Skenè Texts DA • 4

What is a Greek Source on the Early English Stage? Fifteen New Essays

Edited by Silvia Bigliazzi and Tania Demetriou

Edizioni ETS

S K E N È *Texts and Studies*. Text DA

Executive Editor Guido Avezzù.
General Editors Guido Avezzù, Silvia Bigliazzi.
Editorial Board Chiara Battisti, Simona Brunetti, Camilla Caporicci, Sidia Fiorato, Sotera Fornaro, Massimo Fusillo, Felice Gambin, Alessandro Grilli, Chiara Lombardi, Lorenzo Mancini, Stefania Onesti, Nicola Pasqualicchio, Antonietta Provenza, Susan Payne, Cristiano Ragni, Antonio Sánchez Jiménez, Alessandra Squeo, Emanuel Stelzer, Savina Stevanato, Martina Treu, Gherardo Ugolini, Antonio Ziosi.
Managing Editors Valentina Adami, Cristiano Ragni.
Assistant Managing Editors Marco Duranti, Roberta Zanoni.
Editorial Staff Chiara Battisti, Petra Bjelica, Francesco Dall'Olio, Bianca Del Villano, Serena Demichelis, Carina Fernandes, Sidia Fiorato, Leonardo Mancini, Antonietta Provenza, Carla Suthren.
Typesetting Lorenza Baglieri, Cristiano Ragni.
Advisory Board Anna Maria Belardinelli, Anton Bierl, Enoch Brater, Jean-Christophe Cavallin, Richard Allen Cave, Rosy Colombo, Claudia Corti, Marco De Marinis, Tobias Döring, Pavel Drábek, Paul Edmondson, Keir Douglas Elam, Ewan Fernie, Patrick Finglass, Enrico Giaccherini, Mark Griffith, Daniela Guardamagna, Stephen Halliwell, Robert Henke, Pierre Judet de la Combe, Eric Nicholson, Guido Paduano, Franco Perrelli, Didier Plassard, Donna Shalev, Susanne Wofford.

SKENÈ. Texts and Studies (https://textsandstudies.skeneproject.it/index.php/TS)
Supplement to *SKENÈ. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*
Copyright ©June 2024 S K E N È. Texts and Studies
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
info@skeneproject.it
Edizioni ETS
Palazzo Roncioni - Lungarno Mediceo, 16, I-56127 Pisa
info@edizioniets.com
www.edizioniets.com
Distribuzione
Messaggerie Libri SPA
Sede legale: via G. Verdi 8 - 20090 Assago (MI)
Promozione
PDE PROMOZIONE SRL
via Zago 2/2 - 40128 Bologna

ISBN (pdf) 9-788846-7-6957-2
ISBN 9-788846-7-6958-9
ISSN 2421-4353

The ClaRE series collects publications about the receptions of Greek and Greek-related material in early modern English culture. The editions are expanded versions of the texts collected in the ClaRE Archive (https://clare.dlls.univr.it/), which presents three online databases of early modern English texts documenting Greek legacies, often via Latin mediations, as well as printed editions of Greek texts in England up to 1625 (GEMS, EMEC, CoLEEn). It also includes Latin and English grammars which show memories of Greek traditions (EMEGA). The series is part of the Research Project of National Interest PRIN2017XAA3ZF supported by the Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research (MUR).

Contents

Contributors 9

Silvia Bigliazzi
Introduction 17

Part 1 – Authorities *vs* Sources

1. Colin Burrow
Invisible Books: Shakespeare and 'Narrative Sources' 47

2. Silvia Bigliazzi
The Strange Case of the Singing Chorus that Was Not There. On the Authority of Authorities 71

3. Jane Raisch
Classicism as Medievalism: Gower & Mediation in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* 109

4. Alessandro Grilli
An Idea of Old Comedy: Ben Jonson's Metatextual Appropriation of Aristophanes 129

5. Evgeniia Ganberg
'Of gentle and ignoble, base and kings': the Transformations of the Homeric Simile on the Early Modern English Stage 169

Part 2 – Receiving/Adapting/Resisting Models

6. Francesco Dall'Olio
'An Empire equall with thy mind': the 'Persian Plays' and the Reception of Herodotus in Renaissance England 197

7. Francesco Morosi
Aristophanes in *The Staple of News*: Ideology and Drama 223

8. Emanuel Stelzer
Questions of Mediation of the *Deus ex Machina* in Elizabethan Drama 263

Part 3 – Theatregrams

9. Tom Harrison
Hermaphroditical Authority: *Epicene* and The Aristophanic Chorus 295

10. Domenico Lovascio
Unveiling Wives: Euripides' *Alcestis* and Two Plays in the Fletcher Canon 335

Part 4 – Generic Inflections

11. Tom Bishop
Tragedy, Persuasion, and the Humanist daughter: Jane Lumley's *Iphigeneya* 361

12. Gherardo Ugolini
Unwritten Laws and Natural Law in Watson's *Antigone* 385

13. Tania Demetriou
Much Ado about Greek tragedy? Shakespeare, Euripides, and the *histoire tragique* 409

14. Janice Valls-Russell
Translating Greek History into Humanist Neo-Senecan Drama: William Alexander's *Croesus* (1604) 443

Part 5 – Pastiche

15. William N. West
"Is All Well Put Together In Every Part?": Assembling a Renaissance *Bacchae* 471

Index 493

Contributors

Silvia Bigliazzi is Professor of English Literature at Verona University, where she is Director of the Skenè Research Centre on drama and theatre studies. Her Shakespearean publications include monographs on *Hamlet* (Edizioni dell'Orso 2001) and the experience of non-being (Liguori 2005), miscellanies on *The Tempest* (Palgrave 2014), *Romeo and Juliet* (Palgrave 2016), and the Italian receptions of Shakespeare in twentieth-century Italy (John Benjamins 2020), and the edition *Julius Caesar 1935: Shakespeare and Censorship in Fascist Italy* (Skenè 2019). In 2013 she co-edited a miscellany on theatre translation (Routledge). She is the co-general editor of *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, as well as of the *Global Shakespeare Inverted* series (Bloomsbury) and *Anglica* (ETS). Her translations include John Donne's poems (with Alessandro Serpieri, Rizzoli 2009 2nd edn), *Romeo and Juliet* (Einaudi 2012), and Shakespeare's sonnets (Carocci 2023). She is currently the PI of four nationally funded projects: 2017 PRIN (Classical Receptions in Early Modern English Drama); 2022 PNRR PRIN (SENS: Shakespeare's Italian Novellas and their European Dissemination); CEMP (Classical and Early Modern Paradoxes in England – 2018-2022 Department of Excellence); the Cassandra Project (2023-2027 Department of Excellence). She has received several fellowships from New York University, Cambridge, and Oxford (All Souls).

Tom Bishop is Professor Emeritus and former Head of English at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, where he taught Shakespeare, Renaissance literature, and Drama. He is the author of *Shakespeare and the Theatre of Wonder* (Cambridge 1996), translator of Ovid's

Amores (Carcanet 2003), editor of *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (Internet Shakespeare Editions), and was for twenty years a general editor of *The Shakespearean International Yearbook* (Ashgate/Routledge). He has published work on Elizabethan music, Shakespeare, Jonson, court masques, Australian literature, the Renaissance Bible, and on other early modern topics. He is currently editing *As You Like It* for Arden Shakespeare (fourth series).

Colin Burrow is a Senior Research Fellow at All Souls College, Oxford. He has written extensively on relations between early modern and classical literatures. His monographs include *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford University Press 1993), *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity* (Oxford University Press 2013), and *Imitating Authors: Plato to Futurity* (Oxford University Press 2019). He has edited *The Complete Sonnets and Poems* for the Oxford Shakespeare (2002) and the complete poems of Ben Jonson for *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, and the poems of John Marston for *The Oxford Edition of the Works of John Marston.* He is completing the Elizabethan volume of the Oxford English Literary History.

