ABSTRACT

Bruno’s relationship with John Charlewood, the London printer of the Latin and Italian works published by the philosopher while in England from Spring 1583 to Autumn 1585, has so far remained neglected. Detailed information on British printers’ work in the period before 1800 is rare compared with that available for some other European countries. Such information, when to hand, has an important part to play in identifying interest (including publishing preferences) linking printers and readers. Chapter 1 therefore focuses on printing practices and regulations of the book-trade during the reign of Elizabeth I in order to determine the ‘cultural’ trends among the main London printers at that time. This chapter tries also to situate the Italian texts which had appeared in England in the years 1570-90 within this same context. The exploration of Charlewood’s book production constitutes the subject of Chapter 2, where a comparison between some of these publications and Bruno’s Italian Dialogues justifies the philosopher’s choice of applying to Charlewood’s press in the light of similar interests and preoccupations. Opening with a brief account of the reception of Italian humanism in England, Chapter 3 aims to provide an adequate background for the study of the diffusion of texts in Italian (whether printed in England or imported from the Continent), which had become very fashionable within sixteenth-century English culture and society. Finally, Chapter 4 is devoted to a survey of possible borrowings by Bruno from contemporary literary and scientific production, and, borrowing from Bruno in early seventeenth-century English texts.
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Ut pauci sapientiam et rerum cognitionem adsequuntur, quia pauci serio eam quaerunt. Non enim sophiam appetit qui, ut ditescat, ut quaestum per illam faciat, elaborat; ut vulgi honores aucupetur et aurum. Hic etenim illud quod debet esse finis ignobiliora ad ea ordinat quae prae ipsius claritate nihil facienda sunt. Quid ergo? loco sapientiae illud stultitiae genus adsequuntur, quod ad eum, quem sibi proposuere finem, digne valeat ordinari, Sophia quippe divinitas quaedam est, quae se non sinit contemni, et ab indigne quaerentibus inveniri.

Giordano Bruno, De immenso et innumerabilibus seu de universo et mundi 1591.
INTRODUCTION

On the 17 February 1600 the Holy See carried out its sentence against Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) and burned him at the stake for heresy. Thus began the myth of Bruno as the most significant thinker of the late European Renaissance. After a period of silence about his thought and reputation, it was over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that bibliographical and critical articles relating to Bruno increased in number, a trend that has been continued incessantly up to the present. Nevertheless, numerous details about his life, such as those concerning his sudden departure from the monastery of S. Domenico at Naples in 1576, which marked the beginning of his wandering throughout Europe as an exile; his twenty-months stay in Toulouse, where he lectured on astronomy and gave a commentary on Aristotle’s *De Anima* in 1580-81; the nature of the role he played within the court of Henry III in France and later of Elizabeth I in England, as well as his connections with the political and religious groups gravitating around these sovereigns; the reason for his eventual return to Italy in 1591; and finally his nine-year trial for heresy leading to his condemnation and death are still conjectural and open to investigation.

This thesis focuses on one of the most neglected aspects of scholarship on Bruno, namely his relationship with John Charlewood (d. 1593), the London printer of the Latin and Italian works which the philosopher published while in England from 1583 to 1585. How Bruno came to be acquainted with Charlewood is not known. Other than Bruno’s six philosophical dialogues (1584-5), which were printed either anonymously or surreptitiously, Charlewood did not publish any work in Italian. Equally, he never published complete works in Latin, apart from Bruno’s letter to the Vice Chancellor of Oxford University (1583) and the *Triginta sigilli* (1583). By comparison, John Wolfe, the most prolific printer of Italian titles in sixteenth-century England, published twenty-three works in Italian at his printing press in London between 1580 and 1591. All the most prominent Italian exiles in London such as Petruccio Ubaldini, Giacomo Castelvetro, Alberico Gentili, Gian Battista Castiglione had their works printed at his press. The reasons why Bruno did not send his Italian dialogues to him are not clear. In
Chapter 1 much stress has been placed upon printing practices and regulations of the book-trade during the reign of Elizabeth I in order to assess the cultural trends and preoccupations among the production of the main London printers at that time. In the last section of this Chapter, I analyse the Italian texts which had appeared in England in the years 1570-90 and attempt to consider them in relation to the cultural and ideological tendencies as revealed by the contemporary production of books.

According to the principles of textual bibliography, the identification of the printer of a text as well as the general knowledge of his working habits and cultural trend are tremendously significant in order to establish, wherever possible, the degree of fidelity between the author’s manuscript (if it survives) and its various printed versions. Professor Aquilecchia’s recovery of an unknown version of Bruno’s *Cena delle Ceneri* bearing authorial variations (or partial versions) occurring in the sheet D, provides evidence of a development in the author’s own contacts with the Elizabethan court during the printing of the work. If these revisions, as Aquilecchia has argued, fit a consistent pattern, then we might assume that: 1) Charlewood’s awareness of Bruno’s favouring the champions of the Puritan cause at court against the moderate Protestantism that Cecil espoused, a shift in alliances which led to the very expensive reprint of the whole sheet D, might indicate that the printer was familiar with the main lines of the books he was about to print; 2) Bruno and Charlewood’s sharing of interests might reflect a certain consistency between the substance of the thinking of the former and the trend of publications of the latter. Indeed, their ‘business relationship’ might even have affected the book production of Charlewood, whose commitment to Italian or ‘Italianate’ literature seems to have grown stronger from 1585 onwards. I suggest, therefore, in Chapter 2 that Bruno applied to Charlewood’s press in the light of his established pattern of publications, a pattern into which Bruno’s writings, at the time, fitted well.

Opening with a brief account of the reception of Italian humanism in England, Chapter 3 aims to provide an adequate background for the study of the diffusion of texts in Italian (whether printed in England or imported form the Continent) which had become so fashionable within sixteenth-century English culture and society. Finally, a
closer look at the titles of the Italian works listed in John Florio's *New World of Words* (1595) gives an indication of the contemporary interest in England in 'things Italian' at the time. The interaction of Italian and English culture cannot be considered other than in the context of the English reception of the Italian Dialogues. For this reason, Chapter 4 is entirely devoted to a survey of possible borrowings by Bruno from contemporary literary and scientific production, and, vice versa, possible echoes of Bruno in early seventeenth-century English texts.

Taken together, the information and analysis contained in these chapters seeks to demonstrate: 1) that English printers and publishers dealing with books in Italian shared to a certain extent similar interests in diffusing and promoting a well-defined cultural project; 2) that the same aims were shared by contemporary Italian exiles, including Bruno, as revealed by the respective works published in London at the time; 3) that the choice of one printer rather than another on the part of Italian editors or authors may well have been instrumental to these aims.

Bruno's relationship with the London printer of his Italian dialogues was first investigated by the Italian scholar Giovanni Aquilecchia forty years ago. My intention here is, as far as possible, to examine Charlewood's publication of Bruno's works in relation to his printing activity as a whole and to see what light this might throw upon one of the most intriguing and puzzling riddles of Bruno's life, namely, the purpose of his coming to England. Various hypotheses have been made ranging from that of a political and religious mission on behalf of the King of France, Henry III, to that of clandestine activity as a spy on behalf of Queen Elizabeth's Secretary Francis Walsingham (not to mention the significance of his cultural affinities with such prominent Elizabethans as Sir Philip Sidney and John Florio). A solution of the problem would not only help to give an historical interpretation to his "English" works (which embody an enthusiastic exaltation of the Copernican system), but would also clarify the nature of the relation between the Continental exiles and the court of Elizabeth.

Certainly Bruno, even though he promotes himself as the restorer of an ancient wisdom, was not nostalgic where the past was concerned. Nevertheless, I can do no other than agree with Aquilecchia when he says: "Non faremmo che ingannare noi stessi,
rinunciando (...) alla possibilità di vedere più chiaro anzitutto nel significato stesso delle formulazioni del passato e quindi nei motivi, aspirazioni, e, perché no? – talora pregiudizi che le abbiano ispirate ai loro autori. Solo quando si sia riusciti a ottenere un quadro per quanto possibile coerente – e pur qui tenuto conto della non sempre costante coerenza umana – potremo domandarci se e fino a che punto possiamo considerarci compartecipi del cui bono”.¹

¹ G. Aquilecchia 2000:12.
CHAPTER ONE

THE BOOK TRADE IN ENGLAND UNDER ELIZABETH I

Booke-Seller: Want you no other bookes sir?


I.

Printing regulations in Tudor times (1530-90)

Book printing during the second half of the XVI century was inextricably linked to the domestic policy of Elizabeth I, whose Royal prerogative was “not to be argued or brought into question” as Bacon declared.¹ There are a number of theories regarding authority under Elizabeth and the actual function of Elizabethan government in relation to literary production. Whether the government at the time imposed oppressive restraints and strict limitations - and, to what extent, therefore, Elizabeth’s reign may historically be defined autocratic - is a question which continues to prompt historical debate.² It is certain that the combination of deteriorating relations with Spain, the Northern Rebellion, the Catholic activity of Mary in Scotland, as well as that of militant Jesuits, was a clear threat to the Queen’s attempts

¹ Quoted in L. Rostenberg 1965, I: 4.
² The most influential studies in this respect are: G. Wickham 1959-81; F. Siebert 1952; A. Patterson 1984; C.S. Clegg 1997.
to strengthen the unity of her nation. Her efforts to govern a nation divided by religious discord and political intrigue resulted in stronger legislative measures and a stricter vigilance. As an obvious means of circulating both religiously and politically seditious opinions, the production of some 'objectionable' literature gradually aroused the suspicion of political and ecclesiastical authorities. Consequently, a more effective control established by the authorities during the later years of Elizabeth's reign was inevitably bound to affect the printing presses too. This censorship system has in recent years come under scrutiny, especially with regard to Tudor monarchs. During the forty-five years of Elizabeth's reign the amount of freedom granted to Her Majesty's subjects varied considerably. Yet, the encounters between Elizabethan government and the press appear more as a pragmatic response to an extraordinary variety of particular events than a product of a repressive policy.

The notion of censorship serves to introduce the issue of those practices and institutions related to the printing trade in the sixteenth century England. The appearance of the Lutheran tracts first, and of the early edition of the New Testament in vernacular later, stimulated the machinery of censorship. Henry VIII was fully aware of the power coming from the printed propaganda in effecting his revolutionary changes. His policy henceforth was not only against the undesirable reading matter, but also in support of that which could strengthen his cause. In terms of press control, this meant that for Tudor monarchs the central end of press censorship and licensing was controlling opposition to their regime's religious reforms. This situation was bound to affect both Catholic and Protestants.

In Henry VIII's earliest efforts to control the press he defended the Catholic Church against the heretical writings of Martin Luther and other reformers, particularly Lollards. William Tyndale, who partially translated into English the New Testament (1525-26), for instance, was forced to flee the country and he subsequently met a martyr's death before having translated the whole Bible. Following the King's break

---

3 This resulted in the proclamations of 1529 enforcing statutes against heresy and prohibiting unlicensed preaching and heretical books (TRP, I:181-5) and of 1530 prohibiting erroneous books and Bible translations (TRP, I:193-97).
4 Tyndale's work was completed by Miles Coverdale, who made, in 1535, the first Bible in English
with Rome, England entered a new phase. Ironically, it is to the ideas of those reformers once banned that the counsellors of Henry VIII turned for their justification of the English Church’s claim of authority over the Church and against the papal supremacy. This situation entailed an obvious connection between political and religious dissent. Since the 1534 Supremacy Act had subordinated ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the Crown, any rejection of the royal settlement, both in religious or in political terms, could become a weapon against the King. ‘Seditious’ words or writings were, therefore, indictable for misdemeanour, felony or treason. This was the result of the old and fundamental treason law of 1351, according to which “compassing the death of the King/Queen, or their deposition; levying the war; adhering to the king’s enemies; raising people against him, all such offences shall be adjudged Treason”. Increasingly, as religious reforms abroad became associated with political anarchy, in 1538 Henry issued a royal proclamation, which instituted press licensing, in the fear of open actions of the reformers at home. While critics envisioned in the “Proclamation of 1538” a new system of control which can be considered “the first attempt to establish a regular censorship and licensing over all kinds of printing”, the explicit intent expressed here of fighting those sinister opinions contrary to the truth faith, reverence and due observation of such sacraments, sacramental, laudable rites, and ceremonies as heretofore have been used and accustomed within the Church of England […] points rather to the sovereign’s early concern with controlling possible oppositional texts. Yet, Henry’s concern with exiling Anabaptists, depriving married clergy and removing St. Thomas à Becket from calendar, as clearly expressed in the proclamation, seem to strengthen the assumption that the king’s end was both to prevent political

available for the readers. Not being licensed by Church or State, Coverdale’s edition had to be printed at Zurich, and did not appear in England until 1537 when it was published by James Nycolson.

5 The link between ‘disorderly printing’ and opposition to the Settlement, has been rightly pointed out by D.M. Loades 1991:96-106.

6 Statutes of the Realm, I:320. These laws were strengthened under Elizabeth’s reign by means of the 1559 and 1571 treason laws and, later on, by means of the recusancy laws issued in the 1570s and 1580s.


8 TRP, I:270-6.
disruptions associated with radical reformers and to preserve the church Settlement he had concluded.

At the death of Henry VIII the struggling factions and parties which exercised power on behalf of the nine-year old king Edward, reformed religion in a Protestant sense. From 1547 to 1548, the press was freely engaged in printing all kinds of Reformation literature. Nevertheless, a proclamation of the 28th April 1551 expressed the same concern of Edward’s predecessor, that is to achieve social order by condemning his subjects’

vicious livings and corrupt conversation [...] licentious behaviour, lewd and seditious talks, to break continually the laws and statutes of the realm, to dispute of his majesty’s affairs, to sow, spread abroad and tell from mouth to mouth, false lies, tales, rumors, and seditious devices against his majesty, his councilors, magistrates and justices [...].

Due to the great number of Protestant supporters among printers and booksellers, heirs of those Edwardian reformers, the accession to the throne of the Catholic Mary in 1553, had a heavier impact on the book-trade. Her accession was marked by the repeal of Edwardian religious reforms and return to pre-Tudor treason laws. Although in opposite terms, the association of political sedition and religious creed is characteristic of Mary’s statutes and proclamations too. She regarded Protestant writings as heretical and therefore seditious; she issued letters patent to establish a special commission to “inquire concerning all heresies, heretical and seditious books” and “to seize all such books and writings in printers’ houses or shops or elsewhere”;

she finally proclaimed martial law and ordered that anyone possessing “wicked and seditious books” should be “taken for a rebel, and [...] without delay be executed for that offense”. These licensing and censorship measures clearly correspond to a programme of attacking religious and political policies without precedent in the history of British book printing. Actually, during Mary’s reign licensing requirements consisted of a ban on the printing or sale of works by Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Melanchthon, Erasmus, Tyndale, Cranmer, and other

---

9 Ibid., 1:514-18.
10 CPR, Philip & Mary, III:24-5.
11 TRP, II:90-1.
authors foreign and English. It was probably the same concern for “certain seditious and heretical books rhymes and treatises” which were daily published and printed by “divers scandalous malicious schismatical and heretical persons”, that initiated the process leading to the official recognition of the Craft of Stationers as a Guild. This event gave a new impulse to the regulating of the book trade.

The Charter incorporating the Stationers’ Company, granted by Queen Mary on 4 May 1557, and confirmed by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth in 1559, constituted, perhaps, the most effective attempt to achieve the long pursued goal of ‘orderly printing’. Although its formal incorporation came late, printers, booksellers, and binders had practised their trade in London since the end of the fifteenth century. Yet the Charter assured them a status in the City of London comparable to other companies and guilds. As a result, members of the Company acquired privileges and practices common among the older guilds, such as rights of property ownership, self-regulation, keeping apprentices, protection from non-members, voting rights in London and parliamentary elections and participation in London governance. Furthermore, the Charter specified that the Company would be governed by a Master, two Wardens and

---

12 The proclamation, dated 13 June 1555, also ordered the suppression of the prayer-book of Edward VI, and repeated a statute of Henry IV (1400-1) for the repression of heresies.
13 The ‘virtual foundation’ - as Pollard called it - of the Company of the Stationers can be traced as far back as 1403, pre-dating English printing by around seventy years. It was then that the writers of text-hand (that is, copyists of non-legal texts, as distinct from the group that would eventually become the Scriveners’ Company), the limners (manuscript illuminators), the bookbinders and the booksellers were granted two wardens by the City government to oversee their trades collectively. How the Company changed after receiving the royal charter from Philip and Mary one hundred and fifty-five years later is particularly difficult to assess, as the Company’s records we have today only begin in 1554. See G. Pollard 1937:1-38 and 235-60.
14 All the guilds or Companies of the realm functioned under charters obtained from the Crown and all had jurisdiction at least over London and its suburbs. See S. Rappaport 1989.
15 The need to improve regulations and to control numbers and centres of production on the part of Government and the mutual need to defend individual and corporate monopolies, to exclude unfree or non-Company workers and products and to acquire ‘new privileges’ on the part of Stationers, does not explain how and why the London booksellers, limners and bookbinders may have looked favourably on the process leading to their incorporation. The question has been suggested by Ian Gadd (Pembroke College, Oxford), who, in an unpublished paper entitled ‘A Habitation in the Suburbs of Literature’ presented at Amsterdam in November 1996 at the ESTER Seminar, Guilds and Guildmen in European Town, XVI-XIX century, maintains that “perhaps as a consequence of the primarily literary backgrounds and ambitions of most of those studying the London book-trade, the focus has always been on the individual printers, booksellers and bookbinders and their individual (but composite) products, rather than any analysis of their associations and corporate activities”.

---

21
the Court of Assistants. The regular membership of the Company were its yeomen (those members who had served their apprenticeship to the Company or been transferred from another company) – both journeymen who performed the trade’s labour and young masters. Indeed, the crucial importance of the Charter resides in its reserving to members of the Company the exclusive practice of the trade of printing, thus conferring on them in perpetuity the sole economic benefits of printing. The new situation was not without consequences.

In the first place, the earlier practice which allowed members belonging to other Guilds, such as the Drapers, the Grocers, the Fishmongers, etc., to buy, to bind and sell ‘in gross’ with their other wares large quantities of books, as well as to print them, virtually ceased. As a result, the Charter gave the Company a virtual monopoly of the printing industry, whilst constituting an assurance and a protection of the rights of its members:

no person within this our realm of England or the dominions of the same shall practise or exercise by himself, or by his ministers, his servants or by any other person the art and mistery of printing any book or any thing for sale or traffic within this our realm of England or the dominions of the same, unless the same person at the time of his foresaid printing is or shall be one of the community of the foresaid mistery or art of stationery of the foresaid City.

A later clause allowed the masters and wardens of the Company to make search and “to seize, take, hold, burn [...] all and several those books and things which are or shall be printed contrary to the form of any statute, act or proclamation made or to be made”. Finally, by requiring Company licences and by imposing fines “for defautes for pryntynge withoute lycense”, the Company attempted to accomplish its main aim of protecting its members against piracy. By presenting his ‘copye’ to the wardens and by obtaining the

---

16 All information provided on the Company and its composition are taken from C. Blagden 1960.
17 Actually, in the second half of Elizabeth’s reign there were still thirty-five out of about two hundred and seventy London printers and publishers who belonged to other Companies. See M. Plant 1965(a): 122-4.
18 SR, I:xxx-xxxi
19 Ibid., I:xxxi.
20 Ibid., I:100-1.
Company’s permission to print it, printers and publishers secured their rights for a manuscript acquired from the author.\textsuperscript{21} This practice, however, can hardly be considered the antecedent of the modern ‘copyright’. The notice of entrance (entry) to assure copy ownership and to obtain the sole right for printing it had nothing to do with the author, whose reward ended with the sale of his manuscript. Rather, it originally stood for the recognition by the Company that a particular copy is the property of a particular stationer or printer.\textsuperscript{22}

Whether or not the chartering of the Stationers’ Company can be seen as the means by which the government eventually achieved its end of controlling sedition and heresy, and more generally as a means to exercise its power over the printing and publishing trade, is still a moot question. There is no doubt that the set of ordinances and licensing system the Company had elaborated constituted a supreme advantage in the eyes of the government, inasmuch as censorship became comparatively easy. And there is no doubt too that after an unsuccessful attempt in 1542,\textsuperscript{23} it was only under Mary’s regime, whose declared aim was that of suppressing “detestable heresies against the faith and sound catholic doctrine of Holy Mother Church”,\textsuperscript{24} that the Company received its Charter. Nevertheless, that the Company had its own independence with respect to the Crown and that its members enjoyed extraordinary freedom can hardly be questioned. The Company licence, for instance, was required only for first editions, so subsequent issues and editions usually went unentered. Moreover, ephemeral publications could not be expected to appear in the Registers, as they did not need registration at all. And the same applied to books printed wholly in foreign languages, which, at that time, were not required to be registered or licensed. Lastly, Crown printers and privileged printers rarely

\textsuperscript{21} At the time of its incorporation, the Stationers’ Company recorded its activity in two volumes, known respectively as the Wardens’ Book and the Clerk’s Book. Each book or Register entry records the copy’s title, the name of the Stationer holding the licence, the entry date, and the entrance fee. The earlier series of book-entries are not individually dated, but only grouped according to craft-years. Unfortunately, the first original Clerk’s Book went missing, and there are consequently no records before the summer of 1576, nor any book-entries from July 1571 to July 1576, when a new Clerk’s book was opened.

\textsuperscript{22} See, for instance L.R. Patterson 1968; also C.J. Sisson 1960:8-20.

\textsuperscript{23} See C. Blagden 1960:28.

\textsuperscript{24} SR, I:xxi.
entered their titles in the Register. It also seems feasible that for some titles the printers may have made a special verbal agreement with the Company Wardens, as suggested by Clegg. Moreover, it may be that a number of works could have been printed outside the jurisdiction of the Company. If one adds the titles that printers might have not entered intentionally, either to avoid paying the fees, or for the fear of censorship, or to violate another printer’s copy, one can easily conclude that press control was largely ineffectual even after the Charter of the Company was granted.

In raising the important distinction between Company licence and official authorisation, Clegg has convincingly countered the arguments according to which the Company was merely an instrument of a higher authority. By requiring its members to procure a licence, the Company virtually acquired from the Crown the right, feudal in its origin since related to property rights, to give a stationer the ‘privilege’ to print his copy. Therefore, a licence could have been required without approval or authorisation by a government or ecclesiastical official. In situations where a work also received ‘authorisation’ or approval by outside authorities, the entry generally specifies this.

Following the accession of Elizabeth to the throne, both the government and the English book trade changed their practice.

The regulating of the printing trade during Elizabeth’s reign was strictly connected to the legislative measure that has come to be known as the Elizabethan Settlement – the 1559 Parliamentary Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. While the former gave the Queen the title of ‘Supreme Governor of the Church’, the latter by reintroducing the use of the Book of Common Prayer and specifying penalties for those ministers who did not conform to it, brought the reformation process of the English Church to its completion. Moreover, by defining the limits of loyalty to the monarchy the Oath of Supremacy

26 According to Peter Blayney, the company licensing entailed two fees: one fee for licence, which was actually procured by showing copy to the Wardens, and a second fee for the record of the licence or entrance. Blaney’s view on this matter is fully reported in C.S. Clegg 1997:17.
27 Ibid., 15-6.
28 In this regard, Greg distinguished three types of entry in the Registers: the ones made without mention of any authority; the ones authorised on behalf of the Company, usually by one of both of the wardens, rarely by the Master – the so-called ‘domestic licence’ or Company licence -; the ones authorised by persons who were not members of the Company – the so-called ‘official authorisations’ (1944:1-22).
Moreover, by defining the limits of loyalty to the monarchy the Oath of Supremacy called for by the Act formed the theoretical grounds of Elizabethan treason and sedition. As a consequence of these acts, writing or printing texts denying Elizabeth's ecclesiastical and temporal authority, advocating rebellion, calling the Queen a heretic or usurper, "compassing or imagyning" bodily harm against her or slandering or defaming her, and even writing about the succession to the English Crown, came within the definition of high treason. This clearly emerges from the public enactment known as the *Injunctions*, issued by royal proclamation on 19 July 1559, which set forth the form and substance of the Elizabethan Church. In dealing with printing matters, item 51 reads:

> Item because there is a great abuse in the printers of bokes, which for covetousnes cheifel regard not what thei print, so thei may have gaine, whereby arriseth great dysorder by publicatyon of unfrutefull, vayne and infamous bokes and papers.  

As one can note, the language is reminiscent of that in the Henrician and Marian proclamations: once again the principal concern of the Crown is to be sure that no books are to be "either heretical, sedicious or unsemely for Christyan eares". Nevertheless, the 1559 Injunctions represented an appreciable departure from all previous statutes and proclamations. In creating the High Commission and making it responsible for the contents of printed texts in ecclesiastical matters, Elizabeth effectively extended to that Commission the Crown's rights to govern trade, a prerogative which formerly belonged to the Stationers' Company. Such jurisdiction over printing came to be exercised chiefly by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London, as well as by the Chancellors of the University of Cambridge and Oxford. The licensing requirement, however, did not apply to all new books:

> Provyded that these orders do not extend to anye prophane aucthours, and workes in any language, that hath ben heretofore commonly
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29 SR, I:xxviii
30 Ibid.
31 The Ecclesiastical Commission for London, which came to be known as the High Commission, was made up of seventeen members, six of whom must act together, "to put in execution throughout the realm the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy and to inquire touching all heretical opinions, seditious books, contempts, false rumours and the like and hear and determine the same" (CPR, Elizabeth, I:118).
32 SR, I:xxxviii.
Let us leave to the historians the task of judging whether or not and to what extent the licensing requirement of the 1559 Injunctions actually affected the printing trade. What matters here is to investigate press censorship and trade regulations with regard to their legal, political and religious contexts.

The link between book printing and disorder is again discernible in the set of ordinances issued on 24 June 1566 by the Privy Council sitting in the Star Chamber, at the High Commission’s request. These ordinances are worth mentioning in so far as they constitute a record of what can be considered the earliest use of registration of books. It has there decreed that

\[
eavie Printer, Stationer, Bookseller, Merchant, and other person, using anie trade of Bookes, printing, binding, selling, or bringing into this Realme, shall before the said Commissioners, or before anie other persons thereunto to be assigned by the Queenes Maiesties most honourable priuie Councell, enter into seuerall recognisances of reasonable summes of monie to her Maiesties vse.\]

In the event of infringement of the regulations, the offender would be punished by fine, imprisonment, seizure of the press and destruction of the types, exclusion from the trade and sometimes even banishment, or death.

The 1566 ordinances were the Crown’s response to the Catholic apologists’ challenge of the 1559 Injunctions. The books that provoked the government concern were Continental Catholic books in the so-called ‘The Great Controversy’. Although theological debate lay at the centre of the controversy, increasingly the Catholic criticism involved Protestant bishops, English law and Anglicanism. Arguments denying Elizabeth’s ecclesiastical authority could not be tolerated by the government. As a result, the 1566 ordinances extended to the Company the High Commission’s right to control

---

33 Ibid., I:xxxix.
35 SR, I:322. Italics mine.
the flow into England of illegal books from the Continent and to search locations where imported books might be found. The fact that during 1565-66 alone twenty-eight books on the controversy issued from Continental presses were seized serves to clarify the coercive language of the new legislative measures which came into force during Elizabeth’s reign.

Yet, the 1570 papal Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* excommunicating the Queen of England and denying her authority as head of the English Church marked an evident turning point with regard to legislation concerning printing. Due to the equation non-conformity = treason, any person supporting the Pontiff’s sentence against Elizabeth was condemned as an “obstinate traytour against her maisties person” and any book referring to it was subversive in character since it questioned the authority of the Sovereign in the resolution of spiritual matters. Furthermore, in 1569-70, when the efforts of English Catholics in France to re-establish the Catholic Church in England became political, a series of books appeared advancing Mary Queen of Scots’ right to succession. The Papal support of Spanish and Irish military actions against Elizabeth eventually made the problem of Catholic loyalty acute. From this time onward, Catholic matters became the object of Parliament and Privy Council control. The Privy Council employed its own searchers and informers, independent of both the Stationers and the High Commission, to seek out Catholic books.

It was mainly the Crown’s concern over controlling the smuggling of objectionable Catholic texts that brought about the proclamation, issued 14 November 1570, discriminating between a good subject, who complies with the law, and a bad subject, who aids seditious persons or conceals seditious books. This latter “shall be taken, reputed, and punished as abettors and maintainers of the principal traitors that were authors of the same”.37 A further proclamation ordering the destruction of “seditious books and libels to be compiled and printed in divers languages, wherein their final intention appeareth to be blaspheme”38 made its appearance in 1573. The books in question “condemning generally the whole policy of the present estate as having no

37 *TRP*, II:347.
38 Ibid., II:377.
religion, nor piety, nor justice, nor order, no good ministers at all, either for divine or human causes” have issued from “obstinate and irrepentant traitors”, “despisers of God’s true religion” devised “to ruin” her majesty’s person.39

As the measures taken by government officials, ecclesiastical licensers and Stationers’ Company searchers were largely insufficient to suppress opposition literature, new efforts were directed to enforce laws against Catholic recusants, which included an ecclesiastical licensing requirement. The 1583 articles proposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, proscribed that “no bookes be printed being not before perused and allowed under the handes of the Archbishop of Canterbury or Bishopp of London”, and that printers be restrained from printing editions of the Bible other than those allowed.40 This laid the foundation for a somewhat more stringent licensing system.

Despite any decrees or ordinances, books continued for some time to be issued without showing the names of the licensers as stated in the past. The only remaining formality was the payment of a fee to the Stationers’ Company for entry on their registers. It was only after the 1586 Star Chamber Decrees for Order in Printing that the registration of books, once customary, became, in principle, mandatory.41 From this time onward, the Stationers’ Register represented a fairly complete record of books ‘legally’ published. This Decree confirmed and enforced the previous Injunction of 1559: only stationers and privileged printers could print; the number of printers and apprentices was strictly limited; all printing except within the limits of the City, and in Oxford and Cambridge, was prohibited;42 no printer could set a new press up without direct permission; all presses were subject to inspection; and all books and pamphlets issued had to receive the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. In addition, the Decrees specified the period of time for registering presses, the means of

39 Ibid.
41 The 1586 Decrees set forth nine ordinances governing printing and placed their execution in the hands of the “Archebysshop of Canterbury and the righte honorable the lorde and others of her highenes pryve councill”. While eight items deal with the problems in printing-trade relations, only item 4 may be construed as relating to content censorship. Full text of the Decrees is given in SR, II:807-12.
42 This restriction remained until the Licensing Act expired in 1695.
Orders. Finally, as an alternative to the Court of Star Chamber, they gave to the Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical jurisdiction to resolve those disorders in the printing trade involving non-Stationers.

If Clegg is right when arguing that the Decrees were clearly framed in response to the disruptions in the printing trade, i.e. the 1577-83 dispute between journeymen printers and the holders of printing privileges, the conservative nature of the Decrees is particularly noteworthy. Actually, by restricting the proliferation of presses in the hope of providing adequate work for the existing presses and by limiting the number of apprentices, thus creating fuller future employment, the Decrees seem to act in favour of trade interests. In this perspective, Clegg's arguments for a revisionism of the predominant view which sees the 1586 Star Chamber Decrees as an instrument of the Crown to impose press control, appear to be fairly persuasive.

The Catholic political pamphlets prompted the Elizabethan proclamations condemning and suppressing them. However, the process leading to a complete change from the Catholic Church of Rome to the Church of England was undermined not only by Catholics, but also by radical Protestants. Although the 1559 Parliament had settled the Church on a recognisably Protestant basis, there were signs of the beginning of radical Protestant associations starting from the earliest months of Elizabeth’s reign. The settlement which emerged from Elizabeth’s formula was in its essence a compromise and could not satisfy those who were still attached to the old Edwardian liturgies. The significant alterations of the 1552 Prayer Book, including the use of the eucharistic vestments and the use of wafers in the communion were far from being acceptable to Puritans, whose minds, as remarked by Collinson, were schooled in continental reformed theology. To them, the Elizabethan Settlement appeared to comply more with Catholicism rather than with the best reformed churches overseas. The regulation of the ministry of the Church seemed to the Puritans equally faulty. The clergy were ordained indiscriminately into the priestly order and were not called to serve a specific vocation in
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43 See C.S. Clegg 1997:54-65. Clegg’s challenge to the predominant vein of past historical arguments about Tudor censorship is, in fact, the leitmotiv of the whole book. Most of the arguments in this section are indebted to this book.
a particular congregation, according to reformed practice. This situation led to the Vestarian Controversy in 1560s and to the Admonition Controversy in the early 1570s. In both these Controversies clerical nonconformists put their opposition into print. During those years, while the Privy Council assumed authority over Catholic matters, the High Commission was left to contend with radical Protestant opposition. It served as the principal court of inquiry into conformity among the English clergy.

In 1566 Henry Denham, a member of the Stationers' Company, printed Robert Crowley's *Briefe discourse against the outwarde apparell of the popishe church* (STC 6078), which is considered the manifesto of the London reforming clergy in the Vestarian Controversy. Although the book was unlicensed and anonymously printed, Denham did not incur harsh sanctions. As for Crowley, in 1588 he was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the official board of ecclesiastical licensers which had been established in that year.\(^\text{45}\) This is a clear example of how inadequately these measures affected the book-trade. Instead, Elizabeth's first proclamation against books of religious reform came in 1573, ordering the surrender of *An admonition to the Parliament* (STC 10847) and the pamphlets defending it. The book, ascribed to two radical Protestant ministers, John Field and Thomas Wilcox, advocated further reform of the Church along Calvinist lines. It was issued from the secret press at Hemel Hempstead of John Stroud, who was the printer of two other works attacking the church hierarchy.\(^\text{46}\) Despite the Crown's efforts to control the controversy, the Puritan campaign became more intense. In 1573 Thomas Cartwright's *A replye to An answere made of M. doctor Whitgifte* (STC 4711) appeared from the same press advocating presbyterian governance and criticising both the episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer. Once again, the proclamation mainly addressed the suppression of such literature. In this case too the printer's confession that he had printed the books and his admission of their error were all that was required of him.

Not every Protestant who was unhappy with Rome rejoiced over the alternatives

---

\(^{45}\) In 1588 Whitgift appointed a panel of authorisers to regularly "peruse and allow" books for the Stationers. It also served as a link between the Privy Council and the Stationers.

\(^{46}\) STC 4713 and 10850.
Not every Protestant who was unhappy with Rome rejoiced over the alternatives provided by Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. These dissenters formed a positive movement in their own right, independent in origin and fundamentally in disagreement with the basic teachings of these reformers. They can be grouped in a third Protestant body: the Radical Reformers. Apart from Puritans, two other minor radical sects were the objective of royal censorship. A proclamation on 3 October 1580 outlawed the Family of Love and the texts serving as the “ground of their sect”. The proclamation calls upon ecclesiastical officials to search members of the sect and proceed against them by both ecclesiastical and temporal laws, and to destroy and burn all “books and writings maintaining the said heresies and sects”.

A 30 June 1583 proclamation declaring Brownist writings seditious and schismatic appears to be germane to the previous one. A final proclamation directed toward Protestant writings appeared 13 February 1589 to order the destruction of the Marprelate publications.

This brief overview does not claim to be exhaustive in respect of the enormously complex historical problem of the ‘enlightened’ or otherwise character of Elizabeth I’s reign, but only purports to enhance the understanding of the more limited issues raised by this enquiry. During the sixteenth century, the conditions of publishing in England were largely determined by the successive phases of Tudor and later Stuart policy. As we have seen, starting with Henry VIII’s reign, the Crown exerted its direct influence over all the printing presses in England - with the sole exception of the University presses of Oxford and Cambridge - by the following three means. First, it issued injunctions, royal decrees, and ordinances to regulate the industry of printing. Second, it promulgated a Charter which incorporated the Stationers’ Company and gave these stationers authority over nearly all the printers throughout the kingdom; and thirdly, it empowered a set of administrative and judicial departments, such as the Privy Council and the Star Chamber, as well as official censors, to examine any book that was to be printed in England and to seize illegal presses.

47 TRP, II:474-5.
48 On these tracts and their relevant implications for the political and religious events of the time, see D. Wilson 1958 and W. Pierce 1964.
Nevertheless, the evident discrepancy between theory and practice in law enforcement during the Tudor age was significantly emphasised by the frequency of violations. Not only did forbidden books continue to arrive in the country incessantly, but also most of them were surreptitiously printed in England itself, often with a false foreign imprint. A survey of Tudor censorship may help us to find an answer to the question formulated at the beginning of the section of whether or not Elizabethan policy should be considered excessively repressive. There is no doubt that the activity of the censors was often carried out with leniency. As far as religious literature is concerned, unauthorised works both from Puritans and Catholics were freely circulated with the open encouragement of such patrons as Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, Francis Walsingham and others. Indeed, only a few books contain the name of the licensers and, unless the members of the commission objected, older works on religion and government could be reprinted without licence. Although unregistered publication might involve both the confiscation of the copy and the punishment of the offender, it is likely that up to a third of the copies actually printed went unregistered. The government’s attempts to prohibit the smuggling of heretical books printed abroad were equally vain: bootlegging of books continued on a vast scale throughout the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and the enforcement of the policy of regulating printing naturally drove the dissenters, the papists on the one side and the puritans on the other, to resort to secret printing. Furthermore, numerous publications on political topics, including those that attacked the Elizabethan court, or even the sovereign herself, were issued from secret presses and subsequently traded. Needless to say, as Sheavyn states, the control over morals in literature was quite unsatisfactory: “to modern taste, the judgement of the censors was at times strangely at

49 The Star Chamber Decrees itself give evidence of such violations: “Whereas sondrye Decrees and Ordynaunces haue vpon grave aduice and deliberacon been heretofore made and published, for the repressinge of suche greate enormyties and abuses as of late, more then in tyme paste, haue been commonly vsed and practiced by dyvers contentyous and disorderlye persons professinge the arte of mysterye of Pryntinge or sellinge of bookes. And yet notwithstandinge the said Abuses and enormyties are nothing abated: but (as it is found by experience) doe rather daylye more and more encrease to the wilfull and manifeste breache and contempte of the said ordinances and decrees to the great dyspleasure and offence of the Quenes most excellent maiestie”. (SR, II:807).
51 A.C. Southern estimates that, before 1580, twenty thousand recusant books were smuggled into England and clandestinely distributed, and that slightly over one hundred Catholic tracts were printed
fault, both in its condemnation and in its tacit permission". Nor was severe action taken against what might be called the Elizabethan literature of social protest.

The extent to which governmental repression had pernicious effects on English literature must also be established. This question cannot, in fairness, be judged in absolute terms. One may argue - as E. A. Arber, one of the great Elizabethan scholars, did - that “all our preconceptions to the contrary notwithstanding, the Press in England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth was probably the freest in Europe, as free indeed as the political situation at this time would admit of”. On the other hand, it is also worth pointing out that in some cases such as that of theatre, the authorities were hostile and repressive to such an extent as to restrict the freedom of playing companies by prohibiting their performances. William Shakespeare complained that “art was made tongue-tied by authority” and some modern critics have even wondered “whether English literature has not been deprived, by a suspicious Government, of a great epic based upon contemporary national history!”.

After carefully investigating all the available sources and noting the remarkable diversity of scholarly opinions, I am persuaded by the argument which assumes that Elizabeth’s conduct of church and state affairs must be evaluated within its historical context, with its complex combination of legal, social and economic restraints. She succeeded to a kingdom which contained sharply opposed religious interests which threatened political division and social disturbance. The years 1581-88 were marked by dangerous plots, some of them being real, others as the result of what has been called the Plot Mania—or the tendency to smell conspiracies and secret intrigues in many places—which intensified Elizabeth’s concern with censorship, especially apparent in a recurrent
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53 In talking about over thirty cases recorded in the Court Book between 1576 and 1602, Sir William Greg characterises these proceedings by observing that “it may be that as a rule each side had a case of sorts to lay before the Assistants, and no doubt the decisions were given more in accordance with common sense and social diplomacy than with any rigid legal code. It was in fact a Court of conciliation rather than of law” (RCSC:1xxv).
56 Ibid., 162.
hysteria about 'seditious' words. Moreover, the country was so weak externally that its viability as an independent state was open to question. In these circumstances, press censorship can be regarded as an *ad hoc* response – albeit authoritarian – to particular texts that the state perceived to endanger the exercise of its legitimate and necessary authority. Still, the evidence shows that the practice of literature was not subject to excessively stringent restraints in Elizabethan England, and that, as McKerrow pointed out long ago, not a single major literary work was censored in the era, which is more than can be said of most other European countries. In this framework, printers and publishers were left relatively free to express their own views through the power of the art of printing.
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57 As is well known, many of the alleged plots which infested Elizabeth's government during those years were either fictitious, or set afoot by Walsingham's own *agents provocateurs*, or were dynastic only, not murder plots. In this regard, see the letter from the French Ambassador Michel de Castelnau, seigneur de la Mauvissière to the Queen Mother quoted in J.H. Pollen and W. McMahon 1919:42.
II.
Main printers and publishers in Elizabethan London (1570-90)

The connection between the figures of printer, publisher, bookseller and their times has been well summarised by these words: “they are but a microcosm of a much larger group who participated in the drives of the century and helped mould its particular structure”. In the dim background of this rich and fertile period, the bookseller-printer-publisher has remained for a long time a rather shadowy and insubstantial figure of whom little is known, and who does not raise much interest. The main reason is the evident difficulty of gathering and assessing the huge amount of relevant sources scattered around archives, record offices and libraries. On the other hand, it is only thanks to these figures and to their related critical literature that it is possible to offer a more detailed insight into the publishing activities of the century. After the invention of printing in Europe, books of the most various kinds were coming off the presses every year, and in constantly increasing numbers in every European country. Examining the literary output throughout the centuries in different countries is a task which has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention for a long time. A brief outline of various and different reading materials produced by the printers during Elizabeth’s reign will serve to introduce the issue we intend to cover.

The development of the art of printing in England towards a literary profession was quite slow in comparison with that of other countries such as Italy, France, Holland and Switzerland. Unlike these European centres, during the sixteenth century London was only a small publishing centre and the quality of its printing was very poor. Despite the significant role in printing that the Star Chamber Decree had conferred on them, even the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were quite slow in fulfil their printing

---

58 At the very beginning of the book-trade, these groups must be considered together because of the closeness of their relations: the printer was editor, publisher and bookseller at the same time, as well as the printer himself. He chose the manuscripts he wished to print and edited them; he determined the number of copies to be printed; he sold them to his customers. This situation gradually changed on account of the evident difficulty of pursuing all these functions, and the printer concentrated on one or the other aspect of the business. See S.H. Steinberg [1955]1996:59-62.
60 See Map 1.
potentiality.  

As we have seen, Elizabeth’s reign marks a turning point in the history of English book production. Starting from the 80s, thanks to the spread of printing in the English vernacular the reading public widened considerably and publishers and authors had to supply new tastes and demands with new reading matter. As a result, the national output increased, thus reflecting both the growing demand and the commercial ability of the book-trade to meet it.

According to the analysis of English imprints between 1480 and 1640 compiled by E.L. Klotz, religious literature of various kinds still predominated, so that some 44% of all works published fell into this category, which included guides to ‘godliness’, controversial pamphlets and hagiographical material, in addition to Bibles, liturgies, and sermons. Literature, represented by a group of miscellaneous imprints, including accounts of wonders, memorials and epitaphs, accounted for another 22%, while the remainder was divided among subjects such as political essays and works on law (13%); history, geography, travel and news (7%); scientific and quasi-scientific works  

Other works, such as books on commerce, economics and education, which fell under the heading of ‘sociology’, and items related to the fine arts and music covered the final 7%. The publishers printed English texts using black letter, whilst for pages in Latin or modern languages they attempted to imitate the humanist types and occasionally an Aldine cursive type. In particular, the black-letter type was utilised for publications of popular appeal, often in octavo, while roman was generally used in books for the more scholarly or cultured people. If the typography of the volumes produced and their ornaments were not of the highest quality, nevertheless it must be admitted that the range of topics dealt with, above all at the end of the century, reveals an uncommon vitality.
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61 As in London, the early printing presses in Cambridge and Oxford were established by foreigners, namely by Germans. See P. Sutchiffe 1978, and D. McKitterick 1992.
63 This category describes such items as prognostications, calendars, almanacs as well as items on agriculture, husbandry, navigation and military tactics.
MAP 1 Large publishing centres in Europe in the sixteenth century
As has been noted, “no man could well complain in Elizabethan England that knowledge was hidden from him”. In this view, the great variety of sixteenth-century English book production deserves further consideration.

Between the years 1570 and 1590 the greatest demand from the presses was for religious works. This was due, at least in part, to historical circumstances ongoing since the time of Edward VI, whereby political refugees from the whole of Europe fled to England, and once there, utilised the printing houses as a means of producing political and religious propaganda. As a result, the sale of such literature was the reason for the prosperity of the book trade in sixteenth-century England. It is well known that Protestantism exercised a strong influence on the spread of religious works in the English vernacular. Its success depended upon a direct appeal to people reading their own language, and much translation was done to make religious works available for their use. Bible translations, mostly following the Lutheran version, the Psalms in prose and verse, the Book of Common Prayer, as well as meditations, catechisms and sermons were the most common types of book on the booksellers' stalls during these years. To ensure that the works of the great foreign divines, such as Beza, Bullinger, Calvin and others could be widely studied, much translation was undertaken and put into circulation by a number of sympathetic stationers. So far as they could, Catholics, too, went on translating into English works by Jesuit fathers, or lives of the saints, or prayer manuals. Clearly, not all these publications were printed randomly, but corresponded to a religious strategy that both Catholics and Protestants ventured on in order to gain as much consent as possible among readers.

Besides religious literature, legal manuals and medical compendia, volumes on geography, travel and exploration, classics and verse flooded the book market. Apart from the primary sources of the law, such as volumes containing the statutes promulgated year by year as well as erudite manuals and treatises, the production of legal
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64 H.S. Bennett 1965, lxvi.
65 The religious discord increased the number of religious titles for the years 1540-50, so that they represented 62% of the total distribution of English printed books.
66 According to Luther the press was “God's highest and extremest act of grace, whereby the business of the Gospel is driven forward”. Quoted in CHB, IV:432.
textbooks consisted mainly of various books of formulas, precedents, law terminology, etc. Medical books of all kinds were constantly being printed, and those books which covered education were also an important part of the stock trade. Other learning aids came from books on mathematics, astronomy, and popular science, often written in the English vernacular so that they could reach a public ignorant of Latin or of the various European languages used by authors. And still, at a time when the humanistic ideal remained the model, the more educated minds could benefit from reading classical authors and ancient moral treatises, which were not affected by any royal injunction. Although travelling was a pleasure reserved for few people, ‘voyage literature’ depicted the adventures of intrepid English seamen and travellers, inviting the reader’s imagination to reach more distant lands. Finally, historical works, which often represented new currents of thought, were printed on a large scale for the first time.

Almost equal to the number of religious works rolling off the presses were the popular texts of the age. From the late fourteenth century on, new literary forms were emerging in English, for entertainment and self-expression, but also as appeals to, and embodiments of, public opinion. These included cheap broadsides or ballads, epigrams on notable individuals, memorial or satirical poems and rhyming narratives of current events. Later in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, almanacs and pamphlets supplied tales in which popular fantasy depicted such things as monstrous births, strange creatures or events attributed to supernatural powers as well as other sensational happenings. These texts were usually adapted from Italian, Dutch, French and Spanish literature or news. Terse or derisory popular comment and the little book – libellus – expressing scorn or satire constituted the popular genre of libelling.

Small books providing information and dealing with a great variety of everyday practical issues constituted the so-called ‘ephemeral publications’, also belonging to popular literature. The ‘peculiarity’ of this literary genre is explained by a simple market
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67 See above, 25-6.
68 As investigative terms, both ‘popular’ and ‘culture’ have been subjected to an array of conflicting explanations. In the present study, by popular literature I mainly refer to treatises, ballads, satires, political pamphlets, news-books and dramas, which form a contrast with traditional courtly forms and private theatrical performance.
rule: most readers found it more convenient to ask for a small book dealing with the subject in which they were interested, so that they could study it at leisure. As the craft of printing was first of all a business, the earlier printers had to issue as much as they could of what was most likely to meet public demand. In this respect, the development of vernacular printing could please the taste of the class which had no Latin or foreign language but was capable of reading and affluent enough to buy reading matter. Subjects for more practical purposes, such as how to keep bees or silkworms, how to make dyes and paints, how to carve and serve at table, sometimes even how to swim or shoot at the butts, were collected into small easy-to-read books. Herbals and almanacs, treatises on husbandry and astrology, jest-books and chap-books also contributed to the production of popular literature.

The importance of these figures to the economy of the book trade can be easily perceived. In an age so favourable to privileges and book patents, this ‘lower’ form of literature, cheap to buy and produce as well as readily saleable, rendered the struggle for existence less arduous to the unprivileged publishers and printers. What is more, such production made England’s position in European letters rather peculiar from the very beginning of the era of printing. More precisely, while the Continent was flooded by Latin and its translation into vernacular was condemned by reactionary opponents, England was the second country after France in western Christendom where vernacular books outnumbered Latin ones. This was because English linguistic nationalism, with its awareness of the maturity and excellence of the works of the Elizabethan age, was little by little challenging the supremacy of Latin and the other European languages such as French and Italian. But what were, in brief, the causes of this ‘linguistic revolution’?

The invention of printing and its effect on the intellectual conditions of the European nations, with the aftermath of wider diffusion of popular as well as learned works, was perhaps the most incisive element in bringing to a climax the many problems implied in the linguistic controversies in every European country. The consequences were twofold. On the one hand, every single product of the human mind, be it

---

philosophical, scientific, or literary, rapidly became more common property of all nations regardless of its own national origin. On the other hand, the spread of printing tended to deepen, and even created, national frontiers concerning the field of intellectual activities. The use of Latin, the common medium of communication during the Middle Ages and the language of European cosmopolitanism according to the humanistic perspective, was reduced to a near pedantic exercise of rhetoric, only taught in the academic world.

This aspect of linguistic decadence is related to the crisis of the aristocracies in the Modern Age. During these years the bourgeoisie, along with the gentry, increased its strength and power, and the study of the vernacular seemed, at first, to be fashionable. In the sixteenth century, scientific literature partly reflected this new strength. The impressive increase in the number of scientific works in the vernacular, in particular astronomy treatises, composed with evident popular and didactic purposes, seems to denote a rising anti-humanistic feeling. In this respect, Professor Aquilecchia draws our attention to the meaningfulness of the national, popular and anti-humanistic nature of the triumph of the vernacular languages in the three great monarchies of France, Spain and England, as well as in Renaissance Italy. The author, though, emphasises the risk that the much opposed linguistic elitism of the past, based on classical Latin models, could be replaced (as indeed it was) by “a new literary elitism based on the phono-morphological and lexical prestige of a new vernacular classicism”.

If the rapid growth of national consciousness played a crucial role in the development of Italian literature in the vernacular, similarly it was the formation of national identity that made the claims of the vernacular more definite and insistent in sixteenth-century England. In this regard, the convergence of the English literary Renaissance with the entrenchment of the Protestant Reformation, starting in Europe in the 1530s and 1540s, accelerating in England in the 1570s and 1580s, was not accidental. At the same time, the contribution of the Reformation to the vernacular

---

71 Id., Due schede nolane, Atti del Convegno di Nola (feb. 1996), forthcoming.
72 This is the leitmotiv of A. Fox 1997. The various aspects of the relationship between the English Reformation and the English Renaissance, as well as the function of Italianate literary imitation in the background, will be examined in detail in subsequent chapters.
question can hardly be undervalued. Luther's ninety-five theses were broadcast far and wide by the timely invention of printing, and when he published his first reformation tract in the summer of 1520 it found its way throughout Europe in an amazingly short space of time. From that time onward, the official neo-Latin culture became increasingly vernacular and secular. It was in connection with Biblical translation, in fact, that the question was more widely and strenuously debated; and Tyndale, following Colet and Erasmus, became the leading advocate of a Bible in the vernacular.

At a certain point England, like the other European countries, was also part of the general humanist movement that made Latin the universal language. It should be also noted that, although not to the extent seen in Italy, England too had its own 'questione della lingua', not only with reference to Latin, or the development of the Saxon vernacular, but also relating to the use of French. Nevertheless, since the standard of education was very low in Britain at that time, ability comfortably to read classical languages was relatively rare. In spite of great efforts to educate children in spoken Latin, the results must have been more formal than substantial. Concomitantly, the English vernacular increased in popularity. Many translators emphasised the fact that their works were for the 'simple', or the 'unlearned and ignorant', who were "not expert in the tongues", and for those only able to read the vernacular, classical and modern languages being beyond their reach. Meanwhile the problem of fitting the vernacular for its role as a literary medium was also being considered. Use of English by the reformers to obtain popular support, for instance, has been widely reported by scholars. In like manner, the English tongue was gradually replacing Latin both in prose writing and in poetry. As a consequence, from the beginning of the sixteenth century onward, editions of Latin texts in England tended to decrease in number. This occurrence does not indicate that the world of antiquity was neglected there. Instead, it only shows that the prose of Cicero, Livy and Tacitus; the poetry of Horace, Ovid, Terence and Virgil, as well as the drama of Seneca "were all given an English dress".73 Obviously, a total

73 H.S. Bennett 1965:103-4. In these pages, Bennett gives the following figures concerning the translations of classical works: about fifty Greek and one hundred Latin translations were made, adding up a total number of two hundred items including reprints. "If we assume" he adds "that an average edition consisted of not less than 750 copies at this time, this implies that there were some 150,000
disappearance of works in Latin, and its subsequent replacement by an English language equivalent would not be likely, nor correspond to the reality of what took place. For this reason, the Latin output still in circulation was predominantly of classical or religious in theme. At any rate, by the end of the sixteenth century, the literary process that brought about the supremacy of English as the most popular medium of printed literature over Latin and the other European languages was complete.

In the same way, as Latin books lost ground to those in the vernacular, a quickened interest in modern languages was generally felt in sixteenth-century England as in other countries. After the Reformation, the new lingua franca became a continuum of languages that most usually included Latin, French, Italian and Spanish. Moreover, from the second half of the sixteenth century on, the study of modern languages increased in England due to the increased political and cultural communication as well as commercial trades with foreign cultures. English was said to be a useless language beyond the Channel, and the competition with Spanish, Flemish and Italian merchants led the English trader to master the essentials of the languages of foreign lands. As a result, if, on the one hand, grammars and dialogues were being printed to serve these needs, the large scale book market tended, at the same time, to address the new tastes of readers. Despite the fact that translation was so widespread, books in French, Italian, Spanish and other languages found such a favourable market that some printers gave foreign imprints to their books in order to increase their sales.74

Such then was the state of the book production in the English tongue in the second half of the sixteenth century. But we must return now to the printers, so that we shall be better able to understand what kind of ‘cultural policy’ they attempted to put into action and what role they actually played in fostering new literary trends.

England is the only country which owes the introduction of printing to a dilettante rather than a professional figure. This man was supported by, though not dependent on, the nobility and gentry of the realm - William Caxton.75 Yet, his real importance lies in copies of classical works alone printed in England to be disposed of by the booksellers”.74 H. Sellers 1924:110-1. See also Bruno’s statement during the Venetian trial given at p. 138 of the present work.

75 See C. Clair 1965 and P.M. Handover 1960.
the fact that among the 90 books he printed, 74 were in English - some 20 of these 74 being his own translations - so that he made a great contribution to the history of English prose writing. His attempt to overcome the confusion of Middle-English dialects by adopting that of the Home Counties and London led to a process of standardisation and unification of the English language. It is perhaps best that the role of so-called ‘popular literature’ is clarified at this stage. While the rising output of printed matter made it possible for more people to own books, the existence of vernacular literature “made the whole population potentially members of the literate culture merely for the price of learning to read”,76 thus contributing to the spread of literacy.

Whether or not book production was directly associated with literacy has been widely studied.77 The tendency which has led mainly literary historians and bibliographers to assume that the appearance of some new form of publication or an increase in the volume of the existing book production may be associated with an increase in the level of literacy, seems to be rather misleading in dealing with the problem. In fact, there is no necessary correlation between the volume of production and the size of readership. Changes in the volume of book production may have as much to do with technology, economy and legal status of printing as with the ability of people to read. The problem lies in the fact that it is rather difficult to know exactly the market for popular printed works in the Elizabethan period, when the estimated illiteracy of men and women might place male illiteracy around 80% and female illiteracy close to 95%.78 At this stage, the identity and interests of the intermediary agents or printers, who enabled many of the activities recorded in politics, religion and literature to be experienced by readers, becomes an important question for scholars.

78 See Graph 1.
GRAPH 1 Estimated illiteracy of men and women in England, 1500-1900
The evidence and material to which scholars can turn when illustrating the lives and careers of the Elizabethan printers, the milieu in which they lived and worked, their influence upon the period and the period’s influence upon them are not numerous nor very detailed. The most important centres in sixteenth-century London for anyone who had a manuscript to dispose of were Fleet Street and St. Paul’s Churchyard.\footnote{See Map 2 and 3. Elsewhere in London there were other focal points around which bookshops had clustered. These were the Royal Exchange and St. Dunstan in the West.}

Because of its location, Fleet Street offered many advantages to the printers: it was a business crosspoint, since the surrounding population largely represented the legal, learned, and religious professions, in constant demand of books. Furthermore, the nearness of St. Paul’s Cathedral was also significant to Fleet Street printers, because they could meet the demands of Churchyard booksellers. Henry Wykes, Thomas Colwell, Richard John, William Powell and Richard Tottell established their dwelling there. Most of Fleet Street’s output consisted of religious matter.

St. Paul’s Churchyard became famous as a printing centre when the Fleet Street booksellers moved there. Almost all of the more important booksellers, such as George Bishop, Ralph Newbery, Francis Coldocke, Andrew Maunsell, John Wight, Lucas Harrison and William Norton, had their shops and stalls there. Some of the stationers dwelling around there were printers also.\footnote{The term ‘stationer’ may be indifferently applied to any member of the trade inasmuch as it designated the craftsman who was in a fixed position as he would be at a stall or shop. When the Company came into existence, the booksellers and the printers were the dominant group.} There were some of the most active and best known printers of that time, such as Thomas Hacket, John Kingston, Edward White, William Williamson, Hugh Singleton, Thomas Purfoot and many others. Their dwellings were identified by ‘signs’ or ‘poles’, representing animals or drawings taken from popular tradition. Between the years 1570-90, more than fifty printers were located within the Churchyard, either as shopkeepers or as residents, covering a wide range of subjects including religious, historical, political, as well as educational and literary topics.

Printers of the Elizabethan period formed two groups, according to their specific activity: those who published and sold on their own account the works they printed - the so-called ‘printer-publishers’, and those who printed mainly or entirely for others - the
‘trade printers’. The latter sometimes had no shops and they had to employ stationers to sell for them. These two groups, however, can not be sharply differentiated, since it was common practice to combine both kinds of business, doing a certain amount of publishing on one’s own account and also using one’s own press for trade-printing. By 1600, rarely was the printer both publisher and bookseller. More and more the publisher who advanced the money and guided the undertaking dominated the trade. He hired a printer to produce the book and a bookseller to distribute it.

The main printer-members of the Company of the Stationers at the time of its Incorporation were Henry Middleton, Henry Denham, Thomas East, Richard Jugge, John Cawood, John Day and Richard Tottel. After the death of Middleton in 1583 most of his types, pictorial initials, and ornaments came into the possession of Edmund Bollifant alias Carpenter, Arnold Hatfield, John Jackson and Ninian Newton who, a little later on, started printing Latin classics. These four people together held the stock and printing material in Eliot’s Court, the Old Bailey, so that, a short while later, they founded the ‘Eliot’s Court Printing House’, which was run by a syndicate of printers. Several provocative Protestant books were issued from this press.

During the greater part of the Elizabethan period the number of printers, or of presses, was strictly limited. The number of printers at this time fluctuated between 20 and 30. In May 1583 there were 23 printers at work - some of them having more than one press, making a total of 53 presses (including 1 not in use and 2 secret presses). As already noted, following the Star Chamber Decrees of July 1586, no new presses were allowed to go into business until the number of the existing ones was reduced. At that time, there were twenty-five master printers, including the Queen’s printer, working

---

81 This classification can be clearly gathered from the different types of imprints and colophons of the books themselves. A full explanation of what ‘Printed by A for B and sold by C’; ‘Printed by A for B’; ‘Printed by A and sold by C’, or simply ‘Printed for B’ can be found in W.W. Greg 1944:15-7.
82 At the time of its incorporation in 1557, the Stationers’ Company numbered ninety-seven stationers with the privilege of printing and selling books. See SR, Ixxxiii.
83 C. Barker and J. Wolfe had five presses each; J. Day and H. Denham had four each; four other printers had three each, except that “Master Tottel hath iij presses and vseth but one”; seven others (including John Charlewood) had two; and eight others had one each. Two of Wolfe’s presses were found “in a secret Vau[ll]t” (SR, I:248).
between the repeating number of fifty-three presses.\textsuperscript{84} This may seem a small enough number of producers, but apart from the Civil War period, it represented a perceived maximum until almost the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{85} According to the data contained in the STC, between 1580 and 1589 an average of 202 titles were printed each year, which means that each of the twenty-five printers produced an average of about eight books a year. We can guess from this scarce production that the majority of printers were underemployed, while a few had the monopoly rights to print privileged books, some of which were very marketable. By this time the grants were of very long duration, some of twenty-one years, some for life, and some for the lives of father and son, so that although the number of competent printers and the demand for books were great, the patent system hindered even distribution of the work. The obvious unfairness of the situation inevitably culminated in the open revolt of the poorer printers and publishers against the established patentees in the years 1582-84, as well as in their undertaking of unlicensed, surreptitious and pirated printing. This is hardly surprising when one bears in mind that printers, booksellers and bookbinders of those times were in a hopeless economic predicament and had constantly to face the problem of earning their living.

According to Blagden's detailed account of the dispute against the patentees, the opposing factions in the Company were the 'haves' and the 'have nots': the 'haves' were "the original patentees and the growing commercial interest in the trade - the copyright-owners and the wholesale distributors"; the 'have nots' were mainly "the craftsmen - the journeymen printers and the bookbinders - who opposed the commercial oligarchy in their Company and who could be persuaded to rally against a monopoly".\textsuperscript{86} Since these monopolies covered groups of books, not individual titles, and since they mostly dealt with cheap and popular books, this situation contributed to the flourishing of the practice commonly known as 'piracy', i.e. the printing of an impression of a privileged book in defiance of the Letter Patents and contrary to the laws of the realm. In describing the ability of the 'pirates' Judge reports that "not only were books printed, published and

\textsuperscript{84} SR, V:lii.
\textsuperscript{86} C. Blagden 1955:163-4.
sold throughout the country; even the make up of the volumes was copied, including the name of the patentee, his title-page, and his printer's device”.87

The social and economic effects the dispute had both on the book trade and on the traditional structures within the guild itself have been widely debated. For the purposes of this enquiry, the issuing of the Patents allows us to determine with some degree of precision the subjects with which the different printers kept their presses busy. William Seres, for instance, received a privilege for life to print “all authorised books of private prayers, called primers and psalters”,88 while John Day held a ten-year licence for the Psalms in metre and the ABCs with the little catechism. Richard Tottel had complete control over the publication of all legal texts, except those which were reserved by the Crown for the Queen’s Printer;89 the sole right to print almanacs and prognostications was granted to Richard Watkins and James Roberts. John Jugge had Bibles and Testaments, while Henry Bynneman printed dictionaries, chronicles and histories, and Francis Flowers grammars. Finally, Thomas Vautrollier and Thomas Marshe held a patent for Latin schoolbooks, while William Byrd received his patent for music books and manuscript paper.90

Their adversaries, the leaders of the insurgents, were, as recorded in the Registers of the Stationers’ Company, “John Wolfe, John Charlewood, and Roger Ward printers: Henry Bamford compositor: Franck Adams a maker of writing Tables, William Lobley a Bookebinder: Abraham Kidson, Thomas Butter, and [William] Wright booksellers / who are greatly animated by one Master Robert Neak a lawyer”. Robert Waldegrave and Thomas East were also members of the group.91 After several rounds, the conflict was

87 C.B. Judge 1934:32.
88 CPR, Elizabeth, I:54.
89 The Printer to the Crown was appointed as early as the fifteenth century and his principal duty was to supply written and printed books for the members of the king’s family. This important office was granted again by Elizabeth after her accession to the Throne. The Queen’s Printer had the exclusive right to print the Royal Statutes and Proclamations as well as patents on the Book of Common Prayer and the Bible, one of the most lucrative books in England. Among the Queen’s Printers were John Cawood, Richard Jugge, Christopher Barker, George Bishop and Ralph Newbury.
90 The complete list of privileges at the time of the 1582 uprising may be found in SR, I:115-16 and 144; II:775-6.
brought to end and a final report was drawn up. The document recommends a series of reforms: uniform pricing, restriction of the patents for schoolbooks, a limitation on the number of apprentices and foreigners, and revocation of patents for poor work. But it also suggests measures against the rebels, recommending a reduction in the number of printers, seizure of all books printed in contempt of privileges, a ban on the printing of unlawful books, registry of presses and type specimens, and severe penalties for counterfeit printing or the use of another printer's ornaments or name. As a consequence, most of the infringers were fined or imprisoned and suffered the confiscation of the illegally printed copies and even of the press. Others, such as Charlewood and Ward, continued to issue copies belonging to other printers. Wolfe's career, with its reversals of loyalties and tactics, will be examined in the next section.

Besides the protestors against royal privileges, several members of the Stationers' Company appeared in the Register as 'disorderly printers'. One of these was John Alde. From 1560 onwards, he printed prolifically and was often quoted in the Registers for bad behaviour. Like Alde, John Danter was a lively and contentious member of the trade active at Duke Lane and Holborn Conduit. He was engaged chiefly in popular literature and repeatedly reported for stealing books from both authors of manuscripts and his colleagues. Among those resisting the decrees of the Star Chamber were Thomas Butter, one of the dissident stationers against the patentees; Thomas Cadman, who was probably one of the most active of the group in defying the Masters and Wardens of the Company and was constantly in trouble for disorderly conduct and quarrelling with other stationers; Henry Carre, whom the Court of the Star Chamber proceeded against for the infringement of John Day's patents; John Harrison the eldest, who constantly violated the rules and orders of the Company and was fined on several occasions for infringing other printers' copyrights too; Walter Mantell, summoned by the Star Chamber in 1585 for the same reasons; William Wright, who was imprisoned in the Counter for his role in issuing
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92 The wording was used to indicate strictly speaking those copies of books which were openly and regularly printed and published without having been entered in the Registers of the Stationers' Company. In its wider meaning it can be also applied to books without licence, without allowance, without authority, without order, without licence and authority, without allowance and entrance, without authority and entrance. See W.W. Greg 1956:19.
privileged books; and finally Richard Jones, who was fined on one or two occasions for offences such as stitching books and printing and publishing privileged books, although he appears to have been an orderly member. These printers largely dealt with theological books, generally of Protestant content and at the same time they printed ballads and other kinds of popular literature. Their stories are paradigmatic of the legislative measures directed at the book trade between 1558 and 1603 inasmuch as they testify to the degree to which press censorship proceeded *ad hoc* rather than by unifying principles. The remarkably few government actions taken against individual printers all related to texts associated either with Catholic propaganda, or with radical Protestantism. In one case only Elizabeth and her Privy Council acted against an English book regarded as seditious on entirely political grounds.

Robert Waldegrave’s first serious offence against the regulations of the Stationers’ Company occurred in 1582, when he was charged with the infringement of Seres’ patent. Furthermore, he had repeatedly engaged in the surreptitious printing of Puritan literature and he had maintained a close connection with the Puritan sect. His subsequent conflicts against the clerical authorities were mainly in conjunction with the printing of unlicensed Puritan works attacking the episcopacy. In 1588 he had his press confiscated for illegally printing a radical anti-episcopal tract, while in the next few months he was engaged in the printing of the first four Marprelate tracts. Waldegrave set up several secret presses around England, and finally he crossed over to France where he went on printing Puritan tracts against the Church of England. He was replaced in 1589 by John Hodgkins who, less lucky than Waldegrave, was tortured before being released once the authorities succeeded in stopping the production of the same Marprelate publications.

Hugh Singleton’s connections, and the strongly Protestant character of most of the books he printed, led him into constant trouble with the authorities too. From the year 1580, all of Singleton’s associations of which we have record were with Puritans - John Foxe, John Stubbe and Edmund Spenser. He also joined in the protest of the unprivileged stationers against the patentees. Furthermore, as a consequence of the growth of his interest in the advanced religious and political movements of the age and his connections with Puritan circles, he was regarded by the same authorities as an
instrument of the critics of Elizabeth's government policy. Although he managed to escape death after the trial - maybe thanks to his friendship with the Earl of Leicester and with Sir Francis Walsingham, Secretary of the Queen – following the printing of his notorious pamphlet *The discoverie of a gaping gulf* against the projected marriage between Elizabeth and the duke of Anjou, Singleton continued to issue Puritan works.

The 1582 trial, too, of Roger Ward, a Puritan printer who succeeded Wolfe as a leader of the insurgent printers, may serve to illustrate the inefficiency of the authorities in achieving full control over the English press. On the 7th February, 1582, an action was brought by John Day, one of the main Protestant printers of the time, against Roger Ward and William Holmes, for printing the *A.B.C. with the Little Catechism*, a work which was part of Day's patent. During the trial, Ward pleaded guilty to the offence as charged, but attempted to justify himself by emphasising the iniquity of such 'royal granting'. He even admitted that he had printed no less than 10,000 copies of the said *A.B.C.* and that only 200 copies were unsold, only because these latter were imperfect. After a term in prison he returned to his illegal activities for in the same year his defiance of the law is reported to another court.

Nor was Thomas Vautrollier, a printer who mainly dealt with Protestant and anti-papish books on the side of Puritans, without troubles. He was a Huguenot fugitive from France who settled in England in the second half of the sixteenth century. In October 1564 Vautrollier was admitted to be a brother of the Company of Stationers and printed until his death in July 1587. He also imported books from France and Flanders.
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93 STC 26400. Stubbes' pamphlet was considered by the Government one of the most vehement protests against Queen's Elizabeth policy. Although Stubbe protested his complete loyalty to the Queen, he denounced her projected marriage with the duke of Anjou as a threat to English liberty and the continuance of the Reformation settlement. Stubbe remained a prisoner until 1581, when he suffered the amputation of his right hand. See H.J. Byrom 1933:121-56.

94 William Holmes was an apprentice of the printer John Harrison. There is evidence that certain of the younger printers actually banded together in a secret organisation to print and issue various books belonging to the patentees. After the trial, however, Holmes disappeared completely from the pages of the Register, and nothing more is known of him.

95 SR, II:753-69.

96 Ibid., II:776-7.

97 DPB:272-3.

98 SR, I:279.
MAP 2 Fleet Street and St. Paul's Churchyard.
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MAP 3 The Stationers' Hall (1554-1606) and St. Paul's Churchyard
Although a foreigner, in 1573 and 1574 Vautrollier had letters patents to print certain books in Latin including works of Ovid, Plutarch and Cicero, as well as such important texts as Beza's *Novum Testamentum*, Pierre de la Ramée's *Dialectica* and Augustin Marlorat’s *Divinae scripturae thesaurus*. He was also responsible for educational books of the time, as he was given a grant to print popular schoolbooks together with Thomas Marsh. Nevertheless, he is found printing unlicensed works, chiefly sermons by Luther, Calvin and some of the main Puritan authors of the time. Later in 1584, Vautrollier, who seems to have set up a press in Edinburgh, had troubles in Scotland as well on account of retailing books and binding them without permission. He eventually returned to London in 1586, where he died one year later. Vautrollier's relevance to the present study resides chiefly in his interest in Italian texts. This is evidenced by an entry of April 1579 where “ye historic of Guicciardini of master Geffrey ffentons Translation” is licensed to him together with master Norton. Due to his involvement in the printing of certain works by Italian exiles and due to his knowledge of the Italian language, Vautrollier was wrongly thought to be the printer of Giordano Bruno’s Italian works for more than one and a half centuries. Nevertheless, apart from several polyglot conversation-books, usually in English, Italian and French, including an English translation of Lentulo’s *Italian Grammer*, the printer’s contribution to the literature in Italian of his time cannot be considered of a particular relevance.

At Vautrollier’s death in March 1586/7, his business passed into the hands of Richard Field of the Splayed Eagle, Great Wood Street, who had married his widow. Upon his arrival in London, Field was apprenticed to Vautrollier. While his master was abroad, he had the opportunity of representing him at the shop, dealing with foreigners and importing books from other countries. His name is listed among the non-conforming members of the Stationers’ Company. He was associated with the offensive Ward and
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99 Ibid., I:144.
100 Ibid., II:746-7.
101 Ibid., II:322. The authors mentioned are: E. Bunny, H. Bull, W. Fulke and J. Field.
102 Ibid., II:351.
103 For the attribution of the printing of Bruno’s works to Thomas Vautrollier, see G. Aquilecchia [1960] 1993 (a):158-67.
104 See below, 181.
summoned for having printed books distasteful to the Crown. According to Sellers, early in the seventeenth century Field succeeded Wolfe in the printing of Italian books. At the same time, the two printers worked together in the surreptitious printing of propaganda.

