

OXFORD



THE OXFORD HISTORY OF
CLASSICAL RECEPTION
IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

Volume 2: 1558–1660

EDITED BY Patrick Cheney & Philip Hardie

The Oxford History
of Classical Reception
in English Literature

GENERAL EDITORS
DAVID HOPKINS
AND
CHARLES MARTINDALE

The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature

The Oxford History of Classical Reception (OHCREL) is designed to offer a comprehensive investigation of the numerous and diverse ways in which literary texts of the classical world stimulated responses and refashioning by English writers. Covering the full range of English literature from the early Middle Ages to the present day, *OHCREL* both synthesizes existing scholarship and presents cutting-edge new research, employing an international team of expert contributors for each of the five volumes.

1. 800–1558
2. 1558–1660
3. 1660–1790
4. 1780–1880
5. AFTER 1880

The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature

Volume 2 (1558–1660)

EDITED BY
PATRICK CHENEY
AND
PHILIP HARDIE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2015

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015938218

ISBN 978-0-19-954755-5

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Contents

<i>List of Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xi

1. Introduction	I
PATRICK CHENEY AND PHILIP HARDIE	

I. Institutions and Contexts

2. The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship	29
PETER MACK	
3. The Availability of the Classics: Readers, Writers, Translation, Performance	57
STUART GILLESPIE	
4. Classical Rhetoric in English	75
PETER MACK	
5. The Classics in Literary Criticism	87
GAVIN ALEXANDER	
6. Classicism and Christianity	103
MARK VESSEY	
7. Women Writers and the Classics	129
JANE STEVENSON	
8. Cultural Contexts	147
a. Politics and Nationalism	147
CURTIS PERRY	
b. Sexuality and Desire	159
CORA FOX	
c. Literary Careers	172
PATRICK CHENEY	
d. Fame and Immortality	187
PHILIP HARDIE	

Contents

II. Genre

9. Pastoral and Georgic	201
HELEN COOPER	
10. Epic Poetry	225
PHILIP HARDIE	
11. Elizabethan Minor Epic	253
LYNN ENTERLINE	
12. The Epistolary Tradition	273
WILLIAM FITZGERALD	
13. Prose Romance	291
HELEN MOORE	
14. Elegy, Hymn, Epithalamium, Ode: Some Renaissance Reinterpretations	311
ROLAND GREENE	
15. Complaint, Epigram, and Satire	345
SUSANNA BRAUND	
16. Tragedy	373
GORDON BRADEN	
17. Comedy	395
BRUCE R. SMITH	
18. Tragicomedy	419
TANYA POLLARD	
19. Historiography and Biography	433
BART VAN ES	
20. Discursive and Speculative Writing	461
REID BARBOUR AND CLAIRE PRESTON	

III. Authors

21. Homer	487
JESSICA WOLFE	
22. Plato	503
ELIZABETH JANE BELLAMY	

Contents

23. Virgil and Ovid	517
MAGGIE KILGOUR	
24. Horace	539
VICTORIA MOUL (with a contribution by Charles Martindale)	
25. Spenser	557
RICHARD A. MCCABE	
26. Marlowe	579
CHARLES MARTINDALE	
27. Shakespeare	599
COLIN BURROW	
28. Jonson	621
SEAN KEILEN	
29. Early Milton	641
THOMAS H. LUXON	
Classical Reception in English Literature, 1558–1660: An Annotated Bibliography	657
CRAIG KALLENDORF	
<i>Index</i>	743

List of Contributors

- | | |
|--|---|
| Gavin Alexander
<i>Christ's College, Cambridge</i> | Maggie Kilgour
<i>McGill University</i> |
| Reid Barbour
<i>University of North Carolina</i> | Thomas H. Luxon
<i>Dartmouth College</i> |
| Elizabeth Jane Bellamy
<i>University of New Hampshire</i> | Richard A. McCabe
<i>Merton College, Oxford</i> |
| Gordon Braden
<i>University of Virginia</i> | Peter Mack
<i>University of Warwick</i> |
| Susanna Braund
<i>University of British Columbia</i> | Charles Martindale
<i>University of York</i> |
| Colin Burrow
<i>All Souls College, Oxford</i> | Helen Moore
<i>Corpus Christi College, Oxford</i> |
| Patrick Cheney
<i>Penn State University</i> | Victoria Moul
<i>King's College London</i> |
| Helen Cooper
<i>Magdalene College, Cambridge</i> | Curtis Perry
<i>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</i> |
| Lynn Enterline
<i>Vanderbilt University</i> | Tanya Pollard
<i>Brooklyn College</i> |
| William Fitzgerald
<i>King's College London</i> | Claire Preston
<i>University of Birmingham</i> |
| Cora Fox
<i>Arizona State University</i> | Bruce R. Smith
<i>University of Southern California</i> |
| Stuart Gillespie
<i>Glasgow University</i> | Jane Stevenson
<i>University of Aberdeen</i> |
| Roland Greene
<i>Stanford University</i> | Bart van Es
<i>St Catherine's College, Oxford</i> |
| Philip Hardie
<i>Trinity College, Cambridge</i> | Mark Vessey
<i>University of British Columbia</i> |
| Craig Kallendorf
<i>Texas A&M University</i> | Jessica Wolfe
<i>University of North Carolina</i> |
| Sean Keilen
<i>University of California at Santa Cruz</i> | |

Preface

The present volume is one of five that will make up *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature* (henceforth *OHCREL*). Each volume of *OHCREL* has its own editor or team of editors, who determine, within agreed overall guidelines, the appropriate shape and emphasis for the particular period covered by their volume. *OHCREL* charts English writers' engagement and dialogue with ancient Greek and Roman literature from the early Middle Ages to the present day. *OHCREL* is, we hope, sufficiently comprehensive in scope to be legitimately described as a *History*, rather than a series of discrete critical essays. It should thus prove a valuable reference resource for students in the field. But *OHCREL* is intended to be attractive and accessible to a wide range of readers, so discursive interest is given priority over encyclopedic inclusiveness. Some potentially important aspects of the subject will thus receive only brief and passing discussion. *OHCREL*'s main target audience is the serious student of classical and English literature, from (roughly) second-year undergraduate level upwards, but it is hoped that its methods and approach will be such as to appeal to a wide range of readers from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds, within and outside the university.

The title of *OHCREL* includes three potentially contentious terms that need immediate clarification: 'Literature', 'English', and 'Reception'. The main business of *OHCREL* is the close and sophisticated critical engagement with the complex interaction between classical and English literary texts from the early Middle Ages to the present. A comprehensive, totalizing, history of the impact of classical upon English culture would have to be undertaken on a scale far larger than that of *OHCREL*, and would, in any case, run the risk of lacking all coherent focus, purpose, and integrity. The editors of and contributors to *OHCREL* believe, moreover, that legitimate (albeit sometimes 'fuzzy' and always debatable) distinctions can be made—and are, in practice, regularly made—between 'literary history' and cultural history more generally, without that involving any inert acceptance of an unscrutinized literary 'canon', or merely conventional assumptions about what constitutes 'the literary'. Our main emphasis will fall on literary texts of high quality and maximum historical importance. We are aware that neither of these categories is a fixed and agreed entity. But we do not believe that either can be occluded, ignored, or simply subsumed within other intellectual categories. *OHCREL* positively encourages and incorporates debate about questions of 'literary quality' and 'historical importance', rather than assume them as reified 'givens'.

OHCREL conceives of 'reception' as a complex dialogic exchange between two bodies of writing, rather than a one-way 'transmission' of fixed and known entities. Attention is certainly given to matters traditionally encompassed under such terms

Preface

as 'influence', 'echo', and 'allusion', but *OHCREL* also explores the ways in which classical texts have been remade and refashioned by English writers in ways that might cast (now, as well as then) as much light on the originals as on their English 'derivatives'. *OHCREL* certainly does not assume that 'reception' simply charts the afterlife of a fixed and closed canon. Nor does it assume that past readings of classical texts can always be confidently dismissed from the vantage point (whether critical or ideological) of the present. *OHCREL* conceives of reception as a dynamic activity in which meaning is constantly generated and regenerated, rather than simply received. Contributors have been encouraged to think actively about the issues and processes involved in the activity of reception, rather than to take over any existing model inertly.

The title of *OHCREL* is, we think, neater and more memorable than more strictly accurate, but clumsier, alternatives (for example, *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in Literatures in English*). But substantial coverage will, of course, be given in the last two volumes to non-English literature in the English language, including American, Irish, and Caribbean material. The first volume will encompass writing in English from before the Norman Conquest. Literature in Gaelic, Irish, or Scots, however, does not come within its main remit. Nor, in the project more generally, does neo-Latin literature. Nor do (in later volumes) such non-literary cultural productions as comic books or films. Nor do translations of non-classical foreign works into English, such as *Quo Vadis?* Nor (for the reasons given above) do such phenomena as the incorporation of classical architecture in English landscape gardens, the broader influence of Roman republicanism on English political thought, or the collection of classical antiquities on the Grand Tour. We stress, however, 'within its main remit'. Such matters are, of course, discussed by contributors *en passant*, if they bear on the main subject of their chapter. The same applies to theatrical performances. No hard-and-fast distinction, of course, can be made between drama-on-the-page and drama-in-performance. Nevertheless, *OHCREL* will be specifically *literary* in its focus, and viable (albeit 'fuzzy') distinctions can, we think, be made between accounts that stress the textual, rather than performance, elements in plays. Attention is certainly given to the circumstances in which classical literature was read (commentaries, textbooks, *florilegia*, mythographies, and so on), but, again, these do not form the main focus of *OHCREL*.

A detailed rationale for the organization of the present volume is laid out in the first part of the 'Introduction' (Chapter 1), which then goes on to offer reflections on two areas of central importance for classical reception in the English Renaissance: ideas of authorship, and imitation and intertextuality.

Each chapter is accompanied by endnotes that document and reference the discussion within the chapter itself. The Bibliography is intended to provide guidance on further reading on the subject as a whole: as well as collecting many of the items referred to by particular contributors to the volume itself, it provides pointers towards discussions of matters touched on only briefly, or not at all, in the volume.

Preface

Since the envisaged audience of *OHCREL* includes readers from a variety of disciplines (including those unused to the presentational conventions adopted in earlier English texts), a policy rather different from the norm has been adopted with regard to quotations. All quotations in the volume, with the exception of those from Edmund Spenser, have been presented in modernized spelling and punctuation, though references have been supplied (for the reader's convenience) to the standard library editions, most of which are in 'old spelling' form. The modernization of titles has been left to the discretion of individual contributors.

Quotations from classical authors generally use the Loeb texts and translations, sometimes modified in detail. For readers' convenience, all Greek words quoted in the text are transliterated. The editions of English authors used are cited in the endnotes on their first occurrence in each chapter, with the exception of the most frequently quoted authors, for which the following editions are used:

Jonson, *Works: The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1963–7)¹

Milton, *Poems: The Poems of John Milton*, ed. John Carey and Alastair Fowler (Harlow, 1968)

Milton, *Prose Works: Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Don M. Wolfe, 8 vols (New Haven, 1953–82)

Shakespeare: *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans, 2nd edn (Boston, 1997)

Spenser, *Faerie Queene: Spenser. The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (London and New York, 1977)

Spenser, *Shorter Poems: Edmund Spenser. The Shorter Poems*, ed. Richard A. McCabe (Harmondsworth, 1999)

London is the place of publication where no place of publication is given in the bibliographical details.

At Penn State, we would like to thank Katharine Cleland early on, and more recently Paul Zajac, for serving as loyal research assistants on the volume. They performed stellar work on a long and complex project, and we are grateful for the help they gave us. We would also like to thank Robin Schulze, former Head of the English Department at Penn State, and Mark Morrison, the current Head, as well as Susan Welch, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, for assistance along the way. Finally, we would like to thank the contributors for their excellent work on behalf of *OHCREL*, Volume 2.

¹ Those chapters that deal substantially with Ben Jonson were submitted in their final form before the appearance of the 2012 Cambridge edition of the *Works*, and it has unfortunately not been practical to convert references to this edition.

Preface

In June 2008 a conference was held in Cambridge, gathering the greater part of the contributors for a workshop as the volume began to take shape; we are grateful to the Cambridge University Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities for hosting the occasion and for financial support; and, for further financial support, to the British Academy, the Classics Faculty, University of Cambridge, and the Sackler Conference Fund, Trinity College, Cambridge.



Introduction

PATRICK CHENEY AND PHILIP HARDIE

Volume 2 of *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature* (OHCREL) focuses on the dates 1558–1660, because this time span helps define the English ‘Renaissance’ as literary history’s inaugural ‘rebirth’ of classicism. The dates mark a historical period that begins with the coronation of Queen Elizabeth I in 1558 and ends with the return of Charles II as king of England in 1660. The link between political and literary history is more than a convenience, however, because of the remarkable surge of literary authors who, at this time, *recover the classics* largely within the crucible of monarchical court politics.

Nonetheless, the dates 1558–1660 are in large part arbitrary, and indeed literary historians often give different dates for the Renaissance. The most common dates run from 1485, the coronation of Henry VII uniting the Houses of York and Lancaster after the War of the Roses had devastated England for a hundred years, and 1674, the publication of Milton’s final version of *Paradise Lost*, an epic poem modelled on Homer and Virgil that, for many, crowns the English Renaissance. Scholars often prefer these dates because they provide a more accurate historical context for gauging how a major author like Milton produced his epic art—aided, of course, by those who preceded him, from Skelton, Wyatt, and Surrey early in the sixteenth century, to Spenser, Sidney, and Shakespeare in the Elizabethan era, to Donne, Jonson, and Marvell in the Jacobean, Caroline, and Interregnum eras. The editorial decision to include the first half of the sixteenth century in volume 1 of OHCREL mirrors a recent professional movement aiming to bridge the ‘medieval’ and ‘Renaissance’ periods, allowing the medieval to gain a greater inroad into the ‘modern’—a topic to which we will return. The decision itself is not without consequences, because it bifurcates the sixteenth century, when in fact authors such as Spenser and Sidney self-consciously present themselves as carrying on the work of Skelton and Surrey, to cite just a few examples. Necessarily, chapters in the present volume will occasionally discuss material appropriate to volume 1, just as they will occasionally venture into ‘the long eighteenth century’ covered in volume 3.

We have divided the volume into three major parts. The first part, 'Institutions and Contexts', consists of this introduction and ten chapters, and aims to lay the historical foundation. The second part, 'Genres', consists of twelve chapters, and addresses the central literary forms, emphasizing how English authors rework classical forms. Genre, this part of the volume aims to make clear, is a major framework for the recovery of classicism by English authors. The third part, 'Authors', consists of nine chapters, four on classical authors whose presence was central for the period, and five on English authors who are especially important to a critical narrative of classical reception.

In keeping with the General Editors' design, our history is a 'literary history', but we interpret the link between the two concepts differently from many literary historians. Where most see their task as that of unearthing the social, political, and economic networks from which literary texts emerge, we reverse the procedure. For we take the word 'literary' to heart, and aim to historicize it; the effect is to unearth a bedrock process of literariness grounded historically in authorship, genre, and imitation. We view the historical figures we bring front and centre—Homer, Plato, Virgil, Ovid, Horace; Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Jonson, Milton—as *authors*. We see them writing in *genres*—for example, epic, prose dialogue, georgic, elegy, ode, hymn, minor epic, tragedy, comedy, pastoral. And we focus on how authors use genre as the framework within which to *imitate* the classics. For us, imitation includes a host of interconnections between antiquity and the Renaissance. For instance, English authors imitate classical authors' literary careers (the way Spenser does Virgil and Ovid); they also imitate genre-based *ideas*, since each genre tends to have an organizing idea at its centre, which authors can then vary endlessly (for instance, after Virgil, epic focuses on the idea of nationalism); and finally—perhaps most profoundly—English authors imitate classical *language* (key words, phrases, passages). The imitation of Greek and especially Latin into English becomes a hallmark of the era.

We share the General Editors' commitment to the methodology of 'reception' as a 'dialogue' between 'past and present', a 'two-way process of understanding, backwards and forwards, which illuminates antiquity as much as modernity': 'Milton's reception of Virgil is thus potentially of as much significance for Virgilians as for Miltonists, as much a part of Classics as it is of English literature.'¹ Nonetheless, whereas this reception model 'switch[es] the focus from producers to receivers',² we have designed our volume in terms of the producers. Instead of 'readers', we highlight 'authors' (who of course are themselves readers). We do so because the particular moment in which our volume appears invites us to participate in a specific professional conversation. As the General Editors point out, a turn to reception has characterized literary studies since the 1980s, and was especially prominent toward the end of the twentieth century. In contrast, 'authorship studies' is currently one of the most vibrant areas of research and debate.

In particular, a backlash has set in against the 1960s work of Roland Barthes on 'the death of the author' and Michel Foucault on 'the author function'.³ These

Introduction

mid-twentieth-century theories powerfully contested the model of writing that prevailed at the time: an author-based model that privileges the autonomy of the creator of literary works, at the expense of both the 'intertextual' nature of all language and the cultural institutions and practices that produce those works. For Barthes, writing is intertextual, in that by its very nature it consists of tissues of other bits of writing.

Barthes was working from Julia Kristeva's text-based model of 'intertextuality', which denies authority to the creator of a work and instead inspects the network of texts that make it up.⁴ As a methodology, intertextuality helps advance 'the death of the author', because it no longer tries to gauge the author's 'intention'; and any utterance encodes countless, anonymous tissues of other discourse. In making intertextuality the death knell of the Western author, Barthes inaugurated the most potent—and infamous—methodology of the late twentieth century, and it remains alive well into the early twenty-first.

Barthes's work aligned with that of Foucault on the 'author function', which similarly denies authority to an author, and instead locates production in the pressures of institutions and thus 'power'. Foucault's project had a tremendous influence on Renaissance studies, shifting interest from the meaning of the author to the subject of power. The individual was imagined as subjected to cultural pressures in the production of language. In none of this, we hasten to add, is there much interest in classicism. In fact, we might say, imitation was usurped by ideology; classicism, by constructionism.

Following on from Foucault, Barthes, Kristeva, and others, it became fashionable in Renaissance studies during the 1980s and 1990s to engage in 'New Historicism' (in America) and 'Cultural Materialism' (in Britain): to do research on institutions, not authors; on social and political power rather than individual creativity. Yet out of this crucible, paradoxically, authorship studies emerged, as an intoxicating new principle supplanted 'individuation': 'collaboration'.⁵ Critics began to emphasize the way an author became implicated in a whole range of cultural agents in the production of texts: from scribes, publishers, printers, and composers to businessmen, monarchs, and powerful courtiers. The fallout is still with us.⁶

Starting in the 1990s, however, several leading Renaissance critics began to resist the extreme, authoritarian pull especially of Foucault. The most important statement comes from Louis Montrose:

Foucault's own anti-humanist project is to anatomize the subject's subjection to the disciplinary discourses of power. I find this aspect of Foucault's vision—his apparent occlusion of a space for human agency—to be extreme. In other words, my intellectual response is that his argument is unconvincing, and my visceral response is that it is intolerable.⁷

Richard Helgerson put this methodology succinctly: Shakespeare 'helped make the world that made him'.⁸ While critics such as Helgerson and Montrose were trying to

walk a fine line between individuation and collaboration, between the death of the author and the author working in 'reciprocal' relation with collaborators, in practice they tended to emphasize the 'history' in 'literary history'.⁹ At the same time, other leading critics remained committed to the revisionist revolution. David Scott Kastan, for instance, has continued to adhere to a Barthesian- and Foucauldian-based methodology, primarily in his work on Shakespeare: 'Shakespeare had no obvious interest in the printed book. Performance was the only form of publication he sought for his plays.'¹⁰

Today, Shakespeare is the lightning rod for authorship studies, because of his standing as a world-class figure. In a 2003 book titled *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, Lukas Erne challenged the idea that Shakespeare eschewed a literary authorship, arguing that he wrote his plays not merely for the stage but also for the page: 'The assumption of Shakespeare's indifference to the publication of his plays is a myth.'¹¹ The argument has proved controversial, and Kastan, for one, has not been persuaded; nor is he alone. As the current volume goes to press, a healthy debate continues over what has become known as 'The Return of the Author', with Erne's sequel, *Shakespeare and the Book Trade*, just recently published.¹² Most recent work on 'The Return of the Author' neglects English Renaissance classicism.

Curiously, while critics were denying the status of author to Shakespeare, others were publishing books, articles, and editions that established Shakespeare's reworking not simply of Plutarch but of Virgil and Ovid, Lucan and Homer (via Chapman's translations). For instance, around the time that Kastan was writing *Shakespeare and the Book*, arguing that only after the First Folio of 1623 did Shakespeare become an 'author', Heather James published *Shakespeare's Troy*, arguing that plays like *Troilus and Cressida* show an author fully engaged with classicism, especially Virgil and Ovid.¹³ The two conversations have been carried out largely independently of each other; they pass in the night.

Shakespeare may seem a special case, but similar arguments denying the status of author to Marlowe have multiplied, as critics came to speak of a 'Marlowe effect': 'Marlowe' is an 'effect' because the texts of his that have come down to us stand at several removes from his creation, which is now irreparably lost.¹⁴ For instance, after Marlowe died in 1593, *Doctor Faustus* would not be published until 1604, in what has come to be known as the A-text, while in 1616 a radically different text appeared, known as the B-text. Not only do we have two texts; we also have two authors, for scholars have determined that Marlowe wrote only some of the extant scenes. We have not even been able to determine whether Marlowe wrote the play early in his career (1588–9) or late (1592–3). Such *doubleness* has made it seem wise to deny the status of author to Christopher Marlowe: if anyone was 'socially constructed', it was the author(s) of *Doctor Faustus* (see Charles Martindale, Chapter 26, this volume).

