erant qui' she offers the elliptical 'there were that…'.

The same queen who had roused the troops at Tilbury may well have recognised something of herself in Tacitus's Agrippina. As Abraham Darcie (fl. 1625–1635) puts it in his translation of Camden's *Annales*,

> The Queene, with a Kingly courage, mounted on horseback, and holding in her hand the trunchion of an ordinary Captaine, made a review of her Army, & campe, which was at Tilbury, walkes up and downe, sometimes like a Woman, and anon, with the countenance and pace of a Souldier, and with her presence and words fortifieth the courages both of the Captaines and Souldiers beyond all beliefe.[128]

Camden's Latin is yet more explicitly gendered (Darcie was translating via a French intermediary) and Elizabeth is described as boasting a 'masculo animo' ('a manly spirit').[129] As Camden records it, following the defeat of the Armada, commemorative coins were minted to celebrate the victory. The first was stamped with a mock inversion of Julius Caesar's celebrated 'veni, vidi, vici', targeting King Phillip II (1527–98): 'VENIT, VIDIT, FUGIT' ('He came, he saw, he fled'). The second celebrated Elizabeth's martial prowess and featured Virgil's description of Dido's commandeering of a fleet in the first book of the *Aeneid*: 'DUX FŒMINA FACTI' ('a woman was the leader of the deed').[130] In his poem celebrating the English victory, *Elizabetha Triumphans* (1588), James Aske not only described the queen as 'most Dido-like' but compared her to 'Voada once Englands happie Queene', that is, Boudicca, queen of the Iceni, whose uprising against the Roman occupation is recorded in Book 14 of Tacitus's *Annales*.[131] By the time Elizabeth came to translate the *Annales*, she had thus already been compared to two of the most celebrated ancient examples of the female monarch.

Tiberius comes under popular criticism at Rome for his refusal to visit the rebelling armies in person. As Elizabeth translates it, 'He shoulde haue gon himselfe, and shewed his imperiall maiesty. then had they ceased when they had seen a Prince of long experience, Souueraign of correction and rewarde. Coulde Augustus of olde yeares, trauayle so ofte into Germanye Tiberius in best age sitte in the Senate cauilling wordes among the fathers?'[132] Elizabeth, however, understood the importance of appearing before the troops in her own person, and lays a heavy emphasis on her physical presence in the Tilbury speech:

> My loving people, I have been persuaded by some that are careful of my safety to take heed how I committed myself to armed multitudes, for fear of treachery. But I tell you that I would not desire to live to distrust my faithful and loving people. Let tyrants fear: I have so behaved myself that under God I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and goodwill of my subjects.[133]

From another perspective, however, Elizabeth is uncomfortably close to Tiberius's detached method of rule. By the end of her reign, the queen had not once set foot in Ireland, but ruled through governors, administrators, and correspondence.[134] Nevertheless, Tacitus's Agrippina may well have appealed to Elizabeth and her self-representation as a commander and 'woman of great courage' who placed the importance of addressing her soldiers in person above her own safety.

Conclusion

The manuscript translation of Tactitus's *Annales* now preserved at Lambeth Palace Library is most probably the work of Elizabeth I. The hands preserved in the manuscript, both authorial and scribal, paper stock, and contextual evidence strongly suggest that this translation is the 'part of Tacitus' *Annals*' attributed to the queen by John Clapham. The correcting hand in the Lambeth manuscript displays the same idiosyncrasies found in the queen's late hand, while the corrections themselves complement the method adopted by Elizabeth in her translations of Boethius, Cicero, Plutarch, and Horace. The scribal hand which produced the fair copy of the Tacitus translation reveals a compelling proximity to the hand responsible for folio 16^{r} of the queen's translation of Boethius. This scribe, who was also responsible for producing fair copies of Elizabeth's correspondence with foreign monarchs, was using the same paper stock on which the Lambeth Tacitus is written, featuring the rampant lion and G. B. initials watermarks, with crossbow countermark. This same paper stock may also be found in Elizabeth's autograph correspondence and her later translations. The translation itself speaks to Elizabeth's method of translation more generally, especially in its close reproduction of the Latin syntax and its preference for colloquial lexis.

