

Introduction

By Jaime Goodrich with Elizabeth McCutcheon

The Other Voice

Margaret More Roper (1505–1544) has long been recognized as a notable historical figure for her exceptional learning and familial ties. She was the eldest daughter and confidante of Sir Thomas More, the sixteenth-century lawyer, humanist, educator, politician, polemicist, spiritual writer, and martyr who was canonized as a saint of the Roman Catholic Church in 1935. Margaret Roper is also the first early modern woman writer in Tudor England and the first nonroyal woman to have a book printed. By October 1, 1524, at the age of nineteen, she had completed her English translation, *Devout Treatise upon the Pater Noster*, of a commentary on the Lord's Prayer by Desiderius Erasmus (*Precatio Dominica*, 1523), which was published soon afterward and followed by later editions in 1526 and 1531. This work was facilitated by her humanist education, which was virtually unprecedented for a girl or young woman in England and continental Europe. The *Devout Treatise* demonstrated the importance of educating girls as well as boys, not only explicitly, as argued in the preface by Richard Hyrde, but also implicitly by the very fact of its publication, and it opened the way for the humanist education of later Tudor women, most notably Elizabeth I. Furthermore, while the *Devout Treatise* appeared semi-anonymously, it represents Roper's membership in what the sixteenth century thought of as a "Republic of Letters," an international group of humanist scholars and writers based in Western Europe.¹

Unfortunately, all the work she is known to have written before 1524 is lost, as is some of her later writing. Yet what remains is important in its own right. Each of her works implicitly or explicitly addresses crucial religious, political, and cultural issues that remain relevant, especially when we consider that in many countries today girls and women are barred from schools, with the inevitable consequences of a limited and sheltered life. We need only to remind readers of the well-known example of Malala Yousafzai, a Pakistani girl who was attacked and seriously wounded in 2012 by the Taliban (a group that opposes education for girls and women) while on a bus after she had taken an exam.² It is therefore

1. On women and the Republic of Letters, see Elizabeth McCutcheon, "A Young, Virtuous, and Well-Learned Gentlewoman": Margaret More Roper in the Republic of Letters," in *Companion*, 123–58; *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*, ed. Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009); Julie D. Campbell, *Literary Circles and Gender in Early Modern Europe: A Cross-Cultural Approach* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006).

2. Malala Yousafzai with Christina Lamb, *I Am Malala: The Girl Who Stood Up for Education and Was Shot by the Taliban* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 2013).

2 Introduction

hard to overestimate the impact of Roper's education, then and later. Her work also anticipates so much writing by later Englishwomen. Promoted in the early 1520s by her father, Erasmus, and other humanists as a brilliant example of the learned woman, Roper explored two major forms of literary activity—translation and letters—that later Englishwomen embraced, and her interest in religious and spiritual matters, which were always implicitly political, likewise foreshadows a major focus of later Tudor and Stuart women writers. Margaret Roper has more than earned a place in the *Other Voice* series, then, for her own achievements as a learned woman and a writer, for all that her education represented to subsequent generations, and as a forerunner of later developments by English women writers. This is the case despite the unfortunate disappearance of part of her opus as well as the long-standing tendency to represent her as the much-loved daughter of Thomas More rather than as a learned woman and writer, which has historically obscured her importance as a literary and cultural figure.

Historical Contexts

Margaret Roper was born just after the turn of the sixteenth century, into a patriarchal culture that upheld the sexist idea that women were inferior to men, both mentally and physically.³ Men and women consequently held very different societal roles. While men governed the country and their families, women remained in the domestic sphere and managed household matters. According to this patriarchal contract, husbands were supposed to protect and provide for their wives, who in return would submit to their husbands' authority. Such expectations reflected the misogynistic belief that women were naturally prone to vice, particularly lustfulness, unruliness, and talkativeness. The ideal woman was chaste, obedient, and silent, and these three virtues were understood to be interconnected so that a woman who dared to speak in public could be regarded as both unchaste and disobedient.⁴ As this overview suggests, a child's gender informed the paths his or her life could take. If Margaret had been male, that son

3. On women's roles in this period, see Merry E. Weisner-Hanks, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, 4th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019); Allyson M. Poska, Jane Couchman, and Katherine A. McIver, ed., *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013); Olwen H. Hufton, *The Prospect before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe* (London: Fontana Press, 1997); Margaret King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Joan Kelly Gadol, "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, ed. Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977), 175–201; and Ruth Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956).