While critics tend to declassify Marlowe and Shakespeare as authors, they agree that the modern notion of the author—the notion we hold today—begins to

Introduction

appear first in Spenser, and next in Jonson.¹⁵ Critics such as Helgerson and Montrose have persuasively shaped Spenser studies, in particular, by studying his authorship within the context of monarchy, concentrating on his innovative ‘self-presentation’ and his ‘reciprocal’ model of authorship relating his work to Queen Elizabeth: Spenser uses the nascent medium of print to present himself as an author to and of the nation; and in turn the author is shaped by the national leader he addresses. ‘The subject of Elizabeth’ and the ‘Spenserian subject’ are bound up in each other.¹⁶ By concentrating on the historical moment in which Spenserian authorship emerges—what Helgerson terms a ‘synchronic’ interest—such leading voices have shown correspondingly little interest in ‘diachrony’, in which authorship grows out of classical authors.

Volume 2 of *OHCREL* aims to suggest just how vital classical literary culture is to the invention of the English Renaissance, to English Renaissance studies, and thus to English Renaissance authorship. We would argue for a close symbiosis between the renowned literary achievement between 1558 and 1660 and the authorial project of imitating the classics. The English Renaissance can be closely associated with the recovery of antiquity in poetry, drama, and prose. We do not mean that other important agents were not on the scene; they were, including the influence of Christianity and Scripture (see Mark Vessey, Chapter 6, this volume). Yet the works that Spenser and his contemporaries produced in pastoral, epic, ode, epithalamium, hymn, comedy, tragedy, satire, epigram, complaint, and other genres were classical in origin, in frame, and in ideation. Spenser did not write *The Shepheardes Calender* because he wished to imitate the pastoralism of Scripture; he made the choice to publish his first work in the genre in imitation of Virgil, who inaugurated his career with the *Eclogues*. Spenser could do so because his ‘syncretic’ mindset reconciled Virgilian pastoral with the pastoral of Scripture, the Roman Tityrus with the Hebraic David. Much literary history of the time underwrote the reconciliation, including such books in the native (English) tradition as *The Kalender of Shepherds*, as well as the long tradition of pastoral itself, from the Greek Alexandrian inventor of the form, Theocritus, to the first Elizabethan to publish a set of eclogues, Barnabe Googe (1563). The list of ‘influences’ on Spenser includes those who wrote eclogues before him—the *Calender’s* glossator, ‘E.K.’, mentions Theocritus, Virgil, Moschus, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Sannazaro, and Marot, while we could add the Greek Bion and the Henrician Alexander Barclay—and those such as Ovid, Horace, and Chaucer, who did not write eclogues, but whom Spenser nonetheless assimilates to the form (see Helen Cooper, Chapter 9, this volume). However complex the context is for Spenser’s writing of pastoral, the key point is that his decision originated in a classical author, and his name was Virgil.¹⁷

We believe that a volume on ‘classical reception’ in English ‘Renaissance’ literature can profitably participate in current authorship studies.¹⁸ In the remaining two sections of this introduction, we will first situate our connection between *renaissance* and *authorship* in terms of the professional conversation on the ‘period concept’,

from Jacob Burckhardt to Leonard Barkan; and, second, we will look further into the relation between imitation and intertextuality. In both sections, we try to rethink 'classical reception' by charting *the author of the renaissance* in terms of *the renaissance of the author*. In this project, English Renaissance authorship is neither strictly individuated nor collaborative but *intertextual*.

Indeed, in Renaissance studies today authors are very much alive; they have intentions; they present themselves; but in no way does this mean that we should limit interpretation to authorial agency. In fact, it is important to register the working of other agents. One of the most important, in the General Editors' reception model, is the classical author himself. Reception and authorship are not antithetical, but part of a larger hermeneutic linking 'past' with 'present'—and both with the 'future'—along a 'two-way' path that connects antiquity to modernity, modernity to antiquity. Readers are critical to this process; they conduct the research.¹⁹

We argue, then, that it is useful to define the English Renaissance in terms of classical authorship because the seminal literary achievement of this period was to invent an originary English authorship out of an engagement with the classical idea of the author (partly mediated, of course, by such medieval authors as Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate, the native triumvirate to whom sixteenth-century writers so often pay tribute). According to this idea, a writer imitates literary forms written by preceding authors, and he or she puts together a structure of genres to invent a literary career, one that writes the nation along lines that are at once gendered and religious.

Renaissance Authorship

In imitating the classics, Renaissance authors participate in a cultural movement known as 'humanism', an educational programme begun in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Italy that aimed to train boys in classical Latin and, to some extent, in Greek.²⁰ This movement relied in part on works lost since antiquity that the humanists painstakingly unearthed, then disseminated, translated, and integrated into the vernacular (see Peter Mack, Chapter 2, this volume). Petrarch is usually identified as the founding father of the European Renaissance for his leadership role in this project.²¹ Petrarch self-consciously severed his own authorship from that of the 'medieval' past in order to mark himself as distinctly 'modern', his work 'novel'. Petrarch does not use the Italian or Latin word for *renaissance* (French 'rebirth'), but he understood himself to be engaged in a wide-scale attempt to give new life to antiquity.

Yet the term 'Renaissance' applied to this enterprise needed to wait until the mid-nineteenth century, when the French historian Jules Michelet used the term in his *History of France* (1855), followed more influentially by the Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt in his landmark study *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860). For

Introduction

the next hundred years, and up to the close of the twentieth century, when Barkan published *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (1999), scholars attempted to define the 'Renaissance', to mark it off as a distinct epoch, separate from the Middle Ages and connected to modernity.²²

Strikingly, however, many influential voices in this conversation today look away from antiquity when trying to locate the point of origin for the period concept. This helps account for much mainstream criticism since 1980—the publication date of Stephen Greenblatt's inaugural work of New Historicism, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*.²³ In this climate, we might wish to account for a volume that defines the Renaissance in terms of classicism. One consequence, we believe, can be a fresh awareness of an intellectual project that reconciles imitation with ideology, authorship with politics, classicism with constructionism.

Nonetheless, a recent authoritative study of the period concept has a different goal—namely, to look into the history of scholarship behind the word 'Renaissance' that valorizes the 'modern' at the expense of the 'medieval'. In 2007, Margreta de Grazia published her latest instalment on periodization, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', which aims not to solve the problem it pinpoints, but, more modestly, 'to point it out': today we accept the nineteenth-century narrative of the Renaissance as originating in Europe roughly between 1400 and 1600 (the dates vary depending on the historian), but then we rely on the twentieth-century rejection of such 'teleology' by Foucault and others, for whom 'the progression of continuous history has been judged too partial to the dominant power'.²⁴ The effect, says de Grazia, is to create a 'divide' between 'medieval' and 'modern'.²⁵

The nineteenth-century narratives de Grazia discusses are three in particular, and all are important here, not simply because they have been so influential but also because they tend to eschew classicism. First, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel located the break with the medieval and the advent of the modern in Martin Luther, the German monk who launched the Reformation in 1517 by nailing his *Ninety-Five Theses* to the cathedral door in Wittenberg. Luther rejects the 'medieval material fixation' on pilgrimage to the Holy Land as the mark of Christian salvation, and turns the eye of the faithful 'inward in what Hegel termed "that meditative introversion of the soul upon itself"', known as *solafideism*, "the simple doctrine" that faith was all that mattered'.²⁶ Second, Burckhardt responded to Hegel by locating the birth of the modern not in Germany but in Italy, not in '1500' but in '1300', and not in Luther's 'strict inner conscience' but rather in 'raw unbridled will': that is to say, not in 'ideation' but in 'cultural and political event'.²⁷ Whereas Hegel saw the modern as a 'rebirth', Burckhardt saw it as 'a birth': "the birth of man"—of man as individual as opposed to man as subject to the "general categories" of the Middle Ages (of race, people, party, family, or community)', issuing 'not from the retrieval of antiquity but rather from the lapsed civic and religious strictures of the independent city-states'.²⁸ Third, Karl Marx subordinated individuals to account for the birth of the modern through the 'prehistory of capitalist economic production', begun in 'the long

sixteenth century', which forms 'the prelude of the revolution that laid the foundation of the capitalist mode of production'.²⁹

Here is de Grazia's helpful summary:

All three nineteenth-century historiographies—Hegel's theodicy, Burckhardt's cultural history, and Marx's economic prehistory—conferred upon the Renaissance the status of inaugural epoch of the modern. And all three lighted upon it in order to set the modern into motion in a particular direction: Hegel's Reformation leading to the emancipation of consciousness, Burckhardt's Renaissance reactivating the individual's dynamic creative energies, Marx's primitive accumulation culminating in equitable distribution of labor and resources. And all three had their trajectories push off against a lackluster past of Catholicism, medievalism, and feudalism, respectively.³⁰

De Grazia's history helps account for why the present volume might come into being, allowing us to speak of the Renaissance as the intertextual network of authors who write within culture, in a model that links the past to the present and to the future, aware of achievement and limitation alike.

Here the General Editors make an invaluable point. 'The Renaissance was a myth': 'not in the sense that it was untrue, but in the sense that it was a story of resonance and power'.³¹ Rather than saying only that 'the Renaissance was constructed', we can say that Renaissance authors participated in the construction. The binary is neither true nor necessary.

An example occurs in book 1, canto 6, of *The Faerie Queene*, where the arch-Protestant poet of Elizabethan England constructs a British Reformation myth of the Renaissance that readers are left to reconstruct. While narrating the quest of the Redcrosse Knight, Spenser turns to the fortunes of the beloved whom the hero of 'holiness' has abandoned, Una (a figure for the truth of the English Protestant Church). For the young knight believes that his lady is unchaste, since he thinks he sees her coupling with a lustful squire, when in fact he is the victim of a magically induced vision created by the hermit Archimago (a figure for the demonic magic of the Catholic priest). As the villain Sansloy ('without law') attempts to rape Una, suddenly some woodland satyrs arrive; they are so horrible in sight that they scare the paynim to flee. These satyrs then take Una home and worship her as the truth, until she can escape their idolatry through help from their human kinsman, Sir Satyrane.

Spenser's allegory is complex, but the satyrs' religious worship, led by 'old Sylvanus' (*Faerie Queene*, 1. 6. 16. 3), and conducted through rituals of dance, song, and musical instruments, deploys a classical myth (the satyr community) to critique early 'Roman' forms of idolatrous worship *as they get into the literary tradition*. One form is singled out, as the satyrs 'daunc[e] . . . round' Una:

Shouting, and singing all a shepheards ryme,
And with greene braunches strowing all the ground,
Do worship her, as Queene, with olive girlond croud.
(1. 6. 13. 7–9)

Introduction

Thus, Spenser offsets his own English Virgilian epic (1. Proem. 1), serving the true religion from the false religions of classical and late-sixteenth-century Rome, localized in lowly pastoral. His Reformation allegory is a myth of the Renaissance, not simply because it deploys a classical topos, but more particularly because it presents that *topos* as itself a cultural agent, which the reader is to reconstruct through various signs planted in Faeryland (*Faerie Queene*, 6. Proem). In this way, Spenser's story of Una among the satyrs qualifies as a Protestant myth about classical Renaissance authorship.³²

Spenser's story linking classicism to Christianity exemplifies one of the main critical models of periodization to emerge from the twentieth century: that of Douglas Bush, who saw the era as reconciling classical culture with Scripture: 'If the classical revival produced rich fruit and not mere wax flowers, one main reason was the strength of medieval and Christian traditions and beliefs.'³³ Bush did not invent the idea of this reconciliation, for Renaissance writers were themselves self-conscious about the attempt. In the fifteenth century, the scholar Marsilio Ficino made it his project to fuse Platonism with Christianity, known as Christian Neoplatonism. In Elizabethan England, Spenser is hard at the game of reconciliation, as many studies make clear (see Elizabeth Bellamy, Chapter 22, this volume). In the mid-seventeenth century, Milton is still pursuing his own reconciliation, between classical and Christian pastoral, as the title of *Lycidas* records (see Thomas Luxon, Chapter 29, this volume).³⁴

Bush's Renaissance has played a role in the only recent book-length study of the period concept as a professional discourse, *The Idea of the Renaissance*, by William Kerrigan and Gordon Braden.³⁵ In their history, Bush opposes Burckhardt, who had secularized the Renaissance, set it in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and confined it to Italy. Bush plants the concept north in England, and sees it flourishing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In contrast, Kerrigan and Braden aim to recuperate 'Burckhardt's Renaissance', because his narrative about the modern as the change from group identity to individual identity gets it right—gets it right, that is, for the late 1980s, when the 'subject' was all the rage.³⁶

The attempt to identify 'subjectivity' as the heart of the Renaissance advances the Barthesian 'death of the author' and the Foucauldian 'author function', since subjectivity views the individual as constructed by history. Indeed, this is Greenblatt's model in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*: Renaissance selves are fashioned by institutions of power. We can see a version of this model in Joel Fineman's *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye: The Modern Invention of Subjectivity*, under attack in Harold Bloom's *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*, which replaces subjectivity with an author-based Hegelian 'consciousness'.³⁷ In this group, only Fineman displays much interest in classicism. While Greenblatt rejects 'influence' as a critical methodology, Bloom writes his seminal work, *The Anxiety of Influence*, to centre literary relations in the English Romantic era, studying how Wordsworth, Coleridge, and others struggled in the dark shadow of Milton, Shakespeare, and Spenser.³⁸

Yet one mid-twentieth-century model joins Bush in including classicism as part of its period concept. In *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*, Erwin Panofsky introduced an influential swerve. In de Grazia's words, 'it was not the return to antiquity that distinguished the period 1400–1600', since several previous eras had made that return ('the Carolingian renaissance in the ninth century, the Ottonian and Anglo-Saxon *renovatii* [sic] of around 1000, and the proto-Renaissance of the twelfth century'). Rather, the Renaissance could be born only once 'it had first died': 'At a certain point around 1400, antiquity was pronounced dead.'³⁹ As Panofsky himself put it: 'The Renaissance came to realize that Pan was dead... The classical past was looked upon, for the first time, as a totality cut off from the present': 'The Middle Ages had left antiquity unburied and alternately galvanized and exorcised its corpse. The Renaissance stood weeping at its grave and tried to resurrect its soul.'⁴⁰

Recently, Barkan has resurrected this model but given it his own swerve, the late-fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century moment, when suddenly great artworks from the classical past were unearthed, such as the discovery in 1485 of a young girl's body perfectly preserved after fifteen hundred years of burial, or the discovery in 1506 of antiquity's great statue the *Laocoön*: 'Rome contained a whole population in marble... the authentic life of antiquity is emerging from the ground, demanding that the moderns hear its voice and respond with a voice of their own.'⁴¹ In short, a history of criticism and scholarship of the Renaissance exhibits a series of fits and starts, continuities and discontinuities, offshoots and objections. The time appears ripe to revisit the topic.⁴²

What, more particularly, did classical authorship look like? And how did it get into 'the Renaissance imagination'? To answer the first question, we may take the cue of Gordon Braden in his *Petrarchan Love and the Continental Renaissance*, which suggests that 'the master topos of post-classical European literature [is the] unprecedented union... of subjective vision and objective fact'.⁴³ Braden works from Ernst Robert Curtius, who says in *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*: 'The whole plentitude of his [Dante's] inner vision must be applied to the whole extent of the world, to all the depths and heights of the world above... A structure of language and thought is created... as inalterable as the cosmos... poetic production can be compared with that of the creator of the universe.'⁴⁴ Yet the *topos* traces to antiquity: to Homer and Hesiod, as well as to Plato, but most importantly for Dante and later writers such as Spenser and Milton, to Virgil, as Philip Hardie allows us to see in *Cosmos and Imperium*.⁴⁵ Indebted to Virgil and his own imitation of Latin and Greek predecessors, English Renaissance authorship, above all, represents the material artefact of the work in the shape of the cosmos in order to write the nation in the context of Christian eternity.⁴⁶

The phrase 'Renaissance imagination' comes from Harry Berger, Jr, one of the most eloquent cartographers of the concept, in his *Second World and Green World: Studies in Renaissance Fiction-Making*. Berger's goal, shared by many critics of the later twentieth century, was to distinguish the Renaissance imagination from the

Introduction

medieval and the classical. According to Berger, Greeks such as Homer and Plato had represented the cosmos as an image of the human mind; the representation was thus a form of mental projection that made reality appear man-made. St Augustine took this *interior* model and saw it as the product of an *exterior* agent, God, who used the Word as the shaping hand of creation. Here, writes Berger, 'we are faced with the peculiar fact that at no time in our history did the human imagination so completely control the universe': 'The official or prevailing image of the world, from the time of the early church Fathers up through the fifteenth century, was a completely organized and esthetically integrated system of projections—an artistic triumph rarely exceeded in history, characteristic in every way of the mind's processes, its interpretations and forms of thought.'⁴⁷ The Renaissance era is ground-breaking, Berger writes, because it becomes *self-conscious* about this mental projection.⁴⁸

History is indeed a story; its 'truth' lies in an awareness of its status as fiction-making. In the present volume, we are telling a story, and this section will conclude by addressing the *content* of English classical authorship: the epochal attempt to write authorship by relating 'subjective vision' to 'objective fact'. For Berger, 'the Renaissance imagination' distinguishes between three *types* of 'world'. The first is the material world created by God, which we call reality and inhabit as readers. The second world is the *heterocosm* ('other world'), which the poet creates as an artefact by imitating the first world of God. The third world is the 'green world' inside the heterocosm, a fictional environment of forests, fields, and gardens, which characters inside the story enter. English Renaissance authors tell fictions about places other than green worlds—most prominently, the court—but a poem like Andrew Marvell's 'The Garden' (featured by Berger) indicates how important the green world is to Renaissance fiction-making. In such terms, an author creates a work in the shape of the cosmos, and he or she centres it on a green world, in order to ask the key question that fiction can ask: is the 'world' a place of repose where we feel redeemed; or is it a darker place where we 'give up'? Shakespeare's comedies and romances, including *As You Like It* and *The Tempest*, follow Spenser in transferring responsibility for answering this question to the audience, compelling us, as Berger puts it, 'to transform the bounded moment of esthetic delight into a model or guide for action'.⁴⁹

We do not have space to chart this model in any detail, but it might be useful to point to its presence in three major examples. First, in book 6, canto 10, of *The Faerie Queene* Spenser introduces a Virgilian model based on book 6 of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas' descent to the underworld to see a vision of Roman history. On Mt Acidale, Spenser's pastoral persona, Colin Clout, uses his pipe to conjure up a vision of the Three Graces, who dance in a circle around a Fourth Grace (Colin's beloved), and are themselves encircled by a dancing troupe of a 'hundred naked maidens' (*Faerie Queene*, 6. 10. 11. 8). In this configuration of three concentric circles, Spenser represents the poet using his artefact to construct a green world as part of the Ptolemaic universe.

Spenser understands the fragility of the poet's cosmic vision of grace, for the hero of book 6, the knight Calidore, causes the vision to vanish when he steps forward to 'know' it (6. 10. 17. 8). Second, in *The Tempest*, Act 5, scene 1, Shakespeare uses an Ovidian model when an author-figure, the magician Prospero, delivers his farewell to magic, based on a speech by the enchantress Medea in book 7 of the *Metamorphoses*. In Prospero's speech (*Tempest*, 5. 1. 33–57), which Jonathan Bate calls Shakespeare's 'most sustained Ovidian borrowing', the key word is 'make' (5. 1. 37, 39, 47), as Prospero reviews the way his art has shaped the cosmos, "twixt the green sea and the azur'd vault, | Set warring war" (5. 1. 53–4).⁵⁰ And, finally, Chapman constructs a Homeric model in his translation of 'Achilles' Shield' from book 18 of the *Iliad*, when the poet finds embossed on the epic hero's martial weapon a panoramic scene of the universe, sky, sea, and land, animated by the various arts of the human. In all three examples, we glimpse a representation of the author's work in the shape of the universe. In all three, an English Renaissance author re-embroiders a passage from classical culture. All three, therefore, conduct a fiction-making authorship in terms of classical imitation.

The late-twentieth-century interest in distinguishing the Renaissance from the Middle Ages has given way early in the twenty-first century to a generation of medievalists who try to bring the two eras into conversation. Volume 1 of *OHCREL* will be the latest example, but it is preceded by volume 2 of *The Oxford English Literary History, Reform and Revolution . . . 1300–1547*, in which James Simpson sees the sixteenth century as an unfortunate interlude between the premier values of both the medieval and the modern: political liberty and artistic freedom. According to this narrative, the Renaissance, rather than being a time of triumph, is a time of political oppression and artistic failure.⁵¹

In 2010, Simpson and Brian Cummings consolidated this project in another monumental publication, from the Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature series, titled *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, which argues the need to break down the 'standard boundaries' between the two periods and to stop seeing the Renaissance as 'the origin and final triumph of reformed religion'.⁵² Curiously, the very next year Stephen Greenblatt published the Pulitzer Prize winning *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern*, which ignores Simpson's work and unabashedly resorts to a model of 'The Renaissance' as the recovery of antiquity: 'Greek and Roman classics, largely displaced from our curriculum, have in fact definitely shaped modern consciousness.'⁵³ Greenblatt's particular story is about the recovery of a single book, Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* (*On the Nature of Things*), in 1417, by Poggio Bracciolini, and its dissemination through manuscript and print culture: 'In my view, and by no means mine alone, the culture in the wake of antiquity that best epitomized the Lucretian embrace of beauty and pleasure and propelled it forward as a legitimate and worthy human pursuit was that of the Renaissance.'⁵⁴ At present, these two radically different views of the Renaissance remain unreconciled.

Imitation and Intertextuality

In this section we take a closer look at the ways in which a focus on our authors' use of classical antiquity may be put to the service of a dynamic reception history of a kind that has a claim to be a necessary and integral part of any literary history of the period, and not to be detached from wider discussions of political and cultural contexts.

Renewed and closer engagement with Latin and Greek authors feeds through into a reconfiguration of the forms in which writers and readers of the Renaissance thought about and expressed their identities as political and social animals. Roman historical and poetic accounts of civil war shaped the ways in which the English thought about their own civil wars, both those that preceded the establishment of the Tudor dynasty, and those that brought the Stuart dynasty to an end. Cicero's *De Officiis*, 'Tully's Offices', provided 'virtually the whole framework for civic humanist discussions of the active life'.⁵⁵ Curtis Perry (Chapter 8a, this volume) shows how pervasively English thinking on the mutability and possibilities of political institutions was conducted through a reading of Roman historiography. Republican theory of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is inseparable from the Taciteanism of the time (van Es, Chapter 19, this volume). The myths of nationhood with which Tudor and Stuart monarchs fostered national solidarity were calqued in large part on Virgil's *Aeneid*, with upbeat reference to *Eclogue* 4's proclamation of the return of the Golden Age. The private citizen might take as a touchstone for his or her own desires and sexuality Latin love poetry, especially Ovid (see Cora Fox, Chapter 8b, this volume). The stage and the epyllion form (Lynn Enterline, Chapter 11, this volume) provided spaces in which the erotic fantasies of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* might be played out, freed to an extent from the constraints of the Christian denial of the flesh.