The comparison of Elizabeth's translation with that of Richard Greenway shines light on the approaches adopted by both translators. Greenway is sensitive to the lexical and grammatical complexities of Tacitus's Latin and goes to some lengths to elucidate these for the benefit of the reader. Elizabeth champions Tacitus's brevity, and successfully carries over something of his concise prose. As a general rule, where Greenway expands, Elizabeth condenses. That Elizabeth undertook a translation of the *Annales* underlines the fact that engagements with Tacitus in the second half of the sixteenth century were predominantly court-centred. In the seventeenth century, scholars would begin to approach Tacitus with greater caution – for Edmund Bolton (1574/5–c.1634), Tacitus's pro-republican bias seemed both obvious and potentially dangerous – but in the twilight years of Elizabeth's reign,

Tacitus was an historian of the queen and her coterie.[135] Henry Savile, the queen's tutor in Greek and perennial favourite, had produced a translation of the *Historiae* and *Agricola* in 1591, to which he appended one of the most detailed commentaries on Tacitus to emerge in early-modern Europe. This was followed by the queen's visit to Oxford in 1592, during which she exchanged speeches with Savile and appears, as Mueller and Scodel persuasively suggest, to have completed her translation of Cicero.[136] It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that Elizabeth's translation of the *Annales* emerged from the same period, spurred by an appreciation for Tacitus which was shared and encouraged by Savile. This essay will hopefully encourage further discussion not only of the circumstances in which this translation was undertaken, but also of the wider political and cultural significance of Elizabeth I's translation of Tacitus.

Consult editions of Tacitus at Lambeth:

Tacitus, *C. Cornelii Taciti opera quae exstant / I. Lipsius quartum recensuit* (1588),
Classmark: SA6705.A2 1588 [**]. 'Gold-tooled arms of Archbishop Whitgift on binding'.

Tacitus, *The ende of Nero and beginning of Galba*, trans. Henry Savile
Classmark: [ZZ]1591.31. 'Gold-tooled arms of Archbishop Bancroft on binding'.

[1] These include the translations by Henry Savile (1591) and Richard Greenway (1598), both of which are discussed below. There was also a later collaborative translation undertaken in the late seventeenth century, which included contributions from John Dryden: *The Annals and History of Cornelius Tacitus* (London, 1698).

[2] For an introduction to Tacitism, see Anthony Grafton's entry for 'Tacitus and Tacitism' in Anthony Grafton, Glenn Most, and Salvatore Settio (eds), *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2010), 920–924. See also those chapters gathered by T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman in *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition* (Princeton, N. J., 1993).

[3] For some of the stylistic trends in sixteenth-century translation, see Massimilano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Aldershot, 2006), 3–34.

[4] Pliny the Younger, *Epistles*, VII.33.

[5] Salvador Bartera, 'Commentary Writing on the *Annals* of Tacitus: Different Approaches for Different Audiences', in Christina Shuttleworth Kraus and Christopher Stray (eds), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford, 2016), 113–135 (116).

[6] 'Invenies sub Tyrannide adulationes, delationes, non ignota huic saeculo mala; nihil sincerum, nihil simplex, & nec apud amicos tutam fidem […] Tristia ex iis pleraque, fateor, & legentibus mæsta: sed singulis nostrum à Thrasea iam moriente dictum putemus, *Specta iuvenis, & omen quidem Di prohibeant, ceterùm in ea tempora natus es ut firmare animum expediat constantibus exemplis*'. Tacitus, *C. Cornelii Taciti Historiarum et Annalium Libri Qui Extant* (Antwerp, 1574), 5.

[7] Justus Lipsius, *Politica*, ed. and trans. Jan Waszink (Assen, 2004), 3.

[8] Justus Lipsius, *Sixe Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine* (London, 1594), Aiii[v].

[9] 'Verum inter hos, qui artem bene rege*n*di Respublicas, & docuerunt præceptis, & exemplis illustrarunt […] mirum est, PATER BEATISSIME, quantum omnes antecellat & valde emineat P. Cornelius Tacitus, summus

Romanæ historiæ, & grauißimus scriptor'. Annibale Scoto, *In P. Cornelii Taciti Annales et Historias Commentarii ad Politicam et Aulicam Rationem Spectantes* (Rome, 1589), *3[r].

[10] 'Grammaticam, vel Historiarum seriem'. Scoto (1589), *4[r-v].

[11] 'à tous ceux qui ont cayse de s'e*m*ployer aux affaires ciuiles et d'estat'. Tacitus, *Les Oeuvres de Cornelius Tacitus*, trans. Pyramus de Candole (Geneva: Par Les Heritiers d'Eustache Vignon, 1594) *ii[v]; cf. Polybius, *The Roman History*, 1. 2.

[12] Sir William Cornwallis, *Essayes* (London: Edmund Matten, 1600), H3[v].

[13] Tacitus, *Cornelii Taciti: Historici Grauissimi Disertissique Fragmenta* (Venice, 1512); idem. *Libri Quinque Noviter Inventi* (Milan, 1517), 12[v].