Although historians have stressed that print and Protestantism go hand in hand, the Catholic press was far from inactive. Like its Puritan counterpart, it was fundamental to Catholic propaganda. Of the approximately two hundred and twenty-three English books printed abroad and secretly in England from 1565 and 1603, there is almost an equal division between controversial and devotional writings. The former strove to demonstrate the tenets of Catholicism and to refute the attacks of opponents. They represent the opinions of Cardinal Allen, Father Parsons, Thomas Harding, John Rastell, and others, the most influential representatives of the Catholic opposition to the Elizabethan religious settlement. In this regard, it has to be observed that the official doctrine of the English Church did not then or ever designate Roman Catholicism as heretical.105 Actually, the Queen’s Injunctions deplored employing heretic, papist, etc. as terms of derogation.106 As a result, being Catholic or writing about Catholic belief—at least in the early years of Elizabeth’s reign—was neither transgressive nor inherently seditious. Yet, following the 1570 bull of deposition and the papacy’s avowed intent to see the bull executed, Catholicism represented not merely a religious menace but a hostile, foreign danger, a political body linked to Continental power and strength. From that time onward, in accordance with the treason and recusancy laws, political hostility to Elizabeth and her realm implied lèse majesté and therefore it was compelled to persecute religion under the guise of treason. At this stage, the definition of ‘heretic’ loses its purely religious meaning to assume the wider significance of ‘dissenter’ with

105 Although it is commonly used to indicate both Catholics and Puritans, the original meaning of the term ‘heresy’ comes from the Roman Catholic Church, being the formal denial or doubt of any defined doctrine of the Catholic faith. From early on the Church claimed teaching authority and consequently condemned heresy. The need to rebut heresy stimulated the formulation of orthodox Christian doctrine. Yet in the ‘80s the Protestants became increasingly loud in their counter-claim: that they alone were truly Catholic, and that the Papists were heretics. To such an extent it appears that the very term ‘orthodoxy’, as right belief contrasting with heresy, can be ambiguously applied both to Protestants and to Catholics depending on the confession of the user. See OED:237.
106 The term ‘heretical’ was reserved in fact for Protestant deviation and especially for sectarian dissent. See G.R. Elton in W.J. Sheils 1984:163-87.
respect to the Established Church of England. Catholic and other ‘offensive literature’, therefore, was “neither to be read or imported under severer penalty than hitherto inflicted in the Star Chamber”\(^{107}\) and was to be destroyed immediately upon being found.

Despite all the legislative measures, the English Catholics preserved the tenets of their faith and Catholic books freely circulated in England, either having been imported by Catholic agents and militants or secretly printed there.\(^{108}\) Such books were designed not only to reinforce the faith but also to influence and convert the Protestants. The very men of the Counter-Reformation, such as Father Parsons and Campion, had extensive links with Protestantism before becoming Catholic, as some studies have convincingly shown.\(^{109}\) Nevertheless, the collaboration of printers using secret presses turned out to be crucial with regard to the production of such literature.

In 1584 William Carter was executed for secretly printing Catholics books on Tower Hill; the following year Thomas Alfield, suffered the supreme penalty for distributing Allen’s *True Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholiques* (1584). Alfield and two of his agents were hanged at Tyburn after being tried for treasonable activities. Unlike them, Robert Parsons succeeded in setting up of two presses, one in Greenstreet at East Ham in Essex under the superintendance of Stephen Brinkley, and the other at Stonor Park, about 20 miles from London, where Campion’s *Decem Rationes* was printed.\(^{110}\) After the Greenstreet House press had been seized, Richard Verstegan carried on the work of printing Catholic books in his secret press in Smithfield. His activity was soon discovered, his press seized and he himself compelled to flee the country.

About 1588 a Catholic printer named Thackwell was printing “popishe and traitorous Welsh books in Wales”, according to a passage in Martin Marprelate’s *Epistle*.\(^{111}\) No trace of his works now exists. The following paragraph in the same *Epistle*

\(^{107}\) R. Steele 1910, 1:51.

\(^{108}\) Southern estimates that before 1580 nearly 20,000 Catholic books had been imported into England and sold, and this kind of volume continued throughout Elizabeth’s reign. See A.C. Southern 1950: 37.


\(^{110}\) STC 4536.5.

\(^{111}\) *The Marprelate Tracts*: 52. (I use here and thereafter Pierce’s 1911 edition of the tracts). For the history of the secret printing and distribution, the identity of the author, and the contents of the
refers to another secret Catholic press, from which Father Robert Southwell issued his books. Martin points to this press as the one lodged at Charterhouse and until now the printer has been identified as John Charlewood.112

However, not all Catholic printing originated from underground presses, nor was it covertly imported from abroad. In fact, the dissemination of Catholic literature by printers and publishers (some of them members of the Stationers’ Company),113 although not widespread, does indicate the presence of a Catholic book-buying clientele in England. This argument calls attention to another aspect affecting printers and their products: the shifts of allegiance and reversals of behaviour to preserve and protect their own economic interests. The contradictions inherent in the behaviour of some printers, now supporting Catholics, now Protestants, have led scholars each time to brand them as merely ‘opportunistic’ figures. In this respect, the activity of Wolfe and Charlewood appears to be paradigmatic of the competing and often contradictory interests and practices which characterised the book trade. Their names are associated in so far as they are the only English printers – Vautrollier was French – dealing with books in the Italian language between the years 1580-91.


112 Ibid., 54. On John Charlewood as the printer in Charterhouse, see below, 119-20.

113 Richard Field, Thomas Creede, James Roberts, Adam Islip, Edward Allde, Edward Venge and John Danter were all members of the Stationers’ Company stocking Catholic books, as well as Gabriel Cawood, who also became Master of the Company in 1597.
The main questions that naturally arise when considering the printing of Italian books in England between 1580 and 1590 are the following: who were the printers involved? How were they equipped? How did they proceed, and what was the quality of their product? What kinds of material did they print, which Italian authors, which particular works? What audience did they reach? I intend here to give some tentative answers to these and related questions.

As far as the history of the printing of books in the Italian language in England is concerned, no extant title can be found before Wolfe’s first venture in this field, with the sole exception of Mierdman’s *Cathechismo*, a text to which I will presently return. Furthermore, at that time English printing had acquired a quite bad reputation in the field of printing foreign vernaculars. Usually books, or sections of them, in foreign languages were poorly printed on bad paper, with many misprints and corruptions. As foreign books, on the contrary, had good reputations, and the prestige value of an imported article was still high, it is commonly thought that this situation had led some printers, such as Wolfe and Charlewood earlier, and Richard Field later on, to the idea of using a fictitious imprint indicating a continental origin for their books. We shall see how, at least in the case of the first two printers, things are more complex. An interpretation of Wolfe’s printing as being motivated solely by commercial motives fails to address all issues.

The names of these three printers are also found associated with regard to the production of books in the original Italian in England. During most of the period under consideration, Richard Field’s book production in Italian is not very relevant to determining the cultural influence of Italian authors on the English environment. Yet, it is the role of John Wolfe, the most prolific and important printer of works in Italian during Elizabeth’s reign, that has to be more closely examined to better understand the cultural trend brought about by the Italian exiles in England of those years. Let us try to

---

* All the imprints of Wolfe’s editions of books in Italian language are given in full in Appendix 1.
determine whether the collaboration between these exiles and the printer of their works took place on a typographical basis only, or whether there were other factors of a political or cultural nature that assisted the likelihood of such an occurrence.

Like the great majority of biographical sources concerning the printers of the time, those on John Wolfe are not very detailed. Yet, from the extremely fragmentary nature of the extant records we may infer that if Wolfe in many ways represented one of the many typical English printers of his day, at the same time a closer look at his extant titles shows that he was also quite different from his colleagues in terms of working skills and trend of publications.¹¹⁴

The first thing to be considered is Wolfe’s surprising expertise in dealing with Italian books. This was certainly a consequence of his stay in Florence after his apprenticeship in London.¹¹⁵ He must have returned to England by 1579, when his first licence to print a book in England is recorded in the Stationers’ Register.¹¹⁶ His typographical accuracy in printing Italian texts and his lively knowledge of the economic, social and cultural factors affecting the book market made Wolfe an obvious point of reference to any Italian who wished to publish his own work in London and to spread the Italian language there.¹¹⁷ Yet, many aspects of the printer’s life point to considerable literary as well as political skills. By claiming the right of a freeman to print any book he liked, for instance, Wolfe not only displayed openly revolutionary feelings, but he also made an effort to ‘revolutionise’ the literary trend in English culture of his age. In fact, such statements like “it was lawfull for all men to print all lawfull bookes, what

¹¹⁴ For a full list of Wolfe’s book production, see Appendix 2 in C.C. Huffman 1987.
¹¹⁵ A. Gerber dated Wolfe’s residence in Italy largely on the basis of two sacre rappresentazioni, which, according to the colophons, were printed in 1576 Florence ‘ad instanza di Giovanni Vuolfio Inglese’. These works are: La Historia e Oratone di Santo Stefano Protomartire (New York Public Library, Spencer Collection, NN(S)) and the Historia et Vita di Santo Bernardino (British Library, C.34.h.6 (36)). He may have studied printing with the Giunti in Florence, for he later used the Giunti lily as an ornament, and with Giolito. See A. Gerber 1907:129-35.
¹¹⁶ SR, II:353.
¹¹⁷ In the dedicatory letter prefixed to Petruccio Ubaldini’s La Vita di Carlo Magno, in addressing the ‘Nobili et illustri Signori et Magnanimi Cavaliere et altri gentil’huomini della nazione Inghilese’, the author states that they may now have “cagion di rallegrarvi, che I’opere Italiane non meno si possono stampare felicemente in Londra, che le si stampino altrove (essendo questa la prima) per studio, & diligenza di Giovanni Wolfio suo cittadino”. Sig. A2v.
commandement soeuer her Majesty gaue to ye contrary", or the more famous

Tush, Luther was but one man, and reformed all ye world for
religion, and I am that one man, yat must and will reforme the
gouernement of this trade, meaning printing and bookselling 119

testify to a resolute and conscious willingness to be involved in a somewhat political
project.120

According to the interesting research of C. C. Huffman, Wolfe’s entire literary
output undoubtedly had a single and precisely conceived aim: in addressing his books to
specific English readers, who could read Italian, and perhaps Italian émigrés living in
London, John Wolfe “was pressing forward an advertising campaign to popularise a
printing programme of foreign language texts and to take a step in the direction of
cultural pluralism”.121 In this respect, his outstanding typographical skills, as well as the
grateful appreciation of those texts on the London readers’ part, seem to be a necessary
part of such programme. In short, if Englishmen truly recognise the value of what
Wolfe’s abilities are offering, they must show it by responding to this opportunity: by
reading, requesting and buying.

Again, in an attempt to clarify Wolfe’s project, Huffman affirms that “in contrast to
the model of many Stationers, for whom printing was a mechanical, reproductive craft
protected by guild restrictions and privileges, in contrast to the didactic Humanist
printing traditions of earlier Renaissance Italy, and in contrast to the contemporaneous
party-line printing of Protestants and of Catholics on the Continent, Wolfe’s Italian
books express a new vision of what ‘l’arte de lo stampare’ can be, in this new time and in
this new, English, place”.122 This interpretation may err on the side of caution. Certainly
enough, Wolfe’s book production seems to comply with a definite kind of political and
religious trend. In fact, it is the same printer who reveals to us his political tendencies by

118 SR, II:781-2.
119 Ibid.
120 See, for instance, S.L. Goldberg 1955:55-61; M.A. Shaaber 1929.
122 Ibid., 11.
calling himself 'Seruitore de l'Illustrissimo Signor Filippo Sidnei', thus indicating allegiance to the cultural and political trend set by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and William Cecil - the most famous patrons of the Italian exiles - at the court of Elizabeth I. It is almost certain, too, that the pragmatic intent of the printer in responding to the market demand sometimes had a crucial weight in deciding what works he printed. These two aspects of Wolfe’s activity as a printer-publisher run side by side.

Wolfe’s commercial keenness, for instance, is clearly illustrated by the enormous number of foreign books and translations from Continental languages and Latin into English which he entered in the Stationers’ Register. In this way, Wolfe’s whole production could cover a double market: that of reprinted Italian books and that of English translations together with some of the originals. The fact that the printer issued works of the most scandalous Italian authors, Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) and Pietro Aretino (1492-1556), might also be explained by political and commercial motives alike. Although these texts had been placed in Italy on the Pauline Index of prohibited books of 1559, and later on in the revised 1564 Index Tridentinus of Pius IV, and were regarded as “wicked” by all right-thinking Elizabethans, nevertheless they still attracted not only an English, but also an Italian reading public, thus constituting a secure profit for Wolfe’s printing press. At the same time, it may be useful briefly to draw attention to the political or religious intent which the printing of such works might imply. Among the advanced thinkers of the day, these works were both highly regarded for their critical approach to politics, their realistic morality and their freedom of speech.

---

123 STC 92. I. Aconcio, Vna essortatione al Timor di Dio, frontispiece.
124 The registration does not necessarily imply that the work - whether the original in Italian or the English translation - had already been made, nor that it will be actually printed. On these matters, see W.W. Greg 1944.
125 As a consequence of their appearance on the Index, the works of Machiavelli and Aretino could no longer be printed in Italy or any other Catholic country.
126 It must be observed that throughout the period under consideration, there was a strong ambivalence on the English side in the attitude towards Italy and its products. I will devote my attention to this phenomenon in Chapter 3. At the same time, however, as anti-foreign feelings were invading literature from the market place, increased national separateness was making foreign culture more attractive.
127 Gabriel Harvey’s writing to his friend Edmund Spenser in 1580 well summarised the English regard for these Italian authors: “Matchiauell a great man: Castilio of no small reputation: Petrarch, and Boccace in euery man’s mouth: Galateo and Guazzo neuer so happy: overmany acquainted with Vnico Aretino [...]” (G. Harvey, Works, 1884, I:69). On Wolfe’s intention to print Boccaccio’s Decamerone, see SR, II, 475, where this title has been entered to the printer on the 13 September 1587.
The reasons why Machiavelli’s three main works on politics, *Il Principe* (1512-13), the *Discorsi* (1516-17), and the *Istorie fiorentine* (1521-25), were so popular among the sophisticated public of the age, not only in Italy but also throughout Europe once they had appeared on the book market, have already been widely explored by various scholars. In the same way, an extensive treatment of Machiavelli’s reputation in Tudor England would be superfluous, in view of the numerous studies on the subject. Instead, it would be useful to investigate the possible connections between Machiavelli and the Italian reformers, to whose dissemination of thought in England Wolfe’s press chiefly gave impulse.

That the Italian reformers read Machiavelli, either openly or clandestinely, is far from being questioned. Obviously, the religious aspects of Machiavelli’s doctrines were among their main concern. Machiavelli’s open positions against the corruption of the clergy; his criticism of the Italian decline which necessarily followed on that corruption; his reassertion of worldly life and ideals against the ascetic conception of the Middle Ages, which placed the aim of human activities beyond earthly life; his challenging the hierarchy of the Christian universe might have well met at least some of the Italian reformers’ favour. In like manner, Machiavelli’s deep humanist formation, which bestowed on him a great concern for liberty and human dignity, may be rightly seen in close relation with the views of sundry learned Italian heretics. Nonetheless, the evangelical opinions in matter of religion and Machiavelli’s ones were worlds apart, just as the latter’s vision of the political world was fundamentally irreconcilable with the traditional theological view of the universe.\(^{129}\)

Similarly, Machiavelli’s arguments for absolute monarchy and for the centrality of the State might have sounded agreeable to certain Tudor ears. But within a cultural movement such as English Humanism, in which the alliance between education, moral

---

\(^{128}\) Dates in brackets refer to the composition of the works. As far as the actual publishing of the first editions is concerned, one has to wait till the end of 1531 and the beginning of 1532. See V. Frajese 1997:135-55.

\(^{129}\) The relationship between the Italian reformers and Machiavelli’s writings would therefore amount simply to a passage quoting the Florentine in a work by Giovanni Angelo Odoni and to a Latin translation of the *Principe* by Pietro Perna in response to Paulus IV’s placing of the book on the *Tridentine Index of Prohibited Books*. See L. Perini 1969: 877-918.
education, and politics was of the essence, Machiavelli’s observation of the autonomy of politics from morality, as conceived in *The Prince*, could not be completely successful. The relegation of politics to an ethical sphere separate from that of religion simply terrified Elizabethan society, which saw its traditional *Weltanschauung* seriously and validly challenged. Even though the *Discourses* seem to free Machiavelli from the charge of ‘amorality’, *The Prince* was not an openly declared guide for the English monarchy. There, obedience to the crown still retained moral implications in a very medieval sense and the majority of Englishmen could not tolerate the cynicism of the *Principe*. It is perhaps due to this ideology that some appreciation of Machiavelli’s political doctrine was only to be achieved towards the end of the seventeenth century.

Furthermore, Machiavelli’s views on the political purpose of religion were as unacceptable to Catholics as to Protestants, whether Anglicans or Puritans. In this respect, it is quite strange to see how the word ‘Machiavel’ was indifferently used by the Elizabethans to define sometimes the Puritans, sometimes the Anglicans, sometimes the Catholics and of course the Jesuits. In a short time, English anti-Machiavellism and a certain resentment against Italy and Italians began to fuse together. Once again, Wolfe’s opportunism in the field of book marketing needs to be underlined. At the beginning of the 1590s he could not desist from printing the anonymous *A discovery of the great subtilities and wonderful wisedome of the Italians*, whose anti-machiavellian and anti-Italian feelings perhaps better corresponded to the new literary trend.

That Wolfe did not obtain licences for the printing of the composite volume containing both *Il Principe* and *I Discorsi* in Italian seems also to suggest government dislike for their circulation and diffusion. The only works of Machiavelli’s to be printed

---

130 F. Raab 1964:68-70.
131 I have used the phrase ‘openly declared’ inasmuch as while Machiavelli was abused in public, nonetheless he was studied in private by nearly all of the most important contemporary sovereigns and his effectual truth and realism influenced most of the political writers of the age.
132 See below, 166-7.
133 STC 10638. By printing in 1592 Thomas Nashe’s *Pierce Penilesse*, John Charlewood, too, seems to comply with the counter-current bringing to expression the picture of wickedness as characteristic of Italian society. In this book, the author describes Italy as “the Academie of man-slaughter, the sporting place of murther, the Apothecary shop of poyson for all Nations”. (*The Works of Thomas Nashe*, 1958, I:186). For the decline of English Renaissance admiration of Italy, see below, 166-70.
in any English versions during Tudor times were the *Arte of warre* (in 1563) and the *Florentine Historie* (in 1595). The *Discorsi* were not printed in translation till 1636, nor *Il Principe* till 1640. Nevertheless, the evidence shows that the Elizabethans were reading these writings anyway, either having secured a copy which some traveller must have picked up abroad, or having access to manuscript translations which are known to have been in circulation before 1600. As a consequence, Wolfe must have realised that there was a demand for Machiavelli’s works (no one copies, translates and illicitly prints a writer if people are not interested in reading him, as Raab has rightly observed) and decided to produce the Italian editions of *I Discorsi* and *Il Principe* in 1584, with false imprints ‘Palermo’; of *Arte della Guerra* (no date), also unlicensed and with the same imprint, and *Istorie Fiorentine* with the imprint ‘Piacenza’ in 1587, and finally of *L’asino d’oro con tutte l’altri sue operette* with the imprint ‘Roma’ in 1588.

Concomitantly, three volumes of Pietro Aretino’s works issued from the same press: *La Prima Parte de Ragionamenti* and *La Seconda parte de Ragionamenti*, unlicensed and dated 1584; the *Quattro commedie*, dated 1588 and *La Terza parte de Ragionamenti*, dated 1589. This is hardly surprising when we recall that Aretino was to the Elizabethans almost an *alter ego* for Machiavelli, and, obviously, English readers able to read these authors in their original language were a minority. Although Aretino was known to his contemporaries variously as the scourge of princes, yet also as Anti-Christ and as a bare-faced pornographer, the popularity of the ‘Divine Arete’ as a

---

137 F. Raab 1964:52.
138 The other operette are: four capitoli (“Occasione”, “Fortuna”, “Ingratitudine”, “Ambitione”), the *Decinale compendio*, the novella *Belpagor*, and two comedies, *La Mandragola* and *La Clizia*.
139 Despite the printer’s promises in the introductions to the *Ragionamenti*, and the entry which he registered on 14 October 1588 (SR, II, 502), Wolfe does not seem to have printed any edition of Aretino’s *Letters* and *Rimes*.
140 M. Praz lists the following hybrid forms of the two authors’ names: *Mach-Aretines* (in Sylvester’s *Lacrymae Lacrymarum*); *Aretines Politicks* (Gaphthorne); *veneriall Machiavelisme* (Nashe); ‘a Machiavel’ with reference to a prostitute (Thomas Andrew). See M. Praz, 1958:130. The two names are significantly linked together again in Harvey’s marginalia. (Marginalia:119; 121; 122).
professional writer of extraordinary satirical vitality and innovative style constituted an attractive opportunity for a successful printing venture. However, such a positive attitude towards the two Italian authors, as reported by Gabriel Harvey in his marginalia, was not free from widespread moral condemnation: their names were often coupled in English minds with Aretino’s proverbial representation of Italy as a sewer of sexual licentiousness and with Machiavelli’s sense of Italy as a den of iniquity and corruption. Such a prejudice would last in English culture throughout the sixteenth century and part of the ensuing century.

Wolfe’s obvious commercial motives, which lie behind the publication of the surreptitious Machiavelli and Aretino editions, do not prevent us from perceiving the enormous political and controversial significance which these texts imply. One consequence of the massacre of St. Bartholomew’s (1572) was that the traditional view that history was tragedy ruled by divine providence for the first time appeared to be challenged by the radical view that tragedy was history ruled by raison d’état. Starting from that time, it could not be, and was not, effectively concealed from English audiences that such political horrors were the deliberate work of legitimate rulers. In this respect, Machiavellianism, far from being, as Praz thought, merely a “superficial, passing record of a fashionable byword”, should rather be regarded, with Adams, as “one means by which creative men strove to understand and to dramatise how the power to destroy actually worked in absolutist states”. It is perhaps along these lines that the letter from the printer to the reader prefixed to Wolfe’s edition of I Discorsi and Il Principe should be evaluated.

In giving the reasons for his printing venture, “the printer” admits that he used to

---


142 “Unico Aretino in Italian, singular for rare and hyperbolical Amplifications. He is a simple Orator, that cannot mount as high as the quality, or quantity of his matter requireth. Vaine and phantastical Amplifications argue an idle or mad-conceited brain: but when the very Majesty or dignity of the matter itself will indeed bare out a stately and haughty style, there is no such trial of a gallant discourse and no right Orator” (Marginalia:124). Thomas Nashe was another enthusiastic admirer of Aretino. For him, Harvey’s opinion of the Italian writer was not flattering enough.

A thorough examination of this passage inevitably implies a discussion of three main questions. First, such words definitely attest that the fame of the Italian author had quickly travelled from Italy to England and that thus there arose, among English readers, a great desire to see it. As far as the detractors of Machiavelli’s books were concerned, the printer refers to them as slanderers and he singles out one in particular saying that he is “fit to be a salesman of sausage and dried fish”. Most probably, this was the French Huguenot Innocent Gentillet, whose *Discours sur le moyens de bien gouverneur*, a hostile distortion of Machiavelli’s thinking, certainly contributed to nourishing English prejudices against the Florentine and his doctrine. Lastly, this letter suggests that the printer did not regard Machiavelli merely as the author of profitable texts. In this respect, it has interesting similarities with Alberico Gentili’s own interpretation of *The Prince*. In his *De legationibus libri tres*, which was issued in 1585 from Vautrollier’s print shop, not only does Gentili reject the stereotypical image of Machiavelli as a champion of tyranny, but he also describes him as a “democratiae laudator ac assertor acerrimus”. Gentili goes on to add:

144 STC 17159. "Lo stampatore al benigno letitore", fol. 2v. The preface is to both the *Discourses* and *The Prince*.

145 "essendomi poco dopo venuto fatto di leggere gli scritti di cotesto Momo [...] mi risolsi a seguitare la ‘mpresa rendendomi certo che chi senza passione ottimamente considererà gli vni [i.e. Machiavelli’s works], & gli altri [...] stimera a pena degni di servire a questi venditori di salsiccie, & di sardelle”. Ibid., 3r.

146 Gentillet’s book was published in 1576 and circulated first in the Latin translation, which went through three editions during the sixteenth century. Its 1577 English translation by Patericke is not known to have been printed until 1602.

147 STC 11737. *De legationibus libri tres*. This work constitutes an expanded three-volume version of Gentili’s *Legalium comitiorum Oxoniensum actio* (STC 11740), which was printed by Wolfe in the same year.
natus, educatus, honoratus in eo reip. statu; tyrannidis summe
inimicus. Itaque tyranno non fauet: sui propositi non est tyrannum
instruere, sed arcanis eius palam factis, ipsum miseris populis nudum
ac conspicuum exhibere.\footnote{\textit{De legationibus}:172.}

According to Gentili, Machiavelli was merely a sly rhetorician who, in instructing tyrants,
surreptitiously teaches how to subvert them - whether by informing the people of their
methods or by causing such tyrants to bring about their own downfall.\footnote{"Hoc fuit viri omnium prudentissimi consilium, ut sub specie principalis eruditionis populos erudiret;
et eam speciem praetexuit, ut spes esset, cur feretur ab his, qui rerum gubernacula tenent, quasi ipsorum
educator, ac pedagogus". Ibidem.} This attitude, of
course, went unrevealed. Hence, rather than being a manual for tyranny, the book is
defended as a treatise on good government.

The deep knowledge Alberico must have had of Machiavelli’s two most important
works, the \textit{Discourses} and \textit{The Prince}, together with the influence of the Florentine’s
doctrine on his thought, raise the question as to whether it is possible to identify Gentili
with the unknown editor of the Machiavelli and Aretino editions printed in London by
Wolfe in the years 1584-1588. Alternatively, the Italian might have well been the wise
and profound student of politics, who favoured the printer with a copy of Machiavelli’s
book and who was ready to defend him against his bad reputation.\footnote{\textit{Discorsi}:2r-v.} In order to
corroborate such speculations, it is necessary first to recall the main outlines of Gentili’s
biography.

Graduated from the University of Perugia as a doctor of civil law in 1572, Alberico
arrived in England probably in August 1580 with a letter of introduction by his father
Matteo to Giovanni Battista Castiglione, who, in turn, seems to have introduced the
young man to the Earl of Leicester, the Chancellor of Oxford University, and also to Sir
Philip Sidney, two of the most influential figures of the academic and literary London of
those times. In the following year, Gentili was admitted, through the influence of the Earl
of Leicester, to the University of Oxford where he first exercised the right of teaching
law in St. John’s College. Henceforth, it seems that Alberico divided his time between
Oxford and London over the next several years. In 1582-83, Gentili started his
association with the London printer John Wolfe, who issued his early, largely theoretical books, *De iuris interpretibus*, dedicated out of gratitude to the Earl of Leicester,¹⁵¹ and the *Lectionum et Epistolarum quae ad ius civile pertinent*, dedicated to rich benefactors or good friends.¹⁵²

Those were his last writings dealing with the civil law, for starting from 1584 he turned himself to international law, the subject which he made peculiarly his own. In the same year, in fact, taking the occasion of a graduation discourse to speak about a topic related to the scandal involving the Spanish ambassador in England, Bernardino de Mendoza, accused of attempting to poison the Queen, Gentili delivered a speech which was published at the beginning of the following year by Wolfe’s press as *Legaliun comitiorum Oxoniensium*.¹⁵³ Rather surprisingly, a further expanded three-volume version of this work, *i.e.* *De legationibus libri tres*, was printed in 1585 by Thomas Vautrollier and not by Wolfe. Starting from that time, no other work by Gentili appeared from Wolfe’s press until the end of 1587. What had happened, then, during the years 1584-1587, a period of time which corresponds, as we have seen, to a gap in the issuing of the Machiavelli-Aretino’s editions?

That Gentili and Wolfe were still on good terms in 1584 may be inferred from the fact that in that year the printer issued no less than four works by Scipio Gentili, Alberico’s younger brother. It could have been in 1584, therefore, that Alberico might have collaborated with Wolfe in the editing of *I Discorsi, Il Principe*, and perhaps of Aretino’s *Ragionamenti* too. At this stage, we might assume that after that date, for some reason, Gentili was no longer able to accomplish his job as editor at Wolfe’s print shop. This would also explain why the preface to the following pseudo-Aretino edition, the *Commento di Ser Agresto*, bears the signature ‘the Heir’ of ‘Barbagrigia’. In 1586, Gentili was nominated to accompany as a Latin Secretary the embassy of Sir Orazio

¹⁵¹ STC 11736. *De iuris interpretibus, dialogi sex*. The dialogues were written in defence of Gentili’s old Italian masters, the Bartolists.

¹⁵² STC 11739. *Alberici Gentilis Lectionum et Epistolarum quae ad ius civile pertinent* (books I-IV). These books are made up of a series of lectures, supplemented by letters, that Gentili delivered in the years 1582-3. Most probably the first two books were issued separately in 1583.

¹⁵³ STC 11740. As the work refers to a speech Gentili delivered in 1584, Wolfe might have printed it on the basis of the manuscript which is supposed to have been ready for publication by that year.
Pallavicino to the Elector of Saxony. According to the DNB, on that occasion, he “bade farewell to his English friends, apparently with no intention of returning”. But in 1587, at the insistence of Walsingham, Elizabeth recalled Alberico to England, where he acquired a prestigious academic position. Notwithstanding the fierce opposition of Dr. John Rainolds, the most powerful theologian of the University of Oxford, Gentili was appointed Regius Professor of Civil Law at that University. It will be noticed that Rainolds himself during a public controversy with Gentili on the topic of the relationship between jurisprudence and theology accused his opponent of being ‘Italicus, Macchiavellicus, athaeus’.

Given the Puritans’ prejudice against Machiavelli – which I have already mentioned and to which I shall refer more extensively in a later chapter - accordingly to whom the three terms were virtually synonymous, Rainolds’s allegation seems quite inconclusive for what we intend here to demonstrate. Yet, there is no doubt that in 1587 Wolfe sent to press the Historie fiorentine – Gentili’s great concern with Machiavelli’s strong arguments for historiographical method has already been remarked on – as well as the Arte della guerra, in which the author shows, among other things, that the art of war must be studied through history. This is noteworthy too when one realises that the following year Gentili had Wolfe print the work on law which is still now considered his masterpiece, De iure belli commentatio prima, followed by De iure belli commentatio secunda and, the following year, De iure belli commentatio tertia. The year 1589, however, also marked the issuing of the very last volume of the Machiavelli-Aretino editions and the end of the short but prolific collaboration between Wolfe and Gentili.

---

154 DNB, XXI:125.
155 D. Panizza 1969:476-83. While clearly of Puritan sympathies, John Rainolds (1549-1507) was apparently not a radical reformer. His anti-Catholic tendency, however, is testified by his appointment to a special lectureship at Oxford in 1586 for the confutation of Roman Catholic doctrine.
156 Gentili’s stay in Germany during the years 1586-87 could justify the negligence in the printing of the volume containing the Historie and the Arte della Guerra, as reported in Bellorini 1971:39 and by Gerber 1907:194.
157 STC 11734.7 and STC 11735.3. The books are dedicated to the Earl of Essex, Alberico’s new patron at that time.
158 According to some authoritative biographical sources, two further works by Gentili, dating after 1589, were issued form Wolfe’s press, namely Ad Primum Maccabeorum Disputatio and De Unione Angliae et Scotiae Discursus. However, the critics tend to regard them as editions illegally printed since by the time these books appeared, later in 1604-5, Wolfe was dead.
I shall return to the question of Barbagrigia’s identity as a matter of discussion among scholars shortly. So far as my argument is concerned, I would like to point out that if Wolfe’s trend of publications does correspond to the “spirit of initiative and modernity” as envisaged in the works of Machiavelli and Aretino, as well as to his interest in politics, it must be admitted that Gentili’s works on international law perfectly fit with the printer’s publishing policy.

Certainly, that Gentili’s whole production in England was written in Latin does not allow us to make linguistic and stylistic comparisons with ‘Barbagrigia’ s prefaces, as it has been possible to do in regard to other two Italian proof-correctors at Wolfe’s press, Petruccio Ubaldini and Giacomo Castelvetro. It was notably Ubaldini’s outstanding skills in transcribing and illuminating manuscripts, as well as his ability as a calligrapher and miniaturist, in fact, that have suggested to scholars that he may have acted as press corrector for some of Wolfe’s Italian editions of those years, Machiavelli’s and Aretino’s works included. Bruno’s allusion to the beard of ‘Petruccia’ would strengthen this hypothesis. In this respect, the strong anti-papist leanings which characterise Wolfe’s whole book production can hardly be squared with the Catholic views which might have informed Ubaldini’s thought. For these reasons, more recent studies have speculated about Giacomo Castelvetro’s editorship of the editions and consequently about his authorship of the prefaces. Among the elements in our possession, which could be considered in favour of such attribution, there are: linguistic and stylistic features (constructions, colloquialisms, words typical of Castelvetro’s usus scribendi); a series of explanations regarding the use of language in the ‘Corrector’s Note’ to the ‘benigno Lettore’, which lies in the conclusion of Aretino’s comedies and which demonstrates a remarkable linguistic and editorial competence on the part of the author; and last but not least, Castelvetro’s great interest in Machiavelli. Shortly after his second visit to

159 M.G. Bellorini 1971:41.
160 A thorough examination of this matter can be found below, 194-6.
161 See, for instance, S. Rossi 1984:75-7; P.P. Ottolenghi 1982:37-44. An intermediate solution can be found in M.G. Bellorini 1971:31-41, where she suggests that Ubaldini might have been the proof-reader and Castelvetro the actual author of the introductions.
162 A further suggestion of Ubaldini’s extraneousness to Wolfe’s editions of Machiavelli is conveyed by Rossi’s argument when he says that no trace of Machiavelli is found within Ubaldini’s writings. See S.
England in 1580, Castelvetro entered into relations with Wolfe. As they had a number of friends in common within the Italian colony in London, such as Ubaldini, Castiglione, Pallavicini and John Florio, it is likely that the Italian émigré and the printer were introduced each other through one of them.

Ubaldini and Castelvetro appear to contend for primacy in collaborating with Wolfe also in the case of the Italian version of the first part of a pamphlet attributed to Lord Burghley, *The execution of justice in England*, which appeared as *Atto della giustizia d'Inghilterra* in 1584. In this respect, the discovery of a much corrected draft of this second version among Castelvetro's papers at Trinity College seemed to substantiate the arguments of those who had claimed Castelvetro's involvement with the Machiavelli and Aretino editions. According to these scholars, in fact, it would be quite unusual for the printer to have applied to two Italians at a time as editors of his works. Yet, this becomes quite conceivable if one considers the bulk of works in Italian issued by that press in the years 1580-1589 and the ignorance of Italian in any form of Wolfe's London typesetters.

The Italian publications from Wolfe's press which have been conjecturally attributed to Castelvetro's editorship are eight. Nevertheless, it may be possible to extend that number by including also books by minor Italian authors, such as Marcantonio Pigafetta, Julius Caesar Stella and other lesser known figures of the literary

---

Rossi 1984:76. On the other hand, it seems that it was Alberico Gentili who awakened Castelvetro's interest in Machiavelli. See P.P. Ottolenghi 1982:43.

Castelvetro left Italy in 1564 probably because of the unorthodox religious views of his uncle Ludovico with whom he was living. He then paid his first visit to England in 1574, three years after his uncle's death.

On Castelvetro's acquaintance with Florio, see F.A. Yates 1934:78-9; on Castelvetro and Pallavicino, see L. Stone 1956. A list of people Castelvetro was in touch with, such as Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Francis Walsingham and Ubaldini, can be also found in the *Liber Amicorum*, a thick well-thumbed octavo containing a collection of miscellaneous memoranda such as autobiographical notes, lists of acquaintances, letters and general notes. The manuscript is preserved in the British Library (MS Harley 3344).

Castelvetro's connection with Sidney also supports the conjecture that it was the latter who introduced the former to John Wolfe, who in turn, described himself as 'Servitore dell'Illustissimo Cavaliere Filippo Sidnei'. See above, 62.

STC 4907.


Ibid., 9-14.
world. If one adds to this list the editing of Wolfe's publications of Machiavelli and Aretino, it would be easy to realise that it includes nearly the whole output of Wolfe's press during the printer's 'Italian' period apart from works by Ubaldini and Gentili. For this reason, an analysis of this bulk of publications may allow us to trace a possible 'line of action' involving both the printers of texts in Italian and their collaborators, whether the latter were the editors, the publishers or even the authors. In order to better unveil the purposes or intents which motivated the production in England of Italian books, the Castelvetro-Wolfe publications will be grouped according to their genre and contents. The analysis will therefore include: literary works and non-literary works, such as books dealing with theoretical and practical aspects of religion; political pamphlets and geographical literature. Let us now start with the 1591 edition in Italian of Tasso's *Aminta* and Guarini's *Il Pastor fido*, which evidently belong to the first group.

The reception of Machiavelli in Elizabethan England has already been touched on in the preceding paragraphs. But English readers were also familiar with another Italian sixteenth-century author, Torquato Tasso. An assessment of the points of contacts of Tasso with English literature was first made by Praz in 1957. Eight years later, Brand's valuable book *Torquato Tasso: A Study of the Poet and of His Contribution to English Literature* established Tasso's place in Anglo-Italian literary relations, while Huffman's essay of 1979 was entirely devoted to the literary tendencies which emanated from the earliest Tassonian influence in England.\(^{169}\) Reviewing these studies, one can hardly be surprised to come across the London printer John Wolfe as the dominant figure in the incursion into England of Tasso.

Wolfe printed two sorts of work associated with the name Tasso. The first sought to classicize the *Gerusalemme liberata* by translating it into Latin and annotating it "much as one would Homer or Virgil".\(^{170}\) Between 1584 and 1586, Scipione Gentili's three Latin poetic translations of portions of that romantic epic, augmented by his commentary on it, were published by Wolfe.\(^{171}\) The second Tassonian movement in

---

\(^{169}\) See M. Praz 1958:308-47; see also C.P. Brand 1965; C.C. Huffman 1979:245-61.


\(^{171}\) STC 11728.8.
England chose the vernacular as the appropriate vehicle for its works and sought in this way to accustom people to the Italian language. In 1585 the English classical poet Thomas Watson had published a collection of Latin pastoral eclogues entitled *Amyntas*; two years later, a translation of Watson’s eclogues into English hexameters by Abraham Fraunce, *The lamentations of Amyntas*, was issued from Wolfe’s press. In 1591, the same Fraunce translated for the first time Tasso’s *Aminta*, which he added to his Watson translation. Between these two tendencies and the English translations of *Gerusalemme liberata* which appeared in 1594 by Richard Carew and in 1600 by Edward Fairfax lies Castelvetro’s London edition of Tasso’s *Aminta* in the original Italian. This pastoral comedy (it ends happily), which first appeared on stage at Ferrara in 1573, is a work of great subtlety dealing with the private emotions of humble persons—although one can find some court references—but it is nonetheless intended as a serious poetic work, as the use of hexameters shows. It was not published in Italy until 1580, without the permission of the author.

Besides Tasso’s *Aminta*, another Italian play seems to contend for primacy in popularity among English readers. This was Giovan Battista Guarini’s *Pastor fido*, a play which was nine years in the making, and was eventually printed in 1590. Although a quite independent work, the play has scenes closely modelled on Tasso’s work. At all events, Guarini—as in a different way Tasso’s—tended technically to look in the direction of spectacular tragi-comedies, tragedies with happy endings and pastoral plays with an admixture of both tragic and comic tonalities, dominant in the following century. In large part, developments in the area of tragicomedy were a result of theoretical reflections on drama deriving from a study of Aristotle’s conceptions of unity in the

---

172 STC 25118.2. Notwithstanding the title, Watson’s volume exhibits no connection whatsoever with Tasso’s play. Watson also composed another series of Latin poems concerning the joys of Amintas, but did not publish it; it appeared in print only posthumously in 1592, in an edition probably prepared for the press by his friend Christopher Marlowe. See C.C. Huffman 1979:258.

173 STC 23692.

174 STC 11340. Given the chronological coincidence, Fraunce might have used for his translation the Italian text of the Castelvetro-Wolfe edition. The translation, however, is not accurate and the alterations made to Tasso’s play are quite substantial.

action as delineated in his *Poetics*. This question was further developed by Tasso in his *Discorsi dell'arte poetica* dealing with the appropriate matter and form of contemporary epic. It may well have been such literary and linguistic concerns that stimulated Castelvetro’s interest in Tasso, especially when considering the role played by his uncle Ludovico in the Italian sixteenth-century debate on literary form.\(^{176}\)

As a matter of fact, Castelvetro procured a copy of Tasso’s *Aminta* and arrange for it to be printed in London at his expense in a double volume together with its ‘rival’.\(^{177}\) What is interesting now is to understand how the Italian was able to procure the original text so promptly, or, even, as in the case of the *Pastor fido*, no more than a year after its first appearance. Castelvetro’s own explanation is quite enlightening. He had tried to use his connections in Italy to locate a copy, but found this very difficult; eventually, however he received one exemplar from Venice. Thus, as Rosenberg has remarked, rather than a merely commercial venture the edition of the two pastoral plays seems to have been part of Castelvetro’s role as cultural middleman to “offer himself as a purveyor of fashionable masterpieces *e transmarinis partibus*”.\(^{178}\) In order to appreciate the significance of such words thoroughly, it is necessary to turn our attention to the crucial year 1586, when Castelvetro’s publishing activity in London suffered a temporary halt due to a short stay in Frankfurt and Basle.

While in Frankfurt, he appears to have visited the Autumn Frankfurt Fair in September 1586, as two references to his presence there in letters from Horatio Pallavicino to Sir Francis Walsingham show.\(^{179}\) It is at this point that Castelvetro’s activity characterises him not only as editor of texts or publisher, but also as a prominent importer of a rather specialised kind of book as well as most likely as Wolfe’s partner in

\(^{176}\) In 1570 Ludovico Castelvetro published in Vienna the first edition of his Commentary on Aristotle’s *Poetics*. It has been said that Philip Sidney, one of Giacomo’s patrons, in his *Apologie for Poetry* was the first to introduce English readers to the literary theories set forth by Ludovico in his commentary. For Ludovico Castelvetro’s great influence on Giacomo, especially concerning questions of Italian language and style, see: DBI, XXIII:8-21.

\(^{177}\) The frontispiece reads: *Il Pastor Fido, Tragicomedia Pastorale di Battista Guarini*, Londra, Per Giovanni Wolfeo, a spese di Giacomo Castelvetro, MDXCI. There follows with a new frontispiece: *Aminta Favola Boschereccia del S. Torquato Tasso*, con privilegio 1591 (STC 12414). On the last page the imprint reads: “In Londra a XIX di giugno MDLXXXXI”.

\(^{178}\) E. Rosenberg 1943:126.

\(^{179}\) Quoted in K.T. Butler 1950:11. The letters are recorded in CSPF, 1586-88:81 and 87.
the selling of them. By assembling various information on Castelvetro’s life, such as his connection with the book trade; his attendance at the Frankfurt Fair at least twice; and his acquaintance with the Italianate milieu, and by comparing Wolfe’s activity with that of the Italian, R. J. Roberts has emphasised the significance of Castelvetro and rightly identified his role in the story of English printing. Robert’s inference is corroborated by his deciphering of an entry in the relevant London Port Book for Easter to Michaelmas 1589. It shows Castelvetro as an importer of unbound books, and therefore as a bookseller. As the Italian could not sell these books retail, it is likely that it was his business associate, John Wolfe, who accomplished the job. At the same time Roberts’ discovery shed new light on Wolfe’s commercial activity and his links with the Continental book market.

I agree with Woodfield when he says that it must certainly be more than a coincidence that copies of the very first book entered to him in the Register and printed in 1579 should have been sent to the Frankfurt Fair in 1581. Wolfe sold copies of many of his books in Latin and foreign vernaculars through the Frankfurt Book Fairs. Woodfield listed 22 titles in the Fair catalogues corresponding to books published by him, and there may be more. Wolfe’s actual methods of conducting his business at the Fair can now be seen as associated with Castelvetro’s activity at Frankfurt. In the light of these facts, it is conceivable to assume a definite sharing of intents between the printer and the Italian exile. This collaboration persisted till the beginning of the 1590s. Wolfe continued to send books to the Book Fairs quite regularly until 1591, a year which still sees the presence of Castelvetro in London. The promotion of Italian books, too, coincided with Castelvetro’s stay in England and after the latter’s departure for Edinburgh in the first half of 1592, “the mantel of printer in Italian seems to have fallen

---

181 According to the figures extracted from the Port Book, Castelvetro imported into London between 2,500 and 4,000 books in one season. Most probably these books were all purchases from the Spring Fair at Frankfurt. See R.J. Roberts 1988-1991:368-9.
182 According to the Act of 1534, no foreigner could sell books retail in England. There is no evidence that Castelvetro had obtained letters of denization while he was in England.
Castelvetro’s venture as a promoter of books in Italian becomes more evident when examining Wolfe’s non-literary printing. In this respect, granted that such publications correspond to a definite aim, both political and religious, no less than literary, they also show the printer’s role in making available to readers examples of fashionable literature, Continental in orientation, which could not be found easily on the English books market and therefore much more marketable. This is the case, for instance, of the books dealing with voyagers and explorations that Wolfe issued under Castelvetro’s editorship in the years 1585-87. Needless to say, a certain consistency between the printer and the Italian publisher’s views can be easily traced on the ground of contents and goals.

In literary terms, the idea of travel and the projects of geographical expansion related to it might rightly be considered perfectly consistent with the traditional themes of the Pastoral, a genre to which both the Aminta and Il Pastor fido belong. The dream of a pastoral Arcadia, in fact, where there is always Spring and innocence; where on some grassy slope milk-white lambs danced to the piping of Tityrus and Corydon perfectly corresponds to the image of an other world, a parallel, an alternative New World where one can escape the corruption and the brutality of the ‘civilised world’ and, above all, a place of greater safety, purity and religious tolerance where people could live according to their faith. It is not accidental that the pastoral genre was cultivated and fostered mainly by political and religious exiles, and Castelvetro’s case does not stand alone. At the same time, these are trends in publications which fit well with the general spirit of the “exploration and expansion which occupied so much of European thought in the period”. Themes such as the magic of exotic places and customs, too, appealed very much to the taste of readers. During the eighties, Elizabethan England, which had come somewhat late in the rush for transoceanic travel, exploration and colonialism, was caught up by a feverish urge to recover its position in this activity. Merchants, politicians, intellectuals and adventurers were all extremely interested in this question: it

was the topic of the decade, and readers were perpetually in search of novelty. The guiding spirit and promoter of books on geographical explorations was Richard Hakluyt the Younger (c. 1552-1616), one of the greatest historians of the sixteenth century.

During those years, Castelvetro’s business connections with the printing house of Wolfe run side by side with his relationship with Hakluyt. This culminates in the 1585 Italian-language *Itinerario di Marcantonio Pigafetta gentil’huomo vicentino*;\(^\text{187}\) the uncompleted Latin epic on Columbus, written some years before by the Roman noble Giulio Cesare Stella, but never printed before;\(^\text{189}\) the Italian translation of Gonzalez de Mendoza’s *History of China*, l’*Historia del gran regno della China*, 1587, by Francesco Avanzi.\(^\text{190}\) Most likely, these books were part of publicity campaign for the overseas venture in Virginia of Sir Walter Raleigh (1554-1618), as has been widely suggested by scholars. In these works, the arguments for exploration and discovery are increasingly replaced by those for colonisation. As a result, Castelvetro’s publications reveal an open defence of colonisation, whose ultimate aim would be that of saving the Protestant cause in Europe threatened by the Spanish *conquistadores*. In the pamphlet literature of the day, the Pope and the King of Spain are rarely mentioned separately. It is not surprising, then, that conquest and religion came to be associated in Protestant English propaganda.

The topics of exploration and religion are closely interlaced in Wolfe’s geographical literature too. In the *Historie of the great and mightie Kingdome of China* (1588), for instance, the English edition of the earlier Italian version, the printer’s address to the readers stresses the wonders and profits that await the traveller during his explorations no less than the dangers of miracles and superstitions from which his

---

\(^{187}\) The acquaintance between Richard Hakluyt and Castelvetro, either through Walsingham, who employed both of them, or once more through one of the Italian colony in London, such as John Florio or Orazio Pallavicini, might also have constituted Castelvetro’s most important link with Wolfe. For Florio’s relationships with Hakluyt and Castelvetro, see F.A. Yates 1934:55-60; 69-75; 76-9.

\(^{188}\) STC 19914. On Marcantonio Pigafetta little is known. From November 1580 to March 1581, he joined the Italian Protestant church in London. See L. Firpo 1959:388-91.

\(^{189}\) STC 23246.

\(^{190}\) STC 12004. Although Castelvetro’s name does not appear anywhere in the printed work, an holograph inscription has been found on the flyleaf preceding the title-page of the copy of the *Historia* now preserved in the Library of Columbia University. In dedicating the book to Roger, second Baron of North, Castelvetro sends him “questa bella e dilettevole historietta fatta da me stampare e dei molti errori scorsi nella prima stampa purgare”. See E. Rosenberg 1943:132-3 and 147.
Christian reader must keep away. The book, addressed to the famous explorer Thomas Cavendish, and translated “at the earnest request and encouragement of my worshipfull friend Master Richard Hakluit”, evidently aims to promote voyages in that part of the world with the lure of establishing profitable trade relations.

That Wolfe was not insensitive to a trend in support of rising British imperialism can be gathered by the fact that his name is associated with the printing of other works of this kind, including Hakluyt’s numerous works between 1585 and 1589. Nor are the arguments on colonisation and its theological implications alien to Wolfe’s publications of this kind. Gentili’s *Commentationes de iure belli*, for instance, display anti-Spanish feelings and are openly in favour of a battle against Spain in order to put an end to its naval and colonial supremacy. By making a distinction between the law exclusively based on ‘dominium’ and the law of nature, Gentili questions the legality of the Spanish rule over the New World. While the former, in fact, gave the Spaniards the sole right of navigation and trade with the new colonies, the latter established the principle of the freedom of the seas and of trade. Hence Gentili defends the rights of the inhabitants of the New World to refuse to embrace Christianity. According to Gentili’s point of view, in fact, religion is a matter between man and God; therefore no man’s right are violated by a difference in religion. On this ground, he implicitly condemned religious war and made a passionate plea for religious liberty and toleration. Such positions exactly correspond to those one can read in the books printed by Wolfe on behalf of other Italian exiles who fled to England owing to religious controversies. Clearer evidence of this trend can be found in the earliest book in Italian Wolfe is involved with, *Vna essortazione al timor di Dio*, written by Jacopo Aconcio and edited by Giovanni

---

191 STC 12003. ‘The Printer, to the Christian reader’, q4r.
192 Ibid., B3r.
193 At least six works, chiefly travel narrative, were printed by Wolfe on behalf of Hakluyt. See Appendix 3 in G.B. Parks 1928:262-4.
194 *De iure belli*, book I:61 and 71. Alberico’s religious convictions are plainly expressed in the unpublished M.S. *De Papatu Romano Antichristo assertiones ex verbo Dei*, which is preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (M.S.S. d’Orville 607).
195 The importance of this book resides also in the fact that it provides a further the evidence of Wolfe’s stay in Italy. On p. 4 the editor speaks of him as ‘vn giouane di questa Città [London] venuto di nuouo d’Italia, ou’ ha con molta industria appreso l’arte dello stampare’, A2v.
Battista Castiglione, the queen’s master of Italian.

Aconcio’s well-known indifference to dogma and ritual, as can be seen in most of his famous works, a leitmotiv which was widespread among the Italian exiles of those years, has implications for Episcopal authority: if ritual is inessential to salvation, the necessity for the full Episcopal structure of the Established Church of England is nullified. The anti-Episcopal elaboration of this position would achieve its highest literary expression in the Martin Marprelate pamphlets, which attacked the ecclesiastical establishment and advocated dismantling the Episcopal governance of the Church, and about which I shall speak later on. In this respect, possible relations between Wolfe’s activity and contemporary resistance to the English church call for further investigation.

A remarkable link between the 1581-3 controversy against the patented Stationers and the social protest against the church establishment of whom they were the particular beneficiaries has been made by scholars. There is no doubt that the protest against the patents must have had an incipiently ideological, anti-authoritarian dimension. And there is no doubt, too, that Wolfe’s surreptitious printing of Il Principe and the Discorsi within a year of the end of the rebellion, with a preface stressing Machiavelli’s anti-tyrannical and anti-aristocratic teaching, must be seen as closely related to this protest, as Donaldson put it. During those disorderly years, Wolfe and others who opposed the Stationers’ Company’s system of privileged printing were jailed several times. Still, he continued undaunted and prospering so that by the middle of the 80s his printing enterprise was one of the busiest in London.

Gentili’s De legationibus, libri tres, issued in July 1585 from Wolfe’s press, might also be placed in connection with feelings against royal arbitrariness and power abuses. In drawing a full-length portrait of the ideal ambassador, Gentili’s attempt at examining the principles of ambassadorial rights would hardly have been appreciated by the Queen. Actually, the right of the inviolability of the ambassador, as one of the fundamental principles of international law, as strongly maintained by Gentili in this work, might have

---

196 See J. Loewenstein 1988:402, footnote 34. On the insurgence against the patented printers, see below, 90-1.
even hurt the injured Elizabeth as well as influencing public opinion, for the Mendoza affair was still fresh in people’s memories.  

The year 1585 marked a new phase in Wolfe’s career. As a part of the resolution of the dissension in the printing industry, he had already become a member of the Company, and from 1587 held the office of beadle, in which position he distinguished himself by his zeal in tracking down his former allies, defending patent holders and prosecuting infringers. Six years later, he was appointed Printer to the City of London and admitted to the livery in the Stationers’ Company in 1598. The years 1588-98 were also those of Wolfe’s commitment to political pamphlets for foreign propaganda purposes. During this period he must have worked closely with William Cecil - Lord Burghley - the Principal Secretary to Edward VI and later to Elizabeth; for as Woodfield has shown, the first text of this sort, the *Essempio di una lettera mandata d’Inghilterra a don Bernardino di Mendoza*, is an Italian edition of a letter of which there is a draft in Burghley’s hand. As Catholic propaganda became active in the country, Burghley was forced to concentrate more and more on the problem of the English Catholics and of their duties towards a sovereign who did not share the same creed, a matter of discussion that would crop up in Gentili’s works. The *Letter* touches precisely on the question of the loyalty of the English Catholics to their Protestant Queen in reply to Cardinal William Allen’s call for rebellion in *An admonition to the nobility and people of England*. The book was suppressed and the answer was written “as if from the Catholics of England” to friends abroad expressing the belief that a pro-

---

198 Mendoza’s complicity in the conspiracy against Queen and State had been revealed by the confession of the chief culprit Throckmorton and it was also proved that the ambassador had been involved in other conspiracies directed against the life of the Queen.  
199 Wolfe’s reversal of behaviour culminated in the raid on Waldegrave’s house during the Martin Marprelate controversy (SR, I:528). The expedition caused Marprelate to give Wolfe the epithet ‘Machivill’ (*The Marprelate Tracts*:53). Martin’s definition of Wolfe as Machiavelli’s heir is similar to that made by Christopher Barker in 1582 when the printer was associated with the rebellion against the patentees (SR, II:780).  
200 There is no record of the appointment of Wolfe as City Printer in the City Records. Therefore, we must gather the information of his appointment from other data. In his letter of 16th September 1593, Gabriel Harvey addresses Wolfe as Printer to the City. See H.R. Hoppe 1933:266 and C. Welch 1919: 175-241.  
Catholic uprising in England was not possible.

The debate between Cecil and Allen goes back to 1583, when an anonymous writer, since identified as Lord Burghley, published his defence of *The execution of justice in England*. In the following year Allen replied with his *True, sincere and modest defence of English Catholics*. At heart, the two tracts deal with the persecution of the Catholic missionaries in England which had been going on for about half a dozen years. In the course of the exchange the disputants obviously touch upon the topic of toleration. Although Cecil cannot ignore the fact that many subjects of the Church of England “differ in some opinions of religion from the Church of England”, they nevertheless will suffer neither persecution nor have their faith put on trial so long as they remain loyal to the Queen. He maintains that the enemies of the realm were being dealt with not “upon question of religion, but justly, by order of laws, openly condemned as traitors” and that the priests were executed neither “for religion or against the Pope’s supremacy”, but “by the ancient temporal laws of the realm, and namely by the laws of Parliament made in King Edward the Third time, about the year of Our Lord 1330”. In other words, heresy only becomes a capital offence when it implies treason; and therefore persecution is not a religious but a political penalty. Whether or not that was the case, the pamphlet counters, in the name of politics, Gentili’s arguments for religious toleration and against persecution. And much more interesting is the fact that an Italian version of it was printed by Wolfe’s press and it appeared as *Atto della giustizia d’Inghilterra* in 1584, most likely under Castelvetro’s supervision. The political and religious implications that such a publication might have had do not need to be further developed. It suffices here to say that Cecil’s work constitutes the first official justification of Elizabeth’s treatment of her Catholic subjects.

The 1589 Latin work *Explicatio utrum excommunicatio* by Thomas Erastus, which is another product of the Castelvetro-Wolfe collaboration, may also be considered

---

205 Ibid., 7.
206 Ibid., 8.
207 The *Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis utrum Excommunicatio mandato nitatur divino, an excogitata sit ab hominibus* Pesclavii, Apud Baocium Sultaterum (STC 10511) was brought out by Castelvetro, who married Erastus’s widow in 1583. It was from her that Castelvetro probably obtained
evocative of the printer's position at that moment. Erastus's solution to the problem of the organisation of the unity of religion within the unity of the state, in fact, might have been regarded as of value for the Elizabethan Settlement as conceived by Whitgift and Hooker. It is from this seminal idea that the so-called Erastianism, a belief in the subordination of the Church to the State in ecclesiastical causes, which would have a large circulation among sixteenth-century English theologians, was developed in England. I am not going to dwell here upon either Wolfe's ensuing reversals of behaviour or his serious troubles, once again, with the authorities for his role in the publication of John Hayward's *Henry IV* in 1599. I shall limit myself to observing that by dedicating this book to the earl of Essex, a nobleman rather unpopular with the Queen by that time, Wolfe reverted back to his criticism of the government.

At all events, from the point of view of religion Wolfe stayed resolutely a Protestant and an anti-Catholic with a strong preoccupation with religious tolerance until the end of his life. This can be gathered from the large number of Protestant and even anti-papist works by contemporary Italian authors that he went on printing during those years. In this respect, it is noteworthy that Wolfe's rare addresses to readers are always in relation to religious matters.

As the title declares, Giovanni Battista Aureli's *Esamine di vari giudici dei politici: e della dottrina e dei fatti dei Protestanti veri e dei Cattolici Romani*, which Wolfe printed in 1587, deals with differing opinions among Roman Catholics and Protestants in the hope of at least a partial reconciliation between them. For this reason, by examining a list of twenty-two articles of belief that the two hold in common, the author is intent upon showing how few differences in fact separate Catholics and

---

the theologian's unpublished manuscript and enabled it to be printed by Wolfe.

208 On these matters, see G. Migliorato 1979:112-36.
209 STC 12995. The book, a prose history of Bolingbroke's life up to the point at which he became king, was issued with a dedication to Robert Essex. The work was suspected of dealing with political matters on account of the obvious parallelism between early and contemporary times. The edition was burnt and Wolfe, after several weeks in confinement in the Tower, had to compromise with the authorities. On these matters, see F.S. Siebert 1952:94-5; also P.S. Donaldson 1988:104-9; C.S. Clegg 1997:198-210.
210 STC 964. According to Firpo (1959:405), the word 'politici' refers to that group known as 'politiques', who adopted the practice of compromise as a means of sorting out religious tensions.
Protestants and therefore how useless the practice of persecution is. The only solution resides, as for Gentili and Aconcio, in moderation and tolerance. By putting into practice his own guidelines, Aurelio succeeded for twenty-seven years in his duty as the chief of the Italian Church in London. His strong criticism of Catholics who persecute Protestants, permeated the whole of contemporary Italian Protestant production in England, of which so little has come down to us in writing and for whose printing Wolfe was chiefly responsible.

Aconcio’s friend Francesco Betti was another expatriate from Italy because of religious persecution. In 1589 he had the second edition of his Lettera di Francesco Betti romano published in Basle, which, in turn, was promptly printed in Italian by Wolfe in the same year. In the dedication to Sir Orazio Pallavicini, Betti states that he has not changed his religious view which had led him thirty years earlier to fiercely attack the Roman Church and consequently to leave his patron Francesco Ferdinando d’Avalos, Marchese of Pescara, and his country. As far as religious and intellectual freedom is concerned, Betti draws parallels between Italy and Switzerland, where he made his new residence, in terms of religious conduct of life. Reading the letter allows us to define more precisely the most important Italian Protestant arguments against the Roman Catholic Church, i.e. the opposition to indulgences; the rejection of the worship of images and saints; the defiance of the Pope’s supremacy either in secular or in ecclesiastical matters. It was, therefore, God himself who allowed Betti to realise that the Catholic doctrine was false and misleading. According to him, the Christian religion rests on the Scriptures and on the sacraments, so that redemption may come only by the “vera euangelica et christiana dottrina”, which is not “quella della moderna chiesa romana”, but

211 “[...] là onde io concludo che la ragione commanda à i Romani che giudichino che se i Protestanti non sono ben persuasi, meritano instruzioni, e non distruttorne, compassione, e no maggiori afflizioni, ma d’altro canto s’eglino mostrano d’esser ben risoluti e ben insegnati meritano d’esser abbracciati, laudati e accompagnati, e non rigettati, ne abbandonati, meno anch’ora perseguitati”. (Esamine:684).


213 STC 1979.5. The first edition of this letter appeared in Basle in 1557.

214 “[...] ma ho anch’ora dove m’è paruto di far bene, cambiati alcuni modi di parlare, hauendo nondimeno il debito riguardo di non mutare in niun luogo il sentimento, accioche altri per aventure non si facesse a credere, che io hauessi, perché che si fosse pentimento di quello, che scrissi già sono più di trenta anni passati, per dichiarar la mia credenza in materia di religione” (Lettera:A2r-v).
“quella che nel papesimo è appellata Luterana”. This doctrine did not teach other religious creeds but “la dottrina primamente insegnata da signor nostro Giesù Christo”, that is a direct appeal to the Bible alone. For this reason, Betti rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of good works, for “l’opere anchora de maggiori santi non sono, paragonate alla diuina giustizia, altro che peccati in quanto escono da huomini imperfetti e contaminati”, and, full of conviction, he adopts the doctrine of the ‘sola fide’. If we add Betti’s recognition of Baptism and Holy Communion as the only sacraments; his violent opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation, as well as his Protestant sense of free will, one realises that the general line, arguments and ideas of the contemporary Italian Protestants enjoy here a complete statement.

Finally, I have intentionally left to last in this exposition the Aviso piacevole dato alla bella Italia by François Perrot, Seigneur de Mezierscame, a French author who fiercely argued with the Pope and the Roman Church. Although with a fictitious imprint, the work issued from Wolfe’s press in 1586. The book is of particular value for the present analysis not only on account of its clearly religious motivation, but also for the recurring quotations from Dante, Petrarca and Bocaccio upon which the author’s arguments are based. These are directed against the ideological censorship exerted by Papal authority which

arditamente, licenziosamente e senza ritegno veruno, corrompe e falsifica i libri, che consente di lasciare a noi mondani (come ella n’appella) vedere acciocché vivendo noi in una oscurità perpetua non veggiamo la luce manifestatrice delle scelleratezze.

As can be noted, Perrot’s words seem to echo Wolfe’s protest against arbitrary authority and censorship, in one place directed against the oppressive sovereign, in another against the Papacy. Yet, the following quotation is far more interesting.

215 Ibid., 31.
216 Ibid., 32.
217 Ibid., 47-8.
218 This is hardly surprising when one recalls that Betti corresponded with Aconcio, Pucci and Castelvetro.
219 STC 19769.7.
220 Ibid., 11v
In considering Latin a foreign language, alien even to the Italians, and in dismissing it as one of the means whereby the Roman Catholic Church was able to control the press, Wolfe openly involved himself in the debate, widely discussed amongst the Protestant exiles (as I will show in a later chapter), over the superiority of Latin to the vernacular. In this regard, it is highly significant that Wolfe’s first recorded involvement with printing is concerned with the *sacre rappresentazioni*, the only significant body of written vernacular drama in Italy in the Quattrocento. It is perhaps along these lines that the publishing of *La vita di Giulio Agricola scritta da Cornelio Tacito et messa in volgare da Giovani Maria Manelli* (1585) might be clarified.

The features of Wolfe’s career, diverse as they were, have allowed us to identify new patterns in the transmission of Italian language and culture. Although he has been considered by critics to have been merely an unscrupulous printer, thus reflecting a very common tendency among members of the book trade during those times, Wolfe’s attempt at introducing “new, interesting, exciting and unusual Italian books” should not be underrated. Indeed, here as elsewhere, it is quite possible that particular authors and editors, as well as readers, identified with him in the light of his declared cultural interests and preferences. These works, Huffmann claims, “were composed, compiled or translated by men who, in Oxford, Cambridge and London, were linked by common ties: they were literate Europeans, some even intellectuals, who had left the Counter-Reformation climate of Continental Europe - chiefly but not exclusively Italy - for a more

---

221 Ibid., 12v
222 *The sacre rappresentazioni* were religious plays that were based, as elsewhere in Europe, on the Bible, the liturgy, and the lives of the saints, and that attracted huge audiences in the churches or the square outside the church or on the route of religious processions where they were generally performed. Their limitations nevertheless were considerable: they were essentially Florentine in origin and diffusion and their quality and impact outside Tuscany was modest. See C.P. Brand 1995:xxix-xlili.
223 STC 23649. The book is dedicated to Robert Sidney, bearing eulogies to Philip Sidney, as well as to the Earls of Leicester and Warwick.
tolerant land. Their books emphasised a cosmopolitan point of view and approached problems in thought and life not by applying inherited orthodoxies but by recognising the validity of multiple and conflicting claims, and attempting to reconcile them”. On the other hand, Wolfe’s works on politics contributed in a decisive way to the new spirit of objectivity and realism in a literary field that was stirring in the last two decades of the sixteenth century. Likewise, his stream of propaganda pamphlets provided facts; and facts, as Machiavelli remarked, were the foundation of any study of contemporary affairs. Finally, Wolfe’s interest in the current debate on language, which led him to become involved in a controversy over Latin on behalf of the vernacular, was perfectly consistent with the cultural policy of that elite of the ‘Italianate’ with which he and the Italian exiles surely had connections.

The years 1584-88 see a vast publication of Italian books, many of them with false imprints indicating an Italian origin. In this chapter an attempt has been made to read these works as the key to an alliance, commercial no less than intellectual, between Wolfe and some of the most important Italian expatriates residing in England, all of whom, except for Giordano Bruno, had at least one of their writings printed by that press. While the exiles, especially Castelvetro and Castiglione, styled themselves promoters and diffusers in England of Italian, culture and language, the printer could fulfil his personal concerns with politics and religious matters, no less than his interest in sales, thus exploiting most fully the printed word’s extraordinary power to achieve religious, political and cultural ends. At this stage, the role that John Charlewood, the printer of Bruno’s Italian dialogues, might have played in such an intellectual project, if indeed there was any, needs to be investigated.

---

225 Ibid., 14.
226 For the different meanings of the term ‘Italianate’ in England and its implications, see below, 167-70.
CHAPTER TWO

JOHN CHARLEWOOD THE PRINTER

Remember, man, both night and day, thou
must nedes die; there is no nay.
thy mortal body fourmed of clay
Will sone resolve and passe away
But yet the time, houre nor day
Uncertayne is,
wherfore I say
Remember man.

Imprinted at London at Holburne Conduite
by John Tysdale and John Charlewood.

I.
John Charlewood’s printing-house and its production
between the years 1570-90

Details of the professional life of John Charlewood (d.1593), stationer and
printer, are scarce, and so are the documents asserting his relevance within
the context of the Elizabethan milieu. As a consequence, they must be
gathered from a number of different sources, among which the most relevant to the
present study is the list of his publications, notably those which appeared between the
years 1570 and 1590. This chapter explores any possible relationship existing between
Charlewood’s printing production and the main trends followed by contemporary
London printers. Along these lines, a further investigation will include the group of six
philosophical dialogues in the Italian language that Giordano Bruno published through
that press while in England from 1583 to 1585. How Charlewood came to publish

1 John Charlewood’s book production still awaits investigation and little is known about his life. The
only accounts of him can be found in DNB, X:120 and in E.G. Duff 1905:26, but they are far from
complete.
Bruno’s dialogues is still unclear. First of all, it has to be established whether Bruno’s works, as the only works in Italian printed by Charlewood and dealing with religious, philosophical and cosmological issues, can be said to represent an anomaly in his customary book-production, or whether they can be taken as evidence of an attempt to put into action a cultural programme inspired by a deliberate policy, as has been conjectured for Wolfe. Answering this question will later allow us to form hypotheses concerning the possible motivations behind Bruno’s decision to submit his manuscripts to Charlewood.

Charlewood’s date of birth is unknown. Apparently coming from Surrey, since Charlewood is a Surrey parish and the surname is rather popular in that county,² he seems to have started printing “so early as Queen Mary’s reign” in a temporary partnership with John Tysdall (or Tysdale) in Holborn, “nere to the Cundite at the signe of the Sarsins head”.³ His first two imprints, dating to circa 1555, were shared with Tysdale and issued at that sign. Though not a member of the Stationers’ Company, Charlewood was in the printing business since the time of the Incorporation, in the guise first of a bookseller from, possibly, 1557 to circa 1574, and then of a printer from circa 1574 until his death in 1593.⁴ He officially remained a member of the Grocers’ Company until about 1574 when he joined the stationers.⁵ His career as a ‘disorderly’ printer dates to as early as 1559, when he and two apprentices were summoned before the city chamberlain, apparently for some unlicensed works.⁶ The first recorded entry under his name is a ballad dated 1562-63.⁷ By that time, Charlewood had definitely set up his own shop in the Barbican where he worked from 1578 to 1586 at the sign of the Half-Eagle and Key.⁸ During those years he became one of the most prolific printer-publishers of

---

² SR, II:173.
³ TA, IV:345.
⁴ STC, III:40.
⁵ SR, II:85.
⁶ “Payd to WILLIAM of the Chambre of London for the warnynge of Charlewod and his ij prentisse[s] to come before ye chamberlayne.” (SR, I:106). This is the earliest record in the Registers of the Stationers’ Company of Charlewood as a printer. It appeared in the list of payments between 1558 and 1559.
⁸ SR, V:103. Charlewood might have obtained the device representing the Half-Eagle and Key from
Elizabethan England, so that at the time of Bruno's stay in London, he had already set his name to about a hundred works. Several salient episodes marked Charlewood's career as a printer and a Company member.

In 1579 he and another printer, Richard Jones, had the rights to fifteen works of Henry Denham, another prolific printer of those years, transferred to them. Moreover, in 1581-2 Charlewood is recorded as the purchaser of a considerable number of books and ballads, several copies 'which were Sampson Awdeleys' and a few copies 'which were William Williamson's'. These included English translations of classical works, besides several books belonging to a popular literary English genre. While he was able to keep his press busy, during the years 1578-80 Charlewood was constantly fined for the printing of unlicensed or even unregistered works, in defiance of the Stationers' rules. Not long afterwards he, together with John Wolfe and Roger Ward, boldly began to print books belonging by right to the patentees. This situation of open conflict with the authorities reached its climax in 1582 when he is reported by the Wardens of the Stationers' Company as one of the leaders of the struggle against the privileged publishers.

According to the Stationers, Wolfe and his confederates vowed "to withstand her majesty's grants wholly", and collected funds and held meetings in the Exchange and at the church of St. Thomas of Acres in furtherance of their cause. They are depicted as an organised movement, with a small group of working printers and their associates at the centre, acting as organisers and fund-raisers, and a larger following drawn from the 100 to 200 journeymen and apprentice printers, as well as the poorer members of other trades throughout the city. In another entry it is said that while Wolfe was in the Clink, his associates continued to attack patents and "incensed the whole city, saying their ancient

Richard Serle in 1566, when the latter was working at that sign in Fleet Lane. After 1586, Charlewood might either have ceased to use the sign or have leased the house to someone else, for thereafter none of his imprints bears the sign. See PPD:181 and 168.

About the year 1574, Denham acquired the patent for printing Psalters and all books of private prayer in Latin and English. As Denham is said to have taken "seven young men free of the Company of the Stationers" to help him, it is evident that there must have been a large output under his patent (DPB:88).

SR, II:405-6.
12 Ibid., II:780-2.
liberties were thereby infringed." It is highly probable that Charlewood, in his capacity as one of the leaders of the dissident printers, played more than a subordinate role in the protest.

Interestingly enough, both Wolfe and Charlewood obtained a favourable settlement at the end of the struggle. In 1583 Wolfe "hath acknowledged his error and is releved with worke", while "those that haue presses and complaine against the patenties are not aboue iiij". Although there is no positive proof of their identity, the four malcontents were probably Ward, Waldegrave, East and Charlewood. While there are some records of Ward's and Waldegrave's troubles, what happened to the other two we cannot directly say. There is an indication, however, that Charlewood by no means stopped printing books, whether legally or not. In fact, in the same year he is reported to possess two presses, while Wolfe had five. It is somewhat surprising, too, that in 1587 the same Charlewood is found to hold "the onelye ympryntinge of all manner of Billes for players" conferring on him the exclusive right, or monopoly, of printing playbills. A similar turning round had occurred to Wolfe, who had a share in John Day's lucrative patent and who was as zealous as anyone in protecting the privileges which now came his way. There is, however, much more in common between Charlewood and Wolfe, as I shall show later on.

Two other episodes better illustrate Charlewood's dubious integrity as a printer. On 7 August 1592 the printer Abel Jeffes was committed to the Stationers' Company for misdemeanours. The following day, Richard Jones, a free-and-easy bookseller registered Nashe's Pierce penilesse "vnder th[e hjandes of the Archbuschopp of Canterburie and master watkins". According to the STC, the anonymous printer was John Charlewood, who had already turned out Nashe's earliest book The anatomie of

---

13 Ibid., I:144.
14 Ibid., II:784.
15 Ibid., II:477. The formula "prouided yet yf any trouble aryse hereby then Charlwood to beare the charges" at the end of the entry, fully reflects the distress among the printers during those years.
16 See above, 81.
17 RCSC:42. The whole episode is reported in C. Turner Wright 1961:129-38.
18 SR, II:619.
19 STC 18371.
absurdity (1589).\textsuperscript{20} It was Nashe himself who denounced the Jones edition as unauthorised.\textsuperscript{21} Charlewood and Jones might have snatched the manuscript from Jeffes’s shop as soon as the latter had been sent to prison, or, alternatively, it might have fallen in their hands thanks to the help of Anthony Munday, a writer whose business associations with Charlewood were long-standing.\textsuperscript{22}

During the same year, 1592, Cuthbert Burby issued The Axiochus of Plato, labelling it a translation by “Edward Spenser”.\textsuperscript{23} As Swan has pointed out, the real translator may have been the same Munday, while his crony, John Charlewood, printed the dedication and padded the volume with the Sweet speech or the Oration spoken at the Tryumpe at White-hall before her Maiestie, by the Page to the right noble Earle of Oxenforde, written ten years earlier for Munday’s patron, the Earl of Oxford.\textsuperscript{24} According to Swan, the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus and the Sweet speech were issued under the name of Spenser, most probably with the printers’ (the translation proper being printed by John Danter) and the author’s connivance, because of merely commercial reasons.\textsuperscript{25}

On 29 January 1593 Charlewood licensed his last work, a book of ‘huntinge and runnynge horses the breedinge trayninge manuginge and dyettinge’.\textsuperscript{26} He was dead a few weeks later since in March of that year three books were entered in the Registers by “the widdowe Charlewood”.\textsuperscript{27} She soon transferred the presses to James Roberts, who, on 9 September 1593 became her husband and took over the business in the Barbican, which in turn was finally transferred to William Jaggard before the end of 1606.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{20} STC 18364.
\textsuperscript{22} See below, 115 following.
\textsuperscript{23} STC 19974.6.
\textsuperscript{24} M.W.S. Swan 1944:161-81.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 179-81.
\textsuperscript{26} SR, II: 625.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 630. Charlewood was buried at St. Giles without Cripplegate on 31 March 1593.
\textsuperscript{28} DPB:229. Interestingly enough, both Roberts’s and Jaggard’s names are connected with the printing of Shakespeare’s quartos.
Remember, man, both night and day, thou
must needs die; there is no stay.

by mortal body fom-
me'd of clay
Wyll some resolve and
passe away
But yet ye time, houre,
nor day
Uncertayne is,
wherfore I say
Remember man.