As we have seen, the Virgilian model for the poet as spokesperson for the nation and as supplier of charter myths was one embraced above all by Spenser, both in his debut appearance as a fully-fledged author in *The Shepheardes Calender*, and then in *The Faerie Queene*. The English Renaissance saw the development of various models of the literary career, following the precedents of, in particular, Virgil, Ovid, and Horace (Patrick Cheney, Chapter 8c, this volume). Ben Jonson plays a particularly important role in establishing the authority of the author, whose independent identity is stamped on the 1616 publication of his collected *Works*, aspiring to the monumentality of an edition of the *Opera* of one of the great classical authors. The most classicizing of all English authors of the period, Jonson cuts a literary self for his own age largely out of the cloth of the ancients, and in particular out of his reading of the authorial personality of Horace, an early modern self-fashioning through imitation of the ancients (for full discussion, see Sean Keilen, Chapter 28, this volume). The laureate career path, to use Richard Helgerson's terminology,⁵⁶ set its sights on a crown of lasting fame, whose imagery and ideology are predominantly classical,

drawing in particular on well-known texts by Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Statius (Philip Hardie, Chapter 8d, this volume). Helgerson's non-laureate career pattern of the 'amateur' is itself defined in opposition to, and so presupposes, the ideals of mid-sixteenth-century humanism. Furthermore, there were well-known ancient Roman models in Catullus and the love-elegists for a literary career that rebelled against the expectations of civic and personal duty (Roland Greene, Chapter 14, this volume). It has been argued that imitation of Ovid and Petrarch in *Astrophil and Stella* is integral to Philip Sidney's exploration of a lyric subjectivity that tends to undermine the ideology of Sidney's public roles.⁵⁷

When Renaissance authors talk about imitation, they are well aware that their own practice in imitating the ancients is itself an imitation of the imitation of Greek texts by Roman writers. As Maggie Kilgour points out (Chapter 23, this volume), Roger Ascham, whose *The Scholemaster* contains one of the most substantial English Renaissance discussions of imitation, urged students to study how an ancient author transformed his source—for example, Virgil imitating Homer, or Cicero imitating Demosthenes—by leaving out some things, adding others, or changing the words and matter. Renaissance readers and writers were thus encouraged to reflect on how earlier and later texts relate to each other, with consequences for their own practice of imitation and allusion.

The early modern cultural historian may in turn reflect on how studies of the relationship between Greece and Rome in antiquity might offer starting points for thinking about the relationship of the English Renaissance (as a part of the wider European Renaissance) to Greco-Roman antiquity. Historians of Latin culture and literature, in particular, have developed powerful methods for understanding the ways in which Roman culture develops its Roman specificity in response to the adaptation of Greek culture.⁵⁸ The construction of a Roman cultural and literary identity is unthinkable without the 'Hellenization of Rome', and those aspects of their culture and society that the Romans think of as 'Roman' tend to be defined through a conscious contrast with Greek ways of doing things. At the level of detailed literary analysis, Latinists have shown how intertextuality between Latin and Greek literary texts is constitutive of the aims and character of Latin literature, paradigmatically in Virgil's creation of the Roman national epic, the *Aeneid*, through sustained and intricate dialogue with the Homeric epics and with the post-Homeric Greek literary tradition. The same is true across the gamut of literary kinds used by Roman writers, even in the case of satire, of which Quintilian famously said, 'satire is completely ours (i.e. Roman)'.

There are significant structural differences between the relationship of ancient Rome to Greece and the relationship of post-classical European culture to antiquity. Roman culture grew and developed in close contact with the Greek world (whose culture in the eastern empire indeed lasted longer than the Western, Latin, empire), whereas the successive 'renaissances' in Christian Europe, after the fall of the Western Roman Empire, look back to a classical culture whose pastness is increasingly

Introduction

recognized. While there is a continuity between the Christian culture of late antiquity and post-classical Europe, there is an ideological gulf between Christianity and pagan classical culture of a kind that never existed within the pre-Christian Greco-Roman world. Despite these differences, an awareness of how classicists in recent decades have approached the interaction between Greek and Roman may be useful for thinking about the dynamics of classical reception within Renaissance literature, in a complex process of appropriation, identification, and differentiation. Nor is the paganism of antiquity without its allure: the pagan classics offer a space in which the Christian of the Renaissance can enjoy a holiday from a sense of original sin and the need to discipline the flesh, as, *mutatis mutandis*, for an ancient Roman readership the world of Greek myth can offer a glamorous escape from everyday mundanity.⁵⁹

The difference that is registered in the sheer sense of the pastness of classical antiquity leads to a Petrarchan sense of loss and frustration, together with an intense desire for contact and reunion. Although gunpowder and the printing press were regularly cited as examples of post-antique inventions that greatly extended the powers of mankind (for good or for evil),⁶⁰ and although the opening-up of the New World burst open the limits set to the ancient Mediterranean world by the Pillars of Hercules, the period covered by this volume does not see a determined attempt, at least in the literary sphere, to claim a superiority of the modern over the ancient and so to relegate classical literature to history. Samuel Daniel's assertion, in *A Defence of Ryme*, that 'all our understandings are not to be built by the square of Greece and Italy',⁶¹ comes in the particular context of an argument against the necessity of following classical metrical models. But the quarrel of the ancients and moderns lies in the future, being usually regarded as one of the imports from France brought over with Charles II in 1660 (see Bruce Smith, Chapter 17, this volume).⁶² When Jonson tells Shakespeare that

I would . . .

 when thy socks were on,
 Leave thee alone for the comparison
 Of all that insolent Greece or haughty Rome
 Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come.⁶³

he is engaging in a kind of rivalrous comparison entirely contained *within* a culture of imitation; Jonson's similar comment on Bacon's having 'performed that in our tongue which may be compared either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome' (Jonson, 'On Bacon', *Discoveries*; *Works*, 8. 591) is itself an imitation of a challenge to the superiority of Greek rhetoric by Seneca the Elder, *Contr.* 1. praef. 6: 'all that Roman eloquence could put beside or above that of insolent Greece flourished about the time of Cicero.'

The radical unsettling and erosion of the classical system of genres, at least in verse, also lie in the future. One sign of the maturity of ancient Latin literature was

the creation in the Augustan period of works in a range of genres that could stand comparison with their great Greek models, so establishing what was perceived as a canon of Latin works. An analogous ambition to create works in English that engage closely with classical models but at the same time assert an independence in their address to the audiences and concerns of their contemporary world is perceptible in many writers of the period.

But how, more specifically, do literary texts of the period relate to the texts of Greek and Latin antiquity? A good place to start is with Renaissance theories of imitation, a central part of the literary criticism of the time (see Gavin Alexander, Chapter 5, this volume).⁶⁴ Terence Cave puts his finger on the immediate relevance of these writings for the subject of this book when he notes that ‘the problems which sixteenth-century theorists discuss under the heading of “imitation” reappear in literary historical method, as the study of sources, influences, or traditions’.⁶⁵ Unsurprisingly, Renaissance theorists themselves draw on ancient writers on the subject,⁶⁶ with key texts in Seneca, Quintilian, Macrobius, in a line that goes via Petrarch, to the early sixteenth-century European humanist scholars, with the hot spot of the debate over Ciceronianism, and so to Renaissance England. G. W. Pigman identifies three major classes of images and analogies relating to imitation: transformative, dissimulative, and eristic.⁶⁷ All three lay emphasis on the active creation of an authorial self, rather than a passive following in the footsteps of a great writer of the past. Seneca, in his eighty-fourth *Moral Epistle* on how to assimilate one’s reading, supplies metaphors for imitation that were imitated again and again.⁶⁸ First, the image of the bee that collects materials from flowers to make into honey, homogeneous and of a single taste. The bee, gathering pollen from flowers, can also be an image for an anthologizing approach, producing a mosaic of textual fragments cunningly fitted together, a model of eclectic imitation. Secondly, the image of digestion, closely related to the honey-making image, by which a variety of foods is transformed into the flesh and blood of our own persons. Thirdly, filial similarity, in which personal individuality coexists with family resemblance, in contrast to the unproductive similarity of a portrait, or, in another common metaphor, to the unintelligent imitation of a monkey, imitation as aping. Another common figure for the relationship to a great writer of the past was metempsychosis, the conceit that the soul of a dead poet had been reborn in a living poet, a localized moment of renaissance.⁶⁹ In one of the foundational moments of Roman literature, Ennius claimed in the prologue to his epic on Roman history that he was the reincarnated Homer. Spenser claims to find the courage to strive with Chaucer in providing a continuation to the latter’s unfinished ‘The Squire’s Tale’, because

through infusion sweete
Of thine own spirit, which doth in me survive,
I follow here the footing of thy feete.
(*Faerie Queene*, 4. 2. 34.6–8)

Introduction

Spenser is a rather exceptional case of an English Renaissance poet who places the reception of earlier English poetry at the heart of his imitative practice; in the most well-known instance of the figure, Frances Meres wrote that 'As the soul of Euphorbus was thought to live in Pythagoras: so the sweet witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare', in a catalogue juxtaposing English writers with their classical equivalents that was itself transplanted wholesale from another Renaissance writer.⁷⁰

Honey-making, digestion, father-son likeness, metempsychosis—all these images present imitation as a positive and dynamic process or relationship, through which the past is used to produce the materials of a living present, in contrast to the more static and inert metaphors concealed in 'influence' or 'tradition'. With regard to the study of allusion and intertextuality, there is a tension between 'dissimulative' Renaissance models of imitation that advocate so thorough an appropriation of the source texts that they are unrecognizable by the reader, and models that allow the source texts to remain visible through the changes exercised in the course of imitation, or that actively encourage the reader to compare source and imitation through an openly declared rivalry (emulation, *aemulatio*) between an author and his model.⁷¹

These author-based models of imitation need not limit the ways in which modern intertextualists read Renaissance texts. What is concealed, once revealed, may tell us important things about a text's relationship to classical antiquity, and, even if it could be shown in a particular case that an author intended to dissimulate a borrowing, authorial intention need not invalidate a reading that exploits a resemblance. Petrarch, who made a point about not repeating the exact words of classical authors in his own Latin poetry, tells how he was caught out by Giovanni Malpaghini when the latter pointed to an exact replication of a Virgilian phrase from *Aeneid* 6 in his *Bucolicum Carmen*. G. W. Pigman develops a subtle reading of the echo as a clever allusion that reaches further into the context of the Virgilian tag, but only as a warning against the pitfalls of building such an interpretation on a 'coincidental' parallel.⁷² But one could turn this round by denying the author Petrarch complete control over the meanings of his uses of tradition, and so empowering the reader in his or her own pursuit of allusivity.

The insights preserved in the ancient and Renaissance writings on imitation can usefully be put together with the range of new approaches that have been developed in recent decades in the names of allusion and intertextuality. There have been significant interventions in Renaissance studies, although for the most part not in English Renaissance studies. Two landmarks in particular deserve mention. First, Terence Cave's *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Cave is concerned with questions of identity and difference; with the production of authentic discourse and the possibility of 'self-expression' through the reading and appropriation of classical texts by, among others, Erasmus and Montaigne; and with the tension between the meanings of *copia* as 'plenitude' and *copia* as 'copy'. The most influential study of Renaissance imitation has been Thomas Greene's *The*

Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry, largely on Italian and French authors, but concluding with chapters on Wyatt and Ben Jonson.⁷³ Greene elaborates a fourfold typology of imitation, which may be arranged along a spectrum of continuity and discontinuity (or distance): (1) A 'sacramental' or 'reproductive' form of imitation, homage to sacred objects unassimilable into modernity. (2). 'Eclectic' or 'exploitative' imitation, in which the past is a storehouse of topoi for opportunistic use. (3) 'Heuristic' imitation, which both advertises its models, and then measures its distance from them, constructing a literary aetiology or genealogy. (4) 'Dialectical' imitation, which allows for an exchange of mutual criticism between the imitating and imitated texts. Greene's approach has affinities with the 'anxiety of influence' of his Yale colleague Harold Bloom. It runs the risk of being too *dirigiste* in assigning particular instances of imitation to one category or the other, but it has had the beneficial effect of bringing imitation studies in out of the cold.

Greene's *The Light in Troy* appeared just before the explosion of interest in allusion and intertextuality on the part of classical Latinists.⁷⁴ Some Renaissance English scholars have drawn productively on the work of Latinists in approaching allusion in their own texts, but there is surely scope for more interaction between classicists and Renaissance specialists. For example, Latinists have looked hard at the phenomenon of what is variously called 'double allusion' or 'window reference'⁷⁵ whereby an author alludes to text A, and at the same time to text B, to which text A already alludes. Independently, it would seem, Daniel Javitch discussed what he calls 'genealogical imitations' in *Orlando Furioso*, where Ariosto imitates, for example, a Virgilian passage and its prior imitation by Statius, or Boccaccio imitating Dante.⁷⁶ Javitch does cite Greene's *The Light in Troy*, but Greene uses the notion of genealogical imitation in a different sense. Stephen Hinds shows how Latin poets write literary history into their allusions;⁷⁷ Maggie Kilgour (Chapter 23, this volume) takes the example of John Weever's *Faunus and Melliflora* (1610), in which the character Faunus, the son of Picus, looks back to *Aeneid* 7 through *Metamorphoses* 14, and the satyrs who come to England with Trojan Brut are a figure for the immigration of satire as the next generation after Ovidian epyllion.

Latinists have directed attention to poetic and metapoetic markers of allusion in the text, 'Alexandrian footnotes' (phrases of the kind 'as the story goes'), and 'tropics of allusivity', or, in Alessandro Barchiesi's phrase, 'tropes of intertextuality', such things as Fate and fame, dreams, prophecy, images, echoes.⁷⁸ An example of this kind of analysis applied to a Renaissance text and its classical model is Colin Burrow's study of the language of imitation and imaging in Ovid and Spenser, *mimesis* in the sense of the visual artist's imitation of nature functioning as a figure for the literary artist's imitation of prior texts.⁷⁹

Greene focuses on the degrees of distancing involved in imitative and allusive practice. Distance and nearness form a polarity that can usefully be extended in a number of directions. The distance between pagan antiquity and Christian culture could be exploited for polemical or contrastive effects, as in Richard McCabe's

Introduction

appeal (Chapter 25, this volume) to René Girard's 'mimésis de l'antagonisme', in a discussion of Spenser's Christianization of his classical epic models. This absolute confessional distance is relativized if one takes the longer view of the classical past that includes the Christian Greek and Latin writers of late antiquity, poets such as Prudentius and the biblical paraphrasts, and the church fathers, whose works were constantly enlisted in the religious debates that raged throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mark Vessey (Chapter 6, this volume) highlights the continuing influence of an Erasmian humanism that did not seek to segregate (pagan) classical and Christian 'good letters'.

The earlier part, at least, of our period was more distant from Greek classics than from Latin, for the simple reason that far fewer educated Englishmen read Greek than read Latin. But a widespread bilingualism in English and Latin worked to keep the Latin classics constantly at the forefront of the cultural consciousness of the elite, and that closeness to classical Latin texts was reinforced by the flourishing practice of new writing in Latin. English neo-Latin literature is not a central concern of *OHCREL*, but it is important to remember that some of the most important writers of the period, including Marvell, Milton, and Cowley, were bilingual in their output.⁸⁰ Milton's decision to write his great epic in English was a conscious act of distancing English poetry from the dominant classical language of the Renaissance.

For those contemporaries with less than fluent Latin and Greek, the distance between antiquity and the present day could be bridged by English translations of classical texts; Chapman's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* made Homer available to a far wider audience than the small number who could read Greek. Translations were themselves often an exercise in emulating the ancient authors, in order to show that the resources of the English language were equal to those of Greek and Latin. There is no sharp distinction between imitation and translation, as can easily be felt by moving along John Dryden's spectrum of translation to paraphrase to metaphrase.⁸¹ Translations are a major part of the literary output of this period (and even more so of the period covered by volume 3), and play an important role in the development of English literature as a whole.⁸²

At the same time, translation may distance readers from Greece and Rome, through the interposition of a textual layer between the present day and classical antiquity. Shakespeare imitates Ovid through the medium of Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses*; but Shakespeare also remembered the Ovid that he had read in Latin at Stratford Grammar School, and doubtless he went back later to the Latin as well as to Golding.⁸³ The frequently mediated nature of the reception of classics in the Renaissance should never be forgotten. Virgil wrote perhaps 600 years after Homer, and in full awareness of the intervening traditions of interpretations and imitations of Homer. The millennium and a half that separates English Renaissance writers from, for example, the writers of Augustan Rome was not a period of continuous and consistent evolution of classical forms, but in many genres there is a multiplication of intermediaries between classical texts and their Renaissance

descendants, in some cases detouring through other vernaculars. The 'double allusion' beloved of classical Latinists may be extended into longer chains of reference. *The Faerie Queene* draws directly on the epics of Virgil and Ovid, but also approaches the classical models more indirectly via *Orlando furioso* and *Gerusalemme liberata*. Pastoral is an especially densely layered genre. Maggie Kilgour (Chapter 23, this volume) shows how Marvell's 'Damon the Mower' places itself in a tradition of pastoral complaint that looks back through the Polyphemus of *Metamorphoses* 13, to Ovid's own models in Virgil's second *Eclogue*, and to Virgil's models in Theocritus' *Idylls*. A Renaissance pastoral poem like this is fully alert to the intertextual and literary-historical self-consciousness built into the classical genre of pastoral,⁸⁴ and extends it through allusion to earlier Renaissance examples of the genre, both vernacular and neo-Latin. Philip Sidney exploits tensions between Petrarch, and one of Petrarch's own models for his first-person love poetry, Ovid, in his sonnet sequence *Astrophil and Stella*.⁸⁵

The question of distancing also arises with regard to the ways in which the Renaissance reads its classical texts: what kind of a distance does that set between Renaissance and modern ways of approaching the ancient world, and, related, what kind of a distance does that set between Renaissance readers and what we might now wish to reconstruct as ancient ways of reading and responding to texts? The allegorical and exemplary reading practices prevalent in our period are now largely out of fashion (which is not to say that many recent reading fashions are not allegorical, even if not acknowledged as such). Much of the medieval and Renaissance tradition of allegorization would now seem ahistorical, although the importance of ancient allegorical practices, in both reading and writing, in the centuries before the explosion of such in late antiquity is now being properly recognized. An exemplary approach to texts certainly was widespread in antiquity; that it is now out of fashion says more about modern tastes than about a concern for historical reconstruction.⁸⁶

Modern studies of allusion tend to presuppose ideal readers who think of texts as wholes, and who hold in their minds the interrelations between parts of texts. Renaissance readers, it has been argued, were conditioned by their education and by the habit of excerpting choice flowers from texts for their commonplace books to fragment texts, and were so discouraged from taking a broader view of the unity and interconnections of a text.⁸⁷ But it is overly restrictive to suppose that such habituation, for such purposes, suppressed more holistic ways of reading. The fact that our reading of English Renaissance texts for an allusivity that presupposes a wider readerly embrace of model texts by authors of the time leads to productive results may tell us only about our own ability to make patterns, but there is a fair possibility that it corresponds to an authorial pattern-making, and one that contemporary readers might be expected to share. Jessica Wolfe notes (Chapter 21, this volume) George Chapman's protest about the practice of excerpting proverbs from Homer's epics: 'Homer . . . must not be read for a few lines with leaves turned over capriciously in dismembered fractions, but throughout—the whole drift, weight and height of his works set before the apprehensive eyes of his judge.'⁸⁸

Introduction

In the later part of our period, the distance from antiquity is lessened by neoclassical tendencies, as writers, partly guided by developments in literary criticism and literary scholarship, aimed at a more faithful reconstruction of classical forms. Jonson's neoclassicism is routinely contrasted with Shakespeare's freer and less scholastic imitation of classical models; Jonson is followed by, for example, Abraham Cowley's 'Pindaric Odes', which combine translations of Pindar with new poems in the manner of Pindar, and Cowley's unfinished biblical epic the *Davideis*, accompanied by Cowley's own scholarly notes on his own poem. This is the road that leads to *Paradise Lost*, from one point of view a *tour de force* of learned classicizing, from another a poem deeply embedded in the history and controversies of Milton's lifetime. But neoclassicism, aiming at the 'correct' imitation of ancient forms, could also drive a wedge between modernity and classical antiquity, confirming distance and encouraging the development of new and unclassical forms of literature.

In conclusion, we see a close authorial engagement with the genres, forms, and language of classical literature as being at the heart of the literary practice of the English Renaissance, and of fundamental importance for the functions of literature within the society of the period. The reception of classical antiquity is not an 'extra' in the study of English Renaissance literature, a perhaps regrettable product of the dominant educational system of the time, something that acted as a drag on modernity's discovery of itself. So, far from being an inert and backward-looking source of materials and forms that were transformed into something vital and innovative by a nascent modernity, the authorial imitation and reworking of classical texts were central to the literature of the English Renaissance.

