‘So may the songe be famous’: Sir Philip Sidney and the Matter of Troy

Sergei Bogdanov

Christ Church
University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of
MLitt in English.

September 2019

Contents

Some of Sidney's works and Loeb Classical Library editions are cited in abbreviated form. All abbreviated titles are listed in the **Bibliography**.

Introduction

This study of the co-reception of Sir Philip Sidney's literary career from the late 1580s into the 1640s and the matter of Troy begins with the death of the author, who is 'the past of his own book[s]'[1] as well as the past of others' books preoccupied with its – the past's – revival.[2] It examines how in many respects Sidney's posthumous myth and that of Troy played very similar and at times overlapping roles in the development of English Latinate and vernacular culture. Both reception histories have anything but lacked critical attention, however, their interaction has never been considered, at least in a systematic fashion, as a distinguishing phenomenon unique to the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline cultures.

The quotation in the title is taken from the 'Second Eclogues' of *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, from Zelmane's anacreontic poem hesitantly encouraging the muse to sing not the lover's doleful state but 'The warres of ougly *Centaurs*, / The life, the death of *Hector*'[3] in order to achieve poetic fame. While the juxtaposition of personal passions and the miseries of the Trojan war has been a familiar topos since antiquity, this particular verse sheds light on the tensions between the contextualisation of Sidney's personal and literary memory within a broader frame of the languages of loss and praise and individual authorial attempts to establish their literary careers in relation to a legendary past and a more recent history. Troy was an inexhaustible store

---

[1] R. Barthes, 'The death of the author' in *Image. Music. Text*, translated by S. Heath (London, 1977), 145.
[2] See T. M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, 1982) discussing 'a revivalist initiative' inherent to any work of imitation (37); C. Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge, 1993) discussing the inability of a 'textualist approach' to restore the past available to us in the form of allusive 'traces' to a full presence (20–21).
[3] *CPA* V6^{v}.

of early modern exemplars, and Sidney's heroic death instantly turned his life and works into a multivalent myth of equal potency. Compared to the Sidneian, the Trojan myth had many more facets, implications, and nuances, yet they shared several core concepts on which this study will focus. The central argument of the study is that it makes sense to speak of a history of co-reception and mutual catalysis of the Sidneian and Trojan myths rather than of two independent reception histories with coincidental, albeit numerous, intersections. It is difficult to imagine an early modern text, whether a rhetorical textbook, a love poem, or a religious tractate, unaware of or deliberately ignoring a tangible Trojan presence; as Gavin Alexander's *Writing After Sidney* proves conclusively that Sidney's 'conceived presence'[4] was felt virtually in all literary genres available to early modern audience. The aim of the following chapters is to delimit the potential of both presences to move beyond mere co-existence and to engage in a creative conversation instrumental in the shaping of literary careers across genres and communities. In addition to the conventional 'Troy' and the familiar 'Sidney', it will be demonstrated, the literature of the period was also fascinated with a Sidneian Troy and a Trojanised Sidney.

The central terms of the readings of elegies for Sidney and Prince Henry, continuations of the *Arcadia*, Sir Kenelm Digby's quasi-autobiography *Loose Fantasies* and Troy-themed plays examined below are 'intertextuality' and 'allusion', yet due both to the chronological distance and formal dissimilarity between the texts under scrutiny some definitions and re-definitions are necessary, especially since both terms are perhaps the most thoroughly theoreticised concepts of, respectively, post-structuralism and classicism. While the axiomatic definition of intertextuality as a

[4] R. Falco, *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England* (Amherst, 1994).

replacement of 'intersubjectivity',[5] a mode of conveying information through the incorporation of other texts into one's own, certainly reflects to some extent the ways in which the the authors discussed below thought of the relationship between their writings and the cultures of writing about Troy (and) after Sidney, it is self-evident that this notion was, even at the turn of the sixteenth century, anything but monolithic.[6] The variety of its taxonomies and hierarchies somewhat devalues any discussion of specific instances of intertextual referencing because any such instance has to be located on multiple scales of deliberateness and functionality. Moreover, Renaissance scholarship is more used to operating rival terms to describe mechanisms of literary adaptation, such as *imitatio* or *emulatio*, without the anachronistic admixture of formalist and structuralist textual theories: Erasmus, Castelvetro, and Scaliger, as well authors who learned their rhetoric from them, likely thought of the modes in which they appropriated classical and contemporary works in this terminology of conversation and rivalry. However different their concepts of authorship from ours, and however detached the figure of the author from any solid biographical entity, it is evident that an early modern Neo-Latin elegist from Cambridge, or a dramatist from London, treated others' texts with a paradoxical duality of intentional decontextualisation and inability to separate them from their creators altogether.

Sidney's case in a Trojan frame presents a particularly characteristic illustration of this dual life of texts. In *The Defence of Poesy*, Sidney mocks the 'diligent imitators' of classical authors who 'keep Nizolian paper-books of their figures and phrases'[7] in opposition to transformative textual incorporation, yet his own texts, as this study will

[5] J. Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York, 1980), 66.
[6] See, for example, R. S. Miola, 'Seven Types of Intertextuality' in *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality*, ed. M. Marrapodi (Manchester, 2004), 13–25.
[7] *Defence* (1595), I2^{v}.

show, continued to exist long after his death in the parallel realms of the commonplace-book thinking and creative textual incorporation. Counterintuitively, the patterns of Sidney's literary afterlife were not always characterised by departures from the authorial into the folkloric, from precise imitative and emulative conversation into vague verbal or thematic recollection. On the contrary, Sidney's almost immediate canonisation as *the* national author promoted attempts to slow down his dissolution in English literary idiom. One (lesser-known) example is Nicholas Ling's *Politeuphuia* or *Wit's Commonwealth*, an alphabetical commonplace book of mixed classical, patristic and occasional early modern literary gleanings – a doubtlessly indispensable aid to gentlemanly education. The first edition of *Politeuphuia* was printed in London in 1597 – the time when Sidneism, both in its Arcadian and Astrophilic forms, was in its greatest vigour. Sidneian phrases – almost exclusively from the *Arcadia* – appear unidentified in the medley of other, presumably well-known, maxims borrowed indiscriminately from from Bible and Cicero alike. No signature is required either because every reader ought to be familiar with the source or because all words of wisdom are equally wise and need no names attached to them. Whichever explanation is more plausible, the fact that Sidney's language has – or at least should – become part of gentlemanly speech is clearly evident from this editorial decision.

Politeuphia was reprinted many times between 1597 and 1688, and as early as 1598 the editor began to insert sporadic signatures. Not every quotation was identified even in the later editions, yet among those that were, Sidney's were seemingly the most consistently name-tagged with an 'S.P.S.' (Sir Philip Sidney). Even though the *Arcadia* was clearly read on a par with Latin poets and biblical prophets in terms of rhetorical education, there is one distinguishing feature of Sidneian attributions in the *Politeuphuia*. No other author is referred to solely by initials: clearly, the currency of

Arcadian idiom in the late 1590s was so high that no need of providing proper footnotes was felt. This residual blush of the stigma of print testifies to the eventual triumph of Sidney's vernacular classicism, all the more so because Ling's own project seems to be to combine vernacular and classical sources in a heroic, partly Trojan framework of cultural transmission: 'The well-disposed minde shall here find a bundle of good counsailes against vice, and Iliads of prayse for vertue'.[8] The *OED* does not record this metaphoric meaning of the word 'Iliad' – not a consistent account of events but a discontinuous list of intellectual and ethical markers. The letters 'S.P.S.' themselves are viewed as something of an 'Iliad of prayse for vertue' because they evoke a certain mythological paradigm into which any witty commonplaceable quotation, whatever its more immediate subject, fits well; and it is, as this study argues, not coincidental that Ling chooses a Trojan language to speak about decontextualised allusions metonymic of a much broader spectrum of ethical and philosophical concepts.

The *OED*'s first definition of the term 'intertextual' is technical rather than literary: 'That is inserted between lines or blocks of written, printed, or (later) digital text.' A double sense of full or partial alienation and technical tangibility pervades critical attempts to define what 'intertextuality' and 'allusion' are; a similar sense of physical and cultural foreignness is often present both in the broader Trojan narrative and the Sidneian literary myth, the two foundational traditions of early modern English culture. Sidney and Troy, as will be demonstrated, have more in common than mere fortuitous necessity for the development of a particular culture in a particular historical period. Writing about Troy meant not only conversing with history but also reflecting on the art and the very act of allusion and its life in a newly generated text; similarly, 'writing after Sidney' was seen as the utmost manifestation of the art of allusion. Since

[8] N(icholas). L(ing)., *Politeuphuia, Witts Common-Wealth* (London, 1597), A3^{v}.

the main thing that happened to Troy was its destruction, and the most crucial fact of Sidney's biography, his death (and funeral), the fundamental allusiveness of post-Trojan and post-Sidneian texts has a very material dimension to it. Thomas Nashe, in his preface to the 1591 edition of *Astrophel and Stella*, mockingly addresses poets who are 'faine to retaile the cinders of *Troy*, and the shiuers of broken trunchions, to fill vp their boate that else should goe empty'[9]: the commercial value and the potential for mytho-architectural recycling of 'the cinders of Troy' made them a nearly physical building substance during the re-erection of Troynovaunt. Sidney's elegists thought of themselves as weavers of a material shroud for his corpse,[10] which is why the well-worn metaphor of *incorporating* fragments of his texts into poetry, romance, and drama may sound as a more-than-figurative expression of cultural indebtedness and grateful revival of a literary model.

Theoretical accounts of allusions employ other metaphors to describe the relationship between the alluding and the alluded-to texts. Thus, Christopher Ricks begins his study by stating that '[a] llusion is one form that inheritance may take, even while inheritance takes diverse forms in different ages and for individual genius'[11] which can certainly be read as evocative of all the dynastic and imperial implications of the literary matter of Troy as well as of the idea of Sidney's heritage appropriated (i.e. made property) by imitators and emulators.[12] Related to this is the metaphor of a

[9] *Astrophel and Stella* (1591): A4^{r-v}.
[10] On the materiality of early modern poetic funerals, see, for example, a discussion of Camden's account of Spenser's funeral when 'mournfull Elegies and Poems with the Pens that wrote them [were] thrown into his Tombe' in A. Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford, 2012), 394.
[11] Ch. Ricks, *Allusion to Poets* (Oxford, 2012), 1.
[12] On the appropriative function of commonplace-book quotations and, more broadly, literary allusions, see J. Maxwell, 'How the Renaissance (Mis)Used Sources: The Art of Misquotation' in *How to Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays*, ed. L. E. Maguire (Malden, 2008), 62.

paternal and filial relationship[13] which will play an especially prominent role in the chapter discussing elegies for Sidney and Prince Henry with all their pseudo-familial voices of Trojanised mourners; less obviously, the discussion of Kenelm Digby's loosely autobiographic romance with its pronouncedly Aenean (Aeneas's fixed epithet in Virgil is 'pater') and Sidneian undertones also explores this parallel.

There are other metaphors describing how texts within texts function. Gavin Alexander, for instance, prefers the conversational metaphor of 'response', ' that implies agency on both sides (action and reaction), that encourages us to imagine the connections between texts in terms of a dialogue, and that reminds us of the hermeneutic logic of question and answer'.[14] The idea of *Quellenforschung* suggests rich aquatic imagery of influences,[15] *fontes* and *origines*[16] – hunted for and drawn from. While actively (and sometimes very harshly) criticised,[17] *Quellenforschung* even in its most positivist form[18] of accumulating a corpus of references with little interpretation or generalisation – especially in an early modern context – has much value as it reveals

[13] Ibid., 30.
[14] G. Alexander, *Writing After Sidney* (Oxford, 2006), xxii.
[15] Evident as early as in Mary Sidney's 'To the Angell Spirit' (*The Collected Works*, Vol. I, 110): 'As little streames with all their all doe flowe / to their great sea, due tributes gratefull flee: so press my thoughts my burthened thoughtes in mee, / To pay the debt of Infinits I owe / To thy great worth'.
[16] S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987), 4–6.
[17] See, for example, G. B. Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, transl. Charles Segal (Ithaca, 1941), with its famous denunciation of the 'positivistic hunt for sources' (23) and the invitation of the reader to have themselves and their cultures involved into the text via allusions (57). Stephen Greenblatt in 'Shakespeare and the Exorcists' in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, ed. P. Parker and G. Hartman (New York, 1985), 163–186 calls *Quellenforschung* 'the elephant's graveyard of literary history' (163). On a similar note, J. G. Harris, '"Narcissus in thy Face": Roman Desire and the Difference it Fakes in Anthony and Cleopatra', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994), 408–425 speaks of source study as of 'that tired terrain' (408).
[18] For example, in the form of 'allusion books', such as C. M. Ingleby's *Shakespeare Allusion* Books (London, 1909), sections of A. H. Cruickshank's *Philip Massinger* (Oxford, 1920), R. W. Dent's *John Webster's Borrowing* (Berkley, 1960), K. Muir's *Shakespeare's Sources* (London, 1957), and *Spenser Allusions in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* edited by R. Heffner et al. (*Studies in Philology* 68, 1971).

and allows one to measure the extent to which specific authorial voices impacted others' languages and poetics. Therefore, the approach adopted in this study is a gradual departure from the more positivist understanding of the term 'allusion' (an isolated, clearly identifiable quotation – sometimes even typographically marked – evoking a broader cultural code or serving as a communal marker of a certain type of education and rhetorical training) to the examination of less localised and defined presences and influences. Not incidentally, this structure replicates Sidney's ideal gentlemanly biography as well as the development of the Trojan myth in multiple ways.

The first chapter, '"Contemplate Troyes greife when Hector fell": Mourning for a National Hero and Making a National History', examines the earliest responses to Sidney's death, mainly the 1587 series of multilingual collections of elegies published at Oxford and Cambridge, and suggests a connection between remembering Sidney and imagining Troy. The collections document the rapid development of the Sidneian myth: while *Academiae Cantabrigiensis Lachrymae* was compiled hastily for his funeral and shows a very limited scope and complexity of Trojan references, the two Oxford collections (corresponding to later stages of Sidney's iconisation) are highly and elaborately Trojan. The chapter examines the intertextuality of this Trojanisation and traces the increasingly heroic (as opposed to amorous) connotations of Trojan grief. The second part of the chapter analyses another highly Trojanised instance of a national mourning – that for Prince Henry in 1612. Henry's eulogists learnt the art of mythologisation from Sidney's, however, the presence of the Trojan intertext in a similar series of Oxford and Cambridge elegy anthologies demonstrates that Troy was losing its heroic nature for the sake of a more dramatic and victim-focused idea of grief.

The second chapter, '"The training up of youth": Ending the *Arcadia* and Charting Aenean Grand Tours', examines Sidney's reading of Troy not merely through

classical texts but also though the lenses of early modern cartography and educational theories. *The Arcadia* is read as a re-interpretation of Virgilian and romance providential narratives, where Troy is portrayed as synonymous with education and discovery rather than grief and death. The second part of the chapter discusses the treatment of Sidney's educational Trojanism in the *Arcadia*'s continuations by Johnstoun, Belling, and Weamys. Whereas Sidney's interpretation of his Aenean model is transformative and makes use of the suggestive emotional ambiguity of the *Aeneid*'s conclusion, Sidney's continuators seem to avoid the *Arcadia*'s moral tensions and arrive at simplifying solutions independently. The third part is a reading of Sir Kenelm Digby's autobiographical romance, *Loose Fantasies*, in which Digby reconsiders the Sidneian way of thinking about the role of providence in princely education and prioritises the sentimental aspects of a gentleman's grand tour over heroic action – this section of the chapter argues that Trojanism and Sidneism formed a mixed substratum of the genres of romance and fictionalised biography as such.

The third chapter, '"Sights to make an Alexander": Trojan Tragedies on Stage and Page', outlines the development of Trojan drama in England from its origins in the 1550s to Thomas Heywood's encyclopaedic play *The Iron Age*. Counterintuitively, the first part of the chapter demonstrates that Troy was a far less ubiquitous presence in Tudor drama than is often believed, and plays on Trojan subjects were chiefly concerned with a very limited number of isolated amorous plots (such as the story of Dido and Aeneas) and the Asiatic exoticism of the Trojan monarchy serving as a mirror for its supposed British descendants. The chapter proceeds to demonstrate how Thomas Heywood synthesised such scattered instances of dramatic Trojanism to make Troy his career-shaping myth in *Troia Britannica* and, later, *The Iron Age*. The final part of the chapter will discuss both Sidney's potential reception of earlier Tudor dramatic

Trojanism and his influence on later drama dealing with Trojan subjects and will focus on his Trojanised understanding of the terms 'tragedy' and 'history' in the *Arcadia*.

The tripartite examination of the co-reception of Sidney and Troy begins within intellectual university communities. In her introduction to *Discoveries*, Lorna Hutson claims that by culling aphorisms and observations from ancient authors Jonson 'imagines an elite community of readers and writers whose freely expressed discriminations advance political, ethical, and natural knowledge'[19]. This imagining of an ideal community of *literati* is also the structuring force of the Oxford and Cambridge volumes abounding in precisely identifiable, classicising allusions. A similar type of Trojan references is the hallmark of erudite Alexandrian poetry and its Ovidian and Propertian developments where the epic motifs of the Trojan war act as a metonymy of the lyric emotions of grief, mourning, and stoicism. In the second chapter, the discussion leaves the university and embarks on a grand tour of exploring new genre possibilities associated with the more popular poetics of romance. Grief and exemplarity associated with Homeric and Virgilian characters and Sidney evolve into nostalgia and a sense of geographical and cultural displacement characteristic both of the Trojan narrative and the Jacobean wistful recollections of Sidney as the embodiment of Elizabethan military valour and poetic glory. In the third chapter, the discussion returns to London and explores the dramatic – in both senses – tensions between classical and mediaeval forms of Trojanism and reconsiders the reception of Sidney's career on the stage.

[19] D. Bevington, M. Butler, I. Donaldson, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson* (Cambridge, 2012), vol. 7, 492.

'Career', in addition to 'allusion', is another crucial term to be explained here. Samuel Daniel in his *Musophilus* draws an important distinction between Sidney and his works:

> How many thousands neuer heard the name
> Of *Sydney,* or of *Spencer,* or their bookes?
> And yet braue fellowes, and presume of fame
> And seem to beare downe all the world with lookes.[20]

The argument of this study, however, is that it was not Sidney's biography *or* Sidney's texts that were imitated and re-used in other texts and other, consciously self-constructed, biographies, but rather Sidney's integral career reflected and interpreted within others' careers.[21] A similar synthetic definition of Trojanism is used throughout the readings of the elegies, romances, and plays. Similar to the indivisibility of early modern authors from their works, Trojan writers – primarily Homer and Virgil – are frequently viewed not as authors but as agents of the Trojan narrative itself. Robert Edwards suggests that 'Virgil is the poet who signifies civilization and legitimates the vast project of establishing empire, national destiny, and heroic identity ... [his] authority is ... inseparable from the narrative fiction of the *Aeneid*'[22]. This approach to career reception and the relationship between a Trojan author and his matter has one practical implication for the argument of this study: a broader definition of what is

---

[20] Samuel Daniel, *The Poetical Essayes of Sam. Danyel* (London, 1599), E4^{v}.
[21] On the development of the the concept of authorship and a literary career, see M. Foucault, 'What is an Author?' in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, transl. D. F. Bouchard and S. Simon (Ithaca, 1977), 113–138; K. Pask, *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1996); L. Lipking, *The Life of the Poet: Beginning and Ending Poetic Careers* (Chicago, 1981); P. Cheney and F. A. de Armas, eds., *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Toronto, 2002); P. Hardie and H. Moore, eds., *Classical Literary Careers and Their Reception* (Cambridge, 2010).
[22] R. E. Edwards, 'Medieval literary careers: the Theban Track' in P. Cheney and F. A. de Armas, eds., *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Toronto, 2002), 107.

considered a Trojan text. Thus, the *Odyssey* contains little thematic Trojanism beyond its recollective digressions and the fact that it tells a story that took place after the Trojan war, yet Homer's putative authorship of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and the themes of displacement, wandering, and nostalgia make it Trojan at least for the purposes of this discussion. All the more so the *Aeneid*, where Troy is revisited only in memories and verbal reports and imagined as an ideal model for the future Rome. These structural analogies between an individual biography and a corpus of inherently Trojan texts mean that Sidney and Troy became, in many ways, synonymous and that their imitation and emulation were seen as imitation and emulation *par excellence*.

Chapter 1

‘Contemplate Troyes greife when Hector fell’: Mourning for a National Hero and Making a National History

This opening chapter deals with literary reception in its most technical form. It was conceived as a study of one very specific reception mechanism, the parallel appropriation of Sir Philip Sidney’s writings and a range of habitual Trojan texts, from classical antiquity to the Renaissance, in the body of early funerary verse for the courtier poet. The enervating abundance of primary material and the density of its Trojan references made it look almost like an exercise in statistics, in which one was to measure the frequencies of isolated allusions and conclude that Sidney was, for his admirers and imitators, X% Hector and Y% Achilles. Yet every case study potently suggested that neither was this mode of reception purely literary nor was it quite accurate to think of it as of an undifferentiated monolith of a phenomenon. However facelessly idealised Sidney’s posthumous portrayal may be, the membrane between his literary and biographical selves proved so strikingly penetrable in either direction, that in the end it appeared to be more appropriate to study the reception of a synthetic

literary career rather than exclusively that of the 'works'-part of his 'life-and-works'.[1] Similarly, parallel reception turned out to be a rather leaky umbrella term covering an intricate mesh of double, rival, or subordinate reception strategies. Eventually, it was impossible to establish a point at which one tradition of Trojanised appropriations was beginning to take a different shape: the grief-reinvigorated afterlife of Sidney's afterlife – the 1612 mourning for Prince Henry – thus also became part of the study. Even though the Trojan path is so well-trodden that sometimes it was difficult to distinguish between independent *topoi* and direct genealogy, when the two renowned instances of profuse public grief were 'place[d] ... in an informing proximity',[2] their more-than-coincidental likenesses materialised with exceptional clarity. Early modern mourning naturally preferred the comforting familiarity of recurrent patterns and exemplars, and it is hardly unusual that two comparable deaths should provoke comparable responses, but there was something other than the kinship of grief and convention that colligated the two outbursts of courtly sorrow: their shared Trojan intertext. The intellectual elitism of the communities of mourners, the similarities between the grand funeral processions accompanying the bodies of the two heroes, the sorrowful literary voices of the families, and even the graphic medical realism of the two death accounts all helped to establish a more-than-coincidental line of Trojan continuity between the two myths.

Lives and afterlives: Troy in biographical fashioning and literary mythologisation.

[1] The reception of literary careers has received much attention in recent scholarship, for instance Hardie and Moore, eds. (2010), esp. pp. 1–16; Cheney and De Armas, eds. (2002); Cheney's chapter 'Literary Careers' in *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature 1558–1660* (2015), 172–186. Cheney suggests (177) that Sidney may have had no literary career in a Virgilian sense, yet the progress from a pastoral romance to a heroic myth traceable in the early eulogies for him testifies to the contrary.

[2] C. Geertz, *Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (2000): xi.

Although the texts under discussion are the matter of an afterlife, and the matter of Troy, as will be demonstrated, was a naturally fruitful choice for the posthumous construction of a stylised heroic myth within a close-knit intellectual community, it should also be noted that an air of Trojanism surrounded Sir Philip Sidney's figure – as well as that of Prince Henry – even while they were alive. Death surely catalysed their cultural Trojanisation, yet it was not entirely unfounded and could be seen as a logical development of their life-myths carefully fashioned by themselves as well as their circles – families, educational institutions and, in Sidney's case, fellow-poets. Both Sidney and Prince Henry were not only expected but, in fact, quite vigorously encouraged to embody the ideas and ideals brought to Italy by the Trojan fugitives. The rhetoric of this encouragement sometimes used astonishingly similar images and terms. Hubert Languet wrote to Sidney, who was then in Vienna, on 28 January 1574:

> *Disce igitur maxime necessaria, & quorum cognitio ad vitam recte instituendam & transigendam est utilis, & memineris ad te pertinere illud Poëtae, Tu regere imperio populos, &c.*[3]
>
> So learn as much as possible of the essentials, and of those things the knowledge of which is useful for properly planning and carrying out your career; and remember that that word of the Poet, 'you ... have to guide the nations by your authority' etc., applies to you ... (transl. Roger Kuin).[4]

The famous words that Sidney no doubt remembered without Languet's eloquent injunction are uttered by Anchises's ghost in *Aeneid* 6.851ff,[5] and it appears that for Languet, Sidney's self-appointed pen-father and instructor, the real rationale behind quoting them was the desire to cement this relationship by assuming similar

[3] *Correspondence*, 99.
[4] Ibid., 101.
[5] Giunta 2Y^{v}.

ghostly paternity. After Sidney's death, familiar lines would also be used as a cement for Sidney's relationship with literary communities where such lines were current, yet the role of the ghostly paedagogue in poetic art and knightly valour would be reserved for Sidney himself.

On a similar note, James I concludes *Basilikon Doron*, a book of paternal and monarchical edification in epistolary form addressed, initially, to Henry, with the same 'worthie sentence of that sublime and Heroicall Poet *VIRGIL*',[6] implying, of course, a very different set of virtues and actions by that 'regere'. But however dissimilar the implications, the expectations were similarly if not equally great, and further biographical analogies lead to multiple convergences in the two literary afterlives: Prince Henry turned out to be the most natural heir to a large part of Sidney's mythologised heritage. That heritage, however, had an evolution of its own, and prior to studying the effect of Trojan myth on the Henrician via the Sidneian, one should look at the theoretical and textual conduits for the matter of Troy that Sidney's mourners used.

Early modern ideologies of grief were not always easy to reconcile. For example, Thomas Wilson advocates moderate expressions of sorrow[7] 'leaste wee rather purchase hatred, than aswage grief'. [8] In a sample consolatory speech, *The Arte of Rhetorique* – a cornerstone of Tudor education admired and consulted as a practical handbook even towards the turn of the century[9] – gives a chilling anticipation of the

[6] *Basilikon Doron* (London, 1599), X4^{r}.
[7] Moderation in expressing grief and other early modern emotions is extensively discussed by Pigman in *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge,1985), esp. 27–39, and Scodel, *Excess and Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton, 2002).
[8] Wilson (1553): I4^{r}.
[9] For example, Gabriel Harvey terms it 'one of [his] best for the art of jesting' and 'the dailie bread of owr common pleaders, & discourses' (Cited in Stern's life of Harvey, (Oxford, 1979), 239).

medical and military causes of grief dealt with in this chapter and sketches out a proper Protestant way of accepting them:

> ... sorowe is but an euil remedye to heale a sore. For if your hande were detrenched, or youre bodie maimed with some soubdaine stroake, what profite were it for you to wepe vpon your wounde, and when the harme is done, to lamente still the sore? ... A constante christian shoulde beare all miserie, and with pacience abide the force of necessitie, shewinge with sufferaunce the strengthe of his faithe ...[10]

Despite the high degree of theoretical reverence for Wilson, this advice does not seem to have enjoyed much attention either in Sidney's case, when the fatal wound and the body indeed maimed with a sudden stroke were excessively bewailed, nor in Prince Henry's, when profuse tears were applied as a futile remedy to the fever-stricken memory of the nation. This tension between humanist rhetorical prescriptivism[11] and real texts composed on real occasions appears to be especially high in the two cases under discussion because both men were, in their mourners' eyes, the embodiments of 'a constante christian' from Wilson's example. Protestant sentiment blended with religious and cultural nationalism pervaded the eulogies for Sidney and dominated those for Prince Henry, and yet even the most conservative and learned posthumous tributes one could reasonably expect to comply with the Erasmian and Wilsonian rules of mourning conduct, such as the collections published at Oxford and Cambridge both in 1587 and 1612–13, seemingly overindulge in grief instead of attempting to curb it.

On the other hand, Scaliger's famous quinquepartite scheme for various funerary genres[12] – *Laudes*, *Iacturæ demonstratio*, *Luctus*, *Consolatio*, *Exhortatio* – highlights the epideictic and quasi-ekphrastic facets of eulogies. Rather than praising

---

[10] Wilson (1553), K2^{v}–K3^{r}.
[11] For a discussion of grief and consolation similar to Wilsons see Erasmus's 1522 *Opus de Conscribendis Epistolis*.
[12] Analysed in Pigman (1985), 43–44.

the virtues of stoic understatement and tacit resignation, he suggests that the *Iacturæ demonstratio* chart a gradual narrative of anguish:

> Iactura demonstratur suaui primùm, mox incitatiore narratione. in qua immoratio & amplificatio auget amissæ rei desideriũ.[13]
>
> Loss is demonstrated first with a mild, afterwards with a more passionate narration, in which prolongation and amplification increase the desire for the lost object

The hint at an exemplary and sorrowful *narratio* inset into a non-narrative text commemorating the dead aptly encapsulates the function of Troy in the eulogies to be discussed. Troy's most obvious cultural implication is sorrow; its most immediate rhetorical application is analogising a recent tragedy to a familiar set of calamitous plotlines. 'Remembrance of the greater griefe',[14] as the Earl of Surrey put it in an elegy where he imagined himself to be a convive of Priam's children, and patient oblivion are also the two conflicting forces that structure both the Trojan myth and its early modern reception. The Trojan refugees overcome the torment of their memory by lingering on it and eventually re-embodying it elsewhere. Similarly, channelling an enormous and unmanageable grief over the loss of the nation's favourite courtier or prince into convenient literary traditions rendered it more manageable. Literary forms that may appear emotionally inauthentic and trite[15] do so only because they are at the same time conscious of how unprofitable it is 'to wepe vpon your wounde' and mindful of the remedial properties of 'speaking grief': these expressions of immoderate suffering need to be administered with moderation.

---

[13] Scaliger (1561), P4^{v}.
[14] *Tottel's Miscellany* (London, 1557), B3^{v}.
[15] Recent scholarship has focused on the authenticity of emotions in early modern culture, for specific references to grief see Swiss and Kent's *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton* (Pittsburgh, 2002): 17ff.

Puttenham's chapter on 'the forme of Poeticall lamentations' eloquently expresses this synthetic view on the autotherapeutic effects of mourning:

> Lamenting is altogether contrary to reioising ... and yet it is a peece of ioy to be able to lament with ease, and freely to poure forth a mans inward sorrowes and the greefs wherewith his minde is surcharged. This was a very necessary deuise of the Poet and a fine, besides his poetrie to play also the Phisitian, not not only by applying a medicine to the ordinary sicknes of mankind, but by making the very greef ... cure of the disease.[16]

Puttenham then launches into a lengthy review of the types of sorrow and poetic genres suitable to express them. Love and bereavement (the causes range from illness to death on battlefield) naturally attract most of his attention. The two most significant varieties of early modern Trojanism also developed on the basis of amorous and heroic grief. Troy is scattered throughout *Tottel's Miscellany*[17] as Ovidian fragments of highly personalised sufferings, but its ruins also support the scaffolding of the emergent national mythology. Thus, the first version of Warner's *Albions England* (1586, by way of meaningful coincidence entered in the Stationers' Register on 7 November,[18] shortly after the delivery of Sidney's corpse to Tower Hill[19]) allocates almost equal space to Aeneas's flight from Troy[20] and Brutus's resettlement to 'this Isle (vn-Scotted yet)',[21] while the final version (published posthumously in 1612 – this time the year of Henry's death) officially locates James's 'happie Raigne'[22] within the Trojan myth. Warner intended to frame a universal history progressively focusing on *translatio imperii* and the flourishing of that *imperium* at its final destination. The fact that that narrative was

---

[16] Puttenham (1589): G3$^{r–v}$.
[17] See Davis's chapter 'Tottel's Troy' in *Tottel's* Songes and Sonnettes *in Context* (ed. Hamrick, 2013), 63–85.
[18] Arber (1875), II.458.
[19] Hannay (1990), 58.
[20] Excluding the prose appendix recounting Aeneas's 'true Historie'.
[21] Warner (1586), G4^{r}.
[22] Warner (1612).

begun almost at the height of Elizabeth's reign and brought to completion at the height of James's, apart from echoing the Virgilian project of providing an exemplary prehistory for Augustus's peaceful rule, is also revealing about the functions of Trojanism in the cultures of the 1580s and 1610s. By the time of Sidney's death, the bridge between London and Troy was still under construction and required radical literary advances; by 1612, it had evolved from a makeshift structure into an institutionalised concept[23] and needed refinement and interpretation rather than any major additions. While the epic side of this transformation is conveniently illustrated by Warner's example, the Sidneian and Henrician myths demonstrate how these two forms of Trojanism modified lyric poetry and rhetorical theory.

Communal mourning: the early elegies.

Among the promptest responses to Sidney's death were the well-known and relatively unstudied multilingual collections of elegies, one, *Academiae Cantabrigiensis Lachrymae*, published at Cambridge and two, *Exequiæ Illvstrissimi Eqvitis, D. Philippi Sidnaei* and *Peplvs*, at Oxford. The publication of these volumes falls into the category of literary facts of undeniable importance about which little is said other than that they are so significant. Not infrequently[24] are these collections treated not as complexly structured texts conscious of the conflicts and themes that determine their form but as indiscriminately hewn blocks of banal eulogising. Yet the pains taken at the compilation of the volumes are documented well enough to dispel this attitude. This analysis will show that all three collections could be interpreted as a

[23] For example, Heywood's *Troia Britannica* appeared in 1609.
[24] For instance, in Falco (1994), 60.

literary testing ground for several so far little-explored – at least in England – facets of Trojanism, especially its familial and eulogising qualities.

The volumes produced by intellectual university communities were anything but a haphazard mass of grief-stricken verse: for these communities, the therapeutic function of Trojanism consisted in its ability to bind individual emotional contributions into a well-structured system presenting this grief formally and thus turning it into a historical fact. The 'Epistola Dedicatoria' prefixed to the *Exequiae* clearly testifies to William Gager's editorial cautiousness about producing too comprehensive a collection:

> *Quas [Exequias] tamen, vtpote ex integri iam anni spatio interiecto, ornatiores, noli quæso expectare. non enim iam nouæ à nobis Exequiæ instituuntur, sed illæ instaurantur, quas domi quisque suæ, primo fere doloris impetu, apparauerat. Etenim ne minus numerosæ habeantur, non reformido, cui in toto hoc munere obeundo nihil molestius fuit, quàm ne ipsa lugentium turba ac multitudine obruerer. Itaque Hebræos, Græcos, Gallos, Italósque, non paucos etiam Latinos hunc in numerum non aggegaui, ne in immensum excresceret.*[25]

> Please do not expect these obsequies to be more ornate seeing that an entire year has passed. For we are not designing new obsequies but renew those composed by each of us at home at the first outbreak of grief. And I fear not that they may be considered too few in number, for whom nothing has been more troublesome in this whole undertaking than not to be buried in the crowded multitude of mourners. Thus, I have omitted Hebrew, Greek, French, and Italian, as well as many Latin poems, lest the volume grow enormous.

[25] *Exequiae*, *3^{r}.

This seemingly humble presentation of the *Exequiae* as an intellectually unostentatious collection was in fact a polysemous gesture of conservatism and literary irony. In 1587, Greek types were a novelty enjoyed, at long last, by Oxford's academic community largely subsisting on works of Aristotelian scholarship as well as occasional 'poems in learned languages': Joseph Barnes had printed England's first scholarly Greek text, Chrysostom's *Homiliae sex*, in 1586,[26] and Gager's editorial *recusatio* may suggest that the University resisted the temptation of that brand new facility so as not to demarcate Sidney's lifetime from the post-Sidneian age incidentally signalised by the emergence of a cutting-edge technology. Additionally, it was a grief-restrained jibe at the polyglot *Lachrymae*, which featured much Greek and some Hebrew, and at a broader convention of multilingual contributions to similar collections on the Continent. The paradoxical consequence of this twofold curtailment was the unexpressed portrayal of Oxford's community as the last stronghold of the Latinate Englishness yet unaffected by Spenser's linguistic nationalism – and of the England that Sidney personally knew.