Imprinted at London at Holburne Cunduite by John Tysdale and
John Charlewood.

FIG. 1 An epitaph upon the deth of kyng Edward. 1557? (STC 5229)
Charlewood’s activity, as described above, calls for a thorough examination of his book-production. Since other than Bruno’s six dialogues Charlewood did not publish any Italian language book, nor was he engaged in the printing of Latin texts besides sharing in the printing of Bruno’s *Explicatio triginta sigillorum*, to understand the reasons why the two chose to collaborate in this printing venture will require us to look more closely at the literary, political, as well as religious trends of Charlewood’s main publications. In this perspective, the connections that can be demonstrated between Charlewood’s printing programme and the views of the Italian philosopher might be crucial to what we intend here to put forward.

As mentioned previously, Charlewood’s earliest hitherto known imprints are two broadsides, both printed at Tysdall’s address in Holborn. The epitaph, possibly dated 1554-5, consists of fifteen commemorative stanzas upon the death of King Edward ending with a verse for the Catholic Queen Mary. The ballad, which most likely was issued during Mary’s reign, contains an exhortation to all men to remember their precariousness as the “mortal body formed of clay / Wyll sone resolve and passe away”. It bears a beautifully engraved initial, which shows a technical skill rather unusual for English printers of those times.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that among Tysdall’s book production there are several publications that express ‘reforming’ views and were thus liable to the punishment of heresy under the reign of Mary. In fact, Tysdall’s press issued religious works by the bitter controversialist John Bale (1554), the most influential English Protestant author of his time; by the leader of the advanced section of the reformers John Hooper (1550 and 1562); by John Veron (undated) also a Protestant radical writer under Queen Mary’s reign, whose works are written mainly against Papists, as well as

29 SR, V:44.
30 BBB:174-5.
31 See Fig. 1. Despite the general decadence of book illustration in Tudor England, woodcuts played a major role in works issued by Protestants. The Reformation revival of woodcuts after Caxton’s times is due to Continental craftsmen, especially to Dutch artisans. See J.N. King 1982:462-4.
32 John Bale (1495-1563) was, at first, a zealous Roman Catholic, but was later converted to Protestantism. He laid aside his monastic habit, renounced his vows as a Carmeliten, and caused great scandal by taking a wife. Later on he was found to denounce Roman uses and attack the Roman party siding with the reformed opinions. See DNB, III:41-2.
two books by the poet Marcello Palingenio (1560 and 1563). At that time, Charlewood might still have been in touch with that press, having started working in the Barbican only in 1563.

Shortly after he started printing on his own, Charlewood continued issuing books on the side of the reformers, including editions of Tyndale’s and Crowley’s writings. Thereafter, he went on printing a huge selection of works, many of them belonging to the popular genres, i.e. almanacs, ballads, broadsides, news from foreign countries. His output covers a wide range of subjects, including religion, philosophy, history and English translations of classical works. This section will take into consideration publications printed both by Charlewood alone and in partnership with other printers, as well as those printed for someone else who, as publisher, committed the work to Charlewood. This distinction is readily discernible when one looks at the STC entries of the titles listed in Appendix 2a.

Charlewood’s religious writings that appeared between the years 1570-80 undoubtedly represent the points of view of the faction later called Puritans which supported a radical reformation of the church rather than that represented by the ambiguity of the Elizabethan Settlement. Preferring the Protestant polities established on the Continent to their own form of church government, and regarding Swiss practices as superior both spiritually and morally, the Puritans appealed to the authority of Calvin and other religious leaders to justify their programme of ecclesiastical reform: stripping the church of elaborate ceremonialism, reducing the wealth and the power of the bishops, and regulating the character of the lower clergy. Translations from the commentaries, sermons, and treatises of Continental religious leaders testify to the bond between English Puritans and Calvin’s followers such as Peter Martyr Vermigli, Henry

---

33 For Tysdall’s book production, see TA:346-52.
34 STC 24438.5 and 24464; STC 6089.
35 For a definition of the term ‘Puritan’, see M.M. Knappen 1939.
36 As a religious refugee in England, Pietro Martire Vermigli (1500-1562) had been influential in the revision of the English prayer book and his works appealed to the more radical as well as to the more conservative element among English Protestants. His contribution to the development of the English Reformation has been widely recognised by historians of the Renaissance. See, for instance, P. McNair 1967; J. McLelland 1957; J.P. Donnelly 1976; J. Tedeschi 1987.
Bullinger, and Theodore de Bèze. In general, these writers represented the authorities with whom the returning Marian exiles had had contact and whose convictions continued to influence Elizabethan religious thought. In this respect, Charlewood’s press was kept busy by the reprinting in 1576 of Bèze’s religious treatises; in 1577 of another edition of Bale’s A tragedye or enterlude manysteding the chefe promyses of God vnto man; in 1578 and later in 1584 of a translation of Bale’s lectures by Calvin upon Jonas the prophet, whose author dedicated the work to the Earl of Leicester. In 1579 the printer is likely to have had connections with the printing of Bullinger’s Beelefe, contayning his judgement vppon the Lords Supper, and of Garnier’s Calvinist text A brief and cleare confession of the christian faith, translated from French. Vermigli’s Treatise concerning the use and abuse of dauncing in perfect accordance with the Puritans’ attitude towards the stage, was printed in 1580 by Charlewood for Jugge. An apocalyptic poem by John Wharton printed by Charlewood for Conyngton bears Foxe, Crowley and other Radicals’ endorsement.

During those years, the printer was also engaged in the issuing of several works by Edward Dering, a Puritan divine who, down to the end of 60s, seemed to have been well disposed towards the Anglican party as well as in agreement with church discipline and ritual. Yet, on 25 February 1569-70 he gave a sermon at court before the queen attacking the clergy so fiercely that in consequence of the offence thus given to the Established church of England and to the queen herself he was suspended from preaching. The sermon was reissued five times, respectively in 1578, 1580, 1584, 1586 and 1589, by Charlewood’s press. After Dering’s reputation among the citizens of London was bettered by his lecturing on the earlier chapters of the Epistle to the

37 Theodore de Bèze (1519-1605), a Protestant reformer, in 1561 pronounced the profession of faith which still constitutes the Protestant liturgy. See DBF, VI:382.
38 STC 2049.
39 STC 1306.
40 STC 4432 and 4461.
41 STC 4042.7.
42 STC 11620.7. Jean Garnier (?-1574) was a French Protestant minister. In 1545 he became minister of the French Protestant church established by Calvin at Strasbourg. See DBF, XV:498-9.
43 STC 24664. The dating and the attribution to Charlewood is uncertain.
44 STC 20973.
45 STC 6702-6.
Hebrews, also reprinted by Charlewood in 1583, 1584 and 1589, he went on criticising the clergy “which had so ignorant ministers”. The 1572 preface to his *A brief and necessary catechism for christian householders*, which contains Dering’s severe animadversions on the scandalous disputes and litigation which prevailed within the church itself, caused him in the following year to incur a further suspension from lecturing as well as a summons before the Star Chamber. In 1577 Charlewood printed three editions of Dering’s *Catechism*, followed by an enlarged version in 1573 entitled *Godly private prayers for householders*. Different editions of Dering’s *Catechism* came out from the same press in c.1580, 1581 and 1582. Dering’s story and his writings serve us to introduce here the political aspect of Puritan propaganda. Although Puritans gave their complete allegiance to the Queen in civil matters, they deemed their own judgement, based on scriptural and learned authority (including that of foreign religious leaders still alive), better in matters of religion and morality. On this ground, they refused to subscribe to Elizabethan discipline and rejected episcopal authority. Thus it came about that in an age when religion and politics were inseparably connected, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the programme behind the bulk of these publications actually had implications which threatened the sovereignty of the Crown. Nonetheless, Elizabeth and her government could not reject the Puritans’ support against the common enemy, the Roman Catholics and the Pope.

As the religious controversy between England and Rome grew sharper, both sides eagerly put forward their own views and debated those of their opponents through the printing presses. The result was a continuous flow of theological books and pamphlets which were controversial, that is, they were issued for a special occasion and in answer to a specific attack. Among them, an extraordinary series of works against the Pope and ‘the Papist traitorous’ circulated incessantly. They were produced largely by Puritan writers who wished to present their writings as the expression of “true religion” and who
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46 STC 6693 and 6697-8.
47 DNB, XIV:394.
48 STC 6679.7-66797.9
49 STC 6685.5 and 6688. The dating is uncertain.
50 STC 6689, 6680, 6689.2.
were most anxious to arouse the public to the dangers of Catholicism at home and abroad. In this perspective, anti-papal polemic embodied perfectly that combination of loyalty to the Elizabethan church and commitment to the cause of further reformation that typified certain moderate Puritan positions. Again, Charlewood’s publications from the late 70s down to the 80s seem to serve the unified purpose of militant Protestantism.

In 1576 he printed for Maunsell *A philosophical discourse, entitled the Anatomie of the minde* by Thomas Rogers, a Protestant divine whose chief works are two volumes on the English creed published respectively in 1579 and 1585. Other champions of the Protestant cause who rose up in these years to engage in controversy the Catholic writers included William Fulke, by that time Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and one of Leicester’s chaplains. Further editions of two of his sermons issued from Charlewood’s shop in 1578, 1579 and 1586. During those years, Fulke is said to have held frequent meetings with Chaderton, Whitacker, and other Puritan divines at Cambridge for the study of Holy Scriptures. He also distinguished himself in the promotion of Puritanism and in disputations with Romish priests and Jesuits.

Two further sermons preached by the Protestant divine John Keltridge ‘before the Jesuites, Seminaries, and other adversaries to the Gospel of Christ in the Tower of London’ seem to have been printed by Charlewood in partnership with Richard Johnes in 1581. The intent of these sermons is given by the author on the title-page of the work, “in which, were confuted to their faces, the moste principall and cheefe poincts of their Romish and VVhoarish religion”, thus attesting to the definitely anti-Roman and Protestant character of Charlewood’s publications. Further reprints of books by such authors as Ridley (1582); Northbrooke (1582); Regius (1583?); Lupton (1584); Lynne

---

52 STC 21239.
53 STC 11423-4 and 11453.
54 DNB, XX:305-8.
55 STC 14921, title page.
56 STC 18663.5, 188664 and 18667-a. John Northbrooke (fl. 1570) was a Puritan preacher and writer during Elizabeth I’s reign. His *Spiritus est Vicarius Christi in Terra* (1571) is written against the Papists. One of his tracts is regarded as the earliest separate and systematic attack upon dramatic performances in England, which reflects the Puritans’ attitude towards the stage (DNB, XLI:186-7). Charlewood’s involvement with authors attacking the theatre is not rare. Besides Vermigli’s *Treatise* (see above, 96), it seems that Anthony Munday, who frequently used Charlewood’s press, wrote against the stage in circa 1580. See J.D. Wilson 1908-9:484-7.
Five works between 1581 and 1588 bear in their imprints the name of Robert Crowley, an author-printer and Puritan divine who spent all his life struggling for the new doctrines of the Reformation.

In 1587, the *First book of homelies* and the *Second book of homelies* by Cranmer, Harpsfield and other defenders of Protestantism were partly reprinted by Charlewood. This is noteworthy if one recalls that these books constituted part of those significant changes which produced a very considerable revolution in religious matters after Henry’s death in 1547.

Another aspect of anti-Catholic propaganda was concerned with a number of adaptations of some writings by eminent Catholic divines, in which Catholic doctrine was quietly eliminated and the works given a Protestant outlook. The history of the controversy between Robert Parsons (or Persons), the Jesuit priest who had arrived in London in 1580 for a proselytising mission, and Edmund Bunny provides a paradigmatic example of this kind of action. In 1582 an anonymous book entitled *The first booke of christian exercise, appertayning to resolution* appeared as printed in Rouen and bearing the initials R. P. This was an English translation of Gaspare Loarte’s *Exercise of a christian life* by the Jesuit Parsons, who, as the work was well received, put out a revised edition in 1585. Before he could do so, however, two versions of his work had appeared, the one “by a Catholique (as it seemeth)”, although “somewhat incorrected, and very disorderly, not having the consent or advise of such”, and the other “anonymously adapted for the use of Protestants largely from the new material adapted by Edmund Bunny”. Appearing first in 1584, this Protestant adaptation was published again in 1585 as a kind of joint venture by several separate London printing houses and later reissued many times. The controversy between the two theologians went on until
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57 STC 21050; 18664 and 18667; 20844; 16947; 17116; 22659 and 22687; 22700.5, 22701.5 and 22709.
58 STC 13657 and 13673.
59 STC 19353.
60 STC 19362. *A Christian Directorie guiding men. Devided into three booke*. The first whereof....is only conteined in this volume, with repreofe of the falsified edition published by E. Bunny [Init. R.P.].
61 Ibid., A 4.
1589, when Charlewood printed for Wight both Bunny's adaptation of Parsons's 1582 book, and the Puritan writer's answer to its 1585 revised edition. An altered version of Parsons's 1585 edition was eventually issued from Charlewood's press on behalf of Thomas Hacket in 1590.

A further example of how the rival religious parties kept the presses busy may be given by the campaign against the other Jesuit leader Edmund Campion. Between 1581 and 1584 a number of pamphlets designed to reveal the wickedness of the Catholics and to provoke Englishmen to defend their queen against "Romish plots" were produced by Anthony Munday (1560-1633), a hack writer of ambiguous religious tenets. During those years, the smallest details of Campion's arrest, imprisonment in the Tower, torture, trial and execution were discussed in innumerable pamphlets on either side. On the ground of his alleged experience as one of the secret agents employed at home and abroad by Walsingham, Munday not only furnished evidence that furthered the arrest and conviction of Campion and other Catholic missionaries, but he also testified at their trials. Thereafter he used his pen in justification of Campion's execution. The Breefe discourse of the taking of Edmund Campion, and divers other Papistes (1581), libelling the imprisoned priests; the ensuing account of their trial entitled A discoverie of Edmund Campion, and his confederates, (1582) (dedicated to the Earl of Leicester, who may well have been the chief sponsor of Munday's entire anti-Romanist series), as well as the pamphlet A breefe and true reporte of the execution of certaine traytours at Tiborne (1582), are likely to have been printed by Charlewood for other printers. Munday's new counterattack on two pamphlets attacking him and the validity of his evidence was
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63 STC 19364. This 1589 anonymous edition printed by Charlewood for Wight is a different edition of another version of Bunny's adaptation which was printed in 1585 by Joseph Barnes in Oxford.
64 STC 4088. A briefe answer vnto those idle and frivolous quarrels of R.P. against the late edition of the Resolution, 1589.
65 STC 19380. The author of this work was an anonymous compiler who intended it as a supplement to the 1584 Bunny's edition of Parsons's The Christian exercise. Charlewood reissued for Waterson other two editions of the work respectively in 1591 (STC 19381) and 1592 (STC 19382). On the controversy between Parsons and Bunny, see P. Milward 1977.
66 Munday is also mentioned among those employed by the government but not definitely connected with Walsingham's special service in C. Read 1925:323.
67 STC 18264; 18270; 18261. The first and the second being printed for William Wright, while STC 18270 bears the imprints for Edward White.
promptly issued in the same year by Charlewood's press. The pamphlet-series ends in 1584, when Charlewood issued for Hacket Munday's last work on the subject, *A watchword to Englande to beware of traytours.* In the same year, an English translation of Calvin, newly edited by Munday, was reprinted by Henry Car, apparently through Charlewood's press.

While Munday was writing his *Discouerie*, he already had in mind (and probably in manuscript) another anti-Romanist pamphlet to which he refers as shortly forthcoming. This resulted in the publication of *The English Romayne Lyfe* (1582), a full account of the lives of the English seminarians in Rome with the intent of showing how they were trained for the task of subverting their countrymen. Like the *Discouerie*, the treatise was dedicated to the Privy Council and to the Earl of Leicester. This is highly significant when one recalls that in accord with the Parliamentary statute of 1581 all priests coming from abroad who tried to convert Englishmen were guilty of high treason, as were their proselytes. As a result, while Charlewood was at variance with the authorities in the episode of the infringement of patents, he nevertheless supported them in their struggle against 'Papistrie' and 'traytours', thus showing a degree of loyalty to Elizabeth.

At this stage of our research, the evidence merely seems to suggest Charlewood's political tendencies and tends to brand him definitely as one of the Protestant printers of his time. In fact, there is no doubt that his sympathies on the whole were for the Puritan point of view. Yet, having found a somewhat reasonable thread, on closer examination, Charlewood's output still poses some puzzles.

Despite Munday's anti-Catholic writings and his venture into the field of Calvinist publications, his sincerity is suspect. The imprints of his pamphlets against Campion and
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68 STC 18262. *A breefe aunswer made vnto two seditious pamphlets*, 1582. Munday's reliability in such accounts is also questioned by the Catholic author of *A true reporte of the death and martyrdome of M. Campion*. According to him, Munday was also the author of a pamphlet on the trial of another Catholic 'traitor', Everard Haunce, executed 31 July 1581, which was immediately challenged and "disproued by one of his owne hatch". The pamphlet, entitled *The Araignement, and Execution, of a wilfull and obstinate Traitor, named eueralde Ducket, alias Hauns* (STC 18259.3), was printed by Charlewood and White. In 1588 Charlewood printed together with Broome the retractions and confessions of another turncoat, William Tedder, whose sincerity is also questionable (STC 23858.5).

69 STC 18282.

70 STC 4461.

71 STC 18272.
the Jesuits always refer to Munday as “sometime the Popes Scholler”. Whether or not his ‘conversion’ deserves some credence,\textsuperscript{72} his later activity as a writer includes several genres of which the Puritans outspokenly disapproved. In 1588-90 Munday also accepted employment as an anti-Martinist. Rather surprisingly, Charlewood’s production closely follows the same pathway.

In 1581 two hostile books against Catholics written by John Nichols, another renegade priest, engaged the attention of the pamphleteers and controversialists.\textsuperscript{73} A seminary priest at the English College in Rome in 1577, in 1580 Nichols suddenly resolved to return to England where he was captured and committed to the Tower by Sir Francis Walsingham and the Bishop of London. While in prison, he uttered a recantation of Romanism which resulted in the two books mentioned. Naturally enough, the Catholics were provoked to reply and this reply in turn demanded refutation. Nichols’s two books represent a bitter attack upon the Catholic Church. The second pamphlet in chronological order deserves our attention. This is \textit{The Oration and Sermon made at Rome}, dated 1581. The oration goes back to May 1578, when Nichols appears to have presented himself before the Roman Inquisition and preached in defence of the Catholic church before the Pope and four cardinals, thus publicly abjuring his formerly Protestant beliefs. According to the title-page, rather than being spontaneous, his penitence in Rome was made ‘upon paine of death’. The need to unveil the truth led him to turn his oration into English ‘for the great comfort and commoditie of all faithfull Christians’.

\textsuperscript{72} While his biographer C. Turner Wright (1928, 1959) leans towards the hypothesis of Munday’s Catholicism, Professor Galigani (1965) argues that he remains substantially a Protestant. Ambition and hope for prosperity were, according to Swan (1944), the only motive factors in Munday’s sudden conversion to Catholicism.

\textsuperscript{73} STC 18553. \textit{A Declaration of the recantation of John Nichols}. 1581; STC 18535 \textit{The Oration and Sermons made at Rome by commandement of the fowre Cardinalles}. 1581. On John Nicholls (1555-1584 ?), see DNB, XL:441-3; see also A.C. Southern 1950:160-7.
The Oration and Sermon
made at Rome, by commandement of the foure Cardinalles,
and the Dominican Inquisitour,
upon paine of death. By
John Nichols, late the
Popes Scholler.

Which Sermon and Oration was presented before the
Pope and his Cardinalles in his Consistoric, the xxvij. day
of Maie, 1 5 7 8, and remaineth there registred. Now by him
brought into the English tongue, for the great comfort
and commoditie of all faithfull Christians.

Herein also is aanswer'd an infamous Libell,
maliciouslie written and cast abroad,
against the saide John Nichols, with a
sufficient discharge of himselfe from
all the Papist lying reports, and
his owne life both large &e and
ample discovered.

Domine, quàm multi sunt qui tribulant me; multi
confligunt aduersum me; multi discunt amea
mea max, Non est talus ipsi in Deo.

Imprinted at London by John Charlewood,
feruant to the right Honourable, the
Earle of Arundell.

FIG. 2  Title-page of J. Nichols' The oration and sermon made at Rome by commandement
of the foure Cardinalles. 1581. (STC 18535).
This was promptly printed by "John Charlewood, servant to the earle of Arundelle". Although it might sound rather singular to certain scholarly ears, the wording is not an isolated case in Charlewood’s imprints. In 1583, a work by Henry Howard, the second son of the Earl of Surrey, later Earl of Northampton, came off bearing in the imprint “John Charlewood, Printer to the right Honourable Earle of Arundell”. This was *A defensatiue against the poyson of supposed prophesies* (STC 13858), a learned attack on judicial astrology, dedicated to Walsingham, and perhaps suggested by the serious predictions of Gabriel Harvey’s brother Richard in his *Astrological Discourse* (1583). If one deems reliable the STC attribution of Simon Smell-Knave’s *Fearfull and lamentable effects of two cometes* to Charlewood’s press, one can easily discover that the printer eight years later turned again to mocking Harvey’s astrological exploits.

The printer’s association with the Howard family seems to be of long-standing. At the time of the publication of Nichols’s *Oration*, Charlewood was engaged in the issuing of a broadside written by Callophisus (Noble Nature), a fictitious name used by the Earl of Arundel. This *Challenge of the Justes*, as the work has been entered in the Registers, refers to a tilt “to have been performed the fifteenth daye of lanuarie”, but deferred “vntill the two and twenty of the some moneth2 and then “to be held at Westminster, the accustomed place”. In it Callophisus declared that he intends “to
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74 Fig. 2. The STC records four extant copies of the first edition (STC 18535), as well as two further editions of the work (STC 18536 and 15836.a). Only the copies of the first edition display on their title-page the wording concerning the Earl of Arundel. Among them, the copy at Brasenose College, Oxford, has a leaf at the end “Vtilis et pia precatio, ab omnibus Christianis dici digna, mane atque vesperti” in Latin, wanting in other copies. Instead, the 18536 copies, which contain the Author’s postscript dated “Anno 1581, April. 25” as a variant, bear on the title-page: “Imprinted in London by John Charlewood, / and are to be sold at the little North dore / of St. Paulus Church, at the signe of Gunne, by Edward White 1581”. Finally, the 18536.a copies have no date to the postscript as a variant.

75 STC 13858.
76 DNB, XXVIII:29. See also J, Styrpe *Grindal*, 233-4.
78 STC 13868.5. *Callophisus, being brought by the greatest perfection... [1581].* The challenge exists in the form of a printed broadside, the only surviving copy of which is preserved at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington. See Fig. 3.
79 SR, II:387.
80 Details of the tournament are also recorded in Ditchley Mss. (B.L. MS. Add. 41499A:6A) and in Lansdowne Mss. (B.L. MS. Landsdowne 99:259a-64b); see also J. Nichols 1823, II:334-5; A. Young 1987:148-9.
defend and maintayne against all men whosoever, for sixe courses a peece” a series of propositions honouring the beauty and virtues of his mistress, by whom one assumes he means the Queen. As the tournament has been dated to 1580/81, it becomes clear that the *Sweet Speech*, which constitutes the final sheet D of the Luttrell-Pendarves copy of the above mentioned *The Axiochus of Plato,* refers to the same tilt. In fact, the euphuistic speech, printed by Charlewood, was delivered to the Queen by the earl of Oxford’s Page to help his patron to restore his own weakened reputation. As a matter of fact, both Callophisus’ broadside and the speech by the earl of Oxford’s Page were issued from the press of Charlewood in favour of two members of the Catholic party and Spanish sympathisers as an attempt to win clemency from Elizabeth and to reaffirm their questioned loyalty and devotion to her.

Northampton, too, had close ties to Catholics at court under Elizabeth and connections to the Spanish for many decades. After his admission in 1582 that he had taken part in Roman Catholic worship because of conscientious difficulties “in sacramentary points”, following a former reconciliation with the Earl, Elizabeth reopened the enquiry into his activities as a secret Catholic. The discovery in the same year of the Throckmorton conspiracy against the Queen caused Henry Howard to be arrested while his papers were repeatedly searched. He was soon free and spent a year in writing *A defensative*, a book which was suspected of “seeming heresies” and of treason ‘though somewhat closely covered’. For this reason Northampton was again sent to the Fleet.

Whether Charlewood escaped punishment or not, we can hardly say. At any rate, his connections with the Howard family were far from interrupted. In 1584 Greene’s work *Morando, the Tritameron of loue*, set in Bologna and bearing a dedication to the earl of Arundel, was published by E. White. According to the STC, the printers were John Kingston and John Charlewood, although the latter appears to have printed only

---

81 For the dating of the tilt, see E.K. Chambers 1923:270-1.
82 See above, 92.
83 For the episode of Oxford’s life and its later ramifications to which the nobleman turned in disgrace, see J.W. Bennett 1942:354-69.
84 DNB, XXVIII:29.
85 Ibid.
A. Three years later, Charlewood would be stigmatised by Martin Marprelate as “I.C., the Earl of Arundels man” printing “Popery” in a place called Charterhouse in London in 1587 near “about the time of the Scottish Queen's death”. His next two works, the Epistle of Comfort (1587-88) by Robert Southwell, another Jesuit at the English Seminar in Rome who was hanged at Tyburn for his staunch Catholic faith, and the work by an anonymous author, A Consolatory Letter to all the Afflicted Catholikes in England (1588), are both conjecturally attributed to Charlewood's press at 'Arundel House', although they respectively bear on the title-page 'Imprinted at Paris' and 'Imprinted at Roan in Normandy' as false imprints. But who was this earl of Arundel, apparently Charlewood's new patron at the time of Bruno's stay in London?

The question introduces us to the issue of Charlewood's possible commitment to Catholicism during the years 1581-88. The earl was Philip Howard (1557-1595), belonging to one of the most prominent noble families in England under the Tudors. Lord Philip Howard's story is paradigmatic of the family's misfortunes because of the religious beliefs of many of its members. His great-grandfather, the third Duke of Norfolk, had been imprisoned in 1546, while his grandfather, Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, had been executed under Henry VIII. His father, the fourth Duke of Norfolk, had been attained for intriguing with Mary, Queen of Scots, and executed in 1572. Soon after his father's death, Philip went to Cambridge where he graduated in 1576. At that time he seemed to conform to the established church and he gave no sign of a particular religious disposition. While in London Philip gained much favour at court and in 1580 he inherited the earldom from his maternal grandfather, Henry Fitzalan, twelfth earl of Arundel. Yet around 1581 or 1582, for some reasons he seems to have lost whatever

86 STC 12276.
87 The Marprelate Tracts: 54.
88 STC 22946 and 1032.
89 See M.A. Tierney 1834.
90 The conspiracy to dethrone Elizabeth was known as the Ridolfi Plot. On Ridolfi's mission in England and the implications of its aftermath, see J.H. Pollen 1920: 160-84.
91 Henry Fitzalan, twelfth Earl of Arundel (15117-1580), became the leader of the old nobility and the Catholic party supporting Mary Stuart's claim to the English throne at the end of the 50s. In 1532 he married Katherine, second daughter of Thomas Grey, marquis of Dorset, by whom he had three children. One of them, Mary, became the wife of Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, and the mother of Philip Howard. See DNB, XIX: 88-93.
degree of royal favour he had, and consequently he withdrew from court. Apart from his witnessing the public disputations of Campion and his companions with some Protestant ministers in 1581, the motives which may have brought Philip toward the Catholic faith the next year or two are unknown. Although the French ambassador in London, Michel de Castelnau, seigneur de la Mauvissière, dates his conversion as 1582 or 1583, it was only in September 1584 that he was formally accepted into the Catholic Church. Henceforth, he dedicated all his energies to serving his new religious faith, thus stirring up the anger of the Queen. In April 1585 Arundel, worried by the government's suspicion of him, attempted to flee the country; but his ship was captured and he was imprisoned in the Tower. Like his father, Philip was subsequently condemned for high treason, but he was not executed and he eventually died in the Tower in 1595.

It is notable, then, that the years of Charlewood’s service to Philip Howard coincided with those of his patron’s conversion to Catholicism. Because of the ambiguities of their positions and their frequent reversals of behaviour, the printer’s earlier acquaintance with Munday has also been considered by scholars as evidence of Charlewood’s possible connections with Catholicism. Nonetheless, in the following years, the printer seems to have turned Puritan, since he went on printing works for Puritan writers down to approximately the end of the 80s. Yet, the years 1589-90 surprisingly see Charlewood having a share in the Marprelate controversy on the side of the Anglican bishops.

children. One of them, Mary, became the wife of Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, and the mother of Philip Howard. See DNB, XIX:88-93.

92 The French ambassador wrote to Henry III shortly after Arundel’s capture in 1585 that “this young lord the Earl of Arundel took some new discontentment, either from seeing himself very little respected here, or from being in his heart of the Catholic religion” (PCRS, XXI:110).

93 The document concerning Philip Howard’s reconciliation to the Catholic Church is reported in J.H. Pollen and W. McMahon 1919:226 and is taken from Public Record Office, King’s Bench, Baga de secretis, Pouch 49, membrane 14.


95 The three tracts that Charlewood printed in response to the Church’s call for writings to defeat Martin Marprelate are: A countercuffe giuen to Martin Junior. 1589 (STC 19450); The returne o f the renowned caualiero Pasquill o f England. 1589 (STC 19456) and The firste parte of Pasquils Apologie. 1590 (STC 19457).
Allophius, being brought by the greatest perfection
in an order to the smallest liberty in his orelle, seeing the foundation of his
choice to term so it cannot beage, and finding the place of his im-
prisonment to strong as he cannot escape: whilst at the Tisac end by
on the two and twentieth day of January next anturing, at one of the
Closet in the afternoon, there to defend and maintaine against all
men whatsoever, for it comes a颗er, the wholelife, of any of the five Articles, which fol-
low, whereby be splendidly all, these other Women any Lady; whom thew may begge
of for any worth: or I true a Mistréffe, which hath reason to boast of the title for any beaute,
by these last three Articles.

1. The first, that his Mistréffe is for Beatuy of her face, and the Grace of her person, the most per-
fect creature, that ever either the eye of man hath behold, the Arre of Nature hath framed, or the com-
passe of the earth hath enjoyed.

2. The second, that it is as impossible for any other, whatsoever, to abide the beams of his Mistréffe
looke, as for the Cloudes to endure the shining and appearing of the Sunne, and that the one doth
not sooner vanish at the shewing of the Sunne, then the other will suddenly fade at the presence of his
Mistréffe,

3. The third, that the perfections of his Mistréffe, are in number so innumerable, in quality so excel-
ler, and in operation so effectual, as the by the help of them, and they by the direction of her, do
make more men without liberty, and more bodys without harms, Ellen any, or all the women in the
world besides.

And because Calliphas doubts that the taking upon him a quarrel which is to fall on
his lyke, will make that he shall have none to defend the contrary against him, and that the
woorsynellis of his mistrelle will stale away the enterprises of other Ladies, he will, with
one only allmaine, challenge all that either have opinion in the constancy of their love, or
assurance in the greatness of their affection, by these other three Articles.

4. The first, that Calliphas for his faith will yeilde to none, and for his loyalty doth thinke
himself above all, and in these two respects pronounceth himselfe moch worthy, to be accepted
into favor with his Mistréffe, or to receve grace at the hands of the fraytell.

5. The second, that the good will and affection of Calliphas to his Mistréffe, is so imprimit so
deepe, for continuance so lasting, and for passion so extreme, as it is impossible for any other to
carry so perfect love, or to conceive the like affection.

6. The thyrde, that those adventures and hazards, which cannot but be more fowere, to any other
for the pleasing of any Lady (whom they Honour) are moch sweete unto him, for the contenement
of the Mistréffe whom he fetheth.

And if they neither will contend with him for the superiects, or his Mistréffe in wooly syn-
elle, nor for the precegdace of himselfe in affection, having not there judgement bapleed with
so preceual an humor as may bide them to relite of manerely and open truth, and doubting a
bad Mistréffe to a toying opinion, because Vehas vince omnium, then will he, as his founde allainant,
with all fuch, tumme the course, to loyne both them in honouring of his Mistréffe, which
hath no equal, and expelling of his affection which cannot be matched.

Whereas this challenge of Justes, was signified by way of beute before her
Mistréffe, on Twistle night last past, to have been performed the fifteenth
day of January, her Mistréffe pleasure to for divers considerations, that it be
defereed until the two and twentieth of the same month, and then to be held at
Westminster, the accustomed place.

Proclaimed by the sound of Trumpet, and a Herald.

Imprinted at London by John Charlewood.

FIG. 3 Title-page of Calliphasus being brought by the greatest perfection... [1581].
(STC 13868.5).
In view of these considerations, we must try now to determine the chronological order of Charlewood’s religious inclinations in the course of his career as a printer. In the light of the data I have gathered up to now, it seems reasonable to identify three main phases in this evolution: Charlewood is predominantly committed to Puritanism and to the anti-popish cause from the beginning of his career through to the late 80s. This first phase is interrupted, in the years 1581-84, by the printing of books for the Catholic members of the Howard family, as well as of a book dedicated to the earl of Arundel himself. Afterwards, Charlewood’s press is found again to be involved in the production of books of Protestant and anti-Roman Catholic nature, at least up to 1587, when the two years 1587-88 apparently see a revival of the Catholic production. The third phase generally reverts back to Protestantism, notwithstanding the publications against the Puritan Marprelate, in defence of the Established Church of England. I shall turn next to a fuller consideration over Charlewood’s religious beliefs.

Charlewood’s book production was not concerned with the theological aspects of the Protestant quest only. In 1579, a book entitled *Newes out of Powles Churchyarde* was printed by Charlewood and Thomas East.\(^6\) This rare and unique work by Edward Hake, a Puritan author who did not refrain from showing a keen hatred of Roman Catholics, consists of eight satires which denounce clerical and legal abuses. Of particular interest is the sixth satire in which Hake makes clear the identification of the corrupt clergy and the Roman Catholics.

The problem of the corruption and weakness of the church and of clergy involves criticism of the moral aspects of the Christian life. Usury, human suffering, greed, oppression, discrepancy between rich and poor are nothing but the touchstone of the existing order in the church and therefore in society. In this respect, the reformers may be considered ‘revolutionary’, inasmuch as they condemned the established order as well as the institutions and society of their day, which they attempted to change. Some of the writings issued by Charlewood in many ways resemble this tradition of social-religious criticism. This is the case of the work *The Debate between Pride and Lowlines* printed

\(^6\) STC 12606. The book is dedicated to the Earl of Leicester.
for Newbury in circa 1577, which recalls the Piers Plowman literature of social criticism. But it is in 1582 that this tradition clearly emerges in Charlewood’s book production. Among the assignments from Awdely to Charlewood are: a book on the Plowman himself; an anonymous tract on Robin Conscience, another figure of the Plowman tradition, here representing the war of two generations – Robin being Protestant and his father Catholic – on the ground of social and religious values; the Libro [aureo] di Marco Aurelio by the Spaniard Antonio de Guevara, to suggest that it is the higher powers who are to blame; a book of husbandry, which, according to the Plowman literature, is very important to society and “takes a good deal of intelligence”; Writings by authors such as Robinson, who attacked the “wicked worldelinges”, and Stockwood, who denounced oppression by magistrates, clearly involving social aims, were also issued by Charlewood’s printing house.

Several anti-Roman publicists also supported the progressive party and their adherents in the war against Spain in the Netherlands. They wished to see a militant England championing the Protestant cause in Europe against the Catholic powers. Some of the numerous writers who engaged in propaganda for Netherlands campaign turned to Charlewood and his partners to have their works printed. Among these works the most significant is A Woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian Religion, a translation from the French of Philippe de Mornay, the most charismatic Huguenot leader. The book, whose translation was begun by Sidney and completed by Arthur Golding, was dedicated to Leicester and printed in 1587 for Cadman most likely by Charlewood and Robinson. Despite its philosophical nature, the work was intended to support Leicester’s campaign in the Netherlands and the cause of Protestant internationalism altogether. The appearance at this time, during Leicester’s campaign, and in Sidney’s
name of the book which Mornay du Plessis had prepared for Henry of Navarre gave strength to this purpose.

As England's prowess increased and the rift with Spain became more clearly marked, the patriotic cause of English Protestantism inevitably became associated with the New World movement, as already discussed in Chapter 1. A series of geographical publications consisting of accounts of recent discoveries and voyages to Africa, to the Near and to the Far East or the New World immediately flowed into the book market. It was not only English sources that were drawn on, but many translations from French and Spanish sources appeared. The popularity of this literary genre stimulated the book trade, thus representing a secure profit for printers. In 1581 a book by Nicholas Breton in praise of Francis Drake bears Charlewood's imprint. At the same time, an English translation from the Spanish called *The discoverie and conquest of the provinces of Peru* was published as a kind of joint venture by three different printers – including Charlewood – for Richard Jones. In 1583 Peckham's *A true reporte of the late discoveries of the Newfound Landes* was printed for Hinde at Charlewood's press, while seven years later the partnership Charlewood-Jones signed the copy of Breton's *The historie of the life and fortune of Don Frederigo di Terra Nuova*.

At the same time, the growing knowledge of geography and navigation helped to stimulate the production of works designed for seamen and dealing with astronomy. Titles which were brought out by Charlewood include: Madoxe's *A Learned and a godly sermon especially for all marryners* (1581), in which the astronomical material is subsidiary; as well as Tanner's *A Mirror for Mathematiques* (1587), describing the making and use of the astrolabe, the quadrant and the sphere; and *A Brieve Treatise of the ready use of the Sphere* (1591), a tiny handbook on the use of the armillary sphere. Apparently, two editions of the *Kalendar of Shepherdes* were printed by Charlewood on
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105 STC 3646.5.
106 STC 26123.
107 STC 19523.
108 STC 3658.5.
109 STC 17180.
110 STC 23674 and 23671.
behalf of Walley respectively in c. 1580 and 1585. This encyclopedic work, an English translation from the French book *Le Compost et Kalendrier des bergiers*, includes astronomical sections which, though neither extensive nor quite clear, are of great interest because they reached a wide audience. It gives a simple account of the universe along Ptolemaic lines and as an almanac represented a widespread printed source of astronomical information. Its popularity among middle class readers, together with the booklet entitled *The Compost of Ptholomeus, Prynce of Astronomye*, largely drawn from it, became the chief source of astronomical knowledge during the first half of the sixteenth century in England.

Travels and discoveries in the New World had also intensified interest in physical geography, botany, mineralogy, natural philosophy, alchemy and kindred sciences. A good number of books among Charlewood’s production in the years 1570-90 were designed to meet the popular demand for inexpensive treatises on ‘scientific’ themes. Such books are typical of an enormous literature supplying middle-class readers with information similar, as Wright claimed, “to that purveyed by modern magazines that traffic in science and pseudo-science.” In this respect, the production of Thomas Hill (fl. 1590) gives an idea of the ‘popularisation’ of what may be described as the applied science of his times. In 1571 he wrote a treatise on physiognomy. The treatise is lavish in its citations of Aristotle’s authority. It is found among the 1579 assignments from Denham to Charlewood. In 1584 Charlewood turned out another edition of Hill’s treatise on natural philosophy, a translation from Italian in which the author deals with such “magical” material as the qualities of the adamant stone, the secret properties of eggs, “how to turne water into wine”, as well as providing a brief recipe “to ease thy feete for going”. In this perspective, the presence of two treatises drawn from Paracelsus among Charlewood’s publications is far from bewildering. Finally, in 1585

---

111 STC 22416 and 22416.5.
112 The earliest known French edition of the work was published at Paris in 1493. The book was translated three different times into English – in 1503, 1506, 1508 – but later editions, including Charlewood’s, were based upon the 1518 edition which combined the 1506 and the 1508 translations.
113 See F.R. Johnson 1937:70-5.
114 L.B. Wright 1958:571.
115 STC 13480.7.
116 STC 19181.3 and 13215.
and 1590 the printer issued on behalf of Hacket two works by Pomponius Mela dealing with cosmography and translated from Latin by Arthur Golding.\(^{117}\) This latter, one of the most distinguished translators in Elizabethan times, collaborated with Charlewood on several occasions.

Although he mainly concerned himself with religious works, especially translations from Calvin and other continental writers, as well as controversial pamphlets, Golding was first known as a translator of the classics. In this respect, his most important work was a translation in 1567 of Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*, which he dedicated to Leicester. The same year saw Tuberville’s *Heroical Epistles*, a version of Ovid’s *Heroides*, another edition of which Charlewood turned out in 1584.\(^{118}\) This was not the only work of Englishing the pagan classics with which Charlewood was involved during his activity as printer. In 1575 an English version by Fleming of Virgil’s *Bucolikes* was issued by Charlewood for Thomas Woodcock, while an edition of Seneca’s *Hippolytus* by Thomas Newton can be found among Jones’s assignments to Charlewood.\(^{119}\) A further group of assignments from master Robert Walley, which ‘is agreed shalbe printed by John Charlewood for the said Thomas Adams’ concerned English versions of works by Sallust and Cato.\(^{120}\) We shall see the implications of such publications with respect to both contemporary book production and Bruno’s dialogues in the next sections. For now I limit myself to observing that there are traces of Charlewood’s involvement even in the printing of Greek classics, now turned into English from the Latin.\(^{121}\)

During the last decade of his activity Charlewood increasingly produced popular literature, such as romances, realistic tales, books of wonders, narrative of the practices of witches, almanacs, treatises on health, ballads and journalistic pamphlets. Actually, although he is not mentioned in Shaaber’s study among the publishers who specialised in the publication of news, Charlewood profusely turned to this popular genre. Between 1580 and 1590 about thirty titles ranging from personal news to accounts of battles in

\(^{117}\) STC 17785-6.
\(^{118}\) STC 18943.
\(^{119}\) STC 24816 and 22221.
\(^{120}\) SR, II:596.
\(^{121}\) STC 10566 f. Jones; STC 886 *ent.*; STC 181.5 f. Walley.
Ireland, Spain and Netherlands, popular news reporting strange events and miracles, records of calamities and translations from foreign news are listed among Charlewood’s entries or publications. In this perspective, the issuing in 1584-85 of six books in the Italian language dealing with philosophical, cosmological and ethical matters has been considered by most critics as rather inconsistent with the bulk of Charlewood’s publications. The author was Giordano Bruno, the Dominican friar who left Italy in 1578 in consequence of minor charges of heresy. After a short stay in Switzerland, where he embraced Calvinism, and a three-years stay in France, in the spring of 1583 Bruno reached England, a country which seemed to him the right place for bringing about a cultural and speculative policy of religious tolerance and reconciliation in Europe. While there, he had turbulent relations with both the English academies and society and probably the court. As a matter of fact, dealing with works in Italian was an unusual procedure for Charlewood’s press; consequently there is good reason to investigate his practices as a printer in search of evidence to account for his ‘surprising’ publications.

The question gives rise to three main related problems, which can be summarised as follows: 1) why Bruno turned his London dialogues over to Charlewood and not, for instance to Wolfe, the obvious printer for any Italian who wanted his own writings published in London;\(^\text{122}\) 2) whether or not Charlewood had any typographical experience whatsoever with Italian texts at the time of the printing of Bruno’s works; 3) whether or not Bruno’s dialogues are consistent with Charlewood’s book production, and, a more significant question, whether or not there were any specific intention or reason for the printing of such books. As I shall discuss later on, many of the publications coming from Charlewood’s press contain some of Bruno’s favourite topics for discussion couched in terms that the Nolan himself has used in his dialogues. Accordingly, in the following sections, I shall suggest that Bruno applied to Charlewood’s press not for his typographical skills but in the light of his established pattern of publications, a pattern into which Bruno’s writings, at the time, fitted well.

\(^\text{122}\) See M.G. Bellorini 1971:29 and 49. See also above, 60-1.
II.

John Charlewood and his contemporaries

The purpose of the following analysis is to investigate any possible relation between Charlewood’s book production and the general trends shared by the printers of his time. This task is of some difficulty because of both the great variety of these publications covering all kinds of literary genres, and the alleged ambiguity of Charlewood’s political and religious views which apparently led him to different or even incongruous stances over a period of time. He by no means scorned establishing partnerships with Protestant printers, publishers or booksellers, such as Hugh Singleton, charged with printing a political and religious book challenging the Queen’s authority; Robert Waldegrave, the printer of the Marprelate publications against the Established Church; Richard Jugge, who became royal printer conjointly with Gabriel Cawood on the accession of Queen Elizabeth; Thomas Woodcock, the bookseller who was imprisoned in Newgate in 1578 for selling Cartwright’s *Admonition to the Parliament*. What is more, during the years 1584-90, Charlewood is often found printing in partnership with such ‘disorderly’ printers as Roger Ward, Thomas Hackett, John Wight and John Wolfe. Concomitantly, largely because of Charlewood’s close associations with John Allde the printer, with Munday the writer, as well as with the Howard family scholars have concluded that the printer definitely inclined towards Catholicism. Marprelate’s allegation that Charlewood was on the side of the Pope\(^{123}\) seems also to reinforce the evidence of the printer’s adherence to that faith. Nevertheless, since attacks on popery are undoubtedly a recurring element in the whole of Charlewood’s book production, as demonstrated above, in this section I intend to investigate the printer’s religious positions and possibly to clarify Maprelate’s claims. The first matter I propose to discuss is concerning with the issue of when Charlewood initially came into contact with such controversial figures.

Anthony Munday was seventeen when Charlewood in 1577 licensed *The Defence of Povertie against the Desire of Worldlie Riches*, ‘Dialogue wise collected by Anthonie Mundaye’\(^{124}\). Unfortunately, the copy placed at Stationers’ Hall has perished, but there is

\(^{123}\) See below, 119-20.

\(^{124}\) SR, II:320.
evidence that it was in full accordance with the precepts of Thomas Proctor, a zealous Roman Catholic under Queen Mary.\(^{125}\) Charlewood and young Munday might have originally met at the shop of John Allde, who had been the latter’s master from August 1576 to the fall of 1578.\(^{126}\) That Charlewood associated with Allde’s shop is not a secret.\(^{127}\) In 1577 Allde signed a petition against privileges.\(^{128}\) A few years later Charlewood was recorded as one of the leaders of the secret organisation against restrictions.\(^{129}\) By that time, 1582, Munday made his residence in the Barbican, which was Charlewood’s address too.\(^{130}\)

Yet, during Munday’s apprenticeship, both his patron, the earl of Oxford, and Charlewood seemed to be familiar with the Catholic nobility.\(^{131}\) In fact, the connections between Allde and Thomas, fourth Duke of Norfolk (1536-1572), of the Howard family,\(^{132}\) a prominent Catholic, are remarkably similar to those between Chalewood and Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel. Presumably, it was Charlewood himself who, in 1578, helped Munday to become a protégé of Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, the cousin and, from 1576 to 1580, a fellow-Catholic and close friend of Lord Henry Howard. As the Earl of Oxford was a typical ‘Italianate’ Englishman, he may have suggested to his protégé the idea of travelling to Italy and learning the tongue of his favourite country.\(^{133}\) Despite his confession in 1580 that he had been a Catholic since 1576 and his later charging of his cousin as well as his friends Charles Arundel and Francis Southwell with disloyalty for belonging to the Scottish and Catholic party, the

\[\text{SR, II:69.}\]

\[\text{125 C. Turner Wright (1928:8) argues that this work was “no doubt similar to the classical arguments for poverty in The Defence of Contrarie translated by Munday in 1593”.}\]

\[\text{126 J. Allde is found to have “one or two publisher allies, such as John Charlewood and White” (DNB, XIII:1188).}\]

\[\text{127 SR, I:xxvii and 111.}\]

\[\text{128 See above, 49-50.}\]

\[\text{129 C. Turner Wright 1928:63.}\]

\[\text{130 Munday himself gives a statement about his journey to Italy, claiming that he went there because of the need to “attaine some understandeing in the languages” (G. Galigani 1965:105-22).}\]
Earl of Oxford was readmitted to the court in the same year. Munday continued to dedicate works to him until 1583, when the Earl’s favour at court was definitely over. Whether or not he embraced Catholicism while at the English Seminary in Rome, as his patron certainly did, after that date Munday behaved like a zealous Protestant, and so did Charlewood.

Nonetheless, six years later they were both accused of ‘Popery’ in the Marprelate pamphlets. Now chief officer in hunting down the impudent Marprelate, in 1589 Munday was satirised by his rival as follows:

I thanke you Master Monday, you are a good Gentleman of your word. Ah thou Judas, thou that hast already betrayed the Papists, I thinke meanest to betray us also.

‘Martin Mar-prelate’ was the pen-name of a group of Puritan pamphleteers who, with the support of powerful courtiers, ran an illegal press all over the country in the years 1588-89, making violent attacks on the Anglican bishops, particularly those in high positions in the Church of England. The substance of the tracts is standard fare, especially the objection that the Established Church’s hierarchical structure does not reflect Early Church practice, and casts doubt on the discreditable behaviour of the clergy. For this reason, Martin boldly demanded that the episcopacy be replaced with a presbyterian system of government. In the first of these pamphlets, the Epistle, the author/s complained that the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, while enforcing the Star Chamber decree of 1586 against the Puritan printer Waldegrave – who secretly set his press to issue some of these tracts – had allowed ‘popish’ printers to go unpunished on two occasions in 1587. The one was named Thackwell, “a printer of Welsh popish book”, the second was “I.C., the Earl of Arundel’s man”. The latter was accused of supplying the earl of Arundel with an illegal press in February of the same year. It is worth quoting an excerpt from the Epistle, which appeared in October 1589:

134 The three men replied to the charges asserting that the Earl of Oxford was a drunkard, an atheist and a would-be murderer. See J.W. Bennett 1952:354-69.
135 The Marprelate Tracts:352-4. The tract, entitled The just Censure and Reproofe, is commonly known as Martin Senior. The words are put into the Archbishop of Canterbury’s mouth.
136 Cf. above, 57-8.
And, good your Grace [i.e. J. Bridges], I do now remember myself of another printer that had press and letter, in a place called the Charterhouse in London, in anno 1587, near about the time of the Scottish Queen's death [i.e. 8th Feb. 1587]. Intelligence was given unto your good Grace of the same, by some of the Stationers in London. It was made known unto you what work was in hand; what letter the book was on; what volume; \textit{viz.} in 8°; in half sheets; what workmen wrought on the same, namely, I.C., the Earl of Arundel's man, and three of his servants, with their several names; what liberality was bestowed on those workmen, and by whom &c., your Grace gave the Stationers the hearing of this matter.\footnote{The Marprelate Tracts:54.}

While scholars have little doubt that the book was Robert Southwell's \textit{Epistle of Comfort},\footnote{See C. Devlin 1956:138-48.} that John Charlewood was its printer is by no means certain. We may deem acceptable the reasons for the first attribution, whilst I shall concern myself with presenting some additional evidence that I believe should be taken into account.

As already mentioned, Charlewood had his shop in the Barbican. Nonetheless, Martin accused him of supplying the machinery and labour for printing in “a place called the Charterhouse”, which from 1565 was to bear the name of Howard House from the name of its new owner, Thomas Howard, fourth Duke of Norfolk.\footnote{See G.S. Davies 1922 and A. Fraser (ed.) 1994.} On this ground, the STC indicates 'London, in Arundel House' as the imprint of Southwell’s \textit{Epistle} even though it is marked ‘in Paris’.\footnote{STC 22946 a.v.} The entry is puzzling. In his book on Charterhouse, Davies maintains that Arundel House, of which in recent times all trace has disappeared, stood in the Strand, “over several acres of ground slightly to the west of a line drawn from St. Clement Danes to the river”.\footnote{G.S. Davis 1922:143.} In contrast, Charterhouse, or Howard House by Smithfield in the Strand, stood between Pardon Churchyard and Long Lane. As far as we know, there is even no evidence that Philip Howard himself ever lived in Charterhouse. In fact, the Arundel MS states that the Countess of Arundel lived in the countryside while her husband kept court at Arundel House. When in 1580 Philip succeeded to his grandfather Henry Fitzalan Earl of Arundel’s title and estates, they came together and lived at Arundel House. While the earls had lodgings there as their place of residence in
London, Charterhouse was let from 1573 for some years onwards to the Portuguese ambassador, but the records do not say for how long it continued to be his residence. How could Martin Marprelate have inferred, then, that Charlewood printed ‘Popery’ for the Earl of Arundel using Charterhouse as his secret press?

In May 1583 Charlewood reportedly possessed two presses. The connection with Southwell is that he had as a patron the Countess of Arundel. According to her biographer, the Countess of Arundel, who had two small properties where she retired, may have persuaded her relatives-in-law, Henry and Philip Howard, who in turn persuaded and bribed Charlewood, their printer, to allow the old Howard press in one of the Countess’s residence at Acton, for the use of Catholics. Who might have been his assistants is difficult to ascertain. Since Martin could have known that Charlewood used to print for the Howard family during the years 1581-84, he might have only supposed that there would still be an old disused press in the Howard’s lodgings at the Charterhouse, which was in fact not very far from Charlewood’s official dwelling shop in the Barbican. In addition, it was Waldegrave himself who claimed that he had sold his press to “an allowed printer, J.C., one of his own Company, with the knowledge of his Warden Henry Denham”, a fact which is corroborated also by the Archbishop of Canterbury’s reply to Martin:

The Calumnation touching the Presse and the Letters in the Carterhouse (which presse Waldegraue himselfe soulede to one of the Earl of Arundels men, as it is since confessed) must receiue the same answere with the other of Thackwell […]  

In my view there is no precise documentary information to support the hypothesis that Charlewood used Charterhouse on behalf of the Arundel family after 1584. The fear of being persecuted as a Catholic by the authorities must have prevented the printer from further associations with the noble family. On 25 April 1585, while attempting to flee
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142 SR, I:248.
143 The Lives of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, and of Anne Dacres his Wife consists of two seventeenth-century manuscripts by an unknown Jesuit who was the Countess’s chaplain for the last fourteen years of her life. It was published in 1857 from the original manuscript of the Duke of Norfolk.
144 The Marprelate Tracts:272.
145 Ibid., 55.
from England because of his Catholic faith, Philip was arrested and Howard House taken over by the Government. It was at that time that Southwell, who seems to have moved to Arundel House, composed *An Epistle of Comfort* for the consolation of the imprisoned Earl of Arundel. How could Charlewood have gone unscathed if he had had a secret Catholic press there? By that time he might have either sold the press to someone else or abandoned it. Southwell’s *Epistle* and the 1588 anonymous letter to ‘all the afflicted catholikes in England’ have been ascribed tentatively to Charlewood’s press on the basis of their ornaments. It is superfluous here to recall that ornaments might pass from one printer to another, though this practice did not generally happen during one printer’s business career.

Yet, such considerations, whether plausible or not, fail to deal with the main core of the matter, namely Charlewood’s religious leanings. Even though some evidence seems to suggest the opposite, none of Charlewood’s publications overtly identifies him with the Catholic programme. The 1581 *Oration* by Nichols is a confutation of the work itself in support of the author’s sincere intention to turn to Anglicanism. The broadside for the tournament honouring Philip Howard was printed when the Earl was not yet a Catholic convert. Henry Howard’s innermost faith was rather ambiguous too. Like many of the Elizabethan titled nobility and members of their families, he was a crypto-Catholic, pursuing alternatively recusant and non-recusant strategies. His *Defensative* was above all an attempt by the author to distance himself from the ominous charges made by the Earl of Oxford against him about a mysterious book containing painted
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146 Northampton’s *Defensive against the poyson of supposed prophesies*, dating 1583, bears in the Epistle Dedicatorie: “From Howarde house”.
147 STC 1032.
148 In 1595 two editions of Southwell’s poems (STC 22955.7, 22957) were printed by John Wolfe, whose Protestant leanings cannot be questioned. Similarly, the *Short Rules of a Good Life*, doubtfully attributed to Southwell, was entered to Wolfe on the 25 November 1598. (SR, III:132)
149 PPD:xlv.
150 In the *Confutation of the Oration made before the 4 Cardinalles, and the dominican Inquisitor*, which appears in each copy of the three extant editions of the work, Nichols writes: “And yet I have good hope, that considering I was then a Papist, living in error and idolatry, and am now in the trueth [...]” and carries on: “I desire thee to respect me as I am, not as I was, and to forget my folly, on the establishing of my faith”. I refer here to the copy preserved at the Brasenose College, Oxford. In 1583 Nichols again turned to Catholicism and expressed penitence, retracting his accusation against the Roman Church. He died at the end of the same year or in 1584.
151 See above, 104-5.
pictures of treasonable prophecy.\textsuperscript{152} Howard was clearly conducting a polemic against English Puritans and their institution of “prophesying”, condemning political prognostication and the consultation of cunning men. The *Defensative* was also written in support of the queen’s proposed marriage to the Duke of Anjou, denouncing Leicester’s manoeuvres to prevent it. This is perfectly consistent with Bruno’s positions shortly after his arrival in England.\textsuperscript{153} Finally, Greene’s *Arbasto*, dedicated to the Earl of Arundel, is a series of dialogues on the subject of love. Moreover, the fact that the name of Charlewood does not appear either in Fulke’s *Catalogue of Popish Bookes*,\textsuperscript{154} or in the list of “Trayterous and popish bookes” which was submitted by secret agents to the Master of the Stationers’ Company in 1584, seems to strengthen our assumption. The connection with Munday also goes in that direction. Several of Munday’s imprints represent the radical Puritan point of view and his insistence on defining himself as a former “Popes scholars” at the English Seminary in Rome can be convincingly explained by the need to make his anti-Roman pamphlets more credible.\textsuperscript{155}

There is also a further question I think worth raising. This is concerned with patronage, one of the most important factors affecting printing in Elizabethan times. Rather than being merely a one-way system of perpetual praise, patronage in the English Renaissance is a practice of exchange in which the personal motives of writers and printers or publishers should not be overlooked. In this respect, the patron’s desire to be praised in order to enhance his or her own social standing is equalled both by the author’s expectation that response is acknowledged and rewarded and by the printer’s concern with preserving and protecting his own economic interest. In terms of religion, this meant that writers and printers would adjust the religious materials they chose to

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 105.

\textsuperscript{153} The first version of Bruno’s *Cena de le ceneri* is not openly in support of the Puritan wing of the English Protestants as it would become in the revised version. See G. Aquilecchia 1993 (c). Interestingly enough, J. Bossy has suggested that the “Malcontent” to whom Bruno addressed the prefatory poem to the *Cena de le ceneri* was Henry Howard and that the two boatmen in the second dialogue of the same text were the same Henry and his nephew Philip Arundel. See J. Bossy 1991:110-29 and 99-104.

\textsuperscript{154} The *Catalogue of all such Popish Bookes either answered or to be answered which have been written in the English tongue from beyond the Seas or secretly dispersed in England*, appeared in 1579. It was reprinted three times, revised and supplemented. The 1580 version includes forty-one titles of Catholic books printed abroad and at secret English presses.

print according to circumstances and sometimes leaving aside their own religious beliefs. As a consequence, patronage produced competing and possibly contradictory interests and practices, often subverting more official interests. Such a mutuality of interest, which is endemic to the Elizabethan discourse of patronage, pervades Charlewood’s book production. Despite the ambiguity of their positions, for instance, both Munday and Nichols were sponsored by Leicester, one of the most influential protectors of Puritan writers. This was because their pamphlets were useful for the anti-Catholic propaganda of which Leicester was the chief sponsor. Thus Arundel’s connection with Charlewood’s press do not necessary imply that the printer subscribed to his patron’s religious agenda.

Similarly, to explain the ambiguity of the printer’s religious beliefs merely in terms of ‘opportunism’ appears to be rather restrictive. By describing Charlewood as a somewhat irresponsible person, who, “indifferent to divergent religious issues, only sought profit from his profession”, one might forget that the ambiguity of religious belief, both political and religious, is a striking feature of the Tudor age, a state of affairs all the more understandable if one remembers that England was a country in which, in less than half a century, four sovereigns had reformed the State and religion according to four religious creeds, and to which the formula *cuius regio, eius et religio* had applied absolutely. The shifting religious priorities over the centuries, which eventually culminated in the legislation that has come to be known as the Elizabethan Settlement, made any kind of ‘consistency’ in the rapidly emerging printing and publishing trade impossible. As one of the leading Elizabethan historians of religion has recently suggested, it is at least as difficult to decipher the innermost faith of several of the most celebrated Elizabethans as it is to define Queen Elizabeth’s religion itself. This is equally true for such figures as Edmund Spenser, Robert Dudley, Sir Philip Sidney and William Shakespeare.
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156 L. Rostenberg 1971:57.
157 The principle that the territorial ruler could determine whether his lands were to be Lutheran or Catholic (“to whom the kingdom, his the religion”), was one of the main consequences of the 1555 Peace of Augsburg which temporarily ended the religious wars in Europe.
A defensative against
the poysome of supposed
Prophesyes:

Not hitherto confuted by the penne
of any man, which being grounded
by either upon the
warrant and authority of olde paynted bookes, explications
of Dreams, Oracle, Revelations, Invocations of dammed
spirites, Paginallery of a pseude, or any other kind of pretended
knowledge whatsoever; De futures containing anthras, have beene classes as
great disorder in the common wealth, and chiefly among the simple
and vlemen, because very needfull to be published
at this time, considering the truth which grew
by most paynted and pseude wittes

By Henry Earl of Northampton

Quare detraslibis sermonibus veritatis t cume obiis nullus iter, qui pollic
arguere me veruntamen quod cepissir explet, et videre an mentias
wherfore have you detracted from the sooth of truth, since there is
some among you that is able to repose me? What have ye been
beguine full, and see whether I knowe

AT LONDON
Printed by John Charlewood, Printer
to the right Honourable Earle
of Arundell. 1583.
In addition, no publisher or printer was in business for disinterested love of knowledge, especially in the Elizabethan years, where living standards were far from high. Thus, it is fairly conceivable that their main concerns were for the market demand in relation to monetary consideration. As a practical printer Charlewood was neither more nor less than a businessman of his times who attempted to accommodate his religious positions to the varying tides of fortune. In this respect, his practices and habits as a printer do not differ from his contemporaries in the printing trade.

There is, finally, another crucial aspect of the enquiry we have to deal with, namely Charlewood’s practice with texts in Latin and in foreign languages.

As early as 1960, Professor Aquilecchia narrowed Charlewood’s significant typographical experience with Latin – apart from Bruno’s *Explicatio Triginta Sigillorum*— to the following works:

- *Oration and Sermon made at Rome ... by John Nichols* (1581): 17 sheets;
- *Mariae Scotorum Reginae Epitaphium* (1587?) by I. Hercusanus: 8 distichs;
- *Magnifico ac strenuo viro .... by I. Hercusanus* (1587?): 13 distichs;

which he regarded as “a quite negligible quantity as far as the enquiry we intend to carry out is concerned”. To these, I would add the 1579 *Sapientissimi regis Salomonis concio* – whose set of ornaments bears out the stipulation in the entry, that is to say the book was printed by Charlewood for Wolfe, as well as some quotations from Latin scattered in several other works issued from Charlewood’s press.

As far as foreign languages are concerned, it is worth mentioning a 1569 book almost entirely written in French which has been ascribed to Charlewood’s press. It is a small octavo containing Raphel Micheli’s dedication to the “tresnoble and vetueus seigneur G. Paulet”; and an elegy and a sonnet by the same author. Curiously enough, the copy which I have examined – preserved at the British Library – presents at the end

---

159 See below, 140.
161 See below, footnote 175.
162 I have found no record about Raphael Micheli in the DBF.
of the volume an anonymous writing in Latin which bears the title *De Miseriis et fragilitate humanae vitae libellus*. As the numbering of pages starts again, going from A1 to C8, it can be argued that it was not originally in the volume and that it might have been inserted later. At any rate, the STC attributes the volume to Charlewood’s press on account of the ornaments on both the frontispiece and the dedication and of the two initials of the first and the second sonnet.

Charlewood’s friendship with Munday might also furnish some clarity to the apparent incongruity with respect to the printing of Italian texts. Munday’s ability as a translator from both French and Italian is not to be questioned, though the quality of his translations has been often disputed. Between 1576 and 1578, he appears to have been a scholar of Claudius Hollyband, a London Huguenot who offered Latin, French, Italian, penmanship and arithmetic ‘in Paules Churcheyard by the signe of the Lucrece’.

Furthermore, his journey to Rome should have at least improved, if not perfected, his knowledge of Italian. Although it would be absurd to suppose any connection between Munday and Micheli’s book, as at the date of its printing he was only a boy, it is surely more plausible to assume that he might have played a role in the issuing from Charlewood’s press of works in English whose original was in French or Italian. Or he might perhaps have had a hand even in the editions of Bruno’s dialogues, since Charlewood at that time was engaged in the printing of a play adapted from an Italian comedy. The translation, attributed to Munday, totals around 155 words in Latin or Italian, which are taken over directly from the original edition. As a result, the evidence merely suggests that at the time of the publication of Bruno’s works the Italian vernacular was at least familiar to Charlewood. But the reason why the Italian philosopher applied to Charlewood rather than Wolfe, the favourite printer of all Italians in London, is still obscure. I offer here some conjectures.

Giordano Bruno arrived in England in April 1583, with letters of recommendation from Henry III to the French ambassador in London Michel de Castelnau. During the
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163 STC 17857.5 a.v.
164 M. Byrne 1949:12-15.
165 This assumption has received fuller consideration in T. Provvidera 1996:361-7.
166 STC 19447. See below, 150-51.
two years he spent in London, Bruno lodged at the French embassy where he made
acquaintance with most of the prominent figures in the Elizabethan court.167 Among
them, there were Philip Sidney and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, but also most of
the notable members of the Catholic party, such as the Howards and the Earl of Oxford
via Castelnau. Most probably Bruno through one of these figures was brought into
contact with Charlewood, who in turn had some direct connections with both the
Catholic nobility and, perhaps, with Leicester and his entourage.168 If this is the case,
although Yates's well known arguments about Bruno's religious and political 'mission'
in England on behalf of the king of France, Henry III, aiming to form a 'politique' group
in England - corresponding to the 'politiques' of France169 - today appear as a relatively
inadequate explanation for the Italian philosopher's position and role in London,
nevertheless Charlewood's 'median' stance would better fit with Bruno's alleged policy
of conciliation between Protestants and Catholics.170 If Bruno, in fact, worked, according
to Yates, to 'reach' both crypto-Catholic and moderate Protestant opinion among
English intellectuals, then John Charlewood's activity, in view of the printer's
connections with both these groups, might have seemed in Bruno's eyes as perfectly
consistent with such a programme. The fact that Bruno stayed in the household of
Michel de Castelnau, who had fought in person on behalf of Henry III against Protestants
and Catholic alike in the French Wars of Religion (1562-98), seems to provide further
evidence for Yates's arguments. Finally, if we may trust what Byrne says about literal
accuracy being the rule in Charlewood's printing house,171 which implies that the

---

167 On the similarities between some of Bruno's passages and Castelnau's considerations upon the
disastrous effects of religious wars and religious intolerance, see N. Ordine, introduction to
*Oeuvres/Expulsion*:ix-ccvi.

168 Charlewood's loyalty to the cause of Protestantism constitutes the main argument in support of this
hypothesis. It has also to be noted that a prayer "for the preservation of the earle of Leicester, and all his
well-wyllers and followers",
dating to 1585, has been conjecturally attributed to Charlewood's press on
behalf of William Mantel. (STC 7289). Furthermore, an epitaph upon the death of the Earl of Leicester
is entered to Charlewood on 10 December 1589 (SR, II:536). To the same press the STC ascribes the


170 Although he does not see the entire corpus of Bruno's dialogues as being prominently political and
religious in its scope, Professor Aquilecchia in his 1973 introduction to *De la Causa*
 wrote that "non è
da escludere che la sua [i.e. di Bruno] posizione filosofica potesse risultare confacente alle istanze
politeo-religiose dei politiques francesi e della stessa monarchia" (1973:xlii).

171 See M. St. Clare Byrne 1923:9-23.
compositor adhered to the manuscript exactly, it may have been easier for Bruno, who probably was also the editor of his works,\textsuperscript{172} to avoid any substantial interference or errors in the printing of his books. Alternatively, Bruno might have met Charlewood at the Royal Exchange, near St. Paul, one of the favourite meeting points for the Italians in London and in 1582-84 for the dissident printers alike.\textsuperscript{173} It also seems feasible that it might have been Wolfe who recommended to Bruno that he apply to Charlewood as the printer of his books. During those years, Wolfe’s press was kept busy in the printing of some of the Machiavelli and Aretino editions and he must have had no time left for further works.\textsuperscript{174}

Of course, this outline of events is purely conjectural. What seems to be more certain is Charlewood’s acquaintance with Wolfe. They both joined as “dissenters” the protest against the patentees in the years 1582-84; they both pioneered the use of false imprints for foreign propaganda and, legal or not (both Charlewood and Wolfe printed illegally and fictitiously), their printing enterprises were among the busiest in London. Yet there are several pieces of evidence that the two printers also established a business relationship. Wolfe’s first entry in the Stationers’ Registers was a Latin book licensed to him on condition that he had it printed by Charlewood;\textsuperscript{175} and there is evidence that this condition was carried out.\textsuperscript{176} From that time onwards, Wolfe and Charlewood worked in harmony on several occasions. In 1582, Wolfe printed \textit{Archdeaconry},\textsuperscript{177} a work which

\textsuperscript{172} That Bruno could have been directly involved in the editing of his books may be inferred from the fact that in 1578/79, while in Geneva, he acquired some typographical experience as a proof-corrector and editor. See G. Aquileccia 1997 (b):325-68.

\textsuperscript{173} John Florio in his \textit{Second Fruites} mentions that Italians in London customarily met at the Exchange. The distance from the French Embassy, Bruno’s dwelling during his stay in London, to the Exchange was a shortish walk, whether considering it as located in Butcher Row or at Salisbury Court. On the dissident printers and their meeting point at the Exchange, see above, 90.

\textsuperscript{174} Aretino’s first and second part of the \textit{Ragionamenti} bear in their imprint respectively: 21 October 1584 and January 1584; Machiavelli’s double volume \textit{I Discorsi} and \textit{Il Principe} has 28 January 1584. The dating referring to January is old style and should be understood as 1584/5. See D.B. Woodfield 1973:10.

\textsuperscript{175} SR, II:353.

\textsuperscript{176} STC 2761. \textit{Sapientissimi Regis Salomonis Concio....in Latinam linguam ab A. Corrano versa}. [J. Charlewood f.] per J. Wolfium expensis ipsius Authoris, 1579. This is the first book published by Wolfe. As Charlewood’s name does not appear in any of the extant copies of the work, the attribution to his press has been inferred by comparing the set of ornaments in light of what the Registers record.

\textsuperscript{177} STC 10275.
was later entered to Charlewood.\textsuperscript{178} The 1583 Protestant text \textit{A Declaration made by the archbishop of Collen}, i.e. Gebhardt Truchsess von Waldburg, translated into English from Latin, resembles the 1579 work in its STC record,\textsuperscript{179} Charlewood being the printer and Wolfe the publisher, and so does the \textit{Deposition of D. Piementelli concerning the Armada} printed in 1588 by Charlewood for Wolfe.\textsuperscript{180}

It is precisely starting from that date that the collaboration between the two printers seems to become closer. In 1589 Charlewood prints for Wolfe an anonymous work on the history of Catherine Cooper,\textsuperscript{181} the unlucky daughter of a Protestant who was visited by the devil. Concomitantly, an English translation of Bartolome Felippe’s \textit{Tractado del Conseio} appears to be printed in partnership, Wolfe having printed only the first quire.\textsuperscript{182} Two years later, the Latin book \textit{A proceeding in the harmonie of King Davids harpe} by Strigelius and translated into English by R. Robinson, was the last work issued under the two printers’ names.\textsuperscript{183} The fact that Wolfe, now the Stationers’ watchdog, did not proceed against Charlewood’s pirating of \textit{Le Masque De La ligue et De l’Hispagnol decouuert}, which Munday had translated for the former in 1589, seems also to support the hypothesis of a friendship between the two printers.\textsuperscript{184} In September 1593, six month after Charlewood’s death, his widow Alice printed the anonymous \textit{Remonstrance to the Duke de Mayne} on behalf of Wolfe.\textsuperscript{185} It is also worth noting that after 1583 Wolfe had passed some of his types (which, anyway, in some cases are similar even if not identical) to Charlewood.\textsuperscript{186} This fact is of great importance because it definitely shows the closeness between the two printers, especially considering that during those years the ‘piracy’ of books was a very common practice and that the protection of the rights of the printers was rather inadequate.

