



Shakespeare and the Classics

Edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE

www.cambridge.org/9780521823456

This page intentionally left blank

SHAKESPEARE AND THE CLASSICS

Shakespeare and the Classics demonstrates that the classics are of central importance in Shakespeare's plays and in the structure of his imagination. Written by an international team of Shakespeareans and classicists, this book investigates Shakespeare's classicism and shows how he used a variety of classical books to explore such crucial areas of human experience as love, politics, ethics, and history. The book focuses on Shakespeare's favourite classical authors, especially Ovid, Virgil, Seneca, Plautus and Terence, and, in translation only, Plutarch. Attention is also paid to the humanist background and to Shakespeare's knowledge of Greek literature and culture. The final section, from the perspective of reception, examines how Shakespeare's classicism was seen and used by later writers. This accessible book offers the most rounded and comprehensive treatment of Shakespeare's classicism currently available and will be a useful first port of call for students and others approaching the subject.

CHARLES MARTINDALE is Professor of Latin at the Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Bristol. He is the author of *John Milton and the Transformation of Ancient Epic* (London and Sydney 1986), *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge 1993), *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity* (with Michelle Martindale, London and New York 1990) and editor of *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge 1988) and *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge 1997).

A. B. TAYLOR is Retired Dean of Faculty (Humanities), The Swansea Institute. He is the editor of *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge 2000) and has published in *Shakespeare Survey*, *Notes and Queries*, *Connotations*, *English Language Notes*, and *Review of English Studies*.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE CLASSICS

EDITED BY

CHARLES MARTINDALE AND A. B. TAYLOR



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521823456

© Cambridge University Press 2004

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2004

ISBN-13 978-0-511-21104-1 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-10 0-511-20746-8 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-82345-6 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-82345-5 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

to
Jeannette, Mark, Chris, and Sue Taylor
to
Gabriel and Benjamin Martindale

Contents

<i>Notes on contributors</i>	page x
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiii
Introduction	I
PART I AN INITIAL PERSPECTIVE	
1 Shakespeare and humanistic culture <i>Colin Burrow</i>	9
PART II 'SMALL LATINE'	
OVID	
2 Petruchio is 'Kated': <i>The Taming of the Shrew</i> and Ovid <i>Vanda Zajko</i>	33
3 Ovid's myths and the unsmooth course of love in <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i> <i>A. B. Taylor</i>	49
4 Shakespeare's learned heroines in Ovid's schoolroom <i>Heather James</i>	66
VIRGIL	
5 Shakespeare and Virgil <i>Charles Martindale</i>	89
PLAUTUS AND TERENCE	
6 Shakespeare's reception of Plautus reconsidered <i>Wolfgang Riehle</i>	109

- 7 Shakespeare, Plautus, and the discovery of New Comic space 122
Raphael Lyne

SENECA

- 8 'Confusion now hath made his masterpiece': Senecan resonances in *Macbeth* 141
Yves Peyré
- 9 'These are the only men': Seneca and monopoly in *Hamlet* 2.2 156
Erica Sheen

PART III 'LESSE GREEK'

PLUTARCH

- 10 'Character' in Plutarch and Shakespeare: Brutus, Julius Caesar, and Mark Antony 173
John Roe
- 11 Plutarch, Shakespeare, and the alpha males 188
Gordon Braden

GENERAL

- 12 Action at a Distance: Shakespeare and the Greeks 209
A. D. Nuttall

GREEK ROMANCES

- 13 Shakespeare and Greek romance: 'Like an old tale still' 225
Stuart Gillespie

GREEK TRAGEDY

- 14 Shakespeare and Greek tragedy: strange relationship 241
Michael Silk

PART IV THE RECEPTION OF SHAKESPEARE'S CLASSICISM

- 15 'The English Homer': Shakespeare, Longinus, and English 'neo-classicism' 261
David Hopkins

16	‘There is no end but addition’: the later reception of Shakespeare’s classicism <i>Sarah Annes Brown</i>	277
	<i>Select bibliography</i> (compiled by Joanna Paul)	294
	<i>Index</i>	311

Notes on contributors

GORDON BRADEN is Linden Kent Memorial Professor of English at the University of Virginia. He is author of *The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry: Three Case Studies* (New Haven 1978), *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition* (New Haven 1985), *Petrarchan Love and the Continental Renaissance* (New Haven 2000), and, with William Kerrigan, *The Idea of the Renaissance* (Baltimore 1989).

SARAH ANNES BROWN is a Fellow of Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge. She has written *The Metamorphosis of Ovid: Chaucer to Ted Hughes* (London 1999) and *Devoted Sisters: Representations of the Sister Relationship in Nineteenth-Century British and American Literature* (Burlington, VT 2003), and is co-editor (with Charles Martindale) of Rowe's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* (London 1997). She has published several articles on influence and allusion and is currently working on the creative reception of *The Tempest*.

COLIN BURROW is Reader in Renaissance and Comparative Literature at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Gonville and Caius College. He is the author of *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford 1993), *Edmund Spenser* (Plymouth 1996), and is the editor of Shakespeare's *Complete Sonnets and Poems* (Oxford 2002).

STUART GILLESPIE is Reader in English Literature at Glasgow University. He is the editor of the journal *Translation and Literature*, author of *Shakespeare's Books: A Dictionary of Shakespeare Sources* (London 2001), and joint general editor of the forthcoming *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*.

