

# Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa

---

## Goslicius' Treatise of the Ideal Senator : the Englishman's Epitome of Polish Republicanism

---

Kultura i Polityka : zeszyty naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Europejskiej im. ks.  
Józefa Tischnera w Krakowie nr 9, 89-106

---

2011

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach  
dozwolonego użytku.

Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa\*

## GOSLICIUS' TREATISE OF THE IDEAL SENATOR: THE ENGLISHMAN'S EPITOME OF POLISH REPUBLICANISM

### Abstract

In 1919 the historian of Polish science and education Stanisław Kot wrote that in the English constitutional conflict between Royalists and Roundheads in the first half of the seventeenth century, played out not only on the battlefields but also in the war of the pamphlets, participants used to turn to Continental examples for viable models of the constitutional form of the state they were advocating. According to Kot, Poland and the Scandinavian countries were cited as working models of the elective, limited monarchy by proponents of republicanism, while the supporters of absolute monarchy tried to refute their arguments and show that the constitutional arrangements operating in these countries were in fact no different from the "traditional" monarchy. The sixteenth-century treatise *De Optimo Senatore* by Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius was a special instrument for the pens and ink of the two sides in the English controversy. First published in its original Latin in Venice in 1568, the work must have reached England pretty soon, since we know of two surviving manuscript translations of it into English dated to the 1580s. One of them was published as *The Counsellor* in 1598. A knowledge of this book persisted in the political awareness of its English readers for the next six decades at least; it appears to have been referred to in the growing climate of political antagonism. After the Restoration in 1660 it was re-published in a plagiarised version which in effect produced a completely reversed picture of Goslicius' original postulates without quoting his name or the source of the text. Although this was by no means the end of the Ideal Senator's singular career in the political culture of English-speaking countries, and Goslicius went on to earn another English translation in the eighteenth century and thereafter enjoy a peculiar afterlife in the United States in the twentieth century, the early stages of the book's presence in England are a fascinating focus for research on English-Polish cultural relations and republican ideas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

89

---

\* **Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa** – a freelance translator and a retired staff member of the Institute of English Philology at the Jagiellonian University (Kraków), where she worked from 1979 to 2011. Her academic interests are Renaissance interests, translation studies (especially untranslatability) and the history of political ideas.

## Keywords

Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius – *De Optimo Senatore* – reception of literary translation – political theory of the mixed state – 16th-century English and Polish republicanism



In 1919 the historian of Polish science and education Stanisław Kot wrote that in the English constitutional conflict between Royalists and Roundheads in the first half of the seventeenth century, played out not only on the battlefields but also in the war of the pamphlets, participants used to turn to Continental examples for viable models of the constitutional form of the state they were advocating. According to Kot, Poland and the Scandinavian countries were cited as working models of the elective, limited monarchy by proponents of republicanism, while the supporters of absolute monarchy tried to refute their arguments and show that the constitutional arrangements operating in these countries were in fact no different from the “traditional” monarchy (Kot 173-174).

90

The sixteenth-century political treatise *De Optimo Senatore* by Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius was a special instrument for the pens and ink of the two sides in the English controversy. First published in its original Latin in Venice in 1568, the work must have reached England pretty soon, since we know of two surviving manuscript translations of it into English dated to the 1580s. One of them was published as *The Counsellor* in 1598. A knowledge of this book persisted in the political awareness of its English readers for the next six decades at least; it appears to have been referred to in the growing climate of political antagonism. After the Restoration in 1660 it was republished in a plagiarised version which in effect produced a completely reversed picture of Goslicius’ original postulates without quoting his name or the source of the text (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 216-222). Although this was by no means the end of the Ideal Senator’s singular career in the political culture of English-speaking countries, and Goslicius went on to earn another English translation in the eighteenth century and thereafter enjoy a peculiar afterlife in the United States in the twentieth century, the early stages of the book’s presence in England are a fascinating focus for research on English-Polish cultural relations and republican ideas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

That Goslicius’ treatise could earn a commensurate degree of popularity in England pretty soon after its publication may be attributed

to a number of crucial factors. First of all, it was written in Latin, the lingua franca of the times, and certainly the language of international communication in academic and political discourse. Otherwise it could not have been translated, and still less read, by English recipients. However, the question remains to what extent it could have been fully understood by its English readers, since in fact the Neo-Latin of the Early Modern period was not a homogeneous language, but rather a set of endemic, local varieties of the Latin descended from Antiquity, which were used in the diverse parts of Europe for specific communicative needs. If those needs happened to be defined by local realities, the chances were that prospective recipients in other parts of the Latinate world would fail to grasp the full meaning of the words they were reading, which related to phenomena unfamiliar to them and offered no clues to their correct decipherment (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2007). Relatively few readers could afford to verify the sense of what they read through the direct experience of foreign travel. This fact accounts for some of the more intriguing aspects of Goslicius' reception in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England.

