Micha Lazarus

St John's College, Oxford

'Aristotle's *Poetics* in Renaissance England'

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term, 2013

‘Aristotle’s *Poetics* in Renaissance England’

Micha Lazarus
St John’s College, Oxford

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term, 2013

ABSTRACT

This thesis brings to light evidence for the circulation and first-hand reception of Aristotle’s *Poetics* in sixteenth-century England. Though the *Poetics* upended literary thinking on the Continent in the period, it has long been considered either unavailable in England, linguistically inaccessible to the Greekless English, or thoroughly mediated for English readers by Italian criticism. This thesis revisits the evidentiary basis for each of these claims in turn. A survey of surviving English booklists and library catalogues, set against the work’s comprehensive sixteenth-century print-history, demonstrates that the *Poetics* was owned by and readily accessible to interested readers; two appendices list verifiable and probable owners of the *Poetics* respectively. Detailed philological analysis of passages from Sir Philip Sidney’s *Defence of Poesie* proves that he translated directly from the Greek; his and his contemporaries’ reading methods indicate the text circulated bilingually as standard. Nor was Sidney’s polyglot access unusual in literary circles: re-examination of the history of Greek education in sixteenth-century England indicates that Greek literacy was higher and more widespread than traditional histories of scholarship have allowed. On the question of mediation, a critical historiography makes clear that the inherited assumption of English reliance on Italian intermediaries for classical criticism has drifted far from the primary evidence. Under these reconstituted historical conditions, some of the outstanding episodes in the sixteenth-century English reception of the *Poetics* from John Cheke and Roger Ascham in the 1540s to Sidney and John Harington in the 1580s and 1590s are reconsidered as articulate evidence of reading, thinking about, and responding to Aristotle’s defining contribution to Renaissance literary thought.

112,000 words

To Mom and Dad

for the initial concept
and editing since birth

Som peeces remaine, like broken Iewelles, whereby men may rightlie esteme, and iustlie lament, the losse of the whole.

Roger Ascham

Contents

	Acknowledgements	i
	Conventions	iii
	Abbreviations	iv
	Lists of tables and figures	vi
	Introduction	1
I.	*Chaekus habet*: The Circulation of the *Poetics* in England	20
II.	Sidney’s Greek *Poetics*	71
III.	Reading Greek in Renaissance England	108
IV.	Syncretists, Systematizers, and the Critical Tradition	150
V.	*Prolegomena*	202
	Conventions for Appendices I and II	238
	Appendix I	239
	Appendix II	261
	Works Cited	270

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I arrived at St John's College an undergraduate in 2002, and it has been my second home for seven years: for its President and Fellows, for all its inhabitants, from buttery to porters' lodge, domestic office to library, I will forever feel great warmth and gratitude. I could not have undertaken this course of study without the support of an Arts and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Studentship, supplemented at critical moments by the English Faculty's Maxwell and Meyerstein Fund, by a Minor Research Grant from the Bibliographical Society, and by travel and book grants from my college; the Bodleian Libraries encouraged and furthered my work by awarding me the Gordon Duff Prize in 2012.

Any work of this nature incurs a throng of debts to librarians, archivists, and library staff. Their hospitality and assistance has been bestowed upon me, in Oxford, at All Souls, Balliol, Brasenose, Christ Church, Corpus Christi, Lincoln, Magdalen, Merton, and St John's Colleges, and of course at the Bodleian Library; in Cambridge, at the Parker Library (Corpus Christi), the Ward Library (Peterhouse), and the Wren Library (Trinity), at King's, Pembroke, and St John's Colleges, at the University Library, and at Sidney Sussex College, which housed me for the duration of a delightful week of manuscript-hunting. I am also grateful to the staff at the libraries of Eton College, Edinburgh University, and Lincoln Cathedral for answering unreasonably detailed questions I was not able to pose in person, and to a host of rare-book vendors who sent me images of owners' inscriptions in their books while kindly maintaining the fiction that I might be able to purchase them.

The scholars worldwide who have shone the generous light of their expertise upon the one, many, sometimes repeated questions I have sprung upon them, would make a small and very erudite village. Many are acknowledged in the notes to this thesis, but a few deserve special mention. At the Bodleian I was set right early by Dr Alan Coates and Ms Sarah Wheale, and late by Mr Richard Ovenden. Without Mr Julian Reid, Dr Robin Darwall-Smith, Ms Joanna Snelling, and Dr Julia Walworth, my appendices would be a poorer thing by far. Dr Elisabeth Leedham-Green was unfailingly generous in sharing her work and talking probate records on a bucolic afternoon in Darwin College. Prof. Paul Grendler, Prof. Jill Kraye, and Prof. Craig Kallendorf urged on my induction into the Aldine mysteries; Dr Theodor Dunkelgrün was able to decipher puzzles beyond mortals' linguistic reach; Dr Alan Bryson, Dr Fred Schurink, Prof. Jeremy Smith, and most of all Prof. John McDiarmid gave me much on Cheke; Dr Jane Masseglia helped with the third act of Chapter III; Dr Paul S. Needham's generosity no less than his research was a model of scholarship. To Chris Churchill, for the Latin, David Crane, for the Greek, and the indefatigable congregants of the Kendrew *Poetics* group, this thesis owes its core; thanks to Dr Nicola Gardini and the Petrarch Reading Group I was able to talk about poetry during the last four years, which meant more than they know; Dr Tom Roebuck raised the stakes for a generation of Oxonians a year or two in his wake. I am deeply grateful to Mr Nigel Wilson for his expertise in Greek and dinner conversation (in English, for my benefit). Though Prof. Robert Stillman may not remember an email from a young scholar just starting out on Sidney and the *Poetics*, his warm encouragement and generous advice started me off on the right track when I had little clue where it might take me. And though I met Prof. Henry Woudhuysen more recently, his detailed comments and exacting standards will continue to better my work for years to come.

Teaching is everything. My supervisor, Prof. Richard McCabe, set his sure hand to this project at every stage and guided it through tempests. I have learned much and will learn more from my teachers at Berkeley, Prof. Maura Nolan, Prof. Dan Blanton, and Prof. David

Landreth. And without my undergraduate tutors I would not be writing these acknowledgements: Prof. John Kelly, Dr Carolyne Larrington, Dr David Cunnington, and Dr John Pitcher, who has since become a mentor, colleague, and friend whose galvanic intellect and conviction charges every aspect of my reading.

The thanks I owe friends and family is too voluminous to detail. For my closest friends in diverse lands, Thomas Owens, Jonah Rosenberg, Sean Curran, Paul Kosmin, Obioma Ofoego, Stephen Hartley, Elliot Harris, Jessica Fay, Philip and Bonnie Wulff, Claude Willan and Rebecca Munson, Ben Saltzman, Monica Huerta, and my siblings, Lili, Kiks, and Miri, no specifics. You nourish and buoy me in all places and at all times; you have shaped me and my work from epigraph to footnotes.

The greatest debt I owe is recorded in the dedication to this thesis, from Brahms in the womb to Odysseus in the car. But a debt almost as great is owed to Jennifer Miller, who in the last few years has heard every word of this thesis, and every word not of this thesis, and whose brimming pallette of intellect, wisdom, and deep emotion colours my every day: 'there never was a world for her | Except the one she sang and, singing, made.'

Conventions

Citations of the *Poetics* and the *Defence of Poesie*

Numerous editions of Aristotle's *Poetics* and Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* are cited in this thesis. Unless indicated otherwise, such citations refer to Kassel's and Van Dorsten's editions as described under **Abbreviations**, below. Other editions are cited by editor and date in the text, and abbreviated to *Defence* or *Poetics* respectively. All are classed beneath 'Aristotle' or 'Sidney' in the Bibliography. For example:

Defence 103	Philip Sidney, 'A Defence of Poetry' in *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones and J. A. van Dorsten (Oxford, 1973), 103.
Shepherd, *Defence* (1965), 98	Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry: or, The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (London, 1965), 98.
Poetics 1451b	Aristotle, *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*, ed. Rudolf Kassel (Oxford, 1965), 1451b.
Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 65	Aristotle, *Poetics:* editio maior *of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries*, ed. Leonardo Tarán and Dimitri Gutas (Leiden, Boston, 2012), 65.

The *Defence* is known by many names – *A/An/The Defence/Apology of/for Poesy/Poetry* – in various orthography, and some scholars have based interpretive arguments on these variations. Those arguments are not at stake here; I follow Ponsonby's 1595 edition in calling it *The Defence of Poesie* throughout.

Citations of editorial annotations

Editorial annotations from within edited texts are cited here as notes. For example: *Defence*, 290n103.6 refers to page 290 of the volume, note to page 103, line 6 of the text.

Citations of Aristotle's works

References to Aristotle's works are by Bekker number for specific lines or words, and by chapter for general discussions; both systems are represented in Kassel's edition.

Citations of classical texts

Where classical works are cited without specifying an edition, the source is that used by, for Greek texts, the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* at the University of California, Irvine, <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>; for Latin texts, the *Perseus Digital Library* at Tufts University, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>.

Translations

All translations are my own unless otherwise attributed.

ABBREVIATIONS

BCI	E. S. Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1986)
BL	London, British Library
Bod.	Oxford, Bodleian Library
Bod. Ben. Reg.	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodleian Benefactors Register
Bod. Inc. Cat.	Alan Coates, *et al.*, *A Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford* (Oxford, 2005)
Correspondence	Philip Sidney, *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Roger Kuin, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2012)
CHLC-III	Glyn P. Norton, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1999)
CWE	Erasmus, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 89 vols. projected (Toronto, 1974-)
Defence	Philip Sidney, 'A Defence of Poetry' in *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones and J. A. van Dorsten (Oxford, 1973), 59-121
EHR	*English Historical Review*
ELR	*English Literary Renaissance*
ESTC	English Short Title Catalogue (online: http://estc.bl.uk)
Giles	Roger Ascham, *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham*, ed. J. A. Giles, 4 vols. (London, 1864)
Hatch-Vos	Roger Ascham, *Letters of Roger Ascham*, ed. Alvin Vos, trans. Maurice Hatch and Alvin Vos (New York, 1989)
HUO-III	James McConica, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986)
IAAr	[= *Index Aureliensis Aristotle*] F. Edward Cranz and Charles B. Schmitt, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions, 1501-1600*, Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana 38, 2nd ed. (Baden-Baden, 1984)
ISTC	Incunabula Short Title Catalogue (online: http://istc.bl.uk)
JEGP	*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*

LCER	Sears Jayne, *Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (Godalming, Surrey, 1983)
Leader, *HUC*	Damian Riehl Leader, *A History of the University of Cambridge I: The University to 1546* (Cambridge, 1988)
Libraries of Cambridge	Peter D. Clarke, ed., *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 10 (London, 2002)
MLQ	*Modern Language Quarterly*
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004-; online: http://www.oxforddnb.com)
PLRE	R. J. Fehrenbach, E. S. Leedham-Green, and Joseph L. Black, eds., *Private Libraries in Renaissance England: A Collection and Catalogue of Tudor and Early Stuart Book-Lists* (Binghamton, NY, 1992–)
Poetics	Aristotle, *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*, ed. Rudolf Kassel (Oxford, 1965)
PRO	London, Public Records Office
RQ	*Renaissance Quarterly*
RS	*Renaissance Studies*
Scholemaster	Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong...* (London, 1570)
Schrier, *Bibliography*	Omert J. Schrier, *The Poetics of Aristotle and the Tractatus Coislinianus: a Bibliography from about 900 till 1996* (Leiden, Boston, 1998)
SCO	Edward Augustus Bond, ed., *Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1853)
SEL	*Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*
SP	*Studies in Philology*
Spingarn, *History*	Joel Elias Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, 2nd ed. [1908], fifth printing (New York, 1925)
SR	*Studies in the Renaissance*
TCBS	*Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Citations of Aristotle's *Poetics* in Sidney's *Defence of Poesie*	8
Table 2	Aristotle's *opera* not containing the *Poetics*	32
Table 3	Contents of Paris 1741 and the Aldine *Rhetores graeci*, vol. I	213

LIST OF FIGURES

fig. 1	Pietro Vettori, *Commentarii in primum librum Aristotelis De arte poetarum* (Florence 1560), 93. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Meerm. 106.	107

Introduction

to clogg a light song with a long Praeludium, is to corrupt the nature of it.

Philip Rosseter, 'To the Reader'[1]

Blind Gloucester stands in a field Poor Tom tells him is Dover cliff, at 'th'extreme verge', ready to jump. Gloucester believes the field is the cliff. We prefer to believe what Poor Tom tells *us*, that the stage is a field; we know his father's scene is make-believe, though Tom's, and Lear's and Cordelia's, we make-believe are real so they will work on us. Just as Gloucester renounces the world and readies himself to fall, Tom turns to the audience on an explanatory impulse, and speaks 'aside':

> Why I do trifle thus with his despaire,
> Is done to cure it.[2]

Here might be an agent of *katharsis* delivering a fine definition of his work; all the necessary elements are accounted for, *mutatis mutandis*, from a negative passion (despair, in place of Aristotle's pity and fear and 'such emotions') to a kind of ludic homeopathic operation (the 'trifling' evocation of Gloucester's despair appears to bear, or to be, its own cure).[3] Poor Tom imagines his play performing for Gloucester in fractal miniature something like what the *Tragedie of King Lear* as a whole might, by the light of Aristotelian theory, perform for us.

---

[1] Rosseter, *A Booke of Ayres, set foorth to be song to the Lute, Orpherian, and Base Violl* (London, 1601), sig. A2v.

[2] *The Tragedie of King Lear*, 4.5.2240f., in Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, *et al.*, Original-spelling ed. (Oxford, 1986).

[3] *Poetics* 1449b24-8: '*ἔστιν οὖν τραγῳδία μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας*... *δι' ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν*' [tragedy, then, is a *mimesis* of serious actions... through pity and fear accomplishing the *katharsis* of such emotions]. The '*katharsis* clause' has been variously interpreted, but the homeopathic interpretation has been available since at least Vettori's commentary of 1560 and Minturno's *L'Arte Poetica* of 1563: see Veselin Kostić, 'Aristotle's Catharsis in Renaissance Poetics', *Živa Antika* 10 (1960), 61-74, and summaries of classic positions in Stephen Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics* (London, 1986), 350-56.

Aristotle's *Poetics* may not in fact be Shakespeare's inspiration here – nor is Shakespeare's inspiration strictly discoverable – but it may, surely, be imagined among the available possibilities. The *Poetics* upended literary thinking on the Continent throughout the sixteenth century, galvanising generic experiment and vernacular movements, and providing a critical vocabulary still in use today. Yet among literary scholars the influence of the *Poetics* on Shakespeare and his contemporaries is largely considered out of the question, foreclosed by a scholarly consensus, or at least an ever-available scholarly objection, that the *Poetics* was little known, little read, and little understood in England before the critical maturation of Jonson. 'It is highly unlikely that Shakespeare and his fellow playwrights were acquainted with Aristotle's *Poetics*', wrote Martha Rozett in 1979;[4] 'the dramatists and their audiences did not know (and probably would not have cared to know) what Aristotle said', agreed Linda Bensel-Meyers a decade later. 'Aristotle's own theories of drama... were not very accessible', she continued: 'when they reached England from the continent in the form of faulty translations of his *Poetics*, much of the most vital drama had already been written'.[5] And more recently, in the 2007 *Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies*, Janette Dillon vented her frustration that 'the classical name most often associated with the study of Shakespeare nowadays, for no very good reason, is Aristotle': 'Shakespeare, along with most of his contemporaries, almost certainly never read his major work on tragedy, the *Poetics*', which was 'not translated into English until the eighteenth century'; sixteenth and early-seventeenth century definitions of tragedy, 'though often based, sometimes unwittingly, on Aristotle... did not generally derive from a direct reading of his *Poetics* but from commentaries such as Robortello's or late Roman mediations of Aristotle's text, often further mediated through subsequent writers.'[6] Considering the remit of the Cambridge Introductions,

[4] Rozett, 'Aristotle, the Revenger, and the Elizabethan Audience', *SP* 76.3 (1979), 248.

[5] Bensel-Meyers, 'Empowering the Audience: The Rhetorical Poetics of Renaissance Drama', *Style* 23.1 (1989), 73-5.

[6] Dillon, *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies* (Cambridge, 2007), 2, 9.