DAVID HOPKINS is Professor of English Literature at the University of Bristol. He is the author of *John Dryden* (Cambridge 1986), *John Dryden (Writers and their Work)* (Plymouth 2003); with Charles Martindale, editor of *Horace Made New* (Cambridge 1993), and with Paul Hammond,

editor of *Dryden's Poems* (forthcoming). He has a particular interest in English / Classical literary relations, and is currently co-editing volume 3 (1660–1790) of the forthcoming *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*.

HEATHER JAMES is Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of Southern California. Her publications include *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge 1997), and numerous essays on Shakespeare as well as George Sandys, John Milton, Baldassare Castiglione, and Marguerite de Navarre. Her current work focuses on Ovid's influence on poetic form and political thought in the Renaissance. She is co-editor of the *Norton Anthology of World Literature*.

RAPHAEL LYNE is a Lecturer in the Cambridge University Faculty of English, and a Fellow of New Hall. He is the author of *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English Metamorphoses* (Oxford 1998). He has a particular interest in classical traditions and has published articles on Shakespeare, Marlowe, Donne, Drayton and Golding.

CHARLES MARTINDALE, Professor of Latin at the University of Bristol, has a special interest in the reception of the classics in English poetry. He is author of *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge 1993); with Michelle Martindale, of *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity* (London and New York 1990); and editor of *Ovid Renewed* (Cambridge 1988) and *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge 1997). He is currently writing a book on Latin poetry and the Kantian tradition in aesthetics.

A. D. NUTTALL FBA is Professor of English, New College, Oxford; his works include *A New Mimesis* (London 1983), *Why Does Tragedy Give Pleasure?* (Oxford 1996), and *The Alternative Trinity: Gnostic Heresy in Marlowe, Milton, and Blake* (Oxford 1998). He is interested in relations between philosophy and literature and in links between classical and English literature.

YVES PEYRÉ is Professor of English at Université Paul Valéry (Montpellier) and general editor of *Cahiers Elisabéthains*. He is author of *La voix des mythes dans la tragédie élisabéthaine* (Paris 1996), and a contributor to *Shakespeare in the Twentieth Century*, ed. J. Levenson, J. Bate, and Dieter Mehl (Delaware 1999), and *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems*, ed. A. B. Taylor (Cambridge 2000).

WOLFGANG RIEHLE is Professor of English at the Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz and a member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. His books include *The Middle English Mystics* (transl. B. Standring) (London and Boston 1981), *Shakespeare, Plautus, and the Humanist Tradition* (Woodbridge 1990), and in German, a biography of Geoffrey Chaucer (Reinbek 1994), a study of Shakespeare's dramatic art in his trilogy *King Henry VI* (Heidelberg 1997), and a biography of Daniel Defoe (Reinbek 2002).

JOHN ROE is Senior Lecturer in English and Related Literature, University of York. He is editor of *Shakespeare: The Poems* (Cambridge 1992), and author of *Shakespeare and Machiavelli* (Woodbridge, Suffolk 2002).

ERICA SHEEN is Lecturer in English Literature and Film at the University of Sheffield. She has published on Shakespeare, David Lynch, and Hollywood cinema.

MICHAEL SILK is Professor of Greek Language and Literature at King's College London; his works include *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (Cambridge 1974), *Nietzsche on Tragedy* (with J. P. Stern, Cambridge 1981, rev. edn 1983), *Homer: The Iliad* (Cambridge 1987, 2nd edn 2003), *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (ed., Oxford 1996, rev. edn 1998), *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy* (Oxford 2000, rev. edn 2002).

A. B. TAYLOR, formerly Dean of Humanities at The Swansea Institute, edited *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge 2000), and is currently working on *The Wound of Love in a World of Shadows: A Study of 'A Midsummer Night's Dream'*.

VANDA ZAJKO is Lecturer in Classics at the University of Bristol. She has wide-ranging interests in the reception of classical literature, and contributed a chapter to *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (2004).

Abbreviations

<i>ELH</i>	<i>English Literary History</i>
<i>ELR</i>	<i>English Literary Renaissance</i>
<i>HLQ</i>	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
<i>JEGP</i>	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
<i>MLN</i>	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
<i>MLQ</i>	<i>Modern Language Quarterly</i>
<i>MLR</i>	<i>Modern Language Review</i>
<i>N&Q</i>	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
n.s.	new series
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
<i>PMLA</i>	<i>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</i>
<i>PQ</i>	<i>Philological Quarterly</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Renaissance Quarterly</i>
<i>ShQ</i>	<i>Shakespeare Quarterly</i>
<i>ShS</i>	<i>Shakespeare Survey</i>
<i>ShSt</i>	<i>Shakespeare Studies</i>
<i>SEL</i>	<i>Studies in English Literature</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
<i>TLS</i>	<i>Times Literary Supplement</i>