Francesco Dall'Olio holds a PhD in Philology, Literature and Linguistics from the University of Verona. He was twice a visiting research fellow at the Gallatin School for Individualized Studies (NYU) and a postdoc fellow at La Vallée D'Aoste University and Verona University within the 2017 PRIN Project "Classical Receptions in Early Modern English Drama". He has published several articles on the reception of Greek literature in Renaissance England, focussing on Alexander Neville's translation of Seneca's *Oedipus* (2018), Thomas Preston's *Cambises* (2020), Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2021), and Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* (2022). He has recently published articles on the indebtedness of Shakespeare's *Othello* to Seneca and on William Cornwallis' *Praise of Richard III* (both 2023). A book-length study on the reception of stories about Greek tyrants in early modern England (*King Tyrannos*) is forthcoming (ETS).

Tania Demetriou is Associate University Professor at the Faculty of English, Cambridge University and a Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. She works on classical reception in the Renaissance and has published essays and articles on topics including English literary responses to Homer, minor epic in England, translation, early modern textual scholarship and the Homeric Question, and Gabriel Harvey's *marginalia* on literary texts. She is the co-editor of four essay collections: *The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France, 1500-1660* (Palgrave Macmillan 2015), with Rowan Tomlinson; *Milton, Drama, and Greek Texts* (special issue of the *Seventeenth-Century Journal* (2016), *Homer and Greek Tragedy in Early Modern England's Theatres* (special issue of the *Classical Receptions Journal* (2017)), both with Tanya Pollard; and *Thomas Heywood and the Classical Tradition* (Manchester University Press 2021), with Janice Valls-Russell.

Evgeniia Ganberg is a PhD student in English at Trinity College, University of Cambridge. Her research focuses on the comic treatment of the myth of the Trojan War in early modern English literature. Unearthing and exploring texts which range from sixteenth-century interludes to early eighteenth-century fair drolls, from Elizabethan lament literature to Restoration mock-poetry and burlesque translation, Evgeniia's dissertation shows that comedy characterises, to a much greater extent than has been acknowledged, the early modern response to this foundational story and suggests that it is the period's obsession with exemplarity and imitation that makes comedy so pervasive.

Alessandro Grilli is Associate Professor of Classics and Comparative Literature at the University of Pisa. He has written extensively on ancient drama and the tradition of classical literatures. His research interests also encompass literary theory, applied rhetoric, film and genre studies. He has published monographs and essays on ancient and modern authors (from Aristophanes to Proust, from Catullus to Walter Siti), as well as on issues of argumentation theory and film analysis. His current projects include studies on the aesthetics of horror and a monograph on the pragmatics of literature. His latest monograph, co-authored with Francesco Morosi,

is about Aristophanes' influence on the comedies of Ben Jonson (*Action, Song, and Poetry. Musical and Poetical Meta-performance in Aristophanes and Ben Jonson*, ETS - Skenè Studies II, 5, 2023).

Tom Harrison is an independent academic. He is the author of *Imitation and Contamination of the Classics in the Comedies of Ben Jonson: Guides Not Commanders* (Routledge 2023), a book that explores the links between Ben Jonson's dramaturgy and the works of ancient comedy. His research interests include early modern receptions of the classics and early modern performance practices, and he has been published in *Early Theatre*, *The Ben Jonson Journal*, and *Shakespeare*. His next project is a digital edition of Thomas Tomkis' 1614/15 university comedy *Albumazar*, co-edited with Dr Rachel White (Durham University), which will be published by Digital Renaissance Editions.

Domenico Lovascio is Associate Professor of English Literature at the University of Genoa and a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society. He is the author of *John Fletcher's Rome: Questioning the Classics* for the Revels Plays Companion Library (Manchester University Press 2022). He has edited Fletcher and Massinger's *The False One* and Fletcher, Massinger, and Field's *Thierry and Theodoret* for the Revels Plays (Manchester University Press 2022 and 2024), as well as *The Householder's Philosophy* for *The Collected Works of Thomas Kyd* (Boydell and Brewer 2024). He is the Italian advisor to the Oxford edition of *The Complete Works of John Marston*, a member of the editorial board of the journal *Shakespeare*, and a contributing editor to the forthcoming *Collected Plays of Robert Greene* (Edinburgh University Press). He has also edited the Arden Early Modern Drama Guide to Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (Bloomsbury 2019) and a special issue of the journal *Shakespeare*. His research has appeared or is forthcoming in such journals as *Shakespeare Survey*, *English Literary Renaissance*, *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, and elsewhere. In 2020 he received the Ben Jonson Discoveries Award. He is currently guest-editing a special issue of *The Ben Jonson Journal* to celebrate the quatercentenary of Fletcher's death (1625-2025) and working on a Revels Plays edition of *Women Pleased* with Michela Compagnoni.

Francesco Morosi is a Hellenist at the University of Udine. His main field of study is ancient drama (both tragedy and comedy) and its reception in the modern and contemporary eras. He authored monographs on Aristophanes, Sophocles, and Aeschylus. His latest work is a new commented edition of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. He regularly collaborates, as translator, Dramaturg, and consultant, with theatres throughout Europe: among them, the Greek Theatre in Siracusa, the Biennale (Venice), La Comédie Française (Paris).

Jane Raisch is Lecturer in Renaissance and Early Modern literature in the department of English and Related Literature at the University of York. She works on the reception of Greek antiquity in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England and Europe, and her current book project explores the influence of Hellenistic and Second Sophistic Greek literature on early modern practices of fiction and scholarship. Her work has been published in *ELH*, *LIAS*, and elsewhere and she has received fellowships from the New York Public Library; the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publication; the Huntington Library, and other institutions.

Emanuel Stelzer is Lecturer at the University of Verona. He is the author of *Portraits in Early Modern English Drama: Visual Culture, Play-Texts, and Performances* (Routledge 2019) and of *Shakespeare Among Italian Criminologists and Psychiatrists, 1870s-1920s* (Skenè – Texts and Studies 2021). His articles have appeared in journals including *Critical Survey*, *Early Theatre*, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, *English Studies*, *Notes and Queries*, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, and *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*. His main interests are early modern English literature and drama, textual studies, and theatre history, with a particular interest in source studies and early modern paradoxes. His work on William Sampson has earned him the Huntington Library Quarterly Centennial Essay Prize; he has also translated into Italian Philip Massinger's *The Picture* (Aracne 2017) and John Milton's *Comus* (ETS 2020). Emanuel Stelzer is managing editor of *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* and contributes to *The Year's Work in English Studies*.

Gherardo Ugolini is Associate Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Verona, where he teaches Classical Philology, History of the Classical Tradition and History of Greek and Latin Theatre. He previously taught at the University of Heidelberg (1993-1999) and at the Humboldt-Universität in Berlin (1999-2008). He is a member of the editorial board of *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, of *Visioni del tragico* and co-editor of the series *Antichi riflessi* (Edizioni di Pagina), and *Dynamis* (Istituto Italiano di Studi Filosofici). His publications include *Untersuchungen zur Figur des Sehers Teiresias* (Narr 1995), *Sofocle e Atene* (Carocci 2000, 2nd edn 2011), *Die Kraft der Vergangenheit* (Olms 2005), *Guida alla lettura della 'Nascita della tragedia' di Nietzsche* (Laterza 2007), *Jacob Bernays e l'interpretazione medica della catharsi tragica* (Istituto italiano per gli studi filosofici 2020, or. ed. 2012), *Tra Edipo e Antigone. Il mito tebano sulla scena attica e moderna* (Petite Plaisance 2024). He also edited the the special issue on *Catharsis, Ancient and Modern* of *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* (2.1, 2016) and *Storia della filologia classica* (Carocci 2016; English edition: De Gruyter 2022).

Janice Valls-Russell is a retired Principal Research Associate of France's National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) and a member of the Institute for Research on the Renaissance, the Neo-Classical Age and the Enlightenment (IRCL), a joint research unit of CNRS, University Paul Valéry, Montpellier, and the French Ministry of Culture. Her research interests lie in the early modern reception of the classics and 20th- and 21st-century adaptations of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Co-edited volumes include: *Interweaving Myths in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (with Charlotte Coffin and Agnès Lafont, Manchester University Press 2017), *Thomas Heywood and the Classical Tradition* (with Tania Demetriou, Manchester University Press 2021) and *Shakespeare's Others in 21st-century European Performance:* The Merchant of Venice *and* Othello (with Boika Sokolova, Bloomsbury 2021). She has co-edited (with Katherine Heavey) *Shakespeare's Classical Mythology: A Dictionary*, for which she authored approximately half of the 200 entries (Bloomsbury, forthcoming November 2024).

