Translation Practice in Early Modern Europe: Spanish Chivalric Romance in England

Alejandra Andrea Ortiz Salamovich

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of English

November 2014

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and the appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

Acknowledgments

I want to express my most sincere gratitude to Dr Catherine Batt for her constant encouragement and guidance in this research process. Her supervision has been essential for me to complete this work.

I would also like to thank my parents, Eduardo and Sofía, who introduced me to the path of literature and who have always supported me with their love and enthusiasm.

My gratitude also goes to my brother Cristóbal and his wife Sara for their reassurance and affection throughout these years.

I am very grateful to my parents-in-law, Patricio and María Angélica, for their constant support and affection during this process.

I am greatly indebted to Ruth, Mark, Haroldo, Horacio, and Katherine, for their kindness and friendship in these years away from home.

I want to express a big thank you to my dear friends with whom I have shared this incredible research experience, and to those back home who have always believed in my abilities.

Finally, my deepest appreciation to my husband, Gustavo, who has been my partner in this challenging journey, and whose love and understanding have been crucial for me to achieve this task.

Abstract

This thesis analyses the English versions of Spanish chivalric romance as examples of translation practice in Early Modern Europe. It focuses specifically on three works: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood* (*c.* 1578), a translation from Book I of the Spanish romance *Espejo de Príncipes y Caballeros* (1555) by Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra; Anthony Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva* (1588), Parts I and II, a translation from the French *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* (1546), which Jean Maugin had translated from the anonymous Spanish romance *Palmerín de Olivia* (1511); and Books I to IV of Anthony Munday's *Amadis de Gaule* (1590-1619), all translated from the first four books (1540-1544) of the French *Amadis de Gaule* series, translated by Nicolas Herberay de Essarts from the Spanish *Amadís de Gaula* (1508) by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. I analyse the way in which Tyler and Munday use their translation practice to reflect or comment on aspects of their contemporary culture. I examine the way that the translators' modifications work next to their literal translation. Through a comparative study between the translations and their sources, I focus specifically on how both translators draw attention to the topics of marriage and sexuality in their texts. I also analyse in particular Tyler's treatment of the classical material in her source and Munday's attention to the topic of religion. In this respect, this thesis fills particular gaps in the knowledge of literal translations and of early modern romance. Moreover, it widens the scope for exploring the figures of Margaret Tyler and Anthony Munday, showing that the gendered aspect of the former's translation is only one aspect of her practice and that the latter's work is more complex than has commonly been assumed.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Spanish chivalric romance first appeared in English translation in Thomas Paynell's *The Treasurie of Amadis of Fraunce*, printed in London by Henry Bynneman for Thomas Hackett *c*. 1572.[1] Paynell was translating the French *Le Thresor des Livres D'Amadis de Gaule*, which itself first appeared in Paris in 1559. The *Thresor* anthologised extracts from the French translations of the Spanish romance *Amadís de Gaula* and the other books that continued the series. It was presented explicitly as a text to develop fine speaking and writing.[2] The work became so popular in France that it was reprinted in at least eighteen editions between 1559 and 1606, in Paris, Lyon and Antwerp; the Paris 1559 edition alone was reprinted every year until 1571, which made it a publishing phenomenon.[3] This success followed the great popularity of the French *Amadis* series. Book I was first published in 1540 and the translations would continue to build a total of twenty-four volumes, with several editions each, the last early modern edition being printed in Paris in 1615.[4]

Between the years 1570 and 1600 the records shows a peak of 'literary' translation[5] within the English print market, with around 200 to 400 items per decade. During the period 1550-1660, translations not made from Latin were almost all from French, Italian and Spanish, French being the major source language, amounting to some thirty per cent of translations, followed by ten per cent of Italian texts and seven

[1] The extant title page of this edition does not state a year but the *STC* infers this year of publication. See entry 545 in *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, 3 vols, ed. by W. A. Pollard, G. R. Redgrave and others. 2nd edn (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991), I, 30. All subsequent editions of early modern works indicated in parenthesis in the text are of the first printed edition, unless otherwise stated.

[2] Luce Guillerm shows how the 1559 edition's 'Epistle to the Reader' and prefatory poem emphasise the text's usefulness as a resource for rhetoric. Véronique Benhaïm identifies a similar concern in the prefatory material to both the 1582 (Lyon) and the 1564 (Paris) editions, which also explicitly point out to the reader the benefits of using the table of contents. See Luce Guillerm, *Sujet de l'ecriture et traduction autour de 1540* (Lille: Atelier national Reproduction des thèses, 1988), 79, and Véronique Benhaïm, 'Les *Thresors D'Amadis*', in *Les Amadis en France au XVI^e^ siècle*, Cahiers V.L. Saulnier, 17 (Paris: Editions Rue D'Ulm, 2000), pp. 157-81 (p. 171).

[3] Benhaïm, 'Les *Thresors D'Amadis*', pp. 159-60; 165.

[4] Benhaïm, 'Les *Thresors D'Amadis*', p. 160 (footnote 12).

[5] The general editors of *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* use the term 'literary' in a broad sense, meaning 'the full range of non-technical works which has made up the reading of the literate public'. See Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 'General Editor's Foreword', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005-), II: *1550 to 1660*, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummins and Stuart Gillespie (2010), p. viii.

per cent of Spanish.[6] The translation of Spanish material in the period covered a range of texts, among which were Antonio de Guevara's *The Diall of Princes* (1557), *The Pleasunt Historie of Lazarillo de Tormes* (1586), and *The History of the Valorous and Wittie Knight-errant, Don Quixote* (1612), followed by the second part in 1620.[7] Helen Moore notes the great amount of romance translation in the period 1550 to 1660. Publication of translations from Spanish originals during this period also included non-chivalric material, such as Jorge de Montemayor's pastoral romance *Diana* (1598),[8] and Diego de San Pedro's sentimental romance *The Castell of Love* (1548?).[9] Joyce Boro notes that the readership of sentimental romance was not only drawn to it as attractive reading material but also as a means to learn a secondary language, since many of them were printed in multilingual editions.[10]

In contrast to the success of the French *Thresor*, Paynell's *Treasurie* seems to have run to only one edition.[11] This is consistent with the general differences between the publication history of Spanish chivalric romance in England and on the continent. While the Spanish *Amadis* circulated, not only in French translation, but also in Italian, German, and Dutch, since the 1540s,[12] only those in England who spoke one of those languages could have had access to the text at that time.[13] Massimiliano Morini points out that many members of the English court knew Italian and French, and would have read the works of Baldassar Castiglione and Michel de Montaigne in their original

[6] Gordon Braden, 'An Overview', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550 to 1660*, ed. by Braden, Cummins and Gillespie, pp. 3; 9.
[7] For a fuller account of these texts see Dale B. J. Randall, *The Golden Tapestry: A Critical Survey of Non-chivalric Spanish Fiction in English Translation (1543-1657)* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1963). Some of the dates of publication can be checked against the information in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550 to 1660*, ed. by Braden, Cummins and Gillespie.
[8] Helen Moore, 'Ancient and Modern Romance', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550 to 1660*, ed. by Braden, Cummins and Gillespie, pp. 333-46 (pp. 333; 340-41).
[9] Joyce Boro, 'Introduction', in *The Castell of Love: A Critical Edition of Lord Berners's Romance* (Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 1-78 (p. 72).
[10] Joyce Boro, 'Multilingualism, Romance, and Language Pedagogy; or, Why Were So Many Sentimental Romances Printed as Polyglot Texts?', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave, 2011), pp. 18-38.
[11] The *STC* only indicates one edition, see entry 545 in *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books*, I, 30. The same information is given in *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/rcc/> ISBN 978-0-9557876-5-2 [accessed 14 November 2014]. Kirk Melnikoff comments that very few of Thomas Hacket's publication were reprinted during his lifetime, and many failed to spark the interest of investors. See Kirk Melnikoff, 'Thomas Hacket and the Ventures of an Elizabethan Publisher', *The Library*, 7th ser., 10 (2009), 257-71 (p. 263).
[12] An edition of the four books of Montalvo's *Amadís de Gaula* was published in Rome in 1519, and the first Italian translation of the series was published in 1546. In the same year, the Dutch edition was published and in 1569, the first German one. All of these texts were followed by several editions and original continuations of the series. For a survey of these editions, see Stefano Neri, 'Cuadro de la difusión europea del ciclo del *Amadís de Gaula* (siglos XVI-XVII)', in *Amadís de Gaula: quinientos años después*, ed. by José Manuel Lucía Megías and M[a] Carmen Marín Pina, with Ana Carmen Bueno (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2008), pp. 565-91.
[13] See John J. O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1970), p. 132.

languages.[14] Helen Moore, on the other hand, notes that there seems to have been a copy of the Spanish *Amadis* in the library of the Countess of Pembroke at Wilton House, as a letter from Rowland Whyte to Robert Sidney indicates.[15] Elizabeth Spiller comments that Robert Sidney expressed an interest in borrowing a copy of the romance because he was improving his Spanish. In this context, Spiller notes how in the 1590s Mary Sidney 'created a vibrant literary and cultural environment' at Wilton House.[16] Spiller quotes John Aubrey's description of this 'noble librarie of books, choicely collected in the time of Mary Countess of Pembroke', and speculates how these romances must have circulated 'through the coterie at Wilton House'.[17] Specifically on the presence of the *Amadis* in this noble environment, Moore points out that Edmund Spenser appears to have drawn inspiration from French *Amadis* books VIII-X, XIV, and XVI for certain episodes of the *Faerie Queene* (1590 and 1596); while Book XI appears to have inspired certain incidents in Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (1593).[18] Despite its apparent lack of popularity, as compared to the *Amadis*, Paynell's work is valuable in the context of early modern translation of Spanish literature, because it constitutes, if only in anthology, the first translation into English of a sixteenth-century Spanish chivalric romance.[19]

Paynell's text, however, did not seem to spark an interest for the translation of Spanish chivalric romance, as it was six years before the next translation would follow, in the form of Margaret Tyler's *The Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood* (*c.* 1578), a translation from Book I of the Spanish romance *Espejo de Príncipes y Caballeros* (1555) by Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra. This text was quite successful, as its three editions and the translation of the rest of the *Espejo* series indicate. But it would be another ten years before Anthony Munday published Part I and II of his *Palmerin D'Oliva* (1588), a translation from the French *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* (1546),

---

[14] Massimiliano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 65.
[15] Helen Moore, 'Introduction', in Anthony Munday (trans.), *Amadis de Gaule*, ed. by Helen Moore (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. ix-xxviii (pp. xx-xxi). Michael G. Brennan and Noel J. Kinnamon also make a record of this letter, see their *A Sidney Chronology 1554-1654* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 163.
[16] Elizabeth Spiller, *Reading and the History of Race in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 154; 156.
[17] Spiller, *Reading and the History of Race*, p. 154.
[18] For a more detailed analysis of the influence of the French *Amadis* on Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and Sidney's *Arcadia* see O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature*, pp. 163-81; pp. 183-201, respectively. For more on the links between the Amazon disguise in the *Arcadia* and the French *Amadis* see Winfried Schleiner, 'Male Cross-Dressing and Transvestism in Renaissance Romances', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19 (1988), 605-619.
[19] For a discussion of the value of Paynell's text in the context of humanist reading and translation practices, see Helen Moore, 'Gathering Fruit: The "Profitable" Translations of Thomas Paynell', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave, 2011), pp. 39-57.

which Jean Maugin had translated from the anonymous Spanish romance *Palmerín de Olivia* (1511). Two years after that, Munday published Book I of *Amadis de Gaule*, a translation from the French *Le Premier Livre de Amadis de Gaule*, translated by Nicolas Herberay des Essarts from the Spanish *Amadís de Gaula* (1508) by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. Munday followed with the translations of Books II, III, and IV of the *Amadis* series, all from French originals, and was responsible for all the English translations of Spanish chivalric romance,[20] except for *Amadis* Book V (1598),[21] *Bellianis of Greece* (1598), translated by one L. A.,[22] and the *Mirror* series, which I will comment on in detail in chapter I. Unlike the translators of the later volumes of the French translations and Jean Maugin, who pay homage in their prefaces to the work of Herberay that preceded them, the English translators do not acknowledge in any way the earlier translations as an influence on their work. Although it is possible that Tyler encountered Paynell's translation and that Munday knew of Tyler's work, there is no evidence that they were inspired by their forerunners.

England came late to the continental publishing phenomenon that was Spanish chivalric romance, and, perhaps because of this, the vogue which Tyler's translation initiated was not as widespread in England as on the continent. Moreover, by the time English audiences were first encountering these translations, the enthusiasm for the Spanish texts was disappearing on the continent, and the *Amadis* series in particular was facing great criticism, even ridicule. Additionally, as Moore notes, even if aristocratic

---

[20] Munday translated *Palladine of England* (1588), *Palmendos* (1589), *The First Booke of Primaleon of Greece* (1595), *The Second Booke of Primaleon of Greece* (1596), *The Famous and Renowned Historie of Primaleon of Greece* (1619). He also translated the Portuguese chivalric romances *Palmerin of England*, Parts I and II (1596), and *Palmerin of England*, Part III (1602). For a list of all his translations see *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550 to 1660*, ed. by Braden, Cummins and Gillespie, pp. 533-34.

[21] Neither the 1598 nor the 1664 editions of the English Book V indicate the identity of the translator. Nonetheless, Donna B. Hamilton attributes the 1598 edition to Munday, without any explanation, and does not include the 1664 edition, presumably because it is beyond the chronological scope of her study. *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* lists Munday as the translator of the 1598 edition but indicates that the 1664 edition is anonymous. The *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* catalogue, on the other hand, cites the 1598 edition as anonymous, and does not include the 1664 one because it is beyond the chronological scope of the project. Helen Moore also presents both editions as anonymous but concedes the possibility that Munday might be the translator, since he translated books I to IV. See Donna B. Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 96; 'General Bibliography of Translations' in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550 to 1660*, ed. by Braden, Cummins and Gillespie, pp. 471-560 (p. 534); Richard Hitchcock, 'Spanish Literature', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: *1660 to 1790*, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins (2005), pp. 406-15 (p. 406); Brenda Hosington and others, *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk>, ISBN 978-0-9557876-5-2 [accessed 21 November 2014]; and Helen Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean in the English *Amadis* Cycle, Book V', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 41 (2011), 113-125 (p. 118).

[22] Henry Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920), p. 256.

and royal circles were interested in chivalric romance, 'English fiction was turning for inspiration primarily to French and Spanish pastoral romance and to the Italian novella'.[23] These specific features of the translation of Spanish romance in England, added to the great lengths of the texts, the lack, until recently, of modern editions, the literal character of the translations, and the negative reputation of early modern romance, may explain why scholarship has largely overlooked these texts. Nevertheless, the English texts are worth exploring because, even if their circulation was more reduced than that of the continental romances, they did find an audience which embraced them with enthusiasm and they played a role in the development of early modern translation. Moreover, a sense of their context of production and circulation can also provide valuable insight into the audience of early modern romance and the expansion of the early modern print market.

This thesis will analyse Tyler's *Mirror*, Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva*, Parts I and II, and his *Amadis de Gaule*, Books I to IV. I have chosen these texts since they were the most popular in English translation and because they translate the opening volumes of the three most successful series of sixteenth-century Spanish chivalric romance. The sequence of the chapters follows the chronology of the English translations. I analyse the way in which Tyler and Munday use their translation practice to reflect or comment on aspects of their contemporary culture. The translations are generally very literal, however, there are certain issues that the translators draw attention to and I focus on these aspects in my analysis. I examine the way that Tyler's and Munday's modifications work next to their literal translation. Tyler rarely omits material from her source, and her additions are fairly obvious. By contrast, Munday cuts out a larger proportion of his sources than does Tyler, and further modifies them through changes in the language rather than through addition of new material. I also pay close attention to the fact that, unlike Tyler, Munday translates from intermediary French texts, and so I analyse the changes in the course of translation from the Spanish originals into French and English.

Through a comparative study between the translations and their sources, I focus specifically on how both translators draw attention to the topics of marriage and sexuality in their texts. Moreover, I also analyse elements unique to each translator. So, I examine in particular Tyler's treatment of the classical material in her source, and Munday's attention to the topic of religion. In this respect, this thesis fills particular

[23] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xx.

gaps in the knowledge of literal translations and Early Modern romance. Moreover, it widens the scope for exploring the figures of Margaret Tyler and Anthony Munday, showing that the gendered aspect of the former's translation is only one aspect of her practice, and that the latter's work is more complex than has commonly been assumed.[24]

This thesis builds on the work of the few scholars who have explored Tyler's and Munday's translations. Analysis of Tyler's text has been limited almost exclusively to her epistle to the reader[25] which precedes her translation. The few scholars who have gone beyond the preface to analyse the translation proper are: Joyce Boro in the introduction to her modern edition of her *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*;[26] Tina Krontiris in her article and book chapter on the *Mirror*, although the latter reproduces the same ideas analysed in the former;[27] Helen Hackett's brief section in her study *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*;[28] and Deborah Uman's and Belén Bistué's article on the *Mirror*.[29] In the case of Anthony Munday, Mary Patchell in *The 'Palmerin' Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* considers his translations of the *Palmerin* cycle, however, she does not focus on Munday's translation practice, but rather on the themes that link the texts to a medieval tradition and to later

[24] Munday's work has commonly been described as that of a hack writer, more interested in making his abilities as a writer marketable, rather than focusing on the quality of the work, as I will discuss further below.

[25] See, Moira Ferguson, 'Margaret Tyler *fl.* 1578', in *First Feminist: British Women Writers 1578-1799*, ed. by Moira Ferguson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), pp. 51-52; Tina Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers of Genre and Gender: Margaret Tyler's Translation of *The Mirrour of Knighthood*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 18 (1988), 19-39 and *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 44-62; Louise Schleiner, 'Margaret Tyler, Translator and Waiting Woman', *English Language Notes*, 29 (1992), 1-8; Douglas Robinson, 'Theorizing Translation in a Woman's Voice: Subverting the Rhetoric of Patronage, Courtly Love and Morality', *The Translator*, 1 (1995), 153-75; Randall Martin, Introduction to 'Epistle to the Reader', from *The Mirrour of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*, in *Women Writers in Renaissance England*, ed. by Randall Martin (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 15-24; Ana Kothe, 'Modest Incursions: The Production of Writers and their Readers in the Early Modern Prefaces of Isabella Whitney and Margaret Tyler', *English Language Notes*, 37 (1999), 15-38; Helen Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 57-75; Stefania Arcara, 'Margaret Tyler's The Mirrour of Knighthood Or How a Renaissance Translator Became "the first English feminist"', *Intralinea* , 9 (2007) <http://www.intralinea.it/volumes/eng_more.php?id=529_0_2_0_M60% > [accessed 20 April, 2011] (no pagination); Deborah Uman and Belén Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 44 (2007), 298-323; Deborah Uman, *Women as Translators in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012), pp. 17-28; Joyce Boro, 'Introduction', in Margaret Tyler (trans.), *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*, ed. by Joyce Boro, MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations, 11 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2014), pp. 1-36 (pp. 25-31).

[26] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, pp. 1-36.

[27] Tina Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', 19-39 and *Oppositional Voices*, pp. 44-62.

[28] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp. 57-75.

[29] Deborah Uman and Belén Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*', 298-323.

early modern works inspired by the cycle;[30] Giuseppe Galigani's essay gives a general overview of his *Palmerin D'Oliva* and analyses some specific aspects briefly;[31] John J. O'Connor considers his translation of the *Amadis* in a chapter of his *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature*, but his main focus is on the influence of the French translations on Elizabethan literature in general;[32] a section in Hackett's book deals briefly with his *Amadis*;[33] Helen Moore's modern edition of his *Amadis de Gaule* includes an introduction dealing with the Spanish text and the English translation;[34] and she discusses in an article the anonymous *Amadis* Book V.[35] In her study *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633*, Donna B. Hamilton includes an overview of Munday's engagement with the Spanish romances in one chapter, but she focuses more on the context than on the translations themselves.[36] Joshua Phillips's article on Munday's romance translation focuses on the relationship between author and publishing business.[37]Andrew Pettegree's essay alludes in very general terms to certain aspects of his translation of *Amadis* but its main focus is on the European circulation of the text.[38] Louise Wilson's essay deals with the prefatory matter preceding his translations of Spanish chivalric romance.[39] Elizabeth Spiller deals briefly with the preface to Munday's *Palmerin of England* in her study on reading and race in the Renaissance.[40] Jordi Sánchez-Martí's article, while dealing with Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva*, focuses on its publication history rather than on translation practice.[41] Tracy Hill's study of Munday's cultural importance does not analyse his translations of

[30] Mary Patchell, *The 'Palmerin' Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York: Columbia University Press).
[31] Giuseppe Galigani, 'La versione inglese del "Palmerín de Olivia"', in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 13, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), III: *Saggi e ricerche*, pp. 239-288
[32] O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence*, pp. 131-147.
[33] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp. 62-75.
[34] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, pp. ix-xxviii.
[35] Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean', pp. 113-125.
[36] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. 73-112. Her analysis of *Palmerin of England* in the book, was reprinted as an essay, 'Anthony Munday's Translations of Iberian Chivalric Romances: Palmerin of England, Part 1 as Exemplar', in *Catholic Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. by Ronald Corthell and others (Notre Dame, IN; University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), pp. 281-303.
[37] Joshua Phillips, 'Chronicles of Wasted Time: Anthony Munday, Tudor Romance, and Literary Labor', *ELH*, 73 (2006), 781-803.
[38] Andrew Pettegree, 'Translation and the Migration of Texts', in *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Thomas Betteridge (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 113-25 (pp. 119; 21-22).
[39] Louise Wilson, 'Playful Paratexts: The Front Matter of Anthony Munday's Iberian Romance Translations', in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 121-32.
[40] Spiller, *Reading and the History of Race*, pp. 129-31.
[41] Jordi Sánchez-Martí, 'The Publication History of Anthony Munday's Palmerin d'Oliva', *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 89 (2014), 190-207.

Spanish romance.[42] As those studies that refer to Tyler's and Munday's translations, while valuable, are all too brief, there is room for an extended analysis of these texts.

Apart from the works previously cited, there is virtually no mention of Spanish chivalric romance in current discussions of English Early Modern translation practice. Fred Schurink's recent collection of essays on Tudor translation contains no article on this material,[43] although it does include essays on translation of other Spanish texts, namely, Boro's article on Spanish sentimental romance[44] and Moore's essay on Paynell's *Treasurie*,[45] which, although linked to the *Amadis*, is not itself a chivalric romance.[46] Spanish chivalric romance is also mainly missing from the collection of essays in *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640*.[47] While Tyler's and Munday's texts are mentioned in Barry Taylor's essay, it is only to build a context, since he focuses on the analysis of sentimental romance,[48] as does Boro.[49]

The recently published anthology *English Renaissance Translation Theory*,[50] on the other hand, includes only one extract from these translations (Margaret Tyler's epistle to the reader) in a total of thirty-three works selected for the section on 'Literary Translation'. Apart from this instance, no mention is made of this material elsewhere in the anthology, and the generalizing views presented in the introduction, while illuminating, do not necessarily represent the sort of translating practice carried out by Munday and Tyler. One must concede that, as the editors explain, the criteria for selecting material for the anthology considered early modern texts (mostly prefaces) which openly discuss issues of translation theory. The chivalric romances are excluded presumably because, with the exception of Tyler's epistle, they rarely allude extensively

---

[42] Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).
[43] *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave, 2011).
[44] Boro, 'Multilingualism, Romance, and Language Pedagogy; or, Why Were So Many Sentimental Romances Printed as Polyglot Texts?', pp. 18-38.
[45] Moore, 'Gathering Fruit: The "Profitable" Translations of Thomas Paynell', 39-57.
[46] Moore herself notes that Paynell's text was 'intended […] as an oratorical and epistolary guide, rather than a romance narrative', 'Ancient and Modern Romance', p. 337.
[47] *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640*, ed. by S. K. Barker and Brenda M. Hosington (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
[48] Barry Taylor, 'Learning Style from the Spaniards in Sixteenth-Century England', in *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640*, ed. by S. K. Barker and Brenda M. Hosington (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 63-78.
[49] Joyce Boro, 'Reading Juan de Flores's *Grisel y Mirabella* in Early Modern England', in *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640*, ed. by S. K. Barker and Brenda M. Hosington (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 35-39.
[50] *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, ed. by Neil Rhodes with Gordon Kendal and Louise Wilson, Modern Humanities Research Association: Tudor and Stuart Translations, 9 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2013).

to these matters. One must admit as well that it is remarkable that Tyler is associated here with discussions about the theory of translation, because her epistle has most commonly been analysed solely from a gender perspective. Inevitably, since it is the most remarkable issue, Neil Rhodes focuses on what Tyler's preface expresses in terms of gender, but he does point out certain allusions to actual translation practice, such as the relationship with the source,[51] as I will discuss further below. Morini has also recently explored discussions of translation theory in Tudor texts, and has examined the relation between these concepts and a selection of cases,[52] but he gives no examples from Spanish chivalric romances in translation. His chapter on the translation of prose focuses instead on John Rastell's *c.* 1525 and James Mabbe's 1631 translations of Fernando de Rojas's *Celestina* (1499); Thomas Hoby's *The Courtier* (1561); John Florio's *The Essays of Montaigne* (1603), and Philemon Holland's *The Roman History* (1600). Morini selects texts which 'share a mark of modernity', since none of them appear to have used an intermediary translation as their source.[53] In the case of Hoby's, Florio's, and Holland's texts, he chooses them because, as he argues, they were among the most influential English translations from European humanism or classical antiquity. Morini also notes that he has selected these works in order to consider the translation of prose from a synchronic and diachronic point of view, considering prose translations from different periods and genres.[54]

In their respective introductions, Rhodes and Morini acknowledge the difficulties of tracing the clear development of a theory of translation in Renaissance England.[55] Rhodes notes Morini's observation on the lack of an English theoretical treatise on translation at this time, with the exception of Laurence Humphrey's *Interpretatio linguarum* (1559), which was written in Latin and published abroad. He observes that there is no English equivalent to Leonardo Bruni's *De Interpretatione recta* (*c.* 1425) or Etienne Dolet's reworking of Bruni in *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (*c.* 1540).[56] Both Morini and Rhodes note that the prefaces of

[51] Neil Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, pp. 1-67 (pp. 50-51).
[52] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*.
[53] See Morini's chapter 'The Translation of Prose', in *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 65-95 (p. 67).
[54] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 65-67.
[55] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 18-19; Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, pp. 3-4.
[56] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, pp. 3-4.

early modern printed books are the primary sources of commentary on the theoretical issues involved in the practice of translation.[57]

The Spanish romances are not exactly represented by the generalizing categories discussed by Morini and Rhodes about early modern translations. With reference to the status of the vernacular during the first half of the sixteenth century, Morini gives examples of prefaces that expressed anxiety about the inferior quality of English as compared to Latin, Greek, and other vernaculars, such as Italian and French. In them, he notes a common description of English as 'plain' or 'barbarous', and analyses the way that various translators expressed this idea through a clothing metaphor which depicted the language and style of the original as its 'dress', and identified it as the most difficult aspect to imitate. The process of translation is described as one of 're-dressing', which implies an inevitable degradation from 'elegant robes' to 'poor and dirty rags'.[58] Morini observes the use of this metaphor in Gavin Douglas' *Aeneid* (1513), Arthur Golding's *Histories of Trogus Pompeius* (1564), Thomas Newton's translation of Cicero *The Worthye Booke of Old age* (1569), Thomas Wilson's *The Three Orations of Demosthenes* (1570), and Anthony Granthan's *An Italian Grammer* [sic] (1575). For example, Newton worries that he has 'racked [him] from gorgeous Elegancie, and oute of Romayne gownes […] into Englyshe Liuerayes'.[59] Unlike the cases that Morini analyses, Tyler's and Mundays's prefaces hardly ever allude to the status of English. The only reference is in Munday's dedication to the first edition of *Amadis* Book II (1595), in which he apologizes for having written a work in 'plaine English, void of all eloquence'.[60] However, this reference does not appear in the dedication to the second edition of Book II (1619). Im fact, in the preface to *Amadis* Book III (1618), Munday presents this work as 'never extant before in our English' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 516), thus expressing the importance of making these texts available in translation.

Rhodes, on the other hand, identifies a sense of anxiety about status in all discussions about translation during this period, since translations were seen as secondary to the primary status of the original creation.[61] This was linked to the notion that translations were 'inadequate renderings of their originals', to the vision of English as 'poorly equipped for literary purposes', as discussed above, and to the concept that

[57] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 18-19, Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, pp. 3-4.
[58] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 38-39.
[59] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, p. 39.
[60] Anthony Munday (trans.), *Amadis de Gaule*, ed. by Helen Moore (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p. 302. Further references to Books I-IV are to this edition by translator, title, and page number in the text.
[61] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, pp. 32; 44-48.

making a work accessible implied the risk of a charge of commonness, because it was thought that a textual degradation was involved in the process.[62] Morini also analyses this idea and notes that since art was seen as an imitation of nature, translation was then considered as the imitation of an imitation.[63] He notes Nicholas Haward's reference to this anxiety in the preface to his *A Briefe Chronicle* (1564), where he refers to translations as 'troubled streames' and the original as the 'well spryng' which the reader cannot reach. Florio, meanwhile, famously alludes to this notion by describing his translation as 'defective […] since all translations are reputed femalls, delivered at second hand'.[64] However, neither Munday nor Tyler expresses this sentiment in the terms that Rhodes and Morini record. In the case of Munday, the fact that his source is a translation and not the original text, might explain this absence. Tyler, on the other hand, uses the 'second' status of translation to her advantage, by employing it in her epistle to argue that women can be translators, as I will discuss in Chapter I. However, she also alludes to the inevitable difference between translation and original, as she concedes that 'seldom is the tale carried clean from another's mouth'.[65] She also admits that some readers who know the romance in its original form might 'be rather angry to see their Spanish *delight* turned to an English *pastime*' (pp. 50-51) (my emphasis). However, it seems to me that the terms 'delight' and 'pastime', refer more to a change of role for the text, rather than a degradation in quality. Moreover, Tyler follows the statement by justifying this change through her intention of making the text commonly available in English. Hackett sees Tyler as appropriating a humanist argument, whereby learning is made accessible through vernacular translation.[66] Rhodes notes that all translators in this period describe their work as a process of 'making common'. This is a way to argue for the benefits of their work, whether they are engaged with secular or religious texts.[67] Tyler's account of her translation, then, is not so much an expression of anxiety about its status as a positive focus on the benefits of her work.

Morini argues that the prefaces of Early Modern English translators are more likely to express anxiety when written in the first half of the sixteenth century; towards the end of the century a sense of aggressiveness replaces this expression of inadequacy.

---

[62] Neil Rhodes, 'Status Anxiety and English Renaissance Translation', in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 107-20 (p. 110).
[63] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, p. 56.
[64] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 56-57.
[65] Margaret Tyler (trans.), *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*, ed. by Joyce Boro, MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations, 11 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2014), p. 49. Further references are to this edition by page number in the text.
[66] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 61.
[67] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, p. 4.

He links this to what he sees as a growing confidence in the vernacular and therefore in the quality of the translation. Examples are George Pettie's *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo* (1586), in which he expresses rage against those who consider the English language to be barbarous, and Sidney's *The Defence of Poesie* (1595), in which he claims that English is a better fit than any other vernacular for both ancient and modern poetry.[68] However, this aggressiveness is absent from Tyler's and Munday's prefaces, which, in contrast, always adopt an apologetic tone to describe the work of the translator. In this respect, Rhodes argues that an apology is typical of the translator's preface at this time.[69] One can of course also understand this as a standard trope. In the dedication to Part I of his *Palmerin D'Oliva* (1588), Munday describes his 'endevours' [sic] as 'simple' and apologizes for the 'wrong' his 'bad translation' has caused.[70] In his dedication to *Amadis* Book III (1618) he apologizes for the fact that the previous *Amadis* books (I, II, and V) have been 'corruptly [...] translated and printed' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 516). In his dedication to the second edition of *Amadis* Book I (1619), he excuses himself for the 'imperfections' in his translation (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 3). In the dedication to the first edition of Book II (1595) he says the work deserves 'a better penne then mine to pollish it' and asks for his dedicatee's support if the readers should 'find fault with [his] stile' as they read his 'abrupt lines' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 302). However, it is important to distinguish between Munday's apologetic stance and Tyler's. Munday is clearly employing a conventional modesty topos, rather than making a serious point about the quality of his work. This is related to his commercial standing, as I will discuss further below. Tyler, on the other hand, is in such a risky position as a woman translator that she has to appropriate these apologetic tropes in order to justify herself as a published translator. Quality is not even an issue in her epistle, because the question of her gender, and the genre she is working with, are much more pressing in the context of a restrictive society, as I will discuss in more detail in Chapter I.

Both Morini and Rhodes identify the use of metaphors of 'conquest' and 'civilisation' to describe the connection between original and translation. Morini identifies, towards the end of the sixteenth century, a growing confidence in English

---

[68] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 26-28.
[69] Rhodes, 'Status Anxiety and English Renaissance Translation', p. 110.
[70] Anthony Munday (trans.), *Palmerin D'Oliva* (London: by I. Charlewood for William Wright, 1588), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 17 March 2014], sigs. *2^{r}-*2^{v}. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s, sharp s, u/v, and ampersand. Contractions have been expanded. Further references are to this edition by title and signature number in the text.

which qualifies the earlier submissiveness of the translator, and even turns it into aggressiveness. He cites Florio's assertion that he has transported the text 'from France to England; put it in English clothes; taught it to talk our toungue [...] with a jerk of the French *Iargon*'.[71] Similarly, Holland's military tone, in his preface to his translation of Pliny, encourages the act of 'subduing' Roman literature 'under the dent of the English pen'.[72] However, Rhodes argues that Holland's claims are not representative of English views about translation in this period. He points out that later in his preface to Pliny, as well as in his preface to Livy, Holland describes the relationship between source and translation as a receptive one. In his dedication to Elizabeth, Holland depicts Livy as an immigrant who wishes to obtain citizenship. Rhodes links this idea to Hoby's preface to his *Courtier*, where he presents the courtier as an Italian who has 'strayed' but has 'become an Englishman'.[73] Therefore, the relationship between translation and source text at this time was understood as receptive rather than colonising, and Rhodes links this to 'the hospitable ethos of translation represented in the sense of its offering a home to strangers'.[74] Rhodes cites Samuel Daniel's prefatory poem to Florio's translation of Montaigne, where Daniel argues that the translator has contributed to Montaigne's 'happy settling in our land'. Rhodes links this to Florio's own family history as immigrants welcomed into their English 'home'.[75] Tyler also uses this kind of language in her epistle to the reader, as the editors of *English Renaissance Translation Theory* note,[76] where she explains that through her translation she has only been responsible for 'giving *entertainment* to a *stranger*, before this time unacquainted with our country guise' (p. 49) (my emphasis). Rhodes observes that Tyler does not define the relationship between the *Mirror* and her source as a power struggle, unlike many of her contemporary male translators.[77] Boro, on the other, argues that Tyler highlights the text's Spanish origins by depicting it as a 'stranger';[78] however, I also find a sense of genuine hospitability in the translator's offer of 'entertainment' to this foreigner.

Also in terms of the relationship between original and translation, Morini argues that during the sixteenth century there were new constraints and freedoms on and for translators. The printing press brought 'a new attitude to textual integrity and authorial rights', in the sense that translators started to be more respectful of their source, or at

[71] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, p. 27.
[72] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, p. 27.
[73] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, p. 53.
[74] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, p. 54.
[75] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, pp. 53-54.
[76] *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, p. 330 (footnote 8).
[77] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, p. 51.
[78] Boro, *Mirror*, p. 49 (footnote 13).

least expressed this intention in their prefaces.[79] Both Tyler and Munday are in general quite respectful of their sources, and allude in passing to their intention to be as faithful as possible to the text; they also note if they have strayed from the original meaning. Tyler acknowledges the position of the author in terms of creative precedence and her lesser status as translator: 'The invention, disposition, trimming, and what else in this story is wholly another man's, my part none therein but the translation [...]' (p. 49). By means of this simple comment, she not only gives credit to the original author but also reveals an awareness of the links between rhetorical structure and translation made by many in her time.[80] This intention to follow a certain structure in the original is also evident, if less explicit, in Munday's dedication to the first edition of *Amadis* Book II (1595). The translator admits that he has followed his original 'rightly, though not rethorically', and justifies the faults in his style by explaining that he 'was never any scholler' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 302). In the epistle to the reader of that same edition, he declares that 'if my woorke [sic] be compared with the former, it shall in all respects be as answerable to the Aucthors intent, albeit there may be more then a daies difference between them' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 303). Thomas East, the printer of much of the *Mirror* series, apologizes in the epistle to Part I, Book II (1599) for the 'abruptnesse of the translation'[81] and, in the epistle to Part II, admits that the translation may lack in 'grace of eloquence', but that it offers the 'varietie of the matter' as 'recompence'.[82] These examples show that translators and printers are aware of a certain responsibility towards the original texts but also of the possibility that the audience might perceive the changes brought on by the translations, since they may have encountered the texts first in their original language.

While some aspects of Morini's and Rhodes's analysis describe the translations of Spanish chivalric romance, others do not. This reveals, on the one hand, that their discussion misrepresents certain areas of Early Modern translation practice, because a whole genre is not considered in the analysis. On the other, a discussion of Early Modern translation theory based solely on prefatorial material can only reveal an incomplete assessment of the practice, since a methodology is developed in the

[79] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, p. 7.
[80] Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, pp. 8-13.
[81] R. P. (trans.), *The Second Part of the First Booke of the Myrrour of Knighthood* (London: Thomas Este, 1599), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 18 March 2014], sig. A2^{r}. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s and u/v. Contraction have been expanded. Further references are to this edition by short title and signature number in the text.
[82] R. P. (trans.), *The Second Part of the Myrror of Knighthood* (London: Thomas Este, 1583), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 18 March 2014], sig. A2^{v}. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s and u/v. Contraction have been expanded. Further references are to this edition by short title and signature number in the text.

translation proper which might not have expression in the prefatorial material. There is, then, obviously a case for exploring the texts themselves, especially as, Munday's and Tyler's translations reveal an attention to issues that, perhaps intentionally,[83] are not acknowledged in their prefaces.

A study of these translations must bear in mind the status of chivalric romance in Early Modern times. The texts' popularity ran parallel to the condemnation and mockery of the genre, and, in my view, this influenced the translation practice to some extent. Munday himself expresses concern for the low status of the genre in the epistle of the first edition of *Amadis* Book II. The translator admits that 'my labours might have beene better employed, in setting foorth some more *serious matter*', and he justifies his choice by saying he was compelled to answer to his 'friends [sic] request,' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 303) (my emphasis), although one must note that this epistle was removed from the second edition of Book II (1619). Tyler, on the other hand, also acknowledges the problematic nature of the genre by apologizing for translating a text which, as a woman, she should avoid, as I will discuss in Chapter I. However, Lori Humphrey Newcomb notes that condemnation of romance ran parallel to its commercial success and so it seems the criticism did not deter the readership. The defence of the genre in prologues seems more a rhetorical commonplace than a constructive response to criticism.[84] However, in the case of the French *Amadis*, for example, Marc Fumaroli sees direct connections between the effect of Jacques Amyot's critique in the preface to his *Histoire éthiopique d'Héliodore* (1547) and the apologetic prefaces included in the later books of the cycle.[85] In the recommendation of his own work, Amyot draws attention to the foolish and vicious nature of the content of chivalric romance, as opposed to the Greek romance he translates.[86] Similarly, Veronique Benhaïm argues that the condemnation of the French *Amadis* influenced the sort of defensive tone of the first edition of the *Thresor des livres d'Amadis de Gaule*.[87]

Before the publication of Tyler's and Munday's texts, the genre of romance faced vociferous detractors who were concerned at what they saw as the immorality of the genre and its worrying lack of truthfulness. Roger Ascham's disapproval of the

[83] Krontiris argues that her culture's patriarchal ideology makes Tyler uneasy about alluding to the topic of love in her preface, despite the fact that it is an important theme in the romance. See Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices*, p. 48.
[84] Lori Humphrey Newcomb, 'Romance', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture. Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*, ed. by Joad Raymond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), I, 363-376 (p. 365).
[85] Marc Fumaroli, 'Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38 (1985), 22-40 (pp. 34-37).
[86] Fumaroli, 'Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic', 22-40.
[87] Benhaïm, 'Les *Thresors D'Amadis*', p. 175.

'bolde bawdrye' of the genre in his *Schoolmaster* (1570) is probably the most famous native English protest against the genre's immorality.[88] Also well-known is Juan Luis Vives's attack on romances in his *De institutione feminae christianae*, first published in Latin in 1524, and published in English as *Instruction of a Christian Woman*, *c*. 1529 in Richard Hyrde's translation. Vives describes the authors of romance as 'slaves of vice and filth', highlighting the reader's indecency, and warning against the 'venomous allurements' of the love affairs the romances portray.[89] The eleven sixteenth-century English editions of Vives's *Instruction*[90] suggest that his ideas were well-received. Newcomb notes that, although the genre was popular across social classes, it was seen as a subordinate cultural category, a condemnation largely due, she argues, to the anxiety caused by the social spread of print culture.[91] Hackett, on the other hand, claims that Renaissance romance was perceived as a genre with low aesthetic merit, and as a 'women's genre', on account of its light and frivolous nature. While many romances were advertised for women, the female readers were nonetheless condemned or ridiculed for reading them and excluded from writing them.[92]

By the time Tyler and Munday translate their romances, the vogue for the originals had already died down in other parts of Europe. Marian Rothstein has discussed the change in France in the cultural reception of the *Amadis* towards the second half of the sixteenth century. Focus on its linguistic merits, expressed also in the interest on the *Thresor*, turned instead to its scandalous sexual escapades.[93] François de La Noue's *Discours politiques et militaires* (1587), published in English in 1589,[94] dedicates a whole chapter to the dangers of reading *Amadis* and similar books.[95] Part of Francis Meres' *Palladis Tamia* (1598) expands on De la Noue's critique, quoting De la

---

[88] Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster* (London: by Iohn Daye, 1570), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 13 April 2014], sig. $I3^{r}$-$I3^{v}$.

[89] Juan Luis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*, ed. and trans. by Charles Fantazzi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 74-75. Further references are to this edition by page number in the text.

[90] Charles Fantazzi, 'Introduction: Prelude to the Other Voice in Vives', in Juan Luis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*, pp. 1-42 (p. 31).

[91] Lori Humphrey Newcomb, *Reading Popular Romance in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), pp. 1-2; 15.

[92] Helen Hackett, '"Yet Tell Me Some Such Fiction": Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and the "Femininity" of Romance', in *Women, Texts and Histories 1575-1760* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 39-68 (pp. 40-41; 44-46).

[93] Marian Rothstein, 'Clandestine Marriage and *Amadis de Gaule*: The Text, the World, and the Reader', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25 (1994), 873-86 (p. 878). Rothstein also discusses these ideas in her *Reading in the Renaissance: Amadis de Gaule and the Lessons of Memory* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1999), pp. 129-38.

[94] Louise Wilson, 'Playful Paratexts', pp. 121-32 (p. 123).

[95] François de La Noue, *The Politicke and Militarie Discourses*, trans. by Edward Aggas (London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Cadman and Edward Aggas, 1588), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 18 October 2013], sigs. $G4^{r}$-$G8^{r}$.

Noue as a source for his list of works morally injurious to the young. Meres includes in this group the Spanish *Amadis de Gaule, Primaleon of Greece, Palmerin de Oliva,* and the *Myrror of Knighthood,* next to the English *Bevis of Hampton, Guy of Warwicke,* and those of *Arthur* of the Round Table.[96]

Moore observes that earlier criticism of the genre was more focused on the corrupting moral effects of romance, while a post-Cervantes attack was characterized by mocking the excesses of these texts.[97] Among those who note the romances' stylistic faults is Philip Sidney who, in his *Defence of Poesy* (1595), claims a moral and educational value for the *Amadis*, despite what he sees as its lack of quality: it 'wanteth much of a perfect poesy'.[98] Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1613) is ostensibly satirical of romance,[99] and is peppered with references to these Spanish texts. Rafe is initially identified as a Quixote-like character, who reads *Palmerin of England* (although he is actually reading *Palmerin D'Oliva*)[100] and admires characters such as Rosicleer from the *Mirror*.[101] Moore notes how Ben Jonson mocks the style, matter, and readership of the Spanish romances in *Cynthia's Revels* (1600) and in *Epicoene* (1609), while in *Eastward Ho* (1605) he depicts female readers addicted to these romances.[102] In his poem 'An execration upon Vulcan' (1623), Jonson also alludes to the lack of value of these romances, presenting the works as worthy of being burned.[103] However, Moore cautions against accepting either criticism or mockery of romance at face value. She argues that authors might be following a conventional disapproval and that the romances may be influential even if they are being criticized. Moore also points out that references to titles of romances do not necessarily indicate first-hand knowledge of the books.[104] However, I find that one must be aware of this context because the translators are arguably taking it into account when writing their texts.

---

[96] Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia* (London: Printed by P. Short for Cuthbert Burbie, 1598) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 11 April 2014], sigs. Mm4^{r}-Mm4^{v}.

[97] Helen Moore, 'Jonson, Dekker, and the Discourse of Chivalry', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 12 (1999), 121-65 (p. 128).

[98] Philip Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, in *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. by Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 337-97 (pp. 358-59).

[99] Michael Hattaway, 'Introduction', in Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (London: A. & C. Black, 1986), pp. ix-xix.

[100] See *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, p. 25 (second footnote to line 211).

[101] *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, I. 214-45, pp. 26-27.

[102] Moore, 'Jonson, Dekker, and the Discourse of Chivalry', pp. 128-30.

[103] Ben Jonson, 'An Execration upon Vulcan', in *The Complete Poems*, ed. by George Parfitt (London: Penguin, 1988), pp. 181-87 (p. 182).

[104] Moore, 'Jonson, Dekker, and the Discourse of Chivalry', p. 124.

In my analysis of Tyler's translation, I wish to go beyond the limited image that has been constructed on the strength of analysis of her epistle alone. I want to expand on the one-dimensional view of Tyler as just a 'female translator', by reading her gender-based interventions alongside her commentary on her source's classical material. In Chapter I, I argue that her treatment of the classical material shows her to be influenced, as both a reader and translator, by a humanist reading and pedagogic practice based on the selection of material and its reutilization. Tyler's interventions reveal a remarkable knowledge of classical texts for a woman of her time and social position. She is not simply responding, as a woman translator, to a male-dominated culture, but also taking part as an Early Modern intellectual. The commonplace nature of her classical additions indicates a humanist method of reading which treated texts as collections of segments that could be put to later use. The Erasmian method encouraged an involvement with the texts, exemplified in marginal annotations, construction of commonplace books, and learned commentaries of the texts.[105] Tyler's practice of incorporating commentary into her translation, whether related to classical fragments or the experiences of the female characters in the narrative, is arguably using a humanist engagement with the text as a translation strategy. Tyler's example suggests that sixteenth-century humanist education for women may not have been as narrow as a stress on female instruction simply to participate in household duties may indicate.[106]

Furthermore, I will reassess the view that Tyler is simply a defender of women's right to participate in their culture as patrons, readers, and translators. Analysing her additions and modification to her source, I will also focus on the way that she draws attention to different aspects of female experience, responding to the attention that the original author gives to this topic. On the one hand, I will examine how she highlights the inner life of young women, drawing attention to the relation between emotion and reason, and how this affects romantic relations. Tyler's interventions draw attention to the way that women, and also men, have to deal with the expectations of their culture, mainly with respect to love and sexuality.

In the final section of the chapter, I will analyse how Tyler draws attention to the experiences of married women in the translation. Tyler's commentary acknowledges the reality of sanctioned violence within the institution of marriage and encourages husbands to recognize the consequences of their actions on wives and families.

[105] Eugene R. Kintgen, *Reading in Tudor England* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996), pp. 25-43.
[106] Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Women', in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-29.

Ultimately, the text proposes a more harmonious partnership between spouses, arguably influenced by Protestant ideas of companionate marriage.

The *Mirror* is Tyler's only extant text, and all that is known of her biography has been inferred from her dedication, which I will discuss in Chapter I. By contrast, there are many more recorded details about Munday's life and there is quite a lot of information about his career as a published author, which has often been described as that of a hack writer. As Tracy Hill argues, this judgement is partly explained by the fact that Munday made himself into a commodity for the cultural and political marketplace,[107] which is exemplified in the variety of his output as a writer. Hamilton argues that he had 'the longest writing career of any author of his generation and left a body of work larger and more various than nearly all writers of his time.'[108] He translated not only chivalric romance but also works of religion, politics, and rhetoric. He wrote original texts, such as the collection of instructive stories *The mirrour of mutability* (1579), the romance *Zelauto* (1580), and *The English Romayne lyfe* (1582), as well as a number of news and anti-Catholic pamphlets, and ballads. He worked for Philip Henslowe and co-wrote a number of plays, five of which are extant. This association with the world of dramatic production did not deter him from writing the anti-theatrical pamphlet *A second and third blast of retrait from plays and theatres* (1580). He wrote seven pageants and two speeches for the City of London's Lord Mayor's Show, and a water show for the pageant written by Thomas Middleton in 1623. Munday revised and expanded John Stow's *Survey of London* (1598) for the 1618 edition and collaborated in the 1633 edition.[109] It is this versatility, Hill notes, that has excluded him from critical scrutiny;[110] Hamilton observes that he has 'no defined place in the dominant narratives of Renaissance literature and history'.[111] But this dismissal, Hill argues, could be founded less on perceived stylistic faults than on a reaction to his use of the freedom that early modern London could offer a writer. In this sense, he fits Lawrence Manley's description of the professional writer of his time, whose marginal status influenced the creation of 'mobile forms and styles'.[112] Phillips argues that he is

[107] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, pp. 44.
[108] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p.xv.
[109] For a list of Munday's works see Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. 199-206, and Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, pp. 193-95.
[110] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, p. 44.
[111] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p.xv.
[112] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, pp. 44-45.

now rarely mentioned as a writer because he was so enthusiastic about his functional role in the chain of production that was the marketplace of books.[113]

Several of Munday's contemporaries mocked him for his apparent lack of talent. Jonson, for example, ridicules Munday in *The Case Is Altered* (1609), where he depicts him as the character Antonio Balladino, the name Balladino alluding to Munday's ballad-writing. The character is described as an unoriginal writer who uses borrowed material.[114] Hill argues that Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* (1592) expresses a veiled reference to Munday in the description of an impertinent fictional writer who attempts to write in different genres and persistently searches for patronage.[115] Hamilton comments that, as a professional writer, Munday not only wrote in different genres but also invested his energy in building strategic relationships with patrons, printers, owners of playhouses and city administrators.[116] However, Phillips understands these relationships as evidence of the sort of collective labor that reshaped the literary field in the sixteenth century.[117] Nonetheless, as Hill shows, Thomas Middleton is very dismissive of his collaboration with Munday in *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613) and in his pamphlet version for his part of the show *The Triumphs of Integrity* (1623).[118] In the case of Munday's work as a translator, Phillips explains that modern criticism has linked Munday as hack writer with a sense that his great output of translations came as a result of others doing part of the work for him. Phillips argues that there is no evidence for this and that most of these critics have either misinterpreted Munday's prefaces or picked up on Robert Southey's critique of Munday, expressed in his own project of retranslating the *Amadis* and *Palmerin of England*.[119] Hill, on the other hand, advises caution in the interpretation of the perception of Munday's contemporaries, as modern critics have sometimes wanted to see animosities between pageant-makers which weren't real in practice.[120]

However, Munday was not only a versatile writer but also worked for various government officials. He was servant and messenger to the Queen, as well as pursuivant, spy and informer.[121] Munday's occupations, as well as his participation in the persecution and torture of Catholics, prompted criticism from other writers. Meres, in

[113] Phillips, 'Chronicles of Wasted Time', p. 790.
[114] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, p. 75.
[115] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, pp. 72; 75-76.
[116] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. xvi.
[117] Phillips, 'Chronicles of Wasted Time', p. 790.
[118] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, p. 77-79.
[119] Phillips, 'Chronicles of Wasted Time', pp. 781-83.
[120] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, pp. 75-80.
[121] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. xx-xxi.

Palladis Tamia, describes Munday as 'the best for Comedy amongst us' and also as 'our best plotter'.[122] Philip J. Ayres argues that although he was known as a good creator of dramatic plots, there was nothing particularly outstanding about them. Ayres, then, like other modern critics, argues that Meres was referring to Munday's work as a spy and informer under Richard Topcliffe.[123] Jonson, picks up on Meres's allusion in *The Case Is Altered* (1609) and describes Balladino as a 'pageant poet to the City of Milan […] in print already the best plotter'.[124]

I wish to expand on this limited view of Munday as a writer and concentrate on what his translations of Spanish chivalric romance can reveal. In Chapter II, I analyse the way that his *Palmerin D'Oliva* modifies the description of erotic attraction and sexual intercourse in his source, in order, I argue, to draw attention to the topic of official marriage, arguably influenced by Protestant conceptions of marriage and sexuality. I also analyse the way that he highlights the antagonism between Christians and Muslims by mainly manipulating European sexual stereotypes of Islam. For both topics, I argue that Munday uses romance and its representations of sexuality to develop a personal commentary on religious and moral matters which are topical to his time. In Chapter III, I argue that in his *Amadis de Gaule* he reflects the Reformation's tensions between old and new religious practice in the way that he transforms the description of religious devotion in his source. I also examine how Munday transforms the explicit erotic description of his French source, apparently making the text more modest but covertly offering a description which is highly suggestive of physical pleasure. So, while I consider certain aspects of Munday's biography, such as his anti-Catholic activities, I go beyond the stereotypical assumptions about him and his work and show a translator who is not only concerned with religious matters, but also with issues of sexuality, marriage and language. Munday is more than simply a well-connected hack writer; he is a translator interested in contributing to the circulation of foreign material, and tries to be as respectful as possible of his source, but he also shows an awareness of contemporary morality and literary style, and uses his text to reflect these interests.

[122] Philip J. Ayres, 'Anthony Munday: "Our Best Plotter"?', *English Language Notes*, 18 (1980), 13-15 (p. 13).
[123] Ayres, 'Anthony Munday: "Our Best Plotter"?', p. 14.
[124] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, p. 75.

Chapter I: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*

In this chapter I analyse Margaret Tyler's *The Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood* (*c*. 1578), a translation from Book I of the Spanish romance *Espejo de Príncipes y Caballeros* (1555) by Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra. I explore here three aspects of Tyler's translation: how her expansion of the classical material in her source connects her to an early modern humanist culture; how her translation ponders the inner world of maidens, particularly how rationality coexists with emotion, and how these aspects influence their romantic relationships; and, finally, how Tyler's text acts as a platform to acknowledge the existence of violence against wives and to propose a harmonious partnership between spouses.

In his romance, Ortúñez creates characters with a direct connection to Greek antiquity, which is arguably why he includes many classical references. Ortúñez establishes this link from the beginning of the text, when he describes the heroes' father, Trebatio of Epirus, later emperor of Constantinople, as a descendant of Achilles. The author makes further connections with protagonists from classical literature at several points in the romance. Tyler many times expands these references or adds material of her own, thus taking advantage of the possible symbolic interpretations of the classical stories and characters to give more depth to her depictions of events and to develop her judgment of the actions in the narrative. Whether intentionally or not, Tyler's reworking of this classical material shows a knowledge of these works which seems rather surprising for a woman of her unprivileged social position. I would argue that, however she came by her knowledge, the fact that she did and that she chose to use it in her translation, portray her as active in an early modern humanist culture which was invested in closely reading and reusing this classical material. In this respect, the analysis of this aspect, alongside other elements in her translation which have an important gender focus, demonstrates that her work shows her to be an early modern intellectual, not simply a 'female translator'.

Ortúñez gives a lot of attention to the intellectual and emotional dimensions of female characters. Many times through direct speech, the women portrayed in the narrative communicate their feelings of their experiences, either expressing how they affect them or how they shape their relationships. Tyler picks up on this approach and

further develops the Spanish author's depiction, focusing on the way that maidens experience love and sexuality. The English translator cleverly combines a virtuous depiction of femininity with revealing glimpses of the women's inner world. With Olivia, princess of Great Britain, Tyler represents, through modifications, additions, and occasionally omissions, the cultural challenges that unmarried ladies of a high social class must face. However, she also considers the inner world of men and how this affects the relationship between the sexes. Through Olivia's depiction, the translation notes the gender-related limitations of her culture and proposes ways to overcome them.

The Spanish author does not only pay attention to the experiences of maidens but also of married women, specifically of Princess Briana of Hungary, the mother of the heroes of the romance. Ortúñez comments on the character's experience as wife and mother, particularly on her suffering on account of her husband's disappearance for almost twenty years and her separation from her children. Tyler focuses on aspects of the narrative which are ignored or left unresolved, mainly, the violent consummation of her marriage to Emperor Trebatio of Constantinople. Through commentary that she adds to her source, the English translator raises a voice of concern for violence and abuse against women within the institution of marriage. She argues for the legitimacy of marriage and loyalty to the family through a partnership between spouses, which is only possible if there is mutual respect. The idea of wifely commitment to husbands is upheld as a crucial value but the extreme sacrifices and suffering that wives must endure is acknowledged also. Tyler argues that husbands have important obligations to the protection of their families and so the violence and neglect towards their spouses must be recognized and their behaviour reformed.

Printing History of the Two Versions

Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra's *Espejo de Príncipes y Caballeros*, also known as *El Caballero del Febo*, was first published in Zaragoza in 1555 by Esteban de Nájera. The romance was made up of three books which where all published as one text, and it went through a total of six early modern Spanish editions, with the last one printed in 1617.[125] The romance belongs to a prolific line of Spanish chivalric romance which was published throughout the sixteenth century, in the wake of the popularity of Garci

[125] Daniel Eisenberg, 'Introducción', in Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra, *Espejo de Príncipes y Cavalleros, (El Caballero del Febo)*, ed. by Daniel Eisenberg, 6 vols (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1975), I, pp. xvii-lxxxviii (p. lxxiv).

Rodríguez de Montalvo's *Amadís de Gaula* (1508). As was common with these romances, others continued the story Ortúñez created. Pedro de la Sierra Infanzón produced a second part of the *Espejo* in 1580, made up of two books, which went through a total of six editions.[126] Marcos Martínez completed the series with a third part in 1587, made up of four books, which went through three editions.[127] Books III and IV of Martinez's romance were published as a fourth part in 1623. A fifth part appears to have remained unpublished and only survives in manuscript form.[128]

In the prologue, Ortúñez presents himself not as the author but as the translator of this romance, claiming it was written originally in Greek, then translated into Latin and which he has turned into Spanish. Daniel Eisenberg notes that Spanish authors would commonly present themselves as translators of the work of ancient historians, in order to give their romances a pseudo-historical status. He explains that some romance authors went so far as including two separate prologues, one apparently written by the translator and the other by the 'real' author.[129] It is relevant for one to bear in mind this translating persona created by Ortúñez when considering Margaret Tyler's role and status as a woman translator of romance. Even though we know Ortúñez is the real author, his 'disguise', which is meant to provide the romance with a certain authority, is important when considering the gender implications of the act of translation. For a male author in Ortúñez's historical context, defining himself as a translator, as opposed to the author, had positive implications for the way the work was perceived by the audience. Tyler, on the other hand, uses the idea of translation as an acceptable female activity to defend her engagement with the genre of romance, as I will discuss further below.

Ortúñez's romance is dedicated to Martín Cortés, Marqués del Valle, the son of Hernán Cortés de Monroy y Pizarro, the Spanish conqueror who caused the fall of the Aztec empire. Martín Cortés was raised in the court of Charles V, which was well known for its interest in chivalric practice and romances. Eisenberg suggests that he might have been Martín Cortés's tutor, on account of the didactic element of the prologue to the *Espejo*.[130]

---

[126] José Manuel Lucía Megías, *Antología de libros de caballerías castellanos* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2001), pp. 193-94.
[127] Lucía Megías, *Antología de libros de caballerías castellanos*, p. 200.
[128] Axayacatl Campos García, *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros, parte I: guía de lectura* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2001), p. 7.
[129] Daniel Eisenberg, *Romances of Chivalry in the Spanish Golden Age* (Newark, Del: Juan de la Cuesta, 1982), p. 123.
[130] Eisenberg, 'Introducción', in *Espejo*, p. xviii.

Ortúñez uses the prologue to justify the romance and employs a structure common in his time, in which he quotes a classical text, and then links its themes to those present in his romance. The Spanish author begins by quoting from Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* on the unprotected state of human beings and their misery by comparison with other living creatures. Ortúñez argues against this point, drawing on Petrarch's *Remedies for Fortune Fair and Foul*,[131] emphasising God's Incarnation and the hope of resurrection after the final judgment. He then turns from the complexity of the divine to the earthly, and praises the human body and intellect as compared to other living creatures.

Ortúñez's exaltation of humanity is highly rhetorical and shows no direct link with the romance. It is towards the end of the prologue that he addresses the importance of literature and the instruction, both religious and secular, that books provide. He then draws attention to the specific value of romance as a genre that, despite providing entertainment, can also be beneficial to guard the reader against idleness, which encourages other vices. This is a point that Tyler arguably picks up on in her own epistle, as I will comment on further below. Ortúñez does caution that not all romances are equal in moral value, thus clearly distancing his work from other texts. However, he not only defends the romance itself but the craft of authorship as well. He asks the reader to think twice before carelessly expressing criticism and to consider the effort that has been put into the creation of a text.

Book I of the first part of *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood* was first printed *c*. 1578 in London by Thomas East (sometimes spelled Este), who published almost the whole of the series.[132] The extant title page of this edition does not state the year of publication but Boro notes that the text was licensed to East in 1578 and that the *Short-Title Catalogue* ascribes that as the year of publication.[133] Tyler's text went through two more editions in 1580 (?) and 1599 (?), and was followed by the publication of the rest of the Spanish original in English.[134] One R. P. (either Robert Parry or Park)[135] translated Ortúñez's Books II and III, which were published in London in 1585 and 1586, respectively, both of which had a second edition in 1599. He also

[131] Ortúñez de Calahorra, *Espejo*, I, 4 (footnote 11).
[132] The *STC* indicates that East printed all the editions of the English translations of Parts I and II of the *Espejo*. The rest of the series was published by Cuthbert Burby with different printers for each book. See entries 18859 to 18871 in *A Short-Title Catalogue*, II, 199.
[133] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 3 (footnote 11). See also entry 18859 in *A Short-Title Catalogue*, II, 199.
[134] See Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 242-48. Some publication dates can be checked against the information in *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk >, ISBN 978-0-9557876-5-2, [accessed 18 November 2014].
[135] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 3.

translated Pedro de la Sierra's second part of the *Espejo*, published in English in 1583 and in a second edition in 1598. One L. A. translated the four books of Marcos Martinez's third part of the *Espejo* and published them between 1598 and 1601, in one edition each.[136] Jeremy L. Smith shows that Thomas East entered the second part of the *Espejo* in the Stationers' Register before it was translated, to protect it from other publishers.[137] In the dedication to the second part of the *Mirror* (1583), East declares the audience's enthusiasm for the romance:

> […] the first part of a Spanish translation, intituled, The Mirrour of Knighthood: which being published was so accepted, that I was importuned by sundry Gentlemen (my very friends) to procure the translation of the second part: whereto, (partly to accomplish their desires, and partly for the vulgar delight of all) I condescended.
>
> (*The Second Part of the Myrror*, sig. A2^{r})

Tyler translated Book I of this 'first part' to which East refers, and so initiated a vogue in England for Spanish chivalric romance which would continue into the seventeenth century, thus mirroring the enthusiasm with which these texts had been received throughout Europe during the previous decades; especially in relation to the *Amadís*. Tyler is remarkable in the history of early modern translation, as the first person, and the only woman, to translate, from its original source rather than via French translation, a sixteenth-century Spanish romance into English. R. P. and L. A. translated the rest of Ortúñez's *Espejo* also from the original language but the other Spanish romances which came to England appear to have been translated into English via French.[138]

Almost all that is known of Margaret Tyler's life has been inferred from the dedication that introduces her text. Her dedicatee is Lord Thomas Howard, first Earl of

---

[136] Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 242-48. Some publication dates can be checked against the information in *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk >, ISBN 978-0-9557876-5-2, [accessed 18 November 2014].

[137] Jeremy L. Smith, *Thomas East and Music Publishing in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 18; 180 (footnote 58).

[138] The title pages of all extant editions of Anthony Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva*, Part I, indicate that the romance is translated from Spanish, Italian and French. However, a close examination of the text shows that Munday only used the French version as source, as I will discuss in chapter II. While it is likely that Munday knew Italian because he spent time in Rome in his youth, O'Connor argues that Munday's closeness to Nicolas Herberay's French translation of *Amadis* shows he probably knew neither Spanish nor the original version. This is also clear from a close analysis of Munday's *Amadis*, as I will discuss in chapter III. See O'Connor's *Amadis de Gaule and Its Influence*, p. 131.

Suffolk, son of Thomas Howard, fourth Duke of Norfolk and, his second wife, Margaret Audley Howard, in whose household Tyler seems to have worked as lady-in-waiting. In her dedication Tyler praises her former employers:

> And herein, I took no long leisure to find out a sufficient personage. For the maniforld *benefits* received from your *honourable parents*, my good Lord and Ladie, […] at whose hands I have reaped *special benefit*. (p. 48) (my emphasis)

This evidence of Tyler's admiration, as well as the Duke of Norfolk's involvement in the Ridolfi Plot and the Northern Rebellion, her knowledge of Spanish, and her association with East, has led some to think Tyler was a Catholic.[139] There does not seem to be anything in her translation to support this claim, and, although Boro notes an acceptance of certain Catholic practices in the original, she observes in some of Tyler's modifications evidence of a 'suspicion of the marvellous […] consonant with Protestant poetics'.[140] It is worth noting, though, that Tyler openly expresses in the Epistle her avoidance of translating religious material because she claims:

> [...] neither durst I trust mine own judgment sufficiently if matter of controversy were handled, nor yet could I find any book in the tongue which would not breed offence to some. (p. 50)

Unlike the earlier Spanish chivalric romances in which matters of faith and Catholic conversion were important, as I will discuss in Chapter III in terms of the *Amadis*, the part of Ortúñez's work which Tyler translates (Book I) only deals with these issues in passing, and so places her text on safe ground in terms of religious controversy. In fact, Tyler does not translate Ortúñez's prologue, which, as I explained further above, in part alludes to religious matters.

The Education of an Early Modern Woman

Tyler's expansion of Ortúñez's Greek and Roman references reveals a substantial awareness of the classics. This knowledge is intriguing considering the limited access to

[139] See Martin, Introduction to 'Epistle to the Reader', in *Women Writers in Renaissance England*, p. 16; Louise Schleiner, 'Margaret Tyler, Translator and Waiting Woman', *English Language Notes*, 29 (1992), 1-8; and Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, pp. 6-15.
[140] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, pp. 6; 9-12.

education that women had at the time, as well as the restrictions that Early Modern culture placed on the types of texts that women could read. Boro notes that other elements in her translation also reveal her familiarity with literary and Biblical sources, as well as knowledge of oratory and rhetoric. This, added of course to her knowledge of Spanish and Latin, indicates that she must have received an education, but there is no evidence, observes Boro, of where that was developed or what format it took.[141]

Hilda L. Smith argues that Vives's views were very influential in setting the parameters for female education in the first decades of the sixteenth century in England.[142] His *Instruction* became the 'most popular conduct book for women during the Tudor period and beyond', as Charles Fantazzi notes.[143] The text was also translated into Spanish, French, German, Italian, and Dutch, and went through numerous European editions,[144] which gives a sense of the popularity of Vives's ideas.[145] Fantazzi argues that the first book of the *Instruction*, entitled 'Which Treats of Unmarried Young Women', stands out in the history of education as the 'first systematic study to address explicitly and exclusively the universal education of women'.[146] He notes how Vives encouraged women to learn vernacular languages in order to read literature in translation, but later, in his essay *On the Duties of the Husband* (1529), he also advocates the study of Greek and Latin for women. Fantazzi observes that, like Erasmus and More, Vives considered that ignorance 'fosters evil' and that there was no intellectual difference between men and women. However, in his discussion of the non-intellectual attributes of women, Fantazzi argues, Vives reveals a traditional and fanatical focus on female chastity, which is at odds with his more progressive ideas on female education.[147] Helen Smith, on the other hand, presents Lady Margaret Hoby's diary entries on her reading experiences as evidence of the effect of Vives's views. Hoby states that she is often read to by men, among them her chaplain, and Smith sees in this mediated reading experience the influence of Vives's advice that women should follow the counsel of 'wyse and sad men'.[148] He argues that women should not follow

[141] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, pp. 15-18.
[142] Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Women', in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-29 (p. 16).
[143] Fantazzi, 'Introduction: Prelude to the Other Voice in Vives', in *Education*, p. 31.
[144] In the sixteenth century, the *Instruction* went through six Spanish editions, nine French editions, two German editions, two Italian editions, and one Dutch edition. See Fantazzi, 'Introduction: Prelude to the Other Voice in Vives', in *Education*, pp. 30-32.
[145] Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Women', p. 16.
[146] Fantazzi, 'Introduction: Prelude to the Other Voice in Vives', in *Education*, p. 1.
[147] Fantazzi, 'Introduction: Prelude to the Other Voice in Vives', in *Education*, pp. 1-2.
[148] Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 175.

their own judgment in the reading of certain books, since they might 'take false for true'. Helen Smith also mentions Lady Anne Clifford's comments in her diary, where she notes that, on a specific occasion, her husband ordered her to postpone her reading of the Old Testament until she could find someone to read it for her.[149] This gives a sense of the contradiction present within humanism in general, and in Vives's argument in particular, between the encouragement of female education and restrictions of their reading practice.