Introduction

In his own terms, Ben Jonson was right to remark on his friend's 'small Latine & lesse Greek', for to his eyes a grammar-school education, which may have been incomplete, had clearly left Shakespeare an ill-equipped classicist. If Shakespeare considered it necessary, he could read Latin texts: writing *The Rape of Lucrece* for the Earl of Southampton, he apparently studied the relevant section of Ovid's *Fasti* and also consulted the Latin notes by Paul Marsus in the standard edition; and for *The Comedy of Errors*, for a highly literate audience at the Inns of Court, he seems to have made extensive direct use of Plautus' *Menaechmi*, still untranslated at the time. But it is no coincidence that he could have studied both these works in school. In terms of the authors he used, Shakespeare seldom moved beyond the grammar-school ambit, and even within that ambit, perhaps partly because reading Latin texts clearly involved some effort, he habitually had recourse to available translations. For example, for his favourite Latin work, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, parts of which he demonstrably knew well in the original, he also constantly used Arthur Golding's translation, as well as occasionally dipping into other partial versions such as that provided by Abraham Fraunce in *Amintas Dale*. There is no evidence that his 'lesse Greek' (whatever quite that may mean) enabled any approach to texts in that language; the only Greek author he used heavily, Plutarch, paradoxically for his Roman plays, was accessed via an English translation of a French translation of the Greek text.

Yet ill-equipped as Shakespeare might have seemed to Jonson, if his interests were taken by Roman history or mythology or classical tragedy, he read omnivorously and blended what he had absorbed into his work with awesome power and subtlety. Hybrid though his sources were, if one wants to see, transmuted into English, Ovid's depiction of the swift and silent movement of time, or the magic of the myths of the *Metamorphoses*, or Seneca's defiant, tragic individuality, or Plutarch's study of the array of contradictory tensions within men's characters, not only caught but

made into something miraculously new, it is to Shakespeare that one must turn. Along with particular features, the general ambience of the Graeco-Roman heritage which inspired the humanists of the Renaissance has been effortlessly absorbed and was explored in Shakespeare's work as never before.

Knowledge of the ancients which the humanists called the *studia humanitatis* informs his work throughout. In *Hamlet* it shapes the values of the 'sweet prince' who is taken from a philosophical and cultured dream of study of all that man might be, to be embroiled in a shuddering confrontation with the sordid reality of what is ugly in human nature. In *The Tempest*, that other embodiment of the humanist dream, the magus Prospero, controlling life on his own private island, finally has to put away his magic to renew his embrace of imperfect humanity, some of which is unrepentant and unshaken in its commitment to evil.

In the view of many scholars the classics were no more useful to Shakespeare than any other literature. This book is predicated on the obverse principle: that the classics are of central importance in Shakespeare's works and in the structure of his imagination. This was the result of the prestige of antiquity, the influence of Renaissance humanism and the character of the educational curriculum (not to mention the quality of the classical texts in their rich medieval and Renaissance receptions). Most time at grammar school was spent reading and writing Latin; if Shakespeare was not a learned man, he had still read a very great deal of Latin by today's standards. Investigating Shakespeare's classicism is thus not simply a matter of locating 'sources' (something already well done by T. W. Baldwin and others) but of showing how he was enabled by a variety of classical books to explore such crucial areas of human experience as love, politics, ethics, and history.

Our volume, while not attempting to provide any kind of survey, is designed as an early port of call for anyone interested in Shakespeare and the classics, including students and their teachers. There is no single book which currently performs this job in an entirely satisfactory way. Although there have been some fine studies of individual aspects of Shakespeare's use of the classics (for example, Jonathan Bate's *Shakespeare and Ovid*), the only attempt to present a rather more comprehensive account in recent years has been *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity* by Charles and Michelle Martindale (London and New York 1990). Before that one has to go back to J. A. K. Thomson's rather jejune *Shakespeare and the Classics* in the 1950s. In contrast to the Martindales who opted for a more topic-centred approach, this volume concentrates on individual classical authors and the ways the great poet and dramatist knew and made use of them. Some of

these he first met in school, Ovid, Virgil, Plautus, possibly Seneca; others like Plutarch (who, along with Lucian, was an author much more admired and widely read in the Renaissance than later) he devoured later as material for the playhouse. Contributors were asked not merely to introduce their subjects but to engage the reader with sophisticated and novel treatments, while not taking previous knowledge for granted.

This volume uses the talents of classical and Shakespearean scholars (some established, some younger and emergent) from the UK, the USA, and Europe. Inevitably it lacks the individually focused vision that a single author could have brought to the task. But multi-authorship has compensating and great advantages. It enables the reader to experience a range of approaches, from New Historicism (Sheen), varieties of feminism (James, Zajko), the poetics of space (Lyne), reception theory (Brown) to more traditional humanistic approaches. No effort has been made to impose an artificial orthodoxy, and the differences of view should spur the reader to further reflection. Thus the book includes numerous exemplary readings of particular instances of intertextuality, reflecting this or that theoretical approach, in such a way that the reader should be encouraged to explore other instances with a different play, or ancient author, or theme.

