

University of Oxford
Department of English

M.Litt. Thesis

Emotion Unbound:
asyndeton and emotionality in ancient Greek and early modern English prose romance

by
Hannah Kirby
Keble College

Trinity 2013

49,098 words

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Letters in English Language and Literature

Emotion unbound: asyndeton and emotionality in ancient Greek and early modern English prose romance

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Letters in English Language and Literature

By Hannah Kirby (Keble College, University of Oxford), Trinity 2013

ABSTRACT

— asyndeton, n., from the Greek ***ἀσύνδετον***
ἀ without + *συν* together + *δεῖν* to bind.[1]

This thesis seeks to demonstrate that the mode of figurative speech known as asyndeton, and the related asyndetic matrix, offers a unique insight into the way emotionality is depicted in early modern English prose romances. It charts the translation of asyndeton from ancient Greek prose romances, where the figure is used at moments of heightened emotional conflict. It examines the complex process through which this translation and the figure's adaptation into asyndetic matrices in English continues to express and evoke subjective emotional concepts, by breaking down asyndeton's propensity for 'vehemence', 'earnestness', 'special vigour', 'agitation' and even 'frenzy' into a three-step process: dissolution, amplification and union.[2]

In so doing, the thesis examines the asyndetic natures of Achilles Tatios's *Leukippe and Kleitophon* and Heliodoros's *Ethiopian History*, John Lyly's two volumes about *Euphues*, Sir Philip Sidney's Old and New *Arcadia*s and Robert Greene's two volumes of *Mamillia*. By suggesting that the development of linguistic tropes stems from emotional tropes rather than vice versa, the thesis argues that social, emotional or psychological patterns may be potently transcribed in figures of speech, rather than that figures of speech served to fashion emotionality.

[1] 'asyndeton, n.', in *The OED Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[2] 'asyndeton', in *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589), pp.145-46; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. by H. E. Butler, 4 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920) III, IX.3.50; see Jebb's notes on *Ajax* in *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments with critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose*, trans. by Sir Richard C. Jebb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1899), p.60.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In Principall Parte, the Author's thankes to
Her EUER-PATIENTE SVPERUISORE Dr HELEN MOORE, &
DEAREST FRIENDE & nowe HVSBANDE, THOMAS HIRSTE-DVNTON Esq.,
Consciouslye to Ms Photeine Dimirouli & Messr Enrico Prodi
for theyr Knowledge of the Greeke Tongue,
& eeke to Sundrye Other gallaunt Ladyes & fayre Gentlemen of the Vniuersitie,
Who Themselues knowe beste of theyr Identytyes & theyr Supporte.

Here now haue you (most deare, & most worthie to be most deare friendes) this laboured worke of mine: which I feare (like the Spider's webbe) will be thought fitter to languishe in a corner of the Bodleyan, then used to anie purpose. This childe was deliuered by most grieuous paines, but your supporte, to my hart, did beare me through saide laboure as I did beare the worke. Now it is done, & your deare selues can best witnes the maner, it beyng done most of it in the presence & care of Messr Hirste-Dunton, & by sheetes, sent unto Dr Moore, as fast as they were done. In summe, a young head, not so well stay'd as I would it were (& shall be when prouidence will) had many fancies begotten in it, & if they had not ben in some way deliuered (& sooth'd by the goodlie Dr Moore), would haue growen a monster, & more sorie might I be that I came Vp, then gladde. & so it is my dearest wille that you will continue to holde the writer in no contempte, who doth hartelie thanke you & wille holde you in beste regarde; so longe (at leaste) as this childe doth liue in her faultie memorye.

Your grateful seruaunt
Ladye H. Hirste-Dunton
(borne Kirbye)
of Wansleye Manor,
Scholar.

CONTENTS

Introduction **3**

I: Dissolution **28**

Lyly's dissolute characters 32

Lyly's authorial approach 53

Reading the dissolute in *Euphues* 99

II: Amplification **52**

Sidney's structure and authorial approach 53

Amplified character in Arcadia 99

Reading the *Arcadia*s' amplifications 105

III: Union **96**

Greene's authorial approach and parodic practice 99

Greene's characters united: the conflation of amplification 105

Reading Greene's unremitting union 115

Conclusion **120**

Bibliography **123**

Emotion unbound: Asyndeton and emotionality in ancient Greek and early modern English prose romance

— asyndeton, n., from the Greek ***ἀσύνδετον***
ἀ without + *συν* together + *δεῖν* to bind.[1]

'Let nature and passion always speak their own language, and they will suggest Figures in abundance': so states Hugh Blair, student and professor of both ancient Greek and early modern English rhetorical style, in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* in 1783.[2] Blair's conception is one of language that freely expresses the intricacies and nuances of emotionality. For him, the phenomenon of figurative speech is not showy or ornamental, covering and binding one's impulses, but rather allows them to manifest themselves. In pursuing emotionality, then, study of the self-consciously formal or elaborate, rather than the (literally) whimsical, would be counter-productive: as Blair writes, 'the pomp and solemnity' of 'the formal … is altogether a stranger to passion'.[3] This is the mode of study, however – one that embraces elaborate rhetoric and focuses on linguistic aesthetics – that even now dominates such pursuits. Critical conceptions of English Renaissance writing on emotionality, since Stephen Greenblatt's publication, have become almost inextricable from the idea of self-fashioning.[4]

As Greenblatt, Frank Whigham and Norbert Elias (and others) have established, the relationship between courtly behaviour and modes of speech is intricate and complex: the former paralleled or could even shape the latter as courtiers began to *identify* themselves – perhaps, as Whigham suggests, refining such modes in an (often not felicitous) attempt defensively to define aristocratic distinctions.[5] Through his conscious use of what Whigham terms 'social tropes', the courtier took part in the dizzying game of constructing, questioning and reaffirming both the social world and his own place in it.[6] It is interesting that Whigham and his colleagues root their socially macrocosmic theories in the microcosm of formal language, but their treatments often reduce the

---

[1] See 'asyndeton, n.', in *The OED Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[2] Hugh Blair, 'Lecture XVII. Comparison, Antithesis, Interrogation, Exclamation, and other Figures of Speech', *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 3rd edn., 3 vols (London: for A. Strahan and T. Cadell; and Edinburgh: for W. Creech, 1787), I, pp.430-456 (p.453).
[3] Ibid., p.436.
[4] See Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
[5] See Frank Whigham, *Ambitions and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984) and Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).
[6] See Whigham, as above.

role of such language to symbolizing nuances of advancement and power. The language thus remains exclusively formal and, in its own right, not at all rhetorically forceful. Since the early 1990s, the most outstanding work on figurative speech and formal language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has been almost equally formal: critics such as Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander, Katrin Ettenhuber *et al.* (including all those who contributed to their excellent *Renaissance Figures of Speech*[7]) provide rigorous documentary studies of usage practices, but little investigation into *why* the natures of figures were (and are) so effective. In literary studies, figurative speech is largely still portrayed as playful, artistic embellishment, rather than as the raw and evocative language of emotions.

Approaching the topic's opposite face, in their focus on emotion rather than language, in recent years psychologists and neuroscientists have moved away from their field's otherwise common endeavour to evade socialized context when studying emotions in the brain (see, for example, the work of Edmund Rolls[8]). Instead, they have sought to forge interdisciplinary links with the literary arts, in order to substantiate theories that the human brain formulates abstract emotional concepts. They have begun to explore the correspondence between complex cognitive processes and the equally complex, richly nuanced language that subjects generate to express them. As neurobiologist Semir Zeki suggests, to 'obtain better evidence that humans also have a concept of love, it is to the literature of love that we have to turn.'[9] Harwood Fisher's *Self, Logic and Figurative Thinking*, like Zeki's *Splendours and Miseries of the Brain*, depicts the self as a mediator between artistic 'trope' and 'logical form', where the self's conception of reality is both ambiguous and highly subjective, and one's experiences are ordered and expressed *only as they are originated*.[10] Fisher's terminological similarities to Whigham emphasize to what extent the one approach is simply a reversal of the other, and consequently highlight the implications of each for emotionality.

Whigham's construction of figurative speech constrains and oppresses emotionality, rather than transcribing it as Blair's comments suggest it might. As Elias writes in his forcefully influential *The Civilizing Process*, warriors could be uninhibited in passionate discharge, whereas courtiers'

---

[7] Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber (eds.), *Renaissance Figures of Speech* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
[8] See Edmund T. Rolls, *The Brain and Emotion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) and *Emotion Explained* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
[9] Semir Zeki, *Splendours and Miseries of the Brain: Love, Creativity and the Quest for Human Happiness* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p.148.
[10] See Harwood Fisher's *Self, Logic and Figurative Thinking* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2008).

'tamed nobility' experienced 'more muted affects.'[11] The warrior may express intense aggression and eroticism – and conversely, as Mary Ellen Lamb establishes, 'passionate excess' may also be expected of femininity.[12] The courtier, meanwhile, must adjust his words and behaviour to the opinions of others to succeed in court: he "'conceals … his passions," "dis-avows his heart" and "acts against his feelings'" until he develops 'a heightened degree of autonomous affect control'.[13] Any failure to do so, and consequent expression of emotionality, could categorize the courtier as barbarous or, conversely, effeminate. With its 'social trope'-originated approach, the New Historicist consensus is that courtiers exercised self-restraint in their parallel rhetorical and social lives, and carefully edited their actions and their expressed emotions: they bound themselves. In literary and linguistic terms, this thesis instead takes an approach with cognitive origins, which traces emotionality outwards from subjective response to expression, and towards socialization. Its study of the nature of *asyndeton* seeks to probe the potential for insight into emotionality with which Blair credited figurative speech: to provide some insight into what courtiers had to 'conceal'. It seeks to explore unbound emotionality.

Massimo Fusillo used asyndeton specifically to aid such an approach. Occupying somewhat the middle ground between psychology and literary studies, Fusillo's work performs often psychosexual readings of identity as portrayed in ancient Greek fiction.[14] His discussions deal rigorously with polyphony, asyndeton and other figurative language premised on multiplicity. These tropes, as Fusillo conveys, exemplify figurative speech because their effectiveness lies not in what they literally transcribe but in what *way* they transcribe it. Fusillo's treatment of asyndeton and where it is employed, discussed at greater length below, considers what the figure may be trying to evoke, but still remains for the most part documentary: it does not credit figurative speech with the potential to provide the subjective insight indicated by his cognitive approach.

Further exploration of asyndeton grants insight into the ways in which evocative figures of speech work: they allow the reader to engage creatively with a text. Numerous tropes derive from it – zeugma and parataxis, for example – which may be described as asyndetic (and may, indeed,

---

[11] Elias, pp.466–67.
[12] Mary Ellen Lamb, 'Exhibiting Class and Displaying the Body in Sidney's Countess of Pembroke's *Arcadia*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 37:1 (Winter, 1997), pp.55-72 (p.56).
[13] Elias, pp.477, 485.
[14] See Massimo Fusillo, 'The Conflict of Emotions', *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. by Simon Swain (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp.60-82; and *Il Romanzo Greco: Polifonia e Eros* (Venice: Marcilio Editore, 1989).

incorporate the effects of asyndeton detailed here). These subsets and derivatives have, however, assumed connotations alien to asyndeton in its literal, original ancient Greek form, and differ in technicalities of usage. Unlike zeugma, asyndeton is not necessarily dependent on any governing word or phrase: asyndeton can be grammatically discrete. Unlike parataxis, it is not used to represent progress through a chain of conceptions: in contrast to parataxic trains of thought, the aim of asyndeton is to present elements that are always both independent and conjoined into *one* concept; they are parallel, synchronous and always syntactically fluid, rather than sequential. The figure is also similar to polyphony, but is used to express *one* character's feelings or *one* phenomenon's properties, rather than to contrast those of many. Asyndeton's effects may be transposed in these related figures, context allowing. This discussion focuses on asyndeton rather than its varieties, though, in order to clarify the concept and the process involved in understanding language that is intentionally fragmented or incomplete – language without conjunction. Recognition of sixteenth-century authors' and translators' efforts to retain and conserve the effects of asyndeton in their adaptations of it, furthermore, alerts the reader to their changing priorities regarding characterization, authority and the role of the reader, and their motivations for using figurative speech in their prose. In this latter pursuit, asyndeton may be seen as an example of, or even metaphor for, all figures of speech that require readers' inferences or complicity in order to function figuratively, and potentially also assist studies of paronomasia, allegory or metaphor itself.

Asyndeton literally constitutes the omission of conjunctions, typically in oratorical lists such as 'I came; I saw; I conquered'. Definitions of its use and interpretations have remained relatively constant since its ancient Greek origins: Aristotle writes of it as 'the connecting particle … removed', and Herbert Weir Smyth's *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* elaborates that '[t]wo or more sentences (or words) independent in form and thought, but juxtaposed, i.e. coördinated [*sic*] without any connective, are *asyndetic* … and such absence of connectives is called asyndeton.'[15] In its translation to Latin, the figure alters imperceptibly if at all: Quintilian describes it as 'the absence of connecting particles'.[16] Current lexicography agrees (asyndeton is the '[o]mission of conjunctions

[15] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, in *Aristotle*, trans. by J. H. Freese, 23 vols (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd, 1926), vol. 22, III.12.4; Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York, NY, Cincinnati, OH, and Chicago, IL: American Book Company, 1920), IV.38.1033 and IV.50.2165.

[16] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. by H. E. Butler, 4 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920) III, IX.3.50.

between words, phrases, or clauses' for the *Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*[17]), and *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* expands: '[o]mission of conjunctions is technically *brachylogia* – fundamental to all forms of series and catalogues (q.v.) – but many writers now use a. as the cover term for all types of conjunction deletion'.[18] Despite its longevity, asyndeton in its literal form is by all accounts at its most powerful in its language of origin: as Smyth notes, 'the absence of connectives in a language so rich in means of coördination as is Greek is more striking than in other languages'.[19] In his *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*, Edward Cope agrees with this prognosis, 'as connecting particles occur much more frequently in Greek than in our own language'.[20] Nevertheless, as English scholars rediscovered ancient literature from Europe in the sixteenth century, and the English language was championed more prominently, asyndeton too was translated and transformed.

Although intricately connected to its literal meaning, in English asyndeton's figurative nature becomes paramount. The variety and tenor of ways it is used in literature suggest that it ought not to be accounted simply as an English need to find a collective term for 'all types of conjunction deletion' or to subdivide brachylogia or elision. Asyndeton is not simply a grammatical contraction; it performs a distinct figurative function, and the implications of its effects and affects (of the ways its deletions alter the reading experience) are both considerable and wide-ranging. As the *PEPP* continues, asyndeton 'is the genus for *several species* of conjunction deletion': its main difference from brachylogia is located in its variability – in its ability to encompass diverse effects and affects.[21] However, much of asyndeton's rhetorical power does stem from brachylogia: what the *PEPP* terms its 'effects of speed, breathlessness, headlong momentum,' are, for Henry Peacham, 'for expedition and brevitie'.[22] To asyndeton's indication of haste, however, is quickly appended a deviation from 'short speech': the notion of its 'vehemence' is added (again by the *PEPP*), which characteristic George Puttenham terms 'earnestness'.[23] Other critics have extended haste and

---

[17] 'asyndeton', in *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991).
[18] 'asyndeton', in *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).
[19] Smyth, IV.50.2165.
[20] Edward Meredith Cope, *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1877), I.ii.6.
[21] The *PEPP* as above [my emphasis].
[22] Ibid.; Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: by R[ichard] F[ield] for H. Iackson dwelling in Fleetstrete, 1593), p.52.
[23] The *PEPP* as above; George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, dwelling in the black-Friars, neere Ludgate, 1589), pp.145-46.

vehemence to 'special vigour' (as Quintilian detects), 'agitation', or even 'frenzy' (inferred by Sir Richard C. Jebb).[24] Moreover, the *process by which* it achieves such 'special' 'frenzy' distinguishes it uniquely from the simple terseness of brachylogia. This process may be broken down into three stages: dissolution, amplification and union.

Removal of conjunctions is, at its most simplistic and as the *PEPP* states, a form of deletion – and one that removes sequential structure from a list, resulting in characteristic 'unconnected' or 'loose' speech (in the terms of the Liddell & Scott Greek lexicon).[25] Liddell & Scott even use 'asyndeton' as a definitive synonym for λῦσις ('lusis': 'looseness of structure in writing') and διάλῡσις ('dialusis': a 'separating, parting … dissolution'); Quintilian similarly conflates the two terms 'asyndeton' and 'dissolution' to mean 'detachment'.[26] These assimilations are at best simplifications, but they do illustrate the impression of 'breaking up' or wrenching asunder that the dissolution of conjunction deletion incurs, especially in ancient Greek: as Cope's notes on Aristotle continue, in its original form asyndeton 'would give the composition the appearance of being both naked and disjointed.'[27] Consequently, those composing rhetorical guidelines have advised extreme '[c]aution' in implementing asyndeton: Puttenham believed it to be 'in a maner defectiue because it wants good band or coupling', and Aristotle even wrote of it as 'rightly disapproved in written speech.'[28] Despite this, asyndeton *is* found in Greek writing (otherwise, indeed, both the lexicon and this thesis would have little with which to work), and is found often. This is because asyndeton's dissolution of linguistic elements – their separation and their implied deletions – also affects them and their listener or reader in a manner *distinct* from their simpler role rendering orations concise, allowing readers' own 'nature and passion' to 'speak their own language.' Asyndeton's 'looseness' can equate to fluidity and mutability: to ambiguity and freedom of ideas in writing. The deletions that surround 'detached' elements, too, both allow semantic expansions around these existing elements, and provide conceptual space for inferences. As the *PEPP* intimates, asyndeton 'is itself, in turn, one species of all figures of ellipsis' – and ellipsis, while implying content omitted, also both alerts readers to the omission, and prompts them to posit that

---

[24] Quintilian, as above; see Jebb's notes on *Ajax* in *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments with critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose*, trans. by Sir Richard C. Jebb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1899), p.60.
[25] In 'ἀσύν-δετος, ον', in the Liddell-Scott-Jones *Greek – English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).
[26] 'λῦσις' and 'διά-λῡσις', Liddell-Scott-Jones as above; Quintilian, as above.
[27] See 'dissolution' in the *OED Online* as above; Cope, as above.
[28] Peacham, as above; Puttenham, as above; Aristotle, III.12.3.

content themselves. It is this aspect of the figure that Aristotle described, despite his objections, as asyndeton's 'special characteristic'.[29]

Through separation, asyndeton allows the reader to focus on and appreciate each previously conflated constituent element of the list (or clause, sentence, or paragraph). As Aristotle continues:

> [I]n an equal space of time many things appear to be said, because the connecting particle makes many things one, so that, if it be removed, it is clear that the contrary will be the case, and that the one will become many. Therefore an asyndeton produces amplification.[30]

As they become 'many', the diversity and independent values of smaller elements are 'amplifi[ed]': each may be seen more clearly, and each becomes more poignant. 'I came; I saw; I conquered' impresses Caesar's every action: he commanded his fleet to Zela, implying his exceptional captaincy and leadership; he recognized a prize to be taken and strategized an insightful battle plan; he commanded his legions with flawless bravery and martial skill, defeating all opposition. Deletion of conjunctions both halts the flow of the phrase, to enforce emphasis on the words themselves, and seems to remove any elements of contingency or routine from the actions those words represent: each verb and each depicted action seems complete and perfectly executed in itself. Quintilian too recognizes this potential in asyndeton: partly because it is applied 'not merely to single words, but to whole sentences', he writes, 'it at once impresses the [clauses'] details on the mind', and consequently could stimulate intensely dramatic affects:

> [Thus] great effect may be produced by dwelling on [each] single point, and by setting forth our facts in such a striking manner that they seem to be placed before the eyes as vividly as if they were taking place in our actual presence.[31]

Out of (at first apparently nihilistic) dissolution, each element's semantics find space for free, full and vivid expression. These elements are fractured from one another but, in becoming so, attain rhetorically powerful imaginative autonomy in a (sometimes oratorically necessarily) brachylogic forum. Rendering multiple elements separate, as Aristotle and Quintilian recognize, does additionally allow freedom syntactically, as the words, clauses or sentences that might have been bound by contingencies seem to become freely associative. The consequently interpretable space around them, additionally, allows elements to appear in their full diversity: both collectively and individually, their meanings are both 'many' and varied. As Quintilian continues, the elements'

---

[29] Aristotle, III.12.4.
[30] Ibid..
[31] Quintilian, IX.1.27.

dissolution and autonomy seem to amplify their quantity as well as their import: asyndeton 'makes them seem more numerous than they really are', because of the asyndetic sequence's unusually recognizable complexity.[32]

Once not irrevocably conjoined by the restrictions of conjunctions, asyndeton's newly potent constitutive parts (viewed separately) may even appear to contradict one another: asyndeton has the power, Peacham warns, to 'utter [and conjoin] contraries, as if one should say, pleasaure paine, peace warre, life death'.[33] 'Effects may be obtained,' Quintilian summarizes, '… by arguments drawn from opposites, asyndeton'.[34] This combination of dis- and re-alignments – both the syntactical and, ambiguously, the semantic – is what incurs the figure's attributions of 'vigour', 'frenzy' and 'agitation', as conjunctions and contingence are replaced with augmented, self-contained and freely associative elements. In emphasizing the play between such 'opposites', and between what is written and unwritten, asyndeton finds its niche. In comparing asyndeton's constitutive elements, though, the readers are not *only* appreciating each separately; they are also inferring relationships (assimilations, complements or contrasts) – unworded content – between them, in forms more complex than simple conjunctions. Discussing where in literature this idiosyncrasy is of the most use provides the third and final stage of the figure's semantic process – and also with grounds for studying the texts under discussion here.

As perhaps obviously implied by Jebb's inference of 'frenzy', because of asyndeton's capacity for chaotic structure and its characteristic facility for interweaving connections and separations, contraries and lacks, asyndeton has also been found to express emotionality (itself interwoven with human frictions, wants, connections and separations) with unique sensibility. Brian Vickers writes that '*asyndeton*, … the absence of connecting particles, still continues to be associated with emotional disturbance' because (he quotes from James Beattie's *Dissertations Moral and Critical),* '[t]he language of enthusiasm, and of all those passions that strongly agitate the soul, is naturally incoherent', and (from Robert Lowth, lecturing *On the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*), that the more violent affections of the heart 'break and interrupt the enunciation by their impetuosity; they break forth in sentences pointed, earnest, rapid and tremulous.'[35] Asyndeton naturally simulates, by these terms, the human conception of emotions 'of the heart' through its recognizably frenzied word

[32] Quintilian, IX.3.50.
[33] Peacham, as above.
[34] Quintilian, IX.1.34.
[35] Brian Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p.304.

pattern. What these conclusions also imply, moreover, is that, from the ambiguous autonomy of independent elements that asyndeton presents, the reader collates and infers some of the unworded content implied by ellipses. This stance is one that Zeki, too, adopts in his consideration of the ways his subjects attempt to express conceptions of emotion or beauty. As expressive 'realization' of the subjective concept 'is commonly difficult or impossible in real life, or even in art,' he suggests:

> A solution might be to present it in an incomplete form – since it is the complete form that is unattainable – and leave it to the imagination of the perceiver, the artist no less than the viewer or the reader, to complete the experience.[36]

Zeki's theory, like those of Vickers, Beattie and Lowth, testifies that the 'perceiver' is rendered able to engage more with 'incomplete' or fractured creative work than with the straightforward or didactic, because of the mind's propensity towards ambiguity: its ability, even desire, to see multiple conceptual possibilities. (This is, Zeki writes, 'a protective characteristic that the brain has developed but which has been put to good use in enriching many works of art'.[37])

As Peacham's and Quintilian's comments on conjoining contraries imply, asyndeton's capacity to forge union is certainly more flexible and ambiguous than that of conjunctions, and yet is also more powerful. The chaotic syntax of the autonomous and amplified constituent elements does not, after all, render them ultimately decathected from one another: for them to be asyndetic, the term *asyndeton* must refer to the collection as a whole. As Smyth writes, even in the 'absence of connectives' such elements are 'juxtaposed, i.e. coördinated'; as Liddell & Scott clarify, they are 'without conjunction, but *not without connexion*'.[38] Without explicitly linking words, asyndeton does produce a united concept in the mind of its reader; as Peacham concludes, '[a]syndeton is a figure which keepeth the parts of speech together without the helpe of any conjunction'.[39] When 'I came; I saw; I conquered' is reconsidered, after all, around the amplified assertion of Caesar's actual deeds the words also imply a united plan and coup of astonishing conceptual and temporal unity. It is as though Caesar proclaims, 'the moment I came and saw Zela, I had already conquered it' – as though the victory had been nothing more than the whim of a moment to a superman. Still, however, each individual achievement of the campaign is impressed: one reads both the statement's

---

[36] Zeki, p.101.
[37] Ibid., p.63.
[38] Smyth, IV.50.2165; '**ἀσύν-δετος, ον**' in Liddell-Scott-Jones [emphasis *sic*].
[39] Peacham, as above.

nonchalance and its import; both its lightness and its weight; both its elements and its union. Herein lies the real power of asyndeton: through dissolution and amplification, the union that the reader inevitably seeks – and creates – is rendered semantically far richer, more diverse and more speaking.

Dissolution and amplification of contrasting, even contradictory, elements is what allows asyndeton to express the otherwise inexpressible so expertly. Underneath Caesar's apparently so impassive, inscrutable and succinct (even terse) statement of victory, lies a tumult of activity, engagement and, unavoidably, emotionality. The statement itself avoids all of these elements explicitly, but there can be little doubt that both the orator and the listener (now, the reader) sense their presence – and powerfully, as the reader must make an imaginative engagement with the statement in order to compose its implicit content (its union) himself. Especially in a forum where explicit emotionality is discouraged, asyndeton may thus give the writer an outlet for *evoking* unworded emotion. Joseph Priestley, in writing the first major work on rhetorical strategy since the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century humanists upon which both he and this thesis focus, believes as Blair does that this evocative property is inherent to figurative speech. As Peter Stone documents, in 1777 Priestley writes especially aptly for asyndeton that:

> Figurative speech … is indicative of a person's real feelings and state of mind, not by means of the words it consists of, considered as *signs of separate ideas* … but as circumstances naturally attending those feelings which compose any state of mind. Those figurative expressions, therefore, are scarcely considered and attended to as *words*, but are viewed in the same light as attitudes, *gestures*, and *looks*, which are infinitely more expressive of sentiments and feelings than words can possibly be.[40]

Asyndeton's dissolute elements constitute Priestley's *signs* and, in place of explication, they substitute the *gestures* that allow the reader to interpret them creatively. It is precisely this relationship, between diverse, dissolute 'words' and holistic gestures – the union that the reader infers – that asyndeton encapsulates and exemplifies. Readers' compulsions somehow to forge union from the diverse and dissolute elements that asyndeton encapsulates is no less reliable than the desire to make sense from the world, or order from chaos. The very fact that the author's words are 'incoherent' allows freedom for subjective interpretations of the diverse, ambiguous

[40] In P. W. K. Stone, *The Art of Poetry 1750-1820: Theories of Poetic Composition and Style in the late Neo-Classic and early Romantic Periods* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p.66 [emphasis *sic*].

'*signs*' that Priestley felt composed the 'circumstances' for feelings. As Vickers writes, 'the greatest feelings are expressed without language, or through its breakdown'.[41]

Through the ambiguity of asyndeton, authors involve readers actively, allowing them to interpret the exact nature of the figure's interplay between the implicit and explicit, the fragmentary and the whole. Quintilian theorized that thus:

> We may confer with our audience, admitting them as it were into our deliberations, may describe the life and character of persons either with or without mention of their names, [through] a device which is one of the greatest embellishments of oratory and specially adapted to conciliate the feelings, as also frequently to excite them.[42]

In asyndeton, '*gesture*[s]' replace the need for explicit, restrictive 'names' of *concepts*, as well as persons. Asyndeton avoids the 'violent' naming of elusive, ambiguous concepts that has caused critics such as Judith Butler and Denise Riley so much theoretical anxiety. Each reader may interpret it subjectively, so the sensitive and, more importantly, *subjective* experiences to which it alludes may remain subjective rather than being allocated restrictive labels.[43] Asyndeton's ambiguity is therefore its greatest strength. As Aristotle writes, '[this] deliberative style is exactly like a rough sketch, for the greater the crowd, the further off is the point of view; wherefore in both too much refinement is a superfluity and even a disadvantage.'[44] For Aristotle, it is the 'rough[ness]' of the sketch that allows so great a 'crowd' to see beauty or truth in it: were it more complete, it would be more specific and so more exclusive. Because of ambiguity, the greatness of this potential crowd (the audience for which a figurative style is effective), Quintilian theorizes, may extend even across epochs, regardless of socio-historical context: figurative speech may 'delight all ages'.[45] This being the case, if the process of the matrix sequence does inherently, accurately express the ways in which emotion is conceived, asyndeton would naturally remain similarly observable and potent however many years pass – a possibility supported by the similarity of, for example, Priestley's conceptions to those of Aristotle and Quintilian centuries earlier. As if to confirm this position, Roland Barthes, too, recognizes the singular propriety of asyndeton's '*gesture*' towards a conceptual union to be formed by the reader. He posits a complex system inherent to expressing emotional concepts (here,

---

[41] Vickers, p.304.
[42] Quintilian, IX.1.30.
[43] Judith Butler, 'On Linguistic Vulnerability', *Excitable Speech* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1997) pp.1-41 (p.19). See also Denise Riley, *The Words of Selves* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000).
[44] Aristotle, III.12.5.
[45] Quintilian, IX.1.30.

love), which relies upon the interplay of the unsaid and the diverse, and suggests just this connection:

> It is said that words alone have specific uses, not sentences; but underneath each figure lies a sentence, frequently an unknown (unconscious?) one, which has its use in the signifying economy of the amorous subject. This matrix sequence (here merely postulated) is not a "saturated" one, not a completed message. Its active principle is not what it says but what it articulates: by and large, it is only a "syntactical aria," a "mode of construction." For instance, if the subject awaits the loved one at a rendezvous, a sentence-aria keeps running through his head: *"All the same, it's not fair…"*; *"he/she could have…"*; *"he/she knows perfectly well…"*: knows what? It doesn't matter, the figure "Waiting" is already formed. Such sentences are matrices of figures precisely because they remain suspended: they utter the affect, then break off, their role is filled. The words are never crazed (at most perverse), but the syntax is: is it not on the level of the sentence that the subject seeks his place – and fails to find it – or finds a false place imposed upon him by language? Underneath the figure, there is something of the verbal hallucination[.][46]

Barthes' depiction of how elusive, emotional concepts form (here, concepts unique to the 'amorous subject'), does not name asyndeton explicitly. However, Barthes invokes a syntactically unusual matrix: a sequence that involves multiple, contrasting concepts (here, senses of unfairness, obligation, speculation, expectation) that in themselves remain singular and valid, but that *between them* also suggest an unspoken 'figure' (here, 'Waiting'). For Barthes, the matrix sequence is also unspoken ('merely postulated'); it remains 'running through his head'. Asyndeton, however, is able to express the matrix, suggest the emotional '*gesture*' to the reader, and so provoke what Barthes imagines. Thus what appears to be the 'frenzy' of dissolute elements, once amplified and appreciated for their diversity, works to form a union that constitutes for Barthes a uniquely sensitive form of expression – and one that mimics the effects it hopes to portray. Barthes here echoes what Vickers asserts, and quotes at great length to illustrate: that such figures of speech have evolved precisely to express what words alone cannot. Upon this premise, as Vickers agrees, Hugh Blair could make his assertive claim for figurative speech, that 'nature and passion' will suggest their own 'figures in abundance'.[47]

This point emerges repeatedly in writing on asyndetic figures: commenting on Aristotle's and his contemporaries' texts in 1677, John Dryden agrees that rhetoric with the power to move 'must have been an imitation of nature.'[48] Figures of speech such as asyndeton, he continues, 'work their

---

[46] Roland Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (London: Vintage, 2002), pp.5-6.
[47] Blair, as above, cited by Vickers, p.303.
[48] John Dryden, 'The Authors Apology for Heroique Poetry; and Poetique License', in preface to *The State of Innocence and Fall of Man, an Opera, written in Heroique Verse* (London: by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1677), p.b3v.

effect upon the Mind, without discovering [that is, revealing] the Art which caus'd it. And therefore they are principally to be us'd in passion … disorder'd connection[s] of discourse, are graceful there, because they are Natural.'[49] This is the rationale of Quintilian's theory that figurative writing remains so moving across 'all ages' – and may also explain Greenblatt's admission that he is 'constantly struck by the strangeness of reading works that seem addressed, personally and intimately, to me, and yet were written by people who crumbled to dust long ago.'[50] Like Whigham's work does, then, this thesis posits a clear and potent link between the written word and the behaviour of those who read and write it. Unlike Whigham, however, in studying asyndeton's figurative and rhetorical process it does not suggest that the mode of writing, the *rhetorical trope*, influences the mode of thought, feeling or behaviour. Rather, it is the other way around.

To understand the intimate connection between asyndeton and emotionality, Whigham's discussion of 'social tropes' is invaluable if it is inverted. The figure's transition from psycho-social to rhetorical trope follows quite the same lines; it must simply be understood that asyndeton, where it appears most powerfully in its original ancient Greek and in its transition to English, enables expression of natural passions rather than suppressing, re-forming or binding them. Whigham depicts the didacticism of his source material as 'a corpus of strategic gesture that is coherent as practiced even though discontinuous among its textualizations (and sometimes contemplatively continuous within them)'.[51] This, although within a slightly different context, is equally true of asyndeton. Its presence in texts does present a coherent 'corpus of strategic gesture' – or, more precisely, a corpus of gestures composed of a series of *signs*. Whigham's summary is additionally particularly felicitous as regards asyndeton, because the figure *itself* presents a 'corpus of strategic gesture'. A series of signs composes the figure of asyndeton itself as much as it does each textual example: dissolution (caused by separations and deletions), amplification (of both the resonance and diversity of elements) and union (the reader's interpretation of the matrix's gesture). The reader dissolves the figure, appreciates its distinct steps, and infers its ultimate achievement. In Whigham's terms, the nature of asyndetic gestures is 'discontinuous' (dissolute) both across texts and in itself, and the operative process of asyndeton continues 'contemplatively' in each case. The departure this

---

[49] Ibid., p.b4v.
[50] Stephen Greenblatt, in 'Greenblatt Named University Professor of the Humanities', *Harvard University Gazette*, September 21st 2000 <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2000/09.21/greenblatt.html>, [accessed June 30th 2011], para. 3 of 10.
[51] Whigham, p.27.

thesis makes from Whigham's method is to argue that this expressive, strategic gesture is coherent as it is *already* practiced, 'naturally', by the reader's mind – and also by both the characters and narratives that contain it. Dissolution, amplification and union (the 'natural' steps of emotionality) already are psycho-'social tropes' that have become rhetorical, and are enacted on every level of the texts under discussion: texts that, this thesis suggests, accurately portray unbound emotion. In this, the reversal of Whigham's approach, lies its motivation to seek examples of asyndeton in fiction – specifically, in romances.

Discussions of asyndeton feature repeatedly in commentaries on philosophy, drama, history and epic poetry in its original ancient Greek (see notes, for example, on Plato, Sophocles and Homer[52]), and are of great effect in depicting, for example, the chaotic, passionate action of battle (Xenophon writes in his *Hellenica* that 'καὶ ουμβαλόντεζ τὰζ ἀσπίδαζ ἐωθοῦντο, ἐμάχοντο, ἀπέκτεινον, ἀπέθνηκον': *with shields closely interlocked, they pushed; they fought; they killed; they were killed*[53]). However, whilst emotionality is integral to war and politics, it is the cornerstone upon which romance is built. If seeking ultimately to explore how specifically courtly rather than military emotionality was expressed rather than repressed in early modern England, beginning with the Greek prose romances (often termed the Greek 'novels'[54]) proves invaluable. Five remain extant: Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (c. 1AD), Xenophon of Ephesos's *Ephesian Tale*, Achilles Tatios's *Leukippe and Kleitophon*, Longos's *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Heliodoros of Emesa's *Ethiopian History* (all c. 2AD), and their emergence at the turn of the millennium appears to have seen a considerable change of focus for the written word.[55]

---

[52] See Plato, *The Republic*, in *Plato*, trans. by Paul Shorey, 12 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd, 1969), V-VI, e.g. IX.590a; Jebb's *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*, as above; Smyth [on Homer], IV.50.2165; *The Iliad, edited, with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes, and appendices*, ed. and trans. by Walter Leaf (London: Macmillan, 1900).

[53] Xenophon, *Hellenica*, trans. into Latin by Henry Dodwell: *Xenophontos Hellenikon historion biblia Z'. Accessit Cl. viri Henrici Dodwelli Chronologia Xenophontea* (Oxford: 1700) IV.III.12 (p.219); Xenophon, *Hellenica*, ed. by Herbert Weir Smyth and Carleton L. Brownson (New York, NY, Cincinnati, OH, and Chicago, IL: American Book Company, 1908), IV.III.114-26 (p.243).

[54] See B. P. Reardon (*inter alia*)'s corpus of work on the subject, e.g. 'Aspects of the Greek Novel', *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, 23:2 (Oct., 1976), pp.118-131; 'Introduction' to *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, CA, and London: The University of California Press, 2008); 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix*, 23:3 (Autumn, 1969), pp.291-309; *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).

[55] For fuller dating, see Ben Edwin Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley University Press, 1967). Although the latinate spellings of these authors' names are more common (Xenophon of Ephesus; Tatius; Longus; Heliodorus), the most literal translations of the Greek have been retained in order to maintain consistency with character-name spellings throughout the thesis: character names appear in both titles and passages either cited in or necessarily literally translated from the Greek.

In his study of the romances' titular conventions, Tim Whitmarsh charts a rising preoccupation with the private and personal rather than the historiographic amongst ancient Greek readers (a transition that William Nelson suggests was not as troublesome as it would be in early modern England[56]). 'What the titles of the novels promised,' he writes, 'was primarily invasive narratives of private lives,' because of the way they interplayed generic markers.[57] The prepositions 'κατά' and 'περί' (literally meaning *in accordance with* and *about* respectively) are used to introduce protagonists and often to connect them to a toponymical heading: τὰ περί Τηεαγγένεν καὶ Ξηαρίκλειαν Αιτηιοπικά, for example, translates as *That-which-is about Theaggenes and Charikleia [and is] Ethiopian*, or *The Ethiopian [History] about Theaggenes and Charikleia*. Although these prepositions are regularly found 'in metaliterary uses within historiography', Whitmarsh finds that such cases generally 'deal with males, securely located within military and political narratives.'[58] In conjunction with a woman's name, such a title draws the narrative's attention away from the political sphere, the πόλισ, towards and into the οίκοσ and the privacy of the home. This appropriation 'resonates very differently,' Whitmarsh feels; 'there is an air of intrigue and scandal to the phrase' that 'sets the normative desire to conceal … against the eroticized desire to reveal' and plays with curiosity; 'an English parallel, replete with comparable *double entendre*', Whitmarsh suggests, 'might be "The affair of …"'.[59] The Greek romances also, as Victor Skretkowicz writes, betray an increase of focus on characterization through individual expressions, ηθοποιία (usually transcribed as *ethopoeia*, meaning personal thoughts and speech), rather than εκφρασισ (*ekphrasis*: description of external appearance).[60]

Such positions substantiate B. P. Reardon's agreement with Whitmarsh's summary that 'there is little in earlier literature to match these texts' gleeful transgressions of the boundary between public and private'; it reveals, Reardon writes, 'a society interested in private more than public affairs. … The novel belongs to a period farther removed, simply, from the political *polis*'.[61]

---

[56] Nelson cites from Perry (pp.77-78) that the ancient Greek world was 'primarily a world of ideas, which could be put into practical use in the instruction and edification of living man, rather than a world of facts valued only as such, and thereby useless' – William Nelson, *Fact or Fiction: the Dilemma of the Renaissance Storyteller* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp.2-3.
[57] Tim Whitmarsh, 'The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre', *The American Journal of Philology*, 126:4 (Winter, 2005), pp.587-611 (p.587).
[58] Ibid. p.605.
[59] Ibid., p.605-06.
[60] Victor Skretkowicz, *European Erotic Romace: Philhellene Protestantism, Renaissance Translation and English Literary Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), p.14.
[61] Reardon, 'The Greek Novel', pp.292-93.