4. See, for example, Patricia Pender, *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); and Suzanne Hull, *Chaste, Silent, and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475–1640* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1981).

would have likely received a university education. If he did not choose another career, he would have followed his grandfather and father into law, the family trade. He would have been the head of his own family unit after marrying, eventually receiving the bulk of More's estate in his role as the firstborn son. Alternatively, he might have renounced the world and become a monk, a path considered by More himself. The options available to Margaret were far more circumscribed, simply because of her sex. Female children could expect neither an education nor a career, and only two socially approved roles were available to them: wife or nun. Women who married were not able to own property, and they did not possess a legal identity separate from that of their husbands. Widowhood conferred more rights on women, allowing them to run household businesses and have goods of their own. While it is easy to imagine the cloister as a feminist utopia free of patriarchal authority, these institutions were still subject to the control of male church leaders. Yet as feminist scholars have found, these patriarchal societal ideals were not necessarily always put into practice, and class privilege often afforded women more agency than one might expect. Merchantwomen learned to read and write in English, and sometimes French, in order to help with the family business.⁵ Elite women were also literate in one or more languages, partly to demonstrate their status and partly to aid them as they ran estates that were more like small towns than typical single-family households.⁶ While most women were reluctant to publish original works during the sixteenth century, they made important contributions to literary culture by translating, editing, and acting as patrons for male writers.⁷ Nevertheless, the patriarchal bias of English culture necessarily shaped almost every aspect of Roper's life, from cradle to grave.

Two major historical phenomena also influenced Roper's experiences and worldview: humanism and the Reformation. As previously mentioned, Margaret Roper developed an international reputation for her groundbreaking role as one of the first Englishwomen to receive a humanist education.⁸ Humanism originated in fourteenth-century Italy, as scholars like Petrarch began to collect and study

5. For one example of a learned merchantwoman, see Anne Vaughan Lock, *Selected Poetry, Prose, and Translations, with Contextual Materials*, ed. Susan M. Felch (Toronto: Iter Press, 2021).

6. For a classic analysis of elite women's agency, see Margaret J. M. Ezell, *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).

7. Julie Crawford, *Mediatrice: Women, Politics, and Literary Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Kimberly Anne Coles, *Religion, Reform, and Women's Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

8. On women and humanism, see Holt N. Parker, "Women and Humanism: Nine Factors for the Woman Learning," *Viator* 35 (2004): 581–616; Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (London: Duckworth, 1986), 29–57.

manuscripts of texts from ancient Rome.⁹ Realizing that classical Latin differed substantially from the Latin of the medieval church, humanists called for a return *ad fontes* (“to the sources”) of the ancient world. While they initially focused on recovering classical works in Latin, the fall of the Byzantine Empire in 1453 caused an exodus of Greek scholars to Italy. These Byzantine exiles brought expertise in ancient Greek and manuscripts that helped broaden the scope of humanism to include ancient Greece. Over the next two centuries, humanism spread across Europe with the aid of the printing press, revitalizing education, literary culture, and scholarship in the process. Humanists shared a commitment to the study of classical languages and texts, and scholars such as Erasmus produced innovative editions of classical and patristic works by comparing manuscripts and seeking to eliminate errors that had crept into texts over the centuries as they were copied by scribes. Yet humanists did not recover ancient works solely for learning’s sake. They believed that the contemporary world could benefit from the knowledge of ancient Greece and Rome. Indeed, Christian humanists expected that they would surpass the accomplishments of the classical world, which in their opinion had been marred by paganism. Humanism was thus as much of an intellectual movement as a philosophy, and humanists published treatises that positioned the “new learning,” as it came to be called in England, as a source of moral and political wisdom. Yet many Englishmen were skeptical of humanism when it finally reached their country at the end of the fifteenth century. In one famous anecdote from the early sixteenth century, an English aristocrat brashly rejects humanist learning in favor of hunting: “I’d rather see my son hanged than be a student. Sons of the nobility ought to blow the horn properly, hunt like experts, and train and carry a hawk gracefully. Studies, by God, ought to be left to country boys.”¹⁰ Similarly, the introduction of Greek at Oxford proved so controversial that More, one of the leading humanists in England and Western Europe, penned a robust defense of Greek learning in 1518.¹¹ Yet the emerging Tudor bureaucracy relied on communication skills fostered by humanist study. As men of the lower and middling classes were chosen for high-profile political offices, aristocratic men too began to receive humanist educations. By the middle of the sixteenth century,