We begin with an introductory chapter which provides an initial perspective on Shakespeare's classical knowledge, and in which Colin Burrow examines Shakespeare's humanistic culture and suggests that the dynamic in his work derives from a response to its problems and inconsistencies. There follows a series of studies of Shakespeare's use of favourite classical authors and genres. In a book of this kind any organisation will necessarily emphasise some aspects of the subject at the expense of others, and thus have disadvantages as well as advantages. Concentrating on authors has obvious convenience for both reader and contributor, but it must of course always be remembered that often Shakespeare drew on a range of classical writings in combination (Virgil and Ovid in particular are constantly entwined). The structure also embodies a particular ideological belief: an unfoucauldian commitment to the importance of individual authorship and the notion of 'genius' which often accompanies it.¹ Since Latin was of far more moment to Shakespeare than Greek, we start with Roman authors in their approximate order of importance for Shakespeare, Ovid incontestably first, then Virgil and the dramatists. Although after he left school Shakespeare may not have read many words of Greek, Greece and Greek literature have left their mark on his plays, through translations (into Latin and English), through imitations in the vernaculars, and through intermediaries like Erasmus. Comparatively little work has been done on Shakespeare's Greek, so the

chapters on Plutarch, the romances, and Greek drama will help to fill out the picture of Shakespeare's classicism currently available.

Michael Silk's essay on Shakespeare and Greek tragedy (often compared, though Shakespeare had probably had no direct encounter even with Euripides, the best known of the dramatists at the time) leads smoothly to the two chapters which deal, by way of conclusion and in necessarily synecdochal fashion, with the reception of Shakespeare's classicism, and explore some important moments in this vital ongoing process. In this way we highlight the issue of Shakespeare's classicism within the wider perspective of reception. This is an integral part of the project as we have conceived it. We want readers to be aware of the limitations of the positivism which (despite frequent protestations to the contrary) still holds sway in source studies, since we believe that the processes of interpretation and reception are always implicated in each other in a form of continuing dialogue. For example, Shakespeare used Plutarch among other ancient writers in constructing his view of Rome; that view in turn nourished subsequent literature, criticism, and culture in a way that affected later responses to Shakespeare's Rome, including ours. Thus the relationship between Shakespeare and the classics, it could be said, has been created as much as simply discovered by later writers. Part of the book's function is to get away from the idea that the dramatist's classicism is primarily a matter of sources, references, allusions. Rather, as the final essay shows, there is a far deeper interrelationship between 'Shakespeare' and 'Antiquity' (where 'Shakespeare' means 'all the forces that created the plays and their reception'). Though this chapter concludes the volume, it does not seek to impose closure: the relationship between Shakespeare and the classics has not yet run its course.

Documentation and full bibliographical details will be found in the notes to individual chapters. The bibliography is not a bibliography to the book, but a select bibliography to the subject of Shakespeare's classicism, organised for maximum utility to likely users. Although it offers a more rounded treatment of the subject than is available elsewhere, this book obviously cannot claim to be comprehensive; the bibliography gives material on authors known to Shakespeare but not treated here (including Apuleius, Cicero, Horace, Livy). The editors would like to thank: Jo Paul for compiling this bibliography; Sarah Stanton, their understanding editor at CUP; the three readers chosen by CUP to referee the original project for numerous invaluable suggestions; Stuart Gillespie who helped with the bibliography; Colin Burrow, Mark Llewellyn, and Liz Prettejohn; as well as the individual contributors.

Finally, we would also like to dedicate this book to the memory of Thomas M. Greene (17 May 1926 – 23 June 2003), distinguished author of *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. Thomas Greene was originally to have been a contributor but his untimely final illness supervened.

C. A. M., A. B. T.
September 2003

NOTE

1. See Jonathan Bate, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (London and Basingstoke 1997).

PART I

AN INITIAL PERSPECTIVE

*Shakespeare and humanistic culture**Colin Burrow*

No one knows exactly how and when Shakespeare read ‘the classics’, or even what he might have thought they were. Indeed it may be slightly misleading to talk about ‘the classics’ in relation to Shakespeare at all. The word is not recorded before the eighteenth century in the sense ‘A writer, or a literary work, of the first rank and of acknowledged excellence; esp. (as originally used) in Greek or Latin’ (*OED* B.1), and Shakespeare does not use any form of the word ‘classic’ or ‘classical’ at any point in his career. It’s highly unlikely that he had a rigid or restricted sense of a fixed canon of texts which he regarded as the ultimate literary authorities. There was for him much weaker an imaginary boundary than there is now between the Augustan ‘classics’ – Virgil, Horace, and Ovid – and a larger sphere of reading which encompassed, probably in a hodge-podge of languages and surrounded by a variety of levels of commentary, Plutarch, Greek prose romance, a sprinkling of Lucan, the distiches of Cato, a dash of Homer, and perhaps some of Philostratus’ *Imagines*, some of Aphthonius’ dialogues, a little Livy, some Cicero, a bit of Quintilian, all of which would be tumbled together with quotations from classical authors which were used to illustrate grammatical points in Lily’s Grammar or in Erasmus’ educational works. Shakespeare read, remembered, misremembered and hybridised the works which we call ‘the classics’.¹