William N. West is Professor of English, Classics, and Comparative Literary Studies at Northwestern University, where he studies, teaches, and thinks about the performance practices, literatures, and cultures of early modern England and Europe, as they circulated and changed from their points of origin to later periods and other cultures. His book *Common Understandings, Poetic Confusion: Playhouses and Playgoers in Elizabethan England* (University of Chicago Press 2021) won the 2022 Joe A. Callaway Prize for Best Book on Drama and Theatre. He has also published *As If: Essays in* As You Like It (punctum 2016) and *Theatres and Encyclopedias in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2002). He edits the scholarly journal *Renaissance Drama*. His current research is on Renaissance Nachleben: afterlives of the Renaissance in scholarly and popular imagination from the fifteenth century to the present.

Part 4
Generic Inflections

11

Tragedy, Persuasion, and the Humanist Daughter: Jane Lumley's *Iphigeneya*

Tom Bishop

Abstract

This essay situates Jane Lumley's English translation of the Euripides-Erasmus version of *Iphigeneia in Aulis* in relation to exemplars and explorations of 'tragedy' contemporary with Lumley's work, particularly attending to the varieties of text that named themselves "tragedies" around 1550. These include both popular and learned works in both English and classical languages. Using these orientation points, the article then seeks to illuminate the structure and rhetorical texture of Lumley's translation, arguing that its supposed shortcomings derive from a different conception of tragic action from the one that has dominated most critical evaluation of the work as a drama.

Keywords: Lady Lumley; *Iphigenia*; Euripides

This essay rehearses some information and speculations that bear on the networks, relations, and intentions of Lady Jane Fitzalan, also known as Jane, Lady Lumley, in translating "oute of Greake into Englisshe", as her surviving MS puts it, "The Tragedie of Euripides called Iphigeneia".[1] Fitzalan/Lumley's translation is usually described as some combination of "the first translation of one of Euripides' plays into English, and also the earliest piece of extant English drama by a woman" (Hodgson-Wright 2004). It is less usually remarked, but surely also significant, that it *may* be the earliest recorded drama written in English that the writer names unequivocally a tragedy, asserting for the first time, with Euripides' authority, a specifically dramatic form in English.[2] Despite this pioneering, Lumley's play continues to be overlooked. Her work

1 This is the spelling of the title character's name in Lumley's titles. In Euripides it is "Iphigeneia" but in Latin "Iphigenia", as in Erasmus and modern editions such as the Loeb. Lumley's spelling varies throughout the MS, but "Iphigeneya" dominates the headings of her MS pages, suggesting acquaintance with the Greek text.

2 See note 7, below.

receives, for instance, no mention in the 2012 *Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*, edited by Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker. And though Howard Norland devotes a whole section of his *Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558* to "The Emergence of Tragedy" and a whole chapter (21) to Thomas Watson's *Absalom*, and even discusses the influence of Erasmus's translation of Euripides' *Iphigeneia*, he fails to mention Lumley even once.[3]

When it is recognised, Lumley's translation has been rightly noted for its pioneering place in English Renaissance humanist letters. But that place has not always been clearly understood. Assimilated into the later history of English *drama*, Lumley's work tends to look simple, pale, and awkward – a sort of blind alley, closed off from the vigorous infusions of popular dramaturgy visible the following decade in such works as *Gorboduc* of 1561 and *Jocasta* of 1566. But resisting such teleologies, staying with the chronologically local and the occasions of Lumley's work, suggests Lumley was pursuing a different line of tragic writing within humanist rhetoric – one that used drama not for blood, dumb-shows, and noise, but for argumentation, debate, and dialogic discourse. To the end of this line of writing, she moved Euripides' play away from imitative personation and closer to Erasmus' colloquies and Isocrates' orations, which likewise concern themselves less with *pathos,* than with *peithō* or Persuasion.[4] Lumley may also, as I will conclude by suggesting, have had very specific personal motives for choosing this play, and for translating it as she did – motives of an individual kind that illuminate even the 'errors' she is supposed to have made, and that suggest, in turn, her awareness of the stakes of translation itself for a girl of her age, background, class, and prospects as an early modern *female* subject.[5]

3 Nor does Norland correct the omission in his later 2009 volume despite Lumley's higher profile in more recent years, though he again mentions Watson and Christopherson (22).

4 As an orator and a giver of advice to princes, of course, Isocrates took Persuasion as a central concern. On Euripides and *peithō*, see below.

5 On "girl" and "girlhood" as categories of analysis, see Williams 2023. Williams discusses Lumley on pp. 115-23.

To be fair, it is difficult to be certain of Lumley's absolute primacy as a tragic dramatist.[6] Writings calling themselves "tragedies" there were in plenty, and had been for a long time. Chaucer called his *Troylus and Crisseyde* "litel myne tragedye" (V.1786) and compiled a long series of "tragedies" in his "Monk's Tale", a compositional strategy Lydgate continued relentlessly in his own *Fall of Princes* (1431-1438), based on Boccaccio, which was, in turn, the ancestor of the 1559 *Mirror for Magistrates.* Likewise responsive to "Bochas", Sir David Lindsay wrote a poem of "The tragical death of David Beaton, Bishop of Saints Andrews" which appeared in London under that title around 1548, near the time of Lumley's work. Many prose and verse accounts and histories of the early Tudor period presented themselves as "tragedies" in this sense, as a quick search in EEBO confirms.

That "tragedy" as a standard term for a certain kind of narrative had acquired circulation and a fashionable charge in the mid-century is particularly suggested by the printed history of Lydgate's immense poem. When Richard Pynson first printed it, in 1494 (STC 3175), the work was called "the boke calledde Iohn bochas descriuinge the falle of princis", a title it basically retained in Pynson's 1527 reprint (STC 3176). But Tottell's iteration of 1554 renamed it as "A treatise excellent and compe[n]dious, shewing and declaring, in maner of tragedye, the falles of sondry most notable princes" (STC 3177). And John Wayland, in the same year, went even further, trumpeting it as "The tragedies, gathered by Ihon Bochas, of

6 The term "tragedy" is notoriously flexible in sixteenth-century England. See Pincombe 2010, 3-16. Review of the surviving copies and traces of dramatic works listed in Wiggins and Richardson 2012 shows this flux clearly and there were likely more works of which no trace has survived. So for instance *1 and 2 De Christi Passione* by John Bale is described by him in his catalogues as a comedy (W&R #21; 1535) and Nicholas Grimald's Latin play *Christus redivivus* (W&R #91; ca 1541, printed 1543) is on its title page a *comoedia tragica sacra,* in its dedication a *tragica comoedia* and called "cometragicum" in Bale's surviving MS version of his *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae.* A "commoedia" at this date, of course, could simply designate "a play" regardless of its action. Relevant entries in W&R vol. 1 are 25, 29, 59, 76, 78, 85, 93, 99, 114, 120, 130, 157, 181, 186, 195, and 202 (most are in Latin and/or do not survive).

all such princes as fell from theyr estates throughe the mutability of fortune since the creacion of Adam, vntil his time" (STC 3178). The expanding remit of tragedy as a selling-point is clear.

Meanwhile, original plays in classical languages, written in England and designating themselves tragedies, were also being produced around the mid-century date at which Lumley was working. From Cambridge, Thomas Watson's Latin *Absalom* (1535-1545) and John Christopherson's *Jephthah* (ca. 1544), both survive. More of them below. In English, the prolific John Bale seems to have tried out calling various of his dramatic works "tragedies", though not consistently. The title page of a 1538 Bale publication announces *A Tragedy or Interlude manifesting the chief promises of God unto man*, a combination of terms he uses again at the work's conclusion. Another 1538 Bale publication, though called "*A Comedy concerning three laws of Nature, Moses, and Christ*" on its title-page, has its villain, Infidelity, complain that "Companions I want to begin this tragedie" at line 1425, which seems rather late in the piece to begin. Striking in both cases, though, is Bale's equivocation about the name to be attached to his work – tragedy, interlude, comedy, are more or less interchangeable.[7] But Bale is also happy to call other men's works "tragedies", as he does when in "the opening" to his polemical *A mystery of iniquity contained within the heretical genealogy of Ponce Pantolabus* (Geneva 1545; STC) he refers somewhat scornfully to his opponent's work as "his tragedy" (B1*r*).