Dillon must have considered the absence of the *Poetics* from the Renaissance literary scene 'essential information' for students in the field; certainly Tanya Pollard, though arguing for the work's availability, observed in 2010 that 'scholars typically claim that this text, which was neither translated into English nor printed in England before the seventeenth century, has no bearings on the English Renaissance'.[7]

This outright exclusion of the *Poetics* from sixteenth-century English literary discourse is peculiar to literary scholarship. Historians integrate the work into the history of English reading and education quite readily. In the standard history of the University of Oxford for this period, James McConica outlines the texts Richard Fox prescribed for study when he established England's first public lectureship in Greek in 1517, at the just-founded Corpus Christi College, Oxford:

> On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Greek grammar was taught along with the speeches of Isocrates, Lucian, or Philostratus; on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, the lecturer was to read the poets and rhetoricians: Aristophanes, Theocritus, Euripides, Sophocles, Pindar, Hesiod, or another of the *antiquissimi Graeci poetae*, with something of Demosthenes, Thucydides, Aristotle (presumably the *Rhetoric* or *Poetics*), Theophrastus, or Plutarch; on feasts he would provide Homer's epigrams or something of the 'divine Plato' or a Greek theologian.[8]

'Presumably... the *Poetics*': Aristotle's *Poetics* is not, in fact, specified in Fox's statutes, but for McConica it seems a reasonable assumption. The Greek text had been printed for the first time in 1508, at Aldus's press in Venice, and certainly there were such Englishmen then alive as Thomas Linacre, whose connections with Italy and the English universities alike could have brought it across the channel in the next decade.[9]

---

7 *Ibid.*, second front flyleaf *verso*; Tanya Pollard, 'Tragedy and Revenge' in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy*, ed. Emma Smith and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (Cambridge, 2010), 62.

8 McConica, 'The Rise of the Undergraduate College', *HUO-III*, 22.

9 Linacre certainly introduced the great Aldine Aristotle of 1495-98 – which did *not* print the *Poetics* – into England in this period: for its circulation among his friends see Margaret Lane Ford, 'Private Ownership of Printed Books' in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, III: 1400-1557*, ed. Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp (Cambridge, 1999), 225-7.

In fact, what we know of the patchy early absorption of the *Poetics* into the canon of Aristotle's works and the university curricula based upon it casts doubt on McConica's assumption. Fragmentary records of individuals lecturing on the *Poetics* appear in Italy from the 1490s, but substantial coverage begins in the 1540s, by which time the Greek text had issued several more times from presses in Venice, Paris, and then Basel, and gained the Latin translation that would become standard for most of the century.[10] For the *Poetics* to have been the subject of lectures at Oxford in 1517 is not impossible, though on the basis of our current knowledge it would have been extraordinary. Nonetheless, the disciplinary point here is that for historians the diaspora of the *Poetics* seems straightforward. After the Greek was printed in 1508, it could be read and taught in Greek. After Pazzi's Latin translation was printed in 1536, it could be read and taught in Latin; after Segni's Italian of 1549, in Italian. As early as the 1540s, Roger Ascham reports 'pleasant talkes' at Cambridge comparing the neo-Latin tragedies of George Buchanan and Thomas Watson to '*Aristotles* preceptes and *Euripides* examples'.[11] The historian's *Poetics* behaves like any other text in the *corpus aristotelicum*, a body of knowledge whose drift into northern Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century 'is obvious and has been noted often by scholars'.[12]

For the literary scholar, on the contrary, the *Poetics* is scarcely to be found in England before the seventeenth century. Far from its movement north being obvious, Colin Burrow observes that 'the criticism of Aristotle... was slow to naturalize in England'; the same 'slow reception' explains the 'surprising omission' of the *Poetics* from the works included in Brian Vickers's anthology of English Renaissance literary criticism.[13] Taking the case of Sir Philip Sidney as an example, Noam Reisner is more explicit about the conditions governing this

---

10 These records of teaching are discussed in Chapter V.

11 *Scholemaster* 57; also discussed in Chapter V.

12 Luca Bianchi, 'Continuity and Change in the Aristotelian Tradition' in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge, 2007), 55.

13 Colin Burrow, 'Combative Criticism: Jonson, Milton, and Classical Literary Criticism in England', *CHLC-III*, 487; Brian Vickers, ed., *English Renaissance Literary Criticism* (Oxford, 1999), 11 and n16.

‘slow recovery’:

> Bearing in mind that Sidney most likely never read the *Poetics* first hand, but only a summary of its ideas in a number of possible Italian sources, we have to be cautious here... While Sidney read Aristotle at Oxford, perhaps even in the original Greek, he would not have had access there to the *Poetics*. It is far more likely that he read derivative excerpts from the *Poetics* in Italian commentaries.[14]

Access to the text, access to the Greek in which it was written, second-hand mediation through Italian sources: when both Reisner and Vickers cite in support of their positions Marvin Herrick’s *The Poetics of Aristotle in England*, a 1925 Ph.D. thesis first published in 1930, it is clear that these conditions have underpinned the field for a very long time.

Underlying this disciplinary dichotomy is the fact that the *Poetics* was indeed, both in its bibliography and its influence, a very unusual text. Recovered in mid-fifteenth century Italy, it arrived late enough to the Aristotelian *corpus* to avoid most of the scholastic superstructures so opposed (in theory, if much less in practice) by the proponents of the ‘new learning’. As a result, the *Poetics* was generically amphibious. It circulated both as a work of Aristotelian philosophy and as a treatise on aesthetics, at once a recovery from ancient Athens and a new work from Renaissance Italy. It inherited no curricular role in the universities which were responsible for the spread of Aristotelian influence throughout Europe, but at the same time moved through literary circles in the universities’ orbit, to whose conversation it was more immediately germane than, say, the *Sophistical Refutations*. Even within the Aristotelian system it was of uncertain placement: late-Alexandrian and Arabic commentators had included it among Aristotle’s logical works, but it was rediscovered in partnership with, and often printed alongside, the *Rhetoric*. The *Poetics* was less Aristotelian, or less simply Aristotelian, than would support McConica’s estimate of its English *début* in 1517, even if it

[14] Noam Reisner, ‘The Paradox of Mimesis in Sidney’s Defence of Poesie and Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus’, *The Cambridge Quarterly* 39.4 (2010), 334.

was far more Aristotelian than would suggest an arrival as late as the seventeenth century.

Tracing the influence of the *Poetics* is further complicated by the fact that it is the only Aristotle we still read as an active text, rather than as a purely historical artefact. As early as 1909 Ingram Bywater could remark that many of its readers' familiarity with Aristotle 'begins and ends with this one work of his';[15] today, even beyond its widespread use in secondary and tertiary education in the humanities, it is encountered in vocational courses on screenwriting,[16] and students may crib from its appearance in *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Screenwriting*, or Michael Tierno's *Aristotle's Poetics for Screenwriters: Storytelling Secrets from the Greatest Mind in Western Civilization*.[17] In 2007 Michael Lesslie, a fast-rising London playwright, reflected that his education had come 'from Marber, from reading Pinter and from Aristotle's *Poetics*... if you're going to deviate from a grammar, it's best to know that grammar inside-out first'.[18] The *Poetics* is thus historiographically unstable: the operations of its grammar, the criteria by which we might chart its historical influence, continue to be transformed by new interpretations as they arise, and there is investment in the outcome of such interpretations in a way not often felt for, say, the *Sophistical Refutations*. It has proven difficult to trace in the past ideas whose lineaments continue to shift in the present.

I mention these evasive subtleties of the work's historiography here because for the most part they have been pre-empted by the foregone conclusions of literary scholarship. This is not simply a matter of Shakespeare's small Latin: 'even Sidney', Dillon observes, 'may have known the *Poetics* only indirectly'.[19] Sidney has long been the true litmus test of the

15 Bywater, *Poetics* (1909), v.

16 Lew Hunter, *Lew Hunter's Screenwriting 434* (New York, 2004), urges his students to read it every three or four years: 'those are the few rules we have and need' (20).

17 Skip Press, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Screenwriting*, 3rd ed. (New York, 2008), 5-6; Michael Tierno, *Aristotle's Poetics for Screenwriters* (New York, 2002); Tierno's epigraph, from a 1999 *Entertainment Weekly* cover-story, likens the *Poetics* to Sun-Tzu's *Art of War* for Hollywood screenwriters and refers to its being taught in writing courses at UCLA and the University of Southern California.

18 'Arts Spotlight: Michael Lesslie – the boy can't help it', *The Independent*, 30 December 2007.

19 Dillon, *Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies*, 12.

Poetics's absorption in pre-seventeenth-century England, because his *Defence of Poesie* exhibits by far the best *prima facie* evidence of its time of an Englishman's intimate familiarity with the work. Sidney cites Aristotle's *Poetics* directly twice, naming both author and text, and unambiguously by author and precept another four times. These are summarised in Table 1:

Table 1: Citations of Aristotle's *Poetics* in Sidney's *Defence of Poesie*

Defence	**cf. *Poetics***
Poesy therefore is an art of imitation, for so Aristotle termeth it in the word *μίμησις* – that is to say, a representing, counterfeiting, or figuring forth – to speak metaphorically, a speaking picture – with this end, to teach and delight. (79.35-80.2)	*ἐποποιία δὴ καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποίησις ἔτι δὲ κωμῳδία καὶ ἡ διθυραμβοποιητικὴ καὶ τῆς αὐλητικῆς ἡ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι τυγχάνουσιν οὖσαι μιμήσεις τὸ σύνολον* [Epic poetry and the making of tragedy, and also comedy and dithyrambic poetry and most flute- and cithara-playing, all happen to be *mimeses*, generally speaking] (1447a13-16, etc.)
Aristotle himself, in his discourse of poesy, plainly determineth this question, saying that poetry is *φιλοσοφώτερον* and *σπουδαιότερον*, that is to say, it is more philosophical and more studiously serious than history. His reason is, because poesy dealeth with *καθόλου*, that is to say, with the universal consideration, and the history with *καθέκαστον*, the particular: now, saith he, the universal weighs what is fit to be said or done, either in likelihood or necessity (which the poesy considereth in his imposed names), and the particular only marks whether Alcibiades did, or suffered, this or that. Thus far Aristotle: which reason of his (as all his) is most full of reason. (87.34-88.9)	*τούτῳ διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἡ δ' ἱστορία τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον λέγει. ἔστιν δὲ καθόλου μέν, τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποῖα ἄττα συμβαίνει λέγειν ἢ πράττειν κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, οὗ στοχάζεται ἡ ποίησις ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθεμένη· τὸ δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον, τί Ἀλκιβιάδης ἔπραξεν ἢ τί ἔπαθεν* [in this he [the historian] differs [from the poet], in that the one speaks of such things as have occurred, the other such things as might occur. Because of this, poetry is both more philosophical and more serious than history: for poetry speaks more of universals, and history of particulars. The universal is a certain kind of thing which falls to a certain kind of man to say or do, according to likelihood or necessity, at which poetry aims when it imposes names; the particular, what Alcibiades did or what he suffered] (1451b4-11)
That imitation whereof poetry is, hath the most conveniency to nature of all other, insomuch that, as Aristotle saith, those things which in themselves are horrible, as cruel battles, unnatural monsters, are made in poetical imitation delightful. (92.24-26)	*ἐοίκασι δὲ γεννῆσαι μὲν ὅλως τὴν ποιητικὴν αἰτίαι δύο τινὲς καὶ αὗται φυσικαί... ἃ γὰρ αὐτὰ λυπηρῶς ὁρῶμεν, τούτων τὰς εἰκόνας τὰς μάλιστα ἠκριβωμένας χαίρομεν θεωροῦντες, οἷον θηρίων τε μορφὰς τῶν ἀτιμοτάτων καὶ νεκρῶν* [it seems that poetry originates, on the whole, from two particular causes, both of them natural... for we enjoy looking at the most accurate images of things which are in themselves painful to see] (1448b4-12)
Aristotle writes the Art of Poesy; and why, if it should not be written? (109.16-17)	
[*Gorboduc*] is faulty in both place and time, the two necessary companions of all corporal actions. For where the stage should always represent but one place, and the uttermost time presupposed in it should be, both by Aristotle's precept and common reason, but one day, there is both many days, and many places, inartificially imagined (113.8-13)	*ἔτι δὲ τῷ μήκει· ἡ μὲν ὅτι μάλιστα πειρᾶται ὑπὸ μίαν περίοδον ἡλίου εἶναι ἢ μικρὸν ἐξαλλάττειν* [as for its length, tragedy mostly attempts to occur within a single period of the sun or to vary a little] (1449b12-13)
And the great fault even in that point of laughter, and forbidden plainly by Aristotle, is that they stir laughter in sinful things, which are rather execrable than ridiculous, or in miserable, which are rather to be pitied than scorned. (116.5-7)	*τὸ γὰρ γελοῖόν ἐστιν ἁμάρτημά τι καὶ αἶσχος ἀνώδυνον καὶ οὐ φθαρτικόν, οἷον εὐθὺς τὸ γελοῖον πρόσωπον αἰσχρόν τι καὶ διεστραμμένον ἄνευ ὀδύνης* [the laughable consists in some fault or ugliness neither painful nor destructive: for example, the comic mask is ugly and distorted without pain] (1449a34-37; cf. *Ethics* 1128a4-9)

There are in addition about fifteen more passages in the *Defence* sometimes referred to the *Poetics*, Aristotelian by common association if not by name or exclusive reference: these include the arguments that verse is ‘but an ornament and no cause to poetry’,[20] that tragedy operates ‘with stirring the affects of admiration and commiseration’,[21] and Sidney’s report of the opinion that ‘tragedy is tied to the laws of poesy, and not of history.’[22] Aristotle, in short, is everywhere in the *Defence*, more in evidence than Scaliger, who is four times mentioned by name, or than Horace (five); in evidence enough, certainly, for its earliest editor, Dr Joseph Warton, to remark that Sidney read widely enough to be versed in even ‘the best Latin and Italian commentaries on *Aristotle’s* Poetics’.[23]

Yet the strength of his obvious debt to Aristotle is precisely what qualifies Sidney to be the test case when doubt is raised about the reception of the *Poetics* in sixteenth-century England. Could it be shown that Sidney, of all people, was ignorant of the *Poetics*, the ignorance of his contemporaries, for whom the burden of proof is lighter, may be safely

---

[20] *Defence* 81.24-7; cf. *Poetics* 1447b13-23, 1451a38-1451b4, 1451b27-28, etc. As numerous editors have pointed out, the sentiment was a critical commonplace from Quintilian to Sir Thomas Elyot: e.g. Van Dorsten, *Defence* (1973), 191n81.24-5; Gregory Smith, ed., *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1904), I.388n159.35; Shepherd, *Defence* (1965), 64n103.19. Nonetheless, its primary associations were with an Aristotelian position – one championed by the *Poetics*, and one Aristotle was invoked to champion – enough that Vettori, in his commentary on the *Poetics* (Florentiae, 1560), was forced onto the defensive when he admitted to preferring verse: ‘nec me latet habere me multos, qui aliter de hac re sentiant’ (12).

[21] *Defence* 96.21-26, cf. *Poetics* 1459b27-28: ‘*ἔστιν οὖν τραγῳδία μίμησις πράξεως... δι’ ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν*’ [tragedy, then, is an imitation of actions... through pity and fear effecting the catharsis of such passions]. The substitution of ‘admiration’ for ‘fear’ can be overdetermined: Italian critics such as Minturno do use ‘admiration’, but the term had long and often been used in this context; Henri Estienne, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, 5 vols. (Geneva, 1572), III.1353, defines the verb *τραγῳδεῖν* as ‘in admirationem & terrorem vertitur’, and in any case the term is consonant with Aristotle’s discussions of *τὸ θαυμαστόν* [the marvelous] and *ἔκπληξις* [emotional impact], e.g. *Poetics* 1460a11-18,1460b22-26; *Rhetoric* 1371b4-12, too, invoking the terms and concerns of the *Poetics*, defines ‘*αἵ περιπέτειαι καὶ τὸ παρὰ μικρὸν σώζεσθαι ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων*’ [*peripeteiai* and narrow escapes from danger] as causes of *θαυμαστὰ*. See Baxter Hathaway, *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy* (Ithaca, NY, 1962), 205-300; Allan H. Gilbert, ed., *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (New York, NY, 1940), 459-61; and especially J. V. Cunningham, ‘Wonder’ in *The Collected Essays of J. V. Cunningham* (Chicago, IL, 1976), 53-96.

[22] *Defence* 114.3, cf. *Poetics* 1460b13-15: ‘*οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ ὀρθότης ἐστὶν τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς οὐδὲ ἄλλης τέχνης καὶ ποιητικῆς*’ [the same standard of correctness does not hold for politics and poetry, nor for poetry and any other art]. The resemblance to the *Poetics* is strengthened by the consistency of Sidney’s terms here with his earlier direct citation of Aristotle on history as factual/particular, poetry as fictional/general (see Table 1).