Hilda L. Smith explains how, although in theory humanism presented opportunities for female learning, in practice women's education was limited to the requirements of family life. However, she does highlight Vives's attention to the topic of female education in contrast to contemporary views which clearly restricted women's instruction, such as those expressed in Thomas Elyot's *The Governor* (1531) and Richard Mulcaster's *Position [-] necessarie for the training up of children* (1581). However, Hilda L. Smith shows how Vives envisioned female education ultimately aimed at fulfilling a domestic role; rejecting any possibility for female public expression.[150] In this respect, Vives specifies that 'it was not without reason that Saint Paul forbade women the faculty of teaching or speaking in church' (p. 78). Smith argues that Thomas More's instruction of his daughters illustrates the ambivalent relation between humanism and female education. Even though More developed a curriculum which encouraged the reading of a variety of texts, and the study of rhetoric, composition and logic, the final focus was a life in the private space of the home, excluded from the university education which he proposed for male students.[151]

As for women as readers, Jacqueline Pearson notes they had to battle against several forms of cultural policing, expressed in conduct and educational material which recommended controlling what texts women were allowed to read.[152] Vives is one such author who dedicates a whole chapter, in his *Instruction*, entitled 'Which Writers are to be Read and Which not to be Read', to what he considers appropriate and inappropriate reading material for women. He cautions against the negative effect of classical love poetry and chivalric romance. These texts should be avoided, claims Vives, as one would escape 'a viper or a scorpion', and, rather than women looking for 'pleasant gratification' in the 'amorous reveries' described in these texts, it would be better for

[149] Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things'*, p. 175.
[150] Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education', pp. 16-21.
[151] Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education', pp. 16-27.
[152] Jacqueline Pearson, 'Women Reading, Reading Women', in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 80-99 (p. 81).

them to be 'blind and deaf' (p. 74). Alternatively, Vives encourages women to read 'the Gospels […] the Act of the Apostles […] the Epistles [and] the historical and moral books of the Old Testament', in order to 'elevate their minds to God, compose their feelings in a Christian tranquillity, and improve their morals' (pp. 78-79). Pearson argues that female reading was a cause of male anxiety because it seemed to represent encouragement towards rebelliousness. Male authors warned against the dangers that women risked in the act of reading, such as illness, blindness or madness.[153] However, Helen Smith observes that recent trends in the history of reading practices suggest that women only partially followed the strict indications of conduct books. Sir Hugh Cholmley, for example, proudly describes his wife's attributes in his memoirs, presenting her good housekeeping and voracious reading practice as complementary occupations. Moreover, Helen Smith explains that despite her husband's restrictions on the reading of religious material, as mentioned above, Anne Clifford owned a great variety of books of different genres.[154] In this respect, Louise Schleiner observes in the writing of Tudor and Stuart women, evidence of their reading interests, such as, 'the Bible, devotional commentaries on it, Ovid (the *Metamorphoses, Heroides*, and *Amores* in translation), Virgil's *Aeneid* (mainly the Dido episode in translation) […] Diodorus Siculus […], and Senecan or other translated moral aphorisms'.[155] However, she notes that in the course of the meagre education that even aristocratic women received, these texts were encountered indirectly, through 'translated compendia', manuals of rhetoric, and commonplace books,[156] although one can note that men would have read these compilations as well, as I explain below.

Male humanist education, however, was broad and inclusive, since it was considered that men (unlike women) needed to perform well both in the private and public worlds. In this sense, education was proposed as a continuum which could allow men of the middle class to progress from grammar schools, through to boarding school and university in order to reach professional positions.[157] The humanist core curriculum encouraged a detailed study of Latin, Greek, and classical authors.[158] In his essay on Christopher Marlowe's *Dido Queene of Carthage* (1594), David L. Orvis notes that the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses*, the play's sources, would have been an important part

[153] Pearson, 'Women Reading, Reading Women', pp. 84-89.
[154] Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things'*, p. 177.
[155] Louis Schleiner, *Tudor and Stuart Women Writers* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 2.
[156] Louis Schleiner, *Tudor and Stuart Women Writers*, pp. 2-3.
[157] Hilda L. Smith, 'Humanist Education', p. 10.
[158] Joan Simon, *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 103.

of the curricula of grammar schools and universities in Elizabethan England. Orvis argues that, while in grammar school, Marlowe would have translated sections of these classical works into English and then back into Latin, as well as studying their rhetorical and stylistic features.[159] Of course, the early modern reader would not have encountered this vast classical material through Greek and Latin alone but also through the great variety of English translations which circulated at the time.[160] Isabel Rivers notes that most people would not encounter classical myths through the Greek and Roman sources but by way of handbooks which presented them with allegorical interpretations.[161] Fragments of these and other classical texts were included in anthologies (for example, by Richard Mulcaster), which, Rebecca W. Bushnell argues, were produced to aid students to cover the overwhelming number of texts in the humanist curriculum. Bushnell sees the increasing circulation of commonplace books at the time, both in manuscript and print, as another aid for the 'over-taxed' student, and associates this tendency to the humanist practice of close reading and fragmentation of texts.[162] In this respect, Eugene R. Kintgen observes in Erasmus's reading method the intention of 'treating texts as collections of individual and potentially noteworthy segments', and associates this conception of texts with the practice of creating commonplace books, which, he notes, is given great attention by Erasmus in his *De Copia* (1513).[163] While these commonplace books may be seen as similar to the medieval florilegia, and even as based on the medieval model, Ann Blair notes that the former selected passages mainly 'for their rhetorical or historical value', whereas the latter always chose extracts 'for moral edification'.[164] The material used by Tyler in her classical additions and expansions seems to be based on the Early Modern 'commonplace book culture', which

[159] David L. Orvis, '"Lustful Jove and his adulterous child": Classical *Paiderastia* as Same-Sex Marriage in Marlowe's *Dido Queene of Carthage*', in *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction and Performance*, ed. by Kathryn M. Moncrief and Katrhyn R. McPherson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 101-112 (p. 101).
[160] For an overview of these texts see Henry Burrowes Lathrop, *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620* (New York: Octagon Books, 1967).
[161] Isabel Rivers, *Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry: A Student's Guide* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1979), p. 25.
[162] Rebecca W. Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 128-34.
[163] Eugene R. Kintgen, *Reading in Tudor England* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996), pp. 25; 34.
[164] Ann Blair, 'Revisiting Renaissance Encyclopaedism', in *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. by Jason König and Greg Woolf (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 379-97 (p. 390).

Adam Smyth interprets, among other things, as a useful way to 'distil Greek and Latin literature into a series of manageable extracts'.[165]

Considering the limited options for women to come in contact with books, especially for those of a lower social class, perhaps Tyler's knowledge of the classical literature that she alludes to in her translation might have been possible because of her occupation as lady-in-waiting. Schleiner interprets Tyler's knowledge of Spanish as a result of the sort of education she would have received in the household of her employers. She argues that waiting women would have been required to know French or Spanish in order to entertain their ladies by reading to them and sometimes translating these texts. Schleiner speculates that Tyler's translation of the *Espejo* would have probably begun as an oral translation for Thomas Howard's mother and for other of her employers.[166] Similarly, Krontiris suggests that Tyler's service in an aristocratic household would have been 'an opportunity for learning', and that she could have profited from the vernacular and classical texts in her employers' library.[167] The Duke of Norfolk's first wife was Mary Fitzalan, daughter of Henry Fitzalan, twelfth earl of Arundel and sister to Jane Lumley, translator of Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. Henry Fitzalan provided his daughters with an unusually privileged education for women at the time, giving them an opportunity to learn classical languages and to come into contact with a variety of texts.[168] Clearly Tyler's encounter, not only with Spanish romance but also with classical literature, could have been made possible through the education she received as lady-in-waiting, and one can speculate that perhaps there was a variety of classical texts in the Duke of Norfolk's library on account of his marriage to Mary Fitzalan. Holt N. Parker identifies several factors that would have allowed an Early Modern woman to receive a classical education. Among them, he considers that parents within the nobility would have been willing to educate their daughters so as, among other reasons, to make them attractive to achieve convenient marriage arrangements. Learning increased a woman's value on the 'marriage market' and an educated woman also enhanced the magnificence of their environment because they showed the great power of their families who were able to invest in an education which would not have a real manifestation in the public world. In England, Parker notes the

---

[165] Adam Smyth, 'Commonplace Book Culture: A List of Sixteen Traits', in *Women and Writing c. 1340-c. 1650: The Domestication of Print Culture*, ed. by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Phillipa Hardman (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2010), pp. 90-110 (p. 104).
[166] Schleiner, 'Margaret Tyler, Translator', pp. 4-5.
[167] Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices*, p. 27.
[168] Patricia Demers, 'On First Looking into Lumley's Euripides', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 23.1 (1999), 25-42 (pp. 26-28).

cases of the Seymour, Howard, and Fitzalan families, who all gave their daughters a humanist education, and the case of Sir Anthony Cooke, who was not a member of the nobility himself, but ensured good marriages for his daughters, in part through their good education.[169] This gives a sense of the sort of household where Tyler could have acquired an education, and how she might have benefited from the chance of more privileged women to be instructed in the classics. This is useful to understand how remarkable Tyler's reworking of Ortúñez's material is and what it says of her participation in her culture.

Tyler's Epistle to the Reader

The little critical attention to Tyler's work has focused mainly on her remarkable epistle to the reader, as I noted in the Introduction. Moira Ferguson has identified it as 'the first explicitly feminist argument published by a woman in [...] English'.[170] Meanwhile, Tina Krontiris argues that it stands out as the boldest criticism against patriarchal ideology written by a woman up until that time.[171] Douglas Robinson calls the Epistle an 'openly and unapologetically feminist document'.[172] Tyler does not translate Ortúñez's prologue but rather creates an original epistle in which she combines a strong defence of the moral value of her work with the notion that women should be active cultural agents, as patrons, readers and translators. It is an incendiary text, which goes beyond merely introducing the romance to the reader and guarding it from its potential critics, conveying energy and conviction. But, while the prefaces to later translations employ the traditional tropes of profit and delight, as Tyler also does, they dwell more on commercial interests, as I will discuss in Chapters II and III, with reference to Anthony Munday's translations. In the epistle to the translation of Ortúñez's Book II, for example, the printer Thomas East emphasises the chivalric and courtly aspects of the romance but also notes he has honoured the promise of this second book and that a third one will follow soon, clearly urging his readers to make future purchases. The conventional description, in these epistles, of romances as a source of moral growth to the reader, is evidently used as a marketing strategy, and this also affects the relationship set up with the reader. Unlike these other translators, Tyler appears to be

[169] Holt N. Parker, 'Women and Humanism: Nine Factor For the Woman Learning', *Viator*, 35 (2004), 581-616 (pp. 588-92).
[170] Moira Ferguson, 'Margaret Tyler *fl*. 1578', p. 52.
[171] Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices*, p. 45.
[172] Robinson, 'Theorizing Translation', p. 153.

personally invested in her work because she uses her epistle to address issues that concern her as a female translator.

Before the publication of Tyler's text, the genre of romance faced vociferous detractors who were concerned at what they saw as the immorality of the genre and its worrying lack of truthfulness, as I discussed in the Introduction. In the Epistle, Tyler acknowledges these attacks against romance, employing a defensive tone common both to prefaces of Spanish romances and their English translations. Like them, she draws attention to the text's potential for entertainment while also articulating the good it can do, but she distinguishes herself by personifying her text:

> [...] by me it is done in English for thy profit and delight. […] if it shall please thee after serious matters to *sport* thyself with this Spaniard, […] thou shalt find in *him* the just reward of malice and cowardice, with the good speed of honesty and courage [...] he hath ever borne away the prize which could season such delights with some profitable reading, so shalt thou have this *stranger* an *honest man* when need serveth, and at other times [...] a good companion to drive out a weary night [...] (pp. 49; 51) (my emphasis)

Tyler describes the text as a 'man', a 'stranger' with whom the reader can 'sport', a term alluding both to entertainment and sexual activity.[173] Even though Tyler presents herself as a coy and chaste woman along her epistle, it is surprising that she uses such bold imagery. However, these sort of erotic references were common in the prefaces of male writers of the period. Wendy Wall notes that the text was commonly depicted as a female body displayed in public or as a promiscuous woman rescued by the reader,[174] a gendered convention which is not present in the other translations of Spanish romance but which Tyler is apparently transforming, making the objectified text masculine. Her description of the text as 'honest', though, indicates that perhaps she is not explicitly eroticizing the text. What is clear is that gender identity is a key issue for the representation of the work and the author. This is also evident in Tyler's justification of her choice of genre, which is intimately bound up with her relationship, as a woman, with the world of translation and publishing:

---

[173] See definitions I.1.b. and I.6. for the verb 'sport' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 24 November 2014].

[174] Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 169-226. Wall does not address Tyler's translation in her analysis, only making a passing reference to her in relation to cultural restrictions on early modern women's writing. See pp. 310-11.

> Such *delivery* as I have made I hope thou wilt friendly accept, the rather for that it is a *woman's work*, though in a story *profane* and a matter more *manlike* than becometh my sex. (p. 49) (my emphasis)

Even though Tyler's stance is apologetic, the terms 'delivery' and 'woman's work' point to her as a key figure for the production of this text. Uman and Bistué note that instead of referring to the romance as her offspring, as contemporary writers often did, Tyler focuses on the act of childbirth, assuming the role of mother or midwife to Ortúñez's romance.[175] This vindication of the feminine in the act of artistic production is combined with a sense that her gender and the genre of romance place her in a special category, as a woman in print and translating a genre considered 'profane' and (as she here professes it) masculine. Tyler's anxieties are a response to authors such as Vives, who is openly critical of women dealing in matters of arms, whether as readers of romance or as spectators of tournaments:

> What does a girl have to do with weapons, the very mention of which is unbecoming to her? […] a young woman cannot easily be of chaste mind if her thoughts are occupied with the sword and sinewy muscles and virile strength. What room do these thoughts leave for chastity, which is defenceless, unwarlike, and weak? (p. 73)

By combining this defence rhetoric with an apologetic tone for the decisions she has made in translating and publishing this text, Tyler addresses the reader's anxiety of encountering a text by a woman within a largely male print culture. Patricia Crawford estimates that between 1616 and 1620, texts by female authors constituted only 0.5 per cent of all publications.[176] Tyler defies the conventional relationship expected between women and written works, and the awareness of this transgression also informs her justification of her choice of genre, speaking as a helpless woman:

---

[175] Uman and Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship', p. 309.

[176] Patricia Crawford, 'Women's Published Writings 1600-1700', in *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. by Mary Prior (London: Routledge, 1985), pp. 211-82 (p. 212). Maureen Bell points out that Crawford's figures might be misleading since women's texts are difficult to identify because of their mode of presentation and because they are sometimes 'hidden' within works by multiple authors. Bell also notes that the mode of scribal publication, which was popular for both men and women in the period 1557-1695, is not considered in Crawford's assessment. See Bell, 'Women Writing and Women Written', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, with assistance of Maureen Bell, 6 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998-), IV (2002), pp. 431-51 (pp. 432-33).

> [...] the question now ariseth of my choice, not of my labour, wherefore I preferred this story before matter of more importance [...] the truth is that as the first motion to this kind of labour came not from myself, so was this piece of work put upon me by others, and they which first counselled me to fall to work took upon them also to be my taskmasters and overseers, lest I should be *idle* […] (p. 50) (my emphasis)

Like other Early Modern female and male writers,[177] Tyler notes that the choice of translating and publishing was not her own[178] and she argues her activity is valid as it keeps her from idleness, [179] a threat commonly addressed in contemporary conduct literature for women. In *The Voice of the Laste Trumpet* (1549), Robert Crowley advised women to be silent and occupied, 'Do all thy busynes quietly | And delyte not idle to stand | But do thy selfe ever apply | To have some honest worcke in hand'.[180] Vives identifies the theme of idleness as a threat to female chastity[181] as well as the driving force behind romance.[182] This common criticism led the authors of the Spanish romances to counter it by presenting the activity of reading these texts as remedies against idleness. Ortúñez says in his prologue that reading romances '[…] sirven y aprovechan a la ánima en la apartar de la ociosidad, la qual es gran materia para el vicio […], [(…) helps and benefits the soul in keeping it from idleness, which is great

[177] Wall notes that within prefaces the claim of publication without the author's consent became conventional at the time. She argues that this responded to a class anxiety which saw the printed text as a threat to the patronage system of manuscript exchange. See Wall, *The Imprint of Gender*, pp. 173-75. I would argue that in the case of women, this convention responded to an extreme concern for the protection of female virtue. For a detailed analysis of the modesty topos in texts written by Early Modern women, see Patricia Pender, *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

[178] Mary Ellen Lamb notes that the editor's comments of Anne Cooke Bacon's translation of Ochino's sermons makes reference to this modesty topos, praising her modesty because she wouldn't have dared to publish had he not pressed her to do so. See Lamb, 'The Cooke Sisters: Attitudes toward Learned Women in the Renaissance', in *Silent But for the Word*, ed. by Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1985), pp. 107-25 (p. 117).

[179] Martin remarks that another woman to use her writing as a justification against idleness was Anne Wheathill, Introduction to 'Epistle to the Reader', in *Women Writers in Renaissance England*, p. 21 (footnote to lines 55-57). In the epistle to the reader to *A handful of holesome (though homelie) hearbs* (1584), Wheathill says '[...] I shall thinke my time most happily bestowed; for that thereby I did avoid idleness, to the pleasing of almightie God [...]', in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 27 August 2012], sigs. $A3^{r}$-$A3^{v}$. Typography has been modernised in the cases of u/v.

[180] Quoted in Suzanne W. Hull, *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982), p. 54.

[181] Vives argues for the appropriate balance between the time a virgin has for sleeping and for other activities, so that she can be well guarded from idleness and so, from love and lust, *Education*, p. 91.

[182] Vives describes the authors of romance and other such dangerous texts as '[…] idle, unoccupied, ignorant men […]', *Education*, p. 75.

material for vice (…)].[183] Tyler cleverly reshapes these debates to her advantage, using a trope already common in the genre to guard her transgression as a female translator.

After defining herself as meek and apologetic, Tyler's voice gathers strength as she builds an argument for women's cultural participation:

> [...] if men may and do bestow such of their travails upon gentlewomen, then may we women read such of their works as they dedicate unto us. And if we may read them, why not farther wade in them to the search of a truth? And then much more, why not deal by translation in such arguments, especially this kind of exercise, being a matter of more heed than of deep invention or exquisite learning? [...] it is all one for a woman to pen a story as for a man to address his story to a woman. (p. 50)

Tyler's encouragement of women to become active cultural agents, exploring texts for themselves, appears bold and unprecedented. This is the section of the Epistle for which she has become best known and which has received most modern commentary. She appropriates a misogynist argument, defending translation as an intellectually inferior activity, suitable for simple-minded women. Helen Smith and Patricia Demers acknowledge this Early Modern view of translation as a devalued activity, depicted as feminine and secondary, described in these terms famously by Florio, as noted in the Introduction. But both Smith and Demers aim to challenge this view by presenting female translation as a legitimate channel of expression and a valuable contribution to culture.[184] In this sense, Tyler cunningly presents the activity of female translation as seemingly harmless when in reality she is using it as a means for self-analysis and self-expression. By means of additions in the main text she claims the act of reading and translating for women, beyond stereotype or convention.

The three English editions of Tyler's *Mirror* and references to the text in contemporary literature[185] show that it was a successful vehicle for the translator's

---

[183] Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra, *Espejo de Príncipes y Cavalleros (El Caballero del Febo)*, ed. by Daniel Eisenberg, 6 vols (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1975), I, 12. Further references are to this edition by volume and page number in the text. This and all subsequent translations, whether from Spanish or French, are my own, unless otherwise stated.

[184] Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things'*, pp. 31-2, Patricia Demers, *Women's Writing in English: Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), pp. 64-5.

[185] See the reference to 'Artimedorus' (mentioned in Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry*, p. 243) in John Lyly's *Euphues and his England* (London: [by T. East] for Gabriel Cawood, 1580), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 14 November 2014], sig. Gg2^{v}; the critique of the *Mirror* and other romances in Francis Meres's *Palladis Tamia* (London: by P. Short for Cuthbert Burbie,1598), *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 14 November 2014], sig. Mm4^{v}; the references to

views. This is important if one considers Tyler's comment on female experience and that perhaps she was addressing a male readership.[186] Tyler's male dedicatee, Lord Thomas Howard, and her apology for her 'woman's work', in her Epistle, are indications that she addresses a potential male audience, as well as several references throughout the preface. For example, in the opening section of the Epistle, Tyler highlights elements in the romance that might appeal to a male audience, such as the 'exploits of war' (p. 49) and characters 'renowned for their magnanimity and courage' (p. 49), as well as the original author's purpose to 'set on fire the lusty courages of young gentlemen to the advancement of their line by ensuing such like steps' (p. 49). Tyler then tells the reader, 'by example thereof in thy prince's and country's quarrel to hazard thy person and purchase good name' (p. 49). When speaking of the effects of war on both genders, she says '[...] to report of arms is not so odious but that it may be borne withal, not only in *you men* which yourselves are fighters, but in *us women* to whom the benefit in equal part appertaineth your victories' (p. 49) (my emphasis).

It is worth drawing attention to this male audience to whom Tyler speaks because she is thus breaking cultural barriers by addressing her defence of women as cultural agents to them. She defines herself in the Epistle as a woman translator, concerned about the contemporary situation of women, and this sets up the tone for her work on the romance. The reader keeps in mind her ideas about the place of women within Early Modern culture, while exploring the comments and changes that she makes to the original text. In this sense, I argue that her female identity, in her contemporary context, in a way influences the modifications she makes to the text with respect to

---

'Claridiana' and 'Lindabrides' in Ben Jonson's *The fountain of self-love.Or Cynthias revels* (London: [by R. Read] for Walter Burre, 1601), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 14 November 2014], III.5, sigs. F3^{v}-F4^{r}; the reference to the 'mirror of knighthood' in *Poetaster or The Arraignment* (London: [by R. Bradock] for M. L[ownes], 1602), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 14 November 2014], I.2, sig. B2^{r} and the reference to the 'Knight o the Sun' (mentioned in Arcara, 'Margaret Tyler's The Mirrour of Knighthood', no pagination) in *Eastward Hoe* (London: [by George Eld] for William Aspley, 1605) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0eebo.chadwyck.com. wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 14 November 2014], V.1, sig. G2^{v} ; the expression 'mirror of their knightly compliments', noted in John Marston, *The Malcontent*, ed. by George K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 50-1, and the reference to 'Rosicler' and 'Donzel del Phoebo', noted in *A Select Collection of Old Plays in Twelve Volumes*, ed. by Issac Reed et al (London, 1825), IV, p. 83, in John Marston's *The malcontent* (London: by V[alentine] S[immes] for William Aspley, 1604), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 14 November 2014], I.8, sigs. C4^{r}-C4^{v}; V.2, sig. H3^{r}.

[186] Hackett notes that even though Tyler encouraged women to become readers and translators like herself there is no evidence of a specifically female readership for these Spanish romances at this time. She points out that all the subsequent English translators were men and the prefatory material to those later translations calls on male readers to take inspiration from the martial content of the romance. In the epistle to the seventh book of the *Mirror*, the translator explains that he has addressed women within the main text but only because the original author does so. The reference to 'deedes of warlike ladies' and 'chevalrie of the gallant ladies' in the openings of the seventh and the ninth books, respectively, could appeal to both men and women, argues Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction,* pp. 61; 69.

family and marital relationships, and she uses romance to communicate her message to a wider audience.

Classical Material: Margaret Tyler as Humanist Reader

It is important to analyse the treatment of classical material in Tyler's translation because it has been largely ignored by scholarship, but for some very recent comments in the 'Introduction' and notes of Boro's modern edition of the *Mirror*. The editor identifies twenty-one examples in which 'Tyler adds references to classical authors, characters, locations and objects'.[187] However, she not only adds material, notes Boro, but also modifies or corrects inaccurate allusions, as well as enlarging others. The editor argues that the latter treatment of the material shows how the English translator is intellectually engaged with Ortúñez's text, because you can see, for example, her efforts 'to reconcile classical narrative to Christian doctrine'.[188] Moreover, Boro notes that Tyler's use of the classical allusions and her 'working knowledge of Latin', which she reveals through some of the modifications, suggest that she was quite learned, although there is no biographical evidence of the sort of education she may have received.[189] Boro's identification of Tyler's methodology in her work with these classical allusions is very useful to compare and complement what I had already identified before the publication of this modern edition. However, what is particularly interesting is the link the editor establishes between Tyler's treatment of the material and her level of education, and this is something that I hope to develop further, linking the translator's methodology with a humanist reading practice, which Boro does not note.

Apart from Boro, other scholars have alluded to Tyler's classical material, but only in passing, and not necessarily with a focus on her translation strategy. Lorna Hutson, for instance, argues that Tyler presents the female characters in the *Mirror* as positive cases of female agency, and gives as one example the English translator's own depiction of classical female deities as guardians of men,[190] a view which I will comment on more extensively further below. Hackett, on the other hand, in her study of English Renaissance women and romance, dedicates a few sections of her chapter on Spanish and Portuguese texts to the *Mirror*. She argues that Tyler presents a variety of female heroines which would have appealed to a female readership. One example she

[187] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 16.
[188] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 16.
[189] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, pp. 15-16.
[190] Lorna Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 92-93.

notes is that of the Amazon Claridiana, who is compared in the text to the goddess Diana because of her hunting atire, and the other is the enchantress Lindaraza, whose overt sexuality is compared to that of the sirens that tempt Ulysses.[191] However, as she also does with the examples from Anthony Munday's *Amadis de Gaule*, Hackett does not acknowledge that these allusions are part of the original text and that Tyler only enhances certain aspects.

One of Tyler's most intriguing additions, of those that can be linked to a humanist reading culture, is that of a Latin motto and the description of an emblem in the episode when Rosicleer, brother of the Knight of the Sun, comes to Great Britain to take part in the jousts organized by King Oliverio of Great Britain. Tyler's addition is evidence of her familiarity with emblem books and it recalls the same sort of humanist reading methodology that she demonstrates in her incorporation of classical material, which is related to the selection of material. Michael Bath finds strong connections between the development of Renaissance emblem books and commonplace books. Bath sees both practices encouraged by the same interest in rhetorical composition which flourished at the time, and also presents evidence of the use of both sorts of material within English grammar schools.[192] In the scene which Tyler modifies, it is the second day of the jousts and Rosicleer has already seen Princess Olivia of Great Britain, and fallen helplessly in love, the same as she. Here, Ortúñez describes the impression that the Princess has on Rosicleer before the second joust:

> Y como viesse la hermosa infanta Olivia (que ya estaba puesta en los miradores), ansí fue alegre y loçano con su vista que a diez jayanes juntos que contra él fueran no temiera. (II, 32)
>
> [The sight of the beautiful infanta Olivia (who had already taken her place in the balcony), made him so happy and invigorated that he would not have been afraid if had had to face ten giants.]

Tyler translates:

---

[191] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp. 59-60.
[192] Michael Bath, *Speaking Pictures: English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London: Longman, 1994), p. 31

> […] the Princess Olivia was placed on her scaffold in came Rosicleer, mounted upon his courser, and vaunted himself as joyously before his mistress as if he had not feared the skirmish with ten giants. But that which liked the princess best, was a *conceit* devised in the pencel of his spear, being a *burning torch*, the *wax dropping* from it, signifying thereby the *misery* of *lovers*, with this *posy* underneath in Roman letters: *'Extinguo and Extinguor'*. (p. 147) (my emphasis)

Tyler adds Olivia's perspective of the scene, which is absent from her source because the attention is placed on Rosicleer's impression. This modification is consistent with the translator's attention, at other points in the text, to the inner world of the Princess, as I analyse further below. Olivia's very specific observation, of the detail in the hero's pennon, gives a sense of the attention to detail of a character who, as Boro notes, Tyler describes as 'wise' and 'well learned'.[193] Ortúñez himself draws attention to the emotional state of Olivia and of other female characters in the text, which Tyler picks up on and expands further. Tyler's additions of the motto, which Boro translates as 'quench and extinguish',[194] and of the image on the pennon of Rosicleer's spear, also suggest details of her own knowledge of printed material. Tyler probably encountered the emblems that inspired her description in continental emblem books, since England came late to the publication of this material. While in England at least fifty emblem books were published before 1700, no fewer than one thousand were published on the continent during this same period. Many of these circulated in England years before the publication of the first English emblem book, Geoffrey Whitney's *A Choice of Emblemes* (1586), which was not even published in England, but in Leiden. Bath points out, though, that the earliest English emblem book was Thomas Palmer's *Two Hundred Poosies* (*c.*1565), which circulated in manuscript form and was never published. However, Bath notes that emblems did not only circulate in these specific emblem books, but also in works of fiction, such as Sidney's *Arcadia* (1593), and in plays, such as William Shakespeare's *Pericles* (1609). They were also present in different media in this period, not only on the print market but also as an important aspect of interior decoration, as well as in portraits, tournaments, and ceremonies.[195] Emblems, then, feature in many contexts in Tyler's culture.

---

[193] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror,* p. 15.
[194] Boro, *Mirror*, p. 147 (footnote 397). The editor also notes that this is Tyler's addition.
[195] Bath, *Speaking Pictures*, pp. 7-25; 57; 69.

In this environment of varied sources, Tyler seems to have selected certain elements from common emblems and put them together, because I have not been able to find an exact match for the one she describes. However, one of the emblems in Whitney's *Choice* is quite similar to what Tyler portrays. It features the image of an inverted burning torch with a ribbon tangled around it, containing the motto 'Qui me alit me extinguit [The one who nouriches me extinguishes me]'. Under the image, an epigram illustrates the meaning of the emblem, starting with the lines: 'Even as the waxe dothe feede, and quenche the flame, | So, love gives life; and love, dispaire doth give […]'.[196] This allusion to the complexity of love and its cause of suffering can arguably be linked to Tyler's explanation of the image in Rosicleer's pennon as a representation of the 'misery of lovers'. While Whitney's text was published after the *Mirror*, Tyler may have encountered it in manuscript form before, because this text and the subsequent printed edition were dedicated to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester,[197] a supporter of the plan to marry the Duke of Norfolk to Mary Stewart.[198] There is no certainty of the date in which Whitney first presented the manuscript to the Earl of Leicester, although scholars have speculated that it was the year before the printed edition, since the dedication there is dated 28 November 1585.[199] However, it is possible that Whitney's manuscript could have circulated before in a social circle which included Tyler's former employer, the Duke of Norfolk.

Nonetheless, Whitney borrows material from several sources, as it is attested in the title page, epistle to the reader and marginalia of the printed 1586 edition,[200] so Tyler could have encountered the emblem in another text. For example, the motto 'Quod me alit me extinguit [That which nourishes me extinguishes me]', features next to the picture of an inverted burning torch, with its flames 'being extinguished by melting wax', in Samuel Daniel's *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius* (1585).[201] But, Daniel actually copied the emblem from Lodovico Domenichi's *Ragionamiento*, which was itself appended to Paolo Giovio's *Dialogo dell'imprese Militari et Amorose* (1556).[202] Moreover, Werner von Koppenfels argues that Daniel used the 1561 Lyon

[196] *The English Emblem Tradition*, ed. by Peter M. Daly and others, 5 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988-1995), I, 283.
[197] *The English Emblem*, I, 83.
[198] K. J. Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics, and Protest in Elizabethan England* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 36.
[199] *The English Emblem*, I, 83.
[200] *The English Emblem*, I, 84-85.
[201] *The English Emblem*, I, 77.
[202] *The English Emblem*, I, 32.

edition of the French translation of Giovio's *Dialogo*.[203] Since the first edition of the *Mirror* predates Daniel's text, Tyler could have arguably encountered the emblem in the Italian or French editions of Giovio's text.

The same emblem as the one in Whitney's *Choice* features in *The Heroical Devises of M. Claudius Paradin* (1591), a translation into English made by one P. S. of Claude Paradin's *Devises Heroïques* (1551). The *Devises* also includes an appended translation of Gabriel Simeoni's *Imprese heroiche et morali* (1559), in which Whitney's emblem features.[204] The emblem includes the image of a 'torch with flames entwined with a ribbon', and on the ribbon is the motto 'Qui me alit, me extinguit [He that nourishes me killeth me]'.[205] The only difference is that Whitney added the epigram that explains the image and motto. Since the *Mirror* predates P.S.'s translation, perhaps Tyler encountered the emblem directly in Simeoni's work. Alternatively, she could also have come across Simeoni's emblem in Johannis Gubernator's *Symbola heroica* (1562), a translation into Latin of a 1557 edition of Paradin's work, which contained Simeoni's *Imprese* as an appendix.[206]

The verb 'extinguo' is also present in the famous motto 'nutrisco et extinguo' [I nourish and extinguish], associated with Francis I of France,[207] with the image of a salamander which was either 'swallowing fire or spitting water'.[208] E. J. Knecht explains that the salamander's ability to survive fire or water made it symbolize endurance.[209] This emblem features in several books, among which are Paradin's *Devises*,[210] Gubernator's *Symbola*,[211] and P.S.'s *Heroicall Devises*.[212] However, Paradin's emblems were also made known in England by 'devisers of tournament imprese' around 1560, as the editors of *The English Emblem Tradition* note.[213] Thomas Palmer's 'emblem manuscript' *Two hundred pooses* (1565) draws on Paradin's work, as

---

[203] Werner von Koppenfels, 'Two Notes on Imprese in Elizabethan Literature: Daniel's Additions to *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Iovius*; Sidney's *Arcadia* and the Tournament Scene in *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 24 (1971), 13-25 (pp. 13-18).
[204] Gabriel Simeoni, *Imprese Heroiche et Morali* (Lyon: Gvglielmo Rovillio, 1559), sig. e2^{v}.
[205] *The English Emblem*, II, 5; 235.
[206] *The English Emblem*, II, 5.
[207] Bury Palliser, *Historic Devices, Badges, and War Crimes* (London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston, 1870), p. 115.
[208] R. J. Knecht, *Francis I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 6.
[209] Knecht, *Francis I*, p. 6.
[210] Claude Paradin, *Devises heroïques* (Lyon: Jean de Tournes and Guillaume Gazeau, 1551), in *French Emblems at Glasgow* < http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/french/index.php> [accessed 09 November 2014].
[211] Claudii Paradini et D. Gabrielis Symeonis, *Symbola Heroica* (Antwerp : Christosphori Plantin, 1583), sig. B1^{v}.
[212] *The English Emblem*, II, 18.
[213] *The English Emblem*, II, 6.

well as John Bosswell's *Workes of Armorie* (1572).[214] The verb 'extinguo' also appears in the motto 'flammas extinguo' [I quench the flames] in Daniel de la Feuille's *Devises et emblemes* (1691), where it stands next to the image of cupid pissing on a torch.[215] Tyler's combination of the verb 'extinguo' with the image that she describes shows her awareness of a variety of material and her reading practice of selecting specific elements and applying them to her translation. The example quoted above is evidence of the way that her textual knowledge informs her translating practice, which is quite different from Anthony Munday's methodology, as I will discuss in Chapters II and III.

Tyler only adds this one Latin motto to her source; the rest of her classical material deals with well-known stories and characters of Greek and Roman tradition. Some of Tyler's textual modifications, and additions of classical material, convey her interest in the theme of falling prey to temptation, which Ortúñez associates mostly with the character of Trebatio, who is depicted as a man governed by his instincts. When the romance begins, Tiberio, King of Hungary, attacks Trebatio, Emperor of Constantinople, because he claims that his family has the right to the crown of the empire. While Trebatio is laying siege to Belgrado, where King Tiberio has taken shelter, he hears of the great beauty of Tiberio's daughter, Briana, and falls in love with her. Even though he has not met her, the effect that she has on him is so profound that Trebatio abandons his army and sneaks away at night in order to kill Prince Edward of Great Britain, whom Briana is meant to marry. After murdering Edward and stealing the letters that sanction the marriage, Trebatio arrives at the monastery in Buda where Briana is confined and marries her, pretending to be Prince Edward. The consummation scene, after the couple's wedding, shows Trebatio completely dominated by his desire, as I will discuss in more detail below. After Trebatio has left Briana, for fear that his scheme might be discovered, he is tricked into believing that his wife has been kidnapped by a dwarf. He follows the pair through land and sea, until he arrives at a mysterious island which is the home of the enchantress Lindaraza, the one who has tricked Trebatio into believing he is rescuing his wife. The enchantress then bewitches the Emperor, making him remain in her home for the next twenty years as her lover, even conceiving a child with him.

In the Lindaraza episode, Tyler expands on Ortúñez's classical reference and adds material of her own to comment on the way that Trebatio responds to temptation.

---

[214] *The English Emblem*, II, 6.
[215] Daniel de la Feuille's *Devises et emblemes* (Amsterdam, 1691) in *Dutch Love Emblems of the Seventeenth Century* <http://emblems.let.uu.nl/> [accessed 15 June 2014], p. 35b.

This is consistent with her focus on the character later in the text. When Trebatio arrives at Lindaraza's castle, he first encounters her singing, and Ortúñez speculates on the powerful effect it could have on the Emperor:

> [...] cantava con tanto dulçor y suavidad que no era menos peligrosa para el que la oía ques a los mareantes la voz de la serena. (I, 77)
>
> [(…) she sang so sweetly and gently that she was no less dangerous for him that heard her than the voice of the siren is for sailors.]

Tyler translates:

> [...] she played and sung together with such harmony, that it was no less dangerous onto the *poor* Emperor, then the alluring song of the mermaids would have been onto *Ulysses's company*. (p. 69) (my emphasis)

Tyler adds the detail 'Ulisses company' to give a specific reference for Ortúñez's more general mention of the vulnerability of sailors. The translator does not connect Trebatio directly to the classical hero, who avoids giving in to temptation by being tied to his ship's mast, but rather to Ulysses's crew, who are protected by covering their ears. Perhaps she does this to emphasise Trebatio's weakness because he does fall prey to temptation, unlike Ulysses's crew. Ortúñez, however, does associate Trebatio with Ulysses, but at the end of the romance, drawing parallels between the Emperor's long absence from Briana and the classical hero's difficult return to Penelope, as I will discuss further below. Tyler establishes a link between the two heroes earlier in the narrative, meaningfully here, where the themes of temptation and weakness are so important and will determine Trebatio's and Briana's future. By viewing the song of the sirens in the *Odyssey* as a symbol for temptation, Tyler follows one of the medieval and renaissance allegorical interpretations of the story, the other focussing on the nature of the song.[216]

Even though Tyler judges the Emperor's actions quite harshly towards the end of the romance, she appears to be more tolerant at this point in the narrative, as her

[216] See the term 'sirens' in H. David Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998), pp. 312-15.

addition of the adjective 'poor' in the previous quotation indicates. In Ortúñez's text, Trebatio is infatuated after hearing Lindaraza's music:

> Y ansí como el emperador entró en la cuadra y vio esta hermosa doncella, fue preso de su amor, y olvidó a su esposa la princessa Briana. Y esto no fue por la hermosura de la doncella (que tanto y más lo era su esposa), mas fue por un encantamiento que en la cuadra avía […] (I, 77-78)
>
> [And when the emperor came into the hall and saw this beautiful lady, he was overwhelmed by love, and forgot his wife, princess Briana. This was not provoked by the lady's beauty (since his wife was equally or more beautiful), but by an enchantment which existed in the hall (...)]

Tyler translates:

> And *you must pardon* the emperor if by this he was wholly possessed by love, and forgot his late wife the Princess Briana. The entertainment was great. And yet this change proceeded not through the beauty of the enchantress, for his own wife was much fairer, but rather by the secret virtue of the place, which was thereto devised [...] (p. 69) (my emphasis)

Both Ortúñez and Tyler explain that the Emperor has fallen under Lindaraza's spell but Tyler highlights the justification for Trebatio's instant infatuation. Her request that the reader forgive Trebatio's questionable actions reinforces his helplessness, and depicts him as morally weaker than in the Spanish version. This is consistent with Tyler's excusing of Trebatio's neglect of his wife and his sexual violence towards her (even if she does express disapproval of both events). I would see this characterisation of the Emperor as part of Tyler's promotion of a companionate form of marriage, as I will discuss further below.

Towards the end of the romance, Tyler again adds the reference to Homer's sirens, linking it to the theme of overcoming temptation, but this time the subject is Briana's and Trebatio's son, the Knight of the Sun. However, she not only focuses on the male experience but also uses the classical reference to arguably draw attention to the idea of female agency. In the Spanish text, the Prince arrives at Lindaraza's island to

rescue his father Trebatio from enchantment. After overcoming a series of challenges, he finally enters her castle and finds the enchantress and Trebatio in a lavish room where beautiful half-naked women are playing music:

> […] estaba una compañía de doncellas muy hermosas […] con los pechos descubiertos, tan blancos como la nieve […] Y las unas tañían con instrumentos muy bien acordados, y otras cantavan tan dulcemente que el entendimiento parescía elevar al que lo oía. (II, 198)
>
> [(...) there was a group of very beautiful maidens (…) with their breast uncovered, as white as snow (…) And some played well tuned instruments and others sang so sweetly that it seemed to lift the mind of whoever heard it.]

Tyler expands:

> […] he saw a number of faire gentlewomen […] their breasts bare and white as snow. Some played on instruments, and other sang sweetly to them. Such kinde of mermaides woulde have *beguiled* a *well-stayed* Ulysses; or such musicians, as well for their *cunning* song as their *companie*, woulde have brought a *watchfull* Argos to a *sleepyhead*. (p. 200) (my emphasis)

Unlike his father, the Knight of the Sun is not affected by the tempting elements of the scene because he is protected by a magic stone which the wise Lirgandeo has given him before his departure. Tyler stresses the challenge posed by these women by presenting the 'well stayed' Ulysses and the 'watchful' Argus as vulnerable figures. The associations with the classical characters' stories also highlight the power of seduction of these women, expressed by Tyler not only through their 'cunning song' but also through their 'company'. By describing the women, instead of Mercury, as those responsible for Argus's 'sleepy' reaction, Tyler is arguably following a tradition that Susan Yager sees going back to Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, where Argus is primarily emblematic of a husband who falls victim to female deceit.[217] This version of Ovid's story was extensively developed as a commonplace in medieval antifeminist

[217] Susan Yager, 'The End of Knowledge: The Argus Legend and Chaucer', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 10 (1994), 15-26 (p. 19).

tradition.[218] Chaucer includes this version in the Wife of Bath's Prologue, where the Wife appropriates the story as an example of women's cunning ability to be independent despite a controlling husband.[219] In the light of the positive way that Tyler depicts female wit and resourcefulness, one might view her using this version as a way to show female empowerment and male weakness, considering how she later judges Trebatio's adulterous and violent behaviour.

At other points in the text, Tyler uses a specifically masculine experience to introduce a classical female character who is noteworthy for her knowledge or behaviour. Her additions are apparently meant to expand on her source's portrayal of that particular male character in the romance, but actually, Tyler cleverly uses the opportunity, not only to introduce cases of admirable female conduct in the classical tradition, but also to make connections between male and female experience. When Florión of Persia has finally recovered his kingdom with the help of the Knight of the Sun, the latter decides to continue in his adventures, but before he goes, Ortúñez describes the emotion of the wise Lirgandeo:

> […] no pudo estar que no llorasse el sabio a la partida. Y abraçando al Cavallero del Febo, dixo […] (I, 216)
>
> [(…) the wise man could not contain his tears at their departure. Embracing the Knight of the Sun, he said (…)]

Tyler translates:

> But the wise man, not refraining from tears and lovingly embracing the Knight of the Sun, burst out into these speeches in such sort as the *sibyls* in ancient time were wont to read men's destinies […] (p. 119) (my emphasis)

Tyler translates closely but in making Lirgandeo sibyl-like in his gift of prophecy, incorporates a mythical example of female wisdom in a narrative otherwise devoid of female prophets. The translator assimiliates the wise male character into a tradition of

[218] James C. Fumo, 'Argus' Eyes, Midas' Ears, and the Wife of Bath as Storyteller', in *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp (Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 129-50 (p. 133).
[219] Fumo, 'Argus' Eyes, Midas' Ears', p. 132.

women as seers, and therefore arguably establishes a link which presents both sexes as equals in their mental abilities. It is not until Book II, which is translated by R. P., that Ortúñez includes a positive female enchanter: the wise Oligas. She reveals her future to the Amazon Claridiana and gives her the armour of the Amazon Pantasilea. We can only speculate that Tyler would have probably modified her source in some way so as to highlight this female character, but we will never know. However, one can note that R. P. does not expand on Oligas.

Later, Tyler again introduces a classical female character to illustrate a feature in a male character's experience, but she may also be alluding to the experience of another female character: Briana. After Rosicleer has suffered love for Olivia in silence for a while, he decides to confess his feelings in a letter to her. Although the Princess reciprocates his love, her maiden Fidelia convinces her to reject him, on account of his supposed low birth. The Princess writes him a very hurtful letter, on receipt of which Rosicleer utters a despairing complaint:

> O Catón, varón claríssimo, si tú, por huir de César, tuviste por bien de recebir la muerte de tus propias manos, ¡con quánto mayor razón, si la perdición del alma no me lo vedasse, por huir de tan dolorosa vida yo devría de recebirla de las mías! (II, 120)
>
> [Oh Cato, distinguished man, if you, by way of escaping from Cesar, deemed it fitting to accept death at your own hands, with all the more reason, if the loss of my soul did not forbid it, should I receive death at my own hands, so as to escape from this painful life!]

Tyler translates:

> Cato, not to behold the conqueror's face, slew himself with his sword, and *Sophonisba* poisoned herself to be free from bondage. Now, what reason was there in them by death to fly common and ordinary mishaps, if I maintain my life to the abiding of far greater torments than are in death? (p. 179) (my emphasis)

Tyler's addition of the example of the self-sacrificing wife Sophonisba may seem unusual in context. Boro notes that Cato commited suicide to 'prevent Caesar from judging him' because he opposed his politics.[220] The most explicit connection between these two characters is the manner of their sacrificial deaths. Nevertheless, one could also argue that, through Sophonisba, Tyler is drawing attention to other themes in the text, and in particular, to Briana's situation. Although the Princess does not end her life, she does suffer greatly on account of her husband's disappearance, as I discuss further below. Tyler may have encountered the story of Sophonisba (among other classical tales) in William Painter's *The second tome of the Palace of pleasure* (1567), which dedicates a whole chapter to her.[221] Another of Tyler's additions, which arguably foreshadows Briana's misfortunes (that arise from Trebatio's lust), comes earlier in the text. In one section of Rosicleer's letter to Olivia, the Knight explains how he has been unable to defend himself against the power of love, as so many men have experienced, despite their strength:

> […] aquel fuerte y poderoso amor […] cuya fuerça no solamente los varones fuertes, mas los más altos y poderosos entre los mortales no pudieron resistir […] aquel de cuya servidumbre y sujeción el gran Julio César […] no pudo librarse, y de quien aquel Aníbal africano […] fue vencido, aquel que a Júpiter y a Mars […] hizo ser atados con cadenas y transformarse en diversas figuras de animales, y aquel que al fuerte y robustíssimo Hércules hizo hilar […] y al gran Sansón, el más fuerte y poderoso de todos los hombres, hizo ser sin ojos, y al grande Archiles llevó a poder de sus enemigos a rescebir muy triste y dolorosa muerte […] (II, 92)
>
> [(…) that strong and powerful love (…) whose strength neither strong men nor the highest and most powerful of mortals were able to resist (…) he of whose serfdom and subjection the great Julius Caesar (…) could not be free, and by whom that African Hannibal (…) was defeated, he who tied Jupiter and Mars in chains and turned into various animals, and he who made the strong and hardy Hercules spin (…) and who took the eyesight of great Samson, the strongest and most powerful man of all, and the great Achilles, whom he gave to his enemies to receive the saddest and most painful death (…)]

[220] Boro, *Mirror*, p. 179 (footnote 522).
[221] William Painter, *The second tome of the Palace of pleasure* (London: Henry Bynneman, 1567), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 16 June 2014],sigs. N1^{v}-P3^{r}.

Tyler translates:

> What force Love hath […] that […] he beateth downe the stoutest courages, […] that his force, neither the wisest nor the mightiest were able to resist that from his subjection not Julius Caesar […] could free himself; that he quelled the pride of the mightie Carthagenian in the delightes of Capua: and fettered Mars and Jupiter, […] in chains of iron; that he transformeth men into sundry shapes, and as it were by sudden enchantment framed the arm-strong Hercules to the distaff and spindle, *Aristotle* to be *bridled and saddled* […] (p. 168) (my emphasis)

Tyler translates most of Ortúñez's passage literally, but omits the reference to Samson, arguably because Delilah is not a good advertisement for female virtue, and replaces Achilles with the example of Aristotle 'bridled and saddled'. This alludes to the medieval legend according to which Aristotle, who had meant to teach Alexander a lesson against lust, himself falls prey to the charms of Phyllis, and is saddled, bridled, and ridden as a horse, as the condition for her sleeping with him.[222] Natalie Zemon Davis points out that this is a recurring motif in Europe from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, represented in literature, art and household objects.[223] Tyler may have encountered the story in some version of the French thirteenth-century *Lai d'Aristote*.[224] Davis argues that in this legend 'youth overthrows age, and sexual passion, dry sterile philosophy; nature surmounts reason, and the female, the male'.[225] In the case of Tyler, I would argue that, as in the reference to Sophonisba, perhaps she is also alluding to Trebatio's weaknesses and faults. Aristotle's vulnerability to his physical impulses can be related to Trebatio's loss of control in the rape of Briana, at the beginning of the romance, and later to his infatuation with Lindaraza, as noted above. Perhaps Tyler has replaced the example of Achilles because it is more appropriate to that which she wishes to highlight. Aristotle is depicted in this story as a ridiculous figure because his passions have dominated his great intellect and he has become a victim of his own condescending attitude towards his pupil. The English translator

[222] *The Broadview Anthology of Sixteenth Century Poetry and Prose*, ed. by Marie Loughlin, Sandra J. Bell, and Patricia Brace (Peterborough, Ont: Broadview, 2012), p. 435 (footnote 4).
[223] Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1975), p. 135.
[224] Alfred Foulet, 'Le Lai d'Aristote de Henri d'Andeli publíe d'après tous les manuscrits by Maurice Delbouille', Book Review, *Speculum*, 27 (1952), 212-14.
[225] Davis, *Society and Culture*, p. 136.

might want to highlight Trebatio's mistake in acting in a way that is improper to his role as husband. However, Tyler may also be alluding to female agency and its influence on the relation between the sexes, as she arguably suggests with her addition of the references to the Sybils and to Sophonisba to describe male behaviour through admirable female models. Whereas Ortúñez only focuses on the agency of Love, the English translator adds an example in which she draws attention to the initiative of a woman and how it modifies the male character's rigid logic on relationships.

Tyler also develops Ortúñez's classical material and adds elements of her own when describing the Knight of the Sun's experiences as a little boy. Through her additions she not only continues to link female and male experience but also alludes to issues of legitimacy related to the heroes of the story. She also uses the classical material to counter certain Christian elements in the original. Briana's father had ordered her to postpone the consummation of her marriage until the end of his war against Emperor Trebatio. Despite this, the Emperor forces the Princess, as I will analyse further below, and they conceive the twins Rosicleer and the Knight of the Sun. Because she has broken her father's command, Briana hides her pregnancy and delivers the children in secret, with the help of her maiden Clandestria. The maiden helps her to find a way to raise her children without anyone knowing that she is their mother. Briana presents the children as the sons of Clandestria's sister, and expresses her wish for them to be raised in the monastery where she lives, since it will be a cause of joy for the Princess in these difficult times of apparent widowhood (as she believes herself married to Edward of Great Britain and he has been found dead).

However, when the children are almost three years old, the Knight of the Sun accidentally sails into the open sea in a boat and is lost to Briana and her retinue. Some days later, the little boy is rescued by the crew of King Florion of Persia's ship. Ortúñez introduces the episode by pondering on the way that God had tested the young hero and on the boy's triumph in the face of adversity. Tyler translates Ortúñez's thoughts literally and then expands, combining classical and Christian elements and adding this original passage:

> And as the *learned* well know, Achilles hath his Pallas in Homer, and Aeneas his Venus in Virgil, goddesses assistant unto men in their daungerous conflicts, Homer and Virgil meaning no other thing, then the care of God towards His [own]. Why may not we beleeve (that if it so pleased God) that this infant had

> the secret direction of God's mighty hand in all his enterprises? (pp. 79-80) (my emphasis)

Tyler here uses the reference to the aid of the classical goddesses to elaborate on Ortúñez's suggestion that God's providence protects the Knight of the Sun. It is interesting that she uses examples from classical literature to act as precedents for the events in the text, perhaps connecting both the epic and romance genres. This strategy, as well as the link she establishes between Homer, Virgil, and a 'learned' culture, gives a sense of the sort of context in which she is reading and translating this romance. She seems to be directing her work to an audience familiar with this classical material and willing to make connections with the romance narrative. Tyler is also consistent here about her attention to admirable female examples from classical tradition. Hutson argues that the translator's addition of these deities in their role as 'custodians and deliverers of the valour of men', is an example of the way she wishes to highlight female agency.[226] But I would also add that Tyler establishes a link here between male and female experience, highlighting the influence of female deities on the adventures of male heroes.

After the Knight of the Sun is rescued and Florion's men undress him, they notice the mark on his chest in the shape of a sun (on account of which Clandestria has given him this name):

> Y mucho más todos los que en la nao ivan sespantaron, quando acaso mirándolo o vistiéndole hallaron la señal que tenía del sol, y el resplandor que dava. Que viendo una cosa tan estremada, creían que fuesse venido del *cielo*, o que aquello fuesse un gran *misterio*. (I, 131) (my emphasis)
>
> [And much more were astonished all those that sailed in the ship, when, either looking at him or undressing him, they encountered the sign of the sun that he had and its glow. Seeing such a wonderful thing, they thought that he was come from Heaven or that it was a great mystery.]

Tyler translates:

[226] Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter*, pp. 92-93.

> But when they saw him naked and the portraiture of the Sun, with the brightness that it gave to the beholders, it was so strange, that they called to minde Phaeton's fall out of heaven, comparing this young gentleman with Phaeton as if he had been Phoebus's son, like as Phaeton was. Although somewhat diverse again in this, for that Phaeton taking his father's chariot for his presumption was drenched in the sea, this young gentleman was preserved in the sea, as betokening some greater *secrecy* in *nature.* (p. 89) (my emphasis)

Tyler adds the whole reference to Phaeton presumably to explain the mark on his chest but also to expand on Ortúñez's depiction of the Knight of the Sun as a heavenly creature. The story of Phaeton's death in the sea is here used as counterpoint to the Knight's survival. At first sight, Tyler's link to this story, in light of the Knight of the Sun's mark of identity, might seem farfetched, since the character of Phaeton was usually interpreted allegorically as a warning to those who aspire to over-reach themselves.[227] However, Tyler's reference might be more complex, since she might be drawing attention to the Knight of the Sun's unknown origins through a veiled reference to Phaeton's quest for self-knowledge and the discovery of his father's true identity,[228] which is not explicitly mentioned here. This might be an indication of Tyler's concern with potential problems of legitimacy. Uman and Bistué argue that the translator adds several elements which describe Briana's concern to prove the legitimacy of her sons, in case it is contested in the future.[229] When the wise Artimodoro indicates his motivation for writing the chronicles of Rosicleer's adventures, he explains, according to Tyler's addition: '[…] so will I be […] the register of your acts, to enrol your memory in the records of fame that it shall be maintainable against all couterpleas and forged evidences' (pp. 137-38). However, Tyler might also be trying to remove any Catholic associations in the text, secularizing it by means of this classical reference. Boro argues that the translator consistently omits or modifies depictions of the marvellous in her source, and so reveals a 'typically Protestant conceptualisation of romance' which saw the 'supernatural marvellous' in these texts as 'uncomfortably sympathetic to Catholic habits of faith'.[230] Nonetheless, Boro does note that Tyler's text also reveals the 'inconsistencies that evoke a Protestant sensibility', because she also translates literally

[227] See the term 'Phaeton' in H. David Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends*, pp. 267-69.
[228] R. John McCaw, 'Transforming Phaeton: Cervantes, Ovid, and Sancho Panza's Wild Ride', in *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 239-50 (p. 244).
[229] Uman and Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship', pp. 314-15.
[230] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 9.

many allusions to Catholic practice.[231] In the example I quote here, Ortúñez alludes to the origin of the Knight of the Sun by means of a Christian association, by virtue of the terms 'cielo' and 'misterio'.[232] Tyler, on the other hand, replaces these Catholic connotations by linking the episode to classical mythology, connecting Phaeton with 'heaven' rather than the Knight of the Sun. Although Boro does not refer to this specific example which I analyse here, she does note two other points in the text at which Tyler modifies the Spanish suggestion of the hero's heavenly origin in her effort to remove the marvellous from the romance.[233] However, Boro does not note that a few lines before the example I quote above, Tyler translates literally Ortúñez's depiction of the Knight of the Sun as a heavenly creature: 'Armineo […] took him […] to be a *celestial seraphim* than a human creature and believed that this might not be done without some great *mystery*' (p. 89) (my emphasis). In this respect, it is an example of the Protestant inconsistencies that Boro notes elsewhere. While Tyler translates the term 'misterio' literally as 'mystery', she slightly modifies the term in the example I quote further above, rendering it as 'secrecy'. In this way, she arguably makes the theological connotation less obvious and by associating it with the term 'nature', further secularizes the passage. The variety of meanings that Tyler's addition of the Phaeton reference brings to the text shows the complex associations that the translator makes between her source text and the textual culture that she knows. They also reveal how her translating practice contributes new interpretations to the romance.

At other points in the text, Tyler makes additions which reveal knowledge of classical culture beyond Homer, Virgil, and Ovid, and a concern for matters relating to social structure. When Princess Olivia becomes distressed on learning of Rosicleer's supposed lower status, her maiden, Fidelia, advises her by making a speech on the greater value of virtue and noble deeds over high birth (even if she later advises the Princess to reject Rosicleer, as I have shown):

> [...] en otros tiempos […] aquel era el claro de linaje cuyas obras eran claras, y el más tenido que por su bondad merescía serlo. Si no, mirá [sic] aquel fundador de Roma, si fue tenido en más por una Fortaleza que hizo de delgadas cañas que los que después dél succedieron, que hizieron grandes palacios y torres. (II, 102)

[231] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror,* p. 9.
[232] See the Christian meanings of the nouns 'cielo' and 'misterio' in *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* <http://lema.rae.es/drae/> [accessed 24 November 2014].
[233] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror,* p. 10.

> [(...) in the past (…) he was deemed of distinguished status whose deeds were renowned, and he who was admired most of all, was because his goodness made him deserve it. Otherwise, note that founder of Rome, who was admired more for building a Fortress with thin twigs, than for the great palaces and towers built by those that succeeded him.]

Tyler translates:

> [...] behold the builder of Rome, by name Romulus, taken from his *foster-father* a *shepherd*, and in a manner edified for that erection. Although there were many builders in the world both before and after, but the difference of the buildings lieth in the *excellency* of the *workmanship*. (p. 172) (my emphasis)

Tyler specifies Romulus's name and his foster-father's profession. Through this latter detail, she makes his humble upbringing more evident than in Ortúñez's text. She seems to connect these origins with Romulus's later achievements by highlighting the idea of labour through the term 'workmanship'[234] and his craftsmanship by describing it with the noun 'excellencie'.[235] Tyler is making a clearer point than Ortúñez about the value of hard work over connections with a privileged social class. Perhaps she is influenced here by her own condition as a working woman.

Then Fidelia continues with reference to a series of intellectual figures:

> ¡Quánto fueron en el mundo loados, y en quánto más que otros tenidos, Sócrates, hijo de un cantero, Eurípides, de una partera, y Demóstenes, de baxos padres y aun inciertos, [y] Horacio, hijo de un pregonero y una esclava!, la conversación de los quales los grandes reyes y emperadores tenían en mucho alcançar. (II, 102)
>
> [How much were they praised and held in high esteem! Socrates, son of a stonemason, Euripides, of a midwife, Demosthenes, of low and even uncertain

[234] See the noun 'workmanship' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 22 May 2014].
[235] See the noun 'excellency' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 22 May 2014].

> parents, and Horace, son of a herald and a slave, men with whom great kings and emperors desired greatly to be acquainted.]

Tyler translates:

> Again, was there ever one in such credit for *honesty* and *wisdom* as Socrates, the son of a base *midwife*. Euripides one of the rarest men that ever were in *tragical poems*, was born of *mean parentage*. Demosthenes, the flower of *Greeke eloquence*, was a *cutler's* son. Horatius, the *poet*, born of a bondwoman, which had been taken prisoner. And yet all these *preferred* for their *vertuous qualities* before kings and princes. (p. 172) (my emphasis)

In order to makes his point, Ortúñez focuses only on the modest origins of these characters, giving only detail of their parents' occupations. Tyler, on the other hand, adds features that explain why the characters became memorable, and by doing so, shows her knowledge of these figures and an awareness of differences literary categories, which she also expresses at another point in the text. When Rosicleer fights the giant Candramarte earlier in the narrative, Tyler adds this description of the monster: '[…] he would shake his heavy falchion so gallantly and roar so terribly that every man took Candramarte rather for a tyrant in a *tragedy*, then a jester in a *comedy*' (p. 150) (my emphasis). All of this indicates her knowledge of different kinds of printed material. In the example quote above, Tyler also reveals an awareness of the biography of the figures, since she corrects Ortúñez's statement about Euripides being the son of a midwife, which the Spanish author has reproduced from Francisco de Madrid's translation of Petrarch's *De Remediis Utriusque Fortunae*.[236] Tyler also transforms the final sense of the passage, for whereas Ortúñez presents these intellectuals as attractive figures that the monarchy wished to be acquainted with, the translator depicts their 'vertuous qualities' as preferable to the behaviour of powerful men.

Fidelia then mentions those men who had a prominent place in Roman government:

[236] Eisenberg, *Espejo*, I, 4 (footnote to line 11); II, 102 (footnote to lines 7-9).

> Marco Tulo, según se escrive dél, nascido de baxos y humildes padres, vino a ser cónsul en Roma, y no uvo otro consulado más provechoso para la república. Mario, rústico varón, era muchas vezes en la tierra de los pueblos marsos; mas no por esso dexó de ser en Roma cónsul siete vezes, y por otras dos la descercó y la libró de servidumbre. (II, 102-03)
>
> [According to what is written about Cicero, although he was born of low and humble parents, he came to be consul of Rome, and there was no other consulate more beneficial to the republic. Gaius Marius, a peasant as a boy, went many times to the land of the marsos, but this didn't prevent him from being consul of Rome seven times, and for two more, he liberated it from siege and serfdom.]

Tyler translates:

> Cicero could not dissemble his progeny, and yet was he lifted unto the consulship in Rome and never proved other consul so commodious for the *commonwealth*. *Serramus* and *Cnimatus* wise men, and thoroughly exercised in their enemies' land, were consuls in Rome and delivered their countries from spoil and pillage. (p. 172) (my emphasis)

Tyler's translation here is intriguing, as she omits and replaces certain characters in her source. One would expect that perhaps she would add more detail on Cicero, given his importance in the history of rhetoric. However, instead of translating Ortúñez's reference to his humble origins, she refers to them as if that was something that Cicero had tried to conceal ('dissemble'). Most noteworthy, though, is Tyler's translation of the Spanish 'república' with the revealing term 'commonwealth'. This term was charged with meaning in her time, for, during the Tudor period, it 'came into wide use to refer to a constitutional (and substantial) alternative to "kingdom", and helped to make country in the national sense thinkable', as David Rollison argues.[237] Maurice Howard notes that the term was in common use in contemporary literature but, quoting David Norbrook, specifies that, even though the use of the term instead of 'kingdom' was not in itself radical, it did reveal a view of 'the state as an artifice that had been created by a

[237] David Rollison, *The Local Origins of Modern Society: Glocestershire 1500-1800* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 16.

collective agency, rather than a natural hierarchy embodied in […] the monarch'.[238] Rollison notes that the term evolved in England in connection to a 'commonwealth ideology formed in opposition to existing government', and which made the distinction 'between community interest, on the one hand, and class, caste, party, factional and individual interest, on the other'.[239] In this respect, one could argue that, by choosing this term, Tyler is making a political statement about social structure, in a section of the text which speaks about the validity of behaviour and intellect over class. In this sense, Rollison argues that the evolution of the term reflects 'changing political identity'.[240] Tyler further reveals her interest in the structure of society and government a few lines down, when Fidelia introduces memorable characters from other nations:

> Dexo de dezir de otras muchas naciones, entre quienes muchos pastores y de *baxo origen* fueron subidos a este *don real*. (II, 104)
>
> [I have not spoken of many other nations, among which, many shepherds and those of low origin were elevated to this royal grace.]

Tyler translates:

> And if from thence we take our way to other nations round about, what a flock of shepherds, *surgeons*, *labouring men*, *founders*, and such like *servile occupations* shall we meet, which aspired to the highest place of *government* in their countries? (p. 173) (my emphasis)

The translator gives a more specific account, drawing attention to the labouring class to which, it is speculated, she belonged. Therefore she expands on Ortúñez's vague 'de baxo origen' by mentioning specific occupations: 'surgeons, labouring men, founders'. Furthermore, she replaces Ortúñez's allusion to monarchy in the phrase 'don real', with

[238] Maurice Howard, 'Self-Fashioning and the Classical Moment in Mid Sixteenth-Century English Architercture', in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1600*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 198-217 (p. 212)
[239] David Rollison, *A Commonwealth of the People: Popular Politics and England's Long Social Revolution, 1066-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 2; 19.
[240] Rollison, *A Commonwealth of the People*, p. 16.

the term 'government', a recent coinage,[241] and in doing so she perhaps is drawing attention to matters of civil administration in a nation. At the end of Fidelia's speech, Tyler arguably continues these social and political concerns:

> [...] al fin todos descendimos de un mesmo tronco, y que aquel es mejor ramo que con sus propias obras y virtudes más meresce. (II, 107)
>
> [(...) in the end we all descend from the same trunk and the best branch represents he who deserves more because of his own deeds and virtues.]

Tyler expands:

> But to paint out the *pride* of *our times*, let us cast down our eyes to the first root, from whence we all take our beginning. Shall we not finde it all one for all men? Marry, in the body of this tree there are many *branches*, some higher and some onely water-boughs from whome the top boughs keep of the comfort both of sun and showers, yet no man, I trow, will be so *envious* as to hinder the growth of the inferior if they be more *faithfull* then the superior, as *not always* the *tallest men* do the *best service*, and the best born for wealth or might prove not the best always for manners and worship. (p. 174) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez uses the image of the tree trunk and the branch that springs from it to indicate the importance of deeds no matter what the origin. Tyler, on the other hand, highlights the sin of pride as a contemporary fault that needs a remedy. She expands her source's symbolic reference to the tree and focuses on the relations between branches and how their growth can affect each other. In this respect, the translator is arguably drawing attention to a sense of social responsibility for all members of society, even those in positions of power, whom she judges as less faithful than those of more modest social origins. This view of society is resonant of the concept of 'commonwealth' that she adds earlier, and its association with an ideal which seeks to achieve the common good for the whole community. Edmund Dudley, in his *The Tree of Commonwealth* (written

[241] The *OED* records in 1553 the first use of the noun 'government' in the sense of a 'system according to which a nation or community is governed'. See definition 6.a. for the noun 'government' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 24 November 2014].

in 1510), also uses the metaphor of the tree to describe how the commonwealth should function.[242] Dudley's own description has certain similarities with Tyler's text:

> The common wealth of this realme or of the subiectes or Inhabitauntes therof may be resembled to a […] tree growing in a […] field […] vnder the couerte or shade wherof all beastes, both fatt and leane, are protectyd and comfortyd from heate and cold […] all the subiectes of that realme […] are ther by holpen and relyved from the highest degre to the lowest.[243]

As Chloë Houston explains, Dudley's tree of commonwealth 'is rooted in justice, truth, concord and peace', and among its fruits are 'honourable dignity, wordly prosperity and tranquillity'. This description implies that 'the proper organization of society will enable the prosperity of each individual'.[244] Tom Betteridge argues that Dudley's metaphor is a version of the contemporary representation of political structure through the symbol of the human body,[245] for example, in *The booke whiche is called the body of Polycye* (1521), a translation from Christine de Pizan's *Livre du corps de policie* (1407).[246] Dudley's text was not printed in the sixteenth century, but it appears to have circulated in manuscript form, as two extant manuscripts from the sixteenth century and one from the seventeenth indicate.[247] It is not clear how Tyler may have encountered his text, but this section of her translation is reminiscent of his ideas.