It is worth pushing a little further on the network of deployments of the term "tragedy" that can be traced in particular through a group of humanist scholars to be found in the years from about 1535 to 1550 at Cambridge – and in particular at St John's College, and Queens' College where, in May of 1549, Henry, Lord Maltravers, Jane

7 Bale's own best candidate for the rubric of "tragedy", at least by later lights, his play of *King John* – twice performed under different monarchs (in 1538 and again in 1560) but never published in the period – is not described as a tragedy, nor does Bale so describe it in his list of his works in his printed *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae* (1556), where it appears as *De Joanne Anglorum rege* among 22 works "in idiomate materno, commoedias sub vario metrorum genere" (704). https://books.google.co.nz/books?redir_esc=y&id=3BtPAAAAcAAJ&q=Baleus#v=snippet&q=Baleus&f=false

Fitzalan's younger brother, and John Lumley, her future husband, both matriculated as undergraduates.[8] At Queens' these scholars included Thomas Smith and his student, John Ponet; at St John's, John Cheke, Thomas Watson, Roger Ascham, John Christopherson and, later, Thomas Hoby, who was also Cheke's student. In the later 1530s, Smith, Ponet and Cheke in particular were leaders of a movement to reform the teaching and pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge, which saw considerable success, despite earning them the ire of Chancellor Stephen Gardiner, wary of innovation even in Greek phonetics.[9] In later years, less happily, this interlocking group were to polarise strikingly around questions of religion. Smith became one of Somerset's secretaries under Edward, and Cheke, rising from a post as Edward's tutor, drafted the letters and memoranda from the Council attempting to install Jane Grey as Queen.[10] Ascham, who tutored Elizabeth, tried to steer an eirenic course, without much success of any kind. Ponet was Professor of Greek from 1539, Cranmer's chaplain by 1545, and Bishop of Winchester from 1551, after the ejection of Gardiner from the same see. Watson and Christopherson, meanwhile, went the other way. Watson became Master of St John's, as Christopherson later was of Trinity. They are mildly described by *DNB* as among "the leading 'conservative humanists' who worked in and round St John's at this time".[11] But both became less mild under Mary, after suffering their own deprivations – Watson became Bishop of Lincoln and died at Wisbech Castle in 1584, after decades of house-arrest. Christopherson was confessor to Queen Mary, preached, as Bishop

8 John Lumley's distant ancestor, Marmaduke Lumley, Bishop of Lincoln, gave Queens' College, Cambridge a major benefaction of £220 in 1450. Possibly this connection was the reason for Lumley's choice, though there is no evidence his father or grandfather attended Cambridge. See Searle 1867, vol. 1, 61.

9 Smith became the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge under Gardiner in 1543, so the damage cannot have been lasting.

10 Under Elizabeth, Smith was variously a diplomat, ambassador, Privy Councillor, colonialist, and author of the important political treatise, *De Republica Anglorum* (1583).

11 *DNB Online, s.v.* "John Christopherson", entry by Jonathan Wright (accessed 5 July 2021).

of Chichester, an unrepentantly Romanist sermon at Paul's Cross ten days after Elizabeth's accession, and died a month later. Both were involved in Marian visitations at their alma mater in 1557, including assisting at the exhumation and burning of the bodies of Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius.[12]

Tragedy was a preoccupying subject for all these humanist scholars. Some versions were clearly developed from and sought ancient precedents. Watson's Latin *Absalon* (ca. 1540; lauded by Ascham in a nostalgic moment in *The Scholemaster*) is a fully dramatic Biblical-Senecan work in orotund verse. F.S. Boas lamented its "tasteless rhetoric and monotonous versification" but they are entirely of a piece with its aims and genealogy.[13] Christopherson's *Jephthah* (ca. 1544) is an even more radical experiment: it was written first in Greek and then in Latin, and the Greek version shows clear signs of both close study of and an attempt to imitate Greek dramatic style, structure and language.[14] Christopherson himself, in a Latin dedicatory letter of one MS of the play (now at St. John's) to Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, specifically discusses Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis* as his principal exemplar. Boas, again, comments that "the study of his Euripidean model is evident in Christopherson's general handing of his theme. It has the flexibility and breadth of Greek, as contrasted with Senecan, methods".[15] Christopherson was still at Cambridge when Fitzalan and Lumley were undergraduates.[16]

12 See, among other sources, Searle, *A History of the Queens' College*.

13 Boas 1914, 64. Boas decides the play cannot, for this reason, be by Watson, but John Hazel Smith (1964) later showed indisputably that it was.

14 The Greek version exists in two MSS at Cambridge – Trinity o.1.37 and St John's 24.H.19; the Latin version survives in Bodleian MS Tanner 466. See Boas 1914, 42-62, and Streufert 2008. On Iphigeneia as a figure on which Biblical drama, and especially dramas of Jephthah, were built, see Debora Shuger's chapter "Iphigenia in Israel", in Shuger 1994, 128-66.

15 Boas 1914, 49. The Latin passage addressed to Tunstall is especially revealing of contemporary ideas of tragedy.

16 Christopherson remembered his occupation with tragedy. Rehearsing the disorders of Jack Cade's attack on London in *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion* (1554), he lamented "what a cruel wretche was he, y[t] had bene y[e] cause of suche a cruell tragedy?" (C.c.7*v*).

Two other exemplars of what might count as tragedy among this group of scholars are more various, and therefore perhaps more illuminating. In 1549, while Cranmer's chaplain, Ponet published a translation of a lost Latin work by the Italian Protestant exile Bernardino Ochino, who in 1547 had moved from Augsburg, ahead of imperial forces, to England, where Edward gave him a prebend at Canterbury Cathedral and a pension. Ponet's translation was titled *A tragoedie or Dialoge of the vnjuste vsurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome, and of all the iust abolishyng of the same* (1549). It is a remarkable work, and perhaps once an important one.[17] It consists of a series of nine sequenced dialogues, imagined as a vast historical narrative stretching from about 600 BCE to the present and encompassing the Devil's construction of the Papacy as his worldly vicariate, with the eventual defeat of this endeavour – under Christ's sponsorship – by Henry VIII, Cranmer, and Edward VI. Each scene – from the opening council in Hell (triumphantly reprised in scene six) to the final resolution in scene nine by Edward and "The Lorde Protectour" (so in the headnote, but called "Counsell" in the dialogue) to "dooe oure dylygence . . . to put a waye all suche thynges as maye bee a hynderaunce to the goinge forwarde of the Gospell" (Cc.5*v*) – works through some key moment in the arc of a narrative with something of the scope of Bale's dramas or Foxe's later *Acts and Monuments.*[18] It is, moreover, clear that, though their central intent is polemic argumentation against Papal Tyranny, sometimes conducted at great length, as in scene five, these are to be imagined as real scenic units, even though they have no stage directions or other dramatic apparatus. In the first dialogue, Lucifer addresses a crowd of devils as "My deare faithful brethren, and most enttierly beloued frendes" (A3*v*), and Beelzebub replies chorically on their collective behalf. In the second, Master Sapience departs the

17 For an extended account of the work's scope and place in Edwardian politics, see Alford 2002, 101-16. The work was issued again later the same year (STC 18771), suggesting it found a readership.