[23] Warton, *Defence* (1787), sig. a2^{v}.

assumed. If ‘even Sidney’ didn’t know the *Poetics*, that is, no one did; and the consensus of editors and scholars is that Sidney, indeed, did not. Katherine Duncan-Jones, in her Oxford World’s Classics edition of the *Defence* (1989), omits the *Poetics* entirely from her list of Sidney’s sources:

> Among Sidney’s models were Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* (which he is said to have translated); Horace’s *De arte poetica*; J. C. Scaliger’s *Poetices libri septem* (1561); Serranus’s edition of Plato (1578); Amyot’s preface to his translation of Plutarch’s *Lives* (translated by North in 1579); and various Italian theorists such as Minturno (*De Poeta*, 1559).[24]

Peter Herman goes one step further in his edition of 2001. Observing that ‘Sidney’s ideas are not original’, and that ‘he draws much of what he has to say in poetry’s defense from Italian literary criticism – Julius Caesar Scaliger in particular’, Herman aims to contextualise the *Defence* by printing ‘selected attacks and defenses’ exemplifying ‘the Quarrel over Poetry’.[25] Those texts include a wide range of authorities, from the familiar (Plato, Scaliger) to the recondite (Richard Willes, two extracts from Theodore Beza). Yet the *Poetics*, despite having been recognised as a defence against Plato’s attack since at least the 1540s and being cited directly in Herman’s extract from Scaliger, not to mention by Sidney, is not among them. Instead, we learn from a note to the *Defence* that ‘Sidney’s citation of the *Poetics* is unusual, since this text was not yet well-known in England’.[26]

These are not casual omissions: Herman’s 1996 book on ‘Renaissance antipoetic sentiment’ lacks even an entry for Aristotle in the index; Duncan-Jones’s 1991 biography of Sidney mentions the *Poetics* only once, in the context of the citation most easily (and canonically) attributed to an Italian critic.[27] Nor do they come of brevity: Duncan-Jones’s list,

24 Duncan-Jones, *Defence* (1989), 371 (headnote to the *Defence*).

25 Herman, *Defence* (2001), 37.

26 *Ibid.*, 78n83. For Aristotle’s response to Plato, see Vincenzo Maggi, *In Aristotelis librum De poetica communes explanationes* (Venice, 1550), 37: ‘Egit tamen de Poesi potissimùm, fortè ob Platonem, atque alios multos, qui poetis erant insensi; ut Poeseos tum dignitatem, tum usum ostenderet’.

27 Peter C. Herman, *Squitter-Wits and Muse-Haters: Sidney, Spenser, Milton, and Renaissance Antipoetic*

in particular, is a *précis* of almost a century's worth of source-hunting. Horace's influence on the *Defence* was always apparent; Scaliger, though mentioned by Sidney's early biographers and editors, really entered the mainstream with Joel Spingarn's seminal *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (1899); Minturno, too, arrived with Spingarn, and Sidney's debt to him was influentially detailed in Kenneth Myrick's *Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (1935); Serranus's Plato was a more recent addition to the canon, having been proposed in Jan Van Dorsten's edition of the *Defence* (1973) and confirmed by S. K. Heninger in 1983, while Sidney's debts to Plato himself had been investigated since the 1940s, and Amyot's 'Preface' introduced by Marguerite Hearsey in 1933.[28] The *Poetics*, of course, had been posited as a source since Dr. Warton's edition in 1787, but despite this, and despite the fact that it is directly cited more than any of these other authorities save Plato, Duncan-Jones considers only the *Rhetoric*, quoted once and never named,[29] a legitimate inclusion among Sidney's Aristotelian sources. Nor even, finally, do these editors deny Sidney's borrowings from the *Poetics* in individual cases: when prompted by the text of the *Defence* itself, both cite the *Poetics* transparently in their editorial notes on at least a few occasions, Duncan-Jones for 'admiration and commiseration' and the second and third of the passages in Table 1, Herman for all but the third, which is not annotated.[30] The *Poetics* is omitted, that is, from the *Defence*'s general debts, even as it is adduced to gloss its specific debts. Given the apparent contradiction this entails, and the weight of Sidney's direct citations of Aristotle, the evidence for Herman's and Duncan-Jones's positions must be considerable indeed.

Sentiment (Detroit, 1996); Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney, Courtier Poet* (New Haven, 1991), 237 (i.e. the fifth passage in Table 1 on the 'unities').

[28] These studies are discussed in Chapter IV.

[29] *Defence* 117.8-9, 'that same forcibleness or *energia* (as the Greeks call it)', cf. *Rhetoric* 3.2. Some editors also trace *Defence* 118.27-8, 'credit of popular ears (which credit is the nearest step to persuasion, which persuasion is the chief mark of oratory)', to the general discussion of *ethos* in *Rhetoric* 2.1; see Cook, *Defence* (1890) and Shepherd, *Defence* (1965).

[30] Duncan-Jones, *Defence* (1989), 223n475, 227n625, 230n747-8; Herman, *Defence* (2001), 66n37, 78n83, 108n205, 114n236, 118n251. Herman unusually also points *Defence* 95.18, 'the bitter but wholesome Iambic', to Aristotle's association of iambic verse with satire, *Poetics* 1448b31-2; cf. Shepherd, *Defence* (1965) and Robinson, *Defence* (1970).

What is that evidence? Duncan-Jones and Herman argue by omission, but their premises appear more explicitly elsewhere. In the *Spenser Encyclopedia* (1990), we learn from Ronald A. Horton that though the *Poetics* received 'passing notice' in various English works from the 1540s on, the *Defence* was 'the first treatise in English to make substantial use of the *Poetics*':

> Sidney's discussions of the unities and of catharsis, however, show that he did not rise above his Italian contemporaries in his understanding of Aristotle. In a letter to Spenser of 7 April 1580, Harvey remarks that at Cambridge Aristotle is 'muche named, but little read'... Few Elizabethan allusions to Aristotle's critical ideas prove more than a second-hand acquaintance with the *Poetics*...[31]

An interpretation of some points in the *Defence*, a letter from Harvey: like Vickers and Reisner, Horton cites only Herrick's 1930 *Poetics of Aristotle in England* in support. Yet elsewhere Sidney's, and by extension England's, *Poetics* appears not to have been proven second-hand until after the 1960s. In Geoffrey Shepherd's encyclopaedic 1965 edition of the *Defence*, Sidney's quotation of Aristotle on poetry and history, the second passage in Table 1, is taken as an indication of his 'general Aristotelianism in artistic matters'; but when R. W. Maslen came to revise Shepherd's edition in 2002 to take account of 'critical developments of the three and a half decades since Shepherd first published his edition', he thought it necessary to add the qualification that 'it is not certain that Sidney knew the *Poetics* at first hand'.[32] For Herman, Duncan-Jones, Horton, and Maslen, the mediation and neglect of the *Poetics* in sixteenth-century England is a matter long-settled and needless of explication, although when exactly the matter was settled and by whom – whether at some point between 1965 and 2002, or by Herrick in the 1930s – is not entirely clear.

On those rare occasions that make the premises of this position explicit, as reviewed in

---

[31] Ronald A. Horton, 'Aristotle and his Commentators' in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Toronto, London, 1990), 58-9.

[32] Shepherd, *Defence* (1965), 176n109.33f.; Maslen, *Defence* (2002), 78, 168n92.20-21.

the following chapters, any of three interdependent problems of 'access' are cited: first, that the text of the *Poetics* was not available in sixteenth-century England, since it first issued from an English press (in Latin) in 1619, and appeared in English translation only in 1705; second, that even if available, the *Poetics* was written in a Greek inaccessible to the Greekless English; and third, that what ideas did cross the channel were filtered through Italian intermediaries such as Minturno, Robortello, Scaliger, and Castelvetro, all of whom had done their part in subsuming the *Poetics* into a mainstream agglomerate of rhetorical theory. Each of these premises represents, to some extent, an independent field of sixteenth-century scholarship, concerning the bibliography and circulation of the *Poetics*, Greek linguistic education in England, and the development of literary criticism across Europe, respectively. Yet each is also complexly subordinate to the larger field of classical reception in Renaissance England, and though one or another might come to the fore in a given piece of scholarship, we shall see that each stands for and even conceals the others in justifying the axiomatic commonplace that the *Poetics* was absent from the sixteenth-century English literary scene.

This thesis aims to resituate the field by substantially revising the evidentiary basis for each of these premises in turn. Chapter I establishes and describes the circulation of the work in England, by comparing the comprehensive sixteenth-century print history of the *Poetics* with surviving English library records and booklists from the period. Volumes of the *Poetics* thus identified as denizens of sixteenth-century England are detailed in Appendices I and II. Chapter II demonstrates Sidney's direct use of the *Poetics* by considering a passage in the *Defence* that can be shown, by comparison to extant translations and lexicographical sources, to have been translated *verbatim* from the Greek text. Chapter III extends the question of Greek to sixteenth-century England more generally, revisiting the detailed history of Greek learning in England to clarify a baseline both of reading competence in the language, and of how much and what kind of Greek a text like the *Poetics* actually required. This primary

historical work done, Chapter IV reassesses the question of mediation through an historiographical account of the critical field, arguing that it has been founded from the first on essentially anachronistic premises concerned more with twentieth- than sixteenth-century orthodoxies. In Chapter V, in conclusion, I explore a handful of episodes in the early reception of the *Poetics* in England which point towards some of the ways in which we might reconsider the literary and citational record in the light of this revisionary work.

This thesis thus takes the historian's side, if McConica's *a priori* assumption of the *Poetics*'s availability represents the historian's side, and swims against the current of much recent literary scholarship. But its goals are literary, not historical: it adduces archival detail for the express purpose of resurrecting the *Poetics* as a living text in sixteenth-century England, whether its vitality flowed through philological study in St John's College, fashionable debate at Gray's Inn, table-talk at the Tabard, or the midnight pause between nib and paper. This goal can, and on occasion has, been attempted by other means, many of which are considered more fully in Chapter IV but deserve introduction here.

As early as 1944 Cornell March Dowlin raised a salient challenge to the 'too casual' attribution of Italian sources for parallels in Sidney's *Defence*, attributions which portray Sidney as a 'careless reader' and an 'unoriginal thinker, i.e. as no thinker at all'.[33] Dowlin began to question the logic of mediation, demonstrating that Sidney rejected from the Italians as much as he may have taken, and further recognised that even with little Greek, Sidney could have read the complete works of Plato and Aristotle in readily available, one-volume Latin translations. As we shall see in Chapter IV, Dowlin's arguments have not been much heeded; this investigation confirms and extends them on both counts, and goes further in demonstrating Sidney's Greek reading.

More recently, with respect to Italian criticism itself, Daniel Javitch has brought some

33 Cornell March Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', *The Review of English Studies* 20.80 (1944), 258.

historiographical perspective to the Renaissance's 'so-called distortion of Aristotle's theory to make it fit mainstream ethico-rhetorical poetics', as argued influentially by Joel Spingarn and Bernard Weinberg; for Javitch, over-emphasis on this aspect of Aristotle's reception has occluded greater innovations, such as theories of genre, and privileged the contributions of theoretical texts over those of practical composition.[34] Kristine Haugen has similarly noted the 'stony silence' in literary scholarship that followed 'the middle twentieth century's interest in actively redeploying Aristotle's literary ideas', as well as the small interest afforded aesthetic questions in more recent work on Renaissance Aristotelianism, and begun to reintegrate Aristotle's aesthetics into the thriving intellectual-historical field of his philosophy and science.[35]

Javitch's and Haugen's work targets the roots of criticism in Italy; another strategy, inaugurated by Donald Stump in 1983, traces 'indirect routes' through which the influence of the *Poetics* may have spread to England. Stump recognised the 'immediate and apparently insurmountable objection' to the application of Aristotelian concepts such as *hamartia* to Elizabethan drama: 'the embarrassing fact that we have no evidence whatever of Shakespeare's direct contact with Aristotle or the Greek tragedians, or even with the neo-Aristotelian critics of the Italian Renaissance'.[36] Yet these concepts, Stump observes, are as useful in describing Shakespeare's plays as Aristotle found them in describing Greek plays, and he proceeds to explain Shakespeare's 'quasi-Aristotelian form' through 'the indirect influence of Greek tragedy': through the Roman drama of Seneca and Terence, through popular Greek romance such as Heliodorus, which itself came through Sidney's *Arcadia*, and through the Italian *novelle* of Giraldi Cinzio, *via* Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*.

---

34 Daniel Javitch, 'The Assimilation of Aristotle's Poetics in Sixteenth-Century Italy', *CHLC-III*, 58.

35 Kristine Louise Haugen, 'The Birth of Tragedy in the Cinquecento: Humanism and Literary History', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 72.3 (2011), 352, 370.

36 Donald V. Stump, 'Greek and Shakespearian Tragedy: Four Indirect Routes from Athens to London' in *Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition*, ed. Donald V. Stump *et al*. (New York, 1983), 211-13.

'Although Shakespeare may have known nothing whatever about Aristotle's *Poetics* or the plays that it describes', Stump concludes, 'he could hardly have avoided the indirect influence of Greek tragedy'.[37]

Stump's use of Giraldi Cinzio, in particular, has proved influential, because Cinzio was the author of both critical and creative works whose influence might implicitly be yoked.[38] Writing a few years after Stump, Caroline Patey suggested that Shakespeare's familiarity with Cinzio's *novelle* might be extended to his more theoretical *Discorsi*, perhaps as mediated through Florio, 'who would have been the source for Shakespeare's knowledge (if there was any) of Italian aesthetics', or through Ludovico Dolce, who followed Cinzio's example in tragedy and in turn was translated by Gascoigne in the 1570s.[39] And in the last decade Stump's model has been adopted and enriched by Sarah Dewar-Watson, who across a series of detailed essays has suggested that Shakespeare's contact with the *Poetics*, evident in the structural influence of the unities on such plays as *The Tempest*, might plausibly have come through Latin and Italian translations and commentaries, perhaps borrowed from Jonson; through Cinzio and his influence on Gascoigne (*pace* Patey); through Guarini's tragicomic art and its influence on Fletcher; or even through Cinzio and Guarini's theoretical readings of Homer's *Odyssey* as the model for an Aristotelian 'happy-ending tragedy', with Virgil and Ovid as 'mediating sources' for the *Odyssey* which Shakespeare may have used 'to develop a sense of the Greek text of which he, and many of his audience, had little or no firsthand knowledge'.[40] Even if Cinzio's theories are sometimes considered borderline 'anti-Aristotelian', Dewar-Watson's work has the advantage of remembering that, however hard the

37 *Ibid.*, 242.

38 See e.g. Sarah Dewar-Watson, 'Shakespeare's Dramatic Odysseys: Homer as a Tragicomic Model in Pericles and The Tempest', *Classical and Modern Literature* 25.1 (2005), 26: 'In the light of good evidence that Shakespeare read at least some of Cinthio's work in the original, this may well put the theoretical treatises within his range'.

39 Caroline Patey, 'Beyond Aristotle: Giraldi Cinzio and Shakespeare' in *Italy and the English Renaissance*, ed. Sergio Rossi and Daniella Savoia (Milan, 1989), 168.

40 Dewar-Watson, 'Shakespeare and Aristotle', *Literature Compass* 1.1 (2004), 1-9; 'Shakespeare's Dramatic Odysseys', 40.

Poetics set in the neo-classical edifice of the seventeenth century, in the sixteenth it was a text 'more flexible – indeed more slippery' than it became in later codification.[41]

The 'indirect routes' model, as developed between Stump and Dewar-Watson, has gained traction in recent years as a means of reconciling Aristotle's literary presence to what has seemed his historical absence.[42] It can become a little vertiginous and remains apologetically conjectural, although as this thesis will show it is rather less conjectural than contrary positions that deny Aristotle's influence outright; indeed, the baseline of access to the *Poetics* uncovered here may substitute for such apologies.

Finally, many critics simply make casual use of the *Poetics* in the analysis of Elizabethan literature, on the basis that, as Stump pointed out, it remains useful. Many of Shakespeare's editors and numerous critics continue to adopt terms of analysis from Aristotle, despite risking the opprobrium of a Janette Dillon.[43] And in Sidney's case it remains possible to overstep the tripwires of precedent and assume, as one would ordinarily assume given the weight of Aristotle's opinions in the *Defence*, that Sidney did know the *Poetics*: Kathy Eden's and S. K. Heninger's important accounts of Sidney's poetics presuppose his knowledge of Aristotle; scholars such as John Roe and Arthur Kinney have in the last few years quite comfortably discussed uses of and responses to Aristotle in England;[44] Gavin Alexander's

[41] Dewar-Watson, 'Aristotle and Tragicomedy' in *Early Modern Tragicomedy*, ed. Subha Mukherji and Raphael Lyne (Woodbridge, 2007), 26. For Cinzio's perception as anti-Aristotelian, which agrees with Shakespeare's perception as anti-Aristotelian, see e.g. Patey, 'Beyond Aristotle', 179 ('in a word, Giraldi preaches and Shakespeare does exactly what Aristotle deems negative'), and Michele Marrapodi, 'Shakespeare Against Genres' in *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literary Theories: Anglo-Italian Transactions*, ed. Michele Marrapodi (Farnham, 2011), 1-22, esp. 6-7.

[42] e.g. in Pollard, 'Tragedy and Revenge', 62-3.