Goslicius applied his learning and literary talent in an erudite Latinity addressed to two distinct communities of readers. One comprised his own countrymen: his treatise was a political statement on the current situation in his own country. As his very title indicates, he was an advocate for the senators of Poland, embroiled at the time in a constitutional struggle with the lower house of the Polish parliament – and losing the battle (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 62-66). The subtle critical remarks he made in the context of Polish domestic affairs were no doubt lost on foreign readers. But at the same time he was also writing for an international readership, whom he gave a sparkling eulogy of his native land and its political and constitutional system. The reason why he could hope to attract the attention of an international readership was that he committed the treatise to print in a well-known Venetian publishing house while on an academic peregrination to the Italian universities, notably Padua and Bologna, then trysting-places for the international exchange of scholarship and political ideas.

His gambit worked admirably as regards English readers. By 1593 *De Optimo Senatore* was being referenced as a familiar book in a thoroughly English context by the Elizabethan controversialist Gabriel Harvey:

They complaine of corruptions; and worthily, where corruptions encroche (I am no patron of corruptions): but what a surging sea of corruptions would overflow within few years, in case the sword of so great and ample autoritie, as that

in Ierusalem most capitall, or this in Geneva most redoubted, were put into the hand of so little capacitie in government, so little Discretion in Discipline, so little iudgement in causes, so little moderation in living, so little constancie in saying, or dooing, so little gravitie in behaviour, or so little whatsoever should procure reverence in a Magistrate, or establish good order in a Commonwealth. Travaile through ten thousand Parishes in England, and when you have taken a favourable vew of their substantiallest, and sufficientest Aldermen, tell me in good sooth, what a comely shoue they would make in a Consistorie; or with how solemne a presence they would furnish a Councell Table. I believe, *Grimaldus* did little thinke of any such Senatours, when he writ *de Optimo Senatore*; or did Doctor Bartholmew Philip in his Perfect Counsellor, ever dreame of any such Counsellours. (Harvey 114; see Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 16-17, 147)

Harvey's antagonist Thomas Nashe seems to have returned the volley in an ironic tit-for-tat penned in 1596:

...I answer nothing else but that he is idle and newfangled, beginning many new things but soon weary of them ere he be half entered, and that he hath too much acquaintance in London ever to do any good, being like a courtesan than can deny no man, or a grave commonwealth's senator that thinks he is not born for himself alone, but, as old Laertes in Homer's *Odyssaea*, *Dum reliqua omnia curabat, seipsum negligebat*, caring for all other things else, sets his own estate at six and seven. (Nashe 1596: 12; see Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 16-17)

92

Gabriel Harvey was a Cambridge University man, matriculated at Christ's College and later a fellow of Pembroke College (1570), Trinity Hall (1578), and elected Master of Trinity Hall in 1585. He earned his Master of Arts from Pembroke in 1573 and his Bachelor of Laws degree from Trinity Hall in 1585 (see his biography in Venn and Venn's *Alumni Canabrigienses*; Stern 1). All the indications are that Robert Chester, the first English translator of Goslicius we know of, was a Cambridge undergraduate reading Laws when he set about the translation (Venn and Venn 1913: 146)

But before we probe the background of Goslicius' path to English readers, a brief synopsis of the book and its contents needs to be given, in order to show why it could have interested Elizabethan Englishmen.

*De Optimo Senatore* is essentially a mirror-book or *speculum*, in other words a paraenetic composition instructing the prospective public servant how to develop the virtues and skills necessary for political activity. It belongs to an ancient tradition of works on the education and personal development of the prime personages in the state – kings and princes, and later their servants and ministers, senators ambassadors etc.. The paraenetic formula was a convenient instrument for the conveyance and eulogy of its author's (or patron's) political creed.

It also carried an authorial concept of the kind of education a prince or governor required, which offered another opportunity for an ideological statement. In the Renaissance the political virtues presented were drawn from the classical authors, chiefly Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero, but their hierarchical configuration again displayed the author's political preferences (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 25-47). This class of literature was extremely popular in Elizabethan England, and consisted not only of native works, but more importantly and preponderantly of *specula* by Continental authors and their translations (Kelso 53-54, 165).

Goslicius' mirror of the Ideal Senator extols the constitutional system of its author's country, and more particularly its king and senators. Poland is presented emphatically as a *Respublica Mixta* – a mixed state, consisting of a King, a Senate, and the People represented by the lower house of its parliament. Goslicius' mixed state is a blend of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. Of these three components honorific and practical prominence is accorded to the aristocratic Senate: while the King is the head of the state, his Senators are the Heart that gives life to the entire body politic and enables the Head to implement his royal decisions. Goslicius is incontrovertibly critical of the aspirations (pretensions) of the democratic element to a greater share in the government of the state, and in this he is acting as spokesman for the Polish Senate (especially the Catholic bishops who were its top-ranking members) in its contention with the Sejm or lower house representing the *szlachta* (nobility and gentry) for more power. Whereas this reference to the domestic power struggle would probably have been too subtle for foreign readers unfamiliar with developments on the Polish political scene and would have been missed, the striking feature that must inevitably have caught the eye of English readers would have been Goslicius' presentation of the Mixed State – a manifestation of what Markku Peltonen calls "sixteenth-century republicanism" (Peltonen 49 ff.).