Another section of Fidelia's speech focuses on matters of legitimacy, which clearly concern Tyler, as noted further above. Olivia's maiden gives a list of memorable classical figures born out of wedlock:

> [...] por determinar está quién fue su padre del grande césar Augusto, señor que fue del mundo. Miremos a Hércules, y a Perses y a Jugurta, rey de Numidia, todos incestuosos y adulterinos. (II, 105-06)

---

[242] Chloë Houston, *The Renaissance Utopia: Dialogue, Travel and the Ideal Society* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), p. 6.
[243] Houston, *The Renaissance Utopia*, p. 6
[244] Houston, *The Renaissance Utopia*, p. 6
[245] Tom Betteridge, *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation* (Manchester: University Press, 2004), p. 36 (footnote 35).
[246] Whitney R. D. Jones, *The Tree of Commonwealth, 1450-1793* (Madison, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000), p. 27.
[247] S. J. Gunn, 'Edmund Dudley', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/>, [accessed 11 November 2014].

> [(...) Who the father of great Cesar Augustus, lord of all the world was, is yet to be resolved. Let us consider Hercules, Perseus, and Jugurta, king of Numidia, all incestuous and adulterous.]

Tyler translates:

> And to have more notable testimonies, who was father unto the great Caesar Augustus, the ruler of the world? *Virgil*, in a *jest*, made him a baker's son, but his own mind misgave him otherwise. As for a truth, *far worse* be they which rise to glory from the *misliking* of their parents, like as Hercules, Perseus, and Jugurtha the King of Numidia, all begotten in adultery. (p. 173) (my emphasis)

While Ortúñez gives a more detached account of these characters, Tyler adds elements that give a sense of how she has encountered them through her education and what her thoughts are on their actions. In the case of Augustus, the Spanish author does not give any information about his real father but Tyler includes the figure of Virgil to provide more details. The identification of Augustus as a baker's son can be traced back to Aelius Donatus's *Life of Virgil*, from the fourth century A.D.,[248] where Virgil is described saying this to Augustus as a clever way of thanking him for his generosity. Fabio Stok notes that in medieval and Early Modern times, the *Life* was usually added at the front of Virgil's works as an introduction.[249] This is the case in the 1573 edition of the first twelve books of the *Aeneid*, which indicates this addition in its title page: 'There is added […] to this edition, *Virgils* life out of *Donatus* […]'.[250] This is an edition where Tyler could have encountered this Virgil-Augustus anecdote as well as the story of Aeneas. The English translator's addition of this Virgil reference is noteworthy because of the clues it provides about how Tyler encountered this classical material. Her decision to include this reference might be a clever way of revealing her reading habits to her readers. Tyler omits Ortúñez's reference to incest and instead focuses on the question of adultery, which she depicts with a negative tone, as the phrase 'far worse' indicates. The translator also draws attention to the failed relationship

[248] Boro notes this in her edition, *Mirror*, p. 173 (footnote 495).
[249] Fabio Stok, 'Virgil Between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', *International Journal of Classical Tradition*, 1.2 (1994), 15-22 (p. 16)
[250] See Thomas Twyne (trans.), *The whole xii Bookes of the Æneidos of Virgill* (London: by Wyllyam How, 1573), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 24 April 2014], sigs. A3^{r}-CD2^{v}; title page.

between the parents, indicated by the term 'misliking'. This focus on marital difficulties can arguably be linked to Tyler's later judgment of Trebatio's adulterous affairs and their damaging effect on his family.

Fidelia then continues with a list of illegitimate characters:

> Y aun aquel grande Alexandro, rey de Macedonia, ¡quántas vezes Filipo, que era tenido por su padre, al fin de su vida dixo que Alexandro no era su hijo, y que ansí se lo avía confessado su mugger Olimpias! Y aun Constantino, emperador, fue hijo de una manceba. (II, 105-06)
>
> [And even that great Alexander, king of Macedonia, how many times did Filipo, who was regarded as his father, at the end of his life said that Alexander was not his son, and that his wife Olimpias had thus confessed! And even Constantino, emperor, was the son of a concubine.]

Tyler translates:

> [...] likewise, mighty Alexander King of Macedon, as concerning whom his father Philip on his deathbed denied him to be his son by the report of his mother Olympia, for which cause, after his father's death, he would needs be called the *son* of *Jupiter Ammon*. Constantine the Emperor was born of a young maid *before lawful espousals*, and *Jepthah* in the Scriptures, was son to a *harlot*. (pp. 173-74) (my emphasis)

In relation to Alexander, Tyler adds details which highlight the more mythical tradition of the character, namely, his association with Jupiter Ammon. Notably, Tyler adds the phrase 'before lawfull espousals', to describe the conception of Constantine, thus highlighting her concerns for legitimacy, as shown above. The translator's mention of Jepthah is intriguing, first, because this reference to Biblical tradition is unusual in this section of the romance (and the Spanish text offers no precedent). Second, while the story of Jepthah traditionally inspired response on account of his daughter's sacrifice,[251] Tyler here focuses on his mother's influence on his identity. Michelle Ephraim notes

[251] See for example Michelle Ephraim, 'Reading the Sacrificed Daughter in George Buchanan's *Jephthes Sive Votum Tragoedia*', in her *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 89-112.

how many modern feminist critics have read Jephtha's sacrifice of his daughter as an anxious response to his mother's sexual freedom.[252] Tyler might not be making such a connection, but she evidently highlights how Jephtah's mother, as harlot, has shaped his character. In this respect, the translator here repeats a technique she employs at other points in the text, associating a female traditional character with the description of an aspect of male experience, thus highlighting the importance of both genders in the shaping of identity.

Other interpolations Tyler makes seem primarily intended to indicate her classical learning. However, they arguably also connect translator and readers in a shared culture. Towards the end of the romance, when the Knight of the Sun arrives at Lindaraza's island to rescue his father, Ortúñez describes the Knight's first impressions of the physical aspect of the location. After referring to the vegetation, he alludes to the effect that the song of its many birds has on the Knight:

> Juntávase con esto una dulcíssima y muy estraña armonía que tenían las aves en los verdes ramos, que a cualquiera hombre que triste y afligido fuera bastara a consolar. Y al que tocado del amoroso fuego de Cupido la escuchara, le hiziera parescer ser trasportado en la otra vida. (II, 176)
>
> [All of this, added to the sweet and strange harmony of the birds on the green branches, would have been enough to comfort any sad and mournful man. And anyone touched by Cupid's romantic fire, on hearing it, would have been transported to the next life.]

Tyler translates:

> Among the thick trees, he might have seen […] the light squirrel […] with the sweet chirping lays which the birds made, recording so pleasantly among the tender sprays that it would have made a man utterly forlorn to receive comfort, and he that was surprised with Love or Love's darts might have found a more present remedy than the *harts* of *Crete* do when they are wounded by the hunter. This pleasure to have enjoyed, you would haue thought yourself to have been transported into another world or into a celestial paradise. (p. 194) (my emphasis)

[252] Ephraim, 'Reading the Sacrificed Daughter', pp. 104-05.

Boro notes that the remedy that Tyler alludes to is a herb called dittany that was known as a 'hind heal', because it supposedly had 'the property of ejecting arrows from the body'. Boro points out that Venus heals 'Aeneas's arrow wound with dittany from Cretan Ida'.[253] Tyler's reference, apparently only provides an indication of the sort of tradition in which her readership can understand the story. Similarly, when the Knight of the Sun is facing a series of challenges in order to get to Lindaraza's palace, Ortúñez describes the Knight's reaction to the dragon that stands at the entrance:

> Muy espantado se hazía el buen caballero en ver tantas y tan espantosas guardas como avía en aquel castillo, y pensaba en sí que no era posible que todo aquello fuesse por humano poder hecho, sino que, o por mano de aquellos *gentílicos dioses* en quien él creía o por arte de encantamiento fuese hecho. (II, 192) (my emphasis)
>
> [The good knight was terrified when he saw the great number of awful guards in the castle. He thought to himself that it was not possible that all of that was done by a human being, but rather, by the hand of those pagan gods in whom he believed, or by enchantment.]

Tyler translates:

> The good knight, abashed now to see so many fierce keepers in that castle, as if it had been nothing but a lodge of warders, as he supposed to keep in durance the *sons* of *Titan*, which once rebelled against *Jupiter*, the which tale he had often heard in the *gentile's law*. (pp. 198-99) (my emphasis)

The reference to the 'sons of Titan' links not only narrator and reader, but the Knight of the Sun himself, in an awareness of a classical literary tradition. She cleverly modifies Ortúñez's reference to the Knight's pagan upbringing (since he was rescued as a child by the King of Persia), and has the Knight be put in mind, not of his gods, but of an element of his education.

Tyler's treatment of the classical material in her source gives a sense of her knowledge of literature but also of her use of a humanist methodology to engage with printed material. Her selection of memorable characters and stories from classical tradition is evidence of a humanist reading practice which encouraged the selection of

[253] Boro, *Mirror*, p. 194 (footnote 557).

excerpts that could be reworked in other written texts. However, Tyler may probably have encountered these examples already extracted from their texts of origin and incorporated into printed and manuscript commonplace books. This is also an indication of the way in which many Early Modern readers encountered Greek and Roman classics. However, an analysis of Tyler's classical material not only reveals her reading practice and level of education but also shows her translation as a scholarly practice, in which she uses these traditional sources to enhance certain subjects in her translation, such as the relationships between the sexes, the legitimacy of progeny, and the social structure of her society. Her treatment of this material then, contributes to open up new perspectives from which to analyse her work, not only as the product of a female translator, but as that of an Early Modern intellectual.

Maidens, Love and Sexuality

It is important to analyse Tyler's description of maidens and their experiences with love and sexuality because it has been largely ignored by scholarship, since to date there has not been any detailed work on the subject apart from Tina Krontiris's analysis in her article and in her book.[254] Krontiris argues that Tyler's text is critical of certain aspects of her culture, among which are the themes of marriage and class. She claims that the *Mirror* draws attention to the conflict between the 'individual's desire to marry for love', and a sixteenth-century marriage practice which supported aristocratic unions 'to maintain power through inheritance'.[255] Krontiris argues that Tyler develops this theme through the case of Olivia and the difficulties implied in her wish to marry Rosicleer, who is supposedly of humble origins. She focuses on Olivia's speech in which she complains about the rigid class structure and the social expectations that forbid her to marry someone below her position. Krontiris does not acknowledge that these ideas are also in the Spanish text and therefore gives the impression that Tyler is controversially protesting against conventional notions of gender. Krontiris further highlights this point by drawing attention to the way in which Olivia's speech is similar in spirit to Tyler's preface. She argues that both the Epistle and the Princess's argument are critical of the 'binds that culture and class create for women'.[256]

[254] Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', pp. 33-34; *Oppositional Voices*, pp. 54-58.
[255] Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', p. 30; *Oppositional Voices*, pp. 54-55.
[256] Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', pp. 21; 34; *Oppositional Voices*, pp. 49-51; 56.

Female characters who openly express their desire in Spanish chivalric romances are usually depicted as 'exotic'. It is this element of otherness which seems to allow their (in other circumstances) unseemly eroticism, a trait which, in many texts, leads to a tragic end. These female characters that tempt men with their alluring sexuality typically come from a distant geographical location and are not Christians. In the case of the anonymous *Palmerín de Olivia* (1511), for example, Lizanda and Aurencia, the Sultan of Persia's sisters, use their sexuality to try and attract the hero Palmerin and Tryneus, son of the Emperour of Germany. Lizanda commits suicide when she is rejected by Palmerin and Aurencia narrowly escapes being burned alive for her affair with Tryneus, as I will discuss in more detail in Chapter II. In the case of Book I of the *Espejo*, the sexual temptress is Lindaraza, and her exoticism is represented by Lindaraza's magic powers, not by a foreign culture or faith. She is the only maiden in Book I to be portrayed as sexually liberated. Hackett argues that unlike Briana, whose sexual activity is justified by the conception of the heroes of the romance, Lindaraza's explicit eroticism is a 'deviation from […] masculine heroic destiny and feminine propriety'.[257] Hackett also sees the enchantress as an antithesis of Briana's chastity,[258] as I will discuss in more detail further below. With quite subtle interventions in the text, Tyler generally tones down Lindaraza's erotic nature. In the Spanish text, after Trebatio speaks for the first time with Lindaraza, she helps him to remove his armour:

> Y queriéndole besar las manos por la merced que le hazía, ella le travó de las suyas y lo llevó a los estrados donde ella avía estado sentada, *y* allí le rogó que se quitasse las armas. Y *ella mesma* le ayudó a quitárselas, sintiendo tanta gloria en se sentir tocar de aquellas blandas y delicadas manos el grande emperador que en la otra vida le parescía ser transportado. (I, 79) (my emphasis)
>
> [And while he wanted to kiss her hands for her courteous treatment, she joined hers with his and led him to the dais where she had been sitting, and there asked him to take off his armour. She herself helped him to remove it, and the great emperor experienced such glory when he felt himself touched by those soft and delicate hands, that it seemed as if he was transported to another life.]

Tyler translates:

[257] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 59.
[258] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 58.

> [...] and willing to kiss her hand for the grace she showed him, she thought *no scorn* of a *kiss* on her *cheek* when it was proffered. Then, she led him by the hand unto the place where her own throne was. There the emperor felt in himself a great contentment by the touching of her white and delicate hands, imagining with himself that he was transferred into a second heaven.
>
> Some of the *ladies* helped to *unarm him* […] (p. 70) (my emphasis)

Tyler here alternates between a slightly daring depiction of female flirtation and a more modest sense of propriety. While Ortúñez only has Trebatio go as far as venturing a kiss on Lindaraza's hand, Tyler adds the lady's acceptance of a kiss on the cheek, apparently bestowed by Trebatio, as the phrase 'when it was proffered' indicates. However, when it comes to the Emperor's unarming, Tyler modifies Ortúñez's clear indication of Lindaraza's role. She omits the Spanish 'ella misma', and renders Lindaraza's function more ambiguous by adding the remark about the other ladies' agency in removing his armour.

Later on, when desire is clearly building between the Spanish Trebatio and Lindaraza, the English translator conceals the more revealing allusion with a series of euphemisms. In the original, when the characters have eaten, they go and sit by a window and their passions are inflamed as they look at the garden outside:

> Y era tan deleitable la vista del enarbolado vergel, y tan confortable el fragante olor que salía dél, que junto lo uno con lo otro los *amorosos desseos* de los dos *acrescentava*, y muy perezosa la velocíssima carrera del sol se les hazía con la esperança que tenían que venida la noche, su *gozo* y *placer* sería todo *cumplido*. (I, 81) (my emphasis)
>
> [The view of the forested orchard was so delightful and its fragrance so pleasant, that one and the other increased the romantic desires of the two. The quick journey of the sun seemed very slow to them, since they hoped that when night came, their delight and pleasure would be fulfilled.]

Tyler translates:

> I deny not but the savour also of the sweet smelling flowers refreshing their *spirits* did *increase* their *appetites* and gave hope of *better joy* to come. (p. 70) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez here uses the imagery of the pleasurable garden and its incitement of desire, as he also does in the description of Trebatio's and Briana's consummation, as I will discuss further below. He is very clear about how the surroundings encourage the erotic excitement of the couple, who are impatient to fulfil their 'gozo' and 'placer'. Tyler modifies the rhetoric, noting their desire through the more euphemistic terms of 'appetites' and 'joy'. In the English text, the depiction of the garden is condensed and Tyler's use of the term 'spirits'[259] to translate Ortúñez's 'amorosos desseos', might be making a point of replacing the Spanish focus on the physical aspect of the experience. Ortúñez, on the other hand, is surprisingly brief about the actual consummation scene, stating that, after being undressed by Lindaraza's maidens and left alone, the couple '[...] gozaron de sus amores a todo su contento [...]' (I, 81) [(...) enjoyed their love to their complete satisfaction (...)]. Tyler makes no intervention, translating literally: '[...] both of them rejoiced of their loves to their contentations [...]' (p. 70). However, when Ortúñez explains that Trebatio enjoyed an extended period of lovemaking, Tyler subtly passes judgement on the Emperor's conduct:

> [...] en esta *sabrosa* vida estuvo el emperador por muchos días, enagenado de su sentido y sin otra memoria más de aquello que tenía delante [...] (I, 81) (my emphasis)
>
> [(...) the emperor lived this sort of delightful life for many days, without consciousness or memory of anything other than what he had in front of him (...)]

Tyler translates:

[259] Understanding the term as opposed to the material body, see especially definitions I.1.d. and III.11.a. for the noun 'spirit' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 04 June 2014].

> As the emperor had thus lived *wantonly* many days, deprived of his understanding, saving only in *honouring* her which was before him. (pp. 70-71) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez sums up Trebatio's delight with the adjective 'sabrosa', which Tyler translates with the adverb 'wantonly'. This term is complicated because, while on the one hand the English translator could just be referring to the pleasing sense of the Spanish, on the other, the term could also indicate a reckless lustfulness, implying a disregard for the possible consequences of his actions.[260] The latter meaning is in keeping with Tyler's later reproachful commentary on Trebatio's adulterous actions. Furthermore, Tyler also adds the term 'honouring' in a passage which is clearly referring to the couple's sexual activity, since, after this section, the narrator mentions Lindaraza's ensuing pregnancy. Is Tyler trying to convey an ironic meaning? Perhaps, since through this term she might also be highlighting Trebatio's faults as husband and the lack of respect for his wife Briana.

The other maiden that Tyler focuses on in the text, apart from Lindaraza, is Olivia. The Spanish text presents the Princess as an example of the maiden who knows she is expected to behave in a virtuous manner but who struggles to make sense of the contradictions between cultural constraints and her feelings for Rosicleer. Olivia can be taken to stand as a counter to Lindaraza's unrestrained sexuality. Nonetheless, the intensity of her feelings is an indication of her passion, although she does not act on her physical desire. Tyler expands on this emotional aspect and uses it as a way of exploring how unmarried women deal with contradictory romantic feelings and how they understand their relationships with men, as well as the emotional differences between genders.

Rosicleer comes to Great Britain eager to take part in the jousts organized by King Oliverio. He is knighted by the King and performs so well in the jousts, and in combat against an intruding giant, that everyone in the court is impressed. Olivia's beauty is renowned and many distinguished knights and princes come to the jousts in hope of meeting her and possibly winning her favour. However, she considers that no man is good enough to be her husband, until she meets Rosicleer and falls helplessly in love without even knowing his identity. Ortúñez draws attention to Olivia's change of

[260] See adverb 'wantonly' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 04 June 2014].

heart and to her bafflement at falling in love with a total stranger. Tyler expands on Olivia's inner struggle, taking the opportunity to explore female psychology. One of the aspects that concerns Tyler is the constraint that modest female conduct implies. Even though Olivia cannot help her feelings for Rosicleer, Ortúñez praises her discretion but notes its effect on Rosicleer:

> Y como la preciada infanta fuesse tan *cuerda* y *honesta* que ningún favor ni señal de amor, estando en su presencia, le mostraba, el amoroso desseo le causava tanta pena que como atónito y fuera de sí le parescía que andava. (II, 56) (my emphasis)
>
> [The precious infanta was so discreet and modest that she showed him no favour or sign of love, when in his presence. This romantic desire caused him so much pain that he felt stunned and flustered.]

Tyler expands:

> But as again to the princess, in all this *subjection* to Love and his laws, her honesty *is chiefly to be noted*, which for all that both the remedy was above her capacity and the pain likely to *overcome* her *patience*, yet bore out the brunts thereof in such *modesty*, rather by *sufferance* then striving withall, that neither could Rosicleer ever assure himself of her liking, nor any of her *servants* wring it out by the *manner* of her *disease*. (p. 156) (my emphasis)

Even though Ortúñez is here praising Olivia's modesty, his focus is on Rosicleer and how the Princess's behaviour affects his passionate state. Tyler, on the other hand, shifts her attention to the Princess's experience and dwells more on the complexities of achieving this virtuous behaviour. In the translator's version, Olivia's conduct 'is chiefly to be noted' because she must struggle to overcome her own attraction to Rosicleer, so that she can maintain an acceptable public demeanour. The translator draws attention to the Princess's helplessness, for on the one hand, she cannot allow herself access to the 'remedy' but, on the other, she might yield to this 'pain'. In the face of Olivia's 'subjection' to uncontrollable emotions, Tyler highlights her 'patience', 'modestie' and 'sufferance'. The English translator commends her not only for concealing her feelings from Rosicleer, as Ortúñez does, but also from her servants,

thus giving greater value to Olivia's discretion. As princess, she must exercise extreme caution in her conduct, as Tyler notes in another brief addition. When Ortúñez first introduces Olivia and King Oliverio's court, he explains the reason for the paucity of details about the Queen in his source:[261]

> Y no se cuenta cosa alguna de esta historia de la reina, porque mucho tiempo avía que era muerta, y ansí el rey estava biudo. (II, 9)
>
> [Nothing is told in this story about the queen, because she had been dead for so long, and the king was a widower.]

Tyler expands:

> The king at this time was a widower, and *therefore* he sought much the *honour* of the princess his daughter (p. 139) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez makes no mention of the Princess in this passage, unlike Tyler, who adds that the absence of Olivia's mother makes her father place greater focus on his daughter's 'honour'. Boro interprets that Tyler's addition indicates the King's wish to honour the princess,[262] but I find that Oliverio's focus on Olivia's honour alludes to the high expectations that the Princess must maintain in her conduct, which encourage caution in revealing her true feelings for Rosicleer. Later on, Tyler further expands on the way Olivia struggles with the challenge of pleasing her father and his court. When the jousts are over, King Oliverio commands his daughter to bestow the prize on whomever she thinks is worthy of it, as Olivia explains to Rosicleer:

> —Sabed, cavallero novel, quell rey mi señor me ha mandado que yo dé estas joyas de mi mano a aquel cavallero que mejor me paresciere haverlo hecho en estas fiestas. Y como vuestras altas cavallerías a todos ayan sido manifiestas, vuestra bondad asegura tanto la justicia de vuestra parte que, sin hazer agravio a

[261] Ortúñez is supposed to be translating from the chronicles of the wise Artemiodoro and Lirgandeo. On the topic of false translation in Spanish chivalric romance and its pseudo-historicity see Daniel Eisenberg's chapter 'The Pseudo-Historicity of the Romances of Chivalry', in his *Romances of Chivalry in the Spanish Golden Age* (Newark, Del.: Juan de la Cuesta, 1982), pp. 119-129. See also James Fogelquist, *El Amadís y el género de la historia fingida* (Madrid: José Porrúa Turanzas, 1982).
[262] Boro, *Mirror*, p. 139 (footnote 369).

> ninguno destos príncipes y cavalleros, me paresce que a vos con más razón se os deven dar, juntamente con la gloria y fama que avéis ganado. (II, 48)
>
> [—You should know, new knight, that my lord, the King, has commanded me to bestow these jewels, by my own hand, on the knight whom I judge has performed the best in these jousts. Since your noble chivalric deeds were evident to all and your skill ensures that justice be on your side, there is no offence to these princes and knights if I consider that you, above all, should receive them, together with the glory and fame that you have won.]

Tyler expands:

> You know, new knight, what *charge* the king, my father, hath *laid upon* me. Although far *more honourable* than I am *able* to *sustain*, yet by me assumed *neither* to *resist his will* nor yet against *my desire*, for it is commendable of it self to be a *commender* of *virtue* and never too much may I commend it. The charge is that with mine own hands I should distribute these prizes according as my own fancy leadeth me to deem of every man's travail and valiancy. The delivery of these jewels were nothing hard nor doubtful, but the disposing more than hard, because it pertaineth to judgement in deeds of *arms*, whereunto *my sex* is not sufficiently abled.' (p. 153) (my emphasis)

In Ortúñez's text, Olivia explains to the Knight, in a straightforward manner, why she is the one giving him the prize and the reasons for him being the recipient of this honour. In Tyler's version, however, Olivia's confidence is decreased by her expression of doubt in her abilities to perform the task. However, Boro interprets this gesture as an example of 'false modesty' similar to the one that Tyler displays in her epistle. With Olivia's example, Boro argues, Tyler would be depicting a 'shield' against condemnation such as the one expressed by Vives, scandalized by the way that 'girls of noble birth' are 'avid spectators at tournaments […] and […] pass judgment on the bravery of the combatants'.[263] While I agree with this assessment, I find that Tyler's depiction is more complex. She presents a much more realistic character than in her source, delving into her inner contradictions and exposing the thought process involved in the way she deals with the expectations of her environment. The weight of the task is first indicated by the term 'charge', which can be understood, on the one hand, as a reference to the command of a sovereign or an important duty, but on the other, as a

[263] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 28.

burden and a 'source of […] inconvenience'.[264] The load of the responsibility is also indicated in the phrase 'layd upon'. Furthermore, Tyler's Princess expresses contradictory feelings, since she mentions doubts about her abilities, refuses to 'resist [her father's] will', but also admits that this task is not 'against [her] desire'. Additionally, the translator depicts Olivia's pride at being selected as a 'commender of virtue'. However, the Princess feels that her 'sex' is not prepared to make a sound judgment in matters of arms. By presenting the thought process of the Princess, as she expresses her concerns about the implications of upholding acceptable female conduct in this context, Tyler is depicting a dimension which is hidden from her source; she is also making the text more realistic. The same can be said of Tyler's additions when Rosicleer removes his helmet and Olivia sees his face for the first time. After Ortúñez explains how the Princess is struck by his looks, he describes how she must make an effort to contain herself and, to do this, she tells the Knight:

> —Pues acercaos a mí, cavallero. Gozaréis de la Gloria que vuestra bondad os otorga. (II, 49)
>
> [—[…] come close to me, knight. You will now enjoy the Glory that your skill awards you.]

Tyler translates:

> 'You needed not by your favour, Sir Knight, to have been ashamed of your *face*. And yet such as it is, it is far inferior to your *manhood*; but this is *beyond* the compass of my *commission*. Now, come you near and receive at my hands the glory of your worthiness, which your good fortune yeeldeth you'. (p. 153) (my emphasis)

While the Spanish Olivia turns the Knight's attention to his reward, Tyler adds a witty comment in which she compares his looks to his deeds and finds the former lacking. Even though at this point in the text the Princess is clearly smitten with Rosicleer, it is remarkable that in Tyler's version she uses humour and cheek to try and hide her attraction. Instead of making a point about concealing the Princess's emotional

[264] See definitions II.8.a., II.8.b., II.12., and II.15.c for the noun 'charge' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 08 June 2014].

behaviour, as the Spanish does, the English modifications draw the reader's attention to her, and in this way, Tyler arguably questions traditional depictions of female behaviour.

Later on in the narrative, Tyler's additions show the deep thought Olivia gives to behaving in an acceptable manner. In the letter in which Olivia rejects Rosicleer, she feigns great offence at his bold declaration and, in one section of the letter, she considers whether her own conduct could have encouraged the knight:

> Estoy muy maravillada, y nunca acabo de espantarme, cómo pudo en ti caber tal osadía […] Pienso y trayo a la memoria muchas vezes si por ventura en algún tiempo hallaste o viste algún descuido en mí que te diesse causa a tan grande atrevimiento; porque si esto fuesse, yo mesma me daría el castigo. (II, 117)
>
> [I am astonished, and it does not cease to amaze me, how you were capable of such impertinence (...) I repeatedly think and try to recall if by chance, at some point, you found or noticed any oversight in me which gave you an excuse for such great insolence; because if that were the case, I would punish myself.]

Tyler expands:

> […] thy intolerable pride […] seemed rare and strange unto me, so it made me more *narrowly* to *sift*. And *examining* myself *thoroughly* and in every point, if either the *lightness* of my *looks*, or my *unchaste demeanour*, or the *lack* of *foresight* in my *speech*, or the *familiarity* of acquaintance, might give occasion to so base a knight as to attempt a princess. Wherein if I could have called to mind any little oversight whereby thou might have courage of *impeaching* my *honour*, I would first have punished it in myself […] (p. 178) (my emphasis)

Tyler's additions give an indication of the anxiety involved in living up to the expectations of what was considered acceptable female conduct at the time. The variety of elements that Olivia apparently examines in her behaviour, are particularly telling of the excessive care that women needed to have in terms of the impression they made. Her regard for her looks reveals a concern to live up to expectations such as those expressed by Vives, who dedicates a whole chapter to deal with the maiden's external appearance. He concludes: '[…] my ideal young woman […] will look in the mirror […]

to make sure nothing in her face and on her head appears ridiculous or repulsive […] she will groom herself in such a way that here is nothing in her countenance that would defile her chastity and modesty' (pp. 109-08). Olivia's worry about her careless speech, reveals an awareness of a common Early Modern stereotype noted by Kate Aughterson, according to which female speech was equated with 'sexual promiscuity', as the proverb 'free of lips, free of her hips', indicates.[265] The Princess's examination of her conduct with her acquaintances echoes Vives' attention to the behaviour in public of young women, to which he also dedicates a whole chapter. He argues that maidens should 'live in seclusion' and leave their houses only with their mother or 'a woman of austere morals'. Once out in the public world, young women should never talk with men by themselves, not even with their brothers (pp. 126-7; 131). However, Tyler also seems invested in moving beyond female stereotypes as she focuses on the intellectual process involved in Olivia's self-scrutiny. Whereas in the Spanish text the Princess thinks ('pienso') and recalls ('trayo a la memoria') questionable aspects of her behaviour, in Tyler's translation, quoted above, Olivia seems to be much more thoughtful, as she 'narrowly' 'sift[s]', 'examining [herself] thoroughly [...] in every point'. Even if this intellectual process is centred on superficial matters, such as appearance, Tyler is arguably opening up a female inner world which is only suggested in her source.

The previous observations can be linked to other additions related to female thought processes, in which Tyler explores the contradictions between rational and emotional reactions. In terms of Early Modern stereotypes about female speech, an aspect mentioned in Olivia's letter, one of Tyler's rare omissions draws attention to her culture's construction of female conduct. Olivia learns of Rosicleer's apparently humble origins from Arinda, a maiden from Briana's court who has been sent to Great Britain with gifts for Olivia. The maiden's indiscretion later leads Olivia to reject Rosicleer, so Ortúñez associates her actions with a fault he sees in all women:

> Y como un día se hallassen solas la infanta y Arnida y Fidelia, como por la mayor parte las *mujeres* tengan el *callar* por más *trabajo* que descanso, no mirando que no hay parte en el cuerpo tan aparejada para *dañar* como la *lengua*, ni en que tanto recado es menester, por ser ella la *causa* principal de todos los *males*, ansí Arnida, no queriendo volver nada para sí en Ungría, de tal manera

[265] Kate Aughterson, *Renaissance Woman: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Feminity in England* (London Routledge, 1995), p. 224.

> desenfrenó la lengua que toda la vida de la princessa Briana contó a la infanta Olivia, y a las vezes añadiendo, y otras contando la verdad. (II, 96) (my emphasis)
>
> [As they were one day by themselves, the infanta, Arnida, and Fidelia, and since most women consider that remaining silent is more work than repose, not judging that there is no part of the body more capable of doing harm than the tongue, nor that much caution is necessary, because it is cause of all evil, Arnida thus unleashed her tongue, unwilling to take anything back with her to Hungary, and told the infanta Olivia all the details of Princess Briana's life, elaborating at some points, and at others telling the truth.]

Tyler translates:

> […] then Arinda *not* so *well advised* as she ought to have been in the secret affairs of hir mistress, unbri[d]led her tongue and declared to the Princesse Olivia all the life and doings of her mistress, the Princess Briana, *as far* as she had any *knowledge*. And *it may be* that she added sometime more than truth. (p. 170) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez rarely includes this sort of commentary in his text, and this one stands out as it is particularly revealing of a traditional stereotype: that women cannot be discreet, and that their speech is the root of all evil. To be fair, the author does depict the 'tongue' as a source of conflict, whether male or female, but the close link to women's speech does prompt the association with the traditional label. Tyler, on the other hand, rarely omits anything from her source, which makes this particular modification meaningful in the light of her additions on female conduct, as I commented above. Instead of presenting Arinda's indiscretion as a feature of the female gender, Tyler indicates, much more prudently, that she was 'not so well advised' on this particular occasion. Furthermore, the translator makes a point in specifying that the false version of Rosicleer's origins, which Arinda communicates then, is true 'as farre as she had any knowledge', for this is what is publicly known of him in Hungary at the time. In addition to this 'defence', Tyler incorporates the phrase 'it may be' and thus questions Ortúñez's assertion that Arnida included false information in her account.

Ortúñez dedicates quite a few lines to describing Olivia's and Rosicleer's painful and confusing experience of falling in love for the first time. Tyler profits from this and expands certain sections to delve into Olivia's thought process, many times alluding to the contradictions between reason and emotion. After Olivia has met Rosicleer, Ortúñez describes her confused feelings, and in one section she reproaches herself:

> No soy yo, por cierto, aquélla; que otra baxa y abatida donzella soy, pues sola la vista de un caballero (que no sé quién es) me tiene puesta en tan *congoxoso cuidado*, y me haze padescer tan gran *pena*. (II, 55) (my emphasis)
>
> [I am nothing but a worthless and defeated maiden, for the mere sight of a knight (whom I do not even know) leaves me in such distressed anxiety, and makes me suffer such great pain.]

Tyler translates:

> No, assuredly. But *thou* art some base and meane gentlewoman, if the sight of one onely knight not known unto thee hath so *dimmed* thy *understanding* that *reason* is become no more *defensible*. (p. 155) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez's focus on Olivia's emotional turmoil is indicated by the terms 'cuidado' and 'pena', used here to describe her present state. Tyler's translation, on the other hand, while deceptively literal, actually shifts the attention to the way in which the Princess's attraction to Rosicleer has affected her mental faculties. The English translator replaces the Spanish emotional terms 'cuidado' and 'pena' with the more intellectually focused nouns 'understanding' and 'reason'; and describes them, respectively, as 'dimmed' and 'no more defensible'. Noteworthy also is Tyler's shift of grammatical person, from the Spanish first person (*yo*) to the second person (*thou*). In this sense, it is arguably possible to read the passage as a dialogue between female character and reader, in which the latter might identify with Olivia's anxiety about the power of her emotions. This reproachful tone is original to the Spanish, but in Ortúñez's text, the Princess is speaking to herself, whereas in Tyler's translation one might see the possibility of a new platform and mode of communication being set up, which perhaps is encouraging the

readers to make some sort of judgment, perhaps even in terms of their own behaviour. This sort of modification of the source is like that noted by Victoria E. Burke with respect to how Ann Bowyer changes pronouns, gender markers and narrative voices of the texts she copies in her commonplace book, by virtue of which she further appropriates them and widens the possibility of identifying with them.[266] Tyler also constructs an alternative space of communication by modifying the grammatical structure of the original at another point in the text. When Rosicleer first arrives at King Oliverio's court, Rosicleer is introduced to the King by the wise Artemiodoro, who had travelled with the Knight to Great Britain. Artemiodoro tells the King and his court that Rosicleer comes from a worthy family and wishes to be knighted, which he does on account of his awareness of Artemiodoro's fame as a wise man. After this, Rosicleer goes out into the field and Ortúñez describes Olivia's reaction:

> Y no con poca atención la hermosa infanta lo mirava; que como oviesse oído lo quel sabio le había dicho, y su grande y estremada dispusición [sic], con la grande riqueza de sus armas, no dexava de pensar en sí quién aquel caballero pudiesse ser, paresciéndole quel coraçón se le alterava con su vista. (II, 23)
>
> [The beautiful infanta observed him with not a little attention. She could not stop wondering who this knight could be, as she had heard what the wise man had said. This, added to his noble appearance, and the wealth of his weapons, troubled her heart when she saw him.]

Tyler translates:

> And *thou*, fair princess, being within the hearing of the wise man's speech, did *not spare* to *lend* thine *ears* to *another man's* tale and *shine eyes* to *another man's* bravery, that thy *succours* being *far* from thee, thy heart had *not* the *power* to *repulse* thy *aduersary*, love being the only occasion of thy unrest. But Lord, what alteration *both* of you felt by the interchange of your looks, which served likewise for messengers to tell your tales betwixt you! (p. 144) (my emphasis)

[266] Quoted in Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things'*, p. 178.

Again, Tyler replaces the Spanish grammatical person, shifting from third to second (*thou*) and thus making the narrator speak directly to the Princess. In Tyler's view, the Princess's actions have made her vulnerable to emotion ('thy succours beeing farre from thee') and she uses martial metaphors to emphasize that she is not strong enough to 'repulse' her 'adversary'. Despite drawing attention to Olivia's weakness, Tyler also highlights the way that both sexes are affected by emotion, as she indicates that this 'alteration' is felt by 'both' characters, something which is absent from her source, where Rosicleer's and Olivia's reaction are depicted separately.

Tyler is arguably also interested in the way that love affects women's intellectual dimension. This is evident in an addition at the end of Olivia's speech, after she meets Rosicleer for the first time. Following a long monologue, depicting her confused state, Ortúñez explains:

> Estas y otras muchas cosas dezía la hermosa infanta, causando el amor diferentes pensamientos y contrarias operaciones […] (II, 56)
>
> [The beautiful infanta expressed these and other matters as Love prompted diverse thoughts and contradictory behaviour (...)]

Tyler translates:

> Very *wise* was the Princess Olivia, and as the times afforded, very well *learned*; but yet these speeches proceeded rather of her *passion* than of advised *reason* or *good reading*. (p. 156) (my emphasis)

While Ortúñez briefly attributes this behaviour to the effect of love, Tyler dwells on Olivia's change of behaviour. Instead of Ortúñez's satisfaction at finding such a simple explanation, Tyler seems disappointed and blames it all on 'passion', a term which, although it can be understood to mean love, is perhaps being used to make a more emphatic point about Olivia's lack of control over her physical impulses.[267] What is remarkable about Tyler's translation is the importance that she gives to the Princess's intellectual abilities, setting these against her current behaviour. The English translator

[267] Understanding the term as 'sexual desire or impulses', see definition 8.b. for the noun 'passion' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 06 June 2014].

describes Olivia as ‘wise’ and ‘learned’ but stresses that her passionate speech is not an example of ‘reason or good reading’, thus expressing her disapproval. However, Tyler seems interested in the difference love makes to male, as well as female, thought processes. At the beginning of Rosicleer’s letter, Ortúñez makes the Knight explain his motive:

> Como la orden de naturaleza por Dios dada no puede ser por los mortales pervertida, no te maravilles ni recibas alteración porque te escriva, que naturalmente el que padece ha de quexarse, y ningún mal fue ni pudo ser tan cruel que al menos este remedio le faltasse. (II, 91)
>
> [As the order given by God to Nature cannot be disrupted by mortals, do not be surprised or unsettled by my writing to you, because it is natural that one who suffers must complain, and no illness is so cruel that does not at least provide this remedy.]

Tyler translates:

> That which is appointed by God, mighty princess, may not by man’s power be altered or perverted. As in myself I prove it, for since that mine *eyes* first told me of your beauty and my *judgement* gave consent thereto, and that my *will* hath procured liking therof in my *affection*, I have felt an *alteration* in me so incurable that, striving with it both by art and nature, I have not hitherto found my remedy [...] (p. 168) (my emphasis)

Apart from the first section, translated literally, Tyler makes an original reinterpretation of Ortúñez’s passage. While the Spanish Rosicleer merely states God’s providence as sufficient explanation for his situation, Tyler traces the mental process that led him to his current state. She starts with the Knight’s initial visual perception, and then follows the progression of his interpretation of these sensations through his ‘judgment’, and finally his ‘will’, which provokes the ‘incurable’ ‘alteration’ that has led him to the ailing state in which he is now. Instead of focusing on the justification for Rosicleer’s complaint, as the Spanish does, the English text explores the mental complexities involved in the process of physical attraction. Tyler further focuses on these concerns

when Fidelia advises Olivia to reject Rosicleer, on account of his low birth and her royal position. In the Spanish text, Fidelia tells the Princess:

> […] si este amor fuesse natural a todos, todos amarían, y no lo dexarían unos por vergüença y otros por temor. (II, 101)
>
> [(…) if this love were natural to all, everyone would love, and they would not abandon it out of shame or fear.]

Tyler expands:

> […] if this love were natural to all men, as all men then should love by nature, so should they not forbear it either for shame or friends' displeasure. And *if* it proceeded from *Fortune*, or by *grace* inspired, whereof the cause is *not known* but the *event* is evident, then were our *liberty* herein *irrecuparable*. And in that the principal suit was without us, it might excuse the infirmity of the patient, whereas as both *experience* proveth that love hath been removed by *reason*, and we daily *chide* their *impotency* which are not able to resist the darts of Cupid. (p. 172) (my emphasis)

Tyler draws attention here to the peculiarities of romantic feelings, their origins and their conflicting coexistence with intellectual faculties. In the English version, Fidelia notes the uncertainty in determining the origin of romantic attraction, considering as possibilities 'Fortune', 'grace', or a 'cause […] not known'. But, however mysterious the causes are, the consequences of this romantic 'event' are clear: our mental 'liberty' is 'irrecuparable', and the only solution is to overcome this state through 'reason'. Tyler also presents here a certain disapproval of those who allow their intellect to be dominated by passion, as in other examples commented on above. Here, Fidelia expresses her disapproval ('chide') of those who, in their 'impotency', are unable to resist 'the darts of Cupid'.

In addition to her interest in the mental processes of both women and men in love, and perhaps the similarities between them, Tyler also reveals a concern for the differences in their reactions. Shortly after they first meet, Rosicleer feels deeply affected by his feelings for Olivia. However, he is unsure about revealing his present

state to her, on account of their supposed blood relation, as, at this point, Rosicleer believes his father is Prince Edward of Great Britain, Olivia's brother:

> Que como en esto pensase muchas vezes, no avía pena ni dolor que al suyo se pudiese comparar. Pensava en sí que por ventura descansaría algún tanto si su pena a la infanta descubriesse, y como quisiesse hacerlo, jamás hallaba tiempo donde a solas la pudiesse hablar. Y ansí andava confuso siempre, y muy suspenso. (II, 57)
>
> [Since he considered this many times, there was neither grief nor pain that could compare with his. He thought that perhaps he could have some respite if he could reveal his grief to the infanta; but even though he wanted to do it, he could never find the opportunity to speak to her alone. Thus, he was always confused and very anxious.]

Tyler expands:

> In this conflict he did nothing but afflict himself, neither daring to discover his malady nor minded to dissemble it altogether.
>
> By so much the more in worse case than the princess was, as the *infirmity* of her *sex* did *lessen* her *pain* by *yielding* at the first. And the *magnanimity* of his *courage* to have the *mastery* did in the end make the *deeper impression* in his *flesh*, like as in nature the hardest fight is between the *hardiest*, and sooner shall the *cannon shot* deface the high *towers* than break through a rampire of *wool* or *flax*: and so the issue proved in him. (p. 156) (my emphasis)

Tyler translates Ortúñez's passage literally, referring to Rosicleer's inner struggle in deciding what the most convenient course of action is. After this, though, Tyler adds the wholly original passage quoted above, in which she comments on the different responses that women and men have to love. Unlike her reluctance to uphold the stereotype about women's careless speech, as noted above, Tyler here generalizes about the sexes, as the phrase 'infirmity of her sex' indicates. However, she recasts the stereotype of female weakness ('yielding') in a positive light, presenting it as a defence against the pain of love. Tyler uses military imagery to depict the effect of romantic emotions but adds a gendered tone, depicting love as a 'cannon shot', men as 'high

towers' and women as 'rampire[s] of wool or flax'. She makes a clear point about how that which appears to be stronger feels the 'damage' of love more keenly.

Tyler uses metaphoric language to modify her source at different points in her translation. Her use of military and judicial imagery is particularly striking because, like her classical material, it potentially points towards the translator's awareness of a rich printed culture, and they show they way that she appropriates it to explore relationships. During the long and difficult combat between Rosicleer and the giant Candramarte, Ortúñez describes Olivia's reaction as she observes the young Knight's struggle:

> Pues la hermosa infanta Olivia, aunque no conosciesse a Rosicler, *no del todo libre ni asosegada* la batalla mirava; que muy pagada de sus altas caballerías y buen parescer, *gran dolor* en su *coraçon* sintía, viéndole puesto a punto de se perder […] (II, 43) (my emphasis)
>
> [Even though the beautiful infanta Olivia did not know Rosicleer, she observed the battle neither fully freely nor calmly. As she was very pleased with his noble deeds and good looks, she felt great pain in her heart, seeing him on the point of being defeated […]

Tyler expands:

> […] the fair and beautiful Princess Olivia, although as yet altogether unacquainted with Rosicleer, was a spectator *neither careless nor curious*, but as one *without hope*, she only wished well to Rosicleer, whose *bruises* were as deep-set in *her sides*, as they were imprinted in Rosicleers flesh. And every wagging of the most huge and monstrous Candramarte's weapon *struck* a salt *tear* from her fair eyes. So was she *estranged* from herself and altogether *become another man's*. (p. 151) (my emphasis)

Ortúñez uses the image of Olivia's pain in her heart to explain her emotional reaction when observing Rosicleer's suffering. Tyler, on the other hand, expands on this brief reference and explains the way in which Olivia's metaphorical 'bruises' and 'tear[s]' indicate how deeply she identifies with Rosicleer's plight. However, other sections draw attention to the implication of Olivia's loss of control. First, the English text

incorporates a certain ambiguity in terms of the Princess's real interest in the scene. While the Spanish text indicates Olivia's full involvement, with the phrase 'no del todo libre ni asosegada', Tyler complicates the reader's understanding of the depth of the Princess's emotional engagement with the phrase 'neither carelesse nor curious'. Although the first part of the phrase indicates Olivia's concern, the second section gives a sense of her detachment. Then Tyler adds the phrase 'as one without hope' which, on the one hand, could be interpreted as the expression of Olivia's anxiety for Rosicleer's unfortunate position in the combat, but, on the other, could be linked to the final section of the passage, where Tyler indicates Olivia's vulnerable position in the face of attraction. The English translator describes how the Princess was ultimately 'estranged from herself', as her heart and mind become the possession of someone else. Tyler again incorporates military imagery when Olivia first sees Rosicleer's face, as he removes his helmet to receive his prize for his performance in the joust:

> […] quando la infanta Olivia le vio delante sí con tanto estremo, como ya las partes de su coraçón con las altas cavallerías que le avía visto hazer fuessen abiertas, de tal manera tuvo lugar el amor de entrar en él, que del todo quedó hecha su *prisionera* y subjeta, sin que esperança alguna de libertad jamás tuviesse para se soltar. Y toda turbada con el rezio golpe y impression quell amor hizo en su coraçón, con la mayor consolación que pudo, dixo […] (II, 49) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) when the infanta Olivia saw him before her with such distinction, love penetrated her in such a way that she was made its prisoner, for the pieces of her heart had already been opened after she saw his noble chivalry. Thus, she had no hope of any freedom to set herself free. Completely bewildered by the strong blow and impression that love made in her heart, but with the greatest calm she could manage, she said (…)]

Tyler translates:

> When the Princesse Olivia saw him so fair, as already Love had made a *wrack* in the most secret part of her heart by the view of his knighthood, so now the same *breach* being made wider by the second *assault* in his beautiful *looks*, Love entered with *banner displayed*, and finding no *resistance*, took *possession* wholy of her heart, and swore all that he found to be his true *prisoners*. Thus

> lost she her liberty. And yet with the best *courage* that a woman might, she framed out a countenaunce of great *freedom* in this manner. (p. 153) (my emphasis)

Tyler translates the sense of her source very closely but picks up on Ortúñez's image of Olivia as prisoner and from there transforms the passage by introducing a whole set of military metaphors. The terms 'wracke', 'breach', assault', and 'banner', depict the attack performed by love, with the aid of Rosicleer's 'beautiful looks'; while 'resistance', 'possession', and 'prisoner', give a sense of Olivia's helpless position. Even though the Princess is clearly defeated, Tyler describes her efforts to show control with the terms 'courage' and 'freedom', thus, perhaps highlighting the Princess's capacity to dominate her passions when her cultural environment requires it.

However, Tyler does not only use metaphors to depict the process experienced by women when falling in love but also by men. At one point during Rosicleer's participation in the jousts, he stops to gaze at Olivia, whom he has noticed a while before, and Ortúñez describes his inner struggle as he wonders how to overcome the barrier of their supposed blood relation:

> [...] el coraçón de Rosicler, no muy consolado ni seguro, la grande hermosura de Olivia contemplava; que encendido en amoroso fuego de su amor, çufría la pena que la falta del remedio le causava, teniéndose del todo por perdido, paresciéndole quell cercano parentesco que con aquella hermosa infanta tenía impedía qualquier remedio que por su parte pudiesse serle dado. Quanto más, que mirando su tan soberana hermosura, merescimiento le parescía a él faltar para osarse publicar por suyo. (II, 25-26)
>
> [(…) Rosicleer's heart, neither comforted nor safe, observed Olivia's great beauty, and burned in the romantic fire of love. He suffered the pain and lack of remedy that this caused, thinking himself completely lost, and that the close kinship that he shared with the beautiful infanta, denied any remedy that she could give him. Furthermore, looking at her royal beauty, he thought he was not worthy to declare himself hers.]

Tyler expands:

> This was a *breathing time* for Rosicleer, but yet I am persuaded that it was *no playing time* although no enemy appeared. For he had a greater conflict within his bones than he professed outwardly, and therefore, his heart, neither fully assured nor yet in danger, gazed upon the beauty of Olivia. Whereby the fire, entering closely by the veins, wasted and consumed his flesh, sooner than he felt the flame or could think of remedy. But better considering that he was within the compass of Love's *seigniory*, and that his matter was to bee *tried* at the great *assize* in Love's dominion, he took better advisement to alter it to an action upon the case of *covenant* against his mistress, the matter arising upon exchange of looks, as you have heard. And for this cause he entertained *Sergeant Hope* to be his *lawyer* and feed diverse others to assist him. But *Master Despair*, an old stager, had won the day of him had not the whole *bench*, and especially the *chiefe Justice Desert*, stayed upon a *demur*, which relieved much Rosicleer's courage and made him look more freshly upon Hope to find out better *evidence* for recovery of his suite. (p. 145) (my emphasis)

As in the previous example, Tyler maintains the sense of the Spanish text but, crucially, omits the kinship reference and then develops a completely original depiction of the character's emotional process through the use of metaphoric language. In this case, Tyler uses judicial imagery, indicated by the terms 'tryed', 'assise', 'case', 'covenaunt', 'sergaunt', 'Lawyer', 'Bench', 'chiefe Iustice', 'demurre', and 'evidence'. The specificity of the vocabulary is remarkable and shows Tyler's familiarity with legal procedure. 'Hope', 'Despaire' and 'Desert', are all personified as members of the court. The translator also demonstrates great literary skill in creating a scene in which the reader can understand Rosicleer's emotional process, on account of the way in which she personifies his feelings in this imaginary court-room setting. Also worth noting is Tyler's use of phrases such as 'breathing time' and 'playing time', of recent use in her period,[268] to summarize Rosicleer's present state. After this, Ortúñez explains how Olivia is affected by the Knight's looks and deeds:

[268] The *OED* records the first use of the compound noun 'breathing-time' in 1599, and of 'playing time' in 1578. However, Tyler's text precedes the date of the former. See the compound noun 'breathing-time' within the definition of the noun 'breathing' and the compound noun 'playing time' within the definition of the noun 'playing' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 06 June 2014].

> […] en este tiempo, como los mensageros de Cupido la començassen a tentar, mirando con grande atención su tan estremada dispusición [sic] y las altas cavallerías que aquel día avía hecho […] (II, 26)
>
> [(…) in this moment, as the messengers of Cupid started to tempt her, observing with great attention his extraordinary valour and the noble deeds that he had performed that day (…)]

Tyler translates:

> But as Rosicleer thus *pled* his *cause* at the *bar*, so gentle Cupid attended upon his mistress, faithfully serving him and *beating into her head* the remembrance of his acts, and the beauty of his personage […] (p. 145) (my emphasis)

Tyler continues with her judicial imagery and depicts Rosicleer as if he were defending his case in court, trying to influence Olivia. Apart from this, the English translator also includes a rather puzzling image about the effect of Rosicleer's deeds and looks on the Princess, describing Cupid 'beating into hir head' the Knight's memorable features. The phrase has rather violent implications and it gives the sense that Olivia is being forced to fall in love. This can be interpreted as akin to the same sort of criticism that Tyler expresses elsewhere about Olivia's loss of mental control due to her romantic emotions. However, Tyler also adds material to make clear Olivia's vulnerability to her attraction for Rosicleer. When Ortúñez first introduces Olivia in the text, he explains how up to that point she had rejected every suitor, including the most recent, Prince Silverio of Lusitania, considering that nobody was good enough for her:

> Aunque la infanta Olivia uviesse de su pena sentido algo, era ella de tales y tan altos pensamientos que ninguna cuenta dél más que de los otros hazía, y ninguno de quantos a las grandes fiestas vinieron le parescía ser parte para la merecer, porque según su grande hermosura era estremada en el mundo, entre los humanos le parescía faltar príncipe con quien conforme a quien ella era pudiesse casar. (II, 9)
>
> [Even if the infanta Olivia had felt something for his [suitor's] grief, she had such high thoughts that she took no notice of him or of the others, and none of all those who came to the jousts seemed worthy of her, because her great beauty

> made her remarkable in this world. She thought that among humans, there was no prince who could match and marry her.]

Tyler translates:

> For amongst all which were alredy come, she thought none merited to be a peer and match for her beauty, being (as my author sayeth), such in her own conceit as if no prince were worthy of it. But the truth is that the *blind boy*, shooting at random, had *overreached* his *mark*, as appeared in the *second shot* at the coming in of *Rosicleer*. (p. 140) (my emphasis)

At this point in the text, Ortúñez describes the other knights who have come to the joust, highlighting Olivia's rejection of all possible suitors, as is her reputation. The Spanish author does not mention Rosicleer until a number of lines later, whereas Tyler apparently undermines Olivia's distant and controlled persona by announcing earlier her subsequent infatuation with Rosicleer, by way of metaphoric language that alludes to Cupid's influence. Perhaps Tyler has wanted once again to disrupt the more conventional depiction in her source of characters that appear to be in control, by acknowledging the internal turmoil that romantic attraction entails.

This exploration of Tyler's depictions of maidens and the experiences of love and sexuality reveals a profound interest in their internal world, and particularly, the way that emotions coexist with rationality. Much in the same way that she links female classical examples to the experiences of men, as analysed further above, Tyler's modifications here reveal a concern not only for the inner dimension of women but also of men, and on how these features affect the relationships between the sexes. Through her interventions in the text, the English translator shows ways in which to better understand life within the limitations imposed by certain social constrains, and perhaps propose a way to overcome them. Tyler's changes also arguably suggest the possibility of a new space in which she can establish a dialogue with her readers and perhaps propose ways in which new forms of conduct can be developed.

Translation as a Commentary on Marriage

It is important to analyse Tyler's description of marriage and sexuality in the *Mirror* because, like the other topics analysed above, it has, to this date, received very little scholarly attention. Krontiris analyses Briana's and Trebatio's marriage as an example of Tyler's critique of the contemporary rigid laws which favoured material interests over emotional ones, as she also argues in the case of Olivia's speech, mentioned further above. Krontiris argues that Tyler responds to this aspect of her culture by describing how Emperor Trebatio marries Briana for love, as opposed to Prince Edward who had accepted her as wife, earlier in the text, as a commodity in the allegiance he had agreed with her father.[269] However, Krontiris overlooks the Emperor's deceit in this union, since Briana is tricked into believing that she is actually marrying Prince Edward, and Krontiris does not consider the violence of the forced consummation of the marriage; I shall analyse both aspects in detail below. However, Krontiris does analyse Tyler's description of Trebatio's infidelity with Lindaraza as an expression of the translator's critique of the double standard in her culture which morally condemned only women for a lack of chastity.[270] I will also analyse this aspect further below, exploring the ways in which Tyler expands her source to draw attention to the Emperor's failings as a husband.

Uman and Bistué, on the other hand, criticize Krontiris's idealising vision of Trebatio and argue instead that Briana 'submits unwittingly and reluctantly' to the marriage and consummation, bound, ultimately, by 'restrictive patriarchal ideologies'.[271] They agree with Hackett that the 'consummation' is a rape and note how Tyler draws attention to Briana's lack of consent.[272] I hope to build on this analysis to further explore the ways that the translator responds to this scene by adding material which, I argue, can be seen as a critique of violence against women but which also proposes a harmonious relationship between spouses.

As I have shown, Tyler adds several elements to her source which comment on the relationship between the sexes. The most striking additions in terms of female experience relate to events involving the main female character as a wife and mother. At the beginning of the narrative, Trebatio forces Briana to consummate their marriage, even though her parents have asked her to wait because their kingdom is at war. After

---

[269] Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', pp. 31-32; *Oppositional Voices*, p. 54.
[270] Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', pp. 35-36; *Oppositional Voices*, pp. 58-59.
[271] Uman and Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship', pp. 312-313.
[272] As compared with other Early Modern female writers who deal with the topic of rape, Tyler's translation is quite unusual in that it addresses the issue within marriage. For an analysis of the issue by female writers contemporary to Tyler, see Jocelyn Catty, *Writing Rape, Writing Women in Early Modern England: Unbridled Speech* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

this, Lindaraza kidnaps and bewitches Trebatio, and Briana is left to give birth to her twin sons alone and to suffer both the pain of separation from her children and, as she believes, widowhood. Tyler comments on the characters' experience, acknowledging Briana's greater suffering and Trebatio's responsibility for past events.

After the wedding, Trebatio is not satisfied until he has an outlet for his lust, and achieves his purpose after surprising the vulnerable Briana alone in a secret garden. At first, when Briana objects to the disturbance of her privacy, he justifies his lust by speaking of love and implying he is fulfilling God's providence, thus trying to convince the nervous Briana of the honourable and justified purpose of his actions. Soon after, his instincts get the better of him and he exchanges words for deeds:

> Diziendo esto, el buen emperador la abraçava y besava tan a menudo que la princessa no tenía lugar de hablarle, [...] el sabroso ruido quel corriente de la clara agua […] acordado con la dulce melodía que la mucha diversidad de aves […] hazían, en tanto grado el amoroso desseo del emperador acrecentaron, que pensando en cómo executarlo podía, ya la lengua para hablar a la princessa se le turbava, y el entendimiento para entender lo que ella le dezía le faltaba, y todos los miembros le temblavan, de tal manera que conoscido su propósito por la princessa, en grande *temor* fue puesta. Y queriéndose levantar para se ir de aquel lugar, el emperador la tomó entre sus braços.
>
> Y sin ser parte para dexar de satisfazer a su desseo, ni ella para defenderse del, [...] concurriendo las influencias de los venturosos planetas, y mediante el querer del universal Hazedor, fueron engendrados aquellos tan estremados hijos el Cavallero del Febo y Rosicler [...] quedando dueña aquella estremada princessa, aunque harto *contra su voluntad*. (I, 60-62) (my emphasis)
>
> [As he was saying this, the good emperor held her and kissed her so often that the princess had no chance to speak to him (…) the rich sound that the clear running water made (...) together with the sweet melody that the diversity of birds produced (...) intensified the emperor's desire to such degree that, thinking how he could execute it, already his tongue became tangled preventing him from talking to the princess, and his judgment was blurred so he couldn't understand what the princess was saying, and all his limbs shook, in such a way that the princess, aware of his purpose, was put in great fear. And when she was seeking to get up to leave, the emperor took her in his arms.
>
> And not being strong enough to stop himself from satisfying his desire, nor she from defending herself, (…) the influences of the planets came together, and through the will of the universal Maker, those exceptional sons, the Cavallero

> del Fevo and Rosicler, were conceived (…) while that exceptional princess lost her maidenhood, although greatly against her will.]

This highly erotic scene shows Trebatio's loss of control and Briana's vulnerability. Marcia L. Welles analyzes this particular aestheticization of sexual violence in the context of seventeenth-century Spanish narratives featuring rape. In order to explain the convention which these authors are drawing on, she links them to representations of heroic rape in the classical tradition, as in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, as well as to those in the chivalric romance tradition.[273] One can argue that Ortúñez incorporates this same conventional material in the description of the erotic effect the elements in the garden have on Trebatio's growing desire and in the conception of the narrative's heroes. In this way the author eroticizes and justifies Trebatio's sexual violence. Hackett relates the consummation scene to 'the conception of heroes by supernatural rape in medieval Arthurian romance', which she links to divine rape in Ovid.[274] Eisenberg, on the other hand, comments that unlike earlier Spanish romances, such as the *Amadís de Gaula*, Ortúñez is bold in his description of Trebatio's desire. This, Eisenberg argues, is an example of the fall in moral standards in the later Spanish chivalric romances.[275] In terms of the appeal of this sexual element, Hackett comments on the 'semi-pornographic entertainment' that these narratives might have provided for a male audience.[276] Tyler's subtle comments, discussed below, articulate at least one female response.

Tyler translates this episode faithfully, except for a few changes. Uman and Bistué draw attention to her modification of the heading for this chapter, arguing that Tyler highlights Briana's concern for the legitimacy of marriage:[277]

> The Emperor Trebatio driveth in his conceit the order how to *consummate* the *marriage*, which in the end, he bringeth to pass accordingly (p. 63)

Ortúñez's chapter heading reads:

---

[273] Marcia L. Welles, *Persephone's Girdle: Narratives of Rape in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Literature* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), pp. 1-5.
[274] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 58.
[275] Ortúñez, *Espejo*, p. 61(footnote to line 8).
[276] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 68.
[277] Uman and Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship', p. 314.

> Cómo el emperador Trebacio, hallando sola la princessa en un fresco jardín del monasterio, dio fin a su desseo, con *grande pesar* y *enojo* de la princessa (I, 58) (my emphasis)
>
> [How the Emperor Trebatio, finding the Princess in a cool garden within the monastery, fulfilled his desire, to the great sorrow and anger of the Princess]

Uman and Bistué note that the Spanish title is more concerned with the satisfaction of Trebatio's desire than with marriage.[278] However, they do not acknowledge that, unlike Tyler, Ortúñez takes account of Briana's experience by stating her sorrow and anger. Tyler's focus, on the other hand, is all on Trebatio's instinctive actions, which is consistent with her emphasis on his responsibility and need for repentance later on in the text. Even though they are legitimately married and consummation is sanctioned, there is a sense that Tyler is establishing an opposition between Trebatio's impulses and the duty that Briana owes to her parents. This is very evident later on when Briana is explaining to Rosicleer the truth about his birth. In an addition of Tyler's to the original she tells her son he was, '[…] begotten in wedlock, but my parents unwitting thereunto' (p. 125). The translator thus highlights Briana's anxiety about disobeying her parents' command in order to fulfil her husband's desire.

Tyler's translation of the consummation scene also reveals a gendered response:

> The good emperor, having thus said, embraced and kissed her. And not leaving any leasure of reply, made her to sit down by him […] And the gentle murmur that the running water made upon the pebble stones, agreeing with the delicate lays which divers birds made upon the green boughs, increased so much the longing desire of the emperor, that casting how to *win* the *favour* of his lady, already his tongue failed to speak and his hearing to receive that which she spoke. She then all *trembled*, as knowing his purpose, and through fear greatly desired to have shunned that place. But the emperor caught her between his arms, and with such *haste* to *end* his *suit*, left her *unfurnished of her aunswer*. […] all the fortunate aspects intermeddling their forces, at that time, by the grace of the Almighty, were begotten these two noble children, the Knight of the Sun and Rosicleer […] This was the plaudit of his passion, and the beautiful princess now became a *wife somewhat against hir will*. (p.64) (my emphasis)

[278] Uman and Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship', p. 314.

The Spanish Trebatio's wish to satisfy his desire is toned down by Tyler's euphemistic phrase 'win the favor' and 'end his suit'. These modifications might have been prompted by Tyler's fears of criticism over explicit references to sexual fulfilment. However, Anthony Munday later employs these kinds of erotic metaphors extensively in his *Palmerin D'Oliva* and *Amadis de Gaule*, as I will discuss in Chapters II and III, respectively. Tyler also changes another reference to desire by making Briana tremble instead of Trebatio. In this case, however, the translator is drawing attention to the Princess's fear, rather than to Trebatio's lust. Tyler also focuses on the Emperor's 'haste', while Ortúñez highlights his weakness. While the Spanish notes that he did not give her time to defend herself, Tyler explains that Briana was unable to give consent. However, at the end of the passage, Tyler alters one's perception of the intensity of the abuse. By using the term 'somewhat' to describe Briana's willingness, she implies that the princess was less reluctant than Ortúñez leads us to believe. Perhaps this is done to make Briana's later reconciliation with her husband more acceptable, although Tyler's opinion of Trebatio's actions is clear before that.

When Trebatio is released from Lindaraza's enchantment (twenty years after his marriage to Briana), Tyler adds her first observations on family and the relationship between spouses. The Spanish text includes a lengthy theological commentary in which Trebatio's dreamlike state of many years is used as a metaphor for humanity's indulgence in earthly pleasures, while neglecting their spiritual preparation for the afterlife:

> Desta manera y casi desta condición somos los mortales, que olvidados de nuestra esposa, que es el ánima, y de aquella gloria infinita para la que fue criada, a rienda suelta y con una codicia insaciable nos vamos perdidos tras la ligera y vana sombra deste mundo […] (II, 204)
> [In this way and of this state are we mortals, who forgetting our wife, which is the soul, and that infinite glory for which it was created, unrestrainedly and with an insatiable greed we pursue the light and vain shadow of this world (…)]

Tyler translates:

> But of this manner and condition are we mortal men, that for our pleasures we sometimes forget our *spouses*, the *one half* of *ourselves*; sometimes *neglect* our *children*, the *more half* to *ourselves*, as in whom the hope of *posterity* resteth; and lastly, sometimes we *overturn* our *country*, which ought to be *dearer* to us

> *than ourselves*, neither mindful to what use we are created, namely to the benefit of others […] (p. 202) (my emphasis)

These variations and additions to the original are very telling of Tyler's interest in the experience of marriage and its influence on the family. It is possible that she has misunderstood the meaning in the original, but this is unlikely, given that she translates the rest of this passage literally. Considering her later additions, alluding to Trebatio's guilt in the rape and abandonment of Briana, it appears she has chosen to reflect on his faults as husband and father. It is noteworthy that Tyler considers husband and wife to be equal parts of a whole, a vision of marriage that might be challenging the contemporary expectations of wifely submission as expressed, for example, in *The Book of Common Prayer* (1559):

> Saint Paul [...] teacheth you thus: "Ye women, submit your selves unto your husbands as unto the Lord: the husband is the wives head, even as Christ is the head of the Church. [...] as the Church or congregation is subject unto Christ, so likewise let the wives also be in subjection unto their own husbands in all things."[279]

Tyler is proposing a partnership between husband and wife different from one demanding female submission. However, the translator might also be responding to the Reformation's emphasis on a companionate form of marriage. Katharine Cleland argues that these new views of marriage placed greater emphasis on the importance of the role of husbands and fathers at home, even encouraging 'domestic handbooks and treatises […] to teach men how to perform their roles as husbands and householders according to the new Protestant ideals'.[280] Tyler also expands family commitment to a sense of loyalty to the 'country', perhaps expressing contemporary political theory which saw the family as a mirror of the state and the father as a king within the household, with a right to rule but also a responsibility to protect those who depended on him.[281] Cleland argues that contemporary handbooks portrayed 'the household as a miniature commonwealth over which a man rules', in order to make these ideas more appealing to the male

[279] 'The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony' from *The Book of Common Prayer* (1559), in *Daughters, Wives, and Widows: Writings by Men about Women in England, 1500-1640*, ed. by Joan Larsen Klein (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), pp. 3-10 (p. 9).
[280] Katharine Cleland, '"Warring Spirits": Martial Heroism and Anxious Masculinity in Milton's *Paradise Lost*', in *Violent Masculinities: Male Aggression in Early Modern Texts and Culture*, ed. by Jennifer Feather and Catherine E. Thomas (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 129-48 (p. 134).
[281] Susan Dwyer Amussen, '"Being stirred to much unquietness": Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England', *Journal of Women's History*, 6 (1994), 70-89 (pp. 73).

audience.[282] These ideas are arguably also related to Tyler's references to the concept of commonwealth in her treatment of classical material.