[43] e.g. *Julius Caesar*, ed. David Daniell (London, 2003), 8-9; *King Henry VI, Part 3*, ed. John D. Cox and Eric Rasmussen (London, 2001), 102; *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. René Weis (London, 2012), 1. David Bevington, 'Tragedy in Shakespeare's Career' in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, ed. Claire McEachern (Cambridge, 2002), 62-5, contrasts 'non-Aristotelian' tragedies such as *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*, with those such as *Othello* and *Macbeth* that 'might well illustrate Shakespeare's understanding of Aristotle's definitions of tragedy, if we had any reason to think that Shakespeare cared about Aristotle and the critical tradition that descended from him' (62).

[44] S. K. Heninger, *Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker* (University Park, London, 1989), and see Chapter IV, n129; Kathy Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition* (Princeton, 1986); John Roe, 'Theories of Literary Kinds' in *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2010), II.3-14; Arthur F. Kinney, 'The Position of Poetry: Making and

recent edition of the *Defence* likewise has Sidney reading the *Poetics* directly. Where Sidney's rendering of Aristotle on history and poetry caused Maslen to question his first-hand knowledge, Alexander finds it sufficiently close to suggest that 'Sidney, for once perhaps, has the book open in front of him as he writes', and implicitly challenges the over-determination of citational evidence by setting it in the light of Sidney's creative intelligence: Sidney 'can see that much is to be learned from Aristotle, but he absorbs rather than reflects this learning in his development of the literary theory presented in the *Defence* and in his writing of, for instance, the *Arcadia*'.[45]

I am entirely in sympathy with such approaches, which my findings justify. Indeed, this thesis itself began as an inquiry into Sidney's absorption of Aristotle into the practical poetics of his creative work, with the aim of tracing the 'indirect' influence of the *Poetics*, through the *Arcadia*, on Shakespeare and his contemporaries as they claimed Sidney and reclaimed Aristotle for the stage. But it became quickly and forcefully clear that while many scholars quite reasonably take Sidney's knowledge of the *Poetics* for granted, none has explicitly challenged the historical accuracy of the prevailing view, which has thus remained ever and readily available for those who, for whatever reason, wish to foreclose conversation about the influence of the *Poetics* in England, about the possibility that poetic practice might have had something to say about theory, and about a *Poetics* which was a more plastic text in the Renaissance than the prescriptive work it has become today. As the coming chapters will show, the historical conditions invoked to argue the absence of the *Poetics* from sixteenth-century England are illusory, though they are illusions scholars have taken to be concrete for over a century. This thesis aims primarily to dismantle such misconceptions, and to lay a new foundation for further research and commentary on the *Poetics* as a germinal text creatively received by poets and dramatists. Much to my regret, it performs the work of literary analysis

Defending Renaissance Poetics' in *ibid.*, II.15-27.

[45] Alexander, *Defence* (2004), lvii, 330n76.

itself only incidentally and in limited fashion. But then, literary analysis requires literary methods, which have so far been considered insufficient firmly to establish the presence, and consequently to render visible the creative and intellectual diffusion, of the *Poetics* in Renaissance England. The true conclusions of this thesis, that is, have yet to be written; they will emerge not from library records, title-page inscriptions, or lexicographical *lemmata*, but from the willingness of critics to hear a trace of Greek on the wind at Dover cliffs.

Chapter I

Chaekus habet: The Circulation of the *Poetics* in England

Beware, sir, of acquiring the habit of reading catalogues; you will never get any good from it, and it will consume much of your time.

Dr Routh[1]

'While Sidney read Aristotle at Oxford, perhaps even in the original Greek, he would not have had access there to the *Poetics*'.[2] Even granted some Greek, even at Oxford, Sidney's lack of access to the text of the *Poetics* is enough for Reisner to consign him to the commentaries. This construction has held for most of the last century, despite occasional correctives: Sarah Dewar-Watson's remark that 'there was widespread reliance on Latin editions of Greek texts' was as salient in 2004 as was Cornell March Dowlin's sixty years earlier, that 'the complete works of both Plato and Aristotle... were conveniently at hand in one-volume Latin translations', such as Simon Grynaeus's 1538 Latin Aristotle, which 'one can be pretty confident that Sidney knew'.[3] Yet when in 2006 Henry Turner subjected the circulation of Aristotle's *Poetics* in England to the most thorough analysis it has received to date, he concluded that it was indeed negligibly scarce. A survey of Cambridge library records confirmed Turner's assessment of the 'ethical orientation of English Aristotelianism more generally', discovering about four times as many copies of the *Nichomachean Ethics* and *Rhetoric* as the *Poetics*, and nearly twice as many of the *Politics*. Indeed, he found that 'the number of possible editions to include the *Poetics* is quite few, the number of *definite* editions fewer still': H. M. Adams's great catalogue of sixteenth-century books in Cambridge libraries

[1] Quoted in Jan Morris, ed., *The Oxford Book of Oxford* (Oxford, 1978).

[2] Reisner, 'The Paradox of Mimesis', 334.

[3] Dewar-Watson, 'Shakespeare and Aristotle', 2; Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 266.

lists ‘only eight separate editions of the *Poetics* either alone or with rhetorical works’, and a few scattered commentaries, while Scaliger, ‘by far the most closely studied source behind Sidney’s own essay’, appears fourteen times in any of three editions. And the record of private book-ownership is scarcer still: here ‘no separate editions of the *Poetics*... appear at all’, nor do any commentaries or Italian treatises. ‘Anyone seeking to follow the trail of the *Poetics* into private libraries,’ Turner concludes, ‘and from there into English literary culture more broadly, is bound to conclude that it quickly runs cold’.[4]

This chapter counters new and received wisdom as to the text’s absence with primary evidence of its presence. Perhaps the most fundamental problem in the sixteenth-century English print-history of the *Poetics* is that, as Turner stresses, there was none:

> It is worth pointing out that the first Latin translation of the *Poetics* to be printed in England appeared only in 1623, relatively late by Continental standards, while the first *English* translation did not appear until 1705 – nearly forty years after Dryden’s *Essay*, as surprising as this may seem.[5]

These chronological landmarks have been widely cited, on the assumption that publication is transparently correlative to the interests of the book market, to map the belated taste for the *Poetics* among English readers. Only after Theodore Goulston, once a scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and a practising London physician, ‘made the *Poetics* readily accessible to his countrymen’ in 1623, Marvin Herrick insists, was there ‘no reason why an Englishman, if he cared to become acquainted with Aristotle’s critical theories, could not have done so’.[6] Yet on 26th March, 1583, the last entry in the Stationers’ Register made by the successful printer and bookseller Henry Bynneman before his death, deeply in

4 Henry S. Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580-1630* (Oxford, 2006), 86-7 and notes.

5 *Ibid.*, 86.

6 Marvin Herrick, *The Poetics of Aristotle in England* (New Haven, London, 1930), 35. On Goulston see Scott Mandelbrote, ‘The Library of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and the problem of the spatial arrangement of knowledge during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries’ in *Museum, Bibliothek, Stadtraum. Räumliche Wissensordnungen 1600-1900*, ed. Robert Felfe and Kirsten Wagner (Berlin, 2010), 56.

debt, a month later, registered his intention to print an *opera omnia* of Aristotle in Latin – which would by this date, as we shall see, certainly have contained the *Poetics*.[7] The enterprise was abandoned with Bynneman's death, but the record at least demands that we recognise the contingency reflected by the dates of the *Poetics*' issue from an English press, and revise our chronology of the market of interest in such a volume those dates might imply.[8] Indeed, only seven or so texts in total claiming Aristotle's authorship had been printed in England by the end of the sixteenth century – the *Physics* in a Latin compendium by Andreas Hyperius (1583), the *Meteorologica* in English verse (as *De cursione lune*, 1528), the *Ethics* abridged in Latin (by Bruni, 1479; by Heilandus, 1581) and abridged in English (1547), the *Politics* in English via the French of Loys Le Roy (1598); among pseudo-Aristotelian works, *De astronomia* in English (as *Here begynneth the nature, and dysposycyon of the dayes in the weke*, c.1547, 1554), the *Secrete of Secretes* in English (1528, 1572), and excerpted (in *This present boke called the gouernaunce of kynges and prynces*, 1511; as *Here begynneth the dyfference of astronomye*, c.1555), and the Latin *Problemata*, in the original (1583) and in English (1595, 1597)[9] – but such publication dates have not seriously been taken as a *terminus post quem* for English encounters any more with this ragbag of works than with, for example, the *De anima* or *Historia animalium*, or the logical works long studied in the universities.[10]

---

7 Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640 AD*, 5 vols. (1875-94), II.422. See also Mark Eccles, 'Bynneman's Books', *The Library* s.5, 12.2 (1957), 82, and Maureen Bell, 'Bynneman, Henry (b. in or before 1542, d. 1583)', *ODNB*.

8 A point recognised with respect to university presses by Ford, 'Private Ownership of Printed Books', 228: '... the first Oxford ventures ceased printing by 1486. That could not be due to the lack of demand, but rather because the demand was simply being met more effectively by continental imports.'

9 References to the *ESTC* are as follows: *Ethics*: English, S104425 (1547); Latin, S104425 (1581). *Physics*: S108332 (1583). *Politics*: S106844 (1598). *Meteorologica*: S108385 (1528). *De astronomia*: S1043 (c.1547), S121684 (c.1554). *Secrete of Secretes*: S110009 (1528), S122148 (1511), S109574 (c.1555), S113010 (1572). *Problemata*: Latin, S108335 (1583); English, S90323 (1595). For the *Secret of Secrets*, see W. F. Ryan and Charles B. Schmitt, eds., *Pseudo-Aristotle, the Secret of Secrets: Sources and Influences* (London, 1982); for the *Problemata*, see Jill Kraye, 'The Printing History of Aristotle in the Fifteenth Century: A Bibliographical Approach to Renaissance Philosophy', *RS* 9.2 (1995), 208-11.

10 On the comparative poverty of this record of printing see Charles B. Schmitt, 'Philosophy and Science in Sixteenth-Century Universities: Some Preliminary Comments' in *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning*, ed. J. E. Murdoch and E. D. Sylla (Dordrecht, 1975), 498-9, and *John Case and Aristotelianism in*

Most of the books owned in England in the sixteenth century were printed abroad, in any case, and a tally of the full sixteenth-century print-history of the *Poetics* with surviving records of English Renaissance libraries, private and institutional, yields many records of ownership of the *Poetics* which should cause us to reassess our historical model of its circulation, as well as of the various circumstances and forms in which the text could have been read in sixteenth-century England. My purpose in this chapter, it should be stressed, is not to enumerate the *readers* of the *Poetics*, an impossible task lest we are left with such detailed marginalia as Gabriel Harvey's, or a dated list such as Drummond of Hawthornden's, not just of his library acquisitions but of 'bookes red be me'.[11] It is rather to indicate the *availability* of the text to potential readers, its availability to English people – to Sidney, for example – who for some reason or another may have desired to read it. As the text for the most part arrived in England in volumes of Aristotle's *opera omnia*, these findings also shed some light on the bibliographic reception of Aristotle more generally in sixteenth-century England.

First we must take a census of the forms in which the *Poetics* might have been encountered up to the end of the sixteenth century.[12] Because the Greek text was rediscovered and integrated into the *corpus aristotelicum* relatively late, the wide circulation of the *Poetics* for the most part coincides with its history in print, and no substantial manuscript tradition appears outside Italy or before the fifteenth century. We know very little about the work's fortunes in antiquity: a paucity of references implies that it was little read, although some of

---

Renaissance England (Kingston, 1983), 23-4.

[11] Harvey: see Virginia F. Stern, *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia and Library* (Oxford, 1979). Drummond: see Robert H. MacDonald, *The Library of Drummond of Hawthornden* (Edinburgh, 1971), Appendix I, and David Laing, 'A Brief Account of the Hawthornden MSS in the Possession of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland', *Archaeologica Scotica* IV (1857).

[12] The standard bibliography of the *Poetics* is Schrier, *Bibliography*, which supersedes Lane Cooper and Alfred Gudeman, *A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle* (New Haven, London, 1928); for Greek manuscript witnesses, see Edgar Lobel, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics* (London, 1933), and more generally Andre Wartelle, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs* (Paris, 1963) and *Supplement*, ed. Roxane D. Argyropoulos and Iannis Caras (Paris, 1980). The larger scope of Aristotelian

the ideas found in it seem to have percolated into broader conversations about poetry.[13] Definitions of tragedy partly overlapping with Aristotle's can thus be found later in Chaucer, Lydgate, and other medieval writers,[14] and there are clear references to the *Poetics* in Albertus Magnus's commentary on the *Metaphysics* and in his pupil Aquinas's *Summa Theologica*.[15] While these sources bear interestingly on the broader intellectual influence of the *Poetics*, however, they are not immediately related to the bibliographical history of the text in question. The only medieval Latin translation of the *Poetics* directly from the Greek was made in 1278 by William of Moerbeke, a friend of Aquinas; surviving in only two manuscripts, it apparently had little influence until its rediscovery in 1931 by Georges Lacombe.[16] Effectively unknown to the Latin West, the *Poetics* was translated into Syriac after the middle of the ninth century from a pre-700 Greek manuscript, now lost; the translator and the author of its later revisions are unknown. Only one page of the Syriac translation survives, but it is known through subsequent quotation and translations into Arabic, including that of the Syrian Christian Abu Bišr Matta, before 934.[17] Revised versions of Bišr Matta's

---

publication across Europe can be traced in *IAAr.*

13 See for this period Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 25-35; Lane Cooper, *The Poetics of Aristotle: Its Meaning and Influence* (Boston, London, 1923), 86-91, briefly surveys of classical works possibly influenced by the *Poetics*. There is no evidence of a direct influence of the *Poetics* on Horace's *Ars Poetica* – a lost paraphrase of the *Poetics* by Neoptolemus is sometimes enlisted as an intermediary – but Tarán correctly cautions that 'we should not, in the absence of evidence, infer from the scarcity, or non existence, of ancient remains that Aristotle's works were little known' in this period (34).

14 Chaucer: e.g. in the Prologue to the 'Monk's Tale', ll.1973-77, and *Boece*, Book II, prosa 2, ll.70-72, in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson and F. N. Robinson, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1988). Lydgate: e.g. *Lydgate's Troy Book, A.D. 1412-20*, ed. Henry Bergen, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 97, 103, 106, 126, 4 vols. (London, 1906-35), I, 2.852-6. Henryson: e.g. *The Testament of Cresseid*, l.4, in *The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson*, ed. H. Harvey Wood (Edinburgh, 1933). These are but a few representative examples of many: see *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. Hans Kurath *et al.* (Ann Arbor, 1954-2001), *s.v.* 'tragedie'.

15 See Cunningham, 'Wonder', 70-74, and H. A. Kelly, 'Aristotle-Averroës-Alemannus on Tragedy: The Influence of the *Poetics* on the Latin Middle Ages', *Viator* 10 (1979), 174.

16 It was, however, used by Albertino Mussato in the early fourteenth-century; see Kelly, 'Aristotle-Averroës-Alemmanus', 186-93. The manuscripts are Eton College Library, MS 129, and Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, MS 47.10. Lacombe published a note of his discovery in 'Medieval Versions of the *Parva Naturalia*', *The New Scholasticism* 5.4 (1931), 309n28; see also Edgar Lobel, *The Medieval Latin Poetics* (London, 1931), and Lorenzo Minio-Paluello's discussion of the rediscovery of the text in the introduction to his edition, *De arte poetica: translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka*, Aristoteles Latinus XXXIII, 2nd ed. (Bruxelles-Paris, 1968).

17 Printed for the first time, along with the Syriac fragment, in D. S. Margoliouth, *Analecta orientalia ad Poeticam Aristoteleam* (London, 1887). On this Syro-Arabic branch of the manuscript transmission see Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 77-128, on the translations esp. 98-106.

Arabic translation, as Omert Schrier and Dimitri Gutas have shown, were the base-texts for both an Arabic commentary by Avicenna, and the Arabic 'short' and 'middle' commentaries of Averroes, composed before 1160 and around 1174-5, respectively.[18] Averroes's Middle Commentary, in turn, was translated into Latin by Hermannus Alemannus in 1256, in Toledo; in that form it was taught at Paris and read in Florence in the fourteenth century, distilled into several *florilegia*, and circulated widely throughout the Middle Ages.[19]

Since the rediscovery of the Greek text, scholars have tended to judge the Middle Commentary a hopeless jumble.[20] Averroes was not familiar with any art form like Greek drama, and attempts to reconcile tragedy and comedy to moral categories, poetry of praise and of blame. The Averroistic disposition of the *Poetics* (along with the *Rhetoric*) among Aristotle's logical works, moreover, has been imagined incompatible with the sixteenth century's humanist understanding of the work and its purview, as it is with ours. Nor was Averroes's sense helped by Hermannus's translation, which has attracted the criticism of scholars from Roger Bacon onward.[21] Nonetheless, the Middle Commentary remained important long after the rediscovery of the Greek text. Averroes-Hermannus was printed first

---

18 See Omert J. Schrier, 'The Syriac and Arabic Versions of Aristotle's Poetics' in *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism*, ed. Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk (Leiden, 1997), 259-78; Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 106-10; Lutz Edzard, and Adolf Köhnken, 'A New Look at the Greek, Syriac, and Arabic Versions of Aristotle's Poetics' in *Grammar as a Window onto Arabic Humanism*, ed. Lutz Edzard and Janet C. E. Watson (Wiesbaden, 2006), 222-64. Averroes's commentaries were first printed in Arabic in Fausto Lasinio, *Il commento medio di Averroe alla Poetica di Aristotele* (Pisa, 1872); Avicenna's commentary has been translated by Ismail M. Dahiyat, *Avicenna's Commentary on the Poetics of Aristotle* (Leiden, 1974).