The concept of the Mixed State went back to classical antiquity and the writings of Plato and Aristotle, but more particularly to Polybius, who demonstrated the practice of a form of government composed of a combination of monarchical, aristocratic and democratic elements on the example of Rome. It was by no means a new idea. Yet in an age when despotic absolutism was on the rise in many parts of Europe it was an attractive, and sometimes illicit subject for political discussion. It absorbed the attention of the best legal experts in Elizabeth's England, and also of some of her closest ministers, officially upholders of their queen's unquestionable monarchical power. Sir Thomas



Smith, the most eminent English lawyer of the time and one of Elizabeth's most trusted servants, wrote the following on the Mixed State in Book 1, Chapter 6 of his compendium *De Republica Anglorum*:

That common wealthes or governments are not most commonly simple but mixt.

Now although the governments of common wealthes be thus divided into three, and cutting ech into two, so into sixe: yet you must not take that ye shall finde any common wealth or government simple, pure and absolute in his sort and kinde, but as wise men have divided for understandings sake and fantasied iiij. simple bodies which they call elementes, as fire, ayre, water, earth, and in a mans bodie foure complexions or temperatures, as cholericke, sanguine, phlegmatique, and melancolique: not that ye shall finde the one utterly perfect without mixtion of the other, for that nature almost will not suffer, but understanding doth discern ech nature as in his sinceritie: so seldome or never shall you finde any common wealthe or government which is absolutely and sincerely made of the one above named, but alwayes mixed with an other, and hath the name of that which is more and overruleth alwayes or for the most part the other.

94

His book went on to give a detailed, laudatory description of the English administrative and judicial system and became the standard source of reference on the legal and administrative constitution of "The Commonwealth of Englande." It is not surprising, then, that English readers should have been interested in the treatise on the Perfect Counsellor by Goslicius, who propounded the following political doctrine:

*Polibius* extolleth the Romane state, because it consisted of the King, the Nobilitie, and the people; supposing that the king for feare of the people, coule not become insolente, and the people durste not disobeye him, in respecte of the Senate. Which forme of commonweale was with good reason accounted most iust. For as perfect harmonie is compounded, of treble, meane, and base tewnnes: even so a good commonweale, and the surest agreement amongst men, is (as *Cicero* saith) made by mixture of the best, the meane, and the base people. We are also of opinion, that commonweale is perfect, which containeth good and vertuous subiectes, and is gouerned by a king, a Senate, and consent of the people; wishing the King should obserue his lawes, and doe those thinges which be honourable, and agreeable to the aduise of his counsell. (*The Counsellor* 18-19)

There were further important connections between Thomas Smith and Goslicius: both had studied Law in the cosmopolitan university milieu of Padua, and both penned works on the law and their respective commonwealths in the 1560s. Indeed, they must both have utilised their period of scholarship in Italy not only to acquire book-learning, but also for personal intellectual exchange with members of

the international community congregating in the Italian universities. It is noteworthy that when Goslicius describes the systems of government in the diverse contemporary states his information for England in his year of publication, 1568, is absolutely accurate: he writes of a council of fifteen, the correct number of privy counsellors for that year (Pulman 17, 23, 31, 45).

Personal contacts have always played a paramount role as paths of academic inspiration. Perhaps it was no coincidence that like Gabriel Harvey, Sir Thomas Smith had been educated at Cambridge as well and was the University's first Regius Professor of Civil Law. He and Harvey both came from Saffron Walden (see their respective biographies in Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*).

Another sign of what may perhaps have been an instance of readership on a basis of more or less direct personal contact is the mention of Goslicius' work in *The Blessednes of Brytaine*, a poem to celebrate the beginning of the thirtieth year of the Queen's reign (November 1587) by Maurice Kyffin, the secretary of the alchemist John Dee who accompanied Dee on his European travels including a stay in Poland. In the poem, which was published in 1587, Kyffin puts a quotation from Goslicius' original Latin into a marginal note:

The royal increase of Armour, & Artillery, by her Maiestie for the defence of the Realme. *F lix est ea Resp. quæ tempore pacis, Bella tractat. Laur. Grimal. de optimo Senatore fol. 71.*

95

The fact that a sentence from Goslicius is cited almost as a proverb alongside other maxims taken from the Bible and the classical authors and referred to in the margins is telling evidence of the authority and international status *De Optimo Senatore* must have acquired by 1587. Actually Kyffin omitted the word *enim* from the original sentence (probably to fit the quote into the marginalia and adapt it to the context), but got the folio number right, and therefore seems to have had a copy of *De Optimo Senatore* at hand when composing or editing his text for publication. The poem is preceded by a letter dedicatory to the Earl of Essex, which throws more light on Goslicius' status as an author with English readers. Many other parts of this fairly short poem contain echoes of topics treated by Goslicius, so we may speculate that Kyffin used *De Optimo Senatore* as a handy reference for ideas and subject-matter to produce his panegyric of Queen Elizabeth.