18 It is possible that the two councils in Hell (and one in Heaven) may be among the exemplars for Milton's similar scenes in Hell in Book 2 and Book 10 of *Paradise Lost.* But it is not clear whether Milton, an Italophile English Protestant, was aware of Ochino's polemics (and there is a cognate scene in Tasso). See Hanford 1921, and Hill 1977, 286-7.

scene, leaving Pope Boniface to reflect alone ("Sence I disclosed my mynde to Doctor Sapiens, I haue been wonderfully troubled", D2*v*), to return again after consulting "longer then either of *vs* bothe did suppose" (D3*v*) with the Emperor Phocas. In fact, the dialogues are semi-dramatised disputative units not unlike, and surely modelled on, classical and humanist dialogues, such as those by Cicero, Lucian or Erasmus, strung together into the larger narrative of a polemical history ending in godly English triumph. That such a format could advertise itself, in large letters, as "A tragoedie" tells us much about the scope of that term around 1550.[19]

The other tragical work relevant to this discussion no longer survives directly. In 1550, Thomas Hoby, John Cheke's ex-student, was travelling in Continental Europe (where he was later to meet his old teacher again). He kept a detailed diary of his travels, and records there that in the latter part of that year, while in Augsburg at the Emperor's court, he translated Francesco Negri's polemic-allegorical tragedy *Libero Arbitrio* of 1546,[20] dedicating his translation to the Marquess of Northampton, William Parr, Edward VI's Lord Great Chamberlain.[21] Hoby's translation is lost, but two points about it stand out for our purposes, which can be surmised

19 In exile under Mary, Ponet recalled his translation in *An apologie fully aunsvveringe by Scriptures and aunceant doctors, a blasphemose book gatherid by D. Steph. Gardiner . . .* , commenting that "The Genealogy of popry is not vnknowen to the world & that it might the better be knowe[n] I turned a tragedy into the Englishe to[n]ge which was first writte[n] by the excelle[n] t learned father *Bernhardinus Ochinus . . .*" (1556, 119-20; H4*r*-*v*). This is followed by a brief summary of the work.

20 See Powell 1902, 63. A second edition of Negri's play is dated 1550 on its title page but was actually published in 1551, according to its modern editors, so Hoby most likely worked from a 1546 copy. See Negri 2014, 13. The first edition, printed in Basel, featured only the author's initials, and Hoby mentions no name, merely referring to "the Tragedie of Free Will". Negri's play was again translated and this time published by Henry Cheke, John Cheke's son, under the title *Freewyl* (London: Richard Jugge, 1572 or 1573; STC 18419). Whether Henry Cheke was aware of Hoby's translation is unknown.

21 By May of the following year, 1551, Hoby was a member of Northampton's diplomatic train on an embassy to France, so presumably the dedication was acceptable.

from the Italian text. First, it was most likely in prose, like Negri's play; and second, with characters ranging from "Fabius of Ostia, a pilgrim" to "King Free Will" and "Human Discourse, his secretary" to "The Angel Raphael" and "Justifying Grace", it was much more like Ponet's dialogue-drama, or one of Bale's polemic pieces, or indeed like the MS interlude *Respublica* of 1553, than like any sort of work following classical example. Introducing its modern edition, Francesco Mattei describes the work as "una quasi-tragedia. O una tragedia quasi-commedia" and remarks that "Si tratta di uno scritto che esula decisamente dai canoni classici della tragedia e che si tiene lontano dai modelli allora dominanti" (Negri 2014, 9; "We have to do with a work that keeps decidedly clear of classical canons of tragedy and holds itself far from the then-dominant models").

Tragedy then, around 1550, was a remarkably flexible category, whose plasticity was also in active circulation and discussion, and could be exemplified in a striking variety of ways. This elasticity included a central commitment to discussion, enquiry and argumentation whose best realisation was not performance but deliberative reflection that might guide action in some future moment.[22] In this light, the particular choices that Jane Fitzalan/Lumley made in her pioneering work on Euripides are quite explicable, if none the less bold. Several points of linkage with the foregoing are worth making. First, it is clear from the work of Jaime Goodrich and Carla Suthren that, in addition to any discussion or influence she may have had from her brother, Henry, or his college friend, John Lumley, Jane was following broadly the same educational programme as they and her sister were, as also was Princess Elizabeth, whom Roger Ascham was tutoring at just this time (1548-1550).[23] Ascham's lectures at Cambridge had focused on Isocrates; now both Elizabeth and Jane were translating

22 For an extended discussion of wider theoretical argument bearing on tragedy around 1550, the moment of Lumley's work, see Leo 2019, esp. chapter 1, 3-41. Lumley was Catholic, but many of these attitudes crossed the sectarian divide.

23 Goodrich 2012; Suthren 2020, esp. 75. It is not known who tutored the Arundel children. Sarah Gwyneth Ross suggests it may have been the Italian humanist, Francesco Ubaldini, however this is uncertain (2009, 85-7). On the educational programme and achievements of the Arundel children, together with an assessment of Lumley's Euripides within it, see Ellis 2008.

Isocrates: the MS that contains *Iphigeneya* also contains her Latin translations of selected orations.[24] John Christopherson had cited Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* as his principal model of Greek tragedy; now Jane was translating that same play.[25] Jaime Goodrich skilfully relates both these translations to a humanist educational programme centred around issues of counsel and commonwealth – the very issues that would later centre Smith's great treatise *De Republica Anglorum.*

More significantly, the principal and, to us, very striking changes and interventions that Lumley made in her Euripides translation are very much in line with the wider understanding of what might constitute "tragedy" around 1550 that is outlined above.[26] What Lumley did, in effect, was to produce a streamlined and focused discourse that operates very much like Ponet's version of Ochino, that is, as topical dialogues, organised less for stageability or theatrical effect than as a series of disputatious conversations setting out positions and arguing possible courses of action around the overarching question "What must be done to serve best the cause of Greece?" As a result, Lumley's version of Euripides is less a family or mythological drama than a political enquiry that revolves in particular around the key term "counsel".[27]

24 Greek scholarship also seems to have had a well-established place around Queen Mary, including among her women. Both Margaret Cooke (Francis Bacon's aunt and the fourth of the famous Cooke sisters) and Mary Bassett (Margaret Roper's daughter) the translator of Eusebius and other works, were among her ladies-in-waiting. George Etheridge presented a Homeric pastiche poem on 'Wyatt's Conspriacy' to her, and John Morwen a set of saints' lives from Greek. On Greek in Tudor England in general, see the fine overview by Micha Lazarus at the British Library website: http://hellenic-institute.uk/research/etheridge/Lazarus/Tudor-Greek.html

25 By the testimony of Horace Walpole centuries later, Elizabeth also translated "a play of Euripides, likewise into Latin" but nothing survives and what play it was and if/when she did so is not known. See Walpole, *A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England* (second edition, 1759), vol. 1, 31; W&R #181.

26 On issues of translation by women in relation to their sources, see especially Demers 2005. Early modern ideas and attitudes to English translation are extensively documented in Rhodes *et al* 2013.

27 On a later reader of tragedy who adopted much the same stance and owed his hermeneutics to a similar humanist background as Lumley, see the

To the above end, Lumley made a number of crucial adjustments to Euripides, excising or neglecting some aspects of his play and clarifying others.[28] She cut all the choral odes, with their weight of mythographic background and theological invocation. Rather than being incompetent to translate them, as some early critics asserted, she more likely found them a distracting irrelevance to her purpose.[29] She downgraded the details of pagan prophecy and religion, and in several cases moved her play's language closer to a contemporary Christianity. She also ignored the verse medium of the original, and of Erasmus' translation, and cast her work in a clean-limbed, simple and direct prose, producing a style of discourse more like a sustained humanist dialogue than a tragic drama.

Certain aspects of Euripides' play were simply not of interest to her, and in particular, dramatic ones. Despite some claims that the translation may have been performed, the MS version that we have is not very stageable and has several lapses in stage-effect and in continuity that are, on the other hand, irrelevant to a debate-centred work.[30] One involves a matter of logistics. In Euripides' play, Clytemnestra and Achilles learn of Agamemnon's plan to sacrifice his daughter from an elderly slave (855-94). The two discuss how to respond to this news, then leave the stage during a choral ode (1036-97). Clytemnestra then returns, meeting Agamemnon, and Iphigenia's entrance shortly after (1120) makes it clear that her mother has, in the interim and offstage, revealed her father's designs on her life. This makes clear dramatic sense, but Lumley's

excellent discussion of Gabriel Harvey in Demetriou 2021.