This insight into Gager's editing principles reveals one feature of this and, by virtue of reasonable extrapolation, the other two volumes that has been almost completely overlooked by the few scholars who have paid close attention to them at all. The consensual mode of thinking about Gager's edition involves the structural assumption that the Christ Church-based group of neo-Latin contributors was, to adopt an astronomical metaphor, a Solar system rather than a Pléiade. Thus, Bradner describes Gager as 'the greatest of these [Oxford neo-Latin] poets ... surrounded by other lesser lights',[27] which, not unexpectedly, leads him to examining *only* Gager's poems on Sidney's death in any depth. Dominic Baker-Smith discusses the *Lachrymae*

[26] Luna and Ould in *The History of Oxford University Press: Volume I: Beginnings to 1780*, ed. Ian Gadd (2013), 513.
[27] Bradner, L., *Musae Anglicanae* (New York, 1940), 36.

thoroughly and does emphasise the importance – and improbability – of a more synthetic reading in claiming that '[i]t would be interesting to know more about the relationship of [the] contributors; how far Neville drew on a conscious network of collaborators, and how far this Cambridge group had continental contacts',[28] however, his study also fails to identify the forces that transform these collections of individual voices into elaborately orchestrated funerary tributes.

Trojan intertextuality is doubtlessly one such force. Moreover, its almost overwhelming presence is only felt in the texts printed on this side of the Channel. Sidney's continental lamenters do make the Sidney↔Troy connection occasionally, but on the whole their responses prefer other widespread *topoi*, such as 'Mars against the Muses', the Fates' ruthlessness, or fluvial lamentation. For example, of the forty Dutch elegies anthologised by van Dorsten, only one poem by Janus Dousa the Younger contains a consistent sequence of references to the matter of Troy:

> Haud aliter tracto confusa est Hectore Troia
> ...
> Troada sic primus, fato signatus iniquo,
> Sanguine fœdavit Protesilaus humum.[29]

> Hardly different was Troy's confusion when Hector's body was dragged ... So was the ill-fated Protesilaus the first to stain the Trojan soil with his blood.

In England, the shares of Trojanism were also unequal in the Cambridge and Oxford collections. This statement urges one to distinguish between purely emblematic and more sophisticatedly allusive uses of Troy. In *Academiae Cantabrigiensis*

---

[28] In van Dorsten et al., eds., *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend* (Leiden, 1986), 95.
[29] Van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons, and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers, and the Leiden Humanists* (Leiden, 1962), 189.

Lachrymae, for example, Hector often appears in the company of other, not necessarily Trojan, *viri illustres* synonymous with a variety of virtues, from Cato and Scipio to Absalom and Jesus. This lower-case hector is neither Homeric nor Virgilian, he speaks sorrow in a decontextualised and depersonalised voice. Other than that, the *Lachrymae* employs proportionally fewer Trojan motifs than do the Oxford volumes. There are sporadic mentions of Priam and Hector, Thetis and Achilles. By far the most extensive Trojan scene opens R. Banning's Sapphics:

> Ilium postquàm Danai feroces,
> Bellicis quondàm machinis premebant:
> Sordidos vultus lachrymis amaris
> Troes habebant.
> Hæctoris cæsi tumulum videntes,
> Et pij stratum Priami cadauer,
> Ense, deplorant, manibusq; tristes
> Pectora tundunt.[30]
>
> After the cruel Danaans seized Ilion with warlike stratagems, the Trojans's faces were befouled with bitter tears. Seeing Hector's mound and Priam's corpse laid prostrate with a sword, they were wailing and striking their sad chests with their hands.

Yet most importantly, the *Lachrymae* establishes a solid link between Sidney's iconic horsemanship (ironically denounced in the equestrian opening of *The Defense of Poesy*) and the death of Hector. The volume and a substantial number of its texts are dedicated 'Nobilißimi Equiti', and bitter horse-puns feature both the Latin and Greek sections. For instance, Thomas Playster begins his elegy with '῏Ω τριποθάτε Φίλιππε, λίαν γ' ἐφίλεις τεον ἵππον, / Ἵππῳ μαρνόμενος'[31] ('O thrice longed for Philip, much did you love your steed, fighting on horseback'), and William 'Icamsius' combines the love of horses with an Aenean role merited by Sidney:

---

[30] *Academiae Cantabrigiensis Lachrymae*, K2^{r}.
[31] Ibid., I1^{v}.

> Arma virumq; canat, tum sic canat ille *Philippum*
> Nec canat is *Sydney*, ni canat Arma virum.
>
> Esse φίλιππον, & esse *Philippum*, vt differat audi,
> Ille φίλιππος erat non est ergo ille *Philippus*[.][32]
>
> Should he sing of arms and a man, then let him sing of Philip, and he is not singing of Philip unless he is singing of arms and a man. How different do 'horse-loving' and Philip sound! He was horse-loving, therefore, he is not Philip.

There is more than an obvious Homeric subtext to the eulogists' heightened attention to horsemanship. In the *Iliad*, Hector's fixed epithet is 'horse-taming' – only a step away from 'horse-loving'. Book XXIV concludes with 'ὣς οἵ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο'[33] ('thus did they hold the funeral of the horse-taming Hector') – a parallel that is unlikely to have been ignored by the learned eulogists. The similarity becomes even more plausible if the publication history of the volume is considered: it was prepared in a rush to be, as the title page suggests, quite a literal offering for Sidney at his tomb, and its participation in the *ἀμφιέπειν* of the lavishly staged funeral determined the general tenor of its Trojanism. The hasty compilers had no opportunity and, in fact, reason to develop other areas of the Trojan intertext. They needed to bury the dead, and the Sidneian myth in its best-known form did not flourish until after the physical interment.[34] Bolder experiments with the matter of Troy started when Oxford's literary communities took over.

Theories of grief and imitation.

[32] Ibid., C4[r].
[33] *Iliad*
[34] Upton (*Studia Historica Gandensia 273*, 131–141) suggests that the *Lachrymae* is relatively free of propaganda precisely due to its very early date.

Before examining specific cases from the *Exequiæ* and *Peplvs*, it is necessary to understand how sixteenth-century doctrines of *imitatio* perceived the osmosis between epic – in this case, Trojan – themes and shorter poetic forms. This formal tension is crucial to a deeper understanding of the history of European Trojanism, especially in conjunction with the Sidneian myth. The classical Troy was predominantly epic, although its inhabitants and themes naturally migrated into drama and sometimes filtered into lyrical genres – generally, still, in order to introduce a major – historical or otherwise impersonal – theme highlighting the more local lyrical emotion. The mediaeval Troy, as will be shown in Chapter 3, had a stronger dramatic and vernacular sense. Aware of and informed by either tradition, the verse collections for Sidney had to adapt the epic dimension of Trojanism to their own purpose.

A familiar classical specimen of such Trojan appropriation in lyric that also influenced the body of funerary verse for both Sidney and Prince Henry is Catullus 64, an epyllion presenting the wedding of Peleus and Thetis at which the Parcae sing their prophecy about Achilles. The most notable Tudor theorist of rhetoric to comment on Catullus 64 was Roger Ascham. In the second book of his *Scholemaster*, Ascham concludes a cursory critical discussion of 'many learned men['s]'[35] diverse treatments of *imitatio* with the following lengthy tirade against Bartolomeo Ricci:

> *Barthol. Riccius Ferrariensis* also hath written learnedlie, diligentlie and verie largelie of this matter ... He writeth the better [than the authors criticised above] in myne opinion, bicause his whole doctrine, iudgement, and order, semeth to be borowed out of *Io[annes]. Stur[mius's].* bookes. He addeth also examples, the best kind of teaching: wherein he doth well, but not well enough ... He is content with the meane, and followeth not the best ... He teacheth for example, where and how, two or three late *Italian* Poetes do follow *Virgil*: and how *Virgil* him selfe in the storie of *Dido*, doth wholie Imitate

[35] Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (London, 1570), P1[v].

> *Catullus* in the like matter of *Ariadna*: Wherein I like better his diligence and order of teaching, than his iudgemẽt in choice of examples for *Imitation*.[36]

Ascham's poorly contained disgruntlement is elicited by one of Ricci's less celebrated Latin treatises *De Imitatione Libri Tres* first printed in Venice as a handsome Aldine octavo and reprinted in Paris in 1557. Its second book addresses itself to the mechanics of stylistic evolution and focuses specifically on the nature of literary appropriation and its potential paedagogic application based on the example of Catullus and Virgil. The episodes under scrutiny are the beginning of Catullus's epyllion, where the forsaken Ariadne is lamenting her misery and cursing Theseus's perfidy on the desert shore of Naxos, and Book IV of the *Aeneid* with Dido's speech allegedly reiterating and altering her counterpart's:

> Catullus igitur cum Tetidis, & Pellei nuptias diuino carmine celebraret, Ariadnam in solo littore destitutam, ac casum suum grauiter conquerentem, aptissimo in loco in eam laudationem adducit. hũc postea locum Maro integrum in suam Didonem pari ratione ab amatore suo delusam, longe transtulit felicius. sanè Catullum si solũ legas, nihil melius desiderari posse uidetur, uerum si cum Marone conferas, uix iterum Catullum regustabis, ita hic illi quasi tenebras offudit, atque luminibus obstruxit omnibus.[37]
>
> When Catullus celebrates the wedding of Thetis and Peleus in his divine song, he most aptly introduces Ariadne forsaken on a desert shore and bitterly bewailing her destiny. Virgil is much more successful at putting this entire speech in the mouth of his Dido who is similarly deceived by her lover. Certainly, if you read Catullus alone, it seems that nothing better could be desired, whereas if you read him alongside Virgil, hardly ever will you taste Catullus again, so much has the former eclipsed the latter and hidden him from sight.

Ricci then cites a handlist of juxtaposed quotations from Catullus 64 and *Aeneid* IV accompanied with brief elucidations of the rhetorical differences between the two

[36] Ibid., P2^{r}.
[37] Riccius (Venice, 1545), F4^{r}.

monologues for which Ascham tepidly praises him. This series of remarks portrays Virgil not as a slavish, albeit a much more gifted imitator but as a supremely perspicacious craftsman able to prune excessive verbosity and expand too terse a passage without stiltedness. His Dido could have deserved Wilson's approval for lingering on her sorrow:

> Plana tota loci est imitatio, sed quod potuit amplius Maro, id acute & uidit, & præstitit egregie. [38]
>
> The whole speech is written in imitation, but wherever Virgil could amplify, he both saw it acutely and accomplished excellently.

For Ricci, Virgil epitomises the uncontrived balance that every man with a humanist upbringing needs to find between rhetorical amnesia and servile reproduction of tropes and motifs:

> hic uero, de quo nunc agam, ille est, qui non solũ imaginem aliunde sumptam suo artificio, sua eloquentia, suis omnibus numeris in suo opere quàm planissime absoluit, sed qui eam multo etiam ampliorem, multóq; magis splendidam efficit.[39]
>
> He of whom I am now speaking is one who not only completes an image borrowed in his own work from elsewhere with his own ingenuity, eloquence, with all his poetic skill, but also amplifies and refines it significantly.

If read against the modern standards of critical writing, Ricci's analysis of Virgil's debt to Catullus constitutes what may appear to be a body of convincing close readings clothed in an array of broad-ranging generalisations about the methodologies and purposes of literary imitation. However, Ascham's opprobrium rests upon quite a different premise: whereas Ricci selects a collateral – although much beloved and

[38] Ibid., F5^{r}.
[39] Ibid., F3^{v}.

frequently re-exploited – plotline, Ascham insists on a more thorough treatment of the whole text, and on a linear comparison of Virgil's epic and Homer's epic rather than Virgil's epic and Catullus's epyllion. Characteristically, the episodes Ascham offers for comparison are almost exclusively heroic: 'the games running, wrestling, and shoting, that *Achilles* maketh in *Homer*, with the self same games, that *Æneas* maketh in *Virgil* ... The notable combate betwixt *Achilles* and *Hector*, with as notable a combate betwixt *Æneas* and *Turmis* [sic!] ... and other places infinite mo, as similitudes, narrationes, messages, discriptions of persones, places, battels, tempestes, shipwrackes, and common places for diuerse purposes, which be as precisely taken out of *Homer*, as euer did Painter in London follow the picture of any faire personage'.[40] The genre inequality between Catullus's fragmentary adaptation of the myth and Virgil's continuous narrative, in Ascham's view, precludes this particular loanspeech from being called an instance of *imitatio*. The chief implication of this term is proportion: it would have been more appropriate, Ascham argues, to see if Virgil, for example, adapts the respective Homeric episodes and even phrases sequentially or relocates them, and what could be inferred from such faithfulness or such liberty. Ricci, instead of diving into meticulous philology, only alludes to the Homer-Virgil connection as to an unfeasibly complex frame for his elegant investigation.

Sidneian intertext.

The twofold task that Sidney's mourners needed to accomplish amalgamated these two views on the appropriation of the epic by the lyric and vice versa. It was to make Catullus 're-gustable' – that is, to condense epic motifs into elegiac verse without

[40] Ascham (1570), P2^{v}.

disfiguring them – and at the same time to portray Sidney's *casus* in strict proportion to whatever Trojan exemplar they chose. For Sidney's eulogists, this difficult literary project could be achieved by bringing Sidney himself into play. His own texts were used as a background intertext binding the multiple dimensions of Trojanism together. Thus, Sidney's memory was almost physically revived through its creative engagement in other poets' compositions.

One of the most innovatory and successful instances of such abridged and proportional appropriation that yokes together polyvocal epic, pastoral, Catullan, and, crucially, Sidneian contexts is Richard Latewar's 'Stellati Pastoris ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΟΝ, *CVI NOMEN, PHILISIDES*' printed in Oxford's *Exequiæ*. The warp of Latewar's elaborately fabricated elegy is the ''Επιτάφιος Βίωνος', a spurious pastoral monody[41] traditionally attributed to Moschus. Pseudo-Moschus's text diligently absorbs many of the motifs found in its immediate predecessor and model, Bion's own 'Lament for Adonis',[42] and replicates its quasi-stanzaic structure with a refrain: 'ἄρχετε Σικελικαί, τῶ πένθεος ἄρχετε, Μοῖσαι' ('Begin, Sicilian Muses, begin your grieving song'[43]), but whereas the Greek is broken up into sections of unequal length, Latewar uses a regular pattern of eight lines perhaps echoing the Italian epic form, even though it would be somewhat inaccurate to brand his unrhymed hexameters as the *ottava rima*. The refrain itself, in Graeco-Roman poetry, distinguishes performed texts – usually songs on significant events – in which more narrative, historical fragments are inset. The Trojan prophesy of the Parcae in Catullus 64 with its 'Currite ducentes, subtegmina, currite fusi' is one of the most conspicuous representations of this technique in Roman poetry,

[41] See Manakidou (1996) for a detailed discussion of the genre, especially in connection to Menander's definition of monody.
[42] See di Nino's (2009) study of the intertextual connections between the two elegies.
[43] Theocritus, Moschus, Bion (2015): 468ff.

and Latewar moulds his refrain into the quasi-Catullan 'Dicite Philisidem, mea carmina, dicite vatem'. This deliberate intertextual multivalence – Latewar's poem formally alludes both to the pastoral and epic modes – is an important addition to one of the characteristic features of the bucolic monody, its awareness of itself as a text of this genre.[44] Furthermore, the same form is employed[45] by Sidney himself in Queen Helen's complaint over Amphialus:

> Since that to death is gone the shepheard hie,
> Whom most the silly shepheards pipe did pryse,
> Your dolefull tunes sweete *Muses* now applie.[46]

This intersection of multiple referential fields facilitates the building of an even denser structure of intertextual references: Latewar's poem is interspersed with self-conscious literary allusions, erudite 'Alexandrian footnotes'.[47] The central prototext to which Latewar keeps harking back is Virgil's *Eclogues.* The names of the shepherds and patrons altered, the 'ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΟΝ' opens with the opening of Eclogue X immediately followed by a half-verse from Eclogue I.7:

> Extremum hunc (mea Musa) mihi concede laborem,
> Pauca ego Philisidi (sed quæ legat ipse Robertus)
> Cantabo: quis pauca illi, quis multa negaret? [48]

> Grant me, my Muse, this last labour, and I shall sing a few words to Philisides (which, however, Robert himself will read), for who would deny him a few, and who would deny him many?

---

[44] See Di Nino (2009), who uses the term 'consapevolezza' (awareness) to describe this heightened referentiality of Moschus's lament.
[45] In fact, adapted from Sannazaro's 'Ecloga XI' (*Arcadia* (2013), 279–288).
[46] *CPA*, 2Y2^{v}. In the *Old Arcadia*, this is sung by Dicus in the 'Fourth Eclogues'.
[47] D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975), 78.
[48] *Exequiae*, E1^{r}.

The fifth stanza contains references to I.58 and X.52, in the ninth stanza a quotation from V.42–43 is combined with IV.68–69, to name the most conspicuous examples. The Virgilian cento was not, as may appear, one of the dead ends of late-Roman poetry marked by intellectual maturity and the decay of invention[49] but had a practical resonance for sixteenth-century instructive literature. For instance, Richard Willes's *Poematum Liber*, a manual of exotic verse forms, a '[centum] contra otium adolescentiæ pestem antidota'[50] dedicated to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, presents an exemplary 'Cento Virg. Eclog.' on the Feast of the Annunciation.[51] The jolly epigram celebrating the arrival of the Spring, literally and theologically, is assembled from twelve fragments of the *Eclogues*, all footnoted and referenced at the margin as if to demonstrate the chemistry of poetic recycling. Latewar, as the few remains of his oeuvre testify, as well as the other contributors to both Oxford collections, were careful appliers of extreme Elizabethan formal prescriptions. Willes, for instance, composed altar-, wing-, and pyramid-shaped poems,[52] and so did the authors of both the *Peplvs* and *Exequiae.* Yet whereas Willes's theory of imitation implied generically pure borrowings – in this case, only from the *Eclogues* – Latewar's sophistication allows for some significant diversity. The pastoral frame supports and accentuates a much less peaceful allusion to *Aeneid* IX.545–555 in the eighth stanza. Latewar, to comply with pseudo-Moschus's genre, feigns a refusal to depict Sidney's military exploits:

> Sed nec bella gero, nec sunt in prælia vires
> Musæ noster amor ...[53]
>
> But I do not wage wars, nor is there strength in battle; for the Muse is my love.

[49] See McGill's *Virgil Recomposed* (Oxford, 2005) for a detailed discussion of Virgilian centos.
[50] Willes (1573), A4^{v}.
[51] Willes (1573), B5^{v}.
[52] Gager's pyramid-shaped poems are discussed in Binns (*Humanistica Lovaniensa* XXI), 221–238. Also see Puttenham (1589), N1^{v}–N2^{v}.
[53] *Exequiae*, E2^{v}.

The irony of this abnegation is that Latewar – a fit surname for this tardiness of acknowledging his inability to master epic poetry[54] – only claims his love for the rural Muse after a whole '*ottava*' chronicling Sidney's soldierly valiance – incidentally, the only stanza in the text distinguished by marginal commonplace markers:

> O ego, quæ de te nonnulli insignia scribunt,
> Scribentésque sciunt, & scirem, & scribere scirem!
> Ensémque, clypeúmque, & equum sessore frementem
> Immoto, furiasque breues, dum feruidus irâ
> Proruis, & quà tela vides densissima curris ...[55]

> O if I but knew – and knew how to describe – your signs of honour, which some describe! – The sword, the shield, the steed neighing while the rider is motionless, and the brief fury when, burning with rage, you rushed forward and galloped to where you saw spears the thickest.

Part of the key to the riddle is the word 'insignia'. Sutton translates it as 'distinctions',[56] however, one would be right to require greater heraldic specificity. Of the warrior's attributes Latewar enumerates, only the shield could serve as a means of emblematic identification. Without dwelling on the importance of shield ekphrases in epic poetry, it may be interesting to unravel one thread of *topoi* Latewar weaves into his text. The passage in which Latewar wishes he could describe Sidney's 'insignia' relies on a rather minor scene in *Aeneid* IX, where two Trojans, Helenor and Lycus, much less famous than the other two comrades-in-arms in this book, Nysus and Euryalus, perish in the battle with Turnus. Helenor and Lycus escape the fatal collapse of the turret, the Trojan's last stronghold, and the former youth

---

[54] Latewar's epitaph also quibbles on his name:
A SERO BELLO DIVES DURUSQ; VOCATVS,
NOMEN ET OMEN HABES, SIC TVA FATA CANIS. (See Höltgen (1971), 423).
[55] *Exequiae*, E2[r].
[56] See http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/exequiae/trans.html.

> medios moriturus in hostis
> inruit et qua tela videt densissima tendit.[57]
>
> Rushed towards his death into the midst of the enemy's forces and headed to where he saw spears the thickest.

In the space of ten verses Virgil manages both to recount Helenor's biography (he was the illegitimate son of the Maeonian king and his slave Licymnia sent to Troy by his mother) and to present his unassuming insignia (he was forbidden to carry princely arms and died 'ense levis parmaque inglorius alba' – 'lightly armed with a bare sword and inglorious with a blank buckler'). Latewar's recollection of the gory episode is, of course, not a unique trope: Troy was not an uncommon admixture to pastoral poetry. Perhaps most famously, Virgil's Ecloga IV prophesises about the pre-golden-age reiteration of the warlike past:

> Alter erit tum Tiphys, et altera quae vehat Argo
> delectos Heroas, erunt etiam altera bella,
> atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles.[58]
>
> Then there will be another Tiphus, and another Argo to carry the elected heroes, and other ward, and once again the great Achilles will be sent to Troy.

What makes Latewar different from some of his predecessors is that his Trojan allusion wrapped up in a shepherd's attire is not a passive footnote but a dynamic epic fragment, which is heraldically signalled in the text. Blank shields have their genealogy. In Homer, Hector's brother Deiphobus is called 'λεύκασπις' (*Il*. XXII.294)[59] – 'white-shielded' – in the scene of Hector's final fight with Achilles. Hector throws a spear at his foe, but Achilles repels the attack, and Hector, in need of another long spear, calls

[57] Giunta 3H7^{r}.
[58] *Giunta* D2^{r}. The *topos* appears already in Moschus's comparison between Homer and Bion, see Theocritus, Moschus, Bion (2015), 476.
[59] *Iliad*, vol. 2, 274.

Deiphobus – but in vain. In Matteo Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, in the catalogue of the troops Agramante leads to Spain, there is Arigalte, King of Amonia, 'da la insegna bianca, / Né dentro vi ha dipenta alcuna cosa'.[60] Arigalte is, of course, an unlikely exemplary figure: earlier in Book II, he is the first of Agramante's three warriors, 'il fior de Pagania', easily defeated by Ruggiero during the course of the tournament at the Mount Carena (II.XVII.26):

> Ciascun percosse il giovanetto franco,
> Ma lui trasse Arigalte de la sella,
> Qual porta senza insegna il scudo bianco ...[61]
>
> Each of them attacked the young Frank, but he unsaddled Arigalte, who carries the white shield without an emblem.

Yet both contexts in which Arigalte's shield is mentioned – the muster and the tournament – merge in Latewar's pivotal proto-text: Phalantus's joust towards the end of Book I of *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*.[62] Pyrocles and Musidorus suddenly appear in order to humble the haughty Phalantus, both disguised – as 'the ill-appointed knight' and 'the black knight', respectively. The former, in contrast to the above-portrayed knights, each carrying a shield with a lengthily interpreted *impresa*,

> was no lesse marked then al the rest before, because he had nothing worth the marking. For he had neither picture, nor deuice, his armour of as old a fashion (besides the rustie poorenesse,) that it might better seeme a monument of his graundfathers courage ...[63]

Both incognito knights and Phalantus engage in a short triple tussle, and Pyrocles/Zelmane eventually triumphs in spite of his lamentable equipment: virtue will

---

[60] 'of the white shield, and nothing was depicted on it', II.XXIX.11, see Boiardo (2011), vol. 2, 1046.
[61] Ibid., 840.
[62] For the function of *imprese* in the narrative structure of the *Arcadia*, see Skretkowicz (1986).
[63] *CPA*, L2^{r}.

out, albeit 'ill-apparelled'. Mindful of Pyrocles's blank-shielded precursors, Sidney modifies the signification of the absence of an *impresa*: Hector's brother Deiphobus is not at hand to procure another spear; Helenor's poor armour mismatches – because of his unalterable illegitimacy – his selfless courage; contrariwise, Arigalte's professed austerity merely masks his justly curbed vanity; only in the *Arcadia* does the blank shield function as a foil for uprightness and victoriousness, a token of purposeful – not inevitable – humility, a background against which Pyrocles's own – not his imaginary 'graundfather's' – valour looks especially magnificent.

Emblematic Trojanism

Blank and wordless shields presented in epic scenes have a clear literary genealogy: in heraldic practice, they would have been treated as a pretentious extremity, while in the highly symbolic and allegorically interpretable worlds of Sidney and Virgil their tacitness is infinitely meaningful. Such *emblemata rasa* were also subject to discussion in contemporary heraldic theory. Girolamo Ruscelli suggests that 'quelle tante belle Imprese, vsate da gli antichi senza Motto, & che s' vsan' ancor' oggi da molti grand' huomini felicemente, fossero cadaueri, ò corpi morti, ò, per dir meglio, embrioni & aborti, ò sconciature, vscite fuori senz' auer mai riceuuto anima, nè spirito alcuno'.[64] Yet for the romance-influenced theorists and audiences, the memory of classical antiquity that such emblems bore, as Ruscelli points out, rendered them as noble and eloquent as any other, more conventional heraldic image. Samuel Daniel's preface to his translation of Paolo Giovio's *Tract ... Contayning a Discourse of Rare*

[64] Ruscelli (1584), A2^{v}. '... all those beautiful *imprese* used by the ancient without a motto and still used vastly nowadays by many great men, were cadavers, or dead bodies, or, to put it better, embryos and miscarriages, or children stillborn without having received any soul or spirit'.

Inuentions, Both Militarie and Amorous Called Imprese concludes with a 'grammatical' survey of shield devices: Daniel, for example, sets the appropriate limits for the length of and source of the motto and outlines the semiotics of shield embellishments. In addition, he postulates that

> Impreses *are not Hereditarie*, *as are Armes, for the sonne may not vse the* Impresa *of father, nor the successors of their ancestors, and it behoueth that they be of no other colours, saue onoly blacke and white, vnlesse it be rather to adorne them, then for any necessitie ...* [65]

Sidney would have been familiar with Giovio's work[66] and was captivated by heraldry, as incalculable instances in the *Arcadias* prove. So were his earliest mourners: the role and recurrent use of Trojan heraldry in *Peplvs Illvstrissimi Viri D. Philippi Sidnaei* indicates a final stage of the myth's maturation and transition into the realm of materiality. This New College collection is on the whole distinguished by an extremely high concentration of physical Trojanism, partly due to its genre. The analogy between an elegy and a pall permeated early modern funerary verse. Already Gager, whose *Exequiae* appeared in November 1587 about two months after *Peplvs*, respectfully literalises the image of weaving Sidney's last garment:

> Et quidem commodissimè accidit, vt cui amantissima Matertera lachrymas vberimas profudisset, quidam etiam è nostris Peplum elegantissimè texuissent, mater Academia postremo quasi loco incedens (qui est inter lugentes & honorificus, & luctosus maximè) plenas filij sui Exequias persequeretur.[67]
>
> And surely it was very appropriate that after his maternal aunt had shed profuse tears, and some of us had woven a peplos in a most elegant manner, mother University should take the last place (which is the most honourable and comfortless among the mourners) to perform the obsequies for her son.

---

[65] Giovio (1585), A6^{v}.
[66] See Bod. MS Rawl. D. 345 and discussion in Sidney (1987): 527. Also see Woudhuysen 378ff.
[67] *Exequiae*, *3^{r}.

The metaphor may have become an automatic figure of early modern grieving thought, but in Sidney's case there is an unequivocally and consciously Trojan pattern embroidered on the shroud. The first *Peplos* – a slender volume of forty-eight epitaphs for Trojan heroes – was traditionally considered Aristotle's composition.[68] It influenced such authors as Ausonius, but then sank into oblivion for the next 1200 years to be brought back to light at the decline of the age of literary rediscoveries, namely in 1566, by a certain Stephanus and republished in the same year and with a better critical apparatus by Canter. The Aristotelian *Peplos* would have been appealing to early modern audiences as a piece of literature instructive both in an exemplary (the commemoration of valour) and academic (the re-using of Homeric formulae) sense,[69] and, unsurprisingly in an environment of easily instituted literary fashions, only twelve years later a much more ample collection by Giovanni Matteo Toscano, entitled *Peplus Italiae*, appeared in Paris. Toscano's ambitious humanist project deliberately distances itself from the Aristotelian military agenda and attempts to cover the vast field of Italy's letters instead. His instructive and exemplary purpose emerges already in the preface:

> Qvod à me superioribus annis factum est, vt illustrium Poëtarum Italorum carmina duplici volumine distincta publicarem, id non à studio solùm manauit de iis præclaris viris benemerendi, quibus-cum natale solum mihi commune est, verùm ab eo etiam consilio, vt alij nostro excitati exemplo prouinciales suos pari beneficio prosequerentur.[70]
>
> What I accomplished in the preceding years by publishing the songs of Italy's illustrious poets divided into two volumes, sprang not merely from the love of the merits of those eminent men, with whom I share my native soil, but also from the consideration that others, encouraged by my example, would seek equal benefit for their compatriots.

[68] The most detailed account of authorship and reception history of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Peplos* is Gutzwiller's 'Heroic Epitaphs of the Classical Age: the Aristotelian *Peplos* and Beyond' in Baumbach, Petrovic, and Petrovic, *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge, 2010), 219–249.
[69] Ibid., 225, 230.
[70] Toscano (1578), A2$^{r–v}$.

Peplus, each of whose entries is formed of an epigram as well as a more sober prose note, should, Toscano suggests, serve as an extended and explicative index to that former publication, a proto-DNB calling back from Orcus the famous men of letters,[71] whose portraits he sees embroidered on Pallas's 'amictus'[72] in an introductory Boethian vision. Yet the epigrams themselves, with the few exceptions of translators and scholars associated with Homer or Virgil, are remarkably de-Trojanised for a work so explicitly reminiscent of its Aristotelian model. Toscano's antiquarian enthusiasm would have meant that his new Troy had risen not in the realm of military exempla but in the Republic of Letters.

Genres, heroes, and heroines

Both types of *peploi* – Aristotle's epitaphs for warriors and Toscano's pacifist praise of philology – formed an ideal background for the Sidneian myth dominated by the opposition between Mars and the Muses. Although Sidney was at that stage usually portrayed as a courtier, Latewar's example above proves that his literary self had been filtering into university communities not only as yet another meaningless emblem of his virtues, and in giving the collection such a title the New College elegists clearly called attention to the two implications of Trojanism, heroic and literary, that Sidney so conveniently embodied. Even the prefatory note makes an important point of this opposition by extolling Aristotle's poetic faculty:

[71] Ibid., A6^{v}.
[72] Ibid., A4^{r}.

> Aristoteles, vir in omni literarum genere summus, tot seculis elapsis, Peplum suum in virorum fortium, qui ad Troiam ceciderãt, laudes, edere non dubitauit.[73]
>
> Aristotle, the greatest man in every literary genre, did not hesitate to publish his *peplos* praising the valorous men who had fallen at Troy, albeit so many centuries had elapsed.

Literary resurrection advocated by Toscano is performed not only by the volume as a whole but also by its individual texts:

> Virgilivs nostro si forté resurgeret æuo,
> Inque Britannorum poneret orbe pedem
> ...
> Historiamqué tuo *Sidneïda* nomine dictam
> Conderet ...[74]
>
> If Virgil could rise from the dead in our age, and walk the British land, he would compose a history inscribed with your name – the *Sidneid*.

Yet since there is no epic poet to eternalise Sidney's name, the mourners find themselves forced to prefer the humble form of the epigram appropriating, with inevitable losses, to a larger epic motif or plot. The penultimate epitaph in *Peplvs* acknowledges the traumatic disparity between the unworthy form, however learned and polished, and the infinitely richer matter – characteristically, that of Troy:

> RES grandes tenui cur epigrammate,
> Et longas breuibus deminuo modis?
> Cur hîc non potius nascitus Ilias?[75]
>
> Why did I treat great matters in the epigram, and why am I reducing long poetry to short? Why is no *Iliad* born here?

---

[73] *Peplvs*, A2$^{r–v}$.
[74] Ibid., E4^{v}.
[75] Ibid., G3^{v}.

Nevertheless, *Peplvs* seems to come closer to being an epic than do the other collections. Its cast of Trojans, Greeks, and even Aeneas's Italian enemies is impressive. Whereas Cambridge's *Lachrymae* focused predominantly on Hector, now it is Achilles to whom the elegists are particularly favourable. The potential ethical discomfort with this shift of attention is admitted and dealt with:

> Quamvis cruentem sanguine Troico
> Vates Achillem Mæonius canit ...[76]
>
> Albeit stained with Trojan blood, Achilles was still sung by the Maeonian poet.

Yes, Hector could be a better war victim to bewail, but true commemoration requires a certain epic indifference and an ability to take no side but that of virtue. As a result of this strikingly modern understanding of how epic poetry works, the noticeably shorter (in comparison to *Lachrymae* and *Exequiae*) *Peplvs* is peopled not merely by the top three heroes (Achilles, Hector, and Aeneas), but also by Nestor, both Ajaxes (D4r; F2r), Polydamas (F3r^{r}), Agamemnon (E3^{r}), Astyanax (B1^{r}), and even Camilla (B1^{r}). Athena's *peplos* embroidered with scenes of the gigantomachy, from which the Aristotele–Toscano tradition derives its name, was described as 'παμποίκιλος'[77] ('all-variegated'), and since the Alexandrian notion of *poikilia* – stylistic, formal, and thematic *variatio* – seems to have influenced the editorial practices of the erudite university communities, it is not surprising that a collection produced by the students of New College, one of the most learned of those communities, and conscious of its variegated ancestry also ended up being the most faithful and detailed adaptation of the Trojan intertext. However, even after almost a year of mourning for Sidney, Hector's

[76] Ibid., G3^{r}.
[77] Gutzwiller (2010), 233.

funeral remains at the core of this multi-layered intertextual awareness. Thomas Yaydens recalls the parting of Hector and Andromache in his poem of hopeless consolation for Sidney's widowed wife and orphaned daughter:

> CVM galeam capiti, quamuis inuita, dedisset,
> Armaqué iam nullis surripienda dolis,
> Flesse quidem Andromachen, præ mœrore tacentem
> Ante pedes sponsi nil nisi flesse ferunt
> ...
> Non hoc [that I should not leave] Astyanax, tutili mihi sideris instar,
> Non suadere parens ille vel illa potest.[78]

> When she reluctantly put the helmet on his head and gave him the arms that could not be stolen by any wiles, they say Andromache was crying and yet keeping silence because of her woe, nay, not even crying at the feet of her spouse. ... Neither Astyanax, the likeness of my tutelary star, nor my parents could dissuade me from leaving.

Sidney (Yaydens remarks) had no Astyanax, though he did have a daughter who would not renounce the memory of her father,[79] and his parents were dead and would not have tried to prevent him from leaving, while Frances Walsingham, the new Andromache, would replace mourning with the acceptance of her husband's heroism. This evolution of reluctance into acceptance curiously coincides with two shroud-themed episodes in the *Iliad*. In Book VI, just before his departure, Hector tells the desperate Hecuba to sacrifice the fairest *peplos* to Athena so she may pity Troy:

> πέπλον δ', ὅς τίς τοι χαριέστατος ἠδὲ μέγιστος
> ἔστιν ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ καί τοι πολὺ φίλτατος αὐτῇ,
> τὸν θὲς Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἠϋκόμοιο ...[80]

> the fairest and most beautiful *peplos* that there is in your store and that you love most lay on Athena's knees.