Notes

1. David Hopkins and Charles Martindale, 'Introduction', in *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature*, vol. 3: 1660–1790 (Oxford, 2012), 5.
2. Martindale and Hopkins (eds), 'Introduction', 3.
3. Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in Vincent B. Leitch et al. (eds), *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (New York, 2001), 1466–70; Michel Foucault, 'What Is an Author?', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York, 1984), 101–20. On Barthes and Foucault writing 'the two most influential essays on authorship in twentieth-century criticism', see Andrew Bennett, *The Author*, New Critical Idiom (New York, 2005), 5.
4. Julia Kristeva, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel', in *The Kristeva Reader*, trans. Alice Jardine, Thomas Gora, and Leon S. Roudiez, ed. Toril Moi (New York, 1986), 33–61. On the importance of the concept, including in today's methodology, see Patrick Cheney, 'Intertextuality', in Roland Greene (ed.), *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th edn (Princeton, 2012), 716–18.
5. See David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book* (Cambridge, 2001). On collaboration, see Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the*

- English Renaissance* (Cornell, 1993); Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1997).
6. See, e.g. Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*, ed. Helen Higbee and William West (Cambridge, 2000); Tiffany Stern, *Making Shakespeare: From Stage to Page* (2004).
7. Louis Montrose, 'Spenser's Domestic Domain: Poetry, Property, and the Early Modern Subject', in Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (eds), *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture* (Cambridge, 1996), 92.
8. Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago, 1992), 215.
9. See Michael D. Bristol, *Big-Time Shakespeare* (New York, 1996), whose model of authorship remains unmatched: 'Authorship need not be understood as a sovereign and proprietary relationship to specific utterances. It is perhaps more fully theorized in terms of dialogue and ethical sponsorship. The author is both debtor and trustee of meaning rather than sole proprietor; authorship is always ministerial rather than magisterial' (p. 58).
10. Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book*, 6.
11. Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge, 2003), 26.
12. Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare and the Book Trade* (Cambridge, 2013). 'The Return of the Author' is the title of the Forum for *Shakespeare Studies*, 36 (2008), 19–131, ed. Patrick Cheney. In his essay in this Forum, Kastan continues his disagreement with Erne, whose essay also appears.
13. Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge 1997). Studies of classicism and Shakespeare are countless; see Colin Burrow, Chapter 27, this volume.
14. Leah Marcus, 'Textual Indeterminancy and Ideological Difference: The Case of *Dr Faustus*', *Renaissance Drama*, 20 (1989), 1–29; Thomas Healy, *Christopher Marlowe* (Plymouth, England, 1994).
15. Wendy Wall, 'Authorship and the Material Conditions of Writing', in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to English Literature 1500–1600* (Cambridge, 2000), 64–89.
16. For Richard Helgerson's principle of self-presentation, see *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983). For Montrose's principle of reciprocity, see 'The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text', in Patricia Parker and David Quint (eds), *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts* (Baltimore, 1986), 303–40.
17. Patrick Cheney, 'Spenser's Pastorals: *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*', in Andrew Hadfield (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser* (Cambridge, 2001), 79–105.
18. By 'we', we mean the volume editors, not the contributors, who have written about their topic as they see fit.
19. See also Charles Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge, 1993).
20. The schools taught boys to read the New Testament in Greek, and some, such as Westminster, emphasized classical Greek. Such authors as Sidney and Jonson were proficient in Greek.
21. See, e.g. Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (1960; New York, 1961), 11–21.
22. Jules Michelet, *Histoire de France/Michelet: Présentée et Commentée par Claude Mettra*, 18 vols (Lausanne, 1965–7); Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 2 vols (New York, 1958); Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of*

Introduction

- Renaissance Culture* (New Haven, 1999). Needless to say, Barkan brings an unmatched sophistication to the 'aesthetics' of 'Renaissance Culture' (the book subtitle). As Panofsky points out, in 1550 Vasari spoke of 'la rinascita', but applied the rebirth only to art (*Renaissance and Renascences*, 31).
23. Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1980).
 24. Margreta de Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 37 (2007), 461. De Grazia has been instrumental in turning attention away from Renaissance subjectivity to Renaissance objectivity; see her introduction to *Subject and Object*. See also Lisa Jardine, *Worldly Goods: A New History of the Renaissance* (New York, 1996).
 25. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 463.
 26. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 459.
 27. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 459–60.
 28. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 460–1. Burckhardt does devote part 3 of his study to 'The Revival of Antiquity', but 'one of the chief propositions of ... his book' is that 'it was not the revival of antiquity alone, but its union with the genius of the Italian people, which achieved the conquests of the Western world' (*Civilization*, 1. 175). Later, he identifies the classical revival as one of four 'elements' making up the Renaissance in Italy, along with 'the popular character', 'chivalry', and 'the influence of religion and the Church' (1. 179). His generalized chapter on 'The Old Authors' has little to do with the specifics of imitation.
 29. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 461.
 30. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 461.
 31. Hopkins and Martindale, 'Introduction', 9.
 32. Cf. Hamilton's summary of interpretation on the satyrs episode: 'Satyres ... symbolize concupiscence ... They are associated with the desolation of Palestine ... and their presence here has been variously identified: historically, as ignorant Christians ... the Jews ... savage people responding to religion ... the Gaelic population of Ireland ... morally, as "nature without nurture" ... or uncorrupted human nature' (ed., *Faerie Queene* (New York, 2001), 83).
 33. Douglas Bush, *Prefaces to Renaissance Literature* (New York, 1965), 4.
 34. A landmark study remains Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and its Sources*, ed. Michael Mooney (New York, 1979).
 35. William Kerrigan and Gordon Braden, *The Idea of the Renaissance* (Baltimore, 1989).
 36. While Burckhardt's individual and the poststructural subject differ, Kerrigan and Braden aim to connect the two.
 37. Joel Fineman, *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye: The Modern Invention of Subjectivity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1986); Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York, 1998).
 38. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York, 1997). Bloom's final book is *The Anatomy of Influence: Literature as a Way of Life* (New Haven, 2011). See Patrick Cheney, 'Influence', in Greene (ed.), *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 703–5.
 39. De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', 455–6.
 40. Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences*, 113.
 41. Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 63. For Barkan's earlier landmark study of Renaissance classicism, see *The Gods Made Flesh*:

- Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven, 1986).
42. On the death of the Renaissance during the mid-seventeenth century, see William J. Bouwsma, *The Waning of the Renaissance 1550–1640* (New Haven, 2000). In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Renaissance* (Oxford, 2003), Gordon Campbell selects the ‘core period’ dates of 1415 and 1618, ‘the two Defenestrations of Prague’ (p. vii). In its entry on ‘Renaissance’, this *Dictionary* defines the period this way: ‘a model of cultural descent in which the culture of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe is represented as a repudiation of medieval values in favour of the revival of the culture of ancient Greece and Rome’ (p. 655). For a still valuable history of criticism on the Renaissance, see Wallace K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation* (1948; Toronto, 2006). For a more recent, and specified, overview, see Robin Sowerby, *The Classical Legacy in Renaissance Poetry* (Harlow, 1994), which is arranged by genres.
 43. Gordon Braden, *Petrarchan Love and the Continental Renaissance* (New Haven, 1999), 60.
 44. Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, 1953), 379, 400.
 45. Philip Hardie, *Virgil’s ‘Aeneid’: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986).
 46. See Patrick Cheney, *Reading Sixteenth-Century Poetry* (Oxford, 2011), chs 3, 8.
 47. Harry Berger, *Second World and Green World: Studies in Renaissance Fiction-Making*, ed. John Patrick Lynch (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988), 52.
 48. Berger, *Second World and Green World*, 55.
 49. Berger, *Second World and Green World*, 37.
 50. Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, 1993), 149.
 51. Simpson, *Reform and Revolution*, vol. 2: 1300–1547, *Oxford English Literary History* (Oxford, 2002).
 52. Brian Cummings and James Simpson (eds), *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History* (Oxford, 2010), 5, 6.
 53. Stephen Greenblatt, *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern* (New York, 2011), 8.
 54. Greenblatt, *The Swerve*, 8.
 55. Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 2002), vol. 2: *Renaissance Virtues*, 218–19.
 56. Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates*.
 57. Paul Allen Miller, ‘Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid, or Imitation as Subversion’, *English Literary History*, 58 (1991), 499–522.
 58. Erich S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (1993); Denis Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs* (Cambridge, 1998), ch. 2; Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome’s Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge, 2008).
 59. See William Fitzgerald, *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1995), ch. 6.
 60. Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum*, 1. 129 (*The Oxford Francis Bacon*, 15 vols (Oxford, 1996–), 11. 195): ‘Printing, gunpowder and the compass... whence have followed innumerable changes, in so much that no empire, no sect, no star seems to have exerted greater power and influence in human affairs than these mechanical discoveries.’
 61. Samuel Daniel, *The Complete Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 5 vols (1885–96), 4. 46.
 62. See further, D. Hopkins, ‘The French Connection’, in *Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature*, vol. 3, 166–70.
 63. Jonson, ‘To the memory of my beloved, the author, Mr William Shakespeare’, ll. 32–40; *Works*, 8. 391.

Introduction

64. In general, see H. Gmelin, 'Das Prinzip der Imitation in den romanischen Literaturen der Renaissance', *Romanische Forschungen*, 46 (1932), 83–360; Harold O. White, *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance* (Cambridge, MA, 1935); G. W. Pigman, 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33 (1980), 1–32; B. Vickers (ed.), *English Renaissance Literary Criticism* (Oxford, 1999), 22–39; Ann Moss, 'Literary Imitation in the Sixteenth Century: Writers and Readers, Latin and French', in Glynn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3: *The Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1999), ch. 9; Gregory Machacek, 'Allusion', *PMLA* 122 (2007), 522–36. Colin Burrow's 2011 Blackwell Bristol Lectures on 'Imitation' (forthcoming) are a major contribution to the topic.
65. Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text* (Oxford, 1979), 76.
66. For a lucid account of ancient imitation-theory, see Donald A. Russell, 'De imitatione', in D. West and T. Woodman (eds), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1979), 1–16.
67. Pigman, 'Versions of Imitation', 4.
68. On Jonson's assimilation of the classical images for imitation, see Richard S. Peterson, *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson* (New Haven, 1981), ch. 1.
69. See Stuart Gillespie, 'Literary Afterlives: Metempsychosis from Ennius to Jorge Luis Borges', in Philip Hardie and Helen Moore (eds), *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception* (Oxford, 2010), 209–25.
70. Frances Meres, *Palladis Tamia* (1598), cited in Vickers (ed.), *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 28.
71. On Renaissance emulation, see Vernon G. Dickson, "'A Pattern, Precedent, and Lively Warrant': Emulation, Rhetoric, and Cruel Propriety in Titus Andronicus", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 62 (2009), 376–409.
72. G. W. Pigman, 'Neo-Latin Imitation of the Latin Classics', in P. Godman and O. Murray (eds), *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Oxford, 1990), 199–210.
73. Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, 1982). Other important discussions include John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981), and Peterson, *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson*. Christopher Ricks, *Allusion to the Poets* (Oxford, 2002) starts chronologically with Dryden, but has much to interest the student of our period.
74. Landmarks include Gian Biagio Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. C. Segal (Ithaca, NY, 1986); Joseph Farrell, *Virgil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (Oxford, 1991); Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998).
75. Richard F. Thomas, 'Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 90 (1986), 171–98 (repr. in *Reading Virgil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, 1999), ch. 4); James C. McKeown, *Ovid Amores*, vol. 1: *Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool, 1987), 37–45, 'Double Allusion'.
76. Daniel Javitch, 'The Imitation of Imitations in Orlando Furioso', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38 (1985), 215–39.
77. Stephen Hinds, 'Diachrony: Literary History and its Narratives', in *Allusion and Intertext*, ch. 3.
78. Alessandro Barchiesi, 'Tropes of Intertextuality in Roman Epic', in *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets* (2001), 129–40.

79. Colin Burrow, "Full of the Maker's Guile": Ovid on Imitating and the Imitation of Ovid', in Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds (eds), *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Reception* (Cambridge, 1999), 271–87.
80. See Luke B. T. Houghton and Gesine Manuwald (eds), *Neo-Latin Poetry in the British Isles* (2012).
81. John Dryden, 'Preface to Ovid's Epistles', in John Dryden, *The Works*, gen. eds Edward Niles Hooker, H. T. Swedenberg, Jr, and Vinton A. Dearing, 20 vols (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956), 1. 114–15.
82. See the manifesto for a literary history that takes full account of translations of the classics, by Stuart Gillespie, *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History* (Malden, MA, 2011). Robin Sowerby (*The Augustan Art of Poetry: Augustan Translation of the Classics* (Oxford, 2006)) makes the case that translations of Latin poetry played a key role in the translation of a Roman Augustan aesthetic into a vernacular equivalent in seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century poetry. For much fuller discussion of translation in our period, see Gordon Braden, Robert Cummings, and Stuart Gillespie (eds), *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, vol. 2: 1550–1660 (Oxford, 2010).
83. For a demonstration of this, see Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid*, 8.
84. See T. K. Hubbard, *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton* (Ann Arbor, 1998). Marlowe anticipates Marvell's exploitation of the layered intertextuality of pastoral in 'The Passionate Shepherd to his Love', as shown by Patrick Cheney, 'Career Rivalry and the Writing of Counter-Nationhood: Ovid, Spenser, and Philomela in Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd to his Love"', *English Literary History*, 115 (1998), 523–55.
85. Miller, 'Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid'.
86. On allegory and epic, see Philip Hardie, Chapter 10, this volume. On exemplary Renaissance readings of epic, for models of virtuous conduct to imitate, see Craig Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas: Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in the Early Italian Renaissance* (Hanover, NH, 1989); see also Jane Grogan, *Exemplary Spenser: Visual and Poetic Pedagogy in "The Faerie Queene"* (Farnham, 2009). For a reading practice that extends beyond the exemplary to a political reading for action, see Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "'Studied for action": How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 129 (1990), 231–46.
87. The case is made by Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1993); for counter-arguments, see Raphael Lyne, *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English Metamorphoses 1567–1632* (Oxford, 2001), 36–8. See also Heather James, 'Shakespeare, the Classics, and the Forms of Authorship', *Shakespeare Studies*, 36 (2008), 80–9.
88. George Chapman, 'To the Most Honoured Earl, Earl Marshal', in *Achilles' Shield*, in Chapman's *Homer: The Iliad*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Princeton, 1998), 544.

PART I

Institutions and Contexts



The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship

PETER MACK

This chapter is concerned with the ways in which English students obtained access to classical texts, learned how to read them, and began to imitate them. It will describe the classical texts taught at school and university. In school the imitation of classical texts would have taken place in Latin (and occasionally in Greek); in later life mainly in the vernacular, though some English writers continued to express themselves in Latin and (to a lesser extent) Greek throughout the seventeenth century. As the rest of this volume will show, the study of classical literature was an important basis for every kind of writing in this period.

English writers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries first met classical texts and were first taught how to read them through an educational system that was dominated by humanism. The humanists promoted the study of the legacy of the ancient world. Their activities included recovering old manuscripts and editing classical texts, improving the quality of Latin style and reintroducing the study of the Greek language, writing commentaries on classical texts and amassing knowledge about antiquity, imitating classical pastoral, epic, tragedy, and satire, at first in Latin and later in the vernacular languages, and applying classical rhetoric to modern conditions. Humanism, which originated in Padua in the later thirteenth century, eventually influenced most aspects of Renaissance and early modern culture, including Bible study, theology, philosophy, political thought, law, science, music, and the visual arts.¹ By 1558 the prestige and influence of the humanist movement within England was assured, but English writers continued to compose orations and treatises encouraging the study of classical texts.

I shall begin this chapter by discussing the roots of sixteenth-century English humanism and some of its literary expressions, then I shall look at the texts studied and the techniques of reading and writing taught, first in the grammar school and

then in the universities, in the period 1558–1660. Finally I shall say a little about English classical scholarship and editing in the same period.

English Humanism

The previous volume in this series will include chapters on the fifteenth-century origins of English humanism, when scholars had to go to the Continent to learn Greek and acquire a humanist education, and about the growth of humanism in the Henrician period. In the early years of the sixteenth century Erasmus was in touch with several English scholars, was twice (1499–1500, 1509–14) personally in residence in England, and encouraged and assisted John Colet in the foundation of St Paul's School.² His inspiration remained central for English humanists in the Elizabethan period. The most important practical step taken in the early sixteenth century, which continued under Elizabeth, was the foundation or re-establishment of town grammar schools, whose statutes required a humanist programme of training.

Erasmus' *De Ratione Studii* is both a manifesto for humanist education and an outline of the subjects and authors to be studied and the methods by which texts should be taught.

In principle, knowledge as a whole seems to be of two kinds, of things and of words. Knowledge of words comes earlier, but that of things is the more important. But some, the 'uninitiated' as the saying goes, while they hurry on to learn about things, neglect a concern for language and, striving after a false economy, incur a heavy loss. For, since things are learnt only by the sounds we attach to them, a person who is not skilled in the force of language is, of necessity, short-sighted, deluded, and unbalanced in his judgement of things as well.³

Erasmus argues, perhaps unrealistically, that the Greek and Latin languages should be studied together ('not only because almost everything worth learning is set forth in these two languages, but in addition because each is so cognate to the other that both can be more quickly assimilated when they are taken in conjunction'⁴). He wants the grammar to be dealt with quickly so that pupils can move on to reading texts.

For a true ability to speak correctly is best fostered both by conversing and consorting with those who speak correctly and by the habitual reading of the best stylists.⁵

Among Greek writers he specifies Lucian, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Aristophanes, Homer, and Euripides; among the Romans, Terence (or Plautus), Virgil, Horace, Cicero, and Caesar (and perhaps Sallust as well). These writers are enough for learning the languages. For learning about things pupils will need to study Pliny, Macrobius, Athenaeus, Aulus Gellius, Plato, Aristotle, Homer, Ovid, and many other authors. Erasmus gives instructions for the notebooks in which pupils should store the treasures culled from their reading in order to reuse them, for the

The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship

writing exercises that they should be set, and for the teachers' approach to reading texts with their pupils. After giving an introduction that discusses the reasons for reading the book, the author's life, the genre, the plot, and the metre, the teacher should examine the text in detail, pointing out grammatical stylistic, rhetorical, and ethical issues.

He should carefully draw their attention to any purple passage, archaism, neologism, Graecism, any obscure or verbose expression, any abrupt or confused order, any etymology, derivation, or composition worth knowing, any point of orthography, figure of speech, or rhetorical passages, or embellishment or corruption. Next he should compare parallel passages in authors, bringing out differences and similarities—what has been imitated, what merely echoed, where the source is different... Finally he should turn to philosophy and skilfully bring out the moral implication of the poets' stories, or employ them as models.⁶

Erasmus' work serves as a model to the English for the characteristic Renaissance genre of the treatise on education, which aims to praise classical education, to set out a (sometimes Utopian) programme of study, and to suggest teaching techniques and exercises. The most famous English example of the genre is Roger Ascham's *The Scholemaster*, published posthumously and unfinished from his papers in 1570. Ascham's debt to Erasmus' *De Ratione Studii* is made obvious when he addresses the question of the relation between words and things with which Erasmus had begun his treatise.

You know not, what hurt you do to learning, that care not for words, but for matter, and so make a divorce betwixt the tongue and the heart. For mark all ages: look upon the whole course of both the Greek and Latin tongue, and you shall surely find, that, when apt and good words began to be neglected, and properties of those two tongues to be confounded, than also began ill deeds to spring: strange matters to oppress good orders, new and fond opinions to strive with old and true doctrine, first in Philosophy: and after in Religion.⁷

Ascham's preface announces 'three special points' to which he has paid 'earnest respect' throughout the work: 'truth of religion, honesty in living, [and] right order in learning'.⁸ He emphasizes a humane approach to teaching, seeking interest and enthusiasm rather than coercion and fear. He gives strong reasons for preferring that pupils should rather be 'allured to learning by gentleness and love, than compelled to learning by beating and fear'.⁹

Ascham directs that pupils should begin with the basic grammar, which they should learn rapidly so that they can move on to exercise their knowledge of the language by reading Cicero's simpler letters, collected by the Strasbourg humanist and schoolmaster Johann Sturm (1507–89). After the master and pupil have together construed the Latin text into English orally several times, the pupil must make his own written translation of the Latin. After checking the translation, the master should take away the Latin text and after about an hour ask the pupil to translate his own

English version back into Latin. The pupil's version can then be compared with Cicero's original in order to bring out ways of improving the pupil's Latin. For Ascham the rules of concord are best taught and reinforced through examples.

Using the same method of 'good understanding the matter, plain construing, diligent parsing, daily translating, cheerful admonishing, and heedful amending of faults, never leaving behind just praise for well doing', the master should turn next to a good portion of a comedy by Terence.¹⁰ As well as their Latin texts, pupils should have three exercise books: one for their English translations of their Latin texts, a second for their Latin translations of their English, and a third to gather notable points about the texts they have read under six headings: literal (*proprium*), metaphorical, synonyms, distinctions between related terms, contraries, and phrases. This notation applied to the letters and later to some of Cicero's orations 'shall work such a right choice of words, so straight a framing of sentences, such a true judgement, both to write skilfully, and speak wittily, as wise men shall both praise and marvel at'.¹¹

The next stage involves a gradual extension of the reading matter, continuing with daily translation but construing and parsing only where the pupils seem not to understand, to Cicero's *De Amicitia* and his long letter to his brother Quintus, to Terence and Plautus, and to Caesar's *Commentaries* and selected speeches from Livy's history. The teacher may translate into English some passages from Cicero that the pupil has not seen, in order for the pupils to turn it back into Latin.¹² Or the teacher may write an English letter or an English version of one of the *progymnasmata* exercises for the pupil to translate into Latin. Ascham commends the technique of double translation, which he later extends also to Greek, as the most effective way of teaching the classical languages. Following his mentor Sturm, he also gives great importance to imitation and in particular to studying the use that Roman authors made of Greek texts, noting what is retained, what omitted, what added, what reduced, what changed in order and what altered in words, sentence structure, or substance.¹³ Throughout the work Ascham emphasizes the benefit of teaching the rules of language, argument, and expression through the study of examples.¹⁴ Ascham takes a passionate interest in promoting the best ways of teaching children Latin and Greek. He believes that a really sound understanding of both languages and a reading of their best writers will contribute effectively to strong morality, wide learning, and the promulgation of true religion.