\textsuperscript{178} SR, II:465.  
\textsuperscript{179} STC 11693.  
\textsuperscript{180} STC 19935.  
\textsuperscript{181} STC 5678.  
\textsuperscript{182} STC 10753. This is the English version of the original in Spanish which was fictitiously printed by Wolfe in the same year. See D.B. Woodfield 1973:15.  
\textsuperscript{183} STC 23359.  
\textsuperscript{184} STC 7.  
\textsuperscript{185} STC 5012.  
\textsuperscript{186} See H.R. Hoppe 1933:274-8.
Charlewood’s book production does not appear much different from Wolfe’s output in content too. In about 1580, Wolfe published his very first Italian book, *Una Essortatione al timor di Dio*, a collection of poems and an essay by Jacopo Aconcio, a man of heterodox religious opinions who hoped to reform the Church and to compromise with the Protestants.\(^{187}\) In this respect, the importance of these writings mainly resides in their strong plea for political and religious toleration. That moderation and tolerance were the central theme of many titles printed by Wolfe, particularly of those works by the Italian exiles that he issued in the 1580s, has been discussed in the previous chapter. However, what seems to be relevant in Aconcio’s book is a reference to a sun-centred vision of the cosmos.\(^{188}\) Aconcio’s own rough formulation of a cosmology, relatively close to the Copernican system of the universe, contributed to the development of a new vision that broke down the notion of the Earth’s hierarchy, both religious and social, which had found its justification in the hierarchical structure of the universe.

The insistence on unity within Christianity and the opportunity to achieve a religious and political reconciliation between Roman Catholics and Reformed Christians constitute the main issues of Wolfe’s French political pamphlets from 1587 to the early 90s, too. They form a conceptual framework for Wolfe’s effort to bring the international political debate to the attention of his London readers. Describing the major controversies and their causes arising in France, Wolfe advocated his ideal of cooperation among Christians, against the intransigent League formed by the Duke of Guise. Interestingly enough, this goal must have appealed to Charlewood too, for *The Declaration of the King of Nauarre*, entered to him in 1585,\(^{189}\) is openly biased in favour of Henry of Navarre, champion of unity and of the tolerance of religious differences. The same idea would be restated four years later in the anti-Catholic prayer eliciting the protection of Elizabeth I and Henry III against the Catholic League, which has also been ascribed to Charlewood’s press.\(^{190}\) It is therefore remarkable that among Charlewood’s

---

\(^{187}\) See also above, 79-80.

\(^{188}\) *Essortatione*: 8-9. For an analysis of this passage, see C.C. Huffman: 24-7.

\(^{189}\) STC 13106; also SR, II: 443.

\(^{190}\) STC 16520.5. Henry III was often associated with Queen Elizabeth as the King who believed in an
assignments dated 1582 we find Antonio de Guevara’s *Libro aureo di Marco Aurelio*, in which the author, in dealing with the royal and imperial virtue of Justice, used the image of Virgo-Astrea to lead up to the doctrine of the divine origin of kings. But it is with the Charlewood-Wolfe English version of Felippe’s *Tractado del Conseio*, which was regarded by contemporary readers as a model of reason and moderation between the polemical excesses of both the Puritans and the Anglicans, that the two printers’ religious and political attitudes are definitely displayed.

We have already mentioned that during those years, 1588-89, both Charlewood and Wolfe were occupied as printers in the Marprelate controversy on the side of the bishops. Although the Martinist pamphlets are completely Puritan in doctrine, their violence place them slightly out of the mainstream of presbyterian-Puritanism, which was striving to achieve a political reformation of the Church of England. Indeed, the bitterness of Martin’s attack on the government of that Church is closer to the writings of the separatists, Robert Browne, Henry Barowe, and John Greenwood. Thus, the median stance as envisaged in Felippe’s *Tractado* might be taken as the two printers’ response in the face of theological disputes. I shall indicate later on how the same hope for a religious and political reconciliation between Roman Catholics and other Christians on the ground of mutual tolerance, which is reminiscent of Erasmus’s thought, recurs in most of the best passages of Bruno’s dialogues, as well as in the texts by the Italian evangelical exiles who had their writings printed by Wolfe. Finally, the issue of the conflict a person might feel between loyalty to a nation ruled by a monarch with a different faith, as raised by Archbishop Gebhardt in his *Declaration*, was to constitute

ideal of unity based on the tolerance of differences. This ideal is continued by Henry of Navarre, the Reformed hero who opposed the unity that Counter-Reformation Roman Catholicism was trying to recreate. This is a recurring topic in the books by both the Reformed writers in France and the Italian émigrés in London. On Bruno and Henry III, see below, 268.

191 The topic of the imperial and royal virtue has been brilliantly documented by Frances A. Yates in a book of 1975 where she suggests that Bruno, “who shows himself in sympathy with the Elizabethan cult, may have been intentionally linking his philosophical dialogues with the chivalrous romance woven around the Virgin Queen “ (p. 110).


193 During those years Wolfe entered at the Stationers’ Hall the following works: *A Myrrour for Martynistes* (22 Dec., 1589), STC 23628 and *An Admonition to Martin Marprelate and his mates* (19 Jan., 1590), STC 26030. For Charlewood’s tracts, see above, 107: footnote 95.
matter for Alberico Gentili’s speculations about religion and the sovereign’s rights printed by Wolfe.\textsuperscript{194}

Wolfe’s acquaintance with the Italian Protestant refugees in England and his contribution to the circulation of their texts do not need further evidence. What has so far escaped attention, however, is Charlewood’s connections with sixteenth-century Italian evangelicals.\textsuperscript{195} Italian evangelical books received much interest in England from the late 1540s reflecting the presence in England during the brief reign of Edward VI of two Italian churchmen of great prestige, namely Peter Martyr Vermigli, formerly the reformer of the Augustinian order, and Bernardo Ochino, ex-General of the capuchins and the most sought after Lenten preacher in Italy. Undoubtedly, the martyrlogy of John Foxe, the continuing contacts of the returning English Marian exiles with Italian evangelicals on the continent, and the arrival in England of new religious expatriates, sustained an interest in the Italian Reformation, even after most traces of Protestant currents had disappeared in Italy itself. Italians translated Calvin, Beza, Philippe du Plessis Mornay; and they produced Italian versions of the Scriptures and defended Calvinism against the attacks of their more radical compatriots. Charlewood’s book production, especially during the years 1570-80, displays the same tendencies. The dedications to Leicester as one of the leaders in the cause of religious reform, which implied a discipline more rigorous than that of the Anglican Church (which are not infrequent in some of the texts printed by Charlewood), as well as the evidence of the Protestant and anti-popish tenets of a good proportion of these books, may also constitute a significant link between Charlewood and the Italian exiles in England, the majority of them having fled their country because of their religious beliefs. Furthermore, in 1579, as already mentioned, Charlewood printed on behalf of Wolfe an edition of Ecclesiastes with a commentary by Antonio de Corro (1527-1591), a Spanish evangelical preacher suspected of Socinianism who became a member of London’s Italian Church

\textsuperscript{194} In his major work, Commentationes de iure belli, Gentili discusses such topics as the issue of the defining of the stance of religion with regard to law; the question of how heretics should be treated and what kind of legal right a sovereign has towards them. Gentili’s enquiry into these topics culminates in his claiming the unlawfulness of violence in religious matters.

\textsuperscript{195} For the Italian evangelicals and the term ‘evangelism’, see below, 175-6.
FIG. 5 Signatures of John Charlewood and John Wolfe
and who was notorious for his ultraconciliatory position on religious issues. However, the following example is, I believe, much more convincing.

Francisco Spiera was a timorous evangelical lawyer of Padua who abjured before the Inquisition in 1548 and who died shortly thereafter in the grip of agonising fits and convulsions. Calvin interpreted the event as a warning to backsliders; and accounts of Spiera’s death began to appear in several European languages as early as 1549 and in England the following year. The SR has the following entry dating 15 June 1587:

John Charlewood. Receaued of him for printinge a ballad of master FFRAUNCIS, an Italian, a Doctor of Lawe who denied the lord JESUS &c.

Charlewood’s output also complies with the position on linguistic matters put forward by these authors. His production, in fact, is predominantly based on the popular literary genres, which had gradually replaced Latin with the English vernacular. This choice perfectly fits the contemporary trend of scientific learning away from the universities towards a group of intellectuals, working mainly in London and under the patronage of the courts. It is exactly within this framework that Bruno’s works in Italian appeared. Besides reflecting both the widespread knowledge of Italian in court circles and the movement away from Latin in contemporary English scientific works, Bruno’s use of Italian for his philosophical dialogues, as Aquilecchia maintains, must be seen as “an open gesture of polemics and a marked distancing from the rhetoric and sterile philological positions of humanists in the late sixteenth century”. In this respect, Bruno’s anti-classicism is not very different from that of Doni, whose Moral filosofia was entered to Charlewood in 1579, from that of Aretino, whose editions were partly published by Wolfe, from that of Boccaccio, an English edition of whose writings was printed by Charlewood in 1587, as well as from Alberico Gentili’s position against the

---

199 G. Aquilecchia 1997 (b):347. For the reasons which induced Bruno to write his dialogues in volgare rather than in Latin, see G. Aquilecchia 1993 (a):1-40 and 41-64.
"grammaticationes, graecationes, criticationes" typical of humanist jurisprudence. On the other hand, the strong emphasis and use of the vernacular by such authors as Michelangelo Florio, Alessandro Citolini, and Giacomo Castelvetro is closely associated with their open sympathy with the Reformation and their anti-Roman Catholic criticism. On the model of Luther, the Protestants advocated the vernacular for their writings. They called for religious reform through recovery of the Scriptures, so that "even the lowliest women" could study the Bible for themselves. The same idea of reform, which also permeates Bruno's Italian dialogues, will be treated more extensively at a later stage.

Finally, I would like to observe that Charlewood's concern with foreign news and geographical explorations also attests to the genuineness of the printer's loyalty to the cause of Protestantism. In chapter 1 I have already stressed the significance of Protestantism with respect to colonisation and voyages of exploration in foreign lands, but I have not fully developed the argument of the crucial role played by the Reformation in the 'secularisation' of geography, that is, its liberation from a narrow biblicism. This gave a significant impulse to the rise of so-called 'modern science', considering that Reformation geographers were not attacking biblical religion or the Christian faith, but rather they were convinced that if God had revealed himself in nature no less than in Scripture, then the natural world could be investigated independently of special revelation. This issue has been well summed up by Christopher Hill, who in talking about Sir Walter Raleigh's History of the World (1614), claimed that Raleigh's insistence that secondary causes were sufficient in themselves to explain the course of history had both intellectual and social consequences. One of these is concerned with the assumption that by taking seriously the human capacity to transform the world, the power of divine agency in the world is evidently reduced. It is perhaps from that time onward that philosophy without an observational study of nature came to be seen as a sterile speculation. As a result, Charlewood's involvement with travel literature might reveal a

certain consistency with the positions Bruno upheld in his Italian dialogues, notwithstanding the Nolan’s sharp criticism of the new ‘discoveries’. And it is perhaps always having Bruno’s speculations in mind that Charlewood’s views in support of the conformity to English laws and the traditions of the English Church in the Marprelate’s controversy need to be evaluated. No doubt, while Wolfe’s publications were concerned only with a forceful and persuasive presentation of the Elizabethan Church under attack, the series of anti-Martin pamphlets attributed to Charlewood implied a more definite religious commitment.

In the light of what I have discussed so far, a certain consistency between Charlewood’s and Wolfe’s output, whatever the specific intellectual project behind these publications may be, seems not to be far fetched. What I intend to demonstrate in the next section is that Charlewood’s book production may be considered in the same way rather consistent with Bruno’s London works.

---

203 *Oeuvres/Souper:* 45-7. See also below, 260-3.
204 Martin’s position was too extremist even within the Puritan camp. See, for instance, L.H. Carlson 1981.
III.
John Charlewood, printer of Giordano Bruno’s Italian dialogues, and his later book production

Giordano Bruno, perhaps the most famous of the Italian philosophers of the Renaissance, is the author of six dialogues in Italian printed by Charlewood in London between 1584 and 1585. Although there is little doubt that these works were issued by the same printing press, since they are very similar in appearance and style of printing, they were attributed for about one and a half centuries to Vautrollier, probably because of his well-known working knowledge of the Italian language. Eventually, the evidence of the head-ornaments and initials indicated that only Charlewood could have been the printer of Bruno’s books.206

At first sight there is much in common between the six Italian books. They are all written in the vernacular; they are all surreptitious, three having a fictitious Paris imprint,207 two a fictitious Venice imprint,208 and one no imprint at all;209 they are all first editions; none of them was entered in the Stationer’s Register; and so far they have never been reprinted in Italian in Great Britain. What is more, they represent the only Italian works that scholars have attributed to Charlewood’s printing shop. Apart from John Wolfe, as already pointed out, no other printer showed, at that time in London, any disposition, or publishing skill, to deal with Italian. For this reason, according to most scholars, the only explanation for Charlewood’s ‘venture’ into the field of foreign vernacular printing resides once again in a “profitable commercial practice”.210

Bruno himself seems to have confirmed this assumption. During his interrogation at the Venetian trial, he made a statement, which is the only extant account explaining the motive for using a fictitious imprint in foreign vernacular publications in England at that time. On the 2nd of June 1592, when the interrogators asked whether ‘li libri stampati sono in effetto stati stampati nelle città et luochi secondo l’impressione loro o

207 STC 3940. *Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante* (1584); STC 3934. *Cabala del Cauallo Pegaseo* (1585); STC 3937. *De g’heroici furori* (1585).
208 STC 3936. *De la causa, principio, et Vno* (1584); STC 3938. *De l’infinito universo et Mondi* (1584).
209 STC 3935. *La Cena de le Ceneri* (1584).
pur altrove’, Bruno replied:

Tutti quel che dicono nella impression loro che sono stampati in Venetia, sono stati stampati in Inghilterra, et fu il stampatore che volse metterve che erano stampati in Venetia per venderli più facilmente et acciò havessero maggior esito, perché, quando s'havesse detto che fossero stampati in Inghilterra, più difficilmente se haveriano venduti in quelle parti; et quasi tutti li altri ancora sono stampati in Inghilterra, ancor che dicano a Parisi o altrove.  

This assertion makes clear that a fictitious Continental imprint did in fact help the sales of books in foreign language in England, and it is even more evident that Charlewood “obviously hoped that this stratagem would provide easier and increased sales of these books, which would of course allow the printing of a larger and more profitable edition”, as Woodfield put it. I will return to this issue shortly.

Charlewood’s sharing of interests with Wolfe as well as their printing programme in support of Protestantism, the vernacular and cultural pluralism, have already been discussed. This section aims to demonstrate that there is a certain consistency between Charlewood’s typical trend of publications and the substance of Bruno’s thinking. In this section I shall also be looking at the way in which Bruno’s main preoccupations as an author might have affected Charlewood’s book production in the final stage of his career as a printer.

Scholars have speculated widely about the reasons which led Charlewood to surreptitiously print Bruno’s Italian dialogues. Why the printer did not register these works is also obscure. The question might be approached first by looking at Charlewood’s entrance and licensing practice.

The percentage of the book-entries of Charlewood’s works to a certain extent corresponds to the fluctuation of the number of copies entered in the SR during the period of fourteen years from July 1576 to July 1590. For many years the entries of copies are between 100 and 200 with no obvious upward tendency. According to Greg’s study, the output rapidly approached the higher quantity in the early eighties; then there

211 Processo: 166.
was a considerable fall, probably due to carelessness in registration, till in 1585-6 the number reached a record low of 30.\textsuperscript{213} As a consequence of the Star Chamber decrees, entries rose from fewer than half the books printed in 1586 to two-thirds in 1587 and 1588, many printers registering now books they had printed years earlier without licence or official authorisation. This meant that between 1588 and 1590, approximately half the English printed books were “seen and allowed”.

By comparing all the entries to Charlewood in the SR to the total extant copies attributed to his press according to the STC, I have determined a rate of nearly 71% books entered,\textsuperscript{214} a percentage which agrees with that of 60-70% set by Greg to indicate the proportion of London-printed books regularly entered at Stationers’ Hall in the 80s.\textsuperscript{215} The highest numbers of copies entered by Charlewood are in 1581 and in 1588, and once again they exactly correspond to the already mentioned peak years 1580-1 and 1588-9. The lowest, 0 and 2, are, respectively, in 1584 and 1585, which are also the years of the publication of Bruno’s dialogues. Admittedly, such entrance rates can only be approximate. The task of determining the proportion of works published that were actually entered is, in fact, a somewhat difficult one. The most problematic piece of information, for instance, is to know exactly, for different periods, what kind of works need in fact registration. At any rate, a correlation of Register entries with the STC affords no consistent rationale for unentered works. As a result, a possible explanation of Charlewood’s failure to enter Bruno’s books might be that sometimes printers omitted the procedure of registration just to avoid the payment of the two fees which the entry entailed.\textsuperscript{216} If this is the case, Woodfield’s inference that “Charlewood probably did not consider the right to print Bruno’s works to be of any great value [...] and would therefore wish to avoid the unnecessary expense of entering them”,\textsuperscript{217} obviously contradicts the initial claim that Charlewood was a sort of ‘profit-seeking printer’. As practically every writer and printer examined the market, they might know in advance

\textsuperscript{213} For detailed figures, see W.W. Greg 1944.
\textsuperscript{214} In giving these figures, I have not included either different editions of first edition (33) because they did not need registration or copies tentatively attributed to the printer with no substantial evidence (11).
\textsuperscript{216} See above, 24.
what sort of response one could expect for the wares printed and exposed for sale. Thus, a good commercial strategy would be that of printing popular and saleable pamphlets and everything which could constitute a secure profit for the press, or at least cover the expenses. But the risk was more serious in the case of books entirely written in a foreign language. Although by the second half of the century the new habit of printing 'original books' started to appeal to the taste of readers, the great majority of readers were actually "unlearned and ignorant" and therefore "not experte in the tongues", so that the classical and modern languages were beyond their grasp, as many translators emphasised.\footnote{This attitude is attested by George Pettie in his translation of The Civile Conversation of M. Stephen Guazzo (1586), where he writes: "There are some others yet who will set light by my labours, because I write in English: and those are some nice Travailours, who retourne home with such queasie stomachs, that nothing will downe with them but French, Italian, or Spanish, and though a worke bee but meanele written in one of those tongues, and finelie translated into our Language, yet they will not sticke farre to preferre the Originall before the Translation: the cause is partlie, for that they cannot so soone espie faultes in a forraine tongue as in their owne, which maketh them thinke that to bee currant, which is but course, and partlie for that straunge thinges doe more delight them, than that which they are dailie used to: but they consider not the profit which commeth by reading things in theyr owne tongue [...] "}.\footnote{See above, 25-6.} Much more plausible seems to me the assertion that the printer did not enter the books because it was not necessary at that time to license books written entirely in a foreign language. Prior to the Star Chamber decrees, in fact, only books completely or partially in English or Latin seem to have been controlled, the previous regulations having been so worded as to leave a loophole for works that were entirely in a foreign vernacular.\footnote{TRP, I:506. See also above, Chapter 1.}

On the other hand, one can not deny that the kind of books written by Bruno were a risky venture for a printer, above all because of the 'novelty' of the ideas they expressed. It is also evident that the printer, by issuing Bruno's works, which represented a criticism of many aspects of Elizabethan England society and culture, was in danger of censorship. It was precisely during 1584-5, the years of Charlewood's printing of Bruno's books, that Carter and Alfield were executed, the former for printing and the latter for distributing books "containing false, seditious, and slanderous matter, to the defamation of our Soveraygne lady the Quene".\footnote{TRP, I:506. See also above, Chapter 1.} At the same time, due to the appearance of the anonymous \textit{Leycester Commonwealth} (1584), a scandalous libel which
was published against Leicester by his Roman Catholic enemies,\(^{221}\) and the consequent circulation of libellous books on the part of Puritans in response to the Catholic propaganda, two bills were read in Commons claiming statutory control over the printing trade. A royal proclamation against seditious books was also published on 12 October 1584.\(^{222}\) As a result, the government’s growing interest in press control in those years perhaps provides a better answer to the question of why Charlewood concealed his identity in the printing of Bruno’s works. That avoiding entrance and authorisation was done to avoid censorship\(^{223}\) lacks evidential support and, in fact, in most instances this seems highly unlikely.\(^{224}\) Actually, the choice of Venice and Paris as fictitious places of imprint might, in a provocative way, call for the climate of religious and political tolerance that Bruno had found in those cities at the time of his previous wanderings.

If we credit these assumptions as trustworthy, we can also admit that the printer, in all likelihood, was familiar with the main lines of Bruno’s thinking. According to this view, the issuing of Bruno’s dialogues, far from merely a profitable business, might correspond to a ‘cultural’ policy followed by Charlewood’s print shop and shared by other contemporary printers, first and foremost John Wolfe. However, interestingly enough, the production of Bruno’s books in England draws attention to another English printer of those days, John Kingston.

The six works in Italian which Bruno published during the two and a half years of his visit to England were preceded by a book in Latin on the art of memory, the *Ars Reminiscendi*, which must have been written soon after his arrival in 1583. It is bound in a single volume which also contains the *Triginta Sigilli* and the *Explicatio triginta sigillorum* together with the *Sigillus Sigillorum*.\(^{225}\) I shall not rehearse here the

---

\(^{221}\) The book appeared under the title of *The Copie of a Leter, wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambridge*.

\(^{222}\) *TRP*, 1:506-8.

\(^{223}\) C. Turner Wright (1959:155 and 164) claims that it was the disastrous consequence of his printing of Lord Henry Howard’s *A Defensative against the Poyson of Supposted Prophecies* in 1583 that led Charlewood the following year to leave most of his presswork unsigned or unregistered.


bibliographical details relating to the setting up, the binding and the chronological order of printing of these three writings. Their importance lies in the fact that Bruno, while giving the technicalities of the *ars memoriae* (a topic which he had covered during his stay in Paris) a satisfactory theoretical basis, nevertheless starts to envisage and to formulate those issues and questions which were destined to be continuously referred to in the Italian dialogues. My purpose here is merely to focus on some relevant information with respect to John Kingston, the printer who, according to the STC, might have had some share in the printing of the volume.

John Kingston worked as a printer from 1553 to 1557 together with Henry Sutton, dwelling in Paul’s Churchyard. He was freed as a Grocer and he never became member of the Stationers’ Company. In 1583 he is reported to have two presses, although there is no evidence of their address. In the same year Kingston, like Charlewood and Wolfe, is listed among the insurgent printers against privileges and was summoned to court for having printed many copies of Christopher Barker’s patented *Injunctions given by the Queenes maiestie*. Interestingly enough, Kingston and Charlewood worked in partnership on five titles from 1573 to 1584. They also shared the same publishers for most of the works they printed separately and some of Charlewood’s editions of earlier works were originally printed by Kingston or vice-versa. Moreover, by comparing the titles of the works issued at their presses, one can easily observe certain similarities in the two printers’ interests. But unlike Charlewood, Kingston’s practice in dealing with Italian texts can be easily confirmed by the issuing by his press of the *Espositione sopra Apocalypsis spiritus secreti*, an alchemical tract by Giovan Battista Agnello. Much
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227 STC 3939 a.v. Further typographical evidence in support of the STC attribution of the *Ars Reminiscendi* to Kingston’s press can be found in S. Bassi 1997:440-54.
228 SR, I:111.
229 Ibid., 248.
230 RCSC:lxxii-lxxiii.
231 STC 16624; 6075; 26123; 23414; 12276.
232 See for instance, STC 17575; 17848; 486.3; 4304.5; 20797.
233 STC 199. The imprint reads: Londra, Giov. Kingston a instantia di P. Angelino. 1566. I have found no entry for Giovanni Battista Agnello in the DBI. Nor could I collect any information concerning the publisher Pietro Angelino.
more interesting is the fact that in 1584 the two printers were still working together, a partnership which seems to have been abruptly ended by Kingston’s death in the same year. For these reasons, if we deem acceptable the hypotheses that it was Kingston the first printer Bruno applied to when arriving in London, the collaboration between the two printers should deserve much more attention by Brunian scholars.  

My analysis here is concerned with Charlewood’s output only and it consequently starts with Bruno’s letter to the vice-chancellor and doctors of the University of Oxford, which appears only in some copies of the above-mentioned bound volume. The letter, which reflects Bruno’s experience during his first visit to Oxford in June 1583, is significant as a sort of ‘manifesto’ of the Italian philosopher’s intellectual enquiry. The relevance of such enquiry becomes clearer when one recalls the religious, political and social reform this letter implies. In fact, it does not only assert Bruno’s rejection of any kind of nationalistic, sexual and social prejudices, as well as any trivial signs of distinction. It also claims that Bruno’s intellectual approach is different from the academic activity of his time: the genuine man of culture is defined by the “intimate nature of his soul and the refinement of his intellect”. It was the same disposition of mind which led Bruno, only one year earlier, to portray himself as “Academico di nulla Academia detto il Fastidito”. 

The absolute incompatibility between Bruno and Reformed Oxford also emerges in a later work, satirically entitled La Cena de le ceneri, which appeared in 1584. The dialogue, the first of the so-called ‘cosmological’ dialogues, reflects Bruno’s reaction to court society, popular customs and other facets of contemporary Elizabethan England. It also constitutes the first book written in defence of Copernicanism to have been issued in
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234 Bruno’s acquaintance with Kingston is not recorded anywhere. The only explanation for Kingston’s printing of this work might reside in Bruno’s immediate need to make his name known within English academic circles.

235 On this question, see S. Bassi 1997:454-8. The topic was already issued by G. Aquilecchia in 1960 (now repr. in 1993 (a):173-4), when he attributed to Charlewood’s press not only the dedication to Castelnau, the sonetto, the letter to the vice-chancellor and the Triginta Sigilli, but also the Explicatio triginta sigillorum.

236 See L. Limentani 1933:317-54.


238 Oeuvres/Chand:frontispiece.
England.\textsuperscript{239} Such traditional topics as the location of the earth, which is still, at the centre of a finite cosmos, the substantial difference between the earth and celestial bodies, the inanimate cosmos and nature, the conception of a form which animates matter, are also systematically questioned by Bruno in his other two cosmological dialogues, \textit{De la causa, principio et uno} and \textit{De l'infinito, universo e mondi}, both printed in the same year by Charlewood.

Bruno’s model of the universe as conceived during his stay in England was obviously associated with social and religious as well as moral implications.\textsuperscript{240} From an historical perspective, the explanation of moral corruptness and degeneration (which seems to have reached its climax throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) resides, according to Bruno, in the loss of the true values of the ‘ancient religion’. This is partly due to the ‘foolish’ importance conceded by both Catholics and Reformers to external practices and rites, and partly to the unbridgeable gap between the earth and the heavens these doctrines implied. In this respect, both the Protestants underrating of good works, as well as their unshakeable conviction that they alone belonged to the ‘elect’, and the Catholic misrepresentation of ancient Christian spirituality, constitute the main targets of Bruno’s criticism as developed in two of the ‘moral dialogues’, namely the \textit{Spaccio de la bestia trionfante} (1584), dedicated to Sidney, and the \textit{Cabala del cavallo Pegaseo} (1585).

The satirising of rites and practices of both the radical Protestant and Roman Catholic culture, the rejection of the Bible as the sole source of God’s word as well as of the Calvinist doctrine of election, the arguments about the mass and sacraments, the discussion of freedom of the will and divine providence, the social criticism of the hierarchical structure of the Church and of the ignorance of clergy, entirely reflect the religious debate of that century. As already seen, it was the prose pamphlet which gave widest circulation to religious protest. When the pamphleteers decried the old church and

\textsuperscript{239} For a thorough examination of this matter, see Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{240} The close link between the philosophical arguments of Bruno’s thought and its religious and political implications constitutes one of the main concerns of Frances Yates’s studies on the Italian philosopher. See F.A. Yates 1939-40:181-207, and 1938-39:227-42. More recent contributions can be found in G. Aquilecchia 1997 (a):146-57.
its clergy, they accused them of deception and greed. They employed satire and ridicule, turning laughter as well as righteous anger against the church. The pamphlets of the early Reformation thus portray a Christendom in which the spiritual distinctions between the clergy and the laity and between the learned and the simple were vanishing. These issues were incessant concerns in the book production of the age, as the high proportion of religious literature seems to indicate; and satirical pamphlets, whether political, religious or controversial, constitute a good proportion of Charlewood’s output. Of course, Bruno’s peculiarity in this context resides in his idea of freedom and autonomy of the enquiry as the main concern for those pursuing true knowledge. But in terms of general subjects, Bruno’s works may well fit into what was the everyday literary output of a printer of those years.

The theme of the Lord’s Supper, for instance, occurs often in Charlewood’s book production. As early as 1579, he printed for Harison the book *H. B. beleefe, contayning his judgement vppon the Lords Supper* by the Puritan Heinrich Bullinger. Two years later, Bradford’s work *Two notable sermons, the one of Repentance, and the other of the Lordes Supper* was reissued by Charlewood in partnership with John Wight. One of the many enlarged editions of Dering’s *Catechism for housholders*, which contains a reference to the Lord’s Supper, was printed by Charlewood in 1583. Another work of the same date mentioning the Lord’s Supper in its title appears in the list of lost books. In 1586, the printer issued Bartimaeus Andrewes’s work *A very short and pithie catechisme: for all that will come prepared to the supper of the Lord*, while in 1591 a collection of Henry Smith’s sermons entitled *A preparatiue to mariage. Whereunto is annexed a ‘Treatise of Lords Supper’* was printed by Charlewood for Man. Although these books definitely represent a radical Protestants perspective, we may readily assume that Bruno’s title *La cena de le ceneri* would have been quite congenial to Charlewood.

The issue of the Last Supper obviously recalls one of the most controversial
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241 See H.S. Bennett 1965.
242 STC 4042.7.
243 STC 3501.
244 STC 6712.3.
245 See Appendix 2a.
246 STC 586 and 22659.
theological matters between Catholics and Protestants, namely the celebration of the mass. While of immense importance to Catholic laypeople, both as a manifestation of God’s presence in their lives and as a means of succouring after their deaths, to Protestants the mass was almost the quintessence of blasphemy, an idolatrous caricature of the scriptural sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. Accordingly, both the Catholic mass and the priest’s role within it were nothing but a theatrical performance. This view enshrined the essential Protestant critique of the mass: that it was profoundly unscriptural, that in it the people’s communion had been deformed into a priestly sacrifice at which the laity were reduced to helpless and ignorant spectators. Moreover, if the mass was a drama, then the mode of dramatic expression employed was that of allegory. In a certain way, this is rather evident if one considers the obvious spiritual significance of such ritual objects as the altar, the cross, the chalice as well as the liturgical cloths of the celebrant. Less apparent is Bruno’s intent in the choice of *La Cena de le Ceneri* as the striking title for his first Italian dialogue. Does it relate to the allegory of the sacrifice with an implicit reference to his previous experience at Oxford? Does it allude merely to a theological dispute about the Mass and the doctrine of the Eucharist which implies a severe critique of Catholic tradition and political support for moderate English Protestantism, as suggested by Frances Yates? Or might it refer to the allegoric ‘impersonation’ of a “lay Christ” undertaken by Bruno who, although mocked and ridiculed by Oxford doctors, nevertheless appears as the Saviour and a messenger of truth?
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247 F.A. Yates 1939-40:181-207. While in Geneva during 1578-79, Bruno, now converted to Calvinism, made use of “*la cène*” twice to denote Holy Communion. See V. Spampanato 1921:633 and 635. Again Bruno himself used the Italian word *cena* to denote the Eucharist in his deposition to the Venetian Inquisition. See L. Firpo 1993:185. Finally, it is remarkable to observe that it is precisely the doctrine of the Eucharist which marked the distinction between Lutherans and Calvinists within the Protestant world.

248 *Oeuvres/Souper* 47-9. One fascinating possibility is that the *Cena* is an allegorical supper, during which: “l’anima pasce la mente de si nobil cibo, ch’ambrosia e nettare non invidia a Giove” (*Oeuvres/Expulsion*:53). Following this idea, the honey and the nectar might symbolise the truths of Bruno’s philosophy. I consider such an interpretation to be implicitly contained in Granada’s introduction to the *Eroici furori*, in which Granada adds that this nectar and this honey “tout a long des Furori (et d’accord avec et le platonisme), désignent l’aliment et la condition du Furioso après sa métamorphose en la divinité” (*Oeuvres/Fureurs*:xlvi). See also G. Pico *Comm*:49 when he claims that the ancient theologians signified the eternity of the ideas in the Angelic Mind by saying that the nectar and the honey that the gods ate at Jove’s table endowed them with immortality. (I owe this reference to D.
Bruno’s religious criticism is closely associated with his vision of multifarious, infinite, animated, homogenous, imperfect worlds and universe. According to this view, planets are living creatures because they move by themselves, thus contributing to the widespread literature on Bruno’s upholding of the doctrine of God’s immanence rather than the orthodox Christian belief in a transcendental God. The infinity of the universe also affects the concept of hierarchy both celestial and terrestrial. The notion of the homogeneity of the universe, related to its infinity, excludes any cosmological hierarchy in which the hierarchical structure of the Christian Church had found its logical explanation. On the other hand, Bruno’s natural philosophy implies that matter and form are substantially united and that it is the former which produces the latter, thus challenging two of Aristotle’s basic tenets – namely, the distinction between matter and form and the priority given to form inasmuch as it vivifies matter.

As a consequence, if, on one hand, the no longer central position of man within an infinite universe necessarily implies also the relativity of man’s knowledge of such a universe, at the same time Bruno’s natural philosophy suggests a reconsideration of the relations between men and divinity. Once it has been stated that the infinite universe is homogenous and not hierarchically organised, corruption and generation may equally apply to everything and everyone. Therefore, there is no place for perfection in such a universe. Bruno’s appeal to look for divinity inside oneself rather than elsewhere represents the logical conclusion of his relativistic cosmological model. What derives from this ‘democratic cosmology’, as Professor Aquilecchia defines it, is a vision of knowledge which is ‘revolutionary’ not only in astronomical and religious, but also in social terms. The central idea of the universal immanence of God, not only in living creatures, but also in matter, which is infinite and everlasting, was presented by Bruno in the form of love poetry and love emblems in the last of his London works, *De gli eroici furori* (1585), also dedicated to Sidney. At this stage, Charlewood’s engagement with
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249 In the *Cena* Bruno writes: “[… ] Et abbiamo dottrina di non cercare la divinità rimossa da noi: se l’abbiamo appresso, anzi di dentro più che noi medesimi siamo dentro a noi” (*Oeuvres/Souper*:51).


251 On the chronological order of composition and printing of the Italian dialogues, see G. Aquilecchia 1991; also E. Canone 1999(a):xii-xl.
scientific literature needs to be underlined.

In 1578, Richard Jones published an anonymous cosmological tract on the effects of the comets which belongs to the popular genre of news pamphlets. The book, most likely by T. Twyne, has been attributed to Charlewood’s shop. Two years later, the same press was kept busy in the printing of Mexia's *Dialogue concerning Phisick and Phisition*. But it is the following work that deserves much more attention.

A copy of *The castle of knowledge* by Robert Recorde (ca. 1510-1558), who taught rhetoric, arithmetic, astrology and cosmography in the first half of the sixteenth century in England, is found in the Registers of the Stationers' Company among the 1582 assignments from Awdeleys to Charlewood. Recorde was one of the first in his country to mention the Copernican system, which had been presented only as a scientific hypothesis in 1543. His most relevant treatises on this subject - all of them written in his native tongue - were the 1551 *Pathway to knowledge*, in four books, and the *Castle of knowledge*, first printed in 1556. This is an elementary textbook about astronomy in which Recorde explains the solar and lunar eclipses and gives a general description of the main theories concerning the universe, including the Copernican one. It also contains many well designed illustrations and geometrical diagrams. In the passage dealing with the question of the earth’s rotation, Recorde clearly considers the Aristotelian and Ptolemaic arguments against the earth’s rotation to be fallacious. His promise to explain the Copernican system more fully, above all in relation to the planetary motions, was not kept, apparently because of his unhappy death in 1558.

Striking similarities between the attitudes and writings of Recorde and Bruno will
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252 STC 24413.
253 STC 17848.
254 STC 20797.
255 The interpretation of Copernicus’ model as a mere simplification of astronomical calculations was proposed in the unsigned foreword to *De Revolutionibus orbium coelestium* as the view of Copernicus himself. Bruno may have been the first to claim that the preface must have been written by someone other than Copernicus. The foreword in fact was inserted by Andreas Osiander, a Lutheran theologian who completed the overseeing of the publication of the book at Nuremberg and sent it to the press. On Bruno and Copernicus, see below, Chapter 4.
256 Interestingly enough, the STC attributes to Kingston on behalf of Harrison the printing of a subsequent edition of the second book of this work. Cf. STC 20813 a.v.
be underlined in Chapter 4, along with a discussion of how Bruno developed the heliocentric theory and how different his position on this topic was from those expressed in contemporary England and perhaps Europe. What is relevant here is the fact that Charlewood was somehow involved in such literature even before the publication of Bruno’s works. His earlier partnership with Tysdall, the printer of the 1560 English version of Palingenius’ Latin poem *Zodiacus Vitae* (c. 1531), is perhaps too coincidental to have any significance in relation to Bruno’s criticism of the poet’s theory of the infinite, upon which Digges himself seems to have drawn in his writing. Although the *Zodiacus* is merely a survey, ignoring Copernicus, its significance in preparing the way for the rejection of the authority of Aristotle and ultimately of the whole Ptolemaic system must not be undervalued.

One final point must be mentioned in connection with Bruno and Charlewood in respect with ‘scientific’ literature. Charlewood’s commitment to scientific works chimed with Bruno’s critical position with regard to the astrological-eschatological literature. In this respect, Henry Howard’s book against the superstitition of astrology as raised by the “great coniunction” of the two planets Saturn and Jupiter in 1583 seems to coincide with the Nolan’s rejection of the doctrine of celestial influences and the extreme determinism related to it.

The question of affinities between Bruno’s dialogues and the trend of Charlewood’s publications, however, might be perhaps better tackled by considering any involvement of the printer with ‘things Italian’. Although in linguistic terms Charlewood’s dealing with Latin texts and English translations from the Italian can be considered meagre enough only to attest to his typographical ability with those
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259 See, for instance, Oeuvres/Souper:241-3; Infini:43-5; Expulsion:65; Fureurs:13.
260 In 1578 a book entitled *De segni de' tempi* appeared in Venice under Bruno’s name. As the title suggests, in this work, now lost, Bruno might have intended to take a stance regarding the appearance of some celestial phenomena and their possible influence on terrestrial events. In the Italian dialogues, however, Bruno is not merely alluding to this debate. By calling attention to celestial phenomena inasmuch as they call into question Aristotle’s doctrine of the changeless heavens, he also intends to prove the falsity of the Stagyrite’s physical theories and of scholastic cosmology. On Bruno and astrology, see A. Ingegno 1978:15-63.
languages, as Professor Aquilecchia claimed nearly forty years ago, nevertheless it might provide evidence of the printer’s possible interest in that culture and tradition.

In 1576, Charlewood’s press, on behalf of Butter, was involved in the printing of a work translated into English from Italian by Thomas Achelley. This was a novella by another Italian Domenican friar, Matteo Bandello. I shall not treat here the topic of the impact which the Italian novella had on the English literature in the sixteenth century. Instead, I limit myself to observing that the originality of Bandello’s stories in part lies in the break which their protagonists make with their own humanist formation. Once again we have to face anti-humanist motives in Charlewood’s production. At the same time, two books by George Gascoigne (1542-1577) issued from the same press. Although these works merely testify to Gascoigne’s leanings toward Puritanism, nevertheless they come from an English author who modelled his comedies on Ariosto and used dramatic motifs which had been first developed in Italy.

Charlewood’s appreciation of translations from Italian went on through the end of the 70s and the beginning of the 80s. In 1579 The morall philosophie of Doni, “englisched out of Italian” by Thomas North is found in the Register of the Stationers’ Company among the assignments from Denham to Charlewood and Richard Jones. North’s connection with the ‘Italianate’ coterie through Leicester, to whom the work is dedicated, and Castelvetro has already been stressed by scholars. One year later, from the same press came Zelauto, a novel by Munday, which is set near Naples, while the English version of Vermigli’s treatise on the abuse of dancing, also issued by Charlewood, can be taken as an evidence of how the influence of an Italian shaped the course of the English Reformation, besides supporting the formulated hypothesis of the printer’s concern with Italian evangelicals. Still in 1580 a work entitled The true and...
naturall proportion of a monstrous cilde borne in Chieri in Piemonte is found in the Registers under Charlewood’s name.  

It is also during those years that an English translation of Seneca’s *Hippolytus* by Thomas Newton is assigned to Jones and Charlewood. I shall not discuss in detail the influence of Seneca on Elizabethan tragedy. This is because in the process which carried Seneca throughout Europe, beginning in Italy and then moving to England via France, the original model underwent various developments. As a result, according to some scholars, what actually reached England was not the genuine model, but the ‘Italian Seneca’, a mixture of elements generally characteristic of later medieval and Renaissance taste (sententiousness, a gloomy sense of the overpowering rule of fortune in human affairs), or indeed characteristic of tragedy as a genre (horror, blood, desolation). In this perspective, Seneca, like Ovid, conveys an ethic which is far from compatible with the Christian ethic. Nonetheless, the Senecan ethic became more tolerable when the subject-matter was the dynastic quarrels of the modern political world, particularly in the warning against tyranny. This argument once again places Charlewood’s output in harmony with Wolfe’s Italian production as analysed in Chapter 1.

But it is after the issuing of Bruno’s books that Charlewood’s book-production seems to be mostly dominated by those literary genres borrowed from the Italian tradition. In fact, looking at the titles of Charlewood’s publications, one might be inclined to believe even in the possibility of some influence of Bruno’s works on the trend of the printer’s publications.

In 1585 an English version “out of Italian” of the play *Fedele and Fortunio, the deceites in loue* issued from Charlewood’s shop on behalf of Thomas Hacket, who had entered the copy in the Registers one year earlier. The translation, adapted from an Italian play entitled *Il Fedele* by Luigi Pasqualigo, has been attributed to Munday after some controversy. At that time, Charlewood was also printing at least three of Bruno’s books. The following year, *A letter lately written from Rome, by an Italian gentleman*,
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267 SR, II:383 and 472. The work is not extant.
268 See H.B. Charlton 1921; M. Praz 1928; W. A. Armstrong 1948; G.H. Hunter 1978:159-208.
269 SR, II:437. For the attribution of the play to Charlewood’s press, see M. St. Clare Byrne 1923:17 and STC 19447.
concerning the election of the new Pope following the death of Gregory XIII, was printed at the same press. The letter appears to be translated from Italian by John Florio, who was Bruno’s intimate friend and who, at the time, was sheltering at the French embassy, Bruno’s address in London. As a result, the Italian philosopher may have well been a possible link between the printer and the linguist.

During the years 1587-88 Charlewood’s commitment to Italian literature becomes more evident. Boccaccio’s *Amorous Fiammetta* (1587) translated by Bartholomew Young and two issues of Tasso’s *The householders philosophie* printed in 1588 bear Charlewood’s sign. In the same year, echoes of Tasso found their way into English through Charlewood’s printing of Watson’s edition of his Latin pastoral *Amyntas*. Munday’s anthology *A banquet of daintie conceyts*, printed by Charlewood still in 1588, is nearly all lyrical and harks back to Italian *ballate* and *madrigali*. To the collaboration with Munday is probably due also the series of romances of chivalry, i.e. an edition not known to have survived of *Two Parts of Palmerin of England*, entered to Charlewood on 13 February 1581, as well as the edition of the first part of *Palmerin d’Oliva*, printed in 1588 by Charlewood for William Wright. An edition of *Palmendos of Greece* is entered in 1589 to Charlewood, but it appears to have been printed in the same year by John Danter for Cuthbert Burby. Although *Palmerin d’Oliva* and *Palmendos* follow the French version, there is no evidence that Munday translated *Palmerin of England* from the Spanish original (1547-48) rather than from the Italian version (1553-54). In fact, it might be that Munday secured the latter during his Italian
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270 STC 21292.
271 STC 3179.
272 STC 23702.5 and 23703. This is Tasso’s *Il padre di famiglia*, probably translated by Thomas Kyd as *The Householders Philosophie*.
273 STC 25118.5. According to STC, this was another edition “newelie corrected” of that printed in 1587 at Wolfe’s press. See above, 74.
274 STC 18260.
275 SR, II:388.
276 STC 19157. Although no copy of the edition of Part II is known to exist, there is evidence that it was issued in 1589 from the same press. See G.R. Hayes 1925:60.
277 SR, II:513.
278 Munday separated the first thirty-three chapters of the French version of the book of *Primaleon*, which followed *Palmerin d’Oliva*, and issued them under the title of *Palmendos*, that being the name of the knight with whose adventures this section deals.
279 The library catalogue of Sir Edward Coke (1634) includes among its titles: Palmerin de Oliva a)
travels. Furthermore, it has to be noticed that Italian versions of Amadis, Primaleon and Palmerin d’Oliva are listed among the books in the Italian vernacular belonging to the collection known as “the library of John, Lord Lumley” (1606). There is, therefore, at least some evidence of the circulation of the Italian versions of the romances at the time of Munday’s translations into English. At any rate, such production of romances is much more relevant for literary rather than linguistic concerns. In fact, peace, unity and the Protestant culture are the themes which lie behind the chivalric tradition. And it is with this Protestant tradition that perhaps Charlewood identifies himself when issuing in the same years the series of anti-Martinist tracts, the anonymous author of which calls himself Pasquill. The name, in fact, obviously refers to the Roman anti-Catholic satire traditionally written in Latin by means of Pasquill-Pasquino, a character named after a mutilated statue unearthed in Rome in 1501.

With the beginning of the new decade, Charlewood’s press increasingly served the group of English scholars, men of letters and translators who followed the Italianate fashion and who gravitated around the Earl of Leicester in the second half of the sixteenth century. In 1591, he printed for Newman the sonnet-sequence Astrophel and Stella by Sir Philip Sidney after the latter’s death, to whom two of Bruno’s ‘moral dialogues’ are dedicated. Charlewood might have met the English poet six years earlier during the printing of the Italian philosopher’s books, although the only evidence of Bruno’s acquaintance with Sidney and his literary circle comes from what the Italian says

---

L’historia tradotto dal Spagnuolo, Venice 1575; b) La historia del’invitto cavaliero, Venice 1585. See W.O. Hassall 1950:90.


281 The collection, which began as the library of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, and in Mary’s reign belonged to Henry Fitzalan, twelfth Earl of Arundel, was augmented by Lord Lumley, who catalogued it in 1596 at the very peak of its development. Upon his death in 1609 that catalogue, with the subsequent additions, was recopied. It seems to me extremely unlikely that the Italian versions of the romances were brought into England only after 1602, the date of Munday’s issuing of the third part of Palmerin of England, whose translation conceivably follows the Italian continuation of the romance.

282 The term was sufficiently familiar in English by 1533 for Sir Thomas Elyot to use it in the title of his dialogue of good and bad counsel, Pasquil the Plain, although for less cosmopolitan readers he explained about the statue. A document of 1566, half English and half Latin, entitled “A lewd pasquil set forth by certain of the parliament men” contains doggerel verses sketching forty-three members in the turbulent session of 1566. See G.R. Elton 1986:351.

283 STC 22536.
in his London dialogues. The following year, the printer entered a French version of the *Histoire de Roland*, which had constituted the original source for Matteo Boiardo’s *Orlando Innamorato* and Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*. However, the English translation was not printed until six years later, most probably due to Charlewood’s unexpected death in March 1593. Yet, the first English version of Francesco Colonna’s *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, which had appeared first in Venice in 1499, was printed by Charlewood, Jeffes and Eliot’s Court Press and published by Waterson in 1592. The book, originally written in an Italian vernacular “golosamente rilatineggiato nel lessico e nella sintassi”, is concerned, as the title indicates, with the strife of love in a dream, that is, with the endless struggle between knowledge and love in their pursuit of divinity, that is to say, the infinite. By reading some of Colonna’s paragraphs, one can not avoid recalling passages in the *Eroici furori* where Bruno describes the soul’s progression to God in the dualistic terms of intellect, “o generalmente la potenza conoscitiva”, and will, “o generalmente la potenza appetitiva”. Again, in 1592, Constable’s *Diana* and Daniel’s collection of sonnets, entitled *Delia*, both of them recalling the Petrarchan tradition, were printed by Charlewood respectively for Smith and Waterson. In this regard, it is worth mentioning Daniel’s likely presence at Oxford during Bruno’s visits, as well as the letter from N. W. to the poet, which constitutes one of the few pieces of documentary evidence of Bruno’s lecturing at that university. The collaboration between Charlewood and Waterson, who was also the publisher of the 1585 edition of...
Daniel's work in which the above-mentioned letter appeared, might be, once again, the result of an obvious link between these figures.

During those years, Charlewood was also the printer of such pamphleteers as Robert Greene (1560?-1592), Thomas Nashe (1567-1601), and dramatists such as George Gascoigne and John Lyly (1553?-1606), who were rather familiar with Italian language and literature. Greene's and Nashe's tendency of interlarding the English language with Italian words and expressions is well known. All of these authors, together with Thomas Churchyard, who turned to the same printer in 1592, Henry Chettle, as well as George Whetstone, who used his press twice in 1579 and 1582, were hacks, i.e. less talented but very versatile writers. Although most of the pamphlets they wrote belong to the popular genre, there are a large number of them with different degrees of literary sophistication which presuppose an audience capable of recognising parody, burlesque, the use of rhetorical figures, and who knew of Aristotle and Ramus, and appreciated, even if they could not necessarily understand, quotations in Latin and French, exempla, and marginal references to classical authorities. Above all, these authors engaged with Italian culture.

Nashe's famous works, *The anatomie of absurditie* and *Pierce penilesse*, came out of Charlewood's printing house respectively in 1589 and 1592. They were commissioned by two publishers who collaborated with the printer quite often, namely Thomas Hackett and Richard Jones. Nashe's attack on contemporary prose-writers, his contempt for bombastic playwrights and pedantic grammarians, as well as the violence of his satire and his anti-Calvinist feelings, seem to echo certain passages of Bruno's Italian works as well as Aretino's.

---

292 Ibid. The letter constitutes part of the Introduction to *The Worthy tract of Paulus Iouius, contayning a Discourse of rare inuentions, both Militarie and Amorous called Imprese*. By Samuel Daniell late Student in Oxenforde. At London, Printed for Simon Waterson, 1585. The letter is dated 20th of November 1584.

293 It is worth noting that such authors as Spenser, Munday, Churchyard, Gascoigne and sundry others are praised in Webbe's *A Discourse of English Poetry* printed by Charlewood in 1586.

294 STC 18364 and 18371. The *Anatomy of Absurdity* is an open attack on Philip Stubbes's Puritan work, *Anatomie of Abuses*, which appeared in 1583.

295 It might be relevant to underline that in the last decade of the 80s Thomas Nashe engaged in a fierce diatribe against both Gabriel Harvey, follower of the Ramist method, and the Puritans.
Four publications by Nashe’s friend, Robert Greene, have also been attributed to Charlewood’s press, three of them first appeared in 1584, i.e. the first edition of Morando, the tritameron of Loue, dedicated to the Earl of Arundel; the 1587 reprint of Gwydonius, dedicated to the Earl of Oxford; the 1589 edition of Arbasto, the anatomie of fortune; as well as the 1590 English translation of Ronaldi’s Dottrina delle virtù, entitled The Royal Exchange. Greene’s novels were all modelled on the Italian and were very popular. Yet, Rinaldi’s booklet is a sort of summa of moral advice; in this it is a direct descendant of medieval treatises on “morality” and “virtues”, and it consists of 236 aphorisms and proverbs grouped under 154 alphabetically arranged categories.

Lyly’s Endimion (1591) and Gallathea (1592) were printed by Charlewood ‘for the widdowe Broome’. The sources and the references, as well as the style of a great part of these plays, undoubtedly resemble the conventions of the Italian Renaissance comedy and novella. Lyly’s relevance resides also in his being the secretary of Lord Oxford, who in turn was Munday’s early patron. Lyly entered Oxford’s service in March 1580 and remained with him until 1588. Endimion, as some scholars suggest, may have been an allegory written as an apology and a plea for the Earl of Oxford following his fall into disgrace in 1581. The printing of Lyly’s Endimion reminds us the commitment between Charlewood and Munday and tends to define it once more evidently in terms of mutual interest in ‘Italian things’. Lyly’s euphuistic style and the pastoral motifs of his works closely adhere in theme, in treatment and verbal artifice to the Italian pastoral convention of the Cinquecento. This is not an isolated case in Charlewood’s book.

---

296 STC 12276.
297 STC 12262.5.
298 STC 12219.
299 STC 12307. Rinaldi's original work, which is very rare, apparently was printed only once, in 1585, in Padua by Giovanni Canton. See C. Speroni 1962:366-76.
300 STC 17050 and 17080. Lyly may not have been involved in the actual printing of Endimion, as the note provided by “The Printer to the Reader” speaks of “certain comedies” that have come “by chance” into the printer’s hands, with Endimion as the first of these to be published and others to follow if this one can “pass with good liking”. Charlewood then proceeded to publish Gallathea which had been already entered in the Registers in 1585.
301 See W. Jeffery 1929.
production if one considers Munday’s pastoral works.

In the light of these considerations, a certain consistency in Charlewood’s output policy (including Bruno’s dialogues) with regard to religious and philosophical, as well as social and literary, issues becomes more than evident. At this stage, a further enquiry should concern the nature of the relations between Continental exiles and the court of Elizabeth I, in order to assess the specific cultural environment within which the Italian philosopher’s works appeared. For this reason, the next chapter focuses on the Italian exiles in England during the second half of the sixteenth century, their book production and the diffusion of their works.
CHAPTER THREE

GIORDANO BRUNO IN ENGLAND:
THE ITALIAN TRADITION IN CONTEXT

Le creanze e i costumi
Tanto splendenti lumi
Ch'a gli uomini fan l'uom superiore
Eccoli tratti fuori
De l'Italic seno
E piantati ne l'Anglico terreno
Or se li goda ogniun, che porta amore
A' l suo decoro e a' l suo compiuto onore.

Alessandro Citolini

*Galateo of Meister John della Casa Archebishop of Benevento*, 1576,
Commentatory verses.

I. The background: Italian migrations in Tudor England
(1540s-1550s and 1560s-1570s)

The intellectual connections between Italy and England in Tudor times have undeniably attracted enormous attention from scholars and are likely to remain a subject for debate for a long time to come. For this reason, the following survey of the Italian presence in England during the two decades from the 1540s to the 1550s and from the 1560s to the 1570s, offers simply a critical résumé exploring the complex and fascinating role that either Italy as a country or Italian authors played within English society. In this respect, while modern Italian critics tend to emphasise the great contribution Italy made to the development of English letters, their English counterparts have widely stressed both the changing interest of England in ‘things Italian’ throughout the centuries and the subsequent growth of English intellectual and political success following the decline of Italian culture which occurred by the end of the sixteenth century.
I am not about to engage in such worthless controversies as attempting to determine which of the two countries is culturally superior, nor to discuss their respective originality in the literary field. Instead, I propose first to consider some of the most representative Italian figures in Tudor England in relation to the significance of their works within the English context and tradition. More specifically, my enquiry will try to unveil some of the reasons lying behind the English fascination with Italian culture in the sixteenth century, and to uncover what, if any, intent Italians permanently or temporarily residing in England might have had while carrying out this ‘Italianizing process’. Did their presence make any difference at all, and if it did, what was it and why was it important? In the previous chapters I have reported on the state of the printing press in England and on the main printers working with Italians. In this chapter I shall suggest a possible connection between Italian exiles and English printers in terms of cultural and social aims. The enquiry will culminate in Chapter 4, which focuses on the mutual literary influence which occurred between Giordano Bruno, the most prolific Italian writer in England in the sixteenth century, and those ‘Italianate’ Englishmen gravitating around the court and belonging to Elizabethan literary circles.

As J.C. Lievsay put it, at that time “the general dissemination of Italian books in England was no doubt a major factor in establishing and sustaining there Italian primacy in intellectual matters”. And then more specifically he adds: “for the greater number of those Englishmen who interested themselves in things Italian, the impact of Italy upon their imaginations came by way of books”.¹ For this reason, the kind of texts by Italian writers held in British libraries may be taken as a significant criterion to assess the owners’ taste. The third section of this chapter will therefore involve a discussion of the lists of the Italian books which John Florio prefixed to the two editions of his Italian-English dictionary (1598 and 1611) in order to show the great variety and number of such books circulating in contemporary London.

The history of humanism in England during the fifteenth century, which constitutes the crucial starting-point for reconstructing the Italian presence in Renaissance England,

has been extensively studied by Roberto Weiss in a valuable scholarly work of that title.\(^2\) The revival of interest in the Latin and Greek classics; the high conception of the dignity of man; the striking importance given to the study of any kind of eloquence, from rhetoric to law and medicine; all of these elements were the distinctive products of the humanistic world. However, ever since 1860, when Jacob Burkhardt's famous book on the civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy first appeared,\(^3\) there has been a debate among historians as to the meaning and significance of the Italian Renaissance.\(^4\) They have also defined 'humanism' in rather different shades of meaning. If, on the one hand, we cannot properly speak of humanism as a coherent system of doctrines, or code of values,\(^5\) on the other hand we must recognise that many humanists were too individualistic to be related to any specific movement of the Renaissance.\(^6\) In Campana's survey of the meaning of the term 'humanist', for instance, it appears that in its original sense the word was closely connected with the school system: “it qualifies a person as a public or private teacher of classical literature, of the chair of humanitas or umanità”\(^7\). According to Kristeller, the humanists were “those enamoured of the literature and values of the Classical world, and seeking to reflect and propagate them in their own life and work”.\(^8\)

In both ways, the term 'humanism' may be taken as describing men known in fifteenth-century Italy as humanistae, namely those dealing with the studia humanitatis, or humanity as opposed to the divine studies of medieval theologians, thus restricting the two starting terms into one, much more narrow, concept.\(^9\) To put it more easily, the

---

2 R. Weiss 1948.
3 J. Burchhardt Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien 1860.
4 This variety of views was partly due “to the emphasis given by individual scholars to different historical personalities or currents or to different aspects and development of the Italian Renaissance”, as Kristeller put it (1979:83). In this respect, the current debate does not merely involve literary or historiography matters. It also represents a touchstone for different conceptions of men and civilisations.
7 A. Campana 1946:66.
9 This sense given to the word ‘humanism’ by contemporary historians can be explained in terms of a reaction against the more general and vague definition of it as a period of history in which various cultural ideas and values emerged. However, this interpretation (like the traditional view in vogue at the beginning of the century) has been also criticised for “restricting the term ‘humanist’ to the professional school teachers of the Renaissance” implied in the “exclusion of some individuals who were very much concerned with the recovery of classical culture” (P. Burke in A. Goodman and A. MacKay (eds.) 1990:2).
humanista studied what was known at the time as grammar and rhetoric, and there was no ‘humanist programme’, no coherent humanist philosophy beyond the study of these few subjects. Indeed, the humanists were well aware of the fact that their field of study occupied a limited place within contemporary learning. In this sense, humanism was above all an educational movement rather than a philosophical tendency or system. Naturally, it would be very wrong to classify this intellectual position and to dismiss it merely as a materialistic approach to reality. Its revolutionary potential in an era dominated by preoccupations with the divine dimension must never be undervalued or forgotten.

It would be difficult to enumerate the various studies by art historians, literary historians and political historians on what exactly the word humanism means. Suffice it here to recall that whatever its actual origins, it was in fourteenth-century Italy that humanism began to flourish as a combination of cultural trends. This was mainly due to both the particular political structures of that country and to the efforts of individual scholars and teachers who sought to rediscover and restore ancient monuments and texts, and of lawyers who drew upon the conventions of classical rhetoric and applied the precepts of Roman law to fourteenth-century reality, as Nicholas Mann has well summarised it. In the following century, deep changes in the economic, political and social structures of the Western world made Renaissance humanism a phenomenon which was no longer exclusively Italian.

Modern critics have also variously explored the topic of the reception of Italian humanism in England. It has been observed that the spread of the new ideas and values of Italian humanists in England was essentially the result of two factors: frequent travelling to and from Italy and the invention of printing. While travelling allowed personal and direct contacts between the two countries, it was the close collaboration between the humanists and the new printing presses that made the multiplication and circulation of books possible with a rapidity hitherto unhoped-for. Nevertheless, English

---

interest in humanist culture was at first either confined to the court or to the individual endeavours of local aristocrats, both clerical and lay.\(^3\)

Apart from the pioneering works of Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester (1391-1447), who frequently came into contact with the humanist world of Italy, very few English scholars engaged Italian attention during the Quattrocento. Among them, William Grey (d.1478), who many Italians saw as Gloucester’s spiritual successor; John Free (c.1430-1465), who went to Italy precisely to attend humanistic lessons; John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester (1427-1470) as well as Robert Flemmyng, dean of Lincoln (c.1415-1483), seem to have been rather familiar with Italian works. The significance of these figures, however, does not reside in their own literary skills, which were far from outstanding. Instead, these Englishmen are best remembered inasmuch as the majority of them had travelled to Italy - either as members of diplomatic missions or as students at Italian Universities - although only few of them left us records of their reaction to Italy. Once back in England, not only did they take home books from Italian libraries, they also gave patronage to eminent Italian scholars who could accomplish the writing or editing of significant works. Finally, English aristocrats also encouraged Italian humanists to pursue careers abroad and employed them as secretaries or even counsellors in their households.

But it was not until the next generation that English scholarship was brought into touch with the Italian Renaissance. The most distinguished members of this generation were Thomas Linacre (c.1460-1524), William Grocyn (c. 1446-1519) and John Colet (1467-1519). Once again, their initial approach to the ideals of contemporary humanism derives from the fact that all of them had received part of their education in Italy. At the same time, English scholarship was to develop along its own lines. In this respect, humanism in England seems to show marked differences from its Italian equivalent.

To begin with, it is a surprising fact that English humanists were scarcely concerned about philosophical studies as such. Classical literature was regarded by them

\(^{13}\) During the Middle Ages and for the entire course of the 15\(^{th}\) and 16\(^{th}\) centuries, England was essentially a ‘court country’ where the ‘court culture’ flourished absolutely. The court, in fact, was not only the focus of high society, but it was also the centre both of political and cultural life. The Tudor policy of personal government made the court much more important than before, so that the use of the adjective ‘courtly’ dates from the end of the Quattrocento.
less as a source of information and more as the basis for a way of living or for a moral code. As a result, early English humanism was characterised by “a utilitarian impulse to bend the ‘new learning’ to practical ends”\textsuperscript{14}.

This particular aspect of English humanism largely reflects the differences in the political situation between the two countries in the fifteenth century. At that time, the Italian peninsula was politically divided into city-states. For this reason, if on the one hand it was the self-conscious civic culture in these cities that inspired the process of classical renewal known as the Renaissance, on the other hand the political divisions of the Italian peninsula called for a literary debate on the nature of the state. Conversely, the fifteenth century in England was a period of political instability marked by the Wars of the Roses, the civil war between the houses of York and Lancaster. The winner, the Lancastrian Henry Tudor, became king of England as Henry VII and reconciled the warring factions by marrying Elizabeth of York in 1486. From that time on, and for the next two centuries, the Tudor monarchy dominated every aspect of the nation’s life. The problem of the ruling of the State, therefore, was resolved into a strict dependence on the sovereign and the most comprehensive obedience to the Crown, which was practically endowed with absolute power. Hence the programme of educational reforms in sixteenth-century England aimed to provide individuals with a coherent code of moral and political obligations within the scope of the new pattern of the State, rather than pursuing the transmission of pure knowledge. By adapting the new studies developed in Italy to a political or social agenda in order to keep the ruling class in pace with cultural innovation, English scholars turned humanism to practical purposes. As a result, an ideal instrument for a liberal training was at hand in the new type of classical scholarship which men like Erasmus and More transplanted from Italy to Northern Europe. The Renaissance in England was thus bound up with the consolidation of the Tudor regime\textsuperscript{15}.

Yet, one should not forget the powerful role that the Papacy had in propagating of humanism. This has been brilliantly summarised in another study by Weiss, who, in 1964, wrote:

\textsuperscript{14} R.C. Simonini 1952:2.

\textsuperscript{15} On the political aspects of Humanism in England, see W.G. Zeeveld 1948.
As an international institution it [the Papacy] had its officials all over Western Christendom. Legates, nuncios, collectors of Peter’s Pence, went everywhere, and the majority of these officials had received a humanist education, had humanist tastes, and were often themselves professed humanists. While residing abroad, these men continued to cultivate their studies and in this way influenced the ecclesiastics and laymen with whom they came into contact.\(^\text{16}\)

If the Papacy gave an important impulse to the diffusion of the new scholarship, the Protestant Reformation, on the contrary, contributed to sharpening the hostility between the two Romes, the pagan and the papist one. In this way, although the roots of the Reformation lay in the innovation and ideals of Italian humanists, on the Reformers’ part criticism of humanists became more strident. It is especially important, in assessing the transmission of Renaissance humanism to England, to consider its impact on the Protestant Reformation. Although the Renaissance and Reformation appear to have little in common, on closer inspection there is evidence of a relevant link between the ‘secular’ Renaissance and the ‘religious’ Reformation.

The question of the interaction of Renaissance humanism and the sixteenth-century reform movements has been thoroughly examined by critics only in recent times.\(^\text{17}\) It is clear enough that the term ‘Reformation’ coincides as little with the vast movement that we identify today as being described by it as the term ‘Renaissance’ does with the cultural phenomenon that we are investigating. What Luther’s contemporaries used to indicate as ‘reformatio ecclesiae in capite et membris’ first of all applied to the criticism of ecclesiastical abuses within the Catholic Church, whereas the institution itself was not to be questioned. But the Protestant revolution was essentially a reformation of doctrines rather than of morals or administration – although the one obviously entails the other. As a matter of fact, by applying the humanistic philological approach to interpretation, Luther’s translation of the Scriptures into German vernacular initiated a proper process of great religious changes.\(^\text{18}\) Particularly, his criterion of religious truth \textit{sola scriptura} was

\(^{16}\) R. Weiss 1964:87.


\(^{18}\) The application of philological methods to scriptural study clearly suggests the connection between humanist practice and the advance of the Protestant Reformation. It was the same method, for instance,
explicitly directed against the magisterium of the Roman hierarchy and the inner light of Protestant radicals. From that time onwards, so-called 'Biblical humanism'\(^\text{19}\) and the call for reform began to fuse together.

The advocacy of a pure Gospel may also have coincided with the culture of humanist circles in their campaign against scholasticism and clerical obscurantism as well as against 'superstition', as Matheson has rightly put it.\(^\text{20}\) Finally, the core of the alliance between humanism and reform lies in a common concern for education, to whose theory and practice the humanists had contributed so much. Once again the *bonae litterae*, as spread by humanism, together with a deep interest in reforming education, played a significant part in fostering a cultural and religious *renovatio*, thus preparing the way for the Council of Trent. It was with this in mind that Desiderius Erasmus and John Colet initiated in England a new programme of education based on humanistic ideals. This was the time in which going to Italy had been considered the most important element in the education of young noblemen, as it was again to be a couple of centuries later. Besides for literature, the country was mainly praised for its weather and landscape, as well as for the beauties of its towns and the courteousness of its inhabitants. But by the following century both Italy and England had themselves entered a new phase.

In the course of the first half of the sixteenth century, Italian states rapidly lost their former independence, while England was quick to establish itself as a nation-state. For thirty years or more, Italy was a theatre of foreign invasions and of a subsequent series of conflicts that came to an end only in 1559. During the war, parts of Italy suffered considerable destruction and political and social dislocation. In English eyes, at that time Italy was a patch-work quilt of city states, each with a civic identity defined by local sovereigns or councils and conflicting political interests. At most, each city represented a collection of monuments and social customs observable by English tourists. The absence of a clearly defined central government in Italy further increased the malleability of its image, an image which could be turned various ways, towards

---

that led Lorenzo Valla (1407-57) to disprove, on purely stylistic grounds, the Donation of Constantine, upon which the temporal power exercised by the Church had found its justification up to then.

\(^{19}\) See P. Matheson in A. Goodman and A. MacKay (eds.) 1990:28.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 26.
romance or diabolism, towards admiration or loathing. Concomitantly, one important consequence of the Italian Wars was that they brought again European powers into direct contact with Renaissance Italy. Furthermore, as a result of the increasing prestige of the Italian universities, notably Padua and Bologna, which attracted students from all over Europe, and later as a consequence of the Reformation, the interest taken in Italy and Italian literature — although in quite different terms — was on the increase at the beginning of the century.  

In the sixteenth century, praise of Italy was first expressed in England by Thomas Elyot (c. 1490-1546), who in 1531 published *The book named the Governor*, an educational treatise heavily dependent on Castiglione’s *Il Cortigiano* (1528), the first English version of which appeared in 1561 as *The book of the courtier* by Thomas Hoby (1530-1566). Between the issuing of Elyot’s treatise and Hoby’s translation stood William Thomas’s *Historie of Italie*. This work provided historical and geographic details as well as information regarding the habits of the Italians for those wishing to travel in that country. As Rossi points out, at this time the humanist of Erasmus’ generation who went to Italy, captivated by the attractiveness of the new learning, has been replaced by a new kind of English traveller, whose admiration for Latin as an international tongue gave way to the desire to learn modern foreign languages. Hence, the relevance of these works resides in their reawakening of interest for Italy and its language.

It is noteworthy, however, that besides Thomas’s major work on the Italian language, the *Principal rules of the Italian Grammer*, almost all of the Italian grammars written and printed in the sixteenth century in England were the product of the religious exiles, ranging from Michelangelo Florio’s *Regole et institutioni della lingua thoscana* (1558) to John Florio’s *The first fruits* and *The second fruits*, which appeared

---

21 The interest taken in Italian literature in the first half of the century can be traced to about 1530 and involves several figures, notably Thomas Cromwell (1485?–1540), Thomas Wyatt (c.1503-1542), Thomas Starkey (1499?–1538), Richard Moryson (d. 1556), Edmund Bonner (1500?–1569), Thomas Cranmer (1489–1566), Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (c.1517–1547), Edward Courtenay (1496–1538) and others. For a detailed account of the revival of interest in Italian from the 30s to the accession of Elizabeth to the English throne, see G.B. Parks 1962:529-35.

22 STC 4778.

respectively in 1578 and 1591. In the same way, Michelangelo Florio’s *Catechismo*, and Alessandro Citolini’s *Grammatica*, reflect not only the linguistic preoccupations, such as with grammar and vocabulary, of these Italian émigrés, but also their concern with promoting a taste for Italian language and culture. If it is possible that for this first generation of Italian religious refugees their language-teaching was subsidiary to their theological interests, as many scholars maintained, this may not be applied to the great majority of those belonging to the second phase of Italian migration, which occurred during the reign of Elizabeth. Unlike the teaching of French, in fact, which was a subject taught in proper schools, the learning of Italian in Elizabethan England was provided by means of a private teacher or tutor. As a result, Italians were concerned mainly with propagating their own culture and language and a great number of them earned their living in this way. I shall say a word later on about some of these figures and explore John Florio’s famous dictionaries and their impact on English culture in the last section of this chapter. What matters now is to observe that in most cases the knowledge of Italian provided the means for Englishmen to keep in contact with contemporary Italian writings and therefore to be in touch with both the cultural and the political situation of Italy. Increasing familiarity with the literature of Italy was, in fact, a result of the increasing familiarity with the language.

But not every aspect of Italian literature was to the taste of English readers. In particular, Machiavelli represented for a long time what the English least admired in the Italians. The word *Machiavellian*, for instance, was soon associated with the idea of treachery and atheism, and Machiavelli himself became a byword for all that was cunning or villainous, whether in the tyrant or the politician. In a certain way, he came to represent the typical ‘Italian policy’, that is to say, those stratagems of language and power for which Italians were more often blamed than praised. This deterioration of the

---

24 Actually, John Clerk’s *Italice et Gallice verborum coniugationes*, which constituted the appendix to his *De mortuorum resurrectione et extremo iudicio in quatuor linguis succinte conscriptum opusculum* had appeared as early as 1547, thus preceding Thomas’ *Italian Grammer* by three years. See S. Baldi 1957:1-16.


26 See above, 81, footnote 199 where the printer John Wolfe in evading copyright in 1582 was labelled ‘Machivill’ by his competitors. A short survey of the use of the adjective *Machiavellian* in its various forms can be found in N. Orsini 1946:122-34.
older image of Italy as a model of learning and manners increased for the most part after the Reformation, which cut England off from Italy as the home of its religion. After the excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius V in 1570, no English Catholic could legally visit Rome. Italians in the kingdom were often suspected of being secret ‘papists’ and the Puritan animus against Rome was largely responsible for a somewhat anti-Italian sentiment, as Lievsay describes it in his 1964 book on the representation of Italy at the time of the Elizabethans. Moreover, the later discovery of the role played by the Florentine Ridolfi in the Norfolk conspiracy led to a further enhancing of the negative connotation of the word Italian, becoming used as ‘dangerous’ because a plotter, although the two words are obviously not synonyms and the one does not necessarily imply the other. But it is the different use and meaning of the term Italianate that demands further investigation inasmuch as it shows the ambivalence of the image of Italy as envisaged by English authors and writers.