9. On humanism, see Ronald G. Witt, *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Charles G. Nauert, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*, 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Jill Kraye, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Albert Rabil, Jr., ed., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

10. Richard Pace, *De fructu qui ex doctrina percipitur: The Benefit of a Liberal Education*, ed. and trans. Frank Manley and Richard S. Sylvester (New York: Renaissance Society of America, 1967), 23.

11. Rogers, *SL*, 95–103; Rogers, *Corr.*, 111–20; “The Letter to Oxford,” *In Defense of Humanism: Letters to Dorp, Oxford, Lee and a Monk*, ed. Daniel Kinney, vol. 15, *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986), 130–49.

England could also boast a handful of women with humanist training, a trend that Margaret Roper and her sisters had the distinction of initiating.

The Reformation provides a final, and especially fateful, context for understanding Margaret Roper's life and writings. At the start of the sixteenth century, the Roman Catholic Church was the predominant institution in Western Europe.¹² The pope, its leader, possessed unrivaled spiritual authority among kings and peasants alike, and the church had developed a complex hierarchy of priests, bishops, cardinals, and other ecclesiastical officials who managed its affairs. Yet this elaborate system was also prone to abuse, most notably in the form of indulgences: monetary payments to reduce punishments suffered in the afterlife for sins committed on earth. While convents, friaries, and monasteries dotted the European landscape, these institutions had accumulated wealth that was at odds with their members' commitment to a life of chastity, poverty, and obedience. Finally, the church's Bible and liturgical services were in Latin, a language known primarily by clergymen. Unable to understand the mass, parishioners cultivated a lively devotion to the saints, drawn particularly to miracles and relics that could be manufactured by unscrupulous priests. Humanists like Erasmus and More advocated for the church to be reformed from within. In 1516, for example, Erasmus published a groundbreaking edition and Latin translation of the Greek New Testament according to humanist principles.¹³ This work prompted questions about the church's adherence to the Vulgate, a Latin translation produced in the fourth century by Jerome. Inspired by these humanist critiques, Martin Luther and other Protestants broke with Rome after deciding that true reform required drastic changes. Protestant theology and practices varied throughout Europe, but most reformers agreed that the scriptures and liturgy should be in vernacular languages, that the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Rome should be abandoned, that monastic life and the cult of saints should be abolished, and that churches should follow biblical precedents rather than Catholic tradition. While Henry VIII was initially a fierce opponent of Luther, in the 1530s he rejected the pope's religious authority and created the Church of England in order to secure the annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon and to marry Anne Boleyn, who would presumably give him the male heir he lacked. Nevertheless, Henry himself remained a traditionalist in many ways, and the Henrician Reformation maintained the Latin liturgy and an ecclesiastical hierarchy with bishops subject to an archbishop, even as the

12. For a foundational account of the late medieval church and Reformation in England, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400–c. 1580* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992).