---

[78] *Peplvs*, B1[r].
[79] Cf. Vegio's *Astyanax* (2004), where Andromache entreats her son to put away his hereditary animus and pronounce a humble prayer at his father's tomb lest he be killed by the victors (56–58).
[80] *Iliad*, vol. 1, 294

In Book XXII, Anromache promises to burn rich ‘εἶμα[τα] ... λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα τετυγμένα χερσὶ γυναικῶν’[81] (‘garments ... fine and beautiful, woven by the hands of women’) because she cannot shroud Hector’s corpse in them. Early modern mourning rituals and conventions, both in life and literature, were complexly gendered,[82] and the paradox of the university volumes, as Gager’s long genealogical conceit cited above proves, was that they were composed exclusively by men and yet reflected on themselves in terms of feminine – maternal and uxorial – woe. A typically Alexandrian technique (inherited by early modern neo-Latin and vernacular literatures via Ovid’s *Heroides*) of feminising Trojan grief legitimises this paradox with respect to Sidney’s Troy-informed myth. Published (unlike the strictly practical and, therefore, almost Troyless *Lachrymae*) long after Sidney’s funeral, *Peplvs* is obviously intended to replicate Andromache’s symbolic (non-)shrouding of Hector – a change in the genre’s sensibility to heroism that will surface in 1612 during a similar outburst of funerary versification occasioned by the death of Prince Henry.

The Henrician myth

It would be impractical to catalogue every similarity between eulogies for Sidney and Henry, but those *topoi* that move beyond pure convention and reveal something about the contemporary reception of the two *biographies*, not about the toolkit of mourning clichés, deserve attention. A handy set of analogies is offered by

[81] Ibid. vol. 2, 490.
[82] See Vaught, *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature* (Aldershot, 2008), 2–16; Lange, *Telling Tears in the English Renaissance* (Leiden, 1996), passim, esp. 1–17.

two 1612 university collections of, mostly Latin, verse, *Epicedivm Cantabrigiense* and *Ivsta Oxoniensivm*. The volumes outwardly resemble the university anthologies of 1586 and 1587: their Latin is also interspersed with occasional Greek, French, Italian, and (in Oxford) Hebrew; they also show a considerable predilection for elaborate acrostics and allegorical dialogues and emphasise a collective contribution to the nation's mourning: '[c]ommunis est nobis Academicis, cum reliquis Britannis, huius mœror calamitatis, quin etiam nos, præ reliquis affectos esse conuenit'.[83] The Cambridge collection features a sophisticated 'Cento Virgil'. dominated, unlike Latewar's poem, by verses from the *Aeneid* and likening Henry to Euryalus from the episode from which Latewar picks a less renowned character.[84] The Oxford volume not only flaunts big names and high academic titles (Isaac Casaubon, William Laud, Robert Burton, and Henry King are among its authors) but also conveys a strong sense of collegiate unity very similar to its predecessors': a vast majority of the contributors come from the same institutions, Christ Church and New College, and at times literary succession proves a familial matter: for example, a poem by Richard Eedes's son Tobias appears on K3^{v}. Both editions speak one well-established allegorical language and operate one system of Trojan coordinates: William Laud readily bestows Ascanius's epithet, 'magnæ spes altera *Troiæ*'[85] on Henry himself, and William Bouswell, the author of the Virgilian cento, reascribes it, more deservedly, to Charles.[86]

All those matches were doubtlessly prompted by the equivalence of the ceremonies that initiated the two mythologies. The staging and contemporary accounts of Henry's funeral also bespeak an underlying Hectorean analogy: 'The Corps of the

[83] *Epicedivm Cantabrigiense* (1612), A2^{r}. 'We academics share the mourning of this calamity with the rest of the British, moreover, it behoves us to be affected by it more than the rest'.
[84] Ibid., G4^{v}.
[85] *Ivsta Oxoniensivm* (1612), A4^{r}.
[86] *Epicedivm Cantabrigiense* (1612), G4^{v}.

Prince, lying in a open Chariot, with the Princes representation thereon ... The Chariot was covered with blacke Veluet, set with Plumes of blacke feathers, and drawne by sixe Horses couered, and Armed with Scuchions ...'[87] This culminating part of the cortège could be read as a collation, or at least a reminiscence, of three episodes from Book XXIV of the *Iliad*. The book opens with Achilles's implacable grief at the loss of Patroclus, which drives him to abuse Hector's body by tying it to his chariot and dragging it three times around his friend's fresh mound. Pitying Hector and unwilling to witness further abuse, Apollo covers his body with a golden shield 'that rude dogs might not wound / His manly lineaments'.[88] Priam is then instructed by Iris the messenger to ransom his son's corpse. 'He mules and chariot cals', 'downe to his wardrobe goes, / Built all of Cedar',[89] and, despite the Queen's cautiousness about the whole venture, prepares 'rich screenes ... twelue veiles wrought curiously; / Twelue plaine gownes; and as many suits, of wealthy tapistry; / As many mantles; horsemens coates; ...'[90] Achilles relents to Priam's supplications and releases the corpse, whereupon it is brought back to Troy and bewailed by Andromache, Hecuba, and Helen. Even if these scenes were not intended to merge into a perspicuous subtext of the material side of the funeral as well as its literary reflection, they did so inadvertently, and it is easy to imagine that the tragic finale of the *Iliad* – a text doubtlessly rejuvenated in the public minds by Chapman's complete translation printed only a year before – could be superimposed on the actual progress of the bier. By the time of the funeral (7 December) Prince Henry had been dead for one month and one day, and the effigy[91]

---

[87] *The Funerals of the High and Mighty Prince Henry* (1613), B4^{v}.
[88] Chapman (1611), 2F1^{v}.
[89] Ibid., 2F3^{v}.
[90] Ibid., 2F4^{r}.
[91] On the function of the effigy – a funerary device more appropriate to a king – see Elizabeth Goldring's '"So iust a sorrowe so wekk expressed": Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration' in Wilks, ed., *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton, 2007), 280–300.

acted as a version of Apollo's aegis – not protecting the corpse but masking the signs of decay and creating an illusion of incorruptibility. Priam's rich ransom also resonated with the preoccupation with sumptuous fabrics that dominated the entire Jacobean court culture, both in merriment and in mourning.[92] *The Funerals of the High and Mighty Prince Henry*, after itemising his rich lying-in-state outfit, remarks that 'within the said Chariot, sat Sir *Dauid Murrey*, the Master of his Wardrobe' (B4^{v}), in a sense, the second most important person at the funeral responsible for the style and theatrical effect of the ceremony. In Chapman's version, Priam goes down to his wardrobe – a rather peculiar choice of a term for the Greek 'θάλαμος', in this context, a storage room in the inner part of the house with no sartorial connotations. His gifts – especially the 'horsemens coates' instead of the unspecific 'chitons' of the original – clearly evoke the painstakingly catalogued textiles of the funeral account. Whereas Sidney's only literary shroud was the New College slim anthology of epigrams, Henry's body is covered with a far richer texture of Trojan contexts.

Familial voices

Familial lamentation, particularly its female voices, developed to some extent by Sidney's elegists also became a more important *topos* in the eulogies for Henry. The tension between nuptial festivity and prophetic grief elaborated in Catullus 64 migrates, together with the stanza+refrain which fulfilled an ancillary intertextual function in Latewar's idyll, to David Wedderburn's *In Obitu Summae Spei Principis Henrici ... Lessus*. Addressing the Muses, Wedderburn reflects on the trojanised panegyrics and

[92] See Gregory McNamara's '"Grief was as clothes to their backs": Prince Henry's funeral viewed from the Wardrobe' for a detailed discussion of the 'intertextuality ... [of] the garments of majesty and mourning', ibid.: 259–279.

elegies that accompanied Henry while he was alive and commemorate him after his death:

> Vos nascenti olim puero velut omnia fausta
> Omnia venturi cecinistis gaudia sæcli;
> Carmine quo quondam Thetidis [fortissime Peleu
> Cum thalamos ingressa tuos,] celebrastis amores.
> Cum reparanda novæ [meministis] mœnia Troiæ.
> Spes, & Achilleis iterum peritura sub armis.
> At spes & res iam sublata est. Principe dignos
> Fundite ferali cum carmine fundite fletus.[93]

> At the time when the boy was born, you were singing all the favours and joys of the coming age with the song with which you had formerly celebrated the love of Thetis (when, o Peleus, she bravely entered your bedchamber) and commemorated the restoration of the new Troy's walls. Hope was to perish struck by Achilles's weapon, and now both hope and its object have vanished. Pour out funerary lamentations worthy of a prince, pour them out in a song!

Of course, the inexorability of household grief, or at least the perpetuity of its manifestation, was a very generous and hasty advance to Henry's parents and siblings on the part of the elegists. Just as the triumphal Trojanism of Lord Mayor's shows celebrating Henry, a resident at the House of Fame,[94] was converted into the sorrowful Trojanism of the elegies in a matter of weeks, the royal family quickly switched to issues other than the funeral – almost equal in solemnity and starkly opposite in tone. Their seeming forgetfulness emerges as an especially preternatural lack of sensitivity to the nation's enduring grief, for example, in Nichols's annals of James's reign, where, after a multi-page record of the Prince's illness and funeral, epistolary evidence (dated late December) is adduced to depict the pompous affiancing of Frederick V and Princess Elizabeth.[95]

---

[93] Wedderburn (1613), A2^{r}.
[94] See Dekker's *Troia-Noua Triumphans* (1612), C2^{r}.
[95] See Nichols (1828), vol. II, 512ff.

In consequence of this, while the Sidneian myth mostly foregrounded Hector's heroic role, the Trojan intertextuality of Henry's death and funeral prompted a very different set of literary interpretations and elaborations: Henry frequently assumes Hector's filial and fraternal rather than military functions. This shift is well illustrated by Sir Arthur Gorges, who famously lamented both Sidney and Henry.

The skills of elegy composition acquired in the wake of Sidney's death were evidently regarded as transferable, at times quite literally. Gorges composed two poems on Sidney's death, numbers 96 and 97 in MS Egerton 3165. Contrary to H. E. Sandison's contention that Gorges's sonnet form bears no trace of Sidney's influence[96] it is worthy of notice that number 96, 'Of Syr Phyllyp Sydney', is in fact a structural and thematic replica of *Astrophil and Stella* 6, a sonnet about genre disguises that love poetry can assume.[97] Twenty-five years after Sidney's death Gorges re-used the first octet of his sixteen-line poem in a sonnet on Prince Henry's death subtitled 'To his Entombed Bodye' and closing *The Olympian Catastrophe*, itself a Spenserian and Troy-inspired epic about '[t]he stately strife, that did of late befall / Betwixt three dames',[98] where Prince Henry turns into Prince Hector bewailed by a crowd of illustrious Trojans:

> Contemplate by Troyes greife when Hector fell;
> And pensive Priamus and Hecuba;
> Or lovelie Paris how his hart did swell;
> Or the sadd teares of faire Polixena;
> You may conceipt the woe of Troynovant,

[96] Gorges (1953), p. xxx.
[97] The 'some'-anaphora and the contradictory conclusion opening with 'but' are found neither in any Tudor sonnetteer (see May and Ringler (2004), vol. 2, 1360–1368) nor in the major continental authors, such as Petrarch, Marot, Ronsard, Desportes, or Du Bellay, whom Gorges may have imitated without relying on Sidney. Additionally, the motifs of engraving, writing, and the transformation of tears and blood into ink are present in both texts in the same order.
[98] Gorges (1953), 139. The *topos* of a divine strife dominates the Sidneian myth, too. Gorges himself begins the other elegy on Sidney with 'Mars and the Muses weare att mortall stryfe' (118).

Of James, Anne, Charles, Eliza for theire want.[99]

Such non-singularity of early modern epitaphs has called into question their emotional authenticity,[100] yet this example, it can be argued, testifies to an extreme intensity of woeful recollection prompted by the similarity between Sidney and Henry. Gorges, whose *Vannetyes and Toyes* constantly hark back to multiple forms of Trojanism, amorous or heroic, finds a very fit occasion to re-actualise the barely outspoken Trojan motifs from his earlier elegy, and while the Sidneian intertext loses its cementing function as Gorges alters the conclusion,[101] the matter of Troy begins to fulfil it instead.

The persona of Hector the son associatively invokes other Trojan children. Two of them, Astyanax and Ascanius, play a prominent role in *Ivsta Oxoniensium*[102] even though the collection is much less imbued with Trojanism than is, for example, *Epicedivm Cantabrigiense*.[103] As a result of that, even Aeneas's function there is reduced to a genealogical, not exemplary relationship: '*Æneas, Henricus;* vterq; à sanguine *Troum*' ('Aeneas, Henry, both of Trojan blood').[104] In the Sidneian eulogies, the Astyanax episode metonymically encoded a subordinate branch of mythologisation: the hero's young daughter only served to add an extra tragic touch to his decease, while Henry himself, in G. Higgs's phrase, 'fuit Ascanius nobis',[105] so that in some elegies

[99] Ibid., 175. For an extensive discussion of Henry's Hectorean and London's Trojan mask see Michael Ullyot's 'The Fall of Troynovant: Exemplarity after the Death of Henry, Prince of Wales' in Shephard and Powell, eds. (2004): 269–290.
[100] For instance, see Newstock, *Quoting Death in Early Modern England: The Poetics of Epitaphs Beyond the Tomb* (Basingstoke, 2009), 98.
[101] The metamorphosis of weapons into stationery (sword – pen) is substituted for Henry's own catasterism: 'Whose glorye scales the starr-bright firmament' (182).
[102] C4^{v}; I3^{v}.
[103] The other two volumes published at Oxford, *Eidyllia in Obitvm Fvlgentissimi Henrici* (1612) and *Lvctvs Posthvmvs* (1612), contain very few and unsystematic Trojan references.
[104] *Epicedivm Cantabrigiense*, A4^{r}.
[105] *Ivsta Oxoniensivm* (1612), M3^{v}.

his own voice from beyond the grave confirms this analogy.[106] Unsurprisingly, English elegists follow suit and elaborate on the same motif, sometimes straightforwardly, as in G.B.'s 'Cestria Lugens' – 'Pieties shielde, Ascanius of estate',[107] sometimes in more complex ancestral contexts:

> As *Hector*, had he suruiu'd *Troy* to see,
> From *Isliams* lofty Tower his young sonne cast:
> Or such griefe *Priam*, as it was to thee
> When ... *Hector* ...
> ... sunke dead ... me thinkes I see
> In Royall IAMES
> ...
> Your [Princess's] Teares I read in bright *Pollixen's* eyes ...[108]

Since the publication of Vegio's epyllion, the gory narrative of Astyanax's murder, in which Andromache wails over her son's 'tristia ... / uulnera, uel potius toto unum in corpore uulnus'[109] ('sad wounds, or rather one wound that is the whole body'), formed one of the most physically explicit subtexts of Trojan grief, and wounds quite predictably enthralled Sidney's and Henry's mourners. However, whereas Sidney's death was heroic and exemplary in its own right, Henry's needed to be presented as such. Both Sidney's wound and Henry's fever transcended the genre of moralising medical reports[110] and made it into poetry. Robert Sidney's Sonnet 26 bewailing

---

[106] *Lvctvs Posthvmvs* (1612), D1^{v}.
[107] Cited in Kay (1990), 234.
[108] Heywood (1613), C2$^{r–v}$.
[109] Vegio (2004), 59.
[110] Such as George Gifford's *The Manner of Sir Philip Sidney's Death* (see Sidney (1973), 161–172) and de Mayerne's *The Relation of the Sicknes and Death of the Most Illustrious Henry, Prince of Wales* (in W. H.'s *The Trve Pictvre and Relation of Prince Henry* (1634), E1^{r}–F3^{v}.

'deerest lims'[111] affected by 'dead Gangreins'[112] is traditionally regarded as a fraternal obituary,[113] and Thomas Moffett's sinisterly graphic *Lessus Lugubris*, an allegorical post-mortem, transposes Zutphen into the realm of the *Iliad* by proclaiming the author's kinship with Machaon.[114] Incidentally, Machaon treated Philoctetes's wound in the Lemnian isle,[115] and Philoctetes's participation in the Trojan war was a prerequisite for the Greeks' victory[116] – a very handy parallel for a supporter of the Protestant cause embodied by Sidney.

Henry's (de-)heroisation

Printed contributions to the myth also depict the wound from a Trojan angle. For example, a Richard Savage unexpectedly zooms in on the scene of Camilla's death:

> Qvi *Sidnæe* tuum violauit vulnere corpus,
> Et cuius poteras saucius esse manu,
> Vel pereat subito traiectus corpora [sic!] ferro,
> Et Stygias adeat sanguinolentus aquas.[117]

---

[111] The Prince's limbs are also bemoaned by Henry Wickham of King's College in a passage remotely reminiscent of Troy's fire:

> Artus ergo tuos rogus vorabit,
> Et tristis cineres favilla pascet?
> Artus tam nitidos, & elegantes,
> Tam turpis rogus, & fauilla turpis? (*Epicedivm Cantabrigiense*, E1^{r-v}).

So your limbs were devoured by the pyre, and the sad flame feeds on your ashes? Limbs so beautiful and elegant, pyre so wild, and flame so wild?

[112] Sidney (1984), 226.
[113] Ibid., 45–46.
[114] Moffett (1940), 52.
[115] At least in some versions of the myth, for instance in Propertius II.1.59 or Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* I.3.5–6.
[116] The most detailed treatment of the myth is Sophocles's play *Philoctetes*. Moffett is likely to have been familiar with it either in Greek (first printed by Manutius in 1502) or in a more recent Latin translation, see Rataller and Beller (1584), *Tragoediae Sophoclis Qvotqvot Extant Carmine Latino Redditae*.
[117] *Peplvs*, B2^{r}.

> Sidney, may he who wounded your body, and by whose hand you could be injured, perish pierced by swift iron and, covered in blood, descend to the Stygian waters.

Camilla and the naturalistic portrayal of her wound enjoyed much popularity in the Renaissance,[118] yet Savage's interpretation is still unprecedented due to the unusual gender reversal and the very choice of analogy. In Virgil, it is the nymph Opis who laments the queen's death with a promise of revenge: 'quicumque tuum violavit vulnere corpus / morte luet merita' (*Aeneid* 11.848–9),[119] and whereas comparing Sidney to heroes from both camps of the Trojan war, or even lamenting him in feigned women's voices, was by all means conventional, this identification with Aeneas's female adversary (and self-identification with a nymph rather than shepherd) stands out.

Similarly, some verse accounts of Henry's illness take both a medical, Moffett-like and an epic tone. James's court was teeming with physicians of varying degrees of reliability,[120] and it is not inexplicable that therapeutic anxieties affected not just the King's conduct[121] but also the body of textual evidence documenting Henry's death.[122] For instance, Samuel Walsall (Corpus Christi College) addresses an anti-ode to Fever:

> *Maligna*, ah, febris; ah, nimis *maligna!*
> Quid dicam gravius? Febris
> ...
> AEstus turbide, sanguinis Venenum,
> Pestis spirituum, obsidens cerêbrum,
> Cordis Proditor, inde strangulator
> Pulmonum ...[123]

---

[118] See for example Boccaccio (2001), 155–158.
[119] *Giunta* 3R3^{r}.
[120] Furdell (2001), 99ff.
[121] Speculations as to the causes James's ill temper form a substantial part of the studies of his reign, see, for example, Beasley's 'The Disability of James VI & I' in *The Seventeenth Century* 10, 2 (1995),151–162.
[122] See, for example, Charles Cornwallis's *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince* (published 1641).
[123] *Epicedivm Cantabrigiense* (1612), A4^{v}.

> Malign, ah fever, all too malign! What could I call graver? Fever ... Wild heat, venom of the blood, plague of the breath, besieger of the brain, traitor of the heart, strangler of the lungs.[124]

Trojanism's epic and lamentational varieties are easily read into this list of apostrophes: Henry's tormented body itself becomes a city, beleaguered, betrayed, and burnt down,[125] and the oft-cited link between his death on 6 November and the Gunpowder Plot further reinforces the image of a Protestant dynasty fallen under the blows of fate. An even more literal correspondence between Henry and the city of Troy is found in *Ivsta Oxoniensium*: 'O si tu stares, *Priamiq; arx alta* maneres'.[126] John Richards of New College thus reworks *Aeneid* 2.56 ('Troiaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta maneres'[127]) into a fruitful ambiguity by transforming it into a conditional clause where the second person singular of both verbs enables a metaphorical reading of Henry *as* Priam's tower.

All these attempts to heroicise the inglorious circumstances of the Prince's death were aimed at producing a 'myth of the conqueror'[128] more befitting to his status. Henry's deathbed was apparently not considered a suitable enough site for such a tragedy. Sidney's triumphal horsemanship in the texts discussed above relies, albeit with hyperbolic liberties, on sound facts; Henry's equestrian figure only crosses Rand[olph?]. Gilpin's imagination:

---

[124] Cf. Henry King's elegy:

> Oh Killing rhetorick of Death! Two words
> Breath stronger terrours, then Plague, Fire, or Swords
> Er're conquered.
> (From Kay (1990), 261).

[125] The term 'aestus' ('heat') is used, for example, in *Aeneid* 2.706 (Giunta, 2E8^{v}) to describe the Trojan fire.
[126] H3^{r}.
[127] Giunta 2B4^{v}. The passage is also recalled by Fr[ancis]. Nethersole of Trinity College, Cambridge, in his 1612 *Laudatio Funebris*, B3^{r}.
[128] Williamson (1978), see especially 149–193.

> Plangite nunc equitem, qui funera fletis equorum.
> Vidi ego, pondus equus cum plusquam nobile gessit,
> Dardanius tergo sonipes, vel celsior illo
> Qui quondam gremio sæuos complexus Achiuos;
> ...
> Sessor eras Henrice ...[129]
>
> Now lament the horseman, who bewail the funeral of horses.
> I saw a steed bear on its back a more noble burden than the Dardanian horse, and it was truly higher than the one that once concealed the Achaeans in its bowels; ... the horseman were you, Henry ...

This discord between the facts and their portrayals inevitably made Henry's mourners produce a less meticulous map of Trojanism than had been drawn in the elegies for Sidney. As a consequence of this partial detrojanisation, the Prince often lacks the triumphant tone of Sidney's posthumous appearances. For instance, an anonymous sonnet cycle, *Great Brittans Mourning Garment Given to All Faithfull Sorrowfull Subiects at the Funerall of Prince Henry* (1612), manifestly loses in its unspoken rivalry with a variety of texts inspired by Sidney's fate. The collection potentially evokes Sidney and alludes to the Sidneian myth in many ways. The image of a mourning garment and the suggested interactivity of the volume 'given to all ... subjects at the funeral' seem to recall both the *Peplvs* and Lant's pictorial representation of the funeral procession, while the form of the sonnet cycle would have still meant, although perhaps to a lesser degree than in the 1590s, imitating and emulating *Astrophil and Stella*. Some techniques employed by the anonymous compiler were tested and refined in the Oxford and Cambridge volumes dedicated to Sidney, for instance, a heraldic ekphrasis plays a significant role in Sonnet VII:

---

[129] *Lvctvs Posthvmvs* (1612), M2$^{r–v}$. For a detailed discussion of Henry's equestrian iconography see Weigl's chapter '"And when slow time hath made you fit for warre": The Equestrian Portrait of Prince Henry' in Wilks (2007), 146–173.

> let him mone,
> That he to leaue all Tropheis now is seene,
> Whose Crest of late was honored with, I C H *Dien*.[130]

Another one of his mottoes, 'Et nos fas extra quaerere regna' (*Aeneid* 4.350[131]), surfaces several times in *Ivsta*, but – unlike Sidney's Ovidian phrase ('vix ea nostra voco') full of confident authority – it connotes bitter disappointment in Henry's dynastic prospects almost ready to spill over into bitter irony. For instance, John Lloyd of Christ Church presents the 'Symbolum Principis' and remarks: 'O vtinam regnum tibi fas tenuisse paternum, / Hac poteras *Anglos* sorte beâsse tuos'[132] ('O if you had been allowed to retain your father's reign, you would have blessed your Englishmen with this fate').

Neither of the Trojan references in the *Mourning Garment* portrays Henry in the Sidneian way. Achilles and a quasi-Trojan cityscape make a very odd and depersonalised appearance amidst a bunch of *sententiae* reflecting on the frailty of life and inevitability of death:

> Admit we put *Achilles* Armour on,
> That neuer could be pierc't by mortall Iron,
> Or liue enclos'd in towres of brasse or stone,
> Such as no power of enemy can enuiron.
> Yet are we not secure from stroake of death ... [133]

Dido 'rob'd of her delight' and Hecuba lying 'in painted languor' in Sonnet XVII are transformed into fashionable ekphrases decorating 'mournfull galleries'.[134] Henry's

---

[130] *Great Brittans Mourning Garment* (1612), B1^{r}. For Henry's *imprese* with mottoes 'Honi soit qui mal y pense' and 'Ich dien' printed *en regard* with the text of the elegies see Joshua Sylvester's 1612 *Lachrimae Lachrimarum*. *Epicedivm* (D1^{v}), *Ivsta* (G1^{r}), and *Lvctvs Posthvmvs* (A4^{v}) also cite this motto or refer to this emblem.
[131] L6^{v}.
[132] *Ivsta Oxoniensivm* (1612), D2^{r}.
[133] *Great Brittans Mourning Garment* (1612), B3^{r}.
[134] Ibid., C2^{r}.

hearse will be placed among these Ovidian exemplars of female sorrow (that would have made a better appearance in love sonnets) rather than pictures of unfortunate valour.

Sidney's heir?

Examining immediate and collaborative responses to Henry's death in comparison with Sidney's, such as the Oxford and Cambridge anthologies, helps to piece together a clear map of *topoi* prevalent at the two periods. Trojanism strikes the keynote in the 1586 and 1587 collections: Sidney's multivalent character is available for a vast range of personifications from the realms of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*, from Achilles to Hector and from Helenor to Camilla: while the memory of the loss was fresh, and because Sidney's death had no cultural precedents, erudite academics could explore a variety of canonisation approaches, some of which were naturally doomed to remain endemic to that college and that year. Yet the evident tendency was that Sidney's matter of Troy was that of heroes, victorious in their death. Attempts at similar heroisation are made in the Henrician anthologies as well as single-author texts, but, as George Wither puts it,

> May I not liken *London* now to *Troy*,
> As she was that same day she lost her *Hector*?
> When proud *Achilles* spoil'd her of her ioy
> (And triump't on her losses) being victor?[135]

Exemplary figures to whom Sidney is compared almost always seem ignorant of their counterparts from the Homeric or Virgilian realm: if Sidney is Hector, there is

[135] *Prince Henry's Obseqvies* (1612), C3^{r}.

the fact of Hector's death but no Achilles; if Achilles, there is no Hector for him to slay. Whereas the laudatory prose of 1612 are still prone to listing mutually exclusive Trojan prototypes,[136] the 1612 elegists come to realise the limitations of such simultaneous and contradictory exemplarity. The focus of the elegies is beginning to shift. Importantly, now they highlight, often with a satirical edge, anti-Papism and foreground English nationalism,[137] which, as Kay (1990) observes, happens due to Spenser's mediation[138] and which did not happen in the early and predominantly Latin half of the Sidneian myth in spite of Sidney's obvious fittingness to such themes. Troy remains, as a common ground or a *lingua franca*, in more conservative and less centralised collections, such as the *Ivsta Oxoniensivm*, whereas closer clusters of younger authors, such the Magdalen College contributors to *Lvctvs Posthvmvs*, appear to have reconciled themselves to its destruction and settled elsewhere to found a new rhetoric of exemplarity.

As the diversity of motifs shrinks compared to 1586, Henry's Trojan portrayals gravitate to victims and to the weak. Even conventionally heroic Trojans change their habitual armour for less warlike habits of mourning. Sir Arthur Gorges composed another sonnet 'vpon the death of the most Noble Prince Henrie', where this transformation is described with vigorous repetitions:

> Soe sings my Muse, in zeale and sorrow clad.
> So sung *Achilles* to his Silver Harpe,

[136] Nethersole (1612), B4^{r}: 'Fatebuntur hostes ... qui vix dum Astyanacta ingressum, Hectora futurum expauebant. ... Hector enim erat adultus iam, aut Achilles, aut aliquis antiquorum heroum deniq;. ... in quem si non Achillis anima, at certè animus migrauit'. ('The enemies will say ... who feared Astyanax when he had barely appeared and the future Hector ... Indeed, Hector he was, already grown up, or Achilles, or any other of the ancient heroes. ... to whose body if not the soul of Achilles then certainly his spirit had migrated.')
[137] For example, Henry is frequently compared to King Arthur and even Uther Pendragon.
[138] 124–203 *passim*.

When fowle affroont, had reft his faire delight. [139]

Gorges recalls *Iliad* IX, where Achilles appears in his most unexemplary guise, himself a convivial *aoidos* 'ἀείδ[ων] δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν' ('singing the deeds of men') to his 'φόρμιγξ λιγεία' ('clear-sounding lyre')[140] and feeding 'his true mind, that practise faild' with 'sweet contemplations'.[141] In a few hundred lines, he will reject Agamemnon's reconciliatory gifts and announce a soon departure for his native Phthia in the hope to lead a peaceful life. Deheroicised (in a rather non-Shakesperean manner) into pensive indolence,[142] this Achilles gives a clear expression to the disappointment Henry's death engendered as his once-panegyrists and would-be patronees found themselves in the position of the Achaean ambassadors lavishing treasures and eloquence on a reluctant champion and leaving unrewarded for their pains.

[139] Egerton MS 3165, fol. 110^{r}. Its variant is also re-used in the *Olympian Catastrophe* as a preface 'To the Reader' (Gorges (1953), 138).
[140] *Iliad* IX.185–191.
[141] Chapman (1611), L6^{v}.
[142] The *topos* is Ovidian and anti-epic, as is often the case with elegies for Henry. See, for example, Briseis's accusation of Achilles in *Heroides* III.117–120.

Chapter 2

'The training up of youth': Ending the *Arcadia* and Charting Aenean Grand Tours.

The role of Sidney's own texts in the immediate elegiac responses to his death was often decisive, as in the case of Latewar's elaborate heroic pastoral, where the Arcadian reference glued together a variety of Trojan and post-Trojan epic *topoi* and made the entire eulogy distinctly Sidneian. Yet the interaction between these responses and Sidney's *oeuvre* was naturally limited to isolated quotations, however rich and multifarious their functions. The volumes of elegies were communal productions put together by university intellectuals. Sidney's championship of more popular, vernacular genres, such as romance and sonnet, was not so easily compatible with the textbook Latinity of his early mourners who sought to present him in classicised guises of epic valour. This does not mean that the pastoral, the romance, or the amorous modes of writing developed by Sidney were utterly ignored by the Oxford and Cambridge elegists – in fact, all of them were occasionally mixed into the overwhelmingly grievous and epic tone of the collections – however, their inherently classicising nature (as well as the fact that Sidney's texts may not have been accessible to all of his mourners in their entirety, certainly not in print) meant that those communities failed, or consciously refused, to interact with Sidney as an integral literary figure. 'The Alexandrian footnote' was the predominant way of pulling Sidney into the familiar cavalcade of epic

heroes – and his texts, in whatever form they were available to the Oxford and Cambridge communities – into conversation with the classical Troy, however, as the term implies, it meant abbreviation rather than elaboration and philological incorporation rather than extensive and transformative treatment. It was referencing Sidney's texts rather than attaching one's own texts to them that shaped the early manifestations of the Sidneian myth.

Classical Alexandrianism assumed more various forms than merely reinterpreting epic motifs both in longer and shorter poetic forms, as recent research[1] has shown, yet Sidney's mourners appeared to be modelling their communities on their notion of a learned Hellenistic community very strictly.

This chapter attempts to define Sidney's transformative mediation of the matter of Troy in another genre that also happens to have close ties with Alexandria in particular and the Hellenistic world of the Eastern Mediterranean in general – that of prose romance, including direct continuations and looser imitations of *The Arcadia.* The complex nature and sheer volume of the texts under scrutiny makes it seem prudent to preface the discussion of specific metamorphoses of Troy in the Sidneian romance with a general note on what will be meant by a 'Trojan allusion' here. The Oxford and Cambridge 'Alexandrian' references, discrete and pointed reintroductions of Roman elegiac methodologies in English erudite communities with all their epistemological valencies and limitations thoroughly inspected by recent intertextual classicists, from Conte to Hinds, did little to form a solid picture of 'grievous' Trojanism but rather suggested an array of tediously various combinations of exemplars embodying the appropriate modes of mourning: female, familial, or heroic. Both the *Arcadia* and its

[1] For example, see E. Sistakou, *Tragic Failures. Alexandrian Responses to Tragedy and the Tragic* (Berlin, 2016); B. Accosta-Hughes, S. A. Stephens, *Callimachus in Context. From Plato to the Augustan Poets* (Cambridge, 2012), esp. 90–102.

continuations and imitations abound in discrete Trojan citations, however, it is rarely possible to make much of such purely idiomatic Trojanism beyond a general statement about the nature of early modern school education and rhetorical practices. Instead the chapter will focus on the spatial and thematic memory of Troy hanging about Sidney's story of overthrown kingdoms and edifying voyages in the Eastern Mediterranean as a key to the implicit political and ethical anxieties of the *Arcadia* and texts inspired by it, such as the nature of a princely biography and career after the fall of Troy and the tension between the 'prince's' desire to be master of his fate and his potential religious and philiosophical sensibilities indicative of a more resigned view of his personal development. As will be shown below, the conflicting languages of submissive imitation and manly, valorous self-fashioning were one of the most important rhetorical lessons learned in the process of emulating Trojan and Sidneian texts.

Maps and histories

The structure of the chapter is anachronistic in that it first considers the supplements of the *Arcadia* that continued to be published throughout the first half of the seventeenth century, beginning with Gervase Markham's bipartite *English Arcadia* and ending with Anna Weamys's *Continuation* (1651), and then proceeds to a discussion of Sir Kenelm Digby's autobiographical narrative, *Loose Fantasies*, composed presumably in 1628. The reason for this deliberate anachronism is that it seemed more apposite to the present discussion to study the ways in which the *Arcadia*'s narrative frame – Trojan on both ends – facilitates manifestations of structural and thematic Trojanism in texts that were – or at least were meant to be – physically attached to and read together with Sidney's volume and then progress to a

looser, in keeping with its title, imitation composed under the influence of the *Arcadia*'s lasting success in print but not stitched on to it directly. It is therefore necessary to overview Sidney's own uses of Troy, both in structural and symbolic sense, before examining the techniques of attaching a continuation to the *Arcadia*'s Trojan frame and re-interpreting it in a more independent romance.

The first overtly Trojan reference in the *Arcadia* signalling some of the most important elements of Trojanism in the narrative is the famous ekphrasis in the description of Kalander's garden inspired, as Hester Lees-Jeffries has pointed out, by the French translation of Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Polyphili – Songe de Poliphil*e[2]:

> In the middest of all the place, was afaire ponde, whose shaking christall was a perfect mirrour to all the other beauties, so that it bare shewe of two gardens: one in deede, the other in shaddowes: and in one of the thickets was a fine foun|taine made thus. A naked *Venus* of white marble, wherein the grauer had vsed such cunning, that the naturall blewe veines of the marble were framed in fitte places, to set foorth the beautifull veines of her bodie. At her brest shee had her babe *Æneas*, who seemed (hauing begun to sucke) to leaue that, to looke vpon her fayre eyes, which smiled at the babes follie, meane while the breast runing.[3]

Linda Gregerson has attempted to interpret the fatidic significance and genre emblematism of the ekphrasis by suggesting that it 'remind[s] Sidney's readers of the nascent epic lodged in Romance. ... Aeneas thus combines the best of constancy and authorization with the best of errancy'[4] – the qualities to be exemplified by the princes as Sidney's intricate narrative of constant feelings and vagrant heroism unfolds. Recalling the restlessness of Aenean wanderings in a precariously paradisal setting of

---

[2] See Hester Lees-Jeffries 'Pictures, places, and spaces: Sidney, Wroth, Wilton House, and the *Songe de Poliphile*' in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Smith and Wilson (Cambridge, 2011); esp. pp. 189–191.
[3] *CPA*, A4^{v}–A5^{r}.
[4] Gregerson, *The Reformation of the Subject: Spenser, Milton, and the English Protestat Epic* (Cambridge, 1995), 36.