Tyler clearly sees Trebatio at fault, both as a father and as a husband, and feels that he should make amends, as is evident when Trebatio has come out of the enchantment and realizes how many years he has been away from his wife:

> […] aviéndole parescido un ligero y momentáneo sueño todos los deleites y plazeres que con Lindaraxa avía tenido en más de veinte años, ninguna otra cosa de todo ello le avía quedado sino una entrañable vergüença de sí mesmo, y grandíssima pena y dolor de aquello que tanto tiempo avía tenido olvidado. (II, 205-4)
>
> [(...) having felt all the delights and pleasures enjoyed with Lindaraza in more than twenty years to be a swift and fleeting dream, [he] now felt nothing else but a deep shame of himself and great sorrow and pain for that which he had left forgotten for so long.]

Tyler translates:

> Little shall remain thereof after scores of years, and that which remaineth shall be *shame* and grief for the life passed, besides desperate *repentance* which is *double torment*.
>
> And much after this same manner was the valiant emperor for his long delights with Lindaraza. Now twenty years was but a summer's day, and yet there left him not *shame* of his fact to fret his *conscience*, albeit he advised himself the best remedy which *I haue read off* [sic], which is *amendment of life*, the safest haven for a *weather-beaten* [sic] *penitent*. (p. 202) (my emphasis)

Trebatio's feelings of shame, pain and grief are present in Tyler's source, but she goes beyond these, adding commentary to interrogate his actions in terms of his moral failure. She repeats the word 'shame' twice to stress the seriousness of his conduct and links this with the idea of conscience, pointing to the awareness necessary for repentance. Even though Tyler is sympathetic to Trebatio, describing his emotional reaction as a 'double torment' and him as 'weather-beaten', she still notes the importance of making amends for his past faults. Unlike in the original, Tyler incorporates her experience as reader to support her advice on the 'best remedy' for an ailing conscience.

[282] Cleland, '"Warring Spirits"', p. 134.

After referring to Trebatio's neglect of his family and the need for him to purge his sins, Tyler turns to his specific faults as husband, considering his status as a rapist in a remarkable later addition, after the Emperor has left Lindaraza's castle and has rescued his wife's servant Clandestria from violation by a group of men. In the Spanish version, after this event, Trebatio speaks with Clandestria, with no mention of what has just occurred. By contrast, Tyler's translation incorporates her wholly original explanation of the Emperor's actions,[283] reporting his opinion on male abuse against women:

> For the emperor, albeit very inclinable to any reasonable pity, yet was he in this point very rigorous, not to spare the dishonourers of virginity. His saying was that it *quenched* the *natural love* between father and mother, sister and brother, between kith and kin; that the bastard born seldom came to good purpose; that it was partly the sin of sodomy' [sic], and et cetera. And for *his own fault*, it was indeed mere ignorance, or rather constraint, and thereby the more pardonable. Or perhaps the *detesting* of it *himself* made him more *severely exact* the *keeping* of *chastity* in *others*. (p. 221) (my emphasis)

Tyler here arguably brings together Clandestria's escape and Trebatio's responsibility for his young wife's violation long ago. Tyler's report of Trebatio's thoughts focuses on the damaging consequences of this violent act on all family members and on their relationships between each other. Even though Trebatio is depicted as 'rigorous' on this point, he is arguing against the illegitimacy of sexuality outside of marriage rather than condemning male violence against women, and his own conduct is deemed pardonable. In this sense, Tyler's opportunities for feminist commentary seem limited, both by the logic of the narrative and by her contemporary environment. One can argue that Tyler subtly shows how Trebatio is morally culpable, so that she can challenge the contemporary sanction of violence within marriage. She indirectly condemns all violent husbands through Trebatio's uncompromising reprimand of rapists, and also implies he has some consciousness of his own guilt. Hackett argues that it is Trebatio's desire for the preservation of male lineage which prompts his fierce punishment of the would-be rapists.[284] This is true to an extent, but Hackett ignores how the narrator clearly holds Trebatio morally responsible for the violence he exercised in the conception of his children, and speculates that his awareness of his own guilt accounts for his defence of chastity. In the Spanish text, Ortúñez establishes the Emperor's responsibility at the

[283] This addition is noted by Boro, *Mirror*, p. 221 (footnote 628).
[284] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 68.

beginning of the romance but does not mention it again; by contrast, Tyler makes a strong statement about male violence within marriage and the need to acknowledge it, not as the right of the husband, but as abuse against wives.

Tyler's intimate approach to the text sets her apart from the translators that followed her, and this is obvious in the contrast between her account of Trebatio's assault, and another rape scene, in Book III of Ortúñez's *Espejo,* which is translated by R. P. This time, the Knight of the Sun is the aggressor. The victim is Claridiana, a female knight whose remarkable adventures feature in Books II and III, and who, by the end of the text, is the chosen love interest of the hero. Right before the end of Book III, war has come to an end and Emperor Trebatio has organized a hunt with his guests. While everyone is busy, the Knight of the Sun follows Claridiana to a lonely spot in the woods where she has stopped to rest. After an exchange in which Claridiana reproaches him for intruding on her privacy (as Briana does in Book I) the hero explains his burning feelings for her and then boldly kisses her. She finds this very inappropriate since they are not married, and so he proposes. After she accepts and asks to keep the engagement secret until they can announce it publicly, the hero acts on his desire, as did his father years ago:

> […] poco a poco va tomando osadía y atrevimiento, y *a vezes por fuerça y a vezes con ruegos*, como el lugar fuesse muy solo y bien aparejado, la real princesa Claridiana fue vencida y hecha dueña, para mayor honra y gloria suya y más ensalçamiento de los dos imperios.
>
> ¡O felicíssimo y bienafortunado ayuntamiento! En el qual fue produzido aquel excelente fruto de quien tomará nombre la segunda parte desta historia […] (VI, 245) (my emphasis)
>
> [(...) little by little he becomes bold and daring, and *sometimes through force and sometimes pleading*, as the place was very lonely and suitable, the royal princess Claridiana was defeated and lost her maidenhood, for her greater honour and glory and for the exaltation of both empires.
>
> Oh happy and fortunate intercourse! In which that excellent fruit was produced who will give name to the second part of this story (…)]

The violence that both Claridiana and Briana resist is seen as socially positive because it leads to the conception of children who will play important roles in the story. Here, the

experience is also praised as an enhancement to Claridiana's honour and glory. R. P.'s slight modification of the rape scene is nonetheless significant:

> This beeing done, he, little by little, began to take heart at grasse [sic], and to embolden himselfe, and *what with requestes and otherwise* (for that the Pallace was solitarie and fit for the purpose) the royall Princesse was overcome and made a wife, the more for hir honour and glorie, and exalting of the two Empires. Oh happie and fortunate meeting, wherof did proceede that excellent fruit, that the second part of this Historie shall beare the name of […][285]

The Knight of the Sun's use of force is only implied in the term 'otherwise' giving the impression that he is less guilty and Claridiana more willing. As in Trebatio's case, it seems there is nothing reprehensible about the Knight of the Sun's actions; it is all justified, and even though Claridiana has been forced to take part in this experience, in the end, as Briana did before, she accepts the fact that there is nothing to be done; this violence is part of the norm. This is the translator's only modification to the scene and the lack of comment is consistent with his largely literal translation of the whole text. Considering the extent of the reflections Tyler makes in relation to the rape scene in Book I, pondering on family structure, marriage, repentance and even loyalty to nation, one can see a very different relationship between translator and text from that which R. P. establishes. Tyler, if modestly, makes the text her own. R. P. seems to aim only at a faithful representation of the source text. Unlike Tyler, R. P. even leaves the task of writing the dedications and epistles for Books II and III, to the publisher, Thomas East.

Ortúñez presents Trebatio's abuse of Briana as endorsed by matrimony and Briana, in both versions, sees the assault as justified:

> [...] como viesse faltar remedio para lo passado, consolándose algún tanto con ver que era su marido legítimo, le perdonó el atrevimiento que para la enojar avía tomado. Y ansí passaron los dos con grande contentamiento […] (I, 62)
> [(...) as she saw no remedy for what had just occurred, she comforted herself somewhat, reflecting that he was her legitimate husband she forgave him the audacity with which he had angered her. And so they spent the time the two of them, in great contentment (...)]

[285] R. P. (trans.), *The Third Part of the First Booke of the Myrrour of Knighthood* (London: by Thomas Este, 1599) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 19 February 2012], sig. Ll1^{v}. My emphasis. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s and u/v.

Tyler translates literally:

> […] when she saw no remedy to that which was past, she comforted herself in that he was her lawful husband and, therefore, she pardoned him his boldness in troubling her. These two lovers shortened the time with good agreement [...] (p. 64)

Mention of the joyful intimacy of the couple appears to condone marital violence. The fact that Tyler adds no commentary at this point suggests that she manages to be as bold as her cultural environment will allow her. Briana's acceptance of the violence inflicted on her, on account of the prerogatives of marriage, can be related to the way rape was regarded at the time. In Early Modern England rape was a crime difficult to prove and a wife required her husband's consent to prosecute for this kind of assault,[286] which of course was impossible if the husband was the aggressor. In Spain, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, only eight per cent of convicts had been found guilty of crimes of a sexual nature.[287] In Early Modern Castille, evidence for prosecutions against sexual offenders is scarce, as few women made complaints, due to the high cultural regard for honour (both personal and collective) and intimidation from the attacker. In many cases in which a trial did take place, the offender avoided corporal punishment (sanctioned by law) because an agreement was reached between parties, involving financial compensation for the victim.[288] In England, although women may have testified to suffering violence on refusing the husband's sexual demands, there was no set legislation in the case of marital rape.[289] Moreover, medical opinion assumed that female pleasure was necessary to conception. As late as 1655, Michael Dalton argued in his handbook, *The Country Justice*:

---

[286] Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 47.
[287] Francisco J. Lorenzo, 'Actitudes violentas en torno a la formación y disolución del matrimonio en Castilla durante la Edad Moderna', in *Furor et Rabies: Violencia, Conflicto y Marginación en la Edad Moderna*, ed. by José I. Fortea, Juan E. Gelabert and Tomás A. Mantecón (Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, 2002), pp. 159-82 (p. 160).
[288] Tomás A. Mantecón Movellán, 'Mujeres forzadas y abusos deshonestos en la Castilla moderna', *Manuscrits*, 20 (2002), 157-185.
[289] Anthony J. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 195.

> If a woman at the time of the supposed Rape do conceive with child by the Ravisher, this is no Rape, for a woman cannot conceive with child, except she doe consent.[290]

In the *Espejo*, the 'heroic' rape is more important than examining Trebatio's behaviour. Both culturally and narratively it is natural for Briana (and Claridiana) to assume she has no redress. Regardless, Tyler manages, elsewhere in the text, to comment indirectly on the violence Briana has suffered while simultaneously drawing attention to her wifely obedience.

This violence against the female body, legally and conventionally sanctioned, can be linked with the justification of Trebatio's murder and impersonation of Prince Edward. Towards the end of Book I, Briana has waited many years for the husband she believes is someone else and whom she barely even knows. When the couple is reunited, Trebatio tells his wife the truth about how he became her husband, and a further thought-provoking difference between the Spanish and the English version emerges. In Ortúñez's text, Briana is extremely surprised and, initially, scared:

> La qual quando bien uvo entendido el caso, no se puede dezir el grande espanto y admiración que recibió, que por una grande pieça estuvo suspensa, no podiendo acabar de creer cosa tan estraña y nueva para sí. [...] Y como se viesse *esposa* de un tan alto príncipe, que era el más *famoso emperador* que avía en el mundo, otro nuevo gozo y alegría sintió en su coraçón, y no sabía que se dezir, sino abraçarse con el emperador en señal de más amor. (II, 293) (my emphasis)
> [When she understood the situation, one cannot express the great fright and amazement that she felt, on account of which she was bewildered for a great while, incapable of believing such a remarkable and novel thing. (...) And as she found herself to be the wife of such a high prince, who was the most famous emperor in the whole world, she felt new delight and joy in her heart, and she didn't know what to say so she embraced the emperor in token of more love.]

The Spanish Briana quickly manages to forget the horrible circumstances that have, ultimately, made her wife to an emperor. Her high status seems to cancel out ethical considerations. Tyler's translation focuses instead on Briana's sense of moral obligation, even if she has to support a lying murderer:

---

[290] Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 47.

> The princess, for a great while, stood hereat amazed […] And not being displeased with her former error, in the end she told him that whosoever he was indeed, yet was he the same to whom she was married, and that vow which she then made, she said she would perform to him alone. (p. 226)

Tyler's Briana seems to be a more mature and dignified character, conscious of the obligations society has forced on her. Once again, her commitment as a wife is more important than anything else. In this way, Tyler places Briana's constancy against Trebatio's individualistic motivations yet again.

When the couple is reunited, Tyler modifies Ortúñez's classical material to acknowledge the wife's greater agony. Towards the end of the romance, Ortúñez links the suffering Briana to the expectant and faithful Penelope, and the estranged Trebatio to the exiled Odysseus:

> —Mi señora —dixo el emperador—, con razón podéis llamar a la fortuna cruel, pues halló *para los dos* tan gran daño, tan larga y tan prolixa pena. […] no fueron tan crueles ni tan largos aquellos naufragios del griego Ulixes quando de la destruida Troya para Ítaca bolvió, y la su Penélope […] lo esperaba […] *ninguna culpa de tan larga ausencia me a cabido*, porque si libertad y juizio yo uviera tenido, el mundo todo con quanto en el ay criado era muy poco para detenerme por ganarlo, perdiendo de vuestra vista una sola hora. Y si allá en el infierno uviera estado padesciendo con los míseros y tristes condenados, no puedo creer otra cosa sino que la mayor pena y tormento que sintiera fuera el padescer por vuestra ausencia. (II, 292) (my emphasis)
>
> [—My lady —said the emperor—, with reason you may call fortune cruel, for she found for both of us such great harm, such long and great sorrow. (…) those shipwrecks of the Greek Ulysses were not that cruel nor that long, when he came back from destroyed Troy and his Penelope (…) waited for him (…) I am not to blame for such a long absence, for if I had had liberty and freedom to decide, the world and everything that is in it would have been too little to stop me from overcoming it, and thus keeping me from you one more hour. And if in hell I had been suffering with those who were condemned and were miserable and sad, the greatest sadness and torment that I could feel would be for your absence.]

In Ortúñez's version, Trebatio blames Fortune's cruelty for their long separation and despair. He emphasises that his suffering was much greater than the Greek hero's and

mentions Penelope without directly acknowledging his wife's painful experience. Trebatio excuses himself of any responsibility for his lengthy absence, stressing that his greatest torment was the distance between him and his wife, but this misrepresents his time with Lindaraza.

When Tyler translates this passage, however, she first contributes a change of focus which privileges Briana's experience. The English translation introduces the dialogue by adding to the original that 'the princess [...] indeed had the chiefest wrong [...]' (p. 226), to comment on Briana's suffering. She then translates Trebatio's speech (commented on above) as follows:

> 'Madame', aunswered the emperor, 'you may call that fortune cruel, for it hath offered *you* a *great wrong*, by *forcing you* to *endure* a *far greater penance than Penelope* did by *Ulysses's absence* […] the fault was not in me; *though, I am not to be excused*, for if I had had life, and liberty, and judgement, all the world should not have stayed me from you. Since my freedom, if I have not had as loyal a regard of *your constancy* and *my duty*, then blame all mankind for my sake of un-stedfastness and wrong. (p. 226) (my emphasis)

Tyler stresses the wife's more unfortunate experience. Briana has found herself dealing alone with a concealed pregnancy, then separated from her children, and finally enduring a lonely quasi-widowhood of twenty years, while Trebatio has enjoyed the pleasures of love and lust on Lindaraza's heavenly island, even fathering a child. These events are all familiar from the Spanish text, but Tyler chooses to emphasise them, thus making Trebatio responsible, even if he was at one stage helplessly bewitched. Once again, the idea of marriage commitment is present, upheld by Briana and ignored by Trebatio, thus stressing the latter's failure. Krontiris interprets this passage as a challenge to the sixteenth-century double standard of sexual conduct,[291] as noted above, but Tyler is also surely commenting on the Emperor's responsibility for the rape and abandoning of his wife.

Margaret Tyler's strong gendered message, expressed first in her epistle, is further developed in what is for the most part an extremely close translation. Her thoughtful and cleverly placed additions express a distinct and personal voice. She is remarkable because she uses the translation of Spanish romance to make broader

[291] Krontiris, 'Breaking Barriers', pp. 35-36; *Oppositional Voices*, p. 58.

cultural comments, on literary culture, on the experiences of maidens and wives, and on the relations between sexes. Tyler distinguishes herself by transcending cultural barriers and using the medium of translation to establish a thought-provoking dialogue about gender issues with her contemporaries, but also going beyond her identity as a female translator and placing herself as an Early Modern intellectual. Throughout her text, she draws attentions to elements which she could arguably identify with as a woman, but also transcends them by connecting female experience with her contemporary social and political environment. Not only does she introduce Spanish chivalric romance to the English print market, but she also arguably establishes an intercultural dialogue in which author, translator, and audience are able to participate.

Chapter II: Anthony Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva*

In this chapter I analyse Anthony Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva* (1588), Parts I and II, a translation from the French *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* (1546), which Jean Maugin had translated from the anonymous Spanish romance *Palmerín de Olivia* (1511). I explore here two aspects of Munday's translation: the way that he transforms his source in his description of erotic attraction and sexual intercourse in order to highlight the value of an official marriage, approved by the Church, and the way that he portrays the sense of threat that the Muslims in the Near East represent, by mainly manipulating European sexual stereotypes of Islam in order to draw attention to an antagonism with Christianity. The English translator develops both themes through a combination of generally literal translation, slight departures from his source, and omissions, to expose how a translation of romance, and the topic of sexuality within it, are used to develop a commentary on religious and moral matters which are topical to Munday's context.

In the Spanish *Palmerín* all the couples that pledge to marry consummate their relationships before the official nuptials; marriage is thus a defining element in the description of sexuality. Maugin, however, is more concerned about expanding the erotic scenes than in addressing the topic of marriage. For Munday, on the other hand, clandestine marriage sanctions sexual relations; but he argues also for the importance of a subsequent official Church marriage to make the union fully binding. Munday then, constantly departs from his source's explicit erotic description to focus instead on the union's legitimacy. The English translator thus produces a text which acknowledges the sexual activity of its characters, is at times euphemistically suggestive of pleasure, and engages in an erotic complicity with his readership, all the while insisting on the preservation of honour and the sanctity of marriage. Munday informs his translation of the erotic material with contemporary religious discussions, making explicit his awareness of Protestant conceptions of sexuality, chastity, and marriage. The English translator arguably uses the topic of clandestine marriage and the value that Protestantism granted sex within marriage as a way to justify premarital sex in the romance. I focus in this chapter specifically on the way that Munday changes his source by editing it, uses classical material, and modifies Maugin's warfare rhetoric, to produce a description of lovemaking which is less violent, apparently less erotic, and more focused on chastity and marriage, than is his French source.

In the case of the depictions of the Near East, they are developed in the second part of the romance. The Spanish author describes Palmerin's relations with these cultures as generally friendly, even though the text consistently presents the hero as a foreigner who wants to get back to his homeland. Although the Spanish text depicts Palmerin as a Christian whose faith is tested in the course of his travels, once he demonstrates his outstanding chivalric qualities, he is welcome in every court. The French translator, however, heightens the sense of hostility between the Christian and Muslim worlds while at the same time translating literally the magnificence of the foreign kingdoms. Munday, on the other hand, translates literally most of Maugin's description of antagonism between faiths, and its stress on the hero's Christian identity. Both French and English translators manipulate the Early Modern sexual stereotypes used to describe Muslim culture in order to heighten the sense of Islamic aggression, and the purity and holiness of Christianity as a counter to its threat. Even though Munday translates literally most of the descriptions of the dazzling wealth of these foreign kingdoms, a closer examination reveals that what initially appears as a fascination with the exotic is at times used to portray the Muslim culture as one of excess, in order to set it against the restraint and modesty of Christian behaviour. I argue that, by following Maugin, Munday represents the ambivalent views that his contemporary England held about Islam and the Near East. However, such views are also combined with a concern for the tensions of the Reformation, for he is careful to remove elements of Catholic practice. Munday is thinking about religious identity, controversy, and relations between cultures of different faith, and linking the narrative to these topical issues. I argue that Munday uses the symbol of the sexual threat of Muslims to highlight the sanctity of Christian chastity and marriage. The East and the stereotypes associated with it, serve to draw attention to religious issues relevant to the West. I will look specifically at the way in which Munday, following Maugin, highlights the character's Christian identity by emphasizing divine intervention and the characters' devotion, expressed especially through prayer. I will also look at how the translators manipulate the theme of rape, and of seduction by Muslim women, in order to heighten the sense of threat that Muslim culture represents to them.

Printing History of the Three Versions

The anonymous *Palmerín de Olivia* was first published in Salamanca in 1511 by Juan de Porras. It went through a total of fourteen editions during the sixteenth century, with the last edition printed in 1580.[292] There is no current agreement about the identity of the author but there are strong arguments for both male and female authorship, as María Carmen Marín Pina notes.[293] The Latin verses, signed by Juan Augur de Trasmiera, that appear after the end of the text and at the end of the second part of *Palmerín de Olivia*, *Primaleón* (1512), suggest a woman writer, and even link her to a specific location, Ciudad Rodrigo. However, in the colophon of the *Primaleón*, Francisco Vázquez, also from Ciudad Rodrigo, is named as having translated both *Palmerín de Olivia* and *Primaleón* from the Greek. Marín Pina argues that the stationers probably invented a source as a commercial strategy, since the issue of translation is not addressed beyond the paratexts. Some local historians from Ciudad Rodrigo argue that the author of the two romances was Catalina Arias, mother of Francisco Vázquez, whose son, they speculate, would have helped her with the military references in the text.[294] However, Marin Pina argues that the only person who actually puts his own name in the text is Juan Augur de Trasmiera, the man who signs the Latin verses at the end of the text. Trasmiera wrote several works himself and Marín Pina speculates that he could have also written the prologue to the *Palmerín* and the final verses in the *Primaleón*, as well as collaborated with Juan de Porras as editor.[295]

The Spanish *Palmerín* was dedicated to Luis de Cordoba, then a young man, whose family was well known at the time for their contribution to the war in Granada, especially his grandfather, Diego Fernández de Córdoba, second count of Cabra. At the time of its publication, Marín Pina notes the way that the dedication strategically linked the text and its subsequent editions to the monarchy, on account of the family's previous contribution and on the successful career of Luis de Cordoba, first as menino of Charles

---

[292] Encarnación García Dini, 'Per una bibliografia dei romanzi di cavalleria: edizioni del ciclo dei "Palmerines"', in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 13, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), III: *saggi e ricerche*, 5-44 (pp. 5-20).

[293] María Carmen Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, ed. by Giuseppe Di Stefano (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2004), pp. ix-xxxvi (pp. ix-x).

[294] Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, pp. ix-x. For more details on the possible identity of Francisco Vázquez, see Marín Pina's 'Nuevos Datos Sobre Francisco Vázquez y Feliciano de Silva, Autores de Libros de Caballerías', *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, 15 (1990-1991), 117-130.

[295] Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, p. x. For another discussion of the different authorship theories see G. Mancini's chapter 'Il *Palmerín* e i suoi precedenti', in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 12, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), II: *Introduzione al 'Palmerin de Olivia'*, pp. 5-44.

I, and then as ambassador to Charles V.[296] I find it important to contrast this link to the monarchy and the war in Granada to that made by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo in his *Amadís de Gaula* and especially in the fifth book of the *Amadís* series, *Sergas de Esplandián*. As I will discuss in more detail in Chapter III, Montalvo uses many elements in the *Sergas* to develop a political argument in support of the crusading mentality of the Catholic Monarchs. Even though almost half of the narrative in the *Palmerin* takes place in the Near East, as I shall discuss further below, the hero has no interest in developing a Christian crusade, unlike Esplandián, the main character of the *Sergas*. I agree with Marín Pina, who observes how the *Palmerín* series is noteworthy in its departure from the *Amadís*, unlike its many continuations. Even though the author of the *Palmerín* follows the model of chivalric romance popularized by Montalvo, s/he creates here a new hero, who has nothing to do with the Amadís lineage. Marín Pina notes that the author invites the reader, from the prologue onwards, to look back at the history of Constantinople,[297] whereas Montalvo is inviting comparison of the text with a political climate contemporary to him.

Jean Maugin's *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* was first published in Paris in 1546 by Jeanne de Marnef for Jean Longis, who was one of the three stationers who initiated the printing of the *Amadis* series. Not much is known about Maugin, except that he called himself 'le petit Angevin' and that he translated other romances, such as *L'Amour de Cupido et de Psiché* (1546), and some works by Machiavelli and Tacitus. He produced a new version of *Nouveau Tristan* (1554) and he may have been the author of a romance called *Melicello* (1556).[298] *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* was edited nine more times in France during the sixteenth century, with the last edition appearing in 1593. These editions had several reprints each and the romance was printed once in Antwerp in 1572.[299] The editions have no specific dedication but Maugin expresses his admiration for his king and for French culture in general. There is evidence that Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, the translator of the French *Amadis*, was meant to translate the *Palmerin*, as a contract, dated 19 April 1543, between him and the partnership of stationers who published the *Amadis* series, Jean Longis, Denis Janot and Vicent

[296] Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, pp. ix; xi.
[297] Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, pp. xi-xii.
[298] Jane H. M Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France: From Manuscript to Printed Book* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2014), pp. 184-85. For a study of Maugin's paratexts see Elsa Neuville, 'L'espace paratextuel à la Renaissance: Jean Maugin et ses contemporains' (unpublished thesis, École nationale supérieure des sciences de l'information et des bibliothèques, 2010).
[299] For a list of editions see *French Vernacular Books: Books published in the French Language before 1601*, ed. by Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2007), II, 463-64.

Sertenas, indicates.[300] There is no certainty how much of the translation Herberay produced, although, as Jane H. M. Taylor notes, Maugin indicates in his epistle to the reader that he is continuing the work of an unknown translator who only managed to get through a few first chapters before abandoning the task.[301] It is likely that Maugin modified those first chapters to make them consistent with the style of the rest of the work because there is no indication of a different hand. Even if it is not clear whether Maugin is continuing Herberay's translation, there is evidence that he is arguably following and trying to improve on the stylistic model of a translator he evidently admired. As Mireille Huchon notes, Maugin is specific in his epistle about the high regard that he has for his predecessor's style and for his contribution to the French language. Maugin identifies him among writers of prose as the most esteemed and he complements the 'douceur de sa phrase, proprieté de termes, liayson de propos, et richesse de sentences' [the sweetness of his phrase, gracefulness of terms, connection between words, and richness of sentences], characteristic of Herberay's writing.[302] He not only praises a style which by that time had become admired by many, but also, later in his preface, expresses his anxiety at trying to emulate Herberay, as Taylor notes.[303] Maugin's expansions, specifically on matters of love and warfare, are reminiscent of Herberay's *Amadis* in their exaggerated addition of details to the Spanish original. However, Maugin departs from Herberay because, despite his expansions, he wishes to keep 'les guerres selon leur forme ancienne, sans canons, ou harquebuzes' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. A2^{v}) [the wars, according to their old style, without canons or harquebuses], whereas Herberay, especially in *Amadis* Book IV, modernizes the Spanish descriptions of battles, introducing many details related to artillery.[304] Herberay explains in his preface how he has modified the love descriptions of his original, making them more realistic, as I will discuss in Chapter III. Maugin clearly follows his predecessor's example but surpasses him in the detailed description of the characters' erotic encounters, making the translation even more explicit.

Anthony Munday's translation of Maugin's text was first printed by John Charlwood for William Wright in London in 1588. Munday divided the romance in two parts, which were edited separately, as he explains in his epistle to the reader:

---

[300] Annie Parent, *Les métiers du livre à Paris au XVIe siècle (1535-1560)* (Genève: Droz, 1974), pp. 303-304. I am grateful to Dr Jordi Sánchez-Martí for bringing this document to my attention.
[301] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 192.
[302] Mireille Huchon, 'Amadis, "Parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise"', in *Les Amadis en France au XVI^{e} siècle*, publié par le Centre V. L. Saulnier, Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris: Editions Rue D'Ulm, 2000), pp. 183-200 (p. 188).
[303] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 192.
[304] Guillerm, *Sujet de l'ecriture*, pp. 300-02.

> […] a Booke growing too bigge in quantitie, is profitable neither to the minde nor the pursse: for that men are now so wise, and the world so hard, as they loove not to buie *pleasure* at unreasonable *price*. And yet the first parte will entice them to have the second […] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. *3^{v}) (my emphasis)

Munday has been seen as a very crafty businessman, carefully advertising his texts in ways that will ensure an enthusiastic readership, and his commercial strategy is very clear in his epistle.[305] The English translator depicts books as means for 'pleasure' but also as commodities, and cleverly combines the two aspects to advertise this first part of the romance and the second one that will soon follow. *The Second Part of the honourable Historie of Palmerin d'Oliva*, was apparently first printed in 1588, as Jordi Sánchez-Martí speculates, although no copy of the first edition survives. Both parts went through three more editions each in 1597, 1615/1616 and in 1637. This shows that both parts were quite successful. Both 1588 editions of parts I and II were dedicated to Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, as well as the 1616 and 1637 editions of Part II. Oxford had been the dedicatee of Munday's romance *Zelauto* (1580), and Donna B. Hamilton sees these dedications as a sign of Munday's Catholic sympathies.[306] Nonetheless, Hill notes a hiatus in which Munday ceased to dedicate works to Oxford after the Earl was put in disgrace by suspicion of Catholicism, around 1581. Hill finds Munday's interruption understandable given that the English translator himself stood accused of having Catholic sympathies. However, Munday was involved in the betrayal of Catholic priests in the early 1580s,[307] which further complicates the assessment of the translator's religious identity. The other editions of *Palmerin D'Oliva*, Parts I and II, were dedicated to Francis Young of Brent-Pelham and his wife Susan.[308] Louise Wilson explains that Young was a merchant and that the different social status from his previous dedicatee is consistent with Munday's search for patronage in non-aristocratic circles at that point in his career. However, Wilson notes that the translator dedicated other works to Oxford after the *Palmerin* editions, and, after the Earl's death, to his son Henry de Vere, new Earl of Oxford.[309]

The title pages of all the extant editions of *Palmerin D'Oliva* Part I indicate that the romance was written in Spanish, Italian and French 'and from them turned into

[305] Phillips, 'Chronicles of Wasted Time', p. 791-93.
[306] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 80.
[307] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, pp. 84-85; 60.
[308] Sánchez-Martí, 'The Publication History of Anthony Munday's Palmerin d'Oliva', pp. 197; 206.
[309] Wilson, 'Playful Paratexts', pp. 126; 246 (footnote 18).

English by A.M.'. Nonetheless, from an examination of the text against the French version and considering Munday's use of French sources for his translations of the *Amadis* books, it seems that he did not use as sources the Spanish original nor the Italian version, translated by Mambrino Roseo da Fabriano and first printed in 1544.[310] Giuseppe Galigani argues that there is evidence that Munday may have only borrowed some names from the Italian edition.[311] However, it is noteworthy that Munday acknowledges, if ambiguously, the Spanish original here, when he presents the *Amadis* as originally French (as I will discuss in Chapter III). The fact that the *Palmerin* was published in the same year as that of the defeat of the Spanish Armada also makes this element of the title page intriguing. Although, as Sanchez-Martí notes, the first edition of *Palmerin* Part I seems to have come out in January 1588, predating the English military triumph,[312] all the title pages of the subsequent editions of Part I maintain this reference to the Spanish text. In this respect, one can see how the Spanish identity of these romances was in a way lost in the course of translation. This was possible, partly because the original narratives were not specifically Spanish in their basic structure, but also on account of the modifications brought on through the translation process.

All the title pages of the extant editions of Parts I and II, identify Munday as 'one of the Messengers of her Maiesties Chamber'. Hamilton notes that during the 1580s, the translator performed several services for government officials. In *A banquet of daintie conceits* (1588) he calls himself 'Servaunt to the Queenes most excellent Majestie', and his name appears in a list of payments included in the accounts of the Treasurer of the Queen's Chamber of 1586. Hamilton comments that Munday used the same signature as in the *Palmerin D'Oliva* in *Palladine of England* (1588) and in the 1596 edition of *The seconde booke of Primaleon of Greece*, which, she states, is the last time he identifies himself in this way.[313] Hamilton also notes that the term of Munday's appointment as Messenger of her Majesty's Chamber coincides with the period during which he publishes his romance translations. Hamilton finds this context significant because it reveals Munday's negotiations of his religious sympathies within a conflicted environment. She notes how the period follows the execution of Mary Queen of Scots and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and how Munday managed to keep the Spanish romances in circulation at such a politically controversial time. At the same time, he

[310] Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, p. 184.
[311] Galigani, 'La versione inglese', pp. 252-55.
[312] Sánchez-Martí, 'The Publication History', p. 192 (footnote 13).
[313] However, the identification did appear in later dates, in the subsequent editions of *Palmerin D'Oliva*, Parts I and II.

aligned himself with a kind of Catholicism which could uphold loyalty to the Crown as well as a form of outward conformity, which he makes specific in the pamphlets he publishes during that time.[314] While I find that it is very important to bear this context in mind, when analysing Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva* our only certainty is what appears printed in the text. In this sense, the title page indicates that the translator clearly wants to connect his romance to the Queen, but that is not something he labours in his dedication or epistle to the reader. In this respect, his paratexts are different from the Spanish and French versions, which demonstrate more clearly their loyalty to their own crowns.

Anthony Munday's Rhetoric of Marriage

It is important to analyse the treatment of erotic material in Munday's translation because it has been largely ignored by scholarship, since up to date there has not been any work on the subject apart from Mary Patchell's and Galigani's comments. In her study on the *Palmerin* series, Patchell dedicates one chapter to the theme of love, exploring how these romances follow or depart from medieval courtly love convention. She only alludes in passing to the characters' desire, and does not analyse the romances' attitude to sexuality. Patchell notes how the treatment of marriage as a romantic ideal is the greatest departure of these romances from the medieval courtly love tradition, with its attention to adultery.[315] Patchell does not focus on the *Palmerin D'Oliva*, and does not associate the theme of love with the act of translation or the relationship between versions. In her chapter, 'The History of the Palmerin Romances', she acknowledges the narrative trajectory from Spanish original to English via French intermediaries, but only for the purpose of contextualization.[316] Even though Patchell explains that she has 'compared the English with the French texts in some detail', and acknowledges Munday's innovations,[317] she does not analyse them in detail or compare them with the French source.

Unlike Patchell, Galigani does focus on Munday's work as translator of the *Palmerin D'Oliva*, in his essay 'La Versione Inglese del "Palmerín de Olivia"', and he dedicates a few sections to the translator's treatment of erotic material. Galigani argues that Munday edits and modifies the source to make Maugin's explicit sexual description

[314] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. xxi; 86-87.
[315] Patchell, *The 'Palmerin' Romances*, pp. 53-71.
[316] Patchell, *The 'Palmerin' Romances*, pp. 3-24.
[317] Patchell, *The 'Palmerin' Romances*, p. 18.

more decent and suitable for his English readership. Even though he notes some telling examples of the way that Munday changes the sense of the original and how he employs metaphors different from Maugin, Galigani does not dwell on what the language might mean. He assumes that Munday's imagery invariably makes the text more proper, and that this is done to suit the moral conventions of his time, but he does not explore the possible alternative meaning of Munday's vocabulary nor does he provide an account of possible influences on his translation practice.[318]

I find it is important to rescue the erotic aspect of Munday's work from scholarly neglect because, in a generally literal translation, this is one of the few areas that Munday modifies. In this respect, I will explore areas that Patchell and Galigani have not addressed. On the one hand, I will take into account what Maugin brings to the text and consider in what ways Munday is reacting to those aspects of his source. On the other, I will analyse the vocabulary and imagery that Munday uses to describe the eroticism in the romance as well as the way that Protestant conceptions of marriage and sexuality could influence his translation practice.

In his epistle to the reader, Jean Maugin explains that he chose the romance because it was full 'd'argumens amoureux' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. A2^{v}) [romantic themes] and in terms of his translation strategy he tells the reader 'je ne pris de l'original que la matiere principale' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. A2^{v}) [I took from the original only the basic argument]. Maugin used the erotic material of the original as a starting point but then depicted 'les amours à la moderne' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. A2^{v}) [the romantic adventures in contemporary style], as he also indicates in his epistle. Taylor notes that Maugin identifies the topic of love as appealing to contemporary taste.[319] The great number of editions of the French *Palmerin* indicates that this topic, among other elements, is still attractive to the readership of his time, as it was in the *Amadis* series from 1540s onwards, as I will discuss in the next chapter. In this sense, one can argue that Maugin and the stationers are drawing on a topic that they are certain will be successful with the readership. Taylor points out how, in his preface, Maugin justifies his hyperbolic and ornamental style, evident in his *Palmerin* and his *Nouveau Tristan* (1554), as indicative of the superiority of French over Spanish:[320]

[318] Galigani, 'La Versione Inglese', pp. 281-88.
[319] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 192.
[320] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, pp. 187-95.

> […] si en passant j'ay usé de metaphores, similities, et comparaisons, et alegué fables, poësies, histoires, et inventé vers, excusez le desir que j'ay eu de monstrer qu'en cest endroit le Françoys y est plus propre que l'Espaignol. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. A2^{v})
>
> [(…) if, in passing, I have used metaphors, similies, comparisons, and have presented fables, poems, histories, and written lines of poetry, I apologize for my wish to show that, in this matter, French is more suitable than Spanish.]

Taylor finds that Maugin's use of all of these stylistic resources in his translation proper produces such exaggerated expansions that to the modern eye they might seem ridiculous and even at times out of place in the narrative. However, she does concede that this 'richness of language and wealth of allusion' is an element that Maugin's contemporary audience would have enjoyed and it was also a way for him to 'invent' a new text and thus give the translation the status of an original work.[321] I would argue that, in the case of the description of sexuality, Maugin's use of warfare metaphors is not simply ornamental; the violent images describe apparently fulfilling experiences for both lovers, but nonetheless reveal a lack of gender equality and so construct and ambivalent message about sexual relations. Maugin engages his readership by direct addresses which link the fictional descriptions to their sexual experiences. The success of the French editions suggests that Maugin's explicit depictions and violent metaphors met with the audience's approval.[322]

In the case of Munday's translation, the tone of the descriptions is completely different from the one in Maugin's text. Instead of being explicit about the erotic experience of the characters, the translation draws attention to the connections between sexuality and the institution of marriage. Munday transforms his source in order to highlight how the union in marriage sanctions sexuality and this aligns the text with concepts central to the Prostestant Reformation. Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks explains that one of the most significant changes that the Protestant Reformation brought to Catholic doctrine was the positive view of sexuality within marriage, which countered the high

---

[321] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, pp. 188-95.

[322] For studies that focus on Maugin's translation and the Spanish original see, Alan Freer, '"Palmerín de Olivia" in Francia', in in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 13, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), III: *Saggi e ricerche*, pp. 177-237; and Anna Bettoni, 'Il *Palmerín de Olivia* tradotto da Maugin: editori, storie e mode letterarie nella Francia del Cinquecento', in *'Il n'est nul si beau passe temps Que se jouer à sa Pensee: Studi di filologia e letteratura francese in onore di Anna Maria Finoli* (Pisa: ETS, 1995), pp. 173-201.

value that virginity and celibacy represented for Catholicism. Martin Luther argued that true celibacy was only possible for very few and therefore sexual activity should be channelled into marriage. Protestantism understood that sexual desire was created by God and was therefore natural and a central part of marriage, not only in terms of procreation but also because it contributed to create harmony in the home. Even though it was not considered a sacrament, marriage was seen as a 'cornerstone of society, the institution on which all other institutions were based'.[323]

I will start here with the first sexual scene in *Palmerin*, where the eponymous hero is conceived. In terms of Munday's treatment of the erotic material, the scene stands apart from the rest of his translation because it is where he most explicitly depicts pleasure and because the validity of the clandestine marriage is unclear in the original, as opposed to the other unions in the first part of the romance. Subsequently, Munday consistently obscures sexual encounters, concentrating instead on the couples' commitment to marriage, if also maintaining a certain level of erotic suggestiveness. In the case of Princess Griana of Constantinople and Prince Florendos of Macedonia, even though they express their wish to marry each other, and Florendos asks Emperor Remicius for her hand, they cannot fulfil their pledge, because the Empress has convinced her husband to marry Griana to her cousin, Prince Tarisius of Hungary. Nonetheless, Griana is not aware of this engagement when she sleeps with Florendos; all she knows is the pledge they have made to each other and Florendos's intention to ask the Emperor for her hand; this and their commitment is enough for her to feel that her honour is protected.

The ambiguity of the union arguably leads Munday to stress the strength of the promise and a concern for female honour before the sexual encounter, in order to justify the explicit pleasure of the couple. In Maugin's text, when Florendos assures Griana that he will ask the Emperor for her hand, he tells her that he will first employ himself in her father's service 'en sorte qu'il s'y acordera' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B3^{r}) [in such a way that he will agree]. Munday's Florendos, however, specifies that he will go into service because he hopes 'to purchase his consent' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. B1^{v}). With the term 'consent', associated with Griana's father, the English translator highlights parental consent. Protestant modification of the marriage agreement put great emphasis on parental consent, which the Marriage Act of 1653 made obligatory in England (although such consent was later abolished with the restoration of the

[323] Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World: Regulating Desire, Reforming Practice* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 60-63.

monarchy).[324] Eric Josef Carlson explores evidence, such as court records, ballads and contemporary religious writing, of the actual importance given to parental consent in England. He finds that it was a common practice but that consent was many times given by other representatives of authority over the couple, such as other family members or employers.[325] With this detail, the English translator also stresses the elements that ensure that the union is binding, which he also does right before the couple's sexual encounter. Griana agrees to meet with Florendos in a private garden at night in order to lift his spirits, for he is very distressed on account of her father's refusal, and the Empress has ensured that the lovers are not able to see each other. Before she decides to arrange the meeting, her servant Cardina assures her that Florendos has the best of intentions:

> […] je sçay qu'il est tant vostre, qu'il ne voudroit, pour mourir, qu'il vous en avint inconvenient: aussi il ne tend qu'a vous avoir à femme et espouse […] (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B6^{v})
>
> [(…) I know that he is so dedicated to you that he would rather die than allow you to suffer any misfortune, and besides, he only wants you to make you his wife and spouse (…)]

Munday translates:

> […] your knight […] I knowe is so farre devoted yours, as hee will rather loose his life, then *impeache your honour* anie waie: and otherwise then in loyaltie to make you his Ladie and wife […] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D1^{r}) (my emphasis)

The English translator adds this concern for the safety of Griana's honour to emphasize that the lovers are careful to make a commitment before their sexual encounter. At this point in the text, the Princess does not know about the Emperor's refusal, nor that she has been promised to someone else. When they finally meet, Florendos expresses his gratitude for this opportunity to talk to Griana and pledges his service to her:

---

[324] Wiesner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality*, p. 73.
[325] Eric Josef Carlson, *Marriage and the English Reformation* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1994), pp. 117-23.

> […] je vous supplie, pour conserver ma vie, vous m'acordez que je demeure vostre à jamais, vous iurant par la foy que je vou doy […] (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B6^{v})
>
> [(…) I beg you, to save my life, give me leave to be yours forever, as I swear by the faith that I owe you (…)]

Munday translates:

> […] my life for ever heereafter remaines at your soveraigne pleasure: the unfeigned *promise* whereof, I binde to you by *irrevocable vowes*, but especiallie by my faith […] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D1^{v}) (my emphasis)

Munday's translation is very literal but he draws attention to the bond that is set up between the couple before their sexual encounter, with the term 'promise' and subsequently with the phrase 'irrevocable vows'. After these and other delcarations of Florendos's love, Griana says: 'je veux que soyez mien, et pur tel je vous retiens' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B7^{r}) [I want you to be mine, and as such I accept you], which Munday translates as: 'I see then you have given your selfe wholie mine, and so I am well contented to accept you' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D2^{r}). The English translator highlights Griana's consent to the marriage. As I will discuss below, the other couples in the text are more explicit about their clandestine marriage. Here, even if the lovers' intention is clear, Griana's engagement to someone else puts the status of her marriage to Florendos in doubt and this is why, I argue, Munday stresses these elements of the marriage contract, as he also does in the actual encounter.

In the description of the sexual encounter, the three versions differ significantly. In the Spanish text, Florendos only declares his wish to serve Griana before his instincts overcome him and he forces himself on the Princess, without her being able to utter any word of consent, as she does in the French and English versions. The anonymous Spanish author depicts Palmerin's conception as the result of a rape, and is explicit about the woman's distress. The French translator, on the other hand, makes the episode more sexually revealing but also includes martial imagery which renders the violence of the attack more ambiguous, since it also suggests the woman's pleasure. Munday stresses the couple's commitment and the mutual sexual fulfilment, arguably as a way

of pointing towards the theme of partnership associated with marriage. This concept was advocated both by humanists and Protestants alike, as Kate Aughterson explains.[326]

In the Spanish text, when Griana allows Florendos to explain his feelings, they sit down and he is overcome by desire:

> E como se sentaron y él la vido tan fermosa, *no* se le *acordó* de usar con ella de *cortesía* mas tomóla en los braços sin nada le decir e *fizo tanto* que la *tornó dueña*. Griana, aunque *mucho* le *pesasse*, no osó dar bozes *por no ser oýda*; quedó *tan cuitada* que, por cosa que Florendos le dixesse, no la podía amansar, *tanta* era la *yra* que contra él tenía.[327]
>
> [As they sat down he thought she was so beautiful that he did not think to be respectful but, taking her in his arms without saying a word, he did so much that she lost her maidenhood. Griana, although greatly grieved, did not dare to raise the alarm for fear of being heard. She was left so distraught that no matter what Florendos said, he could not calm her, such was the anger that she felt towards him.]

The encounter has clear features of a rape and even though the assault is summed up in the brief but telling statement 'fizo tanto', the fact that it is closely followed by 'tornó dueña', leaves no doubt as to the seriousness of Florendos's actions. The narrator underlines Griana's role as helpless victim by expressing her troubled reaction through the terms 'cuitada' and 'yra'. Likewise, Florendos's misconduct is undoubtedly portrayed in his lack of 'cortesía'. Claudia Demattè claims that Griana doesn't cry for help so as not to reveal Florendos's presence in her garden.[328] In my view this reveals the contradictory features of a social context in which a sense of propriety is stronger than the preservation of chastity, or the ensurance of personal safety. Her passivity acknowledges the helplessness of the female sex in the face of male desire but also as a response to social expectations.

In the French version, right after the Princess accepts Florendos as her partner, as quoted above, he asks for a kiss as proof of her commitment:

---

[326] Aughterson, *Renaissance Woman*, p. 9.
[327] *Palmerín de Olivia*, ed. by Giuseppe Di Stefano (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2004), p. 18. My emphasis. Further references are to this edition by page number in the text.
[328] Claudia Demattè, *Palmerín de Olivia: Guía de Lectura* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2004), p. 12.

> […] pour l'asseurance de tant de graces que me faites, vous permettiez que je vous baise […] (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B7^{r})
>
> [(…) to guarantee the favours you have shown me, would you allow me to kiss you (…)]

Munday translates:

> [...] to *seale* the assurance of this *divine* favour […] let mee intreate to kisse those *sweete lippes*, that delivered the *sentence* I have long looked for. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D2^{r})

The English translator's vocabulary suggests that, while acknowledging the erotic overtones of Florendos's request, he has in mind the establishment of a contract between the lovers, which anticipates the sanction that, in his version, the classical goddesses later grant the erotic encounter. This section directly follows Florendos's 'irrevocable vows' and Griana's 'acceptance', so these terms further stress the validity of the bond. The word 'seal' gives authoritative confirmation to Griana's commitment, and 'sentence', contributes a sense that the agreement is legally binding.[329] The adjective 'divine' describes Griana's favour. This is further enhanced by Florendos's identification of Griana as a 'divine Goddesse' and his love for her as a 'religious service', which are details that Munday adds to his source's description of Florendos's declaration, right before the previous quotation. However, the terms used are not only alluding to the commitment between the lovers but also to their ensuing sexual experience. The term 'seal' could also be a euphemism for lovemaking,[330] and while the term 'favour' could describe Griana's emotional approval it could be pointing to her willingness to sleep with Florendos.[331] Munday's addition of the term 'sweet' also contributes to his indirectly playful tone, since sometimes it was used to suggest sexual

[329] See the verb 'seal' and definition 3 for the noun 'sentence' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 20 October 2014].
[330] See the term 'seal' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, III, 1210.
[331] See definition 1 for the noun 'favour' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 16 October 2014], and the term 'favour' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery* I, 468-69.

pleasure.[332] Later in the text, however, the focus will be put fully on that which binds the lovers together, rather than on the sinful and illicit nature of the relationship.

After the request for a kiss, Maugin describes the action:

> Et combien qu'elle en fit au commencement quelque difficulté, neantmoins à *ville rendu* il ne fut besoin de fort *assaut* […] (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B7^{r}) (my emphasis)
>
> [And even though at first she protested a little, there was no need of a strong attack on a surrendered town (...)]

Griana's clear rejection in the Spanish text is here expressed as a certain reluctance easily overcome, depicted in the war imagery of surrender and attack. This is the same sort of *Roman de la Rose*-inspired allegorical description which Herberay includes in his translation, as I will discuss in the next chapter, so, arguably, Maugin is paying homage to his predecessor's reworking of the material. The emphasis here is on Florendos's success, and his crime, so evident in the Spanish, is here omitted. Instead, Griana's surrender is stressed in light of her attacker's persuasion. The French term 'rendu' can be understood as tired or worn out,[333] and so could be describing Griana's inability to put up any more resistance after a struggle. However, the meaning is ambiguous for it could also allude to Griana's willingness. Munday's translation omits Maugin's war metaphor, making the reference to the sexual encounter less violent, more abstract, and more euphemistic:

> [...] though (*for modesties sake*) at first she *seemed* daintie, yet at length *loove had so supprized her*, as he needed not strive when *no resistance* was offered. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D2^{r}) (my emphasis)

The English translator incorporates the idea that modesty encourages Griana to appear reluctant, as the verb 'seem' indicates. Where Maugin focuses on the Princess's initial unwillingness, Munday's narrator draws attention instead to an apparent concern for

---

[332] See the term 'sweet' in Gordon Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, 3 vols (London: Athlone, 1994), III, 1346.
[333] See the term 'rendu' in *Le Trésor de la Langue Française* <http://atilf.atilf.fr/> [accessed 01 May 2014].

female virtue. Thus, the English translator turns Griana's initial refusal into an intentional demonstration of coyness, and so grants her more agency in the encounter but, as shown above, this is also consistent with her concern to preserve her honour. The personification of 'love' softens both Florendos's moral responsibility (as love, rather than Florendos attacks her), and Griana's agency, since she is also 'surprised'[334] by, and unable to fight against, her own female desire. Moreover, 'love' can allude both to emotional attachment and to explicit sexual activity, since it serves as a euphemism for intercourse.[335] So Munday's modifications attenuate Florendos's role as rapist and show a woman struggling between modesty and desire. Even if the text is very suggestive of the erotic attraction of the couple, Munday's changes depict the encounter as one of mutual pleasure, in which the distance implied by the French aggression is here removed to highlight the bond that joins the lovers, which is also evident in the progression of their foreplay. Following upon the previous quotation, Maugin indicates how Florendos found no resistance:

> [...] au'apres ce baiser redoublé plusieurs fois, Florendos faisant petit à petit ses *aproches* se trouva *en telz termes*, qu'il eut d'elle *ce que plus il eust peu souhaiter*. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B7^{r}) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) after their kissing increased, Florendos conducted his manoeuvres little by little in such a way that he got from her all that he wished.]

Munday translates:

> Thus with *teares* and *solemne* kysses, they *breathed* into eache others *soule*, the *mute arguments* of their *love* [...] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D2^{r}) (my emphasis)

At first sight, Munday emphasises the lovers' emotional connection. His description of their kisses as 'solemne' adds a sense of formality, and perhaps even legality.[336] However, the alternative meaning of the terms employed allows for a veiled erotic dimension to coexist with the less physical image of the scene. The terms 'tear' and

[334] See definition 2.b. for the verb 'surprise' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 03 May 2014].
[335] See the term 'love' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, II, 828.
[336] See the adjective 'solemn' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 12 September 2013].

'soul' were also used at the time to mean semen, while the latter term could also be understood to mean orgasm.[337] The verb 'breathe' (like 'love') is a euphemism for lovemaking.[338] The 'mute arguments' are perhaps the silent manifestation of desire, a metaphor for sexual activity. Although some of these alternatives might not work syntactically, one could argue that the reader could supply the association. Therefore, even though it is highly symbolic, the scene is very suggestive of physical pleasure and more so because of the mutual enjoyment of the couple, in contrast to the French text. Although Maugin is vague about the level of violence that Florendos employs, the military imagery reinforces a sense of attack.[339] Furthermore, even though Florendos's actions remain imprecise, as the phrase 'en telz termes', indicates, it is clear that he is the main agent in this encounter. After the kissing, the French Griana's agency is absent. Munday's translation, however, clearly indicates the couple's mutual enjoyment.

However, at the encounter's climax, in Munday Griana is left out completely of the scene. Although the English translator has softened the element of attack, he cannot help but depict Florendos as military champion, albeit one sanctioned by love. Maugin, on the other hand, continues with the military imagery that he has developed in the rest of the scene:

> Non qu'elle n'y fist grande *resistence*, mais pnur [sic] ce le Prince Macedonien ne voulut s'arrester en si beau chemin, dont elle se monstra quelque peu mal contente. Toutesfois, avant que partir de là, leur *appointement* fut si bien *arresté*, que Florendos (à la *quatriesine charge*) prit entiere *possession* de la *place* tant *assaillie*. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B7^{r}) (my emphasis)
>
> [Not that she did not put up great resistance, but the Macedonian Prince did not want, on that account, to stop when he was set on so excellent a path, about which she showed a certain unhappiness. However, before parting, they had come to such a fine agreement, that Florendos (at the fourth charge) took complete possession of the stronghold so vigorously assaulted.]

[337] See the terms 'soul' and 'tear' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, III, 1274 and 1370, respectively.
[338] See the term 'breathe' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, I, 148.
[339] See the feminine noun 'approche' in *Le Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé* <http://atilf.atilf.fr/> [accessed 19 September 2014], and definition 9.a. for the noun 'approach' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 07 May 2014].

The French translator returns here to his warfare imagery to portray Florendos's sexual culmination as a military triumph. Although Griana's 'resistence' is clear, the hero's perseverance is highlighted. Munday omits Florendos's violence but sanctions his triumph by placing the climax in an idyllic setting:

> [...] faire *Cynthia amiablie favouring* this *delicate* encounter, added such courage to the minde of this *lovelie Champion*: as *breaking* his *Launce* in the face of *Venus*, hee bequeathed the successe of his *devoire* to the *gracious* aspect of that Planet. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D2^{r}) (my emphasis)

Here, the lovers' encounter is spiritual and solemn, the sexual act implicitly divinely sanctioned by Cynthia and Venus. Munday is arguably drawing on contemporary erotic poetry, in the way he uses classical references, as part of his metaphorical vocabulary of eroticism. In this sense, he seems to be responding, as many of his contemporaries, to the circulation of classical erotic material such as Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Amores*, poems by Catullus, and Martial's epigrams.[340] Cynthia's various aspects add multiple features to the passage. First, as the representation of the moon, she shines on the physical encounter. Second, Cynthia's support of this union, expressed in the phrase 'amiablie favouring', alludes to her depiction as goddess of virginity, therefore casting Griana's loss of her maidenhood in a positive light. Third, the presence of Cynthia as goddess of childbirth anticipates Griana's pregnancy.[341] The deity's approval mandates the lovers' actions. Alternatively, the allusion to Cynthia could be a directly sexual one, for the moon was also metaphoric of the female sexual organ.[342] In the case of Venus, the sexual association is more straightforward from the context. Nonetheless, Florendos's dedication of his triumph to the 'gracious aspect', might allude to the heavenly Venus, rather than the earthly one.[343] However, the term 'gracious' is itself complicated since it could refer to benevolence and mercy but also to attractiveness,[344] and the term 'grace' could also mean sexual favour.[345] In any case, this all contributes to cast the sexual relation in a very different light from that in the Spanish and French texts.

---

[340] Ian Frederick Moulton, *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 28.
[341] See the term 'Diana' in Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends*, pp. 98-101.
[342] See the term 'moon' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, II, 906-09.
[343] Considering the 'two Venus' view, popular at the time. See the term 'Venus' in Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends*, pp. 337-46.
[344] See the adjective 'gracious' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 03 May 2014].
[345] See the term 'grace' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, II, 614.

Munday arguably highlights the pleasure of the encounter and the lack of violence through the term 'delicate'.[346] Unlike in the rest of the scene, the English translator keeps Maugin's martial imagery to describe Florendos but here he is not a violent attacker, but rather a courageous and caring knight, as expressed by the phrase 'lovelie Champion', and his success is dedicated to the goddess of love. Munday uses the phrase 'breaking his Launce' as an allusion to the world of chivalry but also as a euphemism for intercourse,[347] as well as a metaphor for the male sexual organ,[348] thus depicting the erotic union as a heroic triumph. The English translator turns Maugin's assault into an act of duty, as expressed by the term 'devoir'.[349] This is not contrary to Griana's wishes, since the resistance evident in the French text is omitted here; in fact, she is conspicuously absent from the scene. Perhaps this responds to a certain sense of propriety in Munday which prevents him from depicting the female climax, leaving Florendos alone in his satisfaction. However, this is somewhat problematic because it depicts the hero in the same terms as Maugin does, as a soldier who takes possession of a stronghold. Nonetheless, on the whole, Munday succeeds in removing the violence of the French attack together with its objectification of Griana's body, and so depicts the experience as mutually fulfilling for the couple.

Munday further draws attention to the commitment of the couple right after the climax, when the lovers share a relaxed conversation. Florendos finally tells Griana of her father's refusal of his marriage request and of her engagement to Prince Tarisius. In response, she swears that she will not be forced to marry against her will and decides to run away with Florendos, because she loves him and, as she indicates in Maugin's text, '[…] puis-que desia je me suis faicte vostre […]' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. B7^{r}) [(…) because I have already made myself yours (…)]. However, while the French Griana alludes to the consummation as proof of the validity of the bond, Munday draws attention instead to their commitment, as the Princess notes she has: '[…] *vowed* my selve onlie yours […]' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. D2^{r}) (my emphasis). Nonetheless, even though Maugin has Griana call Florendos 'mon mary' [my husband] at another point in the dialogue, Munday translates this as 'my Lord'. Although this might be a question of style, it is significant that Munday does not incorporate the term husband. Perhaps this

[346] See definitions 1.a. for the adjective 'delicate' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 02 May 2014].
[347] P. R. Wilkinson defines 'break a lance with' as 'Enter into contest with, pit yourself against; have sex with (a woman)', see *Thesaurus of Traditional English Metaphors*, 2nd edn (New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 80.
[348] See term 'lance' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery* II, p. 780.
[349] See definition 4 for the noun 'devoir' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 12 September 2013].

responds to the fact that Griana and Florendos are eventually not able to run away together and the Princess decides to do what she feels is her duty and marry Trineus. It is only many years later, when Trineus is dead, that they are able to get married. Therefore, even though Munday highlights the sense of commitment in the context of their sexual encounter, the implication of Griana's adultery would have been arguably too difficult to defend, as it was a very serious offence in Protestant Europe. In some nations it was even considered as a reason to grant divorce and in England it was classified as a capital offence in 1650.[350] However, years later, when Griana and Florendos, finally married, meet their son Palmerin, who had been abandoned at birth, Munday, following Maugin literally, has Griana emphasize that she only agreed to the sexual encounter under condition of future marriage, as she explains to her son:

> […] God is my witnesse, that notwithstanding the perill wherein I sawe him, no perswasion could cause me yeeld him that especiall remedie, before he had first *solemnly vowed* marriage to mee […] (*The Second Part of Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. N1^{v}) (my emphasis)

In translating the French 'm'eust promis marriage' [he promised me marriage] as 'solemnly vowed marriage to mee', Munday arguably tries to 'correct' the moral questionability of the hero's conception. He does not seem worried about how the circumstances of his conception could affect Palmerin's reputation, as Montalvo appears to be of the hero of *Amadis* Book V, as I will discuss in the next chapter. Rather, Munday's text invokes Protestant ideas about marriage to present sexuality in an acceptable light.

Munday's use of alliteration and assonance throughout the description of Florendos's and Griana's sexual encounter suggests traces of euphuism in the translator's style. Helen Moore argues that in Munday's work of the 1580s, euphuism is mixed with the 'loose-limbed narrative style of Iberian romance and its hyperbolic incident, emotion, and rhetoric'.[351] In the Florendos/Griana love scene, this euphuistic mode is evident in the alliteration constructed by the sequence of terms such as 'seale', 'sweete', 'sentence', 'supprized', 'solemn', on the one hand, and 'feares', 'faire', and 'favouring' on the other. All of these terms are linked by virtue of their similarity in

[350] Wiesner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality*, pp. 75-76.
[351] Moore, 'Ancient and Modern Romance', p. 340.

sound, and contribute to stress the sense of commitment and sanction that underpins the sexual encounter. Munday's reference to Cynthia and Venus also adds the notion of approval of the physical union, as mentioned further above, and recalls John Lyly's use of classical mythology as part of the construction of his argument in his texts.[352] The section 'An[a]tomy of rare fortunes' in the full title of *Palmerin D'Oliva* arguably indicates Lyly's influence on Munday's romance, since this is not in the French original. Andy Kesson notes that the *Anatomy* of Lyly's title 'introduced the concept of anatomy to a non-scientific market', featuring in titles such as Philip Stubbe's *Anatomy of Abuses* (1583) and Thomas Nashe's *Anatomy of Absurdity* (1589), among others.[353]

Munday is explicitly clear about his admiration for Lyly's work and intention of associating his romance with his predecessor in a work published eight years before the *Palmerin*, his romance *Zelauto* (1580). In the title *Zelauto: The Fountaine of Fame*, Munday repeats the formula of Lyly's heading *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* (1578), just as Robert Greene did in the titles of his romances *Arbasto: The Anatomie of Fortune* (1584), *Gwydonius: The Carde of Fancie* (1584), *Morando: The Tritameron of Love* (1584), and *Pandosto: The Triumph of Time* (1588). Newcomb notes that these titles follow Lyly's combination of 'a protagonist's name and a fanciful genre name exploring a broad theme'.[354] In the title page of *Zelauto*, Munday also indicates that his work is 'given for a friendly entertainment to Euphues, at his late arrival into England', which he reiterates at the end of the romance, [355] closing the text with '[…] thus I byd Euphues hartily welcome into England'.[356] In Kesson's view, these examples make *Zelauto* the 'first non-Lylyan text to present itself as a *Euphues* book', a model that authors such as Greene followed by mentioning Euphues in their titles, for example in Greene's *Euphues His Censure to Philautus* (1587) and in *Menaphon: Camillas alarum to slumbering Euphues* (1589). [357]

Considering Munday's reference to Lyly's text, Jack Stillinger argues that either *Zelauto* was published after *Euphues and his England* (1580) or that Munday was

---

[352] Katharine Wilson, '"Turne Your Library to a Wardrobe": John Lyly and Euphuism', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500-1640*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 172-87 (p. 176).
[353] Andy Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 76
[354] Newcomb, *Reading Popular Romance*, p. 48.
[355] Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship*, p. 85.
[356] Anthony Munday, *Zelauto.The Fountaine of Fame* (London: by Iohn Charlewood, 1580), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 02 April 2015], title page; sig. U2^{v}. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s, sharp s, u/v, and ampersand. Further references are to this edition by short title and signature number in the text.
[357] Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship*, pp. 75; 85.

familiar with Lyly's work before its publication, since both authors were associated to the Earl of Oxford at the time.[358] Celeste Turner interprets *Zelauto*'s dedicatee, title, and plot as evidence of Munday's intention to avoid being downplayed by Lyly and trying to imitate a successful author. She draws attention to the way in which Munday associates his work with the *Euphues* books in order to gain benefit,[359] urging the reader to 'like that Lilly whose sent it so sweete, and favour his freend who wisheth your welfare' (*Zelauto*, sig. A1^{v}). Andy Kesson, on the other hand, while admitting that Munday probably used Lyly's 'marketability' for his own benefit, considers that, through the mention of *Euphues* in his title, he would have also 'extended the visibility of Lyly's protagonist' as well as promoting Lyly's sequel.[360] Munday makes evident his admiration for his contemporary's work and his awareness of his own shortcomings by comparison, as he tells the reader in the epistle of the first part of *Zelauto* that *Euphues* is 'excellent', while his own work is 'so simple', and that his 'wit' is 'so weake' and his 'skyll so simple'. Tracey Hill argues that Munday's modesty about his style is actually confirmed within *Zelauto*, since 'despite its euphuistic pretensions […] it is written in a sturdy vernacular'.[361] However, while Stillinger admits that *Zelauto* is a euphuistic novel he argues that it is 'much more than an imitation of Lyly's best sellers', on account of the way in which Munday combines this style with elements from chivalric romance and pastoralism.[362]

Unlike Greene, who repeated the *Euphues* title formula in a series of consecutive texts, Munday did not use it again until eight years after the publication of *Zelauto*, in the *Palmerin*:

> *Palmerin D'Oliva. The Mirrour of nobilitie, Mappe of honor, An[a]tomie of rare fortunes, Heroycall president of Love [,] Wonder of Chivarlie, and most accomplished Knight in all perfections*.

The full title of *Palmerin* indicates that Munday could be combining his imitation of Lyly with a dialogue with Greene. Apart from the term 'anatomy', noted further above,

[358] Jack Stillinger, 'Introduction', in *Anthony Munday's Zelauto: The Fountaine of Fame*, ed. by Jack Stillinger (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963), pp. vii-xxix (p. vii).
[359] Celeste Turner, *Anthony Munday: An Elizabethan Man of Letters* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928), p. 30.
[360] Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship*, p. 75.
[361] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, p. 70.
[362] Stillinger, 'Introduction', in *Anthony Munday's Zelauto*, p. ix.

Munday also includes the term 'mirror' in his title, in the phrase 'Mirrour of nobility'. The term was very popular at the time[363] and Munday had used it before in his *The mirror of mutability, or principal part of the mirror of magistrates* (1579) and Greene had used it in the titles of *Mamillia: A Mirrour or looking-glasse for the Ladies of England* (*c.* 1580), *Myrrour of Modestie* (1584), and *Penelopes Web* […] *a christall mirror of faeminine perfection* (1587). The combination of the terms 'anatomy', and 'mirror' with the hyperbolic repetition of the Lylyan title formula, might be Munday's response to both Lyly and to Green, who, according to Kesson, 'most thoroughly reworked, rethought, and remarketed Lyly's mode of expression.'[364] This title is an original contribution by Munday (or his stationer), since it does not feature in the French source:

> *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive, Filz du Roy Florendos de Macedone, et de la belle Griane, fille de Remicius Empereur de Constantinople: discours plaisant et de singuliere recreation*
>
> [The Story of Palmerin D'Olive, Son of King Florendos of Macedonia and of the beautiful Griane, daughter of Remicius, Emperor of Constantinople, a pleasant discourse for extraordinary entertainment]

While Maugin emphasises the hero's lineage, Munday incorporates Lyly's characteristic figure of parison to emphasize Palmerin's exemplary qualities. The style of the translation's title might also bear the input of Munday's printer, John Charlewoode, who had printed Greene's *Morando* in 1584. Discussing the marketable potential of prose titles, Kesson considers the similar influence that printers such as Charlewoode might have had on the titles of Greene's texts, since the former had been involved in the printing of Lyly's *Endymion* and *Gallathea* in 1591-92.[365]

In my view, *Zelauto*'s euphuistic style becomes very pronounced when compared to Munday's *Palmerin*. Whereas one can identify less evident traces of Lyly's style in the translation of the Spanish romance, mainly by way of paramoion, Munday is

[363] For the common use of the term 'mirror' in printed titles during the Renaissance, see Herbert Grabes, *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
[364] Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship*, p. 89.
[365] Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship*, pp. 89-90.

very straightforward about the model that he is following in *Zelauto*. At the beginning of the romance, Munday describes Duke Gonzalo Guicciardo and his son Zelauto:

> This aforesayde Gonzalo, (*renowmed* for his princely goverment, *obayed* for his singuler wisdom, *praysed* for his pollitique suppressing of prowde usurpinge enimies, and *honored* for his humilytie to his subiects in generall) was not onely accounted as a second *Mutio* among his freends and familyars, but even amonge his very enemies was also esteemed as a prince worthy of eternal memory. And nature the more to agravate his ioyes […] gave hym a Sonne called Zelauto, *whose* singuler humanitie, *whose* puisance in feates of armes, *whose* dexteritie in witte, and *whose* comelye shape in personage, caused hym through all Venice to bee greatly accounted of. (*Zelauto*, sig. A2^{r}) (my emphasis)

The author uses euphuism's characteristic figure parison to describe the father and then the son, developing a series of parallel clauses of similar structure (introducing with an adjective the ones that describe Gonzalo and with the possessive pronoun 'whose' those that depict Zelauto). By virtue of this repetitive construction, full of praise for both characters, Munday highlights their exemplary qualities. Furthermore, the author also makes use of paramoion to draw attention to the Duke's admirable features and to the extent of his power, linking, by virtue of their sound, terms such as 'praysed'/'pollitique'/'prowde','freends'/'familyars', and 'enimies'/'esteemed'/'eternal'. Added to this, Munday's association of Gonzalo to Mussius Aemilianus is an example of how he tries to incorporate Lyly's use of analogies drawn from classical history.[366]

Bearing in mind *Zelauto*'s evident imitation of Lyly's language, when one turns to a similar description at the beginning of *Palmerin D'Oliva*, the initial portrayal of Emperor Remicius of Constantinople, there seems to be a difference in style:

> […] the eight Emperor succeeding Constantine […] was named Remicius, who governed *so* iustlie, and with *such* exceeding honour: *as* not onelie his Subiectes intirelie looved him, but of the kingdoms about him he was *so* feared and reverenced, *that* his Empire increased more large then in the time of his Predecessors. This Remicius was of *such* a princely and munificent minde, *that*

[366] Leah Scragg, 'Introduction', in John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and His England*, ed. by Leah Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 1-20 (p. 3).