28 A good short account of Lumley's work in the history of translating Greek drama in English is given in Walton 2006, 28-33. Though Walton repeatedly calls Lumley "Jane", his summary is that her work "has intrinsic worth and displays a sense of decided dramatic form which is all hers" (28). No further English translation of Greek drama survives before 1649.

29 Unlike today, Greek tragic choruses were not especially admired in the sixteenth century. Erasmus, in his own translation of Euripides, complained that they were "*ineptissime*" in striving for novelty and "*verborum miracula*". See Walton 2006, 30 and the note on 247. Erasmus himself treated them more freely in his Latin translation of *Iphigeneia* than he had in his earlier *Hecuba*.

30 For argument about possible performance, see the case made by Wynne-Davies 2008.

excision of the intervening choral ode ignores it and, as a result, Iphigenia arrives on stage aware she is destined for sacrifice, with no mechanism to how she has learned enough to lament "Alas, how shoulde I suffer this troble" (624). The problem is immediately obvious to anyone attempting to stage the work as an interaction of persons in space, but of little interest to a conception that focuses on verbal argument and appeal.

The same is true of the handling of the baby Orestes. In Euripides' play, the presence of the infant in the party from Argos is central to the ironies that cluster around the action, and Erasmus in the "Argumentum" he composed for the play (none survives in Greek) took care to mention "Oreste infante", which Lumley translates as "young Orestes her brother".[31] When the weeping Iphigenia is called out onto stage, Clytemnestra in Greek and Latin makes it clear as she summons her that she is to bring with her the baby Orestes: "χὐπὸ τοῖς πέπλοις ἄγε/ λαβοῦσ' Ὀρέστην, σὸν κασίγνητον, τέκνον" (1118-20); "ac fratrem sinu / Gestans Orestem pariter adporta tuum" ("and bring also your brother Orestes, carrying him in your garments").[32] Lumley, however, omits this, and merely indicates Orestes' relevance in a general way: "but goo your waies daughter with your father, and take with you your brother Orestes" (621-2). Diana Purkiss, in her edition of the play, is forced to clarify by adding the stage direction "Enter Iphigeneia and an attendant carrying Orestes"[33] (619) – but her very need to do this indicates Lumley's lack of interest in such details, immediately obvious to anyone thinking about or working with the MS as an *action* rather than a set of speeches. In her later kneeling scene of supplication to her father, Lumley's Iphigeneya says that to compound her failing appeal she "will call hether my yonge brother Orestes, for I know he will be sorye to see his sister slayne" (710-11), as though Orestes has somehow left the stage or never entered. In Euripides and Erasmus, there is no indication that she has ceased to hold him

31 Erasmus' translation is cited from the bilingual edition of 1524 (Basel), which is without line numbers.

32 The Greek text of Euripides is cited from Kovacs 2002.

33 Purkiss has the silent attendant remove the child after fourteen lines to explain Iphigenia's later remark.

throughout, and she specifically offers his infant silence as a mute appeal to her father, a strikingly pathetic piece of stage business. Later on, at the play's end, as she bids a last farewell to her brother, both Euripides and Erasmus have Iphigenia refer to an Orestes who is clearly present (1450: Ὀρέστην . . . τόνδε / hunc . . . Orestem). But Lumley's text is again vague about his whereabouts, and as a result Purkiss's edition has to insert an attendant to carry the child on and then immediately off again four lines later (866, 870), which is awkward.

My point is not to find fault with Lumley's dramaturgy, but to argue that dramaturgy is precisely *not* what she is interested in – a silent figure of staged infant pathos is not part of her calculation in the work. That Lumley's true interest is rather in the mechanics of *argument* and of position-taking in the play is further visible in a notable feature of her style. Throughout her translation, characters position themselves in argumentation, draw attention to their contributions, and attach themselves to a point at issue by the repeated use of 'asseverative' words such as "truly", "surely", and "indeed".[34] An extreme but exemplary exchange is:

> CLYTEMNESTRA But will ther come any bodie hether to sleye hir?
> ACHILLES Yea truly Ulisses will be heare anone withe a greate companie of men to take her awaie.
> CLYTEMNESTRA Is he commanded to do so, or dothe he it but of his owne heade?
> ACHILLES No truly he is not commanded.
> CLYTEMNESTRA Alas then he hath taken uppon him a wicked dede, seinge he will defile him selfe withe the daunger and deathe of my daughter.
> ACHILLES Truly, but I will not suffer him.
> (780-9)

Over and over, speakers present themselves, sometimes trivially, sometimes more materially, with such phatic gestures. It becomes, indeed, a marked tic of Lumley's style in the work. This has two possible, and related explanations. The first is linguistic – Lumley is translating and often also imitating the contours of Greek rhetoric,

34 "Truly" occurs 51 times, "surely" 23 times, and "indeed" 19 times.

which is richer in such positioning particles than either Latin or English. It is a signal feature of Greek syntax that it includes a great deal of enclitic and adverbial gesturing of just this kind, through particles such as μεν, δε, γε, -περ, -τοι and so on.[35] Some of these appear in Erasmus, but in lesser numbers since Latin has fewer. Lumley also positions them in her own sentences in much the way they would be deployed in Greek (she was, after all a translator of Isocrates), sometimes where they occur in Euripides (and not in Erasmus), but also sometimes on her own.

So, for instance, at line 305 of the Greek text, the Old Man says καλόν γε μοι τοὔνειδος ἐξωνείδισας, which Erasmus has in Latin as "Mihi exprobasti proprum honestum scilicet" and Lumley as "Truly you have objected to me a good reproche" (139) where "scilicet " and "truly" do duty for the Greek γε. But at line 517 of the Greek text, Menelaus says τὸ ποῖον; οὔτοι χρὴ λίαν ταρβεῖν ὄχλον which Erasmus translates "Quid hoc? timere non decet turbam nimis" ("What is that? It is not fitting to fear the mob overmuch"), omitting the Greek -τοι enclitic. Lumley however renders the line "You oughte not trulie to feare so moche the hooste" (346), where "not trulie" exactly renders "'ουτοι". Examples could easily be multiplied.[36]

The philological point (which incidentally suggests an attentiveness to the Greek text, or at least to Greek rhetoric, previously denied by some critics) supports and is supported by a rhetorical one, since Greek particles are intimate contributors to the positionality and gesturality of Greek rhetoric.[37] By using equivalents in English,

35 Sometimes sentence connectives function in this way also. Denniston 1996 includes ἀλλά and γάρ.

36 See for instance, Lumley's translations of the Greek at lines 366 and 373. This suggests that Lumley, while she may not have worked at all points from a Greek text (her confusion about Clytemnestra's childbearing, Walton points out, is "a mistake which would have been impossible to make had she been working from the Greek"; 2006, 32), was very much aware of Greek rhetorical patterns in Euripides where she felt they mattered.

37 On the question of Lumley's use of a Greek text, see also Suthren 2021 (however, Suthren's remarks on the Greek-Latin texts Lumley used, 81-4, are likely incorrect, since there is evidence she used an earlier edition of Erasmus). For further discussion of the question, see my "Dating Jane Lumley", forthcoming.