Ascham's *The Scholemaster* can be linked both to treatises on the behaviour and education of the elite, such as Castiglione's *The Courtier* (1528), translated into English by Sir Thomas Hoby in 1561 (and into Latin in 1571 by the Englishman Bartholomew Clerke),¹⁵ and Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Book Named the Governor* (1531) and to more detailed treatises on the syllabus and methods of grammar-school teaching, such as John Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius* (1612) and Charles Hoole's *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole* (1660), which I shall use in my discussion of grammar schools in the next section. John Milton's tractate *Of Education* (1644) rejects the

organization and ordering of education in his day but shares many of the same presumptions. The aim of education is to acquire knowledge and love of God and to fit a man 'to perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war'.¹⁶ Education will necessarily begin with 'the languages of those people who have at any time been most industrious after wisdom'¹⁷—that is to say, primarily Latin and Greek. But the languages should be learned as quickly as possible so that the pupils can progress to matter (always learned, in humanist fashion from the study of classical texts): agriculture, Greek, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, geography, physics, fortification, architecture, meteorology, plants, living creatures, anatomy, medicine. Then they will study poetry, ethics, scripture, Italian, politics, and history. Only at the end of the course will they learn about logic, rhetoric, and poetics, so that they can effectively communicate the knowledge they have.¹⁸

The Grammar School

The Elizabethan grammar-school syllabus had three main elements.¹⁹ The first years are given over to learning how to read, write, and speak Latin. Pupils begin by learning the rules of Latin grammar, which they practise by learning and imitating elementary texts and dialogues, such as *Cato's Distichs*, the *Sententiae Pueriles*,²⁰ a Latin version of Aesop's *Fables*, dialogues by Erasmus and Castalio, and poems by Mancini and Mantuan.²¹ Several of these elementary texts have a strong Christian orientation, and all the statutes of grammar schools refer to prayers and churchgoing as essential components of the programme. The later years are devoted to a fairly consistent course in Latin literature: Cicero's *Epistles*, Terence, Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Aeneid* (and sometimes the *Georgics* as well), Cicero's *De Amicitia*, *De Senectute*, and *De Officiis*, Caesar or Sallust, Ovid (usually *Tristia* and *Metamorphoses*), and Horace. In the third place, the syllabi and the educational theorists propose a series of writing exercises to be practised by the students. Composition of these forms of writing is supported by analysis and imitation of Latin authors and by three handbooks: a letter-writing manual, Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*, and Erasmus' *De Copia*. While some of the statutes are probably too ambitious in the list of texts proposed for pupils' reading (perhaps because the documents were partly intended to reassure the wealthy people or corporations endowing a particular school that they would be getting value for money), it does seem that schools in or near London (such as Westminster, St Paul's, and Harrow) may have studied Greek and a wider range of texts, including Cicero's *Orations*, *Tusculan Disputations*, and/or *De Natura Deorum*, Livy, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Hesiod.²²

An example of the more ambitious type of syllabus from the seventeenth century is the 'Conjectured Curriculum of St Paul's School 1618–25', which D. L. Clark derived from a Trinity College Cambridge manuscript. The school is divided into

eight classes. Pupils would know how to read and write before they entered the school aged about 7. Successful pupils would enter one of the universities at 15 or 16.

1. Latin Grammar. Read *Sententiae Pueriles* and Lily, *Carmen de Moribus*.
2. Latin Grammar. Read *Cato's Distichs* and Latin translation of Aesop.
3. Latin Grammar. Read Erasmus, *Colloquia* and portions of Terence, for colloquial Latin, and Ovid, *Tristia*, for poetry.
4. Latin Grammar. Read Ovid, *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses* (and perhaps other elegiac poets), and Caesar and perhaps Justin for history.
5. Begin Greek Grammar, and continue with some review of Latin Grammar. Read Sallust for history and Virgil, *Eclogues*.
6. Greek Grammar and the Greek New Testament. Begin Cicero (*Epistles* and *De Officiis*), continue Virgil (*Aeneid*), and perhaps take up Martial.
7. Greek Grammar. Read selection of Greek poets (including perhaps Hesiod, Theognis, Pindar and Theocritus), Cicero, *Orations* and Horace.
8. Hebrew Grammar and Psalms. Read Homer, Euripides, Isocrates (and perhaps Demosthenes), Persius and Juvenal.²³

One might compare this list with the one that Hoole gives at the end of his work for the programme at Rotherham Grammar School before he began to teach there in 1636, which he tells us was 'the same that most Schoolmasters yet use', in 1659.²⁴ There are nine classes and the entry expectations are the same as at St Paul's.

1. Learn accidents of Latin Grammar by heart and begin learning the rules.
2. Repeat the accidents; learn the rules in *Propria quae Maribus* and read and exercise in *Sententiae Pueriles*.
3. Repetition of Latin Grammar and syntax; read *Cato's Distichs* and Latin translation of Aesop.
4. More repetitions of rules of syntax, grammatical figures, and prosody. Read Terence and Mantuan.
5. Latin Grammar and begin Greek Grammar. Begin Rhetoric with Butler, *Rhetorica*. Read Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Cicero, *De Officiis*, and selections from Latin poetry in the anthology *Flores Poetarum*.
6. Greek Grammar and Greek New Testament, Virgil and Cicero's *Orations*. Translate from Greek into Latin.
7. Greek Grammar. Read Isocrates, Horace and Seneca's *Tragedies*.
8. Greek Grammar. Hesiod, Juvenal, Persius.
9. Begin Hebrew Grammar. Read Homer and 'some comical author'.

In comparison with the sixteenth-century syllabi, neither of these gives such a prominent place to Cicero's letters (though there are other reasons for thinking that the easier letters did continue to be used as elementary readers, as Sturm and Ascham insisted), both give far more emphasis to Greek and even begin Hebrew. It seems that, while Greek may have been wished for in the earlier statutes and

actually taught only in the larger centres, as the pool of Greek teachers grew it was taught more frequently throughout the country, not least because it gave access to the original text of the New Testament. The course that Hoole himself taught from 1636 and argued for in his book was much more ambitious in terms of the number of authors to be studied. Hoole thought that it was very important to move students on as quickly as possible from the rote learning of the grammar rules to the appreciation of their practical use by the best authors.

1. Latin Grammar (Lily). Latin vocabulary (*Orbis Pictus*), *Sententiae Pueriles*. Lords' Prayer, Creed, and ten commandments in Latin and English.
2. Latin Grammar. Rules of *Propria quae Maribus*, Cato's *Distichs*, Corderius' *Dialogues*.
3. Latin syntax. Prosody. Latin New Testament and English Bible. Latin translation of Aesop, *Janua Linguarum*.²⁵ More dialogues (Erasmus, Castalio), Mantuan, Latin catechism.
4. Latin Grammar. Rules of rhetoric. Begin Greek Grammar. Latin New Testament. Terence. Cicero, *Epistles*, Ovid, *Tristia*, *Metamorphoses*. Double translation (into English and back to Latin).
5. Latin Grammar and Greek Grammar (Camden). *Elementa Rhetorices*. Aphthonius, Isocrates, Theognis, Justin's *History*, Caesar's *Commentaries*, Virgil, Aesop (in Greek), Themes.
6. Begin Hebrew Grammar (Buxtorf's *Epitome*). Revise Latin and Greek Grammar. Hesiod, Homer, Pindar, Lycophron, Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Lucan, Seneca's *Tragedies*, Lucian, Cicero's *Orations*, Pliny's *Panegyrics*, Quintilian's *Declamations*, Goodwin's *Antiquities*. Themes, orations and declamations in Latin and Greek. Verse composition.²⁶

Hoole is most concerned to improve on his predecessors in trying to make his pupils always understand what they are doing and why they are doing it. He finds rote-learning backed up by threats wasteful and ineffective. Instead he wants to engage the interest and intelligence of his pupils—for example, by always giving them an overview of the material they need to learn and dividing it into groups so that they can understand the progress they are making. Like Brinsley, as we shall see, he thinks that pupils can be helped to understand the usefulness of particular expressions and the meaning of texts through systematic questioning and dialogue.

Hoole makes much more open use of English in his teaching than earlier theorists of the grammar school. Among the earliest readers he proposes in both classical languages are religious texts that the pupils will already know well in English. When he introduces pupils to Latin poetry he also sets them to read English poets, such as George Herbert, Quarles, and Sandys's translation of Ovid so that they can get a feeling for the effect of poetry through their native language.²⁷ He advises pupils to translate portions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* into English prose, to ornament the English version with epithets, phrases, sayings, and proverbs and then translate their

elaborated English version back into Latin prose in order to exercise their powers of amplification and come to grips with the differences between Latin prose and poetry.²⁸ Then they can try to turn the Latin prose back into English verse. As in other grammar schools, Hoole gave an important place to reading Scripture in English and to the pupils repeating on Monday different types of material garnered from the English sermon they had heard in church on Sunday.²⁹

Hoole encourages the pupils to read a much wider range of authors than earlier schools had attempted, particularly in the sixth form. This is especially apparent in the lists of classical and subsidiary (this latter class includes both reference works and additional primary reading) books ('A note of School Authors, most proper for every Form of Scholars in a Grammar-School'), which he provides for all classes immediately after his preface.³⁰ He notices this as a possible criticism and responds to it with three arguments:

1. That I have to deal with children who are delighted and refreshed with variety of books, as well as of sports, and meats.
2. That a Schoolmaster's aim being to teach them Languages, and Oratory, and Poetry, as well as Grammar, he must necessarily employ them in many Books which tend thereunto.
3. That the classical Authors are the same with other Schools, and Subsidiaries may be provided at a common charge as I shall afterwards show.³¹

Hoole evidently sees one part of the criticism here as related to the number of books that a pupil would be expected to buy. His response suggests that the subsidiary books would be bought collectively by the class for common use. Other references indicate that, as was probably the case in other grammar schools, several of the books would be read only in part. For example, he tells us that for Homer two books taken either from the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* should be sufficient.³² His instructions for reading Virgil include taking the *Eclogues* in small sections at first, then whole poems at a time, but 'after they have passed the *Georgics* by the Master's help, he may leave them to read the *Aeneid* by themselves, having Cerda or Servius at hand to resolve them in places more difficult for them to construe'.³³

The idea that pupils should taste a range of authors in order to put them in a position to read more thoroughly on their own is also evident in the instructions that he gives for the private teaching of 'young gentlemen' who need to make progress especially quickly. After a brief tour of the accidents and the rules of concord, the pupil moves on to the Latin New Testament, read with the help of the English Bible, Corderius' dialogues, the *Janua Latinae Linguae*, for sentences and vocabulary, Aesop's *Fables*, and Terence.³⁴

After he is once Master of his style, he will be pretty well able for any Latin book, of which I allow him to take his choice. Whether he will read Tully [Cicero], Pliny, Seneca, or Lipsius for Epistles; Justin, Sallust, Lucius Florus or Caesar for History; Virgil, Ovid,

The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship

Lucan, or Horace for Poetry. And when I see he can read these understandingly, I judge him able to peruse any Latin author of himself, by the help of Cooper's Dictionary, and good commentators or Scholiasts.³⁵

Hoole points out that all these authors are available in English, as well as Livy, Pliny's *Natural History*, and Tacitus. He suggests that these private pupils should use the English translation to help them with the Latin, though he still wants them to make translations of their own from time to time.³⁶ Hoole also seems very concerned that pupils should have a wide range of knowledge in mythology and ancient history in order to have a store of examples to use in their own compositions.

Hoole finds a place for rhetoric in his scheme. This chiefly involves learning the tropes and figures, first from a grammar book and later from a Ramist rhetoric.³⁷ He also mentions the importance of practising letter-writing, exercising the pupils using Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* and, as we have seen, giving them exercises in amplification.³⁸ Unlike sixteenth-century statutes and teaching manuals, Hoole makes no reference to Erasmus' *De Copia*.

Like other seventeenth-century plans of study, Hoole's *New Discovery* finds an important place for Greek and seeks to begin the teaching of Hebrew. Hoole lays particular stress on Hebrew, pointing out that, while some defer Hebrew to the university, 'I may say it is rarely attained there by any that have not gotten (at least) the rudiments of it before hand, at a Grammar School'.³⁹ As we shall see, the universities in the seventeenth century seem to have expected that a good part of the study of Aristotle would be based on the Greek text (where the Latin Aristotle was more usual in the sixteenth century), which in turn depends on a good proportion of the pupils knowing Greek from school. Hoole even makes reference to the teaching of Arabic and other oriental tongues at Westminster school, though he does not himself attempt this.⁴⁰

Teaching Latin Literature

Latin literature was taught for the instructional matter it contained, as a model of writing for imitation, and in order to improve pupils' ability to use Latin vocabulary and grammar. In the earlier classical texts, usually Cicero's letters and Terence, pupils were expected to analyse sentences word by word. With the later texts and with abler pupils, grammatical analysis focused on difficult passages. The reading of classical texts was also expected to provide subject matter, vocabulary, and models for Latin speaking and written composition. Terence was chosen for the purity of his use of Latin and for the applicability of many of his phrases to everyday situations, as well as for the delightful perceptiveness of his observation of character.⁴¹ Cicero's letters exhibited the most admired Latin stylist writing an everyday form of composition ideal for the pupils' imitation.

The educational theorists agreed on the broad pattern for the teaching of classical texts. The teacher should begin by giving a general introduction to the author, the genre of writing, and the work to be studied. The text should be read in Latin and its meaning explained, either by Latin paraphrase or by translation.⁴² The teacher should then discuss some of the following: difficult or unusual words, historical or cultural issues, questions of style, parallels with other texts. In his instructions for reading, which were included in Lily's *Brevissima Institutio*, Erasmus suggested that pupils should read texts four times: at first straight through to catch the general meaning; then word by word sorting out vocabulary and constructions; thirdly for rhetoric, picking out figures, elegant expressions, *sententiae*, proverbs, histories, fables, and comparisons; and finally ethically, noting exemplary stories and moral teaching.⁴³ Cardinal Wolsey's statutes for Ipswich grammar school outlined a very similar method of teaching classical Latin texts.⁴⁴

Given that the volume of space required for some texts (such as Virgil's works or Ovid's *Metamorphoses*) leaves the commentator with space only for an introduction and marginal notes, Erasmus' and Wolsey's instructions are broadly consistent with the generality of Renaissance commentaries on classical texts. Most of the commentaries on longer texts include arguments, which provide a summary in advance to each section of a work. This is consistent with the educational theorists' requirement that the pupils should understand the context within which they are parsing, paraphrasing, and annotating difficulties. To some extent these sectional summaries counteract the tendency to fragmentation implicit in the emphasis on the analysis and recording of individual sentences.⁴⁵ In his chapter on construing extempore, to which he often cross-refers as his model of commentary, Brinsley outlines the manner in which his pupils should approach a text for which they have no commentary to hand.

2 Where they have no help but the bare author and that they must construe wholly of themselves, call upon them oft to labour to understand and keep in fresh memory the argument, matter and drift of the place which they are to construe . . .

3 To consider well of all the circumstances of each place, which are comprehended most of them in this plain verse:

Quis, quid, cui, causa, locus, quo tempore, prima sequela.

That is, who speaks in that place, what he speaks, to whom he speaks, upon what occasion he speakes, or to what end, where he spake, at what time it was, what went before in the sentences next, what followeth next after . . .⁴⁶

Brinsley's instructions focus on understanding the author's vocabulary and constructions, but he believes that the best aid to construing is an awareness of the local and general context of a passage. Brinsley urges his pupils to explore local context in terms of speaker, audience, purpose, and occasion. He asks not for the technical rhetoric of a labelling of verbal patterns but for an approach to the text as embedded in the relation between speaker, audience, purpose, and occasion

that is rhetorical in the broader sense. Hoole agrees with Brinsley on the importance of context in construing sentences and on the usefulness of his seven questions in establishing context.⁴⁷ In their reading of more advanced texts, such as Terence and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, pupils are expected to collect useful words and phrases, to construe grammatically, to observe examples of tropes and figures, derivations and differences, and to make use of the narratives in their own compositions.⁴⁸ He suggests that Terence offers the teacher very good opportunities for discussing 'decorum of both things and words, and how fitting both they are for such persons to do or speak, as are there represented, and upon such occasions as they did and spoke them'.⁴⁹ He gives examples of comments on *Andria* that draw moral lessons from the play. The words of the speeches will provide them with material that they can enlarge upon in their own compositions. Finally he suggests that some of the scenes should be acted out by the pupils, to give them practice in pronunciation and gesture. 'This acting of a piece of a comedy, or a colloquy sometimes, will be an excellent means to prepare them to pronounce orations with a grace.'⁵⁰

Composition Exercises

The principal forms of written Latin composition practised in the grammar school were letters and themes (essays on moral topics).⁵¹ One or two syllabi specify declamation as a grammar-school exercise, but Brinsley finds it more suitable for universities or for the very best pupils.⁵² According to Kempe, letter-writing was initially taught through varying phrases from some of the simpler letters from book 14 of Cicero's *Ad Familiares*.⁵³ Later, pupils would be instructed to write letters either within realistic schoolboy situations like those presented in the dialogues, or within situations arising from their reading of classical texts, where the words of their author would provide the main material. Thus the free space of the letter would be filled with matter extracted from reading. Imitation would be assisted by the study of a letter-writing manual. Several of the syllabuses specify textbooks that the pupils should read to assist in composition, most frequently Erasmus' *De Conscribendis Epistolis* for letters, Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* for themes and other composition exercises, and Erasmus' *De Copia* for facility and style more generally. Since these three works were also several times printed in England in the sixteenth century, it is reasonable to assume that they were fairly widely used.

Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* is a fourth-century Greek group of writing exercises that were usually presented to Renaissance schoolboys in a Latin translation by Rudolph Agricola, with commentary and additional examples chosen by Reinhard Lorichius.⁵⁴ The *Progymnasmata* provides a graded sequence of fourteen exercises in composition, beginning with the fable (which consists of a story with a moral attached) and building up to the proposal for a law (a set of arguments in favour of a new law and

a refutation of objections).⁵⁵ The exercises make use of the early reading material (fables, moral sentences) and add different materials and forms (description, speech for a character) that can later be incorporated in larger compositions.

Aphthonius comes closest to the theme in the thesis, his penultimate exercise. The thesis is defined as an enquiry, investigating an issue through speech. It is divided into civil (concerning active life or city business) and contemplative (concerned with the mind). It consists of a preface, urging or praising a particular course of action, a narration of what is involved, arguments from the legitimate, the just, the useful, and the possible, a series of brief objections answered fully, and a conclusion.⁵⁶ The thesis builds on parts of the earlier exercise of the commonplace,⁵⁷ but adds the refutation of objections, thus moving in the direction of the full four-part oration. Like Aphthonius' other exercises, it serves as a preparation for topical invention.⁵⁸

English writers treated the theme as an advanced exercise with a fixed structure. Christopher Johnson, the master at Winchester in the 1560s, taught the theme as a combination of *sententia*, developed commonplace, and proof.⁵⁹ Brinsley expected pupils to follow the structure of the classical oration (*exordium*, narration, arguments in favour, refutation of opposing arguments, and conclusion).⁶⁰ Hoole's instructions on writing themes focus on the need for the pupils to provide themselves with adequate material. He urges them to compile commonplace books from their reading, collecting short histories, fables, proverbs, emblems, laws, witty sentences, rhetorical embellishments, and descriptions. He suggests classical texts that will provide material under each of these headings. Once the subject of the theme has been announced, pupils should search their commonplace books according to the theme's key words. The teacher should ensure that each pupil has adequate collections of material and should then provide models for structure (which may be drawn from Aphthonius) and imitation. The pupils should be encouraged to compete in writing each section of the theme, first in English and then in Latin. His instructions suggest that he prefers themes to follow the structure of the classical oration.⁶¹ Ralph Johnson, writing later in the seventeenth century, provided an equally firm and slightly different structure in which the refutation is dropped and the topics of the arguments in favour are specified (*exordium*, narration, cause, contrary, comparison, example, testimony, conclusion).⁶² The third to seventh sections of this structure, derived from the topics of invention, draw on Aphthonius' exercises.

Universities

Oxford and Cambridge were of central importance to national life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A relatively high proportion of the male population (around 1.6 per cent in the later decades of the sixteenth century), including most of the elite, were educated there, sons of prosperous husbandmen and yeomen, burgesses from the towns, country gentlemen, professional men, and the lower ranks of

the titled. McConica's analysis of Oxford matriculation records for the late sixteenth century suggests that almost half the entrants belonged to the gentry.⁶³ His study of the records of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, shows that university graduates went on to become priests, country gentlemen, school teachers, academics, royal servants, doctors, lawyers, and tradesmen.⁶⁴ Typically pupils matriculated aged 15 to 16 after completing their grammar-school studies. By 1600 around 44 per cent of matriculants went on to take the Bachelor of Arts degree, in principle four years after matriculation. Many of the others attended university for two or three years, without intending to take a degree; some of this group moved to London to study law at the Inns of Court. Of those who graduated, about 12 per cent went on to take higher degrees, almost all of them in theology.⁶⁵

The monarchs and their counsellors took a personal interest in university affairs. Queen Elizabeth made three formal visitations to her universities, each of which lasted almost a week and required the transfer of the whole machinery of government to Oxford and Cambridge.⁶⁶ Under Charles I, William Laud, one of his most trusted advisors and later Archbishop of Canterbury, became Chancellor of the University of Oxford and reformed the statutes of the university. From 1642 to 1646 Charles resided in Oxford and ruled the kingdom from there. The Commonwealth authorities organized three visitations of the university.⁶⁷ The national authorities understood very well the importance of the universities in the education of the elite and the maintenance of any religious settlement.

Recent studies of Oxford in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by James McConica and Mordechai Feingold have changed our view of university teaching in the period. They have shown that within the colleges, under the supervision of individual tutors, students could pursue a wide range of different and more innovative types of study alongside the traditional requirements of the university statutes, which in the BA degree were principally for rhetoric and Aristotelian logic.⁶⁸

Throughout the period the university statutes require extensive study of rhetoric and logic, together with some moral and natural philosophy. At Cambridge the first of the four years stipulated for the BA degree in the statutes of 1570 was devoted to rhetoric; the set texts were Quintilian, Hermogenes, or any of Cicero's rhetoric manuals or speeches. Rather surprisingly, the statutes specify that the texts should be explained in and translated into English.⁶⁹ Two years of the BA are devoted to dialectic. The professor of dialectic is instructed to lecture on Aristotle's *Sophistical Refutations* or Cicero's *Topica*.⁷⁰ The nine lecturers (four of them for dialectic) mentioned in the 1560 statutes of Trinity College, Cambridge, were required to teach, respectively: introduction to Greek; Greek literature; Latin (mostly Cicero); mathematics; an introduction to dialectic; Porphyry's *Isagoge* or Aristotle's *Categories* or *De Interpretatione*; *Prior Analytics*, *Posterior Analytics*, or Agricola's *De Inventione Dialectica*; Aristotle's *Topica*; an Aristotelian work on natural philosophy.⁷¹ Some of the expression of this statute suggests that all these works were in fact taught as a cycle of Aristotelian logic, which seems more sensible than treating these texts as alternatives.