19 Twenty-five MSS surviving from the 13th-15th centuries in Spain, France, England, Italy, and Poland are listed in Georges Lacombe, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1939-61). For the fourteenth-century reception of the Commentary, see William F. Boggess, 'Aristotle's *Poetics* in the Fourteenth Century', *SP* 67.3 (1970), 278-294; Jacqueline Hamesse, *Les auctoritates Aristotelis: un florilège médiéval* (Louvain, 1974); Kelly, 'Aristotle-Averroës-Alemannus', 175-86.

20 See O. B. Hardison, 'On the Place of Averroës' Commentary on the *Poetics* in the History of Medieval Criticism' in *Medieval and Renaissance Studies IV*, ed. John L. Lievsay (Durham, NC, 1970), 65: 'the late Middle Ages was not prepared to assimilate the *Poetics*. On the other hand, Averroës's commentary was easy to assimilate... In effect, it enlisted Aristotle in support of the most characteristic (and most un-Aristotelian) features of medieval poetic theory.' Kelly qualifies this summary in 'Aristotle-Averroës-Alemmanus', 206-9, but does not substantially disagree.

21 On the quality of Hermannus's translation, see E. N. Tigerstedt, 'Observations on the Reception of the Aristotelian *Poetics* in the Latin West', *SR* 15 (1968), 8-9; for Bacon's critique, see E. Massa, 'Ruggero Bacone e la *Poetica* di Aristotele', *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 32 (1953), 457-73, and Kelly, 'Aristotle-Averroës-Alemannus', 172-4.

at Venice in 1481 by Philippus Venetus, poorly edited by a Veronese physician, Lancillotus de Zerlis, and again in 1515 in a volume also reproducing Giorgio Valla's 1498 Latin translation of the Greek original.[22] Averroes's commentary was also caught in the great stream of transmission from Arabic to the West through the work of Jewish scholars, whose superior renderings supplanted Hermannus's as the work continued to be printed through the century. A Hebrew translation of the Middle Commentary by Todros Todrosi of Arles (1337)[23] was put into Latin by Abraham de Balmes, an Italian Jewish physician, and thus printed in a volume of de Balmes's translations of Aristotelian logical works from the Arabic tradition in 1523, and subsequently in a collected Aristotle-Averroes of 1560.[24] Todrosi's Hebrew was also translated into Latin by Jacob Mantinus, a Jewish physician whose family probably came to Italy after the Spanish expulsion, and printed first in the monumental Giunta Aristotle-Averroes of 1550-52, and twice more by 1575.[25] The Giunta edition, begun by Girolamo Bagolino and continued after his death by his son and several others, marked the high-point of Averroistic publishing in the sixteenth century, and was a landmark in what Charles Schmitt calls the 'philosophical reaction to philological humanism' based in Padua and Venice.[26]

All this industry surrounding the translation of Averroes's commentaries on the

---

22 Aristotle, *Declaratio compendiosa per uiam diuisionis alfarabii super libris rethoricorum Aristotilis...* ed. Lancillottus de Zerlis (Venice, 1481), *ISTC* ia01046000; *Rhetorica Aristotelis... addita eiusdem Aristotelis Poetics, cum Averroys*, ed. Alexander Achillinus (Venice, 1515). On de Zerlis's editorial exertions, see William F. Boggess, 'Hermannus Alemannus and Catharsis in the Mediaeval Latin *Poetics*', *The Classical World* 62.6 (1969), 213: 'On the basis of the readings in the 1481 edition and its 1515 reprint, it would not be inaccurate to suggest that, had de Zerlis operated on his other patients with the same execrable judgment, Verona would have been more remarkable for its mortality rate than for either gentlemen or scholars.'

23 The Hebrew was first printed in Lasinio, *Il commento medio*.

24 Abraham de Balmes, *Index illorum quae in hoc volumine continentur...* (Venice, 1523), *IAAr* 107.887, which also contains de Balmes's Latin translation of Averroës's Short Commentary, based on the Hebrew of Jacob ben Mahir (1289); the latter volume was printed by Cominus de Tridino Montisferrati (Venice, 1560), *IAAr* 108.423.

25 In the later Giunta editions of 1562 (*IAAr* 108.456), and 1575 (*IAAr* 108.599).

26 Schmitt, 'Renaissance Averroism Studied through the Venetian Editions of Aristotle-Averroës (with particular reference to the Giunta edition of 1550-2)' in *L'Averroismo in Italia* (Rome, 1979), 131. On this volume see also F. Edward Cranz, 'Editions of the Latin Aristotle Accompanied by the Commentaries of Averroës' in *Philosophy and Humanism*, ed. Edward P. Mahoney (New York, 1976), 125-7, and Paul Grendler, *The Universities of the Renaissance* (Baltimore, London, 2002), 260-61; the volume is described in Paolo Camerini, *Annali dei Giunti* (Florence, 1962-3), pt. 1, 382-86.

Poetics accords not only with the renewed interest described by Schmitt, Kristeller, and others in the Averroistic corpus as a whole, but also with the humanist return *ad fontes* in providing accurate new translations of the *corpus Aristotelicum* itself, indicating that the Averroistic *Poetics* was not simply cast aside once Aristotle's Greek text was rediscovered and translated. Thus the Giunta edition, as we might expect, prints the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* as parts of logic – but so does Camozzi's Aldine *editio minor* of 1551-3, which has no obvious Averroistic ambitions.[27] As late as 1579, Riccoboni's translation, directly from the Greek and entangled in the latest scholarly controversies, could be found prefaced by an essay citing Averroes in its disposition of the poetic art, 'quomodo ars poetica sit pars logicae'; when it was reprinted in the Frankfurt *opera omnia* of 1593, Riccoboni's translation itself appeared in the *tomvs logicvs*.[28] Reflecting on the controversy 'ad quod doctrinae genus sit reuocanda Poesis' in 1613, Paolo Beni could name Philoponus, Avicenna, and Averroes among the ancient adherents to the logical model, Robortello, Lombardi, Riccoboni and Zabarella, Maggi, Patrizzi, and Mazzoni – a veritable who's who of *seicento* commentators – among the modern.[29]

Nonetheless, the rediscovered Greek text and its Latin translations came to constitute the mainstream in the first decades of the sixteenth century. The oldest extant manuscript of the Greek text, representing a version from which all known surviving witnesses save one are

27 Giunta edition: Aristotle, *Aristotelis Stagiritae Omnia quae extant opera... Averrois Cordubensis in ea... commentarii*, ed. G. B. Bagolino, 11 vols. (Venice, 1552), *IAAr* 108.193, I.8: 'In Secundo [tomo] vero relique non ita vere, ac propriae logicae partes Rhetorica, videlicet atque Poetica compositae sunt'. Aldine edition: Aristotle, *Aristotelis Opera omnia, graece, studio Ioannis Baptistae Camotii*, 6 vols. (Venice, 1551-3), *IAAr* 108.218, I: *Aristotelis omnem logicam, rhetoricam et poeticam disciplinam continens*.

28 Aristotle, *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica... Ars poetica ab eodem in Lat. linguam versa*, trans. Riccoboni (Venice, 1579), *IAAr* 108.640, 375-83; Aristotle, *Operum, quotquot extant, Latina editio* (Frankfurt, 1593), *IAAr* 108.721, II: *Aristotelis Tomvs Logicvs, in quo, Rhetorices ad Theodecten lib. III, Rhetorices ad Alexandrum lib. I, De Poetica lib. I.*

29 Paolo Beni, *In Aristotelis Poeticam commentarii...* (Padua, 1613), 25, *s.v.* 'Pro Logica': 'Atque in priorem sententia videtur fuisse Philoponus, Auicenna, Auerroes & ex recentioribus Robortellus, Lombardus, Riccobonus & Zabarella; Madius etiam ac Franciscus Piccolomineus non improbarunt. In posteriore fuit idem Madius, qui etsi nutat interdum, ac modo hoc, modo illud affirmat, in hanc tamen inclinat magis. Patricius quoque & Mazzonius paribus fere studiis hanc amplectuntur. quibus item Franciscus Piccoiomineus [*sic*] fauet non parum.'

thought to derive, is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS gr. 1741, ascribed on palaeographical grounds to the mid-tenth century.[30] We know very little about its provenance before it emerges in the library of Cardinal Ridolfi of Florence in the mid-sixteenth century – 'we do not know,' Lobel remarks, 'when or in what circumstances it arrived in Italy' – but we know that it was circulating before that time: it may well be the vellum manuscript of *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς* listed by Janus Lascaris in his *c.*1491 catalogue of the manuscript library of Lorenzo de Medici, and it is clearly referred to in a letter from Cardinal Bessarion, dated 1457-68.[31] The letter, written to an unnamed correspondent, declines an offer to copy what we now know as the Paris manuscript, because Bessarion has already had the text copied from another source into his compendium of Aristotelian works, completed July 1457.[32] While it is clear, therefore, that Bessarion's codex was not the earliest manuscript to be circulating in the sixteenth century – its ancestors must have been prior, and there are some fifteenth century manuscripts, such as those belonging to Theodore Gaza and to Poliziano, whose dates we can specify only within a range that might imply their circulation earlier than 1457 – it is nonetheless the earliest manuscript whose provenance we can confidently trace, as the other early witnesses can be followed back securely only as far as the sixteenth or later fifteenth century. Such witnesses could be found in the possession of several scholars before the text was translated by Giorgio Valla into Latin in 1498, and published in Venice accompanying his translations of other logical, mathematical, astronomical and medical 'opuscula' such as

[30] Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, MS gr. 46, dating from the fourteenth century but of uncertain location until its rediscovery in 1878, is second-oldest and the only witness to the text independent of Paris 1741; it seems in some cases, however, to have been used to correct manuscripts otherwise descended from Paris 1741 (see Lobel, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics*, 15-18 and stemmata, 45-7, from which many of the details in this paragraph derive). For detailed description of Paris 1741, including questions of dating, see Hugo Rabe, 'Rhetoren-Corpora', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 67 (1912), esp. 337-43; Dieter Harlfinger and Diether Reinsch, 'Die Aristotelica des Parisinus Gr. 1741', *Philologus* 114.1 (1970), 28-50; Aubrey Diller, 'Notes on the History of Some Manuscripts of Aristotle' in *Studia Codicologica*, ed. Kurt Treu (Berlin, 1977), 147-50; the section containing the *Poetics* is reproduced in facsimile in Henri Omont, ed., *La Poétique d'Aristote: manuscrit 1741 fonds grec de la bibliothèque nationale* (Paris, 1891).

[31] See Lobel, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics*, 6-7, in which Bessarion's letter is also excerpted, dated, and discussed.

[32] Now Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Codex Marcianus gr. 200. Bessarion's unnamed correspondent may have been Theodore Gaza, as conjectured by Diller, 'Notes on the History', 148.

Nicephorus's *Logica*.[33] Despite circulating in humanist circles, the Greek text was omitted from Aldus Manutius's *editio princeps* of Aristotle's Greek works in five volumes (Venice, 1495-98); both it and the *Rhetoric* were published first in Greek in 1508, edited by Demetrius Ducas, in the first volume of works from the Byzantine rhetorical corpus that became known as the Aldine *Rhetores graeci*.[34]

By 1508, then, the text had been printed in Greek and in a single, poorly executed Latin translation.[35] By the end of the century it could be encountered in multiple editions and translations. The Greek text appeared in every complete Greek edition of Aristotle's works printed in the sixteenth century: Erasmus and Simon Grynaeus's popular Basel editions (1531, 1539, 1550), the last version of which introduced the chapter divisions still in place today,[36] Camozzi's Aldine *editio minor* (1551-3), Sylburg's Frankfurt edition (1584-7),[37] and the bilingual editions of Casaubon (1590) and Pace (1597). The inclusion of the text in the Latin corpus waited on the more competent translation of Alessandro Pazzi, which was published in Venice in 1536 and first incorporated into Grynaeus's complete Latin edition at Basel two years later. The *Poetics* was subsequently printed, in one translation or another, in every complete Latin edition of Aristotle printed in the sixteenth century: Pazzi's translation, reprinted in various quartos and compendia twenty-five times over the sixteenth century,

---

33 Valla, *Hoc in volumine hec continentur Nicephori logica...* (Venice, 1498); see Bod. Inc. Cat. N-017.

34 *Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi: Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata...* ed. Demetrius Ducas, 2 vols. (Venice, 1508-9). For these volumes see A. Renouard, *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Alde*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1834), 16.1, 54.4; their Byzantine rationale is treated more fully in Chapter V.

35 The critiques of several contemporary scholars are cited in Tigerstedt, 'Observations', 15-16; an extensive evaluation of Valla's translation can be found in Bernard Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1961), 361-6.

36 Contrary to Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 10, Daniel Heinsius's 1611 edition was not the first to observe the chapter divisions. The beginning of chapter 12 – at 1452b9 (*δύο μὲν οὖν*...) in the 1550 edition, but in modern texts at 1452b14 (Μ*έρη δὲ τραγῳδίας*...) – is the only modern departure from the 1550 arrangement. Though widely known as the 'Erasmus' editions, Jill Kraye notes that the dedicatory letter to John More 'was Erasmus's only contribution to the 1531 edition. Despite this the publisher Johann Bebel chose – no doubt for marketing reasons – to put the name of Erasmus, the most famous scholar in Europe, on the title page rather than that of the actual editor, the relatively unknown Grynaeus' ('Erasmus and the Canonization of Aristotle' in *England and the Continental Renaissance*, ed. Edward Chaney and Peter Mack [Woodbridge, 1990], 41).

37 Sylburg's edition would later form the basis for all British editions of the *Poetics* in the following two centuries: see J. C. Eade, 'British Editions of Aristotle's *Poetics* to 1794', *The Library* s.5, 30.3 (1975), 238-41.

remained standard for most of the century despite the appearance of Vettori's learned edition, commentary, and translation (1560, repr. 1573), until Riccoboni's (1579) became dominant with its inclusion in Casaubon's landmark 1590 bilingual edition.[38] In the second half of the century, the *Poetics* could also be read in Italian, whether in Bernardo Segni's seminal translation (1549, repr. 1551), somewhat paraphrased in the fifth and sixth divisions of Trissino's 'poetics' (1563), in Castelvetro's translation accompanying the Greek text and his commentary (1570, 2nd ed. 1576), or in Alessandro Piccolomini's translation (1572, repr. 1573) and commentary (1575). By 1600, the text of the *Poetics* had also been printed either singly or accompanying one other work (usually the *Rhetoric*) some twenty-five or twenty-seven times, variously in Greek, in translation, or embedded in commentaries.[39] The work was also referred to or discussed in numerous publications without being reproduced, but this kind of intellectual diaspora lies beyond our purview for the time being.[40]

In sum: in addition to the 'single' printings of the *Poetics*, all five Greek *opera omnia* after 1531, all twenty-five Latin *opera omnia* after 1538, and both of the bilingual *opera omnia* printed in the sixteenth century and circulating under the name of Aristotle, contained the text of the *Poetics*. For that matter, only one Greek *opera omnia*, the Aldine *editio princeps* of 1495-98, did not contain the *Poetics*, although several Latin *opera* fell into that category before 1538. Given Schrier's comprehensive coverage of volumes that do contain the *Poetics*, it seems more valuable here to summarise in Table 2 those few, early volumes prone to be catalogued as *opera omnia* that do not: perhaps thirteen to sixteen spanning 1479

38 Between its publication in 1560 and the end of the century, Vettori's translation was printed in five editions, three of which were *opera omnia* (*IAAr* 108.457, and supplanting Pazzi's in the second and third Giunta editions, *IAAr* 108.456 and 108.599), compared to Pazzi's eleven, all in *opera omnia* (*IAAr* 108.423, 108.429, 108.430, 108.460, 108.579, 108.610, 108.629, 108.636, 108.644, 108.652, 108.669). From 1579-1600, Riccoboni's translation was printed six times, including three *opera omnia* after 1590 (*IAAr* 108.708, 108.721, 108.755); Pazzi's, meanwhile, was used in four *opera omnia* from 1579, but not printed after 1584 (as above, *IAAr* 108.636 onwards). On the significance of Casaubon's edition, anti-Ramist and for some time a *textus receptus*, see J. Glucker, 'Casaubon's Aristotle', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 25 (1964), 274-96.