The Italianate Englishman is a widely well-known figure in the Elizabethan literary scene. Virtually no scholar of the Renaissance dealing with sixteenth-century English-Italian relations fails to mention Roger Ascham’s quotation of the current byword Inglese Italianato è un diavolo incarnato. According to an interesting piece of research by Parks, Ascham only made a literary application of what Italians themselves would have described as the harmful result of “the common goinge of English men into Italie”. Without the guidance of a tutor, the young aristocrats who used to go to Italy as part of their education, “remaine men in shape and facion, but becum deuils in life and condition”. In other words, Ascham’s own interpretation of the Italian proverb would be that “the Englishman Italianate first learned to say in his heart, like the fool, there is

28 R. Ascham, The Scholemaster, in W. A. Wright (ed.) 1904:229. Robert Ascham (1515-1568) was a younger member of Elyot’s group at one time Elizabeth’s tutor. He composed his programme of classical studies in The Scholemaster, which appeared posthumously in 1570, to show how to educate “a learned preacher or a Civic Gentleman”. All subsequent references to Ascham’s The Scholemaster will be to Wright’s edition.
29 G.B. Parks 1961:201. At the end of his article, however, in the light of the collected accounts for Italian proverbs Parks concludes that “The proverb, or byword, was evidently not Italian, or at least was not acknowledged as such”. (p. 216).
30 The Scholemaster:229.
no God”, as Parks puts it.\textsuperscript{31} The idea expressed here is that of dissoluteness, lechery, niggardliness and disrespect for religion as the consequences of the Italianization of the English travellers. As already mentioned, it was mainly the Puritans, the most radical of English Protestants, who came to regard the land populated by wily Machiavels and dangerous papists as a harmful place of moral and religious corruption. According to them, the pernicious doctrines of Machiavelli, as well as the ‘Italian vices’, as listed by Asham in his Scholemaster, would inevitably corrupt the English, above all impressionable young men. As irreligion leads to sedition, it is in the Elizabethan era that the indictment of the ‘Italianate’ starts to assume a political meaning, when the parallel between irreligion and ‘papistrie’, and therefore conspiracy, was easily demonstrated.\textsuperscript{32}

At first, however, the word ‘Italianate’ did not yet imply ideology of any kind. The proverb quoted by Ascham, in fact, can be discovered earlier, both in Sir William Paget’s reports from Calais to the King in which the evil feature described as Italianate relates to avarice and fraud,\textsuperscript{33} and in the second edition of Thomas Wilson’s Arte of Rhétorique (1560), where it refers to language, not to persons, as a part of the author’s criticism of foreign idioms in English, among the ‘Englishe Italianated’. At a time in which Italy was seen as the nation “which semeth to flourish in civilitie moste of all other at this daie”,\textsuperscript{34} the word Italianate may have even been a term of approval. Gradually, the adjective acquired derogatory connections. This attitude persisted almost to the end of the century. In talking about the Italian gentleman, William Thomas claims that “yf I were disposed to speake of vice, I might happen to find a number as ill as in anye other men”,\textsuperscript{35} thus agreeing with Ascham’s sense of the epithet. The same opinion was shared by Sir John Cheke, Ascham’s teacher and colleague, who after his stay in Padua in 1554 presented the same picture of Italy as a place of ignobility, irreligion and immorality.\textsuperscript{36}

As has already been pointed out, the shift in the meaning of the word Italianate

\textsuperscript{31} G.B. Park 1961:201.
\textsuperscript{32} See above, chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{34} W. Thomas, The Historie of Italie, sig. A2r.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., sig. A4v.
from Ascham's connotations to a label for traitors represents a straightforward consequence of the breach between England and Roman Catholicism. From the time of the papal excommunication of the queen onwards, 'obdurate papists and Italionate (sic) atheists', now identified as two faces of the same coin, became in the English government's eyes agents of conspiracies, leaders of rebellions, and plotters threatening the status quo and attempting to stir up war against the queen. At this stage, there is no distinction between Italianate and Italians, as the following excerpt from Matthew Parker's 1572 biography of Reginald Pole shows:

When he [i.e. Reginald Pole] had remained there [i.e. in Italy] some months in safety in the very lap and bosom of the pope himself, he emerged infatuated and changed, as if he had drunk the cup of Circe, from an Englishman to an Italian, from a Christian to a papist. [...] That simplicity which I think had been in the Englishman originally proper and ingenuous, now acquired in the daily contact with the people of Rome their craftiness, still retaining the exterior and feigned appearance of an honest nature, but concealing deep within the heart cultivated vice of deceit and fraud.

The length of the quotation allows us to observe how Ascham's concept of the irreligious and immoral Italianate constitutes the foundation upon which the new image of Italians and Italy was built according to the changes in religion. Even when Italians ceased to be a danger, Italian kept the meaning treacherous, whereas in the 80s Italianate mainly applied to literary genres to indicate Italian influences upon English works. We shall return to this point in the third section of the chapter. In the meantime, a further consideration that can be inferred from Parker's account is that the criticism of Italian things also involved a reaction against Italy itself, as in Ascham.

37 The image of Italy as the island of Calypso and Circe is also found in Ascham when he says that "These [i.e. religion, learning, policy, experience, manners of Italy] be the enchantments of Circes, brought out of Italie, to marre mens maners in England". (The Scholemaster:229). He further denounces Italy as "Circe's court", teeming with "wanton and dallying Calypso and Sirens" (The Scholemaster:226-30).


39 That the epithet 'Italianate' was inevitably associated with Italy as a country is testified by Ascham himself when he writes: "If some yet do not well vnderstand, what is an English man Italianated, I will plainlie tell him. He, that by liuing, and traveling in Italie, bringeth home into England out of Italie, the
That Italy had degenerated from its former condition was not a matter for discussion. Even to the Italians this decay was noticeable. The earlier wars for the conquest of its territories and the subsequent long years of servitude had overshadowed the cultural vibrancy that the early Renaissance had stimulated. Nevertheless, the power of the Roman church and the dangers of immorality and atheism, were not the only charges against Italy. First of all, at that time Italy was not thought of as a political and social whole and its political differences were emphasised by the objective differences between states. As a result, a political concern about “how division and lawlessness can shatter a commonwealth” and how a disunited country can upset the accepted order of things was also to affect the image of Italy in England. Secondly, as has been noted, “a hatred for everything foreign had long existed in the English mind, and the competition of Italians in commerce and trade only increased the dislike”. Finally, the growing feeling of nationalism, which would characterise a subsequent generation in England did not, at this stage, make it easy to understand Italian ways of thinking.

If the English travelled to Italy for education and pleasure, Italians came to England most often on account of duty or necessity. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in fact, the majority of Italian sojourners were merchants, bankers, artists or political refugees, who left Italy on their own initiative either to set up a kind of business or to avoid the danger of being condemned by the Inquisition. In particular, due to its well-known climate of religious and political tolerance, London became one of the favourite places for the exiles, as for expatriates from other countries, to take shelter. However, compared to the crowded colonies of European refugees, the Italian exiles were in a considerable minority. To their eyes, in fact, England must have seemed too far and too alien to be preferred to closer cities, such as Strassburg, Geneva, Lyon, Zurich and Basle. The flight to London of Italian religious exiles was therefore a

Religion, the learning, the policie, the experience, the maners of Italie”. (The Scholemaster: 229).

40 See H. Baxter 1962.
43 A survey of the Italian residents in London including those naturalised can be found in Kirk, R.E.G. and E.F. (eds.), 1900-1908. According to it, the figures for Italians living in the City are: 138 in 1567 and around 250 by 1590. See also W. Page (ed.) 1893.
relatively modest phenomenon, very often a consequence of personal demands.

Scholars have already variously reconstructed the story of the ‘Italian colony’ in London. In his useful survey *Italian Scholarship in Renaissance England*, for instance, R. C. Simonini lists the prominent names of the Italians who came to early Tudor England: the teachers Michael Angelo Florio and Tito Livio Frulovisi; the banking families of Frescobaldi, Bonvisi, Peruzzi, Bardi and Pallavicini; the diplomat Sir Anthony Guidotti; the court physicians Cesare Adelmore and Cesare Scacco; the humanists Poggio Bracciolini, Enea Silvio Piccolomini and Antonio Beccaria; the fencing masters Vincentio Saviolo, Rocco Bonetti and Jeronimo; the painter Zuccherio and sculptors Torrigiani, Rovezzano and Majano; the religious reformers Bernardino Ochino and Peter Vermigli; the Cambridge teachers Emanuele Tremello and Giulio Borgarucci; the Latin secretaries Andrea Ammonio and Pietro Carmeliano; the Ferrabosco, Bassano and Lupo families of musicians; the actors Martinelli and Dionisio; and the famous bookseller Ascanio de Renialme.\(^{44}\) To this earlier migration of Italians during the sixteenth century, which was interrupted by the cruel restoration of the Catholic Mary Tudor, a new wave of exiles, which reached England soon after the accession of Elizabeth I, has to be added. Among them, there were such figures as Giacomo Aconcio (1500?-1566?), Alessandro Citolini (c.1500-c.1583), Petruccio Ubaldini (1524?-1600?), Giacomo Castelvetro (1546-1616), Giovan Battista Castiglione (?-1597), Orazio Pallavicini (1540?-1600), Francesco Pucci (1540-95), Pietro Bizzarri (1525-c.1586), Alberico Gentili (1522-1608) and of course Giordano Bruno.

The task of dealing with these characters, their lives and stories is of no particular consequence to the present study and the investigation would in any case be far from complete as regards information. Instead, in order to achieve the aims I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, I set out to inquire into the patterns of relationship between these individuals and their English context. First, a closer look at the Italian Church in London might serve the aim of the underlining religious and political interactions between English and Italian culture. Secondly, the role of the Italian exiles in England

\(^{44}\) See R.C. Simonini 1952:7. Not all of the names given above appear in Simonini’s list. As a result I had to integrate it with others publications on the subject.
may help us to better understand their religious contribution to the Reformation in the late Renaissance. Finally, the significance and the circulation of their works, as well as their consistency with the trend of their printers, will serve to introduce us to the topic of the diffusion of the Italian literary genre and its impact on English culture, as developed in the last chapter. Bearing this approach in mind, a brief historical overview needs to be presented in order to define the temporal parameters of my study.

It is well known that the Italian exiles in London were inevitably influenced by the divergent policies of successive sovereigns, as Rossi has emphasised.\(^\text{45}\) During the reign of Henry VII, England had constant commercial contacts with Italy, notably with Florence and Genoa. As a result, Italian merchants and bankers set up their activities in London, and were on good terms with both the locals and the king. Later on, Henry VIII continued his father’s friendliness towards the Italians, employing them either as artists and craftsmen in his policy of constructing new building or as diplomats in his service. These were the so-called ‘vagantes’, most of them astrologers and physicians, individuals who had moved to England with no particular aim, or who had been invited by some member of the Court. What characterised them was the absence of any cultural aims. Due to their cultural pretensions, which led them to regard their English hosts as ‘barbarous’, they remained isolated within English society.\(^\text{46}\) These newcomers from Italy, such as Gulielmus Parronius Placentinus, Cornelio Vitelli da Cortona, together with the fifteenth century ‘Collectors’ of Papal taxes, such as Pietro del Monte, Pietro Griffo and Polidoro Virgilio, represented the very first generation of Italians in England in Tudor’s time.

\(^{45}\) See S. Rossi 1984:56.

\(^{46}\) This attitude of disparaging the English emerges at various dates, ranging from such writers as Poggio Bracciolini, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, to John Florio and Giordano Bruno. See S. Rossi and D. Savoia (eds.) 1989:11-13.
FIG. 6 An Italian gentleman (1594).

FIG. 7 "Pedantius", caricaturing Gabriel Harvey as "the Italianate gentleman" (1631).
The same conviction of belonging to a different and superior culture was shared also by the so-called second generation, but it constituted a commonplace for all Italians abroad throughout the centuries. A group of such Italians embracing the Reformed religion and therefore heretics in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church, had left their country of origin seeking a more tolerant place where their religious and political views could be freely expressed and propagated. Although these new Italian migrants were a minority compared with the colonies of foreigners from other European countries, they got more involved in the political and religious life of their new country than the earlier generation. By 1550, three years after Henry VIII's death, an Italian Church in London was established by Archbishop Cranmer and Sir William Cecil. This was during the reign of Edward VI, when the history of foreigners in Tudor and Stuart England reached what Rossi dubs its 'heroic' phase.

The structure of the small congregation of Italian Protestants in London which met in the church of St. Thomas of Acon in Cheapside, as well as the number of its members, has already attracted scholarly attention. I will therefore limit myself to highlighting its role in and possible contribution to the English Reformation. Like the other churches for foreign communities, the Dutch at Austin Friars and the French in Threadneedle Street, the Italian Church was founded “to serve as a model of the best Reformed practice and as disciplinary institutions intended to regulate the opinions of the new communities and eliminate sectaries”. At the same time, one should not forget the importance of these churches in the economic regulation of the foreign communities, as well as their significance as institutional and political models for the Reformed church of England.

In spite of its name, only a few members of the Italian Church were Italians by birth or tongue. A likely explanation of this phenomenon resides in the fact that Italians tended to avoid any kind of affiliation with any Reformed Church - the great majority of

---

49 Ibid., 41-2. On the contribution of the refugees ‘religionis causa’, and in particular of the Italian exiles, to the cultural and economic development of some European countries in the 15th and 16th centuries, see H. Trevor Roper 1972.
50 Aconcio, Castiglione, Borgarucci, the Gentili brothers as well as Florio belonged, although only formally, to this Church.
them for the fear of being persecuted for apostasy once they returned to Italy. Obviously, there was no such fear on the part of members of other congregations, such as the Flemish or the English, wishing to join the Italian Protestant church.\(^{51}\) As far as the English were concerned, they were those Italianate ones who had been sharply criticised by Ascham. According to him, these Englishmen used to attend the Italian church only to keep up their knowledge of the Italian language, which they had learnt while travelling abroad.\(^{52}\) Nevertheless, it is very unlikely that they took no part in the theological debates during the Sunday communion or on the occasion of the delivery of sermons, and that, consequently, these two aspects of the Reformation did not affect each other.

A much stronger argument to explain the reason behind the disaffection of the Italians of London towards their Church is that they could not stand the climate of rigorous ecclesiastical discipline regulating it, strictly tied as it was to the doctrines of Geneva, and thus certainly not a model of tolerance.\(^{53}\) This was partly due to the strict control of the Established Church under whose surveillance London's non-parochial Strangers' Churches were permitted to function. Notwithstanding the aura of suspicion surrounding the non-integrated 'heretics', the Italian non-conformists,\(^{54}\) both the religious sphere and English literature were broadly affected by their works and ideas. It is along these lines that the influence of Italian exiles of the second half of the sixteenth century on the European Reformation needs to be evaluated. Their main contribution consisted in what twentieth-century historians broadly describe as an 'evangelical Protestant worldview'\(^{55}\) - the term 'evangelism' was coined by a French scholar in 1914.

\(^{51}\) On the events that troubled the Dutch Church and caused the defection of some of its members, see L. Firpo 1959:326-38.

\(^{52}\) "Thies men, thus Italianated abroad, can not abide our Godlie Italian chirch at home: they be not of that Parish, they be not of that felowshyp: they like not the preacher: they heare not his sermons: Excepte somtyme for companie, they cum thither to heare the Italian tonge naturally spoken, not to heare God's doctrine trewly preached" (The Scholemaster:233).

\(^{53}\) See L. Firpo 1959:315.

\(^{54}\) See for instance what Sir Henry Cobham, then ambassador in Paris, writes to Walsingham with respect to Giacomo Castelvetro's arrival in England: "It is now some months past since there is gone into England a Modenese named Castelvetro [...]. It hath been signified unto me that the said Castelvetro should be an Arian, and hold strange opinions, but rather thought and suspected to be a Jesuit [...]" (CSP, Foreign, Elizabeth, 1579-80:441), and two years later about Giordano Bruno: "II Sr. Doctor Jordano Bruno Nolano, a professor in philosophie, intendeth to passe in to England; whose religion I can not commend" (CSPF Elizabeth, January-June 1583:212).

\(^{55}\) It seems relevant here to make a distinction between the Catholic reformation or 'Catholic humanism'...
to characterise the reforming movement in France – a view “not to be identified with the mental set of individual Puritans, but with a set of opinions and principles on morality, the religious polity and foreign policy taken up variously by individuals at specific junctures”.

A number of historiographical studies have variously claimed that during the sixteenth century Italy lacked any significant reform movement. What gives weight to this argument is the assumption that both the tightening of religious control and the forceful intrusion of the Catholic Church in the life of the country prevented the spirit of the Reformation from pervading Italian society in any significant way. Most recently, however, critics have demonstrated that the Protestant Reformation penetrated and sank roots in Italy during the sixteenth century. Notwithstanding the political situation and the power of the Inquisition, it made converts at every level and witnessed the establishment of underground conventicles, not only in the most northerly provinces adjacent to Protestant lands, but also in the remote areas of Calabria and Sicily.

The impact that Italian reformers and their doctrines had on the Reformation by organising alternative churches abroad in the hope of achieving religious and cultural freedom has also been underlined by scholars. I have already pointed out how the early phase of the English Renaissance received its impulse from Italian Humanism, and how the latter was in its turn closely connected with subsequent goals of the reformers. Humanism first, and the religious refugees later, could well have represented the ‘Italian and the Counter-Reformation. While the former occurred during the 30s and the first half of the 40s of the sixteenth century in Italy, the latter was at first a concomitant phenomenon which indeed culminated in the 60s continuing to the end of the Council of Trent in 1564 and the aftermath of persecutions of heretics on the part of the Roman Church. Ideologically speaking, the Catholic Reformation is a rather innovative, and in proper sense, reforming movement and it generally designates the activity and belief of the so-called Italian ‘evangelici’, who operated during those years, while the Controriforma was characterised by a strongly reactionary position. Italian evangelism, through the presence at various times in Edwardian England of Bernardo Ochino, Pietro Vermigli, Emanuele Tremellio and others, also influenced the activity of moderate Puritanism. On this matter, see G. Aquilecchia 1996 (b): 9-23.

56 W. Boutcher 1997:43.
form’ of Protestantism and, actually, an alternative movement to pure Protestantism, an 
original phenomenon which brought about its own religious, political and social goals.\textsuperscript{60} 
It was with aim of religious reform in mind that such men as Ochino, Vermigli, Aconcio, 
Tremellio\textsuperscript{61} and Bizzarri, after wandering throughout Europe, eventually reached 
England. Through their influential position at the Universities of Oxford (Vermigli) and 
Cambridge (Tremelli, Bizzarri), as well as at the court of Elizabeth (Ochino, Aconcio), 
these refugees, at various times, tried to make their contribution to the religious changes 
that led England first from Henrician Anglo-Catholicism to Protestantism during the 
reign of Edward VI, and then to the Elizabethan Settlement. These theologians, in fact, 
were often more influential than Calvin himself in spreading Calvinist ideas to Edwardian 
England, whereas early Elizabethan Protestantism looked more to Zurich than to 
Geneva, as did early Polish Calvinism.\textsuperscript{62} Furthermore, as official church advisers, they 
inaugurated a long tradition of support for learned Protestant foreigners, a tradition 
which would endure till the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Again, modern 
historians have tried to point out the outstanding contributions of Pietro Martire 
Vermigli to the English Reformation, as well as the impact of his thought on the 
continental Protestantism.\textsuperscript{63} More specifically, as McNair has rightly observed, if anyone 
wants to see what Italy contributed to the Protestant church in England, he should read 
Vermigli’s \textit{Common Places}, as did thousands of Christians in England and abroad well 
into the seventeenth century: the great black letter English edition of 1583 must have 
been a formative influence on many of Shakespeare’s contemporaries.\textsuperscript{64} 

\textsuperscript{60} The position held by some idealist Italian philosophers during the late eighteenth century down to the 
first half of this century, like De Sanctis and Croce, according to which Italy had no need of the 
Reformation, the Rinascimento having satisfied all the needs of the religious movements, seems today to 
be too radical and should, therefore, be revised. See T. Provvidera in E. Canone (ed.) 1998:279-87. 
\textsuperscript{61} The chief contributions of Emmanuele Tremellio (1510-1580) to Protestantism were: a Latin version 
of the Bible, the \textit{Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra}, which was the earliest complete Latin Bible printed in 
England; and an edition of the New Testament, which rapidly became the version universally favoured 
by the Reformers. 
\textsuperscript{63} See H. Davies 1970; also A. Beesley 1968:83-8; W. Haugaard 1979:37-60; J.P. Donnelly 1976:81- 
101. 
\textsuperscript{64} See P. McNair 1981:166. Vermigli expressed an opinion on the Vestment Controversy, participated in 
the revision of the Book of Common Prayer and in the formulation of the Forty-Two Articles of 
Religion. He also wrote a refutation of the Catholic position on the Eucharist, as it had been stated by 
Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester.
What is more, if Italian was perhaps the most frequently printed foreign language, this was not only because of the fascination that Italian culture had for Renaissance England, but also thanks to the presence of numerous Italian Protestants in England. At the same time, a number of writings by Italian evangelicals and by Renaissance authors which the exiles transmitted to England were translated on a massive scale by Elizabethan Englishmen. In this way, an interest in the Italian Reformation was sustained even after most traces of Protestant currents had disappeared in Italy itself.65

Unfortunately, the time had to come when even England was swept by a period of persecutions and terror. Following the accession of Queen Mary in 1552, the ‘Ecclesia Londino-Italica’ was abolished, only to be restored in 1565 when the Elizabethan religious Settlement was already well established. At this stage, a new wave of Italians, progressively less and less directly involved in the religious debate, were already well established in the most different varied, ranging from politics to finance and diplomacy. As a result, the figure of the Italian religious reformer was gradually replaced by that of the Italian intellectual, whose aim, as Rossi put it, was that of “slowly encouraging the acceptance of an Italian matrix in England, through translations, publications, the teaching of the language and, in particular, through the universities”.66 For this reason, this kind of intellectual tended to be either a writer, or a language teacher, or an academic professor. Sometimes he even combined two or more of these activities, as the next section will show.

Through both their own writings and those works of Italian origin they promoted for publication, Italian emigrants of the Elizabethan era aimed both at making England aware of the dignity of the Italian language, and Englishmen of the importance of Italian secular learning and culture as represented by such famous authors as Petrarca, Ariosto, Tasso, Guarini, Boccaccio, Guicciardini and Machiavelli. The role they advocated for themselves was that of enriching the culture and the habits of the country they were living in by introducing a different and equally noble element. In this way, the strong

65 This is the thesis advanced, for instance, by John Tedeschi in his studies on the Italian contributions to the Protestant reformers in the late Renaissance. See J. Tedeschi 1987:36-40.
desire of the printers to press forward "an advertising campaign to popularise a printing programme of foreign language texts and to take a step in the direction of cultural pluralism"\(^{67}\) in order to overcome "a certain reluctance made up of distrust, lethargic parochialism, wariness verging on dismissal, and, contradictorily, hospitality verging on awe",\(^{68}\) seems to be perfectly consistent with the aims of the authors of the books they printed and of the exiles who promoted or edited such works. By finding refuge in the Protestant North, these émigrés made an enduring contribution to European culture on two levels, the religious and the literary one. Again, by representing a strong element of desire for the circulation of ideas, the connection between authors and printers, as I have hinted, appears to be one of the crucial factors in the lives and activities of Italians in England at this time.

\(^{67}\) C.C. Huffman 1987:9.
\(^{68}\) Ibid.
II.
The foreground: Italian language and literature in the printing of late sixteenth-century England

The history of book printing in the Italian language represents a striking phenomenon at a significant moment in the history of British culture. The supremacy of the French or Italian language among the Elizabethans has been discussed at great length by historians in the field of English-Italian and English-French literary relationships. As a matter of fact, with regard to both circulation and tradition, French was the second language spoken and read in England. Nevertheless, at some point Italian language and literature became quite fashionable; hence the necessity for the most important figures of the court circles and literary milieus to acquire at least a basic knowledge of that language. At the same time, the emerging English mercantile class, which traded not only with Italy, but also with the Middle East where, thanks to the prominence of Venice in the area, Italian was the conventional spoken language, was also in need of such linguistic competence. M.A. Scott, in her study of Elizabethan translations from Italian, states that “considering its far-reaching and profound effect upon English letters, no foreign vogue before or since ever took such hold upon English society”.  

Various anecdotes show how familiar Italy and ‘things Italian’ were in England from Tudor times onwards. Besides Latin, French and Spanish, for instance, Queen Elizabeth, as well as most of the noblemen of her court, had a perfect reading knowledge of Italian. Obviously, such concern with the Italian language reflects a deeper interest in Italian literature and culture. In other words, one is bound to observe how these linguistic preoccupations cannot be seen in isolation from the appearance of Italian writers in the vernacular on the Elizabethan literary scene.

The importance of a knowledge of Italian in the framework of sixteenth-century literature was underlined by William Thomas in his Principal rules of the Italian Grammer (1550), when he pointed out that

---

69 M.A. Scott 1916:xxxviii.
70 The Queen’s proficiency in languages so as to be able to speak with foreigners without an interpreter is widely recorded, both by original and second-hand sources.
71 STC 24020. The grammar is an adaptation of two Italian works published in 1543: Alberto Acarisio’s Vocabolario, grammatica et ortographia de la lingua volgare and Francesco Alunno’s Ricchezze della
besides the auctours of this time (whereof there bee many woorthie) you shall almost finde no parte of the sciences, no part of any woorthie hisotrie, no parte of eloquence, nor any parte of fine poesie, that ye haue not in the Italian tongue.\textsuperscript{72}

Annexed to this work there was a valuable dictionary “for the better understandyng of Boccace, Petrarcha, and Dante”, which represents the first Italian-English dictionary ever published in England. Although Thomas’s Grammar-Dictionary was too hastily compiled and too incomplete, so that it could render only very limited assistance to the student of Italian, it was nonetheless so well received at the time that three further editions were published after 1550.\textsuperscript{73} Conversely, Michelangelo Florio’s \textit{Regole et institutioni della lingua thoscana}, which circulated in manuscript, obviously had a very limited impact,\textsuperscript{74} while Scipio Lentulo’s \textit{An Italian grammer}, which was printed in London by Thomas Vautrollier in 1574,\textsuperscript{75} was considered one of the best instruments by which most Englishmen acquired the fundamentals of the language during the last decades of the sixteenth century. At the same time, it transferred the debate over the language from the Italian peninsula to England.

One of the main ambitions of foreign, especially Italian, expatriates was associated with political offices such as the position of private Latin secretary (to a monarch or councillor) or to ambassadorial missions for which the use of modern languages was more and more required. In this context, employment as a private language teacher, or much better, as a private language secretary, could represent the fulfilment of an aspiration pursued over a period of years. Still, one should not overlook the political and social intentions behind the sheer number of linguistic and rhetorical manuals released or

\textit{lingua volgare}.

\textsuperscript{72} W. Thomas, \textit{The Principall rules}:A3v.
\textsuperscript{73} See D. J. O’Connor 1972:49-67.
\textsuperscript{74} The only extant manuscripts of this work are: \textit{Regole et institutioni della lingua thoscana}, undated; \textit{Regole de la lingua thoscana}, London, 21 augus 1553. The first copy is preserved at the British Library (Sloane MSS. 3011) and dedicated to Lady Jane Grey, while the second one is preserved at Cambridge University Library (Dd.XI.46) and dedicated to Henry Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. Hereafter cited as \textit{Regole}. See G. Pellegrini 1954:77-103.
\textsuperscript{75} STC 15469. As it appears from the title, it is an English translation of Lentulo’s Italian grammar \textit{Italicae grammatices praecepta ac ratio}, which was first published at Geneva in 1567 and then reissued and translated several times. In his Dedication, Grantham states that he considers it “a very necessary booke (in my concept) for all such as are studious of th’Italian tonge”. See P. Buzzoni 1979.
reissued onto the market. This is well illustrated by such authors as Michelangelo Florio, Alessandro Citolini, and Giacomo Castelvetro, all of them refugees because of their religious beliefs. Their strong emphasis on and use of the vulgar language, in fact, is closely associated with their open sympathy with the Reformation and their criticism of Roman Catholic.

In his translation into Italian of Georg Agricola’s *De re metallica* (1563), for instance, Florio in the dedication to Queen Elizabeth sets forth the concept of vernacular translation against those who would challenge it, in the hope that his efforts would serve to spur similar endeavours, especially in the field of Scripture and religious literature. In this respect, a reference to Luther’s vernacular translation of the Holy Scriptures does not seem to be far-fetched. But while his position on linguistic matters seems to be the result of developing views, the author’s religious motivations remain unaltered as they have been expressed both in the *Catechismo* (c. 1552-53), and in the *Regole de la lingua thoscana* (dated 1558), where dealing with Italian grammar becomes a pretext for criticising the Catholic church and the Pope. Yet, in terms of language, Florio here surprisingly abandons the position outlined several years earlier in his *Regole*, where in fact he had insisted on the priority of the Tuscan language, on account of its beauty and perfection. Conversely, by anticipating criticism on his style, which is not so exact and

---

76 STC 4813. The British Library copy of this book lacks the first two pages of the dedication, but F. Yates found a complete copy from which we know that the work was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. See F.A. Yates 1934:22-3.

77 STC 4813. The *Catechismo* is an Italian version of Archbishop Cranmer’s Latin catechism (1552) and it is dedicated to “Signore Giouanni Dudele degnissimo Duca di Nortamberlande”. For these reasons, Frances Yates presumed that it was composed after the death of Edward and before the fall of Northumberland at the proclamation of Mary as queen. See F.A. Yates 1934:11. According to H. Sellers, its printer was probably Stephen Mierdman, a Protestant refugee in England from 1549-53, who omitted the imprint for fear of religious persecution. See H. Sellers 1924:105-6.

78 In Consideration IX, where Florio deals with the relative pronoun, for instance, he gives the following examples: “che il Papa sia Antichristo è da gran tempo che io l’ho saputo (that the Pope is Antichrist, I knew it since a long time)”, *Regole*, 24r; “il Papa, che è un tiranno, perseguita i pij christiani (the Pope, who is a tyrant, persecutes the pious Christians)”, *Regole*, 25r; “il Papa è Antichristo, per il che non gli dobbiamo credere (the Pope is Antichrist, and therefore we must not believe him)”, *Regole*, 24v; “Di quello che fa il Papa non ci curiamo (we do not care of what the Pope is doing)”, *Regole*, 25v. Also in Consideration XIII, which concerns the use of the adjective *tantus*, he states: “è cosi vero che il Papa sia un tiranno et vicario di Satanasso (it is profoundly true that the Pope is a tyrant and the vicar of Satan)”, *Regole*, 30v. The figures to whom the work is dedicated also point to an anti-Catholic intent on the part of the author. See G. Pellegrini 1954:103.
pure as that of Bembo, in the Epistle to the reader which is prefixed to the translation of Agricola’s work, he justifies his choice of style on the ground of ‘clarity’:

L’intento mio o lettor carissimo, è stato da agevolare tanto il mio parlare (dove negato nò me l’habbia l’autore cò la scurità sua, e cò la profonda dottrina) che i semplici altresì possano intenderlo. E chi non sa che il parlare, e scriuere del Bembo non è q.illo stesso che generalmète s’usa per ogni idiota, ma che da dotti solamente in Alcune Academie vien’usato.79

In addition, to the question why he has not drawn extensively upon the vocabularies used by Boccaccio, Petrarca and Dante for their writings, he promptly replies that

i tempi nò meno astringono altrui a mutare i modi del parlare che i pâni. Se dunq(ue) io nò mi sono servito di moltisimi uocaboli usati dal Boccacio, ne di quei suoi lunghi periodi, non sia chi se ne marauigli: perché questa mia tradozzione nò dee esser letta da l’età del Boccacio, ma de la presente. I parlari da l’hora in qua si sono mutati, come dal di a la notte. Quel che al’hora ueniua stimato pulitezza di lingua, hoggidi che gl’ingegni uie piu che in qué giorni sonsi assottigliati, è tenuta brutta rozzezza.80

Moreover, it may be objected that in describing metals, instruments and other technical matters he used Latin rather than pure Tuscan words. Once again, the author’s answer is so revealing that it deserves to be quoted:

[...] perché generalmète ogni nazione cò uie maggiore agevolezza potrà uenirne in cognizione, o per uia della lingua Latina, o uero da gl’artiﬁci, usati a fare & maneggiare tali stromenti, tai minerali, pesi e misure [...] perché i nomi di tali cose nò meno son diversi, che le nazioni, & i linguaggi. & m’ assicuro ancora che molte cose ci siano che non hanno uerun proprio nome ne la lingua volgare.81

Finally, the visible differences in his spelling from that of Bembo corresponds to Florio’s intention to adhere as much as possible to the spoken language.82

79 Arte dei metalli, Michelangelo Florio Fiorentino al benigno lettore.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid. “Se finalmète l’ortografia che ho qui osservata, nò ti pàia quella stessa che ne le sue prose osserua il Bembo, io ti prego a non uolerla biasimare. Concio’ cosa che io ho auuto l’occhio a fare che quella risponda a la pronunzia, e fauella. Che di uero il fare il contrario, mi pare sconueneuole’’.
Compelled to flee England at the accession of Mary Tudor, Florio moved to the Continent where he published, through the printing house of the Frobens at Basle the translation of Agricola. However, the same positions had been partially expressed by the author in the already mentioned earlier work printed in London, the *Catechismo*. Here the author clears himself of the charge that he has not followed the rules of the Tuscan language, claiming that

\[ \text{le cose divine à regole humane sottoposte non sono. Io nò ho uoluto in questa operetta far professione di schietto scrittore toscano, ma di sincero espositore della parola di Dio,} \]

Citolini’s *Grammatica*, which presumably was ready for printing as early as 1561, turns back to the same topic. In this treatise Citolini’s defence of the ‘lingua volgare’ is clearly expressed from the very beginning of the work. In the “Epistle Dedicatorie” to Sir Christopher Hatton, “Capitan de la Guardia de la Ser.ma Reina d’Inghilterra e Gentiluomo de la Camera Privata di S. M.” the Italian exile writes:

\[ [...] questa lingua, che ora l’Italia parla in luogo de la Latina, fu ne’ primi tempi suo ritenuuta spuria, ed abortiva, e schifata da gli scrittori, non potendosi alcun persuadere, che la dovesse mai sott’entrare in luogo de la Latina. Si diedero poi alcuni a scriverla; ma latinizzandola con certe pedantissime eleganzie insopportabili; come ancora in alcuni scritti antichi si può vedere. Cominciando ella dipoi a mostrare qualche raggio de le sue vere bellezze, cominciarono parimenti molti belli ingegni a porle amore, e ad abbracciarla e con la scrittura più purgata a celebrarla, esaltandola ed ogni giorno più illustrandola.\]

---

83 *Catechismo*, sig. A4r. On Florio’s opinion that a translation should give the sense of the original but need not to be absolutely literal, F.A. Yates (1934:12) has rightly observed that the same precepts for the guidance of a translator exactly correspond with his son’s John subsequent practice.

84 A. Citolini, *Grammatica della lingua italiana*, British Library, Arundel Ms. 258, undated (hereafter cited as *Grammatica*). Although in his Dedicatorial letter to Hatton Citolini claims that the grammar was written just for him, “avendo io inteso quanto la S.V. sia desiderosa dell’intera cognizione de la lingua Italiana”, this statement has been considered by several critics merely an artifice. The grammar, in fact, might have been written even before the *Tipocosmia*, a much more famous work by the same author printed in Venice in 1561. See C. Naselli 1942:51-6; also L. Fessia 1939-40:213-43.

85 *Grammatica*, 2v-3r. In 1540 Citolini wrote the *Lettera in difesa della lingua volgare*, which was first published in Venice in the same year. In this letter he had clearly expressed his own view about the matter. He not only considers the vernacular language to be as noble as Latin, but also states that the vernacular should borrow from other spoken languages what it lacks.
Citolini’s great concern with the ‘living usage’ of the Italian language, both written and spoken, is beautifully described in the following passage of the same Epistle:

Imperochè sendo il parlare un’ istrumento co’l quale noi esprimiamo i pensieri e i concetti de l’animo nostro, quel parlare è senza dubbio, più perfetto, che più perfettamente esprime essi pensieri, e concetti de l’animo; così essendo la scrittura un’ istrumento co’l quale noi esprimiamo il vivo parlare; quella scrittura è senza dubbio, più perfetta, che più perfettamente esprime il vivo parlare. Questa con così poco aiuto esprime il vivo parlare più perfettamente, che alcun’altra ne’ de le presenti, ne’ de le passate da noi conosciute: questa adunque è più perfetta che alcun’altra ne’ delle presenti ne’ delle passate. 

When reading this passage, one can hardly overlook Dante’s similar views as upheld in his De vulgari eloquentia (1304-5). In this work, Dante describes the vernacular as the language spoken by children as soon as they come to articulate the sounds that they have learnt by imitating the adults’ vocabulary. Opposite to this language is Latin or locutio secundaria, a language heavily dependent on rules which can be acquired only after a long period of studying. Bearing in mind such a distinction between primary and secondary language, Dante staunchly claims the vernacular to be the most noble language inasmuch as it can be read by the many rather than the few. Moreover, although it is “made up of different words and pronunciations”, the vernacular is something natural, pre-existing the artificial Latin. This statement makes the so-called questione della lingua worth examining very briefly. This concerned the appropriate form for written Italian throughout the peninsula.

It was Pietro Bembo, the most distinguished Latinist of the age, and one of the supporters of the vernacular tongue, who promoted in Italy the sixteenth-century linguistic debate over the nature and value of the vernacular with respect to Latin. Living at a time when Italian poetry, after the overwhelming Tuscan domination of its early
centuries, was acquiring a somewhat regional character thanks to the emergence in the late Quattrocento of flourishing literary centres outside Tuscany, Bembo not only gave “humanistic approval to the pedigree of the rising vernacular literature and provided a solution to its linguistic problems”, as has been observed, but he also established a general climate of taste. In his most distinguished work, *Prose della volgar lingua* (1525), Bembo declared that Italian was a modern and living language whilst Latin was a remote and dead one. This idea, born of his experience as a humanist, along with his assertion that the language of literature is distinct from that of ordinary speech, he bequeathed to the Italian writers of his times. Henceforth, writers in Italian had two models to which they could turn – the prestigious idiom of the Tuscan classics of Petrarch for poetry and Boccaccio for prose – in the same way as humanists had turned to the great writers of antiquity, namely to the excellence of Cicero and Virgil.

Bembo’s effort to unify the Italian language betrays once again an aristocratic and essentially literary concern rather than linguistic considerations of practical usefulness, social benefit and popular culture. Instead, it was Dante who was referred to as the ‘father of the Italian language’, and it is the earlier use of the ‘illustrious vernacular’ which he put forward in his *De vulgari eloquentia* that later inspired the defenders of the Italian vernacular. His work, in fact, showed convincingly that Italian could be adapted to fulfil the most exacting requirements of literature and society. It is with Dante’s *Vita nuova* that Florentine supremacy in the literary field began, while the *Convivio* (1303-1307) was a conscious attempt to demonstrate the maturity of the vernacular tongue in handling philosophical concepts, not only in Tuscany, but beyond its borders. Whereas in these two books Dante speaks of the Italian language in general, the problem in the *De vulgari eloquentia* is both wider and more refined. Here Dante searches Italy for the most elegant vernacular and finishes by eliminating all dialects, including the Tuscan, inasmuch as they reflect a merely local and municipal reality. Yet, in contrast to the Latin intellectualism of the new humanists, Dante abolished dialect-based peculiarities and demolished the superiority of the Florentine tongue in the name of a higher idiom

---

representing the whole of Italy. This was the volgare illustre, a vernacular which is illustrious, cardinal, courtly and curial and which belongs to all Italian cities and dwells in none of them. The poets who, in Dante’s view, have achieved this ideal language were: lyric poets of the Sicilian school; Guinizzelli; and the poets of the dolce stil novo: Guido Cavalcanti, Lapo Gianni, Cino da Pistoia and Dante himself.

Of course, this is not the place to embark upon a full exposition or discussion of Dante’s role in the history of Italian literature. My purpose here is merely to trace the foundations in Italy of a consciousness of cultural unity – even if from a linguistic perspective only – which would later inform the works of the following generations. In this respect, Dante’s care in matters of artistic technique, his desire to benefit the many rather than the few, as well his love for his own language would constitute throughout the centuries a paradigmatic reference point for all supporters of a unified Italy.

As one might expect, this ‘nationalism’ implicit in Dante’s theory is echoed also in the aspiration towards linguistic unification so much hoped for by Italian sixteenth-century exiles, the great majority of whom had fled a country with long-standing divisions, strong regional traditions and oppressive political links with foreign powers. In this regard, the historical significance of the Renaissance reaction against Latin was the need to break away from fixed and static ideas of perfection and from modes of thought that no longer corresponded to a sense of social evolution and developing experience, as noted by Professor Eugenio Garin. We have repeatedly seen so far how this concept of Italian as a ‘living language’ was well established among the Italians in Elizabethan England, including Giordano Bruno and shared by their printers Charlewood and Wolfe.

In linguistic terms, the publication in England of William Thomas’ s Historie of

---

91 Actually Dante read the works of the Sicilians in the versions already somewhat Tuscanised by scribes. The language it resulted, therefore, could not be found in no part of Italy: it was an innovative language, belonging to all Italy and not to some regions or cities only. Hence, Dante calls it ‘illustre’ because worthy of a court, whether Italy had one.
93 On Citolini’s acquaintance with Florio, Leicester and Cecil, see M.G. Bellorini 1965:285-95. Bruno’s concern with showing consideration to important representatives of the English Reformed group is testified to by the suppression of Citolini’s name in the second version of La cena de le ceneri. See G. Aquilecchia 1991:41.
Italie in 1549 was one of the early signs of a growing Italian influence on English learning and customs, and Thomas followed his history by writing the first Italian grammar to be printed in English and a dictionary which was not superseded for fifty years. Midway between Thomas' pioneering syllabus and Holyband's editions of his most famous Italian manual, *The Italian Schoole-maister*, stood John Florio's elegant conversation book, *The first fruits*, which appeared in 1578. It was followed by *The second fruits*, which, along with its companion volume the *Giardino di ricreatione*, was published in 1591 and dedicated to Nicholas Saunder of Ewell. Unlike Holyband's manuals, Florio's books are not addressed to the 'unlearned', but to educated English readers wanting to improve their basic knowledge of Italian.

If the teaching of the language and the proper use of grammar were among the first concerns of these Italian expatriates in the 50s, the religious crisis that occurred in Italy during those years represented nevertheless the main reason for so many other nationals leaving their country. Once abroad, the Italian Reformers strove to create a council among the evangelical churches to set against the compelling Tridentine orthodoxy in order to build a platform for a doctrinal uniformity within the Protestant world. They demanded religious toleration, the search for peace, liberty of conscience, restraint of the Church's corruption and the unity of Christendom. In terms of doctrine, they advocated the authority of the Holy Scriptures, the quest for truth and purified religious ceremonies. In comparison to this essential matter, all details of mere dogma and ritual were indifferent, and fell away. Unfortunately, in most cases their activity failed. Their ideas of tolerance and their eirenic temperament, in fact, not only alienated them from the other Protestant factions, which by the end of the 1570s and the beginning of the 1580s had become proper creeds, but they also ended by arousing anger and hostility among Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists, sometimes leading to persecution and punishment, as in Giordano Bruno and Francesco Pucci's executions. Their death stifled any hope of an end to persecution for religion's sake and, at the same time, strengthened the feeling that perhaps "la radicale aspirazione comune verso l'ecumenica solidarietà cristiana, l'esigenza unitaria e universale implicita nel messaggio evangelico, potevano
sopravvivere solo nel grembo della Chiesa di Roma”.^4

The tendency to reduce Christianity to a purely moral teaching, relying on personal beliefs, was another common feature of Italian heretic circles. Such men as Ochino, Pucci, Aconcio, but also Castelvetro, certainly partook of it. In this respect, it is worthwhile here to mention Pucci’s *Forma d’una repubblica catholica*, with the annexed *Disciplina domestica, o vero uffitio di religione*, which has even been considered by critics to be one of the most significant works by an Italian religious exile of the second half of the sixteenth century.\(^5\) In this work, the recurring theme of unity among all dissident sects and conflicting creeds in Christendom on the ground of a common doctrine establishes it once again as the main concern of the Italian expatriates of those years, among them Giordano Bruno. In particular, there are several analogies between the two heretics, such as their rejection of both the Lutheran and Calvinist positions concerning transubstantiation; their criticism of the principle and practice of hierarchy which permeated the Christian church, as well as their defence of and support for Henry of Navarre as the Christian king under whom any differences in religion would be merged.

The religious tolerance and the eirenic virtue which characterised Italian heresy of the Cinquecento were not incidental in Bizzarri’s and Aconcio’s thought too.

Pietro Bizzarri was another Italian who fled his native country because of his unorthodox religious opinions.\(^6\) Most probably the exile was brought into contact with Jacopo Aconcio through either the Earl of Bedford, an ardent Protestant who was the patron of both of them, or through their common friend Ochino. Bizzarri staunchly believed in the unity of Christendom, regardless of differences of doctrines, and in the consequent ecumenical endeavours to reconcile them. A pamphlet, dated 1561 and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, has been ascribed to him. The work, whose only extant

---

\(^4\) L. Firpo 1949:25. It is with this statement in mind, perhaps, that Pucci’s reconversion to Catholicism in summer 1585 can be explained. A similar disposition of mind seems to apply to Bruno during his interrogation by the Venetian Inquisition and during the first part of the Roman trial. Yet, it was not enough to prevent them from being executed for heresy.

\(^5\) The manuscript, undated and without name, is preserved in the British Library (Sloane Mss. 926). For its attribution to Pucci and its composition in London in 1581, see L. Firpo 1957:199-200.

copy is preserved in the British Library, is called De Principe, and is a collection of ‘commonplaces’ on the figure of the good prince.\(^7\) Bizzarri was also closely acquainted with Ochino, Citolini and Pucci, and had contacts with English literary and diplomatic circles.\(^8\)

Aconcio’s share of influence in the process involving freedom of conscience during a crucial period of English history is still more evident.\(^9\) Like Pucci, Aconcio appears to be hostile to the dogmatism which characterised the Protestant churches in London, as well as to those who think to have a right to condemn or to punish the individual conscience on the grounds that there being but the one truth. For this reason, Aconcio has been considered by most of the scholars of the ensuing years a champion of tolerance. In his opinion, no believer can hold for certain to possess truth and, consequently, no Church is allowed to persecute another. Excommunication itself leads to the formation of sects, to religious struggles and schisms. In this respect, it is highly significant that Queen Elizabeth in England, like Henry III in France, become a crucial reference in securing religious tolerance and enduring peace. In this respect, that the most important writings of the age on the subject are addressed to those sovereigns is not fortuitous. Notwithstanding their effort to achieve a religious and political reform, the majority of these exiles did not succeed and either lived in poverty or, once back in Italy, died victims of the restored Roman Inquisition. Indeed, it is during the last twenty years of the reign of Elizabeth that the Italians started acquiring a certain influence at Court and, subsequently, gave birth to a proper ‘Italian fashion’ in England.

If the English taste for Italian language and literature implied, at some point, the ‘wickedness’ associated to a great extent with the decay of the Peninsula, the 1600 verse *But an Italian Anglified, / Becomes a Saint Angelified,*\(^10\) fully describes the reverse process. The expression confirms the way in which those Italians that, having perfectly adapted themselves to English everyday life, were also able to obtain good reputation as

---

\(^7\) B.L. Royal Mss. XII.A.48.

\(^8\) See J.M. Osborn 1971:344-54; also Id. 1972.

\(^9\) On Jacopo Aconcio, see O'Malley 1955.

well as honours at the Court and by the favour of the Queen herself. Sir Orazio Pallavicini and Giovanni Battista Castiglione, “Queen Elizabeth’s Master for Italian”, may stand as two representatives of the better class of these anglicised Italians, who “lived amid courtly surroundings, ready to turn hands and brains to any account”.101

Orazio Pallavicini was to his contemporaries a figure of some prominence, familiar to that exclusive society that formed the English ruling class. From the examination of Pallavicini’s activities at the end of the 80s there is little doubt that he held a position of considerable political and social prominence. For this reason, his biography has been considered a field of interest more for historians than for literary critics.102

Conversely, once having joined the English landed gentry,103 Castiglione played a crucial role in promoting Italian culture in England. Aconcio, Bizzarri, Scipione e Alberico Gentili, Ubaldini, all were linked with him by ties of friendship or business. More precisely, Castiglione was Aconcio’s closest friend in England: they both took up Haemstede’s cause in defence of a number of Dutch Anabaptists, and most probably it was Castiglione who encouraged Aconcio to write and dedicate to Leicester his essay on history books and how to read them with profit, Delle osservazioni et avvertimenti che haver si debbono nel leggere delle historie.104 Probably, though, Aconcio left Castiglione his works because they both shared the same religious beliefs. The result of this inheritance was Castiglione’s editing of Aconcio’s Una esssortazione al timor di Dio, Con alcune rime Italiane, nouamente messe in luce, which bears Wolfe’s imprint. In a

101 L. Einstein 1902:190.
102 Pallavicini, however, was acquainted with several Italian exiles. Among them, he was in personal contact with Alberico Gentili, who accompanied him to Germany as a secretary of Latin; and with Castelvetro, who probably met him first in 1584 in Paris together with Richard Hakluyt, and later in 1586 in Frankfurt where he received letters from Cecil and Walsingham. Furthermore, the Italian Protestants Giovan Battista Aureli and Francesco Betti dedicated to Pallavicini their controversial religious works which were printed by Wolfe’s press. See M.G. Bellorini 1971:57-60 and above, chapter 1.
103 In 1560 Castiglione was appointed “groom of the Privy Chamber”. Five years later, the ownership of Benham Valence given to him and his descendants “from the [...] Queen for his many and most distinguished services rendered to her”, quoted in M.G. Bellorini 1974:119. See also CPR, 1564-65, 7 Elizabeth, Par. X, vol. III:336.
104 The manuscript was dedicated to Leicester in the years between 1562 and 1564 and is preserved in the Public Record Office in London. In the first instance, it was meant to be the introduction to a larger historiographical work which was never completed. It also responded to the belief, shared by Castiglione and by Leicester, that history constituted a valid source for political advice. See C.D. O’Malley 1955:167-80.
previous chapter, I have already mentioned Aconcio’s cosmological views as they are delineated in this posthumous book. Here the author, by referring to the central position of the sun, makes use of the new and revolutionary Copernican model of the universe. Here, this vision of harmony is not repugnant to theology. Instead, it is the most genuine way to glorify the infinite goodness of God. The author’s beliefs on the relationship between man and God are far more interesting, inasmuch as they provide a general view of one of the most controversial theological disputes between these evangelicals and the Roman church. This idea of ‘religiosità personale’ (personal belief), as I have stressed, together with the plea for tolerance, constitutes the gist of what not only Aconcio, Bizzarri or Pucci, but also such authors as Aureli and Betti, as well as Gentili attempted to say.

Very interesting, too, are five poems which Castiglione had written several years earlier and now added to Aconcio’s essay. There are two ‘canzoni’ and a sonnet addressed to Queen Elizabeth, which are followed by a ‘Canzone a Dio’ and by another sonnet dedicated to an English lady, ‘Madama Elisabetta Barklei’. These lines, besides their grace and elegance, are acts of gratitude and at the same time the expression of a very precise religious and political aim, as has already been underlined by scholars. In the second canzone addressed to Queen Elizabeth, for instance, there is an explicit reference to the *leit motiv* of the Italian exiles ‘for the sake of religion’, namely the role of Queen Elizabeth as defender of peace and advocate of religious tolerance:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Trafitta, e nuda giace, e merce chiama} \\
\text{Quella Religion, ch'al ciel tant'alme} \\
\text{Guidava e da gli Hesperij, e dagli Eoi:} \\
\text{Et da tera vi porge ambe le palme,} \\
\text{Perché dal fango sollevarsi brama,} \\
\text{Ne spera homai poter se non per voi.}
\end{align*}
\]

105 *Essortazione*, 16-24.
106 In the Epistle Dedicatory to Queen Elizabeth, Castiglione gives the reason for his own Italian poems with these words: “Hora fra certe mie scritture cercando, e essendomi venute alle mani alcune belle rime, e tra l’altro una bellissima canzone Canzone fatta in lode di V.S.M. m’è caduto nel pensiero di far con esse e con la detta operetta un volumetto, il quale prendendo qualche poco di forma, si potesse lasciare uscire in luce”. Ibid., 4.
108 *Essortazione*, 35.
At the same time, the *Essortatione* began the series of publications in Italian printed by Wolfe in London during the twelve years from 1580 to 1592 in collaboration with some of the most distinguished Italian exiles of those years.

Pallavicini's extraordinarily successful career, as well as his impressive wealth, and Castiglione's position at court do not reflect either the real uncertainty of Elizabethan court appointments or the precariousness of life experienced by the majority of the Italian émigrés. Petruccio Ubaldini is an instructive example. Although he tried to support himself by working — either for the Queen or great noble families — as a teacher of Italian or calligrapher, his poverty is persistently reported in the records throughout the 1570s and after.\(^{109}\) However, Ubaldini's views with respect to religious matters stand alone within the 'panorama' of sixteenth century Italian exiles in London. Unlike other Italian expatriates, no extant records speak directly of Ubaldini as having fled from the Inquisition. He first visited England in 1545, then returned to the Continent, perhaps on business for the English government, and finally settled permanently in England about 1562. His main relevance in the English context resided in his being the most famous representative of the "Tuscany tradition" in England.

According to a study by Francesca Bugliani, Ubaldini's *Relazione delle cose del Regno d'Inghilterra* allows us to better examine the cultural relations between England and Italy during the second half of the sixteenth century. The report, in fact, is not only essential for our understanding of English habits, but it also contains first-hand impressions of religious, political and economic matters.\(^{110}\) In addition, it provides one of the very few records of the relationship between Italy and England after the Reformation. From that time onwards, religious and political relations between the two countries badly deteriorated and Ubaldini was ready to fill the gap left by the rupture in official diplomatic and ecclesiastical contacts between them. Although the first version of the report is dated as early as 1551 and covers mainly the reigns of Henry VIII and of his son Edward,\(^{111}\) the later version of 1576 deals with the reigns of both Mary Tudor and Queen

\(^{109}\) *APC*, X:403.

\(^{110}\) See F. Bugliani 1991:165.

\(^{111}\) This version was published by Giuliano Pellegrini in his book of 1967.
Elizabeth. A third undated version, probably going back to the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, seems to be only a shortened version of the previous one and compiled by someone who was not Ubaldini. I am not going to dwell upon the so-called questione ubaldiniana, namely the philological problem related to the different manuscripts of the work and to the several transcriptions - some of which are authentic, while others are undisputedly false - in order to establish which one should be considered more authentic than the others. Instead, I aim to concentrate on the chapters that Ubaldini devotes to religion and to the description of English customs. The point is to establish whether or not the three versions reflect Ubaldini’s gradual accommodation to Elizabethan England. According to this view, in fact, while in London during 1576, the author would have substantially revised his 1551 account, adapting it to the political situation and to the wishes of the authorities. The changes in emphasis, the omissions, the shifts in opinions would also denote the increasing partiality of this work.

The idea of ‘conformity’ to English society as a possible explanation of Ubaldini’s gradual leaning towards Anglicanism has been assumed by Bugliani in an earlier article on the Italian exile. Similarly, the positive attitude towards the Elizabethan Settlement that characterises both the 1576 and the later sixteenth-century version would suggest undeniably that “Ubaldini wrote his account to correct unfavourable opinions that he or his English patrons detected abroad”. Valuable though this interpretation may be, at least two arguments furnish the basis for further discussion. Examination in detail of several episodes of Ubaldini’s life seems to show that he had Catholic sympathies. In fact, he probably stayed a Catholic at least until the end of Edward’s reign. Ubaldini’s views on religious matters at the end of 1551 are clearly expressed in the introduction to his first account of Relazione, where he writes:

Circa la Religione, dicendo solamente quanto loro osservano

---

112 The ms. containing a different version of Ubaldini’s account of England was found in 1993 in the Biblioteca Statale di Lucca by Bugliani herself. It most resembles a further version preserved in the Bibliothèque de la Ville at Aurillac, dated 1583.
113 This is Bugliani’s hypothesis as reported in her 1994 article, pp. 175-190. The undated version was published and edited by A.M. Crino in 1979.
115 Ibid., 182.
seconde le loro constitutioni, aliene da quelle della Romana Chiesa, governandomi in questa ultima parte puntualmente secondo le loro ragioni, acciò che non paia, che io voglia parlare di quello che non fo professione, ma solo di quanto da loro è stato ordinato.\textsuperscript{116}

If, on the one hand, such a ‘diplomatic’ attitude is explained by the author’s activity for the English government, on the other hand, it clearly indicates his intention not to show himself talking about what he actually does not profess, that is to say about what is “adverse to the Roman Church”.

The passage is also repeated without any significant change in the latest revised version which, according to what Bugliani herself reiterates in her essay, is nothing but a summary of the earlier versions.\textsuperscript{117} It could then be said that the omissions as they occurred in the subsequent versions, so thoughtfully described by Bugliani, were in fact more the result of a cautious attitude on the author’s part, an attitude which led him to cut some of the most compromising parts, such as the conclusion of the third chapter of the \textit{Relazione}, which is entirely devoted to his treatment of religion.\textsuperscript{118} In the same way, the Italian’s harsh judgements on Henry VIII; his open support of Mary Tudor, whom he described as “manly in spirit, magnanimous, liberal, and above all devout, and very attentive in household matters”,\textsuperscript{119} against Jane Grey,\textsuperscript{120} may well reflect Ubaldini’s Catholic tenets as professed in those years.

There is at least one irrefutable piece of evidence that Ubaldini had some contact with the English Catholics. His patron was Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, one of the most prominent aristocrats in Tudor England, and whose acquaintances among the

\textsuperscript{116} G. Pellegrini 1967:61. Italic is mine.

\textsuperscript{117} “Circa la religione dirò solamente quanto nell’esteriore appare secondo le loro nuove constitutioni, per le quali si potrà fare dal lettore una facil congettura dell’interior d’essa, governandomi in questa ultima parte puntualmente come l’occhio che rappresenta inanzi senza più, acciò non paia che io voglia parlare di quelle cose delle quali io non fo professione più di quello che alla modestia d’un uomo civile si convenga”. Quoted in A.M. Crinò 1979:672. My Italics. On the other hand, Bugliani herself adds that “to hide religious and political beliefs and goals was often simply a matter of survival or, at least, a way of keeping one’s peace” (1991:162 and 1992:73). The translation into English is mine.

\textsuperscript{118} See G. Pellegrini 1967:136.

\textsuperscript{119} F. Bugliani 1994:181. The translation into English is hers.

\textsuperscript{120} See A.M. Crinò 1979:689-90.
Catholic party were well known. The patronage lasted until Arundel’s death in 1580.\textsuperscript{121} Yet, the evidence of Ubaldini’s inclination toward Catholicism might be reinforced by what in 1584 Giordano Bruno writes about his fellow-countryman:

Due sono le false e onorate reliquie di Firenze in questa patria: i denti di Sassetto, e la barba di Pietruccia.\textsuperscript{122}

The epithet ‘false’, in fact, would indicate Ubaldini’s disguising of his true faith in accordance with Bruno’s mention at the same time of Tommaso di Vincenzo Sassetti, a rather ambiguous figure who was known as “gentiluomo catolico fiorentino”.\textsuperscript{123} Ubaldini was probably held in the same low regard by another Italian exile \textit{religionis causa}, Giacomo Castelvetro. One extraordinary document, an annotated copy in the Newberry Library of the \textit{Relazione d’Inghilterra}, might provide evidence of Ubaldini’s views in religious matters. Hand-written marginal annotations by Castelvetro, in fact, point to his countryman as a “papist” and “blind idolater”.\textsuperscript{124} Thus, it is due to these ambiguous tenets, besides some stylistic clues, that I agree with the identification of Castelvetro rather than Ubaldini as the probable editor of Wolfe’s publications in Italian, as already suggested by Butler and Ottolenghi.\textsuperscript{125}

In the light of the evidence I have gathered so far, the shared interests of Italian exiles in Elizabethan London and the printers/publishers of their works can be easily

\textsuperscript{121} In the 1551 version of the \textit{Relazione}, in talking about the earl of Arundel Ubaldini maintains that he is “di religione ottima” and that “tra tanti travagli” in religious matters there is still someone in England who is “religioso e buon cristiano” (G. Pellegrini 1967:86).

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Oeuvres/Souper}:31. On account of this mention of Ubaldini’s beard, scholars were bound to identify the exile with ‘Barbagrigia’, the unknown author of the introductions to the Machiavelli and Aretino editions printed by Wolfe. See above, 71.

\textsuperscript{123} S. Rossi 1984:72-3, footnote 29. Tommaso di Vincenzo Sassetti might be the author of \textit{The Massacre of St. Bartholomew}. Sassetti’s “Account” is part of a manuscript collection of historical texts which were partly annotated by Castelvetro with the probable purpose of publication. They are preserved at the Newberry Library, Chicago (Case MS. J 93. 154). See: J. Tedeschi in A. Soman (ed.) 1974:99-154; G. Migliorato 1982:243-96.

\textsuperscript{124} The existence of the unpublished document is recorded in P.P. Ottolenghi 1982:17, footnote 30. The copy of the \textit{Relazione d’Inghilterra} with Castelvetro’s marginal annotations is preserved at the Newberry Library, Chicago, cod. 76/2.

\textsuperscript{125} Although he apparently converted to Anglicanism following his wedding with Anna Lawrence on the 21\textsuperscript{st} January 1565, Ubaldini expressed favourable feelings towards Catholicism in his \textit{La descrizione del Regno di Scozia}, The manuscript of this work, which goes back 1576 (Oxford, Corpus Christi Ms cxciv), was probably revised as early as 1580 and printed in 1588 by Wolfe bearing a dedication to Sir Christopher Hatton, the Earl of Leicester, and Sir Francis Walsingham.
discerned. Furthermore, these printers and publishers also produced editions of works by sixteenth-century Italian authors, such as Machiavelli, Aretino, Ariosto, Doni, Boiardo, Tasso, Guarini, which, to a certain extent, seem to be consistent with the religious, political, linguistic and social concerns revealed by the writings of those Italian refugees, including Bruno, of the second half of the century. Such an ideological continuity between the Italian authors of the sixteenth century and the exiles of the end of the century once again perfectly fits with both Charlewood’s and Wolfe’s overall publishing pattern at the time. What needs to be investigated now is the presence and the diffusion in England of Italian book production in order to establish whether or not this kind of editorial venture was successful.
III.

The English reception of books in Italian
at the end of the sixteenth century

In 1591 an edition of Guarini’s *Pastor Fido* and Tasso’s *Aminta* in the original Italian appeared in London bearing Wolfe’s imprint. The literary and political importance of this volume has already been discussed, and so was the extent of its influence on contemporary English literary production. Nonetheless, of great significance in order to assess the popularity of books in Italian in contemporary London is Castelvetro’s Epistle Dedicatory of this work addressing Charles Blount, Lord Montjoy, “ardente seguace sopra ogni altra della nostra favella, e degli scritti dei suoi poeti”.[126] If, on the one hand, this letter gives evidence of the English aristocracy’s love for Italian language and literature, on the other hand, it constitutes a reliable record of the diffusion and of the great demand for books in Italian within the London book market. Castelvetro, in fact, had so frequently been asked by his English friends, he says, to procure for them copies of the *Pastor Fido*, about which they had heard so much, that he eventually decided to meet the demand by printing the play at his own expense in London, once again through Wolfe’s press.

Apparently, the fact that the book was in great demand at the time was also the reason that induced Castelvetro to publish Giovan Battista Della Porta’s *De furtivis literarum notis*, dedicating it to Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland. Judging from the book list made when he was in the Tower, Northumberland, too, was addicted to Italian writers and language.[127] By reading the dedication prefixed to this work, one finds out that the book, which had first appeared in Naples in 1563, was so successful that “brevi tempore nulla amplius exemplaria eius venalia extarent”. Thus since “interea vero cum a doctis multis, clarisque viris librum valde desiderari intellexerem, et multitoties a me quaeri viderem”, Castelvetro had now brought it out, at his own expense, in a corrected

---

[127] Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, seems to have owned more Italian books than English ones. There were chiefly works on history and the sciences, but with Tasso, Guarini and other writers of belles-lettres also included. On Northumberland’s library see: HMC, *Appendix to Sixth Report* 1877:231; G.R. Batho 1950:246-61; H. Gatti 1983:237-42.
That Italian literature to some extent must have met the taste of English readers is well known. And so is the proficiency in Italian language of the majority of noblemen dominating the Elizabethan court. Besides the queen, whose good command of the Italian language, both in terms of comprehension and eloquence has already been stressed, a group of successful English courtiers and political associates could read Italian and speak it fluently. Among them, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Philip Sidney, the Earl of Essex, the Earl of Cumberland, the Earl of Southampton and many others. This was mainly due to both the political and diplomatic affairs that they were involved with, and to the fact that Italian culture at a certain point became fashionable. In fact, a mastery of languages, both in terms of comprehension and eloquence, was considered necessary for success and political prominence, as previously discussed.

What is difficult to assess, however, is what Italian books Englishmen read and owned and, more precisely, how many Italian books they had on their shelves compared to those of other vernaculars. In recent years, one of the central projects of theory and research in the humanities has been a focusing on the interaction of texts and readers. Studying the place of reading, in fact, means attending to the roles of readers in concrete ways, as manifested in the traces they left; for example, marginalia, library catalogues, and the devices and strategies by which authors and readers influenced each other. Unfortunately, much of the evidence, along with many of the books, has now perished. Answers to such questions are therefore to be extracted from a great variety of sources, the most important of which are published and manuscript catalogues of public and private libraries, booksellers’ catalogues as well as printed acknowledgements of sources used by authors in the preparation of their own books. In this respect, my analysis will be necessarily selective; the bulk of evidence is too great to allow full treatment in this edition.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{128} See E. Rosenberg 1943:147-8.

\textsuperscript{129} It is noteworthy that in an annotated copy of John Florio’s \textit{First fruits}, Gabriel Harvey names a group of successful English courtiers and political associates who speak Italian and he places Robert Essex among the ‘Worthies’. The annotated copy is now held in the Houghton Library at Harvard. See G. Stern 1979:156 and W. Boutcher 1997:55. On Robert Essex (1565-1601) and his connections with Bruno, see below, 247-8.
section. Yet, among all the records John Florio's Italian-English dictionary *World of words* is of great interest and deserves special attention.\(^{130}\)

The project of compiling an Italian-English dictionary on a large scale had been in Florio's mind for a long time. In the address "To the Reader" at the beginning of the dictionary, the author says that the idea for it first came to him twenty years earlier when he saw in manuscript the beginning of a collection of material for an Italian dictionary made by a gentleman of "worshipfull account, well travelled, well conceited, and well experienced in the Italian".\(^{131}\) By 1591 he had made great progress with the work, for he then announced that he would "shortly send into the world an exquisite Italian and English Dictionary and a compendious Grammer".\(^{132}\) On the 2\(^{nd}\) of March 1596, "a most copious and exacte Dictionarie in Italian and English made by John Fflorio dedicated to the right honorable the Earle of Southampton"\(^{133}\) was licensed to Edward Blount, but it was published only in 1598.

As soon as it appeared, Florio's *World of wordes* was immediately accepted in England as the most comprehensive bilingual dictionary of its kind, as well as the foremost authority on Italian. Despite its success, Florio started working almost at once on a second edition and an Italian grammar. These were published in one volume in 1611 and dedicated to Queen Anne.\(^{134}\) This second edition was almost double the size of the original dictionary, with an increase from nearly 44,000 to over 74,000 definitions. Given the close connection between the love for Italian literature and the concern with the Italian language as the only instrument for the reading and the comprehension of the original texts, the importance of the two editions of Florio's dictionary in the history of the diffusion of Italian culture in England does not need to be further underlined. Moreover, in linguistic terms, they served as a point of reference for all subsequent Italian dictionaries produced in England up to the second half of the eighteenth century.

Motivated by the concern that his readers should be well equipped to cope with

\(^{130}\) STC 11098. *A worlde of wordes or most copious and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English, collected by John Florio*, 1598.

\(^{131}\) Ibid., b1v.

\(^{132}\) Ibid., b1v.

\(^{133}\) Quoted in F.A. Yates 1934:188.

\(^{134}\) SR, III:60.

\(^{134}\) STC 11099.
the wide range of literary expression they might encounter in the reading of sixteenth-century Italian literature, Florio consulted as many as 72 volumes for the compilation of the 1598 edition of the dictionary and as many as 252 works for the 1611 edition. These lists are the only guide we have to the possible contents of Florio’s library. Interestingly enough, only four volumes in the list of Florio’s sources in the first edition were written before 1500. As a result, the author’s particular concern with contemporary Italian literature is obvious. More important, these lists might be taken as an exhaustive record of what kind of Italian books landed on Englishmen’s shelves, as well as of what currents of taste were reflected in the titles they chose. But the source did not always supply him with detailed information and nor did the author always show a deep knowledge of the work he mentions. The ‘newness’ of Florio’s two dictionaries, therefore, consists more in the vastness of the records than in a critical approach towards the writings of great Italian authors. Thus Florio’s criteria are consistently quantitative, rather than qualitative.

The list which is prefixed to the 1598 edition comprises both Italian works which were already known in English translation and of others, translated into Italian, such as Du Bartas’s *La diuina settimana*, translated by Ferrante Guisone, Xenophon’s works in the translation of Marcantonio Grandini, Livy’s *Deche*, translated by Narni, Olaus Magnus’s *Historia delle cose settentrionali*, translated by Fiorentino. Interestingly, of the 72 books listed, 15, that is nearly one-fifth, are by Pietro Aretino, a fact which gives some evidence of the popularity enjoyed by the author among English readers but also of the complexity of his bawdy language and style. Other works include: Sannazzaro’s *Arcadia*, Della Casa’s *Galateo*, Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata*, Castiglione’s *Il Cortigiano*, Citolini’s *Tipocosmia*, Garzoni’s *Hospedale degli Ignoranti*, Sinagoga de’ Pazzi, *Piazza universale* and *Teatro di varii ceruelli*, Alunno’s *Osseruationi sopra il Petrarca* and *Ricchezze della lingua toscana*, Botero’s *Ragion di Stato* and *Relationi uniuersali*, Doni’s *Zucca*, *I marmi*, *I mondi* and *Pistolotti amorosi*, Boccaccio’s *Decamerone*, the *Novellino*, Alunno’s *Fabrica del mondo*, Passavanti’s *Specchio di vera penitenza*, Caro’s *Apologia against Ludovico Castelvetro*, Bonardo’s *Miniera del mondo*, Salviano’s *Ruffiana*, Bargagli’s *Pellegrina*, Berni’s and Borselli’s comical works, Discorides’s *Storia e materia medicinale* in five books translated by Pietro
Mattiolo, Giorgi’s *Modo di conoscere i falconi*, Grisone’s *Ordini di cavalcare*, Messisbugo’s *Libro di ordinar banchetti*, Mazzella’s *Descrizione del Regno di Napoli*, Mannarino’s *Gloria di guerrieri e d’amanti di Taranto*, Fratta’s *La nobilissima compagnia della Bastina*, the *Capitoli della venerabil compagnia della lesina*, the letters of Caro, Rao and Tolomei, the dialogues of Guazzo, Franco, Speroni and Benedetto Varchi, Turchi’s *Lettere facete di diversi grand’huomini*, the *Rime piaceuoli* of Caporali, Mauro and others, the Italian versions of Gerard’s *The Herball* and of Laguna’s *Aristotelis...de plantis* and Gesner’s *Animali, pesci e uccelli*. To these, have to be added the dictionaries of Venuti, Fenice, Thomas and De Las Casas.

As one can see, the great variety of topics, such as horsemanship, cookery, falconry, zoology and history enables the author to include in his glossary words relating to as many and as varied subjects as he possibly could. At the same time, the list includes works by many authors whose familiarity among English reader has already been stressed in the preceding chapters. It is surprising, however, that Florio failed to consult the writings of such famous authors as Ariosto, Machiavelli, Boiardo, Guicciardini, no less than Dante and Petrarca. It is perhaps due to this criticism, as O’Connor suggested,¹³⁵ that he later included in the list in the 1611 edition as many as four different editions of and commentaries on Dante’s works, as well as “Le opere del Petrarca”. Yet, this is not the only novelty compared to the earlier edition. Notably additions to it are Bembo’s *Asolani* and *Historia veneta*, Guazzo’s *La ciuile Conversatione*, Varchi’s *Lettioni varie*, the novels of Cinthio and Bandello, the *Prose antiche del Petrarca* of Doni, several different editions of histories, the most significant of which are Guicciardini’s, Giovio’s and Villani’s, Guarini’s *Pastor Fido* as well as *Il secretario*, the *Croce raquistata* of Francesco Braccioli – hot off the press – Tansillo’s *Le lacrime di San Pietro* and *Il vendemmiatore*, Alberti’s *Hecatomphila*, Pulci’s *Morgante Maggiore*, Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*, Boiardo’s *Orlando Innamorato*, Tasso’s *Aminta* and “Tutte l’opere di Nicolò Macchiauelli”. Additional works in the areas of history and politics, military strategy, courtiers’ arts, rhetoric and poetic are also included in the list.

At first glance, what emerges from this picture is Florio’s concern with dramatic

works. In fact, approximately one-sixth of all the sources he cites are comedies, tragedies and pastorals. Besides those already mentioned, there are Boccaccio’s *Filocolo* and *Fiammetta*, Piccolomini’s *Amor costante*, Machiavelli’s *Clitia*, Parabosco’s *Contenti*, Boccaccio’s *Corbaccio*, four comedies by Parabosco, namely *Il Marinaio*, *Il Peregrino*, *Il Viluppo* and *Notte*, two comedies and two tragedies by Luigi Grotto, Bracciolini’s *L’Amoroso sdegno*, Rucellai’s *Rosmunda*, six comedies by Antonfrancesco Grazzini, as well as other comedies, tragedies and pastorals by such authors as Francesco d’Ambra, Pompeo Rocchi, Nicolò Secchi, Ludovico Domenichi, Sforza Oddi, Girolamo Razzi, Bernardino Pino di Cagli and Orlando Pescetti. Noteworthy too are the translations from the classics of Tacitus’s *Annales*, of Cicero’s *Epistulae*, of Pliny’s *Naturalis Historia*, of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, an Italian version of Ficino’s commentary on Plato’s *Symposium*, as well as an edition in Italian of Stephanus Conventius’s *De ascensu mentis in Deum, ex platonica et peripatetica doctrina* and an edition in the Tuscan dialect of Terence’s works. Finally, it is worth drawing attention to several titles which had appeared on the Tridentine *Index of Prohibited Books* and, therefore, as they were no longer available in Italy, could be hardly imported into England.136 Most interesting of all for the purposes of this enquiry is Florio’s inclusion of five of the six works of Bruno printed by Charlewood.137 Since Florio included many of Bruno’s philosophical terms in his dictionary, modern editors of Bruno’s texts have turned to for in the interpretation of the difficult classicisms, archaisms and dialectal forms he so frequently employed.138 This is not surprising when one recalls the acquaintance between Bruno and Florio, the admiration of the latter for the former and the fact that they mention each other in their respective works.139 What seems relevant here is Florio’s much broader outlook in realising the great significance, with respect to the Italian language, of Bruno’s style as used in his vernacular dialogues.

136 These works include: *Antithesi della dottrina nuova et vecchia; Capo finto, Comedia; Gio Fero della passione di Giesù Christo*. Besides Aretino, authors in Florio’s list who had received total or partial condemnation in the *Index* were Boccaccio, Speroni, Castiglione, Doni, and Gesner.

137 The *Cabala del cavallo Pegaseo* only is missing.


139 Bruno mentions Florio in *La cena de le ceneri*, while Florio’s reference to Bruno can be found in the *Second fruits* (1591) and in the preface to the translation of Montaigne’s *Essays* (1600).
The importance of the two editions of Florio’s dictionary and its contribution to the history of Italian-English lexicography has already been stressed by scholars. I shall therefore limit myself to a few remarks arising from a comparison between Florio’s list of works with both the Italian books printed in England and John Charlewood’s book production as presented in the previous chapters.