13. On humanist approaches to the Bible, see Christine Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam: Advocate of a New Christianity* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013); and Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983).

government dissolved the monasteries, dismantled the cult of saints, and issued an English Bible.¹⁴ For Margaret Roper and her family, the cultural upheaval of the Reformation was all too personal. More refused to swear allegiance to an oath asserting that the pope held no jurisdiction in England, and his eventual execution horrified Europe and transformed More into a proto-saint and archetype of principled resistance to tyranny. More's death was the great tragedy of Roper's life, and in her final years she quietly battled the Reformation by preserving her father's relics and supporting Catholic resistance to Henrician religious policies.

Life and Works

Margaret Roper was the eldest daughter of Thomas More and his first wife, Joanna Colt, who had three more children (Elizabeth, Cecily, and John).¹⁵ After Joanna's death in 1511, More married Alice Middleton, a widow with a daughter also named Alice. Their household included a foster daughter named Margaret Giggs, who had been taken in by More as a playmate for his children, as well as a number of tutors charged with an unprecedented task: to educate all of More's children, regardless of sex, in the liberal arts according to cutting-edge humanist principles.¹⁶ This innovative home "school" demonstrates the strength of More's personal commitment to humanist education. Its students received instruction in ancient Greek and Latin, as well as astronomy, logic, mathematics, medicine, philosophy, rhetoric, and theology. The curriculum foregrounded reading and writing, with a special emphasis on translation. Margaret and her companions read widely, sampling church fathers such as Augustine and Jerome, classical authors such as Livy and Sallust, and contemporary humanists such as Erasmus and Juan Luis Vives. Not only did More's children compose letters, orations, poetry, and treatises in Latin, but they also frequently translated works to and from Latin. More himself encouraged his children to send him daily letters, advising them, "It will do no harm if you first write the whole in English, for then you will have much less trouble and labor in turning it into Latin."¹⁷ The members of the

14. On Henry's idiosyncratic attitudes toward reform, see D. G. Newcombe, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

15. On her life, see Eugenio Olivares Merino, "Britanniae Decus: Life Records and Writings of Margaret More Roper," in *Companion*, 3–50; John Guy, *A Daughter's Love: Thomas More and His Dearest Meg* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2009); E. E. Reynolds, *Margaret Roper: Eldest Daughter of St. Thomas More* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1960).

16. On this school, see Sarah Gwyneth Ross, *The Birth of Feminism: Woman as Intellect in Renaissance Italy and England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 69–76; and Elizabeth McCutcheon, "The Education of Thomas More's Daughters: Concepts and Praxis," in *East Meets West: Homage to Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr.*, ed. Roger L. Hadlich and J. D. Ellsworth (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1988), 193–207.

17. Rogers, *SL*, 151; Rogers, *Corr.*, 256.

“school” also practiced their skills in English and Latin composition by translating other texts, such as More’s previously mentioned letter defending Greek instruction at Oxford, from Latin into English and vice versa.¹⁸ Morean pedagogy thus relied heavily on the humanist practice of double translation, which would be illustrated most famously in Roger Ascham’s *The Schoolmaster* (1570). Margaret was acknowledged by her father and other contemporaries as the star pupil in this “school,” and her outstanding facility with Latin is evident in her correction of a long-standing textual crux in a letter written by Novatian to St. Cyprian.¹⁹ Even after her marriage to William Roper in 1521, Margaret continued to participate in More’s “school,” likely contributing to the education of its younger members. Hans Holbein memorialized this learned family in a painting that dated from 1529. While the original was later lost in a fire, copies survive as well as Holbein’s original sketch (Figure 1), which shows Margaret in the foreground with an open book on her lap.



Figure 1. Hans Holbein the Younger (1497/98–1543), *Draft for the Family Portrait of Thomas More*, 1527. Kupferstichkabinett, Amerbach-Kabinett 1662, Kunstmuseum Basel, Switzerland. Sammlung Online, <https://sammlungonline.kunstmuseumbasel.ch/eMP/eMuseumPlus>, accessed May 15, 2023.

18. Stapleton, 92.

19. Eugenio Olivares Merino, “Margaret More Roper’s Emendation of a Letter to St. Cyprian and Its Textual Afterlife,” in *Companion*, 253–77.