[14] Tacitus, *Cornelius Tacitus Exacta Cura Recognitus et Emendatus* (Venice, 1534), s.p.

[15] 'protettione de signori SIDNEI'; 'singolarmente penetrano, & intendono la prudenza con che egli hà scritto'. Giovanni Maria Manelli, *La Vita di Giulio Agricola* (London, 1585), s.p.

[16] For a detailed study of Cappel's translation, see Kevin Bovier, 'Ange Cappel et l'Agricola de Tacite: Une Traduction Ancrée dans son Époque', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 67.2 (2018), 301-341.

[17] David Womersley, 'Sir Henry Savile's Translation of Tacitus and the Political Interpretation of Elizabethan Texts', *RES*, 42.167 (1991), 313-342.

[18] Mordechai Feingold, 'Scholarship and Politics: Henry Savile's Tacitus and the Essex Connection', *RES,* 67.282 (2016), 855-874.

[19] Livy, *Titi Livii Patavii Romanae Historiae Principis Libri* (London, 1589).

[20] Compare, for instance, Greenway's marginal note on 'ten hundred thousand sesterties' – 'About 7. thousand eight hundred and twelve pounds ten shillings' – with Savile's marginal note on 'three hundreth sesterces': 'that is, 46. 10d'. Greenway, p. 30; Savile, p. 37.

[21] Greenway, s.p.

[22] Womersley, p. 314, f.n. 5; Alan Bradford, 'Stuart Absolutism and the 'Utility' of Tacitus', *HLQ*, 46.2 (1983), 127–155 (133).

[23] 'An Essay of the Translation of Tacitus first Book of the Annals'. David Wilkins, *Catalogus Manuscriptorum Bibliotecae Lambethanae Confectus a Davide Wilkins*, London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS L.R.F.40, DCLXXXIII.

[24] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS LR/F/16, p. 49.

[25] Cranfield, N. (2008, January 03). 'Bancroft, Richard (bap. 1544, d. 1610), archbishop of Canterbury'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1272.

[26] Edmund Gibson, *Librorum Manuscriptorum In Duabus Insignibus Bibliotechis; Altera Tenisoniana, Londinii; Dugdaliana, Oxonii; Catalogus* (Oxford, 1692), 18.

[27] Henry Savile, *D. Henrici Savilii Oratio coram Regina Elizabetha Oxoniae Habita* (Oxford, 1658).

[28] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 461; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 900. Cf. London, British Library, Cotton MS Titus C/VII fol. 141$^{r–v}$.

[29] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 661, fols 265–71.

[30] Francis Bacon, *Baconia, or, Certain Genuine Remains of Sr. Francis Bacon* (London, 1679), 3.

[31] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 936.

[32] Angela Andreani, *The Elizabethan Secretariat and the Signet Office* (New York, 2017) 328.

[33] Ibid. 427.

[34] John Clapham, *Historical Observations on the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, in John Clapham, *Elizabeth of England* (Philadelphia, 1951), 57–102 (88–9).

[35] London, National Archives, State Papers 12/289, fols. 13^{r}–57^{r}; 64^{r}–83^{v}; London, British Library, MS Royal 17. A. 44, fols 1^{r}–12^{v}; London, National Archives, State Papers 12/289, 90^{r}–99^{v}.

[36] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Translations 1544–1589*, ed. Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (Chicago, 2009), 7.

[37] William Camden, *Tomus Alter, & Idem: or The Historie of the Life and Reigne of that Famous Princesse Elizabeth* (London, 1629), 231.

[38] Henry Savile, *The Ende of Nero and the Beginning of Galba* (Oxford, 1591), ¶2^{r}.

[39] 'I was well assured that he who best might, would take no further paines in this kind: nor hearing of any other which would, I thought some could be contented to have it rather il done, than not at all'. Tacitus (1598), s. p.

[40] Feingold, 869.

[41] The crossbow watermark is found in London, National Archives, State Papers MS 12/289 (hereafter 'SP MS 12/289) fols 54, 55, 103, 104, and 105; the rampant lion on fols. 43, 44, 49, 50; the G. B. initials on fols 7, 53,

56, and 102. Other watermarks include those of Henry Spelman, e.g. the crown and 'E. R.' initials on fols 58, 76, 79, 80, and 98.

[42] London, British Library, Add MS 23240, fols 104–5; London, National Archives, SP 78.31, fols 54–55; SP 78.41, fols 12–13; Washington D.C., Folger Library, MS X.d.130.