We know of at least two English translations of *De Optimo Senatore* made before 1587. Both survive in manuscript form, and one of them was published over a decade later under the title *The Counsellor*. The first comprises an Englished version of the first book of Goslicius'



treatise entitled *The first book of Lawrentius Grimalius Goslicius of the best Senator* and was done by a Robert Chester. The manuscript is preserved in the British Library collection (Ms. Add. 18613). It is dedicated to Justice Thomas Meade of Elmdon in Essex, a member of the Middle Temple who sat on the bench of the Court of Common Pleas from 1577 until his death in 1585. These dates tell us that the translation must have been done not later than 1585, and perhaps the reason why Robert Chester, who was only beginning in translation, as he tells us in the letter to Meade, did not go on to translate the second book of Goslicius' treatise was that his prospective patron died before he could finish it. The information is also a strong indication that the Robert Chester in question was a Cambridge undergraduate at the time, and came from Royston, a small town not far from Justice Meade's country residence (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 132-138). Perhaps he was hoping his near-neighbour would help him start out on a career in London. Robert Chester of Royston did eventually become a member of the Middle Temple, but not before 1599. The other evidence for this identification of Robert Chester is a series of signatures in puerile hands on the first and last pages of the manuscript, of several individuals surnamed Thorold, Welby, Hammond, Langton and Cotton – names of gentry families living in Lincolnshire, many members of which were Cambridge students. In particular, the name "William Thorold" occurs six times. The nature of the signatures suggests that they might have been made by boys who used the manuscript in their education. The William Thorold in question might perhaps have been Sir William Thorold, First Baronet of Marston in Lincolnshire (1591-1678), MP for Grantham and Sheriff of Lincolnshire, who fought on the Royalist side in the constitutional conflict (for his biography see Hughes online).

The alternative Robert Chester whose candidacy for the status of Goslicius' translator has been considered indirectly and rejected is none other than the Robert Chester who contributed a poem entitled *Love's Martyr or Rosalins Complaint* to a collective volume of poetry under the same title (1601) which included Shakespeare's *Phoenix and the Turtle* and poems by Ben Jonson, George Chapman and John Marston, "Vatum Chorus" and "Ignoto." The suggestion would have been tantalising if proved correct, in view of the hypothesis that *De Optimo Senatore* (or more accurately its English translation *The Counsellor*) was one of Shakespeare's sources for *Hamlet*. However, the evidence recorded in the documentary sources is far more in favour of Robert Chester the country gentleman from Essex, rather than Robert Chester the poet, being the juvenile translator of Goslicius; not getting this

identification wrong is an indispensable condition for a reliable appraisal of Goslicius' early reception in England (Grosart's *Introduction* VIII in Chester 1878; Brown XLVII–LII).

Robert Chester's rendering of Goslicius' exquisite Latin may indeed be labelled a juvenile undertaking in terms of quality of translation, with numerous errors of style and cultural misnomers. No attempt is made to translate any of the passages of poetry Goslicius quotes from the Classics, which is another indication against the identification of the translator with the poet. Nonetheless, this translation offers an invaluable insight from the point of view of Goslicius' reception, showing that by the first half of the 1580s the distribution of the treatise was widespread enough for an amateur translator to have access to it. If the Royston identification of Robert Chester is correct, then his translation would corroborate the Cambridge connection observed in the Gabriel Harvey reference and suspected for other members of the university lawyers' milieu.

But scholars and lawyers were not the only professional groups in England preoccupied with treatises on the Ideal Prince and his Ideal Servant. Another group, closely allied to them, were those directly engaged in the administration of the state – the political leaders: the Queen's ministers and their subordinates. Indeed, we could venture to say that as the reign progressed and the problem of succession became more and more of an imminent reality, this group was compelled to search for a remedy to avert the approaching crisis, and in the course of finding a solution observed the situation in other countries in similar predicaments and looked for advice in the political literature. Such inquiries had to be carried out confidentially, in spite of and because of the royal clampdown on "idle prattle" imposed on all of Elizabeth's subjects, not excluding members of parliament like Peter Wentworth who suffered dire consequences for bringing the matter up in the parliamentary debating chamber (Neale 36). It is not surprising, then, that from the 1570s on the Queen's chief advisers like William Cecil, Lord Burghley and later his son Robert Cecil, as well as their political adversary Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, should have been interested in what was going on in Poland-Lithuania, where the prospect of the extinction of the dynasty and a royal election loomed on the horizon. Goslicius' treatise appeared just four years before the demise of the last Jagiellonian king, and elective monarchy was one of the issues it addressed. As an analogous situation developed in England and reached its finale in the 1600s, a *de facto* royal "election," carried out not publicly but furtively by a hermetic caucus of the most powerful ministers, is what ensued when James Stuart of

Scotland was “invited” to take the crown of England. The entire process, which had been maturing for several years (or even decades) before fruition in 1603, had entailed an important subsidiary effect: the rise in the political status and power of the Queen’s principal ministers, the Cecils and their rival Essex. So it was no wonder that they were interested in books which described and eulogised the Counsellor, and indeed themselves (Burghley, Robert Cecil, Francis Walsingham, Essex, Sir John Fortescue etc.) wrote (or had written in their name) books of advice on political behaviour addressed to their sons and heirs (see Kelso’s bibliographical list, e.g. nos. 203, 362). This is surely one of the factors attending the phenomenon that Peltonen calls “English sixteenth-century republicanism”, and it may be traced in the documents left by its chief agents. In 1592, for instance, Robert Beale, one of Walsingham’s assistants and a clerk to the Privy Council, wrote in his *Treatise on the Office of a Councillor and Principall Secretary to Her Majesty*:

Imprimis, my meaning is not to speake anie thinge of such qualities as are fit to be in one that should be a Prince’s Secretarie or Councillor. That argument hath been handled by others; and whom her M[ajestie] shall call to that place my simple Judgment must thinke sufficientlie qualified. (quoted after Read, I, 423-424)

98

These remarks will serve as a preliminary to the discussion of *The Counsellor*, the second English translation of Goslicius’ treatise, and an inquiry into the parties that could have been interested in its original creation and subsequent publication over a decade later.