First, in linguistic terms, by putting emphasis heavily on contemporary, spoken usage and by admitting non-Florentine writers into the canon, Florio carries on his father’s vision of the language, shared by Citolini and by many other Italian exiles whose writings were printed in England by Wolfe. Secondly, setting aside linguistic matters, from a merely literary point of view it is noteworthy that almost all of the Italian authors and works which exerted influence on the Elizabethan literary tradition during the sixteenth century have been included in Florio’s two lists. These range from the writings of the three founders of the Italian literary tradition, Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, to Castiglione, Della Casa and Guazzo for education, Machiavelli and Botero for politics, Guicciardini and Giovio for history, Sannazzaro, Cinthio and Guarini for pastoral, Ariosto and Tasso for the epic romance, Bandello, Cinthio again and Boccaccio for the novella, Boccaccio again, Machiavelli and Ariosto for comedy. Although contemporary critics tend nowadays to emphasise the differences between the two literary traditions and, more specifically, how English writers transformed and progressively defined their works against the Italian originals, nonetheless one cannot deny the stimuli, the attractions and the fascination those Italian writings and authors had on their English counterparts. The fact that they are still cited – although by an author of Italian extraction – as the main sources in the compilation of such distinctive works which appeared during the last two decades of the 16th century and the first two decades of the 17th century, precisely those years which constitute the height of Elizabethan literary creativity and the production of dictionaries, along with the popularity and the fortuna that they achieved up to the end of the century, makes a rethinking and reassessment of our understanding of Italian culture and literature imperative in order to qualify its negative representation in late sixteenth century England. Finally, as one might expect, Florio’s lists are predominantly based on the works written or published by Italian Reformers, most of them religious exiles. If this
can be explained by the fact that he must have been easily able to see and read these books, this is nevertheless indicative of Florio’s adherence to evangelical Protestantism. In this respect, the list of 1598 is dominated by the evangelical writings of Pietro Aretino, including the *Sette salmi della penitenza di David* (1534). In the second list, the religious material broadens very significantly to include the *Trattato del beneficio di Giesù Christo crocifisso*, the anonymous book that became a best-seller in the 1540s and that more than any other work popularised the doctrine of justification by faith in Italy,\(^{140}\) Juan Valdés’s *Alphabeto Christiano*, another milestone of the Reformation in Italy, the *Retrattatione* of the Italian reformer Pier Paolo Vergerio and the Italian Bible of Giovanni Diodati, the leader of Genevan orthodoxy. It is now known that Florio actively encouraged their circulation and use.\(^ {141}\)

Florio’s connections with Protestant evangelism must be evaluated in the light of the patronage of learned foreigners associated in the first instance with figures such as the Earl of Leicester, Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Philip Sidney, the Earl of Bedford, Walsingham, to a lesser extent Lord Burghley and the Queen, and, in general, families of the Marian exiles. In this respect, Florio’s familiarity with those men of letters, such as Stephen Gosson, Edmund Spenser, Edward Dyer, Sir Fulke Greville, Matthew Gwinne, Gabriel Harvey, Samuel Daniel, Richard Hakluyt and Sir Edward Dymoke,\(^ {142}\) who were somehow attracted to this group of patrons, establishes a firmer link between the Italian lexicographer and members of the ‘Italianate’ English milieu. By 1591, however, following the death of these and other key Protestant patrons, this tradition survived in the hands of figures such as the earls of Essex, Cumberland, Southampton, and Pembroke, to whom many Italian exiles at the end of the century dedicated their works. As a result, Florio’s public association with the Essex party in the late 90s along with his likely acquaintance with Shakespeare might throw new light on the reception and fortune

\(^{140}\) Although written anonymously, the book is based to a great extent on material taken from Calvin’s *Instituto Christianae religionis*. The *Trattato del Beneficio* was also one of the texts central to the pre-Marian English reception of Italian and Erasmian evangelism.

\(^{141}\) See W. Bouthcher 1997:87.

\(^{142}\) The association between John Florio and Sir Edward Dymocke has been discussed by W. Bouthcher in a recent article dealing with the discovery in the PRO of new letters addressed to the Italian. See W. Bouthcher 1997:72-4.
of Bruno in England with regard to English literature and drama.\textsuperscript{143}

A final point concerns Charlewood’s book production. As I have already suggested, both Protestant authors and English versions of significant Italian writings, several of which reflecting Florio’s two lists, are well represented in Charlewood’s output. Most important of all, this includes the only extant works in Italian vernacular – except for the comedy \textit{Il Candelaiolo} – by Bruno which we know of. Despite the appearance from his press of some radical authors which marks the beginning of his career, Charlewood’s publications during the 80s and the early 90s seem to be more consistent with the tradition of what can be called “moderate Puritanism”, the foundation of which were laid with Edward Dering, who constantly turned his sermons over to Charlewood from 1577 to 1584. Several works by Henry Smith, along with the collection of his sermons, are also attributed to the same press. Dering’s and Smith’s works reveal tenets that, although not conforming, represent a median stance between the Church of England and the separatists. Such a moderate point of view, as revealed in most of the works printed by Charlewood in the late 80s, does not appear to be very far from Bruno’s positions in his London dialogues. Thus, if on the one hand, these conjectures seem to provide evidence of a possible influence exerted by the Italian philosopher on his printer’s ensuing production, on the other hand, they definitely set Bruno’s writings in a framework which, given Bruno’s by no means favourable opinion of Calvinism in his Italian dialogues, seems to be very close – socially and politically, if not theologically – to that of most of the contemporary Italian exiles in London, as I intend to discuss in the next chapter. This is highly significant when one recalls the link between evangelism and moderate Protestantism in Elizabethan times. As a result, a further consistency between Charlewood and the Italian context, including Bruno, this

\textsuperscript{143} In her recent paper \textit{Giordano Bruno nella cultura inglese (1600-1602): Documenti e testimonianze}, Hilary Gatti has, on the evidence of ties between Essex and theatrical circles in contemporary London, convincingly reaffirmed the idea that there are echoes of Bruno’s death in the two tragedies “that focused on protagonists of great intellectual stature, namely Marlowe’s \textit{Dr. Faustus} and Shakespeare’s \textit{Hamlet}”. This is rather significant whether considering the document reporting the news of Bruno’s death in Rome that I have found among papers belonging to the Earl of Essex. I am deeply grateful to Professor Gatti for providing me with a copy of this paper prior to its publication. On Bruno and Shakespeare, see H. Gatti 1989; also G. Sacerdoti, 1990, 1992 and 1997, along with Chapter 4 of the present study.
time via Florio, can be conjectured.

The task of describing a private library catalogue by dealing with such topics as how it is arranged and which criteria the compiler adopted is a very specific one and it does not need to detain us. On the whole, 16th- and early 17th- century private library catalogues retain the well-established medieval view of the world in the terminology used for their subject headings. Thus the books are broadly listed in loosely alphabetical order under the following general division: Theology, Philosophy (both “moralis” and “naturalis”), Law (both “civilis” and “canonicus”, Medicine (or Physic), Dialectics (or Logic), Grammar (and Poetic), Rhetoric, Mathematics, Astronomy, Music, Geometry, Metaphysics, Res Militaris, Alchemy, Architecture, Cosmography, History (or Historiography). Although there was a sound basis for catalogues to continue the medieval tradition, some did not hesitate to use terms not employed in the catalogue of a bye-gone age, such as ‘Books in folio’, ‘Libri in Quarto’, ‘Divinity books’, ‘Libri in vulgari’. More often than not, catalogues containing language divisions were concerned with both learned and vernacular languages. Books in Italian were included in this final section.

Although I cannot do justice in a few pages to the variety and complex history of all the private libraries and their catalogues of books, a brief outline of some of the main Italian titles will give an idea of their importance for the study of Italian sixteenth-century printing. To this aim, I shall refer here to the catalogues of libraries belonging to Sir Christopher Hatton (1591), John Dee (1583), Sir William More (c.1600), Sir Robert Lumley (1609), Sir William Paget, fourth Baron of Paget (1617), Sir Thomas Knyvett of Ashwellthorpe (1618), William Drummond of Hawthornden the poet (1627), Sir Edward Coke (1634), Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland (1632), inasmuch as they are, easily available in printed publications. The entries of Italian books contain a huge number of titles, of which the following selection must stand as representative.

Among Italian classics are: Dante’s works; Petrarch’s epistles and other works; Machiavelli’s Principe and Discorsi; Castiglione’s Libro del Cortigiano; Guazzo’s Civil Conversatione; Boccaccio’s Delle donne illustri, translated from his De claris mulieribus, Il Decamerone, L’Amorosa Fiammetta, Theseide; Ovid’s Epistles, translated
into Italian; Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*; Bembo’s *Prose*; Dolce’s *Le Troiane Tragedia*; the *Cecaria Tragicomedia* of “Epicuro Napolitano”; Gesualdo’s *Plutosophia*; Grotto’s *La Dalida Tragedia* and *Thesoro Comedia*; Paolo Giovio’s *Commentario de le Cose dei Turchi* and *Istorie del suo tempo*; Ramusio’s *Delle navigazioni et viaggi* in three books; Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*; Giovanni Pico della Mirandola’s works of poetry; Bernardo Tasso’s *Amadigi*; Trissino’s *Italia liberata da Gothi*; Tasso’s *Rinaldo* and *Gerusalemme Liberata*; an Herodotus in the translation of Matteo Maria Boiardo; Guarini’s *Il secretario*; Pasqualigo’s *Lettere amorose* and *Il Fedele*; G. M. Manelli’s translation of Tacitus’ *Vita di Giulio Agricola* (Wolfe-Castelvetro edition); Orlando Pescetti’s *Proverbi*; several editions in Italian of the Testament; Paolo Paruto’s *Historia venetiana*; Leandro Alberti’s *Descrittione di Italia*; Girolamo Balbo’s *Chronologia d’Italia*; Francesco Serdoneti’s *De fatti de’ arme de’ Romani*; Girolamo della Corte’s *Istoria di Verona*; Cesare Campana’s *Della vita di Filippo II*; Petruccio Ubaldini’s *Vita di Carlo Magno, Descrittione del Regno di Scotia, Vite delle donne illustri*; Giovanni Botero’s *Relationi Universali* and *Della raggione di stato*; Giovanni Villani’s *Histoire de suoi tempi*; Giovanni Antonio Summonte’s *Historia di Napoli*; Bembo’s *Historia veneta*; Alessandro Piccolomini’s *Filosofia naturale, Annotazioni nel libro della poetica di Aristotele, Della Institution morale, Della sfera, Theoriche dei pianeti*.

Among the books in Latin by Italian authors, the following are represented: Angelo Poliziano’s epistles and works; Leonardo Bruni Aretoo’s *Historiarum Florentinarum libri*; Carlo Sigonio’s *Historiarum de Regno Italiae libri*; Petrarch’s *De remediis utriusque fortune*; Marcus Vitruvius Pollio’s *De architectura* with commentaries by Daniello Barbaro; Polidoro Virgilio’s *Anglica historia*; Guicciardini’s *Descripito terrae Belgicae*; several sermons and other works by Bernardino Ochino, Giovanni Antonio Magini’s commentary on Claudius Ptolemaeus; Francesco Patrizi’s *Nova philosophia* and *Discussionum peripateticorum libri*; Cardanus’s *De sapientia, De Consolatione, De rerum varietate, Mediolanensis commentaria, Commentaria in Ptolomaei Quadripartitum*; Della Porta’s *De humana physiognomonia, De destillationibus, Della tramutatione metallica, De refractiones optice, De occultis literarum notis*; Fracastoro’s *Opera medica et astronomica*; Savonarola’s *Philosophia epitome* and *Contro astrologia*.
divinatrice; Alberico Gentili’s *De nuptijs, De legationibus, De armis Romanis, De iure belli, De iure magistratum*; Bizzarri’s *De rebus Persicis* and *Varia opuscula*.

To these, Italian authors now in the English translation must be added. Among them, Pietro Martire Vermigli, Polidoro Virgilio, Bernardino Ochino, Petrarch’s *Tryumpe*, Boccacio’s *The falls of princes*, Machiavelli and Aretino in Wolfe’s edition, Florio’s *Worldde of Wordes*, Tasso’s *Amynta* and Boccaccio’s *Filocolo*. It is evident, therefore, that there is a striking similarity between the titles listed above and those listed by John Florio for the compilation of his Italian-English dictionaries, thus confirming the enormous importance assumed by these dictionaries in the history of the reception of Italian books and authors towards the end of the sixteenth century in England. Yet, despite all the deficiencies, I would fail in accomplishing my aim here if I skipped over the presence of Giordano Bruno’s Italian dialogues on the English bookshelves.

In her valuable study of the extant copies of the first edition of Bruno’s texts, Rita Sturlese raises the question of the fortuna of the Italian philosopher in Renaissance England.²⁴² Twenty-four copies belonging to nine different owners who lived during the end of the sixteenth century and the first thirty years of the following century constitute the only bibliographical evidence of Bruno’s presence in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Among them, of particular significance are the copies which once belonged to Queen Elizabeth, those belonging to Alexander Dickson, an English disciple of Bruno, as well as one copy of *Eroici Furori* belonging to the collection of Henry Percy of Northumberland. It might also be possible that Henry Howard, the author of the *Defensative* printed by Charlewood in 1583, acquired both the *Cena* and the *Causa*.²⁴³ That Bruno’s Italian dialogues, with their attack on the pedantic and neo-scholastic aspects of English culture and society, might have annoyed and displeased English readers of the time, including Fulke Greville²⁴⁴ and perhaps even Sir Philip Sidney, is

---

²⁴² See R. Sturlese 1987(a):xxiv-xxvii. The problem, which is still unsolved, of the reception by contemporary English readers of Bruno’s Italian dialogues has been raised also by Hilary Gatti in an article where she deals with the collection of Bruno’s texts she had discovered in the library belonging to the Ninth Earl of Northumberland. See H. Gatti 1983:63-77.

²⁴³ R. Sturlese, 1987(a): nos. 7.17 and 8.17. The suggestion is made by J. Bossy on the assumption that the Arundel House library, which was given to the Royal Society by Henry Howard, 6th Duke of Norfolk (d. 1684), contained copies of the two works. See J. Bossy 1991:125, footnote 59.

²⁴⁴ Bruno mentions Fulke Greville’s disenchantment with him in *Oeuvres/Expulsion*:7.
highly probable. In fact, we know from Bruno’s own words that his “nova philosophia” was furiously attacked by the

invidia d’ignoranti; le presunzioni di sofisti, la detrazioni di malevoli, le murmurazioni di servitori, gli sussurri di mercenari, le contraddizioni di domestici, le suspizioni di stupidi, gli scrupoli di riportatori, gli zeli di ipocriti, gli odi di barbari, le furie di plebei, furori di popolari, lamenti di ripercossi e voci di castigati.147

Despite the lack of documentary evidence, the topic of the influence of Bruno, both in terms of thought and style, upon several of the most significant figures in Elizabethan England, has attracted the attention of modern scholars. As a consequence, in the chapter that follows, by analysing the ‘Italian context’ Bruno came into contact with through his position at the French Embassy in London, I shall be concerned with Bruno’s influence on and indebtedness to contemporary English book production.

147 Oeuvres/Cause:7.
CHAPTER FOUR

BRUNO’S ITALIAN DIALOGUES
WITHIN AN ENGLISH FRAMEWORK

Della censura di onorati spiriti, veri religiosi, et anco naturalmente uomini da bene, amici della civile conversazione e buone dottrine, non si de’ temere; perché quando bene arran considerato, trovaranno che questa filosofia non solo contiene verità, ma ancora favorisce la religione più che qualsivoglia altra sorte de filosofia.

Giordano Bruno, La cena de le ceneri, 1584.

I.
Literary aspects of Bruno’s dialogues: possible ‘borrowings’ from scientific and literary texts of his time and possible echoes of Bruno’s thought in early seventeenth-century texts

In 1543, with the publication of De Revolutionibus orbium coelestium by Nicholas Copernicus (1473-1543), the world of learning was brought into those broader transformations in the conception of the universe that are better known as ‘the Copernican Revolution’. In this book, by openly rejecting Aristotle’s cosmology of perfect heavens circling a stationary earth and by advancing an alternative to the mathematical system envisaged by Claudius Ptolemy (2nd century AD) in his Almagest, Copernicus argued that it was the sun, not the earth, which was at the centre of the universe; that the earth was a planet and, like the other planets, moved in a circular orbit around the sun; and that in addition to its annual motion around the sun the earth also rotated daily on its own axis.¹ He was also to address a third motion, the tilt of the earth

¹ Copernicus had already worked out the main features of his heliocentric theory several years earlier, around 1514, and put them in writing in a manuscript entitled Commentariolus. In 1541 Georg Joachim Rheticus (1514-76), formerly professor of astrology and mathematics at the University of Wittenberg, published a preliminary summary of it, the Narratio prima. However, frightened by the consequences that the new hypotheses were likely to lead to, particularly in the field of theology, Copernicus decided to publish De revolutionibus orbium coelestium only in 1543. The legend goes that a copy of this first edition was brought to him as he lay on his death bed.
that explains the seasons and the phenomenon known as the precessions of the equinoxes.

Modern scholars have discussed at length the ‘newness’ of Copernicus’ heliocentric model of the cosmos.\(^2\) They are in broad agreement with the assumption that such theories, which initiated the reassessment of the old cosmology, were themselves less revolutionary than one might think. Firstly, Copernican cosmology, while providing a unified and systematic treatment of the planetary universe, nevertheless failed to achieve any decisive mathematical advantages over the Aristotelian-Ptolemaic system. Copernicus also retained one of the fundamental assumptions of traditional astronomy, the concept of crystalline spheres, though he tried to emphasise the contradictions between his sun-centred cosmos and the principles of Aristotelian cosmology. The Copernican picture was therefore a halfway revolution.

In his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle had appeared to assign one intelligence, or ‘unmoved mover’, to each of the celestial orbs, assuming either 49 or 55 orbs. Plato’s belief that the heavens were alive added further substance to this idea, which had widespread support among the pagan Greeks. During the Middle Ages, these Aristotelian intelligences were usually conceived as the causes of celestial motion and sometimes identified with angels.\(^3\) In breaking with this tradition, Copernicus maintained that the sphere of the fixed stars did not move at all. Instead, the starry sphere both served as the envelope that holds the world together and allowed him to say that the universe, though immeasurable, was not infinite but bounded.\(^4\) Furthermore, he thought of celestial movement in terms of perfect circular orbits, and, as a result, although he regarded the sun as static, it did not lie at the exact centre of the Copernican system.\(^5\) The observed orbits of the planets still possessed a marked eccentricity and, having eliminated the equants, it was necessary to use the Ptolemaic solutions of eccentricities and epicycles to overcome the difficulty. Finally, that the earth might move is an idea that had already


\(^3\) On the question of the animation of the heavenly bodies in ancient and medieval traditions, see E. Grant 1994:514-28.


\(^5\) For this reason, scholars usually define Copernicus’ system as a ‘heliostatic’ cosmological model.
occurred to ancient astronomers. Heraclides of Pontus (ca. 388-310 BC), the Pythagorean Ecphantus and Hicetas, and possibly Plato, had all suggested that the earth rotated around its axis at the centre of the cosmos. Even the idea of a stationary sun at the centre of the universe with the earth revolving around it is not a novelty in the history of cosmology. Aristarchus of Samos (ca. 310-230 BC) seems to have proposed an heliocentric cosmology entailing both the diurnal and the annual motion of the earth, while Philolaus (5th century BC) ascribed to the earth together with the sun, moon and the five planets a circular motion around a central fire.

At all events, in the dedicatory preface of his De Revolutionibus addressed to Pope Paul III, and later on in the first chapter of the same text, Copernicus himself cites precisely those ancient authors with respect to the movements of the universe’s spheres. Dissatisfied with what he saw as deficiencies and inconsistencies in received astronomy, he realised that his theory was the only one that permitted all the motions to fit well together. For this reason, he did not hesitate to put down his thoughts about the earth’s motion in written form too. In this respect, Copernicus chimes perfectly with the tendency in the sixteenth century towards a revival or revitalisation of old doctrines once known but forgotten or corrupted through time, as Rattansi has recently emphasised. Here, Copernicus’ approach is characteristically humanistic.

On the other hand, historians who wrote in the idiom of revolution spoke of the transformation of conceptual schemes and metaphysical presuppositions or mutations of intellectuals habits rather than the cumulative progress of new theories, as Westman has rightly observed. It is with this in mind that Garin in a chapter of his Rinascite e Rivoluzioni: Movimenti culturali dal XIV al XVI secolo reaffirmed the priority of the

---

6 In the first chapter of his text, Copernicus also mentions the ancient doctrine of Hermes Trismegistus. It was this reference that gave to Yates the idea of a Hermetic Bruno as expounded in perhaps her most famous book about the Nolan philosopher, Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition. It is also worth recalling that Bruno himself, when explaining in the De immenso the reasons which eventually led him to adhere to heliocentric ideas, quotes exactly the same sources mentioned by Copernicus except for Hermes. See De immenso:566.

7 De revolutionibus:22-3.

8 In talking about this sixteenth-century trend, Rattansi adds: “And even those wishing to demolish accepted authority presented themselves as substituting for it one of equal or even superior antiquity, not something new” (1996:98).

developments in philosophical thinking during the Renaissance against the 'scientific revolution', thus underlining the essentially theoretical nature of its humanistic roots, as well as its origins in a cultural crisis. In this respect, Copernicus' achievement in fighting against obstacles to conceptual change, in challenging the leading conceptions of his age, in discovering new ways to understand earlier speculation and in providing new solutions to cosmological problems is beyond all doubt.

The issue of Bruno's homage to Copernicus, along with his critical evaluation of some of the basic Copernican assumptions, which have led scholars to acknowledge the uniqueness of the Nolan's reading of Copernicus, has been much discussed and therefore will not receive much consideration here. Nor shall I engage with interpretations proposed by numerous distinguished scholars on the role that Copernicus might have played in the development of Bruno's cosmological theories, especially with regard to his infinitism and atomism. Instead, for the purposes of the present enquiry I focus on the possible goals which lie behind his three philosophical dialogues dealing with cosmological topics written and published in London in 1584.

There is little doubt that Bruno's La cena de le ceneri, the first of his dialogues in the vernacular to appear in London, purported to describe a debate regarding cosmology, and more precisely, "the earth's motion", as the author himself claimed in both the book itself and again in his deposition of 3 June 1592 to the Venetian Inquisitors. Again, at the beginning of the second dialogue of La cena, Fulke Greville, whose house is the setting of the debate, asks Bruno to explain why the earth moves. Bruno commentators also agree with the connection between Bruno's unhappy

---

10 E. Garin 1975:323 and 318. For the cultural meaning of the Scientific Revolution, see also M.C. Jacob 1988.
11 Copernicus’ hesitation to “bring to light his commentaries written to demonstrate the Earth’s movement” as well as his fear of the scorn which “the newness and of his opinion might provoke” (De revolutionibus:24) among theologians and philosophers testifies to the fact that he was well aware of the revolutionary character of his thesis. I use A.M. Duncan’s English translation of the work.
12 Oeuvres/Souper:39-43; see also De Immenso:563-7.
15 Oeuvres/Souper:9 and L. Firpo 1993:188.
16 Oeuvres/Souper:75. The 'redazione primitiva' of the work seems to confirm Bruno’s concern with the motion of the earth. See D. Knox 1999:356.
conclusion to his lecturing in Oxford in the summer of 1583 and his prompt composition of *La cena*. Bruno intended this work to be a fuller exposition of his philosophy, which he felt had been misinterpreted and ridiculed by the "celebrated doctors and teachers" of Oxford University.\(^\text{17}\) That the aim of this first dialogue was that of ridiculing "some doctors" and their opinions "on those matters", *i.e.* the earth's motion, is admitted by Bruno himself both explicitly in the last part of the deposition of 3 June 1592\(^\text{18}\) and implicitly in the prefatory poem addressed to "The Malcontent", whose gist is that "people in glass houses should not throw stones",\(^\text{19}\) probably referring to one of his antagonists in the debate.\(^\text{20}\)

These considerations allow us to depart from both Frances Yates's reading of Bruno's dialogues in terms of presenting a religious programme of conciliation between liberal Protestants and Catholics by accepting the higher Hermetic religion,\(^\text{21}\) and from an exclusively political or social explanation of the intentions of these texts.\(^\text{22}\) By contrast, I agree with Gatti when she claims that Bruno was immersed in the dramatic scientific developments of his day and that he definitely contributed to the scientific change that was already taking place in his times.\(^\text{23}\) That Bruno intends clearly to play a significant role within the contemporary scientific debate becomes more evident in *La cena* when he chooses as his debating opponents two Oxford Aristotelian philosophers, as well as when he attacks them for taking the instrumentalist view of astronomy proposed in the preface of *De revolutionibus* as the view of Copernicus himself. Furthermore, as Professor Aquilecchia pointed out in his article of 1953, Bruno's use of Italian in his dialogues reflects the movement away from Latin and towards the vernacular in the contemporary school of English writers such as Robert Recorde and Leonard and Thomas Digges. The adoption of the English vernacular for scientific works, in fact, was symptomatic of the

\(^{17}\) *Ad excellentissimum Oxoniensis Academiae Procancellarium*, in OL, II,II:76.
\(^{18}\) See Firpo 1993:188.
\(^{19}\) Quoted from D. Knox, course notes to Giordano Bruno's *La cena de le ceneri*, unpublished, 5. I should like to thank Dr. Knox for providing me with his valuable notes.
\(^{20}\) For Bossy's identification of *The Malcontent*, see above, 121 footnote 153.
\(^{23}\) See H. Gatti 1999:9.
emergent social cadres, technical and mercantile, but also of the aristocratic court circles more open than universities to new philosophical ideas, while constituting an obvious departure from academic or ecclesiastical circles which were predominantly committed to an Aristotelian and scholastic context. This attitude went on till the end of the century, since it was in 1597 that Sir Thomas Gresham, one of the most prominent merchants of Elizabethan England, founded in London the well-known college, named after him, where practical instruction, such as navigation, commerce and medicine – free of charge and in English – was combined with divinity, law, medicine, rhetoric and, most important of all, with astronomy and geometry. Similarly, Bruno intended his dialogues for court circles rather than an university audience. Within these circles, the new Copernican hypothesis, along with the so-called ‘instrumentalist’ interpretation of them arising from the anonymous Letter to the reader affixed to the front of De revolutionibus by A. Osiander, were current subjects for discussion, as Greville’s strong interest in such topics shows.

The reception of the Copernican theory and its variant during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries has been the subject of a detailed analysis by Robert Westman. In an article of 1980 he persuasively argued that the early reaction to Copernicus’ planetary models was conditioned strongly by the way in which the astronomer’s disciplinary role was construed within the universities and that those who gave a more open hearing to their claims were actively engaged in reformulating that role outside of those institutions. According to Westman, by maintaining the high status and legitimacy of mathematics as a discipline and of mathematical astronomers as a body responsible solely to their peers, Copernicus' intent was that of asserting a new relationship between mathematics and natural philosophy. In fact, the Polish astronomer claimed the right of the astronomer to make new kinds of claims about the physical world on the basis of observations and mathematical calculations, thus questioning the evidence of the senses on which much of the discipline of natural philosophy had been built.

26 Ibid., 109.
Nevertheless, by further developing this position, Bruno claims that the natural philosopher is the person best able to interpret the astronomical information provided by practising scientists. In this respect, Copernicus, along with Ptolemy, is praised for his contribution to mathematical achievement. At the same time, Bruno’s three cosmological dialogues might be seen as an attempt to fill the gap with respect to Copernicus’ cosmology. His speculations supplied calculations accounting for the observed motions of the heavenly bodies but did not attempt to explain why the heavenly bodies moved in this way. Paradoxically, Bruno rehearses the traditional interpretation of the different tasks of the mathematician and philosopher according to which the former looks to the ‘mathematical intermediaries’ (found in Plato’s Republic; criticised in Aristotle’s Metaphysics) and the latter looks to the Ideas governing nature. Thus the Italian philosopher explains that

lui [i.e. the Nolan] non era andato per leggere né per insegnare, ma per rispondere; e che la simmetria, ordine e misura de moti celesti si presuppone tal qual è, et è stata conosciuta da antichi e moderni; e che lui non disputa circa questo, e non è per litigare contra gli matematici per togliere le lor misure e teorie, alle quali sottoscrive e crede: ma il suo scopo versa circa la natura e verificazione del soggetto di questi moti.

It is precisely within this frame of mind that Bruno’s attitude towards mathematics has to be evaluated.

If the position and size of planets, the motion of the earth, the principle of uniform circular motion, the composition of the heavenly bodies, along with the desire to ‘save the appearances’ were among the most discussed topics of the day, nevertheless, the close relationship between natural philosophy and theology or between science and religion must not to be dismissed lightly. Medieval natural philosophy was conditioned

---

27 “Similmente che potremmo giudicar noi, se le molte e diverse verificazioni de l’apparenze de corpi superiori o circostanti non ne fussero state dichiarate e poste avanti gli occhi de la ragion? Certo nulla.” (Oeuvres/Souper:39).

28 “Per che lui [i.e. Copernicus] più studioso della matematica che de la natura, non ha possuto profondar e penetrar sin tanto che potesse a fatto toglier via le radici de inconvenienti e vani principii, onde perfettamente scioglisse tutte le contrarie difficoltà, e venesse a liberar e sé et altri da tante vane inquisizioni, e fermar la contemplazione ne le cose costante et certe” (Oeuvres/Souper:39). See also D. Knox, course notes, 39.

29 Oeuvres/Souper:207.
by theological presuppositions, and investigation of natural phenomena clearly required a rethinking of some basic Christian theological tenets. Discussions of the causes of things, for instance, included questions about the cause of the world and revolved around issues of the divine creation of the world or about evidence of providence in the world. Discussions of the nature of animals and how they differ from humans entailed questioning the immortality of the human soul. Discussions of matter and change had implications for the nature of the soul in relation to matter and had a direct bearing upon the interpretation of the Eucharist. As a result, it is not unlikely that Bruno’s—and possibly the printer’s—choice of a ‘paratheological’ terminology for the title of his first philosophical writing in the vernacular might have been prompted also by the eagerness of readers to buy literature of this kind. The use of the dialogue form, moreover, reflects the vogue followed by many authors of the period when composing works on science, philosophy, or theology. This literary device—whose origin is traceable, ultimately, to Plato—enabled the author to set forth his doctrines, through a simple and clear exposition of the master urged on by his disciple’s questions.

To return to cosmological matters, if what historians of science say about the diffusion of the Copernican system in England can be trusted, namely that from the appearance of De Revolutionibus till the end of the sixteenth century one can find no more than ten thinkers who chose to adopt the main claim of the heliocentric theories, one is bound to enquire about any possible contact or influence which might have occurred between those who adopted, whether partly or entirely, Copernicus’ planetary models. While the statutes of Oxford and Cambridge University prescribed predominantly Aristotelian texts in all subjects, Aristotelianism did not dominate the thinking of most mathematicians in sixteenth-century England. Westman, for instance, argued that to encounter an astronomer who rejected outright all features of Copernicus’ version of the heliocentric theory is rare.30 Further research suggests that immersion in an Aristotelian framework implied neither ignorance of the alternative world-view or blind
acceptance of scholasticism. Conversely, advocacy of the new cosmology need not necessarily imply scorn of the Stagirite. As a consequence, there was a large group, particularly among the leading scientific thinkers, to whom those positive aspects of the theory, such as the greater mathematical simplicity and harmony of the system, made a definite philosophical appeal. It was these English scientists and their works that ultimately paved the way for the acceptance of the heliocentric theory in the following century.

The first really original mathematician, a product of the new interest in calculation for technological purposes, was Robert Recorde (1510-1558). His chief importance as the writer of the earliest notable textbooks of mathematics in the English tongue has long been recognised. Indeed, of special interest in connection with the present study is Record’s treatise on astronomy, The Castle of Knowledge. Although a 1551 edition is listed, the work did not appear until 1556, bearing a dedication in Latin to Queen Mary and a prefatory letter addressed to Cardinal Reginald Pole. In this work Recorde decisively sets forth his new method of instruction as a combination of the theoretical and the applied phases of mathematics. In this respect, he consistently avoids both mere abstract theory and a narrow empiricism. His attempts to revise the methods of teaching in the sixteenth century, namely Recorde’s appeal to mathematical reasoning and personal observation as surer guides to the true knowledge, as well as his putting practical use ahead of abstract theory, have led scholars to connect this author with the general anti-Aristotelian movement in English science.

Yet a reading of the book raises two further interesting points. First, as Johnson has persuasively argued, it contains a reference to the Copernican theory, along with an implicit admission that the Aristotelian and Ptolemaic arguments against the earth’s motion might be fallacious. Secondly, if, on the one hand, several passages in the book

---

31 A valuable attempt to re-evaluate the contribution of the English universities to the genesis of modern science can be found in M. Feingold 1984.
33 See D.E. Smith, Rara Arithmetica, 1908 and DNB, XLVII:369. Johnson considers this edition a bibliographical ‘ghost’ (1937:121).
35 See F.R. Johnson 1937:126-8 where the passage is quoted in full.
clearly illustrate Recorde’s familiarity with the history of Greek astronomical ideas, they nevertheless display the author’s attitude to the critical re-examination of ancient authority. Blind acceptance of ancient authorities was allowed by Recorde, whether it of Aristotle or other eminent writers, as he emphasises with regard to Ptolemy’s achievements in astronomical matters:

**Scholar:** [...] I heare all learned men say, Ptolemye is the father of that arte, and proveth all his woordes by stronge and invincible reasons.

**Master:** No man can worthely praise Ptolemye, his travell being so great, his diligence so exacte in observations, and conference with all nations, and ages, and his reasonable examination of all opinions, with demonstrable confirmation of his owne assertion, yet muste you and all men take heed, that both in him and in al mennes workes, you be not abused by their autoritye, but euermore attend to their reasons, and examine them well, ever regarding what is saide, and how is proved, then who saieth it: for autoritie often times deceaveth many menne, as here by and by in Cleomedes it shall appeare.36

In the “Preface to the Reader” Recorde’s method is even better illustrated:

When Scipio behelde oute of the high heauens the smallenes of the earth with the kingdomes in it, he coulde no lesse but esteeme the trauaile of men moste vaine, which sustaine so muche grief with infinite daungers to get so small a corner of that lyttle balle. so that it yrked him (as he then declared) to considre the smalnes of that their kingdom, which men so much did magnifie. Who soeuer therefore (by Scipions good admonishment) doth minde to auoide the name of vanitie, and wishe to attayne the name of a man, lette him contemne those trifelinge triumphes, and little esteeme that little lumpe of claye: but rather looke vpwarde to the heauens, as nature hath taught him, and not like a beaste go poring on the grounde, and lyke a scathen swine runne rootinge in the earthe.37

Once they have read these passages, scholars familiar with Bruno’s thought cannot avoid referring to those sections where the Nolan takes this question up in his London dialogues. In the Cena, for instance, Bruno puts forward the so-called principle of

---

37 Ibid., a4r-v.
'veritas filia temporis' (human understanding improves over the ages) with regard to cosmological matters. In one of the most commented upon passages of the dialogue, when Teofilo-Bruno claims that no one who disagrees with his essential ideas is worthy of disputing with him about cosmological matters, Prudenzio says that in that field he does not want to "discostarsi dalle opinioni degli antichi" because "with the ancients is wisdom". Bruno's reply is incisive. By completing Prudenzio's sentence, he adds: "and in length of days understanding".38

Bruno's perspective on 'modernity' does not yet entail the bitter attack on the myth of the 'Golden Age' as set forth in Spaccio. Substantially, Bruno here is using his adversary's arguments in support of the opposite point of view, a method of discussion which is peculiar to his logic.39 By warning the audience against the 'relativity' of human understanding,40 he eventually concludes by criticising the traditional scholastic method of disputation as it was practised in universities throughout the Latin West. By contrast, the Nolan proposes his own pedagogical method according to which students should not embark on disputation before they have finished their course of philosophy. It is impossible to know how to doubt and to inquire purposefully and with a profitable system about any art or field of knowledge – he says – if one has not first listened.41

The same attempt to revise the methods of teaching in the sixteenth century, particularly with reference to scientific subjects, is constantly discernible in Recorde's writings. To this aim, Recorde planned a series of textbooks in English, written in dialogue form, whose purpose was to provide a comprehensive groundwork in mathematics, each book probably written in the order it was intended to be studied. Like Bruno, Recorde's method of instruction consists firstly in giving a simple and clear exposition of elementary matters, and it is only when student has thoroughly mastered the basic concepts that he can deal with proof or demonstration and even engage in a

---

38 Oeuvres/Souper:57. Bruno's quotation is taken from Job, XII:12.
39 "Bene, maestro Prudenzio, se questa volgare e vostra opinione per tanto è vera, in quanto che è antica, certo era falsa quando era nuova" (Oeuvres/Souper:59). Also in the Cena (p. 223) Bruno had claimed that "la prima lezione che si dà a uno che vuole imparar di argomentare è di non cercare e dimandar secondo i proprii principii: ma quelli che son concessi dall'aversario".
40 "atteso che non è cosa nova, che non possa esser vecchia; e non è cosa vecchia, che non sii stata nova". (Ibid., 59).
41 Ibid., 65-6.
critical review of what he has studied. Obviously, Recorde is mainly concerned with providing both students and teachers with what he believes to be the most appropriate way of learning and teaching, while Bruno is rather developing those principles upon which a philosophical enquiry should be set forth in order to attain true knowledge.

It is with this approach in mind that the Nolan praises the greatness of Copernicus who “having little regard for the vulgar rabble, stood so firmly against the torrent of common beliefs”. It was only when the astronomer “took up again those despised and rusty fragments that he was able to get from the hands of antiquity”, in fact, that he had stumbled upon a truth: that the earth, not the sun, revolves “a l’aspetto dell’universo”. Bruno himself applies this critical approach when attacking Nundinio for taking the instrumentalist view of astronomy proposed in the preface of Copernicus’ *De revolutionibus*. Such an erroneous interpretation of Copernicus’ heliocentric theories has been added by “some ignorant and conceited ass”, who failed to read carefully the text itself, where Copernicus clearly asserts and accounts for the motion of the earth. Similarly, the anonymous author’s arguments in support of the physical impossibility of the heliocentric hypothesis are entirely rejected by Bruno on the ground of the evidence provided by the “true optics and geometry”.

Interestingly in the fourth part of the *Castle of Knowledge*, in dealing with the question of the earth’s motion, the Master-Recorde describes Copernicus as “a man of greate learninge, of muche experience, and of wondrefull diligence in obseruation” – praise which, as already noted, is partly echoed in Bruno’s *La cena* and later in *De immenso* – and scolds his disciple’s definition of the Copernican theory on the motion of the earth as ‘vaine phantasies’. Again, some similarities with some of the best known passages in Bruno’s writings can be detected in Recorde’s work. First, at the beginning of the well-known passage which contains the reference to the Copernican hypothesis,

---

42 Ibid., 41.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., 127-133. It is noteworthy that Thomas Digges, too, in his new edition of his father’s *Prognostication Everlastinge* (1576) states that Copernicus had adopted a ‘realist’ approach and claimed that his heliocentric model described the real movements of the heavenly bodies. See T. Digges *Prognostication*, sig. M1 r-v.
45 Ibid., 133.
46 *The Castle of Knowledge*:165.
the Master states that the opinion contrary to the fixed character of the earth does not need to detain him inasmuch as it is "so firmly fixed in most menne heads, that they account it mere madnessse to bring the question in doubt".\textsuperscript{47} Professor Johnson has called attention to the "distinctly ironic tone" in the author's words, a fact that, according to this scholar, gives definite evidence of Recorde's acceptance of the revolution of the earth around the sun, as well as of its motion.\textsuperscript{48} Yet, the Master's statement calls to mind both Torquato's burst of wrath against Bruno's upholding of the earth's rotation — "Quid? non ne Anticyram navigas?", a saying from Erasmus' \textit{Adagia} whose intended meaning would be: "Are you a fool?"\textsuperscript{49} — but also to Abbot's account of the contents of Bruno's lectures at Oxford with reference to the same topic:


\begin{quote}

[... ] he undertook among many other matters to set on foot the opinion of Copernicus, that the earth did go round, and the heavens did stand still; whereas in truth it was his own head which rather did run round, & his brains did not stand still.\textsuperscript{50}

\end{quote}

Secondly, we have to remember Alberico Gentili's description of Bruno's theories as "assertions strange, absurd and false", probably referring to the same lectures.\textsuperscript{51} Similarly, in Recorde's book, the Scholars's claim that "the opinion most generally receaue, is not moste true", as well as the Master's conclusion that after a better understanding is attained, it might be possible to credit in the future what now is being condemned, find their counterpart in Bruno's ideas on 'progress', which I have mentioned above.

Dwelling on these well-known episodes causes us to emphasise once again how Bruno's choice of arguments, patterns of expression, current opinions and verbal expressions, as he puts them in his London dialogues, closely resemble standard topics and language as developed in several works which were quite familiar to English

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 164.
\textsuperscript{48} F.R. Johnson 1937:128.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Oeuvres/Souper}:55 and 344, footnote 68.
intellectual circles. This is as true for the cosmological as for the moral dialogues, as I intend to show in the following section. In view of these similarities, the question of a possible reciprocal influence between Bruno and contemporary English book production naturally presents itself.

The first matter to be faced with when talking about possible echoes of English texts in the London dialogues is Bruno’s proficiency in the English language. According to Bruno’s own words, after a one-year stay in England his mastery of the language was restricted to two or three very ordinary words “le quali sa che sono salutazioni, ma non già particolarmente quel che voglion dire; e di quelle, se lui ne volesse proferire una, non potrebbe”. Very recently, Professor Gatti has argued that a sense of the difference in point both of linguistic and of conceptual structure – the difference between the way things are thought and said from one language to the other – lies behind Bruno’s digression about his knowledge of English. However valuable this suggestion may be, the Nolan’s failure to learn that language poses a substantial problem with respect to his acquaintance with the English texts of his days.

Naturally, few nowadays would contend that a less than total competence in understanding and speaking a foreign language rules out an ability to understand texts in that language. In this regard, Bruno’s well-known views about the importance of translation from one language to another, seem to be eloquent. Thus, we know from N.W. that Bruno had taught that “by the help of translations, al Science had their spring”, an account which entirely corresponds to the Nolan’s conviction that it is absurd to assume that a philosopher can only be studied in his original language, as voiced in Causa. More interestingly, N.W.’s mention of Bruno’s teaching, most probably at Oxford, with respect to translations, appears, almost literally, in John Florio’s epistle to the reader which prefaces the first book of his outstanding translation
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52 Oeuvres/Souper:125.
53 See H. Gatti 1999:54.
55 Oeuvres/Cause:159-63.
from French into English of Montaigne's *Essays* (1603).\(^{56}\) It might have been precisely Florio who helped Bruno with the reading of English texts during the years they both sheltered at the French ambassador's residence.\(^{57}\) It seems not unlikely that the two might have even exchanged their own opinions about the current issues of the day. If this is indeed the case, Bruno might have been familiar with the works by Recorde, or by other English mathematicians, such as Thomas and Leonard Digges, or John Dee, through Florio.

A further aspect of my enquiry into Bruno's possible borrowings from contemporary English texts that needs to be briefly examined is concerned with intertextuality, a leading concept in twentieth-century literary theory. The term 'intertextuality' dates from the 1960s and implies that the relation existing between texts is one created more by a larger generic, literary or socio-political context, and less by the authors involved. Thus, what is relevant to textual interpretation is not, in itself, the identification of a particular intertextual source but the more general discursive structure (genre, discursive formation, ideology) to which it belongs. More specifically, the theory of intertextuality insists that a text does not function as a closed system, but is the product of both emotional - for instance a charismatic figure - and political or social influences which motivate it. According to Still and Worton, this happens for two reasons.\(^{58}\) First, any author is a reader of other texts and, consequently, his work will inevitably be shot through with references, quotations and influences of every kind. Secondly, any text, at the moment of reading, will be affected by the reader's own background, that is to say all the other texts which the reader brings to it. In this respect, the reader's experience may lead to a fresh interpretation of a text which, in many cases, misunderstands the text's 'proper' meaning, a meaning that might correspond, however imperfectly, to the original intention of the original author. When considered from this point of view, then, the literary text is condemned always to say more than the author intends, an excess that unsettles any univocal or fixed meaning the reader may wish to

\(^{57}\) See F. Yates 1929:28.
draw from it. This same approach, which often can (and clearly did) lead to arbitrary interpretation, can be applied to other contemporary theories, whether philosophical or literary, such as the hermeneutic and the semiotic. Such intertextual practices, with their insistence on the priority of signifying codes, may well entail an infinite deferral of any ultimate meaning of the truth. Insofar as the 'real' signified by literary (or any other) texts is but one single moment in the signifying process generally, and is only ever accessible from within the semiotic system adopted, it has the form, not of a final reference, but of one link in an endless chain of interpretations.

Yet, if the text may be invaded and inhabited from without by the multiple ideological discourses and literary codes of its writer's culture to such a point that its own distinguishing contours and boundaries begin to disappear, at the same time the concept of the author may be completely unnecessary for an intertextual approach to literature. It is the reader of a text or, better, his own way of reading a text, rather than its author, who plays the most important role in activating the infinite process of creating certain codes and meanings. Such a process implies the dissolution or, as Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault put it, the death of the author. The author, then, like the coherent and autonomous subject, is revealed to be a fiction, a reading effect. In like manner, the concepts of authorial intentions and deliberate aims which might motivate the act of writing are inevitably undermined. Yet the meaning intended by twentieth-century theorists of the term 'intertextuality' as well as its use varies significantly.

Julia Kristeva's notion of intertextuality as referring to the literal and effective presence in one text of another text, for instance, is rather different from the theories discussed so far. Accordingly, the phenomenon of intertextuality, now perceived as being related to the practice of imitation, originated many centuries ago. But there is a striking difference between twentieth-century theories of intertextuality and the practice
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60 Pronouncements of this kind can be found everywhere in Barthes's and Foucault's works. In particular, see R. Barthes 1977:142-8 and M. Foucault 1973:384-7.
61 J. Kristeva 1968. Reading Kristeva's definition of intertextuality, Gérard Genette (1979:87) asserts in Introduction à l'architexte that intertextuality is an inadequate term and proposes in its place *transintextuality* (or textual transcendence), by which he means everything, be it explicit or latent, that links one text to the others. On this matter, see M. Worton and J. Still 1990:22-3.
of the early writers who used models as a source of forms or as a cultural resource from which to borrow and imitate. As far as Renaissance writers are concerned, in fact, imitation is mostly a conscious process largely under the author’s control, often corresponding to either literary or cultural aims. Clearly, as many critics have stressed, writers cannot completely avoid being influenced by the reading of a previous text or, better, by the thought of an author they appreciate. Nevertheless, they usually seem to be well aware of the sources they are drawing from. This introduces us to the issue of the relation of one writer to another or, more precisely, to the question of the sources of a text.

It was Felice Tocco, Bruno’s major nineteenth-century commentator, who called our attention, more than one century ago, to the need for a thorough analysis of Bruno’s writings in order to identify the appropriate sources of the numerous quotations, hints, insertions and references which are scattered therein. The problem of the sources of Bruno’s thought was taken up by Aquilecchia and, more recently, by Michele Ciliberto and Rita Sturlese. However, it is thanks to Sturlese’s enquiry that the word ‘intertextuality’ makes its appearance in the field of Bruno studies. Her use of the term is closer to Kristeva’s definition than to others. With respect to Sturlese’s approach, however, it would be more accurate to speak of ‘source criticism’. Still, the word ‘intertextuality’ appears to be rather ambiguous. According to contemporary theorists, this term “seems to cover with a new label well-known facts such as reminiscence, the use of sources (whether explicit, camouflaged, ironic or allusive), and quotations”, i.e. phenomena that are very different from each other and that can be reduced to the very term that covers them in a very general way rather than unifies them.

As Sturlese affirms, in relation to Bruno’s writings the problem is even more complex. The reader is faced with three different kinds of ‘borrowings’ from other texts: a) hidden quotations, i.e. those quotations in which the author and the text are omitted; b) explicit quotations, i.e. those quotations in which the author and the text are
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62 F. Tocco 1889 and 1892.
64 Ibid.
mentioned or are easy to identify; c) overlappings between Bruno’s quotations from different texts and his own comments or views. Bruno’s vast use of Platonic sources caused him to abandon his university lectures at Oxford when someone in the audience denounced him for plagiarising from Marsilio Ficino. In this respect, Aquilecchia, while emphasising Bruno’s use, or rather adaptation, of Ficino’s ideas and symbolism, suggests that we should distinguish between: (a) sources that Bruno explicitly acknowledges, Copernicus and Cusanus being two instances; and (b) sources that Bruno uses but does not acknowledge for fear, on the one hand, of undermining his anti-Aristotelian and ultimately anti-Christian polemic, and, on the other, of complicating the reception of his new cosmology and metaphysics. The overall result is a group of arguments, some of them borrowed from different sources, behind which an original thought can be discerned. Of course this procedure owes much to Bruno’s exceptional mnemonic skills. In 1581, among other things, Bruno had demonstrated his extraordinary powers of memory to the French king, Henry III. In the following year Bruno dedicated his memory treatise De umbris to the same king. The crucial role played by memory when quoting from different texts is rather obvious and does not need to be discussed.

People and texts that I am going to refer to in the following paragraphs are not explicitly mentioned by Bruno in his Italian dialogues. They, nevertheless, share the same philosophical and political attitudes.

If Recorde’s Castle of Knowledge contains the earliest known reference to the Copernican system in an English book, John Feild’s Ephemeris anni 1557 currentis iuxta Copernici et Reinholdi canones supputata represents, in a certain way, its Latin counterpart. Considering the old astronomical tables no longer satisfactory for calculations, John Dee (1527-1608), in the preface to this work, stated that he had persuaded his friend, Feild, to compile new tables basing them on the Copernican theory. Thus Dee accepted the mathematical aspects of the new theory as a valuable aid to astronomical calculations, but, at the same time, he refused to pronounce upon

---


Copernicus’ hypothesis, nor did he ever directly express belief in the physical reality of the movements of the earth. 67

Although there is no absolute certainty that Dee – a distinguished scholar-mathematician, geographer, astronomer, alchemist, kabalist and philosopher-magician of Elizabethan England – ever completely accepted the physical reality of the Copernican system of the universe, nevertheless he did not fail to perceive the precise nature of the problems raised by the conflicts between the two systems of the universe, as Johnson envisions it. 68 There is no documentary evidence, too, that Dee had ever met Bruno, who arrived in England in 1583 just before the former set out on a long journey through Germany, Bohemia and Poland. The only certainty is that Dee taught chemistry to Philip Sidney, to whom, as already mentioned, Bruno dedicated two of his dialogues and with whom he claims to be on terms of personal knowledge. Dee was also in touch with such distinguished individuals as Frobisher, Raleigh, Gilbert and possibly Drake, and numbered among his friends and close associates men like Robert Recorde, Leonard and Thomas Digges, Richard Hakluyt, Sir Edward Dyer, Thomas Blundeville and Thomas Harriot. 69 Nevertheless, Dee’s deep familiarity with Hermetic thought and magic, as well as his reading of numbers according to a cabalistic, neo-Orphic and neo-Pythagorean interpretation, has led some scholars to analyse his works in concert with Bruno’s Italian dialogues. 70 At the same time, the ideological impetus which lies behind Dee’s famous library housed in Mortlake, in the western suburbs of London, a non-academic place where some of the period’s most eminent scholars and politicians could meet to discuss and exchange their ideas, might have whetted the Nolan’s curiosity. Similarly, the Italian philosopher may well have appreciated both Dee’s studies on the appearance of the nova in the constellation of Cassiopeia, 71 and his theorems for calculating a stellar parallax. 72

While the latter necessarily implied an adherence to the Copernican theory, since a stellar
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69 See E.G.R. Taylor 1930:75-139; also P.J. French 1972; N.H. Clulee 1988. It is interesting to note that most of Dee’s friends, in different ways, are found to be in association, although indirectly, with Bruno.
71 J. Dee, *De stella admiranda in Cassiopeiae asterismo*. 1573. The work, now lost, is listed by Dee among his unpublished manuscripts.
parallax is the slight movement in a star’s position which should be observed if the earth in fact circled the sun, Dee’s theory of the recession of the nova (which he placed among the fixed stars) away from the earth constituted the germinal idea of an infinite universe. Furthermore, the appearance of the new star provided an occasion for the questioning of one of Aristotle’s fundamental postulates, the doctrine of the changeless heavens. Of course, Bruno might also have found interesting Dee’s arguments against the Aristotelian theory of motion.

It is high probable, too, that Bruno had at least some knowledge of the 1576 English translation or paraphrase of large sections of Book I of Copernicus’ *De Revolutionibus* by Thomas Digges (ca. 1546-1595), one of the best known English mathematicians of his generation and Dee’s most able pupil. Digges did not confine himself merely to translating Copernicus’ ideas, but he also added comments of his own which go beyond Copernicus by insisting on the infinity of the universe. For this reason, the short treatise, which was inserted as a supplement to a re-issue of Digges’ father’s *The Prognostication Everlasting*, has attracted wide critical attention from Brunian scholars. The debate has centred mainly upon the difference between Bruno’s and Digges’ conception of an infinite universe. There is no doubt that Digges’ treatise, which antedates Bruno’s *Cena* by eight years, must be regarded as the first known English work in which it is stated that the universe is infinite, that the stars are numberless, and that they are located at varying distances from the centre, the sun, and extended throughout infinite space, as Johnson had claimed much earlier. But the question cannot be resolved in terms simply of the order in which these and similar cosmological concepts were addressed, as Granada rightly emphasises.
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73 Scholars have suggested that Bruno and Digges might even have met. Their intermediary would have been Sir Edward Dyer, the friend and patron of Dee and Digges, who was also a member of the Leicester-Sidney-Greville circle with whom the Nolan was definitely in touch. See F.R. Johnson 1937:168. However, as Granada suggests, it is hardly probable that Bruno’s intimacy with such figures as John Florio or Greville, “non lo avessero messo al corrente della portata di questo copernicanoismo, diffuso peraltro in un’opera così popolare in quegli anni ed in un diagramma dell’universo così plastico e trasparente, solidaire per lo più con un’altra opera così popolare in Inghilterra quale era lo *Zodiacus vitae*” (M.A. Granada in M. Ciliberto and N. Mann (eds.) 1997:137). Two of the six later editions of Digges’s *A Perfit description* are dated 1583 (colophon 1584) and 1585.

74 F.R. Johnson 1937:72.

75 M.A. Granada 1992:64.
himself to the new heliocentric theories and criticised and amended Aristotle and his disciples, his conception of the infinity of the universe remained in accordance with an Aristotelian framework. Instead, it is precisely Bruno’s view of a homogeneous universe – which led the Italian philosopher to depart from the hierarchical cosmo-ontology, the ‘chain of being’, of the Aristotelian and Platonic tradition (used as an authority by Digges) – to which I wish to direct attention in order to outline the discrepancy between Bruno’s cosmology and the English reception of Copernicus’ heliocentric theory of the universe. This is, I believe, the key to understanding Bruno’s stormy conflict with Elizabethan court circles and academic learning, a suggestion to which I will presently return.

From 1576 onwards, the year of Digges’ *Prognostication euerlastinge*, references to the Polish astronomer and his theory become much more frequent in English books, either favouring the idea of the earth’s motion – at least to take it as a mathematical device if not as a physical truth – or refuting it by the conventional Aristotelian arguments. Allusions to the new astronomy occurred with increasing frequency in popular handbooks on scientific subjects as well as in the works of some English scientists and writers of the period. We must not forget, either, that mathematics and astronomical observations were of practical importance as the basis for advances in cartography and navigation. In fact, the investigations of English scientists about the stars and the heavens, their discoveries and use of new technologies, along with their mathematical principles, on which a diverse range of astronomical, navigational, cartographic, and surveying practice could be erected, served well the emergent interest in maritime explorations aroused by the Spanish discoveries of the New World, as well as the Elizabethan expansion and trade policy. English ambitions of conquest in the New World inevitably required the aid of mathematicians.

Among Digges’ contemporaries, there was a keen interest in astronomical and scientific investigations. It has been noted that Sir Henry Savile (1549-1622) lectured at
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77 Exploration was high on the list of interests of Sir Francis Walsingham, secretary of Elizabeth’s Privy Council and head of what we might call today ‘secret services’. Besides patronising both Francis Drake and Richard Hakluyt, he also befriended John Dee. See C. Read 1925, III:434.
Oxford on *The Almagest of Ptolemy* in 1570 as part of his M.A.\(^78\) For five years, Savile went on delivering lectures, the notes of which can be found in four notebooks preserved at the Bodleian Library. According to Feingold, these lectures included "a long and detailed account of the Copernican theory".\(^79\) By contrast, Professor Aquilecchia has persuasively pointed out the limitations of Savile's utilisation of *De Revolutionibus* in his Oxonian lectures, which, however, "constitute the first known instance of public references to the work of Copernicus in Oxford, although without any consideration of the system as such".\(^80\)

However, it goes without saying that in spite of Copernicus and the comparatively wide knowledge of his theories, the average Elizabethan thought of the universe as geocentric. Nor did he regard the universe as infinite, populated by an infinite number of worlds. At the most, like Digges, while meditating on its immensity, the average Elizabethan conceived of God as domiciled beyond the bounds of the fixed stars in the *coelum empyraeum* attended by hosts of angels and the elect. Still, in the second half of the sixteenth century, the idea of the infinity of the universe was not a new one. Actually, this was a recurring matter of theological and philosophical discussions throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. I do not intend to rehearse again the history of the ideas about the cosmos from classical philosophers to medieval and early Renaissance authors. It suffices here to say that even England did not remain untouched by the new flourishing speculations concerning infinity, which were encouraged, in turn, by the diffusion of the Copernican cosmology. Nonetheless, that the adherence to a geokinetic and heliocentric system does not necessarily entail the idea of infinity is testified to by Copernicus himself, who thought that the infinity of the cosmos was a matter best discussed by natural philosophers and refused to pronounce upon it.\(^81\) Thus, according to Johnson, Digges was the first in his country to go beyond Copernicus and to consider

\(^78\) On Henry Savile, see DNB, L:370-71.
\(^81\) *De revolutionibus* 38. Similarly in T. Digges *A perfite description* 91: "But whether the worlde haue his boundes or bee in deede infinite and without boundes, let vs leauve that to be discussed of Philosophers".
the realm of fixed stars as having no definite boundary. Commenting on Bruno’s speculations on the infinity of the universe, he went so far as to conclude that

it is entirely possible that Digges’ brief treatise on the Copernican system first suggested to Bruno’s mind the thought of using the new heliocentric theory as a physical proof of his highly speculative notions concerning the infinity of the material world.\(^2\)

Assuming that Bruno read or knew of Digges’ book, is there any evidence in the works of the former that they were materially influenced by the latter? The answer is a simple negative; and it must also be added that where they seem to be expounding the same idea, \textit{i.e.} the infinity of the universe, the difference between them is striking and fundamental. Once that this difference has been clarified, Johnson’s statement raises a series of questions. When and where did Bruno first discover and begin to uphold the new Copernican hypothesis? Did he map out his revolutionary cosmology well before arriving in London in Spring 1583? Did he sketch his Italian dialogues, at least the three cosmological ones, while he was in Paris? The matter is of crucial importance when considering any attempt to indicate possible ‘borrowings’ by Bruno from contemporary English writings by applying the processes of what literary critics have called transtextuality.\(^3\)

In her recent book on the Nolan cosmology, Hilary Gatti devotes a whole chapter to the issue of Bruno’s discovery of Copernicus.\(^4\) Taking Bruno’s own account in the tenth chapter of book III of \textit{De immenso} as the starting point of the enquiry, she gives a stimulating attempt to reconstruct the stages of Bruno’s encounter with Copernicus. Substantially, during his youth Bruno came across the question of the “relationship between the sun and the earth during the course of the year”,\(^5\) which first stimulated his cosmological speculation. Through ancient sources, he could have grasped both the idea of a diurnal revolution of the earth about its own axis and the annual orbit of the earth

\(^3\) See above, 226, footnote 59.
\(^5\) Ibid., 32.
around a central fire or sun. Successively, Bruno would have decided to consult Copernicus’ *De revolutionibus* with respect to the question of the so-called precession of the equinoxes.\(^6^\) At this stage, Gatti draws some important conclusions: firstly, that Bruno could have received his heliocentric ideas independently of Copernicus’ book and therefore before reading it; secondly, that Bruno might first have read Copernicus in a very youthful period, “perhaps shortly after he started studying at the Dominican monastery in Naples in 1565”.\(^7^\)

Prior to Gatti’s contribution, other critics emphasised how the seeds of Bruno’s Copernicanism were outlined during his stay in Paris, and, particularly, the extent to which they were already present in his first surviving printed work, *De umbris idearum* of 1582.\(^8^\) In this work Bruno started to develop such issues as the immobility of the sun; the conception of the heavenly bodies as living creatures; the thesis that the moon, like the earth, revolves directly around the sun, and that it has water, clouds and air.\(^9^\) Yet, there is no direct mention of the infinity of the universe. Nor does he treat the extension to infinite dimensions of the universe, as envisaged by him in the Italian dialogues, either *Cantus Circaeus* nor in *Candelaio*, written and published in Paris also in 1582; nor does he discuss it in *Sigillus Sigillorum* or in *Explicatio Triginta Sigillorum*, which, as already noted, appeared in London the following year. Finally, in another autobiographical passage, which occurs in the fourth dialogue of *Cena*, Bruno states that when he was young and untrained he regarded Copernicus’ hypothesis of the earth’s motions as so erroneous that he was astonished at how Aristotle “non solo non si sdegno di fare considerazione, ma anco spese più di la metà del secondo libro *Del cielo e mondo* forzandosi dimostrare che la terra non si muova”.\(^9^\) Bruno’s admission of ignorance and blindness is echoed in book III, chapter IX of *De immenso*, in which he says that Copernicus’ words
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\(^6^\) Ibid., 31-2 and *De immenso*:573.

\(^7^\) H. Gatti 1999:39. This latter hypothesis might be supported by Bruno’s lecturing on the *Sphaera* first privately at Noli, near Genova in 1577 and later publicly at Toulouse in 1581.


\(^9^\) *De umbris idearum*, in OL, II:7-8.

\(^9^\) *Oeuvres/Souper*:217.
clearly referring to the earth’s diurnal and annual motions. In this case Bruno’s admission of the key role played by Copernicus in his early thinking is clear. Nor does it seem to be in conflict with the suggestion that the notion of infinity – when applied to natural philosophy – may have been elaborated following his adherence to Copernican theories, and more precisely during the early months of his English stay.

More precisely, I am inclined to believe that Bruno’s infinitism is more a product of his opposition to Aristotle than of his reading of Copernicus. Only when he had refuted Aristotle’s finite cosmology could Bruno launch his philosophy of an infinite universe. It is by no means a coincidence that Bruno’s most coherent attempt to illustrate his natural philosophy while staying in London is found in *De l’infiniuto, universo e mondi*, which constitutes a point-by-point refutation of Aristotle’s arguments against infinity in *De Coelo*. It is precisely against the doctrine of the Stagirite and of the Peripatetics, for instance, that Bruno postulated the idea of the void or absolute vacuum, an ether no longer identified with Aristotle’s quintessence, which makes the movements of celestial bodies possible once the transporting spheres have been abolished. Yet, by postulating place as that which delimits a body, Aristotle himself implied an exterior place or region delimiting the universe which must be
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91 *De immenso*:563.
92 In a recent paper, still unpublished, Eugenio Canone has convincingly suggested that Bruno’s conception of the infinite dates back to his early sojourn in Paris, although “sulle orme di Cusano, esso si collocava su un piano metafisico-gnoseologico, anche in riferimento all’arte della memoria e a quella lulliano-combinatoria”. See also E. Canone 1999(b):195.
93 Although Gatti suggests that Bruno “could have met, early in his intellectual development” with “the possibility that the universe is to be considered infinite” (pp. 32-3), this is by no means certain. It is also worth noting that in book III, chapter 9 of the *De immenso*, Bruno praises Copernicus for having announced “alquanto piú audacemente quelle cose che con voce ben piú sommessa nel secolo immediatamente precedente aveva espresso Niccolò Cusano nel suo libro *Sulla dotta ignoranza*” (*De immenso*:564-5). Like Digges, Nicholas of Cusa, before Bruno, had formulated a theologically defined universe, since his model retained the outermost limiting sphere.
94 See for instance *Oeuvres/Infiniti*:121: “[...] cossi a l’opposto noi credemo e veggiamo aperto, che dal contrario di questo principio [i.e. the infinity of the universe] lui [Aristotle] ha pervertita tutta la considerazion naturale”.
infinite. Again, Aristotle’s definition of place implies the priority of the body in respect of the space it occupies: the place exists inasmuch as there is a body located in it. Conversely, Bruno, by identifying place and space, states that we cannot conceive of a body that is not surrounded by space. To Aristotle’s negation of all space and of any body beyond the closed universe, Bruno’s answer eventually resides in his claim of the plurality of worlds. If absolute space existed, Bruno argued, it had to be filled with infinite worlds. Otherwise, a single finite world located in an infinite space had to be conceived of as an insignificant point, a nothingness unworthy of God’s omnipotent power. Finally, a universal continuum, in Bruno’s view, must be founded on a homogeneous concept of substance, as Gatti points out. Thus Bruno also rejects Aristotle’s theory of the infinite divisibility of matter. Last but not least, it was Aristotle’s ideas that after all had prepared the philosophical substratum of Catholicism, a derivative and corrupt version of the ‘antiqua filosofia’.

The objection to English Copernicanism, too, which had found in Digges its most progressive champion, has to be interpreted in the light of Bruno’s plea for the need to break free from Aristotelian physics and metaphysics, which are false and misleading in claiming the finiteness and the hierarchical structure of the universe. It is one thing, in fact, to express oneself favourably about the movement of the earth or heliocentric theories, or, as Digges did, to write that the orb of stars “fixed infinitely up extendeth hit self in altitude spherically”, and quite another to claim, with no shadow of a doubt, the unity of a universe which is infinite, homogeneous, ontologically identical to God. In this respect, it can be argued that Bruno’s exposition of the infinite is cast in
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96 Cameracensis Acrotismus, in OL, I, I:142-3. This is not the first time that Bruno uses Aristotle’s cosmological arguments to reverse the conclusions reached by the Stagirite himself. Elsewhere Bruno speaks of Aristotle’s (and elsewhere of Palingenio’s, Fabrizio Mordente’s and Copernicus’) borrowed ‘prophetic’ powers which sometimes allowed him to say some excellent things in the field of natural philosophy. See Oeuvres/Souper:265-7 and 259-61; Cause:199; De immenso:782. 97 Oeuvres/Infini:65-7; also Cameracensis Acrotismus, in OL, I,I:126-8; De immenso:444-7.
98 See, for instance, Oeuvres/Souper:161. This theme is also recurring in the De infinito, De la causa and De immenso.
100 For Bruno’s polemic with Digges, see D. Tessicini 1999:521-26.
101 T. Digges, A Perfit Description, folding diagram sign. M1, repr. in F.R. Johnson and S.V. Larkey 1934:78.
the form of a commentary on the Stagirite’s natural philosophy. This also applied to Bruno’s attitude towards Christian dogmas and religion in general as set forth in his moral dialogues, an issue that will receive a deeper consideration in the next section.

But to return now to the question of intertextuality, beyond the adoption of those linguistic devices common to literary traditions and genres, such as pastoral or chivalric-adventure elements, apparently there is no other evidence of Bruno’s borrowings from English texts. This is mainly because his cosmological system as elaborated in the Italian dialogues, and later in the Frankfurt trilogy, had no parallel in sixteenth-century English European literature. As a result, the criterion of my research will be distinctive. According to the more genuine concept of intertextuality I will attempt to reconstruct the cultural codes in terms of which the contemporary debate was contested in Bruno’s texts. To this aim, a glimpse at the philosophical, political and religious context in which the Italian dialogues are set seems now to be required.

First of all, it seems evident that Bruno’s diatribe against Oxford dons, as well as against English society and its leading exponents, is (as I shall refer to it) essentially religious in nature. In saying this, I am not espousing or confirming Frances Yates’s arguments concerning Bruno’s religious and political goals in his English works, especially in the Cena. Nor do I wish to underrate the weight that Bruno’s cosmological speculations lend to the scientific enquires of his time and to the history of science in general. Instead, I am arguing that the strong Calvinist strand dominating the ideological world of the Elizabethan aristocracy and, through it, the literary circles and academies, can furnish a solid basis upon which to interpret and evaluate Bruno’s English experience.

Bruno’s quarrel with his English ‘colleagues’ was not concerned with the heliocentric Copernican theories in any strict sense. This is obvious when recalling what has already been mentioned regarding their relatively ample diffusion, at least in the exclusive milieu of the London intelligentsia outside the Ramist and Aristotelian academic circles. Although in the thirty years after its publication Digges’ A Perfit description went through at least six more editions, with the last under King James
(1605), the reception of the book was clearly hampered by state censorship. It remains the case, however, that Digges, to use Koyré's words, "put his stars into a theological heaven, not into an astronomical sky", for his vision of the universe was still clearly embedded in Aristotelianism and, above all, in Christianity. It was perhaps precisely when the Bruno affair had revealed to the authorities the terrible dangers and blasphemies which the concept of the infinite could imply that Digges' *Perfit description* was denied a reprinting.

Protestants, no less than Catholics, were well aware of the theological difficulties which lay behind Copernicus' system, over and beyond those regarding their incompatibility with the Bible. However, although Calvin had followed Luther and Melanchthon in his firm rejection of the theory, he nevertheless turned to the medieval principle of 'accommodation', according to which it is possible to talk about certain matters either in philosophical or in theological terms, a thesis shared by both Bruno and Galileo when confronted by the Inquisitors. As Hooykaas explains, the strongest motive why the Reformers not only tolerated scientific research, but even demanded it, was that it gave to the 'elect' an occasion for glorifying God. In this respect, by calling the realm of the fixed stars "the habitacle for the elect", Digges shows himself to be sharing a clearly Puritan standpoint. It is well known that during the first part of Elizabeth's reign the theology of the Church of England was strongly Calvinistic; many of the archbishops and bishops before Charles I's reign were Calvinists, and the Lambeth declaration on predestination drawn up in 1595 by the archbishop of Canterbury, John Witgift, the persecutor of the Puritans, was decisively Calvinistic. Thus, the theological
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102 See W. Empson 1993, I:211. Empson also observes that one of the explanations of the many reprints of Digges' book resides in the fact that under Elizabeth the law permitted a book, once it had been licensed, to be reprinted at will, so long as no change was made. Thus Digges was only allowed to reprint an exact copy of his first edition without correcting or adding new astronomical or mathematical evidence in support of his theories.

103 A. Koyré 1957:38.

104 In Calvin's opinion Scripture is to be accepted literally in theological, ethical and historical matters, but the Holy Spirit accommodated itself to popular ideas in scientific matters. For Bruno's and Galileo's use of this principle, see G. Aquilecchia 1995 (b) and H. Gatti 1997:283-300.

105 See R. Hooykaas 1955:150.

implications of the ‘Nolana filosofia’ might have sounded as pernicious to the Elizabethan Church of England as to the Calvinists and the Puritans, whose common doctrinal backbone was Reformed Christianity. In this respect, Henry Cobham’s warning, in a dispatch sent to Walsingham regarding Bruno’s arrival in England, of the danger of his religious ideas was in keeping with the Catholic Church’s worry in relation to Bruno’s heretical beliefs.

Recent studies have emphasised the significance of the year 1584 with respect to the struggle between the Elizabethan Church Settlement and Puritanism in England. Scholarly debate has centred on Bruno’s shifting standpoint during the composition of his Italian dialogues with respect to prominent Elizabethans who seemed to have strong Puritan leanings. At the same time, the diffusion and rapid growth of Ramist logic throughout the Protestant countries of Europe during the second half of the sixteenth century had contributed to the criticism of authority by provoking a controversy in Elizabethan universities and court circles concerning the validity of Aristotelianism. This was an important element in the impact of Bruno’s works in that country. In analysing the spread of Ramism in England, Oldrini observed that the same Puritan tradition was at the root of the early alliance between Ramism and Puritanism. This alliance, he specifies, should be taken to mean not that all Puritans were Ramists but rather that all or almost all Ramists had Puritan sympathies.

In 1584, with the publication of his Antidicsonus William Perkins (1588-1602), later Fellow of Christ’s College and a leading Calvinist divine, rejected the Brunian art of the memory as illusory and vain. In a later work,
Perkins considers imagination impious inasmuch as it is a dangerous and illusory faculty leading man into a false sense of his own creativity.\textsuperscript{114} This argument is entirely consistent with Calvinist anthropology, at the centre of which stands the denial of man's intellectual and moral autonomy, and his total dependence on God's revelation for truth and enlightenment. In this perspective, any appreciation of the powers of man's mind was regarded by Calvinists as suspicious.\textsuperscript{115}

Within this context, Frances Yates has argued that specifically religious considerations also played a role in Bruno's conflict with Ramist doctrines of memory in Elizabethan England.\textsuperscript{116} More recently, by comparing two passages which occurred in the two different versions of \textit{Cena} Monica Fintoni concludes that Bruno was well aware of the religious — and philosophical and political altogether — consequences of such debates.\textsuperscript{117} His vehement attack on pedantry, on the other hand, can be better explained as a critique of the rigid interpretation of the metaphorical imagery of the Bible which prevented philosophers from conquering new forms of knowledge and truth.\textsuperscript{118} Before moving on to the religious implications of the Italian dialogues, it will be necessary to recall briefly two further aspects of Bruno's English experience: his relations to Sidney and the reception of his thought.