The larger goal of this curriculum was to inculcate Christian piety and morality through humanist study. More himself commented in a letter to William Gonnell, one of the school's tutors:

Since erudition in women is a new thing and a reproach to the sloth of men, many will gladly assail it. . . . On the other hand, if a woman (and this I desire and hope with you as their teacher for all my daughters) to eminent virtue of mind should add even moderate skill in learning, I think she will gain more real good than if she obtain the riches of Croesus and the beauty of Helen. Not because that learning will be a glory to her, though learning will accompany virtue as a shadow does a body, but because the reward of wisdom is too solid to be lost with riches or to perish with beauty, since it depends on the inner knowledge of what is right, not on the talk of men, than which nothing is more foolish and mischievous.²⁰

In a time when women were expected to adhere to feminine stereotypes that upheld patriarchal society, the idea of educating women was “a new thing” indeed. By linking female learning with virtue, More attempted to forestall potential criticism of his innovation. More consequently notes with approval Gonnell's assessment that “Margaret's lofty and exalted character of mind should not be debased,” and he concludes by urging Gonnell to remind his daughters frequently “that vainglory is despicable, and to be spit upon, and that there is nothing more sublime than that humble modesty so often praised by Christ.”²¹ As Elizabeth McCutcheon observes elsewhere, such insistence on humility may appear to contradict More's advocacy for women's learning.²² However, More and others in his circle viewed female learning as useful for women's roles as wives and mothers. In a letter defending More's “school,” Erasmus contended that a “woman must have intelligence if she is to keep her household up to its duties, to form and mould her children's characters, and meet her husband's needs in every way.”²³ Similarly, Richard Hyrde, a tutor at the school, comments in his dedicatory preface to Roper's translation of Erasmus that humanist learning had enabled her to become a good wife: “With her virtuous, worshipful, wise, and well learned husband, she hath, by the occasion of her learning and his delight therein, such especial comfort, pleasure, and pastime, as were not well possible for one unlearned couple either to take together or to conceive in

20. Rogers, *SL*, 103–4; Rogers, *Corr.*, 121.

21. Rogers, *SL*, 106; Rogers, *Corr.*, 123.

22. McCutcheon, “A Young, Virtuous, and Well-Learned Gentlewoman,” 127.

23. Desiderius Erasmus, *Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 1122 to 1251 (1520 to 1521)*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors, annotat. Peter G. Bietenholz, vol. 8, *Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 298.

their minds what pleasure is therein.”²⁴ From a modern perspective, this emphasis on traditional gender roles may fall disappointingly short of the feminist principle of gender equity. Yet More’s educational program was truly radical in an era when few women were taught to read and write in English, let alone in foreign languages. Indeed, the Morean “school” anticipated the humanist educations of Tudor princesses and other elite women by at least a decade.

Despite More’s praise of his eldest daughter’s modesty, he and his circle soon began to publicize her accomplishments within the humanist Republic of Letters, working in active collaboration with Margaret herself to develop her international reputation as a learned woman.²⁵ It hardly seems coincidental that this publicity campaign began as Margaret More entered adulthood and prepared to marry William Roper on July 2, 1521. More himself ensured that her facility with Latin was known in courtly circles. In early 1521, he reported to his daughter that he had received one of her letters in the presence of Reginald Pole, who “thought your letter nothing short of marvelous. . . . I could scarce make him believe that you had not been helped by a teacher until he learned truly that there was no teacher at our house.”²⁶ A year later, More wrote in a similar vein to convey the astonishment and praise of John Veysey, bishop of Exeter upon encountering her Latin compositions. This account is worth citing in full, particularly since some key elements of the incident are obscured by the standard translation:

It chanced this evening that I sat with Reverend Father John, Bishop of Exeter, a man acknowledged by all as both most learned and most honest. During our conversation, as it happened, when I drew from my pocket a certain paper that was relevant to the subject, by chance I pulled out your letter. Delighted by the hand, he began to examine it; when he discovered from the salutation that it was a woman’s, he began to read more eagerly. Thus, novelty enticed him. But when he had read it and learned that it was your very own hand (which he would not have believed without my corroboration), he extremely admired such a letter, to say no more—yet why should I not say what he said?—so Latinate, so faultless, so erudite, so full of sweet affection. When I perceived this, I brought forth your declamation. Truly, while he read that and your poems at the same time, he was so moved by such an unexpected occurrence that his very face, which did not