There is a cogent reason to suspect that *The Counsellor*, both in its original form extant in the transcript known as the Ogden Manuscript and dated 1584, as well as in the printed version of 1598 (and subsequently re-circulated with a new title page bearing the date 1607), was a translation of Goslicius’ treatise made for the chief political administrators of Elizabeth’s state (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 139-156, especially 149-156). That reason is the significant degree of pre-censoring of the text to be translated, that is the omission of certain key passages in Goslicius’ discourse. This could only have been done by a far more sophisticated editor or translator than the student Robert Chester, working for one or several of the top political figures in the country. The subjects of the passages which were cut out of the translation relate to two publicly inadmissible issues: the first is Goslicius’ declaration of a preference for elective over hereditary monarchy, expressed in a sentence in Book One which Robert Chester had failed to notice as dangerous material and had simple-mindedly translated.

The second is a much longer section from Book Two (Robert Chester's version did not get this far, or at least is not extant), and it concerns the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, its claim to direct apostolic succession and right to play an important part in temporal affairs and the government of the secular state. Here Goslicius was again referring to developments in his home country, where the offensive of the mid-1560s launched against the Senate by the lower house of Sejm was at its keenest against the bishops, who took precedence over the secular senators. The English parliamentary debates of the early 1590s concerning the right of bishops to hold ecclesiastical courts and exercise judicial power over Puritans echoed the situation in Poland three decades earlier, when among the other reforms they were pressing for, Polish Protestant deputies to Sejm had conducted a campaign against the Catholic bishops and their jurisdiction over Non-Catholics. Goslicius' defence of the status of the Roman Catholic bishops had been an answer to their accusations (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 80-82, 86, 102-103). Remarkably, not the whole of the passage was removed in the translation: out of 50 sentences in Goslicius' original text, 29 were completely omitted from *The Counsellor*, 2 were omitted partially, and 1 paraphrased or mistranslated in both the manuscript copy and the printed edition (see the tables with a comparison of the original Latin text and its translation in L1598, with commentary, Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 141-146). On the removal of the material overtly relating to the Roman Catholic Church the sentences that were left in the translation, either fully or in part, acquired a different meaning. They could be used as a justification for an established national church and its contribution to the secular business of the state. If the dates 9th April and 23rd May 1584 at the end of Books One and Two respectively in the Ogden Manuscript are trustworthy (and we have no reason to query this, even though the date on the title page and other items in the volume is 1587), then we can say that the translation was done in the period when Presbyterian attacks against the Church of England were on the rise, and that this translation of Goslicius' treatise could have served as a staid response to the Martin Marprelate controversy which would erupt in 1588, more serene than the vitriolic, rather ribald pamphlets commissioned by Elizabeth's government in reaction to the attack and written by controversialist authors like Thomas Nashe. The dates recorded in the Ogden Manuscript fit the compilation of *The Counsellor* smoothly in with the appointment of John Whitgift to Canterbury (August 1583) and his campaign against the Puritan onslaught. Whoever edited the missing

sentences out of the passage must have been not only very well-versed in the theological controversies of the day, able to recognise Goslicius' application of arguments drawn from the official documents of the Council of Trent (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 146-147), but also familiar with the subtleties of the relationship between church and state that Elizabeth and her secular and ecclesiastical servants were interested in establishing and preserving. Incidentally, John Whitgift was another Cambridge man: Professor of Divinity as of 1563, Master of Pembroke Hall and later of Trinity, and Vice-Chancellor in 1570. He was also the Queen's chaplain and a privy counsellor. And he was the first Archbishop of Canterbury to acquire the right to exercise censorship over all materials going to print (Strype 120-129).

It is in this light that we should view the entry of *The Counsellor*, the translation of Goslicius' *De Optimo Senatore*, in the register of the Stationers' Company, on 6th March 1598:

6 Marcji [. . .] William Blackman

Entred for his copie under the handes of my Lord. The Busshop of LONDON and master man,

A book Intituled The Counsellor wherein the duty of Magistrates, the happie life of Subiectes and the Felicities of the Common Weales are Discoursed. *vi d.* (Arber III, 105)