Certainly, the romances remove their protagonists from the literal *polis*; in each, fate draws the lovers away from their home cities and civic duties, and towards either rural idylls or adventures in the wilderness. However, it is critical convictions of the *attitude* of the romances and their readers that renders their critiques so supportive for proving these texts apt for studying asyndetic expressions of emotionality. If the narratives do set their characters at a remove from the binding expectations of society – moreover, if they do focus on the private, the interior – their depictions of emotionality are inevitable.

As is to be expected in romances, the majority of examples of emotionality depicted are of love. As Barthes illustrated, asyndeton is especially illustrative of love: love perforce combines, after all, the dissolute conflicts of joy, fear, delirium, jealousy, rage, despair and hope *inter alia* (as will become evident in text, but which must also ring true from common experience). Conceptually, love (or ἔρωσ[62]) as Socrates defined it is revealed to be still more fitting of asyndeton if the two major conceits that most clearly represent it in the *Symposium* are summarized. The first is that, in love, man feels a lack and the longing to fill it, through connecting with something conceptually much larger than himself and his own consciousness; the second is that love inspires creation, either physically through the production of children or figuratively through the production of ideas.[63] According to the *Symposium*, considering love itself (like considering asyndeton) mirrors these impressions: Socrates' speech argues that the concept is 'a mean between wisdom and ignorance', 'poverty' and 'plenty'; 'neither mortal nor immortal, but in a mean between them'.[64] Love resides in the endlessly fluid and ambiguous state between contraries, and their lack of conjunction. Contemplating love, one recognizes this lack of cohesion and yearns to resolve it; in so doing, one creates. Reading asyndetically about love – or, less restrictively, about fluid, indefinable emotionality – by this understanding may stimulate the steps of the emotional process poignantly enough actually to stimulate the feeling(s) described. Anne Carson remarks in her astonishing *Eros the Bittersweet*, specifically regarding these fluxes of emotions in the Greek romances:

---

[62] The vast textually discernable scope of ἔρωσ renders the only sensitive translation of the term simply 'love', with all its diverse implications. See, for example, concurring translations by Christopher Gill, William S. Cobb and Benjamin Jowett; see also Stephanie Nelson, 'Shelley and Plato's *Symposium*: the poet's revenge', *The International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 14:1 (Summer, 2007), pp.100-129.

[63] Plato, *Symposium*, in *Symposium and Phaedrus*, trans. by Benjamin Jowett (New York, NY: Dover, 1993), pp.1-43. See particularly Aristophanes' tale of Zeus splitting man in two, and Socrates' speech invoking Diotima (pp.15-18, 23-34).

[64] Ibid., pp.26-27.

> To create pleasure and pain at once is the novelist's aim. We should dwell on this point for a moment. It is of some importance that, as readers, we are typically and repeatedly drawn into a conflicted emotional response which approximates that of the lover's soul divided by desire. … It is almost like being in love.[65]

For Carson it 'is the novelist's aim' to describe the sensation of love so accurately that it is 'almost' reciprocated in the reader's brain. With an assumption like that of Barthes, Carson implies that asyndetic matrices generate the emotional process, and so powerfully that they stimulate a genuine emotional change. As was perhaps 'natural', especially if granted this potential, in the Greek romances asyndeton hallmarks depictions of heightened emotion.

Fusillo's 'The Conflict of Emotions', rather than pursuing this implicit potential in the figure, documents painstakingly the regular occurrences of asyndeton in the ancient romances, where 'the tendency to abstract expression often coexists with a tendency for asyndeton'.[66] For Fusillo, asyndeton simply represents 'emotional conflict': a kind of 'polyphony' that is 'resolved harmoniously in the triumph of *eros*.'[67] This dissection of the figure could take much from his expressive (almost poetic) terminology, of emotional 'polymorphism' 'suspended always in immobility', which reflects the romances' wider 'free, non-hierarchical forms of expression, often turning to the rhetoric of contrast and of competition without winners'.[68] Indeed, Fusillo writes of elements 'suspended always in immobility' just as Barthes writes that matrix sequences or *gesture*s are effective 'precisely because they remain suspended'. The motivation behind Fusillo's study, however, is distinct: Fusillo argues that the frequency of asyndeton's occurrences (and what he believes is its 'novelty', despite Homer, Sophocles, Xenophon and Plato) was imitative, and proved that the romances were early 'novels', with 'rules, conventions and themes'.[69] Nevertheless, Fusillo's rigorous work proves the significant place that literal asyndeton held in the ancient Greek romances. Rather than re-capitulate his research, this thesis discusses how appropriately and creatively the Greek romances' figure of choice was transcribed to the romances that succeeded them, once Hellenic texts began to exert their influence on English writers, and the English written word.

The ancient Greek romances' popularity in sixteenth-century England, reflecting the culture's ubiquitous fascination with classical civilization, was deeply influential. Three were

---

[65] Anne Carson, *Eros the Bittersweet* (Champaign, London and Dublin: Dalkey Archive Press, 1993), p.84.
[66] Fusillo, 'The Conflict of Emotions', p.65.
[67] Ibid., p.79.
[68] Ibid., p.73.
[69] Ibid., p.64.

translated into and published in English before 1600: editions of Heliodoros's, Longos's and Tatios's texts survive from 1567, 1587 and 1589, respectively. Samuel Lee Wolff, Steve Mentz, Helen Moore and Victor Skretkowicz make clear, thematic connections from these narratives to early modern English prose, and to Sir Philip Sidney's and Robert Greene's especially.[70] Certainly, Sidney's New *Arcadia* owed much to the *Ethiopian History*; as Wolff wrote, the book was a 're-weaving [of] the Old *Arcadia* upon the loom of Heliodorus'.[71] Longos's *Daphnis and Chloe* is generically separate from the shared tone and events of the other romances, and so is of less relevance here; although it was undoubtedly a source for Spenser's *Shepheardes Calendar*, too, it appears to have been less widely circulated.[72]

From what copies remain it is evident at the least that Heliodoros' text, after its first, imperfect publication as an 'annex' to James Sandford's *Amorous and Tragicall Tales of Plutarch* in 1567, was fully translated in 1569 and reprinted in 1577 and 1587, before new editions in 1605 (still being printed in 1606) and new translations in 1622, 1631 and 1686. The romance had even been dramatized, for both performance and sale, by 1640.[73] It was cited widely and casually, in works from Sidney's *Apologie for Poetrie* in 1595 to *The Ladies Dictionary* over a century later.[74] Tatios's *Kleitophon and Leukippe*, although only two editions remain (from 1597 and 1638), appears to have been a similarly common source for reference. It, too, was dramatized and the script published in 1638.[75] Robert Burton's 1621 *Anatomy of Melancholy* uses its author's examples over a dozen times, and in 1699 it was still being used to exemplify constancy.[76]

---

[70] See Samuel Lee Wolff, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York, NY: The Columbia University Press, 1912); Steve Mentz, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Helen Moore, 'Ancient and Modern Romance', *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), II (ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummings and Stuart Gillespie), pp.333-46; Skretkowicz, as above.

[71] Wolff, p.353.

[72] Few citations and only two editions remain: *Daphnis and Chloe … termed by the name of The shepheards holidaie*, trans. by Angell Daye (London: by Robert Walde-graue, 1587); and *Daphnis and Chloe. A most sweet, and pleasant pastorall romance for young ladies*, trans. by George Thornley (London: for John Garfield, 1657).

[73] J. Gough, *The Strange Discovery: a Trage-Comedy* (London: by *E. G.* for *William Leake,* 1640), prefacing William Gouge, *The saints sacrifice: or, a commentarie on the CXVI. Psalme* (London: by George Miller for Edward Brewster, 1632).

[74] Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie* (London: for Henry Olney, 1595), p.C4r; N. H., *A Ladies Dictionary, Being a General Entertainment For the Fair-Sex* (London: for John Dunton, 1694), p.59.

[75] '*Fatal Love* … founded on *Achilles Tatius* his Romance, called *Clitiphon and Leucippe;* … printed *Oxon.* 1638', in Gerard Langbaine, *On the Lives and Writings, of all those that have Publish'd either Comedies, Tragedies, Tragi-Comedies, Pastorals, Masques, Interludes, Farces, or Opera's in the English Tongue* (Oxford: by L. L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691), p.441.

[76] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Oxford: by John Lichfield and James Short for Henry Cripps, 1621); John Potter, *Archaeologiae Graecae: or, the Antiquities of Greece* (Oxford: at the Theatre, for Timothy Child and John Jones, 1699).

Mentz's, Moore's and Skretkowitcz's works further detail, in addition to these editions, the popularity and spread of earlier Latin and French translations. Although the majority of the editions referenced here were published too late to have been of use to the early modern romance authors under discussion, the sheer volume of this extant work speaks for the Greek romances' immediate and lasting impact. The genre's popularity is further testified by the fact that even Xenophon of Ephesos's *Ephesian Tale*, although untraceable, seem to have inspired sufficient fascination for Pierre-Daniel Huet's 1672 *A Treatise of Romances and their Original*[*s*] assiduously to document what could be gleaned of its content ('the Amours of *Habrocomas* and *Anthea*') from notes by '*Suidas*'.[77] It is unsurprising, therefore, that romances such as the *Arcadia*s, John Lyly's *Euphues* duology and Greene's *Mamillia* mimic or borrow from the classical romantic conventions.

However it is not only their references and generic ties to the prose that nurtured asyndeton's expressive potential that warrants their place in this thesis. In addition, it is the similarity of the *attitude* of these texts to that attributed to their Greek forerunners by Whitmarsh and Reardon, and their consequent separation from the overwhelming didacticism of most of their contemporary prose works.[78] Lorna Hutson asserts the distance of early modern romances like the *Arcadia*s from a masculinist, *polis*-related literary system, in which the rhetoric of courting functions as a joust of words between men, just as Whitmarsh and Reardon distance their ancient Greek counterparts. She writes that they 'neither uphold the values of a feudal culture, nor maintain the definitions of masculinity and femininity' that their contextual courtly conventions decree.[79] Hutson feels that what is lacking in the rhetorical jousts that 'disenfranchise' linguistic denotation and disconnect it from emotionality is, she writes, the 'inarticulacy and discontinuity' that is 'proper' to the expression of meaningful relationships.[80] As Hutson suggests, the only really exceptional forum for this kind of 'discontinu[ous]' emotionality – fractured, consequently amplifiable, asyndetic emotionality – is the romance.

The nature of romance's power was recognized to be unique by its sixteenth-century authors and readers, in part simply because it was fictional. The tension between fact and story of which

---

[77] Pierre-Daniel Huet, *A Treatise of Romances and their Original, translated out of French* (London: by R. Battersby, for S. Heyrick, 1672), p.60.
[78] See, for example, Baldassare Castiglione's *The Courtyer*, trans. by Thomas Holby (London: by Wyllyam Seres, 1561) and Henry Peacham's *The Compleat Gentleman* (London: for Francis Constable, 1622). For an extensive bibliography see Ruth Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1956), pp.424-462.
[79] Lorna Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter* (London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1994), p.97.
[80] Ibid, p.8.

William Nelson wrote is dissipated by the romance, because it is *clearly* fiction; it lacks real verisimilitude; it declares openly (if, perhaps, coyly) its fanciful nature: Sidney's *Arcadia* is a 'trifle'; Lyly's *Euphues* is 'light' and 'foolish'; Greene's *Mamillia* is 'a toy to passe away the time'.[81] As a consequence, and despite some authors' (often disingenuous) assertions that their books are for instructional purposes, the romance is freed from any real duty of didacticism; it is not, as Sidney wrote in his *Apologie for Poetry*, 'captiued to the trueth of a foolish world'.[82] Furthermore, non-performative fiction (narrative prose rather than drama) is not 'captiued' to any public or even simply discursive truths; it allows the reader complete privacy and the opportunity to engage fully and personally with a text, as free as possible of context. As Naomi Conn Liebler writes, because it is 'a distinctly private activity, reading inspires reconsiderations of one's boundaries: economic, social, physical, geographic or political.'[83] Readers may, solitarily, reassess the text's and their own identities constantly. Fiction allows readers power in their relationships with texts because it is concerned with contemplating and discussing possibilities rather than with informing on fact; it allows what we now term *reader response* interpretive weight.[84] This is not to say, however, that the author loses his authority entirely: neither Wolfgang Iser's authoritative reader nor (for example) Georges Poulet's re-created, resurrected author dominates the field entirely.[85] Poignantly, fiction and its figurative language allow the author to transcribe unobservable, interior processes without inappropriately simplifying or constraining them: in this way, as Sidney continues, 'it doth draw [it both entices and depicts] the mind more effectually, then any other Arte dooth, and so a conclusion not vnfitlie ensueth'.[86]

---

[81] See Nelson, as above; Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes* [New] *Arcadia* (London: for William Ponsonbie, 1593), p.3r; John Lyly, *Euphues: the Anatomy of wit* (London: for Gabriell Cawood, 1578), p.A.ii.v; Robert Greene, *Mamillia: A mirrour or looking-glasse for the ladies of Englande* (London: for Thomas Woodcocke, 1583), p.A3r. For consistency with the sixteenth century translations of Greek texts quoted, and as discussion of the authors' precise linguistic choices is necessary where possible, all references to Sidney's N*A*, Lyly's *Anatomy* and Greene's *Mamillia* I will be to these first extant editions unless otherwise stated. (References to Sidney's Old *Arcadia* only will be to the modern edition, for purposes of accessibility.)

[82] Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, p.E3r.

[83] Naomi Conn Liebler, 'Introduction', in Naomi Conn Liebler (ed.), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Poetics of Reading* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2007), pp.1-17 (p.3).

[84] See Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: a Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978) and *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978). Although of course no critical vocabulary resembling that of *reader response* theory existed for sixteenth-century readers it must be acknowledged that, as Liebler writes, 'the absence of a lexicon does not mean the absence of praxis' (pp.8-9).

[85] See Iser as above and Georges Poulet, 'Phenomenology of Reading', *New Literary History* 1:1 (October 1969), pp.53-68; see also Sarah N. Lawall, *Critics of Consciousness: The existential structures of literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

[86] Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, p.F2r.

This position, that only fiction can fittingly 'draw the mind' and its elusive workings, is one with which countless critics since have agreed. Bruce Smith writes that it allows desire to be 'talked about, not simply named', Ullrich Langer that it permits 'emotional experimentation' with 'multiple codes and values' and Marx that it eschews the 'falsely coherent' by not 'deciding alternatives one way or another'; Bakhtin premises its power upon the irresolvable, heteroglossic nature of fictional prose and its 'multitude' of 'internal contradictions', which 'knit together' to create 'nuances and accents' to be transformed by the reading subject 'into a stylistic unity'.[87] Fiction's power is located in the fact that, as these theories testify and Bakhtin's remarkably apt terms suggest, it operates in a similar way to asyndeton: the 'multiple codes and values', incoherent 'alternatives' and 'internal contradictions' that authors supply and that are inherent to fiction (for Bakhtin, specifically prose fiction) must be appreciated for their diversity, and their 'nuances' must be recognized. 'Because the reader of story is permitted to interpret things,' Charles May observes, 'story has an *amplitude* lacking in information.'[88] So, the diverse elements of fiction are amplified because of the imaginative freedom created by the lack – the consciously removed information – around them. Then, and only then, is fiction able to express the intricacies of subjective 'human perception'. Romances (especially, perhaps, those influenced by the ancient Greek prototypes) furthermore address the nature of emotionality as explicitly as conceivable for early modern courtiers.

The tone and figurative style of the romances in these sixteenth- and seventeenth-century translations survive with astonishing ideological accuracy, considering the artistic pressure on their translators. In contrast with their counterparts today, the early modern translator's preoccupation, as is widely noted, was not with retaining a sense of *the other* but with locating and extracting elements that could be recognized, assimilated or appropriated by the English mind and an English turn of phrase.[89] In their work, translators such as Thomas Underdowne and William Burton (who 'Englished' Heliodoros's and Tatios's works[90]) draw on English cultural norms as well as retaining,

---

[87] Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p.18; Ullrich Langer, *Perfect Friendship: Studies in Literature and Moral Philosophy from Bocaccio to Corneille* (Geneva: Librarie Droz, 1994), p.28; Marx cited by Smith, p.22; Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. by Michael Holquist *et al.* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp.278, 289, 264.

[88] Charles E. May, 'Do You See What I'm Saying?: The Inadequacy of Explanation and the Uses of Story in the Short Fiction of Raymond Carver', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 31: *North American Short Stories and Short Fictions* (2001), pp.39-49 (p.40) [my emphasis].

[89] See, for example, Skretkowizc as above.

[90] Heliodoros, *An AEthiopian historie*, trans. by Thomas Underdo[w]ne (London: Henrie Wykes for Fraunces Coldocke, 1569), ¶i.r. All further references to the text will be to this edition.

more or less felicitously, idiosyncratic features of the original texts. They constantly re-emphasize and de- or re-contextualize these features to fit, to some extent, their own agendas – and to form a patchwork of literal and figurative interpretation in the resulting transpositions. Underdowne and Burton both must have felt weighty expectations to make these works their own; as Constance C. Relihan writes, '[n]o matter how skilled or gifted, a translator is always susceptible to the charge that he or she is merely working with the ideas of another' and so is always engaged in a struggle between identification as a poet and that as a mere 'versifier', attempting to forge an identity somewhere between the two.[91] Treading this middle ground between literality and creativity, no matter how precarious, is precisely what maintains the felicity of the asyndetic matrix in Burton's and Underdowne's work: the translation of the figurative, and especially the emotive, requires both an assiduous attention to the intentions of the original text and a creative understanding of how these intentions may be realized effectively. As Walter Benjamin asserts throughout *The Task of the Translator*, the author himself must be emotionally connected to his text, and not obsessed with producing a word-for-word transliteration. '[N]o case for literalness', Benjamin writes, 'can be based on a desire to retain the meaning' of the original works:

> Fragments of a vessel which are to be glued together must match one another in the smallest details, although they need not be like one another. In the same way a translation, instead of resembling the meaning of the original, must lovingly and in detail incorporate the original's mode of signification, thus making both the original and the translation recognizable[.][92]

Burton and Underdowne may have been aware of asyndeton's intended role (from texts such as Peacham's or Puttenham's), or they may have wished purely to transcribe the passages' effects. Either way, in their translations of the Greeks romances' asyndetic figures both consciously do 'desire to retain the meaning' of this 'mode of signification', and their retention of asyndetic matrices at moments of emotionality grasps not the literal but the figurative nuances of the original texts. Asyndeton in its literal form might be sacrificed, but the affects 'naturally' inspired by tumultuous emotion are transcribed assiduously. In the original Greek, when Tatios's eponymous Kleitophon and Leukippe first see one another, the former narrates:

---

[91] Constance C. Relihan, *Fashioning Authority: The Development of Elizabethan Novelistic Discourse* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1994), p.36.
[92] Walter Benjamin, 'The Task of the Translator', trans. by Harry Zohn, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. by Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2004) pp.75-85 (pp.80-81).

> Πάντα δέ με εἶχεν ὁμοῦ, ἔπαινος, ἔκπληξις, τρόμος, αἰδώς, ἀναίδεια. ἐπήνουν τὸ μέγεθος, ἐξεπεπλήγμην τὸ κάλλος, ἔτρεμον τὴν καρδίαν, ἔβλεπον ἀναιδῶς, ἠδούμην ἁλῶναι.[93]
>
> *All feelings took hold of me at once, admiration, amazement, fear, shame, shamelessness. I admired her stature, stood amazed at her beauty, trembled in my heart, gazed shamelessly, ashamed to be caught.*

Burton's 1597 edition, however, reads:

> In the very selfe same moment of time, I did both praise her stature, was amazed at her beautie, tremble in mind, and more eagerly admire her beautie, and oftentimes did I striue to withdraw mine eyes from beholding her, but they still resisted.[94]

A similar host of emotions bombards Charikleia of Heliodoros's *Ethiopian History* even from an observer's perspective. Upon his detection of her love for Theaggenes, the priest Kalasiris narrates:

> Ἱδρῶτι πολλῷ διερρεῖτο τούτων εἰρημένων, ὦ Κνήμων, καὶ δήλη παντοίως ἦν χαίρουσα μὲν ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἤκουεν, ἀγωνιῶσα δὲ ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἤλπιζεν, ἐρυθριῶσα δὲ ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἑάλωκεν.[95]
>
> *She began to perspire profusely at these words, Knemon, and it was clear that in all possible ways she rejoiced for what she heard, anguished for what she hoped, blushed for what she had caught in herself.*

Similarly, the original is adapted by Underdowne in 1569:

> After I had saide thus, *Cnemon,* shée was in a great swelte, and it was euident that shée was gladde of that shée hearde, and greately in feare, and muche troubled for that shée hoped: at length shée waxed redde, to thinke in what maner shée was taken.[96]

Rather than exhibiting a literal deletion of all connecting words, these translated passages create coherent (and so easily read and aesthetically pleasant) sentences. They do away with the literal asyndeton of the original Greek, perhaps because (as Smyth and Cope assert) it simply is not so dramatic in English. However, as discussed, it is not the actual omission of the word 'and' that formulates asyndeton's rhetorical power. Rather, it is the reader's amplifying, empathetic leaps of imagination between the 'dissolute' elements that such deletions free – the inferences that allow the reader to create a (re)united, and subjective, concept from the matrices 'praise'-'amaze[ment]'-fear-'admir[ation]'-shamelessness-shame (for Kleitophon) and panic-joy-anguish-hope-shame (for Charikleia). Such passages retain asyndeton's unique *figurative* properties, and its evocative power:

---

[93] Achilles Tatios, *Λευκιππε και Κλειτοφωντα*, ed. by S. Gaselee, in The Loeb Classical Library, ed. by G. P. Goold (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1984), Bk. I, p.14.
[94] Achilles Tatios, *The most delectable and pleasaunt history of Clitiphon and Leucippe*, trans. by W[illiam] B[urton] (London: Thomas Creede for William Mattes, 1597), Book I, p.6. All further references to the text will be to this edition.
[95] Héliodore, *Les Éthiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée)*, ed. by R. M. Rattenbury and T. W. Lumb, 3 vols, (Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1938), II, IV.xi.1 (p.19).
[96] Heliodoros, IV.54v.

their effectiveness is achieved through Priestley's *gestures* towards emotional truths, or wholes, from dissolute and often contrary *signs*. These *signs*' interplay (which allows texts, as Quintilian writes, to 'confer with [their] readers') is just as ambiguous in asyndetic matrices as in asyndeton. In the same way, asyndetic matrices are *inferable* even through so slight a reference as Heliodoros's comment on his protagonists' first meeting that '[a]t a woorde, sixe hundred countenaunces appeared in theire faces in shorte time, and the changinge of all kinde'.[97] Such a brief statement, of course, is not illustrative, nor does it do more than hint at the figure. However, the patterning in these examples retains asyndeton's implied 'ellipses', its unstated content, inferred by each reader's conclusions: it still hints. Such passages, for Fusillo, transcribe the 'emotional polymorphism' of the figure – what Vickers terms 'emotional disturbance', the 'incoheren[ce]' of 'passions' for Beattie, and affections' 'impetuosity' for Lowth. Burton and Underdowne achieve this through recognition that, like the asyndetic figure itself, each of their work's '[f]ragments' must be appreciated 'lovingly' in its 'smallest details'. Both engage with the productive splitting and interpretation of their texts as accurate/relatable, and of their own identities as versifier/poet. Such behaviour set a powerful precedent for later translations and adaptations of (and references to) the same texts.

In English literature, asyndetic matrices are far more common than asyndeton is. Transcribed emotionality may be located and examined far more effectively with an understanding of the figurative, conceptually asyndetic power of such sequences and their process than if only the literal figure were pursued. The chapters that follow examine each step of this process: dissolution, amplification and union. Each of these, in turn, examines the process's use by, influence on and reflection in each author's style and wider narrative method, techniques of characterization and the reader's intended – or unintended – reactions to these. Each text displays moments of heightened emotion relayed asyndetically, and is furthermore so influenced by the rhetorical power of the asyndetic that the figure also shapes its structure and wider narrative themes. As asyndeton amplifies the power of inferences, the power of dislocations *between* words, it returns focus to (because it questions) the power of the written word itself. This, as Hutson writes, is often the case with emotional engagements 'articulated in literature', because they tend 'to articulate [themselves] as arising from the intimacy of shared reading and writing'.[98] Hutson refers to the nature of vows and pledges, but the texts under discussion additionally present their readers with richly

[97] Ibid., III.41v.
[98] Hutson, p.3.

interpretable love letters. Through its inherent distrust of the explicit, moreover, asyndeton's implication that words are arbitrary begins to permeate the romances as wholes, rather than solely their emotional passages.

This ostensibly rather gloomy outlook for language is not, after all, pessimistic. Rather than nihilistically abandoning it as oppressive, asyndeton allows language to gesture towards ways for the reader to access aspects of emotionality that are otherwise inexpressible, whether because of subjective sensibilities or constraining contextual conventions. In invoking the dissolute, infinitely flexible possibilities of figurative speech 'naturally' to express abstract concepts, the authors at which this thesis looks ensure a creative engagement with their readers that will alter as they alter, across readings and across epochs. Because 'nature and passion' 'speak their own language' to suggest the figure of asyndeton, asyndeton reciprocally bestows upon the reader all the authority that remains implicit in its compelling aesthetics of ambiguity: its dissolution, amplification and union.

I: Dissolution

> There must in euery triangle be three lines, she first beginneth, the seconde augmenteth, the thirde concludeth it a figure. So in loue three vertues, affection, which draweth the heart, secrecie, which increaseth the hope, constancie, which finish the worke: without any of these lynes there can be no triangle, with-out any of these vertues, no loue.
>
> – John Lyly, *Euphues and his England*[1]

The element that 'beginneth' and is the most definitively integral to asyndeton is dissolution: the figure must be broken apart into its constituent elements. This process, despite its undeniably negative terminology (*dis*-solution; *a*-syndeton) is not destructive. The narrative potency of dissolution – and, therefore, the origin of asyndeton's power – rests in the conceptual spaces created by deleting or omitting conjunctions, whether literal (grammatical) or figurative (semantic). Dissolution disconnects linguistic signs from their immediate contexts, drawing attention to their disparity from and even conflict with these contexts. Through this detachment, it exposes the newly individuated signs as 'both naked and disjointed', allowing the reader to see each more clearly, and permitting each to become more poignant.[2] Dissolution's fissures also provide creative spaces that constitute, in the terms of the *PEPP*, 'one species of all figures of ellipsis': it both emphasizes its lacks and implies absent content to be inferred by the reader.[3] The syntactic freedom granted to elements that are asyndetic – that are disconnected and dissolute – equates to imaginative freedom for these inferences. Dissolution enables both the elements' and inferences' amplification, which 'augmenteth' the figure's connotations, before its union 'concludeth it a figure'. Dissolution thus creates fertile expanses for growth by loosening, but not destroying, figures' groundworks of signs.

John Lyly's iconic, idiosyncratic narrative style hinges on – and celebrates – the vital role that disconnections and separations play in stimulating emotional response. Euphuism is, figuratively, thoroughly asyndetic in its operation, and demonstrates the properties that render asyndetic matrices so powerful: it exemplifies the ways in which familiarities of language may be torn apart, in order that readers might engage with, reassess and then rejoin them to suggest unique and subjective concepts with which they have personal, emotional connections. It is, furthermore, euphuism's innate reliance on such subjective readings that renders *Euphues* still compelling despite

---

[1] John Lyly, *Euphues and his England* (London: for Gabriell Cawood, 1580), p.101r. All further references to *[H]is England* are to this edition.
[2] Cope, as above.
[3] The *PEPP* as above.

its clearly (and quickly) archaic nature. Like asyndetic matrices, euphuism thrives on eccentric syntax, on amplified contrasts and on experimenting with the marriage of the diverse. Lyly's constantly balanced imagery, centred on dissolute elements and their contradictions, can represent disagreements between characters, but more often denotes highly emotional two-mindedness within one character's own thoughts: ideas are necessarily (figuratively) without conjunction in order that they might represent indecision or conflicting feelings. By engaging the reader in the contemplative processes of *Euphues*' narrative and its characters, Lyly creates empathetic relationships between them; in mimicking the reader's own process of comprehension, he also works a remarkable degree of emotional, psychological realism into his text. Dissolution – the breaking open – of the text is what allows the reader to enter into it imaginatively. The profoundly asyndetic nature of euphuism is discussed in detail below, but it must first be recognized that this priority of Lyly's is evident in the structure of *Euphues* as well as in its language. It is not only in euphuism that the tripartite process characteristic of asyndetic matrices, which dissolution 'beginneth', is vital; the process's three pillars, most prominently the first, also govern Lyly's narrative arch and his approach to his own industry.

Lyly's plot openly focuses on dissolution: it is, as he states, 'the discourse of [a] friendship and falling out'.[4] Both *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and his England* feature a repeated narrative pattern that mimics that of Lyly's language; dissolutions permeate the books on every level. In addition to the oppositions that Lyly creates simply for rhetorical effect (those between easily assimilative entities such as a beetle and a dove, clay and wax, and a fly and a bee, for example[5]), Lyly's plots feature little but division. Euphues and Philautus begin as an effectively autonomous unit, until Philautus's emotions are divided between his friend and Lucilla. Euphues then finds himself in an identical situation, with the addition of the ethical opposition between respect for Philautus's prior claim and his own commitment to love; Euphues dissolves the friendship. During the course of the book, Euphues then becomes geographically separated from Lucilla, who dissolves their understanding and, consequently, her relationship with her father Ferardo, with good company and, eventually, with life. As Stephen Guy-Bray notes, Euphues' love

[4] Lyly's *Anatomy*, p.9v.

[5] See *Anatomy*, pp.5r, 14r. Lyly asserts that although both fly, nest and lay eggs, the beetle is killed and the dove revived by perfume; although both are moldable, useful natural materials, clay is hardened and wax softened by the sun; although both are small, droning insects, the fly is susceptible to and the bee immune from poison.

for Lucilla (and therefore, ironically, his one attempt to forge a simple union) 'disorders his relationship with Philautus, the relationship between Philautus and Lucilla, the relationship between Lucilla and Ferardo, the relationship between Philautus and Ferardo, and, most generally, the system of using women to reinforce bonds between and among men.'[6] Euphues severs links with the court and retreats, patching things up somewhat with Philautus through letters distancing both from all women and most society. In Lyly's second volume, the friends distance themselves from their native lands and, upon their arrival in the English court, appear to alienate themselves wholly from their previous experiences to repeat history, when Philautus divorces himself from Euphues' conciliatory advice once more to divide his affection between his friend and a lover (this time, Camilla). Euphues acts likewise, disassociating himself from his own resolutions as well as his experiences by declaring his admiration of Camilla to Philautus; Philautus, this time, dissolves the friendship. Euphues removes himself from court until Philautus requires separation from Camilla, which Euphues achieves by dividing the targets of his misogyny into two camps: definitely wanton women and possibly virtuous ladies. Euphues pairs Philautus with the virtuous Frances, extricating them from courtly life through marriage. He then effectively seals their separation as friends once and for all, and leaves for Greece. With the exception of that between Philautus and Frances the books leave no bond unbroken. Even (re)solution – of Euphues and Philautus's friendship, for example – is untrustworthy, and therefore must be accepted or doubted subjectively.

The dissolutions effected consciously by Lyly throughout the two books of *Euphues* are not limited to those *within* the texts, either. *Euphues* occupies an unusually diverse generic landscape, even for what Robert Maslen terms the characteristically 'shifty, exploratory, perilous territory' of prose fiction in the 1570s, always an 'unruly and disruptive medium' that hinted its contraries 'perhaps never would be resolved'.[7] Euphues' transitions, Maslen feels, dissolve generic norms in what must have been a 'bewildering' and even 'menacing' display of heterogeneity: '[t]he first begins as an Italianate novel and ends as a series of letters,' he writes, 'becoming an educational treatise and theological dispute along the way; the second shifts from novel to fable to patriotic eulogy, and closes as a marriage guidance pamphlet.'[8] In contrast with Lorna Hutson, who accounts

---

[6] Stephen Guy-Bray, 'Same Difference: Homo and Allo in Lyly's *Euphues*', in Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England, 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp.113-128 (p.121). With regards to Guy-Bray's comment on 'the system of using women to reinforce bonds between and among men', see Hutson as above.
[7] Robert W. Maslen, *Elizabethan Fictions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp.18-19, 16.
[8] Ibid., p.12.

Euphues amongst the 'disenfranchis[ing]' didactic fiction of linguistic jousts, and Relihan, who writes of 'Lyly's moralistic euphuism that devolves into a courtesy manual', Maslen believes that Lyly, like Euphues, 'has severed himself from the constraints of didacticism, and has liberated his discourse to be as innovative and as delightful as he pleases.'[9] Lyly's liberated heterogeneity, his text's pervasive ambiguities, its moral disingenuity and its relative philogyny blur the boundaries of 'Italianate novel[s]' and 'courtesy manual[s]' (of courtly fiction, so often set in opposition to romance) and refuse to conform to the concept of genre at all. Despite perhaps being 'bewildering', this is precisely what fits *Euphues* for inclusion in a discussion of romance.

Barbara Fuchs's *Romance* presents the concept as a 'mode' of writing, a set of stylistic and topical characteristics or 'strategies', that rest within and 'animate' all categories of narrative, rather than as a genre.[10] *Romance* is not expressing a wholly unique or left-field thesis; it derives much of its argument's tenor from Patricia Parker's 1979 work, *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode*, which (as Fuchs cites) reads romance as 'a form that simultaneously quests for and postpones a particular end, objective, or object' – as a 'strategy of delay'.[11] This conception of romance as an 'instrumental notion' allows us to 'deconstruct the many oppositions set up by literary history, such as romance versus epic or romance versus novel', and interprets the 'menacing' contrarities of *Euphues* productively.[12] Lyly's dissolutions from recognizable generic form, in this light, become diversions; these *romantic* diversions provide opportunities for amplification. Such faults and uncertainties allow insight into Lyly's characters – they allow the meeting of their and the reader's imaginations as both traverse alien territory. Lyly's style is thus certainly romantic by Fuchs's standards, but it is also psycho-socially realistic. His generic dissolutions make vital progress towards breaking out the notion of characterization from personae's simplistic definition by an ethos or an action (which might construct the hero-type or martyr-type in some genres, for example), and towards creating characters with mutable thought processes that may lack definition but are traceable and relatable for its readers. When thus viewed as a mode of characterization, dissolution is revealed to be (perhaps paradoxically) constructive, and it reveals much of both conceptions about and the conceptions of *Euphues*' personae – and, furthermore, creates

[9] Hutson, p.8; Relihan, p.58; Maslen, p.233.
[10] Barbara Fuchs, *Romance* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), pp.7, 36.
[11] Ibid., p.8. Fuchs quotes Patricia Parker, *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), pp.4-5.
[12] Fuchs, p.9.

opportunity for amplified *readerly* authority. If its effects are examined from the perspectives of *Euphues*' characters themselves, Lyly's authorial methodology and its readers' responses, its potential becomes clear.

Lyly's dissolute characters

The dissolutions within euphuism achieve ends of far greater conceptual magnitude than those Lyly negotiates between genres, although they may be microcosmic in comparison. In euphuism's composition, Lyly was not satisfied simply to deliberate calmly between the two sides to any story, or to posit in guise of narrator a theoretical, alternative option that his characters simply overlook. Playing on the pretensions of his focalizing character, he exaggerates. Lyly's acute consciousness 'of the distinctness and even parity of traditional ideas,' as Walter Davis summarizes, made 'any contact with them' in *Euphues* outlandishly 'histrionic'.[13] Far from narrating a straightforward tale of cause, effect and resolution, or from promulgating any cohesive moral thesis (such as may be attributed to courtly fiction), in euphuism Lyly suggests several ideas with which he (and Euphues) plays, toying with their semantics through manipulating syntax to extract the utmost contradiction in each utterance. (We may recall Barthes' observations for asyndeton that '[t]he words are never crazed (at most perverse), but the syntax is'.) As Davis writes:

> If two qualities are opposed, Lyly sharpens their opposition so that they appear to be products of totally different systems of value, and possessed of totally opposed consequences. Faced with singleness, he is at pains to show that it contains within itself not only duality but self-contradiction. … Such a style – with its constant insistence on doubleness, the ambivalence of choices, the fissure between appearance and reality – conveys an image of the world as infinitely inconsistent and an image of the mind as perpetually ambiguous.[14]

In euphuism, Lyly dislocates from one another not only the multiple ideals (or 'qualities') that Euphues and his companions utter, but also wrenches from conjunction the more nuanced elements within such ideals. As a consequence, the reader may infer alien 'systems of value' and multiple, unconstrained alternative 'consequences', amplified from the dissolution of ideas that, if left alone, could simply have constituted didacticism.

It is this feature of euphuism, its elements' diversity and evasive fluidity, that renders the methodology suggested by asyndeton so apt for discussing euphuism's achievements in

---

[13] Walter Davis, *Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp.109-10.
[14] Ibid., p.113.

characterization. The infinitely inconsistent world Lyly creates allows his personae to remain at liberty for adventure at plot level. Like the signs that constitute the asyndetic gesture, each is recognized as a free agent because he or she is disconnected from friends, family and/or homeland – and, further, each plot twist is presented as one of infinite possibilities because the reader truly believes that anything could happen.

Characters (in the sense of protagonists' individual traits or psyches) too, furthermore, remain free and open for interpretation by readers. Lyly's contradictions constitute intimately internal debates – struggles of wit against will, and morality against impulse, within them. They express character perhaps to an even more poignant extent than the language in narratives consciously removed from courtly concerns (such as the *Arcadia*s), simply because, appropriately reflecting its constraining courtly setting, these internal (euphuistic, asyndetic) debates are the *only* mode of emotional expression Lyly grants his protagonists. Jonas Barish expresses this insight into Lyly's method perfectly; in both terms and tenor remarkably similar to those used in the above discussions of asyndetic matrices, he writes:

> '[Lyly establishes] a kind of paradox emerging from countless minor ones: that things are *not* what they seem, that like allies itself with unlike, that fair and foul, precious and worthless, hurtful and beneficent co-exist in perpetual and inseparable intimacy. And this whole system of contradictions is Lyly's way of expressing the perpetual ambiguities of human sentiment, and above all, of the most ambiguous of all human sentiments, love. Lyly turns the well-worn Petrarchan paradox into the capstone of a whole view of life. The lover, freezing in flames and burning in ice, joyful in grief and grievous in joy, becomes merely *e pluribus unus*, the final and most perfect expression of universal paradox.[15]

Barish's 'perpetual and inseparable intimacy' is, of course, euphuistic options' fluid co-incidence, and assimilates asyndeton's power (as discussed) to 'utter [and conjoin] contraries, as if one should say, pleasaure paine, peace warre, life death' for Henry Peacham, and to obtain its effects '… by arguments drawn from opposites' for Quintilian.