He did this in ways which are distinctive to him, but which also reflect recognisably Tudor humanist methods of reading. These were in all probability drummed into him at school from about the age of seven, and several more or less successful attempts have been made to peer into the satchel of the young Shakespeare as, like the young Lucius in *Titus Andronicus* 4.1, he set off to school with a copy of Ovid tucked under his arm. T. W. Baldwin, in his massive survey of grammar-school curricula *William Shakespere’s Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, argued that Shakespeare read more Latin at school than most classics undergraduates do at university today, and that ‘William Shakespere was trained in the heroic age of grammar school

rhetoric in England, and he shows knowledge of the complete system, in its most heroic proportions.² Baldwin's view of Shakespeare as by modern standards a learned author took a while to take root, but is now effectively an orthodoxy.³ The line from Ben Jonson's elegy on Shakespeare which gave Baldwin his title ('And, though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek') was read as a direct criticism of Shakespeare's ignorance of the classics by later seventeenth-century readers, and was often taken to support a view that Shakespeare studied nature rather than books by most critics before the twentieth century. Commentators since Baldwin, however, have tended to gloss Jonson's remark as a counterfactual speculation rather than a direct attack on Shakespeare's ignorance: "Even if you had little scholarship" – which was not the case – "I would not seek to honour you by comparing you with classical poets".⁴ This may well be to overstate Jonson's generosity of spirit, just as Baldwin may have overstated Shakespeare's learning. But in the late 1970s Emrys Jones and Joel Altman argued not just that Shakespeare read a lot of Latin and perhaps some Greek, but that central aspects of his habits of thought derived from the Latinate rhetorical training which he received at school.⁵ Pupils in the higher forms of Elizabethan grammar schools would have learnt to argue, in Latin, on either side of the question, and to compose orations in the persona of historical characters. Both Jones and (less explicitly) Altman argued that without this training Shakespeare could not have staged debates on either side of a question between Cassius and Brutus, or between Brutus and his conscience. The long-term result of this work has been a high measure of consensus that there was effectively a straightforwardly supportive relationship between Shakespeare's works and his classical education at school.

More recent studies of humanistic forms of education, however, have tended to argue that it was not as spiritually liberating or as effective as it set out to be. For Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine the predominantly rhetorical and 'literary' educational system deriving from Erasmus, which filtered throughout England as grammar school after grammar school emulated the Erasmian statutes and ideals of St Paul's School, was far less suited to the practical needs of its pupils than the forms of logical instruction which it replaced.⁶ They emphasise the practical failings of the system: even pupils such as the young Edward VI, who is frequently presented as the greatest product of Erasmian forms of education, had an imperfect grasp on the finer points of Latin grammar. The emphasis in the humanist classroom on rote learning, on the authority of a master, and on the authority of Latin texts, they suggest, helped to fashion docile servants of absolutist regimes. This is certainly debatable: there is strong evidence

to suggest that there was in fact a delicate balance between magisterial authority and freedom in the Tudor classroom.⁷ Erasmus encouraged his students to argue whether democracy was preferable to monarchy, and to compose orations condemning the tyranny of Julius Caesar.⁸ Pupils who had learned to conduct such debates might not be expected to be simple slaves to monarchs.

This chapter will suggest that Shakespeare's grammar-school education did not feed simply and beneficially into his poems and plays. But it will not argue that we should adopt the iconoclasm of Grafton and Jardine, and assume that Shakespeare's grasp on Latin literature was slight. Rather there were a number of failings, both practical and theoretical, in how Shakespeare was trained to read the classics in his early years, and, oddly enough, those failings were part of what made his later responses to his reading so powerful. Emrys Jones is correct to say that 'Without humanism . . . there could have been no Elizabethan literature: without Erasmus, no Shakespeare';⁹ but this chapter will suggest that the quirks of and failings within humanist methods of responding to the classics mattered for Shakespeare as much as, or perhaps more than, their successes.

First things first. What did Shakespeare read at the King's Free Grammar School at Stratford? The statutes and records of this tiny school, refounded by the humanist prodigy Edward VI in 1553 and crammed into an upstairs room in the Guildhall in Stratford, do not survive.¹⁰ As a result we do not have certain proof that Shakespeare attended it at all. If he did attend it, he would have done so from about 1571.¹¹ Our knowledge of what he may have read at school depends entirely on inference from what we know about other schools, and often the surviving evidence about these consists of statements of principles and ideals (*curricula* and *timetables*) rather than detailed descriptions of what actually happened in practice. Stratford's single master, who was reasonably paid at £20 per annum and was usually a graduate, probably aspired to follow something similar to the educational regime laid out in the statutes and *curricula* of St Paul's School in London. St Paul's had been founded by Dean Colet in 1509,¹² and for its foundation Colet had solicited from Erasmus the *De Ratione Studii* ('Concerning the Method of Study'), which was supplemented by what was to become one of the most influential books in the sixteenth century: the *De Duplici Copia Verborum atque Rerum* ('Concerning the Double Abundance of Words and Matter'). The *De Copia*, a handbook describing how to achieve a rich and eloquent style, went through 150 editions before 1572.¹³ Colet's statutes were designed to produce pupils skilled in Latin and

Greek, who would go on to thrive in the formal disputations required of students at the universities, and eventually perhaps to act as secretaries to noblemen or even as counsellors to monarchs. Colet insisted that the study of literature was the best way to achieve these outcomes: 'I would they were taught always in good literature bothe Laten and Greeke, and good autors such as have the verraye *Romayne* eloquence joined with wisdom, specially Christen autors that wrote their wisdom with clean and chaste Laten.'¹⁴ Colet's emphasis on moral content led him to present a curriculum which was not, to modern eyes, very 'classical', including as it did