In the Oxford Statutes of 1564/5 the grammar course, which lasts for two of the sixteen terms (four per year) of the BA, required Linacre's *Rudiments*, Virgil, Horace, or Cicero's *Epistles*. The four terms for rhetoric were devoted to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* or Cicero's rhetorical works or orations. Five terms are devoted to dialectic, with lectures on Porphyry's *Isagoge* or any book of Aristotle's *Organon*.⁷² Sixteenth-century Oxford college statutes stipulate lectures in Humanity (usually involving Latin poetry, history, and rhetoric), Greek, and rhetoric.⁷³ The Laudian statutes of 1636 provided for lecturers in Grammar (Prisican, Linacre, and selected Latin and Greek authors) and Rhetoric (Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, or Hermogenes), which students were expected to attend throughout their first year. The Lecturers in Dialectic (Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Organon*) and Moral Philosophy (Aristotle's *Ethics*, *Politics*, and *Economics*) addressed the students of the second to fourth years. The lecturer in natural philosophy lectured on Aristotle's *Physics* or *Metaphysics*. The Regius Professor of Greek was to lecture on grammar, propriety of diction, Homer, Demosthenes, and Isocrates to students from the second year until the Master's degree (taken after seven years), while the Regius Professor of Hebrew lectured on grammar and the Bible to students from the fifth to the eighth year, unless they had declared for higher degrees in Medicine or Law. The Camden Professor of History addressed all students after the BA, taken in the fourth year, on Florus and other Roman historians. There were also lectures on Geometry, Astronomy, and Music. As well as attending the required lectures, pupils followed a course of study prescribed by their college tutor and took part in university and college disputations.⁷⁴

The importance of rhetoric in the Elizabethan university is confirmed by the lists of books owned by students who died in residence. Cicero's *Orations* (60 entries in 173 relevant Cambridge lists) and his rhetorical works, especially the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (50 entries) occur very frequently on the lists. Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* (37 entries), Cicero's *De Oratore* (19), Aphthonius (18), and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (28) are less frequent but still found quite often. There are also a reasonable number (16) of entries for Hermogenes.⁷⁵ Modern rhetorics listed include Erasmus' *Ecclesiastes* (27), *De Copia* (35), and *De Conscribendis Epistolis* (27), 13 entries for Melancthon's rhetoric (probably *Elementa Rhetorices*, but one cannot be sure), and 9 for Talon. The great importance of dialectic is also clearly demonstrated with 89 listings of Aristotle's logic (including 34 sets of the complete works), 45 of Agricola's *De Inventione Dialectica*, 30 of dialectic texts by Melancthon, 18 of Caesarius's *Dialectica*, 17 by Ramus, and 12 by Seton, whose textbook was explicitly written to be taught at Cambridge.

English pupils would first read one of the classical textbooks of the whole of rhetoric, such as *Rhetorica ad Herennium* or Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, at university rather than at grammar school. The teaching of rhetoric at the universities was closely connected to the study of classical literature. Those booklists that contain rhetoric texts almost always include a good deal of classical literature. Ralph Cholmondely's Oxford notebook collects quotations from Cicero's orations and

philosophical works alongside notes on a lecture course on his *Partitiones Oratoriae*. Each section of the text is summarized as a main question, to which the commentary adds the opinions of classical and Renaissance authorities, including Quintilian, Agricola, Latomus, Strebaeus, and Talon. The commentary includes objections and replies intended to prepare students for disputations on rhetoric.⁷⁶ In his Oxford lectures on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* John Rainolds assumes that his audience already has a complete knowledge of classical rhetoric. He considers how much the underlying assumptions of rhetoric, as they are presented in the early chapters of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, are consistent with a Christian outlook and useful in a modern context. Rainolds devotes a good deal of his commentary to attacking Aristotle's ethical assumptions. For Rainolds, the *honestum* must always be upheld, especially when it conflicts with the expedient. Rainolds finds that Aristotle's arguments are based on worldly appearance rather than on truth. By concentrating on philosophical questions that arise from Aristotle's text, Rainolds discusses rhetoric in a way that suits the exercise of disputation, but he also forces his audience to face the moral question within rhetoric, where the grammar school had taken a more instrumental approach to the effectiveness of proverbs in winning assent for arguments.⁷⁷

Logic textbooks composed for English universities by Seton, Case, and Sanderson emphasize the connections between rhetoric and logic and the way in which the principles of logic can be used in everyday language and to generate texts useful in contemporary situations.⁷⁸ McConica shows that, while almost all students in Elizabethan Oxford followed a basis of studies in Latin literature, rhetoric, and dialectic, many of them read widely in history, mathematics, physics, ethics, theology, modern languages, and Greek.⁷⁹ The incomplete diary of the Carnsew brothers (Christ Church, 1570s) shows them practising letter-writing, constructing syllogisms, and studying Sturm, Sallust's *Jugurthine War*, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Foxe's sermons, Caesar's *Gallic War*, logic textbooks by Valerius, Caesarius, and Melanchthon, Cicero's *De Amicitia*, Aristotle's *Ethics*, Josephus' *Jewish History*, Agricola's *De Inventione Dialectica*, and textbooks of mathematics and astronomy.⁸⁰ Feingold argues that the undergraduate curriculum in seventeenth-century Oxford provided students with a grounding in the entire arts and sciences curriculum, partly as a consequence of improvements in the teaching of Greek in grammar schools.⁸¹ Feingold shows that in moral philosophy Oxford tutors always taught Aristotle's *Ethics* and generally also recommended other classical authors such as Cicero, Plutarch, and Seneca, but differed in the modern handbooks they suggested as introductions and commentaries.⁸² The Camden Professor of History was required to lecture on Florus' *Epitome*, an abridgement of Roman history up to the wars of Augustus, but generally supplemented that text with information derived from other classical historians and from more recent studies of ancient history.⁸³

The central document for Cambridge BA teaching in the seventeenth century is Richard Holdsworth's *Directions for a Student in the Universitie*, which organizes and lists the books to be studied by an undergraduate in the four years of the BA degree.⁸⁴

The student is directed to begin his course by reading and copying out the instructions so as to have a clear idea of what he is trying to achieve and what he needs to read each term (see Table 2.1).

Holdsworth's scheme begins with a strong focus on logic. The morning studies are devoted to the student's philosophical education: logic, ethics, and physics. In each case he begins with an overview of the whole subject, following this up with longer textbooks and then with exercises and disputations. The requirement for a set number of disputations in order to obtain a degree gives additional importance to logic within the syllabus. In the third and fourth years Holdsworth's pupils go back over logic, ethics, physics, and the *parva naturalia*, this time working from Aristotle's Greek text, with the help of commentaries. Holdsworth emphasizes the importance of this phase for both language and learning.

The reading of Aristotle will not only conduce much to your study of controversy, being read with a commentator, but also help you in Greek, and indeed crown all your other learning, for he can hardly deserve the name of scholar, that is not in some measure acquainted with his works. Gather short memorial notes in Greek out of him, and observe all his terms.⁸⁵

The student's progress through Aristotle's logical and physical works is supplemented with a study of Seneca's *Natural Questions* and Lucretius, read largely for their contribution to philosophical Latin style in preparation for the pupils' round of disputations for graduation and with a summary of theology, intended as preparation for the next stage of their studies.⁸⁶

The student's afternoons are devoted to more literary studies, including a wide survey of Latin writers and a selection of the most important Greek writers. The study of Greek and Latin history, oratory and poetry, is essential, Holdsworth insists.

Studies not less necessary than the first [i.e. the morning readings], if not more useful, especially Latin, and oratory, without which all other learning though never so eminent, is in a manner void and useless, without those you will be baffled in your disputes, disgraced and vilified in public examinations, laughed at in speeches and declamations. You will never dare to appear in any act of credit in the University, nor must you look for preferment by your learning only. The necessity of this study above the rest is the cause that it is to be continued through all the four years in the afternoons.⁸⁷

Holdsworth gives the strongest possible endorsement of the importance of grammar, rhetoric, and the study of Latin literature in the seventeenth-century university. Laud's statutes had made a very similar point when they insisted on an examination for all students seeking the BA.

The examination is not to be on philosophical subjects merely, to which limits the narrow learning of the last age was confined, but also matters of philology; and a principal object of inquiry with the examiners will be what facility the several persons have of expressing their thoughts in Latin; for it is our will that no persons shall

The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship

Table 2.1. Richard Holdsworth, *Directions for a Student in the Universitie*: books to be studied by an undergraduate in the four years of the BA degree

Term	Morning	Afternoon
Year 1 Term 1	Short System of Logic Larger textbook of Logic	These Directions Goodwin, <i>Roman Antiquities</i> Justinus, <i>Historia</i>
Year 1 Term 2	Logical Controversies Another Logic textbook	Cicero, <i>Epistles</i> Erasmus, <i>Colloquia</i> Terence, Cicero, <i>Epistles</i>
Year 1 Term 3	Logical Controversies and Disputations	Ross, <i>Mystagogus Poeticus</i> (a guide to mythology) Ovid, <i>Metamorphoses</i> Greek New Testament
Year 1 Term 4	Brief system of Ethics Longer system of Ethics	Terence Erasmus, <i>Colloquia</i> Theognis
Year 2 Term 1	Brief system of Physics Longer system of physics	Latin grammar and Valla, <i>Elegantiae</i> Greek grammar and Vigerius on idioms
Year 2 Term 2	Controversies in Logic, Ethics and Physics	Cicero, <i>De Senectute</i> , <i>De Amicitia</i> , <i>Tusculan Disputations</i> , <i>De Oratore</i> Aesop's <i>Fables</i> in Greek
Year 2 Term 3	Brief system of Metaphysics Longer system of Metaphysics	Florus Sallust Quintus Curtius
Year 2 Term 4	Controversies of all types	Virgil, <i>Eclogues</i> , <i>Georgics</i> Ovid, <i>Heroides</i> , Horace, Martial, Hesiod, Theocritus
Year 3 Term 1	Controversies of all types for the whole year Scaliger, <i>De Subtilitate</i>	Caussin, <i>Eloquentiae Sacrae et Humanae Parallela</i>
Year 3 Term 2	Aristotle, <i>Organon</i> , with the commentary of Brierwood	Cicero, <i>Orations</i>
Year 3 Term 3	Aristotle, <i>Physics</i>	Demosthenes, <i>Orations</i> Strada, <i>Prolusiones</i> Turner, <i>Orations</i> Quintilian, <i>Declamations</i>
Year 3 Term 4	Aristotle, <i>Ethics</i>	Juvenal, Persius, Claudian, Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> Homer, <i>Iliad</i>
Year 4 Term 1	Seneca, <i>Natural Questions</i> Lucretius	Cluverius, <i>General History</i> Livy, Suetonius
Year 4 Term 2	Aristotle, <i>De anima</i> and <i>De Coelo</i> with commentary	Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, <i>Saturnalia</i> , Plautus
Year 4 Term 3	Aristotle, <i>Meteorologia</i> with commentary	Cicero, <i>Orations</i> , <i>De Officiis</i> , <i>De Finibus</i>
Year 4 Term 4	Wendelin, <i>Summa of Christian Theology</i>	Seneca, <i>Tragedies</i> , Lucan, Statius, Homer, <i>Iliad</i> , <i>Odyssey</i>

be admitted to the bachelorship of arts but those who can with consistency and readiness . . . express their thoughts in Latin on matters of daily occurrence.⁸⁸

The students begin their classics course with Goodwin's English exposition of Roman antiquities and Justinus' epitome of Pompeius Trogus' universal history in order to acquire a basic knowledge of Roman manners and customs and ancient history, which will help them understand all their classical texts, reducing the need for further commentary. The subsequent emphasis on Cicero's letters, Erasmus, and Terence is intended to gain purity in Latin style. Their reading is meant to be paired with composition exercises in the same genre.⁸⁹ The reading of Ovid should be prepared by the study of a compendium of classical mythology and of maps of Greece and the Roman Empire.⁹⁰

Holdsworth emphasizes both the subject matter of the texts, which will provide material to enrich pupils' own compositions, and the benefits that their reading will provide for their Latin style and pronunciation. Where the first year of the literature course had concentrated on the most central authors and the first reading of Greek texts, with the New Testament, the second year provides a very wide diet of Latin literature and history, varied with a little Greek. The fourth term of the second year is given over to a range of poets (Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Martial, Hesiod, Theocritus), who must be read quickly (Holdsworth suggests a fortnight each) and selectively.⁹¹ Holdsworth wants his pupils to be acquainted with a wide range of authors (and he allows that they will enlarge their reading once they have completed the bachelor's degree), but his most important criterion in selection is the help that particular authors will give his pupils in improving their style and in providing materials that they can reuse.

The first half of the second year is given over to rhetoric, for which Holdsworth recommends Nicolas Caussin's immense *Eloquentiae Sacrae et Humanae Parallela*, with its gathering of materials from a range of Greek rhetorical sources, rather than one of the classical rhetoric textbooks.⁹² Holdsworth emphasizes the great value of rhetoric for writing, learning, and practical life and also, in true humanist vein, the close connection between logic and rhetoric, either of which he sees as inadequate without the other.

To obtain a degree students had to participate in disputations. A Renaissance disputation often began with a speech by one of the participants (the respondent). The other participant (the opponent) then made an argument against the respondent's view. The respondent repeated the substance of this argument and denied it. The opponent then made another argument that the respondent repeated and replied to, either agreeing or denying the argument (and perhaps giving a reason). The opponent aimed to force the respondent either to agree to the opponent's first argument or to contradict himself. The opponent would often make arguments that appeared irrelevant to the question at issue (but that could later be shown to be connected). The respondent needed to take careful account of the implications of either agreeing or disagreeing with a particular argument. The respondent often distinguished

different senses of the words that the opponent put to him, agreeing with them in one implied sense but disagreeing in another. The whole exercise called for great mental and verbal agility on the part of the participants.⁹³ Disputations between eminent scholars were often staged as intellectual entertainments for important visitors to the university such as the queen and her court. The practice of disputation had a considerable impact on the way in which debates were conducted in the privy council and in parliament.⁹⁴

Holdsworth gives his pupils some helpful advice on the way to prepare for disputations. Once they have mastered the outline of logic or physics, they should discover which questions are usually disputed, such as ‘what is logic?’ or ‘is logic an art?’ Then they should examine a range of textbooks and commentaries (he suggests Brierwood, Eustachius, the Coimbra, and Complutensian commentaries on the *Organon* and others) in order to discover the principal arguments that have been made on that question in order to understand the controversy.⁹⁵

This being done gather the sum and substance of it in your paper-book, as short and clear as you can, which you can do most easily and readily in this method. First set down the state of the question. Then give a reason or 2 why it is held so, and lastly choose 2 or 3 of the principal Arguments from the rest of their answers . . . This will be enough to make you able to give an account of it upon any occasion, and with a little warning dispute on it.⁹⁶

These documents show very clearly that all students for the bachelor’s degree would have studied a wide range of standard literary texts in Latin and Greek, including Virgil, Homer, Cicero, Ovid, Horace, and the New Testament, together with some rhetorical theory (principally Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle), and a good deal of logic (including most if not all of Aristotle’s *Organon*). Most would also have studied some natural philosophy (based on Aristotle), ethics (Aristotle and Cicero), and history (for example, Florus, Sallust, Suetonius, and Livy). Students would also have read a range of other classical and modern texts depending on their and their tutors’ individual interests.

Scholarship and Editing

Historians have generally regarded classical scholarship and editing in England as being largely derivative of, and inferior to, contemporary scholarship on the continent.⁹⁷ The best-equipped English scholars devoted themselves to biblical rather than classical scholarship. When Casaubon came to England in 1610, King James directed his interests towards theology.⁹⁸ But English scholars possessed very good linguistic skills and excellent access to classical texts. They could produce scholarship of a very high standard, even though they did not generally publish impressive large-scale works and editions. Brink points to the ‘intellectual freshness

and critical independence' of Thomas Gataker (1574–1654) in his *Adversaria Miscellanea* and praises the philological acumen of John Pearson (1613–86) in his notes on the text of Aeschylus.⁹⁹ Feingold draws attention to the high standard of classical scholarship shown by Patrick Young (1584–1652), the royal librarian, Henry Jacob the younger (1608–52), Edmund Chilmead (1610–54), and others. This basic level of scholarship was fundamental to the great achievements of English biblical and theological scholarship in the seventeenth century, notably the King James Translation and the Polyglot Bible.¹⁰⁰

In the whole period 1558–1660 the great majority of classical and learned texts used in Britain were imported from the Continent, and it appears that continental books were easily and widely available in London.¹⁰¹ G. J. Toomer cites the example of George Thomason writing to Cardinal Barberini in Rome and offering his help in securing books 'printed in other parts of the world, which I am many times master of. You may remember at your being here we are generally better furnished with books from all parts then is any parte of Christendom besides.'¹⁰² English scholars enjoyed easy access to the most thorough and up-to-date continental commentaries, as we have seen in the references given by Hoole and Holdsworth.¹⁰³ There were many notable English private collections of classical texts. Both universities possessed large libraries and many cathedrals and parish churches possessed smaller collections.¹⁰⁴ Even though London lacked a large public library, scholars and general readers could find virtually any classical text they needed.

As a result of Henry Bynneman's patent from the 1570s onwards, the basic classical texts used in schools (such as Virgil, Terence, Horace, and various works of Cicero) began to be printed in England.¹⁰⁵ Initially these were copies of continental editions; later English scholars provided commentaries to the texts. As the list of printings in Table 2.2 demonstrates, the volume of editions of the classical texts used in grammar schools produced in England (usually in London, but sometimes in Oxford or Cambridge) grew considerably in the early decades of the seventeenth century.¹⁰⁶

The commentaries produced by Englishmen generally reflect the preoccupations of grammar-school teaching. In John Bond's commentary on Horace, the main focus is on imparting basic linguistic knowledge, what a word means, how a construction works. Just like the much briefer Manutius observations that accompany early English editions of Virgil, Bond's aim is to give pupils the means to read Horace for themselves. He gives a few notes on the implications of the words and a few with rhetorical import, noting allegories and metaphors. Usually his glosses are in Latin, but just occasionally he gives an English gloss for clarification. In comparison with earlier school commentaries on Horace, Bond tends to shorten the headnotes, which usually gave a summary of the structure and the moral teaching of the poem. His preface indicates that his main aim is to give readers all the information that will enable them to read Horace for themselves.

Here kind reader you will certainly find that I have not passed over any word, phrase or sentence which is hard to understand in this whole author without having explicated it,

The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship

Table 2.2. English Printings of Selected Classical Authors in Latin and Greek, 1550–1660, from STC and Wing

Authors	Titles and dates of printings
Aphthonius	<i>Progymnasmata</i> , 1572, 1575, 1580, 1583, 1594, 1596, 1605, 1611, 1616, 1623, 1631, 1635, 1636, 1650, 1655.
Aristotle	<i>Ethics</i> , Latin, 1581, 1590 <i>Posterior Analytics</i> , Latin, 1594, 1631 <i>Physics</i> , Latin, 1583 <i>Poetics</i> , Latin, 1623 <i>Rhetoric</i> , Greek/Latin, 1619, Hobbes's epitome, 1637
Caesar	1585, 1590, 1601, 1655
'Cato'	<i>Distichs</i> , etc, 1553, 1555, 1561, 1562, 1569–70, 1572, 1574, 1577, 1580, 1592, 1598, 1607, 1610, 1620, 1621, 1623, 1625, 1628, 1634, 1639, 1641, 1646, 1651, 1652 (2), 1659.
Cicero	<i>Philosophical Works</i> (includes <i>De Officiis</i>) 1573, 1574, with Manutius notes 1579, 1584 <i>De Officiis</i> with annotations of Erasmus, Melanchthon, Latomus, 1587, 1590, 1593, 1594, 1595, 1598, 1604, 1606, 1611, 1614, 1616, 1621, 1623, 1626, 1628, 1629, 1630 (2), 1631, 1633, 1635 (2), 1638, 1639; 1648, 1651, 1660; Latin/English: 1558, 1568, 1574, 1583, 1596 <i>Tusculan Disputations</i> , 1574, 1577, 1591, 1599, 1615, 1628, 1636 <i>Epistolae ad Familiares</i> , 1571, 1574, 1575, 1577, 1579, 1581, 1584, 1585, 1590, 1591, 1595, 1602, 1607, 1618, 1625, 1630, 1631, 1634 (2), 1635, 1637, 1640, 1656. <i>Orations</i> , 3 vols, 1579–80, 1585; vol. 1, 1587, 1601, 1616; vol. 2, 1596, 1612, 1618, 1636; vol. 3, 1600, 1612 <i>De Oratore</i> , 1573, 1589 <i>De Inventione/Rhetorica ad Herennium</i> , 1574, 1579
Florus	1631, 1638 (2), 1650
Homer	<i>Iliad</i> , 1591, 1648
Horace	1574, 1578, 1585, 1592, 1602, 1604, 1607; editions with Bond's notes: 1606, 1608, 1611, 1614, 1620, 1630, 1637
Juvenal	Printed with Horace editions prior to Bond, then 1612, 1615, 1620, 1633, 1648, 1656, 1660
Livy	1589
Martial	1615, 1633, 1655
Minor Greek Poets	1635, 1651
Ovid	<i>Opera Omnia</i> , 1656 <i>Metamorphoses</i> , 1570, 1572, 1576, 1582, 1584, 1585, 1589, 1601, 1602, 1612, 1617, 1620, 1628, 1630 (2), 1631, 1633, 1636, 1650, 1660; Farnaby edn, 1636 <i>Fasti</i> , 1574, 1583, 1614 <i>Heroides</i> , 1583 (2), 1594, 1602, 1631, 1635 (2), 1649, 1653, 1656, 1658 <i>Tristia</i> , 1574, 1581, 1583, 1612, 1614, 1638, 1653, 1660
Persius	Printed with Juvenal, and 1614
Quintilian	1629, 1641
Sallust	1569, 1573 (2), 1601, 1615, 1639
Suetonius	No Latin edition before 1661
Tacitus	No Latin edition but 7 edns of English translations of individual works
Terence	1575, 1583, 1585, 1589, 1597, 1611, 1619, 1624, 1627, 1629, 1633 (2), 1635, 1636 (2), 1642, 1647, 1648, 1651, 1654, 1655, 1656
Virgil	1570, 1572, 1576, 1580, 1583, 1584, 1593, 1597, 1602, 1612, 1613, 1616, 1620, 1632, 1634, 1649, 1650(2), 1654, 1657, 1658, Farnaby edn 1634

explained it or made it easy, as briefly as possible. I have briefly dealt with all regions, states, towns, villages, mountains, valleys, fields, seas, rivers, proper and family names, laws and customs of peoples, unusual forms of words and in short everything which is a little abstruse in Horace in such a way that anyone who is reasonably well-versed in Latin will very easily understand Horace himself.¹⁰⁷

Thomas Farnaby's edition of Virgil is in many respects more like the continental editions previously used in English schools. He reprints the well-established Latin arguments that set out the structure of the individual poems of the *Eclogues* and the separate books of the longer poems. He explains unfamiliar words and Roman customs and expectations. He glosses proper names, gives Greek parallels, explains what is happening in the narrative and refers to views of other critics. Farnaby makes fewer comments on rhetoric and style.¹⁰⁸

Bond's and Farnaby's editions are not advanced contributions to classical studies, but they do give an idea of the kind of linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical information that teachers thought that grammar-school students needed in order to understand Latin literature. They contribute to the elementary part of a broader education in reading Latin literature.