Kalander's garden, the skilfully carved statue thus foreshadows the two meanings of Trojanism that will both dominate Sidney's tale of roving virtue and influence his emulators' and imitators' reading of it: the Trojanism of geographical displacement and the Trojanism of princely education.

Arcadia has recently drawn some geographically-informed interest as a locus where the realism of late sixteenth-century political anxieties and enticements merges with the symbolism of imaginary models of government and education. Chris Barrett's suggestion that the epic genre had a particularly strong association with what she terms 'the poetics of cartographic anxiety'[5] could be extrapolated to the romance genre – especially since, as will be demonstrated, it also was inherently Trojan in some of its aspects and, therefore, bore vestiges of the epic Trojanism. To cite one example of the romance's preoccupation with precise cartography and its Trojan implications, the *New Arcadia* corrects the *Old Arcadia*'s famous inaccuracy about the shipwreck – the trigger of the narrative – off the non-existent coast of the landlocked Arcadia: now the site of the catastrophe is moved to the shores of Laconia instead. As Nandini Das has suggested in her article on Sidney's fascination with the cartographic aspect of romance wanderings, this shift from a more symbolic to a more physical topography of Arcadia owes much to and implicitly argues with the exemplary stability and visual precision of the Ortelian oecumene.[6] I would like to take this argument somewhat further and show how the cartographic intertext is evocative of some of the Trojan themes outlined above.

Maps as a metonymic incarnation of educational travels underlie the genre of romance and link it to the matter of Troy on a physical, tangible level. Sidney's

[5] C. Barrett, *Early Modern English Literature and the Poetics of Cartographic Anxiety* (Oxford, 2018), 40.
[6] See N. Das, 'Romance re-charted (2011), 51–67.

treatment of maps as intertexts is more than just a figurative definition of the use of visual aids in composing a piece of prose. The careful amendment of the Arcadia coast blunder in the revised version of the romance – evidently, a result of the self-education programme sketched out in the 1580 letter to Edward Denny, where a hierarchy of moral philosophy, leisurely reading, and, finally, factual learning is clearly established[7] – may be a minor alteration if compared to all the other plot amplifications of the *New Arcadia*, but it invites one to look, once again, at the map of the Eastern Mediterranean, the trajectory of the princes' wanderings superimposed.

Early modern maps physically reflected the twofold humanist ideals of antiquarianism and pioneership by combining text and image in a way that may appear dauntingly overencumbered with words and voices to a modern viewer/reader. Thus, Ortelius's 1571 map of the region is captioned 'TVRCICI IMPERII DESCRIPTIO' – which is also the term for the Renaissance's favourite genre of non-fiction narrative, used, for instance, on the title-page of Camden's *Britannia* partly inspired by Ortelius's work and employing the evocative language of cartography as part of its self-presentation:

> I Hope it shall be to no discredite, if I now use againe by way of Preface, the same words with a few more, that I used twentie foure yeares since, in the first edition of this worke. *Abraham Ortelius* the worthy restorer of Ancient Geographic arriving heere in England, about thirtie foure yeares past, dealt earnestly with mee that I would illustrate this Isle of *BRITAINE*, or (as he

[7] See *Correspondence* (2012), I.980–985: 'For in trothe oftentymes wee erre, thinkinge we doe well, as longe as we meane well; where indeed want of knowledge, may make vs doe as much Wickedness ... as they which, even pretensedly co*m*mit all naughtiness. There out therfore may we seeke what it is to be truly iuste, truly vallyant, rightly temperate, & rightly friendly, with their annexed qualityes, and contraryes. And therof are many bookes written [follows a list of books on history and moral philosophy]. But nowe may you aske me. What shall I doe first? Truly in my opinion, an hower to your Testament, & a peece of one of Tullyes offices, and *that* with studdy. Plutarkes discourses you may reede with more ease. For the other matters allott your selfe an other howre for Sacroboscus & Valerius, or any other of Geography, and when you have satisfied your selfe in *that*, take your history of England, & your Ortelius to knowe the places you reed of; and soe in my conceite, you shall pass both pleasantly and profitably'.

> said) that I would restore antiquitie to Britaine, and Britaine to his antiquitie; which was, as I understood, that I would renew ancientrie, enlighten obscuritie, cleare doubts, and recall home Veritie by way of recovery, which the negligence of writers and credulity of the common sort had in a manner prescribed and utterly banished from amongst us. ... In the severall Counties I have compendiously set downe the limits (and yet not exactly by pearch and pole to breed questions) what is the nature of the soile, which were places of greatest antiquitie, who have beene the Dukes, Marquesses, Earles, Vicounts, Barons, and some of the most signall, and ancient families therein (for who can particulate all?)[8]

There is a tension and a sense of interdependence between Camden's phraseologies of recovery and discovery, and the same dualism permeates the imaginary and physical landscapes of the Eastern Mediterranean. Recovering implies antiquarian interest, thorough learning, modelling a contemporary reality on one's understanding of what a classical reality would have looked like. Discovering, on the other hand, is suggestive of adventurousness and action rather than poring over books and maps. Both terms are, of course, applicable to Renaissance treatments of the factual side of the matter of Troy, carefully antiquarian and radically innovative at the same time, and to a broader range of early modern uses of this matter, such as emotional self-fashioning and educational and rhetorical theories. Both terms also describe the aspirations and effects of the Sidneian romance – simulatenously classicising the exotic East and transcending the boundaries of the genre. It is, therefore, of vital importance to have Ortelius and the early modern map in general in front of one's mind's eye as one is reading Sidney and Digby from an educational perspective.

Ortelian maps offer a physical representation of the two contrary tendencies of classicisation and yearning for the exotic. Wading through the throng of italicised inscriptions surrounding the Aegean, one will notice that, in stark contrast to modern maps, ancient geography is present in the Ortelian universe not as a ghostly dispersion

[8] Camden (London, 1637), ¶4^{r}. Underlined phrases are suggestive of Camden's visually cartographical perception of his text and its Ortelian inspiration.

of mangled toponyms but as a physical reality, and that the classical 'Troia' and 'Corintho' coexist with Athens and Constantinople. Bearing this in mind, the *Arcadia*'s anachronistic amalgamation of ancient territory names and early modern concepts of government and legislation can be read as less of a humanist ahistorical generalisation and more of an actual multi-layered visualisation of geo-cum-historiographical tensions: here one could also call to mind the turbulent Mediterranean politics of *Astrophil and Stella*, where '*Love* borne in [ancient] *Greece*' also flees 'from his native land' driven by Turkish hard-heartedness.[9]

Reading the Eastern Mediterranean as a palimpsest map of matters – most prominently, classical and biblical – does not always mean that any reference to this geographical area had traces of all of these matters in its background. For example, Pauline voyages would be difficult to relate to the roughly contemporary story of Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon* and the slightly later *Aethiopian History*, one of the *Arcadia*'s most obvious prototexts, however, the very co-existence of these matters within one region of the map is unlikely to have escaped the attention of a sixteenth-century classicist and Protestant champion and cannot, therefore, be ruled out as an influence on the *Arcadia*'s often anachronistic and politically and religiously suggestive narrative frame. One may struggle to imagine that Sidney consciously merged Paul and the late Greek romance to form an eclectic intertext for the Arcadia, but, as is the case with palimpsests, even the erased, deliberately forgotten text shows through the one written over it and may give an accidental new dimension to its meaning. After all, the miraculous and providential overtones of the shipwreck story in *Acts* 27–28, to take one example, not only resembles the romance style in its precision of nautical terms and the grim depiction of a nearly catastrophic outcome, but also

[9] *Ringler*, 168.

presents the potential for reinterpreting the romance concept of providence in a Christian spirit.[10]

Furthermore, there is an obvious link between the classical and Christian layers of the region's map and the matter of Britain personified by Constantine, the founder of the Christian Troy (Constantinople), who was, according to a number of important historical accounts, born in Britain. Thus, Geoffrey of Monmouth relates how the Roman senator Constantius signed a treaty of peace with Coel, the King of Britons, married his daughter Helen, seized his crown after his death, and bequeathed the kingdom to his son Constantine after eleven years;[11] and Joseph of Exeter, the renowned author of a verse retelling of Dares's spurious diary, mentions Constantine among the British *viri illustres* in the only extant fragment of his crusade epic, the *Antiocheis*, brought to light by John Leland in his 1544 *Assertio Inclytissimi Arturij Regis Britanniae* (and therefore doubtlessly familiar to Sidney)[12] and re-cited by William Camden in the 1605 annotated miscellany, *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine* (and therefore relatively fresh in the memory of Sidney's seventeenth-century followers and imitators):

> In the commendation of *Britaine,* for breeding Martiall men, and praise of the famous King *Arthur,* he song in his *Antiocheidos* these which onely remaine out of that worke,

[10] Acts 27–28 (cited in the Geneva version) employs all the familiar tropes of the shipwreck story used both in Virgil and the late Greek romances: 'And when the fourteenth night was come, as we were carried to and fro in the Adriatic *sea* about midnight, the shipmen deemed that some country approached unto them. ... Then fearing lest they should have fallen into some rough places, they cast four anchors out of the stern, and wished that the day were come. ... And when it was day, they knew not the country, but they spied a certain [s]creek with a bank, into the which they were minded (if it were possible) to thrust in the ship. ... And when they were come safe, then they knew that the Isle was called Malta. And the Barbarians showed us no little kindness, for they kindled a fire, and received us everyone, because of the present shower, and because of the cold'.

[11] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain* (London, 1966), 131–132.

[12] Leland (1544), K1^{r-v}.

> Inclita fulsit
> Posteritas ducibus tantis, tot diues alumnis,
> Tot faecunda viris, premerent qui viribus orbem,
> Et famà veteres. Hinc Constantinus adeptus
> Imperium, Romam tenuit, Byzantion auxit.
> ...
> Hinc celebri fato faelici floruit ortu
> Flos regum Arthurus.[13]

> [Brutus's] glorious posterity shone forth so rich with so many leaders, so abundant in men of ancient fame who conquered the world with their might. From here Constantine inherited his power, who reigned over Rome and increased Byzantium. From here flowered forth in a happy fate the flower of kings, Arthur, of celebrated descent.

Merging the matters of Troy, Britan, Constantinople, and the Eastern Mediterranean in general in such a puzzlingly unspecific way, by means of suggested proximity and association rather than concrete intertextual references, created a literary environment that could accommodate a richer and more multivalent political, historical, and moral allegory pretending to be a tale of love and valour. However, in order for this associative technique to work, the *loci* had to become an active part of the narrative rather than a passive background for it. The ability of a place to tell its own story was an important classical *topos*, and Troy was arguably the most eloquent story-teller, where every noteworthy spot was tagged with a reference to its heroic past like long-destroyed cities on Ortelius's map. One could recall Lucan's Caesar, who, obsessed with the desire to revisit the ancient ruins of his putative ancestor's city, 'Emathia satiatus clade recessit' ['satiated with bloodshed, leaves Emathia'], 'Threiciasque legit fauces' ['reached the Thracian strait'], passed Byzantium, and, finally, 'circuit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae' ['wandered around the memorable name of burnt-down Troy'], where 'nullum est sine nomine saxum' ['no stone is without a name'].[14] Incidentally, Caesar's spontaneous grand tour in search of his mythic origins is almost

[13] Camden (London, 1605), A2$^{r–v}$.
[14] *Lucan,* 576.

exactly replicated by the military and instructive trajectory of Euarchus's conquests and the princes' planned voyage in the *New Arcadia*. In his poorly disguised account of the princes' travels presented to Pamela, Musidorus depicts the mutually educative friendship that arose between them and eventually drove them to leave the safety of Thessaly (bordering Macedon, Pyrocles's homeland and, in effect, the synonym of Lucan's Emathia):

> ... nothing I so much delight to recount, as the memorable friendship that grew betwixt the two Princes, such as made them more like then the likenesse of all other vertues, and made them more neere one to the other, then the neerenes of their bloud could aspire vnto ... . *Musidorus*, what he had learned either for body or minde, would teach it to *Pyrocles*; and *Pyrocles* was so glad to learne of none, as of *Musidorus*: till *Pyrocles*, being come to sixtene yeares of age, he seemed so to ouerrun his age in growth, strength, and all things following it, that not *Musidorus*, no nor any man liuing (I thinke) could performe any action, either on horse, or foote, more strongly, or deliuer that strength more nimbly, or become the deliuery more gracefully, or employ all more vertuously. ... At which time vnderstanding that the King *Euarchus*, after so many yeares warre, and the conquest of all *Pannonia*, and almost *Thrace*, had now brought the conclusion of all to the siege of *Bizantium* (to the raising of which siege great forces were made) they would needs fall to the practise of those vertues, which they before learned. And therefore ... they brake off all delayes ... .[15]

The grand tour analogy has, of course, deeper implications than just a convenient rhetorical link between the ideal yet troubled world of the *Arcadia* and Sidney's own early biography set against the perturbed background of the Huguenot wars or the precarious hospitality of Padua and Venice. Jeff Dolven remarks that 'romances often start in school'[16], and in order to become complete gentlemen the princes haste to apply their virtuous instruction in real wanderings and battles. Even the direction of their grand tour resembles that of a sixteenth-century young gentleman's: just as Sidney's desired and unattainable destination was Rome, the new version of

[15] *CPA*, L4^{r-v}.
[16] J. Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance* (Chicago, 2007), p. 18.

Troy – corrupted and certainly expected to be destroyed by his Protestant teachers, such as Languet – so the Greeks of the *Arcadia* concentrated all their effort to re-conquer Byzantium that would have been retrospectively seen as the Christian Troy.[17] Yet the application of well-studied virtues goes amiss, and 'the actions of Sidney's young heroes ... constantly question the viability of [the] lineal trajectories that humanist pedagogy recommended for its students and its fiction'.[18] The reversed Trojanism, that is, the quest of Troy (whatever present-day geographic location this term signifies) prompted by the antiquarian, *ad fontes* bias of Renaissance schooling swiftly evolves into the Virgilian and Romance Trojanism of expatriation and displacement.

Trojan displacement in Virgil and the foundation myths of mediaeval Europe had dynastic and teleological overtones: the process of *translatio imperii* was hypothetically finite, although its end – the ideal monarchy – lay beyond the scope of the actual narrative and may have been metonymically encoded in the valiant deeds and death of the protagonist – to use Milton's simile from the conclusion of *Defensio Secunda*, a text treating both tyrannomachy and education and setting the art and the very act of writing above those of war,

> ... quemadmodum ... poeta is qui Epicus vocatur, si quis paulò accuratior, miniméque abnormis est, quem Heroem versibus canendum sibi proponit, ejus non vitam omnem, sed unam ferè vitæ actionem, Achillis putà ad Troiam, vel Ulissis reditum, vel Æneæ in Italiam adventum ornandum sibi sumit, reliquas prætermittit.
>
> ... as the poet, who is styled epic, if he adhere strictly to established rules, undertakes to embellish not the whole life of the hero whom he proposes to celebrate in song, but, usually, one particular action of his life, as, for example, that of Achilles at Troy, or the return of Ulysses, or the arrival of Æneas in Italy, and leaves alone the rest.[19]

---

[17] H. Moore, 'The Eastern Mediterranean in the English Amadis Cycle', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 41.1 (2011), 121.
[18] See Das, 'Romance Re-charted', 58.
[19] Milton, Kelly, ed., *The Complete Prose Works* (Yale, 1982), VIII.252–3.

The prescriptive, post-Scaligeran Sidney would have subscribed to that view. Discussing Euripides's *Hecuba*, one of the best-known dramatic Trojan texts of the time,[20] in the *Defence of Poesy*, he sarcastically disparages the modern writers' skill by imagining what 'an history' would look like if begun from the real beginning:

> Where now would one of our tragedy writers begin, but with the delivery of the child? Then should he sail over into Thrace, and so spend I know not how many years, and travel numbers of places. But where does Euripides? Even with the finding of the body ...[21]

The Arcadia often refers to the twists and turns of its own action as tragedies and histories,[22] which may be an Aristotelian echo combined with a mediaevalised perception of princely biographies as unconditionally dependent on the whims of Fortune: for example, *The Mirror for Magistrates* (praised by Sidney in the *Defence* and doubtlessly influencing his mode of reflecting on individual, biographical providence) similarly uses the terminology of tragedies, histories, or 'tragicall histories' in an attempt of self-definition.[23] Yet *The Arcadia*'s romance geography seems to

---

[20] See Braden in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English. 1550–1660* (Oxford, 2010), 262–265; Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Harvard, 1935), 105–107; and the discussion of *Hecuba*'s popularity in the Renaissance in *The Poetical Works of William Alexander*, ed. Kastner and Charlton (Edinburgh, 1921), I.xxxiii.

[21] *Defence* (2006), p. 111.

[22] See, for example, *CPA*, C3^{r}: 'I tooke the best care I could of her [Parthenia]: and of her vnderstood the whole tragicall historie of her vndeserued aduenture'; I6^{v}: 'In the countrie of *Thessalia*, (alas why name I that accursed country, which brings forth nothing, but matters for tragedies? but name it I must) in *Thessalia* (I say) there was (well may I say, there was) a Prince (no, no Prince, whome bondage wholly possessed; but yet accounted a Prince, and) named *Musidorus*'; K3^{r}: 'Doo you not know further (saide she, with a setled countenance, not accusing any kind of inward motion) of that storie. Alas no, (said I) for euen here the Historiographer stopped, saying, The rest belonged to Astrologie'; and numerous other examples.

[23] See, for example, Blenerhasset's preface to *The Second Part of the Mirour for Magistrates* (London, 1578), *4^{r}: 'And I wyll ensure you, the most part of these my Princes dyd pleade their causes vnto me, euen in the Sea, a place in fayth, not meete to penne Tragedies'; D4^{v}: 'Carassus hauing thus finished his Tra|gicall History'. For a more detailed discussion of the *Mirror*'s genre, see also Budra, *A Mirror for Magistrates and the De Casibus Tradition* (Toronto, 2000), 56ff.

encourage a radically different approach to the plot's beginnings and teleology: until Book 3, the text constantly loses control of itself and lapses into the condemned, albeit not perfectly chronological, *ab ovo* tales of sailing into distant lands and lingering there, and the non-linear structure, the ever-thwarted educational tour, and the never-completely-successful attempts to establish peaceful and benevolent reigns propel the perpetual vicissitude of luck and misfortune stretching even beyond the 'FINIS' of Book 5 of the complete *Arcadia*, so that 'the straunge stories ... may awake some other spirite'.[24] Drawing inspiration from the linear Trojan narratives and deliberately loosening their ends may have been an automatic Ariostan technique, but it was the Eastern Mediterranean itself that additionally promoted such a way of thinking and writing *translatio*. The western parts of 'Tvrcicvm Imperivm' were in fact seen as a tangled mesh of *translationes* rather than the unique props for one particular Troy–Rome–Britain narrative. Thus, the opening pages of Richard Knolles's 1603 *The General Historie of the Tvrkes* trace, with a mixture of modern sober skepticism and wild misconception, several of such *translatio*-routes:

> Some ... deriue them [the Turks] from the Trojans, led thereunto by the affinity of the words *Turci* & *Teucri*; supposing (but with what probabilitie I know not) the word *Turci* or Turks, to haue beene made of the corruption of the word *Teucri*, the common name of the Trojans: as also for that the Turks haue of long most inhabited the lesser ASIA, wherein the antient and most famous citie of TROY sometime stood. No great reason in my deeming: yet giue the authors thereof leaue therewith to please themselues, as well as some others, which dwelling much farther off, borrow, or rather force their beginning from thence, without any probabilitie at al ... Amongst others, *Philip* of MORNAY, the noble and learned Frenchman in his woorthy worke concerning the truenesse of the Christian religion, seemeth (and that not without good reason) to deriue the Turks together with the Tartars, from the Iewes, namely, from the ten Tribes, which were by *Salmanazar* king of ASIRIA, in the time of *Oseas* king of ISRAEL, caried away into captiuitie ...[25]

[24] *CPA*, 2S3^{v}.
[25] Knolles, *The General Historie of the Tvrkes* (London, 1603), B1^{r}.

Sidney's familiarity with Mornay's spurious anthropology hardly requires any external proof; furthermore, the cultural parallelism between the matters of Troy and Jerusalem discussed in Chapter 2 was such an important catalyst of the Sidneian co-reception of Trojan and biblical texts that one could safely assume that Sidney was also aware of the exilic multivalence of the Eastern Mediterranean as one of the key romance locales. Finally, it is beyond any doubt that, although Knolles's summary chart of intersecting exile and settlement trajectories postdates Sidney's transformative reception of the matter of Troy by some twenty years, it is informed by the Sidneian romance tradition to such an extent that this historical introduction could also be read as a work of criticism reflecting on and re-defining the region's innate conduciveness to wandering, which will prove especially relevant in the final section of this chapter discussing the instructive Arcadianism and Trojanism of Sir Kenelm Digby's semi-autobiographical *Loose Fantasies*.

The frustration of the grand tour's humanist prescriptivism in the *Arcadia*, however, cannot be attributed only to the arbitrary tempestuousness of the seas and belligerence of the peoples. Influenced by Erasmus, the ideology of princely instruction in Tudor times would have seen the kind of travels that Pyrocles and Musidorus undertake as imprudent extravagance to be avoided by truly virtuous monarchs. The *Institutio Principis Christiani* thus warns the potentially unthrifty sovereign:

> Cõmodissima fuerit augendi uectigalis ratio, si princeps sumptus superuacaneos amputarit ... si bella & his simillimas peregrinationes uitauerit, ... & si magis studeat recte administrandæ dictioni suæ, quàm propagandæ.[26]
>
> The most effective increase of the revenue will be achieved by the prince if he cuts off extravagant expenses ... if he avoids wars and wanderings that are very much like them ... and if endeavours to rule his domain properly rather than expanding it.

[26] Erasmus, *Institutio* (1519), I4^{v}.

From this austere perspective, Pyrocles and Musidorus, utterly ignorant of the pecuniary aspect of fitting out a ship or equipping an army (both would not have been alien concerns for Sidney), withdraw from the ideals of princely virtue as far as possible: not only do they wage multiple wars abroad instead of defending their own kingdoms, but it is their quest itself – an activity just as bad as foreign military campaigns, according to Erasmus – that constitutes the quintessence of their practical instruction in romance 'gentilesse'. This departure from the paedagogic norms designed for the benefit of young gentlemen is portrayed as an internal educational reform grounded in careful considerations. Even more significantly, Musidorus himself comes up with an anti-Virgilian motto of the princes' self-instruction:

> It were the part of a verie idle Orator to set forth the numbers of wel-deuised honors done vnto them [by the people of Pontus] ... And therefore hauing well established those kingdomes, vnder good gouernours, and rid them by their valure of such giants and monsters, as before time armies were not able to subdue, they determined in vnknowne order to see more of the world ... and therefore would themselues ... goe priuately to seeke exercises of their vertue; thinking it not so worthy, to be brought to Heroycall effects by fortune, or necessitie, (like *Vlysses* and *Aeneas*) as by ones owne choice, and working.[27]

It is important to observe how the terminologies of epideictic, political, and chivalric Trojanism intertwine in this transitional reflection separating two military episodes of Musidorus's tale to produce a third model of a post-Trojan princely career – in addition to the antiquarian poetics of return and restoration and the doleful resignation to exile discussed above. Musidorus's professed humility in omitting the 'wel-deuised honors'

[27] *CPA*, M3[r].

and the hyperbolically sketchy account of the princes' valiant deeds together with the characteristically *translatio* parlance of 'establish[ing] those kingdomes' (Aeneas also 'multaque et bella passusdum *conderet* urbem') frame a fundamentally different mythobiography of a post-Aenean *vir*, whose identity is not dissolved in his destiny[28] and who is 'brought to Heroycall effects ... by [his] own choice'.

As Fulke Greville (with something of a hope of self-descriptivism) observes in his mythobiography of Sidney, 'his intent ... was, to turn the barren Philosphy precepts into pregnant Images of life; and in them, first on the Monarch's part, lively to represent the growth, state, and declination of Princes, change of Government, and lawes'.[29] The growth (and the fall) of princes had been the major concern of most Trojan texts, and Aeneas's easily allegorisable and somewhat selfless biography served as a natural departure point for the dressing of philosophical precepts with life-like images. Sidney administers a double-edged praise to 'the feigned Aeneas of Virgil' contrasted by 'the right Aeneas of Dares',[30] but it is the latter that seems to conform to the programme of integrating vividness into philosophy – in Dares's photofit gallery of heroes, the catalogue of Aeneas's virtues is surrounded by his physical distinguishing marks providing a syntactico-visual analogy of this twofold intent: 'Aenea[s] ruffu[s], quadratu[s], facundu[s], affabili[s], forti[s], cũ cõsilio piu[s], uenustu[s], oculis hilaribus nigris'[31] ('Aeneas was red-haired, stocky, eloquent, affable, strong, pious, elegant, and with black and lively eyes'). Similar to the efforts of Sidney's mourners to reconcile the conflicting hierarchies of Trojan exemplarity, the crucial issue with completing the *Arcadia* will be to accommodate the non-Virgilian, sometimes self-

[28] For an outline of the reception of Aeneas's multi-faceted biography, see Hardie, *The Last Trojan Hero* (2014), esp. pp. 85–90.
[29] Greville, *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1651), G1^{v}.
[30] *Defense* (2006), p. 92.
[31] Dares Phrygius, *Historia* (1517), B3^{v}

contradictory realism inherited from *other* Trojan texts within the broader framework of political and instructive coordinates defining the *Arcadia*'s plots.

Supplements and continuations – de-Trojanising Sidney.

Recent scholarship has directed much attention to early modern English continuations of and supplements to romances and their transformative and emulous engagement with the proto-texts. In addition to the 2015 four-volume collection *Continuations to Sidney's Arcadia, 1607–1867* edited by Mitchell, Lange, and Osland, one could mention the edition of Ralf Knevet's *A Supplement of the Faery Queene* (ed. Burlinson and Zurcher, 2015), or Natasha Simonova's *Early Modern Authorship and Prose Continuations: Adaptation and Ownership from Sidney to Richardson* (2015), all of which contribute to a deeper and more nuanced understanding of what continuing and imitation meant and how the poetics of the source texts were used to facilitate a smoother segue into the re-imagined and recreated reality of the supplements. Burlinson and Zurcher observe in their preface to Ralph Knevet's *Supplement* that '[t]he genre of Romance has always encouraged supplementarity: because its basic narrative stock is limited – to the matter of Rome, the matter of France, and matter of Britain – the genre is populated with new works that had sutured themselves to the old, wearing their additivity proudly as a mark of their generic affiliation.'[32] The common denominator for the three matters listed here is their inherent Trojanism, and it can be assumed that the act of continuing a romance in itself follows and echoes the practice of supplementing the *Aeneid* and other Trojan texts. Simonova remarks that 'even text not

[32] Burlinson and Zurcher, eds., *A Supplement of the Faery Queene* (Manchester, 2015), 10.

visibly incomplete always contain some room for elaboration',[33] which is best illustrated by the popular example of Maffeo Vegio's 1428 epyllion *Aeneidos Liber XIII* – one of the numerous[34] Renaissance continuations of the Virgilian epic that became so firmly associated with the *Aeneid* itself that many early modern editions, such as the Phayer and Twyne translation (1596 onwards) included it as an inseparable part of the classical narrative. Emma Buckley suggests that for Virgil's Renaissance audience the text of the *Aeneid* was incomplete[35] and therefore requiring an additional coda resolving the ethical ambiguities of the epic's abrupt closure and celebrating the peaceful end of the Trojans' wanderings and the establishment of a new dynasty in Italy. Ending *in medias res*, Virgil's Book XII creates a potentially continuable emotional duality when the 'momentary suggestion of ethical compassion is ... blown away by a simple passion'[36]:

> ille, oculis postquam saevi monumenta doloris
> exuviasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira
> terribilis: 'tune hinc spoliis indute meorum
> eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas
> immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.'
> hoc dicens ferrum adverso sub pectore condit
> fervidus; ast illi solvuntur frigore membra
> vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.[37]

> Aeneas, as soon as his eyes drank in the trophy, that memorial of cruel grief, ablaze with fury and terrible in his wrath: 'Clad in the spoils of one of mine, are you to be snatched from my hands? Pallas it is, Pallas who sacrifices you with this stroke, and takes retribution from your guilty blood!' So saying, in burning rage he buries his sword full in Turnus' breast. His limbs grew slack and chill and with a moan his life fled resentfully to the Shades below.

[33] Simonova, *Early Modern Authorship* (Basingstoke, 2015), 8.
[34] For other examples, see Schmidt P. G. 'Neolateinische Supplemente zur Aeneis' in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis* (1973).
[35] See *Vergilius* 52 (2006), Buckley, 'Ending the *Aeneid*? Closure and Continuation in Maffeo Vegio's *Supplementum*', 108.
[36] C. Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993), 50.
[37] *Aeneid*, 366–7.

In stark contrast to the *Aeneid*'s gory dénouement, Vegio's supplement swiftly proceeds from warlike action to the static rhetorical embellishments of Latinus's grievous speech and the negotiations between the Trojans and the Rutuli and culminates in the wedding of Aeneas and Lavinia and Aeneas's apotheosis. As Aeneas foretold at the beginning of the epyllion,

> Dabit inde mihi Lavinia coniunx
> bello acri defensa Italo cum sanguine mixtam
> Troianam transferre aeterna in saecula gentem.
>
> Thence will my wife Lavinia, sheltered through the bitter war, grant me to transmit the destiny of the Trojan race, commingled with Italian blood, into all ages to come.[38]

The apotheosis scene in the second half of the epyllion portrays the climactic conversation between Aeneas and his mother in almost ekphrastic, statuary terms:

> Talia iactantem circumstitit aurea mater
> se Venerem confessa almo et sic edidit ore:
> ...
> Nunc tibi parta quies, nunc meta extrema laborum,
> nunc tandem optatam componunt saecula pacem.
>
> While he was thus exclaiming, his golden mother embraced him. Declaring herself Venus, she spoke these kindly words: ... Now peace is granted to you, now at last is the end of your sufferings. Finally, now, the ages accept the covenant of peace long craved.[39]

The *Arcadia*, however, replicates the Virgilian incompletion in more than one way: in that it breaks off in mid sentence with Zelmane fighting with his/her Turnian arch-enemy, Anaxius, and in that the closure borrowed from the *Old Arcadia* deliberately imitates the open closures of other romances, such as Ariosto's, by inviting future readers to complete some of the story lines left loose by Sidney:

---

[38] Vegio (2004), 6–9.
[39] Ibid., 34–35.

> But the solemnities of these marriages, with the *Arcadian* pastoralles, full of many comicall aduentures, hapning to those rurall louers; the straunge stories of *Artaxia* and *Plexirtus, Erona* and *Plangus; Helene* and *Amphialus*, with the wonderfull chaunces that befell them: The shepheardish loues of *Menalcas* with *Kalodulus* daughter; the poore hopes of the poore *Philisides* in the pursuite of his affections; the strange continuance of *Klaius* and *Strephons* desire; Lastly the sonne of *Pyrocles* named *Pyrophilus*, and *Melidora*, the faire daughter of *Pamela* by *Musidorus*, who euen at their birth entred into admirable fortunes; may awake some other spirite to exercise his penne in that, wherewith mine is already dulled.[40]

Characteristically, this ending edited into the unfinished *Arcadia* seems to comply with the Vegian model of ending an epic in a more romance mode – with the 'solemnities of marriages' and 'pastoralles' rather than with further battle scenes.

The first type of incompletion – a physical break on the printed page – has been studied thoroughly, and its Virgilian and, by implication, Trojan genesis has been discussed in virtually any critical source interpreting either the narrative strategies or the inherent continuability of Sidney's text.[41] Gavin Alexander discusses Sidney's fondness for the figure of *aposiopesis*[42] and reads his very self as 'a figure of incompletion',[43] however, the text of the *Arcadia* – depending on which of the versions one considers to be *the* text – presents two types of rhetorical imperfection both of which are rooted in the tradition of Trojan supplements and continuations.[44] The first type is supplementary, i.e. filling an obvious narrative and rhetorical gap. Already Quintilian (9.2) gestures towards a variety of emotional states and rhetorical purposes that the figure of *aposiopesis* can serve:

---

[40] *CPA*, 2S3^{v}.
[41] For example, in Burrow (1993), 139–141; McCoy (1979), 212–214; Hamilton, 173.
[42] For a discussion of the figure, see *Renaissance Figures of Speech* (2007), 7–8.
[43] *Writing After Sidney*, 37.
[44] On the distinction between continuations and supplements, see Cullen's introduction to Weamys's *Continuation*, xxxvii.

> *Ἀποσιώπησις*, quam idem Cicero reticentiam, Celsus obticentiam, nonnulli interruptionem appellant, et ipsa ostendit adfectus, vel irae, ... vel sollicitudinis et quasi religionis.[45]
>
> Aposiopesis too – Cicero calls it *reticentia,* Celsus *obticentia,* others *interruptio* – itself displays emotions: either anger ... or anxiety and, as it were, scruple...

Similarly, Puttenham classifies aposiopesis as an 'auricular' figure, that is, a figure of speech rather than thought, and certainly not as a figure of action, further enriching the range of emotions it can possibly convey with shame, threat, and moderation:

> Ye haue another *auricular* figure of defect, and is when we begin to speake a thing, and breake of in the middle way, as if either it needed no further to be spoken of, or that we were ashamed, or afraide to speake it out. It is also sometimes done by way of threatening, and to shew a moderation of anger.[46]

Reticence, of course developed its broader meaning – 'Reluctance to perform a particular action; disinclination, hesitation' (*OED)* only in the nineteenth century; nevertheless, there is evidence that contemporary rhetoricians also construed *reticentia* in terms of action – even military action – rather than pure rhetoric. The first edition of Henry Peacham's *Garden of Eloquence* defines it as 'a figure of construction, and it is when through some affection, as of feare, anger, sorrow, bashfulness, and such like, we breake of our speech',[47] whereas the 1593 (importantly, post-Sidneian) edition contains an additional section on the use of the figure, in which Peacham suggests that

> The vse of this forme of speech serueth either to stay the vehemency of our immoderate affections, proceeding to some excesse or outrage, or to signifie by the half what the whole meaneth ... it is not vnlike to a truce in war, or sounding to the retreat.[48]

---

[45] *Quintilian,* IV.64–5
[46] Puttenham (1589), T4^{r}.
[47] Peacham (1577), N1^{v}
[48] Peacham (1593), K3^{v}.

In light of these rhetorical formulae, the ambiguous non-closure of the imperfect *Arcadia* can be read as a structural aposiopesis – to use Abraham Fraunce's definition, 'when the course of a speach begun is in such sort staid, that some part thereof not vttred, is nevertheless perceiued'[49] – reminiscent of the *Aeneid*'s ending, where

> So that consenting by the mediation of necessitie, to a breathing time of truce, being withdrawen a little one frõ the other; *Anaxius* stood leaning vpon his sword ... But *Zelmane* strongly putting it by with her right hand sword, comming in with her left foote, and hand, would haue giuen a sharpe visitation to his right side, but that he was faine to leape awaye. Whereat ashamed, (as hauing neuer done so much before in his life.)[50]

Although the emotional setting of the fight scene closely parallels Aeneas's 'ira terribilis' and suggests a lack of the fighters' resolution similar to Aeneas's fleeting doubt in the face of a close completion of the wanderings and the peaceful re-establishment of the Trojan dynasty after the death of the enemy, Sidney's continuators, William Alexander and James Johnstoun, whose rival supplements were both printed with the original text already in the 1638 edition of the *Arcadia*, offer two ethically ambivalent resolutions of the crucial combat. Alexander's menacingly repetitive depiction of Anaxius's death presents it almost as a suicide rather than Zelmane's unequivocal, Aenean victory:

> [Anaxius] ran foreward with such a violent violence on Zelmane (nought being able to resist his vnresistable force) that shee presently interposing her reposed sword, though it ranne him through the heart (or rather hee his heart vpon it) it could not hinder him from running her through the body, and both to the earth, a brave flash of the dying light![51]

[49] Fraunce, *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (1950), 80.
[50] *CPA*, 2F2^{v}–2F3^{r}.
[51] Mitchel, ed., *Continuations to Sidney's Arcadia* (London, 2014), 160.