> no Knight whatsoever came into his Court, without verie honourable receite and bountifull rewardes […] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sigs. A1^{r}-A1^{v}) (my emphasis)

On first glance the use of parison does not seem as explicitly evident as in *Zelauto*. It takes a closer look to identify a parallelism between the structures of the three sections that describe the Emperor. All of these units present the combination of a cause-clause, introduced by the adverb 'so' or the adjective 'such', which emphasises his positive attributes and an effect-clause, introduced by 'that', which highlights Remicius's influence and power on account of those qualities stated initially. However, there seems to have been an evolution in Munday's style since his 1580 romance, by way of which the more rigid syntactical constructions found in *Zelauto* seem to have 'relaxed', making the text more fluid. The parallel structures in the description of Gonzalo and Zelauto, which were brief, which followed each other very closely, and in which the repetition of the syntactical construction was much more evident, have here been expanded and become more complex. Munday could have been following the sort of reworking of euphuism that Greene made evident in his romances. Nancy R. Lindheim finds that, as compared with the 'stricter imitation of Lyly' in earlier romances such as *Mamillia*, *Pandosto* shows a 'more flowing narrative style'. Although she finds 'euphuistic insertions', Lindheim argues that Greene develops a 'more subtle uniformity',[367] which is the sort of style that one can identify in Munday's *Palmerin*.

Added to Greene's possible influence, Munday's modification of style from *Zelauto* to *Palmerin* arguably has to do with the latter being a translation and with Munday's general respect of the French text. This is evident when one analyses the source for Munday's description of Emperor Remicius:

> L'on trouve es histoires anciennes […] qu'apres Constantin, Remycius fut le huictiesme qui luy succeda: lequel gouverna ses subietz *si* vertueusement *qu*'estant aymé d'eux, il se fit craindre et redouter de ses voysins, *en sorte qu*'il amplifia grandement son Empire. Ce Remicius estoit *tant* liberal, *que* Chevalier, quel qu'il fust, ne venoit en sa Court sans estre bien receu […] (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive,* sig. B1^{r})

[367] Nancy R. Lindheim, 'Lyly's Golden Legacy: *Rosalynde* and *Pandosto*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 15 (1975), 3-20 (p. 14).

> [One can find in ancient stories (…) that after Constantine, Remycius was the eighth that succeeded him, governing his subjects in such a virtuous manner that, being loved by them, he was so feared and dreaded by his neighbours that he greatly expanded his Empire. This Remicius was so magnanimous that no Knight came into his Court without being well received (…)]

Placing the two versions side by side reveals that Munday's translation is very close to the French original, and that the use of parison was present in Maugin's text to begin with, although the English translator makes the parallelism between clauses more evident by adding a few elements. However, if one bears in mind the evident euphuistic qualities developed in *Zelauto*, one can realize that Munday has restricted himself in the *Palmerin* because he wants to be as faithful as he can to his source. Nonetheless, he has managed to introduce euphuistic elements in his translation by imitating the sort of style that an author such as Greene developed in the course of his romance writing, first very indebted to Lyly's style but progressively modifying the legacy of his predecessor, incorporating different stylistic innovations in his texts, as R. W. Maslen notes.[368]

An anxiety about adultery arguably lies behind Munday's drastic editing of the next sexual scene in the romance. This is one of the most detailed erotic descriptions in Maugin's text and it involves Prince Lewes of France and the Duchess of Burgundie, whose husband, the Duke of Burgundie, is much older than she is. After an initial flirtation, the Prince and the Duchess eventually sleep together and Munday ostensibly omits much of Maugin's erotic detail, although he deploys *occupatio* to draw attention to the information he withholds. The English translation reflects contemporary views that condemned adultery as a very serious offence. Martin Ingram notes the social importance of maintaining the marriage bond, since adultery was seen as 'hateful to God' and 'a threat to the well-being of the commonwealth', and therefore it must be penalised.[369] Protestant reformers complained that church courts were not rigorous enough in the prosecution of this crime and proposed life imprisonment, exile, or severe physical punishment to chastise adulterers.[370] Aughterson notes that when a couple were ordered to do public penance for fornication or adultery the homily *A sermon of whoredom and uncleanness: against adultery* (1547) was read out in the church. The

[368] R. W. Maslen, 'Robert Greene', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500-1640*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 188-203 (pp. 193-95).
[369] Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1579-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 125.
[370] Ingram, *Church Courts,* p. 151.

text describes 'adultery, whoredom, fornication and uncleannes' as 'a great dishonour of God, the exceeding infamy of the name of Christ, the notable decay of true religion, and the utter destruction of the public wealth'.[371] This gives a sense of a dominant cultural attitude in Munday's time. The English translator also modifies Maugin's sympathetic treatment of female desire, focusing instead on unrestrained sexual conduct as a moral fault. This echoes contemporary anxieties about the imagined uncontrolled erotic conduct of married women, such as those Thomas Becon expresses in *The book of matrimony* (1564). Becon declares that the wife should 'content herself only with the love of her husband', and warns that 'if shipwreck of a woman's honesty be once made, there remaineth nothing in her praiseworthy'.[372] Quoting the Bible, Becon declares that an adulterous woman 'hath been unfaithful unto the law of the highest; […] forsaken her own husband; [and] played the whore in adultery'. He warns that the children conceived in this relationship 'shall not take root' and that the adulterous woman will leave 'a shameful report' behind her and 'her dishonour shall not be put out'.[373] In accordance with this sort of severe logic, Munday's tone here becomes very different from that in the previous scene, for the erotic suggestion is more restrained and the message sterner.

After he first meets the Duchess, the Prince is so determined to conquer her heart that he organizes a tournament to defend her beauty. In the Spanish text, she feels so touched by his attention that she promises to sleep with him at some point in the future, but he insists so vehemently that in the end she yields there and then:

> [...] tanto fue d'él aquexada que por fuerça le convino de complir con él lo que le prometió, porque ella lo amava muy demasiadamente: y tres días antes de Santiago estovo con ella toda una noche e cumplió sus desseos [...] Luymanes fue tan pagado d'ella que más que de antes la amó [...] (p. 89)
>
> [(...) she was put in such a predicament by him that she had to necessarily fulfil her promise, because she loved him so much; three days before the festivity of Santiago, he was with her the whole night and fulfilled his desires (...) Luymanes was so satisfied by her that he loved her all the more (...)]

[371] *A sermon of whoredom and uncleanness: against adultery* (1547), in Aughterson, *Renaissance Women*, pp. 20-22 (p. 20).
[372] Thomas Becon, *The book of matrimony* (1564), in Aughterson, *Renaissance Woman*, pp.110-15 (p. 112).
[373] Becon, *The book of matrimony* (1564), in Aughterson, *Renaissance Woman*, p. 112.

Maugin takes this concise description and expands it into a scene that takes up two folios of his translation. He supplies: details about the Prince's reaction to the Duchess's positive response; their agreement to meet on the next two nights in a secret room in the Duchess's house; and a reflection justifying the lady's adulterous actions. After Lewes's petition, Maugin has the Duchess express her willingness:

> Comme est il doncq' possible que vous aymant en la sorte […] je voulusse reculer à ce qu'Amour, et mon devoir me commandent? […] et comment pourrois-je plus endurer ce *mal* qui vous tourmente, retardant ce grand *bien, plus mien que vostre*, ayant dequoy y *satisfaire* et estaindre le *feu* qui tant estrangement *nous consomme*? […] asseurez vous (mon honneur sauve) que je seray preste d'accomplir ce que voudrez demander. Ie vous laisse à penser, nobles Lecteurs, si ce propos *pleut* au Prince. Certes il n'en faut poinct douter […] que ceste gracieuse parole ne causant en luy un *desir* plus affectionné […] (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. G6^{v}) (my emphasis)
>
> [How is it therefore possible that loving (…) you in that way (…) I would shun that which Love and my duty command? (…) and how can I endure this illness that torments you, delaying that great good, more mine than yours, having the means of quenching and extinguishing the fire that so excessively consumes us? (…) be assured that (saving my honour) I will be quick to accomplish that which you demand. I leave you to consider, noble Readers, whether these words pleased the Prince. Certainly, one must not doubt but (…) that this graceful speech aroused a strong desire in him (…)]

Munday translates:

> […] howe is it possible then for mee (loving as I doo) to flie from that which love commands me to fulfil? Let it suffise you then, that the regarde of mine honour defended, I am readie to doo *ought* may agree with your *liking*. What happened afterward, I leave to your oppinions, but by the *halfe* the *whole* may be *discerned* […] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sigs. V3^{v}-V4^{r}) (my emphasis)

Munday omits all mention of Lewes's 'mal' and of the lady's longing, focusing instead on the satisfaction of his needs, and not hers. In this highly erotic atmosphere, Maugin

playfully engages his readers, encouraging them to imagine Lewes's arousal, while identifying the Duchess's speech as foreplay. Munday instead indicates the lovemaking scene that should come after, but then omits it, teasingly telling his readership that they should be able to imagine the rest, a technique he also employs in the *Amadis*. Maugin, however, provides ample evidence of the lovers' encounter:

> […] mile *caresses* s'entrefirent les deux amans, en manière que la Duchesse s'estant *levée* sur le pied du lict pour là plus à son aise *embrasser* son amy, osa bien prendre la *pacience* (donnant lieu à l'Importunité du Prince) de laisser *gaigner la fort*, que le bon vieil Duc n'avoit jamais vivement *assailly*. Et fut *l'assaillant* si prompt, et adroit à son escrime, et la *deffenderesse* si benigne au soustenir de ses *estoquades gracieuses*, qu'elle *eust voluntiers* passé le reste de la nuict à tel *combat*, qui fut souvent recommencé par un nombre infiny de petitz *incitements* qui ne se font qu'alors, et se disent encores moins. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. G7[r]) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) the lovers caressed each other a thousand times, in such a way that the Duchesse, who had raised herself up at the foot of the bed, the more comfortably to embrace her lover, (making way for his importunity) dared suffer him to win the fort, which the good old Duke had never strongly attacked. The assailant was so quick and skilful in his attack, and the guard so gentle in facing these pleasant blows, that she gladly spent the rest of the night in such combat, which was frequently taken up again through infinite little stimulations particular to the episode, and not to be expressed.]

The French translator is initially explicit about the lovers' actions, detailing their embraces, but turns to conventional military metaphors to describe the progression of their lovemaking. More in the line of Munday's denial of erotic particulars, Maugin uses the term 'incitements' to allude to, but refrain from identifying, certain tantalizing details of the experience. Thus, he jokingly teases the reader for he has already revealed more than enough to get a clear picture of the encounter. Munday omits this whole scene and just translates Maugin's reflections on the consequences of old husbands' leaving young wives alone:

> […] la jeunesse venant en sa force et cognoissance de sa valeur, et estant pointe des esguillons d'Amour, si elle n'a qui satisface, à ses desirs, et les contente

> aucunement, il est bien difficile qu'elle ne rompe ceste austere continence, requise de vieillesse. Ie ne veux dire, toute-fois, que les vertueuses n'y puissent resister, encores que le temps, l'occasion et les solitacions amoureuses s'y offrent: mais telles doyvent estre dictes plus divines qu'humaines, et leur doit estre erigé un trophée au plus magnifique temple de la tentatrice Venus. Ce petit discours un peu hors matiere, sera fait en la *faveur* des jeunes Dames, *solicitées* de leur chair, desirs rebelles, indomptez, et de mignons importuns: Et servira d'exemple aux innocens vieillarts, à fin qu'ils prenent desormais pantouffle propre à leur pied. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. G7^{r}) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) youth, coming into its strength and knowledge of its value, and being the target of the stings of Love, unless it has someone to satisfy its desires in some way, it is very difficult for it not to break this strict abstinence required by old age. I don't mean, however, that the virtuous are not able to resist, despite the time, circumstance and amorous requests offered to them, but such women should be called more divine than human, and to them should be erected a trophy in the most magnificent temple of the temptress Venus. I offer this little speech, slightly to the side of the matter in hand, in support of those young Ladies, plagued by their flesh, by rebellious and unsubdued desires, and by sweet importunities. And this is also a warning to ingenuous old men, so that in the future they choose slippers that fit their feet.]

Munday translates:

> […] *vertous* Ladies *have power* to resist such motions, though time, occasion, and such amorous sollicitings did offer it them: but such may be accounted more divine then humaine, and to them may worthily be erected a Trophe, in *disgrace* of the temptresse Venus. But this little discourse […] is written in *reproche* of such yong *daintie wantons*, that *attende* on their over fonde and *unchast* desires: and may likewise be a warning to undiscret olde men, that they choose theyr Pantefle fit for their foote. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. V4^{r}) (my emphasis)

Maugin justifies youth's unrestrained desire, describing women who are able to overcome temptation as superhuman. Munday, however, omits the excuse of youth and highlights the capacity of virtuous ladies for self-restraint, setting this portrayal in

opposition to the figure of Venus. In the French text, however, to acknowledge female virtue is not, as it is in Munday, to the goddess's shame ('disgrace'). Munday has completely modified the tone of joyous celebration displayed in his description of Griana's and Florendos's union. He instead expresses worried concern about the moral dangers posed by the conduct of women such as the Duchess, possibly because her adultery appears to be more serious than the previous couple's premarital sex, since they had expressed their marriage vows beforehand. In any case, Munday's modifications, to this scene and the previous one, show that he is thinking about topical issues of his time for, as Wiesner-Hanks notes, the majority of cases that Prostestant courts dealt with in Reformation Europe were related to premarital intercourse. Wiesner-Hanks argues that this was due to an inconsistency between the official position of Church and state with regard to sex before marriage, and popular practice, especially in rural areas. While the latter considered that an official ceremony was required to sanction marriage and its consummation, people still considered that sexual intercourse could take place with only an engagement, or a promise of marriage, in place.[374] R. B. Outhwaite, on the other hand, notes how fornication and adultery continued to be a matter of debate for authorities in England, as witnessed by the great number of failed Bills that Parliament tried to pass on the matter of adultery (ten between 1543 and 1629).[375]

These concerns with premarital intercourse and adultery are consistent with Munday's later treatment of the topic of clandestine marriage. The translator reveals an awareness of contemporary modifications of marriage laws which privileged the validity of officially performed weddings over clandestine unions for the sanction of sexual relations. Several measures were put in place to modify the medieval Church's view which considered that verbal vows in the present tense were enough to make a marriage binding. Outhwaite notes how marriage needed to be regulated, not only for theological reasons, but also for economic ones, since a union could involve an important exchange of property.[376] Ingram, on the other hand, points out that the insistence for regulation of marriage and the control of sexual morality also responded to the government's promotion of 'religious unity' and to the wish of members of the Church and laymen to 'improve standards of religious belief'.[377] One of the ways in which the Church tried to exercise control was by demanding certain formalities for a

[374] Wiesner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality*, p. 79.
[375] R. B. Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage in England, 1500-1850* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995), p.11.
[376] Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage*, p. xvi.
[377] Ingram, *Church Courts*, p. 126.

marriage to be binding. The Church required that weddings should be carried out in 'appropriate ceremonies' which should be 'conducted by priests, preferably in the presence of the congregation'.[378] Outhwaite notes that many of these rules were already established in medieval times, but were reemphasized during the Reformation; nonetheless, the practice of clandestine marriage continued throughout the Early Modern period.[379] Ingram notes that while in the sixteenth century an 'informal declaration' was still enough by law 'to create a valid and binding marriage', by the reign of Elizabeth, people of all ranks assumed that marriage was supposed to be solemnized in church.[380] Munday appears to be aware of all of these issues, as his translation reflects how the two practices of clandestine and official marriage still coexisted, but also how the latter was promoted as crucial in order to make a union valid.

Palmerin and his beloved, Princess Polinarda of Germany, make love once they have taken part in a clandestine wedding. Palmerin's friend Ptolome, and Polinarda's cousin Brionella, are present at the scene because they have accompanied the couple to their secret rendez-vous. Ptolome also wants to sleep with his sweetheart, Brionella, but before any sexual encounter, she demands the same promise as Polinarda has had made to her. Ptolome agrees and the couple consummate their marriage. While both the Spanish and French texts describe their erotic union, Munday translates only those details in Maugin's text that concern their 'marriage' vows:

> […] Brionnelle l'empescha, disant: […] le passage ne sera point ouvert pour vous, jusques à ce que vous me faciez semblables promesses, que Palmerin à faites à ma Maistresse, à fin que ce qui sembleroit vice aux hommes: ne soit mal fait devant Dieu. Ptolome […] cognoissant assez de combien luy estoit avantageux ce mariage, estant Brionnelle de noble et ancienne ligne, et seule heritiere de la maison de Saxe, ne fut tardif à la response […] Ma Dame vous pouvez faire de vostre Chevalier et Serviteur ce que bon vous semblera […] Ma volunté respondit Brionnelle est, que vous soyez mon amy, et mary […] Puis qu'il vous plaist, dist Ptolome, je le veux tresbien et vous reçoy comme m'amie et femme. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. K1^{v})
>
> [(…) Brionelle stopped him, saying: […] 'the passage won't be opened for you until you make the same promises as those made by Palmerin to my Lady, so that the thing which people would consider to be a vice will not be an offence in

[378] Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage*, pp. 4; 20.
[379] Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage*, pp. xiii-20.
[380] Ingram, *Church Courts*, p.132.

> the eyes of God (...)' Ptolome, (…) knowing how advantageous this marriage was, as Brionelle was of noble and ancient lineage, and only heir to the house of Saxony, did not delay his response (...) 'My Lady, you can do whatever you like with your Knight and Servant (…) 'My will', answered Brionnelle, 'is that you be my lover and husband' (…) 'Since it is your wish', said Ptolome, 'I want this very much, and I receive you as my lover and wife'.]

Munday translates:

> Let us not heere forget, that Ptolome and Brionella were in the same *predicament*, for he knowing her to be of the noble and auncient *ligne*, beside, sole *heyre* to the house of Saxon, might count himself highly *honored* with such Wife: and therefore the like *coniunction* was made between them, so that nowe these Knights and Ladies were espoused before God, there wanted nothing but *ceremonie* of the *Church* to *confirme* it. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Ff2^{v}) (my emphasis)

Munday gives here no playful suggestion and concealment of erotic detail, as he did before, but rather, alludes vaguely to the relation between sexual conduct and commitment in the terms 'predicament' and 'coniunction'. Rather than combining the promise of marriage with erotic details, as Maugin does after the previous quotation, Munday omits the lovemaking and instead highlights details about lineage and honour that justify this marriage. Most crucially, he adds to his source a reference to the need for the marriage to be confirmed by the Church and by a ceremony, as Reformation clergy insisted on, in order to regulate the great number of clandestine marriages which occurred at the time.

Munday continues developing this interest in marriage as sanction for sexuality, drawing attention to the importance of an official ceremony to solemnize clandestine unions. Instead of omitting the premarital sexual relations of Prince Trineus of Germany and Princess Agriola of England, the English translator highlights the value of an unofficial commitment as justification for the loss of virginity, drawing attention, nonetheless, to the necessary eventual sanction of an official institution. In this scene, as in the Florendos/Griana episode, Munday alludes to classical imagery to render the consummation acceptable and omits all references to pleasure.

While in the English court, Palmerin helps Polinarda's brother, Tryneus, to run away with Princess Agriola of England so that they can be married in Germany. Once they are in the ship on their way back to the German court, Palmerin notices that Tryneus is very eager to unleash his passion for Agriola and so decides to perform an unofficial wedding ceremony so that the lovers can enjoy their sexual intimacy without committing any sin:

> Palmerín los desposó luego, e de allí adelante Trineo complió sus desseos mas *no* de tal manera qu'ella fuesse *dueña*, qu'esto no lo quiso ella consentir. E yvan todos tan ledos que no vos lo podría hombre dezir. (p. 157) (my emphasis)
>
> [Palmerín then married them and from then on Trineo fulfilled his desires, although avoiding Agriola's loss of virginity, for this she would not allow. And they went ahead happier than man could say.]

Maugin translates:

> Palmerin voyant livrer telz *assaux* à la Princesse, eut doute de *foyble resistance*, pensant bien que si Trineus suyvoit ses coupz, il eust peu *monter* sur le *rampart* et *forcer* la *ville*: parquoy s'avisa de faire composition, pour fuyr tout *scandale*. Et pour donner desormais meilleure occasion au jeune Prince et à la Princesse de s'entrevoir en privé plus *honnestement*, […] devant tous ceux du navire les espousa ou (si le trouvez meilleur) fiança par *paroles de present* deffendant toutesfois à Trineus, le *fruit* de *jouïssance* tant *desiré*, jusques à ce qu'ilz fussent en Alemaigne: car ainsi l'avoit il promis à la belle Agriole au departir de son Père. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. O6[r]) (my emphasis)
>
> [Palmerin, seeing him deliver such an attack against the Princess, feared the weakness of the resistance, thinking that if Trineus continued these attacks, he could climb the fort and break open the city, which is why he decided to make this arrangement, to avoid all scandal. And to give, from henceforth, better opportunity for the young Prince and the Princess to see each other in private, in a completely proper way, (...) in front of all in the ship he married them, or (if you prefer), betrothed them by words in the present, nonetheless forbidding Trineus the fruit of pleasure, so much desired, until they reached Alemaigne, for so he had promised the beautiful Agriole when they left her Father.]

Munday changes this scene significantly. First, instead of reporting Palmerin's thoughts, he has Palmerin speak directly to Agriola:

> How carefull we have beene of your *honor*, your selfe can witness, no motion being offered to preiudice your lyking. […] therfore to prevent all ensuing *dangers*, the actual *ceremony* shalbe heere celebrated, and the *royaltie* thereof *solemnized* when we come into Allemaigne. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Y8^{v}) (my emphasis)

The Spanish text makes clear that the lovers will have to wait to consummate their marriage, but Maugin depicts the outcome of Tryneus's desire as inevitable and omits Agriola's protection of her virginity. He adds Palmerin's concern about Tryneus's longing and again uses familiar martial imagery to describe male sexuality. Munday instead has Palmerin express his and Trineus's concern for the protection of Agriola's honor, in order to convince the Princess of the need for marriage. Maugin's 'scandal' becomes 'dangers'; Munday thus turns a social concern into a moral one, which is in keeping with his awareness of contemporary theological debates about marriage. He also omits any mention of the consummation, which Maugin assures will be done 'honnestement', once the couple have solemnized their love. The French translator indicates the validity of the marriage by the verbal agreement of the couple, specified in the present tense alluded to in the expression 'paroles de present'.[381] Outhwaite explains the importance that the verb tense had in medieval promises of marriage in Europe. Those made in the future tense only constituted betrothal, although they could be turned into marriage by the couple's engagement in sexual intercourse. Promises made in the present tense, however, were universally accepted by canon law, after the late 1180s, as proof of marriage. Outhwaite does note that the tense might sometimes be ambiguous but this might be clarified by sexual intercourse because that signified 'current consent'.[382] Munday instead highlights the actual ceremony which will make the marriage binding and therefore justify the consummation.

Earlier in the text, before they have set sail but after Agriola had reciprocated Trineus's affections, the English translator draws attention to the argument of a marriage agreement used by Palmerin to convince Agriola to run away with Trineus.

[381] See the expression 'parole de présent'in the definition of the noun 'parole' in *Le Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé* <http://atilf.atilf.fr/> [accessed 18 October 2014].
[382] Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage*, pp. 1-2.

Munday follows the French text in this assurance of marriage but he stresses the idea of a bond being set up between the two parties. As Palmerin is saying farewell to Agriola, he kisses her hand and, in an addition to his source, Munday specifies that Palmerin does this to 'confirme this promise' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Y2^{r}). Then, Palmerin cautions Agriola not to reveal their plans of escape and tells her, in another of Munday's additions, 'you must conceal this contract' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Y2^{v}). To me, the terms 'promise' and 'contract' clearly indicate the importance that the validity of the union has for Munday. This interest in the legitimacy of marriage is further expressed in Munday's attention to the role of an official confirmation of the union, as is evident in the Ptolome/Brionella episode. Here, even though there is no official sanction for the marriage yet, Munday draws attention to the future formalities, once they are in the German court, which will authorize Agriola's imperial status and by extension the validity of the marriage. Munday further draws attention to the link between institutional structure and the union of Agriola and Trineus just before Palmerin performs the wedding ceremony. At that point in the text, Trineus is trying to raise Agriola's spirits, assuring her that what Palmerin promised, in terms of her marriage and imperial status, will be honoured:

> […] vous purrez voir et experimenter la verité des grands honneurs et richesses, lesquelles par Palmerin vous ont esté asseurées et promises. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. O6^{r})
>
> [(…) you will be able to see and experience the truth of the great honours and riches that Palmerin guaranteed and promised you.]

Munday translates:

> Then shall you finde true, what Palmerin hath spoken, and his promises of *preferment* and imperial *dignity* shall be both *rightly* and sufficiently *perfourmed*. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Y8^{v}) (my emphasis)

While Maugin draws attention to the honour and wealth of Agriola's new position as future empress, Munday instead highlights the sense of institutional structure that will ensure the Princess's new status. The English translator associates the new imperial role

with Agriola's married status by using the term 'preferment', which, although it alludes to a promotion of status or office, it also implies and advancement on account of marriage.[383] The terms 'rightly' and 'perfourmed' also add a sense of formality to the lovers' union.

In Maugin's version, after Palmerin has married the couple, Trineus expresses his agreement to postpone the consummation, but the text is ambiguous about what the lovers do next:

> […] Trineus luy accorda voluntairement, disant, qu'il ne voudroit faire chose à la Princesse, qui luy deust causer ennuy ou fascherie. De lors se visiterent souvent Trineus et elle, prenans en semble un *plaisir* et *contentement* tel, que peut sçavoir celuy qui a experimenté telles choses. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. O6^{r}) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) Trineus readily agreed, saying that he did not want to do anything to the Princess that would annoy or anger her. Then Trineus and she saw each other often, receiving such pleasure and satisfaction that those who have experienced such things will know about.]

Munday instead expands on Palmerin's speech during the ceremony:

> So, if *Himen* claimes his *due*, you may graunt it *without reproch*, and *Iuno* will as well *smile* at her *sacred offering* here, as if it were in bower or hall. The credite of Princes, are charie, and angry parents may hinder, what heaven dooth further: but the deede doon, it cannot be recalled, nor can you be *divorced* but onelye by death [...] The Princes *both agreed*, they were there maried, requiting theyr *chast* love, with a simpathie of *vertuous* desires [...] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sigs. Y8^{v}-Z1^{r}) (my emphasis)

It is not clear in either version whether the lovers consummate their marriage but both translators give signs that indicate this as very likely. Apart from Maugin's allusion to the pleasurable experience of the couple, the fact that he addresses the readers, as he has done at other points in the text in which a sexual relation is explicit, strongly indicates

[383] See definition II.4. for the noun 'preferment' in in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 18 October 2014].

consummation. Even if we are not certain whether Trineus and Agriola sleep together, Munday highlights the assurance that their physical encounter would be sanctioned if they actually did make love. As he did with the Florendos/Griana encounter, Munday here also invokes the Roman god of marriage to approve the physical union. The English translator is consistent with his attention to marriage in his reference to 'Himen' and 'Iuno', both Greek deities associated with marriage. H. David Brumble notes that Hymen was god of lawful marriages only and that authors such as Spenser in *Epithalamion* (1595) and Shakespeare in the *Tempest* (1623) mention the deity to suggest the propitious aspect of a marital union.[384] However, Munday may also be using the term to allude to Agriola's maidenhood with the term 'due' and the phrase 'sacred offering'.[385] This might also be related to Munday's description of their union as demonstration of their 'chast love', thus alluding to the way in which their encounter is in accordance to Christian behaviour. Presumably Munday feels that he cannot go as far as indicating that the physical union is sanctioned by the Christian God, since the couple are not yet officially married, and so uses the classical deities to further stress the idea of acceptable behaviour that he has developed by way of his attention to the topic of marriage throughout the scene. In this sense, Munday also here stresses the idea of the bond established between the lovers by drawing attention to their agreement of the union. As a way to further stress the strength of the oath, the English translator highlights the impossibility of divorce. Weisner-Hanks notes that unlike many other continental Protestant areas in which divorce was granted as a solution for serious marital problems, albeit if being considered as an ultimate resource, the Anglican and Anglo-Irish Churches rejected it, continuing to 'assert the indissolubility of marriage'.[386] Ingram notes that annulments, as well as judicial separations, could be granted, but the records seem to show a traditional position against the 'indissolubility of the conjugal bond' prevailed.[387]

Overall, Munday's translation of Maugin's sexual material draws attention to the value of the clandestine marriage that precedes, and therefore sanctions the erotic encounters in the first half of the *Palmerin*. However, the English text also insists on the importance of a ceremony, and on the authority of the Church that makes the clandestine union officially binding. This concern makes Munday depart from his

[384] See the terms 'Hymen' and 'Juno' respectively in Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends*, pp. 174-76 and 190-92.
[385] See the associations of the term 'due' to conjugal duty in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, I, 423-424.
[386] Weisner-Hanks, *Christianity and Sexuality*, pp. 76-77.
[387] Ingram, *Church Courts*, pp. 145-46.

source and generally omit the more explicit descriptions of pleasure. His interest in the institutional sanction of marriage also explains Munday's cautioning against adultery and divorce. The English translator also solves the problematic loss of female virginity in these unions by associating the event with the requirements of marriage. As I will discuss in the next section, Munday emphasises his culture's Christian social values through the trope of female chastity.

Religion and Representations of the Near East

Munday's representation of Muslim culture and the Near East in his *Palmerin D'Oliva* invites investigation because to date there has not been any detailed analysis of these issues. Galigani briefly comments on Munday's translation of the word 'cross' for the French term 'croissant', which describes the birthmark on Palmerin's cheek, suggesting that Munday's substitution of a cross for a crescent moon replaces a Muslim sign with a Christian one. Galigani concedes that Munday might have not known the Islamic associations of the crescent moon, but points out that other romance heroes have birthmarks with Christian connotations, such as Valentine in *Valentine and Orson*, a work which Munday appears to have adapted for the stage, as is recorded in *Henslowe's Diary*.[388] Galigani does not go beyond the substitution of the symbol, nor does he dwell on the translator's views of Islam. He gives more attention to Munday's omission of Catholic material in the *Palmerin*, but also deals with this topic briefly, presumably for lack of relevant material.[389] I wish to expand on Galigani's observation, to explore how Munday depicts the supposed antagonism between Muslim and Christian culture.

In this context, Helen Moore's analysis of the topic of the Eastern Mediterranean in the anonymous English translation of *Amadis* Book V is helpful to understanding Munday's *Palmerin*. The English version translates the French *Le Cinquiesme Livre d'Amadis de Gaule* (1544), which Nicolas Herberay des Essarts translates from the Spanish romance *Las Sergas de Esplandián* (1510) by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, and which I will allude to further in the next chapter. Moore deals with a text from the same family of romances as the *Palmerin*, which Munday may also have translated. *Amadis* Book V deals with the adventures of Amadis's son Esplandian and his Christian crusade which culminates in the prevention of the fall of Constantinople. Moore notes the resonance that Montalvo's text would have had for Spanish audiences, in light of the

[388] Galigani, 'La versione inglese', pp. 263-65.
[389] Galigani, 'La versione inglese', pp. 279-81.

effect that the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the triumph of Granada in 1492 had on the national consciousness. The former constituted a Muslim threat to Spanish territories in Europe, and the latter, the end of Arab rule in the peninsula. Moore notes how both events are integral to Spanish attitudes to the Reconquest[390] and of the crusading mentality of the Catholic Monarchs' reign. Moore argues that where the Spanish readership would see the reconquest narrative of the *Amadis* Book V as of contemporary importance, English audiences would have regarded it nostalgically, on account of the different relations that England had with the Ottoman Empire at the time. She notes that for early modern English audiences, Constantinople had the symbolic meaning of a fallen city and was depicted by contemporary travel writers as 'an amalgam: an ancient city now ruled by a very modern power'.[391] Moore sees in the French and English treatments of conversion an increase in 'hostility' between pagans and Christians, a throwback, arguably, to the 'binary enmities' of 'medieval Saracen romance'. This anti-islamic feeling also informs more general descriptions of Constantinople. Moore argues that the French and English translators use these techniques to interrogate their 'national, religious and historical identities'.[392] I find Moore's literal and historical contextualizing very useful for building a framework with which to analyse Munday's translation of the *Palmerin*, and will return to it in the next chapter. Her argument about continuities in romance accounts of Christian/pagan hostility is especially germane to the translation of the *Palmerin*, and, building on Moore's views, I want to show how Maugin and Munday use these medieval stereotypes, especially those associated with Muslim sexuality, to highlight Christian superiority. I also hope to show how the translators draw on other medieval material apart from Saracen romance, such as medieval Saints' Lives, to portray the antagonism between Christians and Muslims.

Also relevant to the discussion are Munday's original work *Zelauto* (1580), and recent critical discussions of its treatment of the topic of Islam and the Near East. The views expressed in *Zelauto* can illuminate Munday's translation of the *Palmerin*. In *Zelauto*, Munday deals with the adventures of an Italian knight, son of a Venetian duke, who goes out to win fame. The romance is divided into three parts; Part Two deals with

[390] The term refers to the reclaiming and re-Christianization of the Spanish peninsula, in the wake of the Arab conquest of the eighth century, which culminated in the Christian triumph of Granada in 1492.
[391] Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean', p. 118.
[392] Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean', pp. 113-125.

the hero's adventures in Persia,[393] where he engages in combat to save the Sultan's niece from being burned at the stake for her converting to Christianity.

For Benedict S. Robinson, *Zelauto* exemplifies a 'crisis of representation in early modern romance, produced by the effort to negotiate the complex religious politics of the sixteenth century'.[394] Although Robinson sees the description of Zelauto's adventure in Persia as a product of 'an anxiety about the effects of Islamic power and Islamic law on Christian subjects', he argues that Munday is also depicting the internal fractures of the Christian world. In his analysis, Robinson takes into consideration the context in which the text was produced and the way in which Munday's romance is highly topical, considering that England was engaging in a military conflict with the Turkish Empire in Eastern Europe at the time, while also establishing commercial relations with Persia, Morocco, and the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, Robinson sees the potential execution of the Sultan's niece in the romance, depicted not only in the narration but also in the woodcuts that illustrates the text, as an indication that Munday was also thinking about the punishment of heretics in the Christian world, namely, the execution of Protestant martyrs during Queen Mary's reign and the killing of Catholics in Elizabethan times. Added to this, Robinson also sees the covert conversion of Zelauto's host, and his subsequent execution, as an allusion to the 'politics of secrecy' and surveillance against religious dissidents during Elizabeth's reign.[395]

Similarly, Constance Relihan analyses *Zelauto* as an example of the way in which Elizabethan novelistic discourses used non-European cultures to 'establish the limits of their own identity and the expectations for their social and economic class'.[396] These distant locations, she argues, allowed the authors of these texts to develop a 'highly problematized discussion of the oppositions between reader and society, between collective self and public Other'.[397] Relihan explores the way in which authors such as Munday, William Painter, and Thomas Nashe, used the East to uphold their 'ideological identity' and that of their readers. In this sense, Relihan sees the character of Zelauto as the representation of an idealized Christian hero. She argues that Munday

[393] Joshua Phillips, *English Fictions of Communal Identity, 1485-1603* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 136-36.
[394] Benedict S. Robinson, *Islam and Early Modern English Literature: The Politics of Romance from Spenser to Milton* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 27.
[395] Benedict S. Robinson, *Islam and Early Modern English Literature*, pp. 28-33.
[396] Constance C. Relihan, *Fashioning Authority: The Development of Elizabethan Novelistic Discourse* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1994), p. 119.
[397] Relihan, *Fashioning Authority*, p. 120.

highlights Persia's hostility towards Christians in order to depict an idealized location where 'Christian acts' could take place that were not possible in England at the time. Munday's narrative allows these sorts of actions, argues Relihan, because it does not include the 'internal political and religious struggles' of his own nation.[398]

Donna B. Hamilton, on the other hand, consistent with her aim to reveal Munday's Catholic sympathies, finds in *Zelauto* coded allusions to issues that concerned Catholics in his time, such as 'the imposed relationship between conformity and mercy', which is represented in this romance in the choice of secrecy and death as a way to defend religious beliefs.[399] Hamilton argues that Munday alludes to the second part's hidden message in his epistle to the reader. There, he discusses the 'two-faced head of Janus' and the siren's body as symbols that are misleading if regarded only from one perspective. Munday urges the reader to look for meaning in the whole text, even in the illustrations. Hamilton sees in the origin of the woodcuts further evidence of Munday's Catholic sympathies, since, out of the total of twenty, thirteen were first printed in Stephen Bateman's *The travailed pylgrime* (1569) and three in Thomas North's translation *The moral philosophie of Doni* (1570). The former was a Protestant reworking of a fifteenth-century Catholic text, *Le chevalier délibéré* by Olivier de la Marche, and so, argues Hamilton, the use of Bateman's woodcuts gives Munday's text a 'Protestant face'. Meanwhile, North's woodcuts, claims Hamilton, recalled the Duke of Norfolk's plan to marry Mary Stuart, since *The moral philosophie of Doni* was dedicated to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, who had supported Norfolk's plan but then avoided punishment.[400]

Munday's *Palmerin* arguably develops the same sorts of themes that Robinson, Relihan and Hamilton identify in *Zelauto*. However, the translator is not explicit in his support for Christianity here as he is in *Zelauto*, even if the text demonstrates a hostile view of Islam. There is nothing in *Palmerin* comparable to Zelauto's open expression of his faith, represented in his biblical instruction of his host and his potential sacrifice in combat. Zelauto's host tells him he wants to convert and asks him to teach him the Scriptures, to which the hero answers: 'I wyll helpe to mitigate your wounded conscience, by the sweet and blessed promises of our Lord and saviour Iesus Christe', (*Zelauto*, sig. I1^{r}) and then begins a detailed lesson. Later, Zelauto expresses his conviction to defend his faith in combat by saying: '[…] if I lost my lyfe in defence of

[398] Relihan, *Fashioning Authority*, pp. 119-20; 127-29; 160 (footnote 11).
[399] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 17.
[400] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. 15-17.

my faith, my Captayne Christe would purchase me the greater reward' (*Zelauto*, sig. I4^{r}). I agree with those critics who see in *Zelauto* a way for Munday to refer to issues of persecution and fracture in his homeland because the emphasis is placed on upholding a covert religion, different from the official one, and the consequence of persecution. However, in the case of *Palmerin* the translator's attention is fully focused on the East and on the relationship between Christians and Muslims, which is developed in much more detail than in *Zelauto*. While Zelauto's experience in Persia is depicted only through one main event, Palmerin and his friends move through several Eastern courts, in which the three versions of *Palmerin* can develop the interaction between cultures in a more detailed way. Munday translates literally most of Maugin's descriptions of confrontations between the two faiths and its emphasis on the negative portrayal of Muslims and thus appears to be influenced both by a crusader mentality and by a prejudiced European view of these far away cultures. On the other hand, Munday also translates literally Maugin's description of wealth and power of the Eastern kingdoms, which suggests an interest in the exotic element of these lands. However, on a closer examination, these sections represent these territories as containing cultures of excess. What is particularly interesting in the visions of the near East in the *Palmerin*, as opposed to those of *Zelauto*, is Munday's invocation of sexual issues, such as the threat of rape and a concern for chastity, in a texts in which he promotes Christian conduct. In this sense, as critics argue for *Zelauto*, Munday here uses Eastern locations to develop his views on what for him are topical religious issues. However, in the *Palmerin*, it is the theme of sexuality in Reformation England that which underpins his translation, rather than (as in *Zelauto*) themes of religious persecution. What is remarkable is the way in which respect for his source, and for conventional romance narratives, lead him to combine interests in sexuality and religion with those required by the setting of the second part of the story. The antagonism between Christians and Muslims thus becomes a vehicle for Munday to develop the theme of chastity and marriage which concerned him in the first part of the text.

Almost half of the action in the Spanish original is located in the East, because the hero, Palmerin, is heir to the throne of Constantinople. Marín Pina notes how this represents a shift from the *Sergas de Esplandián* (1510) and earlier romances such as *Tirant lo Blanch* (1490), in which Constantinople is a final destination for the hero. About half of *Palmerin* takes place in the lands of the Sultan of Babylon, the Emperor of Turkey and the Sultan of Persia. However, unlike in Montalvo's *Sergas*, where the hero is defined as a knight completely focused on Christian crusade, as mentioned

further above, Palmerin has no interest in conquest or conversion, even though he is defined as a Christian hero.[401] Nonetheless, the world of Christianity and the world of Islam are brought together in the text, more through social interaction rather than combat. Palmerin first disguises himself as a 'Moor' to ensure his survival in the court of the Sultan of Babylon, but later he is open about his Christian identity and is spared his life in the service of the Emperor of Turkey as a soldier, and then is later welcomed as a guest in the court of the Sultan of Persia. Marín Pina emphasises Palmerin's generally tolerant attitude towards the Muslim community.[402] Even though this portrayal of friendly coexistence takes place in foreign territory, in my view, it must be understood in the context of the historical Arab presence in the Iberian Peninsula. Agustin Redondo points out that even though the Spanish Reconquista lasted eight centuries, after the thirteenth century there was a period when hostilities were 'suspended'. For around the next two centuries, Christians, Muslims, and Jews established some sort of peaceful cohabitation. Redondo argues that for centuries a real and symbolic 'frontier' existed, at which the occasional military skirmish took place, but where different faiths also coexisted. This liminal space, the author notes, allowed for the encounter of the 'Other', not only in terms of rejection but also of relative acceptance, although the latter was possible more towards the final phase of the Reconquista.[403] Even though the Spanish *Palmerin* presents situations of conflict between Christian and Muslims, and many times depicts the latter through cultural stereotypes, Palmerin's experience in the Near East is generally one of peaceful coexistence between faiths, arguably a reflection of the centuries-long Christian-Muslim coexistence in the Iberian Peninsula.

Maugin and Munday portray an antagonism between Christians and Muslims apparently characteristic of Early Modern European misrepresentations of the near East. Daniel J. Vitkus notes an overall demonization of Islam in Western Europe, which he attributes, on the one hand, to a strong medieval foundation of polemical distortions about the Muslim 'Other', and, on the other, a fear of the threat that Islam presented to Christianity. Vitkus draws attention to the long endurance of distorted images of Islam, such as those represented in medieval romance and chivalric 'legends' about clashes

[401] Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, p. xxi.
[402] Marín Pina, 'Introducción', in *Palmerín de Olivia*, pp. xx-xxiii.
[403] Agustín Redondo, 'Moros y Moriscos en la Literatura Española de los años 1550-1580', in *Las dos grandes minorías étnico-religiosas en la literatura española del Siglo de Oro: los judeoconversos y los moriscos*, Actas del Grand Séminaire de Neuchâtel (Neuchâtel, 26 a 27 de mayo de 1994) ed. by Irene Andés-Suárez, Annales Littéraires de L'Université de Besançon, 588 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995), pp. 51-83 (p. 51)

between Christian and Saracen knights. Added to this medieval legacy, Vitkus argues, early modern Europe's anxieties were also encouraged by Islamic wealth and power, and, in turn, this was related to an inferiority complex originated after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453. Even though there was great tension between Catholics and Protestants during this period, and some Protestants were glad of the conflict between Roman Catholics and Ottomans, much poetry, sermons and religious polemic urged an overall union of Christendom against the Turkish threat.[404]

In this period, printed matter provided Europe with much of its knowledge of the East. Matthew Dimmock notes that in the sixteenth century alone, three thousand five hundred texts dealing with the 'turke' were published in northern Europe in a variety of languages.[405] Vitkus notes the incredible rise of interest in learning about Islam and the pronounced increase of literature on the topic during the seventeenth century. He mentions the popularity of 'true stories', such as captivity narratives, which told of the experiences of survival of Christian prisoners under Turks and Moors, or tales about renegades who had willingly joined foreign pirates in North African ports.[406] One such text was Bartholomej Georgijevic's *The offspring of the house of Ottomanno, and officers pertaining to the greate Turkes Court*, published in English translation *c*. 1570, twenty-six years after the French version was printed in 1544. This work encouraged European fears of life under Islamic rule, with its detailed description of abuse captive Christians suffered.[407]

At the same time, during the period which preceded the publication of *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* in 1546, constant diplomatic relations between France and Turkey encouraged the flow of French travellers, traders and missionaries, as well as the printing of texts about the near East. Clarence Dana Rouillard presents a list of 291 pamphlets on Turkish affairs published in France between 1481 and 1660, as evidence of the curiosity provoked by the area.[408] Michael Harrigan, on the other hand, draws attention to the fact that most of the seventeenth-century French travel narratives referring to the near East, focused on the Ottoman Empire, because of commercial and

---

[404] Daniel J. Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe', in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*, ed. by David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), pp. 207-30 (pp. 207-13).
[405] Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 6.
[406] Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism', pp. 215-16.
[407] Benedict S. Robinson, *Islam and Early Modern English Literature*, p. 28.
[408] Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French History, Thought, and Literature (1520-1660)* (Paris: Boivin & C[ie], 1938), pp. 169-79.

diplomatic relations between the two territories.[409] Rouillard comments that a great amount of information about the Ottoman Empire that came through pamphlets and geographical literature, revealed a particular interest in the Ottoman military conquests around Europe. One of the most comprehensive descriptions of the Ottoman Empire was *La Genealogie du grand Turc à present regnant* (1519), a translation from the Italian text written by Teodoro Spandugino in the middle of the fifteenth century, an eyewitness account which went through several French editions. It is a very detailed description of the Turkish court, which became an authority and model for later published descriptions of the Ottoman court.[410]

When Munday was working on his *Palmerin*, England enjoyed fewer commercial relations with the Ottoman Empire, than did France. Robinson notes that in the same year that Munday published his *Zelauto* (1580), the 'first Anglo-Ottoman commercial treaty' was being negotiated in Istanbul, which would 'lead to the establishment of the Levant Company'. [411] Since commercial exchange was underdeveloped, many of the English texts dealing with these distant cultures were, as Dimmock demonstrates, either, translations of foreign travel narratives, pamphlets dealing with military events, or polemical religious tracts, most of which had the Ottoman threat as their main concern.[412] Robinson notes that many of these sermons and pamphlets expressed anxiety about the 'effects of life under Islamic rule', and he argues that Munday's *Zelauto* shows his awareness of these fears.[413] Arguably he expresses them too in his *Palmerin*, as I will discuss below, and therefore reveals the influence of contemporary printed texts in his views of these foreign cultures.

Munday and Maugin emphasise Palmerin's Christian identity, and that of his friends, in order to establish a wider difference between them and the Muslim characters. One particularly interesting example is the way in which the translators use the Muslim threat of rape and Christian divine protection to represent this antagonism between faiths. On the one hand, the translators seem to be developing common early modern representations of Islamic society, which, as Vitkus argues, saw it as a location where 'unbridled sensuality' was the norm.[414] Related to this stereotype, Relihan, for example, argues that many English early modern novellas associated the threat of the East with

[409] Michael Harrigan, *Veiled Encounters: Representing the Orient in 17th-Century French Travel Literature* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 13; 20.
[410] Rouillard, *The Turk in French History*, pp. 169-79.
[411] Benedict S. Robinson, *Islam and Early Modern English Literature*, p. 29.
[412] Dimmock, *New Turkes*, pp. 20-95.
[413] Benedict S. Robinson, *Islam and Early Modern English Literature*, p. 28.
[414] Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism', pp. 222-23.

sexual violence against women by representing the East as a location which 'decentered' and 'dehumanized' Christian men who visited it, provoking in them unrestrained and violent desire.[415] This is not the case in the *Palmerin*, where the hero's restraint is associated to his Christian identity. The translators instead, emphasize the sexual threat posed by Muslim characters, and in doing so, they might be re-appropriating certain medieval stereotypes which Corinne J. Saunders identifies in the chronicles of the Crusades, where rape is depicted 'as a mark of pagan evil'.[416] By emphasising cultural stereotypes which connected the aggression to the religious identity of the attacker, and by drawing attention to the victims' devotion and the consequent divine intervention that saves them, the translators seem to be representing Christianity's ability to counter Muslim aggression. Arguably, this also allows Munday to continue focusing on the issue of sexuality and religion that he develops in the first part of the romance.

At the end of the first half of the romance, Palmerin and his friends, Prince Trineus of Germany, Princess Agriola of England, and Palmerin's cousin, Ptolome of Macedonia, are sailing to Germany, when they are taken prisoner by Olimael, captain of the Turkish army. Palmerin avoids captivity on account of his absence while exploring an island where they had cast anchor to weather a storm. Trineus and Ptolome are taken on board one ship and Agriola on board another because Olimael has taken a fancy to her. While they are sailing towards the Turkish court, Munday, following Maugin, depicts the way in which Agriola reacts angrily at Olimael's advances and manages to repel the captain's first sexual assault:

> […] with angry [stomacke] like a Lyon enraged, [she] caught him by the haire and the throat, saying. Thou *villaine Dogge*, thinkest thou I take any delight in thy company? How darest tho[u] *traitourlye thee[f]e* lay hande on mee? And so roughly did she struggle with Olimael, as if his men had not assisted him, shee had strangled him: notwithstanding hee tooke all patiently, perswading himselfe, that by gentle speeches, smooth flatterings, and large promises, hee should in time win her to his pleasure. So came he forth of the cabin, with his throat and

[415] Constance C. Relihan, '"Dissordinate Desire" and the Construction of Geographic Otherness in the Early Modern Novella', in *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England, 1570-1640*, ed. by Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 43-59.
[416] Corinne J. Saunders, *Rape and Ravishment in the Literature of Medieval England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2001), p. 142.

> face brauely painted with Agriolaes nayles […] (*Palmerin d'Oliva*, sigs. Z2^{r}-Z2^{v}) (my emphasis)

The three texts depict the scene in a very similar way. While the Spanish author has Agriola only scratch the Captain's face, the translators make the scene more dramatic by adding her intention of strangling him. Olimael is identified in the French and English texts, but not in the Spanish, as a 'traitourlye thee[f]e' ('paillard infame' in French) and a 'villaine Dogge' ('trahistre mastin' in French), a term which is later echoed by 'hound'; a common image used by Europeans at the time to describe 'Turks, Muslims, and Saracens', as Phillip John Usher explains.[417] Agriola's strong response against the attack of an enemy of her faith recalls the actions of heroines of hagiographical narratives and other romance characters similar to them. Andrea Hopkins analyses the links between saints' lives and some romances from the 'Eustace-Constance-Florence-Griselda Group', and notes how the protagonists in these narratives are strong and sometimes explicit in their defiance of their attackers. Hopkins describes the example of Florence, from the medieval romance *Le Bon Florence of Rome*, who breaks Sir Machary's teeth with a stone to repel his sexual attack,[418] a portrayal which anticipates Agriola's reaction here. The Princess's actions in this scene, added to the divine intervention that saves her in the other attacks, contributes to present her, and her chastity, as symbolic of the Christian faith, as I shall discuss below. Eventually, Olimael runs out of patience and decides to attack her. The Spanish text is very straightforward about his intentions and gives little detail:

> […] vido que le aprovechava nada sus falagos […] quísola forçar […] (p. 160)
>
> [(…) seeing that his praises were not beneficial (…) he wished to rape her (…)].

Maugin translates:

> Cognoissant doncq' que ses blandices, feintes, paroles, offres, dons, at autres douceurs propres à persuader ne luy pouvoient rien servir, delibera user de main

[417] Phillip John Usher, 'Walking East in the Renaissance', in *French Global: A New Approach to Literary History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), pp. 193-206 (p. 203).
[418] Andrea Hopkins, 'Female Saints and Romance Heroines' in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp.121-138 (p. 135).

> mise et aller par force: en sorte qu'apres plusieurs propos, mist toutes peines de la forcer. (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. O8^{r})
>
> [Knowing that his flatteries, tricks, words, offers, gifts, and other sweet gestures, suitable for persuasion, were not helpful, he decided to exercise dominance and proceed by force. On account of which, after many speeches, he put all effort in forcing her.]

Munday translates:

> He seeing that fayre speeches, offers, gifts, and other inticements proper to perswasion, could not compasse the thing he desired, he grewe into *choler*, intending to gaine his pleasure perforce, so that after manie *threatnings*, with *rough violence* hee woulde needes ravish her. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A1^{v}) (my emphasis)

In keeping with his hyperbolic style, as Taylor describes it, Maugin adds all kinds of details to depict Olimael's wooing.[419] Munday follows closely but crucially adds the terms 'choler, 'threatnings' and 'rough violence', which contribute to enhance the aggressiveness of the captain, thus highlighting, by contrast, the great power of Christian faith in protecting Agriola against this attack. Aware of her helpless state, the Princess prays for divine protection:

> […] ella començó de llamar a Dios e a Santa María que la valiesse […] (p. 161)
>
> [(…) she started to call on God and Saint Mary to help her (…)]

Munday translates literally from the French:

> […] with devout prayer shee called on God, desiring him to take pittie on her, and not to suffer that villainous Ruffian to *dishonour* her. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A1^{v}) (my emphasis)

[419] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 191.

Maugin has removed the figure of the Virgin Mary as a protective figure, like Herberay does many times in the *Amadis*, as I will discuss in the next chapter. The French translator, and Munday with him, draws attention primarily to the loss of honour. However, in the French and English versions (unlike in the Spanish text) the reader is to understand that Agriola has already lost her virginity at this point, on account of the consummation of her clandestine marriage to Trineus, as I noted above. In the French and English versions, then, the Princess's concern for her honour has more to do with her status as wife than as a chaste maiden, even though her official marriage has not yet taken place. The threat vanishes, for Agriola's prayer is instantly answered in all the three versions; Olimael starts shaking uncontrollably, and stops his attack. In the Spanish text, Agriola attributes her safety to the magical power of a ring that Palmerin has earlier given her, which ensures her inviolability:

> […] pensó que aquella virtud venía de la sortija […] e dio gracias a Dios […] (p. 160)
>
> [(…) she thought that power came from the ring (…) and gave thanks to God (…)]

While Munday, following Maugin, also alludes to the ring's power, he notably affords God's aid greater importance than does the Spanish text:

> The Princesse […] was […] greatly comforted […] *imputing* the whole *worke* thereof to the *Almightie providence*, and the vertue of the Ring […] wherefore with thankfull heart, and *elevated eyes to heaven*, shee sayd, O celestiall Father, howe great and infinite is thy *goodnesse*? howe happie is the creature, whom thou regardest with the eye of *pittie*? assurdly I nowe perceyve, that such as in extremitie have recourse to thee, shall no waie perish. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A1^{v}) (my emphasis)

Munday depicts the scene in a more dramatic light with his addition of Agriola's devout gesture of raising her eyes while in prayer; other than this, his translation is literal. The extended prayer gives a clear indication of Agriola's Christian identity and the trust that God's 'goodnesse' and 'pity' will protect her from a foreign threat. A magical

protective ring features in many medieval romances and its stone can be interpreted as 'a material sign of God's grace', as Saunders argues.[420] She comments that in *King Horn*, the ring forms part of other elements that represent divine protection, such as the hero's sword, and Horn is himself associated with the Christian faith in two episodes in which he defeats the Sarracens.[421] Maugin and Munday again emphasize this dynamic between Muslim sexual danger and Christian protection when Agriola has arrived in the Turkish court and is forced to marry the Emperor. The night before the ceremony, Agriola, seeing she has no choice but to go through with the wedding, prays for God's protection:

> […] aquella noche nunca dormió mas estuvo fincada de rodillas rogando a Dios que la guardasse, e dezía: "Ay Señor Dios, no paréys Vos mientes a los mis grandes pecados qué, aunque son muchos, yo por mi voluntad no quebrantaré la Vuestra santa ley ni la fe que devo a mi marido Trineo […] (pp. 162-63)
>
> [(…) that night she did not sleep at all but was kneeling praying for God to keep her, and she said: "Oh Lord God, do not dwell on my great sins since, although they are many, I am determined not to break Your holy law nor the faith I owe to my husband Trineo (…)]

Munday translates literally from the French:

> […] falling downe on her knees at her beds feete, shee thus began.
>
> O my God and *benigne Father*, pittie thy poore distressed creature, and forget the *offences* I have heretofore committed: for what is a sinner, unlesse thou in mercie suffer her to come before thee? Wilt thou then vouchsafe (O *wonderfull workeman of the whole worlde*) one eye of pittie upon thy humble forsaken servant and suffer her not to fall into subiection, to the vowed enemie of thy holy worde, *arming* me so strongly in this temptation, that I no way iniurie my Lord and husbande Trineus […] (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A5^{r})

[420] Corinne Saunders, 'Magic and Christianity', in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 84-101 (p. 89).
[421] Saunders, 'Magic and Christianity', pp. 89-90.

The French and English translations expand on the Spanish Agriola's anxiety about breaking her marriage vows to draw attention to inter-faith conflict. The Muslim captors are enemies of Christianity, bent on subjugation, perhaps even conversion. Agriola's personal struggle represents a more general cultural conflict. As in the episode of Olimael's attack, Agriola's prayer here is also answered; when the Emperor tries to make love to her on their wedding night, he suffers from an attack of apoplexy which makes him end his sexual advances.

The elements of these two near-rape scenes, in the context of the antagonism between two faiths, recall medieval hagiographical narratives, as noted above. Kathleen Coyne Kelly comments on how in these texts the virgin body of the saint represented the '"body" of the Church metonymically'.[422] She argues that the 'female virgin body' epitomized 'the most apt homology between the self and the institutionalized Church' because of its 'mystification as closed, sealed, intact'.[423] Kelly analyses near-rape tales from late antiquity to the end of the Middle Ages which include a threat of rape by a pagan official or suitor and in which virginity, and, by symbolic extension, the Christian Church, is affirmed, usually by miraculous prevention. Kelly notes that most of these tales of 'circumvented rape' were first written 'from the second to the fourth centuries', when the Christian Church was under 'assault […] within the Roman Empire and its ideological margins'.[424] Saunders notes that in later medieval Saints' Lives, the threat does not come from a pagan world; rather, the virgins sacrifice themselves for their faith in the face of the 'trials of family life, politics or asceticism'.[425] The Spanish author is clearly drawing on this tradition in these scenes and, by emphasising Agriola's piety and the divine intervention to prevent the rape, the translators are using these symbolic links to highlight the power of Christian devotion to counter Muslim violence. In this sense, Munday's translation of the French 'me preservant' into 'arming me', in Agriola's prayer before the wedding, echoes the language of these narratives of virgin saints. Kelly argues that the victim is protected from her attackers by an 'armor' that publicly proves her virginity.[426]

In her discussion of Thomas Dekker's and Philip Massinger's *The Virgin Martyr* (1620), Jane Hwang Degenhardt notes how, at first glance, the Catholic hagiographic

[422] Kathleen Coyne Kelly, *Performing Virginity and Testing Chastity in the Middle Ages*, Routledge Research in Medieval Studies, 2 (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 40-62 (p. 41).
[423] Kelly, *Performing Virginity*, p. 42.
[424] Kelly, *Performing Virginity*, pp. 41-43.
[425] Saunders, *Rape and Ravishment*, p. 142.
[426] Kelly, *Performing Virginity*, p. 42.

material on which the play is partly based, might be viewed as problematic in the light of Protestant suppression of virgin martyr material.[427] However, Alison Chapman notes the continuing popularity of the genre of Saints' Lives even during the Reformation, as attested by the great number of printed editions in the period. She argues that rather than abolishing the medieval cult of the saints, the Reformation limited its power.[428] Also discussing *The Virgin Martyr*, Julia Gasper argues that, in the religious context of their time, Dekker and Massinger incorporated a sense of ambiguity from John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* (1563) in the representation of the miraculous powers of St Dorotea, and therefore make her state that she cannot perform any miracles.[429] Arguably, like these authors, Munday here is representing the tensions between the old and new roles of religious symbols, as he does in the *Amadis* in his treatment of the cult of the Virgin Mary, as I will discuss in the next chapter. In this respect, the combination of divine intervention and the magical power of Agriola's ring, plays down any element of Catholic devotion. This may be linked to what Boro notes as a common tendency in post-Reformation Protestant writers to remove the 'supernatural marvelous' from romance, as it was reminiscent of Catholic faith,[430] although here, Munday does not omit it but rather transforms it. References to virgin saints are reworked to fit a different context, since Agriola is at this point a married woman, albeit through a clandestine wedding, and has potentially lost her virginity in the French and English texts, as I mentioned above. The three texts are arguably combining the 'proof of virginity' topos from hagiographical tradition and the 'chastity ordeal' of medieval vernacular romance and the *lai*, in which the issue in question is the wife's chastity, rather than the saint's virginity.[431] Considering this, the possibility of temptation, which the French and English translators incorporate in Agriola's prayer before the wedding, might be hinting to the issue of adultery and ambiguity developed in vernacular romance and the *lai*. This issue of Agriola's married status, as opposed to the virginal condition of the hagiographic heroine, would, arguably, not have been problematic to an early modern

[427] Jane Hwang Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 74.
[428] Alison Chapman, *Patrons and Patron Saints in Early Modern English Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 11-12.
[429] Julia Gasper, 'The Sources of The Virgin Martyr', *The Review of English Studies*, n.s., 42 (1991), 17-31 (p. 18).
[430] Boro, 'Introduction', in *Mirror*, p. 9.
[431] Kelly, *Performing Virginity*, pp. 61-90.

audience since the Catholic ideal of female virginity had been replaced by the Protestant ideal of married chastity, as I discussed in the first section.[432]

Munday anticipates, at the end of *Palmerin* Part I, the concern for chastity that he later develops in the second part, by drawing attention to Agriola's near-rape experiences. At the end of Part I, Ptolome tries to comfort Trineus who is desperate to see Agriola taken away. Ptolome tells him: 'As for your Lady Agriola, doubt not of her unconquerable loyalty, for shee hath in her custody a *iewel* of such vertue, as no one can dishonour her against her owne lyking' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Z3^{r}) (my emphasis). Munday plays here with the term 'iewel' (which translates the French 'bague') for he could be referring to the ring, but he could also be referring to Agriola's chastity, since he uses the term in this sense at other points in the text. A few lines after this dialogue, Munday specifically alludes to the topic in an epistle to the reader which puts an end to Part I, and which is original to the English text. The translator provides a summary of the final events and points towards the resolution of the pending narrative in Part II. Munday here refers twice to the Princess's situation:

> Right straunge will bee the meeting of all these friendes againe, after the hazards of many perillous fortunes. For Agriola thus separated from the Prince her husband, is maried to the great Emperour of Turkie: howe wonderfully the *ring* which Palmerin gaue her, preserves her *chastitie*, will be worth the hearing. (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Z4^{r}) (my emphasis)

After this, he anticipates the reunion of the three main couples at the end of Part II:

> How Palmerin gaines his Polinarda, Trineus his *chast* wife Agriola, Ptolome his Brionella, and all Honors meeting togither in the Emperours Court of Allemaigne, wil be so strange as the like was never heard […] (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Z4^{r}) (my emphasis)

Clearly Munday is concerned with the issue of chastity and he reveals this interest at other points in the text. Crucially for the discussion of his religious message, he only

[432] Richard Halpern, 'Puritanism and Maenadism in *A Mask*', in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 88-105 (p. 92).

points here to the power of the ring in protecting Agriola's chastity, whereas he later clearly gives divine intervention the same amount of importance, as I discussed above. Perhaps his omission here of the religious connotations of the Princess's miraculous protection is indicative of an intention of self-preservation which makes him avoid being overt about matters of religious polemic in the paratexts of his editions, as is evident from the lack of religious references in his dedications and epistles to the reader.

Agriola's invocation to the 'wonderfull workeman of the whole worlde', in Munday's version of her prayer, quoted further above, merits some commentary. The term 'workman' was used at the time to refer to God but the whole phrase does not appear to be that common and it can illuminate the translator's cultural context. The *OED* quotes the use of the term in 1586 in the phrase 'This Speech [=Logos] being the workman of God the Lord of the whole world', included in the text *A woorke concerning the trewnesse of the christian religion* (1587), translated first by Philip Sidney but finished by Arthur Golding and published by John Charlwood, who also published the first part of Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva*.[433] The phrase, 'workeman of the whole worlde' is used by the minister and diarist James Melville in his devotional work *Ane fruitful and comfortable exhortation anent death* (1597), published in the same year as Munday's second editions of his *Palmerin* Parts I and II. Geoffrey Fenton uses the phrase 'workeman of the world' in his *Golden epistles* (1575), a collection of letters translated from Latin, French, Italian, and from Antonio de Guevara's work, which was dedicated to Anne de Vere, Countess of Oxford, wife of Edward de Vere, to whom Munday had dedicated *Zelauto* and some editions of his *Palmerin*, as noted further above. Apart from the connection of dedicatees, this work is meaningful also because of the link it suggests between Munday and an early modern polyglot culture. In this sense, while the links to these other texts and authors can provide details of Munday's religious sympathies, they are also worth considering in terms of what they can say about the intellectual culture in his time and the way in which authors and translators communicated through an intertextual dialogue. This can also be associated with the way in which Munday has potentially incorporated stereotypes against Islam from contemporary printed material.

Maugin's and Munday's emphasis on explicit divine intervention in Agriola's near-rape experiences is unique in the text, for the Christian association of later

[433] See definition 3 for the noun 'workman' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 10 October 2014].

supernatural events is presented in a less straightforward manner. After Palmerin realizes that his friends are missing, he decides to explore the island to see if he can find out what has become of them. On his way, he meets a 'Moor', is forced to fight him, kills him and disguises himself in the man's clothes so that he can ensure his survival, also deciding to pretend he is mute. Eventually, he meets Princess Alchidiana of Babylon and kills a man in her retinue in self-defence. Alchidiana takes a fancy to him, acknowledges that he was provoked by the man and invites Palmerin to join her in the Sultan's court. Although her father is also convinced that Palmerin was trying to defend himself, the Sultan must respond to the family of the dead man who demand justice. In order to please everyone, the Sultan orders that Palmerin must be eaten by lions, but he promises Alchidiana that the hero will only be left a few minutes in the lions' den and then be taken out before he comes to harm. Despite the ensuing challenge, Palmerin gives thanks to God in the three versions for being favoured by Alchidiana in his time of misfortune. Before he enters the den, Alchidiana gives him a mantle to wear and Munday, following Maugin, tells us that '[…] hee boldly entered, desiring God to assist him in this perill' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. B3^{v}). Once inside, the lions smell him and refuse to touch him 'as it were knowing the bloud royall' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. B3^{v}), explains Munday, following his source. The lions lie down in front of Palmerin and Munday has them demonstrate their friendly disposition by licking the hero. Three leopards which are also in the den are quite violent, however, and Palmerin is forced to kill them. The Sultan and his court are all impressed and the sovereign '[…] made more estimation of him then hee did before and because the Lions refused to touch him, reputed him of royall parentage' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. B4^{r}). The Spanish original also has the same outcome but Maugin adds the prayer before the challenge. Even though the hero's safety is explained by Palmerin's royal status, as is typical of romance, I find that the prayer is meaningful, considering that, only three chapters before, Agriola was protected from the Emperor's sexual attack by divine intervention. The mantle and Palmerin's lineage, however, perform the same function as Agriola's ring in rendering the agency of Providence ambiguous, since the marvellous may not necessarily be explained in religious terms.