At the more advanced level of grammar teaching, R. Francklin published his *Orthotonia seu Tractatus de Tonis in Lingua Graecanica* (1629), which was printed three times up to 1660. Francklin sets out the rules for the inclusion of different types of accent in Greek, giving copious examples both of the general principles and of the exceptions to each rule. The work is thorough and detailed and set out with great clarity. It was probably as useful to students as the author's introduction and the commendatory letters from the Bishop of Lincoln and the Professor of Greek at Cambridge indicate.¹⁰⁹

English classical scholarship of the early seventeenth century is now famous for two particular contributions: the edition of the works of St John Chrysostom, more complete than any previously published and based on a wide range of manuscripts, supervised by Henry Savile at Eton 1610–12, and the work of John Selden (1584–1654). Selden was primarily a lawyer and a parliamentarian but he produced a wealth of scholarly works, particularly on issues of legal history, English customs, and rabbinical law. His works display an immense knowledge of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and some acquaintance with Arabic and other near Eastern languages. According to G. J. Toomer, his greatest contribution to classical scholarship was the edition of Arundel's inscriptions, *Marmora Arundelliana* (1628), completed in about a year with the assistance of Patrick Young and Richard Jones. Toomer singles out for praise the edition of the *Marmor Parium*, for which Selden provides transcriptions, a chronological apparatus, and a comparative table of events dated according to different chronologies. 'If we consider this as a whole we must judge it a stupendous achievement. Selden has correctly analysed and laid out the structure of a document of a kind completely unknown before, which is poorly preserved, and has illuminated many of its factual details by

adducing other ancient sources.’¹¹⁰ Toomer also comments on the vast knowledge of classical texts shown and the brilliant emendations to some of them proposed in Selden’s *De Diis Syriis* (1617, 1629).¹¹¹

Conclusion

Thanks to the success of early sixteenth-century humanists in reforming and endowing schools, there was a strong emphasis on Latin language and literature in English schools and universities between 1558 and 1660. The grammar-school syllabus made a central group of classical texts (Cicero’s letters and *De Officiis*, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Sallust or Caesar) widely known. During the seventeenth century, Greek grammar, the Greek New Testament, Homer, Hesiod and Isocrates were commonly taught in the grammar schools. Virtually all the classical texts were available to English readers in up-to-date editions and with commentaries. English printing of classical texts increased. Rhetoric and logic had a considerable influence on the ways in which texts were taught and understood. University students undertook diverse and often wide-ranging schemes of reading, around a central core of rhetoric, Latin literature, logic, and Aristotle (increasingly studied in Greek in the seventeenth century). English scholars displayed a good range of essential skills and a good standard of knowledge, but, with a few exceptions, their achievements were greater in the field of biblical studies and theology than in classical studies.

Notes

1. On humanism, see R. Sabbadini, *Il metodo degli umanisti* (Florence, 1920); P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and its Sources* (New York, 1979); A. Rabil, Jr (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*, 3 vols (Philadelphia, 1988); J. Kraye (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge, 1996); R. Witt, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovati to Bruni* (Leiden, 2000).
2. C. Augustijn, *Erasmus: His Life, Works and Influence* (Toronto, 1991), 31–3, 35–7.
3. Erasmus, *Opera omnia*, I-2, ed. J.-C. Margolin (Amsterdam, 1971), 113; trans. B. MacGregor, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 24 (Toronto, 1978), 666.
4. Erasmus, *Opera omnia*, I-2. 114; trans. MacGregor, *Collected Works*, 667.
5. Erasmus, *Opera omnia*, I-2. 115; trans. MacGregor, *Collected Works*, 669.
6. Erasmus, *Opera omnia*, I-2. 137–8; trans. MacGregor, *Collected Works*, 683.
7. R. Ascham, *English Works*, ed. W. A. Wright (Cambridge, 1904) 265.
8. Ascham, *English Works*, 180.
9. Ascham, *English Works*, 197.
10. Ascham, *English Works*, 185.
11. Ascham, *English Works*, 187.
12. Ascham, *English Works*, 238–9.
13. Ascham, *English Works*, 267–8. Sturm, *De imitatione oratoria* (Strasbourg, 1574). Sturm’s educational works are helpfully translated in L. W. Spitz and B. S. Tinsley,

- Johann Sturm on Education (St Louis, 1995).
14. Ascham, *English Works*, 268–70, 278.
 15. B. Clerke, *De Curiali Sive Aulico*. This Latin version was printed six times in England up to 1612, compared to four editions of Hoby's English translation. J. W. Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (Leeds, 1990), 258–64.
 16. Milton, *On Education*, ed. O. M. Ainsworth (New Haven, 1928), 52, 55; *Prose Works*, 2, 366–7, 378–9.
 17. Milton, *On Education*, 52; *Prose Works*, 2, 369.
 18. Milton, *On Education*, 56–60; *Prose Works*, 2, 388–406.
 19. Since I have written both on the grammar school and on the university in the Elizabethan period in P. Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric* (Cambridge, 2002), 11–75, I have tried to complement that treatment by giving more attention to post-1603 documents in this chapter. In some places in the next four sections I repeat what I said there.
 20. A selection of short sentences intended to give pupils practice in Latin accidence, syntax, and expression composed by Leonhard Culmann (c.1500–61) and widely used in English schools.
 21. Dominici Mancini (fl. 1478–91) wrote poems on the four cardinal virtues. Baptista Mantuan (1448–1516) composed eclogues.
 22. T. W. Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (Urbana, IL, 1944), 1, 122–4, 310, 342–4, 345–51; Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 12–14.
 23. D. L. Clark, *John Milton at St Paul's School* (New York, 1948), 121.
 24. C. Hoole, *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School* (1660), sigs N7^r–8^v.
 25. This must be William Bathe's *Janua Linguarum*, first published in Salamanca in 1611 but later printed twelve times in England, rather than J. A. Comenius' work, which was printed in England both as *Gate of Tongues Unlocked and Opened* (1631) and as *Janua Linguarum Reserata* (1636), reprinted many times later. See STC 14466–14472.5; 15077.3–15082; Wing 5508A–5521.
 26. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs A(2)5^v–B10^v, C4^r–5^r, D5^r, G11^v–12^r, H11^v–12^r, I6^v–8^r.
 27. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs A(1)10^v, G8^v.
 28. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. G10^v.
 29. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs M3^r–5^v.
 30. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs A(1)9^r–12^v.
 31. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. I9^r.
 32. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. I3^v.
 33. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. H7^v. The Jesuit Juan Luis de la Cerda (1558–1643) wrote a lengthy and important commentary on Virgil.
 34. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs Fr^r–3^r.
 35. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. F2^v.
 36. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. F1^v.
 37. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs F7^v–8^v.
 38. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs G7^r, G10^v, H3^v.
 39. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. I1^v.
 40. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. I2v–3^r.
 41. Erasmus, *De Ratione Studii*, in *Opera Omnia*, I-2, 115; Melancthon, *Enarratio Comoediarum Terentii*, in *Opera Omnia*, ed. C. Bretschneider, *Corpus Reformatorum*, 28 vols (Brunswick, 1834–60), 19, cols 692, 694, 695.
 42. John Brinsley's frequent remarks (e.g. *Ludus Literarius* (1612), pp. xxv–vii, 103–21) about the time that the master would save by providing pupils with a printed translation may suggest that translation in class was actually the norm, though it should not be forgotten that this advice also promoted the sale of his own works.
 43. Lily, *Brevissima Institutio*, sig. H5^{r-v}. Erasmus, letter 56, in *Opus Epistolarum Erasmi*, ed. P. S. Allen, 1, 171–3; example of *epistola monitoria* in *De Conscribendis Epistolis*, ed. J. C. Margolin, in *Opera Omnia*, I-2, 496–8. This letter had also

- formed part of *Familiarum Colloquiorum Formulae*: J. Chomarat, *Grammaire et Rhétorique chez Erasme* (Paris, 1981), 513–16.
44. T. Wolsey, in J. Colet, *Rudimenta Grammatices et Docendi Methodus... Per Thomam Cardinalem* (1529), STC 5542.3 (=25944), sig. A4^{r-v}, trans. in J. T. Philipps, *A Compendious Way of Teaching Antient and Modern Languages* (1750), 350–1, quoted by T. W. Baldwin, *Shakspeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, IL, 1947), 169.
 45. A. Grafton and L. Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities* (1986), 9–28, 142–57, 181–200; M. T. Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1993); W. Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody: Ravisius Textor, Zwinger and Shakespeare', in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), 91–126.
 46. Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, 123–4. In Brinsley's text, 'quid' in line 7 is omitted, but the following paragraph makes it clear that it is required.
 47. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. C12^{r-v}. Hoole refers to Brinsley's page number here and repeats his error of omitting 'quid' from the Latin list, while including 'what is spoken' in the English explanation.
 48. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs F10^v–11^r, G10^{r-v}.
 49. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. F11^r.
 50. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sigs F11^v–G1^r.
 51. Baldwin, *Shakspeare's Small Latine*, 1. 25, 343, 348–50. At Sandwich the fourth, fifth, and sixth classes were instructed to practise the exercises of Aphthonius: Baldwin, *Shakspeare's Small Latine*, 1. 343.
 52. Baldwin, *Shakspeare's Small Latine*, 1. 349–50; Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, 185.
 53. W. Kempe, *The Education of Children in Learning* (1588), facsimile reprint in *Four Tudor Books on Education*, ed. R. D. Pepper (Gainesville, FL, 1966), 229–30. Cf. Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, p. xiv.
 54. Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata*, with the commentary of Lorichius (1575).
 55. The full series is: fable, narrative, chreia (an elaboration of a saying or action), proverb, confutation, proof, commonplace, praise, vituperation, comparison, speech for a character (*ethopoeia*), description, thesis, proposal for a law. One of the subtypes of speech for a character is *prosopopeia*, speech for an imagined character, which appears in style manuals as a figure of thought, personification: Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata*, sigs Y8^v–Z5^v.
 56. Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata*, sigs Cc7^r–Dd7^v.
 57. The commonplace, defined as a speech that presents the good or bad that inhere in something ('Locus communis est oratio bona aut mala quae alicui insunt argumentans') consists of: introduction, contrary, exposition, comparison, sententia, digression, exclusion of pity, arguments from the legitimate, the just, the useful and the possible, and conclusion: Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata*, sigs M4^v–7^v.
 58. Aphthonius provides the pupil with a small number of subjects to insert in each particular form. In topical invention the student will have to select from material found through all the topics. See Peter Mack, Chapter 4, this volume.
 59. Baldwin, *Shakspeare's Small Latine*, 1. 334–6. Ian Michael (*The Teaching of English from the Sixteenth Century to 1870* (Cambridge, 1987), 268–78) has some valuable comments on the teaching of themes; also P. Mack, 'Rhetoric and the Essay', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 23/2 (Spring 1993), 41–9.
 60. Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, 174–9.
 61. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. H8^r–10^r.
 62. Ralph Johnson, *The Scholar's Guide* (1665; repr. Menston, 1971), 15–16.
 63. J. K. McConica (ed.), *A History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3, *The Collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986), 54–5, 722–3, 728;

- L. Stone, 'The Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body 1580–1909', in Stone (ed.), *The University in Society* (Princeton, 1974), 3–110 (esp. 103); Rosemary O'Day, *Education and Society 1500–1800* (1982), 86–90.
64. McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 728.
65. McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 685, 156.
66. J. G. Nichols (ed.), *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (1823), 1. 149–89, 206–47; 3. 144–67; Penry Williams, 'Church State and University 1558–1603', in McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 397–440; C. E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford*, 3 vols (1924–7), 2. 231–2, 342–6; K. Fincham, 'Oxford and the Early Stuart Polity', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. IV: *Seventeenth Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), 179–210.
67. Mallet, *History*, 2. 303–403.
68. McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 1–68, 645–732; M. Feingold, *The Mathematicians' Apprenticeship: Science, Universities and Society in England 1560–1640* (Cambridge, 1984), and M. Feingold, 'The Humanities', in Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. IV: *Seventeenth Century Oxford*, 211–448.
69. 'Praelector rhetorices Quintilianum, Hermodenem aut aliquem alium librum oratoriarum Ciceronis. Quos omnes libros vulgari lingua pro captu et intelligentia auditorum explicabit interpretabiturque' (*Documents Relating to the University and Colleges of Cambridge*, 3 vols (1852), 1. 457).
70. *Documents... Cambridge*, 1. 457–9.
71. J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1873–1911), 2. 595–7.
72. Strickland Gibson (ed.), *Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1931), 389–90.
73. McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 21, 46, 56, 337–8, 342.
74. Mallet, *History*, 2. 321–3.
75. The figure of 173 comes from the pre-1600 Cambridge lists, omitting the booksellers' entries. Elizabeth Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1986). The Oxford figures are proportionally comparable, but many of the Oxford lists have still to be published.
76. Bodleian Library MS Lat misc e.114, fos 2^r–49^v.
77. L. D. Green, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Newark, DE 1986), 240–5, 302–4, 348.
78. John Seton, *Dialectica*, with the notes of P. Carter (1572); John Case, *Summa Veterum Interpretum in Universam Dialecticam* (1584), A4^v, B1^r, Kk1^r–^v; Robert Sanderson, *Logicae Artis Compendium*, ed. E. J. Ashworth (Bologna, 1985), 243–59, 317–28, Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 56–7.
79. McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 695–710.
80. PRO SP46.15 fols 212–20, McConica (ed.), *Collegiate University*, 695–9.
81. Feingold, 'The Humanities', 215–18, 256. He gives examples of booklists and programmes of study illustrating the wide range of classical authors studied at pp. 250–1, 258–60, 323.
82. Feingold, 'The Humanities', 321–5.
83. Feingold, 'The Humanities', 341, 345, 351–3.
84. H. F. Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development of John Milton*, 2 vols (Urbana, IL, 1956–61), 2. 623–55.
85. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 643.
86. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 645–6.
87. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 637.
88. Feingold, 'The Humanities', 215, quoting *Oxford University Statutes*, trans. G. R. M. Ward, 2 vols (1845–51), 1. 65–7.
89. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 638.

The Classics in Humanism, Education, and Scholarship

90. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 639.
91. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 642.
92. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 643.
93. Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 58–66, 71–3.
94. Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, 176–252.
95. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 635–6.
96. Fletcher, *Intellectual Development of Milton*, 2. 636.
97. Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England*, 194; C. O. Brink, *English Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1986), 13–14.
98. Feingold, 'The Humanities', 262–3, 266.
99. Brink, *English Classical Scholarship*, 14–17.
100. Feingold, 'The Humanities', 265–9; N. Barker, 'The Polyglot Bible', in J. Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4: 1557–1695 (Cambridge, 2002), 648–51.
101. J. Roberts, 'The Latin Trade', in Barnard and McKenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4: 1557–1695, 141–73.
102. G. J. Toomer, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship*, 2 vols (Oxford, 2009), 47–8, citing PRO 31/9/94, 116–17.
103. Hoole, *New Discovery*, sig. H7^v; Fletcher, *Intellectual Development*, 2. 635–6. On Renaissance commentaries, see A. Buck and O. Herding (eds), *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance* (Boppard, 1975); A. Moss, *Ovid in Renaissance France* (London, 1982); A. Grafton, 'Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on some Commentaries', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38 (1985), 615–49; O. Besomi and C. Caruso (eds), *Il commento ai testi* (Basle, 1992); P. Mack, 'Ramus Reading: The Commentaries', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 61 (1998), 111–41; P. Mack, 'Melanchthon's Commentaries on Latin Literature', in G. Frank and K. Meerhoff (eds), *Melanchthon und Europa II* (Stuttgart, 2002), 29–52; M. Pade (ed.), *On Renaissance Commentaries* (Hildesheim, 2005).
104. E. Leedham-Green and D. McKitterick, 'Ownership: Private and Public Libraries', in Barnard and McKenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4: 1557–1695, 323–38.
105. Thanks to a letter of recommendation from Archbishop Parker in August 1569, Bynneman received a patent in classical school texts, some of which he published himself, while licensing others to other printers. Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Small Latine*, 1. 494–531, STC, III, app. D, pp. 200–2.
106. The figures also suggest a decline after 1640, but this may also reflect the change in source from STC to Wing.
107. Horace, *Poemata*, *Scholiis... a Joanne Bond Illustrata* (1611), sigs A4^v–5^r.
108. Virgil, *Opera. Notis a Thomae Farnabii* (1634). On Farnaby, see R. W. Serjeantson, 'Thomas Farnaby (1575?–1647)', in E. Malone (ed.), *British Rhetoricians and Logicians, 1500–1600, First series, Dictionary of Literary Biography* vol. 236 (Columbia, SC, 2003) 108–16.
109. R.F. *Orthotonia*, 2nd edn (1633), STC 11327, sigs A2^r–B1^v, B7^r–C4^r.
110. Toomer, *Selden*, 366.
111. Toomer, *Selden*, 211–12, 256.



The Availability of the Classics

Readers, Writers, Translation, Performance

STUART GILLESPIE

How classical literary works were experienced by the many early modern English authors who responded to them could be said to be the subject of the present volume as a whole, and these experiences were obviously, and happily, various. Yet these experiences also had many starting points and parameters in common, because over the period 1558–1660 in the English-speaking world readers and writers approached ancient works by common routes. The curriculum followed in the English grammar school, for example, guaranteed basic conversance with a number of Latin authors—authors whose prestige was on an altogether higher level than that of any English writer (Latin and much less comprehensively Greek were the only languages taught in most schools). These Latin authors were not the same ones who had enjoyed high status in the Middle Ages. Other new developments over this period, such as the arrival of fresh English translations of ancient authors, or the staging of ancient dramatic texts, are also of great significance for English writers, both reflecting and encouraging the adoption of ancient works for emulation in the present, as opposed to regarding them as inimitable paragons of the past. As Robert Miola puts it: ‘Ancient texts in the Renaissance . . . surcharged with humanistic commentary in editions, adapted in Renaissance productions, translations, and plays, are . . . in an important sense contemporary, and, therefore, participants in the same circulation of energy and exchange.’¹ It is with some of these common aspects of the experience of classical works that this chapter is concerned, and the focus will sometimes be on what is known of the experience of particular English writers. But we shall also ask what their early modern experiences did to the ancient texts themselves.

Readers and Writers

With few exceptions, reading begins at school, and the new humanist approach that gradually took over European school education during the sixteenth century led to a period of almost 400 years' duration in which the same basic canon of classical authors underwrote school textbooks and teaching. In England, the curriculum Colet devised for St Paul's School in London was widely adopted and adapted for English grammar schools.² And all across Europe, children learned to read in Latin. In Protestant and Catholic countries alike, schools taught Roman rhetoric, moral philosophy, and history to future public servants and churchmen. 'By the end of the 1530s', writes Antony Grafton, 'intellectuals and gentlemen throughout Europe had turned to Rome as enthusiastically as the Romans themselves had once turned to Greece'. But, as Grafton also points out, unlike the Romans seeking communion with Greece, the latter-day Europeans had to recover the cultural ideals they sought from dead institutions, corrupt texts, and a mass of misinformation.³

Rome offered a high literature that could be imitated in vernaculars. School training inculcated this habit, and its products would typically pen Ovidian, Virgilian, and Senecan pastiches before composing vernacular epics or tragedies. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century teachers did not merely tolerate English as an unavoidable evil, or an accidental by-product of Latin learning. It is because humanist teachers were concerned with the quality of the vernacular, even if English did not have its own place in school timetables, that, by teaching Latin and Greek rhetoric as transferable skills, the schools laid the foundations for writing in English from the Tudor era onwards. No school produced more English writers than Westminster, whose curriculum took the learned languages further than most, embracing Hebrew and Arabic, and in the later decades of the sixteenth century combining classical Greek and Latin models when Greek was disappearing from rival schools. Ben Jonson, taught there by William Camden the antiquary, was one beneficiary. Under the later headmastership of Richard Busby (from 1638), translation was evidently accorded a central role. Busby, the most celebrated schoolmaster of his age and something of a legend in his own lifetime, eventually earning the honour of burial in Westminster Abbey, himself compiled excellent Greek and Latin grammars (and an English one too). John Dryden, who attended Westminster School in the 1640s, saw his mature translations as not discontinuous with the exercises he carried out for Busby, recalling in the argument to his version of Persius' Third Satire (1693) that his first attempt on the poem, together with many another 'Thursday night's exercise' from his schooldays, was still in the hands of his 'learned master'. The Westminster curriculum in Dryden's time involved 'exercises in translating English into Latin, Greek into Latin, and Latin into Greek'.⁴ The school was admittedly exceptional, and renowned for its classical language teaching; but it was also in itself a cultural powerhouse. Westminster-trained writers and translators of Dryden's and previous generations include William Cartwright, Abraham Cowley, George Herbert, Thomas Randolph, John Studley, and Richard Taverner.