Lyly figures characters' individualized 'sentiments' – their psychological 'contradictions' and 'ambiguities' – in the subtly detailed nuances of the dilemmas in which he positions them, and allows the reader thoroughly to understand the contrary factors influencing their decision-making processes. Euphues' consideration whether or not to embrace Philautus as his friend, for example, relies upon its 'system of contradictions':

---

[15] Jonas A. Barish, 'The Prose Style of John Lyly', *ELH*, 23 (1956), pp.14-35 (p.24).

> Can any treasure in this transitorie pilgrimage, be of more valewe then a friend? in whose bosome thou maist sleepe secure without feare, whom thou maist make partner of all thy secrets without suspition of fraude. … But whether am I carried? Haue I not also learned that … tryall maketh trust? that there is falshood in fellowship? and what then? Doth not the sympathy of manners, make the coniunction of mindes? Is it not a by woord, like will to like?[16]

Euphuism's fluctuations, and the asyndetic positions of Euphues' options (as worded by Lyly's truisms that 'tryall maketh trust' but 'like will to like' *inter alia*), express the indeterminacy of Euphues' mind. He does joust with words as Hutson asserts but, as in the vast majority of cases in *Euphues*, his jousts are against himself. Through the fracturing of single-mindedness, in the deficit and with the energy created by its fission, readers may amplify the tenor of Euphues' inward struggles. After Euphues first meets Lucilla in the *Anatomy*, another such joust illustrates his struggle to deal with the emotions that have so violently cleaved apart his structured worldview. Euphues argues, '[t]he ratling thunderbolte hath but his clappe, the lyghteninge but his flash, and as they both come in a moment, so doe they both ende in a minute. I but *Euphues*', he counters, '[hast thou] not hearde also that the drye touche woode is kindled with lyme, … yt the fire quickly burneth the flaxe? that loue easilye entreth into the sharpe witte without resistaunce, & is harboured there without repentaunce?'[17] Euphues' gesturing matrix here could be transcribed as awe-doubt-resistance-dismissal-heat-consumption-compliance-remorselessness; when he considers his affection for Philautus, as admiration-security-confidence-trust-caution-suspicion-sympathy-accord.

Similarly Philautus, impressed at first sight with Camilla's charms in England, 'debate[s]' lengthily with himself:

> What straunge fits be these *Philautus* that burne thee with such a heat, that thou shakest for cold, and all thy bodye in a shiuering sweat, in a flaming Yce, melteth like wax, & hardeneth like the Adamant? Is it loue? then would it were death: … *Camilla*, … ye sound of thy name doth make me s[w]ound for griefe. What is in me that thou shouldest not despise, & what is there not in thee that I should not wonder at. … And had not *England* beene thrust into a corner of the worlde, it would haue filled the whole worlde with woe. … *Philautus,* what resteth for thee but to dye with patience, seeing thou maist not liue with pleasure. … I see nowe, that as the resiluation of an Ague is desperate, and the second opening of a veyne deadly, so the renuing of loue, is, I know not what to terme it, worse then death, & as bad as what is worst. I perceiue at the last, the punishment of loue, is to lyue.[18]

---

[16] *Anatomy*, p.9r.
[17] Ibid., p.16r.
[18] *[H]is England*, pp.45r-48r.

Although structured and articulated rationally, Philautus's emotions pass through shock, 'flaming' desire, 'griefe', self-loathing, 'wonder', 'woe', 'patience', 'desperat[ion]' and a kind of masochistic pleasure. The emotional turbulence suffered by the otherwise icy Camilla herself, too, when she must decide whether or not to commit to loving the eloquent courtier Surius, is easily recognizable as asyndetic, euphuistic internal conflict: she finds her emotions flitting between 'furye', 'greife', 'Mirth, Melancholie, Madnesse' and 'shame', and 'debating' between doubt and confidence, despair and hope:

> I but *Surius* is noble, I but loue regardeth no byrth, I but his friends will not consent, I but loue knoweth no kindred, I but he is not willing to loue nor thou worthy to be wooed, I but loue maketh the proudest to stoupe, and to court the poorest.[19]

Such various emotions' portrayal is convincing not only because Euphues' and Camilla's different opinions are given voice, but also because the balance of Lyly's phrasing implies that their final decisions could have gone either way.

In expressing 'human sentiment' in so 'perfect' a manner, such paradox in euphuism becomes, as Nancy Lindheim writes, Lyly's 'main vehicle of character delineation'.[20] The relationship between dissolution and character is certainly a complex one; Relihan, while believing firmly that the former is 'key' for Lyly as discussed, considers that it is the 'lack of individualized characters in Elizabethan novelistic discourse [that] are often seen as preventing such 'dislocation.'[21] Although Relihan does argue against this view, she does not do so against the assertion of the 'lack of individualized characters' but at the narratives' predictability despite this setback. Maslen, like Barish, again contrastingly sees euphuism's contrarieties as appealing to the 'universal' in readers' psyches, believing that they 'urgently call our attention to the splits and contradictions in our own personalities: conflicting desires, divided loyalties, mutually exclusive commitments, and alternative perceptions of the same events'.[22] He, however, makes no connection between this 'exuberant expression' of conflicts and Lyly's psychologically realistic character development, locating its power in Lyly's singular authorial voice rather than in those of his protagonists.[23] Through its evocation of 'human sentiment' and its 'conflicting desires', though,

---

[19] Ibid., pp.105r-v.
[20] Nancy R. Lindheim, 'Lyly's Golden Legacy: Rosalynde and Pandosto', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 15:1 *The English Renaissance* (Winter, 1975), pp.3-20 (p.19).
[21] Relihan, p.142.
[22] Maslen, p.16.
[23] Ibid..

euphuism speaks volumes about 'individualized characters', forcing readers to relate their 'own personalities' to the personae on the page.

Lyly hints at the nature of resolution - or, rather, irresolution - between the contraries his readers face, in the social bout featuring Frances, Camilla and Lady Flavia (their hostess) against Philautus, Surius and a fellow male courtier.[24] During the sequence, Lyly is clearly at pains to show how evenly matched are the two pairs of speakers who form romantic bonds. Philautus and Frances in particular present a fascinating display of balance: rather than taking up opposite sides of a clear argument, as do the two other couples, Philautus presents both contraries and Frances weighs them as equally valid. They then both debate the nature of the argument itself (which adapts itself variously) and, when Lady Flavia eventually 'commaund[s] them both to silence' they are engaged in stichomythic conversation, both continuing to 'speake contraries' without any apparent conclusion.[25] This tenor of equanimity extends to the contest's judgement, which is to be performed by Euphues. Rather than proclaiming a winner, though – or indeed noting any variation of skill or worth in the speeches – Euphues simply recapitulates the topic under discussion each time, apparently, for the most part, failing completely to compare or contrast their themes, before announcing his will 'to conclude against … al' as 'one singular in his owne conceipt', and announcing his own interpretation of the issue.[26] Euphues' reaction to the arguments placed before him is, characteristically, to propound and prioritize his own opinion, but his methodology also reflects that of the reader gleaning meaning from asyndetic matrices. Because he weighs the contradictions before him as equally skilled and meaningful (or, indeed, equally inept and senseless), Euphues posits conclusions that rest between the alternatives provided – conclusions of moderation, but also of new compromise and unique solution. They are subjective innovations, derived from considering polytonal and multi-faceted contradictions (his unique union of the dissolute and individually amplified opinions of his companions), and are excellent demonstrations of the way readers respond to asyndeton and euphuism more generally, and of the ways in which understanding the former can aid appreciation of the latter. Similarity between the two is no coincidence, as appreciation of Lyly's perspective across his authorial career reveals. Lyly's priority, identical to that of asyndetic matrices, was to express emotionality instinctively.

---

[24] See *[H]is England*, pp.92v-104v.
[25] Ibid., pp.102v-103r.
[26] Ibid., p.103r.

Lyly's authorial approach

Lyly's inspiration for the form of euphuism may have originated, even directly, from the Greek romances in which asyndeton wields so much narrative power. Louise Schleiner recognizes this, writing that 'a taste for situations and motifs of this sort, formed on reading Greek romance … and on the kind of rhetoric taught in the schools, etc., already existed in Elizabethan England'.[27] As documented, the Greek propensity for assimilative rhetorical motifs such as brachylogia, polyphony and asyndeton were indeed featured prominently in both the classical and sixteenth-century texts of Aristotle and Quintilian, and Puttenham and Peacham *inter alia*, all 'taught in schools' and therefore intimately familiar to Lyly. Schleiner continues that Lyly adapted such motifs recognizably for his sixteenth-century readers, asserting that 'what we know as euphuism became popular *because* it enabled the writer to work with them effectively'.[28] Schleiner's work later attributes such classical references to Lyly's wish simply to create an emulative, educational text after the models of Roger Ascham and George Gascoigne.[29] What may rather be concluded, though, is that Lyly recognized something curiously compelling in the linguistic make-up of the ancient Greek romances, which involved readers in an active reading process that imbued fiction with more potential for their engagement than did such handbooks. Euphuism's similarities to asyndetic figures – certainly redesigned in Lyly's idiosyncratic way – seek to replicate their effects on its readers. Whether or not euphuism was directly influenced by asyndetic matrices, the ways in which both operate (and the reasons that they operate effectively) are identical: they work because the reader must dissolve their elements in order to amplify and (re)unite them, to recognize their contradictions and explore their ambiguities, and so play a central and ever-evolving role in their interpretations. If *Euphues* is compared to Lyly's later work it becomes clear that this concern with subjective and emotive response was a long-lasting preoccupation, which may have led him to develop euphuism precisely to enable emotional expression.

Discussing Lyly's dialogues of love in his theatrical comedies, Robert Turner suggests that Lyly was writing his plays in a generic context that struggled with the issue of emotional potency, because of the awkwardness inherent to expressing the 'intimately internal' through 'man's external

---

[27] Louise Schleiner, 'Ladies and Gentlemen in Two Genres of Elizabethan Fiction', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 29 (1: *The English Renaissance*), 1989, pp.1-20 (p.20).
[28] Ibid..
[29] See, for example, Roger Ascham, *The scholemaster* (London: by [J]ohn Daye, 1570) and George Gascoigne, *A hundredth sundrie flowres* (London: [by Henrie Bynneman [and Henry Middleton]] for Richarde Smith, [1573]).

behaviour'.[30] Lyly invented increasingly outlandish reasons (from social pressures to intra-gender or intra-familial barriers) that lovers could not communicate openly; as Turner writes, Lyly sought to create forums in which he could develop an effective alternative to labored metaphors and the vagaries of direction or physical performance. What he produced is a series of intriguingly enigmatic scenes in which characters are forced, by the 'tension between unfavorable circumstances and desire', to utter 'tentative' and 'quivering' words that 'poignantly' capture 'an unmistakable sense of what it is like to be in love'.[31] Turner suggests that the 'special dialogues of love' in Lyly's plays 'were innovations that arose … from Lyly's experience in writing novels,' especially 'the uses of language in the two novels about Euphues'.[32] Rather than attributing the success of Lyly's dramatic love-dialogues to any special insight into love, Turner feels it rather results from Lyly's intimate understanding of how 'sense' may be attained from language.[33] Lyly, Turner writes, 'shows an awareness of the *limitations* of language', and creates a series of 'oblique expressions' that seeks to 'dramatize' characters' desire when words, and shows of drama itself, ironically, fail.[34] Through this practice, Lyly's plays create in their audiences a profound understanding of provocative characterized emotion. These dissolutions, the lack of coherence (of conjunction) in narration that Lyly develops in *Euphues*, are Lyly's solutions to the impossibility of portraying open, unbound expression in his creative environment – caused in his plays by his suspicion of bluntness and cliché, and in his prose by this combined with its binding social setting. These dissolutions serve as Lyly's attempts to make his protagonists' emotional identities relatable and believable; they insist that his readers do not simply accept but engage with and understand his characters.

As they seek not to disambiguate but to celebrate its nuances, these characters' uses of euphuism should thus be read as attempts somehow to express their own confusions, rather than as attempts to appropriate euphuism for the purpose of defeating opposition in rhetorical jousts. As Davis describes them, though, euphuism's contraries could offer some argument that Lyly's aim was to retain didacticism, as his protagonists must resultantly be shown as proactive. 'Antithesis implies choice,' Davis writes, 'and when two terms are so presented as to be absolutely destructive of one another, choice becomes a crucial act', squarely impressing the vital roles of action and

[30] Robert Y. Turner, 'Some Dialogues of Love in Lyly's Comedies', *ELH*, 29:3 (Sept., 1962), pp.276-288 (p.276).
[31] Ibid., pp.276-77, 279.
[32] Ibid., p.284.
[33] Ibid..
[34] Ibid., p.287.

decisiveness in the face of chaos.[35] Katherine Wilson finds that this enables Euphues' co-characters linguistically to arm themselves against him to joust for authority and status as protagonist: 'Euphues himself discovers he has to compete with the other personae in the book, all of whom are busily exploiting the sheer oddness of Lyly's style for their own purposes', Wilson writes.[36] Consequently, for Wilson, the flexibility inherent to euphuism becomes a way to impose (albeit subjective) judgment and instruction. 'Euphuism is reinvented by every new speaker in order to make his or her point', Wilson concludes.[37] She overlooks, however, the role that contrast and indecision (let alone decision) play for Lyly as a mode of emotional exposure for his protagonists, at which Wilson's reference to personae's 'own purposes' hints.

In a situation dominated by dissolution, and so by subjective interpretation (Davis's choice-driven situation) the reader too is presented with characters' 'perpetually ambiguous' options, and must therefore appreciate both how arbitrary and how subjective (therefore, how intimately revealing) any decision must be. Readers must recognize themselves to be in contrastingly fortunate positions – ones in which they will not suffer any consequences – but nevertheless are asked to engage emotionally with the gaps and inverses that dwell around alternatives. Readers must project solutions – their own, subjective conjunctions – into these gaps to make (albeit theoretical) choices, on just as regular a basis as do Lyly's characters. For the reader, these choices are constantly under revision; readers have the freedom to change their minds, to fluctuate between standpoints, and so at once to appreciate the possibilities afforded by all.

Lyly's advances towards psychological realism may be primitive, but the beginnings of genuinely relatable internal struggle – so definitive of the most intricately formed modern novelistic characters – are found in euphuism, in its asyndetic properties. Once initiated into Lyly's practice, readers must even begin to empathize with such condemned decisions as Lucilla's to reject Euphues in favour of the 'vnworthy' Curio.[38] They cannot ignore that, because of the profusion of the text's dissolution, her choice must rest on rocky grounds, between the opposition of her inclinations versus her duty, between others' judgments of her wantonness versus her virtue, *and* between the values she places on such judgements. Even those not actively seeking to valorize

---

[35] Davis, p.113.
[36] Katherine Wilson, *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan Narratives: Euphues in Arcadia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), p.54.
[37] Ibid..
[38] *Anatomy*, p.33v.

Lucilla through feminist or Marxist readings (treating Lucilla as a reactionary symbol of rebellion against men's controlling trade in women) must, to some degree, appreciate her unique perspective. Because they are thus compelled to recognize individual characters' struggles and the potential opinions they proffer, readers are consequently able to differentiate between characters through what Davis terms 'a spectrum of possible attitudes' (introduced, he feels, only for contrast).[39] By being allowed to consider each option, each 'attitude', readers consider each character's viewpoint; they see not only protagonists' dilemmas, but also their unique motivations in the lead up to choice, accurately portraying both the variety and the subjective biases of focalizations. In the courtly settings that *Euphues* depicts, where weaknesses ought not to be admitted and moral or emotional instabilities ought never to be spoken explicitly, the guise of euphuism allows Lyly to re-tailor fashioned expressions to gesture towards his characters' internal conflicts asyndetically.

Access to their jousting, influencing factors causes readers to question the decisions made by characters, then, but readers are also forced constantly to re-evaluate those that they make themselves. *Euphues*' narrative toys with readers' expectations: until Philautus's transfer of affections to Frances, for example, his attempts to woo Camilla echo Fidus's eventually felicitous tale of *his* courtship. Because aware of the plot's cyclical nature, sophisticated readers are likely, inaccurately, to second-guess that in this case perseverance, no matter how apparently misguided, will again pay off. Readers' understanding and decisions must constantly shift, always occupying not only the fissures between characters' options (amplifying characters' states of dilemma) but also negotiating Lyly's ambiguous parameters. Even the focus of readers' amplifying contributions to euphuism must, therefore, be splintered apart.

As Lyly constructs his 'system of contradictions', he undermines even the notion that they may be evaluated – that the options they seem to present are legitimate options at all. As Wilson points out, the plethora of references that constitute euphuism's bulk, for one, is not to be trusted. Unlike many of his contemporaries, who 'provided a haven for source hunters,' Wilson writes, 'Lyly spends much of his time faking it'.[40] Indeed, Lyly's landscape of allusion is populated not only by earthly animals, plants and precious stones like Gascoigne's or John Grange's, but also by fictional beasts such as the phoenix and the unicorn, the fly 'Pyrausta' and the birds 'Piralis' and 'Fauras' (this latter matched with a chameleon in a contrast of Euphues' between, cleverly, the

[39] Davis, p.110.
[40] Wilson, p.55.

substantial and the hollow), as well as the moon-loving '*Lunaris* hearbe', 'the stone *Cylindrus*', which rolls downhill during thunder, and the mysterious 'sleeke stone' that 'mounteth at the noyse'.[41] Lyly also invents untraceable myths about real animals, for example that elephants live 'by Ayre' alone.[42] In so doing, he dismantles the reliability of his own narrative style; his sources render the cases they seem to support so fanciful, so literally fantastic, that they become (at best) unreliable, or even (at worst) impotent.

This resignation (or, rather, rejection) of authority by Lyly is one that also disempowers Euphues. Not only do the recognizable 'olde sayed sawe[s]' so inherent to Lyly's authorial voice invite reinterpretation, but the narration focalized through Euphues is also dislocated from the position of an authoritative or trustworthy narrator, especially when considered alongside that of equivalent characters.[43] Comparing Euphues to Gascoigne's Master F.J., for example, Frank B. Fieler writes that his 'diction and conceits … are conventional, but at the same time pretentious, self-conscious, and bookish'.[44] Partly through this contextual awareness and partly through their ability to re-read (and therefore through the power of hindsight) Lyly's readers are forced to recognize that, particularly when emotionally engaged, Euphues is also thoroughly inconsistent: he seems entirely unable to adhere to his own moral resolutions. The vows he makes in the letters that lengthily conclude the *Anatomy* evaporate upon his arrival in the English court, for example, when he confusedly gushes:

> I know not how it commeth to passe, that in earth I think no other Paradise, such varietie of delyghts to allure a Courtlye eye, such rare puritie to drawe a well disposed minde, yt I know not whether they be in *Englande* more amorous or vertuous, whether I should thinke my time best bestowed in viewing goodly Ladyes, or hearing godly Lessons.[45]

Euphues repeats 'I know not', and inadvertantly mocks himself by mimicking his earlier language condemning the amorous 'louer' inhabiting '*Venus* courte' and virtuous, 'modest' 'Uestall Uirgins' alike.[46] Euphues' hypocrisy in friendship, too, amongst many other instances, is highlighted

---

[41] Phoenix, unicorn, 'Faurus', '*Cylindrus*' and 'sleeke stone': *Anatomy*, pp.14r, 49v, 7v, 20v; 'Pyrausta', 'Piralis' and 'Lunaris': *[H]is England*, pp.61r, 50r, 98r. See Gascoigne as above, and John Grange, *The golden Aphroditis* (London: [by Henry Bynneman,] 1577).

[42] *[H]is England*, p.41v. See also *Lyly's Euphues*, ed. by Morris W. Croll and Harry Clemons (London: Routledge, and New York, NY: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1916), p.284, fn. 1.

[43] *Anatomy*, p.1v.

[44] Frank B. Fieler, 'Gascgoine's Use of Courtly Love Conventions in *The Adventures Passed by Master F.J.*', *Studies in Short Fiction*, I (1963), p.28.

[45] *[H]is England*, p.48v.

[46] *Anatomy*, p.39v.

through reused and reconfigured phrases: his condescending assertion that 'trial maketh trust', for example, is recalled by Philautus's appeal, '[t]hou hast tried me, therfore trust mee' immediately before Euphues betrays him.[47] Euphues does not simply go against his own carefully worked-out theories, but seemingly disassociates himself from them even to the point of amnesia, as soon as they fail to tally with his personal life; they are so irreconcilable with his current, emotionally volatile situation that they are also beyond recollection. Able always to justify its new directions, in Mentz's terms Euphues' wit is 'too plastic to be reliable' even for Euphues himself, so there is little hope of him providing a guide of moral certainty for Lyly's readers.[48] *Euphues*' dominant and preoccupying themes are decidedly uncertainty and feeling, rather than the didactic 'speaches … for grauitie' that the *Anatomy*'s dedicatory epistle disingenuously purports his text to constitute.[49] Euphuism, because of its asyndetic properties, allows Lyly's characters to unbind this feeling through apparently rational (but ubiquitously inconsistent) arguments. Feeling and the dissolute dominate rational structure, so the inherent contest between social binds and individual emotions, between the explicit and the instinctive, undermines the idea of controlling, binding, polished wit.

Lyly demonstrates the impracticality of this courtly, polished wit in the forum of real human life, with all its turbulence and emotion, by thus juxtaposing the logically constructed, balanced side to euphuism against the emotional reality that underpins it. Mentz, discussing *Euphues*' references to Ascham particularly through the character of Eubulus, documents how intimate Lyly was with Tudor humanist education, and so how expertly he could have manipulated and undermined it. Euphues, Mentz asserts, 'typifies the ideal product of Elizabethan humanist education'.[50] Euphues' example, however, is not a felicitous one: 'Lyly, a descendant of one of the founders of Tudor education,' Mentz writes, 'proceeds to show how morally impotent that education could be when its literary context is not an educational treatise but an erotic tale'.[51] By demonstrating repeatedly such utter failure of Euphues' tenets in emotionally charged situations, Davis asserts, Lyly's aim is to write a condemning social commentary, to 'satirize those who would live by rigid ideas'.[52] But Lyly's purpose is broader than simply that. Of course his work 'shows the folly,' as Davis

[47] *Anatomy*, p.17v.
[48] Mentz, p.134.
[49] *Anatomy*, p.A.ii.v.
[50] Mentz, p.132.
[51] Ibid..
[52] Davis, p.97.

continues, 'of trying to live out an actual life by adherence to rigid codes of action', but it is also a tale of realization and even learning – not by its protagonists, but by its readers.[53]

In the narrative distance between Euphues and his readers, Lyly takes the opportunity presented by his all-encompassing dissolutions, and therefore deeply ambiguous prose style, to concern himself not with laying down maxims to be followed but with introducing, exploring and submitting ideas to be reviewed by the reader in the often harsh light of their contradictions. By constructing his narrative of arguments that are thus fallible (that are incomplete, dissolute), Lyly may undermine readers' abilities to make informed decisions, but he also invites readerly inquisition constantly. Bolstered with the flattery of being assumed able to appreciate the context and derivation of Euphues and his diction, the reader is compelled into a position of skepticism, nurtured both by familiarity with Euphues' conventional conceits and by the smugly authoritative air with which he regurgitates them. The freedom permitted by Lyly's constant fractures of sense, ideas and narrative structure allows readers to experience for themselves both Euphues' decision-making process and how tenuous and unreliable his arguments are. It is through emotional involvement with Euphues' (and his fellow protagonists') failures – the gaps and fissures between arguments – that readers may experience the text subjectively, posit their own solutions, imagine their own 'consequences' and construct their own 'systems of value'. Euphues' arguments and advice are nothing more than the 'rigid ideas', the 'codes of action', that Lyly always already dooms to failure.

Reading the dissolute in *Euphues*

As *Euphues* itself relates multiple times, advice is insufficient for learning; one must live through formative experiences first hand. The adventures of Euphues and Philautus up until their congress with Fidus in England prove exactly that. On the crossing from Europe, Euphues attempts to engage Philautus with the tale of Callimachus, who ignores a letter of advice (similar to those of Euphues) from his deceased father, and also the experience of his disguised uncle who, when young, had similarly ignored the wisdom of his brother, to make his own forays for profit in the world.[54] Callimachus suffers 'as ill fortune, as euer had any' because of his impetuosity, but eventually gains knowledge (he 'bought witte with the price of woe') and then returns, finally

[53] Ibid..
[54] See *[H]is England*, pp.2r-11v.

appreciating his uncle's sagacity.[55] In response, Philautus conspicuously ignores Euphues' tale by falling asleep. Upon arrival in England, Euphues and Philautus listen to Fidus's tale of his youthful follies and their lessons (during which Euphues, this time, 'had taken a nappe'[56]). They then, appropriately, also ignore that tale during the course of theirs, which constitutes the narrative Lyly weaves for his readers. Clearly, the reader is expected – even intended – to ignore all of *Euphues*' advice in turn. Such impotent didactic single-mindedness is evidently outweighed by the power of evocative dissolution in *Euphues*.

One need only compare Philautus's reactions to Euphues' and Camilla's letters to confirm this. Euphues' letters at the end of the *Anatomy* adapt euphuism for unswerving argument. In his 'Cooling Card', Euphues presents alternatives that agree on woman's unworthiness: 'If she be chaste then is she coy, if lyght then is shre impudent, if a graue Matrone, who can woe hir? if a lewde minion, who woulde wedde hir? if one of the Uestall Uirgins, they haue vowed virginitie, if one of *Venus* courte they haue vowed dishonestie.'[57] The options Euphues offers all lead to the same conclusion: women are to be abhorred. Euphues assimilates the methods of Eubulus's lecture (so easily dismissed at the *Anatomy*'s opening), telling the young Greek that his parents were clearly 'too foolishe in vsinge no discipline, or thou too frowarde in reiecting their doctrine, eyther they willinge to haue thee idle, or thou wylfull to bee ill employed'; whether it is Euphues or his parents at fault, the result is the young man's wantonness.[58] At the time, Euphues argued by insisting on opposition: 'Though all men bee made of one mettall, yet they bee not cast all in one moulde', he counters; '… [p]ut you no difference betweene the younge flourishinge Baye tree, and the olde withered Beeche?'[59]

Euphues' cyclical progression is thorough: in his letters, he even writes 'to preach' to his friends on Eubulus's topic of parental influence – including to Eubulus himself, to 'laugh at the folly' of the old gentleman for weeping at the death of his apparently 'sinful' daughter.[60] Euphues, like Eubulus, leaves his correspondents no reason or freedom to co-respond. In Hutson's pugnacious terminology they cannot perhaps be designated as 'jousts' as they remain unanswered, but Euphues clearly intends his arguments to *win* – to conquer, as it were, all opposing opinions.

---

[55] Ibid., pp.11v, 6r.
[56] Ibid., p.27v (see pp.23r-42r).
[57] *Anatomy*, p.39v.
[58] Ibid., p.2v.
[59] Ibid., pp.5r, 6r.
[60] Ibid., pp.77r, 79v.

This heavy, literally monotonous use of euphuism, though, tethered as it is to one moral message, does not constitute an argument that Lyly intended didacticism. Rather, it demonstrates how unsuccessful Euphues himself is at communicating, and at understanding the strengths (and weaknesses) inherent to Lyly's narrative trope. Both the letters' numbing disconnection from the books' main body text and contradictory later events undermine their potential, and so also undermine that of their straightforwardly moral purpose. Euphues' attitude to euphuism is not Lyly's – and it is not that of *Euphues*.

Philautus is able to annul Euphues' rigid, advisory missives, 'setting his talke at naughte', but the ambiguous double intent that can be inferred from Camilla's early correspondence (when Philautus is able to attribute her 'coldnes' to 'modestie') excites him.[61] The letters achieve their affects because their writers allow a measure of ambiguity in their compositions; their own emotions fluctuate, are transcribed approximately and so may provoke similarly asyndetic reactions. In contrast to Euphues' dogmatic monologues, the letters that pass between Philautus and Camilla convey just the 'disordered discourse' that Philautus's emotions originally provoked on their first meeting (that between shock, 'flaming' desire, 'grief', self-loathing, 'wonder', 'woe', 'patience', 'desperat[ion]' and resigned masochism).[62] Although she never explicitly relays her confused empathy for Philautus, replying to his first essay Camilla experiences 'a thousand contrarieties'; whilst writing she is inflamed with 'a kinde of cholar, for that she knew not what belonged to the perplexities of a Louer' – which phrasing, as well as conveying Camilla's anger based on lack of understanding, also implies that she mistakes 'the perplexities of a Louer' for 'a kinde of cholar' because she is unable to recognize the effects of love when she feels them.[63] Her emotions result, predictably, in a highly-charged epistle that stimulates similar contrarieties in Philautus, despite its lack of open encouragement: it 'wrought such skirmishes in his minde, that he had almost forgot reason', just as seeing Camilla for the first time stimulated 'a thousand thoughtes, hammering in his heade'.[64]

The power of such love letters, letters that so successfully provoke like states, lies firmly in their variabilities, and in the reader's ability to detect what isn't openly said. Lyly compares them with fine art's practice 'that he in painting deserued most praise, that could sette downe most

---

[61] *Anatomy*, p.31r; *[H]is England*, pp.71r-v.
[62] *[H]is England*, p.57v.
[63] Ibid., p.71r.
[64] Ibid., pp.72v, 56r.

colours: wherby there was more contention kindled about the colour, then ye counterfaite, and greater emulation for varietie in shew, then workmanship in substaunce': he emphasizes the importance of the varied, instinctive and appealing over 'workmanship'.[65] So, for Philautus, 'in loue one letter is of more force, then a thousand lookes', and it can be read and re-read, retaining its novelty of effect because of its variety: '[i]f they like writings,' he avows of ladies, 'they read them often', all the while seeking 'the thing they chiefliest desire'.[66] Camilla's letters clearly, unlike Euphues', form matrices that can be reinterpreted repeatedly because of the highly subjective, highly emotional states of both their writer and reader.

In the interplay of letters between Philautus and Camilla, the hierarchical and usually gendered roles of author and reader are also, necessarily, in flux. The power-play is symbolized by Philautus's remark in reference to the tuition on Petrarch he is supposedly also giving: Philautus is compelled 'to call *Camilla* his schollar, when she had schooled him being hir maister.'[67] The two do not simply alternate the role of author, either; as do Lyly's readers, they write in their own inferences as they read, seeking what 'they chiefliest desire', orchestrating their responsive emotional 'skirmishes' and already mentally composing their replies. They themselves authorize (elements of) the texts; they interpret and reinterpret them. Similarly, Lyly's readers are invited to authorize *Euphues*. This is an essential point for Lyly's texts: in the letter addressing 'the Ladies and Gentlewomen of England', revealingly, Lyly requests that his female readers act as 'Tailour[s]' for his text, altering it 'to fit them for a fancie, as the [tailor] doth for a fashion', whilst in that to gentleman readers he instructs, 'Faultes escaped in the Printing, correct with your pennes'.[68] The reader's authority is by no means limited to that of proofreader, though; the very essence of Lyly's idiosyncratic style is that it allows the reader freedom not simply for darning, but for embroidery.

As is most telling especially regarding the power of Lyly's linguistic dissolutions, Camilla's influence – unlike Euphues' – incites Philautus to action, eloquence and engagement, not only reflection. It not only inspires Philautus in exercises of wit more compelling than Euphues', but also in the informal relay of instinctive emotional truths that eventuates in his felicitous romantic union. Unlike Euphues, who turns to 'studie' to learn how to be 'honest', Philautus finds himself able to compass both form and content, as he appropriates euphuism for emotional ends and

---

[65] Ibid., p.67r.
[66] Ibid., p.63r.
[67] Ibid., p.74v.
[68] *[H]is England*, ¶ii.v; ¶iii.v.

celebrates its ambiguities, its dissolutions and its expressive lacks.[69] Philautus learns lastingly from this about the temperance of love, whereas the content of Euphues' letters – what Mentz terms his 'pedantic advice for Philautus, whom he has just betrayed' – is summarily discarded.[70] Emphatically, it is not what is explicitly stated that has the most emotional potency for Lyly's protagonists.

In *Euphues*, the value of the unsaid is perforce Lyly's central concern: as in his drama, he actively avoids straightforward narration when he is writing about emotions. The risk of such a practice, though, is that very little is communicated at all, and so very little is achieved. In the *Anatomy of Wit*, both Euphues and Philautus end up geographically just where they started, and any moral certainty that the plot professes is quickly negated in its sequel. Euphues himself rejects the dogma of his many and excruciating missives rejecting women – and, indeed, almost everything except study – when he arrives in England and mingles with newly stimulating company. He casually chastises himself for hasty judgment:

> I will confesse in two things my extreme folly, the one in louing *Lucilla,* who in comparison of these had no spark of beautie, the other for making a cooling carde against women, when I see these to haue so much vertue, so that in the first I must acknowledge my iudgement rawe, to discerne shadows, and rash in the latter to giue so peremtorye sentence[.][71]

Philautus is incensed by this contradiction (understandably, given how much of Euphues' 'iudgement' he has had to stomach), interrupting Euphues with a violent condemnation of his 'deceite', 'lighte[ness]', 'spight', 'looseness', 'flatterye', 'folly', 'disordinate fancie', 'inconstancie' and 'beastlines' in his attempts to 'blaspheme' and then 'committe Idolatrie' regarding women.[72] He demands furiously, '[w]ith what face *Euphues* canst thou returne to thy vomit, seeming with the greedy hounde to lap vp that which thou diddest cast vp[?] I am ashamed to rehearse the tearmes that once thou didest vtter of malice against women, and art thou not ashamed nowe againe to recant them?'[73]

In his lengthy tirade, Philautus once more expresses his emotionality in asyndetic matrices, expressing mockery ('I cannot chuse but laugh to see thee'), suspicion ('thou shalt neuer deceiue mee') and sorrow ('I lament thy follyes with griefe'), as well as his shame and outrage.[74] Euphues,

---

[69] *Anatomy*, p, 35r.
[70] Mentz, p.133.
[71] *[H]is England*, p.49r.
[72] Ibid., pp.49v-50r.
[73] Ibid., p.49v.
[74] Ibid..

however, characteristically counters with the dry, technically correct point that he 'was neuer either so wicked, or so witlesse to recant truethes or mistake coulours.'[75] '[T]here is no sword made of steele but hath yron,' he continues, 'no fire made of wood but hath smoake, no wine made of grapes but hath leese' – just as, in the 'Cooling Card', he writes that he means 'neyther to flatter men as altogether faultlesse, neyther to fall out with woemen as altogether guyltie' and, in his letter to the matrons and maidens of Italy, that he is 'not so dogged as *Diogenes* to abhorre all Ladyes, neither would I you should thincke me so foolish … that for the light behauiour of a fewe, I shoulde call in question the demeanour of all'.[76] Euphues' position rests on conviction that the events of the *Anatomy* are behind him; he simply cannot read between the lines of the explicit to imagine Philautus's emotional sensitivity to history's repetition even after Philautus exclaims, 'a burnt childe dreadeth the fire'.[77] Euphues proves himself unable to learn from experience, despite all the examples set by his adventures, and his own assertion that it 'is commonly sayd, yet doe I thinke it a common lye, that Experience is the Mistresse of fooles, for in my opinion they be most fooles that want it.'[78] Lyly thus refuses to allow Euphues to read his own experiences receptively.

Euphues' obtuse unwillingness (or inability) to evolve means that over half the content of the first book is dismissed as, or may be reduced to, an irrelevant footnote of the later text. Davis believes that Euphues' retraction in itself suggests a clear lesson, writing that 'the exemplary in these books is negative, for they show the reader what *not* to do' but, as both Euphues and Philautus contract apparently reasonably content (if not ideal) ends, not even that point can be substantiated.[79] Just such a nihilistic conclusion, as much recent scholarship has noted, might also apply to euphuism itself, rendering equally impotent, in Davis's terms, its 'balanced antitheses that add up to exactly nothing'.[80] Clearly, though, Lyly is aware of his own contradictions, and embraces them to imply what can be the only 'lesson' of his text: that living by lessons is pointless. Mentz, like Maslen, believes *Euphues and his England* to be a far better constructed and engaging essay towards romance, rejecting as it does 'the didactic letters that conclude the *Anatomy* in favour of a new emphasis on plot'.[81] Certainly, it relaxes Euphues' pretensions towards didacticism: even Lyly's

---

[75] Ibid., p.54v.
[76] Ibid.; *Anatomy*, pp.39r and 38v.
[77] *[H]is England*, p.49v.
[78] *Anatomy*, p.40v.
[79] Davis, p.97.
[80] Ibid., p.134.
[81] Mentz, p.137.

hero himself sees the ineptitude of rigid codes and adapts to circumstance. He admits, 'Philautus, to set downe precepts against thy Loue, will nothing preuayle, to perswade thee to goe forward, were very perillous, for I know in the one, loue will regard no lawes, & and in the other perswasions can purchase [n]o lybertie.'[82] Once he adopts this new, more flexible stance, Euphues immediately becomes more effective at persuasion: having temperately suggested that Philautus pursue his 'violet' (Frances) rather than his 'rose' (Camilla), he argues that wooing is as satisfying as wedding a woman and so, somehow, provokes Philautus into using the words, '[h]e yt desireth only to talke & view without any further suite, is not farre different from him that liketh to see a paynted rose better then to smel to a perfect Uiolet, or to heare a birde sing in a bush, rather then to haue hir at home in his owne cage.'[83] This surrender could be read as Euphues' one lesson learned. It is not a constructive one, though; what it really reveals is that *Euphues* is overwhelmingly premised on negation, lack of action and, ultimately, lack of assertion.

In so experimental a narrative habitat, and one so permeated with gaps, the inverse and the dissolute, the reader may therefore ask whether Lyly can achieve anything at all. This question's similarity to those of post-structuralism perhaps supplies one reason why Lyly scholarship has gained ground during the last half-century. In contrast, after all, euphuism was derogated so severely by early-twentieth-century critics such as Ernest Baker that it was little wonder it languished unstudied: Baker comments that '[t]he thread of story is of the slightest, exciting hardly any interest in itself; the characters are not persons, but merely copy-book headings, and their doings or mishaps appeal neither to our sympathy nor to our sense of humour'.[84] It has been the preoccupation of recent years to return focus to the sutures, cracks and even decay in and between what is said, in order to query the limits of language's role: J. M. Coetzee and Richard Begam agree in an interview that 'the reading of alterities' (as Coetzee considered in *White Writing*, 'reading *the other*: gaps, inverses, undersides; the veiled, the dark, the buried'[85]) is the defining concern of a thoroughly 'poststructuralist' view of literature.[86] Far from resolving uneasiness with euphuism's potential for nihilism, pinning such a label onto it if anything exacerbates the issue – especially as,

---

[82] *[H]is England*, pp.88v.
[83] Ibid., p.60v.
[84] Ernest A. Baker, *The History of the English Novel* (London: H. F. & G. Witherby, 1929), p.59.
[85] J. M. Coetzee, *White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), p.88.
[86] Richard Begam, 'An Interview with J.M. Coetzee' *Contemporary Literature*, 33:3 (1992), pp.419-431 (p.421).

even in 1992, Begam and Coetzee suggest that 'poststructuralism is dead'.[87] At best, positioning euphuism's study in poststructuralism's ranks files it away again as irrelevant and tiresome; at worst (in this case), it demarcates the figure as intentionally impotent, and fashioned only for formal ornament. Perhaps it is only in light of this context that Lyly's steps to render his characters far more complex than 'copy-book headings' may be appreciated. However, as Mentz comments, if Euphues' letters 'show, as the text exclaims, "what wit can and will do if it be well employed," then the problem is [still] that wit accomplishes very little'.[88] Objectively, Mentz is accurate; euphuism often talks itself into a circle, leaving nothing but *nothing* as its pivotal point. As Davis remarks, '[t]his is the literature of significant failure'.[89] However, it is significant not because it presents a cautionary tale of behaviour or rhetoric (as Davis writes) but because the failure of moral expression is Lyly's major point.