Johnstoun's supplement makes a step further by reducing Zelmane's Aenean agency in the death of Anaxius to simply watching it happen as s/he is prepared to spare him:

> She was now ready to have followed her chace of victory, when *Anaxius* cried, Hold thy hand, O noble Amazon, whom the gods have made to be a corrector of my pride and folly; now I yeeld to thy invincible valour, and demand to receive longer life at thy hand, ... *Zelmane* beholding in him the image of humane conditions, was ready to have comforted him, when the speech died in his mouth, and the messengers of death appearing in his eyes, she might perceive the boiling streames of blood to have left their flowing for want of breath.[52]

The supplement does so in terms borrowed, with blatant literality, from Sidney's own depiction of the death of Lycurgus, Anaxius's brother, only a folio earlier – which is, in its turn, a careful close replica of Aeneas's murdering Turnus.

> *Zelmane* represt a while her great hart, either disdaining to be cruell, or pitiful, & therfore not cruel: & now the image of humane condition, begã to be an Orator vnto her of compassiõ, when she saw, as he lifted vp his armes with a suppliãts grace, about one of them, vnhappily tied, a garter with a Iewel, which (giuen to *Pyrocles* by his aunt of *Thessalia*, & greatly esteemed by him) he had presented to *Philoclea*, & with inward rage promising extreame hatred, had seene *Lycurgus* with a proud force, & not without some hurt vnto her, pull away from *Philoclea*, because at entreatie she would not giue it him.[53]

'The image of human condition' moving Zelmane to Aenean pity in either case proves too unconvincing an orator when s/he notices the garter with Philoclea's jewel worn by Lycurgus – and a belated advocate of already-mortally-wounded Anaxius. The frustration of Aenean compassion towards the break-off of Sidney's own text and the two supplementers' departure from the Virgilian model of ending a combat scene with an uneasy but unambiguous resolution inviting a Vegian continuation require

[52] Ibid., 259.
[53] *CPA*, 2F2^{r}.

explanation. Just as Sidney was apparently planning further revision of the *Arcadia*, Alexander and Johnstoun were not composing a definitive conclusion but were merely bridging a gap between the expanded and the 'old' parts of the Sidneian text and therefore had to accomodate the potential for further development towards a new climax instead of leading the plot, as the Vegian model had it, to a smooth and peaceful ending. Whereas Aeneas's character was torn between heroic cruelty – or valour – and *pietas* in the final scene of Virgil's epic, the supplementers had to dissolve the tension between the passion and self-restraint that determined the general course and events of the Trojans' progress in order to allow the *romance* element to unfold throughout Books 4 and 5.

Yet another closely imitating continuation following the footsteps[54] of Sidney's romance but taking the edge off its moral ambiguities and indulging in amorous tales and lengthy, static descriptions is Richard Belling's *Sixth Booke*, which attaches itself to the Sidneian text at a point of much lesser tragic suggestiveness[55]:

> What changes in Fortune the Princes of *Macedon* & *Thessaly* have past, together with what event the uncertaine actions of so blinde a Goddesse, have beene crowned; they may remember, whose eares have beene fedd with their eloquent Story, written by the never-enough renowned Sir *Philip Sidney*. *Basilius* therefore having beheld with the eye of successe, the accomplishment of his misinterpreted Oracle, hastened (together with *Evarchus*) to his Court of *Mantinia* ...[56]

Most scholars concur that Belling reduces the agenda of his continuation to the methodology of imitation itself thus turning it into a rhetorical exercise rather than an energetic response to *The Arcadia*'s incompletion. For example, Gavin Alexander

---

[54] Simonova (2015). The image of adoring Sidney's footsteps comes from a verse in the *Thebaid* which Belling places at the end of his continuation: '*Tu longe sequere & vestigia semper adora / Sidnaei*.' (O2^{v}).
[55] Following the version completed by Alexander.
[56] Belling (1624), B1$^{r–v}$.

dismisses the *Sixth Book* as 'an indifferent copy' in which Belling 'confirms the impression that he does not really know how to talk to Sidney',[57] and Natasha Simonova concludes that the supplement 'represents an Irish appropriation of his text as a symbol of national equality: if an Irish writer can imitate and conclude Sidney's romance, Irish letters are not inferior to the English'. The publication of the *Sixth Book* was apparently prompted by the 1621 Dublin edition of the *Arcadia* and thus acted as a mere support and confirmation of the literary status of the Sidneian myth in Ireland – the political status hardly needed such an appropriation due to the Irish connections of the Sidney family.[58] Such pure literariness eventually results in Belling's purging his text of the Aenean heroism of Sindey's character. The only Trojan reference that remains is an ekphrasis devoid of any prophetic and military connotations and showing Aeneas fleeing from Dido, not from the Greeks:

> The building of Marble, where, vvhether the Art in carving into manie formes, the in-vaine-resisting hardnesse of the stone, the cunning in knitting these dis-joynted members, or the invention in contriving their severall roomes, did excell; was hard to be judged of. ... [I]t was all hung with the choyce rarenesse of farr-fetcht Arras, in which the ingenious workeman, vvith the curi|ous pensill of his little Needle, had limm'd the dumme records of reviv'd Antiquitie. Here did he present the memorable siege of *Thebs,* vvhere the ruines of her vvalls seem'd yet to hang, and make the beholders feare the downefall of the lively stones. There you might see how cunningly he had expres't the constrain'd flight of the *Trojan* Prince, and the cruell sacrifice of enraged *Dido's* love ...[59]

[57] Alexander (2006), 277. Cf. Belling's own confession as to the nature of his work: 'I have added a limme to *Apelles* picture; but my minde never entertain'd such vaine hopes, to thinke it of perfection sufficient to delude the eyes of the most vulgar, with the likenesse in the workmanship'. ($A3^r$).

[58] On Belling and Ireland, see Gillespie, 'The Social Thought of Richard Bellings' in *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, ed. Siochrú (Dublin, 2001), 212–228; and Rankin, *Between Spenser and Swift: English Writing in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Cambridge, 2005), esp. 199–205.

[59] Belling (1624), $B2^r$–$B3^r$.

The second type of dealing with Trojan incompletion – ending a seemingly perfect story – is exemplified by Anna Weamys's 1651 *Continuation*. The dedicatory poems prefixed to this short addition exhibit a familiar array of time-worn *topoi* associated with Sidney's emulators and continuators, such as metempsychosis[60] or literary obstetrics,[61] however, one of them attempts to construct Weamys's authorial identity in geographical terms resonating with the first part of this chapter:

> MUch of the Terrene Globe conceal'd doth lie,
> Cheating the Searchers curious industrie:
> A R C A D I A too, till now, but partly was discri'd;
> *Sydney* her beautie view'd, fell Love-sick and dy'd
> Ere he could show the world her perfect state
> ...
> for doubtless such is she,
> Perfection gives t' Arcadia's Geographie.[62]

Continuing and completing implies filling the blank spots on the map of the princes' Trojan-like errancy and, in a political – and a Vegian – sense, restoring the troubled kingdom to ultimate peace. Weamys's treatment of the text has been described as 'intimate intertextuality':[63] similar to the continuators of the *Aeneid* (including Vegio), whose additions are effectively centos of Virgilian half-verses, Weamys's text does not look beyond the narrative suggestions outlined in the concluding sentence of the 'complete' *Arcadia*. Following the Vegian model of putting an end to wanderings and setting up a permanently peaceful reign, the story culminates in the quadruple wedding of Musidorus and Pamela, Pyrocles and Philoclea, Plangus and Erona, and Amphialus

[60] Weamys (1994), e.g. 115.
[61] Ibid., 112.
[62] Ibid., 114.
[63] Cullen in Weamys (1994): xxxiv. See also Simonova's (2015) discussion of the continuations' 'intimate relation' to the text, esp. 20ff.

and Helena. 'The Tragedie [ends] with a Comedie'[64] and resolves into a 'happy domestication'[65] of passions.

This happy conclusion allows Weamys to revisit and de-Trojanise the Sidneian fountain ekphrasis, which, as suggested above, was symbolic of the restless displacement of the princes and introduced a genre mixture by disturbing the seemingly untroubled pastoral setting with opening up an epic dimension. In the *Continuation*, the ekphrasis is devoid of its epic suggestivity and transformed into a visual representation of a purely amorous narrative mode:

> The Temple where these Nuptial Rites were thus celebrated, was scituate in a garden, or rather a Paradise for its delightfulness; the murmuring of the waters that flowed from a Fonntain at first entrance dividing, themselves into four streams, seeming to threaten, and yet enticing the comers to venter further; the Fountains bedecked with the Images of *Diana* and her Maids, the Goddess figured with an austere countenance, pointing to the lust-full *Venus,* whose Statue at a little distance stood, as she with lacivious actions endeavored to entrap the modest Boy *Adonis,* but *Hymen* on the other side disputes, those whom his Priests unite, cannot be stiled *Venu's,* but *Diana*'s.[66]

Sir Kenelm Digby's Loose Fantasies – Sidney and Troy in romance autobiography.

Speaking of the genre of autobiography in his essay 'On Exercise and Practice' – as shown above, a major theme in the Mediterranean wanderings of Sidney's princes – Michel Montaigne postulates that '*[t]here is no description so hard, nor so profitable, as is the description of a mans owne life.* Yet must a man handsomely trimme vp, yea and dispose and range himselfe to appeare on the Theatre of this world'.[67] Montaigne's

[64] Weamys (1994), 119.
[65] Kinney, *Humanist Poetics* (Amherst, 1986), 54.
[66] Ibid., 165.
[67] Florio/Montaigne (1613), T3^{r}.

reference to the topos of *theatrum mundi* makes a convenient link between the Ortelian universe of *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* introduced in the opening section of this chapter and Sir Kenelm Dibgy's 1628 *Loose Fantasies*, a fictionalised narrative about his Mediterranean voyage exhibiting a tension between amorous and Trojanised romance similar to that in the continuations of and supplements to the *Arcadia*, which has been variously described as a *roman à clef*, a 'sentimentalized autobiography of a youth in which facts are freely distorted, real people are concealed behind romantic pseudonyms, and the author focuses on emotional development'[68] rather than on the minutiae of the voyage itself, and a dramatic performance rather than an accurate historical account.[69] In its multiple generic capacities, the *Loose Fantasies* testifies to Digby's acute alertness to and transformative reception of the elements of Trojanism absorbed, reworked, and popularised by Sidney's text.

The *Loose Fantasies* centres on Digby's (Theagenes's) intermittent love affair with Venetia Stanley (Stelliana), the character identifications being provided in the 'Key' prefixed to the text. Nearchus (Sir Edward Stanley), a Peloponnesian noble, retires with his family 'to a private and recollected life'[70]; 'their house in the country was near to that where Arete the mother of Theagenes lived ... which gave occasion of frequent interchanging visits between her and Stelliana's guardians ... the two children had part in the meeting'.[71] The children fall in love with each other immediately, but their families happen to fall out, and Theagenes is sent abroad by Arete, whereas Stelliana's father sends her to Morea (London), where she is impudently courted by Ursatius. Assisted by Faustina, Stelliana's nurse, Ursatius attempts to kidnap Stelliana.

---

[68] Delaney, *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1969), 123.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Digby, *Loose Fantasies* (Rome, 1968), 11.
[71] Ibid., 12.

She manages to escape from Ursatius's castle and travels alone under the cover of darkness. She is attacked by a hungry wolf, but is rescued by Mardontius, 'a young nobleman that lived not far from thence, having been abroad all night to harbour a stag in that wood'.[72] She is brought to the palace of Artesia, 'an old lady, famous for her virtue and zeal in religion',[73] where she meets Theagenes once again before his departure for Athens (Paris). In Athens, he is almost seduced by the Queen (Marie de' Medici), but eventually manages to escape spreading false rumours about his own death in a skirmish. The 'desolate tidings'[74] reach Stelliana, who, after a period of mourning, gradually begins to yield to Mardontius's courtship, and finally becomes betrothed. Yet the engagement only lasts until Stelliana finds out that Mardontius solicits the favour of 'a new rural beauty' 'with as much fervour as ever he had done his late mistress's'.[75] Meanwhile, Theagenes is invited to Alexandria (Madrid) by Aristobulus, who

> wisely considering that as the training up of youth in virtuous exercises of the mind and body is at the first mainly necessary, so to continue too long in such a school is a frustrating of the intent of it, and loss of that time which should be employed in the practice of such acquired knowledge and cunning; he therefore sent on purpose into Ionia to invite him to come to him into Alexandria, where he had plentiful means to put him in a way of benefiting himself, and making himself known in great actions ...[76]

On his way to Alexandria, Theagenes meets 'a Brachman of India',[77] with whom he discusses such matters as magic, alchemy, and philosophy. In Alexandria, Aristobulus arranges marriage 'between the King of Morea's son and the King of Egypt's sister',[78] but the plan is thwarted by Hephaestion (the Duke of Buckingham), and the Moreans

[72] Ibid., 29–30.
[73] Ibid., 30.
[74] Ibid., 59.
[75] Ibid., 68.
[76] Ibid., 73.
[77] Ibid., 74.
[78] Ibid., 94.

return home. Theagenes is reunited with Stelliana and finally marries her, although he desires to keep the marriage in secret for the time being. The climax of the narrative is Theagenes's speech addressed to his cousin Rogesilius in defence of his passion for Stelliana. In the concluding chapter, Theagenes 'resolved to undertake speedily something that might tend to the King's service, and gain himself honour and experience'[79] and begins a voyage to Alexandretta 'to interrupt the great trade of the Athenians in Syria and Egypt for silks and other commodities which those countries yield',[80] but the plan is delayed by a devastating disease killing some of the crew. When they arrive at Alexandretta, Theagenes delivers an inspiring speech, and the Moreans defeat the Athenian fleet, where the narrative breaks off abruptly.

Adopting and developing the Arcadian and Aenean ideal of rhetorically and militarily successful masculinity,[81] Digby carefully molds his own romance self into the embodiment of humanist virtue and eloquence. Ben Jonson, Digby's friend, the 'loose papers' whose *Discoveries* were owned by Digby,[82] postulates that

> Language most shows a man: speak, that I may see thee. It springs out of the most retired and inmost parts of us, and is the image of the parent of it, the mind. No glass renders a man's form or likeness so true as his speech. Nay, it is likened to a man; and as we consider feature and composition in a man, so words in language: in the greatness, aptness, sound, structure, and harmony of it. Some men are tall and big, so some language is high and great. Then the words are chosen, their sound ample, the composition full, the absolution plenteous and poured out, all grave, sinewy, and strong.[83]

[79] Ibid.: 161
[80] Ibid.: 167.
[81] See Vaught (2008), 118.
[82] H&S 8.558: 'Sir Kenelm Digby gathered up Jonson's loose papers and handed them over the publisher, just as he found them'; 'Further supporting evidence is the fact that Sir Kenelm Digby, who had custody of the pages of Discoveries before passing them to Thomas Walkley to print, spent some time living in and studying at Gresham College in the early 1630s' (retrieved from http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/works/discoveries/facing/)
[83] Ibid.

The means of linguistic self-presentation of a 'self in a strange land'[84] is what forms the substratum of Trojanism in Digby's autobiography.

Although the narrative does not follow either the Sidneian or any of the available matter-of-Troy models precisely or even closely, the framework within which its amorous and 'educational' plots unfold is both indubitably Sidneian and pronouncedly Trojan. Lady Venetia's transparent alias, Stelliana, obviously harks back to the female protagonist of Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, while the name Theagenes evokes a host of Trojan allusions. Joe Moshenska suggests that Digby's choice of his own pseudonym was inspired by his study of Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*, which he may have been reading immediately before commencing the *Loose Fantasies*.[85] Even if Digby's inspiration was as direct as Moshenska's *biographie romancée* portrays it, the Trojan implications of the pseudonym cannot be ignored. Perhaps most prominently, *Aethiopica*'s Theagenes traces his lineage back to Achilles himself. Towards the end of Book II of the *Aethiopica*, he arrives at Delphi and is preparing to honour his ancestor Pyrrhus with a sacrifice, and Cnemon and Calasiris discuss his genealogy:

> I marueiled how they beinge *Aenians,* did saie they came of *Achilles* bloude, because the *Egyptian* Poete *Homer* sayeth, that he was borne in *Phthia.* The yonge man, and the reste of the *Aenians,* saie plainely that he is their progenitoure, and that *Thetis* was maried to *Peleus* out of *Malia,* & that in olde time *Phthia* was there aboutes, and that who so euer beside them doo chalenge the noble man for his valiaunt actes, saie vntruely. For his parte, he proueth him selfe to be of *Achilles* bloude by an other reason: for that *Menesthius* his Grandfather, who was the Sonne of *Sperchius,* and *Polidora Peleus* daughter, which went with *Achilles* amonge the noble Captaines to *Troye,* and because he was his Kinsman, was one of the chiefest Captaines of the *Mirmidones.* And although he him selfe be very neare on euery side to *Achilles,* and ioyne him to the *Aenians,* yet he accoumpteth these funeralles to *Pirrhus,* for a moste assured proufe, whiche all the *Thessalians* (as he saith) haue graunted to them,

[84] See Helen Wilcox's 'Selves in Strange Lands. Autobiography and Exile in the Mid-Seventeenth Century' in *Early Modern Autobiography. Theories, Genres, Practices*, ed. Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, Philippa Kelly, 131–159.
[85] Moshenska, *A Stain in the Blood: The Remarkable Voyage of Sir Kenelm Digby* (London, 2016), 291.

bearinge them witnesse that they be the nexte of his bloude.[86]

Digby clearly inherited some of his Virgilian Trojanism through the *Aethiopica.* In addition to the Achillean subtext, the name also has – albeit less clearly discernible – Aenean connotations. Literally translated as 'goddess-born', it evokes one of Aeneas's epithets, *natus dea*. For example, in the first book of the *Aeneid* Dido, struck with Aeneas's story, begins her address to him with

> Quis te, nate dea, per tanta pericula casus
> insequitur?[87]
>
> What lot, o goddess-born, drives you through so many perils?

The dual framework of Trojan exemplarity, similar to that constructed in the eulogies for Sidney analysed in the first chapter, reflects Digby's preoccupation with the educational potential of the Eastern Mediterranean imbued with Trojan memories. Whereas the central line of the autobiographical narrative is amorous, the *Loose Fantasies* is equally concerned with other areas of gentlemanly instruction balancing and supporting the love story at the core of the autobiography. Digby may have recalled the relevant passage in the *Defence of Poesy* foregrounding Theagenes's faithfulness and Aeneas's all-round perfection:

> But let those things alone, and go to man—for whom as the other things are, so it seemeth in him her uttermost cunning is employed—and know whether she have brought forth so true a lover as Theagenes; so constant a friend as Pylades; so valiant a man as Orlando; so right a prince as Xenophon's Cyrus; so excellent a man every way as Virgil's Æneas?[88]

[86] Heliodorus (1569), B1$^{r–v}$.
[87] *Aeneid*, I.304–305.
[88] *Defence* (1595), C1^{r}.

In the wake of Lady Venetia's death, Digby appears to have developed a further subtle connection between the memory of Sidney and the love of his own wife. His rhetoric of nostalgia for Lady Venetia, whose death prompted significant revisions to the *Loose Fantasies* transforming it into a narrative of a providentially guided career,[89] bears a striking resemblance to his reverent references to Sidney, whose *Arcadia* largely inspired this encrypted autobiographical reflection. In a letter of 24 June 1633 addressed to his brother and written only a couple of months after Lady Venetia's untimely death, Digby calls her 'the Phoenix of this age ... for as in exactness of beauty and features, in goodlinesse of shape and person, and in gracefulnesse of behauiour, she exceeded y^{e} handsomest of her age, euen by their owne acknowledgement'.[90] Whereas Venetia was 'the phoenix of this age' and the paragon of womanhood, both in appearance and spiritual qualities, Sidney, 'the Phoenix of the age he lived in, and the glory of our nation, and the patterne to posterity of a complete, a gallant, and a perfect gentleman',[91] fulfilled a very similar function of a complete and perfect epitome of nobility in the bygone Elizabethan times – the times the Jacobean culture of the 1620s longed for and sought to revive.

Elaborating on this parallel even further, the *Loose Fantasies* is clothed in vaguely Trojan and distinctly Sidneian paratexts. The very situation of recounting the story of one's life after a furious storm is tinged, of course, with a recollection of Aeneas's wanderings. Like the *Aeneid* and the *Arcadia*, the *Loose Fantasies* begins

[89] See Jackson I. Cope's chapter in Hirst and Strier, eds. *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1999), 68.
[90] 'A New Digby Letter-Book: 'In Praise of Venetia' in *National Library of Wales Journal* (9, 1955), 144.
[91] Digby (1644), 3F3^{r}.

with a shipwreck. Dissenting from his sources, Digby makes it metaphorical by triggering the Neoplatonic 'grand tour' in the semi-imaginary Eastern Mediterranean,

> The sweetness of my contemplations have [sic!] so of a sudden plunged me into an immense ocean, that I can sail no longer in the weak bark of human capacity and reason; therefore all that I can do to save myself from shipwreck, will be to make haste back to the shore; where, betaking myself to an earlier task, I will set down in the best manner that I can, the beginning, progress, and consummation of that excellent love ...[92]

Digby's 'Postscript, or Advertisement to the Reader' clarifies, with feignedly realistic concision, the 'actual' circumstances that inclined him to compose the fictionalised narrative of his life and travel in deliberately Arcadian terms and in a frame purposely reminiscent of the Trojans' wanderings. The 'Postscript' echoes Sidney's letter to his sister prefixed to the Arcadia in a number of ways, most notably, in its deceptive definition of the nature of the work as an assembly of 'loose papers':

> If these loose papers should have the fortune to fall into any man's hands, to which they were never designed, I desire that this last scrawl may beg pardon for the rest ...[93]

The spiritual storm and shipwreck of the preface to the *Loose Fantasies* turn out to be more than just a hackneyed metaphor, as Digby unveils the prosaic story behind the idealised narrative:

> ... after a long and violent storm, which took me between Rhodes and Candia and separated from me all the vessels of my fleet, it was my misfortune to fall in with the island of Milo; where, while I stayed to mend the defects of a leaky ship and to expect the relics of the tempest's fury, I was courteously invited ashore by a person of quality of that place ... I passed my time there with much solitude, and my best entertainment was with my own thoughts. ... I deemed it both a good diversion for the present, and pains that would hereafter administer me much content, to set down in writing my wandering fantasies ... which I did suddenly in loose sheets of borrowed paper ...[94]

---

[92] Digby (1968), 7.
[93] Ibid., 171.
[94] Ibid., 171–3. Cf. *CPA*'s 'loose sheets of paper' (¶3^{v})

To strengthen the Arcadian link even more, the process of composition is compared to 'the weaving of this loose web'[95] (cf. Sidney's 'idle work ... , which I fear (like the spider's web) will be thought fitter to be swept away')[96], and the reader is warned against wasting their time 'in perusing so trivial a discourse of a young and unstayed head as this is'[97] (cf. Sidney's 'a young head is not so well stayed as I would it were (and shall be when God will) having many many fancies begotten in it'[98]).

However, reading Digby's self-portrayal in the *Loose Fantasies* as an interplay of vague intertextualities would be a faulty approach. E. W. Bligh, Digby's most significant 20th-century biographer, makes an important declaration of some relevance perhaps to most modern lives of early moderns – that he has 'desired to regard Digby not as a row of books, or as a subject for bibliography, but as a man'.[99] This desire could be ascribed to Digby himself: as will be demonstrated below, the most fictionalised of his autobiographical texts is deeply concerned with contemporary paradigms of male education constantly hearking back to his Trojan and Sidneian sources.

However straightforwadly the correspondences between the author and the protagonist of the *Loose Fantasies* may be interpreted,[100] it is doubtless that Digby, who was, in John Aubrey's words, 'the most accomplished cavalier of his time ... such a goodly handsome person, gigantique and great voice, and had so gracefull elocution and noble addresse, etc., that had he been drop't out of the clowdes in any part of the world, he would have made himselfe respected', would have chosen appropriate

[95] Ibid., 171.
[96] *CPA*: ¶3r.
[97] Digby (1968), 173.
[98] *CPA*. ¶3v.
[99] Bligh, E. W., *Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia* (London, 1932), viii.
[100] Gabrieli, xxiiiff

rhetorical strategies to present his romanticised self in his 'autobiography in the third person'.[101]

Recent studies of early modern autobiography, such as Adam Smyth's 2010 *Autobiography in Early Modern England*, have highlighted the dependence of this genre on other forms of portraying one's self[102]: commonplace books, journals, letters, or almanacs. Michael Mascuch's claim that 'narrative prose autobiography began, at least at the popular level, quite recently, with the advent of the diary and related forms of recording first-person discourse in writing'[103] is of particular relevance to Digby, who chronicled parts of his Mediterranean buccaneering voyage in three different narrative codes: as a journal, a letter, and a romance. The multiplicity of Digby's modes of self-representation and their contigency on the social status and intended audience of the texts allow one to isolate the fictional constituent of his self-image and to trace its literary – in this case, Sidneian and Trojan – genealogies with greater precision than a reconstruction of his life event based solely on the romance dimension of this triple portrayal could afford. The journal entry of 10 June presents Digby as a man of action fully immersed in preparations for the battle, sparing of words and prompt and prudent in his carefully planned strategic moves:

> The 10th day [of June] ... I hung out a flag of councell, and consulted with all my captaines and masters what was fitt to be done, and made the

[101] See Lejeune, 'Autobiography in the Third Person' in *New Literary History* 9.1 (Autumn 1977), 27–50.

[102] See also Stuart Sherman in *Cambridge History of English Literature* ('Diary and Autobiography', 649–672) states that 'Diary and autobiography are often reckoned as representing opposite ends of the self-writing spectrum, as acts fundamentally distinguished by their oper- ation over time. The diarist, in this opposition, deals in small, serial durations, and works more or less (in Samuel Richardson's famous phrase) 'to the moment', writing up recent events in regular or irregular instalments, one of whose chief characteristics is an ignorance of the instalments that will ensue. The autobiographer works with less ignorance and larger retrospect, recording his or her life perhaps from the moment of its inception to the present moment of composition ... ' (654).

[103] Mascuch, *Origins of the Individualist Self* (Cambridge, 1997), 19.

> exactest preparations I could for a fight, and to fire powerfull enemies ... The 11. in the forenoone my boat came backe to me, who brought me certaine newes that in the roade were 4 French vessels ... that withall there were 2 English shippes, 2 Venice galliegrosses, and 2 of their galliones. I stood in with the roade as fast as I could, but before, hauing first made a short speech to encourage my men, I sent my sattia with letters to the Venetian Generall and the English Captaines ...[104]

The second level of literary mediation – a letter intended for publication together with the articles of the piece agreement following the Siege of La Rochelle – replicates the journal entry virtually word for word, however, it also adds a more elaborate rhetorical component subtly underscoring Digby's oratorical talent through the emotional response of the crew to his (still omitted) speech:

> The tenth of *Iune* 1628. we lay at Hull all night in sight of Cape *Congier* ... The next morning [the boat] brought vs word that there were at Ancor there two Venetian Galleazzes, two of their Galleons, two English ships and foure French vessells. We then ... had fitted our selues in most ample manner, both for offence, defence, and freeing of vessels if we should be hard set, the name of Gallegrezes was a formidable thing, but after a short speech made to our men, they expressed much desire to aduenture in ... neuer men behaued themselues more brauely.[105]

The common denominator in these two related passages presenting the preparations for the battle from two slightly different viewpoints is Digby's ability to inspire his sailors with a terse yet convincing speech, however, depending on the functionality and the supposed audience of both texts, the emphasis shifts from an impartial record of actions in the *Journal* to the psychological sketch in ''*A Letter written from abord the Admirall of Sir* Kenelme Digbie': whereas nothing is said about the efficiency of Digby's words of encouragement in the journal entry, '*A Letter*' demonstrates more consideration not

[104] Digby (1868), 38.
[105] *Articles of agreement made betweene the French King and those of Rochell...* (1628), B2^{v}.

for the intention ('speech to encourage my men') but for the immediate effect of his address to the sailors.

The final short chapter of the *Loose Fantasies* contains an even more processed account of the same central event in Digby's career, this time foreshadowed and supported by two rhetorical triumphs. Like Sidney's princes, Pyrocles and Musidorus, Theagenes 'resolved to undertake speedily something that might tend to the King's service, and gain himself honour and experience'.[106] The only obstacle in his way to honour and experience was Stelliana's reluctance to let him go. The farewell scene between Theagenes and Stelliana is closely modelled on the two classical precedents – the Hector and Andromache episode in the Iliad and the Dido and Aeneas scene in Book IV of the *Aeneid* and echoes the plangent epistles of Ovid's heroides.

> Is it possible that the day can come wherein my sight doth offend your eyes, or that you should find such amiableness in dangers and tempests, as for the gaining of them to hate my presence? What sin have I committed to alienate me from your affection, or rather, what have I not done to win and preserve it? O my unhappy condition, and beyond all others most miserable, that dependeth upon the inconstancy and mutability of others' minds, which, as it changeth, I am still engaged in new causes of deep sorrow! If not for my sake, yet let this innocent part of you persuade you not to leave him a distressed orphan, and me a desolate widow, to lament your long, or peradventure perpetual absence.[107]

Theagenes's Aenean ability to subjugate his sentiment entirely to his vocation and the workings of fate becomes fully evident in his ability to resist the tearful eloquence of Stelliana's monologue and to conquer her rhetorically in a speech of intransigent consolation, '[u]pon which discourse of his, although Stelliana could not suddenly wean her heart from the sense of passionate grief, yet her discretion taught her to

[106] Digby (1968), 161.
[107] Ibid., 162.

contain the expression of it, and ... shewed how her will depended wholly upon his'.[108] Theagenes's second, this time material, victory in the concluding chapter is also associated with rhetorical skill: the short speech touched upon in the two less mediated accounts of the battle of Scanderoon almost becomes – at least in terms of the extent and specificity of emotional nuancing – the central event of the narrative, whereas the description of the battle shrinks into a dry paragraph merely recording the victory:

> But Theagenes, that though valiant deeds would be the best answer to their vain words, and that, doubting such entertainments, had made exact preparations for the fight, as one that deemed caution with valour to be the first step to victory; calling his chief men together, made an oration to them, such a one as the shortness of the time permitted, calling to their minds their past victories that they had gloriously obtained together, and how they had been absolute lords of the sea ...[109]

The indirect retelling of the vigorous speech continues well beyond the quotation cited here, yet Digby's key point – that the oration was short and concentrated – survives from the less fictionalised accounts, quite similar to Aeneas's 'tandem pauca refert' ('yet he replies tersely') in Book IV of the *Aeneid*, where the purportedly concise response to grief-stricken Dido grows into a soliloquy almost as lengthy as hers.[110]

Digby's self-portrayal as a Trojan hero[111] in an Arcadian frame gives rise to a tension between two concepts of heroic behaviour and elite education. As noted above, Pyrocles and Musidorus depart from the Virgilian idea – or ideal – of resignation to one's fate and become masters of their own adventures actively seeking pretexts to perform valorous deeds rather than stumbling upon opportunities to demonstrate their

---

[108] Ibid., 163.
[109] Ibid., 168.
[110] IV.331–361.
[111] Martin, M., *Literature and the Encounter with God in Post-Reformation England* (Ashgate, 2014), 93.

courage and strategic thinking. In this respect, Digby rather appears to conform to the providential framework of historical thinking[112] in that he recognises Fortune's unpredictable workings behind the seemingly random events described on the 'loose sheets'. Virtuous action – the foremost concern of Sidney's princes – migrates into the realm of emotions: using Montaigne's phrase, Digby 'trims up' the story of his own life so that the evolution of sentiment becomes no less, or even more important than the perilous grand tour around the Ionian Sea. Francis Bacon remarked in his essay 'Of Trauaile' that '[i]t is a strange Thing, that in Sea voyages, where there is nothing to be seene, but Sky and Sea, Men should make Diaries'[113] – yet Digby's almost unshifting focus on the internal is precisely what draws him into the composition of an autobiographical narrative in so uneventful a setting. Love itself becomes heroic action, as Theagenes puts it in his speech of defence addressed to Rogesilius:

> ... the love of a virtuous soul, dwelling in a fair and perfect body, is the noblest and worthiest action that a man is master of; it exerciseth in due manner that superior talent that God and nature hath given him ... [114]

On the contrary, external actions, however valiant, are directed by powers beyond the control of the perfect Aeneas-like protagonist. While Theagenes can surely be said to be master of his heart, his encounters with Providence, the constant of early modern autobiographical worldview,[115] are often frustratingly clumsy. To highlight this tension, Digby frequently inserts rhetorical interjections or asides, such as 'how unsearchable is the Providence of heaven!'[116] or 'the just heaven, whose judgements

[112] Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), 12
[113] Bacon (1625), O2^{v}–O3^{r}.
[114] Digby (1968), 131–2.
[115] Bedford and Kelly, eds., *Early Modern English Lives* (Ashgate, 2007), 2–3.
[116] Digby (1968), 29.

are inscrutable, had ordained a happier end to these noble lovers'.[117] The central paradox of the narrative is that if there is anything in it that is 'loose', it is not Theagenes's fantasies (which are supported by sound and clear Neoplatonic rhetoric), but his bewildering encounters with the real world. He knows himself well enough, and yet 'the fortunes of Theagenes did mingle themselves with, and had a part in the actions of great princes, and, but that they were guided by a secret working of Divine Providence, did run in such a way as none could have expected'.[118]

As this reading of close and distant imitations of Sidney's *Arcadia* has demonstrated, emulating also meant seeking comfort in reduced responsibility and moral unequivocalness. Sidney's princes trailblazed the Eastern Mediterranean on their grand tour of emotional education and military exploits. Their choice to put classical learning into practice and their rebellious resignation to fate contrasted by individual acts of defiance begin as a parallel and develop as a radical transformation of the Aenean model of learning *in actione*. A literary imitation that decides, half way through, to break away from its source text, means that its characters also choose to direct their fictional lives in new ways, thus willing to teach their own imitators to be transformative readers. In the princes' carefully fashioned biographies, Troy ceases to be a locus of archeological recovery and becomes one of dauntless *dis*covery: interactions with classical models prove more productive outside the royal classroom. However, for his followers Sidney himself became synonymous with a classical past: they may (or may not) have been creative in their reinterpretation of him, but because it took much courage to confront *The Arcadia* with its complicated providentiality, little post-Aenean courage was left not to lose sight of its Trojan and romance origins and to

[117] Ibid., 67.
[118] ibid., 68–9.

grasp the same variety of ideas about Trojanised princely fashioning that Sidney would have had in front of him when planning the princes' Mediterranean tour.

Chapter 3.

'Sights to make an Alexander': Trojan Tragedies on Stage and Page

Previously focused on intertextual connections of varying degrees of ascertainability, the discussion of Trojan and Sidneian *mythopoeia* has now arrived at a subject allowing for fewer speculations about direct influences – the dramatic Troy and its interaction with Sidney's texts and those of his followers and imitators. The popularity and heterogeneity of the matter of Troy, or even more broadly, Trojan motifs, such as familial grief or aristocratic education in action, not exclusively associated with *translatio imperii* leading up to the matters of Britain and London, in non-dramatic genres, and the historically un- or, perhaps, mis-representative critical focus on the Trojan components of Shakespeare's plays,[1] have resulted in one assumption that seems to underlie any discussion of dramatic Trojanism. It is readily supposed that the Troy legend onstage covered – with equal liberality and diversity[2] – the same array of political, amorous, epideictic, historical, and philosophical topics and functions as did real pamphlets, elegies, rhetorical treatises, ballads, and histories of all natures that made some use of Troy in the second half of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries. However, a simple flicking through Martin Wiggins's *British*

[1] These include both the obvious *Troilus and Cressida* and the Roman and British plays, such as *Titus Andronicus*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, and *Cymbeline.* See primarily Heather James's 1997 *Shakespeare's Troy* thoroughly analysing them as complexly allusive reinterpretations of the *Aeneid* and the mediaeval body of Trojan texts.
[2] James (1997), 15.