39 For further detail, see *IAAr*.

40 A broader scope can be derived from Schrier, *Bibliography*.

to 1520/21, counting as separate the four reprints of Stagninus's Venice edition of 1489 and the single reprint of Quentell's 1497 Cologne edition.[41]

[41] The Venice reprints following Stagninus, 1489 (by publisher, as in Table 2, below: Scotus, 1495-6; de Paganinis, 1501; heredi Scoti, 1507-8; heredi Scoti, 1516), sometimes incorporating minor additions, are described by Cranz, 'Editions of the Latin Aristotle', 120-21.

Table 2: Aristotle's *opera* not containing the *Poetics*

Edition	*ISTC*	*IAAr*
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. Augsburg: Ambrosius Keller, 1479. f°. 4 vols.	ia00960000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. Venice: Filippo di Pietro, 1481-2. f°. 2 vols.	ia00961000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin], ed. Nicoletus Vernia. Venice: Andreas Torresanus, de Asula and Bartholomaeus de Blavis, de Alexandria, 1483. f°. 3 vols; issued in 8 parts.[42]	ia00962000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin], ed. Nicoletus Vernia. Venice: Andreas Torresanus, de Asula and Bartholomaeus de Blavis, de Alexandria, 1483. f°.[43]	ia00963000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. Comm: Averroes. Venice: Bernardinus Stagninus, de Tridino, 1489. f°. 5 vols.	ia00964000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Greek]. Venice: Aldus Manutius, Romanus, 1495-98. f°. 5 vols.	ia00959000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. Ed: Augustinus Niphus. Comm: Averroes. Venice: [Johannes and Gregorius de Gregoriis, de Forlivio], for Octavianus Scotus, 1495-96. f°. 2 vols. issued in 5 parts.	ia00965000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. Venice: Johannes and Gregorius de Gregoriis, de Forlivio, for Benedictus Fontana, 13 July 1496. f°.[44]	ia00966000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. With title: *Expositiones textuales dubiorum*. [Cologne]: Heinrich Quentell, 22 Sept. 1497. f°. 2 vols.	ia00967000	
Aristotle. *Opera* [Latin]. Venice: Paganinus de Paganinis / Ioa. & Gregorius de Gregoriis, 1501. f°. 2 vols.		107.690
Aristoteles. *Opera* [Latin]. With title: *Expositiones textuales dubiorum*. Cologne: In officina Quentell, *c.*1503. f°. 2 vols.	ia00968000	
Aristotle. *Accipe lector studiose Aristotelem peripatheticorum principem ac eius fidelissimum interpretem Auerroem...* Venice: mandato et expensis her. Octaviani Scoti, per Bonetum Locatellum, 1507-8; sumpt. her. Octaviani Scoti et sociorum, 1516. f°. 2 vols.		107.753a 107.838
Aristotle. *Libri Physicorum octo cum singulor... Leonardo (Bruni) Aretino interprete.* Papie [Pavia]: Jacobus Paucisdrapis de Burgofranco, 1520/21. 16mo. 6 vols.		107.870[45]

42 Considered by Cranz, 'Editions of the Latin Aristotle', the 'first single edition of the collected works' (118), earlier editions lacking the full complement of works required for an *opera omnia*. This may or may not not have held true for contemporary cataloguers, as discussed below.

43 Apparently a 'major works' version of the previous edition, reprinting the works of the *Organon* and the *Ethics*, *Politics*, and the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*.

44 Fontana's edition was the first to incorporate a substantial number of new humanist translations, but 'their program of translation was slow to be completed', and vulgate translations were still widely in use until Grynaeus's Basel edition of 1538. See Cranz, 'Editions of the Latin Aristotle', 117.

45 Thus recorded in *IAAr*: in fact one of a series of Aristotelian texts in Latin, many edited by Marco Antonio Zimara, published by Giacomo Pocatela (Jacob Paucidrapium de Burgofranco, Jacob de Burgofranco) in 1520-1, in octavo, and described by Cranz, 'Editions of the Latin Aristotle', 122-23.

Every *opera omnia* circulating in the sixteenth century, and not appearing on this list, contained the *Poetics*. Since the majority of books in sixteenth-century English libraries were in fact printed on the Continent,[46] it would be surprising if the text were not available in England, in Greek and Latin and Italian, and held by a majority of the institutional and larger private English libraries. Books from Italy, where most of these volumes were printed, though with increasing competition from northern European scholars and presses, vigorously outsold books from other nations at the Frankfurt book-fair into the seventeenth century; 'ships plying between Italy and London', Lane Cooper writes colourfully, 'carried books from the Italian presses as ballast'.[47] As for the text's absence from the English print-record until 1623, moreover, it should be noted that the want of a *Poetics* issued from an English press means only that the continental print-record pertains equally to England. To the extent that the English owned volumes of Aristotle at all, that is, there was nothing exceptional about the corpus of Aristotelian works available to them.

Many of these editions did indeed find their way into English libraries, both private and institutional. Appended to this thesis are two lists of English owners of the *Poetics*, compiled from the provenance of surviving books where possible, but in the main from comparison of sixteenth-century library catalogues and booklists with the bibliographical record. Appendix I lists owners of volumes which can be identified with reasonable certainty

[46] This is apparent from even a cursory survey of any contemporary library catalogue, and has been widely noted by library-historians; see, for example, Jayne, *LCER*, 4: 'The Short-title Catalogue has no subject index; even if one were compiled, it would not represent accurately the books read in Renaissance England, since English readers owned far more Continental than English books'. This holds even truer for scholarly libraries, which held a greater proportion of works in Latin and Greek, mostly produced on the Continent: cf. R. Julian Roberts and Andrew G. Watson, eds., *John Dee's Library Catalogue* (London, 1990), 12: 'In common with every scholarly library assembled in England before the eighteenth century Dee's had a vast preponderance of books of foreign origin.' The Lumley library, for example, contained 187 books in English, less than 7% of the total, and only 12% in any vernacular; the rest were in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew (Sears Jayne and Francis R. Johnson, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* [London, 1956], 11). The library of Ben Jonson similarly exemplifies a serious literary collection, three-quarters of which was Latin or Greek (David McPherson, 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: An Annotated Catalogue', *SP* 71.5 [1974], 7).

[47] Cooper, *The Poetics of Aristotle*, 131. Net figures for nationality of books sold at the Frankfurt book fair from 1564-1669 are compiled by James Westfall Thompson in Henri Estienne, *The Frankfort Book Fair* (Chicago, 1911), 116.

as volumes containing the *Poetics* and present in England in the sixteenth century; Appendix II, owners of volumes which may well have contained the *Poetics*, but are not recorded in sufficient detail to be identified with much confidence.

Many, if not most, of the volumes listed in Appendix II probably did contain the *Poetics*; in general, ownership of the work becomes more likely the later in the century an *opera* is recorded, and where labelled 'grece' more likely still. Even books recorded as Latin *opera*, of which several more wanting the *Poetics* were available, could very well indicate volumes printed after 1538 and hence containing the work, as witnessed by the frequent identifiable records of Grynaeus's (1538), Gemusaeus's (1542, 1548, 1549, 1561, 1563), and Curione's (1563) Basel editions in private and institutional libraries alike.[48] But books were not always acquired new: they could be inherited from the libraries of friends or family, for example, as were books belonging to Lord Lumley from Arundel (who in turn had received Thomas Cranmer's confiscated library), to John Caius from William Framyngham, and to Thomas Lorkin from his father-in-law John Hatcher, his tutor Anthony Mayhew, and his colleague Nicholas Simpson, or have passed through several hands before reaching their final destination in England, as did the books of Christopher Longolius on their way to New College, Oxford. The question of how late in the century an unidentifiable *opera* should, on balance, be considered likely to have been printed after 1538 can only be resolved with reference to the purchasing patterns peculiar to the collector at hand, patterns which, deduced as they are from aggregates of interdependent identifications, are all too easy to conjure by analysis. While any given individual represented in these records, however, may plausibly have owned this or that edition of Aristotle's works, it is entirely implausible that a majority of those individuals owned that minority of books from which the *Poetics* was wanting. I have

[48] See Appendix I, e.g. at Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, the University Library, and the books of Perne at Peterhouse, Parker at Corpus Christi College; at Oxford, All Souls, Corpus Christi, and St John's Colleges; and the private collections of John Dee, Lord Lumley, and Sir Thomas Knyvett. Details and references for these and all subsequent libraries mentioned can be found under the relevant heading in the appendices, unless otherwise indicated.

placed individual records, therefore, within the context of their collections where a light touch seemed possible, though I have in general inclined perhaps overmuch towards scepticism rather than give a false impression of certainty amid the vagaries of sixteenth-century book-lists. Appendix II, in short, represents the shortcomings of modern knowledge rather than of Renaissance libraries.

Owners of the private libraries represented in the appendices include royalty, courtiers, gentry, scholars, booksellers, students, and teachers; institutional libraries include colleges at both universities. The earliest volume of traceable ownership I have found is a copy of Giorgio Valla's 1498 translation, which probably was owned by the humanist scholar Thomas Linacre; when Linacre died in 1524, it passed through the hands of Richard Sparkford, archdeacon of Shropshire from 1537, and eventually found its way to John Selden, and thence into the Bodleian.[49] At the later end of the period, I have included some records of the libraries of sixteenth-century men even when they were compiled after 1600, such as those of John Rainolds, Ben Jonson, Lord Lumley, Sir Thomas Knyvett, Henry Percy, and the Bodleian's several early benefactors, but I have not otherwise substantially surveyed library catalogues much into the seventeenth century, by which time the availability of the *Poetics* has usually been taken for granted.

By the evidence solely of those contemporary library catalogues that survive, and solely of extant volumes of whose provenance we can be reasonably certain, compendia of Aristotle's works that contained the *Poetics* were held in the sixteenth century by Corpus Christi, Merton, New, St John's, and All Souls colleges, among the most important Oxford libraries in the period;[50] the first catalogue of the Bodleian in 1605 lists three complete sets of

[49] Linacre is listed as the owner in Bod. Inc. Cat., no. N-017, but see Appendix I, *s.v.* Linacre, Thomas, for a discussion of the volume's complex provenance.

[50] *LCER*, 41-2: 'During the sixteenth century at Oxford the University Library was overshadowed by three of the College libraries: Merton, All Souls, and Christ Church (Canterbury College)'; by the end of the century, thanks to large bequests and architectural development, the library at St John's was 'perhaps the largest in Oxford' (Neil Ker, 'The Provision of Books' in *HUO-III*, 460).

Aristotle in Greek and Latin, two of which contained the *Poetics*, and even has a category for '[*Interpretes*] *In Lib. de Arte Poetica*' in its index.[51] Contemporary catalogues from Cambridge show similar results for Clare Hall and Peterhouse, for Gonville and Caius, Christ's, Corpus Christi, Emmanuel, Pembroke, St John's, and Trinity Colleges, and for the University Library. Of the thirty-seven instances of Aristotle's *opera* attested in Cambridge wills, inventories, and probate records from 1537-1589, comparison with the bibliographical record strongly suggests that a majority contained the *Poetics*.[52] Larger private libraries were also well-stocked: Dr. John Dee had three complete Aristotles containing the *Poetics*; Lord Lumley had two, as well as Valla's 1498 translation, and donated two duplicates from his own collection to the Bodleian in 1599; Andrew Perne left two to Peterhouse College, among them the cutting-edge Greek edition of Sylburg (Frankfurt, 1584-87), the last volume of which had appeared just two years before his death.

Clearly, ownership of the *Poetics* correlates in some way with advances in scholarship and the manifestation in libraries of what has been called the 'new learning': on collections containing older Aristotelian manuscripts or printed books replacing their old stock with new translations and editions; on libraries without Aristotle at all entering the mainstream of Renaissance education and intellectual life. Such is the range of circumstances of acquisition reflected in the appendices that it has made more sense to discuss pertinent details, particularly issues of identification, provenance, or dating, *in situ*. A few comments might be made, however, that contextualise the particulars of Aristotelian holdings within the well-rehearsed history of sixteenth-century libraries.[53]

[51] Thomas James, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae publicae quam vir ornatissimus Thomas Bodleius eques auratus in Academia Oxoniensi nuper instituit...* (Oxford, 1605), 425. This is the earliest English example of such an idex I have seen; Richard Ovenden points out a precursor in the 1595 catalogue of Leiden University, 'The Publication of the Catalogues of the Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' in *History of Oxford University Press*, forthcoming. I am grateful to Mr Ovenden for sharing this work with me prior to its publication.

[52] Net figures can be found in *BCI*.

[53] Classic studies of library development over the sixteenth-century begin with Sears Jayne, *LCER*, first printed in 1956, and continue with Neil Ker, 'Oxford College Libraries in the Sixteenth Century', *Bodleian Library*

Over the course of the century, institutional libraries underwent essential changes that affected their stock, their methods of acquisition, and the book-access they provided to the scholarly community. In 1500, Oxford had ten college libraries, at All Souls, Balliol, Exeter, Lincoln, Magdalen, Merton, New College, Oriel, Queen's, and University College. Five new libraries were established during the sixteenth century, at Brasenose (1509), Corpus (1517), Christ Church (1546), which absorbed the earlier library of Canterbury College shortly after the dissolution, Trinity (1555), and St John's (1555); Jesus College was founded in 1571, but we have no evidence of a library there until 1601.[54] Cambridge began the century with twelve libraries, at Clare, Corpus Christi, Gonville Hall, King's, the King's Hall, Michaelhouse, Pembroke, Peterhouse, Queens', St Catharine's, Trinity Hall, and the new library at Jesus (founded 1496); four more were subsequently founded, at Christ's (1506), St John's (1511), Magdalene (1542), and Emmanuel (1584); Trinity College integrated the older foundations of Michaelhouse and King's Hall in 1546, and Gonville Hall was refounded by John Caius in 1557. The new-founded libraries looked rather different from those dating from before 1500. Pre-sixteenth century libraries consisted mostly of manuscripts and, because acquisition was reliant on donations rather than purchases, were slow to gather new material: there is no record of more than a few printed books at Merton until the late 1540s, and a catalogue of 1556 lists some 300 manuscripts and 200 printed books;[55] at the Cambridge University Library, a catalogue of 1583 is the first in which printed books outnumber manuscripts.[56] The

---

Record 6 (1959), 459-515, and 'The Provision of Books'; Philip Gaskell, *Trinity College Library: The First 150 Years* (Cambridge, 1980). Mark Curtis, 'Library Catalogues and Tudor Oxford and Cambridge', provides an important corrective to Jayne's sense in *LCER* that inventories in probate records demonstrate a 'conservative, scholastic Oxford' and a 'reforming, humanist Cambridge'; Kristian Jensen, 'Universities and Colleges' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640*, ed. Elizabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 345-62, reflects on these classic works in the light of recent findings. Standard works on private booklists include *BCI*; *PLRE*; Jayne and Johnson, *The Lumley Library*; Roberts and Watson, *John Dee's Library Catalogue*. For earlier records of medieval libraries, see the several volumes of the British Library's *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* (London, 1990-).

[54] Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 441n1.

[55] Printed in Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 487-97.

[56] Elisabeth Leedham-Green and David McKitterick, 'A Catalogue of Cambridge University Library, 1583' in *Books and Collectors 1200-1700*, ed. James P. Carley and Colin G. C. Tite (London, 1997), 153.

reliance on donation also led to idiosyncratic biases in the collections even of newer colleges that were not in a position to remedy them with purchases.[57] The library at St John's College, Oxford, for example, had few theological and fewer Protestant books until more than two decades after its foundation, as the early donors were all Catholic.[58] In contrast, early gifts to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from its founder, Richard Fox, and its first president, John Claymond, quickly placed the college at the forefront of Greek and humanistic studies in England and, according to Erasmus, among the wonders of the world: regularly corresponding with Erasmus and Linacre, Claymond assisted Simon Grynaeus when he came to Oxford in search of manuscripts to print at Basel in 1531.[59] When from the 1530s to the 1550s some of the older and more wealthy colleges, such as Merton, All Souls, New College, Magdalen, and Oriel, came at last to purchase some of the crucial printed text-books[60] – modernising perhaps in response to the demands of the Marian commission, perhaps in a fit of remedial scholarly progress[61] – they were able to overtake such libraries as Corpus's, which had no need to modernise for some time. All Souls's purchase of a full Aristotelian library all at once in 1544-45 thus afforded it probably the richest collection of such texts in Oxford until the

[57] See R. M. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford* (Cambridge, 2009), xxxv: 'It has been observed more than once that the system of library-acquisition by donation must have been inconvenient. On the one hand, it presumably led to the acquisition by the library of unwanted material such as suplicate copies or outdated works. On the other, the reception of up-to-date and important works might be delayed indefinitely. The second problem could be dealt with by direct purchase; the first was harder to solve because of the sanctions against disposal.'