100

Registration meant that the book had been submitted to the censorship authorities, represented by the Bishop of London and the Warden of the Stationers' Company, and had been passed as fit for publication and distribution. The published version which subsequently came out was essentially the text of the Ogden Manuscript, with a few minor editorial adjustments and most emphatically with the same omissions and departures from Goslicius' Latin original. It was registered for William Blackman, a stationer who was just beginning a career in the book trade and whose name never occurred in the documents of the Stationers' Company thereafter. On the other hand, the book's printer, Richard Bradocke (or Braddock), and Nicholas Lyng (or Ling), the stationer who took over the rights to it from Blackman and whose initials appear on the title page of copies in the re-issue of 1607, went on to hold prominent positions in their profession and both were in fact associated with the publication of Shakespearean texts (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 150-151). As I explain elsewhere, the 1598 publication must be regarded as an aftereffect of the diplomatic fracas at Elizabeth's court in the summer of 1597 involv-

ing the public speech of complaint delivered by Ambassador Paweł Działyński representing the King of Poland and the City of Gdańsk and the Queen's vitriolic impromptu reaction to it in Latin (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 151-156). *The Counsellor*, replete with the remarkable inscription *To the honour of the Polonian Empyre* on its title page and a translation of the original letter of dedication to a long-deceased Polish monarch, was part of a campaign of reconciliation launched by Elizabeth's astute ministers to repair diplomatic relations between England and Poland-Lithuania following the "unfortunate" incident.

One passage from the record of the Queen's words of vituperation is highly relevant in the context of Goslicius' reception in England prior to publication in 1598. In a spate of volatile indignation, she uttered the following ironic observation, showing that she was aware of Goslicius' book on the *Ideal Counsellor* – perhaps she had read it herself, too? – and more importantly, that she associated its political message with the Polish Ambassador who, she now felt, had grievously offended her sovereign majesty before a large assembly of her subjects:

Quod ad te attinet, tu mihi videris Libros multos perlegisse, Libros tamen Principum ne attigisse, sed prorsus ignorare quid inter Reges conveniat.

[As regards yourself, you seem to me to have read many books, but never to have come across the books of princes, and you are totally ignorant of how to behave when acting on behalf of kings before other kings.] (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 153)

101

In her spontaneous outburst of irony Elizabeth voiced her rejection of the concept of the mixed state represented by Poland-Lithuania and described in Goslicius' book. At the same time she showed how well-known the work had become at court and the extent of its reception by the English social elite. In this sense her words of indignation and recognition would be reflected by the compliment made to Goslicius in 1600 by the Polish writer and diplomat Varsevicius (Krzysztof Warszawicki), who patently wrote them on the wave of the diplomatic campaign launched by Elizabeth's ministers:

Unus ille de optimo Senatore liber tuus, quantam non modo tibi, sed et cunctae genti nostrae conciliaverit gloriam, arbitror dubitare neminem; cum sincere quidam mihi dixerit, nullius libentius, quam tuum illum librum in Anglia te[ne]ri in manibus hominum de optimo Senatore

[On receiving reliable information from someone that in England there is no other book more popular with readers but your own *De Optimo Senatore*, I think no-one will doubt how much glory *De Optimo Senatore* will bring not only you but also all of our nation . . .] (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2009: 15, 156)



## Source Materials

- Laurentii Grimalii Goslicii *DE OPTIMO SENATORE LIBRI DVO. In quibus Magistratuum officia, Ciuium uita beata, Rerumpublicarum foelicitas explicantur. Opus plane aureum, summorum Philosophorum et Legislatorum doctrina refertum, Omnibus Respu. rite administrare cupientibus, non modo utile, sed apprime necessarium. Accessit locuples rerum toto Opere memorabilium Index. CUM PRIVILEGIO. VENETIIS, Apud Iordanum Zilettum, MDLXVIII.*
- Chester, Robert. *The first booke of Lawrentius Grimalius Goslicius of the best Senator.* British Library, Ms. Add. 18613.
- The Counsellor. Wherin the Offi ces off Magistrates, The happie life of Subiects & the felicitie off common weales is discoursed: Written by L. G. Goslicius of Polonia. [4 lines erased: ?*
- Written in the . . . (?) by Laurentius Grimalius (?) Anno 1587 (dates at end of Book I and II respectively: FINIS LIBRI PRIMI APRILIS ixo Anno 1584; Finis Maij xxij Anno Dñi 1584) – Ms. Ogden 14, C.K. Ogden Library, University College Special Collections – The Ogden Manuscript.*
- The COVNSELLOR. Exactly pourtraited in two Bookes. WHEREIN THE OFFICES OF Magistrates, The happie life of Subiectes, and the felicitie of Common-weales is pleasantly and pithily discoursed. A GOLDEN WORKE, REPLENISHED with the chiefe Learning of the most excellent Philosophers and Lawgiuers, and not onely profitable, but verie necessarie for all those that be admitted to the administration of a well-guerned Common-weale. Written in Latin, By LAVRENTIVS GRIMALDVVS, and consecrated to the honour of the Polonian Empyre. Newlie translated into English. London, Imprinted by Richard Bradocke, Anno Salutis Humanae M.D.XC.VIII.*