It remains a matter for discussion whether or not Bruno was personally acquainted with Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586) during his three-year stay in England. As a matter of fact, in the extant works of Sidney, letters included, there is no mention of Bruno; therefore, in the absence of evidence, whatever we conclude regarding their association

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Art of Preaching}, 1607 in W. Perkins, \textit{Works}, II:670 and 458.
\textsuperscript{115} See G.F. Waller 1972:331-43.
\textsuperscript{116} See F. Yates 1966:260-78. Ramism and Calvinism are linked also in John Rainolds's \textit{Orationes} which were delivered at Oxford during the years 1570-80. This is also remarkable when considering that scholars have suggested that Bruno may have had in mind Rainolds as one of the two antagonists in the debate described in the \textit{Cena}. On Bruno and Rainolds, see M. Ciliberto 1998:23-30. According to Aquilecchia (1973:xlvi), however, "la circostanza per cui la mnemonicamamotoiato dovesse risultare accetta ai puritani inglesi, laddove l'arte bruniana e dicsoniana dovesse a questi apparire sospetta dal punto di vista morale (...) e religioso" is affected by "più di un equivoco".
\textsuperscript{118} See G. Aquilecchia 1973:xl.
must be based upon Bruno's testimony in his Italian dialogues. According to Gentile, for instance, to Bruno Sidney was not merely a powerful and influential object of flattery; he was also a friend, who probably financed the printing of Bruno's writings. The intimacy between the two is also attested by Bruno's knowledge of Sidney's affair with Penelope Rich, the Stella of the English poet's sonnets. According to a recent survey of Bruno in England, his 'disciple' Alexander Dicson (1558-1604) might have been the means of introducing Sidney to the Nolan. Probably Sidney was the "cavalier" mentioned by Bruno in the Cena. However, the Italian dialogues certainly did not go unnoticed by Sidney, to whom Bruno dedicated texts, and whose Italian was excellent. On this ground, Frances Yates singled out Sir Philip Sidney and his poetic circle as those above all who were influenced by Bruno. According to her, in fact, Sidney was deeply touched by Bruno's 'admonition' in Furori, so that in his later sonnets he was able to resolve the conflict he himself felt between the various kinds of love by favouring a sense of love as directed more or less exclusively towards God.

On the contrary, in a 1992 essay David Farley-Hills argues that it was precisely his conversations with Sidney that helped the Nolan "to arrive at the radical transformation of Petrarchism he himself attempted in Eroici furori". In this way, the English scholar seems to clarify Bruno’s dedication to Sidney of a book openly attacking both Petrarchism and Petrarchists. Instead, by analysing Bruno's poetry, Aquilecchia was able to identify themes common to Bruno's ethics and Sidney's politics and suggested that these common interests might have encouraged a degree of friendship between the
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119 Besides dedicating to Sidney the Spaccio and the Eroici, Bruno elsewhere implies that he met the courtly gentleman soon after his arrival in London. See Oeuvres/Souper:101 and Expulsion:5. Sidney is also the potential recipient of dedication in the Cabala. See Oeuvres/Cabale:7; 15.
120 OI, II:vii. It is interesting to note that in a letter to Matteo Egizio dated 1715, Philip von Stoch, an agent of the English government, in talking about Bruno's Italian dialogues says that "ces livres ne sont pas imprimés par les livraires pour gagner, mais tous a la depense de la Reine Elisabeth et c'était le Chevalier Philipp Sidney qui a ce qu'on scai de bonnes memoires a eu le soin". Quoted in P. Totaro 1998:214-15.
121 See F. Yates 1934 and 1943; also G. Aquilecchia 1995 (a):30.
123 Oeuvres/Souper:119.
two.\textsuperscript{126} In an article published two years later Aquilecchia elaborated upon these interests in more detail. He commented that the two authors both proposed:

un rovesciamento a livello semantico del petrarchismo da parte dell'uno e dell'altro autore, pur nella comune utilizzazione di esso sia a livello lessicale e retorico.\textsuperscript{127}

This similarity of interests was in keeping with the familiarity that must have existed between the two during Bruno's stay in England.\textsuperscript{128}

Although Yates's arguments for Bruno as a key factor in the development of Elizabethan poetry have necessarily to be tempered and qualified, nevertheless she pioneered the question of the English reception of the Italian dialogues. Despite the lack of documentation, this matter has attracted considerable scholarly attention especially in recent years. I limit myself here to summarising the main lines of research.

The Copernican theories on the movement of the earth were affirmed scientifically in England at the beginning of the seventeenth century with the works of William Gilbert (1540-1603).\textsuperscript{129} One of the tasks facing any physical theory that postulated diurnal revolution of the earth was to account for gravitation and to explain why the revolving globe does not fly into pieces. In De magnete (1600), Gilbert's physics proved capable of saving the phenomena inasmuch as the Aristotelian notion of heaviness was definitively superseded. This was replaced by Gilbert's doctrine which attributed a 'magnetic form' both to the celestial bodies and to the earth. On this basis, he invoked the diurnal revolution of the earth, while explicitly refraining from pronouncing upon the "Earth's remaining motions".\textsuperscript{130} But it is in the posthumous De mundo (1651) that Gilbert seems to engage with the new heliocentric cosmology.\textsuperscript{131} However, this is not the place to embark upon the question of whether or not Gilbert was a Copernican. My purpose here

\textsuperscript{126} See G. Aquilecchia 1996(b):33.
\textsuperscript{127} Id., 1998:16.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibidem
\textsuperscript{129} On William Gilbert, see DNB, XXI:338; also G. Freudenthal 1983.
\textsuperscript{130} De magnete:220.
\textsuperscript{131} Although the De magnete appeared in 1600, the prefatory letter which is prefixed to it indicates that the work was ready for publication in the early 1580s. The later De mundo was apparently started soon after completing the De magnete, since the first part was started in the 1590s and was still being worked on by Gilbert at his death, whereas the second part was started in the 1580s and left incomplete. See H. Gatti 1999:96-87.
is merely to summarise some of the cosmological implications of Gilbert's physical theory of gravitation with respect to traditional cosmology.

First of all, Gilbert's new cosmology implied the rejection of the traditional Aristotelian distinction between the heavens and the earth. Physically speaking, celestial bodies (including the sun) and the earth are entirely equivalent and indistinguishable. Secondly, by eliminating both the solid orbs and the outer orb in which the fixed stars were embedded, sweeping away at the same time also the idea of a *primum mobile*, Gilbert raised once again the question of the infinity of the world. The contemporary concept of an infinite universe, along with the explanation of the earth's motion in animistic terms and a certain familiarity with the atomic theory of matter have focused scholarly attention on the similarities between Gilbert's and Bruno's positions. At the same time, the presence in *De mundo* of two diagrams bearing the headings "Alius movendi modus Nolani cum esset junior" and "Alius modus iuxta Nolanum", leaves no doubt about Gilbert's acquaintance with, and interest in, Bruno's cosmological speculations.

The relationship between Bruno and Gilbert has led Gatti to suggest an interesting scenario in which all the main speakers in *Cena* belong to the circle of Gilbert's friends. Others too, besides Gatti, have investigated the connections between Bruno's thought – especially as formulated in the Latin poems published in Frankfurt in 1591 – and the so-called 'Northumberland Circle'. This was a group of thinkers – such as Thomas Harriot (1560-1620), Walter Warner (ca. 1557-1643), Robert Hues (1553?-1632), Thomas Allen (1542-1632) Nicholas Hill (1570?-1610), Nathaniel Torporley (1564-1632) and Sir Thomas Aylesbury (1576-1657) – gravitating around the Ninth Earl
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132 See G. McColley 1936 and 1937; also S. Ricci 1990 (a); H. Gatti, 1989 and 1999. The name of Digges does not appear anywhere in Gilbert's works.

133 *De mundo*:199-201.

134 The scenario is as follows: Nundinius is Launcelot Browne (d.1605), a neo-Aristotelian and member of the Royal College of Physicians; Torquato is William Barlowe (d.1625), a zealous Protestant from Balliol College of Oxford and a follower of magnetic philosophy; Smitho is Mark Ridley (1560-1624), a Copernican who believed in an homogeneous universe; Prudenzio is Thomas Blundeville (fl.1561), who appears to have been the typical Elizabethan grammarian and pedantic man of letters. All of these people were members of the Gilbert circle. See H. Gatti 1999:92-6.

of Northumberland, famous in particular for his patronage of mathematicians and natural philosophers. Most of them, with their experiments and research, made direct contributions to astronomy, optics, mathematics and physics. According to some scholars, their works and papers are suffused with the Nolan’s vision of the universe and mnemonics.

That the Earl of Northumberland was familiar with Giordano Bruno is well known since the libraries of the former held six texts of the latter, besides an annotated copy of the *Eroici furori*. Although Northumberland himself makes no mention of him, Bruno’s name appears twice in Harriot’s unpublished manuscripts, the first occurrence being an annotation beside mathematical notes on a progressive series of numbers, the second being a reference to the Nolan’s interpretation of motion. It has also been established of recent years that another document in the British Library, a treatise headed *De infinitis progressionibus* is by Harriot; written in his own hand, it must have been put together by 1603.

Mention of Bruno can also be found in the first edition of Nicholas Hill’s *Philosophia Epicurea* where the author includes the former among those who “Terrae motum sufficienter probant”. Besides advancing various proofs of the earth’s motion, Hill associated Copernicanism with the notion of an infinite universe. It is almost certain that he wrote another, unpublished work, with the tantalising title *De Infinitate et Aeternitate Mundi*, which is now lost. What is more, Hill, a pensioner of the Earl from 1590-95, was reputed to have “applied himself to the Lullian doctrine”. And it is exactly on the mnemotechnic side of Bruno’s speculations as a possible influence on the

---

138 *Philosophia Epicurea* 1601:92. It is relevant to note that Robert Hues, Hill’s contemporary, testified that Hill “professed himself a disciple of Jordanus Brunus” (Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B. 158, quoted in H. Trevor-Roper 1987:11).
140 Quoted in S. Clucas 1997:43 where the author (footnote 31) adds that Hill was actually “critical of Lull’s combinatorial logic in his *Philosophia Epicurea*”. 
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activities of the Northumberland circle that commentators have recently focused their enquiry. Again from Giacomo Castelvetro’s words we know about the Earl’s interest in mnemonics and Kabbalah. Thus, it seems plausible that besides the scientific interests arising from Bruno’s new vision of the universe, the Nolan’s ideas on memory and imagination, too, might have been continued by the Northumberland circle, notably by Hill and Warner.

Echoes of Bruno’s cosmology might also have reached the works of the most prominent of living dramatists and writers of Elizabethan London, William Shakespeare (1564-1616). Although Shakespeare lived and wrote at a time of great change in the field of astronomy, whether or not he appreciated these profound changes in world view no-one can say exactly. The question has been addressed by Gilberto Sacerdoti with reference to Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* (1608-1609). In his book entitled *Nuovo cielo nuova terra*, Sacerdoti convincingly suggests that this play must be read in the light of the author’s adherence – though in the way of a Silenus, i.e. hidden to profane eyes – to the new heliocentric model. According to Sacerdoti and following Hotson’s and Rowse’s studies, Shakespeare might have learned of the heliocentric theories thanks to his connections with the Digges and with the members of the Northumberland circle, notably through Thomas Harriot. Alternatively, it is also possible that Bruno’s writings constituted a source of inspiration for the English dramatist.

Despite the lack of documents, the idea of a Brunian influence on the plays of Shakespeare is not a new one. German scholars of the mid-nineteenth century first, and Frances Yates later, began to look in this direction. In 1989, Gatti saw Bruno’s ideas as the possible intellectual and literary background to both Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* (c.

---

141 J. B. Portae *De furtuils literarum notis vulgo*. 1591. On Castelvetro’s dedication to the Earl of Northumberland, see E. Rosenberg 1943:139-42.
143 See G. Sacerdoti 1990. An astronomical interpretation of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* made by P. Husher points to similar conclusions. See P. Husher 1999.
1693) and Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* (c. 1601). Similarly, the strong interest of John Donne (1572-1631) in the new cosmologists, Copernicus and Kepler; the idea of space travel as a corollary of the post-Copernican discovery of a possible plurality of inhabited worlds, thus “denying the uniqueness of Jesus”; the sharp criticism of Christian dogma as expressed in his sceptical, rebellious and revolutionary poems, seemed to modern commentators to be dependent on Bruno’s views.

Not surprisingly, Donne was patronised by the Earl of Northumberland and had some relations with both Thomas Harriot and Sir Walter Raleigh, the leader of a group of unorthodox scientists and natural philosophers which was styled by a contemporary as ‘Sir Walter Rawleys Schoole of Atheisme’. Even were it to be proved that Donne had actual connections with the ‘Schoole’, he might surely have known of its activities either through popular report or through his acquaintance with some of its members. After Raleigh’s disgrace and imprisonment in the Tower, his associates gathered at Syon House around Northumberland. Thus it would be difficult to imagine how Donne could have escaped hearing about Bruno’s works and reputation. But there are at least two more figures who might have been the means of introducing Bruno’s ideas to this generation of scientists and writers. These are Sir Philip Sidney and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex (1565-1601).

Bruno’s relationship with Sidney has already been discussed. Instead, what needs to be assessed is Sidney’s possible role in the diffusion of Bruno’s thought within English literary circles. As the probable unnamed knight at the table of the *Cena*, Sidney might
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147 See H. Gatti 1989:74-113 and 114-64; also Id., 1986:99-138. Christopher Marlowe is quite likely to have been edged into Sir Walter Raleigh’s circle.


149 According to Shirley (1983), that a formal association surrounding either Raleigh or Northumberland took place is by no means certain.

150 While there is documentary evidence of contacts between Donne and Henry Percy, it is also likely that Donne knew Raleigh and was also acquainted with Harriot, the trusted friend of both Northumberland and Raleigh. Donne is also known to own a copy of Hill’s *Philosophia Epicurea*. On Donne and Raleigh, Northumberland and Harriot, see R.C. Bald 1970; also M. Nicolson 1940, P.J. French 1972 and J. Carey 1990. French’s and Carey’s studies point also to Donne’s possible acquaintance with Dee and therefore with Thomas Digges, who esteemed Dee as his “mathematical father”.
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well have been the beneficiary of Bruno’s work and talk.\textsuperscript{151} If we add that Greville’s London residence – where the dinner is said to take place – was, as we know, attended by Edward Dyer, Dee’s close friend and patron, it is not unlikely that those discussions might have reached also the Syon House group’s ears.

Equally interesting are Sidney’s ties with Robert Essex, the beloved brother of Penelope Devereux-Rich and future husband of Sidney’s widow, Frances Walsingham. On Robert Essex and his possible connections with Bruno I have already written recently and will return on another occasion.\textsuperscript{152} Essex’s interest in the Italian philosopher seems to be confirmed by my recent discovery of an English document recording Bruno’s death in Rome on 17 February 1600. The document, a note, probably a letter, which was written between May and July of the same year, reached England very shortly after Bruno’s death and found its way into the miscellaneous documents belonging to Robert Devereux.\textsuperscript{153} In view of Essex’s importance politically, as well as of his connection with the court, the reference to Bruno among his personal papers appears to reinforce the Nolan’s testimony on his contacts with some of the prominent London aristocratic minds. Besides Sidney and Dyer, the list of Essex’s acquaintances, in fact, includes Gabriel Harvey, Edmund Spenser, Sir Walter Raleigh, Samuel Daniel and Sir Fulke Greville, the amphitryon of Bruno’s party-supper. The hypothesis that Essex might have heard of or even met the Nolan is not groundless.\textsuperscript{154} If so, it is hard to believe that Essex, involved as he was in political activity throughout these years, could remain unaffected by Bruno’s religious and political views, as I shall indicate in the near future. Moreover, the evidence that the news of Bruno’s death at the stake freely circulated within English circles by 1600 fully justifies the tendency of the Earl of Northumberland and his close

\textsuperscript{151} On the points of resemblance between Bruno’s and Sidney’s moral and political philosophy, see N. Ordine’s introduction to \textit{Oeuvres/Expulsion}:clx:clxxii.


\textsuperscript{153} See fig. 8.

\textsuperscript{154} Whether or not Bruno had met Essex at court cannot be proved at present. The precise time of Essex’s move to Court has caused much confusion. The universal consensus among modern commentators is that Essex arrived there by late 1584. At any rate, it is almost certain that Bruno was welcomed into the house of the Earl of Leicester and his second wife, Lettice Knollys, Countess of Essex and Robert’s mother, during the composition of the \textit{Cena}. (\textit{Oeuvres/Souper}:99). At that time Essex was living in his Welsh estates. It seems that he took up residence at Kenilworth Castle, Leicester’s seat in Warwickshire, about the third week of August 1585. See P. E. J. Hammer 1999:14-5.
associates either to assume a cautious silence on crucial points of philosophical and scientific speculation, or to ambiguously dissociate themselves from unorthodox views.\textsuperscript{155} Essex's awareness of the development of scientific enquiry within the circles of London scientists, as well as his links with some of their members, can also be demonstrated.\textsuperscript{156}

But what might be extremely relevant is that Shakespeare's patron, Southampton, was the best friend of Robert Essex who, in turn, had Alberico Gentili among his protégés. As a result, it seems more than likely that Essex, and perhaps Shakespeare through him, was familiar with Bruno's views. Thus that the news of Bruno's death circulated in England by 1600 may also corroborate the conventional hypothesis of Shakespeare's disguising his belief in an infinite universe for fear of persecution. I have already hinted at Sacerdoti's conclusions about the dramatist's support for the Copernican world view. Yet, he goes further in asserting that reading Bruno can help to understand some verbal tricks and metaphors which are to be found throughout Shakespeare's plays. Furthermore, Shakespeare took up the Machiavellian idea of religion as an *instrumentum regni*, according to which the belief in the mysteries of religion allows rulers to control the masses and at the same time to neutralise the revolutionary potential of conflicting factions.\textsuperscript{157} In this respect, Shakespeare's indebtedness to Bruno extends not only to cosmological but also to religious and political issues.

\textsuperscript{155} On this argument, see H. Gatti 1989:68-72.
\textsuperscript{156} In 1594 Northumberland married Dorothy Deveraux, the sister of Robert Essex. It was when she was known to be pregnant that the 'Wizard Earl' penned the first draft of the *Advice his Son* (ca. 1596). For Essex's preoccupation with astronomical instruments and magnetism, see HMC, Salisbury MSS, XI:4. On Essex links with Thomas Harriot, see F.A. Yates 1936:137-51 and H. Gatti 1993:4.
\textsuperscript{157} G. Sacerdoti 1997:239-49. See also Id., 1992 and 1994.
FIG. 8 The news of Bruno’s death in Rome.
II.
Political and religious aspects of the Italian dialogues:
Bruno's rethinking of the Italian Renaissance from an English angle;
his 'indebtedness' to English culture and society

The most crucial episode in Bruno's life is his arrest and trial for heresy which, starting from the summer of 1592, first in Venice and later in Rome, brought the philosopher into conflict with the authorities of the Catholic Church and, in 1600, led to his death at the stake. Despite their importance with respect to Bruno's life and thought, the official documents recording the trial are incomplete, the original volume of the proceedings of the process in Rome being lost, and we lack both the list of the charges and of the heretical propositions that the philosopher refused to retract and for which he was burnt. Nevertheless, we know from the Sommario of the trial that at the beginning of 1599 the charges were at least 20.\(^{158}\) Luigi Firpo classified them according to three main groups.\(^{159}\) The first one chiefly deals with Bruno's disciplinary offences, such as his disrespect for the Church and its ministers, as well as his irreverent comments – some of them even outrightly blasphemous – on saints, relics and images. The second includes strictly theological subjects. Bruno was guilty of holding opinions contrary to the main articles of Christian faith, such as denying Christ's divinity, incarnation and resurrection; the immaculate conception and transubstantiation, as well as the orthodox account of the creation of the world in time. Finally, the last group is concerned with Bruno's cosmology, i.e. those philosophical opinions that were at variance with the letter of the Scriptures. The revolutionary extent of Bruno's cosmology, as well as the related topic of the role of religion within civil society, are presented in a more systematic form in the Italian dialogues.

Although during his deposition of 2 June 1592 Bruno submitted to the five Venetian Inquisitors a list drawn up in his own hand of all his books, both those already printed and those still in manuscript,\(^{160}\) it is not easy to ascertain which of these were in

\(^{158}\) The manuscript containing a copy of the 'Sommario' of Bruno's trial was discovered in 1940 by Angelo Mercati, a member of the Papal curia, in the private library of Pope Pius XI. The manuscript was allowed to be published two years later. See Processo:87.

\(^{159}\) Ibid., 88-90.

\(^{160}\) Ibid., 165-6.
fact available for perusal. We know from the extant documents that Giovanni Mocenigo, the first of Bruno’s prosecutors, enclosed in his letters of accusation the *De' predicamenti di Dio*, now lost; the unpublished lectures he gave in Paris in 1582; the *Cantus Circaeus*; and three printed works, most probably the *De minimo*, the *De monade* and the *De la Causa*. To these, we must add the *De infinito universo e mondi* and the *Cena de le ceneri*, the latter probably being the only outcome of the search made at the pope’s behest. In fact, on 16 February 1595 Clemente VIII instructed the Inquisitors to look for Bruno’s missing writings to be perused and censured. It was only in April 1596 that Bruno’s printed works were entrusted for examination to a panel of theologians, the most influential of them being the Jesuit Roberto Bellarmino, and suddenly a list of errors was submitted to the prisoner for recantation.

From Bruno’s fragmentary *Responsiones ad censuras* we infer that the eight censurable propositions had to do mainly with Bruno’s ontology and cosmology, namely with the question of the creation of the world, its eternity and infinity; the doctrine of the soul; the idea of the incorruptibility of spiritual substance; his adherence to Copernican astronomy; the assumption that stars and celestial bodies were living creatures, and the more dangerous axiom of the earth as an intelligent and animate whole, in order to explain its movements; the doctrine of metempsychosis. Finally, in the letter of Kaspar Schoppe to Conrad Rittershausen, dated 17 February 1600, it is possible to find two further indictments, the first concerning Bruno’s adherence to the pre-Adamite heresy, and the second his tendency to identify in some way the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, with the equivalent of the Platonic and later Stoic notion of the *anima mundi*.

---

161 Ibid., p. 161: “Et doppoi per le guerre civili me parti et andai a Paris, dove me messi a legger una lezione straordinaria per farmi conoscer et far saggio di me; et lessi trenta lezioni et pigliai per materia trenta attributi divini, tolti da Santo Thoma dalla prima parte”.
162 Ibid., 144-5; 159.
163 Ibid., 227-8.
164 Ibid., 233-5.
165 Ibid., 299-304.
166 Ibid., 348-55. Kaspar Schoppe, a young Catholic convert from Lutheranism, had personally attended both the public condemnation (8 February) and Bruno’s death (17 February).
It appears clearly that the three so-called cosmological dialogues were the most censured among Bruno’s works, particularly *De la causa*, which in the eyes of Inquisitors deserved no fewer than five censures. Yet, it is difficult to understand the tragic end of the trial without considering Bruno’s cosmology and its implications for religious and ethical matters, of which he was fully conscious.

From the early stages of the trial Bruno must have realised that it was mainly his cosmology that raised theological problems because of its incompatibility with most Christian tenets. In this respect, one is entitled to wonder whether Graziano’s allegation that Bruno “si vantava che da putto cominciò a essere nemico de la fede catholica” might correspond to those adolescent years when the Nolan rejected Aristotle and began to read Copernicus. As a matter of fact, in his replies to the Inquisitors not only does Bruno appear to be as truthful and laconic as possible, but he also turns to his books only when he thinks that they could serve to support his claims, thereby avoiding any reference to Spaccio and Cabala, as well as to Candelao. Similarly, in the London dialogues Bruno repeatedly distinguished between philosophy and religion, reason and faith. This standpoint reflects a clear-cut strategy which goes back to his early sojourn in Paris. According to a well-known conjecture formulated by Ciliberto, on his arrival in London Bruno had no intention whatsoever of arousing religious controversies, nor of clashing in any way with the Church. Indeed, as he had in Paris, he trod the way of ‘concordismo tradizionale’ to be achieved through the distinction between reason and faith. Bruno’s approach to cosmological issues in 1583 ultimately reflects this tendency:

*Ad excellentissimum Oxoniensis Academiae procancellarium* in OL, II,II:77-8.

**Processo**: 251. Francesco Graziano, one of Bruno’s fellow prisoners in Venice, was a new witness at the trial. His testimony, unexpectedly rancorous, seriously affected the Nolan’s cause.

**See above**, 234.

**On Bruno’s ‘discrediting’ of the Cabala in 1591**, see *De compositione imaginum* in OL, II:237.


252
This ‘pact of tolerance’, as Papi defined it in a highly interesting book of 1968 (whence Ciliberto takes the cue for his observations), finds its origin in the Averroist distinction between ‘theological knowledge’ pertaining to philosophers and ‘knowledge of God’ which pertains to theologians. However, in developing and defining his cosmological dialogues, in which Bruno’s principles of natural philosophy were fully articulated, it emerged that such compromise was no longer feasible. Bruno’s awareness of some of the dangers involved in separating physics from metaphysics, and ontology from cosmology, once he had understood the relationship which brings together ethics, religion and science, might have motivated both the composition of the moral dialogues and the intransigent position which eventually prompted his execution. The heretical implications of Bruno’s doctrine of nature and God were in fact numerous and varied.

In the preliminary epistle of Cena, as elsewhere, Bruno likens the philosopher to a painter or draws analogies between painting and philosophy. This analogy has a twofold importance. On the one hand, for medieval and Renaissance thinkers the model of thought through images was the key to the art of memory, of which Bruno was a notable exponent. On the other hand, the philosopher’s goal is to understand God – inasmuch as we can understand Him – ‘in things’, that is nature understood as the infinite universe. And nature, as Bruno says in De immenso, is the painting of God. In replying to the Inquisitors’ inquiry into the ‘orthodoxy’ of his doctrines, Bruno claims that the universe, being as infinite as God’s creative power and goodness, is ruled by a

providenza universal, in virtù della quale ogni cosa vive, vegeta et si move et sta nella sua perfettione; et la intendo in due maniere, l’una nel modo con cui presente è l’anima nel corpo, tutta in tutto et tutta in qual si voglia parte, et questo chiamo natura, ombra et vestigio della divinità; l’altra nel modo ineffabile col quale Iddio per essentia, presentia et potentia è in tutto e sopra tutto, non come parte, non come anima, ma in modo inesplicabile.

---

173 Oeuvres/Souper.13; see also Triginta sigillorum explicatio in OL, II,II:133-4; Expulsion:15. Again Bruno represents himself as the painter Giovanni Bernardo in his comedy Il Candelario. On the analogy between the philosopher and the painter, see D. Knox, course notes, 13.
174 De immenso:12.
175 Processo:168.
Here are summarised two fundamental premises underlying Bruno’s thought: so-called monism and animism. Within a theological perspective, by rejecting the Tridentine transcendental God he intends to abolish the insurmountable chasm between God and man. In fact, Bruno conceives of the idea of “divinity in us”, according to which man and God are aspects of one and the same reality. In such system of thought there is no place for Christian revelation. In resolving the gap between man and a transcendent God, Bruno bestowed human beings with the dignity and perfection which they had lost through the Fall. The promise of salvation, which played a crucial role in the Christian tradition, was thus reduced by him to a fairy tale fitted for “foolish people”. Bruno’s radical doctrine of God’s immanence, which represents one of the fundamental themes of his Italian dialogues, is associated with the identification between divine law and natural law, as developed more fully in Spaccio. In this perspective, ‘miracles’, far from being a divine attribute of the transcendental being of Christian tradition, must be explained as naturally occurring powers, that is, nothing but “una cognizione dei secreti della natura con facoltà d’imitare la natura nell’opere sue, e fare cose meravigliose agli’occhi del volgo.” Scholars now have reason to believe that Bruno was not so much questioning the authenticity of Christ’s miracles as ridiculing all versions of Christian theology, particularly Protestant, as being (as Bruno believed) distant and corrupt derivatives of an ancient wisdom.

On the other hand, Bruno’s metaphysical animism undermined the Ptolemaic stationary primum mobile as the cause of all motions. The new cosmology, in fact, assumed a nature that carries its vital principle within itself, so that motion results from an internal energy, the World Soul, thereby eliminating the awkward notion that an

---


177 For Bruno’s idea of dignitas hominis, see M. A. Granada 1993(b) and 1999. See also A. Ingegno 1985 and 1987.

178 Processo:275. It is noteworthy that some late medieval and Renaissance philosophers gave natural explanations for supposedly miraculous biblical events. For instance, the Islamic philosopher Avicenna (980-1037) provided a natural explanation of Christ’s walking on water. Among Italian Renaissance thinkers Pietro Pomponazzi (1462-1525) assigned the powers attributed to Christ in the performance of his miracles, including bringing the dead to life, to purely natural means. Similarly in Oeuvres/Expulsion:461.
external intelligence or God moved the heavenly bodies directly. According to this view, planets were living creatures because they moved themselves by virtue of their intrinsic animation and were part of a single animate whole. In theological terms, if such doctrines encouraged the idea that heavenly bodies were animate, intelligent and divine, i.e. encouraged polytheism of the kind practised in classical antiquity, at the same time they definitely released the functioning of the world from divine intervention. Matter was self-organising and self-metamorphosing and it did not need a God or a demiurge to put order into its native chaos. Everything was the result of dialectical coincidences of opposites.

The concepts of the infinity and homogeneity of the universe also entail a rethinking of Christian religion and its dogmas. Since God cannot be understood as a being separate from men, the Incarnation and the very notion of Christ as the universal medium between man and the divinity were dismissed by Bruno as false and misleading. The infinite universe, which is the same as the homogeneous nature, virtually becomes the Word of God and, therefore, the only mediator between man and God. Equally, the Eucharist, like the crucifixion and death of Jesus, no longer represents the privileged channel for establishing communion with God. Catholic doctrines of the Mass, as well as the Protestant Eucharist, derived from a mistaken interpretation of divine participation in things. Thus, the perfect man is not Jesus, the Word incarnate, but natural man who, through philosophical ‘contemplation’ of the infinite universe, achieves union with the divinity. As a result, Bruno claims the

---

179 D. Knox, course notes, 17; 49; 165. The classical doctrine that identifies the pantheon of Gods with the planets and the constellations was entirely rejected by scholastic authors. Indeed in doing so they contradicted Aristotle, who believed that the heavens were alive.

180 Bruno expressed the idea of the existence and necessity of contraries and unity as a resolution of contraries first in the De umbris idearum (1582) and became a recurring topic in his Italian dialogues.

181 During the third deposition to the Venetian Inquisition, Bruno admits that he had doubted that the second person of the Trinity could be incarnated as a human being. See Processo:169.

182 The rejection of the role of Christ as the mediator between man and God inevitably implies the annulment of the function of the Pope as Vicar of Christ on Earth. On these questions, see A. Ingegno 1987.

183 A satire on Eucharist may be found in La cena, Spaccio and Furori, but it is also in nuce in the Sigillus sigillorum of 1583. I have also found very useful D. Knox’s course notes on Bruno and the Eucharist (Documents:7-15).

184 Oeuvres/Fureurs:119-21 and 421-3.
supremacy of philosophy over theology in that by means of the former a man can achieve the “true beatitude that he can have as a man”,\textsuperscript{185} that is, wisdom. In doing so, he inevitably departed from the position as developed by Averroists and took a decisively anti-Christian stance. We can find traces of this tendency already in the epistle prefixed to \textit{Infinito}, as Granada correctly puts it in his introduction to Aquilecchia’s French/Italian critical edition of this dialogue.\textsuperscript{186}

But the Nolan goes further by challenging the fundamental Christian dogma of creation. His universe was not regarded as having its origin in time, and the very doctrine of God’s immanence does not seem necessarily to require an additional transcendent principle to justify the existence of the universe. Rather, the union and unity of cosmic mind and cosmos could contain, exclusively and entirely within themselves, the reason for their absolutely necessary existence. Thus Bruno maintains that humans had come into being naturally at various times and places, a process in which, as Papi points out, “si può riproporre il ritmo inesauribile della vita naturale anche senza il rapporto di generazione tipico della specie”.\textsuperscript{187} Such an idea, Papi claims, fitted well with Bruno’s metaphysical model of the inextricable union of matter and form, as well as with his idea of an animated universe.

The relationship of God and the universe understood as ‘God in things’ found its ontological explanation in \textit{De la Causa}. In this dialogue, half-way between the \textit{Cena} and the \textit{Infinito}, the Nolan develops a vigorous attack on the pillar of the Peripatetic tradition: Aristotle’s doctrines of causes and of hierarchies. In contrast with the Aristotelian dualism of form and matter Bruno enunciates the most revolutionary postulate of his ontology, the indissoluble interconnectedness of the material principle and of the form in the One. In opposition to Aristotle’s notion of matter as merely an empty receptacle of forms, Bruno built a system of thought where matter is not infinitely divisible, eternal and can take every shape. Furthermore, the coincidence in God of potency and act, of ‘Cause’ and ‘Principle’, puts an end to the hierarchy of beings. The

\textsuperscript{185} \textit{Oeuvres/Infini}:41.
\textsuperscript{186} Ibid., xxvi-lix.
\textsuperscript{187} F. Papi 1968:11.
supreme Intelligence and eternal Principle is the Whole and contains everything that can be. The cosmos, therefore, is the one reality in which a single life circulates and in which a single order is present, each part of which is connected to the others so that it is possible to obtain the whole from any part. As a result, the physical monism of Bruno’s cosmology found its metaphysical counterpart in his conception of reality. Nature becomes the whole of all processes, changes, vicissitudes, and even of the single elements which make it up. Concomitantly, nature is the One, the homogeneous principle of everything.

On this view, generation and corruption are fundamental principles of Bruno’s cosmology and ontology. In the cosmological dialogues Bruno suggests that the earth is not different in kind from the other heavenly bodies and that therefore it is not the most abject part of the universe, whereas the notion of homogeneity excludes any hierarchy in cosmic matter on which the hierarchical structure of the Church found its logical justification. At the same time, in rejecting the traditional distinction between sublunary and superlunary regions, the philosopher concluded that generation and corruption occurred throughout the whole universe, thus constituting its vital principle. It is here that Aristotle’s conception of the soul as the incorporeal form or first entelechiae which vivifies the matter is open to question.

According to Bruno, following Pythagoras, generation and corruption must be regarded as manifestations of life, since they are the continuous alteration of one eternal substance. In this perspective, death is nothing but the dissolution of the temporary configuration that the one substance had assumed in the context of the changes and vicissitudes of life. This of course also presupposes a different conception of the soul. In

---

188 In a passage of the Cena Bruno states that the earth moves so that it can continually renew itself by exposing all parts of its body to the sun (Oeuvres/Souper:255). This conception, which is fully developed in the De infinito, gives an idea of the extent to which Bruno’s metaphysics and cosmology are inextricably linked. Since all things in nature change, Bruno claims, and since the earth is part of nature, it follows that the earth cannot remain immobile and in the same state. As a result, the Earth’s motions providentially produced the ‘vicissitudine’ required to ensure that all of its parts realised their potentialities (Oeuvres/Souper:259).

189 “Ogni produzione di qualsivoglia sorte che la sia è una alterazione; rimanendo la sostanza sempre medesima, perché non è che una, uno ente divino, immortale. Questo lo ha possuto intendere Pitagora, che non teme la morte ma aspetta la mutazione” (Oeuvres/Cause:281).
Bruno's opinion the Aristotelian definition of the soul was one of the most absurd and dangerous among scholastic ideas inasmuch as it gave rise to doctrines such as the fear of death and the related disparagement of worldly life, especially amongst the unlearned.\textsuperscript{190} These opinions were not only false, they also instilled fear of the afterlife. It is precisely the irrational fear of death and Hell which had allowed impostors to threaten people continuously and to exert power under the pretext of the illusory promise of salvation.\textsuperscript{191} Yet, by suggesting that death does not exist and that only change occurs, Bruno warns his readers to avoid considering the world and the individual body merely as a dreadful prison.\textsuperscript{192} Conversely, immortality is a quality of life, attainable in this world through the contemplation of universal beauty or divinity.

Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that Bruno had rejected his well-thought-out strategy of compromise between his positions and the Bible's teaching. As has already been said, this strategy, which is recurrent in the three cosmological dialogues, was temporary abandoned in \textit{Cabala} and partly in \textit{Spaccio}. In this dialogue, as in the \textit{Cena}, Bruno maintains that philosophers should not divulge to the unlearned their philosophical ideas, correct though they might be philosophically, since they might undermine religion on which morality and political cohesion depended.\textsuperscript{193} Although sharply distinguished, theological dogmas and philosophic speculations, faith and reason, are by no means in conflict. Bruno uses this argument to show the 'orthodoxy' of his philosophic reasoning. He claims, for instance, that his ontology supports the idea of the immortality of the soul and, therefore, it can be considered better suited to Christian theology than scholastic philosophy and Aristotle himself. In the same way, Bruno's comment that God is the infinite cause of all things is a standard idea in Christian philosophy. What is not orthodox is his insistence that this infinite cause is bound by a law of nature to produce

\textsuperscript{190} Oeuvres/Souper:203; Cause:139-41; Expulsion:21-3.
\textsuperscript{191} This heretical standpoint implies that Christ, who is presented as the vessel of salvation by Christian theology, is a ludicrous impostor who has "ripieno il mondo tutto d'infinito pazzie, bestialità e vizzi, come di tante virtù, divinità e discipline" (Oeuvres/Souper:47).
\textsuperscript{192} Oeuvres/Souper:171; 257-9; Cause:141; Infini:37-45; Expulsion:21.
\textsuperscript{193} Oeuvres/Expulsion:195-9. See also Oeuvres/Souper:191-201.
an infinite universe. In other words, Bruno implies that the infinite cosmos, and the world itself, was the only option for God as God.194

The coincidence in God of potency and act, of necessity and liberty, required Him to create an infinite universe.195 This is because an omnipotent God can only create an infinite world inasmuch as a finite world would represent a limit to divine power in the act of creation.196 Such a heretical stance, which denied God's free will, could hardly escape Cardinal Bellarmino's attention when perusing Bruno's writings and preparing the list of all the propositions that he thought required recantation. Despite Bruno's insistence on the differences in language and codes used for matters concerning natural philosophy, religion and philosophy, the Inquisitors were keenly aware of the extent to which his arguments on the ontological need for an infinite universe and, more generally, his conception of the soul, were harmful to Christianity.

By restoring pre-Socratic monism, Bruno was at variance with Christian dogmas too. In sharp contrast to Aristotle's beliefs, he argued, siding with Cusanus, that perfection does not exist in the universe. As a result, Bruno did not even hold that the universe has a tendency towards perfection, a goal or a telos towards which it must strive. Thus Bruno denied the biblical eschatology, the final destruction of the world, and, consequently, the reward of men in Heaven, or punishment in Hell, according to their conduct in this life. By excluding original sin and Adam's fall, the Nolan has to deal with the Christian messianist and apocalyptic vision of history based upon Christ's sacrifice at Calvary. In contrast, Bruno sets out to explain his idea of renovatio as the return to a true and ancient doctrine which defines itself throughout the moral dialogues as a 'de-Christianisation of the sky'.197 Thus, in Papi's own words, the history of the world for Bruno is no longer 'sacred history' and the Augustinian eschatological model

---

194 In this regard, the anonymous Neapolitan commentator, showing himself to be well aware of the religious consequences of Bruno's philosophy, rejects both the infinity of the universe and the plurality of worlds, thus supporting the claim that as far as God's will is concerned "non bisogna che noy metiamo regole de le sue opere secondo il nostro stolto cervello". Quoted in R. Sturlese 1987:124.
195 Oeuvres/Infini: 89. See also De immenso: 456-8.
196 The logical argument that divine omnipotence cannot suffer any self-imposed restraint leads Bruno to postulate the eternity of the universe and the plurality of inhabited worlds which are infinite in number. This constitutes matter of the third and the fourth dialogues of the Infinito.
197 On the idea of 'Reform' as Renovatio in the sixteenth century, see NRL 1996/II.
appears to be inadequate. If, as we have already seen, the idea of the end of the world was questioned by the new philosophy, at the same time Bruno’s adherence to the theory of spontaneous generation had a disastrous impact on the Christian idea of the creation of the world in time, place and space.

Indeed, Bruno’s philosophy of history does not comply with Christian revelation, and his assumption of the likely existence of living beings in other worlds is not consistent with the Genesis account (especially as understood in the theological tradition) of the earth as the only place where God put human beings. The discoveries of the New World cultures and of its primitive inhabitants gave Christians far more confidence in questioning such dogmas. If hitherto the New World had had no relationship whatsoever with the Old, how are we to explain the existing similarities between the two Worlds in terms of flora, fauna and even humanity? And if life, including human life, had flourished in the newly discovered lands without the Europeans knowing about it, then could there not have been an analogous process in the infinite number of worlds which populate the universe?

Bruno develops his views on America and its inhabitants in Spaccio. In this dialogue, after ridiculing the pseudo-Aristotelian theories about alleged ancient navigation which were widely accepted as an explanation of the unexpected encounter with new lands and peoples, the author makes fun of the biblical chronology of the world. Most important, Bruno’s taking up the theory of Pre-Adamites in order to explain the differences among human races, as well as his Lucretian-type argument of abiogenesis, i.e. spontaneous generation, definitely made him a heretic in the Inquisitors’ eyes. If the traditional account of the ‘monogenesis’ of humankind was to be

199 Oeuvres/Expulsion:449-51. The argument about ancient navigation was drawn from the De mirabilibus auscultationibus, a work which was attributed to Aristotle. But already by the end of XVIth century the authenticity of the work was questioned by historians. See F. Papi 1968:208-9.
200 Oeuvres/Expulsion:451. It is noteworthy that Thomas Harriot and Christopher Marlowe both discussed the existence of Pre-Adamites in connection with the discovery of ancient monuments in the New World. In fact, according to Thomas Nashe, Harriot was one of the mathematicians who proved the existence of men before Adam. See J.W. Shirley 1974:36-53.
201 De immenso:784-5; see also De monade, in OL, I,II:363.
replaced by 'polygenesis', what would remain of the truth of the Creation? This is not
the place to trace the story of the possible sources of Bruno’s arguments on the New
World, nor to compare them with the positions of some of the prominent European
thinkers from the late 16th to the end of the 18th century. Bruno’s attitude toward the
new discoveries needs to be discussed inasmuch as it placed him in a unique position
within the contemporary Italian debate.203

It has been underlined that in Cena Bruno deals with Columbus and his voyages
when considering the infinity of the universe, his own discovery of a boundless,
homogeneous, acentric cosmos, which was of greater importance to him, than
Columbus’ discovery of America.204 Similarly, in De immenso after countering Aristotle’s
objections to the plurality of worlds, he has severe words to say on the colonisation and
the ‘commerce’ among peoples.205 In Bruno’s eyes the Aristotelian cosmology, based
upon a finite and hierarchical universe, provided a justification for the European
exploitation of and dominion over the newly discovered races. Such a system could well
be combined with the standard Christian justification of slavery, the curse of Ham, which
was destined to have a long and notorious career throughout the following centuries.206
Instead, Bruno’s model of the universe as homogeneous and infinite allows him to
elaborate his own pantheistic philosophy according to which any minute detail, or
‘minuzzaria’, participates in the divine as an integrated unit.207 In bestowing upon all
individuals the same dignity, inasmuch as they are all part of the whole, and in
condemning every kind of hierarchy – whether cosmological, religious or social – Bruno
went beyond the concept of tolerance which was to find in Locke and Voltaire its most
celebrated champions.208 In an age in which numerous treatises about the dignity of man
were flooding Europe – but as Rousseau was to point out almost two hundred years later
they were all concerned with the aristocratic European man – Bruno’s plea for the

204 Oeuvres/Souper:45.
205 De immenso:780-1.
206 The link between Aristotle and Spanish cruelty to American Indians was first analysed by L. Hanke
(1959). On the same issue, see also F. Papi (1968), M. Ciliberto (1986), S. Ricci (1990) and M.A.
207 Oeuvres/Expulsion:171-3.
'other' on the grounds of not being different from ourselves paradoxically appeared to displease rulers, men of letters and theologians alike.

Yet, Bruno distanced himself from both the heralds of the return of a Golden Age and their portrayal of Indians as 'good' savages, which was later to play a crucial role in Rousseau's philosophy. Despairing of the corruption of Europe, it was natural that certain members of the religious orders should have seen an opportunity for re-establishing the primitive church of the apostles in a new world as yet uncorrupted by European vices. Thanks to this idyllic picture, Eden and Arcadia could now be located on the far shoes of the Atlantic. Yet Bruno criticises both the Catholic and Protestant attitudes to the New World. He regarded as equally intolerant and vain the Catholic providential explanation of the geographical discoveries in terms of the divine intention of bringing about the conversion of the Americans cut off from the Christian revelation, and the Protestant desire to turn toward an alternative, pure and genuine world far from the capricious reach of a Machiavellian prince. While the former, he tells us, inevitably led to

\begin{verbatim}
pertubar la pace altrui, violar i patrii genii de le reggioni, confondere quel che la provida natura distinse, per il commercio raddoppiar i difetti e gionger vizii de I'una e I'altra generazione, con violenza propagar nuove follie e piantar l'inaudite pazzie ove non sono [...]\end{verbatim}

the latter could hardly be congruent with Bruno's idea of progress and of universal vicissitude as theorised in his cosmological dialogues.

His critique of the 'state of nature', as delineated in \textit{Spaccio}, gains here political and religious thrust whose roots can be traced to his early ontological and cosmological speculations. Bruno's target is both the Christian vision of 'fallen creatures' in which the images of the savage and the heathen merged and the related idea of human labour as God's punishment. The return to the Golden Age is, in fact, the renewal of the cosmic cycle, a return to a previous essentially beast-like incarnation. In this sense, Bruno's

\footnote{\textit{Oeuvres/Souper}:45. Similarly in \textit{Spaccio}: "Quella ch'ha varcato gli mari, per violare quelle leggi della natura, confondendo que' popoli che la benigna madre distinse, e per propagare i vizii d'una generazione in un'altra" (p. 333).}
views regarding the New World and its inhabitants must be read in association with his philosophical stance. While the Judeo-Christian inheritance encouraged a classification of mankind in accordance with religious affiliation, Bruno, following the classical tradition, points to the degree of civility as the only mark of distinction of human beings. Concomitantly, by rejecting otium and by praising human industry, work, solicitude, in that they promote innovation and progress, Bruno ultimately sets his dialogues among radical anti-Protestant pamphlets. With withering sarcasm, he attacks the Calvinist doctrine of salvation by faith alone, as well as the rejection of man’s free will and the absolute dependence on divine grace which are implied by it. This question has stimulated lively debate among Bruno’s critics. If Spaccio is manifestly an anti-Protestant book, why did Bruno dedicate it to Philip Sidney, a champion of English Protestantism? Once again Yates’s explanation that there existed between the two men a “marriage of true minds”, both intellectual and political rather than religious, appears to be inadequate. And so is Weiner’s conclusion that “Bruno turns to Sidney not as to his natural disciple but as to one who must be purged of his errors, made to repent them, and finally formed anew”. Rather, it might have been precisely Sidney’s involvement with the New World which caught the Nolan’s attention.

The New World was a constant presence in Sidney’s life. The first book on this subject was published a year before his birth and dedicated to his grandfather. The second and the fifth were dedicated respectively to his godfather and father. Both the Sidneys and the Dudleys had an interest in the English voyages and they put money into Martin Frobisher’s venture in North America. The young Philip was acquainted with Humphrey Gilbert (1539?-1583) and Richard Hakluyt, even if that acquaintance had been brief. But it was during the year 1572 that Sidney had a decisive encounter with the New World. While in Paris with the English envoys for the Treaty of Blois’s ratification, the seventeen-year old Englishman was adopted as a spiritual son by Hubert

210 The expression is Weiner’s (1980:5).
211 F. Yates 1964.
213 See STC 18244; STC 645; STC 23950.
214 DNB, LII:220.
Languet (1518-1581), one of the foremost representatives of French Huguenots. From then on, an intense correspondence began between the two which came to an end with Languet’s death in 1581. In particular, two letters from 1577 are emblematic of Sidney’s gradual coming round to Languet’s point of view with regard to the westward expansion of Europe. By condemning the ‘gold fever’ and any desire for personal advantages, Languet moves his protégé’s spirit from the consideration of quick exploitation towards that of colonisation. This admonition was evidently successful, for Sidney’s goal in the New World project was, as reported in Greville’s memoir, to set up “an Emporium for the confluence of all nations that love or profess any kind of virtue, or Commerce”. This sentiment and these plans on Sidney’s part seem to have belonged to the period 1584-85, the years of Bruno’s moral dialogues.

It is remarkable that precisely the word ‘commerce’ is central to Bruno’s condemnation of the Spanish atrocities in the Indies. And it is also commerce which represents the ideal platform from which the idea of the state of nature can be dismissed. The parallel decay of both nations was the backdrop for Bruno’s attack on ‘civil’ society and helped him to define his interpretation of progress and moral reformation. In fact, that injustice and vice increase along with industry is only a corollary of the increase of justice and virtue. And it is not unlikely that Bruno had Sidney in mind when in Spaccio he backs the English colonisation of the New World. During the years 1582-85, in fact, Sidney was involved in more than one project involving a colonisation scheme in the New World. In 1585, he was about to join the Drake West Indian expedition when the latter’s poor behaviour induced him to abandon the undertaking. The epithet ‘avaricious’ applied to the Britons in the passage quoted above might simply refer to the

215 [...] I am very much afraid that England, seduced by desire for gold, will throw itself entirely upon those islands recently discovered by Frobisher; and how much English blood do you think will need to be shed not to let them be taken away from you? [...] If that hope of gold that is tempting you has not led you astray, you will need to establish some port where your ships may have anchorage: because if those lands do turn out to be suitable for cultivation, it would be far wiser to build a town than forts in which garrisons will have to be fed [...]. Quoted in R. Kuin 1998:563.
216 F. Greville, Works:118.
218 Oeuvres/Expulsion:483.
‘desire for gold’ and self-interest which sustained the early English voyages rather than
being an attempt at offending Sidney and his family, as Weiner understands it. Surely, English colonists must have disappointed the Italian philosopher since in *De immenso*, too, he complains about Britain’s expansionism. However, if one considers the way in which anti-Aristotelian arguments and opinions on the New World and its discovery are all of a piece in Bruno’s own moral and political philosophy, then it may well be no accident that the Nolan dedicated his undertaking to Philip Sidney.

The question may be better tackled by referring to Bruno’s own words in addressing Sidney. In *Spaccio*, after praising Sidney’s intellect, customs and merits Bruno proceeds to present him with his work, but not without lashing out against those foolish detractors of his philosophy who

sotto il severo ciglio, volto sommesso, prolissa barba, e toga
maestrale e grave, studiosamente a danno universale conchiudeno
l’ignoranza non men vile che boriosa, e non manco perniciosa che
celebrata ribaldaria. 221

The ‘Eternal Truth’ which Bruno sets against the false doctrines of the fools can be restored only by expelling vices and replacing them with their contrary virtues. Indeed the *Spaccio* taken as a whole must be understood as the premise of a hitherto undefined project for the civil and moral reform of humankind to be achieved “se non con ponere in numero e certo ordine tutte le prime forme de la moralità, che sono le virtudi e vizii capitali”. 222 What is required for the much-needed reformation of Heaven is a “repentant” Jupiter (“who represents each one of us”, as Bruno tells us), who has now decided to interrogate himself as to his past actions and attitudes. Driven by the new picture of universe as envisaged in the cosmological dialogues, Jupiter, whose decrepitude symbolises the decline and the dissoluteness of society, is now able to initiate the change that “the soul and man incur in finding themselves”. 223 This process of redemption is ultimately exemplified in *Furori*, the last of the dialogues, bearing a dedication to Sidney

---

221 *Oeuvres/Expulsion*: 9.
222 Ibid., 17.
223 *Oeuvres/Expulsion*: 29 and 61-3. In this regard Ingegno (1972:136): “Storicamente dunque è il venir meno del possesso del vero che si colloca all’origine della corruzione morale”.
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as the only man fit to appreciate his philosophy. At this stage one is entitled to wonder about Sidney’s role in this project.

Despite Sidney’s Calvinist leanings, which permeate the content of all his works, several similarities connect his views to Bruno’s. An accurate analysis of their thought, in fact, reveals distinct parallels in ideas and in ways of thinking with respect to philosophy, literature, politics and ethics. Such themes as the aristocratic contempt for the masses and a complete distrust of their judgement; the reliance upon the human mind as the only means of attaining the genuine truth; the desirability of loving God and the vanity of worldly love; the defence of the value and function of art and poetry; the combining of moral philosophy and poetry; the insistence on the necessity of keeping peace and social order as the only solution to the crisis and to the moral and intellectual decrepitude facing contemporary Europe can be detected in both Bruno’s and Sidney’s writings. Bruno’s confidence in Sidney’s understanding, open-mindedness and wisdom appears to be firm even when disputing the essential elements of Calvinist thought, notably its underrating of both man’s intellectual powers and the efficacy of good works. As a result, Bruno looks for an adviser, but also for an ally “contra le rughe e supercilio d’ipocriti, il dente e naso de scioli, la lima e sibilo de pedanti”. But there is more.

In an essay dating 1972, G.F. Waller drew attention to the philosophical tension in Sidney between the Calvinist doctrine of the absolute transcendence of the divine and magical hermetic and occult doctrines asserting man’s autonomy and powers of self-transformation. Whether or not Bruno might have perceived such tension is, at present, impossible to say. Yet the key to Bruno’s aim in addressing to Sidney two moral works rather than the cosmological ones is to be found, I believe, in the ecumenical proposal therein framed. If Bruno’s contempt for some of the key-ideas of Protestant theology...
might have upset the English Puritan, nevertheless Bruno’s attempt to heal the religious strife that blighted his age, to bring peace and solidarity, and above all, to secure their survival might have intrigued Sidney. No doubt the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre of 1572 together with the fury of religious fanaticism which bathed France in blood was still all too fresh in Sidney’s mind. As a result, he might have been at least impressed by Bruno’s claim that to heal only one lame person, who was no better off cured than lame, was anyway insignificant when compared with the benefit of saving one’s homeland or reforming a perturbed soul through philosophy. Similarly, he would have surely agreed with Bruno’s statement that “the troubles in religion would be easily removed if these questions [i.e. disputes concerning the sacraments and doctrinal matters] were removed”, as later reported by Guillaume Cotin in his diary.

On the other hand, as Ingegno has remarked, irrespective of a strictly theological perspective, Bruno’s outlook is not so far from some Reformist attitudes as it might seem at first sight. Among these, one can rank the hostility to the concepts of purgatory and intercessions; the critique of the celibacy of the priesthood; the scoffing at the superstitious folly of the people’s devotion to the consecrated host and to the altar and, more generally, to religious imagery, the worship of which was equated by the Reformers with idolatry. At the same time, according to Bruno, the vision of truth, or ‘supernatural’ illumination, is reserved for only a few. It may operate, therefore, like Christian grace in an ignorant subject who has not sought it. But, contrary to the Protestant doctrine of grace, the divine mind is revealed in a “different way” to those who seek it, and to them alone. The strong emphasis on the ‘strenuous effort’ in attaining knowledge, as well as the reliance on human perfectibility and on the man’s progress distinguish Bruno from Protestantism. Nevertheless, the great prestige that his

---

229 On 18th August 1572, Sidney was a royal guest at Henry of Navarre’s marriage in Notre Dame to Margaret, the king’s sister. There followed, on 23 August, on the eve of St. Bartholomew’s day, the great massacre of Protestants. See DNB, LII:221.
230 Oeuvres/Expulsion:206.
231 V. Spampanato 1933:40.
philosophy gained in Lutheran Wittenberg seems to show that there was no sharp conflict between the two different points of view.\footnote{233}

Even the encomium of Henry III must be read through the glasses of Bruno’s programme for a radical ethical renovation which he hoped would serve to redeem Europe from its decadence.\footnote{234} In appealing to the King of France as the “Re cristianissimo, santo religioso e puro”, Bruno aimed to offer to Sidney a picture of the French situation and at the same time to point to a way leading to universal peace: “Perché suspetterete e temerete voi altri principi e regi che non vegna a domar le vostre forze, et involarvi le proprie corone?”\footnote{235} Bruno’s message to Sidney, and to the whole of England alike, is expressed by the motto “Tertia coelo manet” (third crown in heaven) which Jupiter says a good four times within a few lines. Besides the power exerted over the kingdoms of France and Poland, Henry III has to rely on the power of religion inasmuch as it is essential to the cohesion – and therefore to the political stability – of any state. It must be borne in mind that the idea of subordinating church to state had motivated not only the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion in 1559, but also Henry III’s Catholic \textit{politique} policy and Henry of Navarre’s abjuring of Calvinism. The conviction that religion was valuable solely as a means of reinforcing political and social cohesion permeated the works of another celebrated Italian, Niccolò Machiavelli, who was as disparaged as he was secretly admired by rulers, as I have mentioned in earlier chapters.\footnote{236}

The continuity between Bruno’s thought and the Machiavellian and ‘Averroist’ concept of religion has already been underlined by scholars.\footnote{237} And it has also been noted

\footnote{233} It is noteworthy that during the years 1578-79 the threat of the Inquisition drove Bruno from Italy to Geneva, where from 1552 onwards an Italian Evangelical community had settled. Once there it seems that he attended Calvinist services and that, in fact, he had become a Calvinist. He was then involved in a dispute with De la Faye, an authoritative Calvinist professor, and arrested. After having been pardoned and released from prison Bruno left for France. According to Aquilecchia Bruno’s anti-Calvinism, which reached its climax in \textit{Spaccio}, shows traces of this episode. See also Bruno’s praise of Luther in \textit{Oratio Valedictoria}, \textit{OL}, I,II:21.\footnote{234} \textit{Oeuvres/Expulsion}:cxliv-cl.
\footnote{235} Ibid., 501.
\footnote{236} See above, 64, footnote 131.
\footnote{237} See M. Ciliberto 1985:54-7; M.A. Granada 1998. However, they do not mention Bruno’s condemnation of Machiavelli’s prince in \textit{Oeuvres/Expulsion}:43.
that in 1584, the year of the publication of *Spaccio*, an Italian edition of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* and *I Discorsi* issued from John Wolfe's press.\textsuperscript{238} Indeed, Bruno's relation to those radical reformers who fall into the group of Italian exiles that Cantimori has aptly named the *eretici*\textsuperscript{239} is a subject which has not received all the attention it deserves. This topic, which I intend to treat briefly in the following pages, brings to a conclusion the present enquiry.

The possible connection between Renaissance authors and religious reform was first investigated by Delio Cantimori in his *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento* (1939). This research was concerned primarily with the attempts by radicals to introduce into Reformation theology concepts derived from Renaissance humanism. By means of this investigation Cantimori succeeds in detecting among their doctrines a remarkable number of typically Italian features and aspirations which were indicative of a separate rather than a communal religious development with respect to the European Reformation. Disappointed by the progressive absorption of the Reformation into the so-called 'Protestant orthodoxy'\textsuperscript{240} and by the repressive and authoritative policy of Calvin and of the Protestant leaders, those radicals, like so many Renaissance scholars interested in an overall philosophical synthesis which would stand above cultural and religious divisions, conflated the Neoplatonist and Kabbalist traditions where mysticism and scientific knowledge met in a comprehensive world-picture. The overall result was a common tendency to simplify Christian doctrine in an extreme way and to reduce it to its ethical component, as Cantimori maintained.\textsuperscript{241}

Still more important theologically, the heretics of Italy opened Christology, the Trinity, and the whole doctrine of God to questioning. They were particularly interested in how Jesus the Son related to God the Father. While Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans and Calvinists substantially agreed on a Christocentric and biblical theology, radical

\textsuperscript{238} M. Ciliberto 1986:176.
\textsuperscript{240} Significant in this respect is Cantimori's distinction between, on the one hand, 'reformation ideals' that tended to reinforce the social and religious status quo through renovation and, on the other, 'innovative ideals' that, by espousing radicalism and utopianism, resulted in violent revolutionary movements (p. 45).
\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., 40.
Italian Protestants with their questioning of traditional dogma strove to create a balanced, coherent logical, defensible system which gave reason a major role to play in theology and foreshadowed the future. Nevertheless, this divergence from the traditional Christocentric vision of the world took two directions. With the eretici, Christ is not regarded as the Son of God but only as the most pure and perfect ideal, although undoubtedly human, to be followed and imitated in order to act and behave as a real Christian (imitatio Christi). In this way, the celebration of human free will and works comes to its full completion. Original sin loses its meaning while the sacraments have a merely symbolic relevance as the communal commemoration of Christ’s self-sacrifice by a fellowship of believers. With Bruno, given his doubts about the Trinity and about the incarnation, not only is Christ deprived of his divinity, but he also is credited with perpetuating a false sense of the relationship of God to nature, a sense which separates them rather than unifying them into a homogeneous whole and which encourages a sense of the indignity of the latter. In short, Christ was the enemy of civilised life and its accomplishments. This marks a shift within the humanist tradition, and also helps to explain Bruno’s choice of the vernacular to spread his learning.

From this short survey, Bruno’s indebtedness to the Italian tradition of the Renaissance becomes more evident. As is well known, the wide circulation of the writings of Reformers such as Butzer, Melanchthon, Calvin, Ecolampadius, Brunfels and Hutten in the early 30s and later on of heretical pamphlets down to the end of the century, undoubtedly contributed to the spread of the new Reformed doctrines throughout the Italian peninsula. Despite the greater geographical distance from Reformed countries and a smaller urban density, the Spanish vice-realms of Southern Italy were not unaffected by heretical influences. During the forties Naples, more especially, played a central role in conveying and spreading doctrines which were partly at variance with the new Lutheran and Calvinist faiths. It may well be that the young Bruno became acquainted with all the current strands of Italian Protestantism and that some reading had an impact upon his thought. Indeed Juan Valdés’ (1509?–1541) doctrines had attracted many disciples and were to last for centuries. From his teachings

\[242\text{ Oeuvres/Expulsion:468-80.}\]
adopted a certain religious subjectivism and spiritualism whereby the access to divinity does not spring from Scriptures but from the ‘enlightenment’ of the soul. In this way, all prejudice, all traditional beliefs that rest on authority, all theological constraint are to be cleared away. Furthermore in Bruno’s critique of Calvinism there is much of Sebastian Castellio’s *Four Dialogues* (on predestination, election, free will and faith), first published by the Italian reformer Faustus Socinus in 1578. The very project of a ‘concilio’ representing a secular counterweight to the Council of Trent to provide a satisfactory solution to the political and social crisis was not uncommon among Italian heretics of Cinquecento. This ‘utopia’ went hand in hand with the lofty Renaissance ideal of universal religion. This remarkable combination of views in Postel’s *Concordia mundi* (1563), Bodin’s leaning towards conciliarism in 1576, Pucci’s *Forma d’una Republica Catholica* (1581), and eventually in the conciliarist views which were nurtured in France in the court circles gravitating around Henry IV, who in 1589 promised to allow himself to be guided by “un buono e legittimo concilio, nazionale o generale”. It is perhaps in the light of this that we must understand Bruno’s decision to return to Italy.

Besides humanistic and Neoplatonic themes, Bruno and the Italian heretics also shared an interest in the love of truth, which is reminiscent of Machiavelli’s love of freedom; in the struggle against the idleness of the ‘volgo’ unable to combine reason and the senses; in the contempt for any cultural emphasis tending to undermine man’s potential for achieving virtue and acting in a way that would be fruitful for himself and for his society. Perhaps most importantly, they had in common their awareness of religious and political decadence; their rejection of the notion of hierarchy based on differences in religion, social status, dignity, or a combination of these; their hope for an inner renovation; their fight against the intolerance and persecutions which invariably resulted from conflicting religious doctrines. Based on the conviction that social and

---

244 See above, 189.
246 Bruno’s interest in securing an academic position in Padua has amply been demonstrated by G. Aquilecchia. On the other hand, his aim of gaining the favour of the Pope by the addressing to him the book *Delle sette arti liberali* and his support of Henry IV clearly emerge from the acts of the trial. See *Processo*:158; 189; 248. On the pro–Navarre attitude in circles close to Clement VIII and the hopes of conciliarists after his election as Pope, see A.E. Baldini 1999:232-4.
political conditions had seriously deteriorated, Bruno presented his idea of the moral ‘reformation’ of society. In this perspective, the notion that religion was of practical use to achieve stability, an idea which was to play an important role not only among Italian Protestants (Pucci, Aconcio), but also in the English (More, Foxe) and French (Ronsard, Bodin) traditions alike, was merely an obvious consequence. Moreover, Bruno’s contempt for the Protestant doctrine of predestination and, in consequence, its lessening the importance of good works, links up with the literary humanist tradition and with the heretical movements of the Cinquecento, from Erasmus to the late sixteenth century. Finally, by insisting on the definition and revision of linguistic codes, both the eretici and Bruno, stimulated critical attitudes in a world characterised by new kinds of learning that would have a devastating effect on traditional sources of scientific authority.