[58] Pointed out by Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 460.

[59] Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen *et al.*, 12 vols. (Oxford, 1906), III.619 (ep. 990), quoted in J. R. Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century', *The Library* s.4, 18.4 (1938), 385. For Claymond's assistance in 1531, see Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1517-1617', B.Litt. thesis, University of Oxford (1933), 30, and Kraye, 'Erasmus and the Canonization of Aristotle', 39-41.

[60] Ker knew of no evidence that the other six colleges at Oxford (Queen's, Brasenose, Lincoln, Balliol, Exeter, and University College) purchased books around the mid-century (Ker, 'Oxford College Libraries', 479-84). Evidence of purchases at Cambridge in this period, while probable by analogy, is lacking; see Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 6.

[61] Gaskell argues for the latter view (*Trinity College Library*, 6), R. M. Thomson for the former, speculating that many printed books among Merton's suddenly rich collection recorded in 1556 'may have been acquired on the eve of the inspection, merely to satisfy the demands of the commissioners for modernity' (*Medieval Manuscripts of Merton*, xxxviii).

Bodleian's foundation at the end of the century.[62] This burst of commercial activity was short lived, and for the next twenty or thirty years there is again little evidence of book purchasing.[63] But in the last quarter of the century there are signs of recovery in libraries across Oxford and Cambridge: more money is spent on purchasing and binding books, donations are larger, more frequent, and better recognised by the colleges, and several libraries are remodelled in the 1590s to accommodate their growing collections, with horizontal shelving taking the place of the medieval lectern desks.[64]

Patterns of acquisition such as these account rather better for developments in Aristotelian holdings than the political and religious turmoil that reigned from the visitation of the Henrician commissioners in 1535 through the commissions of Edward VI in 1550 and Mary in 1556-57 to which histories often refer – 'the new eagerness of Reformer and counter-Reformer', in W. D. J. Cargill Thompson's words, 'to purge the bookshelves as well as the souls of the nation'.[65] No doubt protean ideologies and the very real threat of violent state

[62] Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 459: 'Corpus did not need to modernize in the forties... therefore, and the fellows of Corpus had to be content to read their fathers in editions older than those at All Souls or Merton.' While generally true, this point requires modification for particular texts: Corpus received a work containing the *Poetics* from Richard Fox in 1517-28, and picked up another from Richard Alan in 1552; the All Souls purchase of 1544-45 included Gemusaeus's Latin Aristotle (Basel, 1542), and 'a whole series of the Greek commentators on Aristotle published at Venice in the 1520s and 1530s' (Ker, 'Oxford College Libraries', 494); Merton's purchases were mainly theological, and the college received its first work containing the *Poetics* from Thomas Savile on his death in 1593.

[63] See e.g. Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 8: 'the period from about 1560 to the mid-1580s saw a general improvement in the college libraries' holdings of Protestant theology, but otherwise there was little progress.'

[64] See e.g. Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 453, 457; for Cambridge, see J. C. T. Oates, 'The Libraries of Cambridge, 1570-1700' in *The English Library before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright (London, 1958), 215: 'similar revivals took place in the college libraries during the last thirty years of the century'; the recovery of the University library, too, began with the major donations of Andrew Perne, Matthew Parker, and Nicholas Bacon in 1574, visible in Leedham-Green and McKitterick, 'A Catalogue of Cambridge University Library, 1583'.

[65] W. D. J. Cargill Thompson, 'Notes on King's College Library, 1500-1570, in particular for the period of the Reformation', *TCBS* 2 (1954), 42; see also 38-9: 'Decline and neglect were the common fate of most English libraries during the Reformation. A few academic collections, like Corpus, were swollen later in the century by the plunder of the abbeys, but in the thirty years before Elizabeth's accession the libraries of College and Monastery had been equally subject to loss... The chief effect of the Reformation was that most academic libraries had to be formed again.' Further discussions of the commissions and the 'purgation' they caused can be found, for example, in Jayne, *LCER*, 41; Ker, 'Oxford College Libraries', 429; Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 7; John M. Fletcher and James K. McConica, 'A Sixteenth-Century Inventory of the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge', *TCBS* 3 (1961), 187; Sargent Bush, Jr., and Carl J. Rasmussen, *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1584-1637* (Cambridge, 1986), 4; C. Y. Ferdinand, 'Library Administration (c. 1475 to 1640)' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640*, ed. by Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 581.

censorship militated on the whole against a complacent conservatism in book collection as in intellectual life: Protestant books were publicly burned at Cambridge during Cardinal Pole's visitation in 1557, and Duke Humfrey's library was gutted from books to benches. The Henrician visitations to both universities in 1535 eliminated many 'frivolous quibbles and blind and obscure glosses' on Aristotelian texts – the surviving injunctions at Cambridge forbid the study of Scotus, Burley, Trombet, Bricot, and Brulifer – which may have engendered a need to modernise holdings of an Aristotle who nonetheless remained at the centre of the university curriculum.[66] But the print-history of Aristotle's works themselves was hardly scholastically inclined, having from the earliest editions been guided by the desire (if not always the ability) to replace the vulgate texts with new humanist translations;[67] and the fate of Duke Humfrey's library should not imply, as P. S. Allen has it, the 'wholesale evacuation' of college libraries everywhere.[68] The commissions were set up to root out not books in general but heretical works, whether of Protestant theology, Catholic canon law, or Biblical commentary to taste. The impact of the commissions accordingly registered mostly in theological holdings;[69] there is no evidence to suggest that collections at non-monastic

[66] *Statuta Academiae Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge, 1785), 137; cf. Jensen, 'University and College Libraries', 346; J. M. Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts', *HUO-III*, 161n5; Leader, *HUC*, 332-3; the fullest account is F. Donald Logan, 'The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities, 1535', *EHR* 106 (1991), 861-888. The visitations are treated in greater detail in Chapter III.

[67] See Cranz, 'Editions of the Latin Aristotle', 116-123; cf. Fletcher, 'Faculty of Arts', 161-2: 'Many texts used were Greek classics, the work of Aristotle, Euclid and Ptolemy, for instance, and no taint of Romanism was attached to these.'

[68] P. S. Allen, 'Early Documents Connected with the Library of Merton College', *The Library*, s.4, 4.4 (1924), 270. Ker points out that, in fact, the University Library 'ceased to have an obvious function soon after it was built' in the absence of a committed base of donors or the funds to purchase books ('The Provision of Books', 477).

[69] Thus 'we need only consider the nature of the surviving manuscripts at New College, Balliol, Merton, and Magdalen, and in Cambridge at Peterhouse, Caius, and Pembroke, to see that many of the books condemned or laughed at in 1535 and later have been preserved... the King's [College, Cambridge] catalogue of 1553 shows that the old collection was not destroyed altogether in King Edward's reign', (Ker, 'Oxford College Libraries', 489-90); 'the evidence from All Souls suggests that the sheer necessity of making room for new books on the desks may have been a more compelling reason for discarding old books than the orders of the Henrician and Marian Commissioners in the visitations of 1535 and 1549' (Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 429); the catalogue of Corpus Christi, Cambridge, shows that 'a considerable proportion of the pre-Reformation college library had survived undisturbed through the troubles of Edward's reign. That many of the books are no longer to be found in the library is probably more the result of their replacement by later and better editions than of any sudden and systematic policy of destruction' (Fletcher and McConica, 'A Sixteenth-Century Inventory', 191). A summary of the retention of manuscript collections at both

colleges were much affected;[70] and, as Ker acutely observes, 'many books in the chained libraries are [not] likely to have been objected to by Cardinal Pole's Commissioners, simply because most books containing writings of the reformers printed before 1553 were too small to be library books.'[71] Aristotelian works were certainly large enough to appear in chained libraries, but what offence they could have caused to the commissioners is hard to imagine, unless Cardinal Pole's zeal stretched as far as condemning the Basel editions of 1538, 1542, and 1548 for containing a *Vita Aristotelis* by the reformer Melanchthon. Yet we have records of just these volumes surviving the Oxford visitations, at Corpus Christi and All Souls.[72] There, at least, no objection was made, and it is reasonable to extrapolate from these records a general disinclination on the part of the commissioners to intervene in Aristotelian holdings.

The factors affecting those holdings, therefore, were probably more banal. Old editions might be lost, or discarded in favour of new editions for want of shelf-space. On the other hand, libraries that were dependent on donations lacked the luxury of shaping their collections, and several records indicate a conservative eclecticism governing Aristotelian texts late into the century. Amid a drive in 1601 to acquire new Aristotelian holdings, Christ Church received a donation from one Jaspar Swyft, M.A., of Stagninus's old Latin edition (Venice, 1489), when as much as a decade earlier it had received Zabarella's cutting-edge Aristotelian work *De rebus naturalibus* (1590) from the recently matriculated Thomas Grantham.[73] And some libraries, of course, simply did not replace their earlier holdings: the Aldine Aristotle (1495-98) purchased by Queens' College, Cambridge, from the sale of Henry Bullock's estate in 1526, was in 1580 still the college's only holding of Aristotle's *opera*.[74]

Universities is given by Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 7.

70 Jensen, 'University and College Libraries', 346-7.

71 Ker, 'Oxford College Libraries', 493.

72 Both sets survive: see Appendix I, *s.vv.* Oxford, All Souls College, 1156-57, and Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 51.

73 Ker, 'The Provision of Books', Appendix III: Books at Christ Church 1562-1602, nos. 1591.1, 1601.6.

74 Clare Sargent, 'Two Sixteenth-Century Book Lists from the Library of Queens' College, Cambridge', *TCBS* 12 (2001), List I (167-70), no. 10; List II (170-78), no. 43.

Comparing a 'humanist' Oxford library, such as Corpus Christi's, with its 'conservative' counterparts at All Souls and Merton reveals more complex patterns of ownership than we might expect from the epithets alone: Merton had no modern Aristotle until 1593, All Souls purchased a full set in 1544-5, and Corpus boasted both old *and* new editions in 1589.[75] While Gaskell's sketch of the likely contents of a college library around 1580 – affording it Aristotle in Greek – is probably correct, and can be reasonably extended to colleges for which no records survive, the range of possible editions held cannot reliably be narrowed.[76]

Access to college books was wider, however, than the holdings in library catalogues alone would suggest. From the fifteenth century the warden of a college might have had his own collection, from which books could be distributed among the fellows.[77] The largest body of college books not held in the libraries, however, was that included in the *electio sociorum*, a circulating collection mostly of smaller books and manuscripts, which fellows could remove to their rooms. The extent of this system has never been fully mapped, due to the scarcity of available evidence: there are records of three elections at Merton in 1508, 1513, and 1519, but after that date the only concrete evidence pertains to Lincoln, where entries in the college register show books circulating in election as late as 1596.[78] *Electiones* were gradually abandoned over the sixteenth-century, although book-borrowing in general appears to have

[75] In addition to the records of the modern edition listed for the college in Appendix I, see Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century', nos. 35, 37, 38, i.e. volumes of the Aldine Aristotle (1495-98).

[76] Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 8: 'Altogether the divinity books were likely to make up about two-thirds of the whole library. The classes which followed divinity varied more between the colleges. There would be dictionaries, but few classics, and those few probably in Greek rather than Latin; they would not have included Virgil or Horace. Aristotle would be there, and probably Plato, both in Greek.'

[77] Thomson, *Medieval Manuscripts of Merton*, xxxiii; the lists are printed in F. M. Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College* (Oxford, 1931), 71-77. For evidence of a similar system at All Souls in the mid-sixteenth century, see Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 449.

[78] Merton's *electiones* of 1508 and 1519 are printed in Powicke, *Medieval Books of Merton*, 247-52; those of 1513 are in H. E. Salter, ed., *Registrum annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1483-1521* (Oxford, 1923), f.221v. The Lincoln lists are printed in Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 479-86; Magdalen elections of the fifteenth century are discussed by C. Y. Ferdinand, 'Magdalen College and the Book Trade: The Provision of Books in Oxford, 1450-1550' in A. Hunt, G. Mandelbrote and A. Shell, eds., *The Book Trade and its Customers, 1450-1900* (Winchester, 1997), 178-79; and see in general Elisabeth Leedham-Green, 'University Libraries and Book-sellers' in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, III: 1400-1557*, ed. Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp (Cambridge, 1999), 323-6.

continued later into the century, in Merton at least;[79] the problem with the *electio sociorum* was, as it ever shall be, that books were all too frequently damaged, lost, kept, or even sold. The Merton election lists are better evidence of the failure of the system than its success: in 1508 Dr. 'Adamys' had lost twenty books, 'Gydyng' four, and the infamous 'Marstone' his entire election of twenty-eight; in 1513, eight books were lost among six fellows. Matthew Parker's bequest to Corpus Christi, Cambridge, anticipated such depredations by mandating annual inspections with the power to fine the college if volumes or manuscript leaves were found wanting, and in the last resort forcing Corpus to cede the collection to Caius, Caius to Trinity Hall, Trinity Hall back to Corpus, should too many volumes be lost in the space of a single year.[80]

If these circulating books were sold, pawned, loaned, or retained by fellows, they suggest points of access to books, through teachers, colleagues, and personal purchase, that can be traced neither through surviving records of college libraries nor, for the most part, through records of personal collections. They gesture towards a kind of communal library unlikely to have left much trace at all, a virtual collection that circulated within intellectual networks, and one that probably better reflects the conditions of sixteenth-century access to books than the surviving records. Occasionally we might come across fragmentary evidence of this library in Jonson's loans to his friends, in Matthew Carnsew's diary record at Christ Church of borrowing one John Goldsmith's copy of Cebes's *Tabulae* ('what needyd that?' objected his lynx-eyed father, 'sythe yo*u* haue on of yo*ur* owne?'), in Alexander Nowell's note of 'books wych Thomas Bedel lefte wyth me att hys departyng' from Brasenose in 1539,

[79] Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 457: 'Merton decided in 1595 that if any of the (fifty-eight) books given the year before by Robert Barnes duplicated books already in the library they were to be available for loans to fellows.' Thomson, moreover, suggests that the omission from Thomas James's 1600 catalogue of around sixty books known to be owned by the college at the time may have been 'dispersed among the fellows when James made his list, even if the *electio* system no longer survived as an institution' (*Medieval Manuscripts of Merton*, xli).

[80] M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1912), I.xii-xiii; Oates, 'The Libraries of Cambridge', 216.

or in the words 'Chaekus habet' next to the copy of the Aldine *Rhetores graeci* listed in the manuscript catalogue in London, British Library, Add. MS 40,676.[81] But such references represent only the historical flotsam of everyday practice, *tanquam tabulae naufragii*, and we should not underestimate the freedom of movement this shadowy library afforded extant books, any more than the number of books now perished that it may once have held in stock.

The movements of these book-communities may go some way to explaining the phenomenon of libraries containing commentaries on Aristotelian texts which, to all appearances, the library did not have. Among the collections inspected by John Leland around 1538, Balliol's was especially unbalanced:

> Lincolniensis super 8. libros Physicorum. Est quiddam compendiosum.
> Andreas Antonius super Metaphys: Aristot:
> Bukfeld super Metaphys: Aristot:
> Burley super libros Ethicorum Aristotelis
> Bacon super libros Physicorum
> Ethica & Politica Aristotelis, interprete Leonardo Aretino ad Martinum 5.
> Oeconomica Aristotelis, eodem inteprete ad Cosmum
> Commentaria Eustachii, Metropolitani Niceae, in Ethica Aristot:
> Burleus super 8. libros Physicorum
> Quaestiones M^{i}. Joannis Sharp de anima
> Canonicus super libros Physicorum
> Dedicus super libros Physic:
> Burley super Porphyrium, super Praedicamenta, super 6. principia, super librum Perihermen. super libros Poster: super libr: de sensu & sensato. Idem de universalibus, de potentia animae, de somno & vigilia. Idem super libros Topicorum. Idem super libros de generatione & corruptione.
> Quaestiones Roberti Cary super libros Posteriorum, editae anno D. 1325.[82]

Amid a blizzard of exegesis on the *Metaphysics*, *Ethics*, *Physics*, *De anima*, and logical works, Balliol appears to hold only three actual texts, of the *Ethics*, *Politics*, and pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*. The lists emerging from Leland's visits to Cambridge in the same

[81] For Jonson, see Louise Schleiner, 'Latinized Greek Drama in Shakespeare's Writing of *Hamlet*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41.1 (1990), 32; for Carnsew, see PRO SP 46/15, f. 217, described by James McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford: The Collegiate Society' in *HUO-III*, 697-701; for Nowell, see Bod. MS Brasenose College 31, f. 38; for BL, Add. MS 40,676, see Appendix I, *s.v.* 'Unknown Scholar'. The incidence of student borrowing, as seen in the cases of Carnsew and Nowell, is remarkably common given how few sources of this type we have at all.