102

## Works Cited

- Arber, E. (ed.) (1875-1877). *A transcript of the registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1620*. Vols. I-V. London and Birmingham.
- Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, T. (2007). Cross-cultural communication breakdown: a 16th-century case study. In: *Cognition in Language. Volume in Honour of Professor Elżbieta Tabakowska*. Eds. Władysław Chłopicki, Andrzej Pawelec, Agnieszka Pokojńska. Kraków: Tertium, 275–289.
- Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, T. (2009). *Goslicius' Ideal senator and his cultural impact over the centuries: Shakespearean Reflections*. Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego LXXVIII. Kraków: PAU and UJ.
- Brown, C. (ed.) (1914). *Poems by Sir John Salisbury and Robert Chester*. London: Early English Text Society.
- Chester, R. (1878). *Love's martyr, or, Rosalins complaint (1601) with its supplement, Diverse poeticall essaies on the turtle and phoenix by Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, George Chapman, John Marston . . .* Ed. Alexander Balloch Grosart. Sine loco [London]: Trübner for the New Shakspeare Society. Online: [http://phoenixand-turtle.net/loves\\_martyr.htm](http://phoenixand-turtle.net/loves_martyr.htm) (last accessed 134 October 2011).

- Harvey, G. (1593). *Pierces Supererogation, or a new prayse of the olde asse*. London: John Wolfe,
- Hughes, A. Godiva rides again – on Front Street?. <http://www.tbhs./hughes/godiva.html> Accessed 14 October 2011.
- Kelso, R. (1929). *The doctrine of the English gentleman in the sixteenth century*. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 14. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kot, S. (1919). *Rzeczpospolita Polska w literaturze politycznej zachodu*. Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza.
- Kyffin, M. (1587). *The blessednes of Brytaine, or a celebration of the Queenes holyday* . . . London: John Windet. Online in a 19th-century reprint: [http://ezproxy.villanova.edu/login?URL=http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx\\_ver=Z39.88-2003&res\\_id=xri:eebo&rft\\_val\\_fmt=&rft\\_id=xri:eebo:image:8603](http://ezproxy.villanova.edu/login?URL=http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_val_fmt=&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:8603) (last accessed 14 October 2011)
- Nashe, T. (1596). *Have with you to Saffron Walden, or, Gabriel Harvey's hunt is up*. London: Printed by John Danter, Online: <http://www.luminarium.org/renlit/nashebib.htm> (ed. Nina Green), (accessed 14 October 2011).
- Neale, J.E. (1924). Peter Wentworth. *The English Historical Review* 39 (53), 36-54; 175-205.
- Online <http://www.oxford-shakespeare.com./nashe.html> (accessed 14 October 2011).
- Peltonen, M. (1995). *Classical humanism and republicanism in English political thought, 1570–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pulman, M. B. (1971). *The Elizabethan Privy Council in the fifteen-seventies*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press.
- Read, C. (1925). *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the policy of Queen Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, T. (1583). *De Republica Anglorum*. . . . London: Printed by Henrie Midleton for Gregorie Seton. (Written 1566). Online: [http://www.constitution.org/eng/repang\\_tit.jpg](http://www.constitution.org/eng/repang_tit.jpg) (accessed 14 October 2011).
- Stern, V. F. (1972). The Bibliotheca of Gabriel Harvey. *Renaissance Quarterly* 25(1), 1-62.
- Strype, J. (1822). *The life and acts of John Whitgift, D.D.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, (4 vols.); see especially Book IV, Chapter VIII, p. 120-129 <http://www.archive.org/stream/lifeandactsjohn01strygoog#page/n140/mode/2up> - <http://www.archive.org/stream/lifeandactsjohn01strygoog#page/n148/mode/2up> (accessed 14 October 2011).
- Venn, J. & Venn, J. A. (1913). *The book of matriculations and degrees in the University of Cambridge from 1544 to 1659*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Venn, J. & Venn, J. A. (1922–1958). *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 10 vols.



**Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa** – tłumacz, emerytowany pracownik Instytutu Filologii Angielskiej Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w Krakowie (1979-2011). Naukowo zajmuje się badaniami nad renesansem, teorią przekładu (zwłaszcza zagadnieniem nieprzekładalności) oraz historią doktryn politycznych.

## Abstrakt

*Wawrzyńca Grzymały Goślickiego traktat o Senatorze Doskonałym – angielski wgląd w XVI-wieczny model ustroju Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów*