[43] Elizabeth I to James VI, 26. Dec. 1598, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury*, Vol. 8, 1598, accessed via https://www.gale.com/intl/primary-sources/state-papers-online-early-modern

[44] For an example of Elizabeth's early italic hand, see her letter to Edward VI (1537–1553) preserved in London, British Library MS Harley 6986 art. 035, fol. 21^{r}. Compare also the examples collected by Felix Pryor in *Elizabeth I: Her Life in Letters* (California, 2003), 17–25.

[45] Henry Woudhuyson, 'The Queen's Own Hand: A Preliminary Account', in Peter Beal and Grace Ioppolo (eds), *Elizabeth I and the Culture of Writing* (London, 2007) 1–27 (13).

[46] For the challenges which Elizabeth's late autograph posed to her correspondents, see Woudhuyson, 24.

[47] Elizabeth I, *The Consolation of Queen Elizabeth: The Queen's Translation of Boethius's* De Consolatione Philosophiae (Tempe, 2009), 6.

[48] Elizabeth I, *Queen Elizabeth's Englishings of Boethius, De Consolatione Philosophiae, Plutarch, De Curiositate, Horace, De Arte Poetica*, ed. Caroline Pemberton (London, 1899), xi.

[49] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 683 (hereafter 'LP MS 683'), fols 10^{v}–11^{r}.

[50] OED, s.v. 'quit, *v.*', 3b, c.

[51] SP MS 12/289, fols 13^{r}; 43^{r}.

[52] London, British Library, MS 24023, fol. 1^{r}.

[53] LP MS 683, 2^{r}.

[54] Tacitus (1574) 218; cf. *Annales*, 1.7.

[55] SP MS 12/289, fol. 86^{r}; Bod. MS 900, fol. 2^{v}.

[56] LP MS, 9^{v}–10^{r}.

[57] SP MS 12/289, fol. 36^{r}; Bod. MS 900, fol. 8^{r}.

[58] Elizabeth I, 'Queen Elizabeth I to James VI', Dec. 22 1593. London, National Archives, SP 52/51 fol. 75. For a further sample of this hand, see 'Queen Elizabeth to King James', Sept. 21 1596, SP 52/59 fol. 42.

[59] See SP 52/59 fol. 42; 52/51 fol. 75.

[60] London, British Library, Royal MS 17 A XLIV, fol. 2^{r}. Here one may again compare the break of the top stroke of Elizabeth's 'e' with those examples found in the Lambeth Tacitus.

[61] Elizabeth I (2019) 72, f.n. 1.

[62] SP 12/289, fol. 89^{v}.

[63] Elizabeth I (2009), 10.

[64] Alessandra Petrina, 'Ethics from the Classroom: Elizabeth I's Translation of Cicero's "*Pro Marcello*"', in ed. Donatella Montini and Iolanda Plescia (eds), *Elizabeth I in Writing: Language, Power and Representation in Early Modern England* (London, 2018), 37–58 (50).

[65] Tacitus (1574) 216–7; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 3–4.

[66] LP MS 683, 1^{v}.

[67] Greenway, 2.

[68] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589*, ed. Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (Chicago and London, 2009), 19.

[69] Tacitus (1574), 220, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.10; LP MS 683, 3^{r}; Greenway, 5.

[70] See OED, s.v. 'garboil', *n*. and *v*.

[71] Tacitus (1574) 232, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.34; LP MS 683, 7^{v}.

[72] Edmund Spenser, *The Shepheardes Calender* (London, 1579), 30^{r}.

[73] Elizabeth I (2009), 76; 100, cf. Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, 1.1 prose, 1.5 metre.

[74] Tacitus (1574), 243, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.57; LP MS 683, 12^{v}; Tacitus (1574) 224, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.59; Elizabeth I (2009), 466; 472.

[75] Tacitus (1574), 222, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.12; LP MS 683, 3^{v}; Greenway, 7.

[76] LP MS 683, 9^{r}; Tacitus (1574), 235, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.39.

[77] London, British Library, MS Harley 6986 art. 035, fol. 23^{r}.

[78] Elizabeth I (2009), 111; 177; 271.

[79] Elizabeth I (2009), 18.

[80] Tacitus (1574) 221, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.10; LP MS 683, 3^{v}; Greenway, 5.

[81] Tacitus (1574) 224, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.15; LP MS 683, 4^{v}; Greenway, 8.

[82] Tacitus (1574), 229, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.28; LP MS 683, 6^{v}; Greenway, 13.

[83] Elizabeth (2009), 18; 30. Cf. Cicero, *Pro Marcello*, 2; 22.

[84] LP MS 683, 1^{r}; Tacitus (1574) 216, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.3; Greenway, 2.