Institutum Christiani Hominis, which that Learned Erasmus made at my requeste, and the booke called *Copia* of the same Erasmus. And then other authors Christian, as *Lactantius*, *Prudentius*, and *Proba*, and *Sedulius*, and *Juvenius*, and *Baptista Mantuanus*, and suche other as shall be thought convenient and most to purpose unto the true Laten speech . . . I saye that fylthiness and all suche abusion whiche the later blynde worlde brought in, whiche more rather may be called *Blotterature* then *Litterature*, I utterly abannyshe and exclude out of this Schole, and charge the Maisters that they teche alwaye that is beste.¹⁵

St Paul's School, along with Westminster and Eton, certainly provided the model for the statutes of many Tudor grammar schools, but this does not mean that all schools were like them in practice.¹⁶ Even William Lily, the first High Master of St Paul's and the author of a Latin grammar which was to be prescribed by statute as the only one to be used in schools, noted that 'The varietie of teaching is diuers yet, and alwaies wil be.'¹⁷ Richard Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius*, printed in 1612, a century after Colet's statutes, is probably our best guide to Shakespeare's school, since it was explicitly designed to assist provincial schoolmasters rather than teachers at elite urban institutions such as St Paul's or Westminster. Brinsley, schoolmaster at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, fifty miles from Stratford and a similar distance from London, begins by emphasising the exhaustion and demoralisation of the provincial schoolmaster: 'I wax vtterly wearie of my place, and my life is a continual burden vnto me.'¹⁸ It is likely that keeping order and keeping going was the highest priority for masters in the poorer schools.¹⁹ Brinsley has a clearer conception than Colet of the ancient texts which might be most worthy of imitation by modern pupils: 'And therefore I would haue the cheifest labor to make these purest Authors our owne, as Tully for prose, so Ouid and Virgil for verse, so to speake and write in Latine for the phrase, as they did.'²⁰ It is very likely that Shakespeare would have read at least some of 'Cato, Corderius dialogues, Aesop's fables, Tullies [Cicero's] epistles gathered by Sturmius, Tullies Offices, de Amicitia, Senectute, Paradoxes, Ovid's *Tristia* and *Metamorphoses*, Virgil. Also *Terentius Christianus*.'²¹

This reading would in all probability have been carefully graded for difficulty: students at Canterbury grammar school (which was larger and better endowed than Stratford's school) would cut their teeth on Cato's *Distiches* and would move on to Terence and the neo-Latin *Eclogues* of Mantuan (the poetic nick-name of Baptista Spagnuoli) in the third form. It is just possible that Shakespeare studied English translations along with the Latin originals, although the evidence here is thin. Charles Hoole in 1659 was to urge his pupils to 'procure some pretty delightful English Poems, by perusal whereof they may become acquainted with the Harmony of English Poesie. *Mr. Hardwicks* late Translation of *Mantuan*, *Mr Sandys* of *Ovid*, *Mr. Ogleby's* of *Virgil*, will abundantly supply them with Heroick Verses.'²² As Hoole's choice of translations indicates, this practice seems to have become fashionable only in the later seventeenth century, as the value of translations to the growth of the national tongue came to be more generally recognised. Brinsley embarked on an ambitious programme of translating some of the key texts used in Tudor classrooms, such as Cicero's *De Officiis*, but his cribs did not begin to appear until the early years of the seventeenth century. Shakespeare may conceivably have had access to Phaer's *Aeneid* or Golding's Ovid in the classroom, but there is little evidence that teachers at this date were making use of translations.²³ These early years would have been chiefly spent in exercising the memory: pupils would learn the whole of Lily's Latin grammar by heart, and were in most grammar schools supposed to speak Latin at all times. Here too though Tudor educational ideals and actual practice were almost certainly at odds. Brinsley is clear that Elizabethan schoolboys were not angelic swots: 'if we could bring them to speake Latine continually, from that time that they beginne to parse in Latine: but this I haue had too much experience of, that without great seuerity they will not be brought vnto: but they will speake English, and one will wink at another, if they be out of the Masters hearing'.²⁴

The older boys would not simply read Ovid, Virgil, or Cicero. They would in theory write them too. In a method known since Roger Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* (printed in 1570) as 'double translation', students would be presented with a passage of Latin which they would be required to translate into English prose. The original would then be removed, and the poor students would be set the task of replicating the original as closely as they could. Learning to produce lines that scanned in the quantitative metre of Latin was as hard then as it is now: even the mild-mannered Brinsley has to confess that versification was the most painful part of grammar-school work: 'my schollars haue had more feare in this, then in all the former, and myselfe also driuen to more seuerity'.²⁵ Presumably

those with excellent memories stood a better chance of succeeding in replicating the style and the content of the original: 'By which daily contentation you shall find, that those who take a delight in Poetry and haue sharpness & dexterity accordingly, will in a short time attaine to that ripeness, as that they who know not the places which they imitate, shall hardly discerne in many verses, whether the verse bee Virgils verse, or the schollars.'²⁶