Drama, the catalogue of all extant and lost (but attested to in official records, diaries, autobiographies, or polemical writings) plays, pageants, masques, and other dramatic performances, disproves this assumption with almost shocking, or at least uncomfortable counterintuitiveness. Plays on Trojan subjects constitute a minority among histories of British kings, Asian tyrants, or biblical patriarchs, not to mention the numerous non-historical genres, such as pastorals or comedies, and the scope of Trojan motifs covered in these plays between the 1530s and 1630s surprises one with its narrow selectiveness. However, in an intertextual or inter-motif reading, this scantiness of material and its thematic narrowness may prove a helpful limitation: comparing isolated instances of Trojanism is technically more achievable than reading two whole Troys alongside one another.

Since dramatic Sidneio-Trojan intertextuality, both due to the limited number of plays at hand and the nature of dramatic allusions, largely escapes the more positivist approach adopted in the previous two chapters, this study is divided into two contrasted parts. The first part, a reading of Thomas Heywood's *The Iron Age*, a semi-forgotten (albeit a highly successful) dramatic version of the Trojan myth, portrays a Trojanised fashioning of an early modern dramatic career *without* Sidney. The second part examines Jasper Fisher's *Fuimus Troes*, a play with numerous Sidneian echoes, to demonstrate how Sidney's textual memory was capable of modifying dramatic Trojanism. Less associated with Sidney's literary heritage than elegies and educational romances, Trojan drama clearly had a rich potential for co-adapting the *Arcadia* and classical and mediaeval Troys in ways not always available to other genres. Its frequent reluctance to do so may be indicative of certain formal limitations of this co-reception. This chapter will attempt to identify the aspects of the Trojan and Sidneian myths that were viewed as mutually incompatible.

Plays and companies.

Prior to focusing on *The Iron Age* and *Fuimus Troes*, it is essential to provide an outline of early modern dramatic Trojanism, the shapes it assumed, and the manifestations of the matter of Troy that captivated Tudor and Stuart dramatists. In his essay on Shakespeare and Virgil, Charles Martindale mentions that '[t]he main focus of Shakespeare's interest in Virgil was the three episodes from the *Aeneid*, the tragedy of Dido, the sack of Troy, and Aeneas' visit to the Underworld' and cautiously suggests that '[w]hether Shakespeare read the second half of the poem, either in Latin or in the translation of Phaer and Twyne (1584), cannot be proved, though it is likely enough'.[3] The careful and suspicious tone of discussing Shakespeare's learning in the ancient languages is, one may be certain, derived from Jonson's pronouncement about 'small Latin and less Greek', but in terms of Trojan allusions Shakespeare's Virgilian interests and preferences are extraordinarily typical of the dramatic culture, add or take a few decades, to which he belonged.

Among several thousand plays performed between 1533 and 1623, Wiggins registers fewer than thirty explicitly Trojan texts. Some of them are translations of adaptations closely modelled on the original, such as John Studley's 1566 version of Seneca's *Agamemnon*, Jasper Heywood's translation of, again, Seneca's *Troas* (printed in 1559), or Sophocles's *Ajax Flagellifer* performed in 1564 at the King's College Chapel, Cambridge. The Senecan moment in Tudor and early Stuart drama, both in translations and original texts deserves a separate study,[4] and its multifarious

[3] Charles Martindale (ed.), *Shakespeare and the Classics* (Cambridge, 2004), 89.
[4] For discussions of Seneca in English drama, see, for example, Miola's *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford, 1992); E. M. Simpson's 1912 *The*

implications range far beyond the thematic horizon of this chapter, however, it is worthwhile to mention it as a side note to the discussion of Thomas Heywood's play below because it was, to an extent that is difficult to overestimate, Newton's 1581 edition of a collective translation of Seneca's *Tenne Tragedies* that established a firm connection between Trojan gore and ghosts and the tragic in later drama via the figure of the Roman author himself. One is used to aligning *Gorboduc*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Hamlet* along the clear Thyestan bloodline of violence and liminal encounters of human morals and the afterworld, but the genetic link between English tragedy and Seneca also affects the structural properties of the text and ties in with broader issues of *imitatio* and *emulatio*, as Eliot remarks in his introduction to the reprint edition of the *Tenne Tragedies*:

> [T]here can be little doubt that [Heywood's] translations indicate a nascent interest in a new vernacular drama to vie with classical drama, and that they in turn stimulated the beginning of this drama. At the same busy moment took place another event of capital importance, which combined with this Senecan work to produce English tragedy. In 1557 came the publication of Surrey's translation of Book II. of the *Aeneid*, in the new 'blank verse' ... without which the Elizabethan drama would have been impossible.[5]

Seneca impersonates the same prototypical emotional and stylistic polymorphism that was frequently looked for in the Trojan myth, and the imitation of his plays is akin to Trojan imitation to such a degree that the amalgamation of these two *imitatio* patterns in Elizabethan and early Stuart drama, including Thomas Heywood, can hardly be separated. Their indivisibility and, simultaneously, the tension between them was a

---

Elizabethan Translations of Seneca's Tragedies; L. Woodbridge's 'Resistance Theory Meets Drama: Tudor Seneca' in *Renaissance Drama 38* (2010), 115–139; B. Arkins's 'Heavy Seneca: His Influence on Shakespeare's Tragedies' in *Classics Ireland 2* (1995), 1–16; Pincombe's chapter 'Tragic Inspiration in Jasper Heywood's Translation of Seneca's *Thyestes*: Melpomene or Megaera?' in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama* (531–546).

[5] Newton, ed., and Eliot (n/d), xlvi–xlvii.

phenomenon that largely predetermined the development of isolated Trojan motifs in drama in the last decade of the sixteenth and the first decade of the seventeenth centuries, but it was reflected upon already by Seneca's early translators. Thus, Jasper Heywood, in his 'Argument' prefacing *Troas*, remarks with bloodthirsty regret at the fact that his translator's duty binds him to be faithful to the original that

> ... as for me I naught therof[6] endight,
> Myne Author hath not all that story pend:
> My pen his wordes in English must resight,
> Of latest woes that fell on Troy at end,
> What finall fates the cruell God could send.
> ...
> Not I with spere who pearced was in fielde,
> Whose throate there cutte, or head ycorued was
> Ne bloudshed blowes, that rent both targe and shield
> Shal I resight, all that I ouerpasse.
> The worke I wryght more woeful is alas,
> For I the mothers teares must here complayne,
> And bloud of babes, that giltles haue bene slayne.[7]

Senecan and Trojan translations set a framework for what would later become of the matter of Troy in drama, however, a number of texts transcended the Senecan genre boundary. Very few of the original plays deal with unique subjects, for example, the story of Penelope's wooers (a 1608 masque performed at St John's, Oxford), or Brutus's travels and eventual founding of the New Troy, later to become London, in Henry Chettle's and John Day's phantasmagorical *The Conquest of Brutus* (1598).[8] By far the most popular plot choices, however, are the amorous, women-centred novellas

---

[6] Of the heroic events described in Dares Phrygius, Homer, and Virgil (in this hierarchical order).

[7] Newton, ed. (1581), O2^{v}–O3^{r}.

[8] Wiggins, vol. IV (2014), 'While hunting, Brutus accidentally shoots and kills his father Silvius, and is banished from Italy. He travels to Greece, where he frees the Trojans enslaved after the Trojan war, and fights the local king, Padrastus. ... A statue of Diana directs Brutus in a dream to found a new Troy in the island of Albion. On the way, he lands in Gaul and makes war on a the local ruler, Goffarius, and achieves victory ... They land on Albion at Totnes, and find the island overrun with giants, including Gogmagog ... Having conquered the island, Brutus renames it Britain and found the city of New Troy' (79).

of Dido and Aeneas and Troilus and Cressida. The Dido story comes into vogue already in the 1560s with *Aeneas and Queen Dido* by William Crofton and William Man (1563?) and *Dido* by Edward Halliwell (1564, King's College Chapel, Cambridge), remains widely enjoyed both by educated university audiences and on London stage throughout the 1580s and 1590s (the Latin tragedy of *Dido* by William Gager staged in 1583 at Christ Church and attended by several illustrious characters including Sidney and Giordano Bruno[9]; *Dido Queen of Carthage* by Marlowe and Nashe performed by the Children of the Chapel Royal in 1584 or 1588; *Dido and Aeneas* first performed in January 1598 by the Admiral's men), and appears to remain a much beloved subject well into the next century as is evidenced by the 1607 *Tragedy of Aeneas and Dido* perhaps staged at a banquet at Arundel house. The Cressida story makes an appearance even earlier with Nicholas Grimald's 1550(?) *Troilus* and is attested to even outside the more habitual theatrical environments, namely, in Wales, where Humphrey Llwyd's(?) *Troilus and Cressid* was staged in 1565.

With the self-evident statistical limitations (the fewer-than-thirty texts, many of them known only through brief retellings or hypothetical reconstructions and scattered over a period of some seventy-five years form a database insufficient to draw any definitive or clearly shaped conclusions in the manner of Franco Moretti's 'Reflections on 7,000 titles'[10]), one can also arrange these plays, however loosely, in three chronological clusters corresponding to the resurgences of interest in Trojanism some of which have been already discussed in the previous chapters: the early Elizabethan (1550s–1560s) attempts to construct a new national identity through translation and

[9] For more details on Sidney, Bruno, and theatrical attendance, see H. Gatti's 1989 *The Renaissance Drama of Knowledge*; J. Bossy's 1991 *Giordano Bruno and the Embassy Affair*, and John Dee's *Diary*, ed. Halliwell-Phillips (1842), entry for 15 June 1583.
[10] F. Moretti, *Distant Reading* (London, 2013).

imitation, the late Elizabethan (late 1580s – 1600) attempts to redefine and cement it, and the Jacobean reconstruction of a classicised national mythology (around and after 1612). For a reading of the parallel reception of Sidney and the Troy legend, the first Elizabethan cluster is pre-history, but the latter two can be mapped neatly onto the development of the post-Sidneian myth and its rediscovery and revival in the wake of Prince Henry's death as described the Chapter One.

Thomas Heywood and Troy

For many of the authors listed above writing about Troy may have been accidental. As this thesis deals with the ways in which Trojanism defined the construction of literary careers in the post-Sidneian world, now is good time to zoom in on Thomas Heywood, an author for whom Troy was indeed a career-shaping choice and a life-long engagement. His example will elucidate the reasons and effects of choosing theatrical Trojanism as a subject and pave a path to a broader discussion of how Sidney and those writing after him interacted with it. Heywood was probably the most eloquently and productively Trojan linking figure between the two chronological clusters outlined above, active in creating and, later, summarising the two pivotal revivals of the Troy legend during the decades between 1590 and the 1630s. His *Iron Age*, an all-encompassing and, one may at times feel, overcrowded dramatisation of the fateful events from the rape of Helen to an abridged and concentrated Oresteia will be the main focus of the first half of the chapter.

Since *The Iron Age* and its author lurk in the dusky background of early modern theatrical history, some prefatory facts are necessary. Heywood's literary reputation, as well as the reputation of his play cycle *The Ages*, has been somewhat ambiguous – that

of a prominent, but *typical* playwright, the average poetic voice of his time frequently yet weakly heard in introductions to Shakespeare or broad contextual histories of the London stage. Charles Lamb, for example, defines his character with a characteristic mixture of disparagement (in comparison to better dramatists) and praise (out of the romantic antiquarianism) as 'a sort of *prose* Shakespeare' whose 'scenes are to the full as natural and affecting' but in whom 'we miss *the Poet*',[11] and even the most recent monographs on Heywood, such as Richard Rowland's *Thomas Heywood's Theatre: 1599–1639. Locations, Translations, and Conflict*, calling for a reassessment of the dramatist's seminal role in the development of the London stage in the same vein as Thomas Middleton's dramatic, in both senses, influence has been recently re-evaluated with the publication of the 2010 *Collected Works* (general eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino), overlook the *Ages* tetralogy despite their acknowledgment that Heywood's plays are

> rewarding and complex pieces; all of them contain remarkable tonal shifts ... [W]e see Heywood reading late mediaeval and mid Tudor history with the same level of concentration he brought to his excavation of Livy, but overlaying his narratives of the past with an unprecedentedly detailed evocation of a material London ... [W]e see ... Heywood turning to ancient Rome in order to pose disturbing (and interrelated) questions concerning gender, servitude, class, and political and moral responsibility. ... even in the Pageants ... we find him exploiting his formidable erudition, often mischievously, to address the increasingly urgent concerns of his fellow citizens ...[12]

All this could well apply to the *Ages*, especially to the *Iron Age*, which Heywood had published in 1632 – twenty years after its success – and which he apparently intended to transform into an erudite volume 'securing [his] position as a major playwright'[13] by offering his erstwhile popular texts 'as anachronisms within the context of current

[11] *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets Who Lived About the Time of Shakespeare* (1808), 112.
[12] R. Rowland (2010), 16–17.
[13] D. Bergerson, *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570–1640* (Ashgate, 2006), 174.

theatrical fashions'[14] festooned with footnotes and commentaries that would have made the difficult text accessible to the less learned, as he suggested in his preface to the second part of *The Iron Age*:

> If the three former Ages (now out of Print,) bee added to these (as I am promised) to make vp an handsome Volumne; I purpose *(Deo Assistente,)* to illustrate the whole Worke, with an Explanation of all he difficulties, and an Historicall Comment of euery hard name, which may appeare obscure or intricate to such as are not frequent in Poetry.[15]

Heywood, who died in 1641, never produced such a volume, and his relative failure to establish himself as an important dramatic author in print has led to *The Ages* slipping into partial oblivion or at least to their inability to gain any substantial academic currency beyond the early twentieth-century exhumations of obscure early modern texts only so that they be discussed in cursory biographies or reprinted in no less obscure editions, such as Arlene Weiner's 1979 edition of *The Iron Age*. As a result, the *Iron Age* has often been read by a vast majority of critics as an intermediate compilation of sources, mainly Chaucer and the Lefèvre/Caxton romance *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, with some Ovid and Lydgate, shedding intertextual light on Heywood's own better-known *Troia Britannica* and, of course, Shakespeare. For instance, Tatlock claims that '[t]he young Heywood ... chose the ever popular Troy-story' which proved so successful 'that it not only ran for years ... but inspired him to hope for and win popularity for three plays dealing with the earlier parts of the same body of tradition ... a striking sign of the vogue of the story which Shakespeare was to use very little later',[16] and the commentators of the Arden edition of *Troilus and*

[14] D. A. Brooks, *From Playhouse to Printing House: Drama and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006), 199.
[15] Heywood (1632), A4$^{r–v}$.
[16] Tatlock (1915), 725–726.

Cressida remark that 'the resemblances and differences of the two plays give some insight into the seeming vogue of plays on the subject around 1596–1601 and afterwards, and into varying strategies of dramatization on the public stage of classical Greek sources'.[17] All such readings seem to employ *The Iron Age* as a critical instrument rather than an independent work, whereas a more focused examination of its text could in fact lead to a deeper understanding of Trojanism and its valencies and implications in the drama of the period.

The publication of the bipartite *Iron Age* in 1632 was a long-delayed literary event: the play itself was completed, presumably, around 1612, but Heywood's interest in the matter of Troy is very likely to have been sparked even earlier, namely, in the second half of the 1590s, possibly even between 1594 and 1600 or 1601, during his work for and with the Admiral's men as an actor and author.[18] The company was largely responsible for the increasing interest in the Trojan legend in the last decade of the sixteenth century – perhaps, as Andrew Gurr suggests, due to its rivalry with its 'opposites', Shakespeare's company, and, consequently, the necessity to be more inventive and catering to the popular taste at the same time.[19] As early as June 1596, Henslowe recorded performance by the Admiral's men of a play called *Troy* which was, it appears, almost as popular as the exotic *Tamar Cham*[20] – supposedly an imitation of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* which became somewhat proverbial in its turn as is evidenced by Simon Eyre's phrase in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*: 'Every hair, I assure thy Majesty, that sticks in this beard Sim Eyre values at the King of Babylon's ransom. Tamar Cham's beard was a rubbing-brush to't'.[21] A play about

[17] Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington (Oxford, 2015), 429.
[18] See F. G. Fleay (London, 1891), i.281.
[19] A. Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574–1642* (Cambridge, 2009), 36.
[20] *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. Foakes (2002), 47–48.
[21] Fleay (1891), i.284–285.

Hercules, a prequel to the Trojan cycle explored by Heywood himself in the *Ages*, had been staged in 1595, and a sequence of now-lost Trojan plays – *Dido and Aeneas*, *The Conquest of Brute*, and *Troy's Revenge*[22] by Chettle followed in 1598 and 1599.[23] Some scholars, for example, Fleay, have even been convinced that the 1596 *Troy* was Heywood's own proto-version of *The Iron Age*,[24] however, others[25] have proven rather conclusively that that could not have been the case since *The Ages* were based on *Troia Britannica* which was almost certainly composed towards the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century, likely after 1607, when Caxton's translation of Lefèvre was republished. Nevertheless, Heywood's work with the Admiral's men and his residence in the vicinity of the Rose throughout the 1590s[26] make it very possible that he was familiar with the new vogue for Trojan themes revived at that theatre – moreover, potentially being one of the actors in those plays,[27] he would have known the texts thoroughly enough to recall them some fifteen years later when composing *The Ages*. It is therefore beyond all doubt that the first Trojan impulse in Heywood's literary and dramatic career can be safely attributed to this period.

Heywood's migration to the Earl of Worcester's men around 1601 coincided with a considerable decline of interest in dramatic Trojanism. The only Trojan play from the first decade of the century Heywood could have seen was *Troilus and Cressida*, as numerous readings of *The Iron Age* against Shakespeare, most prominently Tatlock's, have shown, however, even that cannot be fully ascertained on the basis of any non-intertextual evidence since the performance history of the tragedy is enveloped

[22] According to Wiggins, vol. 4 (2014), 142, the play recounts the story of Ulysses's landing on the island of Polyphemus and, possibly, his subsequent adventures.
[23] See Teramura, 'Brute Parts: From Troy to Britain at the Rose, 1595–1600' in *Lost Plays in Shakespeare's England*, ed. McInnis and Steggle (Palgrave, 2014), 127ff.
[24] Fleay (1891), i.284–285.
[25] E.g. A. M. Clark in *Thomas Heywood, Playwright and Miscellanist* (Oxford, 1931), 63ff.
[26] Ibid., 57.
[27] E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), iii.338.

in obscurity. One of the versions of the 1609 quarto opens with a prefatory address to the reader describing the play as 'neuer stal'd with the Stage, and neuer clapper-clawd with the palmes of the vulger',[28] yet most critics concur that *Troilus* was either performed at the Globe and then taken to court or to the Inns of Court,[29] which makes Heywood's familiarity with its text all the more probable. The second dramatic source of tragic Trojanism from around 1600s could have been *Hamlet* II.ii[30] where the First Player readily continues another 'never acted' speech begun impromptu by Hamlet himself – 'Aeneas's tale to Dido' containing the story of 'Priam's slaughter' by Pyrrhus – which would later form the essence of *II Iron Age* Act 3. Indeed, the verbal parallels between '[t]he rugged Pyrrhus, he whose sable arms, / Black as his purpose, did the night resemble' and 'senseless Ilium, / Seeming to feel this blow, with flaming top / Stoops to his base, and with a hideous crash / Takes prisoner Pyrrhus' ear',[31] on the one hand, and Pyrrhus's own confession in Heywood, on the other, may be close enough to suggest a distant intertextual dialogue rather than a coincidental overlap in elaborating the same classical theme:

> My acts shall speake my name,
> I am that *Pyrhus* who did mount you Horse
> Hyding mine armour in his deepe vast bulke,
> The first that lept out of his spacious side,
> And tost consuming fire in euery street,
> Which climb'd, as if it meant to meete the stars,
> I am that *Pyrhus* before whom *Troy* falls:
> Before whom all the Vanes and Pinacles
> Bend their high tops, and from the battlements
> On which they stand, breake their aspiring necks.
> The proudest roofe and most imperious spyre
> Hath vaild to vs and our all wasting fire.[32]

---

[28] Shakespeare (1609), ¶2^{r}.
[29] See, for example, Th. J. King, *Casting Shakespeare's Plays* (Cambridge, 1992), 89–90, or N. Coghill, *Shakespeare's Professional Skills* (Cambridge, 1964), 78–95 for a more detailed discussion of the performance history.
[30] The date of Hamlet is also questionable. Duncan-Jones in *Shakespeare: An Ungentle Life* (London, 2001): 143–9 suggests 1600, other estimates vary from 1599 to 1602.
[31] Shakespeare (1623), 264.
[32] Heywood (1632), F1^{v}–F2^{r}.

Additionally, a non-dramatic Shakespearean source from an earlier date could have contributed to Heywood's reflections on the matter of Troy during the relatively de-Trojanised period in his career from 1600 to 1607 – namely, *The Rape of Lucrece* originally published in 1594 but reprinted several times due to its enormous popularity in 1598, twice in 1600, and in 1607. There is no doubt that Heywood was familiar with it because he published a close imitation of it, *Oenone and Paris*, in 1594, almost immediately after it first appeared, and that he never lost sight of it until 1607 or 1608,[33] when he reworked the story for *Troia Britannica*, and perhaps until 1612, when his clearly related *Heroides*-style correspondence between Paris and Helen was printed together with Shakespeare's *Passionate Pilgrim* and when he, once again, returned to Oenone's story in a subplot of *II Iron Age*. The lengthy Trojan ekphrasis in *Lucrece* would reverberate[34] through both *Iron Ages* in the stories of Ajax and Ulysses, Nestor, 'many Trojan mothers', Priam, Hecuba, and Sinon – all 'Troy's painted woes'.[35]

In contrast to the scarcity of important Trojan texts Heywood would have been working with actively during the first years of the century, the late 1600s and early 1610s were a period of his intense reflections both on the matter of Troy and its theatrical representations. His 1612 *Apology for Actors*[36] printed by the very same Nicholas Okes,[37] who also printed both parts of the *Iron Age* twenty years later, is pervaded with elaborate Trojan imagery all striving to prove one crucial point: that dramatic imitations of the matter of Troy are imitations, in the Aristotelian sense, *par*

[33] See J. Q. Adams's edition of *Oenone and Paris* (1943), xxxiv–xxxvii.
[34] Cf. A. Holaday, 'Heywood's *Troia Britannica* and *The Ages*' in *JEPG* XLV (1946), 430.
[35] Shakespeare (1594), K4^{v}.
[36] See, however, Clark (1931), 68–9, who agrees with Chambers that the *Apology* may have been drafted earlier, in 1607 or 1608.
[37] For a more detailed discussion of Okes's activities and especially collaboration with playwrights, see P. W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of King Lear and Their Origins*, vol. I: *Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto* (Cambridge, 1982).

excellence, and that the very idea of imitation and dramatisation by later generations lies at the heart of the Trojan history in its Homeric form – in fact, theatres themselves, and, by implication, the notion of theatricality and the staging of historical events, according to Heywood's witty citation of an anachronistic passage in the *Aeneid*, appeared simultaneously with the destruction of Troy as its less evident cultural legacy.[38] Thus, he recalls the education of Alexander the Great which importantly involved dramatic re-enactments of Homer contributing to the formation of a truly princely character capable of conquering the entire *oecumene*:

> *Aristotle* that Prince of Philosophers, whose bookes carry such credit, euen in these our our vniuersities, that to say *Ipse dixit* is a sufficient *Axioma,* hee hauing the tuition of young *Alexander,* caused the destruction of Troy to be acted before his pupill, in which the valor of *Achilles* was so naturally exprest, that it imprest the hart of *Alexander,* in so much that all his succeeding actions were meerly shaped after that patterne, and it may be imagined had *Achilles* neuer liued, *Alexander* had neuer conquered the whole world. ... A Description is only a shadow receiued by the eare but not perceiued by the eye: so liuely portrature is meerely a forme seene by the eye ... but to see a souldier shap'd like a souldier, walke, speake, act like a souldier: to see a *Hector* all besmered in blood, trampling vpon the bulkes of Kinges. A *Troylus* returning from the field in the sight of his father *Priam* as if man and horse euen from the steeds rough fetlockes to the plume in the champions helmet had bene together plunged into a purple Ocean ... Oh these were sights to make an *Alexander*.[39]

If the *Apology* was written in 1607–1608, after the re-publication of Caxton's *Recuyell*, its connection with Heywood's magnum opus, *Troia Britannica*, an epic whose dramatic qualities have become a critical commonplace,[40] appears even more

[38] Cf. Heywood (1612), E4^{r}: *'Homer,* the most excellent of all Poets, composed his Illiads in the shape of a Tragedy, his *Odisseas* like a Comedy. *Virgil* in the first of his *Aeneiads,* in his description of *Didoes Carthage* ... Which proues, that in those dayes immediatly after the ruine of *Troy,* when *Carthage* had her first foundation, they built Theaters with stately columnes of stone'.

[39] Heywood (1612), B3^{r}–B4^{v}.

[40] See, for example, F. S. Boas, *Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies* (London, 1950), 63.

significant. The poem is dedicated to the same Edward, Fourth Earl of Worcester, who was the patron of Heywood's company before 1604, the year of its conversion into the Queen's men, and 'whose Fauour', as Heywood suggests in the dedication (apparently oblivious of his more than fruitful collaboration with the Admiral's men) 'gaue [his] Muse first breath / To try in th' Ayre her weake vnable wing ... to show her office to her Patron-Lord'.[41] Contrary to the opinion that *Troia Britannica* acted as support, but was not the main source for the dramatisation of the same material in the *Ages*,[42] it is obvious that his interest in Troy and its tragic heroes and imperial potential after 1607 was more than an experimental revival, as Holaday suggests, of the long-forgotten Henslovian play. Working with the matter of Troy had become a conscious instrument of self-fashioning, and the tiresomely encyclopaedic nature of many of Heywood's Trojan texts is an inevitable by-product of his exhaustive experimentation with the matter in his thorough search of its emotional strategies and mythopoetic potentials. Heywood's technique of creating 'long, garrulous mythological miscellan[ies]' overpopulated with classical characters reaches its climax in the *Ages*, yet his non-dramatic and even ephemeral texts are often representative of a similar strategy. *A Funerall Elegie* on the death of Prince Henry discussed in Chapter One brings together a grievous cast of Trojan men and women in just three stanzas:

> As *Hector,* had he suruiu'd *Tray* to see,
> From *Isliams* lofty Tower his yong sonne cast:
> Or such griefe *Priam,* as it was to thee
> When worthy *Hector,* both the first and last
> Of all *Troyes* hopes, sunke dead; me thinkes I see
> In Royall IAME's, thy sorrowes quite surpast,
> With double anguish, trebole passions fired,
> When he first heard Prince *Henry* was expired.
>
> And you Maiesticked ANNE, when *Hecub* saw

[41] Heywood (1609), A3^{r}.
[42] Holaday (1946), 439.

> Sweet, *Polymnestor,* all the poore remaine
> Of her braue Issue, beat by many a flaw,
> And to the shore forc'd by the billowy Maine:
> Methinks from her face I your griefe could draw.
> And you Prince *Charles,* next of that royall straine;
> In yong *Polytes* I your teares can tell,
> That day in field his brother *Troylus* fell.
> For you (most hopefull Princesse) I comprise
> Your passions in a Dame though not so faire,
> Yet as those Times affoorded, beauteous, wise,
> And with the best of that age might compare:
> Your Teares I reade in bright *Pollixen's* eyes,
> That sonne which shee beheld saw none so rare,
> Though you (but once) she (oft) had cause of woe,
> Her, as in beauty you in griefe out-goe.[43]

Heywood's favourite Oenone as well as Helen, Polyxena, Paris, Hector, Ulysses, Priam, and Hecuba all reappear in his 1613 *Epithalamium in Memorie of the Happie Nuptials betweene ... Prince Count Palatine and ... Princesse the Lady Elizabeth*, and an unusually concentrated series of Trojan micro-plots is forced even into the dedicatory piece prefixed to Henry Peacham's 1612 *Minerva Britanna*,[44] not to mention his editorial agency in the modernisation of Lydgate printed in 1614 under the title *The Life and Death of Hector*.[45]

The Iron Age I & II – Classicism and exoticism.

[43] Heywood (1613), C2$^{r–v}$.

[44] Pallas thou hast a second champion bred,
As great in Artes, as was stout DIOMED
In Armes; that gainst enraged MARS could stand,
And dar'd to wound faire VENVS in the hand:
The ARGIVE fleete his sole Arme could defend,
And with the Gods he durst alone contend;
All this thy influence gaue, and more desired,
Like power thou hast into this braine inspired:
Thy champion too, whose Artes are fam'd as farre,
As was TYDIDES for his deedes of warre.
We know thou art MINERVA that alike
Hold'st Artes and Armes, canst speake as well as strike (B3^{r}).

[45] Fleay (1891), i.285.

Against this richly Trojan background, Heywood's dramatic strategies deployed in both *Iron Ages* are less surprising than they may appear if read only in the context of contemporary Trojan drama. Perhaps the best definition of the play's effect on a reader more accustomed to less compressed texts is a stage direction in Act V of the second part: 'A confused scuffle, in which *Orestes* kils *Pyrhus: Pyrhus, Orestes: Cethus* wounds *Pillades, Diomed, Menelaus, Vlisses, Thersites, &c.*'[46]. At one point, in III.i, there are more than thirty characters on the stage, which would have been physically impossible for one company to perform, therefore, as Heywood suggests in the preface to *I Iron Age*, 'these were the Playes often (and not with the least applause,) Publickely Acted by two Companies, vppon one Stage at once, and haue at sundry times thronged three seuerall Theaters, with numerous and mighty Auditories'[47] – presumably, by the Queen's men (at the Red Bull), where he was at that time an actor and sharer, together with the King's men, who 'had the unique luxury of two theatres, the Globe and the Blackfriars'.[48] The development of both parts is also strikingly different from other extant historical plays: although they retain the outward five-act structure of more habitual histories and tragedies, the Aristotelian sense of peripeties leading to a cathartic climax is entirely absent. Each act could be a self-containted tragic tale of its own: in fact, the first act of *I Iron Age* opens not with scenes of prosperity and peace, but on the brink of an imminent destruction foretold in a sequence of Cassandra's grim prophecies:

> Then let *Troy* burne,
> Let the *Greekes* clap their hands, and warme themselues
> At this bright Bone-fire: dream'd not *Hecuba*
> The night before this fatall Youth was borne,

[46] K3[r].
[47] Heywood (1632), A4[r].
[48] J. Q. Adams, 'Shakespeare, Heywood, and the Classics' in *Modern Language Notes* XXXIV (Baltimore, 1919), 339.

> That shee brought forth a fire-brand?
> ...
> Why speakes not in this case *Andromache?*
> Thou shalt loose a *Hector,* who's yet thine.
> Why good *Aeneas* dost thou speech forbeare?
> Thou hop'st in time another *Troy* to reare,
> When this is sackt, and therefore thou standst mute,
> All strooke with silence; none assist my suite.[49]

Ben Jonson may have laughed indignantly at the very idea of compressing the entire history of the destruction of Troy into one text, especially a dramatic text, which, as he scornfully suggested in his *Discoveries*, contradicted both the nature of tragic and epic poetry (however fluid the distinction between the two in early modern literary-critical terminology) and common sense:

> So many there be of old that have thought the action of one man to be one, as of Hercules, Theseus, Achilles, Ulysses, and other heroes; which is both foolish and false, since by one and the same person many things may be severally done which cannot fitly be referred or joined to the same end: which not only the excellent tragic poets, but the best masters of the epic, Homer and Virgil, saw. ... Contrary to which, and foolishly, those poets did, whom the philosopher taxeth, of whom one gathered all the actions of Theseus, another put all the labours of Hercules in one work.[50]

The Iron Age, a miscellany of tragic subplots none of which manages to evolve into a fully-fledged tragedy, fulfils the important function of a dramatic commentary on and elaboration of the epic digest eventually leading to the establishment of the Trojan monarchy in Britain so readily reinterpreted and re-projected in Jacobean culture. The need for such gap-filling compilation is alluded to in the long sequence of negative statements in Canto XV of *Troia Britannica*, which seems to suggest that in the first decade of the seventeenth century Heywood already had in mind the dramatic project which the epic could not accommodate:

---

[49] Heywood (1632): B3^{v}.
[50] D. Bevington, M. Butler, I. Donaldson, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson* (Cambridge, 2012), vol. 7, 595.

> Nor how the *Greekes* after their bloody toyles,
> *Antenor* left to inhabit raced *Troy,*
> And after th'end of their sad Tragicke broyles,
> All *Asiaes* wealth within their flect inioy,
> Robbing the Towne of all her richest spoyles,
> Whose hye Clowd-peircing spyres the flames destroy,
> nor how *Aeneas* doth his forces gather,
> And ships with his young son, and aged Father.
> ...
> Nor of Queene *Didoes* loue and Tragicke bate,
> Nor of *Aeneas* trauels nobly fam'd
> ...
> Of *Albions* Isle first knowne, my Muse next sings,
> Her Chariot now I can no further driue,
> *Brittaine* from conquerd *Troy,* we next deriue.[51]

It appears that the reason behind Heywood's radically undramatic – and yet successful – design was a desire to further classicise a subject where, despite its origins, 'the medieval and chivalric dominant remained: the love interest still outweighed the epical, the supernatural was still minimized and the classical deities rationalized, the heroes were still knights and the women were still medieval ladies and matrons'.[52] Rather than simply presenting the worthies of the past as allegories of virtues and passions re-embodied and speaking a new language[53] associated with the conventional plot development on the stage of the 1590s and beyond, he attempts a structural redefinition of the very idea of a Trojan narrative in dramatic form through a sense of estrangement and exoticisation. Perhaps based on the opening of Book III of the *Aeneid*, 'Postquam res Asiae Priamique evertere gentem / immeritam visum superis, ceciditque superbum / Ilium et omnis humo fumat Neptunia Troia ..'.[54] Heywood persistently portrays Priam's kingdom as a remote and de-Europeanised Asiatic power utterly destitute of its

[51] Heywood (1609): 2L6^{r}–2L7^{r}.
[52] Clark (1931): 54.
[53] See Wiggins (2000): 23.
[54] *Aeneid*, 372.

mediaeval courtly and ethical conventions. Thus, in Act I of *I Iron Age* Helen flirts with the supposedly barbarian Paris:

> 'Tis not the *Spartan* fashion thus to greet
> Vpon the lips, when royall strangers meete.
> I know not what your *Asian* Court-ship is.
> Oh *Ioue,* how sweetely doth this *Troian* kisse?[55]

And Agamemnon in Act IV of the second part of the play recalls his past military exploits in such terms as would have been appropriate in a speech by an Alexander returning from an India:

> Vnto our Country and our Houshold-gods
> Wee are at length return'd, trophied with honours,
> With *Troyes* subuersion and rich *Asiaes* spoyles,
> This is a sacred day.[56]
> ...
> Not all the *Asian* Legions, no not *Hector*
> Arm'd with his bals of wild-fire, had the power
> To shake me like this tremor: Is our Pallace
> Lesse safe in *Greece,* amidst our subiects here,
> Then were our Tents in *Asia?*[57]

This exoticism, unusually for such an extended elaboration of the theme of *translatio imperii*, is also highlighted in one of the prefatory letters to the first part suggesting a non-European angle at which to read the entire retelling of the Homeric and Virgilian narrative:

> [Troy], although it were scituate in *Asia,* yet out of her ashes hath risen, two the rarest Phoenixes in *Europe,* namely *London* and *Rome*.[58]

---

[55] Heywood (1632): C2^{v}.
[56] Ibid.: G4^{v}–H1^{r}.
[57] Ibid.: H4^{r}.
[58] Ibid: A3^{v}. Note also Heywood's consistent spelling 'Islium' hinting at the English continuation of the Trojan history.