[85] Elizabeth (2009), 26; Cicero, *Pro Marcello*, 14.

[86] Lipsius (2004), 93; 97.

[87] Ibid. 149.

[88] Lambeth Palace Library, MS 649, fol. 253^{r}

[89] Savile (1591), ¶3$^{r.}$

[90] Paolo Giovio, *Historiarum Sui Temporis Tomus Primus* (Florence: Laurentius Torrentinus, 1550) s.p.: 'senicetis'. Tacitus, *Gli Annali di Cornelio Tacito*, trans. Giorgo Dati (Venice, 1563) ,*2^{r}: 'sabrosità'.

[91] Bartera, 121.

[92] Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (London, 1570), 32^{r}.

[93] Ibid. 35^{r}.

[94] 'nullam hîc prodigam verborum copiam, nullas pusillas, suspitiosas, superuacuas sententias'. Tacitus (1581) aii^{v}.

[95] Erasmus's *De Duplici Copia Rerum ac Verborum*, first published at Paris in 1512, was reproduced throughout the sixteenth century, making several appearances from London presses between 1520 and 1573.

[96] 'il più breue scrittore forse che sia'. Tacitus, *Il Primo Libro degl'Annali di Gaio Cornelio Tacito* (Florence, 1596) A3^{r}.

[97] Hans Claude Hamilton (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Elizabeth. 1592, October–1596, June*, vol. 199 (London, 1890), 320.

[98] Cornwallis (1600), k2^{r}; Ee5^{v}.

[99] Tacitus (1574) 224, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.15.

[100] LP MS 683, 4^{v}.

[101] Greenway, 8.

[102] As, for example, in the phrase 'by their authority of LL' for 'ex authoritate patrum' ('through the authority of the fathers'), where 'LL' is used as an abbreviation for 'Lords'. Livy, *The Romane Historie* (London, 1600) 296; Livy (8.21.10).

[103] Tacitus (1574) 220; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.9.

[104] LP MS 683, 3^{r}.

[105] Greenway, 5.

[106] See Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*, 28.3.

[107] Tacitus (1574) 255; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.81. LP MS 683, 17^{r}; Greenway, 32.

[108] Tacitus (1574) 224; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.16; LP MS 683, 4^{v}; Greenway, 8.

[109] Tacitus (1574) 238; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.46; LP MS 683, 10^{r}.

[110] Greenway, 19.

[111] Tacitus (1574) 236, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.42.

[112] LP MS 683, 9$^{r–v}$.

[113] Greenway, 18.

[114] Tacitus (1574), 237, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.43; Greenway, p.19.

[115] LP MS 683, 9^{v}.

[116] Greenway, 18.

[117] Tacitus (1574) 236; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.42.

[118] Elizabeth I (2009), 12.

[119] Savile (1591) 1; Tacitus (1574) 15, cf. Tacitus, *Historiae*, 1.1; Savile (1591) 11; Tacitus (1574) 24, cf. *Historiae*, 1.18.

[120] Tacitus (1574), 237, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.44.

[121] LP MS 683, 10^{r}.

[122] Greenway, 19.

[123] OED, s.v. 'tribune, *n*.1'; s.v. 'legion, *n*. and *adj*. A.1, a'.

[124] OLD, s.v. 'centurionatus, -us *m*., 2'.

[125] Tacitus (1574), 249–50, cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.69.

[126] LP MS 683, 15[r].

[127] Greenway, 28.

[128] William Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth* (London, 1625) 283.

[129] William Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum, et Hibernicarum, Regnante Elizabetha* (London, 1615) 493.

[130] Ibid. 494. Cf. Suetonius, *Vita Divi Iuli*, 37; Vergil, *Aeneid*, 1. 364.

[131] James Aske, *Elizabetha Triumphans* (London, 1558) 25; 23. Cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 14.31–39; *Agricola*, 31.

[132] LP MS 683, 10[r]; cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, 1.46.

[133] Elizabeth I, 'Queen Elizabeth's Armada Speech to the Troops at Tilbury, August 9, 1588', *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago and London, 2000) 325–6.

[134] For an assessment of Elizabeth's rule in Ireland, see Hiram Morgan, "Never Any Realm Worse Governed': Queen Elizabeth and Ireland', *Transactions of the RHS*, 14 (2004) 295–308.

[135] For Bolton's misgivings regarding the *Annales*, see Edmund Bolton. *Averrunci or The Skowrers,* ed. Patricia J. Osmond and Robert W. Ulery, Jr. (Tempe, Arizona, 2017) 74; 124-7; *et passim.*

[136] Elizabeth I (2009) 3.