The next miraculous event is the most fantastic of them all but is also the most ambiguous in its association with Christian faith. Towards the end of the three versions, Palmerin and Trineus come to the Sultan of Persia's court for his wedding. The Sultan encourages his two sisters Lyzanda and Aurencida to seduce the heroes so that they will agree to marry them and remain in his court. Palmerin resists the temptation, but

Trineus ends up sleeping with Aurencida, despite Palmerin's warning and his commitment to Agriola. When the Sultan finds out, he is very angry because they have not agreed to get married beforehand. He proposes not to punish them if Trineus accepts the engagement, but the Prince refuses and so the lovers are condemned to be burned. On the day that Trineus and Aurencida are to be killed, Palmerin is ready with his men to intercept the Sultan's soldiers who are taking the Prince and Princess to their place of execution. However, before Palmerin has a chance to attack, a great miraculous storm breaks out:

> […] the ayre was suddenly obscured, and such thunder, haile and raine fell, as never was the lyke heard or seene before, the Soldanes squadron seemed to bee all in a flaming fire. The poore Persians thinking the end of the world was come uppon them, fledde towards the Cittie: but notwithstanding all theyr haste, the greatest part of them remained dead in the field. If the natural fire (prepared for Tryneus*)* made him fearful, doubtlesse this fire raysed by *coniuration* made him much more affrighted […] (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. V3^{v})

Here Munday follows Maugin literally, just as the French translator has followed the Spanish. However, one crucial addition made by Maugin is the description of Trineus's reaction to the storm and the implication that there may be some supernatural element associated with it, indicated by Munday through the term 'coniuration' (translating the French 'conjuration'). The term 'coniuration' clearly implies the presence of the supernatural or the magical, although it was used disapprovingly during the Reformation to refer to profane practices.[434] Saunders argues that magic in romance many times works towards the 'illumination of divine providence'.[435] This could help to explain the role of the storm here, in the context of the Christian emphasis that the translators bring to other parts of the text. Just as Saunders interprets as expressions of divine protection the 'blowing winds and driving seas' that help Horn, in his romance, to move to different locations,[436] so this storm in the *Palmerin* has a similar role in the way it benefits Trineus. The Spanish author, at first, only hints at this mysterious cause by introducing the storm with the phrase 'avino una cosa maravillosa' (p. 334) [a wonderful thing came], where the adjective 'maravillosa' can be alluding to the

[434] See definition 3 for the noun 'conjuration' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 10 October 2014].
[435] Saunders, 'Magic and Christianity', p. 101.
[436] Saunders, 'Magic and Christianity', pp. 90; 101.

extraordinary quality of the event but not necessarily to its supernatural cause.[437] However, the Spanish text later describes the Sultan's reaction:

> […] el Soldán en su palacio no pensó de ser escapado de la muerte e pensava qu'el su gran pecado avía fecho aquello e ar[r]epentiéndose de lo que avía fecho. E desque la tormenta fue secada, los cavalleros vinieron ante el Soldán muy espantados e dezían que *Dios* avía fecho aquella gran maravella por librar a Trineo […] (p. 335)
>
> [(…) the Sultan in his palace did not think to escape death and thought he had committed great sin and repented what he had done. When the storm had dried up, the frightened knights came before the Sultan saying that God had caused that great marvel to liberate Trineo (…)]

Maugin translates:

> Le Soudan […] estoit tellement estonné, qu'il cuy doit estre à la fin de ses jours […] Las, disoit il, je cognois maintenant, que *le Dieu de la haut* est courroucé contre moy, veu les espoventables signes qui son apparuz à ce jour. L'un des Princes luy venoit dire: Sire, la foudre est cheute en la basse court, qui a occis tous voz *enfans* d'honneur. L'autre […] il est mort plus de trois parts des soldatz […] (sigs. Dd2^{v}-Dd3^{r}) (my emphasis)
>
> [The Sultan (…) was so astonished that he thought he was at the end of his days (…) 'Alas', he said, 'I know now that the God on high is angry with me, seeing the horrendous signs that have appeared this day'. One of the Princes came to tell him: 'Lord', the lightning that has struck in the courtyard has killed all your junior ushers. Moreover (…) it has killed three quarters of the soldiers (…)]

Munday translates:

> After a long and verie dangerous tempest, with whirle-windes, lightnings, and straunge apparitions, to the *great discomfort* of all the *Persians*: one of the Princes, came to the Soldane, saying.

[437] See the adjective 'maravilloso' in *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* <*http://lema.rae.es/drae/*>[accessed 19 November 2014].

> My Lord, the lightning hath fallen so terriblie in the Court, as all the *Ladies* of honour are slaine therewith. An other brought newes, that three partes of the soldiours […] lay all slaine in the rough tempest. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. V4^{r}) (my emphasis)

Both the Spanish and French texts associate the events with the intervention of divinity and the former hints at an association with the Christian God because it alludes to Trineus' safety as a result of the past events. However, Munday omits the Sultan's acknowledgement of providence, highlighting instead the 'great discomfort of all the Persians', thus still establishing a difference between the two faiths. This follows the French which, instead of associated events directly with Trineus, adds details about the tragedy that befalls the Persians. What is particularly intriguing here is Munday's translation of 'enfans d'honneur' as 'Ladies of honour'. While this might be explained by Munday's ignorance of a direct translation for the French term, another possibility is to link this to his concern for female chastity. In the case of this section of the romance, the miraculous storm might not only be seen as a punishment for the Sultan's tyrannical actions but also for Aurencida's improper conduct.

Even though the Christian connection with these divine interventions is at times ambiguous in the translations, Maugin and Munday highlight the antagonism between faiths through other means, namely, the characters' prayers and religious reflections. The translators depict the experience in Muslim territory as a test of their faith and modify the Spanish Palmerin's motivation of returning to his lover Polinarda, drawing attention instead to his aim of leaving the dangers of the 'heathen' land and return to the safety of Christendom. In the Spanish text, when Trineus, Ptolome, and Agriola are about to be separated and made prisoners by Captain Olimael, Ptolome comforts the Prince who feels desperate in these troubling times (see above), assuring him how '[…] muchas vezes acorría Dios a las grandes cuytas […]' (p. 159) [(…) many times God aided those in great trouble (…)]. However, Munday, following Maugin, transforms Ptolome's speech:

> […] will ye be subiect to passions […] You that are sprung from the most auncient noble and generous *race* of *Christendome* […] when he that hath assurance of his God, and knows that all persecutions, fortunes and mishaps, are *prooves* of his fidelitie, and the meanes to attaine *eternal quiet* […] and if

> you will not perswade your selfe, that these troubles happen for the increasing of our ioye, it maye bee the meane that God will forsake us. Then neyther feare or dispayre I praye you, for he that suffered us to fall into these *Moores hands*, both can and will deliver us againe […] Comfort your selfe then in the power of the highest, and repose your selfe […] with this certaine perswasion, that this *crosse* and adversitie hath fallen upon us, for our greater good and *advauncement* heereafter. (*Palmerin d'Oliva*, sigs. $Z2^{v}$-$Z3^{r}$) (my emphasis)

The characters' imprisonment at this point in the text marks the beginning of their adventures in the Near East. By identifying Trineus's identity as of the 'race of Christendom' and by describing falling into 'Moores hands' as a divine test, the translators give a sense that the whole adventure in Muslim territory will be a Christian trial. Maugin and Munday thus attach a symbolic meaning to the characters' experiences in this part of the romance, which goes beyond the literal narrative. Maugin and Munday also emphasise this sense of difficulty associated with the experience in Muslim territory by constantly expressing Palmerin's wish to return to the safety of Christendom. After the hero has been in the court of the Sultan of Babylon for a while he secretly expresses his hope that the Sultan will ask him to join the army to attack Constantinople so that he can have an excuse to leave the kingdom and thus 'escape the Turks and Moorish Infidels' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. $V4^{r}$). The Spanish text does not make this religious dimension part of Palmerin's motive for wanting to leave, but instead says that the hero wants to join the Sultan's army because it is the most convenient way to leave the Babylonian court, '[…] pensando que con aquéllos se yría mejor e más a su voluntad' (p. 176) [(…) thinking that with them he would depart better and at his will]. When the Sultan asks Palmerin to lead his army against Constantinople, in revenge for his brother's death many years ago, the hero suggests that the King of Balisarca would be a better leader, on account of his greater knowledge of the soldiers, but his real motive is to get home quickly:

> […] Palmerín dixo esto al Soldán por no llevar aquel cargo, que le sería gran mengua de no fazer todo su poder para cumplir el cargo qu'el Soldán le dava; mas su voluntad era, en saliendo en tierra de cristianos, de apartarse de la hueste e yrse; y por esto no quiso tomar el cargo. (p. 185)
>
> [(…) Palmerín said this to the Sultan so that he would not have to take on this position, for it would be a great dishonour to him not to be able to fulfil the role

> he was given by the Sultan. In fact, his wish was that on arriving in Christian land, he would detach himself from the army and leave. This is why he did not want to take on this position.]

Munday translates, following Maugin:

> […] This counsell gave Palmerin, […] (desiring nothing more, then the *ruine* and generall *destruction* of these *Heathen hounds*, sworne enemies to *Christ and his Servants*) to ridde himselfe of that charge, which would bring him so great and shamefull report, to *fight against his Lord* and *maker*: therefore premeditating on all these inconveniences, he but expected the meane to gette footing in Christendome againe. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. E5^{v}) (my emphasis)

The translators transform the Spanish Palmerin's sense of chivalric responsibility into a religious concern, which highlights the way that the hero's Christian identity prevents him from leading a Muslim army against Constantinople, a location full of symbolic associations for Christians. Maugin, and Munday following him, brings to the text an animosity towards the Muslim characters which is completely missing from the Spanish original but which is consistent with their stress on the hero's Christian identity. Whereas in the Spanish text Palmerin is motivated by his wish to see Polinarda as soon as possible, the translators put more emphasis on his desire to get away from these lands antagonistic of his faith. This motive can also be noted a little later on, before the Sultan's army leaves for Constantinople, when Palmerin is armed and ready to face the army of Gramiell, son of the King of Phrygia, who has come to avenge his brother's death. The Spanish narrator describes Palmerin right before combat:

> […] venía armado, salvo de yermo, de unas armas nuevas qu'él avía fecho fazer y eran todas verdes por mostrar la esperança e alegría que levava en yrse de aquella tierra para donde estava su señora […] (p. 186)
>
> [(…) he came armed, except for the helmet, with new armour that he had ordered to be made. It was all green, to show the hope and joy he felt leaving that land towards the one where his lady was (…)]

Munday, following Maugin, translates:

> […] Palmerin, who was now in marvailous sumptuous Armour, bearing a sheeld of Sinople, with a barre of Gold figured therein, signifying his inward ioy, that in so short time he should get from these barbarous and *unchristian helhounds*. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. E7^{r}) (my emphasis)

For Munday and Maugin, Palmerin is anticipating not the sight of Polinarda but rather his joy at being free of his spiritual enemies. Unlike the French text, which does not make here a specific reference to faith, Munday departs from his source and highlights the religious difference between him and his hosts by adding the phrase 'unchristian helhounds'.

The translators also stress the characters' experience in Muslim territory as a divine challenge in the context of the sexual advances Muslim women make. Maugin and Munday depict these seductions as experiences which put the characters' Christian identity to the test, on account of which the characters ask for spiritual strength through prayers. The translators use the Spanish accounts of tests of Palmerin's fidelity to Polinarda to highlight the sense of Muslim threat, conflating the women's overt sexuality with their religious identity. After Palmerin successfully repels the challenge of the lions he is welcomed into the Sultan of Babylon's court. The hero receives honourable treatment but is constantly pursued by Alchidiana and her cousin Ardemia who have fallen in love with him. Ardemia is the first to declare her feelings to him and even hugs Palmerin and tries to kiss him. Palmerin is shocked:

> Él, que poco la preciava e más siendo mora, quitóse afuera muy presto mostrando grande yra contra ella. (p. 173)
>
> [He that little esteemed her and more so because she was a Moor, left very quickly, showing great anger against her.]

Munday, following Maugin, translates:

> Palmerin amazed at this strange accident, because shee was a *Pagan*, and *contrary* to him in *faith*, that making no aunswere, but following the example of *chaste Ioseph*, who refused Zephira Wife to Putiphar, great provost to the King of Aegipt: started from her suddainlie, and mooved with displeasure, departed the Chamber […] (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. C3^{r}) (my emphasis)

The translators stress all they can the religious difference between Palmerin and Ardemia, even using a Biblical story to highlight the contrast between Christian chastity and pagan eroticism. The Biblical allusion is rare in the translators' texts because usually Maugin includes examples from classical mythology, which Munday always translates literally. It is evident that here the example acts as a way to further draw attention to the hero's Christian identity. On account of Palmerin's rejection and Alchidiana's condemnation of her cousin's romantic confession, Ardemia kills herself. Palmerin is distraught because he feels responsible for this tragic event, but to ease his conscience he justifies his rejection of her as a defence of his faith, as he expresses in prayer:

> O divine wisedome, that hast suffered me to fall into this *lucklesse accident*, protect mee from any further disadvauntage […] forgette me not then, but so enable me, as in such badde occasions I swarve not from my *duetie*. And such is my confidence in thy promises, as no *temptation* shall prevaile against mee: but this *captivitie* once discharged, I hope to direct my course *pleasing* in *thy sight*, and to performe such *gracious service*, as *thy name* shall be *exalted* and glorified for ever. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sigs. C6^{r}-C6^{v}) (my emphasis)

This prayer is almost the same in the three versions, except for the Spanish explicit association between Palmerin and Catholic faith, as he promises God not to fail 'Vuestra santa fe cathólica' (p. 174) [Your holy catholic faith]. Apart from this detail, the three versions clearly express Palmerin's Christian identity as an element that protects him against the challenges Islam poses, in this specific case, related to sexual temptation. After Ardemia's death, Alchidiana makes explicit her attraction for Palmerin. At the end of her speech Munday adds an allusion to the lady's virginity by having her say: 'I commit my honour into your protection' (*The Second Part of*

Palmerin d'Oliva, sig. C8[r]). Thus, even if a Muslim character is trying to seduce a Christian hero, Munday cannot help but express his concern for female chastity. In response to Alchidiana's confession, the hero identifies this challenge as a test of his faith:

> Palmerín […] fue muy triste porque por cosa del mundo él no avía de errar a Dios ni a su señora […] (p. 175)
>
> [Palmerín (…) was very sad because on no account did he want to fail God or his lady (…)]

Munday, following Maugin, emphasises the religious associations to the Princess's advances:

> […] lifting his eyes to heaven, thus privately invocated. My God, deliver me from this *enemie*, and suffer me not to fall in consent to this temptation, for I thinke her a *Devill incarnate*, and sent to deceive me. Impossible is it that a *maiden*, by nature modest and bashfull, would let slip such effronted [and audacious] wordes. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. C8[r]) (my emphasis)

The translators emphasise the link between Palmerin's rejection of Alchidiana's advances and his faith by presenting this emotional prayer and the dramatic gesture of looking up to heaven. As they do with the previous allusion to the Biblical story, in which they oppose Joseph's purity to Zephira's lustfulness, here Maugin and Munday place Alchidiana's erotic enticements against the behaviour of a 'bashful' 'maiden'. They characterize her open sexuality as unnatural and therefore devilish. None of this is in the original Spanish text, where, in fact, it is Alchidiana who describes Palmerin as 'el diablo' (p. 175) [the devil], because he refuses her advances, and in her mind, all men should respond to these sorts of sexual suggestions. In the translations, however, by asking for God's protection, Palmerin treats Alchidiana's attempted seduction as a threat against his faith. This association is further enhanced when Aurencida, the Sultan of Persia's sister, is trying to seduce Trineus. When Palmerin notices the Princess's first advances in the Spanish text, he warns his friend that '[…] se guardase de errar contra

Dios e contra Agriola […]' (p. 319) [(…) he should be careful not to fail God and Agriola (…)]. Munday, following Maugin, expands on the religious implications of the lady's seduction:

> Good Friende, beware of this Ladie, that shee cause you not to offende God, and violate the loyaltie you owe to Madame Agriola. Such experience have I had in these actions, as when Ladies have enterprised theyr am[o]rous *furies*, if they cannot compasse it by the meanes of men, they will adventure it with *hellish* familiars, that can deceive the very wisest, especially in this *wicked* Countrey, where is *no knowledge* of *God* or his *Lawes*. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sigs. T5^{v}-T6^{r}) (my emphasis)

As in the case of Alchidiana's advances, both translators present Aurencida's overt sexuality as behaviour which can lead to the offence of the Christian faith. Munday, however, adds terms that describe the Princess's conduct as evil, since the terms 'furies' and 'wicked' are his additions and 'hellish' is translating the French 'espritz'. As he does in the *Amadis*, Munday also modifies the French's direct reference to the Virgin Mary, and so translates '[…] ilz n'ont cognoissance de Iesus Christ, ne de sa benoiste Mere' [(…) they do not know Jesus Christ, nor his Blessed Mother] as 'no knowledge of God or his Lawes'.

These examples reveal how Munday is influenced by various contemporary conceptions of religious difference. In his modification of the allusion to Christ and the Virgin, the translator expresses his concern for references to Catholic practice relevant during the Reformation, as I will discuss in the next chapter. Munday's association of this Muslim territory with evil practices is an expression of a commonly held Early Modern European idea about of Islamic doctrine, whereby, as Vitkus argues, Muslims were depicted as worshippers of 'devilish idols'. In this sense, Vitkus examines the case of *Paradise Lost*, in which John Milton identifies Satan's demonic followers with the names of pagan gods and compares the capital of hell with cities in the Middle East.[438] This, Vitkus explains, is also linked to the Early Modern European vision of the Qur'an as a mixture of fables and superstitions.[439] Munday clearly expresses this stereotypical view at the end of the romance, when, in an addition to his French source, Palmerin

[438] Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism', pp. 216-18.
[439] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 17-18.

laments the fact that the child born from Trineus's and Aurencida's affair will grow up among Muslims, hoping that when he is older he can 'understand, that all the Alchoran is tales and fables' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. Aa4^{r}). This misconception of Muslim religious doctrine is joined, in the examples of Alchidiana's and Aurencida's seduction, with the early modern misconception of Muslim overt sensuality. Maugin and Munday also exploit this stereotype in their depiction of Captain Olimael's and the Emperor of Turkey's attacks against Agriola, describing the men's uncontrollable sexual urges, and the violence of their advances, as a quality related to their religious identities. Vitkus notes that early modern Europeans 'narrowly defined' Islam as 'a religion of violence and lust'.[440] In this sense, it is highly significant that almost all the Christian men in the text only make love to their partners, who share their faith, in consensual relationships which are sanctioned by clandestine weddings, as I discussed in the first section. However, Trineus is the only Christian character who sleeps with a Muslim woman, and when he is confronted by the Sultan, the Prince argues in his own defence:

> As for the fact thou twittest mee withal, well may it be excused: for I have *neither ravished* or *violated*, but by force of Love erred […] (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. V2^{v}) (my emphasis)

With this detail, which is not in the Spanish original, Munday, following Maugin literally, sets against the Muslim sexual stereotype the conduct of Christian men, since he makes explicit Trineus's non-violent conduct. This can also be related to Maugin and Munday's emphasis on the Muslim women's explicitly erotic conduct, as opposed to that of the modest Christian women. As I discussed in the first section, although Munday alludes to the Christian women's sexual activity, he repeatedly draws attention to their concern for their chastity and highlights the sanction of marriage for their erotic encounters. In the examples analysed here, Maugin and Munday identify the sexual conduct of Muslims characters with evil and violent practices in order to enhance the purity of Christian conduct by contrast.

However, the translators' emphasis on the religious difference between the Christian and Muslim worlds is at times ambiguous, for it coexists in the text with the depiction of wealth and luxury in the Muslim courts. Maugin and Munday reveal a

[440] Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism', p. 217.

fascination with the exoticism that these foreign cultures represented for them and their contemporaries. While the Spanish text hints at the prosperity of the foreign kingdoms, Maugin expands on the details and Munday follows closely. In the Spanish text, after Agriola is introduced to the Emperor of Turkey, she is then conducted to her chamber by Pólita:

> Pólita […] fuesse con ella a un aposentamiento donde el Gran Turco le mandó, el qual estava antoldado de muchos paños de oro e de piedras preciosas. (p. 162)
>
> [Pólita (…) went with her to a chamber, canopied with many cloths of gold and precious stones, where the Great Turk sent her.]

Munday, following Maugin translates:

> Hippolita […] conducted her into a marvailous princely Chamber, the floore covered all over with cloth of *Tissue*, and hung about with such *sumptuous Tapistrie* and cloth of *Gold,* as hardly might the richnesse thereof be valued. There Hippolita caused the Princesse to sitte downe in a *Chayre* of *state*, which was purposely provided for her […] (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A3^{v}) (my emphasis added)

The translators expand on the theatrical, stage-like atmosphere of the setting. Later on, when Palmerin meets Alchidiana, they have dinner in her tent before setting out for the court of the Sultan of Babylon. The Spanish author describes how her servants brought: '[…] grandes baxillas de oro, guarnecidas de piedras preciosas […]' (p. 166) [(…) big golden plates, decorated with precious stones (…)]. Munday, following Maugin, expands on the luxury: 'The tables being covered for their hunting banquet, very choice delicates were served in on great plates of Gold, garnished with very pretious and costly stones […]' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. B1^{v}). However, the description of wealth in the translations does not always seem so straightforward, for while apparently portraying the luxury and power of the foreign kingdoms, they are actually perpetuating certain stereotypes in order to position them as 'Other' and as dangerous to

Christianity. When describing the Emperor of Turkey's wedding celebrations, the Spanish text briefly mentions Agriola's dress, the ceremony and the celebrations:

> Otro día de mañana vinieron todas las Infantas e traxéronle ropas a maravilla ricas que vestiesse […] No vos podría hombre dezir con la grande solemnidad que fueron llevados a la mesquita. Era la gente tanta e los juegos de estrañas maneras que no avía quien anduviesse por las rúas. […] fueron casados a la costumbre de los turcos. Pues dezirvos las cosas qu'estavan aparejadas para comer e los combidados e las grandes riquezas que allí avía, sería nunca acabar. (p. 163)
>
> [The next day, all the Princesses came and brought her wonderfully rich clothes for her to wear (…) No man could express the great solemnity with which they were taken to the mosque. There was such a great press of people, and the spectacles were so astonishing, that no-one could make their way through the streets. (…) [T]hey were married following the custom of the Turks. Well, it would be never-ending to tell you of the things that were there to eat, and of the guests, and of the great riches.]

Munday, following Maugin, translates:

> […] in the morning came the Queenes and Ladies newlie come to the Court, to bid the sorrowfull Bride good morrow in her Chamber, attyring her in wonderfull gorgious vestures, after their Country maner· farre beyonde the royaltie of *Helena,* after her arrivall at Troy. Betweene foure Kings shee was brought into the greate Hall, and from thence conducted to the *Temple*, where they were espoused by the *Mosti.* To recount here thy royall solemnitie in the temple, the Maiestie and unspeakable dignitie at the pallace, the excellent *Comedies*, rare *triumphs*, *Maskes*, *Momeries*, *Moriscoes*, and such like courtly pleasures, would bee a matter too prolixious: for they are not to our purpose. Let it then suffice yee, that after they were magnificently entreated at Dinner and Supper, the dauncing began, and God knowes how the Turks, Moores, Arabes, and Medes, set foorth themselues in their *devises*, and *sports* before their Ladies, much lyke the *Satyres* and horned *Faunes*, giuing new invasions on the *Nimphes* of *Diana.* (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A5^{v})

While the Spanish author briefly alludes to the way that celebrations were conducted all over the city, the translators are more explicit about the spectacle and give a clearly sexual connotation to the celebrations. On the one hand, there is a sense of theatricality to the scene, given by the references to 'Comedies', 'Maskes', and 'Mommeries'. Munday has added 'Maskes' here and in Book IV of the *Amadis* he adds the term 'mummeries' to a similar description of entertainment, but in a western court. Munday uses a similar description of entertainment while Palmerin is in the English court, citing 'Maskers, Mumeries and Moriscoes' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig. Y1[r]) as part of the celebrations. Moore notes that by associating masques and mummeries in the *Amadis*, Munday might have been alluding to dramatic entertainment popular in the English court of his time.[441] The same can be argued here and also that it must have been a form of spectacle common to Maugin as well. What is interesting to me, is the sort of 'prefabricated' sense of the list of entertainment, seeing as earlier in the *Palmerin* and in the *Amadis*, Munday employs it to describe a celebration in the context of European courts, whereas here the same terms are used to describe a celebration in the near East. This gives a sense of the fictional quality of the description of these Muslim spaces, fed more by preconceptions and fantasies than by a real knowledge of the locations, and perhaps by an intention of making the text more familiar. However, the description of the European courts in the *Amadis* and earlier in the *Palmerin* is stereotypical as well, and of course is part of the fictional logic of romance.

Maugin and Munday also give this sense of fantasy, in this scene, by employing material from classical mythology. This is not uncommon in Maugin's translation, as I have shown. Generally, these additions make a point about a specific issue in the narrative, as Tyler does in her translation. However, in this particular scene, this element is combined with an intention to develop the stereotype of the Muslim court as over-sexed. Arguably, Maugin and Munday include the 'Nimphes of Diana' as an allusion to the sexual excesses of the celebration, since the characters were known for their virginal state. The 'Satyres' represent the Muslims' stereotypically unbridled sexuality. Brumble notes that in the *Ovidius Moralizatus*, Mohammed is likened to a satyr, and therefore portrayed as bestial.[442] Munday's 'sport', which translates the French 'faire allegresses' [demonstrate enthusiasm], is also part of this sexualized atmosphere, for on the one hand he could be alluding to staged amusements, but on the

[441] Moore, *Amadis*, p. 999 (endnote to p. 894).
[442] See the term 'Satyr' in Brumble, *Classical Myths and Legends*, pp. 304-05.

other to sexual intercourse.[443] This stereotypical depiction is in keeping with the difference that the translators want to portray between Christians and Muslim, for right after this, they describe the scene in which the Emperor tries to consummate his marriage with Agriola, as commented further above. Maugin and Munday set the excesses of the Muslims against the purity of Christians as they describe how the Princess was not happy with these celebrations on account of what would follow:

> But all these marvayles, ioyes and follies, coulde not chaunge the Princesse countenaunce […] above all, fearing the losse of her *chastitie*, which was a *Iewell* never to be recovered. (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. A5^{v})

Against the Muslims' overt sexuality, Maugin and Munday place Agriola's concern for her chastity, which functions in the narrative as a symbol of Christian purity, as noted above. Munday here translates the French 'pudicité' as 'Iewell', just as he does at other points in the text, and thus enhances the value of Agriola's chastity as something precious which must be protected, just like the Christian faith.

In the description of the celebrations, Munday also reveals a concern for the religious allusions in his source, and so translates the French 'Mesquite' as 'Temple', thus removing the specifically Muslim association. Munday omits such details at other points in the text and thus betrays a more conflicted view of Islam than does Maugin. When the Sultan of Persia gets married, Maugin describes the religious ceremony: '[…] le grand Mesen des Mahumetistes faisoit les ceremonies au Temple' (*L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive*, sig. Cc2^{v}) [the great patron of the Mohammedans performed the ceremonies at the Temple]. Munday translates: '[…] the Arch Flamin was performing the ceremonies in the Temple […]' (*The Second Part of Palmerin d'Oliva*, sig. T6^{v}). The *OED* notes that the noun 'flamen' was used during Roman antiquity to refer to 'a priest devoted to the service of a particular deity', and also by Geoffrey of Monmouth to identify 'sacerdotal functionaries in heathen Britain'.[444] Munday thus identifies Islam as a religion of idolatry and paganism, a notion he also expresses when describing Muslim women's sexuality, as noted further above. This view is linked to the way in which Munday adds the term 'Myrmidon' to a group in which Maugin includes Turks and

[443] See the verb 'sport' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 19 October 2013].
[444] See the noun 'flamen' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 13 October 2014].

Moors, at another point in the text. As with the allusions to classical material, the English translator locates these people in a world of mythology or fiction. This is also related to the generalized way in which both Maugin and Munday describe Muslim characters, employing arbitrary constructions of the foreign 'Other'. All this suggests that neither Maugin nor Munday have encountered these cultures directly, but are reworking conventions (whether received from contemporary or traditional literary accounts). Moore notes how the translations of European histories, and of Italian and Spanish fictions about the Eastern Mediterranean, must have played an important role in communicating Continental ideas of this foreign space that were not known to the English from experience, and how these conceptions became 'naturalized through reiteration'.[445] In the terms that Maugin and Munday use to refer to the foreign cultures one can see the influence of inaccurate information. Characters are referred to indistinctly as 'Moors', 'Arabs', and 'Turks', which can be related to what Vitkus sees as a tendency to reduce these peoples' stature to a 'barbaric' state, thus also revealing European confusion about their ethnicity. He notes that 'Turk' and 'Moor' were terms sometimes used to refer specifically to people from Turkey or Morocco, but most commonly were applied to a 'generalized Islamic other'.[446] Maugin and Munday describe the Muslims as 'pagans', 'heathen', 'hellhounds', and 'atheists', which is a trend that, in Vitkus's view, shows a misunderstanding about Islam.[447] Even though the Spanish presents these sorts of stereotypical visions as well, the translations clearly emphasise more strongly what separates Christian and Muslim culture, with these and with the other elements commented on above.

Overall, Munday follows Maugin closely in exaggerating Christian and Muslim difference and antagonism. Many of the elements that the translators use to describe Islamic culture seem to be informed both by contemporary stereotypical representations of the kingdoms of the Near East and by medieval misrepresentations. However, Munday re-works his source's manipulation of sexual stereotypes in the portrayal of Muslim culture to develop issues of sexuality and religion which clearly concern him, as his translation of the first part of the romance indicates. The English translation then becomes a commentary on contemporary views of religious doctrine and sexual conduct, all the while following his source closely and respecting the logic of the romance. Munday arguably uses Eastern locations to highlight those issues that he is concerned

[445] Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean', p. 115.
[446] Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism', pp. 216-17; 225.
[447] Vitkus, 'Early Modern Orientalism', pp. 216-17.

with. Through his treatment of this material he also at times reveals his concerns with the tensions of the Reformation between old and new devotional practices which will become crucial to his translation of the *Amadis* years later, as I will discuss in the next chapter.

Chapter III: Anthony Munday's *Amadis de Gaule*

In this chapter I analyse Books I to IV of Anthony Munday's *Amadis de Gaule* (1590-1619) and a few sections of the anonymous *The Fifth Booke of Amadis de Gaule* (1598), all translated from the first five books of the French *Amadis de Gaule* series, translated by Nicolas Herberay de Essarts from the Spanish *Amadís de Gaula* (1508) and *Sergas de Esplandián* (1510) by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. I explore here two aspects of Munday's translation: the way he translates accounts of religious devotion, and so reflects the tensions between old and new religious practice during the Reformation and the way he transforms explicit erotic episodes in the French texts, apparently making the translation more modest but covertly offering a description highly suggestive of physical pleasure.

Books I to IV of the Spanish *Amadís* are filled with a religious spirit, evident in the constant link between chivalric activity and religious devotion, as well as in the various glosses and moralizing commentaries (sometimes labelled 'consiliaria') which frame many of the adventures. The first four books of the Spanish *Amadis* are not, strictly speaking, pious romances; a religious element is a basic feature of chivalry, but is not the focus of the narrative. In the *Sergas de Esplandián*, however, Montalvo creates a new kind of knight who is focused on Christian crusade and whose adventures culminate in the successful defence of Constantinople. Montalvo manifestly relates this spirit of crusade to the Reconquest mentality of the Spanish Catholic Monarchs' reign. Therefore, the moral frame of the text is much more evident than in the previous books, manifesting itself in whole chapters of moral commentary, in the main hero's constant expression of devotional intention in his chivalric actions, and in the Christian conversion of a series of pagan enemies. The French translator, however, while he translates literally many examples of religious practice in Books I to V, such as attendance at mass and prayer, condenses or omits most of the 'consiliaria', changes quite a few of the religious exclamations (for example, removing some, not all, references to the Virgin Mary) and omits some of the conversions which appear in Book V.

Munday's first four books, on the other hand, translate faithfully the moral commentary in the French source but are contradictory in their treatment of those elements of Catholic practice Herberay has translated literally from the Spanish,

especially confession, attendance at mass, devotion towards the Virgin Mary, religious oaths and religious exclamations. At certain points Munday omits them, while at others he includes them or modifies them in ways that still keep remnants of the older tradition. As Moore notes, Munday produces a text which gives a more generalized sense of piety;[448] although one must note that he is not straightforward about his position. What is clear is that religious practice is a sensitive issue for Munday and encourages him to make changes in his source. By analysing the literal translations alongside his modifications, one gets a sense of his ambivalence about the subject.

I argue that through this inconsistent translating technique, which incorporates religious elements of his source in certain parts of the romance while omitting them at other points, Munday represents the tensions Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins identify between official doctrine and devotional practice in the Church of England in his time.[449] Munday, attuned to his contemporary cultural environment, uses his translation to comment on these tensions, as he also demonstrates in his *Palmerin D'Oliva*. The romance genre's ambivalent relation to religious doctrine and practice, which K. S. Whetter identifies,[450] arguably allows Munday to mirror the transition between Catholic and Protestant practice in his context. Whetter argues that the genre of romance is 'pluralistic and contradictory', and that, in religious terms, it is 'sometimes supportive of Christian values and sometimes subversive of them'.[451] Munday is able to refer to religious elements which are potentially controversial in his time because they are in keeping with the logic of the narrative and the basic structure of romance, which incidentally, also allow his religious omissions to work without disrupting the text. Furthermore, Munday can arguably draw attention to religious issues in the text because he has omitted content that could have been controversial in his context, but also, because romance is different from religious sermons or pamphlets, which directly focused on the controversial debates topical to Munday's time. Whetter notes that romance combines the religious, either conservatively or subversively, with the themes of love and adventure. Romances can be exemplary or didactic, while in other cases, they can only focus on earthly matters, or they can be a combination of each.[452] These features arguably also allow Munday to discuss religious doctrine and culture in his

[448] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxiv.
[449] Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins, 'Introduction', in *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, ed. by Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 1-19 (p. 4).
[450] K. S. Whetter, 'Subverting, Containing and Upholding Christianity in Medieval Romances', in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 102-118 (pp. 103-04).
[451] Whetter, 'Subverting, Containing and Upholding', pp. 103-104.
[452] Whetter, 'Subverting, Containing and Upholding', pp. 104; 118.

Palmerin, as I analysed in the previous chapter. However, in the *Palmerin*, the issue of marriage and the oriental location made it potentially easier to draw attention to religious matters more openly, because of their more general acceptance, because, since medieval times, marriage was seen as a sanction for sexuality and Muslims were stereotypically seen as a threat, so it was logical to uphold the values of Christianity by opposition. Nonethless, in the first four books of the *Amadis*, confession, attendance at mass, devotion towards the Virgin Mary, religious oaths and religious exclamations, are much more prevalent than in the *Palmerin*, and these religious practices are set in the West, much closer geographically to Munday's own cultural context. This leads the translator to deal with these issues in the way that he does in his text. I will look specifically at the way in which Munday translates literally the moral glosses in his source, how he modifies the depictions of the Virgin Mary, both in oaths and prayers, and how he omits or includes the characters' attendance at mass.

The treatment of the religious material of the anonymous English Book V, however, is very different from Munday's translation practice in the first four books because the translator follows his French source unquestioningly. This suggests to me that it is not Munday's text. The scope of this thesis does not allow me to explore the differences between Muday's translation and that of Book V, as I will explain in my Conclusion. However, I will consider Book V as an example of translation practice contemporary to Munday's methodology. In this sense, I will refer to certain aspects which contribute to my analysis of the translation practice in the first four books of the English *Amadis*. One must concede, however, that it is not impossible that Munday translated Book V, since he appears to have translated all of the Spanish chivalric romances that came into England, except for the books that make up the series *Espejo de Príncipes y Caballeros*, as I discussed in the Introduction. Nonetheless, neither the 1598 nor the 1664 edition includes a dedication, and the epistle to the reader is signed by the stationers, Adam Islip and T. J., respectively, and neither gives information about the translator. By contrast, all of Munday's *Palmerin D'Oliva* and *Amadis* editions include edither a dedication or an epistle to the reader signed by him, with the exception of the 1595 edition of *Amadis* Book II, also printed by Adam Islip, which is signed by one Lazarus Pyott, now understood to be Munday's pseudonym.[453] In Book V, the

[453] Henry Thomas argues against the pseudonym theory in his *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 310-15. However, Celeste Turner Wright, in her 1963 article contests Thomas's thesis, presenting strong evidence (dealing with the relationships and behaviour of stationers and translators within the early modern English print culture) that shows that Lazarus Pyott was Munday's creation. Her views are still considered valid today. See Celeste Turner Wright, '"Lazarus Pyott" and Other Inventions of Anthony

anonymous English translator avoids the sort of meticulous modifications of the previous four books, and so both French and English texts clearly present a Christian knight on a mission against pagan forces, many times alluding to elements of Catholic practice, but without the political associations of the theme of conversion which is so important in the Spanish text. Herberay's fifth book is consistent with the first four books in its treatment of the religious material. He also omits all of Montalvo's demonstrations of political allegiances and in their place supplies, in his prologue, clear praise of Francis I.[454] However, what remains in the French and English translations is the overall sense of an alliance within Christendom against a pagan threat, which translates Montalvo's depiction of a successful defence of Constantinople against the Muslim enemy.[455] This element links the anonymous English translation with Munday's emphasis on Christian-Muslim antagonism in his *Palmerin*, but, as commented on in the previous chapter, this interest is not unique to Munday, indeed, it is common in contemporary literature. However, Christian conversion plays no part in the *Palmerin*, whereas in *Amadis* Book V, Herberay, and the anonymous English translator with him, while he omits some conversion scenes, translates the rest literally, thus maintaining the supposed religious 'illumination' of the pagan characters, although he removes the cultural and political relevance of conversion in the Spanish original.

Montalvo refers very briefly to erotic attraction and sexual intercourse in the *Amadis*, but they are constantly present in his romance. Michel Bideaux notes that the Spanish author's treatment of sexuality is ambivalent. According to Bideaux, on the one hand, Montalvo withholds information on account of a struggle with Christian scruples, while, on the other, the author makes the erotic scenes very clear and hardly ever condemns the characters.[456] Moreover, only two couples in the text have sexual encounters that are sanctioned by a clandestine wedding. By contrast, the French translation is very straightforward in its description of the characters' sexuality, with or without the sanction of marriage. Sexual material is amplified; the lovers' verbal exchanges become lengthy and rhetorically complex speeches, and there are extra details about their love-making. Munday's translation, while generally following the

---

Mundy', *Philological Quarterly*, 42 (1963), 532-541. For recent endorsement of Wright's argument by Munday scholars see Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 109 (footnote 103), and Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxvi (footnote 33).

[454] Véronique Duché and Jean-Claude Arnould, 'Introduction', *Le Cinqiesme* [sic] *Livre d'Amadis de Gaule*, Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, trans. by Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, ed. by Véronique Duché and Jean-Claude (Paris: Garnier, 2009), pp. 18-19.

[455] Duché and Arnould, 'Introduction', in *Le Cinqiesme* [sic] *Livre d'Amadis*, p. 26.

[456] Bideaux, 'Introduction Relative au Livre I', in *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*, ed. by Michel Bideaux (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), pp. 85-157 (p. 118).

French text closely, also omits material, and substitutes metaphorical descriptions for the French *Amadis*'s language of desire. While the relationship between sexuality and marriage remains in the French and English translations, and Munday has demonstrated such a strong interest in it in his *Palmerin*, in the translation of the *Amadis*, surprisingly, he does not draw attention to the sanction of the clandestine union but rather to the details of the couples' lovemaking. However, the English portrayal is not at all straightforward, constantly fluctuating between a suggestion and a concealment of pleasure. Therefore, a Protestant perspective about channelling sexuality through marriage might still be influencing Munday's treatment of the material. Although he apparently highlights a sense of secrecy and modesty, Munday also uses very suggestive erotic imagery, thus perhaps drawing attention to the contradictions between the cultural expectations of modest female and male behaviour with the reality of sexual conduct. His ambivalence is surprisingly similar to Montalvo's original depiction, which we are almost certain Munday did not know. Perhaps this link has to do with the depiction of sexuality in the genre of romance, and gives evidence of certain continuities given by the features of the genre, despite the cultural and chronological distance between versions. However, Munday might also be responding to the negative reputation that the *Amadis* series had acquired by that time, specifically in relation to the apparent immorality of the genre, as I will explain further below. On the other hand, he might want to cater to the contemporary literary taste of an audience interested not only in romance but also in prose material in which the erotic was relatively prominent, such as George Pettie's *Petit Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure* (1576), William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* (1565), Barnebe Riche's *Farewell to Military Profession* (1581), George Whetstone's *Heptameron of Civill Discourses* (1582), and William Warner's *Pan his Syrinx* (1584), all of which Steve Mentz classifies as texts that met a demand for racier fiction.[457] I will focus specifically on the way that Munday develops a metaphoric style of erotic description in which he incorporates suggestive contemporary vocabulary and elements from medieval allegorical imagery, close to the tradition of the *Roman de la rose*.

[457] Steve Mentz, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 35.

Printing History of the Three Versions

Amadis de Gaula (Books I-IV) by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo was first published in Zaragoza in 1508 by Jorge Coci. It went through a total of nineteen editions during the sixteenth century, with the last edition printed in 1586.[458] These first four books were followed by *Las Sergas de Esplandián* (1510), also by Montalvo, and then by a series which added up to thirteen books in total, written by other authors. The *Sergas* went through a total of ten editions in the sixteenth century[459] and most of the other books in the series were re-edited several times.[460] Not much is known of Montalvo, but some biographical details have been speculated from what is stated in his texts. In the colophon to the first edition of *Amadis*, his full name is indicated and his occupation: 'regidor de Medina del Campo' [governor of Medina del Campo].[461] Montalvo expresses his allegiance to the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, in several sections of the *Amadis* and the *Sergas*, as I will explain below, and he has been specifically linked to the Monarchs, among other things, because Medina del Campo was an occasional royal residence.[462] Although he praises the victory of Granada in his texts, Carlos Sainz de la Maza notes that Montalvo does not associate it to his own experience, which is an indication that he probably did not take an active role in it.[463]

It is now agreed that Montalvo was working from an earlier manuscript which contained the story of the first three books. It is thought the manuscript possibly originated in the thirteenth century.[464] Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua comments that the uncertainty about the features of the original text has prompted all kinds of theories about its origin, of which he considers only the Portuguese and the Spanish theses as having any serious basis, although he argues that the latter claim is the strongest because it is supported by fragments of a manuscript in Spanish, possibly dating from the fourteenth century.[465] Montalvo himself indicates in his prologue that he has found a

---

[458] Emilio José Sales Dasí, *Antología del ciclo de Amadís de Gaula* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2006).
[459] Sales Dasí, *Antología del ciclo de Amadís de Gaula*, p. 51.
[460] For a record of all the extant early modern editions of the Spanish *Amadís* series see Sales Dasí, *Antología del ciclo de Amadís de Gaula*.
[461] Carlos Sainz de la Maza, 'Introducción', in Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Sergas de Esplandián*, ed. by Carlos Sainz de la Maza (Madrid: Castalia: 2003), pp. 7-92 (p. 9).
[462] Emilio J. Sales Dasí, 'California, las Amazonas y la Tradición Troyana', *Revista de Literatura Medieval*, 10 (1998), 147-67 (pp. 152-53).
[463] Sainz de la Maza, 'Introducción', in *Sergas*, pp. 11-12.
[464] Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua, 'Introducción', in Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Amadís de Gaula*, ed. by Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua, 6th edn, 2 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 2008), I, pp. 19-206 (pp. 67-72)
[465] Cacho Blecua, 'Introducción, in *Amadís de Gaula* pp. 57-72. On the manuscript fragments see M. Rodríguez Moñino, 'El primer manuscrito del *Amadís de Gaula*, in his *Relieves de erudición (Del Amadís a Goya)* (Madrid: Castalia, 1959), pp. 17-38. On the *Amadis* before Montalvo's intervention see Juan

manuscript containing the three first books and that he has revised them, adding Books IV and V to the work, which are of his own creation. Eisenberg points out that many writers took up Montalvo's claim to be working from an earlier text, as a rhetorical device to create an apparently authoritative historical testimony for the romance text.[466] Both Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua and Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce argue that among Montalvo's modifications to the original are the glosses and moral commentary which frame the narrative.[467]

The period in which Montalvo wrote his *Amadis* is uncertain but Cacho Blecua argues that his reference to the Catholic Monarchs in his prologue to Book I and their conquest of the Muslim emirate of Granada in 1492,[468] can shed some light. Cacho Blecua notes that since the conquest of Granada is described as a past event, the prologue must have been written after 2 January 1492 (the date of the fall of the city) and before 25 November 1504 (the date of Isabella's death) since the text refers to the monarchs' future heavenly reward.[469] In his preface, Montalvo is not speaking to a specific patron but rather to an undefined readership, and his concern is to draw attention to the moral value of his work. He links his romance to a praise of his King and Queen, which shows him engaged with his contemporary context, wishing to link it with his text even if the events in the narrative take place in a remote historical past.[470] María Carmen Marín Pina comments that although none of the chivalric romances published during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs were set in a contemporary historical context they were linked to the most glorious and imperialistic period of their reign. The conquest of Granada, argues Marín Pina, was crucial both for the development of this new political strategy and for the success of these chivalric romances, and it becomes a topos in the prologues of these first books. Ferdinand as the figure of the warrior Christian king, leading a heroic crusade which united the aristocracy under the Crown's goals, provided the perfect heroic climate for these

---

Bautista Avalle-Arce, *Amadís de Gaula: El primitivo y el de Montalvo* (México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1990), pp. 64-132.

[466] Eisenberg, 'The Pseudo-Historicity', pp. 119-129. For a more detailed discussion of the pseudo-historicity of Spanish romances see Fogelquist, *El Amadís y el género de la historia fingida*.

[467] Avalle-Arce, *Amadís de Gaula: El primitivo y el de Montalvo*, pp. 64-132 and p. 200 (footnote 15). Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua *Amadís: heroísmo mítico cortesano* (Madrid: Cupsa, 1979), p. 265 (see also footnote 9).

[468] Simon Barton, *A History of Spain*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 103-04.

[469] Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Amadis de Gaula*, ed. by Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua, 6th edn, 2 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 2008), I, 220 (footnote 5) and I, 221 (footnote 12).

[470] Towards the end of Book I, in a moral commentary against pride, Montalvo mentions the Catholic Monarchs again, praising their efforts against the infidels. See Montalvo, *Amadís de Gaula*, p. 642.

romances to emerge.[471] Montalvo also presents Isabella as engaged with the war effort to reunite Spain, a view which agrees with general contemporary opinion in his time.[472]

Book I of the French *Amadis de Gaule* was translated by Nicolas Herberay des Essarts and first published in Paris in 1540 by the printer Denis Janot and the booksellers Jean Longis and Vincent Sertenas. [473] Herberay held the title of Commissaire Ordinaire à l'Artillerie du Roi in the reign of Francis I of France, and in the prefatory matter of Books I and V, he claims to have served in several campaigns. Jean-Pierre and Luce Guillerm note that from what can be gathered from extant official documents, Herberay's role was purely administrative, since there is no proof that he ever fought on a battlefield.[474] The practice of establishing a partnership of stationers to finance an edition was common in the Paris book trade at the time. The printer was instructed to prepare 'copies with the names of each of the participating publishers/booksellers on the title page'.[475] Herberay translated the first eight books[476] and then other translators took over until the series reached a total of twenty-four books.[477] Janot, Longis, and Sertenas published Books II and III in 1541, and Books IV and V in 1544. They continued the partnership throughout the publication of the first twelve books and the first two editions, in 1599 and 1560, of the *Le Thresor d'Amadis de Gaule*, a selection of excerpts from the French *Amadis* books, presented as a manual for fine speaking and writing.[478] The partnership continued even though Janot died in 1544 because he was succeeded by his widow, Jeanne de Marnef, and then by her

[471] María Carmen Marín Pina 'La historia y los primeros libros de caballerías españoles', in *Medioevo y Literatura Actas del V Congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval* (Granada, 27 septiembre-1 octubre, 1993), ed. By Juan Paredes, 4 vols. (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1995), III, pp. 183-192 (pp. 184-86).

[472] See Elizabeth Teresa Howe's discussion of the depictions of Isabel through characters from the classical and biblical tradition, first through the examples of warrior women but after the reunification of Spain shifting towards comparisons with virtuous wives and mothers, in 'Zenobia or Penelope? Isabel la Católica as Literary Archetype', in *Isabel la Católica, Queen of Castile: Critical Essays*, ed. by David A. Boruchoff (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 91-102.

[473] Stephen Rawles, 'The Earliest Editions of Nicholas de Herberay's Translations of *Amadis de Gaule*', *The Library*, 6th ser., 3 (1981), 91-108 (pp. 92-93).

[474] See Jean-Pierre and Luce Guillerm, 'Vestiges d'Herberay des Essarts Acuerdo Olvido', in *Studi Francesi*, 151 (2007), 3-31 (pp. 18-21).

[475] 'Introduction', in *French Vernacular Books: Books published in the French Language before 1601*, ed. by Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2007), I, pp. vii-xvii (p. ix).

[476] Michel Simonin, 'La disgrace d'"Amadis"', *Studi Francesi*, 28 (1984), 1-35 (pp. 11-13).

[477] Most scholars today agree on this total of twenty-four volumes, with the exception of Mireille Huchon who claims that the total number was twenty-five but does not give any evidence on that final book. See her 'Traduction, Translation, Exaltation et Transmutation Dans Les *Amadis*', *Camenae*, 3 (2007), 1-10 (p. 1, footnote 2).

[478] For a discussion of the *Thresor* see Benhaïm, 'Les Thresors D'Amadis', pp. 157-81.

second husband, Estienne Groulleau.[479] Ten of the French *Amadis* books were translations from the Spanish originals, and the rest were based on the Italian and German continuations of the *Amadis*.[480] The series was so successful that each of these books was re-edited and reprinted several times. Book I alone was re-edited seven times in Paris, with several reprints for each edition, five times in Antwerp, and two times in Lyon.[481] The last early modern edition of the series was printed in Paris in 1615 and it included Books XXII-XXIV.[482]

Herberay was granted rights to the publication of the series by a royal privilege, as a shortened version, printed in the editions of his translations, indicates. He handed over these rights to the partnership of three stationers, as it is attested in his employment contract for the translation of Book I.[483] Bideaux notes the agreement among most critics that this privilege must have been linked to a royal commission, which would also explains the risky investment made by the stationers.[484] This can also explain Herberay's dedication of Book I to the Duke of Orleans, of Books II, IV and V to King Francis I, and of references to the royal family in the prologue of Book V. In fact, the rhetoric of the prefaces in the first books of the series constantly emphasises the nationalistic associations of the translation, drawing attention to the appropriation of the *Amadis* as a work of French culture[485] and the contribution made by Herberay to the greatness of the French language. The translator links the concepts of national pride and the vernacular in his dedication of Book I to the Duke of Orleans:

> [...] ay [sic] prins plaisir à le communiquer par translation […] pour faire revivre la renommée d'Amadis (laquelle par l'injure et antiquité du temps estoit estaincte en ceste *nostre* France). Et aussi pour ce qu'il est tout certain qu'il fut

[479] Michel Bideaux, 'Introduction Générale', in *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*, ed. by Michel Bideaux (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), p. 61,
[480] For an overview of the origin of all twenty-four French books, see Henry Thomas's *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 199-203.
[481] For a list of editions of the first twenty-one books in the French *Amadis* series see *French Vernacular Books: Books published in the French Language before 1601*, ed. by Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2007), I, pp. 18-31.
[482] Benhaïm, 'Les *Thresors D'Amadis*', p. 160 (footnote 12).
[483] Rawles, 'The Earliest Editions', p. 94.
[484] Bideaux, 'Introduction Générale', in *Amadis, Livre I* p. 59.
[485] On the claim of a French origin for the Amadis cycle see Bideaux, 'Introduction Générale', p. 67. Christine de Buzon argues that the whole editorial project for the French *Amadis* developed as a way to erase Spanish origin see, 'Amadis de Gaule en Français: Continuation Romanesque, Collection, Compilation', *French Studies*, 65 (2011), 337-46.

> *premier mis* en *nostre langue Françoyse*, estant Amadis *Gaulois*, & non Espaignol.[486]
>
> [(...) I have taken pleasure translating it for you [...] to revive the fame of Amadis (which by means of the damage and passage of time had been extinguished in this our France) and also because it is absolutely clear that it was first created in our French language, since Amadis was a Gaul and not Spanish.]

The hero's national identity is linked to a supposed original in the French vernacular, and this in itself is central to the translator's justification for his work. Later on in his dedication of Book I, Herberay goes so far as to claim that he has found an old text in the language of Picardy (Herberay's birthplace),[487] from which he claims the Spanish must have been translated. Bideaux argues that this fiction of a French original does not hold any serious claim, but expresses Herberay's desire to assert his identity as an author in the face of his Spanish rival.[488] Here, the translation is connected to a heroic past as it constitutes a revival of this famous figure. Herberay appeals to a sense of common identity between him and his dedicatee, expressed in the possessive adjective 'nostre' to emphasise a shared sense of nation and language. In these claims Herberay mirrors the lively debate in France at the time about the theory of translation, which Anne-Marie Chabrolle links to contemporary discussions of the status of the vernacular in general. Chabrolle charts a growing tendency to praise the French language, but without forgetting the contributions made by Greek and Latin to its development. She observes a French enthusiasm for making foreign works available in translation to French readers, but also for enriching the vernacular. The publication of the first bilingual dictionaries and the first French grammars testifies to a growing interest in the vernacular. Chabrolle also mentions Joaquim Du Bellay's *La défence et illustration de la langue françoyse* (1549), and the latter's view that the French vernacular had evolved to a point where it could be considered a language of culture at the service of literature.[489] Valerie Worth-Stylianou, on the other hand, notes that Etienne Dolet in his

---

[486] Herberay de Essarts (trans.), *Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*, ed. by Michel Bideaux (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), p. 166. My emphasis. Further references are to this edition by short title and page number in the text.
[487] Bideaux, 'Introduction Générale', in *Amadis, Livre I*, p. 56.
[488] Bideaux, *Amadis, Livre I*, p. 166 (footnote 2).
[489] Anne-Marie Chabrolle, 'L'idée d'un spécificité linguistique et culturelle au XVI^{e} siècle et sa manifestation dans l'activité traduisante', in *Traduction et Adaptation en France à la fin du Moyen Age et à la Renaissance*, Actes du Colloque organisé par l'Université de Nancy II 23-25 mars 1995, ed. by Charles Brucker (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997), pp. 319-324 (p. 320).

La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre (*c*. 1540) and Du Bellay both conceived the French vernacular as a vehicle for national glory.[490]

The prefatorial poems to the editions of the *Amadis* books link a sense of pride in the vernacular and praise for the work of the translator. In one of the three poems prefacing Book I, Michele le Clerc, Seigneur de Maisons, comments:

> [...] des Essars par diligent ouvrage | A retourné en son *premier langaige*, [...] Espagne en cest affaire | Cognoistra bien, que France a *l'avantage* | Au *bien parler* autant comme au bien faire. (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 161) (my emphasis)
>
> [(...) Essars's diligent work | Has returned to its original language: (...) Spain in this matter | Knows well, that France has the advantage | In terms of good speech as well as of good conduct]

Le Clerc repeats Herberay's claim that the romance was first written in French and that the translator's work is all the more praiseworthy because he is reclaiming part of the nation's heritage. France now has the advantage over other nations on the basis of the quality of the vernacular and good speech. Antoine Macault, secretary and valet to the chamber of the King, continues these associations in another of the prefatory poems to Book I:

> Suyvez ce translateur, qui des branchuz Essars | Du parler Espagnol, en essartant, deffriche | Nostre Amadis de Gaule: et le rend par ses artz | En son *premier Françoys, doulx, aorné, propre*, et *riche*. (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 163) (my emphasis)
>
> [Follow this translator, Essars, who the branches | Of the Spanish speech, has cleared out and prepared | Our Amadis de Gaule, and by his skill renders it | Into its original French, sweet, ornate, fitting, and eloquent.]

Macault, like Le Clerc, identifies the work as French in origin and praises the translator for his improvement of the Spanish through the use of such refined language. In the

[490] Valerie Worth-Stylianou, '*Translatio* and translation in the Renaissance: from Italy to France', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, 9 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989-2013), III, ed. by Glyn P. Norton (1999), pp. 127-135 (p. 130).

same way, Louis des Masures, secretary to the Cardinal of Lorraine, takes pride in the language in a prefatorial poem to Book IV:

> […] le lisant en sa langue *de France* | Vous y prendrez et plaisir et profit.[491]
>
> [(…) by reading it in its language of France | You will take pleasure and profit in it.]

De Masures links the national identity of the language with the value of the works. Christophe Plantin makes a slightly different point in his 1561 edition of Book I, highlighting the pedagogical potential of the *Amadis*. Immediately after the prefatory poems, Plantin includes a section entitled 'A tous Ceus Qui Font Profession D'Enseigner la Langue Francoise en la Ville D'Anvers' [To all Those Who Have the Profession of Teaching the French Language in the City of Antwerp]. Here, he takes the poetic praises to a more practical level, making a clear statement about the pedagogic value of the romance. Plantin presents it as a means to learn and improve the knowledge of French, highlighting 'l'élégance, douceur & facilité du langage Françoise' [the elegance, sweetness and ease of the French language].[492] This is clearly linked to the success that *Le Thresor des Livres D'Amadis de Gaule* (1559) had in associating the *Amadis* series to the improvement of fine speaking and writing. The *Thresor* had first been published in France a year before and Plantin alludes here to his own 1560 edition of the *Thresor* in terms of the discussions of orthography included in its epistle.[493]

This prefatory praise for Herberay's work and the vernacular in the *Amadis* books mirrors the general appreciation of the translator's style at the time that the texts were published. Mireille Huchon comments that since the publication of Book I in 1540, Herberay's style had been celebrated as a model of perfection.[494] In the Epistle to his *Discours du songe de Poliphile* (1546), Jean Martin regrets that the work wasn't translated by the 'vray Cicero François, qui est Nicolas de Herberay' [the real French Cicero who is Nicolas de Herberay]. Jean Maugin also expresses his admiration for Herberay in his preface to his *Palmerin D'Olive* (1546), as I noted in the previous

[491] Nicolas Herberay des Essarts (trans.), *Amadis de Gaule Livre IV*, ed.by by Luce Guillerm (Paris: Honoré Champión, 2005), p. 70. My emphasis. Further references are to this edition by short title and page number in the text.
[492] Christophe Plantine, 'A tous Ceus Qui Font Profession D'Enseigner la Langue Francoise en la Ville D'Anvers', in Hugues Vaganay, *Amadis en Français : Essais de bibliographie* (Firenze : Leo S. Olschki, 1906), pp. 15-16 (p. 15).
[493] Plantine, 'A tous Ceus Qui Font Profession D'Enseigner la Langue Francoise', p. 16.
[494] Huchon, 'Amadis, "Parfaicte idée "', p. 183.

chapter. In his 'Ode au segneur des Essars su le discours de son Amadis' (1552), Joachim Du Bellay gives the translator 'Le nom d'Homere François' [The name of the French Homer].[495] Mathurin Héret, in the prefatory material to his translation of Dares Phrigius's account of the war of Troy, *La vraye et breve histoire de la Guerre et Ruine de Troie* (1553), calls Herberay's style in the *Amadis* a 'parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise' [the perfect idea of our French language].[496] Huchon argues that Herberay's translations came at a crucial moment of linguistic debate in France, when the specific character of the French vernacular was being defined. Herberay did for French what Boccaccio and Petrarch did for Italian. According to Huchon, his contemporaries praised Herberay's style because he enriched the language with elegance and grace. Huchon observes an evolution in Herberay's initial simple style, as seen in *Amadis* Book I, and the more ornate language that he used in Book VIII.[497]

Herberay was also praised for his creativity, as Michel Le Clerc expresses in his prefatory poem to *Amadis* Book IV, where he describes the translator as a true creator, not a mere translator:

> Tu te faitz tort des Essars [...] D'intituler Amadis translaté | Car le subgect tu n'as prins qu'à demy, | Et le surplus tu l'as bien *inventé* […] quand je leiz les combatz […] | Je pense ouyr sonner certainement […] trompettes et allarmes. (*Amadis, Livre IV*, p. 73) (my emphasis)
>
> [You do yourself an injustice, des Essars (…) To call Amadis translated | For you have taken only half of the matter | And the rest you have invented [...] when I read about the combats (…) | I definitely heard (...) trumpets and calls to arms.]

Herberay's changes to the text, which in the case of Book IV are quite extensive, elicit praise. His invention is of such quality that Le Clerc imagines he experiences events almost at first hand. Herberay, in his dedication to the Duke of Orleans, is open about his changes to the original:

---

[495] Huchon, 'Amadis, "Parfaicte idée "', p. 190.
[496] Huchon, 'Amadis, "Parfaicte idée "', p. 183.
[497] Huchon, 'Amadis, "Parfaicte idée"', pp. 183-200.

> [...] si vous apercevez en quelque endroit que je ne me sois assubjety à le rendre de *mot à mot*, […] je l'ay fait, tant pource qu'il m'a semblé beaucoup de choses estre mal feates aux personnes introduites, eu regard aux *meurs* & *façons du iourd'huy*, qu'aussi par l'avis d'aucuns mes amys qui ont trouvé bon me delivrer de la commune *superstition* des *translateurs* mesmement que ce n'est *matiere* ou soit requise si scrupuleuse observance. (p. 168) (my emphasis)
>
> [(...) if you see that in some places I have not been able to render word for word, (...) I have done it because it seemed to me that a lot of things were ill suited to the characters depicted with respect to the ways and fashions of nowadays, but also on the recommendation of some of my friends who thought it right to deliver me from the common superstition of translators, mainly because this is not the kind of material that requires such meticulous fidelity.]

Herberay is clearly aware of debates about word-for-word against sense-for-sense translation, which Rhodes notes is a common concern at the time, whether one is translating religious or secular material.[498] Nonetheless, the French translator seems quite comfortable not following a literalist approach, in accordance with Dolet's advice that the ideal translator should not be bound by the limitations of a word-for-word translation.[499] Huchon explains that Dolet's distaste for literalism has to do with his view that word order is one of the organizing principles of each language. Bideaux notes that Dolet uses the term 'superstition' in his *Maniere*, published in the same year as Herberay,[500] where he considers a word-for-word approach to be a form of 'besterie ou ignorance'.[501] Herberay here refers to the liberation that a sense-for-sense translation implies, but most crucially, links it to what the secular 'matiere' allows.

The English *Amadis de Gaule*, Books I to IV, were translated by Anthony Munday from Herberay's text, although there is no certainty as to which editions Munday used as sources.[502] There is no certainty either about the publishing details of the first edition of the English Book I since, as Moore notes, the only extant copy is a black-letter quarto which lacks its title page, 'and probably two other leaves'.[503] However, the entry in the *STC* speculates that Edward Allde might have published the

[498] Rhodes, 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, p. 16.
[499] Worth-Stylianou, '*Translatio* and translation', p. 129.
[500] Michel Bideaux, 'Introduction Générale', *Amadis, Livre I*, p. 64 (footnote 3).
[501] Estienne Dolet, *La Maniere de Bein Traduire D'Une Langue en Autre* (Lyon: E. Dolet, 1540), pp. 15-16.
[502] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxvii.
[503] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxvi.

work in 1590 since Books I to IV were entered to him in the Stationers' Register on 15 January 1589.[504] Book II was first published in English in London in 1595 by Adam Islip for Cuthbert Burbie,[505] and appears to be translated by Lazarus Pyott (the pseudonym for Munday). Apart from Edward Allde, the *STC* indicates that Books II to V were entered to John Wolfe on 10 April 1592, and Books II to XII were entered to Adam Islip and William Moring on 16 October 1594. Moore notes that the Wolfe-Pindley rights to Books II to V were entered to George Purslowe on 2 November 1613.[506] Books I and II were later published together in London by Nicholas Okes in 1619 and were usually bound, in folio format, with Books III and IV, which were published by Okes in 1618.[507]

The *c*. 1590 edition of Book I is prefaced by two of the three poems which featured in the French editions of Book I. Antoine Macault, secretary and valet to the King's chamber, addresses one to the readers, and the poet Mellin de Saint Gelays addresses the other to Herberay. The poems are presented in their original language, perhaps in the hope of attracting an audience already familiar with the *Amadis*, although this inclusion remains puzzling. Even though they draw attention to the features of the text (glory, honour, fame, good conduct) which could attract any romance reader, their primary focus, as I have shown, is on how the French translator has transformed the original Spanish text and appropriated it as a work of French culture, as I discussed further above. Considering this nationalistic tone, it is understandable that the poems do not feature in the 1618-1619 editions.

The surviving copy of the 1590 English edition of Book I lacks its preface, but Munday's dedication to the 1619 edition has been well preserved. In it, the English translator offers his translation to Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, later Earl of Pembroke,[508] to whom he also dedicated Books III and IV. In the dedication to Book I, Munday twice mentions a 'worthy Lady', thanking her for her support and aid in accessing the best editions of the source material. Michael Brennan identifies this Lady as Susan de Vere, Countess of Montgomery, Philip Herbert's first wife, and argues that her enthusiasm as patron probably encouraged the many romances dedicated to the couple.[509] Hamilton notes that Munday also makes allusion to Lady Susan's

[504] See entry 541 in *A Short-Title Catalogue*, I, 30.
[505] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 202.
[506] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxvi.
[507] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxvi.
[508] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxvi.
[509] Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988), p. 157.

encouragement and protection in the dedications to Books III and IV.[510] Unlike Montalvo's and Herberay's political prefaces, Munday's dedications dwell mainly on advertising projected future translations in the series.

Religious Devotion and Doctrine

It is important to look into the religious aspect of Munday's translation because up to this date there has not been a detailed analysis of them other than Donna B. Hamilton's discussion in one chapter of her book *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633,* and John J. O'Connor's comments in one chapter of his *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature*. Hamilton acknowledges the 'malleability of religious positioning in England' during Munday's time and considers the Catholic-Protestant binary insufficient to describe the 'religious and ideological identities' of the period.[511] She seeks to counter the idea of Munday as a 'rabid Protestant', 'rabidly anti-Catholic', and 'anti-papist', a view Celeste Turner endorses, as Hamilton notes, only to modify it when she later identifies Munday as a Catholic convert. Hamilton notes that these religious labels are constructed on the basis of evidence of Munday's employment as a pursuivant in the 1580s, during which time he wrote anti-Catholic pamphlets. In the light of scholarly neglect of Munday's works, Hamilton presents her book as a way to 'open a slot' to understand his texts better.[512] Despite these productive intentions, I find it problematic that she is intent on finding evidence of Munday's Catholic sympathies without really doing an in depth analysis of the romances. I consider that the context she builds to understand Munday's translations is very useful because she takes into account the translator's contemporaries, England's relationship to Spain, Munday's anti-Spanish pamphlets, the status of religious controversy at the time, and the religious sympathies and political connections of Munday's patrons. However, I would like to build on this context and consider Munday's contradictory omissions and inclusions of religious material within it, which Hamilton alludes to, for example in noting Turner's contradictory claims, but does not dwell on in relation to the translations of Spanish romances. While Hamilton acknowledges that Munday 'sanitized the original' by removing much of the Catholic material in the *Amadis,* she finds it more significant that he did not make the work fully Protestant, as Spenser did with Ariosto and other 'continental forerunners for *The Faerie Queene*', and that he did not 'disparage or revise

[510] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics,* p. 98.
[511] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics,* pp. xvi.
[512] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics,* pp. xv-xvi.

the ideology of the Iberian works'.[513] However, Hamilton's argument here seems to accept what Paul J. Voss calls a 'monolithic assessment of the period',[514] which appears to uphold the binary that she is trying to modify, as her unquestioned association of Spenser's work with Protestant ideology would indicate. H. L. Weatherby, for example, in a 'much-needed corrective' of *The Faerie Queene* scholarship, as Voss argues,[515] questions the 'Protestantizing critics' of Spenser's romance who assumed that the Catholic material in the work could not have been intended to be taken at face value. Weatherby argues that not enough attention has been paid to Spenser's text and proposes to look at the Catholic material without making assumptions about the author's 'particular brand of Churchmanship'.[516] I find this view illuminating in that it allows for the possibility of religious inconsistency to exist in works contemporary with Munday's translations, acknowledging the need for assessing works such as the *Amadis* in this light.