Such Asiatic Trojanism casting a new light on the essentially European set of literary conventions and collisions was not an uncommon phenomenon in non-dramatic genres, as has been explained in the chapter on Kenelm Digby's quasi-autobiography; its strange offshoot also features prominently in the Troy legend's rival plays about Eastern conquerors, Marlowe's Tamburlaine and his dramatic descendants.[59] Tamburlaine the Great himself, especially in the second part of the play, shows proneness to extraordinarily learned soliloquies evoking the Trojan myth, be it in a military context and a trojanised setting,[60] as in III.v, where the conqueror addresses the following speech to the assembly of the kings:

> Ye petty kings of Turkye I am come,
> As *Hector* did into the Grecian campe.
> To ouerdare the pride of *Groecia.*
> And set his warlike person to the view
> Of fierce *Achilles,* riuall of his fame,
> I doe you honor in the *simile.*
> For if I should as *Hector* did *Achilles,*
> (The worthiest knight that euer brandishe sword)
> Challenge in combat any of you all,
> I see how fearfully ye would refuse,
> And fly my gloue as from a Scorpion.[61]

– or in a lamentation for Zenocrate crammed with elegiac and epic footnotes reminiscent of the kind of mournful, Alexandrian Trojanism discussed in Chapter One:

> Proud furie and intollorable fit,
> That dares torment the body of my Loue,

[59] For a more detailed discussion of this phenomenon, see Ladan Niayesh's 'Europeanizing the Turks in Robert Greene's *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*' in *Early Modern Constructions of Europe*, eds. F. Kläger and G. Bayer (London, 2016): 57–71.
[60] Stage direction in Marlowe (1590), D2^{r}, II.ii: '*Tamburlaine with Vsumcasane, and his three sons, foure bearing the hearse of Zenocrate, and the drums sounding a dolefull martch, the Towne burning'.*
[61] Ibid.: D8^{v}.

> And scourge the Scourge of the immortall God:
> Now are those Spheares where *Cupid* vsde to sit,
> Wounding the world with woonder and with loue,
> Sadly supplied with pale and ghastly death:
> Whose darts do pierce the Center of my soule,
> Her sacred beauty hath enchaunted heauen,
> And had she liu'd before the siege of *Troy,*
> *Hellen,* whose beauty sommond Greece to armes,
> And drew a thousand ships to *Tenedos,*
> Had not bene nam'd in *Homers* Iliads:
> Her name had bene in euery line he wrote:
> Or had those wanton Poets, for whose byrth
> Olde Rome was proud, but gasde a while on her,
> Nor *Lesbia,* nor *Corrinna* had bene nam'd,
> *zenocrate* had bene the argument
> Of euery Epigram or Eligie.[62]

Writing *Tamburlaine* in the late 1580s, Marlowe would have been familiar with the predominantly nationally-oriented, Anglo-Saxon readings of the matter of Troy that dominated earlier Tudor drama, such as the sombre warning in Philander's monologue at the close of Act III of Norton's 1565 *Gorboduc*, where the ancient destruction of Priam's dynasty is perceived as the tragic driving force still pre-determining the rise and fall of princes and magistrates millennia later:

> But I will to the king their father haste
> Ere this mischiefe come to that likely ende,
> That if the mindefull wrath of wrekefull Gods
> Since mightie *Ilions* fall not yet appeased
> With these poore remnant of the *Troians* name
> Haue not determinedlie vnmoued fate
> Out of this Realme to rase the *Brutish* Line
> By good aduise, by awe of fathers name
> By force of wiser Lordes, this kindled hate
> Maye yet be quentched, ere it consume vs all. [63]

Heywood worked on *The Ages* at an additional remove from the mediaevalised Tudor interpretations of political Trojanism hovering threateningly behind the dynastic

[62] Ibid., G7^{v}–G8^{r}.
[63] Norton (1565), B4^{r}.

anxieties of the time, and his classicising agenda differed essentially from that of a dramatist in the 1580s and early 1590s. Writing Troy several years into James's reign meant dealing with an *established* Troynovaunt, whereas the tragic and, more broadly, emotional valences of Trojanism were increasingly becoming reserved for other modes of political expression such as pageant or funeral elegy. Although the siege of Troy is referred to as a 'dismall' or 'fatall' *tragedy* throughout *II Iron Age*, the text finally arrives at a different genre designation, that of a 'chronicle', and it is hardly surprising that this designation is also employed recurrently throughout *Troia Britannica*, a panegyric and a romantic tale rather than an ominous political admonition. After the murder of Priam's family in *II Iron Age*, Pyrrhus thus summarises the fateful events of Act III:

> And now *Troyes* warres are ended, we in peace
> With glorious conquest to sayle backe to *Greece.*
> Their Nation's vanish'd like their Citties smoake,
> Our enemies are all ashes: worlds to come
> Shall Cronicle our pittilesse reuenge
> In Bookes of Brasse and leaues of Adamant.[64]

Paradoxically, the dynastic instability and the destruction of a nation that has 'vanish'd like their Citties smoake' is carved in brass and adamant chronicles as, simultaneously, a model and omen for future generations, a comfortable rhetorical-manual-like text to experiment with in poetic exercises, such as transfiguring it into a romance epic or a sketchy tragedy, or alluding to it in a 1620s pageant as an unshakeable historical symbol rather than a topical and menacing archetype, as would have been the case in the 1580s, when Heywood, born, almost certainly, in 1573, would have first encountered Troy on stage and in print, or, to a lesser extent, in the late 1590s, when he would have been

[64] Heywood (1632): F4^{r}.

active in transforming the myth himself. Exoticised and rendered somewhat alien through the numerous Asiatic references in *The Iron Age*, the tragedy's status as a purely literary, rhetorical, and educational matter is further cemented in the curious speech by Hector's ghost addressed to Aeneas, where Priam's son, as if observing the historical significance of the gory stampede of dramatis personae through an intertextual lens of several literary traditions, from Rome, through the Middle Ages, to the 1590s stage, counsels the future founder of European dynasties by quoting, anachronistically, his own monologue on the same subject as it appears in Book II of Virgil's *Aeneid*:

> Hence *Aeneas* post from *Troy,*
> Reare that abroad the gods at home destroy.
> ...
> *Cassandraes* long neglected prophesies
> This night fulfils. If either strength or might
> Could haue protected *Troy,* this hand, this arms
> That sau'd it oft, had kept it still from harme.
> But *Troy* is doom'd, here gins the fatall Story
> Of her sad sacke and fall of all her glory.
> Away, and beare thy Country gods along,
> Thousands shall issue from thy sacred seede,
> Citties more rich then this the Grecian spoyle,
> In after times shall thy successors build,
> Where *Hectors* name shall liue eternally.
> One *Romulus,* another *Bruite* shall reare,
> These shall nor Honours, nor iust Rectors want,
> *Lumbardies* roome, great Britaines *Troy-nouant.*
> Heu fuge nate Dea, te*que* his pater eripe flammis;
> Hostis habet muros, ruit alto a culmine Troia
> Sacra, suos*que* tibi commendat Troia penates
> Hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere
> Magna: pererrato statues quae denique ponte.[65]

[65] Heywood (1632), E2^{v}.

Jasper Fisher's Fuimus Troes: Arcadian form and Trojan matter.

Similar dynastic and political anxieties were one of the grand themes of the English Trojan narrative; they also were firmly associated, although in a different allegorical key, with Sidney's heritage. The *Arcadia* sometimes refers to itself, its subplots and narrative digressions, as tragedies and comedies.[66] This section of the chapter analyses a text that brings together more traditional tragic and historical treatments of the matter of Troy and the Sidneian tragicomic plot development by imposing the five-act structure with *intermezzi* on the story of Caesar's conquest of Britain – Jasper Fisher's 1633 *Fuimus Troes*. The imposition of this structure on a familiar story of national resistance to foreign usurpation allowed Fisher to employ forms of Trojanism that often lay beyond the purview of most Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline Troy plays and that have been discussed in connection with other genres: funeral elegies for Sidney and Prince Henry, Troynovaunt pageants, and romance. As the title page of *Fuimus Troes* suggests, the play was 'Publikely represented by the gentlemen students of Magdalen Colledge in Oxford'. It is hardly unusual that a work produced for an academic audience alert to multiple intertextualities, similar to the learned collections of funerary verse discussed in Chapter 1, would make ample use of a variety of narrative strategies and Trojan referential systems. Whereas Heywood's encyclopaedic *Iron Age* dealt primarily with the entire richness of Trojan allusions in one aspect, that of a national identity modelled on Trojan virtues, the reading of *Fuimus Troes* will demonstrate that a more subtle, albeit less all-encompassing treatment of the Trojan material generated a more variegated picture of Trojanism, and that Sidney's formal as well as thematic mediation proved crucial for this achievement.

[66] For example, *CPA* E4^{v}, K2^{v}, 2E6^{v}.

The formal genesis of the *Arcadia*'s five acts interlaid with sequences of eclogues has been unanimously, if somewhat cursorily, attributed to the Italian genre of *commedia erudita*, the erudite comedy patterned on Terence and Plautus and influenced by their humanist editors and commentators. In fact, Sidney's adoption of the Terentian five-act structure[67] should be distinguished from his generally recognised tragicomic indebtedness to Tasso's *Aminta* and Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, since he would have been familiar only with the early performances of the plays by the Gelosi company in 1574 during his sojourns in Venice, when the *intermezzi* – the likely precursors of the *Arcadia*'s eclogues – had not yet been included in the play's texts, at least in their performed version.[68] One could, of course, trace other structural sources of the acts-and-eclogues combination, such as the Boethian and Sannazzaran *prosimetra*, and recall other precedents of commingled matters, to which Sidney himself points in the *Defence*,[69] however, it is the language of the famous 'mongrel tragicomedy passage' that partly supports the *commedia erudita* (as opposed to broadly tragicomic and epic-pastoral) explanation of the *Arcadia*'s form:

> But besides these grosse absurdities, howe all their Playes bee neither right Tragedies, nor right Comedies, mingling Kinges and Clownes, not because the matter so carrieth it, but thrust in the Clowne by head and shoulders to play a part in majesticall matters, with neither decencie nor discretion: so as neither the admiration and Commiseration, nor the the right sportfulnesse is by their mongrell Tragicomedie obtained. I know Apuleius did somewhat so, but

[67] See R. W. Parker, 'Terentian Structure and Sidney's Original *Arcadia'* in *ELR* (December 1972), 61–78; C. L. Chalifour, 'Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia* as Terentian Comedy' in *Studies in English Literature* (vol. 16.1, 1976), 51–63; W. R. Davis, 'Narrative Methods in Sidney's *Old Arcadia*' in *Studies in English Literature* (vol. 18.1, 1978), 13–33. For a more general discussion, see Marvin T. Herrick, *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century* (Urbana, 1950).

[68] See K. M. Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy* (Oxford, 1934), I.262, for a more detailed discussion of Sidney's potential familiarity with the plays.

[69] 'Now in his parts, kindes, or species, as you list to tearme them, it is to be noted that some Poesies have coupled togither two or three kindes, as the Tragicall and Comicall, whereupon is risen the Tragicomicall, some in the manner have mingled prose and verse, as Sanazara and Boetius; some have mingled matters Heroicall and Pastorall, but that commeth all to one in this question, for if severed they be good, the conjunction cannot be hurtfull'.

> that is a thing recounted with space of time, not represented in one moment: and I knowe the Auncients have one or two examples of Tragicomedies, as Plautus hath *Amphitrio*.[70]

The context of the passage and subsequent denunciation of counter-Ciceronian comic practices in England, where the 'Comedients thinke there is no delight without laughter', seem to suggest that the object of disparagement here is only the mingling of genres, but a closer analysis of the arguments and examples cited reveals a more complex and contradictory structure of Sidney's critical insight. The mingling Sidney really alludes to is threefold: the 'kinges and clownes' evoke the Arcadian mixture of the epic and pastoral narrative modes, both in its bucolic and farcical, Dametan aspects, since the word 'clown', as is evident from the *OED* pre-1600 examples, connoted anything on the spectrum from 'a peasant' to 'a man without refinement and culture', but was devoid of its later courtly and theatrical semantics; the 'admiration and commiseration' hark back to the Aristotelian language of Renaissance literary theory and are, therefore, by implication restricted only to the stage; and the two Roman pieces of evidence turn out to be curious exceptions hardly testifying in favour of Sidney's potential opponent who might have referred to their ancient authority to support the English way of treating tragicomedy, since Apuleius, Sidney argues, in fact employs an entirely different narrative technique, and *Amphytrio* is only one of the 'one or two examples' of the genre (needless to say, the second example is suggestively omitted). Moreover, Plautus's play, a core text for any Renaissance discussion of tragicomedy,[71] itself challenges the definition and nature of the genre immediately in the prologue delivered by Mercury:

> post argumentum huius eloquar tragoediae.

[70] *Apology* 112.
[71] See M. Doran, *Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama* (Madison, 1954), 190ff. Also See *Scaliger* I.vii for a critical discussion of Plautus's use of the term.

quid? contraxistis frontem quia tragoediam
dixi futuram hanc? deus sum, commutauero.
eandem hanc, si uoltis, faciam <iam> ex tragoedia
comoedia ut sit omnibus isdem uorsibus.
utrum sit an non uoltis? sed ego stultior,
quasi nesciam uos uelle, qui diuos siem.
teneo quid animi uostri super hac re siet:
faciam ut commixta sit; <sit> tragico[co]moedia;
nam me perpetuo facere ut sit comoedia,
reges quo ueniant et di, non par arbitror.
quid igitur? quoniam hic seruos quoque partis habet,
faciam sit, proinde ut dixi, tragico[co]moedia.[72]

> I'll tell you the plot of this tragedy. ... What? You're frowning because I said this was going to be a tragedy? I'm a god, I'll change it. If you want, I'll immediately turn this same play from a tragedy into a comedy with all the same verses. Do you want it to be one or not? But I'm being silly, as if I didn't know that you want it; after all, I'm a god. I know what your feelings in this matter are: I'll make sure it's a mixed play; it'll be a tragicomedy. Well, I don't think it would be appropriate to turn completely into a comedy a play where kings and gods come on stage. What then? Since a slave has a role here as well, I'll make it, as I said, a tragicomedy.

Mercury's speech features two concepts that Sidney could have found appealing both from a creative and a critical perspective when structuring the *Arcadia* and chastising English dramatists for their lack of genre awareness. The 'commutatio' (sudden transformation) of the play about to be performed is presented as a concession to the popular taste which Mercury clearly anticipates in his ironic omniscience, but which he nevertheless chooses to expose via a mock opinion poll. As will be shown below, and the discussion of Troy-related plays and their performance histories in the opening section of the chapter suggests, the public's predilection for the mixed genre of tragicomedy could naturally be linked to the somewhat plebeian sociological status of Trojan texts in early modern English culture. The elitist purism of ancient genre imitation and the matter of Troy were incompatible for authors less inclined to catering to the public's judgement, which is why, for example, Ben Jonson's folio does not

[72] *Plautus,* 16–19.

contain a single play on a Trojan subject – a conspicuous lacuna in the catalogue of Elizabethan and Jacobean Didos and Priams.

Even more importantly, Mercury's genre re-designation project expressed in 'ut sit omnibus isdem uorsibus' ('with all the same verses') questions the very inherence of certain formal features to certain genres: if the same set of verses can be transfigured into a different text without altering them, what makes a genre a genre – and what does it mean to create a mixed genre, if intrinsically tragic or comic linguistic registers and dramatic patterns have such fuzzy boundaries?[73] The contemporary critical consensus was, of course, that Plautus coined the term 'tragicomedy' as a jocular nonce word which, in Aubignac's vitriolic phrase, 'nobody since wished to adopt, as it was dead in the cradle long before the death of the Latin language',[74] and that real tragicomedy was a 'resolutely modern'[75] invention, whereas the Plautan and Terentian tradition revived in fifteenth-century Italy was exclusively comic.

This seems to support the initial assumption that whereas the subject, language, and plot patterns of the *Arcadia* may be tragicomic or epo-pastoral, its structure has predominantly comic overtones, and, just as it is necessary to distinguish between ancient, mediaeval, and Renaissance perceptions of the matter of Troy, it is essential to disentangle the idealised understating of Roman comedies forming a theoretical background to early modern treatments of the genre and its humanist incarnation in the *commedia erudita*. Ringler seems to interpret the *Arcadia*'s structure as a combination of the two by suggesting that '[i]n addition to giving his prose narrative a dramatic

[73] For a broader discussion of the relationship between structure, style, and genre, see, for example, David Young, *The Action to the Word: Structure and Style in Shakespearean Tragedy* (New Haven, 1990).
[74] D'Aubignac, *La Pratique du théâtre*, quoted from Hammond, 'Highly Irregular: Defining Tragicomedy in Seventeenth-Century France' in Mukherji and Lyne, *Early Modern Tragicomedy* (Cambridge, 2007), 78.
[75] Ibid.

[five-act, Terentian] structure, Sidney accentuated the division into acts by placing after each of the first four a set of ... 'eclogues', in the manner of the *intermezzi* of the learned comedies of Italy'.[76] His next conclusion – that the sets of pastoral poems are interwoven with the prose text much more firmly than are the Italian comic *intermezzi*[77] – is, however, countered by the claim that the eclogues 'also form an isolable unit with a structure of its own that can perfectly well stand by itself'.[78] Such structural ambivalence is deeply rooted in the nature of Italian erudite comedies with which the *Arcadia* also shares its two-dimensional role as a humanist project embodying comic theory from Donatus to Scaliger and as a pleasant entertainment for a narrow circle of courtly intellectuals.[79] The relationship between the world of comic action and the five-act form established by the Donatan triad of *protasis*, *epitasis*, and *catastrophe*, which was thoroughly discussed by sixteenth-century theorists,[80] was a tension rather than a harmony. Brand goes so far as to suggest that the *intermedi* became not only reconciliatory breaks between comic acts but, paradoxically, the high points of the comedy whose plot was forced to spin out of control by the artificially imposed dramatic structure:

> The effect of the act-division was to break up the performance and allow room for the *intermedi*, the attractive spectacles involving music and

[76] *Ringler* xxxviii.
[77] See also Robertson's General Introduction in *OA* xxi.
[78] Ibid.
[79] See C. P. Brand, 'The Renaissance of Comedy: The Achievement of Italian *Commedia Erudita*' in *MLR* 90 (October 1995), xxix–xlii: '*commedia erudita*, like Roman comedy, is closely linked to festivity, to Carnival or weddings or the visits of celebrated persons, and ... it is essentially a court entertainment as contrasted with the public performances of the Romans' (xxiv).
[80] On the reception of Donatus's commentary on Terence and other writings, see Paul F. Gehl, 'Selling Terence in Renaissance Italy: The Marketing Power of Commentary' in Christina S. Kraus and Christopher Stray, eds., *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford, 2015), 253–271. On the attempts to reconcile Donatus's tripartite and Horace's quinquepartite structures, see Ioannes Baptisa Pigna's *Poetica Horatiana* (1561) and discussion in T. W. Baldwin's *Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1947).

> dancing which eventually came to dominate the play. But it also forced playwrights either to spin out their comic action .... or to extend the action with ever more complicated intrigues and digressions. Small wonder that they then found the audiences fidgeting and chattering during the play while they waited for the *intermedi*.[81]

The dramatic and lyric aspects of the *Arcadia* – and their reciprocal pressure – endow its text with an unprecedented degree of self-reflection. The prose world is a 'realm of events ... in which we interest ourselves in the causes and effects of human actions', whereas the eclogues are 'a realm of ideas, where individuals derive their chief dignity from how justly they conceive their world and from how skillfully they express those conceptions in song.'[82] The application of the Terentian structure to the *Arcadia*'s romance reality can be seen as a response to Sidney's own threefold criticism of tragicomedy in the *Defence*: it combines theatricality with all the trappings of an Ariostan and Heliodoran narrative and demonstrates that a classical model can be regarded as more than a mere quaint oddity left undeveloped in later traditions.

Whereas the *Arcadia*'s influence on English romance and, later, novel is unquestionable, its *structural* influence on drama seems counterintuitive: however rich a quarry of dramatic plots, a novel is not the most obviously dramatic form. *Fuimus Troes*, an heir to Plautus, Terence, and their Italian erudite successors through Sidney's transformative intercession, proves otherwise: what might have been an intellectual formal game devised for an erudite audience at Magdalen College could, in fact, lead to an interesting reconsideration of the interaction between the classical and the British, and, eventually, early modern perceptions of Sidney and the matter of Troy, or, as

---

[81] Brand, 'The Renaissance of Comedy', xxv.
[82] Robert E. Stillman, *Sidney and Poetic Justice: The Old Arcadia, Its Eclogues, and Renaissance Pastoral Tradition* (Lewisburg, 1986), 94.

Mercury, who also opens Plautus's tragicomedy, phrases it in the prologue to Fisher's play, the'[m]irrours of Britaine, and of Romane valour'.[83]

Fuimus Troes was composed, as Curran suggests in an attempt to explain the inclusion of a song in Scots discussed below – apparently, a gesture of flattery to James –'[s]ometime before 1625',[84] however, Lisa Hopkins in her comprehensive article on the play disagrees by suggesting that, in spite of some evidence in favour of an earlier composition and performance date, the play 'certainly also shows some marked affinities with various of the other texts that were either newly written, or were being published for the first time, in 1633'.[85] Hopkins cites examples of thematic and, perhaps, coincidental affinity between *Fuimus Troes* and other contemporary texts, for example, John Ford's *The Broken Heart*, however, it may also be helpful to consider the play's publication contexts because it may shed light on its reception by an audience broader than the students of Magdalen College, Oxford, where it was performed on an unknown date and, more importantly, irrespective of this date. As is indicated on the title page, the play was printed by I. L. (John Legate Jr.), the printer of Philemon Holland's translation of *Cyropaedia* (1632) for Robert Allot, who was also the publisher of Shakespeare's Second Folio in 1632. Legate was also responsible for the fifth edition, in 1629, of Richard Bernard's complete English version of Terence. Furthermore, the late 1620s and the early 1630s were a period of newly increased attention to Sidney, with the *Arcadia* and its several supplements re-published in 1627 and 1629, and Francis Quarles's *Argalus and Parthenia*, a dramatisation of the Sidneian subplot, first printed in 1629. Heywood's *Iron Age*, with which the discussion of

[83] Jasper Fisher, *Fuimus Troes* (London, 1632), A3^{v}.
[84] J. Curran, *Roman Invasions* (Newark, 2002), 19. See also his overview of sources discussing the composition date (potentially, as early as 1607) in a note on p. 261.
[85] See Lisa Hopkins, 'We were the Trojans: British national identities in 1633', *Renaissance Studies* vol. 16 No. 1 (2002), 36–51.

dramatic Trojanism in this chapter began, was also published in 1632. Even if Fisher, as some scholars have suggested, had composed the play earlier, it may be less than a deliberate act of self-fashioning through skilful interaction with Sidneian, Trojan, and Terentian texts published at the same time but more than a pure coincidence that he decided to print *Fuimus Troes* in the wake of Heywood and the reappearance of the *Arcadia*.

The title page of *Fuimus Troes* is an intertextual tour de force attempting to draw together the archetypal Trojan narrator and the model non-narrator of the Homeric and, by implication, Virgilian matters in a conversation that anticipates the play's diversified tensions between the historical and the private, between the national and the international, and between feud and reconciliation. Fisher (or his printer) is academically explicit about his source, which highlights the importance of a more careful contextualisation particularly because the source is probably the best known Trojan text any person of Latinate literacy would have encountered. The intermediary reference – '*Æneid. 2.*' – interposed between the Latin title *FVIMVS TROES* and its English interpretation, *THE TRVE TROIANES*, acts as a scholarly bridge between the realm of atavistic Latinity restricted to the classroom and that of a live and constantly revived national identity (hence the subtitle in a smaller font: 'A Story of the *Britaines* valour at the Romanes first invasion'): the perfect indicative of 'fuimus' becomes the attributive and, by implication, still effective 'true' in the same way that a classical verse gains a new semantic existence through dramatic performance. The verse is culled from Aeneas's account of the fall of Troy (*Aeneid* II.325), but the context in which it appears in the Virgilian narrative is by no means an obvious choice for a play glorifying British valour in the olden days. The words 'fuimus Troes' are not Aeneas's own – they are uttered by Panthus, Apollo's priest who had been captured by Antenorus at Delphi

and brought to Troy when, after the destruction of the city by Hercules, Priam desired to re-build it 'iisdem fundamentis' ('on its original foundations'), as Servius explains in his gloss *ad locum*. Holding his grandchild and sacred figurines in his arms, Panthus gives the following mournful reply to Aeneas's hopeless question about the outcome of the siege:

> fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens
> gloria Teucrorum; ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos
> transtulit; incensa Danai dominantur in urbe.[86]
>
> We Trojans are no more, Ilium is no more, nor the great glory of the Teucrians; in wrath Jupiter has taken all away to Argos; our city is aflame, and in it the Greeks are lords.

William Lily's *Grammatices Rudimentis*, the sixteenth-century's standard Latin manual giving shape to John Colet's educational programme, suggests that the perfect tense, or 'the preterperfyttes', 'speketh of the tyme that is perfytly past' (in contrast to the imperfect signifying 'the tyme that is lyttel past' and the pluperfect, 'the tyme that is more than perfytly past').[87] Panthus's lamentation would have, therefore, connoted the exact opposite of Jasper Fisher's intention: that Troy has been just – but irrevocably – destroyed, and that its symbolic *imperium* has been irremediably *translated* to Greece: a particularly powerful résumé for a Greek who had been inquired in the distant past about rebuilding the city in its original location.

In contrast to the title itself, the second classical reference on the title page is unattributed, as was the typographic convention. It is taken from Horace's *Odes* I.6, a famous elaboration of the *topos* of *recusatio*, a refusal to adopt Homeric forms and themes,[88] addressed to Marcus Agrippa. The ode is divisible into three parts, a refusal

---

[86] *Aeneid* 338–339.
[87] Colet and Lyly, *Grammatices Rudimentis* (London, 1534), 2B^{r}.
[88] On *recusatio* in Roman poetry, see, for example, Richard F. Thomas, 'From recusatio to Commitment: The Evolution of the Virgilian Programme' in *Reading Virgil and His Texts:*

to sing Agrippa's own military exploits, a rhetorical comparison of a potential *Aggripeid* to other epics, and a declaration that the poet will limit himself to singing convivial pleasures. It is from the second part that Fisher selects perhaps the least specific verse, 'Quis Martem tunica tectum adamantina / Digne scripserit?' ('Who could write worthily of Mars clad in his adamantine brestplate[?]),[89] omitting a series of more concrete mentions of historical and literary episodes significant for the play's employment of the Trojan themes:

> pudor
> imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
> laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
> culpa deterere ingeni.
> quis Martem tunica tectum adamantina
> digne scripserit aut pulvere Troico
> nigrum Merionen aut ope Palladis
> Tydiden superis parem?[90]
>
> Diffidence, and the Muse who controls the unwarlike lyre, forbid me to diminish the exploits of glorious Caesar and yourself by my inadequate talent. Who could write worthily of Mars clad in his adamantine breastplate, or Meriones black with the dust of Troy, or the son of Tydeus who, with Pallas' aid, was the equal of the gods?

Meriones, a relatively minor character in the *Iliad*, reappears in post-Homeric developments of the Trojan matter, most notably, in Quintus Smyrnaeus, where he is mentioned in the catalogue of Greeks who entered Troy in the belly of the wooden horse,[91] Diomedes, referred to by his patronymic, is not merely one of the Trojans' most prominent antagonists, but also the king of Argos, a metonymic designation of Greece in Panthus's doleful monologue. By juxtaposing the Trojan and Greek

Studies in Intertextuality (Ann Arbor, 1999), 101–113; Ruud R. Nauta, 'The *Recusatio* in Flavian Poetry' in Ruud R. Nauta, Smolenaars, and Harm-Jan Dam, eds., *Flavian Poetry* (Brill, 2005), 21–40.

[89] *Horace* 37.

[90] Ibid.

[91] See Quintus Smyrnaeus, *The Fall of Troy*, transl. A. S. Way (Harvard, 1913), 508.

perspectives concealed from the less sophisticated audiences by way of erudite ellipsis, Fisher foreshadows the constant switching between the British and Roman camps in the play and gives his dramatic text a truly epic sense of impartiality and comprehensiveness which will later resonate with the themes of ancestral discord between the 'true Troianes' and the Roman invaders.

Fuimus Troes is an erudite mixture in more than one sense. Classicism intermingles with the Galfridian tradition. In keeping with the almost scholarly presentation on the title page; the *dramatis personae* list is also equipped with an apparatus of references. Mercury, Furius Camillus, and Brennus are yoked together with a curly brace with an italicised '*Livius, lib. 5.*', a host of Roman warriors is similarly linked to Books 4 and 5 of Caesar's *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, whereas their British antagonists, as the respective note suggests, originate from Book 4 of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia*. The play combines equestrian military scenes reminiscent of courtly tilts and epic catalogues –

> First *Cridous* leades from the Albanian realme,
> Where Grampiu's ridge deuides the smiling dales,
> Fiue thousand horse, and twenty thousand foote,
> Three thousand Chariots man'd. The Brigants come
> Deckt with blew-painted shields, twelue thousand strong.
> Vnder the conduct of Demetiaes Prince,
> March twice three thousand, arm'd with Pelts and Glaues:
> Whom the Silures flanke, eight thousand stout,
> Greedy of fight, borne souldiers the first day,
> Whose gray-goose-winged shafts neere flew in vaine.
> Then *Guerted* mounted on a shag-haire steed,
> Full fifteene thousand brings, both horse and foote,
> Of desperate Ordovicians, whose vse is
> To rush halfe naked on their foes, inrag'd
> With a rude noyse of pipes.[92]

– with pastoral visions evocative of Arcadian landscapes:

[92] *Fuimus Troes* D1^{r-v}.

> We saw a Paradise, whose bosome teemes
> With siluer oare: whose Seas are pau'd with pearle:
> The Medowes richly spread with Floraes tapistry:
> The fields euen wonder at their haruest loades.
> In Christall streames the scaly nations play,
> Fring'd all along with trembling poplar trees:
> The Sun in Summer loath to leaue their sight,
> Forgets to sleepe, and glauncing makes no Night.[93]

Most importantly, however, *Fuimus Troes* appears to replicate the *Arcadia*'s Terentian structure by inserting poetic *intermezzi* between dramatic scenes of turbulent action. Fisher accomplishes more than a mere reproduction of the Sidneian structure – which could be, after all, a plot design uninfluenced by Sidney's adaptation of the Roman comic tradition through the lens of Italian *commedia erudita*: the relationship between the acts of his play and the *intermezzi* resembles the *Arcadia*'s balance of vigorous plot development and static reflection on it in the *locus amoenus* of the 'Eclogues'. Thus, Act I juxtaposes episodes of highly Trojanised naval preparations for war where Nennius effectively likens Britain to 'falling Kingdomes crack[ing] in fatall flames',[94] and Caesar draws a geographic analogy between his future conquest of Britain and Asia Minor ('I long to stride / This Hellespont, or bridge it with a Navy, / Disclosing to our Empire vnknowne Landes, / Vntill the Arcticke Starre for Zenith stands'[95]), and a confession made by Eulinus infatuated with Landora, 'the Trinobanticke [i.e. from the tribe of the Trinobants] Lady', to his misogynistic friend Hirildas resembling Pyrocles's exchange with Musidorus in Book I of the *Arcadia*:

> *Hir.* Why then, let scorne succeed thy loue, and brauely
> Conquer thy selfe, If thou wilt conquer her:
> Stomackes, with kindnesse cloy'd, Disdaine must stirre.
> *Eul.* Most impious thoughts! O let me rather perish,

[93] Ibid., C4[r].
[94] Ibid., A4[r].
[95] Ibid., B1[r].

> And louing die, than liuing cease to loue:
> And when I faint, let her but heare me cry,
> Aye me, there's none, which truely loues, but I.[96]

A parallel conflict between undisturbed pastoral peace and looming threat is expressed in the two songs performedby a 'Chorus of fiue Bardes laureate, foure voyces, and an Harper'. The first song (trochaic dimeter with a jolly refrain 'Hees no bard that cannot sing / The praises of the flowry Spring'[97] is contrasted by sad premonitions of the second song harking back to the Virgilian and Spenserian image of putting aside a bucolic flute in the face of a graver matter and reversing Isaiah's prophecy about swords and ploughshares:

> Leaue then your wonted prattle,
> The Oaten reed forbeare:
> For I heare a sound of battell,
> And Trumpets teare the ayre
> ...
> Let no Birds sing, no Lambkins daunce,
> No fountaines murmuring goe:
> Let Shepheards crooke be made a launce:
> For the martiall hornes doe blow.[98]

Dialogism is a defining feature of the bucolic genre which Sidney unfolds into a second dimension: his singing shepherds converse not only with one another but also with the eventful narrative surrounding their pastoral entertainments. As *Fuimus Troes* progresses, it becomes clear that Fisher attempted to fashion a similar bifocality of his *intermezzi* that could be read both as self-contained manifestations of the genre and encrypted commentaries on the non-literal layers of the acts. Act 3 serves as the most eloquent illustration of this attempt to reproduce the Sidneian relationship between the

---

[96] Ibid., B3^{v}.
[97] Ibid., B4^{r}.
[98] Ibid.

worlds of deed and versification. The central sub-theme of the act is that of a civil war. Pursued by Nennius, Ceasar himself exclaims:

> We may confesse, they come of Troiane kind,
> An hundred valiant Hectors here we find.[99]

After the near-defeat of the Roman army by the Britons, he further explicates this idea and attributes his initial military failure to the fact of the enemy's *origin* rather than pure valour or blind fortune:

> Our Ships in Gaule
> Wind-bound, at length put forth, and come in view
> Are tost, and torne: Our Nauy on the shoare
> With ciuill discord breake each others plankes.
> When, powerfull Fortune, will thy anger cease?
> Neuer till now did *Caesar* fortune feare.
> Mount Palatine, thou Throne of Ioue, and ye
> Whose lesser Turrets pinnacle Rome's head:
> Are all your Deities fled? or was I bold,
> To out-goe Nature, and our Empire stretch
> Beyond her limites? Pardon then my fault.
> Or doe we basely faint? Or is our might
> Answer'd with like, since Troy gainst Troy doth fight?
> Nor can I write now, *I came ouer, and*
> *I ouercame:* Such foes deny such hast.[100]

A solemn invocation against foreign invasions and civil feuds also concludes the final set of songs appended to Act 5 ('That Forraine spight, or Ciuill fight, / Our quiet trouble neuer'[101]), however, it is crucial to note that within the play itself all hints at a civil discord come from the attacking side: it is Caesar's double weakness that he recognises the ancient Britons' kinship with the Romans. The fear of tyranny and a civil conflict also permeates the *Arcadia*. Blair Worden suggests that Sidney portrays destructive

[99] Ibid., E2^{r}.
[100] Ibid., E3^{r}.
[101] Ibid., I4^{r}.

misgovernment leading to internal struggles on all levels of the romance, from Pyrocles's unreasonable infatuation with Philoclea[102] to the more obvious menaces of '[n]eighbours inuasions, ciuill dissention, crueltye of the comming Prince, and whatsoeuer in common sence carries a dreadfull shewe' that were 'in all mens heads, but in fewe how to preuent'.[103] Additionally, as demonstrated in Chapter One, Elizabethan and Jacobean funeral elegies for national heroes, Sidney and Prince Henry, frequently exploited the themes of foreign invasion and civil discord to induce sharper grief and simultaneously offer some consolation through historical analogies and political allegories. It is unsurprising that Fisher, who was active in the construction of the Trojanised Jacobean myth,[104] also places Nennius's funeral – a ceremony commemorating an archetypal British national hero,[105] '[o]ur Britaine Hector'[106] – in the most anti-civil-war act of his play. 'A Funerall Elegie sunge to the Harpe' likewise employs many of the *topoi* and comparisons familiar from the university collections of eulogies for Henry and Sidney:

> Turnus may conceale his Name,
> Nennius had Aeneas fame.
> Hannibal let Africk smother,
> Ne*n*nius was great Scipioes brother.
> Greece forbeare Achilles story,
> Nennius had braue Hectors glory.
>
> Thrush and Nightingale be dumb:
> Sorrowfull songs befit a Tombe.
> Turne ye marble stones to water:
> Isis Nymphes forswear al laughter:
> Sigh and sob vpon your bed:
> Belyes noble Sonne is dead. [107]

[102] Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue* (London, 1996), 319.
[103] *CPA* 2O^{r}.
[104] He contributed to the 1613 collection of epithalamia on the wedding of Princess Elizabeth and Frederick – a literary event closely connected to the preceding period of mourning for Prince Henry.
[105] On connections between Nennius and Henry, see Hopkins, 'We were the Trojans', 39.
[106] *Fuimus Troes* I1^{v}.
[107] *Fuimus Troes* F3^{r}.