W 1919 roku historyk polskiej nauki i edukacji Stanisław Kot pisał, iż w angielskim konflikcie konstytucyjnym z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku – rozgrywającym się nie tylko na polach bitew, ale również i w wojnie na pamflety pomiędzy zwolennikami parlamentu, okrągłymi głowami a zwolennikami króla, kawalerami – strony konfliktu zwykły zwracać się do europejskich przykładów możliwych modeli ustroju państwa, za którymi się opowiadały. Według Kota Polska i kraje skandynawskie były przytaczane przez zwolenników republikańizmu jako sprawnie funkcjonujące modele ustroju monarchii elekcyjnej i ograniczonej, z kolei zwolennicy monarchii absolutnej usiłowali obalić ich argumenty i wykazać, że rozwiązania konstytucyjne stosowane w tych państwach w rzeczywistości nie różnią się wcale od formy monarchii „tradycyjnej”. XVI-wieczny traktat *De optimo senatore* autorstwa Wawrzyńca Goślickiego okazał się być specjalnym narzędziem dla pisarzy po obu stronach konfliktu. Wydane po raz pierwszy po łacinie w Wenecji w 1568 roku dzieło to musiało dotrzeć do Anglii dość wcześnie, ponieważ wiadomo nam, że zachowały się dwa tłumaczenia tego manuskryptu na język angielski – datowane są one na lata 80. XVI wieku. Jeden z nich został wydany w 1598 roku jako *The Counsellor*. Znajomość tej książki utrzymywała się w świadomości politycznej jej angielskich czytelników przynajmniej przez kolejne 60 lat; wydaje się, że odnoszono się do niej w atmosferze narastających antagonizmów politycznych. Po Restauracji Stuartów w 1660 roku traktat został opublikowany po raz kolejny, tym razem w splagiatowanej wersji, która w rezultacie przedstawia zupełnie inny obraz oryginalnych postulatów Goślickiego, nie przytaczając jego nazwiska ani źródła tekstu. Pomimo że nie oznaczało to wcale końca kariery rozprawy *O senatorze doskonałym* w kulturze politycznej krajów anglojęzycznych – Goślicki doczekał się kolejnego angielskiego przekładu w XVIII wieku, w związku z czym doświadczył swoistego życia po śmierci w Stanach Zjednoczonych w XX wieku – początkowe etapy obecności tej książki w Anglii stanowią fascynujący przedmiot badań na temat relacji kulturowych i wymiany idei republikańskich pomiędzy Anglią a Polską w XVI i XVII wieku.

## Słowa kluczowe

Wawrzyniec Goślicki, *De Optimo Senatore*, recepcja przekładu literackiego, teoria polityczna państwa o ustroju mieszanym, XVI-wieczny republikańizm w Polsce i w Anglii



**Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa** ist freie Übersetzerin und pensionierte Mitarbeiterin (1979–2011) des Instituts für Englische Philologie an der Jagiellonen Universität Krakau. Der Schwerpunkt ihrer Forschung gilt der Renaissance-Epoche, den Übersetzungstheorien, (insbesondere der Unübersetzbarkeit) und der Geschichte der politischen Ideen.

## Resümee

*Wawrzyniec Grzymała Goślickis Abhandlung De optimo senatore – ein englischer Blick auf das Verfassungsmodell der polnisch-litauischen Adelsrepublik im 16. Jahrhundert*

1919 schrieb Stanisław Kot, ein hervorragender polnischer Kulturhistoriker mit einem Faible für die Geschichte der polnischen Wissenschaft und Bildung, dass der englische konstitutionelle Konflikt zwischen Royalisten und *Roundheads* aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts nicht nur auf den Schlachtfeldern sondern auch mit dem Feder in der Publizistik ausgefochten worden war – als ein Krieg der Pamphlete, deren Autoren eine Lanze für die tragfähigen staatspolitischen Modelle in Europa brachen, in denen die Verfassung als Staatsform eingeführt worden war. Kot zufolge galten Polen und die skandinavischen Länder in den Augen der Anhänger des Republikanismus' als flagrante Beispiele für die eingeschränkte Monarchie, während die Verfechter der monarchistischen Staatsform die Argumente ihrer Gegner zu widerlegen und nachzuweisen versuchten, dass sich in jenen Ländern die verfassungsmäßige Ordnung von der „traditionellen“ Monarchie kaum unterscheidet habe. Die aus dem 16. Jahrhundert stammende Abhandlung *De Optimo Senatore* von Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius (Goślicki) wurde durch die beiden Seiten in der englischen Kontroverse gerne aufgegriffen und in der eigenen Sache in zahlreichen Publikationen zitiert. In seiner originellen lateinischen Fassung wurde sie zunächst im Jahre 1568 in Venedig veröffentlicht. Doch ziemlich rasch muss sie nach England gelangt sein, da man zwei Manuskripte, bereits auf die 1580-er Jahre datiert und ins Englische übersetzt, kennt. Eins von ihnen erschien im Jahre 1598 unter dem Titel *Der Berater*. Die dort gebündelten Ideen entfalteten auf das politische Bewusstsein seiner Leser, mindestens für die nächsten sechs Jahrzehnte, ihre Wirkung – dazu in der Atmosphäre des zunehmenden Antagonismus. Nach der Restauration im Jahre 1660 wurde das Buch in einer Plagiat-Version neu aufgelegt, welche die ursprünglichen Ideen von Goslicius, ohne Angabe seines Namens und der Herkunft des Textes, in das Gegenteil verkehrte. Dies markierte keinesfalls das Ende der einzigartigen Karriere von *De Optimo Senatore* in der politischen Kultur der englischsprachigen Länder. Das Werk wurde im 18. Jahrhundert nochmals ins Englische übersetzt, um im 20. Jahrhundert in den USA wieder seine Wiedergeburt zu feiern. Die ersten Phasen der Präsenz des Buches in England fungieren allerdings als eine faszinierende Periode für die Erforschung der englisch-polnischen kulturellen Beziehungen und der republikanischen Ideen des 16. und des 17. Jahrhunderts.

### **Schlüsselbegriffe**

Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius, *De Optimo Senatore*, Rezeption der literarischen Übersetzung, politische Staatstheorien betreffend die gemischte Staatsform (*respublica mixta*), das englische und polnische Republikanismus des 16. Jahrhunderts