Hamilton considers that Munday's *Amadis* has a Catholic world-view. She calls the Amadis of Book III an 'international Christian hero',[517] but this misrepresents a character who, compared with his crusader son Esplandian, emerges as a rather worldly knight,[518] as Esplandian himself points out in the anonymous English translation of Book V:

> […] if the prowess and knightly adventures of my Father had been as well employed to the advancing of the Christian faith as they were to win and obtain honor in this world, I think his like would not be found, but having passed his youth in things so vain and transitory, doubtless his glory is the less […][519]

[513] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 78.
[514] Paul J. Voss, 'The Catholic Presence in English Renaissance Literature', *The Ben Jonson Journal*, 7 (2000), 1-26 (p. 3).
[515] Voss, 'The Catholic Presence', p. 23 (footnote 16).
[516] H. L. Weatherby, 'Holy Things', *English Literary Renaissance*, 29 (1999), 422-42 (pp. 425-26)
[517] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 101.
[518] In relation to this idea of contrast between what Amadis and Esplandian represent as chivalric knights, see for example Susan Giráldez, *Las Sergas de Esplandián y la España de los Reyes Católicos* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), p. 32.
[519] *The Fift* [sic] *Booke of the Most Pleasant and [D]electable Historie of Amadis de Gaule* (London: by Adam Islip, 1598) in Early English Books Online <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 30 September 2014], sig. B4^{v}. Some terms have been modernised as well as typography in the cases of long s, sharp s, u/v, and ampersand. Further references are to this edition by short title and signature number in the text.

Furthermore, Hamilton presents as evidence of Amadis's Christian status the Emperor of Constantinople's favouritism towards him after he has killed the evil monster Endriagus. She argues that when Munday shows them going to mass together, he is drawing attention to the 'religion of the Christian emperor'.[520] While the detail of the mass is noteworthy, as I will show, Hamilton does not acknowledge the fact that Herberay has already removed quite a few religious details in the episode, most notably, Montalvo's description of the Emperor as '[…] mayor hombre de los christianos […]'[521] [(…) greatest man of all Christians (…)] and Constantinople as '[…] cabeça y más principal cosa […] de toda la christiandad […]' (*Amadís de Gaula*, p. 1174) [(…) head and main thing (…) of all Christendom (…)]. This is just one example of Hamilton's consistent disregard for the influence that Herberay's translation might have had on Munday's treatment of religious material in his text, which I find crucial to bear in mind when evaluating the English translator's message. Other than a passing reference to the royal patronage and expensive formats of the French translations,[522] Hamilton does not mention Herberay at all, and so appears to be comparing the Spanish with the English text, ignoring the French intermediary.

O'Connor's scholarship, meanwhile, offers just a general view of Herberay's and Munday's translations of the *Amadis*, noting that the translators' changes to the religious material give 'differing views of religion in Spain, France, and England'.[523] O'Connor sees Munday as even more thorough than Herberay in editing out Catholic material, but concludes from a brief analysis only that Munday's modifications 'may or may not reflect general attitudes'.[524] Unlike O'Connor, I will analyse how Munday also translates quite a few religious elements literally and what that might mean when placed alongside his omissions.

Montalvo's agenda is clearly expressed in the prologues to Books I and IV of the *Amadís*, in the prologue of the *Sergas*, and in chapters 98 and 99 of the latter, in which he includes himself in the text as a character.[525] Of all this material, Herberay only translates Montalvo's prologue to Book I. Despite the other omissions, the inclusion of this material in the first book of the French series is remarkable, since in it

---

[520] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 102.
[521] Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Amadis de Gaula*, ed. by Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua, 6th edn, 2 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 2008), II, p. 1158. My emphasis. Further references are to this edition by title and page number in the text.
[522] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 75.
[523] O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence*, p. 145.
[524] O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence*, pp. 144-46; 260 (footnote 10 for Chapter VII).
[525] Carlos Sainz de la Maza, 'Introducción', in Rodríguez de Montalvo, Garci, *Sergas de Esplandián*, ed. by Carlos Sainz de la Maza (Madrid: Castalia, 2003), pp. 7-92 (p. 11).

Montalvo clearly expresses his admiration for the politics of the Catholic Monarchs' reign, as noted further above. Herberay, however, reduces the excessive tone of admiration and modifies the religious associations to the Monarchs' rule. In the section in his prologue where Montalvo praises King Ferdinand's role in the military victory of Granada, he specifically depicts it as a holy and Catholic triumph: 'aquella *santa* conquista […] y jornada tan *cathólica*' (*Amadís de Gaula,* p. 220) (my emphasis) [that holy conquest (…) and mission so Catholic]. Herberay, on the other hand, even though he maintains the tone of admiration, reduces the religious character of the military event, because in his text it is the King not the the military campaign that is depicted as Catholic, as the phrases 'magnanime Roy catholique' (*Amadis, Livre I,* p. 169) [*magnanime* Roy *catholique*] and 'glorieuse conquest' (*Amadis, Livre I,* p. 169) [glorious conquest] indicate.

Anthony Munday does not translate the Spanish or the French prologue. Almost all the French editions of the French Book I include the translation of Montalvo's prologue.[526] This consistency in the French editions indicates that Munday must have surely seen the Spanish preface, although what edition he used as his source is unknown.[527] However, there is evidence that he did encounter the other French prefatorial material, since he included two poems from the French Book I editions. So Munday must have consciously chosen to omit the Spanish prologue, as well as the French dedication. Herberay's dedicatory epistle to the Duke of Orleans, like Montalvo's prologue, conveys a clearly political message by linking his work to the royal family. These highly topical prefaces arguably do not have any place in the English text.

Susan de Vere, mentioned in Munday's dedication to the second editions of *Amadis* Books I, III, and IV, has been seen by Hamilton as indicative of Munday's religious sympathies. Susan's father, Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, was dedicatee of Munday's romance *Zelauto* (1580) and of some editions of his *Palmerin D'Oliva,* as noted in the previous chapter. This is why she argues that Munday's dedication of *Amadis* to Philip Herbert was due, in part, to his wish to remain close to the family of his early patron. Hamilton also suggests that Munday's dedication to Herbert links his work to an aristocratic and court readership, since both Phillip and Susan were

[526] Of some fourteen editions of the French Book I, I have been able to confirm that eight contain the translation of Montalvo's prologue. I have not had access to the other six. For an overview of all the French editions of Book I see Bideaux, 'Introduction Relative Au Livre I', in *Amadis, Livre I,* pp. 3-17.
[527] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis,* p. xxvii.

favourites of the King and Queen.[528] Considering Montalvo's and Herbert's declared allegiances in their prefaces, Munday may also be indicating his political and ideological inclinations, but in a more indirect manner, especially since, in his dedication, Munday dwells less on praise for his dedicatee and more on advertising future translations of the series. Unlike Herberay, whose incorporation of the Spanish prologue is arguably part of his French appropriation of the Spanish material, Munday, in 1619, has nothing to gain from including material from the Spanish or the French prefaces. In 1590, however, Munday's inclusion in his edition of two French prefatory poems which praise Herberay's translation, clearly played a part in advertising the text, or in drawing attention to its continental origins. However, uncertainty about Munday's religious and political sympathies suggests that analysis of his translations presents the most reliable evidence of his sympathies.

Montalvo's glosses and commentary give his romance a Christian moral and didactic frame. Cacho Blecua has seen this aspect of Montalvo's text as evidence of the author's reworking of older material and of his intention to highlight its originally didactic tone. He notes that Montalvo uses specific episodes as exempla of conduct to be followed or avoided.[529] James Fogelquist, on the other hand, argues that Montalvo's commentary, taken as a whole, is a treatise on chivalry and the good ruler, linked to the medieval tradition of the mirror for princes.[530] I personally find that the comments reveal how the didactic potential of the romance, which is highlighted in the prologue, is developed through the text by way of this dialogue that is set up between the author/narrator and the reader.

It is important to be aware of the role that moral commentary has in Montalvo's text because it is an aspect that Herberay mostly omits and reduces in his translation, as he acknowledges in his dedication to the Duke of Orleans. Herberay argues that they are additions to the Picardian original he has identified, so there is no problem in removing them since they were part of a process of naturalization:

> […] je n'ay voulu coucher la plus part de leur dite *augmentation*, qui'ilz nomment en leur langaige *Consiliaria*, qui vaut autant à dire au nostre, comme

[528] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. 14-18; 98.
[529] Cacho Blecua, 'Introducción, in *Amadís de Gaula*, pp. 46-47; 50-51; 55-56. Also see his *Amadís: heroísmo mítico y cortesano* (Madrid: Cupsa, 1979), p. 265 (also footnote 9).
[530] Fogelquist, *El Amadís y el género de la historia fingida*, p. 170.

> advis ou conseil, me semblans telz sermons mal propres à la *matiere* dont parle l'histoire [...] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 166) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) I have not wanted to set down most of their additions, which they call in their language Consiliaria, namely, councel or advice, since it seems to me that such sermons are ill-suited to the subject matter of this tale (...)]

Herberay thus justifies his editing on grounds of genre. As Luce Guillerm points out, the moral comments constitute an act of interpretation separate from the narrative fiction, and this is why the few that Herberay does translate literally, are integrated into the narrative, eliminating that clear separation which Montalvo established between gloss and plot. Guillerm claims that Herberay's modifications were motivated less by ideology and more by an aim to please his contemporary audience, who would not have been as receptive as was the Spanish readership to Christian preaching in this context. Particularly relevant to my analysis is Guillerm's claim that Herberay tends to make the commentary more secular, explaining the narrative's events through the workings of Fortune instead of Providence.[531] An awareness of this intermediary translation process contributes to understand Munday's literal translation of the glosses that remain in his source, whereas he is so careful to modify the references to religious practice elsewhere, as I will discuss further below.

In the first four books of the *Amadis*, Munday follows Herberay's modifications of the glosses and moral commentary unquestioningly. There is no evidence that Munday knew the Spanish text, so he was probably not aware of the French translator's editing. Munday appears to have no quarrel with the views expressed in the glosses, or their fit with the narrative. As stated above, most of Herberay's glosses are distinctly secular in tone. However, Herberay does incorporate a few theological references from the Spanish original and the way in which Munday translates literally or slightly departs from his source reveals the English translator's awareness and position in terms of certain Protestant doctrinal debates. For example, the commentary on female virtue, after Amadis's parents consummate their clandestine marriage, is consistent with the views of sexuality and marriage that Munday expresses in his *Palmerin*. In a gloss which Herberay translates literally from Montalvo, and which Munday follows closely, he cautions women against the temptation of wordly desires. The text presents Amadis's mother, Princess Elisena of Little Britain, as a negative exemplum; having previously

[531] Guillerm, *Sujet de l'ecriture*, p. 161.

dedicated herself to a holy life, she abandoned it as soon as she met King Perion of Gaul, and fell in love with him. Nevertheless, the narrator presents a clandestine marriage as the sanction for their sexual relationship, and shows how the actions of Elisena's maiden, Darioletta, who arranged the union, are exemplary in the preservation of Elisena's honour:

> I made this little discourse, for it is to the end that it happen not to them, as it did unto the faire Princesse Elisena, who so long labored in thought to preserue her selfe: yet notwithstanding in one only moment, seeing the beauty and good grace of King Perion, changed her will in such sorte, as without the aduise and discretion of Darioletta, who would couer the honor of hir Mistresse vnder the *mantle* of *mariage*: you may see she was at the poynt to fal, into the very lowest parte of all *dishonor*. (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 15)

In keeping with his treatment of the sexual material in his *Palmerin*, Munday presents here the value of the union in protecting female honour. His original does not deal in any way with doctrine or matters that the English translator might find controversial, therefore, he translates the gloss literally, as he does with most of the others in the French text.

However, in some glosses, Herberay has maintained something of Montalvo's theological emphasis and Munday also translates these literally, possibly because he agrees with the tone of the message. For example, in *Amadis* Book II, Amadis abandons his chivalric life and commits to a life of penance, an event which takes up most of the action of Book II. His motivation is the rejection of his beloved Princess Oriana, on account of misinformation which leads her to believe that Amadis is in love with someone else. Munday, following Herberay, anticipates at the beginning of the Book the upcoming events, and indicates how after his period of penance Amadis only found comfort through God's mercy:

> […] neither force of armes, the continuall remembrance of his Lady, nor the magnanimitie of his heart were once sufficient to procure him remedy: but onely the *grace*, and *mercy* of our *Lord God* (who in *pittie* regarded him) after hee had sometime remained in the rocke of aduersitie in sorrow and tribulation […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 318) (my emphasis)

Amadis remains on 'Poore Rock' island for a while, living an ascetic life with a hermit he encounters not long after Oriana has rejected him. In the Spanish and French texts, but not in Munday, Amadis asks the hermit if he can remain with him in order to do penance. That detail and Munday's literal translation here, of the importance of God's grace and mercy to the hero's recovery, possibly indicate Munday's Protestant views on issues of salvation and justification by faith. As David C. Steinmetz explains, John Calvin's interpretations put aside 'the penitential practice of the medieval church' to ensure salvation, arguing instead that sinners were justified through their faith in a process that lasted their whole lives.[532] We know that Munday was aware of Calvin's views because he edited Robert Horne's translation of two of Calvin's sermons in an edition entitled *Two godly and learned sermons made by that famous and woorthy instrument in Gods church, M. Iohn Caluin*, printed in 1584.[533] Ian Hazlet notes that Protestant reformers saw justification as 'a gratuitous divine gift, grounded in God's grace and the work of Christ', and that their agreement on this view had been made evident in the Marburg Colloquy.[534] By drawing attention to the importance of God's grace to Amadis's salvation in the previous quotation, Munday, following Herberay, shows familiarity, at least, with these Protestant views. The English translator further stresses these ideas in Book I by omitting Herberay's reference to the importance of good works. In the first book, the enchanter Arcalaus imprisons King Lisuart of Great Britain and Princess Oriana. Foquelquist suggests the King's pride brings this about, and that Montalvo's gloss highlights the unpredictability of providence through the example of Lisuart's sudden hardship.[535] In the three versions the narrator comments on the King's responsibility for the unfortunate events but also anticipates the eventual positive resolution of the characters' captivity. Herberay, translating literally from the Spanish, notes the importance of the monarch's good works in the providential release of the prisoners, but Munday omits this detail:

> […] *nostre Seigneur* permist le faire tomber en tous ces dangers […] car il le meit en peu d'heure au plus bas qu'il eust peu estre: mais il le releva aussi tost

[532] David C. Steinmetz, 'The Theology of John Calvin', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 113-29 (pp. 124-25)
[533] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 200.
[534] Ian Hazlett, 'Bucer', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 100-12 (pp. 108-09).
[535] Foguelquist, *El Amadís y el género de la historia fingida*, pp. 160-61.

> *par* le *merite* d'aulcune de ses *bonnes oeuvres* […] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 544) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) our Lord allowed him to fall into these dangers (…) for he put him suddenly at the lowest position that he could be in, but he raised him up again, just as quickly, on account of the merit of some of his good works (…)]

Munday translates:

> […] the diuine ordenance suffred him to fall in these dangers […] for in short time hee was brought so lowe as might be, and afterwarde restored againe […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 245)

Moore notes that Munday's omission indicates his intentional avoidance of 'the Roman Catholic overtones of the reference to Lisuart's good works'.[536] However, I would add that the translator also indicates his awareness of Protestant views such as those expressed by Martin Luther, who attacked 'the late medieval way of salvation' by arguing against 'meritorious human righteousness', as Scott Hendrix explains. Luther argued that salvation was not obtained through 'human achievement and merit' but rather through a 'passive righteousness of God'. Hendrix explains that Luther had to clarify that although people were saved by faith and not merit, genuine good works should still be done 'in obedience to God's commandments.[537]

This awareness of the Protestant debates over salvation and Munday's concern to remove evidence of Catholic doctrine is what perhaps leads the English translator to omit from his translation references to devotional practices dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which mainly celebrate her role as mediator. However, at other points in the text he preserves references to Mary as Christ's mother. I argue that these contradictions show Munday's awareness of tensions between the old and new roles that the Virgin was given in the Church of England, and the dilemma of how to represent her. Christine Peters explains that in late medieval Christian devotion Mary was regarded as fundamental in the scheme of salvation, performing the role of mediator to achieve

---

[536] Moore, *Amadis*, p. 976 (endnote to page 245).
[537] Scott Hendrix, 'Luther', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 39-56 (pp. 42-45 and 47-48).

Christ's mercy. This was problematic for Protestant reformers who considered that the only appropriate 'mediator to God' was Christ, and in this role she usurped 'the office of Christ' and the 'veneration due to God alone'.[538] The Reformation then rejected Mary's adoration as intercessor and some even denied that Christ took flesh from her, so as to claim that no sanctity came from her. However, Peter notes that reformers struggled with the fact that in reducing Mary's role there was a danger of 'diminishing the humanity of Christ', which was essential to Protestant doctrine. This, argues Peters, encouraged a shift which emphasized Mary as a model of emulation: humble, modest and 'filled with divine grace'.[539]

The Virgin Mary is present all throughout Montalvo's text in the constant religious exclamations of characters, which Javier Roberto González argues are more often no more than mere interjections than expressions of devotion.[540] However, Jonathan Michael Gray notes that both medieval Catholics and sixteenth-century Protestants considered 'that oaths were a form of worship'.[541] Nonetheless, medieval Catholics believed that 'the power of God was diffused throughout the material world' and therefore could be worshipped by swearing oaths to 'saints, relics, books of the Gospel, and the consecrated host', among other things. Protestants, on the other hand, considered the practice of worshipping God by means of saints, relics and the Mass as idolatry and superstition. Instead, they 'favoured a more direct approach to God through the word' and so they 'restricted the acceptable nouns by which one could swear, rejecting oaths by relics, saints, the Mass, and the Mass book'.[542] These changes in doctrine are possibly what Munday has in mind when he omits or modifies those oaths in the text that appeal to the Virgin Mary for help. In the first two books of the *Amadis*, the English translator replaces the references to the Virgin with a more generalized allusion to divinity. In Book I, when Amadis sets out to rescue Oriana from the enchanter Arcalaus, he chances upon a hermitage and asks the hermit if he has seen any knights pass by with some maidens. When Amadis explains that the Princess has been taken prisoner, the hermit in the French text exclaims: '[…] je prie à la doulce vierge Marie qu'elle vous soit en ayde […]' (*Amadis, Livre I,* p. 549) [(…) I pray that the

[538] Christine Peters, *Patterns of Piety: Women, Gender and Religion in Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 216; 218-19.
[539] Peters, *Patterns of Piety*, pp. 60; 207-42.
[540] Javier Roberto González, 'Amadís Orante', *eHumanista*, 16 (2010), 33-56 (p. 33).
[541] Jonathan Michael Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 22.
[542] Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation*, pp. 22; 30

sweet virgin Mary will help you (…)]. Munday, on the other hand, translates: 'The *God of heaven* […] further your intent […]' (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 248) (my emphasis).

There are other examples where even when the French translator has removed a controversial reference to the Virgin, Munday further modifies the text. He may have been encouraged by the fact that oaths were not taken lightly by religious writers during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. As Gray explains, both Catholics and Protestants developed criteria according to which an oath could be considered lawful: 'one had to swear in truth […] in judgment […], and in justice'.[543] Gray notes that both for medieval Catholics and sixteenth-century Protestants oaths that did not meet these criteria 'were sinful and a serious offence to the majesty of God'.[544] One example of a typical modification comes in Book I, when a lady comes to Lisuart's court asking him to intercede for her to avoid marrying someone she does not love. In the end, it is decided that she must marry this man anyway and she reacts by exclaiming: '¡Santa María, valme!' (*Amadís de Gaula*, 537) [By Saint Mary!]. Herberay translates this as 'Sur mon Dieu' (*Amadis, Livre I,* p. 511) [By my God], while Munday translates 'Out alas' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 221). Munday may here want to avoid a vain oath. As Gray explains, these were oaths that were sworn without necessity and in a setting that was not 'liturgical, legal, political', or in any way serious. While they were very common in everyday conversation, they were constantly condemned in religious writing because they were considered to lead to the more serious fault of perjury.[545] However, in Book III, Munday translates literally a lady's exclamation on having been insulted by Norandel, illegitimate son of King Lisuarte: 'By Sainct Mary […] you do mee wrong […]' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 594). This shows the inconsistencies between religious doctrine and popular practice.

Montalvo's characters are constantly praying for the Virgin to act as their intercessor, and, in keeping with Reformation doctrine, Munday either omits or modifies Mary's role. When Amadis manages to locate Arcalaus, in order to rescue Oriana, and is hiding while he watches the enchanter and his men approaching, the Spanish describes the hero's plea for divine protection: '¡Ay, Dios!, agora y siempre me ayuda y me guíe en su guarda […]' (*Amadís de Gaula*, p. 570) [Oh, Lord, now and

[543] Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation*, p. 35.
[544] Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation*, p. 42.
[545] Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation*, pp. 38-39.

always, keep me in your care!]. In a rare expansion of this material,[546] Herberay translates:

> […] [Amadis] se *meit* à *genoulx*, et faisant son oraison, dit ainsi: "Dieu tout puissant, je vous supplie qu'il vous plaise ester en mon ayde. Et vous, *Marie vierge glorieuse, priez* maintenant *vostre filz* (qui est vostre pere) de me *guider* et *adresser*". (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 550) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) he knelt down, and praying, he said as follows: "Almighty God, I beg you to come to my aid. And you, Mary, glorious virgin, beg your son (who is your creator) to guide and lead me".]

Munday, on the other hand, condenses:

> […] hee fell downe on his knee and prayed, that *God* would *strengthen* him in this enterprise […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 248) (my emphasis)

Munday maintains the devotional gesture of kneeling but makes Amadis request the more generalized aid of strength. The English translator not only removes his source's appeal to the Virgin but also a sense of Amadis's vulnerability. However, elsewhere in the text Munday does not omit the reference to the Virgin but instead changes her role. In Book II, before Amadis leaves his squire Gandalin and his friend Isanjo for a period of penance at Poor Rock Island, Herberay, following Montalvo literally, describes the hero's devotion in a chapel close to Isanjo's castle:

> […] s'en partit sans tenir voye ne sentier, tant qu'il s'approcha d'ung hermitage: adonc demanda à Ysanie quel *Sainct* y estoit reclamé. Monseigneur, respondit il, la *glorieuse* vierge Marie y *fait* souvent maintz miracles: et a ceste cause Amadis descendit de cheval: et entrant en l'eglise meit les genoulx à terre et par grand devotion commença à dire: *Dame glorieuse*, consolatrice et refuge des affligez, ie vous supplie me *implorer* la *grace* de *vostre filz*, et me secourir, prenant pitié de ma *pauvre* ame en ceste extremité.[547]

[546] This is noted by Bideaux in his edition, see *Amadis, Livre I*, p. 550 (footnote 1).
[547] Nicolas de Herberay (trans.), *Le Second Livre de Amadis de Gaule* (Paris: imprimé par Denys Ianot, 1541), sig. B3^{v}-B4^{r}. My emphasis. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s, sharp s, u/v,

> [(…) he started on his way keeping to neither road nor path, until he came upon a hermitage. Then he asked Ysanie what Saint was venerated there. 'Sir', he answered, 'the glorious Virgin Mary often performs many miracles here'. And at that news Amadis dismounted and, entering the church, kneeled down on the ground and with great devotion began to say: 'Glorious Lady, comfort and refuge of the afflicted, I beg you to implore your son for grace, and to help me, taking pity of my poor soul in this extremity.]

Munday condenses:

> […] he mounted upon his horse, keeping neither way nor path untill he came neere unto an Hermitage, then he demanded of Isania what *place* that was: My Lord answered hee, this Chapel is dedicated to the Virgin Marie, wherein oftentimes are diverse strange miracles *wrought*. For which cause Amadis alighted from his horse, entred into the Church, and kneeling downe with great devotion, hee made his *prayers* to *God*. (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 323) (my emphasis)

Herberay maintains the Spanish representation of both Mary's and Christ's late medieval roles in the scheme of salvation. Munday, however, modifies Mary's direct influence by not identifying the identity of the miraculous agent, whereas Herberay represents her role clearly through the verb 'fait'. Of course, the context can supply the missing link between deity and miracle, but I find the change meaningful in the way it subtly distracts attention from the positive results of the Virgin's devotion. Most crucially, Munday makes Amadis's prayer a direct appeal to God instead of Mary. The English translation also omits the question of the chapel's dedication by adding the more general reference to a 'place'. This possibly reflects a Protestant disapproval of the cult of saints. Saints were worshipped in late medieval Catholicism because they were seen as channelling God's power. The Reformation attacked their role as mediators[548] and saw their cult, and the worshipping of images associated with them, as a substitute

---

and ampersand. Contraction ē has been expanded. Further textual references are to this edition by short title and signature number in the text.

[548] Peters, *Patterns of Piety*, p. 210.

for the worship of God.[549] However, Munday keeps the association of the chapel with miracles, and with Mary, which possibly endorses a role for the Virgin in the England of his time. Peters argues that although the iconoclasm of the Henrician Reformation in the 1530s destroyed many images at Marian pilgrimage sites, it did not remove the general visual presence of the Virgin. She notes that in places such as Worcester and Rewe (Devon), images of Mary still attracted devotion, even if 'offerings and rich mantles' were removed. Although Mary's veneration was eliminated from Protestant practice, explains Peters, her image as a focus of emulation was not, as her presence in several texts shows.[550] In his *Cathechism* (first published in *Works* in 1564), Thomas Becon presents the behaviour of the 'pure and glorious virgin Mary' as an example to illustrate that maidens 'should be seen and not heard'.[551] Later, Thomas Bentley's *The monument of matrons* (1582) includes in the section 'For a sick child', the 'song of the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our saviour Christ', which she sang when 'she felt herself conceived of our Saviour Jesus', based on Luke 1:46.[552] Peters points out that Mary continued to represent 'a positive, and enabling, symbol for women'; Dorothy Leigh explains in her *Mother's Blessing* (1616): 'what a blessing God hath sent to us women through that gracious Virgin, by whom it pleased God to take away the shame which Eve […] hath brought to us'.[553] This endurance of Mary is also seen in Munday's literal translation of the Virgin in her role as Christ's mother. In Book III, the three versions describe how Amadis comes out of the fight against the evil monster Endriagus severely wounded, and thinking he is going to die, he prays:

> Oh, my Lord God, who to redeeme mee tooke humaine flesh, in the blessed Virgins wombe […] take pitie on my soul […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 638)

Munday, following Herberay literally, separates Mary in her role as mother and Christ as redeemer of humanity, thus consistently expressing Protestant views on salvation. After this prayer, Amadis is cured of his wounds and survives. He then writes a letter to

[549] David Bagchi, 'Catholic Theologians of the Reformation Period before Trent', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 220-32 (p. 229).
[550] Peters, *Patterns of Piety*, pp. 217; 228.
[551] Thomas Becon, *Cathechism* (1564), in Aughterson, *Renaissance Woman*, p. 27.
[552] Thomas Bentley, *The monument of matrons* (1582), in Aughterson, *Renaissance Woman*, pp. 120-22 (pp. 121-22).
[553] Peters, *Patterns of Piety*, p. 228.

the Emperor of Constantinople, sovereign of the island on which the monster used to dwell, telling him that he has killed the beast, and asks him to name the island 'ínsola de Sancta María' (*Amadís de Gaula*, p. 1152) [island of Saint Mary], formerly called the 'ínsola del Diablo' (*Amadís de Gaula*, p. 1152) [island of the Devil]. This is to mark the end of the diabolic reign of Endriago, a monster who was the product of incest and whose father had constantly tormented and killed Christians. Munday, following Herberay, keeps this reference as well. Hamilton argues that these Catholic references in Book III were included by Munday, unlike in his translations of the 1580s and 1590s, because there was a more favourable religious climate when the translation was published, in 1618.[554] However, Munday does include references to the Virgin in the 1590s, as the examples from Book II analysed above indicate. Moreover, in Book V, published in 1598, the anonymous English translator also translates literally a section in which Mary is invoked in her role as Christ's mother. The scene describes the conversion of the giant Mandraco, after he has been convinced of the power of the Christian god represented in his defeat against Esplandián:

> […] mettant les genoulx à terre, et levant les yeulx et les mains au ciel, s'escria: "Jesus filz de la vierge, je crois indubitablement que tu es la vraye verité, et que tous les aultres dieux, esquelz j'ay toute ma vie adheré, sont faulx et pleins de mensonges […][555]

The anonymous translator follows:

> […] kneeling on the ground, and lifting both his eyes and hands unto heaven, he cryed out and said, Jesus the Son of the Virgin Mary, I most certainly believe thee to be the *onely*, *infallible*, true, and *living* God, and that all others whom during my life I have worshipped and adored, are of no power […] (*The Fifth Booke*, sig. E4^{r})

[554] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, p. 99.
[555] *Le Cinqiesme* [sic] *Livre d'Amadis de Gaule*, Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, trans. by Nicolas Herberay des Essarts, ed. by Véronique Duché and Jean-Claude (Paris: Garnier, 2009), p. 105. Further references are to this edition by short title and page number in the text.

Herberay has translated literally from Montalvo here, except for the allusion to the Virgin which he has added to replace the Spanish 'hijo de Dios' [son of God].[556] The English translator follows unquestioningly all the dramatic devotional gestures of his French source, typical of his practice throughout Book V. This exemplifies both the endurance of the cult of Mary and the constant adjustment to Reformation doctrine of religious representation during the period.

Another element of the religious material which Munday focuses on is attendance at mass. While he omits quite a few examples in his text, Munday also translates others literally. In the Spanish text, Montalvo constantly describes how characters attending mass, frequently before combat. Cacho Blecua refers to Ramón Llull's *The Book of the Order of Chivalry*, where Llull states that knights should often attend mass, worship and fear God, because, by this act, knights have a constant consciousness of death and are reminded to fear damnation and to ask for God's protection. By doing this, says Llull, the knight exercises the virtues and upholds the tradition of the order of chivalry.[557] Rafael Mérida points out that in the *Amadis* hermits often say mass and that hermitages commonly appears as sites for prayer.[558] As Peter Marshall explains, late medieval Catholicism was 'profoundly sacramental', which meant that people believed God's grace became available through 'ritual actions […] forms of words […] material objects and sacred places'. The sacraments of penance and the eucharist 'were endlessly repeated', thus renewing 'grace in the penitent sinner'. The mass held a special place in the imagination of late medieval Catholics because it was the moment in which 'Christ became physically present among his people'.[559] Eamon Duffy explains that 'the redemption of the world' was renewed in the sacrifice of the mass and that the body of Christ 'was the focus of all the hopes and aspirations of late medieval religion.'[560] However, Martin Luther opposed 'the Mass as a good work performed without attention to interior dispositions, especially the exercise of faith', as

[556] Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, *Sergas de Esplandián*, ed. by Carlos Sainz de la Maza (Madrid: Castalia, 2003), p. 169. Further references are to this edition by short title and page number in the text.
[557] Cacho Blecua, *Amadís de Gaula*, p. 635 (footnote 29).
[558] Rafael M. Mérida Jiménez, 'Monasterios y Hermitas en el *Amadís de Gaula*: Encrucijadas Narrativas e Ideológicas de Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo', in *Amadís de Gaula: Quinientos Años Después: Estudios en Homenaje a Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua*, ed. by José Manuel Lucía Megías and Mª Carmen Marín Pina, with the collaboration of Ana Carmen Bueno (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2008), pp. 525-37 (p. 531).
[559] Peter Marshall, *Reformation England, 1480-1642*, 2nd edn (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012), p. 5.
[560] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580* (New Haven, C.T,: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 91.

Robert C. Croken explains.[561] Hendrix explains that Luther 'rejected the concept of the mass as a sacrifice and replaced it with that of a testament'.[562] In England, masses on behalf of the dead were prohibited between 1547 and 1553, during the Edwardian Reform, [563] in the 'Actes against the popish masses' of 1549 and 1552. Mass was restored in 1553, during Mary I's Counter-Reformation,[564] and then abolished again by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity of 1559.[565] However, Christopher Haigh cautions against assuming that there was one uniform Reformation in England and argues that official policies need to be considered in light of actual practice in parishes and in everyday life.[566]

Throughout *Amadis* Book I, Munday consistently omits the characters' attendance at mass. Therefore, in his version, Galaor fights the giant Albadan without attending mass the night before, Amadis does not go to mass after escaping from Arcalaus's enchantment, nor before he avenges the murder of Princess Briolanja's father, only to name a few examples. However, from Book II onwards, religious services feature again in Munday's translation. It is possible to argue that this is proof that Book II was in fact translated by Lazarus Pyott, and not Munday. Nonetheless, masses feature prominently in Books III and IV as well. This all indicates again how the ambivalent religious climate could have influenced Munday's translation practice. O'Connor crucially notes that in Books I and II, which were first published during Elizabeth I's reign, Munday consistently replaces the word 'Mass' for 'service'. It is only in Books III and IV, both first published in 1618, that the word 'Mass' features again.[567] I can add to O'Connor's observation that the term 'service' remains in the 1619 editions of Book I and II.

During Amadis's experience as a penitent in 'Poor Rock' Island in Book II, Munday consistently translates fully the hermit's performance of mass, although he refers to it as a 'service'. However, while there are many other religious elements which Munday translates fully here, he also omits others, as noted above in the scene at the Virgin's chapel, giving a sense of how complicated the task is of doing justice to his

---

[561] Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front: The Eucharist as Sacrifice* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1990), p. 13.
[562] Hendrix, 'Luther', p. 47.
[563] Robert Whiting, *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 2.
[564] Marshall, *Reformation England*, p. 98.
[565] Duffy, *The Stripping*, p. 566.
[566] Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 16; 12-21.
[567] O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence*, p. 260 (footnote 10 for Chapter VII).

source while also conforming to current religious doctrine. Remarkably, when Amadis first meets the hermit that will guide his penance, he asks if he is a priest, which the hermit confirms: 'Truly […] it is more then forty yeeres since I first said Masse' (*Amadis de Gaule*, p. 339), and, while the French Amadis answers 'Dieu soit loué' (*Le Second Livre de Amadis*, sig. C6[r]) [God be praised] to this revelation, Munday's hero replies: 'The gladder am I thereof' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 339). This perhaps indicates in a subtle way the changes that had been brought to the clergy with the Reformation, which saw them pass from 'a sacramental priesthood' to a 'preaching ministry'.[568] This reflected the ideas of reformers such as Luther and Calvin, who argued for a 'common priesthood of believers' which 'meant that all Christians had the right by virtue of their baptism to preach and preside at the sacraments'.[569] However, Munday's identification of the priest with the term 'Mass', and his use of the word 'service' to describe the masses in Book II, indicate the coexistence of reformation doctrine with elements of older religious practice in the English text.

In the three versions of Book III, Galaor attends mass with Sildadan while on their way to King Lisuart's court and Amadis does so before setting off on his adventures later on. Most crucially though, Munday has the hero attend mass before he goes to fight the monster Endriagus, which is important because the whole episode emphasises the power of Christian faith to counter evil:

> […] [Amadis] ouyt devotement la messe. Lors appella tous ceulx du navire […] "Mes amys je m'en voys droict au chasteau chercher le monstre, et s'il plaist à Dieu j'auray la victoire de luy.[570]
>
> [(…) [Amadis] heard mass devoutly. Then he spoke to all those in the ship (…) "My friends, I am going straight to the castle to look for the monster, and if it please God, I will be victorious over him.]

Munday translates:

> […] [Amadis] afterward heard Masse devoutly […] then […] he thus spake. Loving friends, I will go directly to the Castel to seek the Monster: where (if it

[568] Marshall, *Reformation England*, pp. 79-80.
[569] Steinmetz, 'The Theology of John Calvin', p. 128.
[570] Nicolas Herberay des Essarts (trans.), *Le Livre III d'Amadis*, ed. by Michel Bideaux (Paris : Garnier, 2011), p. 213. Further references are to this edition by short title and page number in the text.

> so please God) I may have the victory over him. (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 634)

Munday thus preserves the religious aspect of the whole episode, as Amadis's prayer after being wounded, and his attendance at mass later with the Emperor of Constantinople, have already indicated.

The 'plurality of romance approaches to Christianity', which Whetter identifies,[571] arguably also allows Munday to combine a literal translation with certain modification of the knighting ritual in the *Amadis*. In all three versions this event has strong religious connotations, which is in keeping with a medieval conception of knighthood. Radulescu notes Maurice Keen's observations on the description of the knighting ritual in the influential *Ordene de Chevalerie* (*c.*1250), noting that it is presented as 'specifically Christian'.[572] Lull also portrays the ceremonial in these terms, stating that: '[…] before the squire joins the Order of Chivalry […] he shall come to the church to pray to God, the night before the day on which he shall be knight, and he shall keep a vigil and be at prayer and contemplation […]'.[573] However, Radulescu notes that even though the Christian elements are important to the way that the *Ordene* presents chivalry, 'secular virtues […] are favoured in this treatise, in much the same way as in the medieval romances'.[574] Even though Munday follows this typical Christian structure, he omits the reference to the mass in the knighting of Amadis's brother, Galaor. When he wishes to be knighted, Amadis points out that they must first go to a church and keep vigil, but Galaor argues that he is ready because he has already gone to mass that day:

> […] au nom de Dieu soit: allons en quelque Eglise pour faire la vigile. Il n'en est besoin, dist Galaor, car i'ay ce iourd'huy *ouy messe*, et veu le *precieux corps* de *Jesus Christ*. (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 298) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) in the name of God be it; let us go to some church to keep vigil. It is not necessary, said Galaor, for I have already heard mass today and seen the precious body of Jesus Christ.]

---

[571] Whetter, 'Subverting, Containing and Upholding', p. 118.
[572] Raluca L.Radulescu, 'How Christian is Chivalry?', in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 69-83 (p. 74).
[573] Ramon Llull, *The Book of the Order of Chivalry*, trans. by Noel Fallows (Woodbrdige: The Boydell Press, 2013), p. 62.
[574] Radulescu, 'How Christian is Chivalry?', p. 74.

Munday modifies:

> […] in the name of God let it be done: goe we then to some Church to performe the vigill. It shall be needlesse, quoth Galaor, to stand about *such matters* now, in that I come *not unprovided* of them already. (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 86) (my emphasis)

Herberay translates literally from the Spanish and therefore not only indicates Galaor's previous assistance at mass but, most crucially, he possibly make reference to his having received communion ('corps de Jesus Christ'). Munday avoids referring to this religious event directly and instead alludes to it by using vague euphemisms, with the phrases 'such matters' and 'not unprovided'.[575] The English translator is here possibly avoiding referring explicitly to what Marshall describes as perhaps 'the most pressing theological question […] of the entire Reformation: the nature of the eucharist'.[576] Marshall explains that the evangelical movement was divided over the issue, with Luther arguing for 'a real and objective "presence" of Christ in the bread and wine', whereas Zwingli and other reformers claimed that 'the words were to be understood symbolically'.[577] In England, Edward VI's government responded to the controversy with the publication of a new *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549, which 'reformed the eucharist service', as Marshall explains.[578] Duffy claims that this reform 'eliminated almost everything that had still been central to the lay Eucharistic piety,' including the removal of the 'sharing of holy bread', among other things. Further changes to the communion were introduced in the 'second Edwardine *Book of Common Prayer*' in 1552 and in 1559.[579] However, Munday does fully translate Amadis's vigil and prayer before being knighted in Book I:

> […] he fel [sic] on his knees before the Alter, desiring God to be his aide: not onely in conquering such as he should deale withal in Armes, but also in

[575] The removal of these references is noted by Moore in her edition, see *Amadis*, p. 967 (endnote to page 86).
[576] Marshall, *Reformation England*, p. 69.
[577] Marshall, *Reformation England*, pp. 69-70.
[578] Marshall, *Reformation England*, p. 70.
[579] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 464; 472-73.

> obtaining her, who caused him to endure so many mortal passions. (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p.39)

Unlike at Galaor's knighting, there is no mention of mass and communion in his source that Munday feels he needs to omit. Amadis's prayer and vigil are in accordance with a traditional element of medieval chivalry, as noted above, which do not appear to be controversial in the English translator's context. Moreover, the religious element of the ritual is balanced in the three *Amadis* versions by the allusion, in Amadis's prayer, to the chivalric and romantic aspirations of the hero. Esplandian's vigil and supplication in Book IV, however, are different from his father's in that his focus is solely on his chivalric mission, which is logical because at this point he has not fallen in love. However, Montalvo is arguably highlighting his role as a Christian knight above all. Munday, following Maugin literally, describes the moment when Esplandian and the other young men who are going to be knighted perform the vigil:

> All this while, was Esplandian on his knees, before the Altar devoutly imploring the assistance of *heaven*, to give him grace and meanes, whereby to accomplish those things destined to him […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 959) (my emphasis)

Munday translates literally, presumably because Herberay has already removed the prayer to the Virgin Mary. He only modifies Herberay's 'nostre Seigneur' with the term 'heaven', something which he does at other points in his texts.

When analysing the religious aspect of Munday's translations of Spanish romances, Hamilton argues that noting how much remains the same is just as important as realising what has changed.[580] Her observation is useful because it encourages one to pay attention to the way in which those literal aspects of Munday's translation work together with his modifications of the religious material. While Herberay modifies much of the Catholic atmosphere that Montalvo's moral commentary gives his text, he reproduces many of the countless manifestations of devotion. Munday's translation, on the other hand, is inconsistent, because at times he omits certain elements which he later translates literally. This ambivalent attitude to the depiction of elements such as the

[580] Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. 78-79.

veneration of the Virgin Mary or attendance at mass, gives a sense of the tensions and adaptations implied during the process of the Reformation, which advocated for a great change in religious doctrine but which encountered much challenge and inconsistency in actual practice. Munday was clearly concerned about these topical religious matters and so reflects them in his translation methology. However, he is also very respectful of the original and does not make changes that modify the basic plot and the features of the genre. In this sense, romance is actually a useful medium for Munday to depict the revolutionary religious changes of his day, because it allows for a malleable depiction of Christianity. The translator is working with a genre which is not seen as controversial in terms of religious debate because allusions to Christian devotion are part of its basic structure. However, its combination of the religious and the secular allows Munday to modify his source and still maintain its basic structure.

Anthony Munday's Rhetoric of Pleasure

It is important to analyse the treatment of erotic material in Munday's translation because, like *Palmerin*, it has been largely ignored by scholarship, but for some brief comments by O'Connor, Hackett, and Moore. O'Connor argues that Munday follows his source very closely and so reproduces literally the French expansions of the erotic material, as well as the freedom and humour that he brings to these descriptions. O'Connor selects as examples the three sexual encounters between Amadis and Oriana, where Munday translates most faithfully, so he finds no difference between the two versions, but rather focuses on what has changed in regards to the Spanish original. The other episode he comments on is one of Galaor's sexual encounters, and when O'Connor highlights one aspect in which the translation departs from the Spanish original, he does not note that it is an addition that Munday has brought to his source, assuming that it is a literal translation from the French.[581] In this respect, O'Connor does not acknowledge the ways in which the treatment of the erotic material in the English text is different from the French, which is what I will discuss further below.

Hackett, on the other hand, in her study of English Renaissance women and romance, dedicates a few sections of her chapter on Spanish and Portuguese texts to the topic of sexuality in Munday's texts. However, she does not address matters of translation practice in her analyses and therefore does not acknowledge the Spanish or

[581] O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence*, pp. 138-42.

French versions. In this respect, some of her examples might be interpreted as Munday's creations, because one is not made aware of the treatment of the material in Montalvo's and Herberay's texts. She argues, for example, that the *Amadis* is very explicit in its description of female sexuality, and that the female characters are 'driven by fierce and physical passions'.[582] One of her examples is Princess Elisena of Little Britain's eagerness to make love to King Perion of Gaul, but this is not an element that Munday brings to the text because it is already present in the Spanish original. Hackett's focus on the English translator's work alone gives a sense that he intentionally emphasized the experience of the female characters and therefore made the text potentially more appealing to a female audience, but Montalvo and Herberay arguably do the same. However, Hackett's observations on female characters' secrecy as a 'marker for female perfection' and her analysis of the potentially pornographic apeal of the *Amadis*,[583] are useful to analyse Munday's rhetoric of concealment and suggestion of erotic pleasure, as I will discuss further below.

Moore briefly comments on Munday's treatment of the erotic material in the introduction and footnotes to her edition of the English *Amadis*. She notes how Munday omits or 'tones down' the more explicit French descriptions, especially in Galaor's sexual encounters. Moore gives a few examples of ways in which Munday euphemistically describes the characters' lovemaking by way of 'circumlocutions', 'sex-as-food' motifs and 'love-as-battle' metaphors. She argues that through these mechanisms, Munday both 'qualifies the overt sensuality of Herberay's text, and enhances the eloquence of his translation'.[584] Even though Moore does not offer an in depth analysis of these elements, presumably because of the constraints of the edition, her comments are a useful starting point for my analysis because it is precisely on the metaphorical language of Munday's description of sexuality that I am going to focus further below.

In the Spanish romance, Amadis is motivated by his love for Oriana, daughter of King Lisuart of Great Britain. The hero's loyal service to the Princess is rewarded in the characters' first sexual encounter,[585] which is framed by their clandestine marriage. The couple make love for the first time in Book I, in the early stages of Amadis's chivalric career, and it is not until Book IV that their marriage is celebrated publicly. The scholarly criticism that has focused on the erotic aspect of the Spanish *Amadis* has

[582] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 63.
[583] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp. 63-71.
[584] Moore, 'Introduction', in *Amadis*, p. xxv.
[585] Cacho Blecua, *Amadís: Heroísmo Mítico*, pp. 170-89.

mainly analysed it in relation to the topic of marriage. Bideaux sees this consummation as a peculiarity of Montalvo's work, since it departs from a chivalric tradition in which the hero's romantic prize is obtained at the end of the heroic quest.[586] Cacho Blecua, on the other hand, sees the clandestine marriage in the *Amadis* as a response to adultery in the courtly love tradition and as an orthodox solution to the premarital lovemaking, which might have been part of the older narrative that Montalvo reworks.[587] Pierre Le Gentil sees in the couple's clandestine wedding a successful way of solving the anti-marriage prejudice of the older courtly tradition.[588] Cacho Blecua, however, also sees in the resource of the secret marriage a way of guaranteeing the legitimacy of Esplandián and therefore ensuring that he could become not only Amadis's rightful heir but also the Christian hero of Book V.[589]

Most of the other sexual encounters in the text involve Amadis's brother Galaor, whose promiscuity is a structural counter to Amadis's fidelity to Oriana.[590] However, I would argue that even though Amadis is faithful to one lover, his sexual drive is just as strong as that of his brother. Sylvia Roubaud comments that Montalvo's stance on Galaor's sexual freedom is contradictory, for while at certain points the author draws attention to his omission of erotic details to spare the moral sensibilities of the reader, at others he makes no comment at all. Without full knowledge of the content of the original *Amadis* which Montalvo is reworking, Roubaud argues, it is difficult to make a definite evaluation on his point of view on the sexual dimension of the story.[591] Le Gentil notes that while Montalvo's delivery might be conservative, the lovemaking scenes are highly suggestive.[592] These views are important to bear in mind when one analyses Munday's treatment of the material because, in my view, he moves beyond the link between sexuality and marriage, and focuses on the depiction of pleasure. However, as I noted further above, Munday modifies Herberay's explicit portrayal and thus presents a position as ambivalent as that of Montalvo, apparently struggling between concealment and suggestion of pleasure.

---

[586] Bideaux, 'Introduction Relative au Livre I', in *Amadis, Livre I*, p. 116.
[587] Cacho Blecua, 'Introducción', in *Amadís de Gaula*, pp. 122-24.
[588] Pierre Le Gentil, 'Pour l'Interprétation de l'Amadis', in *Mélanges a la mémoire de Jean Sarrailh*, 2 vols (Paris: Centre de Recherches de L'Institu d'Études Hispaniques, 1966), II, 47-54 (pp. 51-53).
[589] Cacho Blecua, 'Introducción', in *Amadís de Gaula*, pp. 121-24.
[590] Avalle-Arce, *Amadís de Gaula: El primitivo*, p. 154.
[591] Sylvia Roubaud, 'La forêt de longue attente: amour et mariage dans les romans de chevalerie', in *Amours légitimes amours illégitimes en Espagne (XVI^e^-XVII^e^ siècles)*, Colloque International (Sorbonne, 3, 4, 5 et 6 octobre 1984), ed. by Augustin Redondo (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1985), pp. 251-267 (pp. 263-65).
[592] Le Gentil, 'Pour l'Interprétation de l'Amadis', p. 52.

In the French *Amadis* editions Herberay draws attention to his descriptions of love and sexuality as attractive elements of his translation:

> […] en ceste traduction d'Amadis […] si trouvera (…) tant de rencontres chevaleureuses et plaisantes, avec *infiniz* propos d'amours si delectables à ceulx qui ayment ou sont dignes d'aymer, que toute personne de *bon jugement* se doit persuader […] à lire son histoire […] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 167) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) in this translation of the Amadis (…) will be found (…) so many chivalric and pleasant encounters, with infinite accounts of love that should be pleasing to those who love and who are worthy of being loved, and so, anyone of good judgment should convince himself (…) to read its story (…)]

The 'infinite' descriptions of love are part of Herberay's 'hyperbolic' style. Michel Simonin notes that in the prefatorial material for the subsequent books in the series, the publishers develop an advertising campaign in which they highlight the topic of love. As I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, this is not the only focus of this commercial campaign. As Jane H. M. Taylor notes, the insistent reference to the *Amadis*'s 'Frenchness' in the series' prefaces is also evidence of the 'shrewd commercial pragmatism' of the translator and his publishers.[593] The scheme was successful, Simonin argues, because readers found provided in the texts the romantic enjoyment that the prefaces promised. A contemporary, Langrois Bénigne Poissenot, approvingly writes of the *Amadis*, that 'l'amour el les armes [sont] unis d'une liaison admirable' [love and arms are united by an admirable bond].[594] In one of the prefatory poems to Book IV, Loys de Masures draws attention to this aspect of the romance:

> […] vous amans qui voulez lire et veoir | Les passions telles qu'amour vous livre | Vous trouverez l'un et l'aultre en ce livre […] (*Amadis, Livre IV*, p. 70)
>
> [(…) you lovers that wish to read and see | Such passions that love delivers | Will find the one and the other in this book (…)]

'Un amy du Seigneur des Essars', develops this idea further in his prefatory poems to Book IV and links these passions directly to Amadis's experience:

---

[593] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 163.
[594] Simonin, 'La disgrace d'"Amadis"', p. 28.

> En ce quart livre […] | Un point y a pour plaire et contenter, | (…) Le cueur qui vient librement à gouster | Ses grands *plaisirs* par malheurs interdictz | Les troys premiers c'est l'enfer d'Amadis | […] Ce quart luy donne *amoureulx paradis* | *L'heureuse fin* de *plaine joyssance*. (*Amadis, Livre IV*, p. 71) (my emphasis)
>
> [In this fourth book (…) | There is one point to please and satisfy, | (…) The heart that comes freely to enjoy | These great pleasures forbidden by misfortunes | The first three were hell for Amadis | (…) This fourth gives him romantic paradise | The happy end of complete pleasure.]

Herberay's 'amy' refers here to the happy conclusion of Amadis's adventure by the end of Book IV, where the hero is reconciled with his lord, King Lisuart, all military conflicts are brought to an end, and his marriage to Oriana is publicly celebrated. The language used to refer to Amadis's relationship with Oriana in this final stage of the narrative actually seems to be alluding more to the erotic dimension than to the emotional one, as the terms 'plaisirs', 'amoureulx paradis', 'heureuse fin', and 'plaine joyssance' indicate. In one of the prefatory poems to Book V, an anonymous 'amy', perhaps the same as in Book IV, goes as far as to claim that 'L'inventeur de l'ouvre est Amour, le dieu puissant' (*Le Cinqiesme* [sic] *Livre d'Amadis*, p. 56) [The creator of the work is Love, the powerful god].

Herberay's *Amadis* has been seen as more of an adaptation than a translation because his style greatly transforms the Spanish original. Taylor argues that Herberay's great expansions respond to the contemporary taste for verbal abundance and ornamental speech. Quoting Luce Guillerm, Taylor describes Herberay's romantic and sentimental portrayals as 'language made spectacle' through the use of 'rhetoric of sentiment', thus building 'hyperbolic' scenarios.[595] Taylor explains how Herberay's style is an example of the celebration of 'linguistic plenitude' developed by writers and theorists in the sixteenth century. The tendency was to exploit the 'inexhaustibility' of a new language and the 'richness of poetic ornament', which Herberay develops, not only in terms of romantic description, but throughout his translation. The poet Éttien Tabouret's criticism in 1584 illustrates the extent of Herberay's verbal profusion when he says: 'D'autres y a encore qui se plaisent de […] monstrer comme ils sçavent Amadigauliser, remplissant vne page entire de ce qui se pourroit escrire en deux lignes'

[595] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 168.

[Others there are who delight in demonstrating how they can Amadise, filling a whole page with something that could be set out in two lines].[596] To me, this 'abundant' style is interesting particularly in the way the translator employs it to make explicit the sexual activity of his characters. Displaying his rhetorical expertise, Herberay also makes the text highly erotic, even pornographic. This eroticism might of course be deliberate, but Herberay's use of this style elsewhere in the romance, for example in his description of warfare or architecture, indicates that perhaps the detailed descriptions of sexual activity could be partly understood as a by-product of his interest in rhetoric. In Book II, the scene, in which Amadis and Oriana make love, before the hero abandons King Lisuart's court after the King has turned against him, leaves little to the reader's imagination, and is clearly titillating in its detail:

> […] n'ayant sur elle qu'ung mantheau de nuict, s'alla mettre entre deux draps, et ainsi qu'elle se couchoit il estoit si ioignant d'elle, qu'apres que le rideau fut tiré (non pour luy augmenter ses affections: mais pour redoubler son plaisir) […] ilz se meitrent tant à baiser et caresser l'ung l'aultre, que de grand aise leurs espritz recevrent double plaisir par les festoyements que leurs ames transsies se donnoient l'une à l'autre, sur l'extremité de leurs lebures, sans avoir povoir de profeser une seule parolle […] Et à peine eut il achevé le mot, qu'il se iect a nud entre les bras de la princesse. Adonc recommencerent leurs baisers et amoureux plaisirs, donnans peu apres contentement à la chose ou chascun pretendoit le plus. (*Le Second Livre de Amadis de Gaule*, sig. O5^{v})
>
> [(…) not wearing anything except a night gown, she lay down between two sheets and just as she went to the bed he was so desirous of her that, after the curtain was drawn (not to increase his desire but rather to intensify his pleasure) (…) they began to kiss and embrace each other, in such a way that the their spirits received twice as much pleasure, also on account of the celebration that their transported souls gave one another, at the climax of their labours, without being able to utter a single word (…) And as soon as he had finished his speech, he plunged himself naked into the arms of the princess. And so continued their kisses and romantic pleasures, soon afterwards fulfilling that which each most sought.]

[596] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, pp. 168-70; 175. Taylor's translation.

Herberay modifies the style of the Spanish and makes explicit what Montalvo only suggests:

> […] con muchos besos y abraços fueron juntos sin ver imbidia a ningunos que verdaderamente en el mundo se amassen, considerando no aver en el suyo par. Acostados en su lecho […] (*Amadís de Gaula*, pp. 897-98)
>
> [(…) with many kisses and embraces they were together, without envying those in the world who truly loved each other, considering that none could compare to their love. Lying in her bed (…)]

Montalvo's text gives only a brief idea of what the lovers are doing ('besos' 'abraços'), but other than clarifying that they are on a bed ('lecho'), leaves it to the reader to supply many missing details. In contrast, Herberay's text gives a clearer description of the characters' sexual activity, combining the more explicit references with the metaphoric.

Ian Frederick Moulton defines as Early Modern 'erotic writing' any text that is concerned with 'human physical sexual activity', whether it is explicit in its language or metaphorical, and whether it was originally intended to arouse the reader or not. Moulton analyses the circulation of 'erotic writing' in manuscript form in early modern England, and finds that these texts were commonly compiled in miscellanies with all sorts of different texts, some not erotic at all. Moulton finds that this is proof of the way in which early modern sexuality was more integrated with other areas of culture than it is today and therefore more public than private.[597] This is a useful way to think about the place of Herberay's and Munday's erotic descriptions within the context of the romance narrative they translate. Herberay's romance is not erotic as a whole, because, even though these descriptions are explicit, they are only a minimal part of a very extensive narrative dominated by chivalric and military activities. However, they are important both to the French narrative and to the advertising of the editions. Taylor argues that 'translation, as a hermeneutic enterprise, illuminates the […] dialectical relationship between the translator and his or her source text, and […] this allows us privileged insights into the socio-cultural category of 'taste' in their own […] culture'.[598] In this respect, Herberay's expansions of what is only suggested in his Spanish source, as the example above illustrates, indicate how he both exploits an

[597] Ian Frederick Moulton, *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 5-6; 37-40.
[598] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 167.

attractive element in the text and develops a style that he knows has contemporary appeal. Taylor claims that Herberay and the other contemporary translators of romance 'were conscious of their readers' preferences, and in consequence adopted stylistic and thematic strategies which […] contributed to, and may even […] have produced, their […] popularity'.[599] Hackett finds that the sexual freedom in the *Amadis* could represent an opportunity for 'semi-pornographic entertainment' for a male readership,[600] which also leads one to wonder about Herberay's deliberate intention of arousing the reader with such a description. For example, Taylor argues that Herberay's description of Amadis's and Oriana's consummation scene invites the reader to 'share his undeniably male gaze', for it is 'disturbingly intrusive' and, quoting Guillerm, 'frankly voyeuristic'.[601] In the Spanish text, Oriana has just been rescued by Amadis from the enchanter Arcalaus, and as she lies down to rest in a forest and the hero sees her, he feels aroused. Even though Montalvo is clear about Amadis's desire, however, he notes that after he first notices her, he 'sólo catar no la osava' (*Amadís de Gaula*, p. 574) [did not even dare look at her]. Herberay instead has Amadis openly gazing at the apparently unaware Oriana who seems to have fallen asleep, as he explains that the hero 'ne povoit oster l'oeil de dessus elle' (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 556) [could not take his eyes off her]. The French translator then explicitly describes what the hero sees from his standing perspective:

> […] [Oriane] tenoit les bras negligemment estendus comme endormie: et avoit pour le chault laissé sa gorge descouverte, et monstroit deux petites boules d'alebastre vif, le plus blanc et le plus doulcement respirant que nature feit jamais. (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 556)
>
> [(…) (Oriane), had her arms carelessly extented as if she was asleep, and, on account of the heat, had left her bosom uncovered, therefore showing two little balls of living alabaster, that nature had ever made, the whitest and the most sweetly breathing.]

Taylor notes that the scene is an example of 'a slightly risqué eroticism that invites imaginary participation'.[602] This, of course, is what Montalvo does in the original to

[599] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 167.
[600] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 68.
[601] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 172.
[602] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 172.

begin with, but it is evident that Herberay adds a lot more details to help build the reader's fantasy. Although we cannot know for sure what Herberay's intentions were in this respect, his critics certainly found his erotic portrayals worrying, as I will show. This erotic appeal of the three versions of the *Amadis*, which coexisted with criticism of the immorality of the genre, offers context for Munday's moral ambiguity.

By the time Munday published his translation of *Amadis* Book I in 1590, criticism of the genre of romance, and of Herberay's *Amadis* in particular, was widespread. Henry Thomas notes that in his *Introductio ad sapientiam* (1524), Vives dedicates a section warning against dangerous literature, and in his Spanish translation of the work, Francisco Cervantes de Salazar adds specific references to the *Amadis*. He warns a fictional father against allowing his daughter to read the romance, 'from which she learns a thousand depravities, and forms worse desires', and also cautions that young men will have 'their natural desires enflamed by evil reading'.[603] Also in Spain, Alejo Venegas de Busto's prefatory remarks to Francisco de Salazar's version of Luis Mexia's *Apólogo de la ociosidad y el trabajo* (1546), reproach the father who lets his daughter read these books, allowing 'the devil to corrupt her privately by means of these *Amadis, Esplandians*, and all the rest of their tribe, from which she learns […] those habits of sensual thought'.[604] Thomas notes that Bishop Antonio de Guevara, in *Aviso de privados y doctrina de cortesanos* (1539), sees these texts as works that 'incite sensual natures to sin'.[605] Simonin notes that from the publication of the *Le Thresor d'Amadis de Gaule* (1559) onwards, the publishers of the French *Amadis* made an effort to 'clean' the series' image, as the epistle to the reader of this first *Thresor* reveals:[606]

> Aucuns aussi ont eu ceste opinion, que ledict livre ne devoit estre receu, pour les propos fabuleux et lassifz y contenuz […] mais à telz ie responds, que ledict livre […] ne donne occasion de lassiveté, ny aucun talent de mal-faire, car quand il parle d'Amour, il recite […] les travaux, miseres et calamitez provenans d'iceluy: du marriage et chaste amour, il en parle en plusieurs endroitz sainctement.[607]

[603] Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 164-65.
[604] Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 166-68.
[605] Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances*, pp. 169-70.
[606] Simonin, 'La disgrace d'"Amadis"', p. 28.
[607] *Le Thresor Des Douze Livres D'amadis de Gaule* (A Paris: Pour Estienne Groulleau Libraire, 1559), sigs. ã2^{r}- ã2^{v}. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s, sharp s, u/v, and ampersand. Contractions have been expanded.

> [There are some who are also of this opinion, that the aforementioned book should not be welcomed, on account of the fabulous and lascivious material it contains (…) but to them I say that the aforementioned book (…) does not give any opportunity for lustfulness, nor any intention to do harm, because, when it speaks of Love, it tells […] of the efforts, miseries and disasters that come from it; and it speaks virtuously in many places of marriage and chaste love.]

Simonin interprets the tone of the epistle in the context of a print market where advertisement played an important part, since he notes that these same publishers who were intent on cleansing the text's image were also those ones who had highlighted the erotic aspects of the previous editions in order to attract a readership.[608] The chapter on the dangers of reading *Amadis* in La Noue's *Discours politiques et militaires* blames French translators of the series for their portrayal of princesses neglecting their modesty and of dazzled knights constantly quenching their burning desire.[609] Taylor notes how La Noue warns against the seductive effects of the rhetorical embellishments that the French translators have brought to the original:[610]

> Les traducteurs Françoys […] ont aussi adiousté […] touz les pluz *beaux ornemens* qu'ilz ont peu emprunter de la *Rhetoric*, afin que le nouveau eust pluz d'efficace de *persuader* […] Et l'ayant rendu fluide et affeté, il ne faut point demander si son murmure est doux aux aureilles, ou apres avoir passé, il va *chatouiller* les plus tendres affections du *cœur* […][611]
>
> [The French translators (…) have also added (…) all of the most beautiful ornaments that they have been able to borrow from Rhetoric, in order to make the new work more effective in persuading (…) And having made it fluid and ornate, there is no need to ask if its whisper is sweet to the ear, because, after it has entered, it will tickle the most tender pains of the heart (…)]

La Noue is not only concerned about the content of the work but is also conscious that the style of the translators (by this point in time not only Herberay's) is instrumental to

---

[608] Simonin, 'La disgrace d'"Amadis"', p. 28.
[609] De La Noue, *The Politicke and Militarie Discourses*, sigs. G5^{v}- G6^{r}.
[610] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, pp. 167-68.
[611] François de La Noue, *Discours Politiques et Militaires* (Basle: Imprimerie de François Forest, 1588), sigs. I6^{r}-I6^{v}. My emphasis. Typography has been modernised in the cases of long s, sharp s, u/v, and ampersand. Contractions have been expanded. Further references are to this edition by short title and signature number in the text..

the effect that the romance might have on the readers, specifically here in terms of the portrayal of sexuality. Louise Wilson argues that Munday would have been aware of La Noue's criticism, since he translated the French author's *The Declaration of the Lord de la Noue* in 1589.[612] Mentz interprets the tone of Munday's preface in his romance *Zelauto* (1580) as a consequence of such criticism, which led Munday to present 'a chaste and modest version of chivalric romance'.[613] Mentz specifically notes the influence of Ascham's attack because he interprets certain sections of Munday's epistle to the reader as 'claims that he has tempered Arthurian excess'.[614] Mentz observes that Munday 'offers wanton pleasure but diffidently', because he notes 'I may be deemed […] more wanton than wise, and more curious than circumspect'. However, to those readers who 'will desire for *Venus* daintie dalliances' he clarifies that '*Iuno* dealeth so iustly in this cause, that their also they misse their mark'.[615] In Munday's opposition of Venus and Juno, there is an emphasis on the value of marriage as an institution that channels sexuality for the good. This is an aspect of his treatment of the erotic material in the *Palmerin D'Oliva*, as I argued in Chapter II. In respect to Munday's response to the criticism of the immorality of the genre, I can note that all the title pages of *Palmerin*, Part I, address this issue by presenting the romance in a respectable light. The heading assures the reader that the content has been '[...] handled with modestie to shun offense [...]'.[616] Munday expresses the same concern in his epistle to the reader of these editions when he says that this is '[...] matter altogether of delight, and no way offensive [...]' (*Palmerin D'Oliva*, sig.*3^{v}). Whether Munday is following a convention or reacting to previous criticism, it is clear that ideas of 'modesty' and 'offence' are linked to the publication of this sort of material, and might also have played a part in its translation. These opinions about appreciations of the genre of romance are important to bear in mind for they contribute to construct the environment in which these texts were produced and read.

In the case of the English translation, Munday seems to see that the erotic scenes make narrative sense, but at times he seems to find Herberay's explicit description at odds with the taste of his contemporary audience. He translates all of the scenes which portray Amadis's and Oriana's love-making literally, as well as the description of the sexual encounter of Amadis's parents, Elisena and Perion. The English translator's

[612] Wilson, 'Playful Paratexts', p. 123.
[613] Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, p. 37.
[614] Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, p. 37.
[615] Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, pp. 37-38.
[616] See title pages of 1588, 1615, 1616, and 1637 editions of *Palmerin D'Olive*, Part I, in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 01 May 2014].

literal translation of these sexual scenes might be explained by the fact that both Amadis and Oriana, and Elisena and Perion, have commited to a clandestine marriage before their lovemaking. This link between marriage and sexuality seems to be very important for Munday, as his treatment of the erotic material in the *Palmerin* shows. However, here he does not draw attention to the validity of the bond between lovers but rather to the detail of their sexual activity.

Munday is less straightforward in his description of other sexual activity in the narrative, which mainly involves Amadis's brother, Galaor. At times Munday omits sections altogether and at others he modifies the language, and is more metaphoric and less explicit, but still suggestive. He is consistent with his treatment of this sort of material in the *Palmerin*, but here he omits less and is more playful with the language. However, he appears ambiguous in his treatment of the material, sometimes apparently censoring, and sometimes alluding to sexual activitiy much in the way of the Early Modern erotic writing Moulton analyses. Molton notes, for example, how John Marston, in his *Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image* (1598), is contradictory, on the one hand, offering the possibility of arousal in his text, but then withholding tantalising details and condemning the readers as shameful on account of their voyeurism. Marston 'encourages and condemns sexual pleasure' at the same time, in the text itself as well as in the prefatory material.[617] To Moulton, Marston's text is an example of the extent of the uncertainty of erotic writing in Early Modern England, which, he argues, is related to greater social hesitancy about these sorts of texts: 'uncertainty about the moral status of poetry as a discourse, about the appropriate modes of erotic representation within the conventions of particular genres, about whether condemnation or praise of eroticism was a more effective stance to adopt in launching a poetic career'.[618] Even though Moulton refers here to Marston's particular case as a poet early in his career, these statements can just as well be applied to the case of Munday's ambivalent attitude towards eroticism in a genre such as romance which already had received criticism and mockery, and also within a mode of expression such as translation, which was also characterized by a self-conscious inferiority complex, as opposed to original writing. Munday's ambivalence both here and in the description of religious practice, shows him aware and influenced by his contemporary context, but not completely constrained by it.