One of *Euphues*' repeatedly demonstrated principles is that subjective, not objective or second-hand, experience constitutes euphuism's value. Another is expressed by the repeated epigram, 'so many men so many mindes' or 'sundrye men are of sundrye mindes' – or, indeed, expressed as a euphuistic matrix, 'as all floures that are in one Nosegaye, are not of one nature, nor all Ringes that are worne vpon one hand, are not of one fashion: so all friendes that associate at bedde and at boord, are not of one disposition'.[90] These two emergent spirits of the text, if applied to the reader's response, emphasize what is constructive about Lyly's stylistic approach. Readers' 'sundrye' subjective experiences of the text – their own (re)constructions of value – mean the subjectively read text is not full of holes, but full of amplifications, and therefore full of points of emotional contact between characters, author and readers. The dissolution of Euphues' conclusions from the premises that Lyly has presented over the course of the narrative creates not a vacuum but a receptive lack in the text, which readers themselves are prompted to fill. Lyly recognized that, unlike drama (and perhaps this is why Lyly labored so hard to create 'intimately internal' dialogues of love in his comedies), prose fiction has the ability to remain private, subjective, and so to remain intimately personal. Each time it is read it is relevant and – as long as readers remain curious about exploring their own imaginations – emotionally stimulating. Lyly denies any authorial investment in *Euphues*, announcing, 'I Gentlewomen, am indifferent' and, in

---

[87] Ibid..
[88] Mentz, p.133.
[89] Davis, p.97.
[90] *Anatomy*, p.4v; *[H]is England*, pp.126v, 56r.

conclusion, also resigns his omniscience regarding the felicity of his protagonists: 'were the trueth knowen, I am sure Gentlewomen,' he seems to shrug, 'it would be a hard question whether *Philautus* were a better wooer, or a husband, whether *Euphues* were a better louer, or a scholler'.[91] He leaves his characters and readers to 'conferre' on the tenor of its conclusion, ultimately resigning from authority.[92]

As Wilson reports of Gabriel Harvey's discomfort with the style (and with Lyly's influence on Greene), its emerging power was both liberating and – for some – disturbing, precisely because of 'the lack of certainty about what prose fiction [could] be or do'.[93] For readers 'both within and without the text', Wilson writes, this dissolution of what they had come to expect from their reading material – this 'lack' that they themselves had to fill, was 'extraordinarily emancipating'.[94] It also resulted in reactive consternation at the breaking apart of the social distinctions that were latent in more instructional texts. Rather than maintaining the author-reader dynamic as that of pedagogue and obedient student, Lyly presents the dissolution of literary norms (as through Philautus's and Camilla's letters) and puts the consumer-reader almost on a par with the author as regards creative input and textual (re)construction. This provoked, as Wilson shows, 'Harvey's horror at the merging of categories, or author, text and reader'.[95] Such a reaction, Wilson persuasively infers, 'shows how easily these books get under your skin' due to the newly 'common places', which 'are created from readers' own experience[s]'.[96]

Rather than composing an empty ornamental tale or, conversely, a 'moral treatise' through which to instruct his public, by employing such an asyndetic style in the *Euphues* duology Lyly presents a work of fiction that allows the reader to instruct the text. It constituted a new kind of thought experiment for prose fiction, one that prioritized imagination and experimentation over constraints. In romances such as the *Arcadia*s, the idea of readerly freedom initiated by Lyly's dissolutions is allowed much freer rein for amplification.

---

[91] *[H]is England*, p.132r.
[92] Ibid..
[93] Wilson, p.17.
[94] Ibid..
[95] Ibid..
[96] Ibid..

II: Amplification

> I thinke in deed, that better it is to be priuate
> In sorrows torments, then, tyed to the pompes of a pallace,
> Nurse inwarde maladyes, which haue not scope to be breath'd out
> … Better yet do I liue, that though by my thoughts I be plunged
> Into my liues bondage, yet may disburden a passion
> (Opprest with ruinouse conceites) by the helpe of an outcrye:
> Not limited to a whispringe note, the Lament of a Courtier.
>
> I see the boundes of all these knowledges: but the workinges of the minde I finde much more infinite, then can bee led unto by the eye, or imagined by any, that distract their thoughts without themselves. And in such contemplation, or as I thinke more excellent, I enioye my solitarines; and my solitarines perchaunce is the nurse of these contemplations.
>
> – Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*[1]

Amplification of the *private*, *contemplative* elements that make up asyndeton (to use the phrasing of both Sir Philip Sidney and Frank Whigham) is achieved once the dissolution of asyndetic elements – their figurative lack of conjunctions – is recognized. Disjunction and decathection of these elements from one another gives language 'the appearance of being both naked and disjointed'; it intrigues the reader into probing them more interrogatively, as though able to consider their true and diverse potentials intimately, for the first time.[2] Both semantically and syntactically, as Aristotle and Quintilian recognize, asyndetic elements are 'loose', mutable and able to be interpreted variously; in their separation from the certainties provided by context, the reader may recognize all such vehicles' possible tenors synchronously, and so appreciate each element in its full diversity.[3] Furthermore, as the *PEPP*'s definition that asyndeton constitutes 'one species of all figures of ellipsis' implies, in the conceptual gaps ceded by conjunction deletion the reader may infer more complex relationships between elements, and innumerable new (subjective) contexts for them.[4] In Aristotle's words, dissolution creates language that says 'many things'; '[t]herefore an asyndeton produces amplification'.[5]

This amplification of elements' variety and volume is what causes the asyndetic matrix's 'earnestness', 'agitation' and 'frenzy', making it uniquely apt for expressing states of heightened

---

[1] Sidney's N*A* as above, I.43r, I.16v; see also *The Countesse of Pembroke's* [Old] *Arcadia*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), I.76, I.13-14. All further references to the O*A*, unless stated otherwise, are to this edition.
[2] Cope, as above.
[3] See 'ἀσύν-δετος, ον', in Liddell-Scott-Jones; 'asyndeton', in *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*; Aristotle, III.12.3-4; and Quintilian, IX.3.50.
[4] The *PEPP* as above.
[5] Aristotle, III.12.4.

emotion.[6] The figure's inherent inquietude relies upon the reader's subjective engagement with (re)assembling its gallimaufry of meanings, and so may always be interpreted subjectively. Readers may instinctively relate a combination of asyndetic elements' tenors to their own conceptions of emotions, which causes the matrix's consequently 'earnest' invocation of, as Priestley wrote, 'a person's real feelings and state of mind'.[7] Asyndetic elements become an author's '*gestures*', subjectively recognized by the reader, 'which are infinitely more expressive of sentiments and feelings than words can possibly be'.[8] As Basilius recognizes in Sidney's New *Arcadia*, truly *feeling*, disjointed speech therefore provokes empathy because it relates to subjective experiences of emotion – both the author's and the audience's. As Basilius consoles his advisor Plangus:

> Thy wailing words do much my spirits move,
> They uttred are in such a feeling fashion,
> That sorrowes worke against my will I prove.
> Me-thinkes I am partaker of thy passion,
> And in thy case do glasse mine owne debilitie:
> Selfe-guiltie folke most prone to feele compassion.[9]

Sidney's structure and authorial approach

Like Lyly, Sidney uses dissolute, asyndetic elements to express his characters' emotions – as did Heliodoros and Achilles Tatios, the ancient Greek prose authors who so influenced him.[10] Unlike Lyly, though, Sidney's focus is not on the act of dissolution itself, but on the potential expression and experimentation enabled by cutting loose elements' restrictive ties to one another and to context. Sidney shows that the 'ellips[e]s' created by these elements' dissolution can provide a contemplative, sheltered and therefore solitary space that allows free interpretation. In the *Arcadia*s as in their Greek models, amplification is nurtured by the 'delay' and consequent narrative 'dilation' that is central to Barbara Fuchs's and Patricia Parker's assessments of the romance mode, and which provides just this haven for emotional expression.[11]

---

[6] Puttenham, as above; Jebb's notes on *Ajax* in *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*, as above, p.60.
[7] In Stone, as above.
[8] Ibid..
[9] N*A*, II.77v.
[10] As Samuel Lee Wolff establishes decisively, the reworked *Arcadia* was built 'on the loom of Heliodorus' and, as confirmed by Maurice Evans and Skretkowitcz (amongst others), another 'major source' for Sidney was Achilles Tatios's '*Clitophon and Leucippe*, from which, as from Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, he borrowed the occasional episode.' – See Wolff, p.353; Maurice Evans's 'Introduction' to Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. and annotated by Maurice Evans (London: Penguin, 1977), pp.9-50 (p.19); Skretkowicz as above.
[11] Parker, p.5, cited in Fuchs, p.8.

Like chaotic, asyndetic elements, the adventures that befall Heliodoros's, Tatios's and Sidney's protagonists seem entirely at odds with epic's 'purposefulness'; they are disjointed and random and, importantly, seem entirely out of control. As Wolff comments on the Greek romances and Davis cites with reference to the *Arcadia*s, the narratives portray a 'totally "unclassic" Alexandrian view of life', which is 'based on the premise that the normal links of causation have collapsed in a world of fragments.'[12] Because of this dissolution of 'causation' into 'fragments', Tatios's, Heliodoros's and Sidney's protagonists diverge into infinitely unpredictable courses in which anything could happen – courses dominated by the 'frenzy' integral to asyndetic matrices. The narratives present characters caught on the cusp of adult responsibilities when their respective lives are thrust (temporarily) off-trajectory: Tatios's Kleitophon is about to be married, Heliodoros's Theaggenes is beginning his military career and Charikleia her vocation as sacred acolyte, and Sidney's Musidorus and Pyrocles are returning to their homeland to resume their responsibilities as rulers. The Greek proagonists fall violently in love and and elope, but the elopements themselves are interrupted by a shipwreck and a pirate attack; Sidney's princes experience this in reverse, being shipwrecked in Arcadia and then falling in love. These disjunctures render protagonists 'independent' from the realistic 'facts and associations' of their depicted lives, in the terms Fuchs borrows from Coleridge (the political or social sphere that is represented by the court for Lyly), and positions them instead in a chaotic narrative forum that 'owes no allegiance to time and place' but rather to 'our nature' and 'imagination'.[13]

Unlike epic, romance focuses on the subjective and multiple: romance is, for Fuchs, 'an ideal strategy of narrative expansiveness, trumping the single-minded, collective purposefulness of epic with rich detours into individual experience, erotic delay, and the exploration of alternative perspectives.'[14] The 'individual experience[s]' of the princes emulate those of their forebears in many ways (they meet with pirates and lecherous queens, battle 'cruell monsters, and monstrous men', become prisoners, believe *scheintod*s and disguises, become separated and are reunited). Additionally, in Arcadia, their own assumptions of disguise and the intercessions of Philoclea and Pamela, these princesses' guardians, some wild beasts and warring protesters pose equal problems.

---

[12] Davis, p.160, citing Wolff, p.7.
[13] Fuchs, p.94, citing Samuel Talylor Coleridge, *Writings on Shakespeare: A Selection of the Essays, Notes, and Lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge on the Poems and Plays of Shakespeare*, ed. by Terence Hawkes (New York, NY: Capricorn Books, 1959), p.203.
[14] Fuchs, p.69.

Still more intricately, as this chapter will discuss, the princes' lives and even identities become interrupted and split by both the events that befall them in Arcadia and their own conduct, as Sidney's closer focus examines both their inter- and intra-personal relationships. In the *Arcadia*s' conclusions the princes are wrenched back into a semblance of their previous realities when they are, as are all of their Greek counterparts, called to trial, reunited with their family, and married.

In all of these texts, notwithstanding their conclusions, it is the *interruptions* to protagonists' lives and plans that constitute the books' substance. The narratives are occupied almost entirely with the overwhelming delay of their heroes' eventual reentry into the socially conditioned 'real world' and assumption of their adult responsibilities, signalled by their much-anticipated unions in marriage. The delays also, vitally, separate protagonists and allow the reader to appreciate each as an individual and in the fullness of his or her respective capabilities. The obstacles in the texts prioritize exploration of the emotional connections made by their heroes through the temptations and challenges facing them. Plot, characters, their exploits and their emotional progressions are dilated – '[a]mplified' in Fuchs's own choice of words – by the delay caused by their dissolution from, and before their (re)unions with, their social realities.[15]

Sidney's (and indeed Lyly's, and Greene's) mode of amplification in his plot is one of repetition. As did his Greek forbears, Sidney piles up examples of diversion and interruption that, to the modern reader at least, feel at times as static – even as stagnant – as Lyly's laborious euphuism. They are certainly, as Virginia Woolf writes, 'long-winded'.[16] For Heliodoros, Tatios and Sidney, however, the ceaseless regularity of opposition facing their protagonists represents a cumulative test of character that amplifies it simply by increasing the volume of proven virtue. Woolf's criticism that Sidney's 'succession of stories fall on each other like soft snowflakes, one obliterating the other' is almost precisely their point: they are intended to fit together to form a conceptual whole constituted from multiple unique elements.[17] The New *Arcadia*'s establishment of worth in the princes' only equal, Argalus (a man so 'noble' and 'worthie' 'as hardly the nicest eye can finde a spot in') acts as concise exemplar: in desperation to 'remoue him' as a suitor to her daughter, a spiteful mother uses Argalus 'in as many dangerous enterprises, as euer the euil stepmother *Iuno* recommended to the famous *Hercules:* … [and] in more & more dangerous

[15] Fuchs, p.79.
[16] Virginia Woolf, 'The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia', *The Common Reader, Second Series*, ed. by Andrew McNeillie (Orlando, FL: Mariner Books, 2003), pp.32-42 (p.40).
[17] Ibid..

attempts'; she finds 'the world sooner wanted occasions, then he valour to goe thorow them'.[18] After relentless and repetitious labour (although its details are, perhaps mercifully, condensed for narration) Argalus's mettle is confirmed: it is premised, Sidney makes explicit, on it being proved 'many' times, 'more & more', against 'all the things', even infinitely; Sidney piles up example on example ('enterprise' upon 'attempt' upon 'occasion'), bearing Argalus aloft to the 'hight of honour'.[19] Argalus rises to become a paragon or symbol of virtue, and the sheer quantity of challenges that faces each of Sidney's primary characters bears them in the same direction. In these major protagonists, the variety both of these challenges (some civil, some erotic, some martial, some bestial) and of the protagonists' reactions to them complicates, however, any symbolic or unitary character definition. Presented (albeit laboriously) with the details of these central couples' disruptions, the reader is able to appreciate the nuances of what their reactions (and inactions) reveal: not only character but also emotional character development.

Vitally, the fragmented digressions and inconsistencies that face these characters also face the reader, as the preeminent feature of both narrative style and generic position. Throughout the New *Arcadia*, Sidney adopts and adapts Heliodoros's most unusual stylistic narrative device, the flashback. The *Ethiopian History*, uniquely among Greek prose texts, proceeds not chronologically but through a patchwork of fragmented recollections; it begins *in media res*, filling in early details through later explanations and jumping between viewpoints. Heliodoros's text appears both fractured and multi-layered, as the tales that interweave to form his narrative begin and break off suddenly – when, for example, the speaker's story is halted because of a fresh invasion: asked to expand upon his tale, the narrator exclaims, 'The time (aunsweared he) will not suffer me'.[20] As a consequence, like the 'ellipsis' implied by asyndeton, the resultant narrative gap prompts the reader to infer the ways in which the speakers' lives must have continued divergently from the narrative as written – readers appreciate the fragmented nature of the tale as they receive it and posit that there should be more to read.

The flashback also decontextualizes events by distancing them geographically, temporally and culturally from the narrative line (as is further discussed below). Because of this, and each fragment's subjective focalization, readers are compelled to question narrators' assumptions and

---

[18] N*A*, I.9r-v.
[19] Ibid..
[20] Heliodoros, I.16v.

draw their own conclusions from often misleading perspectives: at times Heliodoros preempts a contradictory plot twist (for example divulging that 'that whiche shortely after woulde make [Knemon] very ioyfull, was nowe turned into sorrowe'[21]), but deceptively, at others, allows the reader to believe appearances (mischievously implying a dead woman is Charikleia by warning that Theaggenes hurries to her 'not knowinge the sorrowes whereunto he should falle'[22]). Just such readerly involvement is also prompted in *Leukippe and Kleitophon*, which is narrated in the first person by Kleitophon himself. As a result, Tatios's story necessitates constant narratorial self-editing and self-contradiction; it is fractured when his hero must backtrack (he regresses with hindsight on nuances known only 'priuily'[23]) or relies on others to detail reports of events from which he was absent (when he realizes, for example, that Leukippe has not been executed as he had believed, she teases, 'I pray thee *Menelaus* do not holde him in admiration any longer, but delcare [*sic*] to him the meanes wherewith these traiterous Rouers were deceiued'[24]). The effect of such faulty or at least biased narration, like that of the broken-off stories that constitute flashbacks, is not to retain a sense of disjuncture or disbelief. Rather, it compels readers to think for themselves and to probe further into the potentials of the story, making their own interpretative conclusions from the information presented, and re-organizing them into a cohesive narrative structure that makes subjective sense. Within and around the narratives, this information is rarely presented unambiguously, and increases the dissolute options with which readers may improvise.

Just as in *Euphues*, generic inconsistencies also litter the texts, constantly stimulating the reader's imaginative anticipation as they refuse to engage with a predictable narrative format. Grouping the ancient Greek romances as homologous is still contentious, despite their clear consistencies of plot, two thousand years on; the fact remains that nowhere in Greek literary commentary are prose works discussed as a cohesive kind. Ancient Greek, as far as is evident, lacks any such distinguishing word: as Whitmarsh (who terms the romances 'novels') remarks, 'even the best candidate, "dramatikòn" (sc. "diæghma") of the novels, does not appear before Photios in the sixth century and even then seems to refer to the "dramatic" aspects of plot (sufferings and

[21] Ibid., V.62v.
[22] Ibid., II.20v.
[23] Tatios, V.83. John J. Winkler's engaging translation voices this expressively as 'unbeknownst to us, …' – in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989), pp.170-284 (p.234).
[24] Tatios, III.61.

reversals of fortune) rather than the novel form itself'.[25] Whitmarsh tellingly summarizes that the crucial point regarding these texts, unusually, 'is that genres are not fixed by genetic inheritance; they are, rather, *flexible matrices* of convention at the service of the author in question'.[26] Rather like Fuchs, he believes the romances' conventions to be 'not recipes, but strategies.'[27] They are again loose in both structure and ideology, and refuse to be proscriptive.

In this looseness, the Greek romances challenge the reader's search for the holistic, and the *Arcadia*s follow suit. Whether through design or the accident of the New *Arcadia*'s incompletion (the *aposiopesis* that Gavin Alexander feels renders it 'especially open'[28]), the works promote contrast, debate and diversion, and refuse to resolve it – just as in the dialogical eclogue between Reason and Passion, for example, in which Sidney refuses to declare a victor.[29] As Relihan reports in her work on novelistic discourse, able to read only the New *Arcadia*, Virginia Woolf describes the 'novel' (her term for it) as a text that 'ultimately remains unsatisfying because it lacks cohesion'; Relihan appends in parentheses, '[o]ne wishes, at this point, that she had access to the more unified *Old Arcadia*.'[30] Relihan's regret may be well-founded – although even the Old *Arcadia* has more than its fair share of the fragmentary and diverse, and certainly features the 'inequality and elasticity' of language on which Woolf also remarks.[31] Neil Rhodes writes of the book as 'textually unstable'; Steve Mentz (rather less disparagingly) terms it a 'strangely fractured work', believing this to be 'in part because of its structural fragmentation'.[32] Mentz concludes that 'the *New Arcadia* seems an extended experiment with the idea of coherence itself' conducted by, in Stephen Greenblatt's terms, a 'connoisseur of doubt'.[33] Mentz does not wholly, however, attribute this to the vagaries of the New *Arcadia*'s incompletion; he also cites Steve McCoy's judgment that Sidney presents an "'eclectic narrative" with characters of "contradiction and irresolution"', which features persist in

---

[25] Whitmarsh, p.588.
[26] Ibid. [my emphasis].
[27] Ibid..
[28] Gavin Alexander, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p.xix.
[29] N*A*, II.111r-v (O*A*, II.119-20).
[30] Relihan, p.21.
[31] Woolf, p.36.
[32] Neil Rhodes, in his Introduction to *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics* ed. by Neil Rhodes (Tempe, AZ: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1997), p.13; Steve Mentz, 'The Thigh and the Sword: Gender, Genre, and Sexy Dressing in Sidney's *New Arcadia*', in *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities* as above pp.77-91 (pp.77-78).
[33] Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, p.77, citing Stephen Greenblatt, 'Sidney's *Arcadia* and the Mixed Mode', *Studies in Philology*, 70 (1973), pp.269-78 (p.274).

both versions.[34] The commonalities of impression here are telling: the *Arcadia* is agreed to be fragmentary and ambiguous of course, but it is 'strangely', evasively so. The language that Greenblatt and McCoy use suggests that what is fragmentary about both books may be a quality inferred by the reader rather than one inherent to the text; the reader, not the text, suffers from 'irresolution' and 'doubt'. Readers' (specifically, critics') determination to secure and pigeonhole Sidney's work has been complicated by, for one, what Greenblatt calls Sidney's 'mixed mode', which is explained by Mentz as his 'modification of fixed generic codes'.[35]

Generic classification of Sidney's prose works has, indeed, been hotly and continuously debated. Critics from C. S. Lewis to Davis have debated their suitability as 'epic', in guise of a 'heroic poem' and as 'pastoral', leading Davis to argue summarily (from the ground-point that they are pastoral romances) that the *Arcadia*s take a form that 'pushes the genre to its limits':[36]

> If … the *Arcadia* contains many elements that seem to us totally unlike the pastoral romance, we may do well to remember that this most hospitable of genres had opened its arms to epic games, dream vision, mystic love story, Platonic dialogue, autobiography, patriotic celebrations, courtly compliment, Ovidian myth, Greek romantic melodrama, tournaments, warfare, satire, theology, and sea fights before it ever reached Sidney's hands.[37]

Davis invokes a strategy for dealing with the Greek romances in terminology remarkably similar to Whitmarsh's: he recourses to 'flexible matrices of convention' rather than a decisive label or code. Whatever the debate's outcome, its importance (like that of the similar generic inquietude surrounding the *Euphues* duology) is to prompt recognition of the various and subjective interpretations that Sidney's 'eclectic narrative' can produce. Most relevantly, Greenblatt connects it to Sidney's attitude regarding the ways in which characterization in his books should be approached, with a flexible understanding of human character: 'Sidney seemed instinctively to feel that for the world he wished to portray, there could be no unified, pure form with a single style, a uniform set of characters, and a fixed perspective.'[38] This lack of 'fixed perspective', Sidney's

---

[34] Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, p.78, citing Richard McCoy, *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), p.x.
[35] Mentz p.77, citing Greenblatt p.271.
[36] 'epic': C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), p.33, and Alan D. Isler, 'Heroic Poetry and Sidney's Two *Arcadia*s', *PMLA*, 83:2 (May, 1968), pp.368-379 (fn. 8); 'heroic poem': Kenneth O. Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935) pp.149-150, and Edwin A. Greenlaw, 'Sidney's *Arcadia* as an example of Elizabethan Allegory', *Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913), pp.327-337 (p.330); 'pastoral': Isler, p.373, and Davis, p.169.
[37] Walter Davis, *A Map of Arcadia: Sidney's Romance in Its Tradition* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1965), p.169.
[38] Greenblatt, 'Sidney's *Arcadia* and the Mixed Mode', p.271.

'extended experiment with the idea of coherence', is also an extended experiment with morality – one that presents moral shiftiness with far greater ambiguity than does *Euphues*, but not one that Sidney presents frivolously.

Sidney's equivocal attitude towards the morals of his text is suggested, for one, by how heavily he leans upon Greek novelistic tropes in his revisions. The conclusion to the *Arcadia*s, the princes' trial for the supposed murder of Basilius and their transgressions against his daughters, is a passage that Peter Lindenbaum feels 'modern critics' censure as 'the most unsatisfactory part of Sidney's romance', and onto which he projects Sidney's intense 'dissatisfaction' (despite the fact that it remained largely unchanged in the revised version, even by Sidney's posthumous collaborators).[39] A source for Sidney's and readers' 'dissatisfaction', as Lindenbaum suggests, may be their conflicted feelings regarding the outcome of Pyrocles and Musidorus's trial: there is disparity between the princes' familiarity to the reader and their constant, irreverent deceit – which, in Pyrocles' case in the Old *Arcadia*, becomes blasphemous when he swears to Philoclea's 'unstayned vertue' and 'chastetye', protesting, 'I attest the heavens, to blaspheame which I am not now in fit tune, that so much as my comming into her chamber, was wholie unwitting unto her.'[40] For both princes even in the New, their conduct regarding the princesses certainly constitutes treason and (as only they and the reader know for sure) also amounts to attempted rape.[41] The reader's internal conflict also responds to that between Euarchus's portrayal as a fair judge and as a cruel kinsman and, ultimately, between senses of justice and of mercy. Lindenbaum contends that Sidney had intended to revise the princes' conduct during the trial (so disrespectful that it 'astonished' its onlookers[42]) in order to increase sympathy for them. Whether or not this was the case, Sidney's only real (re)solution in Euarchus's court seems to have been to divert authority to his Greek forebears – specifically, in this case, to Heliodoros.

Euarchus's dilemma mirrors that of Heliodoros's Ethiopian king Hydaspes during one of the most powerful passages of the *Ethiopian History*: at the story's climax Charikleia returns home as a prisoner of war and is anointed to be sacrificed in martial thanksgiving. Charikleia proves her identity as the Ethiopian king and queen's exiled daughter, but her father is forced by both religious

---

[39] Peter Lindenbaum, 'Sidney's *Arcadia*: The Endings of the Three Versions', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 34:3 (May, 1971), pp.205-218 (pp.205-06).
[40] N*A*, V.232r (O*A*, V.328).
[41] See N*A*, II.87r-v; II.101v.
[42] N*A*, V.239r (O*A*, V.348).

law and moral imperative to condemn his own kin to death; for Hydaspes, consecration for sacrifice represents a binding contract. He addresses his subjects:

> Yee that be presente, the Goddes contrary to all hope, have declared that I am a Father, as you both heare & see, & that this is my Daughter it is proved by many argumentes: yet doo I owe such good wil to you, and my Countrie, that without regarde either to the succession of my Bloude, or ioye that I haue to be called a Father, whiche all by her are like to ensue, am ready to offer her to the Goddes for your behoofe.[43]

Although distressed by his familial ties, Hydaspes chooses a public good over a personal one until, moved by divine will, his public cries out in Charikleia's favour, 'saue the Mayde, saue the Bloude Royall, … you haue donne to vs so muche as the Lawe requireth, wee acknowledge you for our good Kinge'.[44]

Trapped between the Scylla of the princes' misdeeds and the Charybdis of his quest for a satisfactorily happy ending, Sidney's solution to the *Arcadia*'s similar dilemma is to mould Euarchus's actions upon those of Hydaspes. Euarchus tearfully tells the Arcadian court:

> I wayed the matter which you committed into my hands, with most vnpartiall and farthest reach of reason. And thereout haue condemned them to loose their liues, contaminated with so manye foule breaches of hospitalitie, ciuilitie and vertue. Now contrarye to all expectations, I finde them to be my onely sonne and Nephew … . But alas shall iustice halte? … Or rather shall all priuate respectes geue place to that holy name? Bee it so, bee it so, … let the small remnant of my life, bee to mean inward and outward desolation, and to the world a gazing stock of wretched misery: But neuer neuer, let sacred rightfulnes fall.[45]

Correspondingly, this unpleasant judgement stands until Basilius makes a miraculous recovery, and those gathered acquit Pyrocles and Musidorus unanimously: '[e]uen [the prosecutor] *Philanax* owne reuengefull hart was mollified … to a compassionate conceite'.[46] As well as securing a model for a satisfactory ending, Sidney's recourse to the Greek solution also ensures that his plot, if under scrutiny, has at least precedent (and at most another's authority) onto which Sidney might deflect any moral censure. In this manner, Sidney is able ingeniously to retain the nature of his commitment to writing in the Old *Arcadia* and elsewhere: his prioritizing of fluidity and contestation over fixity and judgement. Despite this, Sidney succeeds in ending his tale in apparently just as summative and united a manner as do Tatios and Heliodoros, with a return to hegemony, patriarchy and the social convention of marriage.

---

[43] Heliodoros, X.239r.
[44] Ibid..
[45] N*A*, V.241v (O*A*, V.355-56).
[46] N*A*, V.241v (O*A*, V.355).

The structure of asyndeton's process provides an apt blueprint for this pattern. The eventful and (for Sidney, at least) moral turbulence of Sidney's, Heliodoros's and Tatios's texts resides within the union that precedes it, which is dissolved and which then succeeds it. Darlene C. Greenhalgh invokes Northrop Frye's tripartite notion of the adventure quest ('the "perilous journey," "crucial struggle," and "final discovery and recognition"') to illustrate the stringency of the structure within the Greek romances.[47] For Greenhalgh, a moment of emotionality ('the awakening of passion') begins the struggle, which is both complicated and explored when characters become 'separated' (from each other or, indeed, divided within themselves) and is defined by its *variety*: 'a variety of situations and adventures', 'a variety of temptations and enticements', and also, most importantly, producing 'a variety of physical virtues – fortitude, strength, and intrepidity … fidelity and chastity', all of which are piled up to amplify character.[48] The quest is concluded when its participants' 'desire for reunion' is eventually fulfilled.[49] The most poignant point of the analogy is that the 'reunion' of which Greenhalgh writes differs from the societal (and often, already, consensus of marital) union that preexisted 'the awakening of passion' – the characters and readers alike have since then been altered subtly by the quest and its revelations. Its variety, and the series of separations that enable this variety, means that they understand more about one another (and, more importantly, far more about themselves, their priorities, their capabilities and their motivating passions) because they have been temporarily free to appreciate them. The process of experience occurs between 'the two poles of plot movement', in an arena uniquely appropriate for discovery, which is simultaneously enveloping and testing.[50]

The experience of reading mirrors the form of these tales. The reader follows this 'tripartite' and sheltered journey in the dislocation and isolation inherent to reading alone, and therefore does so freely and subjectively. The forum of the romance provides just as protective and nurturing a sanctuary from society and reality as do romantic digressions themselves for their protagonists; readers' emotional responses to prose needn't be bound and may be amplified, because the medium doesn't expose them publicly. What is experienced when reading privately somewhat seals the reader, author and characters together in a pact of confidentiality. They share only the

---

[47] Darlene C. Greenhalgh, 'Love, Chastity, and Women's Erotic Power: Greek Romance in Elizabethan and Jacobean Contexts', in *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities* as above, pp.15-42 (p.16); see Northrop Frye, *An Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp.186-206.
[48] Greenhalgh, pp.16-17.
[49] Ibid., p.38 fn.5.
[50] Ibid., p.16.

awareness that there exist things no-one has said, but each must understand. As Liebler writes, 'reading a book … protects by privacy whatever thought, response, fantasy, approval, or disapproval arises from the exposure.'[51] Because of romance's pact of confidentiality, Sidney is able to demand what Claire Preston terms 'the collusion of the reader', and romance is freer to express chaotic sentiments of dissent – just like the Arcadian shepherds' pastorals, which utter 'vnder hidden formes … such matters, as otherwise they durst not deale with'.[52] Sidney exploits the nature of his fiction to mask his (in)sincerity; the romance mode essentially cloaks any authorial sincerity or disingenuousness with the same mantle – not simply that of untruth, but of dislocation from a world in which absolute truth is a priority. In his *Arcadia*s, Sidney creates a web of ideological uncertainty that, Preston writes, is both 'decadent' and 'thoroughly unethical'.[53] Preston's terminology is faulty in that, because of his playful evasions, Sidney's texts are not 'unethical' or immoral, but amoral, as he cedes morality to his readers. Sidney's ethical dislocations act in the same way as those that express emotionality; they force the reader to contribute and so supply a way of 'figuring the ineffable' that remains subjective.[54] He requires a shared understanding achieved with a subtextual wink, just as Musidorus, 'under that couert manner', conveys *his* true identity to Pamela, in the nuances of an apparently disassociated tale – to which nuances Pamela's guardian Mopsa remains oblivious.[55] Musidorus makes his meaning clear by discriminating between 'Pamela's wit and Mopsa's ignorance', and draws the equally discerning Pamela into a 'secret consent'.[56]

This method of misdirection allows the *Arcadia*s to go about their more dissenting business; the texts' fictional premises and fantastical embellishments pull focus from the heartfelt emotional frenzy that the discerning reader may detect and reciprocate. The substantial revisions that constitute the New *Arcadia* – its tales of heroic battles, shipwrecks and prophesies – seem to vindicate the princes' inactive, contemplative existence with exploits conceptually lifted from the Greek romances. They constitute a bid to excuse the degraded condition of the princes as they

---

[51] Liebler, p.3.
[52] Claire Preston, 'Sidney's Arcadian Poetics: A Medicine of Cherries and the Philosophy of Cavaliers', *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics*, ed. Neil Rhodes (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1997) pp.91-108 (p.108); N*A*, I.8r.
[53] Preston as above.
[54] Ibid..
[55] O*A*, p.93.
[56] O*A*, pp.II.89, II.94; see N*A* II.53r-v.

reside in Arcadia, shirking not only their noble garments but also their princely duties.[57] Unconcerned with public opinion in his original tale, Sidney trivializes the princes' exploits before their arrival as 'a work for a higher style than mine.'[58] Although ostensibly adopting this 'higher style' in the New *Arcadia*, Sidney portrays the events only through flashback, stories and third-party updates, rendering them distant from Arcadia geographically, temporally and culturally. Even after Sidney's revisions the princes never even recount their own recurring tale concerning the ill-fated Queen Erona, for example; it is first, readers are told, narrated by Plangus; then it is brushed over by Pamela in conversation with Musidorus; it is finally recounted by the sisters to Pyrocles.[59] Thus the tale of the rescue appears fictionalized thrice over both chronologically and, in this instance, synchronically by three reporters: Plangus, Pamela and finally Sidney himself. The princes themselves also fictionalize their adventures; Pyrocles, for example, adapts his foreign exploits and shipwreck to fabricate:

> I hauing in this my youth determined to make the worlde see the *Amazons* excellencies, aswell in priuate, as in publicke vertue, haue passed some daungerous aduentures in diuers countries, till the vnmercifull Sea depriued me of my company: so that shipwrack casting me not farre hence, vncertaine wandring brought me to this place.[60]

The prince refigures his 'shipwrack' to fit his assumed identity, mingling it with outright lies.

Sidney's implementation of his changes to the Old *Arcadia* is shrewd; his dressing of it in more laudable conventions is what allows it to retain its focus on the microcosmic, private and emotional. Sidney creates an aesthetic utopia in which artistic merit and introspection are given free rein, not despite but enabled by his sidelined epic interludes. The voices Sidney assumes, then, including that of the 'higher style' he declined in the Old *Arcadia*, act as smokescreens behind which he and the reader, and his characters, may safely collude. Ironically, Sidney turns the New *Arcadia*'s virtuously action-packed, politically-motivated, widely-travelled recollections into digressions within the digression of Arcadia – he positions them in a foreign territory usually reserved for romance. They are temporally constrained, even if not by the 'one year' limit suggested

---

[57] In Sidney's social climate these duties, as the *Apologie* (disingenuously or not) bears witness, were 'not onely to have the skill, but to performe the practise of a Souldier: so that the ending end of all earthly learning, being vertuous action, those skilles that most serve to bring forth that, have a most just title to bee Princes over al the rest' (Sidney's *Apologie*, Dr).
[58] O*A*, p.10.
[59] N*A*, II.72r.
[60] N*A*, I.27r (O*A*, I.33).

by the original text, by the reader's dual awareness that the adventure will end with the telling of it in Arcadia, and that the tale will end when Sidney returns to narrating the events therein.[61]

Sidney frees his readers from the 'mistake' of subscribing to conventional modes of thought, in Ronald Levao's terms, 'by short-circuiting traditional logical categories, teasing his readers with puzzles that lead to a coincidence of opposites', just such as this repositioning of romance and epic.[62] The technique, Levao continues, 'does not free [readers] from illusion but does bring them to recognize its inevitability, allowing them to manipulate it consciously' and, like Pamela rather than Mopsa, to read between the lines of Sidney's reversioning.[63] Like the Greek romances they emulate, the *Arcadia*s represent a temporary haven – an ellipsis – from societal mores. They represent, in Bruce Smith's words, 'not real life,' 'a place apart,' and 'time out' that allow unconventional ideas and emotions to be amplified; in writing them, Woolf suggests, Sidney was 'absenting himself from the present and its strife'.[64] Arcadia is furthermore a place 'suspended always in immobility', just as asyndetic elements are; in terminology remarkably similar to Fusillo's and Barthes's, Davis writes that the province exists between worlds, 'juxtaposed' against the solid reality represented by Asia (itself a land alien and romantic to Sidney's readers) because it is related only 'implicitly', defined 'by negatives asserting a peculiar state of stasis without cold or heat, without either direct sunlight or complete shade,' and is thus 'a place of eternal becoming'.[65]

This place is thus able to become what Goran Stanivukoic terms a 'private realm within which the young men [and, indeed, young ladies] in romances explored their … unbridled emotions' and within which Sidney, as Skretkowizc writes, 'explores and demystifies erotic love'.[66] As a result, Greenhalgh writes (selecting buzz-words from Bruce Smith), the *Arcadia*s and Greek romances alike 'become sites of carnival "sexual license" where misrule and lawlessness reign within the constraints of the Elizabethan "power structure"'.[67] Certainly, in Sidney's revision of the Greek amatory style, 'sexual license' causes the most controversial representation of his dissenting ideology. As Robert Maslen observes, 'it is by no means certain that he … wishes his young male readers to learn that they will live to regret their sexual misconduct – or even to acknowledge it',

---

[61] O*A*, p. 10.
[62] Ronald Levao, 'Sidney's Feigned Apology', *PMLA*, 94:2 (Mar., 1979), pp. 223-233 (p.232).
[63] Ibid..
[64] Smith, pp.122-23; Woolf, p.33.
[65] Davis, *Idea and Act*, p.57.
[66] Goran V. Stanivukovic, 'English Renaissance Romances as Conduct Books for Young Men', in Liebler as above, pp.60-78 (pp.73); Skretkowicz, p.224.
[67] Greenhalgh, citing Smith as above, pp.126, 128.

judging by the attitudes of Pyrocles and Musidorus, and by the way in which Sidney chooses to delegate authority and refuse condemnation.[68] Fiction, in itself and in the practice of its consumption, then, allows emotive license with no bounds, and allows the author, characters and reader to collude (for Stanivukovic as for others, specifically regarding emotionality) with impunity. It stands stalwartly against the notion of binding and fashioning emotionality; as Stanivukovic and Relihan concur:

> In this uninhibited pursuit of *eros* and pleasure, early modern prose fiction, it might be argued, is diametrically opposed to Michel Foucault's assertion that self-mastery and moderation control and police early discourses of sexuality.[69]

'While the narrative structures exist to try to contain desire in early modern fiction,' the passage continues', they refuse 'to effect that control'. In effect, the embracing structures of romance protect, rather than 'control' or 'contain' emotionality.[70]

The nature of the *Arcadia*s protects the exploration of emotionality for Sidney and his readers just as that of fiction and the romantic mode do. For Sidney's characters, Arcadia is equally protective. The province is a 'little world' explicitly opposed to the public, the city, in Basilius's flight from his feudal responsibilities; under his rule '[p]ublicke matters had euer bene priuately gouerned'.[71] Arcadia is represented as an enclosed haven: its populace '(finding that the shining title of glorie so much affected by other natio[n]s, doth in deed helpe little to the happinesse of life) are the onely people, which by their Iustice and prouidence geue neither cause nor hope to their neighbours to annoy them'.[72] It is recognized as a cradle for exploratory thought, as Dorus sings: '[c]ontemplation here holdeth his only seate: / Bownded with no limitts'.[73] It is also shown to have a profoundly distracting, diverting effect on those who enter into it: just as Philanax bemoans to Basilius the 'Oracle, which led you from your owne course', Musidorus complains to Pyrocles that 'since our late comming into this countrie, I haue marked in you, I will not saye an alteration, but a

---

[68] Robert W. Maslen, 'Sidney, Gasgoine, and the "Bastard Poets"', in Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukokic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) pp.215-233 (p.224).
[69] Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Staivukovic, 'Introduction', *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities* as above, pp.1-14 (pp.1-2).
[70] Ibid..
[71] N*A*, II.108r; IV.217r (O*A*, II.117; IV.277).
[72] N*A*, I.5r (O*A*, I.4).
[73] N*A*, II.120v (O*A*, II.146).

relenting truely, and a slacking of the maine career, you had so notablye begon and almost performed.'[74]

In this arena (perhaps reflecting Sidney's wholly private intentions for the Old *Arcadia*), the Arcadian events remain intimately private and introspective. Even in the New *Arcadia*'s Arcadia, Pyrocles and Musidorus are alienated from any sense of their outside responsibilities, and are explicitly dissociated from their public duties: 'what soeuer they were, *Arcadia*, was to acknowledge them but as priuate men'.[75] They act accordingly irresponsibly, allowing their emotions whimsically to dictate their (lack of) action. Flashback and fictionalized account feel the only ways the princes' previous adventures fit with their altered reality; the fact that these men were at one point involved in multiple examples of virtuous action seems to be completely at odds with the tenor of Arcadia. Consequently, they feel able to refuse responsibility for Erona's still-pressing fate; at first Pyrocles is content 'purposing with [him] selfe (as soone as this pursuit [he] now was in, was brought to any effect) to succour her,' and later resigns the task completely, satisfied that '*Euarchus* would not spare to take in hand the iust deliuering of her'.[76] Consequently, Arcadia remains an enclosed and largely idle forum.