The practice of double translation might seem on the face of it to endorse Grafton and Jardine's claim that humanistic education was aimed to instil in its victims a sense that classical culture was a given which had to be mastered and emulated mechanically. Students with good memories must certainly have found 'double translation' much easier than those who had painstakingly to reinvent their Latin originals from the ground up. But actually the removal of the source text and the requirement to reconstruct it must have been intimidating and liberating in equal measure: who now gets to *write* Virgil, and who now is rewarded for inspired misrememberings of the classics? Humanist education may well have fostered a cult of memorial reconstruction of classical texts rather more than its professed aim of encouraging their creative imitation. But that practical failure was absolutely central to Shakespeare's treatment of his reading. There are several moments in his works when bad memories of a classical education create both broad comedy and exquisitely subtle attempts to retrieve, and to dramatise the dissemination of, classical works. Schoolmasters in Shakespeare's plays are dogged by the difficulty of recalling Latin texts to mind. The pedantic provincial master Holofernes in *Love's Labour's Lost* (4.2.93–4) misquotes the opening lines of Mantuan's first Eclogue, that staple of the early years of Latin reading. This may simply be a compositorial slip, or a joke at the expense of the failing memories of provincial schoolmasters; but whether intentional or not, it is a moment when a failure accurately to recall a past text serves to characterise a particular person in the drama. The fallible processes of recalling and construing Latin also generate the great moment in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* when a schoolboy called William (and that name hints at autobiography) is tested on his grasp of Lily's grammar by Sir Hugh Evans. The scene represents not just a battle to remember, but also very deliberately embeds the Latin tongue in a variety of vernacular influences. Evans, like Thomas Jenkins, master at Stratford school from 1575, is Welsh, and the lesson is overheard by two women, William's mother and Mistress Quickly, neither of whom know Latin:

EVANS What is your genitive case plural, William?

WILLIAM Genitive case?

EVANS Ay.

WILLIAM *Genitivo: 'horum, harum, horum'.*

MISTRESS QUICKLY Vengeance of Jenny's Case! Fie on her! Never name her, child, if she be a whore. (4.1.52–7)

Remembering and mishearing here run together in the treatment of the classical tongue, which is rapidly translated by the bawdy phonic imagination of Mistress Quickly into a sexual scandal. This scene makes Latin a marvellously rebellious language, which breeds whores from its 'horums' and bawdy puns from its cases (the word could mean 'vagina'). Mistress Quickly, a woman, and consequently excluded from grammar school, is not simply embodying female ignorance or feminine loquacity: she is rather representing onstage the kinds of linguistic revenge which any Latinless members of the audience might reap on the learned tongue presented to their ears.²⁷ They hear it as a schoolboy might, as English and as rude.

This leads on to a crucial point: to argue whether Shakespeare's education was liberatingly dialectical or whether it was crushingly grounded in the authority of the classics is not very fruitful. Shakespeare's works exploit the slippage between the august ideals of humanist education and its practical shortcomings, between its ambitions and its unintended consequences. Misremembering and mishearing the classical tongues can be as much a response to 'the classics' as careful imitations and artful echoes. In this connection it is remarkable how often jolts to the memory precede extended allusions to Virgil in Shakespeare's works: even the moment when Lucrece seeks out the picture of the sack of Troy to use as a vehicle for her woe is preceded by '*At last she calls to mind where hangs a piece / Of skilful painting, made for Priam's Troy*' (1.366–7; my emphasis), and the picture when it is described seems very, very old, as though the memory of Troy is fading from recall. The Player's speech on Hecuba and the sack of Troy in *Hamlet* is at some level an *imitatio* of Virgil, but is presented as a virtuoso act of memory ('if it live in your memory', 2.2.449–50) of a piece of English paraphrase which clearly belongs to the lexical world of decades before the play in which it is set. The concern with memory can leak out, as it were, from the classical texts to the plays in which they are set. *Hamlet* is, after all, a play as much or more about remembering as it is a play about revenge.²⁸ Even *The Tempest*, in which allusions to the *Aeneid* tend to be glancing and fragmentary, is primarily concerned with recalling and re-enacting past usurpations: Ariel's quasi-Virgilian appearance as a harpy is designed

to jog the fading memories of the courtly characters that they are 'men of sin' (3.3.53). Ben Jonson, who attended the metropolitan hothouse of Westminster School under the great scholar and antiquarian William Camden, never presents the recall of a classical text as a task to tax the memory: Virgil *reads* from the *Aeneid* in *Poetaster* (5.2.56–97), rather than labouring to recall his poem. The different attitudes of these two authors towards classical learning are clearly connected with their differing and politically inflected conceptions of authority.²⁹ But they also went to very different kinds of school. In Stratford 'the classics' may well have partly meant labouring to recall – not in a sense of appreciating the gulfs of time that lay between the modern scholar and the past, but in the humdrum sense of trying to remember what those old poets wrote. This is not to revive the old claim that Shakespeare knew little Latin. Rather it is to argue that the thick, distorting medium of memory can turn a classical text into something new, and indeed can make the classical text seem so antiquated as to be entirely secondary to the newly constructed memory of it.