If Bruno could borrow ideas from the Italian heretics, it was because they all shared similar intentions. Nevertheless, Bruno’s renovatio surpassed that proposed by all previous and many later reformers. They had not developed what he had, namely an entirely new philosophical system that undermined and supplanting Aristotelianism as well as Neoplatonism. In the Italian dialogues, in fact, the rejection of the static, hierarchical Christian theology parallels the rejection of Aristotelian physics and the building up of an infinite, animate universe. The soul’s reform and the new celestial order, therefore, are inextricably interlocked inasmuch as God pervades all the universe and is intimately present in all that is to be seen, and therefore in us. Thus Bruno’s concern does not limit itself to a ‘revolution’ in the heavens; it also encompasses the entire human endeavour. His solution to the religious and political crisis follows a pattern which was to characterise every kind of cultural discourse in modern Europe: the proper way to acquire knowledge and to attain truth was no longer the passive acceptance of dogmas or mathematical procedures, but the fruit of the strenuous exercise – a word which implies activity, effort, and achievement – of the human intellect. Failure to realise this had led the world away from ancient Egyptian and pre-Socratic Greek thought, whose
'approach' to the truth was not based on a divine revelation which was outside of nature, but on the true understanding of the 'secrets' of nature.\textsuperscript{247}

If Bruno’s views on religious, political and social reform seem to be partly affected by contemporary Italian heretics, nonetheless it was following his English experience that he fully developed them.\textsuperscript{248} It was during his English stay that Bruno’s enquiry shifted from gnoseology to cosmology, and from there it involved ethics and politics alike. And it was still in England, first at Oxford and later in London, where the religious and political conflict with certain “corrottori di leggi, fede e religione”,\textsuperscript{249} that is to say, with those “spezie de Religiosi […] che cusì si chiamano tra loro religione riformata, essendo difformatissima”, which for Bruno was “più degna di esser estirpata dalla terra, che serpi, draghi et altri animali perniziosi alla natura umana”, reached its climax.\textsuperscript{250} Nevertheless, it was precisely England that, perhaps on the account of the presence of such men as Sidney who combined a refined intellect and spirit with a genuine love for the arts and learning, embodied, in Bruno’s hopes, the place wherein the truth, which had been obscured for so long, would eventually be restored, as the following sonnet illustrates:

\begin{center}
Leggiadre Nimfe, ch’a l’erbose sponde \\
del Tamesi gentil fate soggiorno, \\
deh, per dio, non abiate (o belle) a scorno \\
tentar voi anco in vano \\
con vostra bianca mano \\
di scuoprir quel ch’il nostro vase asconde. \\

Chi sa? forse che in queste spiaggie, dove \\
con le Nereidi sue questo torrente \\
si vede che cossì rapidamente \\
da basso in su rimonte \\
riserpendo al suo fonte, \\
ha destinat’ il ciel ch’ella si trove.\textsuperscript{251}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{247} The issue here involves Bruno’s distinction between ‘natural religion’ and ‘positive religions’, according to which the latter serves only as a means of inspiring and stimulating moral practices. On these questions, see A. Ingegnò 1985 and 1987; also G. Sacerdoti 1994.
\textsuperscript{249} \textit{Oeuvres/Infini:}93.
\textsuperscript{250} \textit{Processo:}178.
\textsuperscript{251} \textit{Oeuvres/Fureurs:}479.
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# Appendix 1: Italian Book Production in London (1580-91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580?</td>
<td>J. WOLFE</td>
<td>ACONZIO (Acontius), G. Vna Essortazione al Timor di Dio. Con alcune rime Italiane novamente messe in luce.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>T. VAUTROLLIER</td>
<td>MERBURY, C. A Briefe Discourse of Royall Monarchie. Whereunto is added a collection of Italian Proverbes [etc.]. (Eng. and Ital.)</td>
<td>17823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>G. WOLPIO</td>
<td>UBALDINI, P. La vita di Carlo Magno imperatore.</td>
<td>24486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BRUNO, G. La Cena de le Ceneri. Descritta in cinque dialoghi.</td>
<td>3935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BRUNO, G. De la Causa, Principio et Uno, Venetia [i.e. London].</td>
<td>3936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BRUNO, G. De l'Infinito unierso et mondi, Venetia [i.e. London].</td>
<td>3938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BRUNO, G. Spaccio de la bestia trionfante, registrato dal Nolano, Parigi. [i.e. London].</td>
<td>3940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>J. WOLPIO</td>
<td>[CECIL, W. Lord Burghley]. Atto della iustitia d'Inghilterra, esseguito, per la conservatione della commune &amp; christiana pace.</td>
<td>4907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Appresso gli heredi di ANTONIELLO degli ANTONIELLI [i.e. J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>MACHIAVELLI, N. I Discorsi di Niccolò Machiavelli, sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio. In Palermo [i.e. London]. Anr. issue:1584.</td>
<td>17159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Appresso gli heredi d'ANTONIELLO degli ANTONIELLI [i.e. J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>MACHIAVELLI, N. Il Prencipe di Nicolo Machiavelli...con alcune altre operette. Palermo [i.e. London].</td>
<td>17167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Appresso A. BAIO [i.e. J.CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BRUNO, G. De gl'heroici furori. Parigi [i.e. London].</td>
<td>3937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Appresso A. BAIO [i.e. J.CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BRUNO, G. Cabala del cavallo pegaseo. Con l'aggiunta dell'asino Cilenico. Descritta dal Nolano, Parigi, [i.e. London].</td>
<td>3934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>C. BARCHER</td>
<td>ENGLAND PUBLIC DOCUMENTS Dichiariatione delle Caggioni che hanno mosso la Serenissima Reina d'Inghilterra a dar'aiuto alla Difesa del Popolo afflitto e oppresso negli Paesi Bassi.</td>
<td>9193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>G. WOLFIO</td>
<td>PIGAFETTA, M.A. Itinerario di Marc'antonio Pigafetta, gentil'huomo fiorentino (da Vienna a Costantinople).</td>
<td>19914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>nella Stamperia di GIOVANNI WOLFIO</td>
<td>TACITUS, C. La Vita di Giulio Agricola scritta sincerissimamente da Cornelio Tacito suo Genere et Messa in volgare da Giov. Maria Manelli.</td>
<td>23649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>[J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>GENTILI, S. Annotationi sopra la Gierusalemme Liberata di Torquato Tasso. In Leida [i.e. London].</td>
<td>11728.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Appresso Giovanni Swartz [i.e. J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>PERROT, F. Auiso piaceuole dato alla bella Italia da un nobile giovanni Francese [Francois Perrot] sopra la mentita data dal Re di Navarra a Papa Sisto V. Giovanni Swartz, Monaco [i.e. London].</td>
<td>19769.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Per Andrea Muschio [i.e. J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>J. GONZALES DE MENDOZA L'Historia del gran regno della China, fatta vulgarre da F. Avanzi, in Vinegia [i.e. London].</td>
<td>12004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>appresso gli heredi di Gabriel Gioliti de Ferrari [i.e. J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>MACHIAVELLI, N. Historie Fiorentine. In Piacenza. [i.e. London].</td>
<td>17161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>appresso ANTONIELLO degli ANTONIELLI, [i.e. J.WOLFE]</td>
<td>MACHIAVELLI, N. Libro dell'arte della guerra. In Palermo. [i.e. London]. Anr. issue: 1587.</td>
<td>17163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Appresso Giovanni Wolfio</td>
<td>G. B. AURELLO Essame di Varii Giudicii de i Politici e della dottrina e de i fatti de i protestanti veri &amp; de i Cattolici romani. Libri quattro.</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>[J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>ARETINO, P. Quattro comedie del divino Pietro Aretino.</td>
<td>19911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Per Arrigo del Bosco</td>
<td>Essempio d‘una Lettera mandata d’Inghilterra a Don Bernardino di Mendoza, In Leida. [i.e. London].</td>
<td>15414.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1588]</td>
<td>[J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>MACHIAVELLI, N. Lasino doro di Nicolo Machiavelli con tutte l’altre sue operette, In Roma MDLXXXVIII. [i.e. London].</td>
<td>17158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. WOLFE</td>
<td>CASTIGLIONE, B. The courtier of count Baldessar Castilio. [Italian, French, and English in parallel columns].</td>
<td>4781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Appresso G.A. del Melograno [i.e. J. WOLFE]</td>
<td>ARETINO, P. La terza, ed ultima parte de Ragionamenti [London].</td>
<td>19913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>G. WOLFIO</td>
<td>F. BETTI Lettera di Francesco Betti gentilhuomo Romano, All’Illustriss. &amp; Excellentiss. S. Marchese di Pescara....Stampata la seconda volta.</td>
<td>1979.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>J. WOLFE</td>
<td>UBALDINI, P. Le vite delle Donne Illustri del Regno d’Inghilterra. Anr. issue: 1591.</td>
<td>24487.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>J. WOLFE a spese di G. CASTELVETRI</td>
<td>GUARINI Pastor Fido e Aminta [London]</td>
<td>12414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2a: John Charlewood's Book Production (1557-1593) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>J. TYSDALE a. J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>An epitaph upon the death of kyng Edward. [Anon.]</td>
<td>5229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>J. TYSDALE a. J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Remember man both night and day, thou must nedes die there is no nay. (Ballad)</td>
<td>17236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>[H. DENHAM f.] J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1562-63</td>
<td>Thys booke is called the Treasure of gladnesse and semeth by the copy (beeing a very little manuel, and written in velam) to be made about CC yeres past at least...The copypy hereof is for the antiquity of it, preserued and to be seene in the Printers Hall. Now first imprinted. Other eds. 1563(2), 1564, 1568, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1577, 1579, 1581, 1590.</td>
<td>24190.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1563-64</td>
<td>ANON. Anr. ed. of TYNDALE, W. A compendious introduction, prologue or preface vn to the pistle off Paul to the Romayns. 1526.</td>
<td>24438.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1563-64</td>
<td>ANON. Anr. ed. of TYNDALE, W. A path into the holy scripture. [1536?]</td>
<td>24464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1566-67</td>
<td>WAGER, L. A new enterlude, neuer before this tyme imprinted, of the life and repentance of Marie Magdalene. A variant w. imprint: 1567.</td>
<td>24932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>H. EYNNECKENN f. J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1565-66</td>
<td>CROWLEY, R. The opening of the wordes of the prophet Joell, in his second and third chapters, concerning the signes of the last day. Compiled M.D.XLVI. And perused again.</td>
<td>6089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>[ J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>MICHELI, R. Le premiere liure des poemes [Sonet]</td>
<td>17857.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Bruno's works, see Appendix 1. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD a. J. KINGSTON? f.] W. JONES</td>
<td>LLOYD, L. The pilgrimage of princes.</td>
<td>16624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1575</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JOHNES</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of A ryght pleasaut and merye historie, of the mylner of Abyngton. Wherunto is adioyned another merye iest, of a sargeaunt that woulde haue learned to be a fryar.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>[H. DENHAM a. J. CHARLEWOOD?] f. J. WIGHT Ent. 1568-69</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of MASCALL, L. A booke of the art and maner, howe to plante and graffe all sortes of trees......, by [D. Brossard]. Tr. L. Mascal.[1569].</td>
<td>17573.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>PARACELSUS The true and perfect order to distill oyles out of al maner of spices. Tr. J. H (ester)</td>
<td>19181.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. T. WOODCOCKE</td>
<td>VIRGILIUS, P. M. The Bucolikes of Publius Virgilius Maro, with alphabeticall annotations. Drawne into Englishe by A. Fleming.</td>
<td>24816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. T. BUTTER</td>
<td>BANDELLO, M. A most lamentable and tragical historie, conteynyng the tyrannie Violenta executed vpon her louer. [Anon.] Newly tr. into English meter, by T. A(chelley).</td>
<td>1356.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1576]</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD] (f. T. WOODCOCKE)</td>
<td>BEZI, T. de The treasure of trueth, touching the grounde worke of man his salvation, and chiefest pointes of christian religion. Written in Latin and newlie turned into English by J. Stockwood. Whereunto are added, these godly treatyses. One of J. Foxe. The other of A. Gylbie.</td>
<td>2049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JOHNES</td>
<td>CAIUS, J. Of Englishe dogges, the diversities, the names, the natures, and the properties. Newly drawne into English by A. Fleming.</td>
<td>4347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JOHNES</td>
<td>GASCOIGNE, G. A delicate diet, for daintiemouthde droonkardes.</td>
<td>11640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576?</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JOHNES Ent. 26 no. 1576</td>
<td>GASCOIGNE, G. The epoyle of Antwerpe. Faithfully reported by a true Englishman, who was present [i.e. G. Gascoigne].</td>
<td>11644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>GLAUCUS, J. A knowledge for kings, and a warning for subjects: conteyning the</td>
<td>11920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. JOHES</td>
<td>history of the Raellyans peruerited state, and government. First written in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 15 oc.</td>
<td>Latine, by J. Glacus a Germaine: and now tr. by W. Cleuer scholemaster.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>A little treatise, conteyning many proper tables and rules, 1571. Other</td>
<td>12156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. WALEY</td>
<td>eds: 1579, 1582, 1585, 1588, 1591.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of RASTELL, W. A table collected of the yeres of our Lorde God, and</td>
<td>20739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. WALEY</td>
<td>of the yeres of the kynges of England [Anon.] 1558.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>J.C[CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>ROGERS, T. A philosophicall discourse, entituled, The anatomie of the minde.</td>
<td>21239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. A. MAUNSELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>J.C[CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>WOOLTON, J. The christian manuell, or of the life and maners of true</td>
<td>25976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. T. STURRUPPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>christians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent. 29 oc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>A variant of YOUNG, J. Bp. of Rochester A sermon preached before the queenes</td>
<td>26110.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. WATKINS</td>
<td>malestie, the second of March. An. 1575. Anr. variant: 1576?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of BALE, J. A tragedye or enterlude manyfestyng the chefe promyses</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. S. PEELE</td>
<td></td>
<td>of God vnto man, 1547?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>3 eds. of DERING, E. A briefe &amp; necessary instruction, verye needefull to be</td>
<td>6679.7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knoen of all housholders, 1572. [By J. More, Preacher, revised by] (E. D[ering])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anr. ed: 1581?; 1581.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1577)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>MONDAY, A. The defence of Pouertie [A dialogue in verse between Irus and</td>
<td>18269.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent. 18 no 1577</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poliphisius].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577?</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>RAMSEY, L. The practise of the diuell....in his papistes, against the true</td>
<td>20665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. T. RIDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>professors. [In verse]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent. 4 ap. 1577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577?</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>ANON. The debate betweene pride and lowlines, pleaded to an issue in assise</td>
<td>24061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. R. NEWBERY</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Init. F. T. In verse].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>(J. C[HALEWOOD] f. T. STURRUP)</td>
<td>WOLTON, J. The castell of christians and fortresse of the faithfull, beseeged, and defended.</td>
<td>25975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD) f. E. WHITE</td>
<td>CALVIN, J. The lectures or daily sermons, of J. Caluline, vpon the prophet Jonas [tr.] by N. B(axterus). Whereunto is annexed an exposition of the two last epistles of S. John in Latin by A. Marlorate, and englished by the same N.B.</td>
<td>4432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of DERING, E. A Sermon preached before the Quenes maiestie, by maister Edward Dering, the 25 day of February 1569. 1569? Other eds: 1580, 1584, 1586, 1589.</td>
<td>6702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD)</td>
<td>DERING, E. Godly private prayers for Householders in their families. Other eds. [c 1578?], [c. 1580?], 1581, [1581?]</td>
<td>6685.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1578)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. A. MAUNSELL</td>
<td>DROUETTE, P. A new counsell against the pestilence...[Tr. by] [T. T[wyne]].</td>
<td>7241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of FULKE, W. A comfortable sermon of faith, in temptations and afflictions. Preached XV February 1573. 1573? Other ed. 1586.</td>
<td>11423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>(J. C[HALEWOOD])</td>
<td>GREGORY XIII The popes pittifull lamentation, for the death of his deere darling don Joan of Austria: and deaths aunswer. Tr. after the French printed coppy by H. C. [In verse].</td>
<td>12355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1578)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 30 Jan. 1578</td>
<td>CLERCK, T. The Life and death of Peter Kempe LOST.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578?</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD)</td>
<td>LANEHAM, R. A letter: whearin, part of the entertainment vntoo the Queenz maiesty, at Killingwoorth Castl, iz signified. [Init. R. L.]</td>
<td>15190.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1578)</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] (W. B[ARLETT])</td>
<td>24 of August 1578 A discourse of the present state of the wars in the lowe Countryes. Wherein is containeyd the pittifull spoyle of Askot.</td>
<td>18438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1578)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>PHILLIPS, J. A commemoration of the right noble and vertuous ladye, Margrit Duglasis good grace. [In verse]</td>
<td>19864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>(J.CHARLEWOOD) f. H. DENGHAM</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of Physicke for the soule, verye necessarie to be vsed in the agonie of death. Tr. out of Latine by H. Thorne [1567?]</td>
<td>19896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JHONES</td>
<td>T. T. A view of certain wonderful effects, of the comete. [By T. Twyne]</td>
<td>23629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. P. CONYNGTON</td>
<td>WHARTON, J. Whartons dreame. Conteyninge an inuective agaynst vsurers [In verse].</td>
<td>25295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] (R. JHONES)</td>
<td>WHETSTONE, G. The right excellent and famous historye, of Promos and Cassandra [A drama in two parts]</td>
<td>25347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of WIMBLEDON, R. A sermon no lesse fruteful then famous made in the yeare M.CCC.LXXXVII [Anon] 1540? Anr. issue: 1579</td>
<td>25828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD a. T. MAN) Ent. 24 mr. 1579</td>
<td>A dolorous discourse, of a most terrible battel, fought in Barbarie. 1578.</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] per J. WOLFIUM, exp. ipsius authoris Ent. 16 my.</td>
<td>CORRANO, A. Sapientissimi regis Salomonis concio...in Latinam linguam, ab A. Corrano versa.</td>
<td>2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Ass'd to R. JONES a. J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1569-70</td>
<td>BIDPAI The morall philosophie of Dcm. First compiled in the Indian tongue, and now englisshed out of Italian by T. North. 1570.</td>
<td>3054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD?] f. J. HARISON</td>
<td>BULLINGER, H. H. B. beeleefe, contayning his judgement vppon the Lords supper, with an exposition of the sixte article of the christian faith. Tr. out of Latine by P. Shakleton. 1579.</td>
<td>4042.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD? f.] T. NEWTON</td>
<td>COBHEAD, T. A brieve instruction, collected for the exercise of youth, and simple sort of people.[A Catechism]. 1579.</td>
<td>5455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Printer/Publisher</td>
<td>Author/Title</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>A summe of the Guisian ambassage to the bishop of Rome, founde lately amongst the writinges of one Dauid and tr. out of French into Latin, and from Latin into English.</td>
<td>6319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD? f.] R. JOHNES Ent. 2 my 1579</td>
<td>EUNAPIUS The lyues, of philosophers and oratours: written in Greeke. Tr. into Latine and now set forth in English, at his (Hadrianus Junius Hornanus) request.</td>
<td>10566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1570-71</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of FULKE, W. A sermon preached at Hampton Court, 12 Nov. 1570. Wherein is proued Babylon to be Rome. (1570).</td>
<td>11453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD] f. E. WHITE Ent. 2 jn. 1578</td>
<td>GARNIER, or GARDINER J. A briefe and cleare confession of the christian fayth. Containing an hundreth articles, after the creede of the apostles. By J. Gardiner. Tr. out of French by J.Brooke of Asshe. 1577.</td>
<td>11620.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD a. R. JHONES Ent. 1566-67</td>
<td>HAKE, E. News out of Powles churchyarde. Wherein is reprooued excessive seeking after riches. [In verse]</td>
<td>12606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Ass'd by H. DENHAM to R. JONES a. J. CHARLEWOOD 31 au. 1579</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of HILL, T. The contemplation of mankinde containing a singular discourse of phisiognomie. In the ende is a little treatise of moles, by Melampons. A pleasant history: declaring the whole art of phisiognomie. All Englished by T. Ryll, 1571.</td>
<td>13483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 5 my 1579</td>
<td>N. T. A pleasant dialogue betweene a lady called Listra, and a pilgrim. Concerning the gouernment of Crangalor.</td>
<td>18335.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>STUKELEY, T. Newe newes containing a shorte rehearsall of the late enterprise of certaine fugytive rebelles in Ireland. Tr. out of Dutch.</td>
<td>23406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Marked in SR: NOT PRINTED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1579/1580</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. Abr. KITSON</td>
<td>MOORE, P. An almanack and prognostication for xxxiiii yeeres.</td>
<td>486.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1580)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 4 au. 1580</td>
<td>Newes from Antwerp, the 10 day of August 1580. Contayning a speciall view of the present affayres reveale by sundrie late intercepted letters. Tr. out of French, and Lattin; according to the cope, printed ad Antwerp.</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1580)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 21 de 1579</td>
<td>BURLZ, T. An excellent and comfortable treatise sent vtnto all those which haue a longing desire for their salvation.</td>
<td>4123.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] E. WHITE</td>
<td>Anr. ed. newly augmented and inlarged of C., T. An hospital for the diseased, 1578</td>
<td>4304.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>DERING, E. A short catechisme for householders. With prayers to the same adjoyning [Anon.] Hereunto are added the proues of the Scripture. Gathered by J. Stockwood. Anr. ed. of the Cathechisme alone: 1580, 1583 (by J. Stockwood). Other eds. 1581(2), 1582 (2)</td>
<td>6710.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JHONES</td>
<td>Anr. ed., with additions? of The wyll of the deuyll, [1548?] Whereunto is adioyned, a dyet for... dronkardes.</td>
<td>6794.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1580)</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>The exemplification of the queenes maiesties letters, pattents for Portsmouth. The copye of the [Privy] Counsels letters, directed to the bishop of this diosesse. [18 June 1580].</td>
<td>8121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 11 jn.</td>
<td>MEXIA, P. A pleasaunt dialogue, concerning phisicke and phisitions.(Tr. out of the Castlin tongue T.N[ewton?])</td>
<td>17848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. H. CAR Ent. 9 se 1578</td>
<td>MONDAY, A. The paine of pleasure [In verse]</td>
<td>18277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1580)</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. W. WRIGHT, sold [by J.ALLDE] Ent. 27 ap. 1580</td>
<td>MONDAY, A. A view of sundry examples. Reporting many strange murtherers.</td>
<td>18281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>MONDAY, A. Zelauto. The fountaine of fame.</td>
<td>18283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580?</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] (R. JHONES)</td>
<td>An earnest complaint of divers vain, wicked and abused exercises, practised on the Saboth day, 1572.</td>
<td>21090.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1580)</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD f. W. WRIGHT)</td>
<td>SCLICHTENBERGER, E. A prophesie vittered by the daughter of an honest country man called Adam Krause. (Tr. According to the highe Dutche).</td>
<td>21818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1580</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] (JHON WALLY)</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of Here begynneth the Kalender of Shepardes. [Robert Copland's translation (1508), supplemented considerably from Pynson's (1510)] Other ed.: [c. 1585]</td>
<td>22416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JOHNES</td>
<td>A shorte and pithie discourse, concerning earthquakes. [By T. T[wyne].</td>
<td>24413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580?</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] JOHN JUGGE</td>
<td>A briefe treatise, concerning the vsuall and abuse of dauncing. Collected oute of P. Martyr, by R. Massonius: and tr. into English by I. K.</td>
<td>24664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD ?] f. E. WHITE</td>
<td>An excellent historie bothe pithy and pleasant, discoursing on the life and death of Charles and Julia [In verse]</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD a. J. WIGHT</td>
<td>Anr. ed. newlie imprinted of BRADFORD, J. Two notable sermons... the one of repentance, and the other of the Lordes supper newre before imprinted, 1574.</td>
<td>3501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>A discourse in commendation of the valiant gentleman, maister Frauncis Drake.</td>
<td>3646.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1581)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 16 ja 1581</td>
<td>CALLOPHISUS (HOWARD, P. Earl of Arundel) Callophisus, being brought by the greatest perfection...wilbe at the tilts ende vpon the two and twentie day of Januarie next.</td>
<td>13868.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD [a. J. KINGSTON]</td>
<td>An answer to sixe reasons, that T. Pownde, gentleman, and prisoner in the Marshalsey required to be answered. Written by R. Crowley. Anr. ed. 1581 J. C. alone.</td>
<td>6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 21 au.</td>
<td>CROWLEY, R. A breefe discourse, concerning those foure vsuall notes, whereby Christes catholique church is knowne. Occasioned by a conference with that ranck traitor, E. Haunce.</td>
<td>6081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Ass'd by W. BARTLETT to J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 1562-63</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of CROWLEY, R. The voyce of the laste trumpet blown bi the seueth angel wherin are contayned xii lessons to twelue seueral estates of menne [in verse], 1590.</td>
<td>6095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of the Preface only of DERING, E. A briefe &amp; necessary instruction, very needefull to be knowne of all householders. [By J. More, Preacher, revised by] [E.D[ering]. 1572.</td>
<td>6680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 15 ja 1582</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of An introduction for to lerne to reckon with the pen. 1539.</td>
<td>14121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1581)</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD a.] R. JHONES Ent. 22 my 1581</td>
<td>KELTBRIDGE, J. Two godlie and learned sermons, appointed, and preached, before the Jesuites in the Tower of London.</td>
<td>14921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1581)</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. E. WHITE Ent. 20 de 1580</td>
<td>M. A. The true reporte of the prosperous successe which God gaue unto our English soldiours in Ireland, 1580. Anr. issue, anon.: [1581]</td>
<td>17124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1581)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>MADOXE, R. A learned and a godly sermon, especially for all marryners.</td>
<td>17180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>JOHN CHARLEWOOD Ent. 24 jan. 1581</td>
<td>MARTIN, D. Instructions for Christians, fruitfull and godly exercise. (tr. from French catechism). LOST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1581)</td>
<td>J.CHARLEWOOD a. E. WHITE</td>
<td>MUNDAY, A. The araignement, and execution of a wilful and obstinate traitour named E. Ducket, alias Hauns. [Init. M.S.]</td>
<td>18259.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. W. WRIGHT Ent. 24 jy</td>
<td>A breefe discourse of the taking of Edmund Campion. Attrib. to A. Munday</td>
<td>18264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. H. CARRE</td>
<td>MUNDAY, A. A courtly controversie, betwenee looue and learning. passed in disputacion betweene a Ladie and a Gentleman of Scienna.</td>
<td>18268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD, servant to the earle of Arundelle Ent. 22 ap 1581</td>
<td>NICHOLS, J. of the E. Seminary, The oration and sermon made at Rome...the xxvii daie of Maie 1578.</td>
<td>18535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD sold by E. WHITE</td>
<td>A variant of NICHOLS, J. of the E. Seminary, The oration and sermon made at Rome...the XXVII daie of Rome Maie 1578.</td>
<td>18536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1581 | Ent. to J. CHARLEWOOD | PALMERIN, of England  
The [first] seconde part, of the no less rare, historie of Palmerin of England [by F. De Moraes] Tr. A. M[unday], 1596. | 19161 imperf. copy |
| 1581 | J. CHARLEWOOD  
a. [i.e. for] E. WHITE | A true report of the late horrible murder committed by W. Sherwood, upon R. Hobson, gentleman, bothe prisoners in the Queenes Benche, for the profession of poperie, the 18 of June. 1581. | 22432 |
| 1581 | [J.CHARLEWOOD f.] R. JHONES | WARREN, W.  
A pleasant new fancie of a fondlings device: intitled and cald the Nurcerie of names [In verse]. | 25095 |
| 1581 | [J. CHARLEWOOD, W. HOW, a. J. KINGSTON f.] R. JHONES | ZARATE, A. de  
The discouerie and conquest of the prouinces of Peru. And also of the ritche mines of Potosi. Tr. out of Spanish by T. Nicholas) | 26123 |
| 1582 | Ent. to J. CHARLEWOOD | ATHENAGORAS  
The most notable and excellent discourse touching the resurrection of the dead, tr. into Latine by P. Nannius, and out of Latin by R. Porder. 1573. | 886 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD | BELL, A.  
Adam Bell, Clym of the Cloughe [In verse],1505. | 1808 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. Awdeley to J. CHARLEWOOD | CONSCIENCE, R.  
The booke in meeter of Robin Conscience; against his father Coutousnesse, his mother Newgise and his sister Proud Beautye. Newly corrected by the author. | 5633.3 |
| 1582 | (Ent. as “Corvins postyll” to J. Charlewood | CORVINUS, A.  
A postill or collection of moste godly doctrine vpon every gospell through the yeare [according to] the booke of common prayer. [Anon. tr.], 1550. | 5806 |
| 1582 | Ass’d by J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD | Anr. ed. of CROWNLEY, R.  
A briefe discourse against the outwarde apparell of the popishe church, 1566. [Anon.] | 6080 |
| 1582 | Ass’d from AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD | Anr. ed. of CROWNLEY, R.  
One and thyrtye epigrammes, wherein are bryefly touched so many abuses, that ought to be put away. [In verse], 1550. | 6088.7 |
| 1582 | Ent. to J.CHARLEWOOD | EGLAMOUR, Sir  
Sir Eglamour [In verse], 1500 | 7544.5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1582 | Ass'd from AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD | FITZHERBERT, J.  
The Boke of husbandry, 1523? Here begynneth a newe tracte or treatyse most profytable for all husbande men. [Anon.] | 11003.5 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | GIBSON, L.  
The tower of trustinesse, a strong defence, under the banner of Christe. [Verse w. prose exposition]. | 11835 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | GUEVARA, A. de Bp.  
The golden boke of Marcus Aurelius [Anon.] (Tr. out of Frenche by J. Bourchier lorde Barners), 1535. | 12447 |
| 1582 | J. CHARLEWOOD a. R. JHONES Ent. 13 jn. | HARWARD, S.  
Two godlie and learned sermons, preached at Manchester. The first, containeth a reproofe of worldlings. The other, a charge for vnlearned, negligent, and dissolute ministers. | 12924 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | Anr. ed. of HEYWOOD, J.  
The playe called the foure PP [1544?] | 13302 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | Anr. ed. of HEYWOOD, J.  
A play of loue (1534) | 13304 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | Anr. ed. of HEYWOOD, J.  
The play of the wether (1533) | 13307 |
| 1582 | Ent. to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | Anr. ed. of HOOPR, J. Bp.  
A declaration of the ten holy commaundementes, [1549?] | 13751 |
| 1582 | Ass'd from J. AWDELY to J. CHARLEWOOD 15 ja 1582 | Anr. ed. of Hycke scornor [An interlude], 1515? | 14040 |
| 1582 | [J. CHARLEWOOD] f. W. WRIGHT Ent. 31 my | MUNDAY, A.  
A briefe and true reporte, of the execution of certaine traytours at Tiborne. | 18261 |
| 1582 | J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 12 mr. | MUNDAY, A.  
A brefe aunswer made vnto two seditious pamphlets. | 18262 |
| 1582 | [J. CHARLEWOOD] f. E. WHITE Ent. 12 mr. | MUNDAY, A.  
A discoverie of Edmund Campion, and his confederates. Anr. ed. : 1582 | 18270 |
| 1582 | J. CHARLEWOODE f. N. LING Ent. 21 jn. | MUNDAY, A.  
The English Romayne lyfe. Anr. ed 1590. | 18272 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of</td>
<td>18664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 15 ja 1582</td>
<td>NORTHBROOK,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Spiritus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est... A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>breefe and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pithie summe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>christian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>faith, 1571.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anr. ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>newly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corrected:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1582?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1582?)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of</td>
<td>18667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 15 ja 1582</td>
<td>NORTHBROOK,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Spiritus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>est... The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poore mans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>garden, 1571.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anr. two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eds. [1582?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>JOHN CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>PITT, J.</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wish of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poore wisher,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saluation to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ass'd to J.</td>
<td>Here begineth</td>
<td>20034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>a lytell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1582</td>
<td>geste how</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the plowman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lerned his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pater noster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[In verse].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1510]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ass'd from</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of</td>
<td>20108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. AWDELY to J.</td>
<td>THE NOBLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>HISTORY OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1582</td>
<td>KING PONTHUS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TR. H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WATSON?, 1509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ent. to J.</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of</td>
<td>20797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>RECORD, R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1582</td>
<td>The castle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of knowledge,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1556.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ent. to J.</td>
<td>REYNARD, THE</td>
<td>20922.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>FOX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1582</td>
<td>This is the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>table of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>historye of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REYNART THE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOXE, 1481(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TR. W. CAXTON).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ass'd from</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of</td>
<td>21050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWDELY to J.</td>
<td>RIDLEY, N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>CERTAIN GODLY,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1592</td>
<td>LEARNED AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMFORTABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONFERENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BETWEEN N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RYDELEY AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. LATIMER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1556.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1582)</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD)</td>
<td>Anr. trans.</td>
<td>21066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. A. MAUNSEL</td>
<td>RIVIUS, J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A guide vnto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>godlinesse,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moste worthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to bee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Englished by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W.G(ace) 1579.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Anr. trans.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foolishnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of men in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>putting-off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the amendement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of their liues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newlie tr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ass'd from</td>
<td>ROBINSON, R.</td>
<td>21121.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAMSON to J.</td>
<td>THE REWARDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>OF WICKEDNESSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1582</td>
<td>DISCOURSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THE SUNDREY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MONSTROUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABUSES OF WICKED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WORLDLINGES.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[In verse]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1574]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1582)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD a.</td>
<td>A SPECTACLE</td>
<td>23030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[i.e. for]</td>
<td>FOR A BLINDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. WHITE</td>
<td>PAPIST.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 2 my 1582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1582)</td>
<td>T. E[ast]</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of</td>
<td>23414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[J. KINGSTON, W.</td>
<td>STYWARD, T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOW, and J.</td>
<td>THE PATHWAIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>TO MARTIALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imp. M. Jenyngs</td>
<td>DISCIPLINE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOW newly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imprinted,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and deuided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTO THREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOOKES, 1581.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Ent. to J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>SYMON, J. A pleasant posie, or sweete nesseyg of fragrant smellyng flowers;</td>
<td>23589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ja 1582</td>
<td>gathered [from] the Bible. Ballad, 1572 ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1582)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>WHETSTONE, J. A remembrance of the precious vertues of the right honourable</td>
<td>25345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>judge, sir James Dier, who disseased the 24 of Marche 1582 [In verse]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr.ed. of WIMBLEDON, R. A sermon no lesse fruteful then famous. Preached at</td>
<td>25830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paules Crosse by R. Wimbledon. Other eds: 1584, 1588, 1593.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>AVERELL, W. A wonderfull and straunge newes, which happened in the countye</td>
<td>982.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. WHITE</td>
<td>of Suffolke, and Essex, the first of February, where it rayned wheat, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 22 fb.</td>
<td>space of vi or vii miles compas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1583)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD, the</td>
<td>3 ed. of A newe boke of presidentes in maner of a register, wherin is</td>
<td>3341.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assigne of Rychard</td>
<td>comprehended the very trade of makyn all maner euydence and instrumentes of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tottle [f. J.Waley]</td>
<td>practyse, 1543.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 24 ja 1583</td>
<td>Anr. ed. enlarged of DERING, E. A short Catechism for Housholders... not</td>
<td>6712.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>onely of them throughly to be understoode, but also requisite to be learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by harte, of all such as shall be admitted unto the Lordes Supper. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eds. 1583, 1584, 1587, 1588, 1590.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of DERING, E. A lecture or expositioun vpon a part of the .V chapter</td>
<td>6693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1573.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>GEBHARDT, Abp. of Cologne A declaration made by the archbishop of Collen,</td>
<td>11693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. WOOLFE</td>
<td>vpon his mariage. With the letter of Gregorie the 13 against the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mariage, and the bishops answer. [Tr. from German by] (T. Deloney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>HOWARD, H. Earl of Northampton A defensatiue against the poysen of supposed</td>
<td>13858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 13 jn.</td>
<td>prophesies. Anr. ed. newlie revised: 1583.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD after</td>
<td>The number of all those that hath dyed in the city of London, &amp; the liberties</td>
<td>16738.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1582]</td>
<td>from the 28 of December 1581 vnto the 27 of December 1582.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JOHN CHARLEWOOD'S OUTPUT (1557-1593)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>MUNDAY, A. The sweete sobbes, and amorous Complaintes of Shepardes and Nymphes in a fancye confusde.</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>PECKHAM, sir G. A true reporte, of the late discoveries of the Newfound Landes [Init. G.P.]</td>
<td>19523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>JOHN CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>STUBBES, P. Rosarie of Christian prayers and meditation.</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>AVERELL, W. A dyall for dainty darlings, rockt in the cradle of securitie [etc. 3 moral tales]</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>BILLERBEG, F. de Most rare and straunge discourses, of Amurathe the Turkish emperor that nowe is: with the warres betweene him and the Persians, the Turkish triumph lately had at Constantinople. [Tr. from Latin or French]</td>
<td>3060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>CALVIN, J. Two godly and learned sermons. Long since tr. out of Latin by R. Horne. Nowe published by A. M[unday].</td>
<td>4461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of A sermon preached at the Tower of London...the XI of December 1569. By maister Edward Dering.[Anon.] Other ed. 1589.</td>
<td>6697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>DRANT, T. Three godly and learned sermons.</td>
<td>7170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD a.]</td>
<td>GREENE, R. Morando, the tritameron of loue. Charlewood printed only A4.</td>
<td>12276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of HILL, T. A brieve and pleasautnt treatisent, entituled, Naturall and artificiall conclusions: written by sholers of Padua and now Englished by T. Hill, 1581.</td>
<td>13480.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>MUNDAY, A. A watch-woord to Engalnde to beware of traytours. (Init. A.M.)</td>
<td>18282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. T. HACKET</td>
<td>Anr. ed. : 1584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1584</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of Epistolae Heroidum. The heroycall epistles of Publius Ouidius Naso in English verse. Tr. G. Tuberville with A. Sabinus answeeres. 1567.</td>
<td>18943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. T. BUTTER</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of S., D. A godly learned and fruitfull sermon.</td>
<td>21483.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>SOOWTHERN, J. Pandora, the musyque of the beautie, of his mistresse Diana [In verse]</td>
<td>22928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. T. HACKET</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of S., D. A godly learned and fruitfull sermon.</td>
<td>21483.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584?</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>STOCKWOOD, J. A verie godlie and profitable sermon of the necessitie, properties and office of a good magistrate.</td>
<td>23287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. T. BUTTER</td>
<td>A most rare and wonderfull tragedy...of the life and death of a miserable usurer of Fraunce [named Lanton], which hanged himselfe in Hell streete. Printed at Paris, for M. Breuille, 1583.</td>
<td>24167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585?</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>Here begynmeth the book of the subtyl histories and fables of esope which were Tr. out of Frenshe by W. Caxton [With the Life by M. Planudes and other fables by F. Avianus, P. Alfonsi, and Poggio Bracciolini], 1484.</td>
<td>181.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J. WALLEY)</td>
<td>CHUB, W. The true trauaile of all faithfull christians, howe to escape the daungers of this wicked world. Whereunto is added a christian exercise for private housholders [in a catechism].</td>
<td>5211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>J. CHARLE-WOOD</td>
<td>CHUB, W. Two fruitfull and godly sermons, the one touching the building of Gods temple, the other what the temple is. A variant w. imprint: 1586.</td>
<td>5212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD)</td>
<td>COTES, W. A dialogue of diverse questions [sic] demanded of the children to their father [etc.].</td>
<td>5829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>W. MANTELL</td>
<td>A most necessary and godly prayer, for the preseruation of the earle of Leicester, and all his well-wyllers and followers.</td>
<td>7289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>I. C [CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>H. R. The Preparation of a Christian to the Supper... taught in Epping.</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>MARKETT, M. The seuerall factes of witch-crafte, approved and laid to the charge of M. Harkett, of Stanmore, in Middlesex, executed at Tyborne this 19 of February 1585.</td>
<td>12786.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 17 jy</td>
<td>The declaration of the king of Nauarre, touching the slaunders published against him by those of the league [10 June 1585] Tr. according to the French copy [by] (C. Hollyband). Attrib. to P. de Mornay.</td>
<td>13106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD?] f. T. HACKET Ent. 12 no. 1584</td>
<td>PASQUALIGO, L. Fedele and Fortunio. The deceites in loue. Tr. out of Italian [by A. Munday Anon.]</td>
<td>19447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD] f. J. PERIN</td>
<td>Peters fall. A godlie sermon: preached before the queens maiestie.</td>
<td>19796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>A letter lately written from Rome, by an Italian gentleman, to a freende of his in lyons. Wherein is declared, the suddaine death of pope Gregory the thirteenth. The election of the newe pope [etc.]. Tr. J. F. (lorio).</td>
<td>21292a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD] f. T. HACKET</td>
<td>SIMSON, L. The third step of the ladder to repentance: most needefull for this time present.</td>
<td>22571.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>ANDREWES, B. A very short and pithie catechisme: for all that will come prepared to the supper of the Lord.</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1586)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>CROWELY, R. Fryer John Frauncis of Nigeon in Fraunce. A replication to that lewde aunswere, which fryer John Frauncis hath made to a letter sent to him out of England. Written by R. Crowley.</td>
<td>6091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1586)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>The exemplifications of the queenes, maiesties letters, pattents, for G. Pormorte, marchant of Hull.</td>
<td>8158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586?</td>
<td>(J. C[harlewood]</td>
<td>W. D., Archd. Certain necessarie instructions, meet to be taught the younger sort.</td>
<td>24902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. R. WALLEY Ent. 4 se.</td>
<td>WEBBE, W. A discourse of English poetrie [With a trans. of Virgil's 1st 2 Eclogues, etc.].</td>
<td>25172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. T. GUBBIN a. T. NEWMAN</td>
<td>CROMPTON, R. A short declaration of the ende of traytors, against the state, &amp; the duetie of subjectes to theyr soueraigne gouernour:</td>
<td>6055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587 ?</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>D., R. An epitaph vpon the death of Richard Price esquier [who died] the fifth day of Januarie, 1586. [In verse].</td>
<td>6178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587 ?</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.] H. SINGLETON</td>
<td>FOXE, J. A most breefe manner of instruction, to the principles of christian religion. By J. F. [A catechism].</td>
<td>11238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. T. HACKETT Ent. 15 jn.</td>
<td>GREEPE, T. The true and perfecte newe of the explyttes, performed by syr F. Drake: at Sancto Domingo...and vppon the coast of Spayne, 1587 [In verse].</td>
<td>12343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD pro R. WALLIE</td>
<td>HERCUSANUS, J. Danus. Magnifico ac strenuo viro D. Francisco Draco Anglo equiti aurato. [Init. J.H.D. In verse].</td>
<td>13193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD pro R. WALLIE</td>
<td>HERCUSANUS, J. D. Maria Scotorum reginae epitaphium [Init. J.H.D. In verse]</td>
<td>13194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD a. T.EAST] Charlewood pr. A-F; East the rest.</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of HOMILIES Certain sermons, or homilies, appoynted by the kynges maistie, to be declared and rede, by all persones, vicars, or curates, every Soday in their churches, where thei haue cure. [by T. Cranmer and other]. 1547.</td>
<td>13657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD a. T. EAST] Charlewood pr. A-U; East the rest.</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of HOMILIES The seconde tome of homelyes, 1563.</td>
<td>13673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD?f.] H. SINGLETON</td>
<td>Orders appointed to be executed in the cittie of London, for setting roges and idle persons to worke.</td>
<td>16712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Ent. to J. CHARLEWOOD 4 mr. 1587</td>
<td>MIDDLESEX, Archdeaconry (1582)</td>
<td>10275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD a.] (G. ROBINSON) f. T. CADMAN Ent. 13 oc. 1581</td>
<td>MORNAY, P. de A worke concerning the trewnesse of the christian religion. Begunne to be tr. by Sir P. Sidney and finished by A. Golding.</td>
<td>18149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J.C[harlewood] f. T. H[acket] Ent. 26 ap.</td>
<td>RANKINS, W. A mirour of monsters: wherein is plainely described the manifold vices &amp; spotted enormities, that are caused by the infectious sight of playes.</td>
<td>20699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. R. WALLEY Ent. 22 mr.</td>
<td>RICH, B. A path-way to Military practise</td>
<td>20995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD Ent. 28 no. 1586</td>
<td>SAVORINE, A. The true image of christian love. Written in Latin by A. Savorine a Dominicen frier, and tr. 50 yeeres ago by R.Rikes, &amp; now truely conferred with the auncient copies, and published by A. M(onday).</td>
<td>21801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f. T. HACKET</td>
<td>SOLINUS, C. J. The worthe worke of Julius Solinus polyhistor. Contayning many noble actions of humaine creatures. Tr. out of Latine by A. Golding. Other 2 issues: 1587</td>
<td>22895a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587?</td>
<td>Paris [i.e.] London J. CHARLEWOOD in Arundel House?</td>
<td>Attrib. to SOUTHWELL, R. An epistle of comfort, to the reuerend priestes, &amp; to the laye sort restrayned in durance [Anon.].</td>
<td>22946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD, f.</td>
<td>CROWLEY, R.</td>
<td>6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. WOODCOCK</td>
<td>A deliberat answer made to a rash offer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 18 no.</td>
<td>which a popish catholique, made to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learned protestant and publyshed anno 1575.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Ent. to J.</td>
<td>Gloucester and Bristol.</td>
<td>10209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>(Church of England, Visitation Articles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 fb. 1588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J.C[ARLEWOOD] f.</td>
<td>GIBBON or GYBBON, C.</td>
<td>11819.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. GUBBIN</td>
<td>A premonition for every disposition [Bible quotations].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 6 de.</td>
<td>Mans, miserable. Gods justice. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>causeat for rich-men [etc]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>(J.C[ARLEWOOD] f.</td>
<td>ANR. ed. of HERMAN V, Abp. of Cologne</td>
<td>13209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. S[INGLETON])</td>
<td>A breke and a playne declarayton of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dewty of maried folks, set forth in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>almayne and tr. by H. Dekyn [1553?].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>LYNNE, W. [Anr. ed. revised] of</td>
<td>17116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 22 jy.</td>
<td>The beginning and endyng of all popery,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1548?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>LYTE, H., the Elder</td>
<td>17122.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The light of Britayne. A recorde of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>honorable originall &amp; antiquitie of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Britaine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. C[ARLEWOOD] f.</td>
<td>MUNDAY, A.</td>
<td>18260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. WHITE</td>
<td>A banquet of daintie conceits. Furnished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 6 jy 1584</td>
<td>with vere delicate and choyse inuentions,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>either to the lute, bandora, virginalles,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or anie other instrument. [In verse]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>PALMERIN de OLIVA</td>
<td>19157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. W. WRIGHT</td>
<td>Palmerin d'Oliua. [Pr. 1] The mirrour of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nobilitie. Turned into English by A. M(unday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>PIMENTEL, D.</td>
<td>19935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. WOLFE</td>
<td>The deposition of D. Piementelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 29 oc.</td>
<td>[concerning the Armada]. Tr. out of Dutch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by F. M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>First sermon Ent.</td>
<td>SMITH, H.</td>
<td>22697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>The sinfull mans search: or seeking of God.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 dec.</td>
<td>Published according to a corrected copie,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sent by the author.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. C[ARLEWOOD] f.</td>
<td>TASSO, T.</td>
<td>23702.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. HACKET</td>
<td>The householders philosophie. Wherein is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 6 fb.</td>
<td>perfectly described, the true oeconomia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of housekeeping. Tr. T. X[yd]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. C[ARLEWOOD] f.</td>
<td>TASSO, T.</td>
<td>23703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. HACKET</td>
<td>[Anr. issue] Whereunto is anexed a dairie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ent. 9 jy.</td>
<td>booke for all good huswliues. [By] (B. Dowe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Printer/Publisher</td>
<td>Author/Table</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>TEDDER, W.</td>
<td>ENT. 12 de.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>WAGENAER, L. J.</td>
<td>ENT. 3 ap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>The mariners mirrou...Now [tr. and] fitted with necessarie additions by A. Ashley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>J. CHARLE-WOOD</td>
<td>Anr. ed. newelie corrected of</td>
<td>ENT. 3 ap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. T. NEWMAN</td>
<td>The lamentations of Amyntas for the death of Phillis, paraphrastically tr. into English hexameters by A. Fraunce [Anon.] 1587.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. T. GUBBIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>BUNNY, E.</td>
<td>ENT. 20 my 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>A briefe answer, vnto those idle quarrels of R. P.[arsons] against the late edition of the Resolution. Whereunto are praefixed the Resolution, and the treatise of pacification, perused and noted in the margent, shewing in what section of this answer following, those places are handled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J. WOOLFE</td>
<td>ANON.</td>
<td>ENT. 4 ap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>A notable and prodigious historie of a maiden (Katerin the daughter of Cun the Cooper of Schmidweiler), who for sundry yeeres neither eateth, drinketh, nor sleepeeth. Published in high Dutch, in French, and nowe tr. into English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J. WOLFE</td>
<td>FELIPPE, B.</td>
<td>[a trans.] The counsellor a treatise of counsels and counsellers of princes, written in Spanish by B. Phillip. Englisshed by J. T(horius).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a. J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>GIBBON, or GYBBON C.</td>
<td>Ent. 1 feb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Our trust against trouble...composed for consolation, and consideration of these crosses of warre, lately attempted, and still intended against vs. With speciall prayers and meditations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>H. JACKSON</td>
<td>ANR. ED. OF</td>
<td>Ent. 26 dec. 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>GREENE, R.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Arbasto, the anatomi of fortune, 1584.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1589)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>A forme of prayer for the protection of Elizabeth of England and Henry [III] of France; aginst the Catholic Leagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>I. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>JOLIPH, W.</td>
<td>Ent. 9 ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Spectacle of Gods mercie out of Iob 8. 5-7. I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J.C[CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>MORAES, F. de</td>
<td>[Monday].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. S. WATERSONNE</td>
<td>The honorable, pleasant and rare conceited historie of Palmendos [Anon.] Tr. A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>NASH, T. The anatomie of absurditie: contayning a breefe confutation of the slender imputed prayses to feminine perfection. A variant w. date: [1590]</td>
<td>18364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>A Protestant anonymous adaptation of PARSONS, R. A booke of christian exercise, appertaying to resolution [Init. R. P.]. Perused [i.e. edited and altered], and accompanied now with a Treatise tending to pacification by E. Bunny. 1584.</td>
<td>19364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Printed between the skye and the grounde. [J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>PASQUILL OF ENGLAND A countercuffe giuen to Martin junior. [Formerly attrib. To T. Nash]. Anr. ed: 1589.</td>
<td>19456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>If my breath be so hote that I burne my mouth, suppose I was printed by Pepper Allie. [J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>PASQUILL OF ENGLAND The returne of the renowned caualiero Pasquill of England [Formerly attrib. to T. Nash]. Other 2 issues: 1589.</td>
<td>19457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Ent. to J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>PRIMALEON, of Greece The first booke of Primaleon of Greece. [7r. A. Munday].</td>
<td>20366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>J.C[CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>ROBERTS, H. James trumpet soundinge. Or commemorations of sir W. Mildmay, and sir M. Calthrop. [In verse]</td>
<td>21080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>AVERELL, W. Four notable histories applyed to fours worthy examples. Whereunto is added a dialogue, expressing the corruptions of this age.</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>BEATNIFFE, J. A sermon preached at Torceter, in Northampton.</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>BRETON, N. The historie of the life and fortune of don Frederigo di Terra Nuua.</td>
<td>3658.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD)</td>
<td>HERMANNI, P. An excellent treatise teaching howe to cure the French-pockes. Drawne out of T. Paracelsus. Put into English (out of Germaine) by J. Hester.</td>
<td>13215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD) f. T. HACKET</td>
<td>Anr. ed. enlarged of the 1585 ed. MELA, P. The rare and singuler worke of P. Mela. Whereunto is added, that of J. Solinus Polyhistor. (1587).</td>
<td>17786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1590)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD] f. W. WRIGHT</td>
<td>NELSON, T. A memorable epitaph, made vpon the lamentable complaint of the people for the death of Sir F. Walsingham...7 apr. 1590 (In verse)</td>
<td>18424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD a. [i.e. for] S. WATERSON Ent. 30 ja</td>
<td>PARSONS, R. The seconde parte of the booke of christian exercise. Or a christian directorie. Written by the former author R. P(arsons) Other eds: 1591, 1592.</td>
<td>19380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Printed where I was, and where I will bee... [J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>PASQUILL The firste parte of Pasquils apologie. Wherin he gallops the fiedle with the Treatise of reformation. [Doubtfully attrib. to T. Nash]</td>
<td>19450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590?</td>
<td>J.C(HARLEWOOD) f. J. BUSBIE</td>
<td>SMELL-KNAVE, S. The fearefull and lamentable effects of two comets, which shall appeare in 1591.</td>
<td>22645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1591)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD] Ent. 15 my.</td>
<td>CENTURION, Ship The valiante and most laudable fight by the Centurion of London, against fiue Spanish gallyes. Who is safely returned this present May.</td>
<td>4911.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>J.C(HARLEWOOD) f. A. KITSONNE Ent. 12 ap.</td>
<td>CLAYTON, G. The approoued order of martiael discipline, with every particulier officer his dutie. Whereunto is adioyned a second booke, for the true ordering and imbattelling of any number. A variant w. imprint: 1591</td>
<td>5376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Ass'd to R. Walley 7 mr. 1591, proviso that Charlewood was to be the printer.</td>
<td>CONSCIENCE, R. A &quot;second booke with songes&quot;</td>
<td>5633.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f.</td>
<td>GARRARD, W.</td>
<td>11625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. WARDE</td>
<td>The arte of warre...By W. Garrard, who died 1587. Corrected and finished by captaine (Robert) Hichcock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD f.</td>
<td>LILLY, J.</td>
<td>17050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the widdowe Broome.</td>
<td>Endimion, the man in the moone [Anon.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>R. JONES</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of PARTRIDGE, J. The fourth tyme corrected, 1584.</td>
<td>19429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>R. JONES</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of REGIUS, U. The solace of Sion, and joy of Ierusalem. Beeing a godly exposition of the Lxxxvij. psalme. Tr. into English by R. Robinson, 1587.</td>
<td>20853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>T. NEWMAN</td>
<td>SIDNEY, Sir PHILIP Syr P.S. his Astrophel and Stella. To the end of which are added, sundry other rare sonnets of divers gentlemen. [S. Daniel, etc. In verse]</td>
<td>22536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>T. MAN</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of SMITH, H. The christians sacrifice, Seene and allowed, 1589.</td>
<td>22659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>T. ORWIN</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of SMITH, H. A preparatiue to mariage. The summe, whereof was spoken at a contract, and inlarged after. Whereunto is annexed a Treatise of the Lords supper, and another of Vsurie. 1591.</td>
<td>22687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>T. MAN</td>
<td>SMITH, H. Three prayers, one for the morning, another for the euening; the third for a sick-man. Whereunto is annexed, a godly letter and a comfortable speech. [Anon.]</td>
<td>22703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1591)</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOOD?</td>
<td>STRIGELIUS, V. A proceeding in the harmonie of king Dauids harpe. Tr. out of Latin by R. Robinson.</td>
<td>23359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>f. T. GOSSON</td>
<td>VAUGHAN, E. Nine obseruations howe to reade the Bible.</td>
<td>24598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>f. W. WRIGHT</td>
<td>A particular, of the yeelding vppe of Zutphen, and the beleagering of Deuenter. With the honourable enterprise of sir R. Williams, at Cinque Saunce. Anr. issue: 1591.</td>
<td>26134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</td>
<td>AUTHOR/TITLE</td>
<td>STC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>The masque of the League and the Spanyard discovered. Tr. [by] (A. Munday) out of the French coppy.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>The wonderfull combate (for Gods glorie and mans saluation) between Christ and Satan. In seven sermons [Anon.].</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>Orlando inamorato the three first bookes. Done into English heroicall verse, by R. T[ofte] gentleman, 1598.</td>
<td>3216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>A feast full of sad cheere. [Epitaphs. In verse]</td>
<td>5231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>Good counecill against the plague. Shewing sundry present preseruatiues for the same. To auoyde the infection, lately begun in someplaces of this citty. Written by a learned phisition.</td>
<td>5871.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>Delia. Contayning certayne sonnets: with the complaint of Rosamond. Anr. ed. 1592.</td>
<td>6243.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1592)</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD]</td>
<td>Good newes from Fraunce. A true discourse of the winning of sundry cheefe townes, now in the obedience of the French king.</td>
<td>11273.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD?]</td>
<td>An altered version of Of prayer and meditation contayning foureteene meditations. 1562.</td>
<td>16909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. CHARLEWOODE</td>
<td>Gallathea [Anon.]</td>
<td>17080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD f.]</td>
<td>Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell.</td>
<td>18371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## JOHN CHARLEWOOD'S OUTPUT (1557-1593)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER/PUBLISHER</th>
<th>AUTHOR/TITLE</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD f. C. BURBY)</td>
<td>ANON. The sermons of master Henrie Smith, gathered into one volume. Printed according to his corrected copies in his lifetime.</td>
<td>22718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>[J. CHARLEWOOD a. J. DANTER] f. C. BURBIE Ent. 1 my</td>
<td>AXIOCHUS. A most excellent dialogue, written in Greeke by Plato [pseud.] Tr. by Edw. Spenser. Heereto is annexed a speech spoken at the tryumphe at White-hall by the page to the earle of Oxenforde. Both the trans. and the speech have been attrib. to A. Munday.</td>
<td>19974.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>(J. CHARLEWOOD)</td>
<td>TANNER, R. Anno domini 1592. A briefe treatise for the ready vse of the sphere.</td>
<td>23671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>J. C[CHARLEWOOD] Ent. 16 ap.</td>
<td>TELIN, G. Archaioplutos. Or the riches of elder ages. Proving that the auncient emperors were more rich then such as liue in these daies. Tr. (A. Munday).</td>
<td>23867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. WARDE [in the shop of J. CHARLEWOOD] Ent. 17 ja</td>
<td>CURCHYARD, T. A pleasant conceite penned in verse. Presented on new-yeeres day last, to the queenes maestie.</td>
<td>5248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>J.C[CHARLEWOOD] f. R. SMITH Ent. 29 ja.</td>
<td>MARKHAM, G. A discourse of horsmanshippe.</td>
<td>17346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. R. JONES Ent. 28 no. 1586</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of SEAGER, P. Certayne psalmes drawne into Englyshe metre, 1553.</td>
<td>22137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>[J.CHARLEWOOD] f. the widdow Perrin</td>
<td>Anr. ed. of SMITH, H. The trumpet of the soule, sounding to judgement, 1591.</td>
<td>22709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. CHARLEWOOD</td>
<td>WELLS, W. The sickmans meditation.</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2b: John Charlewood’s Entrances of Copies (1563-1593)*

22 July 1562-22 July 1563

Received of Cherlewod for his license for printing of a ballet intituled *a Diolige of the Rufull burr[ng]ynge of Powles*

Received of John Cherlewod for his license for printing of a ballet intituled *o lorde which arte in heaven so hye &c*

Received of John Cherlewod for his license for printing of a booke intituled *the treasure of gladnes*

Received of John Cherlewod for his license for printing of a ballet intituled *whan yonge Powlis steple olde Powlies steple chylde &c*

Received of John Charlewod for his license for printing of a ballet intituled *beholdyn bothe the stay and state of man kynde*

Received of John Charlewod for his license for printing of iiiij ballettes the one *Declarynge how evell we do kepe the Lordes tenne commandementes / and other of a man that his wyfe ys master / an other shewynge how that the worlde ys the lenger worse an other as I me walked my selfe all a lone*

22 July 1563-22 July 1564

Received of John cherlewod for his license for printing of a ballet intituled *ye vanite of this worlde and the felycite of the worlde to come*

Received of John Cherlewod for his license for printing of a ballet intituled *Wysdome Wolde I wyshe to haue*

Received of John Cherlewod for his license for printing of the *Tenne commandementes of almyghty GOD / an other shorte treats in tyme of saynt HEUGHES &c / a ballet Reprovynge all Reball sonnges*

Received of John cherlewod for his license for printing of a booke intituled *the pathe waye vnto the holy scriptures with a compendious introduction or preface vnto the epistle to the Romans*

Received of John Cherlewood for his license for printing of a booke of *seren godly prayers of Lady JANEs &c*

Received of John cherwood for his license for printing of ij ballettes *betwene Death and youghte / an other of Ruffes and longe sleves*

22 July 1564-22 July 1565

Received of John charlewod for his license for printing of a *Dyaloge of too Lande lordes &c*

Received of John charlewod for his license for printing of ij ballettes the one intituled *be mery in GOD saynte PAWLE sayth playne / the other a Warnynge to synners this holy tyme of lente*

* Because of the loss of Court Book A (the original Clerk’s Book), there is a gap in the entrances of copies extending from July 1571 to July 1576, a gap, that is, of exactly five craft years.
22 July 1565-22 July 1566

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for pryntinge of a ballett intituled prescrybyng to all youg[1]h this momentary lyfe Warnyng them to prepare them selves to Dye to the worlde

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for pryntinge of a ballett intituled of one complaynyng of ye mutabilite of fortune

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for pryntinge of a boke the openynge of the Wordes of the prophet JOELL in his ifte and thyrd chapeter Rehersed by CHRISTE in MATHEW xxii chapeter / MARKE the xv chapeter LUKE the xx chapeter in the Actes the ifte

22 July 1566-22 July 1567

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for ye pryntinge of an interlude of the Repentaunce of MARY MAGDALEN &c

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for the pryntinge of an interlude named the Colledge of canonycall clerkes

22 July 1569-22 July 1570

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for pryntinge of a ballett intituled all for advantage

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for the pryntinge of a ballett intituled how every christian souliour shulde fyghte under his captayne CHRISTE

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for pryntinge of a ballett intituled the mýrror of tru fryndshyppe

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for the pryntinge of a ballett intituled the vnfortunate ende of IPHIS sonne vnto TEUCER kynge of Troye

Recyved of John charlewod for his lycense for pryntinge of an epytaph of the Deathe of the lady JANE GRYFFEN

LACKING OF RECORDS JULY 1571-JULY 1576

vj to Die Augusti 1576

Recyued of him for his licence to prynte a ballat intituled a lookinge glasse fo r Lovers

xxiiij to Die Septembris 1576

Recyued of him for his licence to printe the description of the glasse of conforte

xxv to Die Januarij 1577

Lyczencd vnto them* a ballat yntituled A warnynge songe to Cities all to beware by Andwerpes fall

* Richard Jones and John Charlewood
18 November 1577

Lycenced vnto him the Defence of pouertie againste the Desire of worldlie riches Dialogue wise collected by ANTHONIE MUNDAYE

Lycenced vnto him a sonnet necessarye for this tyne of GODs visitacon aswell againste the excessive pride and abuse of apparell as other vices to warne the Citie and Cuntrey to returne to the Lorde

xxxo Die Januarii 1578

Lycensed vnto him. a commenracon of the life of PETER KEMPE late of Stamford Deceased. and also the tragicall discourse of him and his wife deceasinge bothe within the space of v. houres reported by THOMAS CLARK as witnes of the same

Secundo Die Junii 1578

Lycenced vnto him. A brief and clere confession of the christian faithe conteining an hundreth articles of the crede of th[e] apostles made and Declared by JHON GARDENER

18 Augusti 1578

Lycencid vnto him An epitaphe of the lady LOMLEY

Vicesimo die Augusti 1578

Lycenced vnto him A newe ballad Declaringe the frailtie of this world

Item a proper faringe well worth the meaninge

JOHN CORKINS faringe for maydens and wives &c

xjmo die Septembris 1578

Lycenced vnto him these ij ballates viz one intitled a newe ballad of the end of the world and of the signes and tokens afore the second comminge of CHRIST taken out of holie scripture.

Item another intitled A ballat of many miracles donne by our saviour JHESUS CHRIST while he remained on the earthe perfect man ? sume only excepted.

(J. Charlewood is in square brackets)

20 die Octobris 1578

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e]andes of the Wardens ij ballates folowinge

Th[e] one intitled A paire of garters for yonge menne to weare yat serue the LORD GOD and Lyve in his feare

Th[e] other intitled the complaint of pouertie for Lacke of frendship

Tercio die Decembris 1578

Lycencid vnto him an epitaphe vppon the death of Sir ANDREWE CORBET
Secundo Die Januarii 1579

Lyncenced vnto him ye Idle huswifes exercise

xxo Die Januarii 1579

Lyncenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of the lord maiour and the wardens. A booke intituled COTES comparison of hollie and lyve compared with true Religion and superstition Describinge bothe their natures and qualities, wherevnto ys annexed Twelue sentences called 'preservatiues for the Ryche against the day of vengeauce' and also the taken out of the booke of Wisdom the 2 chapter and Ecclesiastes the 5 chapter

[This is the first time the Lord Mayor of London appears in the Registers as a licenser]

24 Marci 1579

Receaued of him, for the Barbarie newes of ye battell there

Item the Lamentacon of the pope for the Deathe of DON JHON [of Austria]

Item a Shrovinge for ladies

Lyncenced vnto him a ballat of ye Receyvinge of the Quenes maiestie into Norwiche

10 Aprilis 1579

A newe thinge

vto Die Maii 1579

Lyncensed vnto him vnder th[e h]and of the Bishop of LONDON and the Wardens A Dialoge betwene a Ladie called LISTRIA and a pilgrim concerninge the gouernement and commen weale of the great province of Crangalor

26 Junii 1579

Lyncenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of the wardens: A ballad of vij dronkardes whome the evil spirit procured to Death at Ravenspurgh in Swaben

xxjo Die Juli 1579

Receyued of him for printinge a true declaracon of ye greate valiancye of ye noble towne of Ma[e]stricht

xijo Augusti 1579

Receyued of him for printinge a booke concerninge ye welles found at Newnam Regis in Warrwickshire

ultimo die Augustii 1579

Allowed vnto them* by the consent of henry Denham these copies folowinge which they bought of him

The Arbor of Amyyte
TURBERVILLES songes and sonnettes
The merrie meetinge of Maides
Newes from Nynyve
The castell of Christian
A Ryche storehouse for gentelmen
The greene forreste
The fourthe Tragedie of SENECA
Newes out of Paules Churchyard
Palmistrye
The pityefull state of the tyme present
HILLes Phisiognomye
The Travelled Pilgrym
A Contemplacon of misteries
Morrall Philosophie

* (Ric[hard] Jones and John Charlewood

21 December 1579
Lyncenced vnto him vnnder ye hand of master bishop and master Crowley an excellent treatise to all those yat haue longinge desire for yeairsaluacon or yet knowe not howe to attaine thereto by reason of the mischieuous subtilitie of SATHAN ye Archennemy of Mankinde

24 Febbruarii 1580
Lyncenced vnto him a ballat made by ANTHONY Monday of th[e] encoragement of an English soldior to his fellow mates

17 Marcii 1580
Lyncenced vnto him ij ballades. Th[e] one the ship of careles conuersation. Th[e] other A pastport for pirates wherein they maye marke: and shun their abuse by the Death of THOMAS CLARKE.

11 Junii 1580
Lyncenced vnto him a delectable dialoge wherein is conteyned a pleasant Disputacon betwene ij Spanishe gentlemen Concerninge phisick and phiscians with sentence of a learned master geven upon their argumentes. Translated out of the Castilian tonge by T. N.

27 Junii 1580
A thinge scene in th[e] ayre.

Quarto die Augusti 1580
Lyncenced vnto him vnnder th[e] h]and of the bishop of LONDON: certen intercepted lettres of sundry Counterfalt Cuntrymen of the Lowe Cuntreis

29 Octobris 1580
Lyncenced vnto him certen newes of the Turk
Quinto die Novembris 1580

Lycenced vnto them* vnder th[e h]andes of the wardens a ballad of _an exhortacon to amendemente of life by Signes and tokens scene in ye ayre and of the laste Blasinge Starre that began the viijth of october 1580_

* E. White and John Charlewood

Sesto die Dicembris 1580

Lycenced vnto him vnder master _watkins_ hande _the true and naturall proportion of a monstrous Cilde borne in Chieri in Pie[d]monte_

Quarto Die Januarii 1581

Lycenced vnto him vnder the Bishop of LONDON his hande and the wardens _An Answere to Sixe Reasons of THOMAS POUND Gentleman prisoner in the Marshallsey_

Tollerated vnto him by the wardens _The Historye of CHARLES and JULIA Twoe Brittanie Lovers_

Tollerated vnto him by the wardens _a Discours in Commendacon of the valiaunte and verteous mynded gentleman master FFRAUNCIS DRAKE_

xvjto die Januarii 1581

Receyued of him for _the challenge of the Justes_

Vicesimo quarto die Januarii 1581

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of the wardens _The A B C or instruction for Christians Contayninge a frutefull and godlie Excercise, aswell in wholesome and frutefull prayers as in Reuerente discerninge of GOD holie Commaundementes and sacramentes newelie Translated out of Frenche into Englishe by D M which he [i.e. J. Charlewood] boughte of John Arnolde_

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e] handes of ye wardens, _The voice of the laste Trempett, Blowen by the seconde Angell as is menconed in the xjth of ye Apocalips, which he bought of WILLIAM BARTLETT_

Decimo Tertio Die ffebruarii 1581

Lycenced vnto him by master _watkins_ a booke intituled _the historie of PALMERIN of Englande_, vppon Condicon that if there be anie thinge founde in The booke when it is extante worthie of Reprehension That then all the Bookes shalbe put to waste and Burnte.

Decimo Die Marcii 1581

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of the wardens, _A Ballad Intituled, A ffrendelie well wishinge to such as endure &c By NICHOLAS BOURMAN_

Vicesimo Secundo die Aprilis 1581

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of the wardens and allowed by the Bishop of LONDON, _The oration and sermon made at Rome by Commaundemente of the ffoure Cardinalles and the dominican Inquisitor vppon paine of death, by JOHN NICHOLS the Popes sholler._
viio die Julii 1581

Lycenced vnto him. *a true reporte of the late horrible murder committed by WILLIAM SHERWOOD prisoner in the Quenes Benche*

quarto die Augusti 1581

Lycenced vnto them* by master Dewce, the Conqueste achived by Captaine NORRICE generall Colonell in the Campe in Ffriseland the ixth of Julie 1581.

* E. White and John Charlewood

vicesimo primo die Augusti 1581

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of master Dewce *A brief discourse Concerninge those fhoure vsuall notes whereby CHRISTes Catholike Church is knowen* written by Roberte Crowley Clerke.

Tollrated vnto him by master Dewce *The wrath of GOD in the punishmente of Twoo Drunckardes at Nekers Hofen in Almayne.*

Sesto die Septembris 1581

Lycenced vnto him by master Dewce, *An Abstracte of the Historie of CESAR and POMPEIUS*

15 Januarii 1582

Receaved of him for his licence to printe theis Copies hereafter menconed

ALWAIES PROVIDED That yf it be founde that anie other hath righte to print anie of theis Copies, That then this his lycence as touchinge euerie suche of those Copies soe belonginge to anie other shalbe void and of none effecte,

Copies which were Sampson Awdeleys and nowe lycenced to the said John Charlewood vnder the condicion aforesaid

- The Somme of Dyvynitie
- The booke of Husbandry
- RIDLEIS Conference
- MARCUS AURELIUS
- Th[e] olde Algorisme
- Th[e] argumente of apparell
- A Pennyworth of witte
- A hundred merry tales
- ADAM BELL
- The banishmente of CUPID
- Crowleyes Epigrams
- CALVIN againste th[e] anna-baptistes
- A ffoxe Tale
- Th[e] olde governoance of vertue short
- HOOPER vpon ye Tenne commandementes
- HOOPERs Homilies
- A Morninge prayer
- Againste praise of womens Bewyte
- Kinge PONTUS
- The Polices of warre
- ROBIN CONSCIENCE
- A proude wyves pater noster
- The Plowmans pater noster
- A Sackefull of newes
- Sir EGLAMORE
- GOWRE de Confessio amantis
- The good Sheppard and the Badde
- The Coniectures of th[e] end of the worlde
- PLAIEBOOKES
- The weather
- iiij P
- Love
- youthe
- ympacient pouertie
- Hicke Skorner
- ATHANAGORAS of the Resurreccon
- CORVINS postyll
The Christian state of Matrimont

The Tower of trustynes

The Castell of knowledge

BALLETTES
A replye to the lokinge glasse
A Toye to mocke an Ape
A Smellinge Nosegaye
The xxxij Ladyes

Copies which were william williamson and nowe licenced to the said John Charlewood vnder the Condicon aforesaid

The poore mans Garden
NORTHEBROOKes confession
The rewarde of wickednes

vio maii 1582

Lycenced vnto him A booke intituled A waspes nest found aboue the ground. Master crowleis hand beinge to yt as a testimonie yat yt is tollerable to be printed.

Decimo tercio die Junii 1582

Lycenced vnto him vnder the handes of the Bishop of LONDON and master Dewce Two sermondes preached at Manchester by SYMON HARWARD preacher.

Vicesimo primo die Junii 1582

Lycenced to him vnder the handes of the Bishop of LONDON and master Dewce the Englishe Romaine Lyfe (with N. Lynge)

Decimo quarto die Decembris 1582

Lycenced vnto him vnder master Barker and master Coldockes handes. VRBANUS RHEGIUS his homely of goods and evill Angells

13 Junii 1583

Receaued of him for printinge A booke intituled. A defensatiue against ye poison of supposed prophesies / Alowed vnder the handes of the Bishop of LONDON and ye wardens.

Tertio Die Augusti 1583

Receaued of him for his licence to ymprint The Rosarie of christian Prayers

Decimo Die Augusti 1583

Receaued of him for his lycence to printe A ballade intituled Twinkle Downe DAVIE made touchinge the former fryvolous ballade that goeth vnder the same Tytle.
Decimo Nono Die Augusti 1583

Lycenced vnto him vnder both the wardens handes, The sweete sobbes, and amorous Complaintes of Shepardes and Nymphes in a fancye confusde by ANTHONY MUNDAY

26 februarii 1585

Alowed vnto him for his copies A booke Intituled. The coumfort of A Trewe Christian

17 Julii 1585

Recaued of him for his licence to printe the declaration of the kinge of Navarra touchinge the Sclaunders published against him in the protestacions of them of the league which are risen in armes in Ffraunce. which is graunted to him for his copie so it be laufull.

9 Julii 1586

Recaued of him for printinge A Replication to the lewd answere which frere JOHN FRAUNCIS of Nigeon in Ffraunce made to a lettre of his mother &c Authorised vnder the Archbishop of CAUNTERBURY his hand and entryed by warrant of master watkins as deputye to master Byshop. / and of master warden denham with their handes to the copie.

4to Septembris 1586

Recaued of them* for printinge A Discourse of Englishe poe tyre

* R. Walley and John Charlewood

10 novembris 1586

Recaued of him for his licence to prynte A ballad of the three laste Traytours that suffered at Tyborne the 8 of October 1586 master bishop hand beinge to yt.

Recaued of him for printinge in Englishe xxvjth sermons of master HENRY BULLINGER vpon the first Sermon of the prophet JEREMYE conteined in the first vj chapters of his prophecie. Auctorised vnder the bishop of LONDONs hand.

28 Novembris 1586

Recaued of him for pryntinge a booke called the ymage of Loue, aucthorised or allowed vnder th[e h]andes of master Roberte Crowley and both the wardens.

10 marci 1587

Recaued of him for printinge articles to be enquired of by ye churchwardens and Sworne men within the archdaleconry of Middlesex. vnder Master Bysshops hand.
Lyenci

Xвиио марци 1587

Lycenci	no	him
under the wardens' hands by warrant from master HARTWELL under his hand to the
Copye A ballad intytuled, the iuste Judgement of GOD upon a myserable hard harted ffermour

Sexto die Aprilis 1587

Receaued of him for his lycence to printe a booke intituled, A myr ror for Mathematiques / A golden Gem for
Geometrycians, A sure safetie for saylers / and an anciente Antiquarie for Astronomers and Astrologians /
vnder th[e] handes of the Arch Bishop of CANTERBURY and the wardens.

15 Junii 1587

Receaued of him for printinge a ballad of master FFRAUNCIS an Italian a Doctor of Lawe who denied the
lord JESUS &c.

Xвиijo Augusti 1587

Receaued of him for pryntinge, Praiers or meditacons collected out of certen holie workes by the moste
vertuous Pryncesse KATHERYNE PARRE Queene of England &c Anno 1545. and nowe newlye Imprinted at
the request of mistres ELIZABETH ROUS, and is intytuled The sweete songe of a synner. 1587. authorysed
vnder the Arch Bishop of CANTERBURY his hand and master warden Coldocks.

Vicesimo Tertio Die Octobris 1587

Receaued of him for his lycence to prynte A table [or Broadside] Intytuled ffoure Elementes, foure Seasons,
foure humors and foure vertues, authourised vnder the master warden Coldock[es] hand.

XXXO Die Octobris 1587

Lycence to him by the whole consent of Th[e] assistantes, The onelye ympryntinge of all manner of Billes for
players.
PROUIDED yat yf any trouble aryse herebye then Chartwood to beare the charges.

10 Novembris 1587

Receaued of him for his lycence to printe Allowed vnto him vnder th[e] h]andes of Th[e] archbishop of
CANTERBURYE, master JOHN MULLYNS and master warden Coldock, the ympryntinge of a Booke
Intytuled The answere of Robert Crowley (a protestant Christyan) made to those offers that a Catholick
Papiste made to a learned protestant

Xiiiijto Die Novembris 1587

Receaued of him for his Lycence to prynte, A prayer and thancksgyvinge vnto GOD for the prosperous estate
and longe Contynuance of the Queenes maiestie to be songe on the xvijth of November 1587. Authorysed
vnder the Bishop of LONDONs hand and master warden Coldock.

Die mercurii. 28 februarii 1588

Receaued of him for his lycence to prynte, Artycles to be enquired of within the Dyoces of Gloucester and
Brystoll. vnder master warden Coldockes hand.
Die Saturn[a]e Secundo Die Marcii 1588

Receaued of him for his lycence to prynte a ballade auuthorised vnder master warden Coldockes hand, the begynnynge wherof is, goe from thy wanton and be wyse &c.

Die mercurii. xxviith. of marche 1588

Lycenced vnto him vnder master warden Coldockes hand, A ballade intytuled, an excellent dyttie and necessarye, wherein is shewed howe we must stryve against all manner of Synnes.

25 Junii 1588

Alowed vnto him An epitaphe vpon the life and Death of the Countesse of OXON, perused by master GRAVET

22 Julii 1588

Receaued of him for pryntinge a book intituled. The begynynge and endynge of all popery and popish kingdom

Item Receaued of him for ij ballades

  The first intitled a Ditty shewing the folly of man
  The second. The meane to amendment
  The third A Caveat for christians

Master COLES hand being to them who is one of my lord graces Chaplain.

Xixo die Novembris 1588

Allowed vnto him for his Copie, An Epitaphe of master WILLIAM LYNAKERs deathe, Allowed vnder th[e h]andes of master GRAVETT and master Warden Coldock, with warrant from master Coldock.

24to Decembris 1588

Lycenced vnto him vnder th[e h]andes of master HARTWELL and master warden Coldocke / The newes of a most certen victorie againste the Spanyardes by the helpe of GOD the 19 of November. 1588 by the Captaines of Holland.

26 Decembris 1588

Entred for his Copie A sermon vpon the 8 Chapter of JOB. the 5, 6. and 7. Verses, Allowed vnder master Doctor STALLERS hand and master warden Coldocks.

9 Januarii 1589

Entred for his copie. The honorable histories of PALMENDOS and PRIMALEON of Grece, Sonnes to the famous emperour PALMERIN D'OLIU of Constantinople Devided into. viij. seuerall booke or partes.

1 februarii 1589

Entred for his Copie A compendious forme for Domesticall Dutyes, Collected by CHARLES GIBBON. and Alowed vnder Doctor STALLARDES hand: and master Coldockes beinge to the copie.

Entred for his Copie vnder th[e h]andes aforesaid A little booke intituled Our truste against trouble. Collected by the said CHARLES GIBON.
10 Decembris 1589
Entred for his copie an epitaph vppon the death of the Earl of LEICESTER Written by HENRY ROBERTES: and aucthorised: by the Bishop of LONDON. The wardens handes beinge to the copye.
Entred for his Copie vnder master Doctor WOODES hand: A lookinge glasse for England and the whole world Master Cawoodes hand also beinge to the copy.

xxxmo die Januarii 1590
Entred for theire* copie, A booke intituled A christian directorie guidinge all en to their Salvation, Allowed vnder the handes of Doctor STALLER and bothe the Wardens.
*S. Waterson and John Charlewood

xxvto die Marcii 1590
Entred for his Copie, vnder th[e]andes of Doctor STALLER, and bothe the wardens / A Catechisme or pythie somme of principall matters concerning faith and Religion.

xixo Augusti 1590
Entred for his copye to prynte, A moste shorte, and profytable introductyon to learne to read wrytten and prynted hand with in a monethe space, By THOMAS FFLOWER. and aucthorysed vnder th[e]andes of master GRAVETT, and master warden newberye.

12 Aprilis 1591
Entred for his copie vnder th[e]andes of the Bysshop of LONDON and the Wardens. A booke intituled The order of martiall discipline.

iido Die Junii [1591]
Entred for his copie vnder the handes of the Bishop of LONDON and master warden Cawood, a particulier of the yeildinge vp of the towne of Zutphen and the belegeringe of Deventer / with the honorable enterprise of Sir ROBERT WILLIAMS performed vppon a Thousand and twoo hundred of the Enemies soldyers lyeinge at Cuique Samne 9 leages from Deepe.

12 octobris [1591]
Entred for his* copies by assignement from master Robert walley: these copies folowing viz

The Shephaerdes Calender in fo[lio]
JOSEPHUS of the warres of Jewes
ESOPes fables in English
GRAFTONs computacon
SALLUST in English
RYCHis farewel
LEVYNs Dictionary. 4to.
SIMONIDES :ja [i.e. prima] pars

Art of English poetry
ROBIN CONSCIENCE. 2 partes
RASTELes tables
CATO English and Latin
Proverbs of SALOMON 16.
RICHys military practis
SIMONIDES .2. pars
Auncient & late phisik with HERODIAN in Englishe

and all other the said Robert walleis bookes and balleres whatsoever.
All which bookes. yt is agreed shalbe printed by John Charlwood for the said Thomas Adams: as often as they shalbe printed.
And the said Charlwood to be as reasonable for the workmanship as other men would

* Thomas Adams

14 Januarii [1592]

Entered for his Copy vnnder th[e h]andes of Master Watkins a merrie newe Jigge betwene JENKIN the Collier and NANSIE

xxviiij ffebruarij [1592]

Entred for his copie vnnder th[e h]andes of Doctor DOYLYE and master Watkins, to be translated into Englishe. Le Masque De la ligue et De L'Hispagnol decouuert.

Xvito Die Aprilis

Entred vnto him for his copie by warrant from master watkins a Booke entytuled Archaioplutos or the Riches of Elder ages. Provinge by manie good and learned Authours, that the auncient Emperors and Kinges, were more Riche and magnificant, then suche as lyve in their daies.

Xxvito Junij [1592]

Entred for his copie vnnder master watkins hande a booke, intituled / Histoire de ROLAND L'amoreux Comprendant les Chevaleureux faictes d'armes et d'amours Devisée en trion liures to be translated into Englishe

iiijo Die augusti [1592]

Entred for his copie vnnder th[e h]andes of ye Bishop of LONDON, and master Stirrop Certen godlie Sermons on the Temptation of CHRISTE.

22 Die Septembris

Entred for his Copies vnnder th[e h]andes of master watkins and master Stirrop theis thinges followinge

Viz.

A ballad intytuled a pleasant communicacon betuene a yonge man a householder, and his love hee woed for his wief

Item another ballad intytuled the pleasure of Content preferred before all estates

Item another Ballad begynninge thus, yf weeping eies or inwarde bleedinge harte, yf outwarde signes are showes of hidden smarte

Item a little Booke intituled DYANA the prayses of his mistres in certen sweete Sonnettes
Xxijo Die Decembris

Entered for his Copie vnder th[e h]andes of the Lord Bishop of LONDON and master George Byshop nowe Master of the Companye a booke intituled a Second procedinge in the Harmony of Kinge DAVIDs Harpe

29 Januarij [1593]

Entred for his copie vnder th[e h]andes of master Stirrop, a booke of huntinge and runninge horses the breedinge trayninge manuginge vand dyettinge.
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