This focus allows Sidney to examine the nature of personal relationships more closely, as he effectively cuts off Pyrocles, Musidorus, Philoclea and Pamela from the wider world: the outside acquaintances of the princes' earlier voyages are all but forgotten. The isolation and consequent closeness of the major characters stands in contrast to the condition of the Greek romances' heroes and heroines, whose friendships regularly offer timely acts of assistance but are casually made and discarded during lovers' journeys. Heliodoros's Theaggenes, for example, abandons his crew and his host at Delphi, and his helpmates Kalasiris, Knemon and Thiamis who all save his life; Tatios's Kleitophon leaves all his kinsmen and protectors to fend for themselves as their pirate captors' ship sinks. In place of this fair-weather camaraderie, Sidney develops a focus on the princes' and princesses' relationships with one another and individual states of mind. Upon the deciding moment of disruption to the princes' lives (not the shipwreck, but the dissolution of their reason by passion when they fall in love), they suffer great torments over the prospect of separation: when the friends argue over Pyrocles' love for Philoclea, Musidorus's speech is 'interrupted with sighes,

[74] N*A*, II.107v; II.16v (O*A*, I.12).
[75] N*A*, V.233v (O*A*, V.333).
[76] N*A*, II.81v; II.111r.

and his countenaunce with enterchanging coulour dismayed, [s]o much his owne hearte did finde him faultie to vnbende any way the continuall vse of theyr deare friendshippe'.[77] Sidney also adds scenes of emotional bonding both between the men and between the ladies: in guise of Zelmane, Pyrocles unburdens 'her'self to (Musi)dorus with 'so pitifull a declaration of the insupportablenes of her desires, that *Dorus* eares (not able to shew what woundes that discourse gaue vnto them) procured his eyes with teares to giue testimonie, how much they suffered for her suffering'.[78] Similarly the sisters share their heartache: during a new scene of sororal intimacy in Pamela's bed, Philoclea bemoans:

> Alas [Pamela] weepes because shee would be no sooner happy; I weepe because I can neuer be happie; her teares flow form pittie [*sic*]; mine from being too farre lower then the reach of pittie. Yet doo I not enuie thee, deare *Pamela*, I do not enuy thee: only I could wish that being thy sister in nature, I were not so farre off a kin in fortune.[79]

The reader has much more intimate access to the conflicts of each, due to the protective isolation and contemplative freedom characters are allowed. Such a focus on the private was certainly a preoccupation of the Greek romances (as Whitmarsh and Reardon conclude) – even though the latter may not have achieved such a sophisticated a level of character development as that under examination in the *Arcadia*s. The romances present adventure through intimate focalization, and the intimacy of emotional attachment through public trials. To their contemporary readers, these were strategies sufficiently intriguing to merit advertisement in the stories' titles. It is these that also result, Reardon feels, in a canon of 'latter-day epic for Everyman, in a non-heroic world'.[80]

Within the multiply-protective environment permitted by fiction, romance, translation/allusion and the Arcadian border, Sidney is able to explore this fascination in depth. Due to such protection, too, his characters are at times able to speak about their emotions openly: Pyrocles and Musidorus, and Philoclea and Pamela, confide explicitly in one another – but they do not express themselves (until much later) to the objects of their respective affections. In contrast, Basilius and Gynecia both announce their ardours for Pyrocles/Zelmane/Cleophila and press their respective suits, much to his (or 'her') discomfort. In the *Arcadia*s, spoken love is presented as tiresome or inappropriate even if it is possible – masked love, such as that of the princes and princesses for one another, is stronger, nobler and more affecting.

---

[77] N*A*, III.171v (O*A*, III.153).
[78] N*A*, II.52r.
[79] N*A*, II.62r.
[80] Reardon, 'The Greek Novel', p. 294.

Sidney chooses to express much of the veiled emotionality that perplexes Arcadia's inhabitants implicitly, in as asyndetic a manner as Tatios and Heliodoros do. This may simply, again, be an extension of the analysis-genesis that established the New *Arcadia* as a tale rewoven 'on the loom of Heliodorus'; Wendy Olmsted, however, supposes that circumlocution of emotional concepts suggested a way around the awkward social situations that plague Sidney's characters, in a manner similar to that used by Lyly in his drama. The 'unequal relationships with respect to gender and estate' created by the princes' adoption of disguise, combined with their constant surveillance by social or intellectual inferiors (for example Pamela's guardians or the infatuated Basilius), 'create obstacles to honest speech,' Olmsted writes.[81] With the exceptions mentioned (the moments of honest intimacy between the princes, the princesses and, at the *Arcadia*s' conclusion, the couples), this does account for the *characters'* motivations for expressing themselves circuitously. Nevertheless, the result of *Sidney's* decision to do so has additional intent: to expose his readers to the personal dilemmas that lie behind characters' speech and actions and, most importantly, to immerse the reader in these divergent, chaotic ambiguities; as a motif the indirect, asyndetic mode of expression replicates the dissembling inherent to both the princes' and the New *Arcadia*'s disguises, and requires the reader's knowing complicity. Sidney's text is saturated with such interpretable fluidity, just as Lyly's work focuses on the moment of dissolution that enables it; the amplification of tumultuous emotional contraries is all that the reader can understand to constitute Arcadia's, and the story's, reality. In this context, Sidney's figuratively asyndetic matrices of emotion naturally also allow the reader insight into character formation – and, in the princes' case, to contrast their emergent characters with those suggested by the tales of their lives before they fell in love.

Amplified character in Arcadia

The *Arcadia*s are replete with examples of characters' asyndetic emotional matrices. Predictably, they figure the princes' and princesses' first recognitions of love in one another; Pyrocles reacts immediately to his first glimpse of Philoclea in her painting, while hearing the narrative of her father's removal to Arcadia:

---

[81] Wendy Olmsted, *The Imperfect Friend: Emotion and Rhetoric in Sidney, Milton and Their Contexts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), p.47.

> Which the more I questioned, the more pittie I conceaved of her unworthie fortune: and when with pittie once my harte was made tender, according to the aptnesse of the humour, it receaved quickly a cruell impression of that wonderfull passion which to be definde is impossible, because no wordes reach to the strange nature of it: they onely know it, which inwardly feele it.[82]

Skipping between curiosity, pity, tenderness, pain and wonder, Pyrocles' passion aptly locates expressions of desire somewhere outside words. When Musidorus suspects his cousin's distraction, still more tellingly, he perceives:

> [S]uch strange diversities, that they rather increased new doubtes, then gave him ground to settle anie judgement: for, besides his eyes sometimes even great with teares, the oft changing of his colour, with a kinde of shaking unstayednes over all his bodie, he might see in his countenance some great determination mixed with feare; and might perceive in him store of thoughts, rather stirred then digested; his wordes interrupted continually with sighes (which served as a burthen to each sentence) and the tenor of his speech (though of his wonted phrase) *not knit together to one constant end, but rather dissolved in it selfe, as the vehemencie of the inwarde passion prevayled*[.][83]

Pyrocles also avows to Musidorus that his love 'is accompanied … with hopes, griefes, longinges, and dispaires', and later, in Sidney's original version of the text, sings of it to Dorus expressing 'horrors', 'terror', 'fears', 'hope', 'tired[ness]', 'pinching care', 'happy shows', 'bliss', 'desire', 'raging', 'pains', and 'dreads'.[84] Musidorus too succumbs to passion as, in the New *Arcadia*, he glimpses 'the *Arcadian* Kings eldest daughter in whom he forthwith placed so all his hopes of ioy, and ioyfull parts of his heart, that he left in himselfe nothing, but a maze of longing, and a dungeon of sorrow'; in the Old, he is subject to a 'passionate dilating' of 'pain', 'grief', 'desire', 'inquisitive[ness]' and 'hope', 'with more violence … than ever Pyrocles was.'[85] Pamela, when she discovers Musidorus's true identity, corresponds in the Old *Arcadia*: 'every passion he expressed had his mutual working in her. Full well she found the lively image of a vehement desire in herself,' joined with 'belief' and its reluctance, 'glad[ness]', 'hope', 'assurance', 'reason', 'longing', 'suspicions' and eventually 'a dull yielding-over her forces' resulting in 'drops of tears', 'constancy', 'weakness' and 'secret consent'.[86] In the New *Arcadia* her sister detects this tumult, cajoling, 'Ah my Pamela (said Philoclea) I have caught you, the constancy of your wit was not wont to bring forth such *disjointed speeches*: you love, dissemble no further.'[87] Philoclea herself, upon realizing Pyrocles to be a man, feels:

---

[82] N*A*, I.25v (O*A*, I.11).
[83] N*A*, I.17r (O*A*, I.15) [my emphasis].
[84] N*A*, I.24v (O*A*, I.20); O*A*, I.150-51.
[85] N*A*, II.55r; O*A*, I.36-38.
[86] O*A*, II.93-94.
[87] N*A*, II.60r [my emphasis].

> [A] certaine sparke of honour, which rose in her well-disposed minde, made her feare to be alone with him, with whome alone she desired to be (with *all the other contradictions* growing in those minds, which neither absolutely clime the rocke of Vertue, nor freely sinke into the sea of Vanitie) … . But even sicke with a surfet of ioy, and feare full of she knewe not what (as he that newly findes huge treasures, doubts whether he sleepe or no; or like a fearefull Deere, which then lookes most about, when he comes to the best feede) with a shrugging kinde of tremor through all her principall partes, she gave these affectionate words for answere[: ']Alas, how painefull a thing it is to a *deuided minde* to make a well-joyned answere[!'][88]

The 'contradictions' in Philoclea's 'diuided minde' encompass the pangs of honour, fear, desire, sickness, joy, doubt and affection.

Sidney also expresses instances of passionate emotions other than love in the *Arcadia*s in asyndetic terms, including moments of sorrow, frustration, panic, martial fury and, in an exceptional instance of literal asyndeton in the revised text, Pyrocles' relief at discovering Philoclea not to have been beheaded as he had believed:

> [H]e saw her aliue, he was glad to see her aliue: he saw her weep, he was sory to see her weep: he heard her comfortable speches, nothing more gladsome: he hard her prognosticating her own destruction, nothing more dolefull … [he had] little taken breath from the panting motion of *such contrarietie in passions*[.][89]

Indeed, emotion is presented as asyndetic in the *Arcadia*s as a matter of fact. In his furious speech against Pyrocles upon the latter's transformation, Musidorus invokes this very nature categorically to denounce love's effects. Love's 'adioyned companions', he rages, 'be unquietnes, longings, fond comforts, faint discomforts, hopes, ielousies, ungrounded rages, causlesse yeeldings; so is the hiest ende it aspires vnto, a litle pleasure with much paine before, and great repentaunce after' – Pyrocles is unable to contradict him.[90] Sidney refers glibly back to this recognition, to invoke asydetic matrices' wealth of nuances through such succinct descriptions as Philoclea's acknowledgement of her 'deuided minde', Pyrocles' 'many contrary passions' and the 'new swarme of thoughts stinging [his] minde'.[91]

So intrinsic is the motif to Sidney's style of characterization that Sir William Alexander's 'Addition' adopts it; when the imprisoned princesses fear for their princes' safety, he writes:

> [A] multitude of thoughts, without art artificial, did paint feare in [Philoclea's] face and engraue griefe in her bosome. Whilest they continued thus, Pamela in vaine striuing to match maiestie

[88] N*A*, II.87r (O*A*, II.106) [my emphasis].
[89] N*A*, III.163v [my emphasis].
[90] N*A*, I.52v.
[91] N*A*, II.87r (O*A*, II.106); N*A*, III.190v (O*A*, III.204); N*A*, II.86r (O*A*, II.104).

> with affection, stood with a distracted statelinesse, & with a stately astonishment, where griefe and feare in Philoclea made easily a consort in sorrow[.][92]

The 'consort' of 'multitud[inous] … thoughts' is clearly as characteristic and imitable in Sidney's style as it is in his influences'. Sidney uses asyndeton to pile up contradictory but cumulative emotions internal to his characters, just as he does the disruptions that face them externally: repeated examples of repetitively similar emotional demonstrations amass to raise characters' emotions to great heights, and to establish the concept of character itself as one defined not simply by actions, but also by feelings. As long as readers choose to engage with this laborious process, asyndetic matrices are thus the basis for characterization for Sidney, just as they were for Lyly.

Once affected by love, the conflicts in the princes' minds contrast starkly with the single-minded heroism of their sequential, multiple, but easily-summarized earlier adventures. Sidney's princes do not fight against its ambiguous influence like Euphues does, however; they adapt their previously disciplined soldierly strategies (such as disguise) to conform to the new, shifting parameters their emotions dictate, even at the expense of their equally soldierly pride. Immediately, each engages with the distinction of context: he has left the fantasy world of tilts against giants (suffered in both the Old and New *Arcadia*s), and entered one far more personal, subjective and therefore universally relevant – perhaps not literally (it is, after all, still a world of oracles), but internally, in terms of emotional realism. The princes engage with the empathy and uncertainty that relates so powerfully to the reader. Pyrocles achieves this shift before Musidorus does, presenting the contrast between their characters before emotional dissolution and their consequent development clearly.

Musidorus's insults against Pyrocles prioritize single-minded rationality over the broadened perspective Pyrocles acquires. Musidorus emphasizes that Pyrocles is abandoning his identity as 'the *onely* yong Prince in the world, formed by nature, and framed by education, to the *true* exercise of vertue' diverging from the *one* 'way of goodnesse', that he is the 'excellent' paragon of valour and should strive for the '*absolute* commaundement' of reason.[93] In contrast, Pyrocles' emotional flux and consequent reevaluations 'soften [his] hart' and open it up to the 'infinite'.[94] Pyrocles gains empathy not only with the object of his affections, but also with the 'inwarde working' of emotions

---

[92] Sir William Alexander's continuation or supplement, in Sidney's *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia … Now the fovrth time published, with some new Additions* (London: by H. L. for Simon Waterson, 1615), p.7 of 19, inserted between pp.332 and 333.
[93] N*A*, I.23r-v (O*A*, I.17) [my emphasis].
[94] N*A*, I.23v (O*A*, I.18).

themselves: as Musidorus appreciates (although disparagingly), 'true loue … doth transforme the verie essence of the louer into the thing loued, vniting, and as it were incorporating it with a secret and inwarde working.[95] Pyrocles consequently invokes the sympathy of his 'friendship' with Musidorus rather than appealing to his reason, and can relate not only to Amazons but also to motherhood and nursing, protesting, 'I am not yet come to that degree of wisedome, to thinke light of the sexe, of whom I haue my life; … I was to come to it, born of a woman, & nursed of a woman.'[96] He declaims 'tyrannous ambition' and admits 'I am good witnesse of mine own imperfections' – a statement that explicitly re-presents Pyrocles as, to employ Reardon's term, an 'Everyman'.[97]

As proof of this transformation's universality, as soon as Musidorus too falls in love his appeals to 'the highest power of the mind' become pleas for 'compassion' instead.[98] Sidney thus presents a sophisticated development that resists the princes' categorization as symbols (of invincible heroism, perhaps, or valour), and appreciates the disruption, consequent pragmatism and potential failure that is involved in emotional engagement. As Stanivukoic writes, it is a change 'involving humility and a shift from emotional naïvety and superficiality to melancholy, associated with the lover figure. The example is a model of the psychological realism of the path one's experience of love takes, from naïvety to maturity, from the surface of looking to the depth of interiority.'[99] It is, furthermore, a path that the princes themselves recognize they are on: both figuratively and literally, as Musidorus says (in a section of Book III cut by Sidney's sister or friends), '[f]ar am I (God knows) from the place where I hope to stop, but yet well advanced am I from thence where I took my start.'[100]

Just as Sidney cloaks the profundity of the *Arcadia*s, he also provides the princes' newfound depth and maturity with disguises. Some see this device, however, as just the simplification it defies: perhaps influenced by Woolf's dismissive assertion that 'changes of dress … serve instead of psychological subtlety', Preston believes that the sum of Sidney's characters' '[i]nterior emblems' is their respective choices of 'costume' – that their selection and display of coverings is the means

---

[95] Ibid..
[96] N*A*, I.24r (O*A*, I.19).
[97] N*A*, I.24r (O*A*, I.19-20); Reardon, 'The Greek Novel', p.294.
[98] N*A*, I.24r (O*A*, I.20); N*A*, I.34v (O*A*, I.38).
[99] Stanivukovic, p.69.
[100] O*A*, III.151.

through which they are wholly characterized.[101] As Woolf writes, 'they must either be heroes of stainless virtue, or villains untouched by humanity.[102] For Preston, the princes and Arcadians are self-fashioning; they are making conscious adaptions of their selves to forge a compromise between serving the conceptions of their society and manipulating these conceptions to serve their own ends. Literally, the princes do self-fashion when they disguise themselves, and Preston's work makes a fascinating point regarding costume's symbolism of the reciprocal gesture required to assume one's position in any society. But the fact that Sidney shows his readers the process of such self-adaptations – that his narrative engages with its characters' options and decisions rather than simply these decisions' results – prevents one from reading his protagonists as 'emblems'. Sidney's characters do not appear as mere caricatures; they engage readers on an emotional level, as 'priuate men' and even representing 'Everyman'.

This engagement is achieved through the amplified diversity and fluidity Sidney captures in his discussion of emotionality, and which is echoed in his treatment of the *Arcadia*s at large. Readers are provided with the dissolute components from which they may construct their impressions of the texts by everything from the *Arcadia*s' ambiguity of genre to their recollection of the princes' travels and heroic escapades, to the princes' disguises. Arcadia's multi-faceted nature renders the province (and the book) multiply contextualized on an overwhelming scale, and therefore effectively decontextualized in terms of both ethics and identity. In Sidney's construction of character, therefore, this habitat of asyndetic chaos dissolves its constituent elements' ties to any definitive context. The *Arcadia*s' range of conflicting demands renders these elements mutable, ambiguous and therefore assembled and reassembled arbitrarily, or at least pragmatically, as volatile passions (such as the princes' love and Basilius's fear) dictate both the conceptions and behaviour of Sidney's personae. Because Arcadia is isolated, too, it is caught in a vicious cycle as chaotic emotionality dissolves convention and structure, and the lack of structure licenses further indulgence of chaos. Consequently, everything potentially definitive of character must be questioned, including (as the princes' lovers would attest) social status and gender. The binaries of definition, just like the binaries of author and reader, must also be doubted; differences between male and female, prince and shepherd, and virtue and vice become sliding scales rather than clear distinctions.

---

[101] Woolf, p.38; Preston, p.99.
[102] Woolf, p.41.

One of the ways Sidney chooses to construct character, as this suggests, is by further exploring its gendered attributes, which become conflated with those of social position and moral worth. Conventionally, in Helen Moore's words, 'for Sidney, the knight is the agent of virtuous action' with moral validity, which prognosis the *Apologie* supports; passionate, and verbose, excess was the domain of women or the unrefined.[103] As one sixteenth-century proverb expressed the attitude, 'men are deeds; women they are words'.[104] Furthermore, as implied by the relative values placed on words and deeds in the *Apologie*, the difference of gender often equates to difference in 'hierarchy' or nobility, in terms of both social and moral superiority. The princes' dislocation from their noble activity and embrace of the Arcadian lifestyle of idleness and eclogues, then – the literally disarming effect of passion – are not only emasculating but also potentially degrading, as the outrage of Musidorus's initial judgement (that the 'effeminate loue of a woman, doth so womanize a man'[105]) makes clear. After both have fallen in love, both men become 'effeminated': Pyrocles literally by adopting a feminine disguise, but Musidorus too, if the archaic definition of 'effeminated' as 'degraded by subjugation to a woman' is acknowledged to be applicable to his conception of the lowly Dorus.[106]

Like everything in the *Arcadia*s, though, Sidney's depiction of manhood is fragmented. In Musidorus's horror at Pyrocles' transformation into Zelmane/Cleophila, he proposes an unusual remedy, emploring, 'O sweete *Pyrocles*, separate your selfe a little (if it be possible) from your selfe, and let your owne minde looke vpon your owne proceedings'.[107] Lisa Hopkins addresses this as an 'alarming' suggestion, 'implying that masculinity depends on self-division' and, furthermore, as one that raises the 'question of the degree of correlation between assigned gender and biological sex'.[108] More than simply raising the question, this moment divides the concepts as effectively as it does the princes' identities; it decontextualizes gendered properties from sex, allowing them too to become asyndetic. What this early transformation achieves in the *Arcadia*s is not to relabel the princes as worthless or, to use Musidorus's word, 'vile', but to provide them with more expressive

---

[103] Helen Moore, 'Romance', in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* as above, pp.317-326 (p.323); see Lamb, as above.
[104] In James Knowles, 'Sexuality: A Renaissance Category?', *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp.674-689 (p.680).
[105] N*A*, I.23v; O*A*, I.18.
[106] 'effeminated, ppl.a.', in *OED Online* as above.
[107] N*A*, I.23r (O*A*, I.17).
[108] Lisa Hopkins, 'Passion and Reason in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*', *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities* as above, pp.62-75 (p.65).

freedom; it opens up the possibilities of their characterizations completely, rather than allowing them to remain as the two-dimensional 'emblems' of princely valour that feature in their flashbacks. It makes categorization of the princes as models of self-fashioning impossible and renders each prince a more vulnerable, sympathetic 'Everyman' more suited to the 'non-heroic world' in which he finds himself. The princes are simply characters attempting to cope as best they know how (by adapting their strategies of disguise, for example) when overwhelming emotion has dissolved everything they thought was fixed in their identities. In complementary fashion, Sidney's decontextualization of gendered attributes (their decathection from exclusive cohesion to a 'male' or 'female' identity) allows him to add depth and variation to his characterizations of the princesses, too, and to create convincingly reciprocal relationships between his couples.

The princes' courtships of Philoclea and Pamela are saturated with the passionate excesses of mournful monologues, pastoral eclogues and songs. This 'effeminate' emotionality progresses to such an extreme that at several points in the Old *Arcadia* the verses of the men and women are indistinguishable: for example, near-identical stanzas are sung and carved as 'prettie knottes' in the forest by Musidorus and Pamela during their escape (literally forging two into one as they 'tyed togither the names of *Musidorus* and *Pamela*, sometimes entermixedly changing there, to *Pammedorus* and *Musimela*'); rather more unexpected harmony is also found between Gynecia and Pyrocles: when they are hidden from one another by the gloom of a cave their maudlin poetic verses are assimilated with one another so completely that Pyrocles himself remarks, 'O *Venus*, … who is this so well acquainted with mee, that can make so liuely a portracture of my miseries?'.[109]

In the passage during which Pyrocles appears in Philoclea's chamber and, in the Old *Arcadia*, their desires are eventually consummated (along with Pyrocles' poetic progress, aptly resolved in his climactic mental recitation of Philisides' erotic verses), the two lovers alternate between masculine and feminine roles. Initially, Philoclea is emotional, injured and volatile due to Pyrocles' neglect of her, speaking of 'cruel … torments' and 'sorrowes'; the latter tries rationally to argue his motives in terms of pledges, 'troth[s]', 'witnes[es]' and sanctity.[110] Upon Philoclea's rejection of him, however, Pyrocles falls submissively into a faint: Philoclea 'did so ouerthrowe all the might of *Pyrocles* minde' that, 'voide of all counsell … he fell downe by her bedside'.[111] Philoclea is left to revive him (she is

[109] N*A*, III.179r (O*A*, III.174-76); N*A*, III.174r (O*A*, III.159).
[110] N*A*, III.190v (O*A*, III.204-05).
[111] N*A*, III.191r (O*A*, III.206).

'lifted vp' to action) and, when Pyrocles awakes in the Old *Arcadia*, he describes her in terms of the commanding 'morning sun', a typically masculine symbol particularly when combined with reference to a 'rising fairness'.[112] Finally Pyrocles, reviving and 'lifting the sweet burthen of her body in his armes, laid her againe in her bedd.'[113]

Although these lovers' physical union is cut from the New *Arcadia*, this passage is not – and similar alternation is also retained during that in which Pyrocles confesses his identity to Philoclea.[114] Sidney furthermore establishes that such gendered confusion within his protagonists' characters occurs not only when the lovers are in one another's presence, but also when the princes and princesses are apart; it is displayed as a genuine fragility of their characters rather than, as perhaps it may otherwise be interpreted, a mode of manipulation. When the princes are alone together, immediately preceding Pyrocles' admission to Musidorus that he must leave Arcadia (in the Old *Arcadia* and inserted, incompletely, after the New halts), Musidorus is found 'not with out tender tears' at the contemplation of Pamela's 'Sweet glove', before vocalizing his passion in song.[115] The song seems at first to establish Musidorus as a stereotypical Petrarchan lover, composing a blazon with all its familiar devices.[116] Unconventionally, however, Musidorus includes (parts of) himself in the blazon: his and Pamela's shared 'truest band' 'ties [his] chiefest part', which contains his 'secret joys'.[117] His concluding couplet openly states his wish to 'Unite in one' with Pamela. This wish could, of course, refer to the legal union of marriage or to the incontinent desire Musidorus so clearly feels later on – which is perhaps more likely, considering the verse's reference to the prince's 'chiefest part' and the archaic definition of 'band' as 'confinement'.[118] Figurative union or even assimilation with Pamela, however, is a feat Musidorus has already accomplished in the subjectivity of his verse; conceptually, he has already established that he considers they are, or could be, as 'one'. The prince's blazoning of more abstract, cerebral concepts in addition to physical features (the 'pledge' and 'band' of his love) implies Musidorus's inclination towards considering Pamela to share the level of intellectual unity that he shares with

---

[112] N*A*, III.191r (O*A*, III.206-07).
[113] N*A*, III.191v (O*A*, III.207).
[114] See N*A*, II.86r-87v (O*A*, II.104-06).
[115] O*A*, III.148-49.
[116] See O*A*, III.290.
[117] Ibid..
[118] See 'band, n.', in *The OED Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Pyrocles, bestowing her with inherently masculine qualities such as reason, at the same moment that he identifies himself with the effeminate through song.

This inclination is proved appropriate in both of the *Arcadia*s, when Musidorus and Pamela are captured as they attempt their flight: while a teary Musidorus battles with his fury and grief, Pamela becomes a pinnacle of fortitude and honour, showing 'wisdome' in the 'authoritie of her speach' and preventing any 'witnes of her weakenes'.[119] When being tormented by Cecropia in the New *Arcadia*, Philoclea too protects herself in typically masculine manner: by calculated feigning, deliberately emphasizing her submissiveness and denying her womanhood, and by invoking vows:

> Philoclea looked vpon her, and cast downe her eie againe. Aunt (said she) I would I could be so much a mistres of my owne mind, as to yeeld to my cousins vertuous request: for so I construe of it. But my hart is already set (and staying a while on that word, she brought foorth afterwards) to leade a virgins life to my death: for such a vow I haue in my selfe deuoutly made.[120]

To an even greater extent than Lyly does, in instances such as these Sidney eschews 'the definitions of masculinity and femininity' that Hutson feels his contextual courtly conventions decree – by decontextualizing and redistributing their masculine and feminine characteristics, he conflates his masculine and feminine characters completely.[121]

Such conflation is also a recurring motif in the Greek romances, where heroines are lifted up to great feats of courage or strategy: running a potential rapist through with a sword, for example, or constructing a defense using combinations of divine oaths and threats; the romance heroes' inaction, on the other hand, has often subjected them to accusations of 'cowardice' or 'unmanliness'.[122] The profundity of the trope is particularly evident, however, in the unreciprocated infatuations that surround each pair of lovers. Throughout the romances, the rival passions that surround their protagonists are deflected: often by pleading, sometimes by providence and, once or twice, by violence. Not always, however, are these passions portrayed as wanton lasciviousness or tyrannical exploitations of power; rather, they are sometimes clearly the sincere emotions of a respectable and sympathetic character. In *Leukippe and Kleitophon* and its model, Chariton's *Chareas and Kallirhoe* (which there is no proof was accessible by Sidney, but which provides a still more

---

[119] N*A*, IV.214v-215r (O*A*, IV.270-71).
[120] N*A*, III.129r.
[121] Hutson, p.97.
[122] David Konstan, 'Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and narrative in the novel', in J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp.49-63 (p.51).

powerful example of the genre's priorities[123]), both Kleitophon and Kallirhoe believe (incorrectly) that their spouses are dead. Kleitophon's second fiancée Melite desires a legal union, and (albeit reluctantly) concedes to respect his chastity even until the resurrection of her violently abusive husband. Similarly, Kallirhoe's second husband Dionysius frees her from slavery, publicly weds her and lovingly brings up her child. These ardours are comparable to the protagonists' in commitment and duration and, furthermore, are described just as asyndetically as are the couples' reactions at their meetings. Melite's and Dioysius's senses are confused, and emotions become overwhelming: Dionysius 'did not know what to do … There was a visible conflict in him now, between reason and passion; desire was flooding over him but his noble soul tried to bear up against it', while Melite detects that her moods, like the 'changings of the windes' are 'mutable'; although incoherent, they allow Kleitophon to understand her feelings, 'piercing to the heart'.[124]

The cases of these two suitors are relatively felicitous; Dionysius and Melite are at least blessed with the company of those they desire. The intensity of their love is, however, at least partially unreturned (or, indeed, there could be little promise for the books' plots). As the ideal of symmetrical love is disrupted, the effects of desire upon the gendered roles of the lovers become both more pronounced and more compromising. Dionysius neglects his public and devotional duties, reprimanding himself:

> The most virtuous, the most distinguished man in Ionia, the admiration of satraps, kings, whole populations – and you behave like an adolescent! You fall in love at first sight – and while you're mourning at that, before you've even paid proper respect to your poor wife's departed spirit![125]

Melite, conversely, as well as taking on the role of seducer, resorts to deceptive cunning and bargaining, utilizing cultural knowledge to command the services of a Thessalian, for the race's publicly reputed excellence in potion-making.[126] The further from legitimate (that is, reciprocated) realization that suitors' desires become, too, the more extreme these desires' repercussions. Chariton's King of Persia, otherwise a monarch of 'approved … moderation and sense of justice' but who falls for Kallirhoe as he conducts the trial to decide to whom she is legally married,

---

[123] The one 'thirteenth-century manuscript in Florence' that contained it was, it is thought, only 'discovered and published … in 1750'. – Skretkowicz, p.35; Perry, p.98.
[124] Chariton, *Chareas and Kallirhoe* (c.1AD), trans. by B. P. Reardon, in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Greek Novels* as above, pp.17-124 (II.¶3); Tatios, V.91-92.
[125] Chariton, II.¶4.
[126] See Tatios, V.99-100.

becomes utterly unfit to be patriarch.[127] His arbitration even during the trial descends to an asyndetic matrix ('delight was mixed with anguish, joy with fear, danger with enjoyment'), in order to prolong Kallirhoe's presence he blasphemously feigns a dream 'from the royal gods' and, disregarding his whole city's preparations for a feast, the King puts off the trial indefinitely.[128] He even, *in extremis*, condemns himself as 'like an old woman'.[129] A still less fortunate female admirer of Chareas is driven to madness and slaughters her entire family.

Sidney's *Arcadia*s tally with this trend; Basilius, Gynecia and (in the New *Arcadia*) Amphialus all feel asyndetically: '*Doubt* & *Desire* bred a great quarrel in [Basilius's] mind. For his former experience had taught him to doubt: & true feeling of Loue made doubts daungerous'; he did 'humbly swell, and with a lowly look stand upon his tiptoes – such diversity her words delivered unto him.'[130] Gynecia suffers 'contrarieties' she feels to be 'whole armyes of mortall adversaries' and in the New *Arcadia* is said to have 'such a battaile in her thoughts, and so deadlye an overthrow given to her best resolutions, that even her bodie (where the fielde was fought) was oppressed withall'.[131] Amphialus, who actually dies for his love, recognizes 'the two passions of Feare & Desire, wherein he was enchained' alongside the 'hurt' against which he 'strave' for 'grace', his 'amazement', 'beseeching' and 'honour'; these feelings render him 'full of incongruitie'.[132] As a result, Basilius becomes so poor a ruler for love of Zelmane/Cleophila that his subjects rebel, Gynecia threatens to slaughter her own child ('that accursed cradle of mine shal feele the smart of my wound', she vows[133]) and Amphialus, finding 'his noble hart melting with compassion' commits suicide rather than defend his castle from invasion.[134] More incidental casualties of love also abound: the original Zelmane, for example, disguises herself as the page Daiphantus, fights bravely but dies at the princes' side in battle, and passion for Pyrocles/Zelmane quickly incites a young rebel of the Arcadian uprising to reject his warlike inclinations and call eloquently for peace, only to be promptly run through.[135] Given the similarities of feeling in minor characters, it seems clear that malevolently gender-disrupting consequences of unbound emotion could just as powerfully

---

[127] Chariton, IV.¶4.
[128] Ibid., IV.¶3, V.¶7.
[129] Ibid., IV.¶1.
[130] N*A*, III.172v, III.173r (O*A*, III.155, III.157).
[131] N*A*, III.181r (O*A*, III.178); N*A*, II.51v.
[132] N*A*, III.125r-v.
[133] N*A*, III.175r (O*A*, III.162).
[134] N*A*, III.143v.
[135] See N*A*, II.96r-98v and II.103v.

manifest themselves in the Greek romances' and *Arcadia*s' heroes and heroines, were each couple not melded complementarily together. The only difference between this destructive conduct and that of Pyrocles/Zelmane/Cleophila may be that the latter inspires reciprocal feeling in Philoclea.

Having established the mercuriality of emotionality, character and its gendered attributes, Sidney's text also invites consideration, however brief, of potential fluctuations in sexual attraction. (In the Greek texts long-term homosexual relationships feature regularly so there, although present, these moments are of no more import than heterosexual attractions.) Pyrocles' disguise naturally raises related questions, but as Basilius is deceived and Gynecia is not, and Philoclea, at least in the Old *Arcadia,* attempts to address the 'poisonous heats' of her unhappy desires by wishing 'that Cleophila might become a young transformed Caeneus', these questions remain for the most part rhetorical.[136] The relationship between the princes, however, has attracted constant scrutiny and, for what Gregory Bredbeck terms the 'common' or 'modern gay reader', could well qualify the *Arcadia* as a sympathetically homoerotic text.[137]

The princes' social relationship (notwithstanding their familial one) is that of 'so good a schoolmaster' and a beautiful, 'chaste boy' – a sufficiently asymmetrical dynamic to admit the possibility of pederasty in their past if not their present (and Musidorus's rather protesting use of the word 'chaste' is certainly evocative).[138] Considering this nuance in combination with the ostentatiously pastoral motifs that surround the princes' moments alone together (they meet, for example, 'sitting down among the sweet flowers', 'under the pleasant shade of a broad-leaved sycamore'[139]), the reader may easily infer suggestive links to decidedly homoerotic desires such as those between Daphnis and Ganimede in Barnfield's *The Affectionate Shepheard*, or Hobbinol and Colin Clout in Spenser's *Shepheardе's Calendar.*[140] In such a reading, the older prince's prompt about-turn from despising women to worshipping Pamela becomes more psychologically convincing than mere coincidence and the demands of plot: Musidorus may be reacting to Pyrocles' termination of their previously so intense relationship by acting as though he cares just as little as his friend. In a passage during which the princes discuss parting from one another indefinitely, more tellingly,

---

[136] O*A*, II.97-98.
[137] Quoted in Gregory Woods, 'Review: *Sodomy and Interpretation: Marlowe to Milton* by Gregory W. Bredbeck', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 46:4 (Winter, 1993), pp.863-864 (p.864).
[138] O*A*, III.148.
[139] Ibid..
[140] Ibid.. See Richard Barnfield, *The affectionate shepheard* (London: Iohn Danter for T. G[ubbin] and E. N[ewman], 1594) and Edmund Spenser, *The shepheardes calendar* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1579).