24. See *A Devout Treatise*, 43.

25. On Roper’s agency in this publicity campaign, see McCutcheon, “A Young, Virtuous, and Well-Learned Gentlewoman,”; Mary Ellen Lamb, “Margaret Roper, the Humanist Political Project, and the Problem of Agency,” in *Opening the Borders: Inclusivity in Early Modern Studies: Essays in Honor of James V. Mirollo*, ed. Peter C. Herman (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), 83–108.

26. Rogers, *SL*, 154; Rogers, *Corr.*, 301–2.

dissemble in the least, readily made it plain that his opinion by far surpassed his words, although they were lavish in your praise.²⁷

Several points in this account deserve further consideration. First, More appears to overemphasize the role of chance (*contigit*, “it chanced”; *casu*, “by chance”). Considering that More had on his person not only one of his daughter’s letters but also her declamation and poetry, it seems likely that he was fully prepared to share her writings with other elite English humanists. Second, it is the letter’s handwriting that first catches Veysey’s attention, which attests to Roper’s proficiency in the italic hand associated with humanist education. Further evidence of her skillful hand can be seen in Roper’s holograph letter to Erasmus written in 1529 (Figure 2). While Veysey naturally assumed that the writer was male, the salutation’s identification of Margaret Roper as the author further piques his interest. Veysey then praises the letter on multiple grounds: its Latin style, its flawless grammar, and its learning, all of which express affectionate filial sentiments in keeping with patriarchal expectations. Roper’s declamation and poetry are advanced compositions that irrefutably illustrate her humanist credentials. While Veysey may first regard Roper’s letter as a “novelty,” his astonishment at her accomplishments ultimately exceeds his ability to convey it in words. Third, More emphasizes Veysey’s sincerity and honesty several times, thereby assuring the veracity of this account for his daughter and any other potential readers. Given the public nature of early modern letter-writing, it seems possible that Margaret Roper shared her father’s letter with others, as she would later do after receiving an epistle from Erasmus (see Letter 2).²⁸ More’s efforts to publicize his innovative “school” peaked when his daughters engaged in a philosophical disputation before Henry VIII sometime around 1525.²⁹

27. “Sedere mihi contigit hoc vespere cum R. P. Joanne, Episcopo Exoniae, viro et litteratissimo et omnium confessione integerrimo; quum inter confabulandum, ut fit, schedulam quandam quae faciebat ad rem e loculo meo depromerem, epistolam tuam extraxi casu. Delectatus manu coepit inspicere; ubi ex salutatione deprehendit esse mulieris, legere coepit avidius. Sic eum invitabat novitas. Sed quum legisset et (quod nisi me affirmante non erat crediturus) tuam ipsius manum esse didicisset, epistolam, ut nihil dicam, amplius talem—quanquam cur non dicam quod dixit ille?—tam Latinam, tam emendatam, tam eruditam, tam dulcibus refertam affectibus, vehementer admiratus est. Id quum sentirem, protuli declamationem. Eam vero legens et simul carmina, re tam insperata sic affectus, ut ipse vultus hominis minime fucati facile planum faceret, animum eius verba, quanquam in tuas laudes effusa, longe superare”: Rogers, *Corr.*, 257, Goodrich’s translation. For the standard translation by P. E. Hallett, see Rogers, *SL*, 152.

28. *Cultures of Correspondence in Early Modern Britain*, ed. James Daybell and Andrew Gordon (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); James Daybell, *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); *Early Modern Women’s Letter Writing, 1450–1700*, ed. James Daybell (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave, 2001).

29. Rogers, *Corr.*, 405. On the dating, see Reynolds, *Margaret Roper*, 49, and Guy, *Daughter’s Love*, 155–57.