Lumley is buttressing and communicating her play's close adherence to Greek canons of argumentative exchange. Speakers entering into a debate or announcing themselves take up the moment and "inflect" themselves into it, drawing attention to their engagement. That this style is a deliberate marker of debate and dialogue in relation to the momentum of a specifically "tragic" discourse in Lumley is especially suggested by the similarity of these rhetorical gestures to those made in Ponet's "tragoedie or dialogue" version of Ochino, in which similar sentences are prominent, such as:

> The People So that if he cōpel me to his wickednes, and commaunde me to beleue his heresies before he be deposed of hys popshipe, I must obey by youre iudgemēt. Surely it is handsomly counselled of you. (F.4.*v*)
>
> Beelze[bub] Surely the churches of Christ wyll neuer so take it, thoughe oure churches so doe. (S.2.*v*)
>
> Counsell . . . Trulye all doctrine that is necessarye for saluacyon is playne and cleare yf we darken it not with the darkenes of mannes inuentions.
>
> (Cc.5.*v*)

These cumulative features of style in her text suggest that Lumley's working sense of "tragedy" in her translation was less dramatic than deliberative and dialogic, in line with a prominent understanding of the term in her day which has since been largely displaced by a dramatic tradition that was not yet cemented when she was writing. It also tends to confirm that Lumley's intention in her work was not for it to be presented on the stage but for reading and considering, at most by small groups.[38]

In effect the play could be seen as a series of debates over who offers the best counsel to advance the interests of the Greek host in the patriotic project of the Trojan war, a purpose for which the choral odes, and verse itself, are irrelevant. Such a context for Lumley's work bears further on another of the key terms in her version of *Iphigenia*: "counsel".[39] The latter occurs twelve times

38 See the arguments around the issue of "closet" drama in Straznicky 2009, esp. Ch. 2 on Lumley.

39 On "counsel" in Lumley's translation, and its relation to her Isocrates,

in the play's action (and four further times in the "Argument"), sometimes in direct response to the original, but in other, significant cases glossing or adding a specific emphasis where there was none. The balance of these uses is also significant: the first four in the play belong to Menelaus in the opening scenes, as he resumes the history of debate in the Greek camp and gives advice to Agamemnon. The final uses of the word, however are all from or relate to Iphigenia, who emerges at the play's end emboldened as the triumphant exponent of the winning counsel for Greece: that of her own death in support of her country's "commodity". That we are to understand this as a triumph of *counsel* is made clear in the chiming of the word across her last scenes, and in her emergence with a rhetoric of enhanced authority over those around her:

> IPHIGENEIA Be of good comforte mother I praie you, and folowe my councell, and do not teare your clothes so.
> CLYTEMNESTRA Howe can I do otherwise, seinge I shall loose you?
> IPHIGENEIA I praie you mother, studie not to save my life, for I shall get you moche honor by my deathe.
> CLYTEMNESTRA What shall not I lament your deathe?
> COUNCELL No truly you oughte not, seinge that I shall bothe be sacrificed to the goddess Dyana and also save Grece.
> CLYTEMNESTRA Well I will folowe your cownsell daughter, seinge you have spoken so well.
> (848-57)

It is significant of Lumley's intentions here that there are no Greek or Latin equivalents for her deployment of the word "counsel" to frame this passage. The choice of this word to thread her scene on is hers alone.[40]

see also Goodrich 2012, esp. 110-12. On "counsel" as a key term of political theory in the period, and especially in humanist discourse, see Guy 1995; Rose 2011; Paul 2020.

40 In the first line, the Greek simply instructs Clytemnestra to "do as I say" (ταδε δε μοι πιθου, 1435), for which Erasmus gives an extended periphrasis. In the latter line, 1445, Clytemnestra simply says she will obey because "you are speaking well" (λεγεις γαρ ευ); Erasmus gives "ipsa dixisti probe" ("You have spoken these things rightly"). An interesting detail is Iphigeneia's conflated command to her mother not to "tear your clothes so" – in Euripides

The commitment to "counsel" is deeply bound up with the interest in *peithō* or Persuasion, noted earlier as central to the tradition of Isocratic and humanist rhetoric in which Jane Lumley was trained. It is, of course, not lacking in Euripides either, since Greek tragedy – and that of Euripides in particular – is filled with scenes of argument and debate. In the middle of the above final scene between Iphigeneia and Clytemnestra, πιθοῦ (1435) and πείσομαι (1445; both forms of πείθω) mean, respectively, "be persuaded" and "I shall be persuaded". The issue of whether Iphigeneia can get her mother to accept her advice is key here to the sense of the younger woman's emergence as a bearer of authority. The first, imperative is hers and respondent, future passive, her mother's. For Lumley this is clearly a key moment of her design, and she reinforces the semantic content in each case from "persuade" to 'follow my/your counsel'. It is perhaps also significant here for the force of Iphigeneia's particular counsel that Lumley's translation moves the reference to her intention to act in the general interest to "save Grece" from its original place at 1446 to a position *before* Clytemnestra owns herself persuaded, so that it becomes part of her daughter's winning argument.[41] This is part of a general pattern in Lumley's translation which moves tragedy away from what we, and later decades, might approve as dramatic, and towards Isocratean rhetoric and the preoccupations of humanist training of the mid-century.

But for whom was this all this exploration of counsel intended exactly? For young humanist scholars like Jane's brother or his friend, her husband, a vocation as counsellor of state was inevitable. But for Jane Fitzalan/Lumley and her sister, the way was shut. Critics have proposed various purposes, beyond that of an exercise, for Lumley's extensive and unusual labour on Euripides' play. Several have asserted that Lumley's translation was written "for" her father,

Iphigeneia requests her not to tear her hair or wear black *in future*: μήτ᾽ οὖν γε τὸν σὸν πλόκαμον ἐκτέμῃς τριχός, / μήτ᾽ ἀμφὶ σῶμα μέλανας ἀμπίσχῃ πέπλους (1437-8; Erasmus: "Ne tu capillis igitur evulsis comam / Laniaris, aut pullos amictus sumpseris").

41 The Greek text, and Erasmus's translation both follow the received order of these lines, with the reference to Ἑλλάδος / Graecia (1446) *after* λέγεις γὰρ εὖ / dixisti probe (1445). I am grateful to Bill Barnes for this point.

one even asserting it was "at his behest".[42] But the evidence for this is equivocal at best. The MS in which it survives, into which Lumley seems to have recopied all her works, also contains the Isocrates translations, which are prefaced to her father and were clearly written (but not therefore necessarily copied) for his eyes. The Euripides, however, which comes after, has no such preface or dedication, but begins baldly with a simple title. Commentators have also connected the choice of play with the imprisonment and later execution, on 12 February, 1554, of Lumley's cousin, Lady Jane Dudley (more usually known as Lady Jane Grey). This is an exciting prospect, but unfortunately there is no good evidence for it, and the likelihoods are equivocal. Though both circumstances involve young women going to their deaths, it is not easy to imagine Catholic Jane Lumley regarding her cousin as dying for her country's "commodity", since that would involve seeing Northumberland as essentially right to have opposed Queen Mary, whose coronation Jane attended. But perhaps the relevant focus was simply "young women exploited for their father's advantage" regardless of religion. On the other hand, there was no shortage of women threatened with death for their politics in these years, including Mary Tudor herself, defiant and in considerable danger throughout precisely the years in which Lumley was most likely to be translating.

Still other readers have emphasised the networked character of Lumley's activity as translator, downplaying any sense of her work as rehearsing an individual voice or project. Marion Wynne-Davies emphasised her contribution to the cultural and political capital of the Arundel family, while Alexandra Day has stressed the "multiple collaborative contexts" of Lumley's work, alongside that of her siblings, even while acknowledging the risk of "overdetermining the purpose and outcome of literary, and indeed cultural, activity." (2017, 127).[43]

42 Jane Stevenson claims that Lumley "wrote entirely for their father" and that her translations were done "at [her father's] behest" (2015, 136). Ellis merely claims they were done "for" Arundel (p. 60), which is demonstrable for most, though not, in fact, for *Iphigeneia*. Lumley continued to be remembered as a signally learned woman into the seventeenth century (Ross 2009,128-9).