Musidorus's feelings towards Pyrocles appear to be identical to those by which he had not so long previously been horrified, when Pyrocles admitted his love for Philoclea. Even in the New *Arcadia* Musidorus's speech contemplating his love for Pyrocles, which was 'interrupted with sighs' while 'his countenance with interchanging colour [was] dismayed', is a linguistic mirror of the emotion that Musidorus so violently berates in his friend: 'the oft changing of his colour … his words interrupted continually with sighs which served as a burthen to each sentence,' 'as the vehemancy of the inward passion prevailed'.[141] Whether homoerotic or not, the princes' feelings for one another appear here to inflict all the damage of heterosexual desire: the princes are weakened, and incapable of speech let alone action. This constitutes far more poignant a possible fluctuation than any potential insinuation of male-male sexual activity.

Reading the *Arcadia*s' amplifications

Such mutabilities – of gendered, sexual, or class-related character attributes – are presented to the reader for their contemplation, not for objective judgment or even evaluation, but to stimulate their subjective involvement with their alignments and realignments. In order for these mutabilities or this contemplation to be productive, the reader must embrace the process of engaging with Sidney's text (laborious though it may be) with just as much enthusiasm as demonstrated in the herculean labours of Argalus. Just as in Lyly's *Euphues* books, readers *in* the *Arcadia*s and the Greek romances provide examples for readers *of* them regarding the affects of written discourse and, although clearly discomforted, each responds because emotionally fully engaged. The contrasts and contraries inherent to expressive, asyndetic passages of prose (not constrained missives like those of Euphues) are shown to incite the effects on emotionality they describe (similarly to the ways in which those written by Lyly's Camilla and Philautus do). In the Greek texts, remarkable examples of asyndetic emotionality follow the reading of a letter almost as often as they follow a lover seeing his (or her) beloved. On reading the letter that proves Leukippe to be alive, for example, Tatios's Kleitophon narrates, 'my minde was distracted into a thousand parts, I did burne in loue, waxe pale, and sometime maruailed, otherwhiles I did beleeue the letters, being perplexed betweene feare and ioy'; finding the missive, his wretched (soon to be ex-)fiancée Melite, too, is 'oppressed with bashfulnesse and anger, with loue, and slaundering'.[142]

---

[141] N*A*, III.171v (O*A*, III.153); N*A*, I.17r (O*A*, I.14-15.
[142] Tatios, V.96, V.101-02.

In the New *Arcadia*, Sidney shows not only the 'new swarme of thoughts' that is provoked by the verses that Zelmane/Pyrocles inscribes on the river bank, and Philoclea's prostrate agony at re-reading her own words on the white stone in the forest, but also that the reserved Pamela's passionate emotional engagement is only really stimulated by the letter of supplication she is sent by Dorus.[143] Pamela describes a physical, even pathologized battle within herself, between the 'delight … in [her] soule' Dorus causes, and her need to 'to suppresse it, or at lest to conceale it'.[144] She agonizes:

> Indeed I must confesse, that as some Phisitions have tolde me, that when one is colde outwardly, he is not inwardly; so truely the colde ashes laid upon my fire, did not take the nature of fire from it. Ful often hath my brest swollen with keeping my sighes imprisoned; full often have the teares, I draue backe from mine eies, turned backe to drown my hart.[145]

Discussing the letter with Philoclea, Pamela experiences tempting 'curtesie' striving against her 'resolution', 'kindenesse' against her 'feare' and is left in 'sorrow' and a 'riuer of … teares' striving to drown out the rapturous 'fire' with which she read it.[146] Basilius, too, receives correspondence and there, as *Euphues* does, the *Arcadia*s present a contrast that emphasizes where the potency of writing lies. The king's disparate responses to the oracle's prophecy and to Philanax's letter of advice regarding it in the New *Arcadia* are revealing: he completely ignores Philanax's didacticism and temperateness, in favour of charting a course premised on the oracle's definitively ambiguous words. He is able to interpret and repeatedly reinterpret the oracle, creating meaning that is always relevant to him, and provokes the reaction that premises Sidney's tale.[147]

Woolf, in her criticism of Sidney's 'too vague, too long-winded' style and mutable authorial role of covert collusion, feels that the license the *Arcadia*s allow their reader is uninteresting. She asserts that '[n]o reader can be kept in bondage, whatever the grace and the charm, when the ties between him and the writer are so irresponsibly doffed and assumed'; her criticism, however, suffers in its suggestion that the attentive reader ought to be kept 'in bondage' at all.[148] The inattentive or already uninterested reader, for whom the labour of reading and interpreting does not yield its own reward, may require 'bondage' to traverse the text, but the very point of Sidney's 'elastic' prose (and the fact that authority for it may be 'doffed and assumed') is that its readers and

---

[143] See N*A*, II.58v-59v (O*A*, II.97).
[144] N*A*, II.61r.
[145] Ibid..
[146] N*A*, II.61r-62r.
[147] See N*A*, I.6v-7v; II.107v (O*A*, I.5).
[148] Woolf, p.41.

their emotions, like the characters and theirs, are *unbound*. Read in the spirit of emotional collusion, Sidney's text remains potent precisely because it is 'vague'; as Aristotle writes of figurative speech, this 'deliberative style is exactly like a rough sketch' in which 'too much refinement is a superfluity and even a disadvantage' if it is to feel relevant to a wide readership.[149]

These instances in the *Arcadia*s portray the committed act of reading – whether of letters within the narratives, or of the narratives themselves – as so affecting and stimulating of emotion that it too can effect physical changes incurred by the emotion that reading excited. As Katherine Craik writes in *Reading Sensations*, the notion of such a passionate response to reading was also clear in the minds of Sidney's contemporaries, and served as well-established and attractive a purpose as Whitmarsh feels the provocative titles of Greek romances did. '[P]rose romance,' Craik suggests, 'appealed … partly because of its unique ability to enflame intense and intensely pleasurable feeling among soldiers', in the manner the *Apologie* suggests it might.[150] As implied by the texts' examples of written discourse, the effects incurred by the emotion that reading excited were considered real – and they were also considered physical. 'The passions aroused by reading,' Craik summarizes, 'like any other exogenous encounter, entered the body … through the inevitably wayward senses', disrupted humours and prompted audiences to 'read with their bodies instead of their minds'.[151]

The 'exogenous encounter' of reading Craik here likens to real-life emotional encounters, or the emotional encounters between characters: those of feeling heatedly. Craik references Richard Braithwaite's *A Nursery for Gentry*, suggesting that 'the material bodies of books make new and increasingly insistent demands on the bodies of their readers. Braithwaite describes the experience of reading unsuitable books giving rise to the same "love-sicke passions" as those aroused by ill-judged love affairs': 'For as the Lover is ever blinded with affection towards his beloved: so it fareth with these, who [are] affected to light passages, in the end do fixe their deluded conceits upon them.'[152] As Craik shows, at least according to Braithwaite, '[b]ooks therefore perform something resembling a seduction on unwary young men', making them feel 'transported', 'besotted', 'apishly addicted', 'beleagred' and 'tormented' – an asyndetic matrix in itself.[153] In being moved, by Craik's estimation, not only readers' emotions are rendered volatile but also their bodies,

---

[149] Aristotle, III.12.5.
[150] Katherine Craik, *Reading Sensations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p.68.
[151] Ibid., p.6.
[152] Craik, p.122; see Richard Braithwaite, *A Survey of History: Or, A Nursery for Gentry* (London: I. Okes for Jasper Emery, 1638), p.R3v.
[153] Craik, p.123, citing Braithwaite, pp.N2r, R2v, 2Y2r.

and their genders. 'Since gender difference was constructed humorally and thermally,' Craik suggests, 'the affective and somatic changes occasioned by literature could either shore up or erode markers of masculine perfectibility such as bodily strength and impregnability', and so reading could produce 'womanish men' and manly women.[154] The asyndetic matrices that dominate the *Arcadia*s and the Greek romances certainly permit readers' subjective engagement with the emotional elements of the texts, and so may well pose this risk.

Characters' responses to texts certainly seem to imply that Sidney and the Greek novelists were aware that there existed, or exists, something inherent to reading a text that can provoke an emotional response, in the same way as viewing the object of one's desire. Brigitte Egger, having established the plausibility of a female readership for ancient texts, makes a similar connection when she equates voyeurism within the text to the reader's response. Egger writes in terms of a 'male gaze' on the detailed and often highly eroticized passages that describe the books' female characters (Tatios, for example, details 'a deepe nauill, a plaine smooth belly, narrow flanke, round buttocks: her tender brests seemed to swel, throgh the midle of which went down a faire narrow way most pleasant & delightfull to the beholders'[155]).[156] Egger remarks that 'the device of making the reader watch' through such an 'admiring and appraising perspective' particularly in texts explicitly or implicitly addressed to women readers 'also invites female interest' in the heroine's sexual attraction.[157] Sidney, too, invites the 'fair ladies' reading his work to 'watch': the poem by Philisides used as a textual climax for Pyocles and Philoclea's relationship in the Old *Arcadia*, and inserted during Book II's bathing scene in the New, illustrates Philoclea's body vividly.[158] Pyrocles ruminates on the 'liuelie clusters of her brests … Like pomels round of Marble cleere' with 'dearest tops of porphyrie', and details both the 'Indian odours' of her skin and taste of her thighs – her 'sugred flankes'.[159]

Lamb believes that in examples such as this an intentional 'lesbian reading must not be discounted', but more powerful than this is the inference that Sidney and his Greek forebears designed to stimulate each reader, whether male or female, into an appreciation of his or her own

---

[154] Ibid..
[155] Tatios, I.3.
[156] Brigitte Egger, 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe', in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp.31-4 (p.38).
[157] Ibid..
[158] See N*A*, II.73r-74v (O*A*, III.207-11).
[159] N*A*, II.73v-74r (O*A*, III.208-09).

sexual mercuriality.[160] The hegemonic female reader is altered, however briefly, when she 'watch[es]' Philoclea's body (for example): she experiences a fluctuation of sexuality or gender. The same may be said, additionally, of male readers asked to appreciate the beauty of Greek romantic heroes or Sidney's princes, who can hardly be said to appear less sexualized than their spouses: when Theaggenes makes his first appearance, Heliodoros writes, 'the winde … moued his heare about his necke, parting it before his forehead, and made his cloke waue, and the nether partes thereof to couer the backe, & buttockes'; the people 'were al of this opinion, that there could be no humaine shape, whiche coulde surmounte the seemelinesse of *Theagenes*'.[161] Pyrocles, similarly, is imaged as so stunning that even the wrathful '*Philanax* rested awhile uppon himselfe, stricken with admiracion at the goodlie shape of *Pyrocles*, whome before he had neuer seene'; although in rags in captivity, he renders 'euery one desirous to haue him in his charge, so much did his goodly presence … breede a delightfull admiration in all the beholders'.[162]

Furthermore, Egger asserts that the reader's gaze becomes 'a means of reducing women [or, rather, all sexualized characters] to the status of object – the object of perception, of desire, of representation, of discourse': effectively, to the status of text.[163] This causes additional disruption for the texts' voyeurs, as they are compelled to position themselves simultaneously as reader, text and author of their own desires. This last point applies equally, of course (albeit to a hegemonically less altering extent), to all instances of heterosexual appreciation. The point is that readers' emotions are genuinely and movingly excited, because the texts are able convincingly to amplify the *nature* of emotional excitement. In the *Arcadia*s at least, this in itself has a gender-altering effect on the reader, Lamb theorizes; she writes that the texts' embedded cultural narratives 'imbricate' the very idea of storytelling with 'passionate excess', effeminacy and idleness – although, she qualifies, 'topical allusions' in narratives are exposed as the prerogative of the noble both extra- and intratextually, as illustrated in Musidorus's veiled confession to Pamela.[164] Consequently, Lamb feels, Sidney immerses his readership and himself (as the eloquent storyteller) in the texts' accusations, and traps them into passionate, physical readings.[165]

---

[160] Lamb, p.66.
[161] Heliodoros, III.40r.
[162] N*A*, IV.211v-212r (O*A*, IV.262-63).
[163] Egger, p.37.
[164] Lamb, pp.55-56.
[165] See Lamb, p.61.

Whether regarding sex, gender, propensity for virtuous action or extent of single-mindedness, none of these variations in the reader or in characters is demarcating in itself; none of them is certain, and certainly none is definitive of any character's (or reader's) identity. What they provide in combination is a matrix of non-exclusive possibilities. Lyly's euphuism, on the other hand, provided options that were diametrically opposed. The result of this additional uncertainty and irresolution in Sidney's text (Woolf's 'elasticity') is that his characters either are not able or, more promisingly, do not feel the need to curtail the ambiguities that comprise them into anything coherent and singular – anything resembling the emblematic or symbolic characters of which Preston wrote. In this manner they stand in contrast to Lyly's main protagonists, who (no matter what combinations of contrasts occupy their minds in the lead up to choice) embody their decisions when they act: they become either creative and permissive or didactic and censorious, a friend or a lover, virtuous or wanton. Instead, every central character of the *Arcadia*s undergoes a splitting of their personalities that allows their opposing inclinations to coexist (for example, in their roles as leader and supplicant or mother and rival). Sidney's language repeatedly evokes such splitting: Pyrocles feels he must 'forsake himselfe'; Philoclea would 'haue fallen out with herselfe' rather than with Pyrocles; Gynecia believes that Pyrocles 'camest to draw [her] from [her] selfe'; Euarchus is concerned that Basilius is 'burying himselfe aliue', Philanax feels 'like a man gone a farre iorney from himselfe'; Musidorus, summarily, refers to himself forlornly as 'divided Dorus'.[166] Vitally, none of these characters is compelled actively to resolve the dilemma, because the revelation of the princes' identities means that the princesses' inclinations may all be fulfilled, and leaves their parents with no second options.

The princes' identities themselves, meanwhile, are split both more obviously and more subtly; they adopt disguises, but the impetus for this comes from within themselves rather than from any external necessity. The language that the princes use regarding their situation is telling: Musidorus's command that Pyrocles 'separate [him]self a little … from [him]self' suggests that Pyrocles' 'separat[ion]' from himself may, his cousin feels, preserve his nobility. Perhaps in a way unintended by Musidorus, the decision to adopt a disguise does achieve this end, and perhaps ironically renders the princes' situation less complicated. Because they are able to split their personas effectively, and to allow their dissolute passions amplification (they even allow their inclinations their own

[166] N*A*, II.51r (O*A*, II.82); N*A*, II.87r; N*A*, II.51r (O*A*, 83); N*A*, V.225v (O*A*, V.310); N*A*, V.225v (O*A*, V.310-11); N*A*, III.175v (O*A*, III.163).

identities), the princes are able to retain their nobility *as well as* embracing the tumult of emotions that both drives and is harnessed by them to win access to Philoclea and Pamela. The princes' conscious separation of themselves allows them to fulfill their narrative potential. Unlike the family they infiltrate, even when they leave Arcadia the princes need not limit the variety of motivations and characteristics that have distinguished them during their stay; they may explicitly resume their titles and duties, and retain the perspective on and amplification of themselves that their respite in the country allowed. Disguise provides protection and a method of preservation for the princes, just as fiction and particularly romance enabled Sidney both to re-fashion his story for publication and to retain its subversive ideology. As Relihan writes of cross-dressing (and this term ought to include Musidorus's dressing down), it is a 'release … from conventions', protection from fear and a method through which one 'can determine the sincerity of … love'.[167] Maslen concurs, assimilating the idea of emotional engagement with that of disguise:

> Both conditions – being in love and being in drag – help those who embrace them to lay aside, for a time, their expected subservience to a discreditable national regime. And they also serve as the perfect cover for an analysis of what has damaged that regime.[168]

What emerges from both of these conceptions is that the emotions that stimulate disguise can be fully 'determine[d]' and 'analys[ed]' from within it and so have room to achieve their potential: they can be fully appreciated; they can be amplified. In Davis's decisive terms, '[d]isguise, as Sidney presents it, is double-edged. It is a way of extending the personality into experiences one had never encountered before, and hence offers ultimately to enlarge the self.'[169]

The enveloping protection offered to the princes by disguise, to all characters by Arcadia's isolation and to Sidney by the *Arcadia*s' fictions may alienate outside threats, but its 'double edge' is really that those apparently protected remain at the mercy of all threats from within. In isolating Arcadia, Sidney prioritizes internal, emotional battles over the combats of armies; the one battle that disrupts the country's harmony, after all, originates from arguments between Arcadians at one, intimate dinner gathering, where 'table-talk', 'wel chafed with wine', became 'proud … & disdainful', and '(like a furious storme) presently carried away their wel inclined brains'.[170] In the New *Arcadia* this apparently invasive attack, the travelling dancers' kidnap of the ladies and even

---

[167] Relihan, p.86.
[168] Maslen, *Elizabethen Fictions*, p.229.
[169] Davis, *Idea and Act*, p.64.
[170] N*A*, II.104v-105r (O*A*, II.111-12).

the violence of the wild, ravenous lion and bear are furthermore revealed to have been stirred up by Cecropia, the princesses' own aunt, and caused by private, intra-familial jealousies.[171] Indeed the very premise of the tale, Basilius's misguided reaction to the oracle's prophesy against (as he thought) foreign threats, incurs a strategy of protective custody that breeds from within the very menace he fears. For the princes, the contraries raging in their own minds take the place of giants, dragons and tyrant kings, as their action even against interference by the princesses' multiple guardians is that of evasion and diversion rather than confrontation.

Because Arcadia's shelter allows the princes the isolation necessary fully to amplify their emotions, these emotions become unwieldy and unmanageable. Readers examining the princes' motivations are soon able to see the full extent of the characteristics that won duels, wars and rescue missions alike for Pyrocles and Musidorus: in a new context, their passionate feelings, coupled with their martial inclinations, are not curtailed but exaggerated; they are followed through with near disastrous consequences, because they are turned inward and affect those closest. Musidorus's vain struggle not to take advantage of Pamela during their elopement is even *relieved* by an outside threat: until they are interrupted his intention, 'tyrannize[d]' and rendered 'violent' as he is by Pamela's beauty, is quite clear.[172] As Reardon comments on the Greek romances, 'the dangers which beset virginity are as much internal to the heroes as external'.[173] Retaining Musidorus's digression even though he made several other efforts to ameliorate the princes' sexual behaviour, Sidney clearly deemed this to be of significant import to his theme. It is certainly a risk of which the princes themselves are aware: Pyrocles sighs, '[t]he evill is inward, my Lute, the euill is inward' and, once the princes are arrested, Musidorus acknowledges to his cousin, 'I well know there is nothing euill but within vs, the rest is either naturall or accidentall.'[174] Faced with such well-matched opponents as themselves, the princes can no longer expect to win all of their battles – especially their emotional battles – because, in Arcadia, the contestation inherent to contemplation presents a jousting matrix that must remain 'suspended' without a victor at all. In the *Arcadia*s, the princes' battles between respectful restraint and passionate domination do not cease at threatening virginity, though. Their acknowledgement of fluidity and arbitrariness, which originally resulted in emotional 'maturity', begins to dominate them: about to flee with Pamela, Musidorus realizes, 'this

[171] See N*A*, III.124v-125r.
[172] N*A*, III.180v (see also O*A*, III.177).
[173] Reardon, 'The Geek Novel', p. 300.
[174] N*A*, II.51r (O*A*, II.82); N*A*, IV.126v (O*A*, IV.275);

enchantment of my restlesse desire hath such authoritye in my selfe aboue my selfe, that I am become a slaue vnto it, I haue no more freedome in mine owne determinacions.'[175] As 'restless desire' threatens to become anarchic within the princes' psyches, 'contaminat[ing]' them (in Euarchus's words) 'with so manye foule breaches of hospitalitie, ciuilitie and vertue', it is also shown to become malevolently ubiquitous in Arcadia.[176]

After Basilius's apparent death, asyndetic chaos embraces the whole nation: 'this was the generall case of all, wherein notwithstanding was an extreame medly of diuersified thoughts: … [t]his composicion of conceytes, brought foorth a daungerous tumulte', Sidney writes; '[the] daungerous division of mens mindes, the ruinous renting of all estates, had nowe brought *Arcadia* to feele the pangs of uttermost perill'.[177] This most disastrous result of the princes' chaotic, invasive, licensed emotions causes them to be accused, arguably quite accurately, of having caused it – inaccurately, though, by having plotted Basilius's murder. At this point (the point of their near self-destruction), it becomes literally vital that the princes seek some union for their amplified and combative characteristics, and rejoin 'real life'.

Dominated by the asyndetic as it is, naturally Arcadia is full of contestation and, as seen, splittings of the self. At its conclusion, the outside world is re-introduced through the character of Euarchus, defined in the New *Arcadia* by his reputation for unity and single-mindedness:

> [H]is first and principal care being to appear vnto his people, such as he would haue them be, & to be such as he appeared; making his life the example of his lawes, and his lawes as it were, his axioms arising out of his deedes. So that within small time, he wanne a singular loue in his people, and engraffed singular confidence.[178]

Sidney presents the reader with a poignant ultimatum: can divisive, fully amplified, entirely unbound emotion achieve felicitous resolution, will it self-destruct, or must it be bound by hegemony for society to function? Perhaps, as the princes' marriages may suggest, a solution may be found in relationships of complement and reciprocity – relationships in which the imbalances caused by heightened emotion are distributed evenly between lovers. As Davis suggests, after all, 'left to itself, love encourages passion and self-division; if it is directed to the right woman, however, it can produce a new and vital conception of the self.'[179]

---

[175] N*A* III.171v (O*A*, III.152).
[176] N*A* V.241v (O*A*, V.455).
[177] N*A* IV.217r-v (O*A*, IV.277-78); N*A*, V.223r (O*A*, V.305).
[178] N*A*, II.63r-v.
[179] Davis, *Idea and Act*, p.66.

In the New *Arcadia*, the union of Argalus and Parthenia depicts the ideal marriage of man and woman: a marriage of true reciprocity and equality. After momentous sacrifices from them both, their union is clearly entire: in Parthenia's pleas that Argalus refrain from fighting ('Parthenia shal smart in your paine and your blood must bee bled by Parthenia) and in the couple's epitaph – therefore in life and death alike – the reader is in no doubt that '[hi]s being was in her alone: / And he not being, she was none'.[180] The princes' and princesses' fortunes are thus provided with a felicitous model. A pro-marriage sentiment is not unexpected in literature contemporary with England's concern for its queen's alliance with the far younger Duc d'Anjou, but Sidney's message is, again, ambiguous: he also presents, in much greater detail, the blighted marriage of Basilius and Gynecia, which was contracted despite their wildly disparate virtues and ages. '[O]ur good king Basilius,' Sidney narrates, 'with better successe then expectation, tooke to wife (euen in his more then decaing yeares) the faire younge Princes Gynecia.'[181] Sidney makes it clear that, if the story's conclusion is to be satisfactory, it will be on condition that Pyrocles and Musidorus genuinely have met their matches – that the princes will continue to be dominated (even 'tyrannize[d]') as often as they dominate. This is the solution for which the princes press when threatened with death, suggesting 'as it were the mending vp of the matter by their marriage'.[182] Perhaps with less bias, such a remedy does seem to calm asyndetic feeling at least in Pamela: although 'transported with desire & troubled with feare' beforehand, once travelling to her new life with Dorus she finds '[n]ow that the pang of desire with euident hope was quieted, & most part of the feare passed, reason began to renew his shining in her hart, & … loue fortified with her louers presence kept still his own in her hart.'[183] Pamela, for one, resolves that 'all doubte is past'.[184]

If one of the most disruptive effects of feeling passionately is, as Craik writes and the romances' protagonists demonstrate, that one's gender and/or social status becomes imbalanced (that unbound emotion can create 'womanish men' and manly women), perhaps the dissolution caused in the princes' minds *is* soothed by their eventual unions. Fusillo, after all, feels that the disturbance caused to characters feeling asyndetically in the Greek romances is 'resolved harmoniously in the triumph of *eros*' – which creates, Elliott Simon concurs, 'an ideal human order'

---

[180] N*A*, III.142v; III.151r.
[181] Ibid., I.9r.
[182] N*A*, V.240r (O*A*, V.351).
[183] N*A*, III.178v (O*A*, III.172).
[184] N*A*, III.179r (O*A*, III.173).

premised on symmetry and balance.[185] Fuchs is of the same mind; she believes that 'the single-minded fidelity of the characters functions as a kind of remedy to the indeterminacy of identity in a fundamentally dislocated world. The erotic attachment,' Fuchs writes, 'is the one thing that remains unchanging as hero and heroine move through a vast geography' – that is, that the love union is simple and holistic, and stands in contrast to the chaotic vicissitudes of the worlds romance characters inhabit.[186]

Although the notion of balance has merit (it is, perhaps, the foundation on which these partnerships are built), used definitively and holistically as it is here it implies that (at least elements of) characters' identities are fixed and exclusive, and so able to contrast, harmoniously, with an opposite. The *Arcadia*s, however, make it clear that the incessant mercuriality of desire makes identities, including gender identities, tricky to reconcile at all, let alone within marriage's embodiment of hegemonic expectations. In addition, Fuchs's premise that the 'erotic attachment' does remain 'unchanging' is in itself misjudged. It is an attachment that is constantly changing, constantly challenged by rival suitors (and often felicitous rival suitors, in the Greek romances at least) and constantly causing changes in the ideology and behaviour of its hosts. Bakhtin's distaste for the ancient Greek narratives stems from a similar misconception of their protagonists' bonds, which he feels are not 'tested in action' and so 'matured' to create psychological depth.[187] *Internal* tests of these bonds are posed constantly, however, by the heroines' stewardship and conceptions of virtue certainly, but also by the nature of emotions themselves: the heroes' propensity to inaction, characters' divisions of personalities, and their double-edged need for and incompatibility with both expression and rational, tactical thought. As is typical of the romance mode they, in Fuchs's words, 'both pose a quest and complicate it.'[188] Resolution of asyndetic emotions is always complicated and often prevented by its own conditions. In Arcadia, disguise enables and prevents the princes' courtships, as they bewail; Pyrocles/Zelmane/Cleophila sings in the first Eclogues, 'But wretched be the souls which, veiled in a contrary subject, / How much more we do love, so the less our loves be believed.'[189] In the *Arcadia*s, similarly, delay and emotionality cause and are

[185] Fusillo, 'The Conflict of Emotions', p.79; Elliott M. Simon, 'Sidney's Old Arcadia: In Praise of Folly', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 17:3 (Autumn, 1986), pp.285-302 (p.297).
[186] Fuchs, p.23.
[187] Bakhtin, p.90.
[188] Fuchs, p.9.
[189] N*A* I.42r (O*A*, I.74).

caused by one another, and threaten to trap Sidney's protagonists into a vicious circle – like asyndetic elements, 'suspended always in immobility'.

Sidney does round off his story, with Euarchus's arrival and the re-introduction of 'real life' law and order, but he cedes moral loose ends by effectively pardoning the princes of their felonies in total (their treason, blasphemy, kidnapping, near-rape and constant, ubiquitous deceit) because they are proved not to be guilty of murder. The reader must also recognize, with Pyrocles as an example, that the amplification of dissolute emotionality in the princes (and its 'effeminating' effects) is not directed exclusively towards their eventual brides: as discussed, Pyrocles' passions also engage Musidorus's; moreover, the supposedly exclusive united mutuality he finds with Philoclea may also be detected between Pyrocles and other women enamoured of him. In the New *Arcadia* his love for Philoclea is, he freely admits, based upon her resemblance of his deceased lover Zelmane, with whom he literally merges his identity just as he did with Philoclea to become Cleophila in the Old *Arcadia*. In both versions of the text Pyrocles' voice also melds into harmonious union with the unseen Gynecia's. In suggesting that Pyrocles' transforming passion extends beyond his liaisons with Philoclea, these likenesses imply that the amplification of the princes' identities will not be contained and resolved by their matrimony.

In both his New and Old *Arcadia*s, Sidney presents an unfinished, 'open' story: one that refuses to conclude the dissolution that began it with any decisive union.[190] As Simon observes, his 'courtly figures do not degenerate when they enter Arcadia; they bring their follies with them' and are simply given the opportunity, through full and unbound emotional engagement, to explore and indulge what was latent in them.[191] Davis concludes that, afflicted by 'wars of reason and passion' within themselves, the princes are never able to turn back into the single-minded heroes (perhaps back into the mere 'emblems') of the flashbacks' literal battlefields. 'So terribly', he writes, 'have their minds been torn asunder by their experiences that, by the time they have won their mistresses – and, surprisingly enough, they do – they are more disturbed than ever, rather than content at last.'[192] The reader, too, remains disturbed, as the *Arcadia*s conclude rather by surprise, within two paragraphs of Basilius's *deus-ex-machina*-like recovery. The position in which readers find their heroes is unlikely to be the one they had preconceived as, clearly in the New *Arcadia* but also in the

[190] See Gavin Alexander, as above.
[191] Simon, p.293.
[192] Davis, *Idea and Act*, p.65.

Old, the majority of the final two books occurs as an interruption to Sidney's characters' plans rather than as the projected end of them. Consequently, it is just as difficult for Sidney's readers to accept the outcome passively as to remain passive throughout the rest of the text. At the book's close, they are prompted to wonder not only what happens to the regal offspring Pyrophilus and Melidora (regarding whom, Sidney instructs, 'some other spirit [must] exercise his pen'), but also what may have happened had Basilius not awoken, had Euarchus not been the trial's arbiter, or had the princes' elopements succeeded. Readers of the New *Arcadia* are also, it must be acknowledged, compelled to wonder what may have happened had Sidney lived to finish his revisions. It is this uncertainty – or, perhaps more accurately, dissatisfaction – regarding the summary constriction of the princes and their princesses, though, that caused so many continuations to the *Arcadia* to be written after its publication, not simply Sidney's untimely death.

Simon suggests that 'when [the princes] emerge from their follies in Arcadia, in the trial before Euarchus, they are reconciled to those follies and to each other' – which assessment, although at first glance simplistic, makes an interesting prioritization.[193] It invokes reconciliation over unity; it allows for the potential of compromise, of settling, rather than summarily presuming unproblematic, blissful union for what have been revealed to be such complicated, such psychologically realistic characters, 'torn asunder' by their own emotions. Consequently, Simon feels, the princes may 'assume their true identities for the first time' but, if this is true, it is not because their passions are finally bound.[194] The princes' 'true identities' are as many and varied as they have opportunity to amplify during their time in Arcadia but, as they learned from their disguises, in order to function productively they must present their identities in a form that can be recognized by others. Pyrocles and Musidorus 'assume' their final (redeemed, betrothed, responsible) identities as they assumed these disguises: to embody a truth that best fits their current purposes. How that fit is achieved, and the extent of its felicity, is to be decided subjectively by the princes and, extra-textually, by the reader – but it is at least a better-informed fit for all its disturbance.

Readers can never be fully informed regarding the identity Sidney wished to assume for his newly disguised *Arcadia*, even if the fact that it remains 'suspended immobile' and incomplete seems unusually appropriate. They can, however, be sure of Sidney's reliance on his discerning

[193] Simon, p.294.
[194] Ibid..

audience to locate what was important to the text. Like Pamela, rather than Mopsa, the intelligent reader is granted the status of interpreter, or translator, for his work. The reader, encircled, privileged and protected, is invited to contemplate the nuances of the story, and stimulated to amplify them. Sidney begins the exploration, but declines to judge it; he breaks off his conclusion both literally and figuratively mid-sentence.

III: Union

> [Y]our question *Signior Gostino* is of that which the common people cal loue. … [E]uerye one payntes it out in his colours, as it please them, and yet none can tell what they say; in such sort that they make it a misterie, which can neither bee expressed nor taught, but by demonstration in a dumb schoole, as secret[.]
>
> — Robert Greene, *Mamillia: A mirrour or looking-glasse for the ladies of Englande*[1]

> The excitement of Elizabethan literature is the excitement of discovering the power of language. … With a judicious turn of phrase, an incantation, a trick of words, the disparate elements of reality can be made to cohere.
>
> — David Margolies, *Novel and Society in Elizabethan England*[2]

In its (re)union, asyndeton's diverse and subjective 'misterie' should be 'made to cohere' – albeit in only subjective, 'secret' ways. Its elements may be 'disparate', but to each reader they form a conceptual whole; the reader (re)synthesizes meaning from these elements, allowing them to be recognized as a cohesive figure. Even in the 'absence of connectives' asyndeton's elements are 'juxtaposed, i.e. coördinated'; they are 'without conjunction, but *not without connexion*'; it is a point of asyndeton that it 'keepeth the parts of speech together without the helpe of any conjunction'.[3] As discussed it can almost through perlocution, as Peacham warns, anarchically 'utter contraries' that recontextualize its elements and expose all their 'many and varied' nuances.[4]

Readers are able to (re)interpret union from these mutable elements because of their semantic ambiguity, and to infer content into the conceptual 'ellipsis' created by asyndetic elements' lack of conjunction.[5] Readers' engagement with and interpretation of such a 'frenzy' of warring but *coordinated* elements forms the elements into a semantically rich and adaptable 'gesture' that, because of its frenzy and subjectivity, is uniquely evocative of heightened emotional states (true descriptions 'of the heart') – this gesture is, in Priestley's words, 'infinitely more expressive of sentiments and feelings than words can possibly be'.[6] Authors are able to 'confer' with their readers regarding protagonists' emotional 'deliberations' (even in a forum where explicit emotionality is discouraged) and to 'excite' reciprocal emotions through their texts.[7] Ultimately, this allows authors to create psychologically realistic characterizations – or, at the very least, for readers to infer psychological

---

[1] Greene, *Mamillia* I, p.22r.
[2] David Margolies, *Novel and Society in Elizabethan England* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), p.1.
[3] Smyth, IV.38.1033 and IV.50.2165; 'ἀσύν-δετος, ον' in Liddell-Scott-Jones; Peacham as above.
[4] Peacham as above.
[5] The *PEPP* as above.
[6] See Jebb's notes on *Ajax* in *Sophocles*, p.60; Vickers, p.304; Priestley quoted by Stone, as above.
[7] Quintilian, IX.1.30.

realism from them. As an extreme consequence, the characterizations involved may become so mutually fractured and mutably ambiguous, so ready for subjective interpretation, that they are completely alien from character symbols or 'emblems' (such as the knight, the maiden or the rake).[8] In order for discernible characters, types or emotional states to emerge from the asyndetic matrices that compose them, the text would therefore rely upon *only* the subjective relationship each reader detects between the figure's dissolute 'signs' and holistic gestures – the union that readers are compelled to infer in line with their own emotional and social experiences.[9]

Sidney declines fully to embrace the union of character even at the close of his *Arcadia*s. He concludes the dissolute and amplified elements of the princes' characters with compromise and reconciliation rather than unity; he denies the simplicity of blissful union to his protagonists, realistically because they have emerged as such complicated and contradictory characters 'torn asunder' by their own emotions.[10] Re-emerging into the world outside Arcadia, the most the princes can semble are approximations of themselves that allow them to function relatively productively in society. Sidney presents a fraught, complex notion of union that is perhaps the most psychologically convincing, especially in terms of individuals' identities or a couple's union in love. This nuanced understanding is what asyndetic matrices achieve uniquely: a thorough understanding that union of emotionality, of character or in love is approximate, and yet that it is worth forging so the subject may become 'interpellated', 'inaugurat[ed]' and recognized in society, in Judith Butler's weighty terms.[11] Emotionally, the union that emerges from asyndeton is any one that the subject feels able to 'mov[e] towards and accept' in order to appeal to others: it is a condensed form of expression or presentation, as Denise Riley elaborates, that allows one to be not only accepted but also loved.[12] Sidney is acutely aware of the compromise that his princes make when they (re)unite their amplified characteristics in order to assume their societal and political positions and, as discussed, makes his reader equally aware of and equally responsible for it.

This conservation of ambiguity rather than ultimate union, however, is one against which Robert Greene reacts. In his more mature work, most notably in *Menaphon* and *Pandosto*, Greene asserts a definite and united narrative voice, a focus on unambiguous and event-driven plot and, in

---

[8] Preston, p.98.
[9] In Stone, as above.
[10] Simon, p.294.
[11] Butler, pp.26, 2.
[12] Riley, p.2.

both style and characterization, a totality that entirely displaces the vagaries of asyndetic matrices. Isolated moments of emotional upheaval are expressed through a few contradictory terms in each text, but their central concerns are not the ambiguity and interpretability key to asyndeton. Straightforward union (not re-union), simplicity and particularly the solid coherence of his own narrative voice constitute Greene's ultimate priority. In *Mamillia*, however, his first essay into extended prose, Greene's style is heavily influenced by both Lyly and Sidney – and, indeed, constitutes something of a stylistic half-way house between euphuism and more conventional Sidneian romance.[13] In the interim between beginning *Mamillia* and beginning *Menaphon*, certainly, Greene's style made a transition between Lyly's and Sidney's; Wilson suggests that he was 'rebrand[ed]', with help from Nashe, 'from old-fashioned Euphuist to trendy Arcadian'.[14] Whether or not this was the case, *Mamillia* provides a critiquing combination of (or compromise between) Lyly's and Sidney's styles; it exemplifies both the similarities and differences between the narrative mannerisms of these two major influences, prominently including their adaptations of asyndeton. In this text, Greene mimics the chaos of asyndetic amplification almost to the point of parody; he at once realizes the potential of asyndeton, to *express* rather than to *name* instances of emotionality in a manner evocative to the Everyman, and proves its limitations. Greene's work may not be quite satirical, but it does feature a knowing and light-hearted exaggeration of figurative asyndeton's familiar manifestations (in Lyly's euphuism and Sidney's *piling up*) in a newly accessible, perhaps even dismissive, medium. At the conclusion of *Mamillia*, Greene moves to substitute Sidney's asyndetic union for the unambiguous, plot-centric alternative that he would continue to prioritize. At a text level, therefore, Greene's comment on the productive union forged by asyndeton is minimal. Instead, he exaggerates the more troublesome implications of amplification: the alternative union forged by protagonists' engagement, mutuality and even conflation with subsidiary characters, for example.

Macrocosmically, however, *Mamillia* deals comprehensively with the conclusion of asyndeton as a figure. Greene pulls apart and amplifies Lyly's and Sidney's *uses of asyndeton themselves*, and makes them ridiculous. The book then presents the concept of the asyndetic matrix in union: as an always

---

[13] Of course, the *Arcadia* was barely published in time even to have influenced *Menaphon* ('*Greenes Arcadia*', as it was re-published from around the turn of the century), but internal evidence that Greene had access to one of Sidney's few manuscript copies has convinced, *inter alia*, Dennis Kay, Lori Humphrey Newcomb, Mentz and Wilson. See, for example, Newcomb's *Reading Popular Romance in Early-Modern England* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), pp.54-65.

[14] Wilson, p.5 (see also p.14).

already recognizable, derivative stylistic trope. To amplify the figure's amplification of emotional elements, Greene saturates his characters' prose with *such* similar and equally disjointed forms of expression that they become completely indistinct from one another. Greene exaggerates the unexpected union that can be found between, say, the equally lyrical Pyrocles and Gynecia in the *Arcadia*s, or the equally capricious Lucilla and Euphues in *Euphues*, to create such an impenetrable web of union *between* protagonists that it obstructs the reader from discerning or inferring individual characters or their emotions. The whole process of characterization dissolves into a pool of dissolute, disconnected characteristics, suspended in immobility. In this way, the reader's confusion – even frustration – does also create a sympathetic union with these characters *en masse*, but it is far from productive. Even if it were possible for the reader yet to 'paynte … out' a 'secret' understanding of this anarchic matrix 'in his [own] colours', Greene emphasizes its uselessness as a form of communicative expression. Thus, *Mamillia* suggests the extent and limit to which the figurative use of asyndeton (and of particularly asyndetic figures) was found to be useful in sixteenth-century fiction. Greene's self-conscious invocation of asyndetic expression furthermore suggests reasons that the figure in its various forms was not widely further adapted in the seventeenth century; his summary exposition of the asyndetic matrix concludes the Greek trope's influence on prose writing – at least until the eighteenth century's boom in extended prose fiction, and its 'invention' of the novel. *Mamillia*'s conclusion of asyndeton, then, is similar to asyndeton's conclusion regarding dissolute emotions: the union forged may be a compromise or even, as is Sidney's conclusion, dissatisfying, but the experiment is at least made.