Not unlike his Elizabethan and Jacobean precursors, the unhistorical Nennius of the play is forced into multiple frameworks of Trojan exemplarity: he is both Hector the murdered defender and Aeneas the victorious conqueror. Moreover, as was often the case with Sidney's mourners, the elegy for Nennius differentiates between the classicising and pastoral modes: the former becomes associated with his individual military career worthy to be remembered among those of ancient Trojan heroes, while the latter is linked with his identity of a distinctly British hero, Beli's (i.e. the King of Britain's) son bemoaned by local nymphs of Isis.

Following Nennius's funeral, a real, non-metaphorical civil war breaks out as a result of Eulinus's accidentally killing Hirildas in a tournament, and his uncle Androgeus refuses to satisfy Casibelane's demand to punish him, which leads to a conflict between the tribes which will later enable Caesaer to conquer Britain. It is all the more surprising that amid this twofold political crisis Fisher concludes Act 3 with an *intermezzo* of two songs, one glorifying the recent victory ('Reioyce O Britanie, / Britaine O reioyce: / The stormy cloud past ouer'[108]) and the other, a pastoral hymn in Scots, depicting a peaceful rural dance:

> Gang ye lads and lasses,
> Sa wimble and sa wight:
> Fewle mickle teene betide ye,
> If ye ligg in this plight.
> Bee bonny, buxome, iolly.
> Trip haydegues beliue:
> And gif night gars the welkin merk
> Tom piper doe you blive.
>
> Hidder, eke and shidder,
> With spiced sow ycramd;
> Sa that vnneath thilke borrells
> May well ne yede, ne stand:

[108] Ibid., G1[r].

As leefe as life doe weete it,
When timbarins gin sound;
Fore haruest gil prankt vp in lathe,
To loute it low around.[109]

The inclusion of this song in the play has encouraged various interpretations: depending on the conjectured composition date of *Fuimus Troes*, it has been read a tribute to James, the unifier of England and Scotland,[110] or an allusion to Charles's Scottish coronation.[111] Whatever the linguistic significance of this inclusion, it is evident that the combination of a victorious hymn and an encoded political homage to a king from the Scottish dynasty placed together after the most tragic act of the quasi-historical tragicomedy could be read not as a calmative *intermezzo* preparing the public for yet another escalation of military tensions but as an idealised insight into an alternative history where the two peoples will be unified in the face of a common enemy, the un-true Trojan seeking to usurp the British throne. As any utopian vision, it has a potential to become a warning or a prophecy.

Fisher certainly wanted it to be the latter. In Act 4, Rollano ('a Belgic') utters a grim prognostication reminiscent of the famous Trojan subplot woven into a pastoral, Virgil's Fourth Eclogue:

Rising from shore Coniecture might descry
A thousand Ships with painted prowes, to pave
The briny fields of Neptune, their broad sayles
Did Nereus canopy, Titans taper vayle.
As nations twenty nine 'gainst Troy built vp
A floating Delos of a thousand Ships,
To plough the liquid glasse: No frame of Pallas,
No crafty Sinon; but Those woodden horse
Did *Troy dis-Troy:* So Troynovant shall feele
Her Mothers Fate: *Achilles* comes againe:
And Pergamus againe shall sinke in dust:

[109] Ibid., G1^{v}.
[110] See John Kerrigan, 'The Romans in Britain' in Burgess, Wymer, and Lawrence, eds., *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke, 2006), 123.
[111] Hopkins, 'We were the Trojans', 37.

They threaten.[112]

However, this comfortless forecast turns out to be exactly what Virgil intended his 'erunt etiam altera bella' to be: a prologue to a second golden age. Instead of becoming a usurping tyrant, Caesar puts an end to the civil strife between the peoples of Britain and acknowledges Cassibelane as the legitimate King; Troy is reconciled with Troy:

The Semicircles,
First letters of the Leaders names,[113] we see
Are ioyn'd in true loues endlesse figure.
Both come of Troiane race, both nobly bold,
Both matchlesse Captaines, on one Throne behold.[114]

This sudden re-establishment of an undisturbed reign and resolution of multiple and seemingly irresoluble conflicts, of course, echoes in many ways the scene of Euarchus's judgement threatening to transform the *Arcadia*'s plot into a gory tragedy but eventually bringing it to a Terentian, comic dénouement. Inheriting the Sidneian (and, genetically, Italian and Roman) structure interlaid with scenes of poetic reflection and interpretation evidently meant taking a step away from the traditional reading of the matter of Troy: it allowed for the inclusion of patriotic sentiment inherent to pageants about Troynovaunt as well for scenes of symbolic grief for a national, Sidneian and Henrician hero. Although an exception among other Jacobean and Caroline treatments of the matter of Troy, *Fuimus Troes* testifies to the transformative valency of Sidney's co-reception with familiar classical and mediaeval subjects.

---

[112] *Fuimus Troes* G3^{r}. Cf. 'erunt etiam altera bella / atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles. / Hinc, ubi iam firmata virum te fecerit aetas, / cedet et ipse mari vector nec nautica pinus / mutabit merces' ('a second war will be fought, and great Achilles be sent again to Troy. Next, when now the strength of years has made you a man, even the trader will quit the sea, nor will the ship of pine exchange wares' in Virgil (2014), 50–51).
[113] I.e. the C's of Caesar and Cassibelane.
[114] *Fuimus Troes* I3^{v}.

Conclusion.

This study has demonstrated how pervasive the co-reception of Sidney and the matter of Troy was from the late 1580s to the 1640s in a range of genres both on the level of isolated, conventional allusions and in a broader sense of being co-present in the intertextual background. The three examples discussed at length – elegies, romance, and drama – suggest that other forms of writing, sometimes avoiding convenient categorisation, may have also been influenced by this fusion of an exemplary biography with an exemplary history.

Perhaps the most promising field for further research is that of Bible-based narratives, where the Trojan Sidney occasionally appears in various guises. An interesting example is Nathaniel Baxter's 1606 *Ouránia, That is, Endimions Song and Tragedie, Containing all Philosophie*, a polymath poetic project associated with the Sidney circle and aimed at a poetic revival[1] in a number of ways. The long creation narrative clearly evocative of Du Bartas (whom Sidney apparently translated, although the translation is no longer extant[2]) is dedicated to the Countess of Pembroke and cleverly contextualised both in the Virgilian (or broadly Trojan) and Arcadian meta-texts:

> Pardon (Princesse) though I conceale thy name.
> Thy Traine, and Paragons of high degree
> *Homer* and *Virgill*, vsed to doe the same,
> And *Astrophill* when hee decyphred thee,
> *Baxtero Mastix* may disparage mee,

[1] *Writing After Sidney*, 1.
[2] See W. A. Ringler, *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 1962), 339.

That I dare make thee subiect of my pen.[3]

Like many later (that is, post-1590s) tributes to Sidney, the poem itself is more Spenserian than Sidneian in terms of its language and formal structure. It is this Spenserian mediation that allows Baxter to imagine Sidney in a physical juxtaposition of the Arcadian and Trojan themes:

> It greeues my heart to se the gentle Swayne,
> That kept his tender Lambes on *Ida* Mount:
> And brought them downe againe into the plaine,
> To take their pleasure by the siluered Fount,
> Folding them all, and taking iust account,
> Least one of them by Carelesse ouersight
> Should wandring perish in the darke-some night.
>
> It greeues my heart (I say) to heare his moane,
> Fast by the walles of *Troy* where once he dwelt:
> With wringing hands and many a greeuous groane,
> He did expresse the miseries he felt.
> A heart of flint I thinke would surely melt,
> To see a gentle Shepheard thus cast downe,
> By Enuies practise and great *Cynthyas* frowne.[4]

Spenser's agency in amalgamating the two myths indubitably deserves further critical attention. The most obvious instance of this agency is *Faerie Queene* III containing the celebrated depiction of the garden of Adonis, who, like Sidney, received a lethal wound to the thigh.[5] As Philoctetes's example in Thomas Moffett's biography (discussed in Chapter 1) demonstrates, this basis for comparison was something of a

[3] N. Baxter, *Ouránia* (London, 1606), A2^{r}.
[4] Ibid., B1^{v}.
[5] For a discussion of this parallel in Spenser's elegy (based on Bion and Ronsard), see R. Falco, *Conceived Presences* (Amherst, 1994), 59, and *Writing After Sidney* 70. For a more detailed reading of Sidney's presence in the *Faerie Queene* III.6, the garden of Adonis canto, see J. Quitslund, 'The Work of Mourning in Spenser's Garden of Adonis', *Renaissance Papers* (1997), 23–31 and Quitslund, *Spenser's Supreme Fiction* (Toronto, 2001), esp. 219–227.

medical *topos* in the Sidneian myth. In Canto VI, Venus laments Time's cruelty and the loss of her creations[6]:

> Yet pittie often did the gods relent,
> To see so faire things mard, and spoyled quight:
> And their great mother *Venus* did lament
> The losse of her deare brood, her deare delight.[7]

The familial undertones of the term 'brood', Venus's progeny, in conjunctuion with the Spenserian – and, by pronounced implication, Trojan and Sidneian[8] – theme of complaining in the face of Time's mercilessness add a distinctly Aenean subtext to the seemingly de-Trojanised world of Adonis's garden. Later in the book, in Canto IX, Paridell famously relates the story of the Trojan fugitives' escape, their wanderings, and the eventual building of Troynovaunt emphasising Aeneas's divine genealogy:

> *Anchyses* sonne begot of *Venus* faire,
> (Said he,) out of the flames for safegard fled,
> And with a remnant did to sea repaire,
> Where he through fatall errour long was led
> Full many yeares, and weetlesse wandered
> From shore to shore ...[9]

It was also Spenser's use of Trojanised imagery in *The Ruines of Time* that linked together Sidney, this time as a translator of the Psalms, and the matter of Troy[10] for some early seventeenth-century readers of the Sidney Psalter. One such reader was Sir John Harington, whose paraphrase of the Psalter (existing in two manuscript versions, Bod. MS Douce 361 and Ohio State University Spec. MS Eng. 16), draws

---

[6] J. Campana, *The Pain of Reformation* (New York, 2012), 218.
[7] *Faerie Queene* (London, 1596), 2H6^{r}.
[8] Expressed primarily in the *Ruines of Time*.
[9] Ibid., 2L6^{v}.
[10] On the link between *The Ruines of Time* and Psalm 137, see D. Cartmell, ''Beside the shore of siluer streaming *Thamesis*': Spenser's *Ruines of Time*', *Spenser Studies* 6 (1985), 77–82.

heavily both on the Sidneys' formal intricacies and on Spenser's quasi-Chaucerian parlance. Harington's project of a new English psalter (presumbly, designed to accompany the 1611 translation of the Bible) began to take shape at the turn of the century. Gavin Alexander suggests that 'by mid-1590s Harington had persuaded Pembroke to let him have copies of three of her psalm translations ... and that he did as much as he could to refer to these and to circulate them'.[11] The psalms in question, 51, 104, and 130 – had clearly sedimented in his memory in this particular incarnation and formed a basis for all his later work with the Sidneian paraphrase, as his letter to Lucy, Countess of Bedford (19 December 1600) indicates with a dash of false humility:

> ... I have sent you heere the devine, and trulie devine translation of three of Davids psalmes, done by that Excellent Countesse ...
> I have presumed to fill up the emptie paper with some shallowe meditations of myne owne;[12] not to conjoyne theise with them; ... much lesse to compare them; ... but as it were to attend them.[13]

In 1604, Harington completed his translation of Book VI of the *Aeneid* in *ottava rima* recorded in Trumbull Add. MS 23. The act of completion consisted in a kind of consecration resembling that performed by the Countess of Pembroke in her continuation of Sir Philip's paraphrase: Harington had ostensibly englished Virgil's text some time before 1604 so that his own son might use it as a Latin primer, but after a series of calamities including incarceration and an exorbitant debt he re-dedicated it to the new king's son, Prince Henry, in the hope to regain courtly favour.[14] The re-dedication included both textual revision and a great deal of paratextual material – copious footnotes occasionally sliding into theological musings and six brief discourses

[11] *Writing After Sidney,* 133.
[12] Ten epigrams copied in Petyt MS 538, vol. 43, 289^{v}–292^{r}.
[13] *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington* (Philadelphia, 1930), 87.
[14] Harington, J., Cauchi, S., *The Sixth Book of Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1991), xii–xiii.

on 'obskure and difficult questyons'[15] aroused by the Virgilian narrative. Harington's annotations abound in biblical references, and whenever he quotes from a psalm, he does so either in Latin or in Mary Sidney's voice. His treatment of the text of the Psalter strongly suggests that in 1604 he was in preparation for a full-scale versification contest with his patroness and model, and provides an insight into the nascent methodology of his recycling of the Sidney Psalter. Although the Countess of Pembroke's 'excellent translacion'[16] appears to be treated on equal terms with the biblical book itself, Harington's occasional misquotations suggest a more transformative engagement with the Sidneian text. There were other matters (such as the matter of France or Britain) and other exemplary authorial figures (such as Chaucer or Spenser) that may have created similar complex intertextualities in which a poet became a metonymy of a national matter, and the national matter was embodied in the poet's career – a mutually enriching union in which poetry and history, as Sidney himself imagined it, 'did concurre'[17]. Hopefully, some of the interpretative methodologies proposed in this study may be applied to other instances of such complex concurrence.

[15] Ibid., 62.
[16] Ibid., 9.
[17] *Defence* (1595), D4^{r}.

Bibliography

Sir Philip Sidney's works

Astrophel and Stella (London, 1591) – *A&S*
Duncan-Jones, K, van Dorsten, J. *Miscellaneous Prose*, (Oxford, 1973)
Kuin, R., ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 2012) – *Correspondence*
Ringler, W., ed., *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 1962) – *Ringler*
Robertson, J., ed., *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, (Oxford, 1973) – *The OA*
Shepherd, G., Maslen, R. W., eds., *An Apology for Poetry (Or The Defence of Poesy)* (Manchester, 2006) – *Defence* (2006)
The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia (London, 1593) – *CPA*
The Defence of Poesie (London, 1595) – *Defence* (1595)

Manuscript sources

Bod. MS Rawl. D. 345
Egerton MS 3165
Petyt MS 538, vol. 43

Loeb Classical Library

Homer, *The Iliad*, transl. Murray, A. T. and Wyatt, W. F. (Harvard, 1999) – *Iliad*
Homer, *The Odyssey*, transl. Dimock, G. (Harvard, 1995) – *Odyssey*
Horace, *Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica*, transl. Fairclough, H. R. (Harvard, 1932) – *Horace*
Lucan, *The Civil War*, transl. Duff, J. D. (Harvard, 1977) – *Lucan*
Ovid, *Heroides. Amores*, transl. Showerman, Grant (Harvard, 1977) – *Heroides*
Ovid, *The Metamorphoses*, transl. Miller, F. J. (Harvard, 1984) – *Metamorphoses*
Ovid, *Tristia. Epistulae ex Ponto*, transl. Wheeler, A. L. (Harvard, 1988) – *Tristia*
Plautus, *Comedis*, transl. De Melo (Harvard, 2011)
Quintilian, *The Orator's Eductation*, transl. Russell, D. A. (Harvard, 2014) – *Quintilian*
Quintus Smyrnaeus, *The Fall of Troy*, transl. A. S. Way (Harvard, 1913)
Theocritus, Moschus, Bion, transl. Hopkinson, N. (Harvard, 2015)
Virgil, *The Aeneid*, transl. Fairclough, H. R. (Harvard, 1966) – *Aeneid*

Primary sources

Academiae Cantabrigiensis Lachrymae (London, 1587)
Articles of agreement made betweene the French King and those of Rochell. (1628)
Ascham, R., *The Scholemaster* (London, 1570)
Bacon, F., *Essayes* (London, 1625)
Baxter, N., *Ouránia* (London, 1606)
Belling, R., *Sixth Booke to Arcadia* (London, 1624)
Blenerhasset, Th., *The Second Part of the Mirour for Magistrates* (London, 1578)
Boccaccio, G., *Famous Women*, ed. and transl. Virginia Brown (Cambridge, MA, 2001)
Boiardo, M. M., *Orlando Innamorato*, ed. A. Canova (Milan, 2011)
Camden, W., *Britannia* (London, 1637)
Camden, W., *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine* (London, 1605)
Chapman, G, *The Iliads of Homer* (London, 1611)
Colet, J. and Lyly, J., *Grammatices Rudimentis* (London, 1534)
Cornwallis, Ch., *A Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince* (London, 1641)
Daniel, S., *The Poetical Essayes of Sam. Danyel* (London, 1599)
Dares Phrygius, *De Excidio Troiae Historia* (1517)
Dee, J., *Diary*, ed. Halliwell-Phillips (London, 1842).
Dekker, Th., *Troia-Noua Triumphans* (London, 1612)
Digby, K.,'A New Digby Letter-Book: "In Praise of Venetia"', *National Library of Wales Journal* (9, 1955)
Digby, K., *Loose Fantasies* (Rome, 1968)
Epicedivm Cantabrigiense (Cambridge, 1612)
Erasmus, *Institutio Principis Christiani* (Basle, 1519)
Erasmus, *Opus de Conscribendis Epistolis* (Basle, 1522)
Fisher, J., *Fuimus Troes* (London, 1633)
Fraunce, A., *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (1950)
Gager, W., ed., *Exequiæ Illvstrissimi Eqvitis, D. Philippi Sidnaei* (Oxford, 1587)
Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain* (London, 1966)
Giovio, P., *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Giovius*, transl. Samuel Daniel (London, 1585)
Gorges, A., *The Poems*, ed. Helen Estabrook Sandison (Oxford, 1953)
Great Brittans Mourning Garment (London, 1612)
Greville, F., *Life fo Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1651)
Hannay, M. P., *The Collected Works of Mary Sidney Herbert, Countess of Pembroke*
Harington, J., Cauchi, S., *The Sixth Book of Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1991)
Heliodorus, Underdown, Th., transl., *An Aethiopian Historie* (London, 1569)
Jonson, B., Herford, C. H., Simpson, P., Simpson, E., eds., *The Works of Ben Jonson* (Oxford, 1925–1952)
Heywood, Th. and Adams, J. Q., ed., *Oenone and Paris* (London, 1943)
Heywood, Th., *The Ages* (London, 1611–1613)
Heywood, Th., *The Iron Age. Part I and II* (London, 1632)
Heywood, Th., *Troia Britannica* (London, 1609)
Holinshed, R., *The Third Volume of Chronicle* (London, 1587)
Ivsta Oxoniensivm (Oxford, 1612)

James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* (Edinburgh, 1599)
Kastner, L. E., Charlton, H. B., *The Poetical Works of William Alexander* (Edinburgh, 1921)
Knolles, R., *The General Historie of the Tvrkes* (London, 1603)
L(ing)., N., *Politeuphuia, Witts Common-Wealth* (London, 1597)
Lant, Th., *Sequitur celebritas et pompa funeris* (London, 1587)
Leicester's Commonwealth: The Copy of a Letter Written by a Master of Art of Cambridge (1584) and Related Documents, ed. D. C. Peck (Ohio, 1985)
Leland, J., *Assertio Inclytissimi Arturij Regis Britanniae* (London, 1544)
Lvctvs Posthvmvs (Magdalen College, Oxford, 1612)
McClure, N. E., *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington* (Philadelphia, 1930)
Middleton, Th. and Taylor, G., Lavagnino, J., *The Collected Works of Thomas Middleton* (Oxford, 2010)
Milton, J., Kelley, M., ed., *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton Volume 8* (Yale 1982)
Mitchel, M., ed., *Continuations to Sidney's Arcadia* (London, 2014)
Moffett, Th., *Nobilis … and Lessus Lugubris*, ed. and trans. Virgil B. Heltzel and Hoyt H. Hudson (San Marino, 1940)
Montaigne, M., Florio, J., *The Essayes* (London, 1613)
Nethersole, F., *Memoriæ sacra illustriss. potentiss. Principis Henrici Walliæ Principis, Ducis Cornubiæ, &c. laudatio funebris* (Cambridge, 1613)
Nichols, J., *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court* (London, 1928)
Norton, Th., *The Tragedie of Gorboduc* (London, 1565)
Peacham, H., *The Garden of Eloquence* (London, 1577)
Peacham, H., *The Garden of Eloquence* (London, 1593)
Peplvs (Oxford, 1587)
Pigna, G. B., *Poetica Horatiana* (Venice, 1561)
Puttenham, G., *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589)
Riccius, B., *De Imitatione Libri Tres* (Venice, 1545)
Ruscelli, G., *Le Imprese Illvstri* (Mantua, 1584)
Scaliger, J. C., *Poetices Libri Septem* (Apud Ioannem Crispinum, 1561)
Seneca and Newton, Th., ed., *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies*. *With an Introduction by T. S. Eliot* (London, 1927)
Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. David Bevington (Oxford, 2015).
Sidney, R., *The Poems of Robert Sidney*, ed. P. J. Croft (Oxford, 1984)
Sophocles and Rataller, G., Beller, J., transl., *Tragoediae Sophoclis Qvotqvot Extant Carmine Latino Redditae* (Antwerp, 1584)
Spenser, E. and Burlinson, Ch., Zurcher, A., eds., *A Supplement of the Faery Queene* (Manchester, 2015)
Sylvester, J., *Lachrimae Lachrimarum* (London, 1612)
The Funerals of the High and Mighty Prince Henry (London, 1613)
Toscano, G. M., *Peplus Italiae* (Paris, 1578)
Tottel, R., ed., *Songes and Sonettes written by the ryght honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other* (London, 1557)
Vegio, M., *Short Epics*, ed. Putnam, Michael and Hankins, James (Cambridge, M and London, 2004)
Virgil, *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*, ed. Giunta (Venice, 1544) – *Giunta*
W.H., *The Trve Pictvre and Relation of Prince Henry* (London, 1634)

Warner, W., *Albion's England* (London, 1586)
Warner, W., *Albion's England* (London, 1612)
Weamys, A., *A Continuation of Sir Philip Sidney's* Arcadia (New York, 1994)
Wedderburn, D., *In obitu summæ spei principis Henrici* (Edinburgh, 1613)
Willes, R., *Poematum Liber* (London, 1573)
Wilson, Th., *The Arte of Rherorique* (London, 1553)
Wither, G., *Prince Henry's Obseqvies* (London, 1612)

Secondary sources

Accosta-Hughes, B., Stephens, S. A., *Callimachus in Context. From Plato to the Augustan Poets* (Cambridge, 2012)
Adams, J. Q., 'Shakespeare, Heywood, and the Classics', *Modern Language Notes* 34 (Baltimore, 1919), 336–340
Adamson, S., ed., *Renaissance Figures of Speech* (Cambridge, 2007)
Alexander, G., *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney 1586–1640* (Oxford, 2006)
Arber, E., ed*., A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640 A.D*. (London and Birmingham, 1875–94)
Arkins, B., 'Heavy Seneca: His Influence on Shakespeare's Tragedies', *Classics Ireland* 2 (1995), 1–16
Baldwin, T. W., *Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1947)
Barrett, C, *Early Modern English Literature and the Poetics of Cartographic Anxiety* (Oxford, 2018)
Barthes, R., Heath, S, transl., *Image. Music. Text.* (London, 1977)
Baumbach, M., Petrovic, A., Petrovic., I., eds., *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge, 2010)
Beasley, A. W., 'The Disability of James VI and I', *The Seventeenth Century* 10, 2 (1995), 151–162
Bedford, R., Davis, L., Kelly, P., *Early Modern Autobiography. Theories, Genres, Practices* (Ann Arbor, 2006)
Bedford, R., Kelly, Ph., *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation, 1500–1660* (Ashgate, 2007)
Bergerson, D. M., *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570–1640* (Ashgate, 2006)
Bevington, D., Butler, M., Donaldson, I., , *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson* (Cambridge, 2012).
Binns, J. W., 'William Gager on the Death of Sir Philip Sidney', *Humanistica Lovaniensa* 21 (1972), 221–238
Blayney, P. W. M., *The Texts of King Lear and Their Origins* (Cambridge, 1982)
Bligh, E. W., *Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia* (London, 1932)
Boas, F. S., *Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies* (London, 1950)
Bossy, J., *Giordano Bruno and the Embassy Affair* (Yale, 1991)
Braden, G., Cummings, R., Gillespie, S., *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English. 1550–1660* (Oxford, 2010)
Bradner, L., *Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry 1500–1925* (New York, 1940)
Brand, C. P., 'The Renaissance of Comedy: The Achievement of Italian *Commedia Erudita*' *MLR* 90 (October 1995), xxix–xlii

Brooks, D. A., *From Playhouse to Printing House: Drama and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006)
Buckley, E., 'Ending the *Aeneid*? Closure and Continuation in Maffeo Vegio's *Supplementum*', *Vergilius* 52 (2006), 108–137
Budra, P., *A Mirror for Magistrates and the De Casibus Tradition* (Toronto, 2000)
Burgess, G., Wymer, R., Lawrence, J, eds., *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke, 2006)
Burrow, C., *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993)
Campana, J., *The Pain of Reformation* (New York, 2012)
Cartmell, D., '"Beside the shore of siluer streaming *Thamesis*": Spenser's *Ruines of Time*', *Spenser Studies* 6 (1985), 77–82
Chalifour, C. L., 'Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia* as Terentian Comedy', *Studies in English Literature* 16.1 (1978), 13–33
Chambers, E. K., *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923)
Cheney, P., de Armas, F., eds., *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Toronto, 2002)
Cheney, P., Hardie, P., eds., *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature. Volume 2: 1558–1660* (Oxford, 2015)
Clark, A. M., *Thomas Heywood, Playwright and Miscellanist* (Oxford, 1931)
Coghill, N, *Shakespeare's Professional Skills* (Cambridge, 1964)
Conte, G. B., Segal, Ch., transl., *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca, 1941)
Cruickshank, A. H., *Philip Massinger* (Oxford, 1920)
Curran, J., *Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism and the Historical Imagination in England 1530-1660* (Newark, 2002)
Das, N., 'Romance re-charted: the "ground-plots" of Sindey's *Arcadia*', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 41.1, 51–67
Davis, W. R., 'Narrative Methods in Sidney's *Old Arcadia*', *Studies in English Literature* 18.1 (1978), 13–33
De Ridder-Symoens, Fletcher, J. M., eds., *Academic Relations between the Low Countries and the British Isles, 1450–1700*, (Ghent, 1989).
Delaney, P., *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1969)
Dent, R. W., *John Webster's Borrowing* (Berkley, 1960)
Di Nino, M. M., 'Le 'Verità Nascoste': Consapevole Appartenenza a un Genere, Autoinvestitura e Bugie in [Mosco] III', *Philologus* 153 (2009), 86–108

Dolven, J., *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance* (Chicago, 2007)
Doran, M., *Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama* (Madison, 1954)
Duncan-Jones, K., 'Sidney's Personal Imprese', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1970), 321–4
Duncan-Jones, K., 'Sidney's Personal Imprese', *JWCI* 32 (1970), 321–4
Duncan-Jones, K., *Shakespeare: An Ungentle Life* (London, 2001)
Falco, R., *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England* (Amherst, 1994)
Fleay, F. G., *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559–1642* (London, 1891)
Foucault, M., and Bouchard, D. F., Simon, S., transl., *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (Ithaca, 1977)

Furdell, E. L., *The Royal Doctors 1485–1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts* (Rochester, 2001)
Gadd, I., ed., *The History of Oxford University Press: Volume I: Beginnings to 1780* (Oxford, 2013)
Gatti, H., *The Renaissance Drama of Knowledge: Giordano Bruno in England* (London, 1989)
Geertz, C., *Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (USA, 2000)
Greene, T. M., *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, 1982)
Gregerson, L., *The Reformation of the Subject: Spenser, Milton, and the English Protestat Epic* (Cambridge, 1995)
Gurr, A., *The Shakespearean Stage 1574–1642* (Cambridge, 2009)
Hadfield, A., *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford, 2012)
Hamilton, A. C., *Sir Philip Sidney: A Study of His Life and Works* (Cambridge, 1977)
Hamrick, S., ed., *Tottel's* Songes and Sonettes *in Context* (London, 2013)
Hannay, M. P., *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (New York, 1990)
Hardie, P., Moore, H., eds., *Classical Literary Careers and Their Reception* (Cambridge, 2010)
Hardie, P., *The Last Trojan Hero: A Cultural History of Virgil's 'Aeneid'* (London, 2014)
Harris, J. G., '"Narcissus in thy Face": Roman Desire and the Difference it Fakes in Anthony and Cleopatra', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45, 408–425
Herrick, M. T., *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century* (Urbana, 1950)
Hinds, S., *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987)
Hirst, D., Strier, R., eds., *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1999)
Holaday, A., 'Heywood's *Troia Britannica* and *The Ages*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 44 (1946)
Höltgen, K. J., 'Richard Latewar Elizabethan Poet and Divine', *Anglia* 89 (1971), 417-38
Hopkins, L., 'We were the Trojans: British national identities in 1633', *Renaissance Studies* 16.1 (2002), 36–51
Ingleby, C. M., ed., *Shakespeare Allusion* Books (London, 1909)
James, H., *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge, 1997)
Kay, D., *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford, 1990)
King, Th. J., *Casting Shakespeare's Plays* (Cambridge, 1992)
Kinney, A. F., *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Amherst, 1986)
Kläger, F., Bayer, G., *Early Modern Constructions of Europe: Literature, Culture, History* (London, 2016)
Kraus, Ch. S., Stray, Ch., eds., *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford, 2015)
Kristeva, J., *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York, 1980)

Lamb, Ch., *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets Who Lived About the Time of Shakespeare* (London, 1808)
Lange, M. E., *Telling Tears in the English Renaissance* (Leiden, 1996)
Lea, K. M., *Italian Popular Comedy* (Oxford, 1934)
Lejeune, P., 'Autobiography in the Third Person', *New Literary History* 9.1 (Autumn 1977), 27–50
Lipking, L., *The Life of the Poet: Beginning and Ending Poetic Careers* (Chicago, 1981)
Lyne, R., Mukherji, S., eds., *Early Modern Tragicomedy* (Cambridge, 2007)
Maguire, L. E., ed., *How to Do Things with Shakespeare: New Approaches, New Essays* (Malden, 2008)
Manakidou, F. P., 'ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΑΔΩΝΙΔΟΣ and ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΒΙΩΝΟΣ: Remarks on Their Generic Form and Content', *Materiali e discussioni per l'nalisi dei testi classici* 37 (1996), 27–58
Marrapodi, M., *Shakespeare, Italy, and Intertextuality* (Manchester, 2004)
Martin, M., *Literature and the Encounter with God in Post-Reformation England* (Ashgate, 2014)
Martindale, Ch. (ed.), *Shakespeare and the Classics* (Cambridge, 2004)
Martindale, Ch., *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge, 1993)
Mascuch, M., *Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591–1791* (Cambridge, 1997)
May, S. W., Ringler, W. A., *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559–1603* (London, 2004)
McCoy, R. C., *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick, 1979)
McGill, S., *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity* (Oxford, 2005)
McInnis, D., Steggle, M (eds.), *Lost Plays in Shakespeare's England* (Palgrave, 2014)
Miola, R. S., *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford, 1992)
Moore, H., 'The Eastern Mediterranean in the English Amadis Cycle', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 41.1 (2011), 113–125
Moretti, F., *Distant Reading* (London, 2013)
Moshenska, J., *A Stain in the Blood: The Remarkable Voyage of Sir Kenelm Digby* (London, 2016)
Muir, K., *Shakespeare's Sources* (London, 1957)
Myrick, K. O., *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Harvard, 1935)
Nauta, R. R., Smolenaars J. J. L., Dam, H.–J., *Flavian Poetry* (Leiden, 2005)
Newstock, S. L., *Quoting Death in Early Modern England: The Poetics of Epitaphs Beyond the Tomb* (Basingstoke, 2009)
Parker, P., Hartman, G., eds., *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory* (New York, 1985)
Parker, R. W., 'Terentian Structure and Sidney's Original Arcadia', *English Literary Renaissance* (December 1972), 61–78
Pask, K., *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1996)
Pigman III, G. W., *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge, 1985)
Quitslund, J., 'The Work of Mourning in Spenser's Garden of Adonis', *Renaissance Papers* (1997), 23–31

Quitslund, J., *Spenser's Supreme Fiction: Platonic Natural Philosophy and The faerie queence* (Toronto, 2001)
R. Heffner et al., *Spenser Allusions in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (*Studies in Philology* 68, 1971)
Rankin, D., *Between Spenser and Swift: English Writing in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Cambridge, 2005)
Ricks, Ch., *Allusion to Poets* (Oxford, 2012)
Ross, D. O., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge, 1975)
Schmidt, P. G., 'Neolateinische Supplemente zur Aeneis', *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis* (1973)
Scodel, J., *Excess and Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton, 2002)
Shepard, A., Powell, S. D., eds., *Fantasies of Troy: Classical Tales and the Social Imaginary in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Toronto, 2004)
Simonova, N., *Early Modern Authorship and Prose Continuations: Adaptation and Ownership from Sidney to Richardson* (Basingstoke, 2015)
Simpson, E. M., *The Elizabethan Translations of Seneca's Tragedies* (Cambridge, 1912)
Siochrú, M., *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s* (Dublin, 2001)
Sistakou, E., *Tragic Failures. Alexandrian Responses to Tragedy and the Tragic* (Berlin, 2016)
Skretkowicz, V., 'Devices and Their Narrative Function in Sidney's *Arcadia*', *Emblematica* 2 (1986), 267–92
Smith, H., Wilson, L., *Renaissance Paratexts* (Cambridge, 2011)
Stern, V. F., *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library* (Oxford, 1979)
Stillman, R. E., *Sidney and Poetic Justice: The Old Arcadia, Its Eclogues, and Renaissance Pastoral Tradition* (Lewisburg, 1986)
Swiss, M., and Kent, D., eds., *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton* (Pittsburgh, 2002)
Tatlock, J. S. P., 'The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan England, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 30, No. 4 (1915), 673–770
Thomas, R. F., *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, 1999)
Van Dorsten, J., Baker-Smith, D., Kinney, A. F., *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend* (Leiden, 1986)
Van Dorsten, J., *Poets, Patrons, and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers, and the Leiden Humanists* (Leiden, 1962)
Vaught, J. C., ed., *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature* (Aldershot, 2008)
Wiggins, M., *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue* (Oxford, 2013–)
Wilks, T., *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton, 2007)
Williamson, J. W., *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, a Stuy of 17th Century Personation* (New York, 1978)
Woodbridge, L., 'Resistance Theory Meets Drama: Tudor Seneca', *Renaissance Drama* 38 (2010), 115–139.
Woolf, D., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000)
Wordern, B., *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics* (London, 1996)

Woudhuysen, H., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640* (Oxford, 1996)