In accounts of female desire and its satisfaction, Munday regularly departs from Herberay's explicit references to female desire and sometimes transforms his source to

[617] Moulton, *Before Pornography*, p. 26.
[618] Moulton, *Before Pornography*, pp. 22-27.

conceal the women's pleasure, while at the same time alluding to it through metaphoric language. Despite the Spanish text's clear moral agenda, most evident in the narrator's constant digressions, there are quite a few allusions to this topic, not only related to Oriana but to other young women in the text. Hackett points out that this sexual behaviour could be seen as transgressive in the light of Renaissance codes of female conduct, which upheld chastity as the highest virtue. She argues that the *Amadis* justifies questionable female behaviour by highlighting the hero's virility and the women's suffering and constancy in love,[619] although one might argue that this is truer of Oriana than of the women who sleep with Galaor. At the beginning of Book I, Elisena and Perion fall helplessly in love as soon as they meet. They make love and Elisena conceives Amadis; their union is sanctioned by a clandestine marriage, as I noted above. Elisena's maiden, Darioletta, acts as go-between to arrange the encounter and ensures that the King promises to marry the Princess. On the night in which Darioletta has arranged for the lovers to meet, Elisena and she cross a secret garden in the moonlight to get to Perion's chamber:

> […] Darioleta se levantó y tomó a Helisena assí desnuda como en su lecho estaba, solamente la camisa y cubierta de un manto, y salieron ambas a la huerta, y el lunar hazía muy claro. La doncella miró a su señora, y abriéndole el manto, católe el cuerpo y dixo riendo:
>
> —Señora, en buena hora nasció el caballero que vos esta noche avrá, y bien dezían que ésta era la más hermosa doncella de rostro y de cuerpo que entonces se sabía. (*Amadís de Gaula*, pp. 237-38)
>
> [(…) Darioleta got up and took Elisena, naked as she was in her bed, wearing only a nightgown and a mantle, they went out into the orchard, clear in the moonlight. The maiden looked at her lady, and opening the mantle, looked at her body and said laughing:
>
> —Lady, in good time was born the knight who will have you tonight, and, indeed, they said that she was the most beautiful maiden, of face and body, that was known.]

Herberay omits certain elements and adds others:

[619] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp.64; 73.

> Élisene […] hastivement se leva (…) jecta seulement un manteau sur ses espaules, et se mist à chemin, puis entrerent elles deux au jardin […] certes l'une avoit plus d'occasion d'estre contente que l'autre, qui eust tresvolontiers pris *ce bien*, ou un semblable, pour elle mesme, si elle en eust eu moyen […] Élisene voyoit bien, qu'il n'y avoit faulte que de executeur pour y *satisfaire*, car ceste Dariolette, sentant en son esprit *l'ayse* prochain, que devoit recevoir celle, qu'elle conduisoit, *ne* se *pouvoit tenir de luy manier*, puis les *tetins*, puis les *cuisses*, et *quelque chose d'avantage*, et de trop *vehemente ardeur* souspiroit souvent […] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 191) (my emphasis)
>
> [Élisene (…) quickly got up, (…) put on only a mantle over her shoulders and went on her way, and then both of them entered the garden (…) But one certainly had more reason to be happy than the other, who would most willingly have taken that good, or a similar one, for herself, if she had the means. (…) Élisene understood that without question she would fulfil this to her satisfaction, for Darioletta, feeling in her mind the coming ease that the one she guided was about to receive, could not restrain from touching her, her nipples, her thighs, and something more; from intense fervour she sighed often (...)]

Munday translates literally, until the description of Darioletta's arousal, which he modifies:

> […] Darioletta feeling in her *spirit*, the ease at hand which she should [receive][620] whom shee conducted, could not but very pleasantly *jest* and *dally* with her Mistresse, breaking many a bitter *sigh* among, as though she were to participate in Elisenaes future *good fortune* […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 13)

Cacho Blecua interprets Darioletta's laugh, in the Spanish text, as a sign of her mischievous complicity.[621] Herberay's translation transforms the relationship between the women from friendly intimacy to a completely erotically charged rivalry. The text is almost pornographic in its description of the details of the maiden's excitement and bold in the indication that Elisena pleasures her maiden, albeit combining explicit with

[620] Not in Moore's edition. See Anthony Munday (trans.), *The Ancient, Famous And Honourable History of Amadis de Gaule* (London: by Nicholas Oakes, 1619) (STC 687:11), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk> [accessed 31 October 2014], sig. B4^{r}.
[621] Cacho Blecua, *Amadís de Gaula*, p. 237 (footnote 4).

suggestive language. Munday avoids referring in such an explicit way to this expression of female desire and mentions only Darioletta's 'spirit'. Moreover, the erotic outburst of the French text is here changed to a pleasant 'jest and dally'. This could be Munday's veiled allusion to Darioletta's satisfaction, since 'jest' and 'dally' were both used as euphemisms for copulation.[622]

In later examples of female desire, Munday appears to highlight female modesty but actually draws attention to the female characters' intention to conceal their attraction, and thus give the impression of coyness. At one point in the text, Amadis and Galaor are the prisoners of Madasima, a lady who wishes to take revenge because Amadis has killed the knight Dardan. She imprisons the brothers on account of their service to King Lisuart's court, but ignoring their identity. Madasima's father tries to secure freedom for the brothers and suggests that Amadis try to seduce her. The hero, loyal to Oriana, asks Galaor to 'sacrifice' himself instead. Madasima's feelings for Galaor are initially encouraged by her father's praise of the knight and by her first sight of him in broad daylight:

> […] Galaor […] approchant d'elle luy *monstra le meilleur visaige qu'il peult* […] Madasima, qui ne l'avoit veu que de nuict, jecta l'oeil sur luy, et le trouva tel, qu'elle l'estima l'un des plus beaulx gentilz hommes qu'elle eut oncques veu. Parquoy à l'instant fut *surprinse de son amour*, et luy demanda comme il se trovoit. (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 430) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) Galaor (...) coming near her, showed the best countenance that he could (...) Madasima, who had seen him only by night, gazed at him, and found him to be one of the most good-looking and noble men that she had ever seen. For this reason she was instantly overcome by love, and she asked him how he was.]

Munday translates:

> [...] his beautie and good grace so especially contented her, as she became surprized with his love, which she *shadowed* under demanding how he fared [...] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 237) (my emphasis)

[622] See the terms 'dally' and 'jest in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, I, 362 and II, 734, respectively.

Herberay elaborates on Galaor's efforts to seduce Madasima and specifies her reaction. The English translation, on the other hand, introduces the idea of concealment, not present in the French, by describing how Madasima hides her true feelings.[623] Munday draws attention to the way in which the lady uses politeness to conceal her attraction but does not remove Madasima's desire. The English translator reveals his ambivalent style in the use of the verb 'shadow' which is ambiguous because as well as implying concealment, it also means to 'cover sexually', as it was also understood at the time.[624] In this way, the English translator perhaps playfully points towards disguise with a term that actually hints at the lady's arousal. Munday similarly portrays the lady's reaction to Galaor's first words:

> Madasima hearing his gentle language, was more and more enflamed with his love, yet striving to *dissemble* it, she merrilie said [...] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 237) (my emphasis added)

The French text doesn't mention how she hides her flustered reaction:

> Madasima, l'ouyant parler de si bonne grace, s'enflamma le cœur de plus en plus en son amour: au moyen dequoy elle luy dit en riant […] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 531)
>
> [Hearing him speak with such good grace, Madasima's heart became ever more inflamed with love, so that she said to him, laughing (...)]

Munday's female characters, constantly aware of social expectations, carefully disguise their desire. If, as Hackett suggests, secrecy in the Spanish romance is an index of female perfection,[625] Munday nevertheless highlights women's intention to appear more modest than they really are, and shows how they take advantage of social etiquette.

Munday further develops this awareness of certain social contradictions by describing Amadis's and Oriana's first sexual experience by means of an ambiguous style which depicts the Princess's concern about hiding her desire as well as her enjoyment of the sexual experience:

---

[623] This is noted by Moore in her edition, see *Amadis*, p. 975 (second endnote to page 237).
[624] See the term 'shadow' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, III, 1222.
[625] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 71.

> […] Amadis forgetting his former *bashfulnesse*, seeing Fortune allowed him so *quaint* a *favour*, let loose the reines of amourous desire with such advantage, as notwithstanding some weak resistance of the Princesse, she was enforced to prove the good and bad together, which maketh *friendly* maidens become *faire* women. *Dainty* was the good grace and *subtiltie* of Oriana, in *shadowing* her surpassing pleasure, with a feminine complaint of Amadis *boldnesse*, shewing in countenance such a *gracious choller* and *contented displeasure*: as in stead of consuming time in excuses, Amadis resaluted her with sundry sweet kisses […] But she being loth to mixe angry speeches with amiable sollace, or with frowning lookes to crosse an equall content, thought it better to *commend* the *controule* of so *kinde* a louer, and therefore continued this pleasing recreation, as *neither party* receiued occasion of *mislike*: rather with kisses […] they chose to confirm their unanimity […] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, pp. 252-23) (my emphasis)

In the Spanish text it is Oriana's bold willingness, as opposed to Amadis's shyness, that allows the sexual encounter to take place. Herberay playfully portrays the opposite, for in his version Oriana's disposition is instead expressed in a feigned reluctance, which Munday translates here literally. Guillerm argues that this is part of the role required of her in this comedy of love which Herberay presents for the reader's entertainment.[626] Similarly, Taylor notes the use of a 'courtly oxymoron' to express Oriana's modesty,[627] evident here in the phrases 'gracious choller' and 'contented displeasure'. Bideaux notes that, while this rhetorical trope was common of contemporary romantic poetry, it was not usually employed in romance.[628] The French translator also emphasises the Princess's cleverness in exercising control over her emotions ('Grande fut l'astuce et bonne grace qu'eut la princesse de sçavoir si bien temperer son grand plaisir') (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 556) [Great was the cleverness and good grace of the princess in knowing so well how to moderate her great pleasure]. Therefore, Oriana's agency goes beyond the fake reluctance that Guillerm observes, but she also cleverly controls her physical reactions. While Munday's literal translation appears to acknowledge this aspect, he also draws attention to another aspect of social behaviour by focusing on the idea of concealment. He concentrates on the way Oriana hides her pleasure, translating the

[626] Guillerm, *Sujet de l'ecriture*, p. 265.
[627] Jane H. M. Taylor, *Rewriting Arthurian Romance*, p. 173.
[628] Bideaux, *Amadis, Livre I*, p. 556 (footnote 3).

French term ‘temperer’ as ‘shadowing’. The term ‘subtiltie’ is an accurate translation of the French ‘astuce’ but also suggests secrecy and deceit, as the adjective ‘subtle’ implies.[629] The term ‘dainty’, which translates the French ‘Grand’, also qualifies her ‘good grace’ as pleasing[630] and therefore, appropriate, highlighting her concealment of certain instincts in order to comply with social expectations. Analysing the reading choices of Renaissance women, Hackett observes that a romance heroine’s character depicted as a combination of defiance of, and conformity to, patriarchal definitions of female virtue, would have appealed to a female audience because she represented a negotiation with a culture which constantly voiced concerns about female ‘silence, chastity and obedience’. Hackett argues that for Oriana to ‘indicate her essential virtue, she still has to show an ability to conceal her enjoyment’.[631] However, Munday’s depiction of the Princess as conventional is complicated by her sexual willingness and by the fact that she is clearly enjoying herself while only pretending to be concerned for her modesty. Munday’s additions of Fortune’s ‘quaint favour’ and of the adjective ‘friendly’, potentially allude to the maiden’s willingness. Even though Amadis explicitly states that ‘Fortune’ has given him this opportunity, ‘friend’ was understood in this context as ‘romantic or sexual partner’,[632] and ‘favour’ was used as a euphemism for ‘sexual benevolence’ from women.[633]

With reference to the role of Amadis in this scene, Hackett claims that the narrative allows ‘female sexual pleasure […] primarily as a proof of the hero’s virility – hence the emphasis on his force’.[634] However, this misrepresents Munday’s main focus on Oriana’s agency in the experience and the depiction of the hero as a caring lover. Even if Amadis is bold in taking the initiative, Munday still draws attention to the hero’s previous passiveness by translating the French ‘discretion’ as ‘bashfullness’. Furthermore, Munday omits Herberay’s allusion to the potentially unsuitable conduct of the hero, indicated in the phrase ‘à la charge d’estre importune’ (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 556) [at the risk of being inappropriate], and the hero’s impatience in a phrase which

---

[629] See definition 2.b. and 7.a. for the adjective ‘subtle’ in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0 www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 19 October 2013]. The *OED* gives as the earliest example of the adjective ‘subtle’ to mean ‘secretly’ in William Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (1616). Even though Munday’s text was published twenty-six years earlier, it is possible that Munday intended it with this meaning, as the context of the scene shows, and therefore indicates an earlier use of the term.
[630] See definition 1 for the adjective ‘dainty’ in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 09 October 2013].
[631] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp. 30-31; 65.
[632] See definition 6 for the noun ‘friend’ in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0-www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 15 September 2014]. See also the term ‘friend’ in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, I, 553.
[633] See term ‘favour’ in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, I, 468-69.
[634] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, pp. 64-65.

describes Oriana's awareness of the futility of her complaint, 'voyant que c'estoit peine perdue, et qu'il estoit obstiné' (*Amadis, Livre I,* p. 556) [seeing that this was a waste of time and that he was determined]. Munday also adds to his source the description of the hero as a 'kind […] lover'. Moreover, Munday not only presents a less violent depiction of the male lover but also observes the contradictions in the expectations and reality not only of female conduct but also of male behaviour. While the term 'quaint' might possibly be acting as a pun for the female sexual organ,[635] as Hackett also notes,[636] the English translator might also be subverting the 'courtly' and 'refined' meaning of the term.[637] By doing this, Munday further notes the contradictions of a social space which demands the conformity to a high standard of behaviour, but which inevitably clashes with the reality of sexual conduct. This might also be why Munday draws attention to the hero's former shyness, while at the same time pointing towards his real erotic intentions, in the first part of the quotation.

Munday modifies his source to highlight the women's concealment of desire and also to obscure the sexual act itself. Galaor's second adventure, after he has been knighted, involves Brandueta, a lady whom Galaor rescues from an evil knight after avenging the murder of her father. She is so grateful to him and so struck by his looks that she gladly responds to his amorous advances and they sleep together. After their first sexual encounter, the couple meet again when everyone else is asleep:

> […] [Brandueta] […] vint secrettement où Galaor *estoit couché*: lequel se reputant *heureux* de si *bonne adventure*, la receut tant humainement et courtoisement, que leur dormyr fut convert en trop plus de *plaisir*, jusque au poinct du jour qu'elle print congé […] (*Amadis, Livre I,* p. 466) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) [Brandueta] (...) came secretly to Galaor's bed, where he was lying; the latter, who was so happy at this good fortune, received her so graciously and courteously, that their sleep was turned into extreme pleasure, until dawn, when she took her leave (...)]

Munday follows closely but makes a few changes:

---

[635] See term 'quaint' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, III, 1125. See also the noun 'quaint' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 15 September 2014].
[636] Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction*, p. 64.
[637] See definition 4.a. for the adjective 'quaint' in *Oxford English Dictionary* <http://0www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/> [accessed 15 September 2014].

> [...] secretly shee came to Galaor's chamber, where shee had no *churlish speeches* to drive her away, but most dainty, sweet, and gracious *entertainment*: *what else they did I know not*, but shee tarryed there till morning [...] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 200) (my emphasis)

Munday is again ambiguous, for while he is clearly describing an erotic scene, he constructs an apparently decorous encounter by alluding to the avoidance of 'churlish speech'. He describes the sexual engagement of the couple with the vague term 'entertainment' and any other detail of this pleasurable experience is lost in the translator's apparent ignorance of events. This suggestion and denial of arousing details is also present earlier in the three versions of the *Amadis*, in the description of Galaor's first sexual experience: '[…] they spent this night so amorously, as they that have tasted like fortune may conceiue, and therefore need I make no further talke thereof' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 200). The English translator is here translating the French literally; Herberay has also translated quite closely from the Spanish, although he has omitted Montalvo's moral commentary which explains why it is not proper to dwell on these erotic details. This same technique is present in Munday's *Palmerin* and in his French source, where Munday is specific about choosing to leave out information and appealing to the reader's imagination, as in this last *Amadis* example. However, in the Galaor/Brandueta quotation, the English translator has added this allusion to the concealment of description and he pretends ignorance, rather than the intended omission of events in the other quote. This version of the technique is also what Moulton identifies in John Marston's *Pigmalion* (1598). When the author is about to describe Pigmalion's apparent sexual fulfilment, he tells the reader instead: 'Who knows not what ensues? […] | […] Expect no more […] | Be not obsceane […]'.[638] Munday is not as mockingly stern as Marston in his apparent disapproval of the reader's shameful curiosity, but he is as contradictory as Marston in his suggestion and denial of erotic description. Herberay is not as explicit either, but the enjoyment of the couple is clear in his text. Arguably, it is also evident in Munday's translation but his changes make the readers focus their attention on the stance of the narrator, explicitly admitting ignorance but clearly knowing what made Brandueta spend the night in Galaor's chamber. This might be pointing towards the same sort of message as in the Amadis/Oriana episode,

[638] Moulton, *Before Pornography*, p. 25.

about the contradictions between social appearances and sexual activity. In the Madasima episode, Munday uses the same sort of vague allusion to refer to the characters' intercourse, although there he has recourse primarily to metaphor. Madasima offers to be Galaor's lover and to give the brothers their freedom if they promise to leave Lisuart's court and declare this in front of a friend of hers. After they arrive at her friend's castle, Madasima explains the reason for their visit. In the French text, once the men have sworn their oaths, Madasima demands that the brothers stay there that night:

> [...] ce disoit elle pour avoir Galaor à *coucher avec elle*, ce qu'il luy accorda [...] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 532) (my emphasis)
>
> [(...) this she said because she wanted Galaor to *sleep with her*, which he agreed to do (...)]

Herberay is explicit where Montalvo is euphemistic ('hazer […] amigo') (*Amadís de Gaula*, p. 556) [make (…) a friend] about Madasima's sexual intentions. Munday, on the other hand, is periphrastic: 'These words she spake, because she intended to *seale the bargaine* with Galaor' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 237) (my emphasis). However, the sexual scenario is alluded to in the alternative meaning of the verb 'seal', which was used as a euphemism for intercourse.[639] The term 'bargain' draws attention to Madasima's agency in her erotic relationship with Galaor. The female character is not objectified as an element of exchange but is an active participant in negotiating the conditions for this sexual transaction. While apparently avoiding explicit sexual reference, Munday suggests these elements anyway and highlights the role of physical desire in the fulfilment of pleasure.

Munday also expands on Herberay's medieval allegorical imagery in his euphemistic description of the sexual encounters. In an addition to the Spanish text, Herberay describes how Galaor and Brandueta would have eagerly continued their lovemaking had they not been interrupted by the lady's maidens: '[…] ils vouloient faire nouvelle *charge* […]' (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 465) (my emphasis) [(…) they would have wanted to carry out a new attack (…)]. Munday, on the other hand, describes how, if the lovers had been allowed the opportunity, 'they would once more have *besieged* the *Fortresse* of *love*' (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 199) (my emphasis). Helen Moore

[639] See term 'seal' in Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery*, III, 1210.

notes that Munday is here using material developed in the *Roman de la Rose*.[640] Arguably, Herberay is directly inspired by the *Rose* to add military vocabulary to his source, and indirectly encourages the English translator to expand on his imagery. The text appears to have still been popular in Herberay's time, as the twenty-one French printed editions between 1481 and 1538 indicate.[641] Both English and French translators clearly found the military imagery useful for a metaphoric description of sexuality. In the example quoted above, while Herberay focuses on the idea of attack ('charge'), Munday, with his addition of the phrase 'Fortresse of love', arguably draws attention to what is metaphorically conquered during the sexual encounter. This image of the siege of love was very popular in medieval culture in general, as Malcolm Hebron notes, and features in art, literature, folk festivals, proverbial and colloquial speech, and civic ceremonies and pageantries; extending even to Tudor and Jacobean times.[642] Heather Arden notes that the *Rose* is the first work to depict a full 'military-erotic complex', although the castle was a commonly used erotic image in medieval literature. Quoting from William Calin, she states that the 'assault on a fortress is a fundamental image of love-conquest'.[643] Arden argues that the castle stands as the defence of female chastity and the ultimate goal for the Lover is sexual possession of it, which he finally achieves.[644] Hebron distinguishes between a siege and a pitched battle, since the former focuses on the 'enclosed space which is assailed and defended', and this encourages all kinds of suggestive ideas,[645] as is evident in Munday's use of the fortress image. However, both translations arguably modify the *Rose*'s clear gender binary of attacked and attacker, since they describe the lovers as equally involved in the erotic action. This arguably modifies the element of male possession so clear in the *Rose*, and opens up the possibility for a shared experience, whereby perhaps the attack overcomes the modesty of both lovers. However, Munday is contradictory, for in the Galaor/Madasima episode, he turns to the more traditional imagery of the lover as attacker, while Herberay continues to develop the idea of amorous partnership:

---

[640] Moore, *Amadis*, p. 973 (endnote to page 199).
[641] *French Vernacular Books*, I, 720-21.
[642] Malcolm Hebron, *The Medieval Siege: Theme and Image in Middle English Romance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 150-63.
[643] Heather Arden, 'The Slings and Arrows of Outrageous Love in the *Roman de la Rose*', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 191-206 (p. 192, footnote 7).
[644] Arden, 'The Slings and Arrows of Outrageous Love', pp. 193; 200-201.
[645] Hebron, *The Medieval Siege*, p. 2.

> […] Galaor (qui estoit desirant si bonnes fortunes) la traicta comme celluy qui estoit sejourné de longue main, et gentil *compaignon* en telles *escarmouches*. Dont la belle dame se contenta, tant qu'elle dist depuis en maintz lieulx, que de sa vie n'avoit eu plus plaisante nuict […] (*Amadis, Livre I*, p. 532) (my emphasis)
>
> [(…) Galaor (who was eager for such good fortune) treated her as someone who had lingered a long time, and who was a noble companion in such *skirmishes*. The beautiful lady was so satisfied that after this she declared, in many places, that she had never had such a pleasant night in her whole life (...)]

Munday develops Herberay's martial imagery:

> Galaor likewise, a man forward to such fortunes, when *Love* had *erected* his *scaling-ladders* to the walls, quickly got *possession* of the *Forte*. And so well liked shee these *amorous skirmishes*, as afterward she reported in many places, how she never tasted a more pleasant night [...] (Munday, *Amadis de Gaule*, p. 238) (my emphasis)

Munday expands the metaphoric French text using very suggestive imagery. Love acquires a leading role, helping Galaor to gain the 'Forte', either because it has encouraged him or contributed to Madasima's willingness. Unlike in the previous example, here the English knight is the one in command, as the word 'possession' indicates and the terms 'erected' and 'scaling-ladders' are very suggestive of his arousal. Munday also modifies the French text's sense of fine companionship, since, in his translation, the lady is more of a receiver than a partner.

Overall, Munday follows Herberay's depiction of eroticism closely but modifies the text mainly to highlight tensions between expectations of social conduct and the reality of sexual pleasure. In this respect, the English translator develops a style in which his ambivalence draws attention to the contradictions between women's intentional concealment of pleasure while clearly enjoying their sexual experiences. He also expands the French metaphors in order to apparently obscure the sexual act, while clearly suggesting the desire and fulfilment of the characters. In the same way, his narrator explicitly draws attention to the concealment of erotic detail. This more ambiguous portrayal coexists in the text with the literal translation of Herberay's

explicit description of the sexual activity of couples who have already pledged their commitment by means of a clandestine marriage.

Conclusion

England came late to the translation of sixteenth-century Spanish chivalric romance. The publication of the works was not as widespread as on the Continent and the translations were very literal, unlike the French texts, which appropriated the Spanish originals by way of extensive modifications. This, added to the criticism and mockery of Early Modern romance, the great length of the works and, until very recently, a lack of modern editions, may explain why scholarship has largely overlooked these texts. However, as I have demonstrated in this thesis, these romances merit attention for what they can reveal about Early Modern translation practice, and other aspects of the period, such as the market for printed books, reading strategies, the education of women, intellectual culture, and ideas about gender, marriage, sexuality, relationships between men and women, and cultural expectations as concerned social conduct of both sexes. My methodology, which proposed a close comparison between translation and source, and, in the case of the *Amadis* and the *Palmerin*, of the role of an intermediary translation, has revealed how translators developed their translation practice and how the contexts in which they worked influenced their craft. Moreover, my attention to how Margaret Tyler's and Anthony Munday's modifications work in combination with the literal aspects of their texts illuminates those themes to which the translators draw attention in their romances.

In the case of Margaret Tyler's *Mirror*, I have moved beyond her widely discussed Epistle to show how productive an analysis of the translation proper can be. I have first explored how Tyler's treatment of the classical material in her source shows how she participates in an Early Modern intellectual culture. Her references to works by Homer, Virgil, Ovid, to stories from Greek and Roman mythology, to emblems, and to the language of the law, show the translator's awareness of a wide variety of printed sources. In addition, Tyler is familiar with intellectual and political figures from classical antiquity, as well as with Latin in general. Most remarkable, however, is how she infuses her translation with her learning, revealing an awareness of humanist reading practices which encouraged the selection and reutilization of literary material. From the way she accommodates her learning in her translation, she is clearly aware of the symbolic potential of the material. For example, her reference to the character of Phaeton, and to the issues of children born out of wedlock and adultery, draw attention

to the topic of legitimacy which is a matter of concern in terms of the heroes' social status in the romance. Tyler's references to female characters from antiquity to describe features in male characters, arguably suggests a consonance in the experiences of men and women, which is in keeping with the philosophy of the text in general. Her focus on the occupations of a working class, her use of the term 'commonwealth', and the imaginary surrounding it, also shows an interest in social structures.

I have also explored Tyler's evident interest in young women's psychology. By analysing her description of Princess's Olivia's romantic experience I have argued that the translator draws attention to the contradictions between reason and emotion, in men as well as women. The *Mirror* explores the intellectual process of falling in love and the struggle between restraint and desire. Tyler takes into account the anxiety caused by having to live according to the cultural expectations of acceptable female conduct, and the contradictions prompted by love and desire. With its attention to the experience of men as well as women, the translation arguably proposes a more realistic view of love than does its source. This can be linked to the mixed readership that Tyler addresses in her Epistle and in the translation proper. The stylistic indicators that show that the translator is addressing men in the Epistle and the pronoun modifications in the sections dealing with Princess Olivia, which enable a dialogue between the character and the romance's female readers, show how the *Mirror* is proposing a more inclusive perspective on relationships between sexes.

This inclusivity is in evidence in Tyler's portrayal of married women's experience. I have argued that the translator supplies comments on the responsibility of Trebatio in the rape and abandonment of his wife Briana. Throughout the romance, Tyler argues for the legitimacy of marriage and loyalty to the family, but expresses concern at violence against wives, and neglect of the family. The *Mirror* describes the commitment of wives towards husbands as crucial, but also acknowledges their sacrifices and notes the responsibility of husbands and fathers towards their families. In this respect, Tyler's translation is consistent with its attention to the idea of commonwealth and to the relationship between the sexes. The *Mirror* reflects Early Modern ideas about companionate marriage and the household as a small commonwealth. Tyler's translation is, then, strongly connected to the culture in which it is written, acting as a commentary on the contemporary intellectual and political concerns.

With regard to Anthony Munday's translations, I have demonstrated how analysis of his romances shows his literary contribution to be more than simply a hack work, and shows a more nuanced perspective to his religious sympathies. Particularly in the case of his *Palmerin D'Oliva*, I have shown that an awareness of the anonymous Spanish original and Jean Maugin's French translation is crucial to understanding how Munday has produced his text and what aspects he draws attention to. I have first explored how he alludes to the topic of marriage in his treatment of sexuality. I have argued that Munday deals with the issue of pre-marital sex in the romance by highlighting the value of clandestine marriage to sanction sexual activity but ultimately pointing towards the legitimation given by an official church wedding. By way of modifications to his source, the translator demonstrates concern for topical issues associated with the Reformation's conception of marriage and sexuality, such as the importance of parental consent, the idea of a contract, and the relevance of an official ceremony. Munday omits the lengthy erotic descriptions of his source to focus on the marriage union, but also to condemn adultery and to express his concern for the protection of female chastity. I have determined that the translator reorganizes certain sections of his source and incorporates classical imagery in order to draw attention to these topics. Considering that Tyler expresses the same interest in marriage, sexuality and female virtue, albeit with a different focus, one can argue that the analysis of these works also corrects assumptions about how the gender of the translators influences their practices.

In *Palmerin* Part II, I have looked at how Munday uses his literal translation of the exaggerated differences between Christians and Muslims in Maugin's text, in order to develop the topic of sexuality that features in Part I. Both translators employ Early Modern misconceptions about the overt sexuality of Islamic culture, and medieval stereotypes of rape as a mark of pagan evil, in order to represent Muslim culture as a threat. Munday, following Maugin, underlines Palmerin's and his friends' Christian identity as an element which protects them from Muslim aggression, for example, when divine interventions occur in answer to the characters' prayers. The most striking example is the prevention of rape, where the Spanish author arguably drew on the genre of Saints' Lives, and where the translators emphasize the agency of divine providence. Munday and Maugin also depict adventures in the Near East as trials for the good Christian; they stress the hero's desire to escape from Muslim territory, and how faith can counter the sexual advances of Muslim women. The lustful Muslims are the opposite of the chaste Christian women and to the topic of marriage that Munday

develops in Part I, because, unlike the clandestine marriages that sanction the loss of virginity of the Christian women, there is no such commitment to guard the honour of the female Muslim characters. I have also shown how Munday's treatment of the topic of Christian and Muslim difference in *Zelauto* illuminates the specifics of his approach in the *Palmerin*: where *Zelauto* is concerned with religious persecution, in the translation, the East provides location for developing the topics of sexuality, marriage, and chastity that feature in Part I.

With regards to Munday's *Amadis de Gaule*, I have concentrated on demonstrating how an analysis of the translation yields a fuller understanding of the translator's possible religious sympathies. As with the *Palmerin*, it is important to consider not only (of course) Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo's Spanish original, but also Nicolas Herberay de Essarts' French translation to establish how Munday has changed the text. Munday's inconsistent translating technique, with respect to the treatment of religious elements, reflects tensions between official doctrine and devotional practice in England in his time. My methodology, which considers Munday's literal translations from the French, in tandem with his own textual modifications, provides a clearer sense of those aspects of Munday's cultural context to which he is drawing attention, for example, the depiction of the Virgin Mary and the characters' attendance at mass. I have also argued that romance's ambiguous relationship to religion, which sometimes deals subversively with the topic and sometimes conservatively, is a useful vehicle for Munday to develop his translation technique, since the omission of certain elements does not affect the structure of the genre, and the literal translation of others is not in danger of causing controversy in his time, since it is part of romance's basic structure. Romance allows Munday to express his views of his religious climate because it is not thought of as politically inflammatory as other contemporary texts.

I have also examined Munday's description of erotic attraction and sexual intercourse in the *Amadis* and I have shown how he generally modifies Herberay's more explicit depiction in order to make the romance apparently more modest, but how, at the same time, he deploys very suggestive vocabulary. Unlike in the *Palmerin*, Munday here does not stress the topic of clandestine marriage, but actually translates the married couples' lovemaking literally. In this respect, his more ambivalent representations of the sexual encounters of unmarried couples may be motivated by a moral concern, or by anxiety about the criticism of the French *Amadis*'s depravity. However, Munday's rhetoric is very suggestive of pleasure. He may here be catering for an audience not only

interested in romance, but also in erotic fiction. Whatever his motivation, I have shown that his style of concealment and suggestion is ultimately more similar to Montalvo's original romance. Perhaps this responds to the fact that sexuality is conventional to romance. I have also discussed how Munday consistently obscures the sexual act, but employs several techniques to suggest pleasure, such as when he expands Herberay's military imagery and explicitly addresses the audience in reference to the omission of sensual details. In relation to the depiction of lovemaking, I have also considered Munday's treatment of female desire. While the translator appears to conceal the female characters' sexual longing, he actually seems to be drawing attention to how the women intentionally hide their true emotions in order to meet social expectations of female conduct. Munday's *Amadis* can be seen to highlight contradictions between a rigid cultural code of conduct and the reality of human desire. In this respect, as with the *Palmerin*, this translation also modifies assumptions about the influence of the translators' gender in their practice, since here there is another evident point of contact between Tyler's and Munday's texts.

Overall, my analysis of these romances shows first, that it is important to go beyond the prefaces of early modern texts, and to explore the translation in full in order to get a more comprehensive sense of what translation practice entails. Apart from Tyler's Epistle, the prefatory material of these romances is very conventional and does not give much idea of the topics that the translators draw attention to in the romances. In fact, not even Tyler's Dedication and Epistle give any sense of the issues that she comments on in the main text, although the reader may anticipate that there will be some account of female experience. In the case of Munday's prefaces, the idea of the romances as a commercial product is very strong, and if one explores his dedications and epistles alone, one gets the strong sense that the stereotype of him as a hack writer is true. However, an analysis of the translations themselves shows that he engages in a complex translation practice.

Second, while the stories in the romances might be removed from their readers in time and space, the translators draw attention to elements in the texts which make them highly topical, such as sexuality, marriage, gender relations, religion, and social structure. In this sense, the common prefatory argument about the profitable quality of the romances is revealed as more than just a trope, because the translators allude to issues that go beyond mere entertainment. Tyler and Munday are generally very respectful of their sources, but they do manage to make the translations their own and to

use them as vehicles to comment explicitly on important aspects of their culture, as Tyler does, or to more subtly mirror important contemporary issues, as Munday does. Marian Rothstein looks at Herberay's *Amadis* as a 'record of reception', and as an example of Umberto Eco's view of translation as interpretation and as the result of an 'interventionist' reading practice.[646] In my opinion, Tyler's and Munday's translation practices reveal a response to elements in their sources that are relevant to their own cultural contexts. They make their translations speak to their particular environments.

My examination of these romances has also exposed areas of research that I have not been able to address in the limited scope of this thesis, but which will reward future study. In the case of the *Mirror*, I have only focused on Tyler's translation, which covers one book out of a total of nine that made up the English series. I have also only referred to one aspect of R. P.'s translation of Book II (Part I) in order to compare it with Tyler's text. However, there is plenty of material to analyse in the rest of the books, even though the translations (for example, R. P.'s translation of the rest of Ortúñez's work) might seem very literal at first reading. One could try to identify R. P. and L.A., the translator of the third part of the *Espejo*. Another interesting topic is to explore how the translations handle the female knight Claridiana, daughter of the queen of the Amazons, Diana, who has a prominent role in the rest of the series but whom Tyler only briefly introduces. Another important female character in the rest of the series is Princess Lindabrides of Tartary, who is interesting, among other things, for the fact that her name becomes a term for 'lover' in early modern England, as Eisenberg points out.[647] Ben Jonson invokes her name in his *The fountain of self-love. Or Cynthias revels*, as I noted in Chapter I. This example arguably opens up another area for research which might explore the cultural importance of these translations and their influence on British early modern culture.

Two potential topics of interest feature in the anonymous English translation of *Amadis* Book V. The first has to do with the identity of the translator, who is not, in my opinion, Munday, since the treatment of the religious material in Book V, and that in Books I to IV, reveals strikingly different translation strategies. While the anonymous translator follows his source unquestioningly, Munday is clearly invested in modifying the religious material. On the other hand, the issue of conversion is very important in Book V but scarcely features in Books I to IV. Linked to the theme of conversion, and to the *Mirror*'s Claridiana, is the Amazon Queen Calafia. Montalvo created this

[646] Rothstein, *Reading in the Renaissance*, p. 51.
[647] Eisenberg, *Espejo*, III, 183 (footnote to line 14).

character in *Las Sergas de Esplandián* (1510) and she is the first example of a warrior woman in Spanish chivalric romance. The character inspired the creation of other Amazons and female knights in the later books of the *Amadis* series, and in other Spanish romances, such as the *Espejo*. In the Spanish text, Calafia's knightly skills and independence make her a striking character, but Herberay (and the anonymous English translator who follows him), depicts her as a weak woman, easily vanquished and discouraged by her male enemies and ultimately more willing to take on the role of the dutiful wife and to relinquish her power to her husband than to remain independent as sole ruler of her island. This difference in portrayal appears to be motivated by the different political agendas of the original author and the translators. Montalvo presents the Amazon as an example of pagan conversion, rational, friendly, and therefore ideal,[648] and he takes pains to distinguish her from the other non-Christians in the text.[649] This concern with conversion reflects Montalvo's support of the new crusade mentality that took hold during the reign of the Spanish monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella,[650] and the romance also demonstrates an awareness of contemporary Spanish debates about the Christianization of New World Indians.[651] Herberay (writing in 1544) depicts Calafia differently because, with Francis I as his patron, his concern is to appropriate the original text and use it to praise his own monarch (a purpose he clearly expresses in his dedication), taking special care to remove Montalvo's references to the concerns of his rulers and his time. However, the difference in depiction might also respond to dissimilarity in the cultural currency of the symbol of the Amazon or female warrior. The Amazon myth was developed quite differently in Early Modern Spain and England. While in the former these female warriors were widely incorporated in the romance narrative and given a space as characters in their own right, in the latter, the Amazon was commonly regarded with suspicion and fear, kept at a distance, cautiously praising some aspects of their past glory and many times depicting her as an enemy.

This thesis has shown how an analysis of the English versions of Spanish chivalric romance can contribute to a more complete understanding of Early Modern translation practice. It has also demonstrated how relevant the main texts of the translations can be to explore aspects of the culture, providing insight beyond the

[648] Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean', p. 123.
[649] Alison Taufer, 'The Only Good Amazon Is a Converted Amazon: The Woman Warrior and Christianity in the *Amadís* Cycle', in *Playing with Gender: A Renaissance Pursuit*, ed. by Jean R. Brink, Maryanne C. Horowitz and Allison P. Coudert (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), pp. 35-51 (p. 38).
[650] Judith A. Whitenack, 'Conversion to Christianity in the Spanish Romance of Chivalry, 1490-1524', *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, 13 (1988), 13-39 (pp. 25-26).
[651] Taufer, 'The Only Good Amazon', pp. 37-39.

prefatorial material. In this respect, the scrutiny of the literal elements in the body of the texts, considered alongside the modifications brought on by the translators, can reveal themes which are very topical to their contemporary environment. This illuminates new areas of research which can consider the connections and differences with other contemporary translations and literary genres, as well as with the themes developed in them.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ascham, Roger, *The Schoolmaster* (London: by Iohn Daye, 1570), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

Beaumont, Francis, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (London: A. & C. Black, 1986)

Becon, Thomas, *The book of matrimony*, in, *Renaissance Woman: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Feminity in England*, ed. by Kate Aughterson (London Routledge, 1995), 110-13

Bentley, Thomas, *The monument of matrons* (1582), in *Renaissance Woman: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Feminity in England*, ed. by Kate Aughterson (London Routledge, 1995), pp. 120-22

De La Feuille, Daniel, *Devises et emblemes* (Amsterdam, 1691) in *Dutch Love Emblems of the Seventeenth Century* <http://emblems.let.uu.nl/>

De La Noue, François, *Discours Politiques et Militaires* (Basle: Imprimerie de François Forest, 1588)

_____*The Politicke and Militarie Discourses*, trans. by Edward Aggas (London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Cadman and Edward Aggas, 1588), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

Dolet, Estienne, *La Maniere de Bien Traduire D'Une Langue en Autre* (Lyon: E. Dolet, 1540)

'The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony' from *The Book of Common Prayer* (1559), in *Daughters, Wives and Widows: Writings by Men about Women in England, 1500-1640*, ed. by Joan Larsen Klein (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), pp. 3-10

Heinsius, Daniël *Quaeris quid sit Amor* (*c.* 1601) in *Dutch Love Emblems of the*

Seventeenth Century (Amsterdam, 1601) <http://emblems.let.uu.nl/>

Herberay de Essarts, Nicolas (trans.), *Le Second Livre D'Amadis de Gaule* (Paris: Pour Denys Ianot, 1541)

_____*Amadis de Gaule Livre IV*, ed. by Luce Guillerm (Paris: Honoré Champión, 2005)

_____*Amadis de Gaule, Livre I*, ed. by Michel Bideaux (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006)

_____*Le Cinqiesme* [sic] *Livre d'Amadis de Gaule*, Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, ed. by Véronique Duché and Jean-Claude (Paris: Garnier, 2009)

_____*Le Livre III d'Amadis de Gaule*, ed. by Michel Bideaux (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2011)

Jonson, Ben, *The fountain of self-love.Or Cynthias revels* (London: [by R. Read] for Walter Burre, 1601), in *Early English Books Online <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>*

_____*Poetaster or The Arraignment* (London: [by R. Bradock] for M. L[ownes], 1602), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*Eastward Hoe* (London: [by George Eld] for William Aspley, 1605) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____'An Execration upon Vulcan', in *The Complete Poems*, ed. by George Parfitt (London: Penguin, 1988), pp. 181-87

Llull, Ramon, *The Book of the Order of Chivalry*, trans. by Noel Fallows (Woodbrige, The Boydell Press, 2013)

Lyly, John, *Euphues and his England* (London: [by T. East] for Gabriel Cawood, 1580), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0 eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and His England*, ed. by Leah Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003)

Marston, John, *The malcontent* (London: by V[alentine] S[immes] for William Aspley,

1604), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0
eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*The Malcontent*, ed. by George K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)

Maugin, Ian (trans.), *L'Histoire de Palmerin D'Olive* (Anvers: par Ian Waesberghe, 1572)

Meres, Francis, *Palladis Tamia* (London: Printed by P. Short for Cuthbert Burbie, 1598) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

Munday, Anthony, *Zelauto. The Fountaine of Fame* (London: by Iohn Charlewood, 1580), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*Anthony Munday's Zelauto: The Fountaine of Fame*, ed. by Jack Stillinger (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963)

Munday, Anthony (tran.), *Palmerin D'Oliva* (London: by I. Charlewood for William Wright, 1588), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*The Second Part of the honourable Historie of Palmerin d'Oliva* (London: by Thomas Creede, 1597), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*The Fift* [sic] *Booke of the Most Pleasant and [D]electable Historie of Amadis de Gaule* (London: by Adam Islip, 1598) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*The Ancient, Famous And Honourable History of Amadis de Gaule* (London: by Nicholas Oakes, 1619) (STC 687:11), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____*Amadis de Gaule*, ed. by Helen Moore (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

Ortúñez de Calahorra, Diego, *Espejo de Príncipes y Cavalleros (El Caballero del Febo)* ed. by Daniel Eisenberg, 6 vols (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1975)

Painter, William, *The second tome of the Palace of pleasure* (London: by Henry

Bynneman for Nicholas England, 1567), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

Palmerín de Olivia, ed. by Giuseppe Di Stefano (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2004)

Paradini, Claudii et D. Gabrielis Symeonis, *Symbola Heroica* (Antwerp : Christosphori Plantin, 1583)

Paradin, Claude, *Devises heroïques* (Lyon: Jean de Tournes and Guillaume Gazeau, 1551), in *French Emblems at Glasgow* < http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk /french/index.php>

P., R. (trans.), *The Second Part of Mirror of Knighthood* (London: by Thomas Este, 1598) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

_____ *The Third Part of the First Booke of the Myrrour of Knighthood* (London: by Thomas Este, 1599) in *Early English Books Online* http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk

Rodríguez de Montalvo, Garci, *Amadis de Gaula*, ed. by Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua, 6th edn, 2 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 2008)

_____*Sergas de Esplandián*, ed. by Carlos Sainz de la Maza (Madrid: Castalia, 2003)

A Select Collection of Old Plays in Twelve Volumes, ed. by Issac Reed et al (London, 1825), IV

A sermon of whoredom and uncleanness: against adultery (1547), in *Renaissance Women: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Feminity in England*, ed. by Kate Aughterson (London Routledge, 1995), pp. 20-22

Sidney, Philip, *A Defence of Poetry*, in *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. by Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 337-97

Simeoni, Gabriel, *Imprese Heroiche et Morali* (Lyon: Gvglielmo Rovillio, 1559)

Le Thresor Des Douze Livres D'Amadis de Gaule (Paris: Pour Estienne Groulleau Libraire, 1559)

Twyne, Thomas (trans.), *The whole xii Bookes of the Æneidos of Virgill* (London: by

Wyllyam How for Abraham Veale, 1573), in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

Tyler, Margaret (trans.), *Mirror of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*, ed. by Joyce Boro, MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations, 11 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2014)

Vives Juan Luis, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*, ed. and trans. by Charles Fantazzi (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000)

Wheathill, Anne, 'Epistle to the Reader' from *A handful of holesome (though homelie) hearbs* (London: by H[enrie] Denham, 1584) in *Early English Books Online* <http://0-eebo.chadwyck.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk>

Secondary Sources

Amussen, Susan Dwyer, '"Being stirred to much unquietness": Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England', *Journal of Women's History*, 6 (1994), 70-89

Arcara, Stefania, 'Margaret Tyler's The Mirrour of Knighthood Or How a Renaissance Translator Became the "the first English feminist"', *Intralinea*, 9 (2007) <http://www.intralinea.it/volumes/eng_more.php?id=529_0_2_0_M60%> (no pagination)

Arden, Heather, 'The Slings and Arrows of Outrageous Love in the *Roman de la Rose*', in *The Medieval City under Siege*, ed. by Ivy A. Corfis and Michael Wolfe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 191-206

Avalle-Arce, Juan Bautista, *Amadís de Gaula: El primitivo y el de Montalvo* (México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1990)

Ayres, Philip J., 'Anthony Munday: "Our Best Plotter"?', *English Language Notes*, 18 (1980), 13-15

Bagchi, David, 'Catholic Theologians of the Reformation Period before Trent', in *The*

Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 220-32

Barton, Simon, *A History of Spain*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Bath, Michael, *Speaking Pictures: English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London: Longman, 1994)

Bell, Maureen, 'Women Writing and Women Written', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, with assistance of Maureen Bell, 6 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998-), IV (2002), pp. 431-51

Benhaïm, Véronique, 'Les *Thresors D'Amadis*', in *Les Amadis en France au XVI^e^ siècle*, publié par le Centre V. L. Saulnier, Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris: Editions Rue D'Ulm, 2000), pp. 157-81

Betteridge, Tom, *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation* (Manchester: University Press, 2004)

Bettoni, Anna, 'Il *Palmerín de Olivia* tradotto da Maugin: editori, storie e mode letterarie nella Francia del Cinquecento', in *'Il n'est nul si beau passe temps Que se jouer à sa Pensee: Studi di filologia e letteratura francese in onore di Anna Maria Finoli* (Pisa: ETS, 1995), pp. 173-201

Blair, Ann, 'Revisiting Renaissance Encyclopaedism', in *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. by Jason König and Greg Woolf (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 379-97

Boro, Joyce, 'Introduction', in *The Castell of Love: A Critical Edition of Lord Berners's Romance* (Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 1-78

_____'Multilingualism, Romance, and Language Pedagogy; or, Why Were So Many Sentimental Romances Printed as Polyglot Texts?', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave, 2011), pp. 18-38

_____'Reading Juan de Flores's *Grisel y Mirabella* in Early Modern England', in

Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640, ed. by S. K. Barker and Brenda M. Hosington (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 35-39

Braden, Gordon, 'An Overview', , in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005-), II: *1550 to 1660*, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummins and Stuart Gillespie (2010), pp. 3-11

Brennan, Michael, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988)

Brennan, Michael G. and Noel J. Kinnamon, *A Sidney Chronology 1554-1654* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

The Broadview Anthology of Sixteenth Century Poetry and Prose, ed. by Marie Loughlin, Sandra J. Bell, and Patricia Brace (Peterborough, Ont: Broadview, 2012)

Brumble, H. David, *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998)

Buccola, Regina and Lisa Hopkins, 'Introduction', in *Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama*, ed. by Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 1-19

Bushnell, Rebecca W., *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996)

Cacho Blecua, Juan Manuel, *Amadís: Heroísmo Mítico Cortesano* (Madrid: Cupsa, 1979)

Campos García, Axayacatl, *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros, parte I: guía de lectura* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2001)

Carlson, Eric Josef, *Marriage and the English Reformation* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1994)

Catty, Jocelyn, *Writing Rape, Writing Women in Early Modern England: Unbridled Speech* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)

Chabrolle, Anne-Marie, 'L'idée d'un spécificité linguistique et culturelle au XVI^{e} siècle

et sa manifestation dans l'activité traduisante', in *Traduction et adaptation en France à la fin du Moyen Age et à la Renaissance*, Actes du Colloque organisé par l'Université de Nancy II 23-25 mars 1995, ed. by Charles Brucker (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997), pp. 319-324

Chapman, Alison, *Patrons and Patron Saints in Early Modern English Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2013)

Croken, Robert C., *Luther's First Front: The Eucharist as Sacrifice* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1990)

Cleland, Katharine, '"Warring Spirits": Martial Heroism and Anxious Masculinity in Milton's *Paradise Lost*', in *Violent Masculinities: Male Aggression in Early Modern Texts and Culture*, ed. by Jennifer Feather and Catherine E. Thomas (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 129-48

Crawford, Patricia, 'Women's Published Writings 1600-1700', in *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. by Mary Prior (London: Routledge, 1985)

Degenhardt, Jane Hwang, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010)

Davis, Natalie Zemon, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1975)

De Buzon, Christine, 'Amadis de Gaule en Français: continuation romanesque, Collection, Compilation', *French Studies*, 65 (2011), 337-46

Demattè, Claudia, *Palmerín de Olivia: Guía de Lectura* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2004)

Demers, Patricia, 'On First Looking into Lumley's Euripides', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 23.1 (1999), 25-42

_____*Women's Writing in English: Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005)

Diccionario de la Real Academia Española <http://lema.rae.es/drae/>

Dimmock, Matthew, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early*

Modern England (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)

Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580* (New Haven, C.T,: Yale University Press, 1992)

Eisenberg, Daniel, *Romances of Chivalry in the Spanish Golden Age* (Newark, Del: Juan de la Cuesta, 1982)

The English Emblem Tradition, ed. by Peter M. Daly and others, 5 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988-1995)

English Renaissance Translation Theory, ed. by Neil Rhodes with Gordon Kendal and Louise Wilson, Modern Humanities Research Association: Tudor and Stuart Translations, 9 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2013)

Ephraim, Michelle, *Reading the Jewish Woman on the Elizabethan Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)

Ferguson, Moira, 'Margaret Tyler *fl.* 1578', in *First Feminist: British Women Writers 1578-1799*, ed. by Moira Ferguson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), pp. 51-52

Fletcher, Anthony J., *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995)

Fogelquist, James, *El Amadís y el género de la historia fingida* (Madrid: José Porrúa Turanzas, 1982)

Foulet, Alfred, 'Le Lai d'Aristote de Henri d'Andeli publíe d'après tous les manuscrits by Maurice Delbouille', Book Review, *Speculum*, 27 (1952), 212-14

France, Peter and Stuart Gillespie, 'General Editor's Foreword', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005-), II: *1550 to 1660*, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummins and Stuart Gillespie (2010), p. viii

French Vernacular Books: Books published in the French Language before 1601, ed. by Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2007)

Freer, Alan, '"Palmerín de Olivia" in Francia', in in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols,

Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 13, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), III: *Saggi e ricerche*, pp. 177-237

Fumaroli, Marc, 'Jacques Amyot and the Clerical Polemic Against the Chivalric Novel', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38 (1985), 22-40

Fumo, James C., 'Argus' Eyes, Midas' Ears, and the Wife of Bath as Storyteller', in *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp (Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 129-50

Galigani, Giuseppe, 'La versione inglese del "Palmerín de Olivia"', in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 13, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), III: *Saggi e ricerche*, pp. 239-288

García Dini, Encarnación, 'Per una bibliografia dei romanzi di cavalleria: edizioni del ciclo dei "Palmerines"', in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia: saggi e ricerche*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 13, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), III, 5-44

'General Bibliography of Translations', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005-), II: *1550 to 1660*, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummins and Stuart Gillespie (2010), pp. 471-560

Giráldez, Susan, *Las Sergas de Esplandián y la España de los Reyes Católicos* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003)

González, Javier Roberto, 'Amadís Orante', *eHumanista*, 16 (2010), 33-56

Grabes, Herbert, *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

Gray, Jonathan Michael, *Oaths and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Guillerm, Jean- Pierre and Luce, 'Vestiges d'Herberay des Essarts Acuerdo Olvido', in *Studi Francesi*, 151 (2007), 3-31

Guillerm, Luce, *Sujet de l'ecriture et traduction autour de 1540* (Lille: Atelier national Reproduction des thèses, 1988)

Gunn, S. J., 'Edmund Dudley', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/>,

Hackett, Helen, '"Yet Tell Me Some Such Fiction": Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and the "Femininity" of Romance', in *Women, Texts and Histories 1575-1760* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 39-68

_____*Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Haigh, Christopher, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)

Halpern, Richard, 'Puritanism and Maenadism in *A Mask*', in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 88-105

Hamilton, Donna B., *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)

_____'Anthony Munday's Translations of Iberian Chivalric Romances: Palmerin of England, Part 1 as Exemplar', in *Catholic Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. by Ronald Corthell and others (Notre Dame, IN; University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), pp. 281-303

Harrigan, Michael, *Veiled Encounters: Representing the Orient in 17th-Century French Travel Literature* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 13 and 20.

Hazlett, Ian, 'Bucer', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 100-12

Hebron, Malcolm, *The Medieval Siege: Theme and Image in Middle English Romance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 150-63.

Hendrix, Scott, 'Luther', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed.

by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 39-56

Hill, Tracey, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004)

Hitchcock, Richard, 'Spanish Literature', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: *1660 to 1790*, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins (2005), pp. 406-15

Hopkins, Andrea, 'Female Saints and Romance Heroines' in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp.121-138

Hosington, Brenda and others, *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/>, ISBN 978-0-9557876-5-2

Houston, Chloë, *The Renaissance Utopia: Dialogue, Travel and the Ideal Society* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014)

Howard, Maurice, 'Self-Fashioning and the Classical Moment in Mid Sixteenth-Century English Architecture', in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1600*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 198-217

Howe, Elizabeth Teresa, 'Zenobia or Penelope? Isabel la Católica as Literary Archetype', in *Isabel la Católica, Queen of Castile: Critical Essays*, ed. by David A. Boruchoff (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 91-102

Huchon, Mireille, 'Amadis, "Parfaicte idée de nostre langue françoise"', in *Les Amadis en France au XVI^{e} siècle*, publié par le Centre V. L. Saulnier, Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris: Editions Rue D'Ulm, 2000), pp. 183-200

_____'Traduction, Translation, Exaltation et Transmutation Dans Les *Amadis*', *Camenae*, 3 (2007), 1-10

Hull, Suzanne W., *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982)

Hutson, Lorna, *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in*

Sixteenth-Century England (London: Routledge, 1994)

Ingram, Martin, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1579-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)*

Julia Gasper, 'The Sources of The Virgin Martyr', *The Review of English Studies*, n.s., 42 (1991), 17-31

Jones, Whitney R. D., *The Tree of Commonwealth, 1450-1793* (Madison, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000)

Kelly, Kathleen Coyne, *Performing Virginity and Testing Chastity in the Middle Ages*, Routledge Research in Medieval Studies, 2 (London: Routledge, 2000)

Kesselring, K. J., *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics, and Protest in Elizabethan England* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Kesson, Andy, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014)

Kintgen, Eugene R., *Reading in Tudor England* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996)

Knecht, R. J., *Francis I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

Kothe Ana, 'Modest Incursions: The Production of Writers and their Readers in the Early Modern Prefaces of Isabella Whitney and Margaret Tyler', *English Language Notes*, 37 (1999), 15-38

Krontiris, Tina, 'Breaking Barriers of Genre and Gender: Margaret Tyler's Translation of *The Mirrour of Knighthood*', *English Literary Renaissance*, 18 (1988), 19-39

_____*Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1992)

Lamb, Mary Ellen, 'The Cooke Sisters: Attitudes toward Learned Women in the Renaissance', in *Silent But for the Word:Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. by Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1985), pp. 107-25

Lathrop, Henry Burrowes, *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to*

Chapman, 1477-1620 (New York: Octagon Books, 1967)

Le Gentil, Pierre, 'Pour L'Interprétation de L'Amadis', in *Mélanges a la mémoire de Jean Sarrailh*, 2 vols (Paris: Centre de Recherches de L'Institu d'Études Hispaniques, 1966), II, pp. 47-54

Le Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé <http://atilf.atilf.fr/>

Lindheim, Nancy R., 'Lyly's Golden Legacy: *Rosalynde* and *Pandosto*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 15 (1975), 3-20

Lorenzo, Francisco J., 'Actitudes violentas en torno a al formación y disolución del matrimonio en Castilla durante la Edad Moderna', in *Furor et Rabies: Violencia, Conflicto y Marginación en la Edad Moderna*, ed. by José I. Fortea, Juan E. Gelabert and Tomás A. Mantecón (Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, 2002), pp. 159-82

Lucía Megías, José Manuel, *Antología de libros de caballerías castellanos* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2001)

Mancini, G., *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia*, 3 vols, Instituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Ispano-Americana: collana di studi diretta da guido mancini, 12, (Pisa: Università di Pisa, 1966), II: *Introduzione al 'Palmerin de Olivia'*

Mantecón Movellán, Tomás A., 'Mujeres forzadas y abusos deshonestos en la Castilla moderna', *Manuscrits*, 20 (2002), 157-185

Marín Pina, María Carmen, 'La historia y los primeros libros de caballerías españoles', in *Medioevo y Literatura Actas del V Congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval* (Granada, 27 septiembre-1 octubre, 1993), ed. by Juan Paredes, 4 vols. (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1995), III, pp. 183-192

_____'Nuevos Datos Sobre Francisco Vázquez y Feliciano de Silva, Autores de Libros de Caballerías', *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, 15 (1990-1991), 117-130

Marshall, Peter, *Reformation England, 1480-1642*, 2nd edn (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012)

Martin, Randall, Introduction to 'Epistle to the Reader' from *The Mirrour of Princely Deeds and Knighthood*, in *Women Writers in Renaissance England*, ed. by Randall Martin (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 15-24

Maslen, R. W., 'Robert Greene', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500-1640*,

ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 188-203

McCaw, R. John, 'Transforming Phaeton: Cervantes, Ovid, and Sancho Panza's Wild Ride', in *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 239-50

Melnikoff, Kirk, 'Thomas Hacket and the Ventures of an Elizabethan Publisher', *The Library*, 7th ser., 10 (2009), 257-71

Mendelson, Sara and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

Mentz, Steve, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Mérida Jiménez, Rafael M., 'Monasterios y Hermitas en el *Amadís de Gaula*: Encrucijadas Narrativas e Ideológicas de Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo', in *Amadís de Gaula: Quinientos Años Después: Estudios en Homenaje a Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua*, ed. by José Manuel Lucía Megías and M[a] Carmen Marín Pina, with the collaboration of Ana Carmen Bueno (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2008), pp. 525-37

Moore, Helen, 'Ancient and Modern Romance', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005-), II: *1550 to 1660*, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummins and Stuart Gillespie (2010), pp. 334-346

_____'The Eastern Mediterranean in the English *Amadis* Cycle, Book V', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 41 (2011), 113-125

_____'Gathering Fruit: The "Profitable" Translations of Thomas Paynell', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave, 2011), pp. 39-57

_____'Jonson, Dekker, and the Discourse of Chivalry', *Mediaeval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 12 (1999), 121-65

Morini, Massimiliano, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Moulton, Ian Frederick, *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*

(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Neri, Stefano, 'Cuadro de la difusión europea del ciclo del *Amadís de Gaula* (siglos XVI-XVII)', in *Amadís de Gaula: quinientos años después*, ed. y José Manuel Lucía Megías and M[a] Carmen Marín Pina, with Ana Carmen Bueno (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2008), pp. 565-91

Neuville, Elsa, 'L'espace paratextuel à la Renaissance: Jean Maugin et ses contemporains' (unpublished thesis, École nationale supérieure des sciences de l'information et des bibliothèques, 2010)

Newcomb, Lori Humphrey, *Reading Popular Romance in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002)

_____'Romance', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture. Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*, ed. by Joad Raymond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), I, 363-376

O'Connor, John J., *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1970)

Orvis, David L., '"Lustful Jove and his adulterous child": Classical *Paiderastia* as Same-Sex Marriage in Marlowe's *Dido Queene of Carthage*', in *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction and Performance*, ed. by Kathryn M. Moncrief and Katrhyn R. McPherson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 101-112

Oxford English Dictionary <http://0www.oed.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/>

The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English 1550 to 1660, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummins and Stuart Gillespie, gen. eds. Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005-), II (2010)

Outhwaite, R. B., *Clandestine Marriage in England, 1500-1850* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995)

Palliser, Bury, *Historic Devices, Badges, and War Crimes* (London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston, 1870)

Parent, Annie, *Les métiers du livre à Paris au XVIe siècle (1535-1560)* (Genève: Droz, 1974)

Parker, Holt N., 'Women and Humanism: Nine Factor For the Woman Learning',

Viator, 35 (2004), 581-616

Patchell, Mary, *The 'Palmerin' Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York: Columbia University Press)

Pearson, Jacqueline, 'Women Reading, Reading Women', in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 80-99

Pender, Patricia, *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Peters, Christine, *Patterns of Piety: Women, Gender and Religion in Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Pettegree, Andrew, 'Translation and the Migration of Texts', in *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Thomas Betteridge (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 113-25

Phillips, Joshua, 'Chronicles of Wasted Time: Anthony Munday, Tudor Romance, and Literary Labor', *ELH*, 73 (2006), 781-803

Radulescu, Raluca L., 'How Christian is Chivalry?', in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 69-83

Randall, Dale B. J., *The Golden Tapestry: A Critical Survey of Non-chivalric Spanish Fiction in English Translation (1543-1657)* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1963)

Rawles, Stephen, 'The Earliest Editions of Nicholas de Herberay's Translations of *Amadis de Gaule*', *The Library*, 6th ser., 3 (1981), 91-108

Redondo, Agustín, 'Moros y Moriscos en la Literatura Española de los años 1550-1580', in *Las dos grandes minorías étnico-religiosas en la literatura española del Siglo de Oro: los judeoconversos y los moriscos*, Actas del Grand Séminaire de Neuchâtel (Neuchâtel, 26 a 27 de mayo de 1994) ed. by Irene Andés-Suárez, Annales Littéraires de L'Université de Besançon, 588 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995), pp. 51-83

Relihan, Constance C., *Fashioning Authority: The Development of Elizabethan*

Novelistic Discourse (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1994)

_____'"Dissordinate Desire" and the Construction of Geographic Otherness in the Early Modern Novella', in *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England, 1570-1640,* ed. by Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 43-59

Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640, ed. by S. K. Barker and Brenda M. Hosington (Leiden: Brill, 2013)

Renaissance Woman: A Sourcebook, Constructions of Feminity in England, ed. by Kate Aughterson (London Routledge, 1995)

Rhodes, Neil, 'Status Anxiety and English Renaissance Translation', in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 107-20

_____ 'Introduction', in *English Renaissance Translation Theory*, ed. by Neil Rhodes with Gordon Kendal and Louise Wilson, Modern Humanities Research Association: Tudor and Stuart Translations, 9 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2013), pp. 1-67

Rivers, Isabel, *Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry: A Student's Guide* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1979)

Rodríguez Moñino, M., *Relieves de erudición (Del Amadís a Goya)* (Madrid: Castalia, 1959)

Rothstein, Marian, 'Clandestine Marriage and *Amadis de Gaule*: The Text, the World, and the Reader', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25 (1994), 873-86

_____*Reading in the Renaissance: Amadis de Gaule and the Lessons of Memory* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1999)

Robinson, Benedict S., *Islam and Early Modern English Literature: The Politics of Romance from Spenser to Milton* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Robinson, Douglas, 'Theorizing Translation in a Woman's Voice: Subverting the

Rhetoric of Patronage, Courtly Love and Morality', *The Translator*, 1 (1995), 153-75

Roubaud, Sylvia, 'La forêt de longue attente: amour et mariage dans les romans de chevalerie', in *Amours légitimes amours illégitimes en Espagne (XVI^e^-XVII^e^ siècles)*, Colloque International (Sorbonne, 3, 4, 5 et 6 octobre 1984), ed. by Augustin Redondo (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1985), pp. 251-267

Rouillard, Clarence Dana, *The Turk in French History, Thought, and Literature (1520-1660)* (Paris: Boivin & C^ie^, 1938)

Rollison, David, *The Local Origins of Modern Society: Glocestershire 1500-1800* (London: Routledge, 1992)

_____*A Commonwealth of the People: Popular Politics and England's Long Social Revolution, 1066-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Sales Dasí, Emilio J., *Antología del ciclo de Amadís de Gaula* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2006)

_____'California, las Amazonas y la Tradición Troyana', *Revista de Literatura Medieval*, 10 (1998), 147-67

Sánchez-Martí, Jordi, 'The Publication History of Anthony Munday's Palmerin d'Oliva', *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 89 (2014), 190-207

Saunders, Corinne J., *Rape and Ravishment in the Literature of Medieval England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2001)

_____ 'Magic and Christianity', in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 84-101

Schleiner, Louise, 'Margaret Tyler, Translator and Waiting Woman', *English Language Notes*, 29 (1992), 1-8

_____*Tudor and Stuart Women Writers* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994)

Schleiner, Winfried, 'Male Cross-Dressing and Transvestism in Renaissance Romances, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19 (1988), 605-619

A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640, 3 vols, ed. by W. A. Pollard, G. R. Redgrave and others. 2nd edn (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991)

Simonin, Michel, 'La disgrace d'"Amadis"', *Studi Francesi*, 28 (1984), 1-35

Simon, Joan, *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967)

Smith, Helen, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Smith, Hilda L., 'Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Women', in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9-29

Smith, Jeremy L., *Thomas East and Music Publishing in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Spiller, Elizabeth, *Reading and the History of Race in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011

Steinmetz, David C., 'The Theology of John Calvin', in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, ed. by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 113-29

Smyth, Adam, 'Commonplace Book Culture: A List of Sixteen Traits', in *Women and Writing c. 1340-c. 1650: The Domestication of Print Culture*, ed. by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Phillipa Hardman (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2010), pp. 90-110

Stok, Fabio, 'Virgil Between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', *International Journal of Classical Tradition*, 1.2 (1994), 15-22

Taufer, Alison, 'The Only Good Amazon Is a Converted Amazon: The Woman Warrior and Christianity in the *Amadís* Cycle', in *Playing with Gender: A Renaissance Pursuit*, ed. by Jean R. Brink, Maryanne C. Horowitz and Allison P. Coudert (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), pp. 35-51

Taylor, Barry, 'Learning Style from the Spaniards in Sixteenth-Century England', in

Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640, ed. by S. K. Barker and Brenda M. Hosington (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 63-78

Taylor, Jane H. M., *Rewriting Arthurian Romance in Renaissance France: From Manuscript to Printed Book* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2014)

Thomas, Henry, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920)

Tudor Translation, ed. by Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave, 2011)

Turner, Celeste, *Anthony Munday: An Elizabethan Man of Letters* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928)

Uman, Deborah, *Women as Translators in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012)

Uman, Deborah and Belén Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 44 (2007), 298-323

Usher, Phillip John, 'Walking East in the Renaissance', in *French Global: A New Approach to Literary History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), pp. 193-206

Vaganay, Hugues, *Amadis en Français: Essais de bibliographie* (Firenze : Leo S. Olschki, 1906)

Vitkus, Daniel J., 'Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe', in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*, ed. by David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), pp. 207-30

_____*Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Von Koppenfels Werner, 'Two Notes on Imprese in Elizabethan Literature: Daniel's

Additions to *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Iovius*; Sidney's *Arcadia* and the Tournament Scene in *The Unfortunate Traveller*', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 24 (1971), 13-25

Voss, Paul J., 'The Catholic Presence in English Renaissance Literature', *The Ben Jonson Journal*, 7 (2000), 1-26

Wall, Wendy, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993)

Weatherby, H. L., 'Holy Things', *English Literary Renaissance*, 29 (1999), 422-42

Welles, Marcia L., *Persephone's Girdle: Narratives of Rape in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Literature* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000)

Whetter, K. S., 'Subverting, Containing and Upholding Christianity in Medieval Romances', in *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*, ed. by Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman and Michelle Sweeney (Cambridge: Brewer, 2010), pp. 102-118

Whitenack, Judith A., 'Conversion to Christianity in the Spanish Romance of Chivarly, 1490-1524', *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, 13 (1988), 13-39

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E., *Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World: Regulating Desire, Reforming Practice* (London: Routledge, 2000)

Wilkinson, P. R., *Thesaurus of Traditional English Metaphors*, 2nd edn (New York: Routledge, 2002)

Williams, Gordon, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, 3 vols (London: Athlone, 1994)

Wilson, Katharine, '"Turne Your Library to a Wardrobe": John Lyly and Euphuism', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500-1640*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 172-87

Wilson, Louise, 'Playful Paratexts: The Front Matter of Anthony Munday's Iberian Romance Translations', in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 121-32

Worth-Stylianou, Valerie, '*Translatio* and translation in the Renaissance: from Italy to France', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, 9 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989-2013), III, ed. by Glyn P. Norton (1999), pp. 127-135

Wright, Celeste Turner, '"Lazarus Pyott" and Other Inventions of Anthony Mundy [sic]', *Philological Quarterly*, 42 (1963), 532-541

Yager, Susan, 'The End of Knowledge: The Argus Legend and Chaucer', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 10 (1994), 15-26

Yapp, M. E., 'Europe in the Turkish Mirror', *Past & Present*, 137 (1992), 134-155