Greene's authorial approach and parodic practice

In order for Greene's parodic experiments with the asyndetic matrix in *Mamillia* to have been appreciated, or even conceivably worth publishing, he must have relied on a readership that was not only literarily aware but also critical. Such an assumption regarding the buyers of Greene's books, however, merits some discussion. David Margolies draws an impassable line between audiences for the 'aristocratic' works of Sidney, John Lyly and Edmund Spenser, and the bourgeois, professional writings of authors such as Greene, Henry Forde and Thomas Nashe.[15] Margolies writes that, in the mid-1580s still, writing for publication was considered to produce 'base minded'

[15] Margolies, p.15.

work.[16] Unlike their aristocratic colleagues, he contends, professional authors 'were not concerned to erect timeless monuments of beauty and truth' honed by 'careful filing' (they 'were not constructing "English Literature"'), but instead produced 'instant' and disposable 'toys' for the masses.[17] The unversed reading public, Margolies continues, whether as its cause or result, was simply unable to appreciate the 'literary (not just story-telling) conventions', 'subtlety', 'intricacy' and 'refinement' of Sidney's or Lyly's prose and, instead, required 'practical value'.[18] For Margolies, Greene's 'alternative literature' constitutes a binary opposite to the prose that influenced it; its readers, in turn, possessed the unsophisticated, uninquiring minds that Mopsa represents in Sidney's dichotomy of understanding, and required the heavy-handed didacticism with which *Euphues* begins.[19]

More recently, as Lori Humphrey Newcomb establishes, the distinction between Lyly, Greene, Gascgoine, Lodge, Sidney *et cetera* has been challenged roundly; Newcomb argues for a characteristically diverse readership for prose fiction, pointing out specifically that the supposed dichotomies of readership were united at least in the person of William Ponsonbie who, despite being Sidney's publisher, made his fortune through Greene.[20] Nevertheless, several of Margolies's points are telling. Margolies supports his assertion that 'different classes' were suited to 'different things' in their reading matter with reference to Forde's butchery of 'Sidney's eloquent exposition' into populist elements for his various reductions of the *Arcadia* (Margolies refers to its humour, sentimentality and licentiousness, rather than its poetry or subtle internal struggles).[21] He also scathingly credits the 'alternative' authors for creating work '[f]reed from the demands of large-scale heroic action' by their reading populace's literary ignorance, and for an ill-educated attempt at an almost Marxist form of social revolution that would 'organize its world on different principles' within fiction, and make 'the concerns of the petty bourgeoisie more important than those of state or status quo'.[22] Margolies's tone is always condescending, but these points, especially when considered together, suggest an innovative audience: they suggest the existence of a reading public contradictory of both Margolies's assumptions and its own 'status quo'. Latent even in Margolies's

---

[16] Ibid., p.14, quoting Brian Melbancke's dedication to *Philotimus* (1583).
[17] Ibid., p.2.
[18] Ibid., p.16.
[19] Ibid., p.4.
[20] See Newcomb, as above.
[21] Margolies, pp.16, 6.
[22] Ibid., p.6.

condemnations is a readership that read subjectively and selectively, that would not be constrained by tradition, that compelled its book-sellers to organize their world on their own principles and that (in real life, not only in fiction) made their 'bourgeois' concerns of paramount importance – at least within the world of publishing. These readers did not require didacticism; they recognized it for the literary trope it was, and did with it what they would. They were the kinds of readers capable of not only inferring psychologically realistic emotions and characters from asyndetic matrices, but also forming critical opinions of narrative styles, and furthermore appreciating an author who respected this.

If Greene lacked the 'demands' of classical references, he parodied literary tropes with which these readers would be familiar. Begun when Lyly's euphuism was at the height of its popularity, *Mamillia* opens just as proscriptively.[23] It even conforms to Margolies's demand that commercial texts ought to have 'some suggestion of practical value in their full title': *Mamillia* is, ostensibly, a 'mirrour or looking-glasse for the ladies of Englande'.[24] Davis believes this to be a sincere homage – that the book is 'the most slavish of imitations of *The Anatomy of Wit*' – and C. F. McClumpha's critique agrees that in *Mamillia* Greene seems to be 'wholly under the influence of Lyly's euphuism'.[25] If the text is viewed simply as imitation rather than parody, it is unsurprising that its comparison with Lyly's original has not often been particularly favourable, despite the criticism so often levelled at Lyly himself: C. S. Lewis feels that Lyly's 'so improbable' storylines are at least transfigured by 'high sentiment and enthusiasm. In Greene', he contrasts, they are 'bleached bare of any moral feelings whatever. … There is a coldness, even a brutality, about Greene's mind, which unfits him for telling this sort of tale'.[26] It would be natural, though, if Greene's aim in *Mamillia* were to *amplify* Lyly's peculiarities, that it would be colder and, plot-wise, still sparser than the 'slightest' 'thread of story' that Ernest Baker writes constitutes Lyly's: the young lady Mamillia, warned against love in a letter from her absent friend Florion, becomes betrothed to one Pharicles, 'a youth of wonderfull witte, and no lesse wealth,' 'beautie' and 'filed speech', who then falls for Mamillia's cousin Publia.[27] At the height of his double-dealing, Pharicles' romantic quandary

[23] As Alexander B. Grosart annotates, *Mamillia* is entered into the Stationer's register on October 3rd 1580. See Robert Greene, *Mamillia: Parts I and II*, in *Life and Works of Robert Greene, M.A.*, 12 vols, ed. by Alexander Grosart (London and Aylesbury: Hazell, Watson and Viney, 1881), II, pp.1-252 (p.2).
[24] Margolies, p.16; *Mamillia* I, A1r.
[25] Davis, *Idea and Act*, p.139; C. F. McClumpha, 'The Metamorphosis of Greene and of Lyly, *PMLA*, 12, Appendix I and II: Proceedings 1897 (1897), pp.lv-lix (p.lv).
[26] C. S. Lewis, p.423.
[27] Baker, p.59; *Mamillia* I, pp.3r, 5r, 4v.

prompts his flight from Padua to Saragossa and there the first volume breaks off. In Saragossa and volume two, Pharicles (eventually) spurns the advances of an apparently repentant courtesan, is arrested due to her vengeful lies and is eventually rescued and wed (against her recently-deceased father's wishes) by the constant Mamillia.

This 'thread of story' may be relayed with 'coldness', but if so it is certainly with teasing emulation of Lyly's style. Greene's assimilative imagery provides so many directly combative examples that, far more obviously than in Lyly's writing, they methodically cancel one another out; Greene inflates Lyly's trope to outsized proportions. Embodying the paradox that Barish used to describe Lyly's style (that of distinctly asyndetic contraries locked together in 'inseparable intimacy' to express 'the perpetual ambiguities of human sentiment'[28]), swathes of Greene's idioms, for instance, draw attention to the foolhardiness of trusting to appearances: Mamillia, Publia and Pharicles all assert, to give a fractional example, that 'he that cannot dissemble, cannot lyue', 'a faire face may have a foule minde: sweete words, a sower heart', 'al is not gold that glysters' and '[t]he dogge byteth sorest: when hee doeth not barke'.[29] However, upon every occasion, precisely equal swathes immediately commend the opposite (and so, ironically, contradict themselves as well as their counterparts): Greene has the same characters list, for this example, 'yet the Gem is chosen by his hue, and the cloth by his colour', 'the Diamond [is] of greatest dignity, that is most glistering', 'the hearbe, which hath a faire bark, and a sweete sappe, is the more to be esteemed' and 'what the heart did think, the tongue would clinck'.[30] What references to Classical thought Greene does include are similarly depicted as hollow; the 'false' Aeneas, 'troathlesse Iason' and 'dissembling Damocles' are quickly contradicted by 'the betroathed fayth of Erasto to his Persida,' 'Leander to his Hero, or Piramus to his Thesbe', and the routing of Pharicles' argument for women's inconstancy apparently disproves the conclusions of 'Pindarus, Homer, Hesiodus, Ennius, Virgil, Martiall, Propertius, and many authors more'.[31] Consistently, Greene also exaggerates Lyly's propensity for untraceable myths and pseudo-sources: while the latter adds one or two to a list of otherwise verifiable referees, it is only '[s]ometimes', as John Weld's study concludes, that 'Greene's

---

[28] Barish, p.24.
[29] *Mamillia* I, pp.3r, 4v, 5v.
[30] Ibid., pp.4v-5r, 7r, 10v, 32v.
[31] Ibid., 34v, 15v; Robert Greene, *Mamillia: The second part of the triumph of Pallas* (London: by Th. C. for William Ponsonbie, 1593), p.Hv. All further references to *Mamillia* II will be to this edition.

attributions are correct'.[32] Certainly, whole arguments are composed of fantastical and ridiculous examples: 'The Crysolite being worne on the finger of an adultresse, so detesteth the crime as it cracketh in peeces by meere instinct of nature,' Pharicles muses; '[t]he Unicorne is such a foe to adulterie, and such a friend to chastitie, as hee alwaies preserveth the one and killeth the other. The iuice of the Basco leafe so abhorreth unlawfull lust, as it will not by any meanes be digested in the stomacke of strumpet.'[33] These borrowings are more often than not, moreover, shoehorned into speech as feignedly 'casual' and ostentatiously 'inappropriate' asides.[34] No statement remains without being contradicted or undermined, and such incessant negations go further than Barish's 'system of contradictions'; they promote the idea at which *Euphues* only hinted: that all vestiges of truth will be negated.

Greene amplifies again this exaggeration towards nihilism by counterpointing it with that towards elaborate aestheticism. He corrupts the sense of his borrowed imagery in favour of embellishment and ornamentation, as is shown by minor changes in phrasing: as Weld exemplifies, choosing an adaptation from Henry Wotton, with Greene's embroidery "'if men woulde neuer marrie, they could not fayle to attain great felicitie," becomes "If men would neuer marry, they should neuer be marred"'.[35] Greene displays no concern for the nuance of the words' *meaning* (attaining 'great felicity' differs, after all, from not being 'marred'), but focuses instead on phrasing the sentence with pedantic balance: alliteration is added, and while the phrase's tenor becomes 'marred' its vehicle is aesthetically endowed. For Greene far more than for Lyly, then, the similes that fill his text are not valuable, or 'significant' in Weld's term, in themselves – '[h]is irresponsible and needless invention of authorities, for instance' shows his 'lack of interest' in them.[36] Greene's borrowings could be read as straightforward parody, but his implementation of them (his ideological disassociation, and clearly playful tone) additionally allow readers to doubt the veracity of the narrative voice, just as they doubted Sidney's.

Borrowing too from Sidney's more straightforwardly romantic tradition, *Mamillia* also inflates the exotic gallery of fictional motifs that made their way into the *Arcadia*s from the ancient Greek romances: diversion, exile, trials, recognition, breathtakingly beautiful women (and, more

---

[32] John S. Weld, 'Some Problems of Euphuistic Narrative: Robert Greene and Henry Wotton', *Studies in Philology*. 45:2 (April, 1948), pp.165-171 (p.169).
[33] *Mamillia* II, pp.Gr-v.
[34] Weld, p.168.
[35] Ibid..
[36] Ibid., p.171.

centrally in Greene's later works), oracles and foundlings.[37] These elements are included offhand, with an equally disinterested lack of commitment to those from euphuistic or more broadly classical origins. Wilson recognizes that Greene's invocations of Sidney, too, serve to create 'a phoney culture of debate' – such as is shoehorned into *Mamillia* when, for example, a wandering Pharicles conveniently happens across an argument regarding the relative faithfulness of the sexes, just as he debates fidelity within himself.[38] Greene furthermore amplifies the cornerstone properties of the Greek source texts, as Mentz figures them: the priority of the heroine (over the hero), of passivity (over activity), of the supernatural or serendipitous (over that controlled by human means) and of the *reveal* (a calculated, unexpected victory or salvation, rather than straightforward resolution – what Mentz calls 'moral deception').[39] Greene exaggerates these by emphasizing human helplessness; the passive heroine Mamillia, left 'abandoned', 'defenseless' and highly emotional, threatens to caricature romantic concerns.[40]

In every case, Greene's 'borrowings' are highly self-reflexive, and emphasize his awareness of what Wilson terms his 'distance from classical theories of imitation': Greene's texts are both proprietorial and alienating of Sidney's, Lyly's and Greek practices alike, as they re-organize imitations on their own principles for a knowing readership.[41] Greene thus distances himself and his work from ingenuous involvement with narrative tradition, and this dissociation is perhaps what Lewis detected when he wrote of Greene's 'bleached' 'brutality'. If Greene's motivation for writing had been the *purely* aesthetic or ornamental, as it appears to have been for his referencing, it would quite brutally have alienated his work from any sympathy as well as from what Greene and his readers may have seen as the binding expectations of the literary. As discussed, though, Greene did not consider his references to be important in themselves – even those references to already digressive or irreverent texts, such as Sidney's. Greene's purpose was not simply to parody recognizable styles to construct a comedic review or scrapbook of the day. It was not even to explore the ways in which warring, asyndetic factions (truisms, similes and references to contemporary narratives) could be juxtaposed for greatest effect, as his abandonment of asyndetic

---

[37] *Mamillia* also features knowing references to the 'Grecian hystories' and specifically (falteringly) to Heliodoros's text (see pp.17v, 25r). Greene could be simply name-dropping Sidney's influences – although Wolff, Mentz, Moore and Wilson, *inter alia*, assert Greene's familiarity with the texts.
[38] Wilson, p.17.
[39] See Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, p.41.
[40] Ibid., p.111.
[41] Wilson, p.17.

matrices in his later texts testifies. Rather, his focus was on amplifying the ways these factions *were* juxtaposed by his influences, to explore *their* motivations and critique their work's effects. What was laborious in the prose of Lyly and Sidney, therefore, becomes even more so in that of Greene.

Many of these instances could be attributed, as Davis and McClumpha attribute them, to simple imitation of popular texts by an unpracticed and/or mercenary new author, rather than to a critique. Greene's treatment of asyndetic matrices in *Mamillia*, however, strongly suggests that Greene sought to make a point with his exaggerations. Rather than allowing his characterizations to be his work's saving grace, as did his forebears, Greene's characters are given little if any distinction by what Wilson nevertheless considers as their processes of 'interior reflection'.[42] Contrarily, Greene appears to have been experimenting, to some extent, with the ways in which the sophisticated and desensitized readers at which his prose was aimed – and his equally desensitized characters – might express emotionality. As Greene's exaggerated references to Lyly and Sidney suggest, he was writing for those readers saturated with awareness not only of the bound ways in which courtiers conducted themselves, but also with the supposedly *unbound*, chaotic and laborious patterns of Lyly's euphuism and Sidney's *piling up* used to express uncontrolled or uncontrollable emotionality in literature.

Greene's characters united: the conflation of amplification

Just as Lyly and Sidney did, Greene expresses his characters' 'interior reflection' through asyndetic matrices. Mamillia, after lengthy consideration of the wisdom of love, is 'driuen into such a maze' when her nurse suggests she welcome Pharicles' advances 'that she stood … *fearing* the fetch of her old nurse, *doubting* what a sleeue she shoulde shape for the coate, least shee should be ouertaken in *misliking* so lightly: or (though *not very chary* of her choyse) in *choosing* so quickly.'[43] The 'crased conscience' of Pharicles reciprocally suffers him to feel 'burnt', 'drowning', 'in hazard', 'broken', 'halfe crased', 'timid', 'hurt', 'guiltie', 'enchanted' and 'sotted' in senses: he considers himself to be altogether 'transformed' and decides, 'I will consent vnto Nature: … I will at this time giue the raynes of libertie to my amorous passions'.[44] Alongside these relatively concise examples, too, the virtuous Publia (a far more Lyleian character than Greene's primary protagonists who, as Euphues

[42] Ibid..
[43] *Mamillia* I, p.11r [my emphasis].
[44] Ibid., pp.6r-7v.

would condone, removes herself to a nunnery after her affair with Pharicles ends badly) responds to an amorous letter from Pharicles with asyndetic euphuism:

> Pvblia hauing read ouer this Letter, viewing and reuiewing euery lyne in particular, chaunged colours at euery sillable, fearing to be foyled by flatterye, or to be brought into a fooles paradise by promises, knowing that the Nyghtingale hath a sweete voyce, and yet but a ranke fleshe: that the Storkes in *India* haue a pleasaunt cry, but a bloody byl: that the fayrest Nutte without, may haue the fowlest Worme within: that the most daynty delicates may be sauced with deadly poyson: that smooth talke and fayre promises maye haue but small performance: that wordes were but winde: that inke and paper were not sufficient pledges for such an inseperable knot: yet hope haled her on to thinke well of his offer: and that shee whiche would not trust ere she tryed, should not proue without peryll: saying that experience is the Mistresse of fooles, and that they which were incredulous, incurred the greatest suspition of flatterie[.][45]

As do the protagonists of Heliodoros, Tatios, Lyly and Sidney, Publia feels multiple emotions, changing 'at euery sillable': notably pleasure, fear, suspicion, hope and, finally, resolution to trust. The dilemma is phrased distinctly euphuistically, but is distanced from straightforward mimicry by Greene's allocation of it to a woman; throughout, the reader must remember that Greene conveys her turbulent emotions alongside a considered, conscientious thought process that is associated with a bookish male counterpart. In mixing such passion and rationality, Greene achieves a gendered alternating of the kind that is a staple of the *Arcadia*s. This role-reversal is also illustrated in wider, narrative points (but ones that are less complimentary to either gender than those in the *Arcadia*s or Greek texts): Pharicles is the character who (rejected from his *polis* into 'ixile'[46]) is pursued by a seducer and must be rescued; Greene's abandoned and independent heroines, meanwhile, are united in opposition (and in power) against him; one renounces society for study, and two represent themselves eloquently in court – one perjuring herself, and one begging acquittal for the guilty Pharicles.

Role fluctuation in *Mamillia*, though, is not limited to that permitted by individual characters' amplifying experimentations with their own potentials. Every character in *Mamillia* affected by love employs the repetitive, idiomatic asyndetic expressions already familiar to Greene's readers from the *Euphues* and *Arcadia* texts, amongst others, to process their emotions and conceptions (regarding, for example, verity versus deceit, as partially detailed). Therefore, their individually diverse interior monologues are all inherently similar. These matrices of 'interior reflection' may still serve to evoke an understanding of broad emotionality in the reader, therefore, but are faulty

---

[45] Ibid., p.27v.
[46] *Mamillia* II, p.Dv.

for the purpose of characterization. Greene teasingly brings to attention the unhelpful universality of what should be the highly subjective experience of asyndetic expression, when Mamillia's father Gonzaga leaps to a misdiagnosis of his gravely ill friend's asyndetic symptoms: 'the oft chaunge of colours, his sodaine traunces, his sighes in his dreame, the dead stopping of his pulses, and then their beating a fresh,' he lists; 'al these are signes of an vnquiet minde, of an impatient affection, and to be flat, of loue it selfe.'[47] The friend, proving Gonzaga's assumption wrong and his assertion dubious, promptly dies. Greene's analysis of such symptoms is that their commonness renders them hallmarks of men 'that did lust, but not loue.'[48] He elaborates:

> [W]ith which fickle feuer ye Gentlemen of our time are greatly troubled: … they wil needes fry in frost, & freese in fire: they see, & yet are blind: they heare without eares, they spend the day in sighing, and the night in sobbes; they haue heapes of care, streames of teares, waues of woe: yea, to be short, they like without loue, and fancy, without affection, that their choyce must needes chaunge, because it is without reason.[49]

Because it is so common, Greene associates the asyndetic 'feuer' with the physical, carnal and common effects of enflamed passion, but dissociates it from any psychological depth that could meaningfully express character. Pharicles demonstrates this assertion for Greene and, furthermore, suggests that the figure is not, in Priestley's phrase, a true description 'of the heart', but precisely the antithesis of genuinely figurative speech: an affectation. Pharicles employs it in his courtly posture: 'he thought himselfe not to haue on al his armour, vnlesse he had teares at command, sighes, sobs, prayers, protestations, vowes, pilgrimages, and a thousand false othes to bind euery promise.'[50]

Nevertheless, Greene's attitude to Pharicles, and to his emotions, is not straightforward. His narrative voice avows that this anti-hero's emotional flux (his 'crased conscience') does not prove 'any sincere affection, enforced by [Mamillia's] vertue: but that his mind was set vpon lust,' and declares that 'his loue was but a lose kind of likinge'. However, the narrative later implies an importantly *inexpressible* force of feeling, and psychological *calm* rather than physical fever: 'the greater care, the greater ioy: the more doubt, the more pleasure: so [Pharicles'] vnlookt for hap [in winning Mamillia's affection] brought such an *inspeakable contentation*'.[51] Greene's seeming reluctance to commit to his own assertion that asyndetic matrices transcribe lust or posturing rather than love

---

[47] *Mamillia* I, p.20r.
[48] Ibid., p.20v.
[49] Ibid..
[50] Ibid., p.3r.
[51] Ibid., pp.7v, 17v [my emphasis].

leaves only his negation that, once recognized as a trope, they say little about emotionality at all. Greene's extension of such matrices to every character, moreover, renders both the matrices and the characters indistinct; all of his protagonists, whether each is male or female, virtuous or wanton, an aristocrat or an Everyman, begin to merge together as the amplified elements of their expressions seem not only to reciprocate but also to replicate one another's.

Greene does not revert to characterization through emblem, however; in parallel, his *descriptions* of his characters also lack distinction. His heroine Mamillia (unlike, for example, Heliodoros's Charikleia, Tatios's Leukippe, Sidney's Philoclea or Lyly's Camilla) is humanized and normalized; she is not depicted as a unique paragon of perfection. Mamillia is equalled not only in amplified feeling and the rational art of euphuistic debate by her cousin (as discussed): her 'beames of inward bountie', wondrous 'wisdom', 'exquisit perfection and singular beautie' too are upstaged when Greene introduces Publia:[52]

> [W]hose bewty and bringing vp, shewed that she was in no respect second vnto *Mamillia:* but rather more perfect in the giftes of nature … and that comlines of body, and curtesie of the minde hadde a continuall warre, which shoulde haue the superyoritie.[53]

Even the villainous 'professed Curtezan' Clarynda (who attempts to seduce and then wreaks revenge on Pharicles) proves herself a match. Upon seeing Pharicles, she too is 'taken at ye gaze … into perpetuall bondage', suffers 'a straunge Metamorphosis' and feels 'entrapped', 'fierce', 'beseiged', 'a haplesse horrour' and (after many fluctuations more) hope and 'ioy'.[54] Proving her wit, Clarynda also debates euphuistically with herself that 'those birdes which sing sweetest, haue oftentimes the sowrest flesh' but that '[t]he Garlike killeth the Serpent, & shee by instinct of nature escheweth the same', and refers as glibly to (pseudo-)classical precedent as any more respectable character, invoking the examples of 'Vlisses', Sappho, 'Ph[a]edra', Theseus, Ariadne and 'Hipolitus', amongst many others.[55] Physically, too, Greene renders Clarynda 'so sufficientlie furnished with the perfections & dowries of nature, that … shee might haue bene for her person a fit mate for the most famous Prince in the worlde', and states that her 'comely proportion surpassed the brauest dames in Europe, if the stayne of her honesty had not been a blemish to her incomparable beawtie' – which 'dames', presumably, include both Mamillia and Publia.[56] Not even Greene's supposed

---

[52] Ibid., p.1r.
[53] Ibid., p.19r.
[54] *Mamillia* II, pp.E2v-Fr.
[55] Ibid., pp.Ev, E3v, E3r, see E4r-F3r.
[56] Ibid., pp.Ev, F4r.

villain Pharicles is characterized distinctively as an out-and-out bad seed, as his self-condemning reflections on his behaviour so closely resemble those of Mamillia and Publia: Greene positions Publia's desperate questions, 'though he had no troth, shall I be treacherous? shall his fleeting make me fickle, or his inconstancie make me without conscience?' with Pharicles': 'O fickle loue, fraught with frailty. O traiterous hart ful of trechery. O cursed conscience, altogether careles.'[57] Pharicles is certainly flawed but, as Greene demonstrates, so is Mamillia; the reader may be able to overlook her disobedience and stubbornness as loyalty, but she is also conceited: 'she think[s] as much of her selfe as others speake, yet she would haue hid fire in the straw'.[58]

The 'interior reflection' of major protagonists' various internal debates is furthermore replicated by minor characters such as Ferragus (a friend of Pharicles), Signor Farnese (his father) and the Marquesse (an acquaintance of the latter), who repeat both their subjects and their shared turn of phrase again and again. Even Mamillia's nurse argues:

> [T]he Margaret is of great valure, yet soonest broken; ye Musk is most strong in sauour, yet endureth but a smal time. … [A]nd yet the byrds that breed in Bohemia, are of the same colour in their age, that they were hatched in their shell: the finest Crystall neuer changeth colour, and the cleere Diamond remaineth alwaies in one state[.][59]

The asyndetic emotional delineations of Greene's heroines and anti-hero even assimilate with those of characters barely encountered: the suitors reportedly in Mamillia's past each had 'two faces in a hood: to wax with the Moone, and ebbe with the sea: to beare both fire and water, to laugh and weepe all with one winde', and Pharicles, immediately after his asyndetic outburst, feels that he is now sympathetic with ('serued of the same sauce' as) all the women he has rejected in the past.[60] Pharicles' exodus at the beginning of Greene's second volume provokes an exemplary phenomenon of this assimilation. Firstly, Mamillia argues with herself regarding whether or not she ought to remain faithful; she veers from condemnation of Pharicles' rejection to lamenting the rumours regarding his second attachment, to consideration that there may be a reasonable explanation for his absence, to vowing constancy whatever befalls. As Mamillia falls to weeping after this decision, her father enters with advice – which repeats almost literally the reflections she has just concluded; it follows the same pattern, with much of the same phrasing: Mamillia's cry, '[h]ast thou no more care of thy credite but to cracke it with inconstancie …?', for example,

---

[57] Ibid.; *Mamillia* I, p.34r.
[58] *Mamillia* I, p.16r.
[59] Ibid., p.C4v.
[60] *Mamillia* I, p.2v, 6v.

becomes Gonzaga's condemnation that Pharicles 'crackt his credit … [with] peeuish inconstancie'.[61] Then, a few pages later, the whole debate is repeated again by Publia when she realizes the betrayal: she, too, laments the potential 'crack to [her] credit' and 'his inconstancie'.[62] As a consequence of Greene's assimilative faultiness/virtue, consideration/willfulness and logic/passion, his protagonists all productively become relatable rather than aspirational for the Everyman – but at the same time their delineations are, like the verses (but more so than the characters) of Sidney's Pyrocles, Philoclea and Gynecia, almost indistinguishable.

As this comparison with Sidney may suggest, and as is latent particularly in Pharicles' sudden sympathy with women, it is possible that Greene's decision to yoke together his characters so indiscriminately could say as much about the beneficially uniting power of love as about the impotence of figurative speech to express it. Pharicles remarks, after all, when requested to define love, that the concept often means 'the losse of a mans selfe.'[63] As Sidney's protagonists also find, it can prompt a sacrifice of certain parts of the independent self, to effect an evening or sharing out of imbalanced characteristics so that harmony and complementarity may exist within a relationship; as Pharicles continues, imperfectly, love 'imparteth wealth [of knowledge] to the foole and pouertie to the wise.'[64] Such unity of character certainly suggests a much more comprehensive equanimity of gender in Greene's text even than in Sidney's, and one that is deeply ingrained in Greene's narrative – this, too, however, reflects badly on both sexes.

When Pharicles and his friend Ferragus join the all-too-convenient debate regarding 'whether the man or the woman be more constant or loyall in loue', Greene's treatment of the contest is curious.[65] Superficially, the gentlemen's arguments against those of their female partners seem balanced (certainly, the speakers call an amicable stalemate at dinner-time), but it would probably have been clear to Greene's immediate readership that Greene actually leaves his masculinists without a leg upon which to stand. Both Pharicles and his opponent the Marquesse of Saldena characterize women as 'phlegmatike' and men as 'Chollerick', which Pharicles argues means that 'of necessitie [women] must be fickle, mutable and inconstant, whereas Choller, wherewith men do abound, is contrarie, and therefore by consequence stable, firme and without change'.[66] It is the

[61] *Mamillia* II, pp.B2v, B4v.
[62] Ibid., p.Dr.
[63] *Mamillia* I, p.22r.
[64] Ibid., pp.20v-21r.
[65] *Mamillia* II, p.Hr.
[66] Ibid., p.Hv.

Marquesse's counter-argument, however, that tallies more closely with Craik's analysis of how sixteenth-century society perceived love's undesirable effects upon the humours. The Marquesse states:

> For the Phlegmatike complexion is cold and moist, vtterly repugnant to the flaming heate of volumptuous desires … whereas the Chollerike constitution is hote & drie, soone set on fire and soone out, easily inflamed and as easily quenched, readie to be scorched with the least heate of beawtie, being of the nature of fire which is the most light and mouing Element of all … being very violent and little permanent.[67]

Craik too presents the choleric as the most excitable of temperaments, 'inscrib[ing] itself starkly on young men's bodies, heating their blood, swelling their veins, causing their faces to flush crimson and putting fire in their eyes'.[68] It physically alters the state of a man's being, his control over his body and so his conduct. As Craik quotes from John Downame, 'other affections lead a man, but this drawes him, others intice him, but this compels him'.[69] Furthermore, choler was considered so mutable as to be a danger to soldiers, liable to fail them at crucial moments:

> Often dubbed a *brevis furor*, or short madness [Greene writes that it is 'little permanent'], anger drew heat away from the heart to those parts of the body furthest from the centre of life. Its natural lightness [it is Greene's 'most light and mouing Element'] then ascended towards the brain, depriving men of reason and plunging them into insanity.[70]

In depriving men of reason, their primary and principal emotional response of choler perhaps ironically deprives them of perhaps their most gender-definitive virtue; phlegm, on the other hand, Craik links derogatively only to the relatively minor flaw of 'weeping' in women.[71] From this perspective, Pharicles' contestation, that men's reason makes them single-minded and therefore constant, is already defeated. '[T]o come to humane Reason,' he argues, many authors' 'golden sentences haue in all their writings with one consent auerred', while 'the naturall disposition of women is framed of contraries'.[72] Such an erroneous premise need not even be contradicted by the reader's recollection of *Mamillia* so far: on this point even Pharicles acknowledges – that 'to praise men for their loyaltie he found his own concience a iust accuser of their inconstancie, to condemne women for their ficklenesse he sawe Mamillia and Publia two presidents of perfect affection'.[73]

---

[67] Ibid., p.H2v.
[68] Craik, p.8.
[69] Ibid., p.57. Craik quotes John Downame, *Spiritual Physicke to Cure the Diseases of the Soule* (London: Gabriel Simson for William Iones, at the signe of the Gun, 1616), p.124r.
[70] Ibid..
[71] Ibid., p.9.
[72] *Mamillia* II, pp.Hv-H2r.
[73] Ibid., p.Hv.

Rather than allowing this debate to highlight the 'perpetual ambiguities' of his style, and (like both Lyly and Sidney) refusing to name a victor, Greene seems decisively to allow the ladies the upper hand.

In concluding the dispute, however, Greene turns the tables again: Pharicleschivalrously claims a defeat, allowing that the Marquesse's words had satisfactorily negated the Saragossan verses that had begun it ('who soever made the forepassed verses, was both vniust and iniurious'[74]); in doing so, he renders the contest far from a victory for either party. Upon reflection, it is clear that the verses in question are unrelated to its topic: in fact, they criticize not inconstancy but misleading decoration in form of 'new guise[s]': 'conceits', make-up, wigs and corsetry.[75] Greene calls to attention the 'phoney' nature of the debate, and foregrounds not the importance of contestation or even of disingenuousness, but of meaninglessness in *Mamillia* – of characters impotently pursuing diversions and achieving nothing. Even the supposed innovation of such a verbal joust is revealed as unsuited for its purpose. Again, Greene's personae struggle to express anything of their individual characters at all.

This struggle for expression becomes, if anything is, the major theme of Greene's text. Much like the *Arcadia*s and *Euphues*, *Mamillia* aims, as its title professes, 'to descipher … the perfect substaunce of pure loue'.[76] Greene does not feel it can achieve this through figurative language, however, as is indicated by his critique of the asyndetic matrix. Nevertheless, he rejects filed and fashioned speech (he condemns Pharicles' propensity to 'speak finely though without faith'[77]) and instead acknowledges the role played by subjective experience in reading: like Lyly, albeit with gentle mockery, he refers repeatedly to the phenomenon of 'so many heades, so many wittes'.[78] Such uncertainty as to where meaning truly can be found leaves Greene and his characters in something of a quandary regarding true and free expression of emotionality – or, indeed, of anything important. Readers' greatest sympathy with the malign Pharicles stems from his awareness of this issue: trying to express his love to Mamillia, he laments, '[m]iserie I may wel cal it', for in trying to put his feelings into words he finds 'nothing is more yrksome than bondage, & yet my restraunt of liberty is so much the more acceptable, by how much the more it is desired.'[79] Just as

[74] Ibid., H3v.
[75] Ibid., pp.Hr-v.
[76] *Mamillia* I, title page.
[77] *Mamillia* II, p.D4r.
[78] See, for example, *Mamillia* I, p.A3r [amongst many other instances].
[79] *Mamillia* I, p.15r.

he is pressurized into sealing up his passions with marriage, Pharicles is striving to say what is required of him, to 'restra[i]n' his free-form emotions into a 'desired' form, but feels bound by the attempt. His flight from the situation is consequently understandable, if not even predictable. The anti-hero later laments to Publia's father:

> Did not Retormodicus ouer[t]hrow the whole state of the Lacedemoniens, for the loue of Scedasus daughters? Roderick of Spaine lost his kingdome for Camma, yea many haue not onely hated, both father and mother for the loue of their Ladyes, but also haue poysoned their kinsmen and acquaintance, for to fulfil their fancies. Cateline slew his sonne, for the loue of Orestilla, and yet men are counted neither loyall nor faythfull. Tibullus, called loue a profound science: to be briefe, euerye one payntes it out in his colours, as it please them, and yet none can tell what they say: in such sort that they make it a misterie, which can neither bee expressed nor taught.[80]

Confronted with the apparent probability that no matter how he may choose to express his love he will be named 'neither loyall nor faythfull', Pharicles seems to be sufficiently distressed by the labels' lack of power that he abandons attempts to aim at either.

Throughout his text Greene counterpoints without victor the notions of bondage and liberty with which Pharicles contends, claiming hegemonically but paradoxically that 'there is bondage in the shape of licentious libertie', and that love represents 'a bondage, but a freedom,' and marriage 'a band of liberty'.[81] As regards linguistic expression, Greene's interplay of the ambiguous versus the proscriptive adds little to the suggestions made by Lyly's and Sidney's texts. Letters in *Mamillia*, for example, just as in the *Arcadia*s and in *Euphues*, draw attention to the powerlessness of unambiguous, committed speech and favour the evocation permitted by a fluid, re-interpretable style. Pharicles reads and rereads a message from Publia, managing to formulate each time a different interpretation of her degree of encouragement, just as, when she was writing the letter, Publia's passion and conscience strove against one another. Responding to her resolution to make her letters 'sower in the mouth, & sweet in the maw', upon his first reading Pharicles 'seeing the beginning was hard, thought the ending as ill'; re-reading, however, he finds that 'though the first part was sharp and rigorous, yet he found the last to be mixed with mettal of more mild matter' with a decidedly 'freendlye conclusion'.[82] In contrast, the didactic authority embodied by Gonzaga (who, in his will, forbids Mamillia and Pharicles' marriage) and by Mamillia's absent friend Florion, is rejected entirely. Pharicles' and Publia's supposedly productive emotional responses to their

---

[80] Ibid., p.Gr.
[81] Ibid., pp.8v, 10v.
[82] Ibid., pp.36v, 28v, 33r.

missives, however, are the destructive causes of the plot's disruptions. After his unfavourable first reading, Pharicles commits officially to his betrothal with Mamillia; only re-reading afterwards does he find himself now also committed to her cousin, and forced to flee the country. Greene suggests, rather, that the straightforward may be preferable to the figurative – that it may provide a 'band of liberty' – when *truth* is required.

A contrast to *Mamillia*'s characters' incessantly ambiguous, asyndetic shared mode of expression is made available in the letters that Greene's heroine receives from Florion at the narrative's outset. Florion's involvement in the rest of the story is non-existent and, many feel, puzzling; his function is, Schleiner believes, clumsily structural, and a product of Greene's wrangling to introduce a female protagonist to a euphuistic narrative structure.[83] Florion is, concludes Schleiner, the result of 'women being assumed incapable of Platonic friendships'.[84] He could rather be read as a version of Euphues that Greene's narrative could explicitly abandon as it also abandons Lyly's euphuism and didacticism. Greene describes him, after all, as having vowed 'to abandon the company of women for euer' but as not so 'absurd' as 'to condemne al of lightnesse, for ones leawdnes' – thematically, just like Euphues.[85] Florion's linguistic style, however, is overwhelmingly unaffected and direct; his letters are only minimally euphuistic in manner and refrain from self-contradiction, although he does propound many of the ascetic sentiments Euphues drives home in his post-scripts to the *Anatomy*. Florion simply advises Mamillia against the 'glistering miserie' of courtly life and 'beauty, without vertue' in suitors, for which commands Greene, in Florion's character, restrains himself to no more than two illustrative similes.[86] Florion's 'by definition asexual' stance, then, affirmed by his being a 'professed enimie to Loue', contrasts him with Pharicles and Greene's female characters as a man un*affect*ed by passion, euphuism and asyndetic matrices alike.[87] More than any other character, Florion is a type or *emblem*: he is a 'professed souldier', chivalrously and disinterestedly interceding in his friend Mamillia's life to preserve her as 'chast' and 'wise'.[88] He seems marked as irrevocably separate from *Mamillia*'s other characters in several terms: his geographical absence from Padua, the temporal distance that the delivery of a letter is bound to incur, and also in his linguistic differences.

---

[83] See Schleiner, p.6.
[84] Ibid..
[85] *Mamillia* I, p.2r.
[86] *Mamillia* I, p.8v.
[87] Schleiner, as above; *Mamillia* I, p.9r.
[88] *Mamillia* I, pp.8v-9r.