Shakespeare exploited the theoretical shortcomings of the form of education he received just as creatively as he made use of its practical deficiencies. The first and most radical of these shortcomings concerns the ends of the highly literary and almost exclusively literary training. What was it for? If this question is asked at a merely instrumental level a number of problems immediately arise. It was to equip students with the *copia*, or fullness of language and knowledge, which would enable them to delight an audience, to persuade, to praise, or to obtain work as lawyers, secretaries to noblemen, or perhaps even counsellors to the monarch. But fullness of language has as its nightmarish double an ability to paraphrase, circumlocute, and ornament in a manner which serves no instrumental purpose at all. Erasmus confronted this danger at the very start of his *De Copia*: 'We find that a good many mortal men who make great efforts to achieve this godlike power of speech fall instead into mere glibness, which is both silly and offensive. They pile up a meaningless heap of words and expressions without any discrimination.'³⁰ There are indeed moments when Erasmus seems to encourage his students to produce 'a meaningless heap of words': he lists no fewer than 148 alternative methods of saying 'Dear Faustus, thank you for your letter', which expand from *Tuae literae me magnopere delectarunt* ('your letter greatly delighted me') into the outer reaches of hyperbole. A student who had diligently grasped this art would be equipped to draw on a rich store of synonyms in whatever rhetorical circumstances he found himself, and might also enjoy parodying such circumlocution by creating pedantic abusers of the art of *copia* such as Holofernes. If one adds to

this skill the art of even-handedly arguing either side of the question it is clear that the ideal humanist schoolboy was not going to be someone who simply gets things done. Hamlet's 'To be or not to be' soliloquy is in its deliberative structure precisely the kind of *quaestio* (open-ended argument on either side of the question) which all grammar-school boys were trained to produce, and Hamlet, a good humanist scholar, elsewhere can weave pieces of Quintilian into his soliloquies.³¹ But 'To be or not to be' is of course notoriously *not* followed by Hamlet's sweeping to his revenge. This is scarcely surprising: *Hamlet's* author was trained in the arts of copious expression and of deliberation on either side of a question. Repeatedly he transfers those skills to characters within his plays and poems in ways that wryly recognise both the fascination of those methods and their potential for sicklyng o'er the name of action with a pale cast of words.

By the late sixteenth century it was clear that the output of the grammar schools exceeded the number of vacancies for eloquent young men. In 1581 Richard Mulcaster, the first headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School in London and a devoted follower of Ascham in his educational principles, voiced a fear that the spread of Erasmian education in grammar schools was resulting in the oversupply of young men with the wrong kinds of skills to suit the commonwealth and its needs. As a result 'there must be a *restraint*, and that all may not passe on to learning, which throng thitherwards, bycause of the inconueniences, which may ensue, by want of preferment for such a multitude, and by defeating other trades of their necessarie trauellours'.³² According to Mulcaster, the unemployed victims of this educational overproduction were a threat to social equilibrium. In London in the 1580s and '90s a significant number of those produced by the Tudor educational machine ended up not as rebels or ne'er-do-wells, but as poets and playwrights. They were people who are not Prince Hamlet and who were never meant to be, but who shared Hamlet's lack of a clear role in life, who could turn out a *quaestio* to order, and who could remember, some time back, learning about Hecuba and the sack of Troy. For these men the contradictions and excesses in what they had been taught become a vital literary resource: they could turn the very goddess of love, Venus herself, into someone who could argue with endless copiousness that it is better to marry than to remain single, and could make her rhetorical failure to persuade the resistant Adonis a reflection, perhaps, of the lack of fit between their own rhetorical sophistication and any practical purchase on the world. They could ornament and embellish Ovid, as Shakespeare does in *Venus and Adonis*, weaving him in to a mass of textual authorities culled from a wide range of classical and post-classical reading, encrusting him

so thoroughly with adages and *exempla*, chronographies and *sententiae*, that his original outlines were entirely obscured. They would be able to hybridise, as Shakespeare does in the description of the painting of the sack of Troy in *Lucrece*, a Virgilian scene with passages from the *Imagines* of Philostratus,³³ and to embellish both of these sources with memories of how Erasmus characterised particular heroes at the siege of Troy.³⁴

This argument could be pressed further: that the way in which Shakespeare learned to read and imitate the classics had the effect of ultimately making the classics almost invisible in his work. Humanist education encouraged the pragmatic use of earlier literature. Erasmus advocated the compilation of commonplace books, which were notebooks with headings, usually in alphabetical order, designed to enable the storing and retrieval of passages of classical literature to suit particular occasions.³⁵ The headings might be rhetorical (under the heading 'chronographies' for example a student might record rhetorically elaborate descriptions of particular times of day, such as *Aeneid* 4.522–7, to which he would look back when composing a passage of his own, as Shakespeare may have done when composing the great set piece chronographies in *Venus and Adonis*, 1–6, 853–8). Other topics might include 'Old Age', or 'Time', or 'Sleep'. Perhaps not surprisingly many students found it much easier to compile lists of headings than to undertake the organised programme of reading required to store the headings with examples.³⁶ Nonetheless this method was both a way of reading and a means of converting that reading into writing. As such it provided a counterbalance to the method of double translation: where double translation encouraged a mastery of, and perhaps a servility to, the style and lexis of one particular author, commonplacing fostered a quite different set of implied attitudes: a phrase from *any* author might be set down under a particular heading next to a phrase from any other author, and often such phrases might be entirely divorced from any indication of authorship when they were set down in commonplace books. This did not exactly mean that literature, classical or otherwise, acquired an individual and specific meaning for each reader; but it did mean that any given piece of textual matter could have a particular use for and applicability to any particular person who happened to have a particular rhetorical need for it. As Bacon remarked 'one man's notes will little profit another, because one man's conceit doth so much differ from another's'.³⁷ This form of reading and recalling creates a precondition for a type of drama which generates effects of intersubjectivity by presenting a variety of characters onstage who have different experiences and needs, and whose response to what they read is determined by those particular needs. And this vitally influences how