The Availability of the Classics

Needless to say, the university-level study to which these men were then promoted deepened their acquaintance with classical literature. Classical authorities were heavily involved in their progress through, say, moral philosophy (Plutarch, Seneca), while their study of classical literature itself (Horace's *Sermones*, say) was an in-depth affair, following time-honoured methods (analysis in turn of 'grammar', 'rhetoric', 'logic'). As for what the key texts were, one well-known mid-seventeenth-century document outlining undergraduate life, the 'rules' of James Duport (later Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge), gives representative guidance, Duport advising students 'to read, among the ancient classical authors, the best, and of the best note as Homer, Aristotle, Virgil, Tully, Seneca, Plutarch, and the like'.⁵ Duport, like Dryden, was educated at Westminster and Trinity College, Cambridge. Dryden himself recalled reading the notes on Plutarch in Charles de la Rue's edition in Trinity College library.⁶ Dryden's extensive use of classical texts in his own later work (especially as a translator) has been traced in some detail,⁷ and, for all his cavils at 'Dutch commentators', it is evident that he availed himself of the learning of the full range of editors and commentators (for editions, see further Peter Mack, Chapter 2, this volume). More unexpected, perhaps, is the mature Dryden's interest in French translations of classics: auction catalogues of the early 1680s show him purchasing French versions of Arrian, Caesar, Cornelius Nepos, Herodotus, Lucan, Lucian, Ovid, Polybius, and Thucydides.⁸

The composition of individual book collections and libraries tells us more about what ancient literature was read—and in what form—beyond the education system. Individuals have diverse tastes and priorities, but certain broad patterns are nevertheless clear. First it should be stressed that overwhelming Latinity is the norm for all private as for all institutional libraries of the early modern period. It could be said that Latin was simply the form in which the world's learning, secular as well as spiritual, was available for access. Furthermore, the importance of reading authors in their original language was an established precept of the age, promulgated in such guides for the middle classes as Henry Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman*, 1622. Peacham's attention to geography, cosmology, geometry, and the liberal arts are all echoed in the contents of the English Renaissance libraries from which records and/or primary materials survive, and again leads naturally to a preponderance of Latin works, though not necessarily to a preponderance of ancient works. The nobility was if anything still more strongly disposed to view Latin as the language of culture, and to look on the vernacular as unworthy. Sir Thomas Bodley called playbooks 'baggage-books' and refused to have them in his library; in general he scorned English-language publications as 'idle books and riff-raffs'.⁹

Hence editions of Latin authors of all kinds, supplemented by editions of non-Latin authors (ancient and modern) translated into Latin, made up the bulk of all Renaissance libraries. And these libraries, we should remember, were normally far more heavily biased towards theology and philosophy, even towards language, grammar, and rhetoric, than anything we should now think of as literature. Both things

are true of the book collection belonging to John, Lord Lumley, one of the last of the Elizabethan nobles (c.1533–1609).¹⁰ His wealth allowed him to become one of the great Elizabethan collector–patrons, and his library was one of the largest of the era. The 1609 catalogue lists almost 3,000 books, incorporating some inherited collections. Lumley’s first wife, Jane (d.1577), was a translator of Euripides (for her work, see Jane Stevenson, Chapter 7, this volume); Lumley himself knew Latin and probably some Greek, French, and Italian. Only 12 per cent of his collection was in a vernacular language, with the other 88 per cent composed of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew books. Since all items in the last two languages were inherited, it is easy to see where his preferences lay. The Lumley library’s subject matter embraced theology (36 per cent), history (22 per cent), and science, with good support in philosophy, music, politics, economics, and practical subjects.¹¹ Literature is there too, but with a heavy bias towards continental neo-Latin material.

We know that literary figures fortunate enough to have possessed sizeable book collections sometimes constitute exceptions to these patterns. Among Ben Jonson’s surviving books, almost half the items are what he would have called poetry and poetics, and about half of these are texts of, translations of, or commentaries on Greek and Roman authors. There is only a handful of original works in English, whereas ‘it is safe to assume . . . Jonson owned works by every single Greek and Latin poet of any importance whatsoever’,¹² ‘safe’ because he owned so many anthologies. Anthologies and similar collections should not be overlooked as an affordable source of multiple classical texts for private use. Two in Jonson’s possession between them covered virtually all extant Greek and Latin poetry respectively: *Poetae Graeci Veteres*, in two volumes with Latin translations (Geneva, 1614), and *Chorus Poetarum* (Lyons, 1616), a heavily Jesuit-censored edition, in Jonson’s copy of which many expurgated passages have been reinserted in a minute version of his own hand.¹³ Jonson also owned five volumes of *Lampas, Sive Fax Artium Liberalium* (1602–6), a large-scale anthology of Renaissance critical treatises on the ancients.

Jonson’s friend Drummond of Hawthornden, the minor poet, had an unusually good command of languages and a special interest in continental verse, but his sizeable working library, collected in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, is also predictably heavy on literature in Latin, with over sixty Greek items too.¹⁴ Of ancient playwrights, for instance, he owned texts of Seneca, Plautus, Terence, and Aristophanes, but no English translations of them are found in his catalogue. In some of these cases no published English version was, to be sure, available at this date. Nor could Drummond have bought a worthwhile English version of, say, Juvenal to match his Latin one. But he chose to rely on Latin texts rather than acquire the recent English Pliny (1601) or Suetonius (1606) translations. He had a Latin Thucydides but no Greek text; for Herodian, Homer, and Polybius, he owned both.

Drummond’s library, like Jonson’s, nevertheless does reflect some active interest in English translations. He read translations of modern European works much more extensively than translations of ancient authors,¹⁵ but he owned the Marlowe–

The Availability of the Classics

Chapman *Hero and Leander* and May's Lucan (he naturally owned a Latin Lucan too). In 1611 he read one of the recent Savile–Grenewey English Tacitus translations (but his library contained a Latin–Italian text of the *Histories* as well). He would have been able to compare more than one translation of the *Aeneid*, since he owned those by Douglas and Stanyhurst, as well as Abraham Fraunce's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Similarly, Drummond's library contained both Golding's and Sandys's versions of the *Metamorphoses*.

Comparison between Ovid translations was not quite possible within the library of Robert Burton (the anatomist of melancholy), whose somewhat larger collection of books acquired from 1594 to 1640 contained Thomas Overbury's *Remedia Amoris*, Thomas Underdown's *Ibis*, and Francis Beaumont's retelling of the story of *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus*.¹⁶ While other translations can be found in it (for example, the first edition of Hobbes's Thucydides), Burton's library, like all others of his time, is far richer in Latin than English-language texts. There is, as it happens, no Latin Ovid, but, taking the catalogue pages for the letters A–C, ancient authors printed in the Latin are Achilles Tatius, Apollonius Rhodius, Apuleius, Boethius, Caesar, Catullus, and Quintus Curtius. There are also Greek and/or Latin texts of Anacreon, Aristotle, and Ausonius. For a man whose main concerns lay with modern phenomena and current affairs, and 74 per cent of whose 1,738-book library consisted of items first published in his lifetime,¹⁷ the showing of classical writers is not inconsiderable.

Where 'professional' writers are concerned, of course, the books they used for their trade may sometimes have been borrowed from the collection of a patron or associate. Because of the prohibitive cost of owning the works he used as sources, it is sometimes speculated that Shakespeare had access to Southampton's library. There is no evidence either way. Neither have most writers left behind any direct record of what their reading consisted of, but at least some of it can often be reconstructed inferentially from their works. So it is that a study of *Shakespeare's Books* is able to deal with his direct use as poet and playwright of some 200 authors, of which a sizeable minority are ancient.¹⁸ It is often possible, too, to show that he used the English translations of the day—an especially innovative and stimulating day where ancient literature was concerned. Shakespeare's Plutarch will be mentioned below; for his classicism at large, see Colin Burrow, Chapter 27, this volume.

A look at one further private library, the records of which allow us to follow developments over time, as it is first built up and then moves through succeeding generations of owners, may be worthwhile. Sir Thomas Knyvett of Ashwellthorpe (b. c.1539), a Norfolk collector of the Elizabethan era, gathered a library of over 1,400 printed books and at least 70 manuscripts by the time of his death in 1618.¹⁹ In a library intended to encompass most branches of knowledge, some 9 per cent of these books were in English, another 15 per cent in French, Italian, Spanish, or (a handful) Greek. Three-quarters were in Latin. What follows concentrates on the (minority) ancient authors. At first, in the 1560s, Knyvett naturally enough gathered

standard works, many probably from the family library: an illustrated Virgil (Venice, 1522) with Servius' commentary; the Hervagius editions of Ovid (Basle, 1550) and Seneca (1557); the Froben edition of Juvenal and Persius (1551) with extensive commentaries; a Boethius of 1498. In the early 1570s he seems to have been establishing himself as a serious collector, acquiring such elaborate items as Beroaldus' Apuleius (Venice, 1516) and Porphyry's commentary on Ptolemy (Basle, 1559). In 1584 Knyvett was searching (unsuccessfully) for a copy of Hesiod's *Works and Days* in Greek. It took him until 1608 to purchase Horapollon's *Hieroglyphica* (Augsburg, 1595) and Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (1584). Having developed a special interest in emblems, he found the means to afford Vaenius' *Emblemata* (Antwerp, 1607) accompanying the poems of Horace. The few vernacular translations of ancient authors in his library include the folio of Thomas Nicholls's Thucydides (1550) and Gavin Douglas's *Aeneid* (1553).

Knyvett's collection does much to enlighten us about Elizabethan libraries. The view of ancient literature that it reflects (and the position it merits) is that not of a scholar or an aristocrat, but of a man who read and collected for pleasure. This view is of its time. The collection's next owner, during the difficult decades of the mid-seventeenth century, was Knyvett's grandson (also Thomas, 1595–1658), under whom things took a significant new turn: few books in languages other than English are recorded as arriving. To his grandfather's thinly populated English poetry shelf he added Donne and Herbert. He also added Sandys's Ovid. The following generation's custodianship takes us closer to classical translation: at the start of his adult life Sir John Knyvett (d. 1673) had translated Juvenal,²⁰ while at its end he willed his copy of Ogilby's English Virgil (1660) to his son-in-law. It is to the translation of ancient authors that we now turn.

Translation

The subject of this section has been glimpsed in the previous one, and also connects with the next, on performance. Like a performance, a translation is only one possible way of representing a text, and, as translators realize, all translations will eventually be succeeded, and probably superseded, by others. In other words, translations, like performances, are of their time. Renaissance English translations use the idioms of the present, not the past, and they have a strong tendency to make ancient authors think in terms of contemporary English scenes and details. In this period translators can adopt aggressively up-to-date or distinctively vernacular language, and replace Greek or Roman with native English cultural practices of all kinds. Some of the characters in Golding's *Metamorphoses* speak with West Country accents, or display a knowledge of English fairy lore.

What follows concerns translation into English, though the translation of Greek texts into Latin is another dimension of how ancient works were becoming availa-

ble, at least to some classes of reader.²¹ That is a reminder of a basic limitation in early modern English translators of classical texts: Greek was to them a language far more remote than the Latin with which they had enjoyed easy familiarity since their schooldays. In translating Homer around 1600, for example, George Chapman would have been reliant on the literal Latin text facing the Greek in his edition. That is, although Chapman liked to pretend otherwise, the words evoked a Latin equivalent before they suggested any cognates or context in Greek. It would be anachronistic to imagine that translating Greek was ever in this period the routine task it was to become in later eras: education simply did not provide for the level of Greek training on offer in Victorian schools. Even those with comparatively good Greek were inclined to use Latin translations to check their understanding. Of the twenty-nine Greek texts found among Ben Jonson's extant library books, only two are unaccompanied by Latin versions.²² The availability of good French texts of major works by an author such as Plato explains in large part why the anglophone world did not find translation of Plato a pressing need until after 1660.²³

Up to a quarter of books printed in the Elizabethan era seem to have been translations, and a similar proportion probably applies for the first half of the seventeenth century.²⁴ In a recent 3,000-item listing of the more literary book-length English translations from all languages recorded as published in the period 1550–1660, some 40 per cent are translations of works originally in Latin. The market for translations from the Latin was sizeable, then. Ancient writings play their part in this statistic, but high numbers of contemporary works, especially on religious and topical subjects, make up the bulk.²⁵ In this sample, classical and patristic Greek originals account for about 8 per cent to Latin's 40 per cent, but, for the reasons just given, many of these works are Englished via intermediate Latin texts.²⁶

What authors and texts were translated? To begin at the most familiar level of classical learning, school texts often included translations alongside selections from beginners' authors such as Aesop and Terence. These unpretentious aids to learning probably reached a wider readership than any other type of translation, with the exception of the Bible. The translations are often in 'grammatical' form—that is, with the English syntax conformed to the Latin for pedagogical purposes. One once-famous compilation by the schoolmaster Nicholas Udall first appeared in 1533: *Flours for Latine Spekyng Selected and Gathered oute of Terence, and the Same Translated into Englysshe*. Another was *The Distichs of Cato*, used in England with the annotations of Erasmus, presented as an aid to Latin language learning in 1540 by Richard Taverner in a bilingual text reprinted in 1553, 1555, and 1562, then supplanted in 1577 by an anonymous version 'newly englished to the comfort of all young scholars', itself reprinted in 1584. 'Cato', as it was called, has been singled out as '*par excellence* the first of schoolbooks, and the elementary moral treatise of the Middle Ages'. This collection of proverbial wisdom and moral precept (authorship unknown, but 3rd or 4th century AD) was edited, augmented, selected, and in time translated into a dozen European vernaculars, 'first as a means to assist in the understanding of the original,

or in verse, emulating the Latin in a modern language'.²⁷ Such compilations, forgotten today, were in use on a massive scale (and their users, we might bear in mind, will have included almost every historically identifiable male in early modern England). First experiences of ancient Latin texts came not in the form of complete works of verse or prose, but from the excerpts in such collections of wit, wisdom, *sententiae*, 'dicta', in which the Latin was often accompanied by more or less literal English translations (other examples would be the proverbs of Publilius Syrus and the *Dicta Sapientum*).²⁸

Classical translation was also a growth industry at a more exalted level, for there were many more motives to it than the pedagogical. The result was the arrival of an expanding corpus of English-language classics, sometimes read, it has long been established, by English writers. There was no programme, no state patronage (as for translation in seventeenth-century France), but national pride and the high ambitions entertained for the English language made for a sense of common purpose. Sixteenth-century translators embarked on the vernacularization of Ovid, extending to most of the corpus in published verse translations by 1572; of Horace's *Sermones* and *Ars Poetica*; of Martial and Ausonius; of Seneca's tragedies; of Homer; of Longus, Heliodorus, and Apuleius. The exemplary and informative works of classical historians received much attention: Sallust (translations printed from c.1520), Caesar (1530, 1565), Livy (1544, 1570), Thucydides (1550), Herodian (1556), Polybius (1568), Appian (1578), and Tacitus (1591, 1598). For the sixteenth century, literature or 'letters' could also include such authors as Proclus (1550), Euclid (1570), and Vegetius (1572), as well, of course, as moralists such as Epictetus (1567) and orators and rhetoricians such as Isocrates (1534, 1576, 1580) and Demosthenes (1570).²⁹

We can glean from many of the prefaces and advertisements to such translations what kind of readership their authors expected, and these expectations varied. Sometimes translators had in mind the young, the unlearned, or the female reader, whereas at others they expect the close scrutiny of scholars. But the question to be asked in the present context is: what did translations offer English writers, at least after their schooling had been completed?³⁰ This is a far more specialized matter, the usual assumptions about which look distinctly questionable. It is sometimes supposed, for instance, that the principal role of translation in English literary history was to make available for new treatment the 'raw material' ancient texts contained—particularly the narrative materials of history, myth, and fable. In general this is a mistake: English translations were in most cases not required, let alone preferred, for these purposes. School knowledge of Livy served Shakespeare well in *The Rape of Lucrece*, while the fable of the body's members in *Coriolanus* draws on Livy's Latin and, it seems, retellings by Sidney, Erasmus, Camden, and others.³¹ Notably, though, the 1600 translation of Livy's history by Philemon Holland is not a confirmed source for Shakespeare; in this case and many others, we look in vain for translations that are decisive in making material available, because the material was already available in other forms within the Latin-soaked culture of the early modern era. In any event,

the Renaissance preference was for direct contact with the classics wherever possible. Of the three surviving English plays from the 1600s based on Livian history, respectively by Thomas Heywood (*The Rape of Lucrece*), Heywood with John Webster (*Appius and Virginia*), and John Marston (*Sophonisba*), all use Livy and/or other classical sources (Appian, Dionysius of Halicarnassus) directly. And, although all the playwrights would have been aware of contemporary retellings of the relevant narratives (such as William Painter's), and, given the dates of their work, of Holland's recent translation, they made little, or sometimes no, apparent use of either in preparing their scripts.³²

It is sometimes supposed, alternatively, that the role of classical translation for English writers in the period was to make available fresh stylistic and formal models. It is true that effects used by translators to approximate Greek or Latin features can become a resource for English poets. Compound epithets ('wine-dark sea'), for instance, often tend to carry a whiff of the Homeric about them, creating a resonance in itself.³³ But it is not necessary to read a translation of Homer to find out what a compound epithet looks like. Some of the potential of blank verse can be worked out because Surrey's partial translation of Virgil shows that iambic pentameter can read more like Latin hexameters if it goes unrhymed.³⁴ But the role of translation is hardly direct here, and the blank verse writers of the late sixteenth century do not think of Virgil as their model (indeed, the major leap forward for blank verse comes with the inspired idea of using it in the non-Virgilian environment of the stage). Successful metrical innovations are much easier to find in translations from modern literatures (sonnets, *ottava rima*) than classical: indeed, classical translation was sometimes backward-looking in this respect, and the fourteeners of Chapman's Homer, or of the cumbrous complete Seneca of the 1580s, would have been disastrous models for the English verse of the future to follow. The experimental quantitative metres in which so much energy was invested by Thomas Campion and a number of his contemporaries in another type of response to the question of how to translate classical verse were largely a dead end.³⁵ And the extensive eighteenth-century tradition of the English ode was not launched by early translations of Pindar or Horace, but by the looser imitations of Cowley's *Pindarique Odes* (1656).

It would be wrong to dismiss altogether the claim that translations gave access to narrative material, or helped English writers to adopt and adapt classical forms and styles, but these vague propositions require much refinement and qualification. The classical translations read and used by English writers played a role more diffuse, more subtle, and, it should be underlined, one grounded upon what the translators brought—or added—to their originals. Translators who brought little (such as the authors of textbook trots) seem to have correspondingly little impact on writers. But some translators aimed to bring much. Some of the metaphors they use reveal that translation was seen not just as a stimulus, but, in other moods and contexts, as a form of partnership, or even of dominance (metaphors can include tropes of invasion, colonization, and conquest).³⁶ Translators who think this way do not see themselves as

conduits, as passive intermediaries, but as actively contributing to or even taking charge of the work in question. And what counts for subsequent English writers is not that translators neutrally 'convey' something (often something long familiar and already available in various other forms), but that their particular performance, their unique re-enactment, seems to allow new prospects and possibilities to be glimpsed. This can happen at many levels. Ovid is represented as an English country gentleman (or as a Restoration rake), Theseus as a Tudor monarch, Achilles as a rebellious earl.³⁷ Some new piece of English phrasing, once it has been used by a translator, is found apt, and begins a new career among English poets—the word 'slippery' to describe the precarious security a courtier's life entails, say.³⁸

Golding's Ovid gives us an example of a more thoroughgoing Renaissance Englishing of an ancient text. Golding's wish to enrich his native language was widely shared, but this is by no means normally a matter of creating new, Latinate English words. Again, it is more complicated than that: Golding, like others, preferred to stick to a clearly English idiom. Gordon Braden has shown how in this he went beyond contemporaries such as Thomas Phaer in his *Eneidos* (1558) or John Studely in his *Medea* (1566), in his command of 'quirky, vigorous little terms' such as 'gnorr', 'smudge', or 'chank', and in his readiness to unfold a Latin word into a string of English equivalents: 'hirtus' gives 'harsh and shirle', 'pugnes' becomes 'strive, struggle, wrest and writhe'.³⁹ And Madeleine Forey has summed up the general transformation of the Ovidian world that Golding effects:

It is a world of raspberries, hips and haws rather than mountain strawberries, crabs rather than octopuses, lapwings rather than hoopoes. One encounters witches, pucks, elves and fairies not nymphs. . . Music is provided by pots and pans not clashing cymbals, viols not lyres, and shawms not flutes. The dead are placed in coffins not urns.⁴⁰

It is a matter not of generating new vocabulary or exotic scenery, but of finding a possible English idiom. Whatever reservations we may have today about 'domestication', such a translation as Golding's Ovid constructs a bridge between English and Roman worlds, a route by which writerly use of the ancient text is facilitated.

Or we might consider Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* as an example of the impact of translation. The continental folio editions of the *Lives* in the sixteenth century (in Latin from an early date) were too expensive to be purchased by the ordinary cultivated reader. Instead, the numerous European vernacular versions were, to judge by the publishing record, easily the preferred form in which to acquire the book,⁴¹ but, even so, the *Lives* were not standard reading for most of our era. They were not prescribed in Elyot's *Governor* (1531), nor in Ascham's *Scholemaster* (1570). The *Moralia*, much valued for their wise sayings, were available in convenient selections; the *Lives* not. And the arrival of the French scholar Jacques Amyot's celebrated version in 1559, then of Sir Thomas North's English one of 1579, did not do much to change this position: throughout this period, they too were available solely in expensive folios designed for libraries (whether those of wealthy individuals or of institutions). Thus,