Greene rests just as little authority in Florion, however, as he does in Gonzaga: Florion's advice, too, is roundly ignored. Furthermore, the real extent of Florion's separation is called into doubt as echoes of Euphues' characteristics also appear in Publia, as discussed, and even in Pharicles: just as Philautus furiously demands of Euphues, '[w]ith what face, Euphues, canst thou return to thy vomit, seeming with the greedy hound to lap up that which thou didst cast up', Philautus demands of himself, 'shal I requit ye liberal loue of Mamillia with such disloyalty, returning as ye dog to my vomit in liking Publia?'[89] Most potent, however, is Greene's suggestion of how precarious Florion's state is, even if he *is* originally alien to the asyndetic. Euphues, of course, creates precedent for the inconstancy of a didactic life, but the progress of Mamillia herself is most closely threatening: although Mamillia's consciousness is not narrated before she meets Pharicles, Greene narrates that prior to her falling in love Mamillia and Florion were 'two bodyes and one soule: their will and wish was alike, … yea the concord of their nature was such as no soppes of suspition, no mistrs of distrust, no floddes of ficklenes could once foyle their fayth, their friendship was so firmely founded on the rocke of vertue'.[90] Once enamoured of Pharicles and being delineated in asyndetic terms, however, Mamillia's character is quickly irreconcilable with Florion's; in response to his letter she finds herself able to argue that as 'ye Muske is most stronge in sauour, yet endureth but a smal time: so the nature of Florion by how much the more it is precious, by so much ye more it is to be doubted'.[91] If the friends are truly of 'one soule', Florion, too, is one chance encounter away from losing himself to Greene's mêlée of amplified and indistinguishable emotions.

Reading Greene's unremitting union

Greene compels his readers similarly to lose or sacrifice themselves, or parts of themselves, in order to engage with him or his text. His later work makes clear the part he knows the reader *must* play, and the part he reserves for himself in and around his narratives: in his preface to *Menaphon*, Greene appeals to readers to 'thinke the metaphors are well ment, and that I did it for your pleasures, whereunto I euer aymed my thoughts'.[92] Where the reader finds his matter 'dark' or

[89] Lyly, *[H]is England*, pp.301-02; *Mamillia* I, p.34r.
[90] *Mamillia* I, p.1v.
[91] Ibid, p.9v.
[92] Robert Greene, 'To the Gentlemen Readers, health', prefacing *Menaphon* (London: T.O. for Sampson Clarke, 1589).

'strange', Greene writes, '[I] desire you to take a little paines to prie into my imagination'.[93] To Greene just as much as to Sidney, a book appears to have been a conduit aimed to connect directly with the feelings (specifically the 'pleasures'[94]) of his readers, and capable too of facilitating their connection with his. As Arthur F. Kinney writes, these mutual pleasures 'are subject to, held together by, the powers of … imagination' and can be 'shared by his readers with only a little effort on their parts.'[95] *Mamillia*'s prospects would be stark if it sought to achieve this sharing of emotionality only through the characterizations Greene seems to have found so troublesome. Later, his series of pamphlets would cut out the middle men to figure Greene himself as a character whose very life is threatened by their composition, hinging the connection between author and reader on a merging of boundaries between fact and fiction (and potentially making a self-referential and contrary comment on what critics now term *the death of the author*). This merging, begun in the emotional quagmires of *Mamillia*, rests authority with the reader just as it did when employed by Lyly or by Sidney, and so retains at least one of asyndetic figures' positive impacts on the reading experience. As Mentz observes, by the time Samuel Rowlands engaged in writing *Greenes ghost haunting conie-catchers*, 'Rowlands seems to have learned from Greene that authors rely on readers to complete their work.'[96] Rowlands, like Greene, was fully utilizing the imaginations of a reading public that was (although hallmarked by the Everyman rather than the aristocrat) 'wise, discrete, and of the same mind as his author' – as discerned above from Margolies's scathing commentary.[97] However, these 'wise' readers, Greene knew, would react to the tried and recognizable asyndetic matrix tropes that Lyly and Sidney had explored in the way that he causes his characters to react: as Wilson writes, they would 'find that literary language lets them down' when they wish to 'reflect on their emotions' precisely because that language is now ostentatiously 'literary' rather than evocatively figurative.[98] So how might Greene hope to provoke in his readers the emotional engagement needed for their 'pleasures' and 'imagination' fully to be 'share[d]' or merged with those woven into *Mamillia*, if not through the process of involvement with asyndetic matrices?

---

[93] Ibid..
[94] Ibid..
[95] Arthur F. Kinney, 'Afterword', in Liebler, *Early Modern Prose Fiction* as above, pp.148-152 (p.148).
[96] Mentz, *Romance for Sale*, p.219.
[97] Ibid..
[98] Wilson, p.16.

Readers' recognition of the asyndetic matrix as a united trope rather than a series of dissolute elements detaches the reader from the process of dissolution, amplification and (re)union. As Davis writes, however, detaching or 'decathecting' emotional involvement (what Davis terms 'desire') from its direct cause is of absolute importance when the reader (the desiring subject) seeks identification rather than complete union (assimilation) with its object.[99] What this may mean for Greene's early work is that, as much as desire is checked by dissolution from its cause (that is, as much as readers' emotional involvement with a text is checked by their critically aware distance from the asyndetic matrices that should cause this involvement), it is also unbound completely from its connection to a particular object or character. The reader's emotional capital is consequently rendered available for investments to come; emotions could be excited, but kept at enough of a distance from the text to permit their easy alteration and transfer. Emotions stimulated in this manner would then require a similarly invested leap of imagination as do asyndetic elements, to (re)unite them with the author's: as Greene writes, the reader must 'take a little paines' to 'prie into' them. Such decathection would put the reader's emotionality into circulation: in a way, readers' awareness would demand its unlimited trade 'on their terms' just as it commands the tailored trade of books.

This theory of decathected desire holds, though, only if readers are aware of (have been taught) the *intentions* of figures such as asyndetic matrices, and have become practiced in recognizing them – if readers already understand what they amplify when presented with the figure in union. It would be Greene's knowing reference to the codes of emotional expression in romance that could promote, in the long run, an overall investment by the reader in the emotional processes of reading, and in literature more generally. For Greene, therefore, the best defense against the consequences of desensitization is perhaps desensitization itself. In any case, his use of amplified and overwhelming (almost parodic) asyndetic matrices attempts to achieve the starkest ends of truly figurative speech: it *gestures* to readers, and admits them into the author's and characters' deliberations – as though with a footnote reading, 'you know what I mean'. In *Mamillia*, Greene only begins a long journey that experiments further both with emotionality and with the ideas of author, character and reader. Mentz believes it is one that he is not able to conclude himself, writing that it is only Rowlands who 'finishes what the prefatory letters to *Mamillia* began: a long-

[99] Davis, *Idea and Act*, p.129.

wandering romance between Author and Reader.'[100] Such a romance – a vital diversion from the literal purpose of storytelling, taken to commune on an understanding of emotionality – is just the journey upon which Theaggenes, Charikleia, Leukippe, Kleitophon, Heliodoros and Tatios embarked, facilitated and structured by asyndeton. The beginning of Greene's journey, however, is the end of asyndeton's in sixteenth-century fiction.

Greene favours his readers' emotional engagement with himself and his text as a whole over their engagement with his protagonists, and somewhat gives up on characterization in *Mamillia*. Even the anarchy of shared emotionality that dominates its first volume (what Lindheim slightly misinterprets as 'moral anarchy'[101]) is relegated towards the end of the second: Mamillia's necessarily vexed reaction to Pharicles' plight is curtly summarized by Greene with no flourish:

> [W]ithin short space she furnished a ship wherein in disguized apparrell shee sailed to Sicilia comming to Saragossa the day before Pharicles should be executed, where she dealt so warily and wisely, that not onely she learned the cause of his imprisonment, but also got the coppy of those letters which had passed betweene Clarynda and Pharicles[.][102]

In the end, it isn't fluctuations of relatable character that define Greene's heroine, but action – what distinguishes Mamillia is not her emotions, her passion or, indeed, anything as subjective as her eloquence in court, but her prompt and concise relay of the facts and their evidence. No manner what her motivation (the flawed Mamillia, after all, could be acting purely out of self-interested pride), at the critical point, and in order to resolve the narrative, she assumes the direct manner hinted at imperfectly by the emblem Florion. This definitive clarity of action, of *plot*, remains Greene's central concern in his later fiction. Just as in asyndeton itself, however, the union of tenor and vehicle in Mamillia's expression is only meaningful to the reader of *Mamillia* because its preceding turmoil has also been witnessed.

Mamillia's closing sentence, naturally, mimics both Lyly's and Sidney's. Lyly leaves the fate of Euphues and Pharicles in his characters' own hands, and bids a decisive farewell to 'you', his reader: he 'leave[s] them both to confer at their next meeting; and commit[s] you to the Almighty.'[103] Sidney, as discussed, invokes the reader's responsibility for his conclusion, inviting 'some other spirite to exercise his penne' to resolve his protagonists' states.[104] Greene, neatly

---

[100] Mentz, as above.
[101] Lindheim, p.20.
[102] *Mamillia* II, p.Kr.
[103] [*H*]*is England*, p.462.
[104] N*A*, V.243v.

completing the triptych, returns authority (and attention) to himself, the author. He does so characteristically teasingly, however; his conclusion suggests that more tales may be anticipated regarding Mamillia and Pharicles' happiness: 'if it be my hap to heare,' Greene writes, 'looke for newes as speedilie as may be.'[105] Greene leaves his readers able to formulate their own opinions, but keen for an authoritative resolution. Greene's punchline is that this resolution will never come. The reader's emotional involvement in the text, and in Greene, is left hanging; as is idiosyncratic of asyndetic matrices, the emotional elements stirred up are 'suspended always in immobility'.

[105] *Mamillia* II, p.K3r.

'[C]oncludeth it a figure … finisheth the work.'[106]

What asyndeton literally omits is conjunction, but asyndetic matrices *gesture* towards boundless imaginative ellipses that allow it space for constant reinterpretation. Its elements are free to be reorganized, re-contextualized and re-signified; instead of a structure, the elements of asyndeton create a dynamic and involved reading experience that adapts not only with every reader but also with every reading. Asyndetic figures of speech are both expansive and concise at one moment: they assimilate paradoxes and yet emphasize their contradictions, referring in *short speech* to an infinite number of evocative questions or questionable concepts. Barthes calls this a *syntactical aria*: it is the distraction inherent to romance that diverts the reader's attention and offers a chance to muse on what the words mean *this time*. In abstraction (in fiction), an asyndetic matrix does not demand even that readers 'mov[e] towards' and compromisingly 'accept' a concept they haven't generated themselves and may shift around for a better fit.[107]

Dissolution, amplification and union interpret the figure's effect in a linear manner, but naturally they occur at once: the figure must have been united for it to dissolve; dissolution is prompted because elements demand amplification; amplifying elements (re)defines the nature of their union. Only such subjective figures of speech could come close to expressing truly subjective conceptions such as emotionality, because their expression is simply a gesture that signals the reader subjectively to infer whatever meaning feels relevant. Both asyndeton's success and its failures stem from and are in proportion to how vague this gesture is. In Aristotle's terms, 'the deliberative style is exactly like a rough sketch, for the greater the crowd, the further off is the point of view; wherefore in both too much refinement is a superfluity and even a disadvantage.'[108] A 'rough sketch' naturally removes distinction from individuals' emotions and, as Greene illustrates, this can depreciate as well as enrich the practice of storytelling. Reversing Frank Whigham's approach and supporting Hugh Blair's, asyndeton's form is shaped by its figurative potential, which is in turn defined and repeatedly redefined by 'nature and passion['s] … own language.'[109] What really depreciates the figure's worth for Greene is that its popular use by such characteristically

---

[106] [*H*]*is England*, p.401.
[107] Riley, p.2.
[108] Aristotle, III.12.5.
[109] See Whigham, as above; Blair, p.453.

stylized authors as Lyly and Sidney makes it appear too stylized itself, too recognizable and so too ornamental to remain figurative in the sense that Blair and Joseph Priestley clarify.

The fictions of Tatios and Heliodoros, and Lyly, Sidney and Greene all adapt asyndetic matrices in their own ways, but all do so in an attempt to diverge from formal, bound modes of expression and the denial of sincere emotionality. They attempt to use the synchronously contradictory elements that make up the figure to represent their characters' wars of emotions, to allow them to appear fallible, interpretable and relatable, and so to proffer characterizations that seem psychologically realistic to their readers. By presenting intentionally fractured and faulty descriptions of subjective experiences, influenced by the literal asyndeton of the Greek romances, these authors ensure a constant, reciprocal engagement with their readers who, individualistically, seek to (re)solve the chaos that faces them. The asyndetic matrix's power lies in the fact that both it and emotionality lack solid coherence, that they might be queried, and that the reader might creatively complete the reading experience to unite the two. It has the potential for hinting, between its elements, at the unbound, the unbounded, and the abstract.

Dissolution admits the faults of expression; it appreciates the contradictions inherent to any form of feeling and, especially, any attempt to translate that feeling into unambiguous language. Euphues attempts to deny this ambiguity, and only reaches contentment once he embraces it. Lyly's so-called didacticism contradicts itself and refuses to name a victor; just as Euphues is, readers are compelled not to choose a side, but to suggest their own interpretations. Amplification is permitted by the conceptual space allowed for the reader to take control of a text. Surrounded by warring factions, the reader may find, like Pyrocles and Musidorus do, an enclosed haven where they might fully explore the many and diverse elements of emotionality and character that refuse to sit calmly together. Sidney's linguistic experimentation dances around explicit discussion of emotionality, both allowing courtiers to express themselves without constriction by fashioned turns of phrase and conveying the chaos caused when these constrictions are removed. When union is reached, or imposed, it is always then mutable. The subjective (re)union of asyndetic elements is preceded by an understanding that this union is necessarily at least partly arbitrary – that another understanding could have been, and could still be, reached. The reader may, though, as Pharicles does, even feel relief at the curt restrictions of emotionality society eventually demands, after such a chaotic reign of loose desires. Even Greene's more cynical, near-parodic reference to the figure,

always-already united, effects reference to this chaos: asyndetic matrices fail in some respects because the figure has become literary but, also because it is literary, it refers outwards to the warring elements that have influenced it. Each of Greene's exhausted and methodical asyndetic debates unites the Greeks', Lyly's and Sidney's experiments with the figure, and provokes the reader's (re)interpretations of them, as well as invoking each character's dilemma.

After *Mamillia*, and even at points within it, Greene and his colleagues favour stark and honest declarations of love (for example, Fawnia's realization in *Pandosto*: 'Dorastus, ah Dorastus is the man I loue!'[110]). This is perhaps because much of the motive for asyndetic modes of expression dissolves with the relevance of courtly expectations for the average reader: the importance placed on self-fashioning is immaterial to the majority of Greene's readership, so emotions no longer need to be bound – or, as a result, expressed covertly. Their evocative power holds true, however, and asyndetic matrices reemerge at times for each generation: in the temporal dissolution inherent to Richardson's epistolary heroines, in the constantly re-cathecting illusions of Lucien de Rubempré and in the shifting epigrams of Dorian Gray's affair with love, for example. Literal asyndeton, too, appears in the free indirect discourse of Mrs. Dalloway's absent mind and Lawrence's lovers' tempers. The figure's brief popularity in the sixteenth century, furthermore, testifies to the rise in authors' reliance on their readers to contribute actively and imaginatively to the reading process, and in their focus on realistic characterization. Even in Greene's developing insistence that he himself be recognized, he cannot hope to be didactic. After the dissolution of the author's supremacy, and the amplification of the reader's authority – after, as Aristotle wrote, so 'many things appear to be said' – he can hope at most for union in a creative collaboration.[111]

[110] Greene, *Pandosto the triumph of time* (London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Cadman, 1588), p.D4v.
[111] Aristotle, III.12.4.

Bibliography

Adamson, Sylvia, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber (eds.), *Renaissance Figures of Speech* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Alexander, Gavin, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Aristotle, *On the Art of Poetry*, in Aristotle, Horace, Longinus, *Classical Literary Criticism*, trans. by T. S. Dorsch (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), pp.29-75

——, *Rhetoric*, in *Aristotle*, trans. by J. H. Freese, 23 vols (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd, 1926)

Ascham, Roger, *The scholemaster* (London: by [J]ohn Daye, 1570)

Baker, Ernest A. *The History of the English Novel* (London: H. F. & G. Witherby, 1929)

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981)

Balzac, Honoré de, *Illusions Perdues*, *Œvres complètes de H. de Balzac*, 19 vols (Paris: Veuve Alexandre Houssiaux, 1863-1865), VIII

——, *Splendeurs et Misères des Courtisanes*, *Œvres complètes de H. de Balzac*, 19 vols (Paris: Veuve Alexandre Houssiaux, 1863-1865), XII

Barish, Jonas A., 'The Prose Style of John Lyly', *ELH*, 23 (1956), pp. 14-35

Barnfield, Richard, *The affectionate shepheard* (London: Iohn Danter for T. G[ubbin] and E. N[ewman], 1594)

Barthes, Roland, *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (London: Vintage, 2002)

Beasley, Jerry C., 'Romance and the "New" Novels of Richardson, Fielding and Smollett', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 16:3 *Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (Summer, 1976), pp. 437-450

Begam, Richard, 'An Interview with J.M. Coetzee' *Contemporary Literature*, 33:3 (1992), pp.419-431

Benjamin, Walter, *Selected Writings 1913-1926*, ed. by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1996)

——, 'The Task of the Translator', trans. by Harry Zohn, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. by Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2004) pp.75-85

Blair, Hugh, 'Lecture XVII. Comparison, Antithesis, Interrogation, Exclamation, and other Figures of Speech', *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 3rd edn., 3 vols (London: for A. Strahan and T. Cadell; and Edinburgh: for W. Creech, 1787)

Boswell, John, 'Revolutions, Universals, and Sexual Categories', *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, ed. Martin Bauml Duberman *et al.* (New York, NY: New American Library, 1989), pp.17-36

Boyd, Brian, *On the Origin of Stories* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010)

Braithwaite, Richard, *A Survey of History: Or, A Nursery for Gentry* (London: I. Okes for Jasper Emery, 1638)

Brown, Paul Tolliver, 'Relativity, Quantum Physics, and Consciousness in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*', *Journal of Modern Literature* 32:3 (Spring, 2009), pp.39-62

Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy, What It Is* (Oxford: by John Lichfield and James Short for Henry Cripps, 1621)

Butler, Judith, *Excitable Speech* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1997)

Carroll, Joseph, *Literary Darwinism: Literature and the Human Animal* (London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2004)

Carson, Anne, *Eros the Bittersweet* (Champaign, London and Dublin: Dalkey Archive Press, 1993)

Castiglione, Baldassare, *The Courtyer*, trans. by Thomas Holby (London: by Wyllyam Seres, 1561)

Cavanagh, Sheila T., '"What ish my nation?": Lady Mary Wroth's interrogations of personal and national identity', in Naomi Conn Liebler (ed.), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Poetics of Reading* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2007), pp. 98-114

Certeau, Michel de, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. by Steven Rendall (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984)

Chariton, *Chareas and Callirhoe*, trans. by B. P. Reardon, in *Collected Greek Novels*, ed. by B. P. Reardon (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989), pp.17-124

Chislett, William, Jr., 'The New Hellenism of Oscar Wilde', *The Sewanee Review*, 23:3 (Jul., 1915), pp. 357-63

Chun, Maureen, 'Between Sensation and Sign: The Secret Language of *The Waves*', *Journal of Modern Literature* 36:1 (Fall, 2012), pp. 53-70

Coetzee, J. M., *White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988)

——, *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992)

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Writings on Shakespeare: A Selection of the Essays, Notes, and Lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge on the Poems and Plays of Shakespeare*, ed. by Terence Hawks (New York, NY: Capricorn Books, 1959)

Cope, Edward Meredith, *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1877)

Craik, Katherine, *Reading Sensations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Crooke, Helkiah, *Mikrokosmographia: a description of the body of man* (London: William Iaggard dwelling in Barbican, 1615)

Davis, Walter, *Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969)

——, *A Map of Arcadia: Sidney's Romance in Its Tradition* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1965)

Downame, John, *Spiritual Physicke to Cure the Diseases of the Soule* (London: Gabriel Simson for William Iones, at the signe of the Gun, 1616)

Dryden, John, *The State of Innocence and Fall of Man, an Opera, written in Heroique Verse* (London: by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1677)

Egger, Brigitte, 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe', in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp.31-40

——, 'The Role of Women in the Greek Novel: Woman as Heroine and Reader', *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. by Simon Swain (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp.108-136

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)

Elias, Norbert, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996)

Fieler, Frank B., 'Gascgoine's Use of Courtly Love Conventions in *The Adventures Passed by Master F. J.*', *Studies in Short Fiction*, I (1963)

Fish, Stanley, *Is There A Text In This Class?: the Authority of Interpretative Communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980)

Fisher, Harwood, *Self, Logic and Figurative Thinking* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2008)

Frye, Northrop, *An Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957)

Fuchs, Barbara, *Romance* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004)

Fusillo, Massimo, 'The Conflict of Emotions', *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. by Simon Swain (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 60-82

——, *Il Romanzo Greco: Polifonia e Eros* (Venice: Marcilio Editore, 1989)

Gascoigne, George, *A hundredth sundrie flowres* (London: [by Henrie Bynneman [and Henry Middleton]] for Richarde Smith, [1573])

Gellner, Ernest, *Plough, Sword and Book: The Structure of Human History* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988)

Gesner, Carol, *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: a study of origins* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970)

Gottschall, Jonathan and David Sloan Wilson (eds.), *The Literary Animal* (Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2005)

Gough, J., *The Strange Discovery: a Trage-Comedy* (London: by *E. G.* for *William Leake,* 1640), prefacing William Gouge, *The saints sacrifice: or, a commentarie on the CXVI. Psalme* (London: by George Miller for Edward Brewster, 1632)

Gould, Thomas, *Platonic Love* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963)

Grange, John, *The golden Aphroditis* (London: [by Henry Bynneman,] 1577)

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Renaissance Self Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005)

——, 'Sidney's *Arcadia* and the Mixed Mode', *Studies in Philology*, 70 (1973), pp. 269-78

Greene, Robert, *Greenes Arcadia, or Menaphon: Camillaes alarum to the slumbe[ring] Euphues* (London: W. Stansby for I[ohn] Smethwicke, 1616)

——, *Life and Works of Robert Greene, M.A.*, 12 vols, ed. by Alexander Grosart (London and Aylesbury: Hazell, Watson and Viney, 1881)

——, *Mamillia: A mirrour or looking-glasse for the ladies of Englande* (London: for Thomas Woodcocke, 1583)

——, *Mamillia: The second part of the triumph of Pallas* (London: by Th. C. for William Ponsonbie, 1593)

——, *Menaphon: Camillas alarum to the slumbering Euphues* (London: T[homas] O[rwin] for Sampson Clarke, 1589)

——, *Pandosto the triumph of time* (London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Cadman, 1588)

Greenhalgh, Darlene C., 'Love, Chastity, and Women's Erotic Power: Greek Romance in Elizabethan and Jacobean Contexts', in Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp.15-42

Greenlaw, Edwin A., 'Sidney's *Arcadia* as an example of Elizabethan Allegory', *Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge* (Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913), pp. 327-337

Guy-Bray, Stephen, 'Same Difference: Homo and Allo in Lyly's *Euphues*', in Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England, 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 113-128

Hagstrum, Jean, *Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980)

A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991)

Harker, James, 'Misperceiving Virginia Woolf', *Journal of Modern Literature* 34:2 (Winter, 2011), pp. 1-21

Harvard University Gazette, Interview: 'Greenblatt Named University Professor of the Humanities', September 21st 2000 <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2000/09.21/greenblatt.html> [accessed June 30th 2011]

Heiserman, Arthur, *The Novel before the Novel* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1977)

Heliodoros of Emesa, *[T]he hystorie of Cariclea & Theagenes*, in *Amorous and Tragicall Tales of Plutarch*, trans. James Sandford (London: H. Bynneman for Leonard Maylard, 1567), pp. 10r-27v

——, *An AEthiopian historie*, trans. by Thomas Underdo[w]ne (London: Henrie Wykes for Fraunces Coldocke, 1569)

——, *Les Éthiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée)*, ed. by R. M. Rattenbury and T. W. Lumb, 3 vols, (Paris: Collection des Universités de France, 1938)

——, *An Ethiopian Story*, trans. by J. R. Morgan, in *Collected Greek Novels*, ed. by B. P. Reardon (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 349-588

Homer, *The Iliad, edited, with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes, and appendices*, ed. and trans. by Walter Leaf (London: Macmillan, 1900)

Hopkins, Lisa, 'Passion and Reason in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*', in Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukokic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 62-75

Huet, Pierre-Daniel, *A Treatise of Romances and their Original, translated out of French* (London: by R. Battersby, for S. Heyrick, 1672)

Hutson, Lorna, *The Usurer's Daughter* (London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1994)

Iser, Wolfgang, *The Act of Reading: a Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978)

——, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978)

Isler, Alan D., 'Heroic Poetry and Sidney's Two *Arcadia*s', *PMLA*, 83:2 (May, 1968), pp. 368-379

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of pure Reason*, trans. by J. M. D. Meiklejohn (London: Bohn, 1860)

Kaufmann, Linda S., *Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre and Epistolary Fictions* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986)

Kay, Dennis (ed.), *Sir Philip Sidney: an Anthology of Modern Criticism*, ed. by (Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1987)

Kelso, Ruth, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1956)

Kent, H. W. (ed.), 'Sir Philip Sidney (15541586) ii. The Countesse Of Pembrokes Arcadia', *Bibliographical Notes on One Hundred Books Famous in English Literature* (New York, NY: The Grolier Club, 1903), pp.28-31

Kinney, Arthur F., 'Afterword', in Liebler, Naomi Conn (ed.), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Poetics of Reading* (New York: Routledge, 2007), pp.1138-52

Kleinbard, David J., 'D. H. Lawrence and Ontological Insecurity', *PMLA* 89:1 (Jan., 1974), pp. 154-63

Knowles, James, 'Sexuality: A Renaissance Category?', *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp.674-689

Konstan, David, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994)

——, 'Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and narrative in the novel', in J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London: Routledge, 1994)) pp.49-63

Lamb, Mary Ellen, 'Exhibiting Class and Displaying the Body in Sidney's Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 37:1 (Winter, 1997), pp.55-72

Langbaine, Gerard, *On the Lives and Writings, of all those that have Publish'd either Comedies, Tragedies, Tragi-Comedies, Pastorals, Masques, Interludes, Farces, or Opera's in the English Tongue* (Oxford: by L. L. for George West and Henry Clements, 1691)

Langer, Ullrich, *Perfect Friendship: Studies in Literature and Moral Philosophy from Bocaccio to Corneille* (Geneva: Librarie Droz, 1994)

Lawall, Sarah N., *Critics of Consciousness: The existential structures of literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968)

Lawrence, D. H., *Fantasia of the Unconscious; and, Psychanalysis and the Unconscious* (London: Penguin in association with William Heinemann, 1971)

——, *The Rainbow* (London: David Herbert, 1915)

——, *Sons and Lovers* (London: Duckworth, 1913)

——, *Women in Love* (London: Martin Secker, 1921)

Leavis, F. R., 'Lawrence and Class', *The Sewanee Review* 62:4 (Oct.-Dec. 1954), pp.535-62

Lei, Bi-Qi Beatrice, 'Relational Antifeminism in Sidney's *Arcadia*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 41:1 *The English Renaissance* (Winter, 2001), pp.25-48

Levao, Ronald, 'Sidney's Feigned Apology', *PMLA*, 94:2 (Mar., 1979), pp. 223-233

Lewis, C. S., *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954)

Lewis, Charlton T., *An Elementary Latin Dictionary* (New York, NY, Cincinnati, OH, and Chicago, IL: American Book Company, 1890)

Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek – English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940)

Liebler, Naomi Conn (ed.), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Poetics of Reading* (New York: Routledge, 2007)

Lilar, Suzanne, *Aspects of Love in Western Society* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1965)

Lindenbaum, Peter, 'Sidney's *Arcadia*: The Endings of the Three Versions', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 34:3 (May, 1971), pp. 205-218

Lindheim, Nancy R., 'Lyly's Golden Legacy: Rosalynde and Pandosto', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 15:1 *The English Renaissance* (Winter, 1975), pp.3-20

Longos, *Daphnis and Chloe … termed by the name of The shepheards holidaie*, trans. by Angell Daye (London: by Robert Walde-graue, 1587)

——, *Daphnis and Chloe. A most sweet, and pleasant pastorall romance for young ladies*, trans. by George Thornley (London: for John Garfield, 1657)

——, *Daphnis and Chloe*, trans. by Christopher Gill, in *Collected Greek Novels*, ed. by B. P. Reardon (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 285-348

Lyly, John, *Campaspe* (London: for Thomas Cadman, 1584)

——, *Euphues and his England* (London: Gabriel Cawood, 1580)

——, *Euphues. The anatomy of wit* (London: Gabriel Cawood, 1578)

——, *Lyly's Euphues*, ed. by Morris W. Croll and Harry Clemons (London: Routledge, and New York, NY: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1916)

——, *Gallathea* (London: Iohn Charlwoode for the widdow Broome, 1592)

——, *Mother Bombie* (London: Thomas Scarlet for Cuthbert Burby, 1594)

——, *Sapho and Phao* (London: for Thomas Cadman, 1584)

Manganiello, Dominic, 'Ethics and Aesthetics in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 9:2 (Dec., 1983), pp. 25-33

Margolies, David, *Novel and Society in Elizabethan England* (London: Croom Helm, 1985)

Maslen, Robert W., 'Sidney, Gasgoine, and the "Bastard Poets"', in Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukokic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp.215-233

——, *Elizabethan Fictions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

May, Charles E., 'Do You See What I'm Saying?: The Inadequacy of Explanation and the Uses of Story in the Short Fiction of Raymond Carver', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 31: *North American Short Stories and Short Fictions* (2001), pp. 39-49

McClumpha, C. F., 'The Metamorphosis of Greene and of Lyly', *PMLA*, 12 (1897), Appendix I and II: Proceedings 1897, pp.lv-lix

McCoy, Richard, *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979)

Mentz, Steve, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

——, 'The Thigh and the Sword: Gender, Genre, and Sexy Dressing in Sidney's *New Arcadia*', *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England 1570-1640,* ed. by Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp.77-91

Moore, Helen, 'Ancient and Modern Romance', *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, ed. by Peter France and Stuart Gillespie, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), II (ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummings and Stuart Gillespie), pp. 333-46

——, 'Romance', in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp.317-326

Morgan, J. R. and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London: Routledge, 1994)

Moss, Martha Niess, '"L'Enigme de Couple": Balzac and Marriage', *South Atlantic Bulletin*, 44:1 (Jan., 1979), pp. 73-80

Miller, D. A., 'Balzac's Illusions Lost and Found', *Yale French Studies*, 67, *Concepts of Closure* (1984), pp. 164-181

Myrick, Kenneth O., *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935)

'N. H.', *A Ladies Dictionary, Being a General Entertainment For the Fair-Sex* (London: for John Dunton, 1694)

Nashe, Thomas, *Strange Newes, Of the intercepting certaine letters, and a Conuoy of Verses, as they were going Priuilie to victuall the Low Countries* (London: John Danter, 1592)

Nelson, Stephanie, 'Shelley and Plato's *Symposium*: the poet's revenge', *The International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 14:1 (Summer, 2007), pp. 100-129

Nelson, William, *Fact or Fiction: the Dilemma of the Renaissance Storyteller* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973)

The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993)

Newcomb, Lori Humphrey, *Reading Popular Romance in Early-Modern England* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2002)

Norbrook, David, 'Sidney and Political Pastoral', *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp.82-96

Nygren, Anders, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love*, trans. by A. G. Hebert (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, [1932-39])

The OED Online (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Olmsted, Wendy, *The Imperfect Friend: Emotion and Rhetoric in Sidney, Milton and Their Contexts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008)

Parker, Patricia, *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979)

Peacham, Henry, *The Compleat Gentleman* (London: for Francis Constable, 1622)

——, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: by R[ichard] F[ield] for H. Iackson dwelling in Fleetstrete, 1593)

Perry, Ben Edwin, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley University Press, 1967)

Plato, *Plato's Erotic Dialogues*, trans. by William S. Cobb (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993);

——, *The Republic*, in *Plato*, trans. by Paul Shorey, 12 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd, 1969), V-VI

——, *The Symposium*, trans. by Christopher Gill (London: Penguin Classics, 1999)

——, *Symposium and Phaedrus*, trans. by Benjamin Jowett (New York, NY: Dover, 1993)

Potter, John, *Archaeologiae Graecae: or, the Antiquities of Greece* (Oxford: at the Theatre, for Timothy Child and John Jones, 1699)

Poulet, Georges, 'Phenomenology of Reading', *New Literary History* 1:1 (October 1969), pp. 53-68

Preston, Claire, 'Sidney's Arcadian Poetics: A Medicine of Cherries and the Philosophy of Cavaliers', *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics*, ed. Neil Rhodes (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1997) pp.91-108

Puttenham, George, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, dwelling in the black-Friars, neere Ludgate, 1589)

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. by H. E. Butler, 4 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920)

Rackin, Phyllis, 'Androgyny, Mimesis, and the Marriage of the Boy Heroine on the English Renaissance Stage', *PMLA*, 102:1 (Jan., 1987), pp. 29-41

Reardon, B. P., 'Aspects of the Greek Novel', *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, 23:2 (Oct., 1976), pp.118-131

—— (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989)

——, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991)

——, 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix*, 23:3 (Autumn, 1969), pp.291-309

Relihan, Constance C., *Fashioning Authority: The Development of Elizabethan Novelistic Discourse* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1994)

Relihan, Constance C., and Goran V. Stanivukovic (eds.), *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England, 1570-1640* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Rhodes, Neil (ed.), *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics* (Tempe, AZ: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1997)

Richardson, Samuel, *Clarissa* (London: for A. Millar, J. Rivington *et al.*, 1748)

——, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (London: for C. Hinch, L. Hawes *et al.*, 1754)

——, *Pamela* (London: for C. Rivington and J. Osborn, 1741)

Riley, Denise, *The Words of Selves* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000)

Rolls, Edmund T., *The Brain and Emotion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

——, *Emotion Explained* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Rowlands, Samuel, *Greenes ghost haunting conie-catchers* (London: for R. Iackson and I. North, 1602)

Schellenberg, Betty A., 'Using "Femalities" to "Make Fine Men": Richardson's Sir Charles Grandison and the Feminization of Narrative', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 34:3 *Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (Summer, 1994), pp. 599-616

Schleiner, Louise, 'Ladies and Gentlemen in Two Genres of Elizabethan Fiction', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 29 (1: *The English Renaissance*), 1989, pp.1-20

Schleiner, Winfried, 'Early Modern Controversies about the One-Sex Model', Renaissance Quarterly, 53:1 (Spring, 2000), pp.180-191

Seagroatt, Heather, 'Hard Science, Soft Psychology, and Amorphous Art in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*', *Studies in English Literature, 1550-1900,* 38:4 *Nineteenh Century* (Autumn, 1998), pp.741-759

Sidney, Sir Philip, *An Apologie for Poetrie* (London: for Henry Olney, 1595)

——, *The Countess of Pembroke's* [Old] *Arcadia* (c.1580), St. John's College, Cambridge, MS I.7 (James 308)

——, *The Countesse of Pembroke's* [Old] *Arcadia* (c. 1580), ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

——, *The Countesse of Pembrokes* [New] *Arcadia* (London: for [W]illiam Ponsonbie*,* 1593)

——, *The Countesse of Pembrokes* [New] *Arcadia … Now the fovrth time published, with some new Additions* (London: by H. L. for Simon Waterson, 1615)

——, *The Countess of Pembroke's* [New] *Arcadia*, ed. and annotated by Maurice Evans (London: Penguin, 1977)

Sieber, Harry, 'The Romance of Chivalry in Spain: From Rodríquez de Montalvo to Cerantes,' in Kevin Brownlee and Marina Scordilis Brownlee (eds.) *Romance: Generic Transformatoon from Chrétian de Troyes to Cervantes* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1985)

Simon, Elliott M., 'Sidney's Old Arcadia: In Praise of Folly', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 17:3 (Autumn, 1986), pp. 285-302

Skretkowicz, Victor, *European Erotic Romace: Philhellene Protestantism, Renaissance Translation and English Literary Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010)

Smith, Bruce R., *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (London: the University of Chicago Press, 1991)

Smyth, Herbert Weir, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York, NY, Cincinnati, OH, and Chicago, IL: American Book Company, 1920)

Sophocles, *The Plays and Fragments with critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose*, trans. by Sir Richard C. Jebb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1899)

Spenser, Edmund, *The shepheardes calendar* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1579)

Stanivukovic, Goran V., 'English Renaissance Romances as Conduct Books for Young Men', pp.60-78, in Naomi Conn Liebler (ed.), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Poetics of Reading* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2007), pp. 6-78

Stewart, Jack F., 'Expressionism in *The Rainbow*', *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 13:3 (Spring, 1980), pp. 296-315

Stone, P. W. K., *The Art of Poetry 1750-1820: Theories of Poetic Composition and Style in the late Neo-Classic and early Romantic Periods* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967)

Swain, Simon (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Tatios, Achilles, *The most delectable and pleasaunt history of Clitiphon and Leucippe*, trans. by W[illiam] B[urton] (London: Thomas Creede for William Mattes, 1597)

——, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, trans. by John J. Winkler, in *Collected Greek Novels*, ed. by B. P. Reardon (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 170-284

Turner, Robert Y., 'Some Dialogues of Love in Lyly's Comedies', *ELH*, 29:3 (Sept., 1962), pp. 276-288

Vickers, Brian, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989)

Weld, John S., 'Some Problems of Euphuistic Narrative: Robert Greene and Henry Wotton', *Studies in Philology*. 45:2 (April, 1948), pp.165-171

Whigham, Frank, *Ambitions and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984)

Whitmarsh, Tim, 'The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre', *The American Journal of Philology*, 126:4 (Winter, 2005), pp. 587-611

Whitworth, Stephen, 'Passing for Mean: Barnfield and the Aristotelian Poetics of Copulation', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 29:3 (Summer, 1999), pp. 71-86

Wilde, Oscar, *The Decay of Lying* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2004)

——, *An Ideal Husband* (London: Leonard Smithers & Co., 1899)

——, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (New York, NY: Signet Classics, 1962). Reproduction of Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, first revised edition (London: Ward, Lock & Co., 1891)

Wilson, Katharine, *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan Narratives: Euphues in Arcadia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006)

Wolff, Samuel Lee, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York, NY: The Columbia University Press, 1912)

Woods, Gregory, 'Review: *Sodomy and Interpretation: Marlowe to Milton* by Gregory W. Bredbeck', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 46:4 (Winter, 1993), pp.863-864

Woolf, Virginia, *Collected Novels of Virginia Woolf: Mrs. Dalloway, To the Lighthouse, The Waves* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992)

——, 'The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia', *The Common Reader, Second Series*, ed. by Andrew McNeillie (Orlando, FL: Mariner Books, 2003), pp. 32-42

——, *Mrs Dalloway's Party: a Short Story Sequence* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1973)

——, *Orlando: a Biography* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1928)

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, ed. by Herbert Weir Smyth and Carleton L. Brownson (New York, NY, Cincinnati, OH, and Chicago, IL: American Book Company, 1908)

——, *Xenophontos Hellenikon historion biblia Z'. Accessit Cl. viri Henrici Dodwelli Chronologia Xenophontea*, trans. into Latin by Henry Dodwell (Oxford: 1700)

Xenophon of Ephesos, *An Ephesian Tale*, trans. by Graham Anderson, in *Collected Greek Novels*, ed. by B. P. Reardon (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1989), pp.1250-169

Zandvoort, R. W., *Sidney's Arcadia: a Comparison Between the Two Versions* (Amsterdam: Springer Netherlands, 1929)

Zeki, Semir, *Splendours and Miseries of the Brain: Love, Creativity and the Quest for Human Happiness* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009)