43 Most of Day's attention, however, is devoted to the Arundel children's

What view Jane Lumley may herself have had about her work as translator and counsellor is likely impossible to recover, even supposing that view was coherently formed and stable. But a suggestive hint about the tensions involved in her position as one aristocratic daughter offering up an image of another in circumstances at once similar and radically different is offered by an odd detail of that translation itself in its account of the play's concluding event, where Iphigenia at the altar is at the last minute miraculously replaced, so we are told, by a deer. In Erasmus and Euripides both, the deer surrogate is very clearly female, a "cerva" or "élaphos gàr aspaírous'" (1587) – a female victim dedicated to Artemis to whom it is being sacrified. In English this would properly be a doe or hind. But in Lumley it is a "hart", a male deer, and has also acquired the immaculate colour "white". This may possibly have to do with an association of Lumley's between Iphigeneia's sacrifice and that of Christ, though the latter is not anywhere else in mainstream Christian iconography represented by a *hart*, being normally imagined as a lamb. The change of gender, however, just as striking, may also have to do with a registration by Lumley of the several costs of doing business with the masculine world of national "commodity" for which her meticulous humanist education has prepared her without giving her any place. The male and dying deer may in this way be a figure for the fate of a girl adept in and trained for, that is *translated into,* a world of male language and action at once available to and withheld from her, except at a price figured both as regendering and as death. Lumley confronting at once Euripides and her destiny both translates and is herself translated, but also wrenches the intersection of these two translations away from her text by an act of mistranslation that points to the route along which her own voice and her own being, in being translated, are also stricken with a particular and fatal silence. In her own words, her figure for her several translations appears as "a white hart lying before the altar, struggling for life".

collective work on their Isocrates and Erasmus texts, much easier to integrate into networks of gift and self-performance, with comparatively little attention to the Euripides translation. See Wynne-Davies 2007, Ch. 4.

Early readers of Lumley's translation tended to condescend to or mock it for various failures – of erudition, of dramaturgy, of tact.[44] But it is easy to criticise something for not being what it has not yet learned to become. Nor does it help to wrench what it is to make it better fit some later version. Better to remain aware that literary kinds are always in negotiation, and never more so than when they are being remade for a variety of purposes at the same time. Though there is much about its first resonances that we cannot now recover, Jane Lumley's translation of Euripides *Iphigeneia in Aulis* is best understood in relation to some of the things English tragedy *might* have been, and might still have become, around 1550 when she wrote it. If now it looks stranded and unproductive to us, that simply means we know where the history of the reception of classical tragedy in early modern England actually went. That Lumley did not know does not mean we should assume her work was not doing coherent and carefully judged work in its own moment.

Works Cited

Alford, Stephen. 2002. *Kingship ad Politics in the Reign of Edward VI.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bale, John. 1556. *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae.* Basel: Oporinus.

Betteridge, Thomas, and Greg Walker, eds. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boas, F.S. 1914. *University Drama in the Tudor Age.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Christopherson, John. 1554. *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion.* London: John Cawood.

Crane, Frank D. 1944. "Euripides, Erasmus, and Lady Lumley". *The Classical Journal* 39: 223-8.

Day, Alexandra. 2017. "Literary Gifts: Performance and Collaboration in the Arundel/Lumley Family Manuscripts". In *Gender, Authorship and Early Modern Women's Collaboration*, edited by Patricia Pender, 125-48. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Demers, Patricia. 2005. "Margaret Roper & Erasmus: the relationship of translator & source". *wwr magazine* 1 (1): 3-8.

Demetriou, Tania. 2021. "How Gabriel Harvey Read Tragedy". *Renaissance Studies* 35 (5): 757-87.

44 See, for instance, the dismissive remarks of Crane 1944.

Denniston, J.D. 1996. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing.

Ellis, Roger. 2008. "Translation for and by the young in sixteenth-century England: Erasmus and the Arundel children". In *Thou sittest at another boke: English Studies in Honour of Domenico Pezzini*, edited by Giovanni Iamartino, Maria Luisa Maggioni, and Roberta Facchinetti, 59-72. *Monza: Polimetrica International Scientific Publisher.*

Goodrich, Jamie. 2012. "Returning to Lady Lumley's Schoolroom: Euripides, Isocrates, and the Paradox of Women's Learning". *Renaissance and Reformation/ Renaissance et Réforme* 35 (4): 97-117.

Guy, John. 1995. "The *rhetoric* of *counsel* in *early modern England*". In *Tudor Political Culture*, edited by Dale Hoak, 292-310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hanford, J. H. 1921. "Milton and Ochino", *MLN* 36 (2): 121-2.

Hodgson-Wright, Stephanie. 2004. "Jane, Lady Lumley", *DNB* online, https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-47846?rskey=9gEHPO&result=1 (Accessed 2 July 2021).

Kovacs, David, ed. 2002. *Euripides. Bacchae, Iphigeneia at Aulis, Rhesus.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Leo, Russ. 2019. *Tragedy as Philosophy in the Reformation World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Negri, Francesco da Bassano. 2014. *Tragedia Intitolato Libero Arbitrio.* Edited by Cristiano Casalini and Luana Salvarini. Roma: Anicia.

Norland, Howard. 2009. *Neoclassical Tragedy in Elizabethan England.* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press.

— 1995. *Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Paul, Joanne. 2020. *Counsel and Command in early modern English Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pincombe, Mike. 2010. "English Renaissance Tragedy: Theories and Antecedents". In *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy*, edited by Emma Smith and Garrett Sullivan, 3-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ponet, John, trans. 1556. *An apologie fully aunsvveringe by Scriptures and aunceant doctors, a blasphemose book gatherid by D. Steph. Gardiner* . . . Strasbourg: Printed by the heirs of W. Köpfel (?) (1 STC 20175a)

— 1549. [Bernardino Ochino] *A tragoedie or Dialoge of the vnjuste vsurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome, and of all the iust abolishyng of the same.* London: Walter Lynne. (STC 18770)

Powell, Edgar, ed. 1902. *The Travels and Life of Sir Thomas Hoby*. London: Royal Historical Society

Purkiss, Diane, ed. 1998. *Three Tragedies by Renaissance Women.* London: Penguin.

Rhodes, Neil et al., eds. 2013. *English Renaissance Translation Theory.* MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations, vol. 9. Cambridge: MHRA.

Rose, Jacqueline. 2011. "Kingship and Counsel in early modern England". *The Historical Journal* 54 (1): 47-71.

Ross, Sarah Gwyneth. 2009. *The Birth of Feminism: Woman as Intellect in Renaissance Italy and England.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, Harold Spencer, and Edgar Powell, eds. 1902. *Camden Miscellany Volume Ten.* London: Royal Historical Society.

Searle, William George. 1867. *The History of the Queens' College of St. Margaret and St Bernard . . .* , 2 vols. London: MacMillan.

Shuger, Debora. 1994. *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity.* Berkelely & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Smith, John Hazel. 1964. *A Humanist's "Trew Imitation": Thomas Watson's "Absalom".* Urbana: Illinois Studies in Language and Literature.

Stevenson, Jane. 2015. "Women Writers and the Classics". In *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature, vol. 2: 1558-1660*, edited by Patrick Cheney, 129-46. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Straznicky, Marta. 2009. *Privacy, Playreading, and Women's Closet Drama 1550-1700.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Streufert, Paul D. 2008. "Christopherson at Cambridge: Greco-Catholic Ethics in the Protestant University". In *Early Modern Academic Drama*, edited by Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert, 45-64. Farnham: Ashgate.

Suthren, Carla. 2020. "Iphigenia in English: Reading Euripides with Jane Lumley". In *Acquisition through Translation: Towards a Definition of Renaissance Translation*, edited by Alessandra Petrina and Federica Massiero, 73-92. Turnhout: Brepols.

Walton, J. Michael. 2006. *Found in Translation: Greek Drama in English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walpole, Horace. 1759. *A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England* (second edition). London: Printed for R. and J. Dodsley in Pallmall and J. Graham in the Strand.

Wiggins, Martin, in association with Catherine Richardson. 2011-. *British Drama 1533-1642: A Catalogue. Vol. 1: 1533-1566.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Deanne. 2023. *Girl Culture in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.*

(Arden Shakespeare) London: Bloomsbury.

Wright, Jonathan. "John Christopherson", *DNB* online, https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-5373?rskey=fVzKef&result=1 (Accessed 5 July 2021).

Wynne-Davies, Marion. 2023. "The Good Lady Lumley's Desire: *Iphigeneia* and the Nonsuch Banqueting House". In *Heroines of the Golden Stage: Women and Drama in Spain and England, 1500-1700*, edited by Rita Walthaus and Marguérite Corporaal, 111-28. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger.

— 2007. *Women Writers and Familial Discourse in the English Renaissance: Relative Values.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.