[82] Leland, *De rebus Britannicis collectanea*, ed. Thomas Hearne, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (London, 1770), IV.64-65.

period show similar results, for example at Pembroke, Queens', and Peterhouse, which among several Aristotelian texts lacked the *Politics* or the *Ethics* on which it owned commentaries,[83] while an inventory of King's College for the Marian commissioners in 1556-7 seems to exhibit no Aristotle at all.[84] These lacunae were gradually filled over the century: the gaps witnessed by Leland were recorded before the mid-century rise in purchasing. Unless we assume the circulation of Aristotelian works for which we have no record, however – either informally, through *electiones*, or through private ownership – it is difficult to explain such partial holdings.

With private ownership and circulation of books we approach another category of library altogether. Before we reach it, however, one final paracollegiate sphere of activity should be noted: the purchase and loan of student textbooks. Gaskell notes that around 1580, the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, contained 'none of the octavo text-books that were used by this time in both universities for teaching the junior courses.'[85] This is an archival blind-spot: octavo works were too small to be listed in the catalogues of libraries proper before horizontal shelving was adopted towards the end of the century.[86] But from other sources we can see that student textbooks did a lively trade.[87] One side of the transaction can be seen in the accounts of Oxford and Cambridge booksellers, such as John Dorne's famous day-book of around 1520; a Cambridge account of 1572, for example, suggests high demand

---

[83] *Ibid.*, IV.15-23.

[84] Printed in Cargill Thompson, 'Notes on King's College Library'.

[85] Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 9.

[86] Ker, 'The Provision of Books': the extant catalogues '[do] not tell us much about what books were available in these colleges, but only about what books could be fitted into their library rooms. Small books were excluded: their first appearance is at Merton in 1590, after the library had been converted to the new horizontal shelving. For up-to-date reading the books belonging to fellows were more important, more important probably than the rather miscellaneous collections of books which belonged to the colleges, but they were kept outside the library' (441-42); 'many of the cheap books are small textbooks of logic, philosophy and theology, the sort of books we do not find at all in college records' (474).

[87] See Jensen, 'University and College Libraries', 354: 'A medium-term impact of the invention of printing was to turn small, individually inexpensive books into commercially viable merchandise which could be produced for sale throughout Latinate western Europe. The commercially viable small books were the up-to-date tools of the trade for the sixteenth-century scholar.'

for octavo and quarto editions of the *Organon*.[88] Evidence for the consumers' side of the market is harder to come by, but is clearly represented in John Whitgift's tutorial accounts of books bought for his pupils at Trinity in the 1570s, including two premium 'aristotells' for Francis and Nicholas Bacon at eighteen shillings apiece.[89] Most textbooks were not nearly this expensive. Many, indeed, were not purchased at all, but were instead borrowed, copied, or handed down from seniors or teachers:[90] the books of John Rainolds, for instance, including two complete Aristotles and two commentaries touching on the *Poetics*, were distributed at his death in 1607 widely among his students throughout Oxford.[91]

Of private libraries proper there is less that holds generally true, as the range of owners and attendant conditions of collection is much greater than that pertaining to private libraries. The falling price and increasing availability of books throughout the sixteenth-century encouraged collection of many kinds, from Arundel's presentation volumes to scholars' working libraries.[92] The size of scholars' collections – perhaps a dozen books on average at the turn of the century – grew rapidly after the late 1570s, when an average Cambridge scholar might have owned about seventy books, and a senior fellow as many as three hundred;[93] by Ker's calculations from inventories made in the plague-year of 1577, 'young men in the 70s might expect to own as many books as much more senior men owned in the 30s.'[94] Private book ownership outside the universities was far less extensive, and it is rare to find inventory records listing more than fifteen books, the number Sears Jayne thus made the

---

88 F. Madan, 'Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller in Oxford, A.D. 1520' in *Collectanea I*, ed. C. R. L. Fletcher, OHS 5 (Oxford, 1885), 71-177, and see Appendix II; David Pearson, 'A Cambridge Bookseller's Accounts of 1572', *TCBS* 9 (1988), 230-47.

89 Philip Gaskell, 'Books Bought by Whitgift's Pupils in the 1570s', *TCBS* 7 (1979).

90 Some instances of hand-me-down textbooks are mentioned in Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 466 n.3; see also Ferdinand, 'Magdalen College and the Book Trade', 181, and Madan, 'Day-Book of John Dorne', 75.

91 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Wood D. 10; see Appendix I for treatment of the Aristotelian holdings.

92 Jayne and Johnson, *The Lumley Library*, 4: 'Like most Tudor nobles he [Arundel] measured gentility more by the possession than by the reading of books. For him a library was not a workroom but a showplace, and he bought books with an eye to large copies and fine bindings.'

93 Jayne, *LCER*, 14.

94 Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 477.

lower limit for inclusion in his *Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance*. The largest private libraries, however, were sufficient to eclipse institutional collections, and moreover had more flexibility to specialise than libraries dependent on donations.[95] In 1582, for example, the University Library at Cambridge only had about 451 books and manuscripts, while the Bodleian would not be founded for another two decades.[96] John Dee, meanwhile, estimated that his library, magnificent enough to be visited by Elizabeth and to all intents and purposes filling the role of a London university library, held perhaps four thousand works distributed among two and a half thousand volumes, just fewer than were held in the library of Lord Lumley;[97] the poet Drummond of Hawthornden had around fifteen hundred volumes in the early seventeenth century, and the libraries of Thomas Cranmer, Sir Thomas Smith, William Cecil, Matthew Parker, Henry Percy, Gabriel Harvey, Ben Jonson, and John Donne, to name but a distinguished few, have all been recorded or reconstructed in the hundreds.[98]

With the exception of these very large collections which were catalogued independently, records of private libraries survive in the unusually high number of inventories presented for probate between the 1530s and 1580s that listed books individually among the deceased's goods.[99] Much of this evidence has been made available to scholars of sixteenth-

[95] Jensen, 'University and College Libraries', 353, cites Thomas Simon's Oxford library for medical texts, William Brown of Merton's for classics, in the 1550s.

[96] Oates, 'The Libraries of Cambridge', 215.

[97] Peter J. French, *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London, 1972), 43-45. See also Roberts and Watson, *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, 41: 'Any library in one of the universities would have filled the theological and legal gaps in Dee's collection, but it would not have remedied his lack of interest in English literature and would not have been as rich as in his books in the other European vernaculars. Apart from these gaps Dee's library was far more universal in its scope than any other collection in England.'

[98] See in general Jayne, *LCER*. Drummond: see MacDonald, *The Library of Drummond of Hawthornden*, and Laing, 'A brief account of the Hawthornden MSS', 73-77. Cranmer: see Bernard Quaritch, *Contributions toward a Dictionary of English Book-Collectors*, Part I (1892), 3-28; additional books identified in Jayne and Johnson, *The Lumley Library*, indexed under 'Cranmer'. Harvey: see Stern, *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia and Library*. Donne: see Geoffrey Keynes, 'Books from John Donne's Library' in *Bibliography of Dr. John Donne*, 4th ed. (London, 1974), 258-79; 'More Books from the Library of John Donne', *The Book Collector* 26 (1977), 29-35, and 27 (1978), 570-72; and M. Hobbs, 'More Books from the Library of John Donne', *The Book Collector* 29 (1980), 590-92. For Smith, Cecil, Parker, Percy, and Jonson, see Appendix I.

[99] The increase in booklists in probate inventories after 1530, and their dramatic decline after about 1580, have been often noted, e.g. by Ker, 'The Provision of Books', 471, and Jayne, *LCER*, 14-15; the reason commonly given for their decline is that as books became more numerous and affordable later in the century, and collections concomitantly grew, they became 'too large to list' (McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', 701). This

century libraries in two landmark publications: Elisabeth Leedham-Green's *Books in Cambridge Inventories* (Cambridge, 1986), and the serial *Private Libraries in Renaissance England*, under the general editorship of R. J. Fehrenbach (Binghamton, 1992-). In the first, Leedham-Green edited the book-lists found in 241 inventories taken by the probate court at Cambridge, mostly in the sixteenth century: though the latest record dates to 1760, only twenty-three lists date from after the sixteenth century, and sixteen of those fall into the first two decades, or thereabouts, of the seventeenth.[100] The second has published, in the seven volumes so far released, all 162 libraries found in Oxford probate inventories between 1507 and 1653, and plans to continue with book-lists from beyond the jurisdiction of the university's probate authority. Many of these records appear in Appendix II, as even before 1580 they often lack a level of detail sufficient to be identified precisely: this poses methodological challenges to identifying individual books, to which we shall return shortly.

The contents of the appendices thus represent the results of reading the comprehensive sixteenth-century bibliography of the *Poetics* against the majority of surviving institutional library catalogues, against all the private book-lists found in probate records from the two universities, and against as many independent private libraries and oddities as I have come across in the course of this research. It is not an exhaustive survey; it is doubtful whether any such survey could be exhaustive, due both to human limits and the limits of the archive. My failure comprehensively to survey college Benefactors Books is not much excused by Jayne's caution that such sources are unreliable witnesses to the dates of benefaction, having been instituted only around the turn of the seventeenth century in imitation of the Bodleian's stately volume, and often giving us little more information than the evidence of provenance recorded

explanation is unsatisfying: it underestimates the legal and financial importance of precise inventory, and fails to account for the increase in booklists in the first place. I am preparing work on this subject.

[100] One was discovered after the publication of Leedham-Green's two volumes: see Elisabeth Leedham-Green, 'One That Got Away: The Inventory of Thomas Southwell, 1605', *TCBS* 9 (1990), 526-530.

in the surviving books to record which they were initially constructed.[101] There are doubtless many such volumes currently sitting on library shelves that might be identifiable from inscriptions, the hands of marginalia, or binding, as having been present in England in the sixteenth-century; I cannot claim to have searched for these systematically, though I have been guided towards many by the detailed cataloguing of numerous unsung librarians. Though the universities make for the richest hunting-grounds, such volumes might be found in the holdings of cathedral libraries across Britain, and the remains of early libraries of London-based institutions, such as Worshipful Companies and the Royal College of Physicians, where Theodore Goulston, the first English translator of the *Poetics* into Latin, was a member; little evidence for the contents of the libraries at the Inns of Court in the period survives, where book-ownership seems to have been mostly private and highly specialised.[102] That these institutions may not have had much use for new humanist editions of Aristotle, as surveys of their earlier holdings suggest, is true but not entirely satisfying.[103] And no amount of industry will fill the lacunae in the record, some as literal as the blank space in the Merton College Register that follows 'Iunii 18 recepimus hos libros a magistro Thoma Savile emptos in Italia'.[104] But further research would only add to the results collated here, which I hope are sufficient to answer the question of whether English readers had access to the text of the *Poetics* in the sixteenth century, and indicate some of the ways in which they

[101] Jayne, *LCER*, 18-21.

[102] See J. H. Baker, 'Common Lawyers and the Inns of Court' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 448-460. For an example of the impact of specialism on holdings, see also W. C. Costin, 'The Inventory of John English, B.C.L., Fellow of St. John's College', *Oxoniensia* XI-XII (1946-7), 103: 'Although the complete absence of Plato is not surprising, it is noteworthy that there is no text of Aristotle, except a French translation of the *Politics*. Perhaps the explanation lies in that, being a Jurist, he had not to steep himself in Aristotle to the same extent as would be necessary for an artist.'

[103] There are few Aristotelian holdings listed in, for example, Nigel Ramsay and James M. W. Willoughby, eds., *Hospitals, Towns and the Professions*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 14 (London, 2009), or Margaret McLeod *et al.*, *The Cathedral Libraries Catalogue: Books Printed before 1701 in the Libraries of the Anglican Cathedrals of England and Wales* (London, 1984); C. E. Newman, 'The First Library of the Royal College of Physicians', *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of London* 3 (1968-69), 299-307, does not provide a catalogue.

[104] 'June 18: we received these books purchased by Master Thomas Savile in Italy'; printed in J. M. Fletcher, ed., *Registrum annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1567-1603* (Oxford, 1976), 277 (p.152), *s.a.* 1591.

had it.

It remains to consider the significant methodological problems arising from the attempt to read abstract bibliography into real library catalogues, especially when that bibliography has been derived in the first place from modern catalogues with modern cataloguing rubrics.[105] For a present example, let us return to Table 2, the 'negative list' of *opera* wanting the *Poetics*. None of these volumes contains the *Poetics*; but some of them, considered '*opera*' by the *ISTC* and by Cranz, do not contain the full *corpus aristotelicum* to that date in any case, and are better thought of as volumes of 'extensive selected' rather than complete works. Kraye notes, for example, that the 1479 Augsburg edition contained mostly the logical works, and the 1497 Cologne edition only the *libri naturales*.[106] To label these compendia '*opera*' is reasonable cataloguing practice on the part of the *ISTC*, since '*omnia*' need not necessarily be implied – though it often is. But there were many more volumes of *selected* works in circulation, as we might expect, that did not contain the *Poetics*. This lexical uncertainty, in short, raises the possibility that volumes of 'Aristotelis opera' recorded, without a standard rubric, in contemporary library catalogues might indicate either collected or selected works. We have seen that if one were to purchase a new copy of Aristotle's collected works in Greek after 1531, or in Latin after 1538, one would consequently own a copy of the *Poetics*. But if we cannot determine whether an *opera* is collected or selected, it becomes much harder to apply this broad criterion.

In practice, however, the problem of rubric is not as grave as it seems. Sixteenth century library catalogues in all their various forms, from collectors' lists to probate inventories, were composed in pursuit, first and foremost, of disambiguation. Librarians needed to provide finding aids for particular texts, and scholars, too, were dealing with the

---

[105] Schmitt gestures towards these problems in *IAAr*, viii, n.9; Kraye discusses them with respect to incunabula in 'The Printing History of Aristotle in the Fifteenth Century', 189-94.

[106] Kraye, 'The Printing History of Aristotle in the Fifteenth Century', 202 n.54.

precise contents of their volumes; the probate courts, if a detailed list of books was required at all, needed a legal record of holdings for inventory and accurately to estimate the wealth of the owner at death; for bibliophiles, of course, the particular edition of a work would often matter more than the works therein, as is attested by the several different editions of *opera omnia* held in the larger collectors' libraries. The rhetoric of library catalogues thus tended to strive towards the elimination of ambiguity wherever possible. Partial and selected works were usually listed under the title of their first, or most important, work, rather than indiscriminately under 'opera'. For example, in a catalogue compiled for the Marian commissioners in 1556-7, the Cambridge University Library lists the following:

> Organon Arist. grece
> Theophrastus de historia plantarum; Idem de causis plantarum; Problemata Arist. Problemata Alexandri aphrodisij; Mechanica Arist.; Metaphysica Arist.; Metaphysica Theophrasti[107]

These entries, recording the gift (probably from Cuthbert Tunstall) of volumes I and IV of the Aldine Aristotle of 1495-8, could quite legitimately have been catalogued as members of an *opera omnia*, and perhaps of all volumes would have been most likely to bear that name, since the Aldine edition was famed as a landmark in the printing of the collected works. Yet they are instead listed individually by their contents, precisely in order to distinguish them from one another. By the same token, the tendency towards descriptive specificity can be seen working to disambiguate complete works from what I called above 'extensive selected' works, such as the 1479 and 1497 editions listed as '*opera*' in the *ISTC.* In the 1553 probate inventory of Thomas Simons, for example, we find 'opera quaedam Aristotelis colligata' (no.65.85) listed in opposition to such entries as 'Hippocratis opera' (65.54) and 'opera arnoldi medici' (65.58).[108] For all their brevity, the words 'quaedam' ('certain', as opposed to

107 J. C. T. Oates and H. L. Pink, 'Three Sixteenth-Century Catalogues of the University Library', *TCBS* 1.4 (1952), nos. 160, 161.

108 *PLRE* 65, ed. Marc L. Schwarz: Simons, Thomas (M.A., B.M.). Scholar. d. 1553. Probate inventory,

all) and 'colligata' (indicating a volume of many works) here bear a lot of taxonomic weight in comparison with the probate court's terminology in evidence across the catalogue as a whole.[109] We cannot assume that cataloguers were always consistent, even within a single list, and the danger of being unwittingly misled is ever present. In general, however, terms like 'opera' tend to be applied with precision and in a limited sense in the rhetorical ecosystems of their catalogues, and more often than not can be taken to imply 'omnia' in the absence of other qualifiers.

Stated more generally, the methodological problem for bibliographers is how to reconstruct the identity of a volume from minimal data. This problem is especially pertinent to the earliest two printings of the work: Giorgio Valla's 1498 Latin translation and the Aldine *Rhetores graeci* (1508). Because collections of *opuscula* by various authors, these volumes were not recorded in libraries primarily as works by 'Aristotle': they represent a period in the transmission of the *Poetics* prior to its bibliographical absorption into the *corpus aristotelicum*. While later texts of the *Poetics* in sixteenth-century libraries can for the most part be identified by comparison to other editions of Aristotle, identifying these volumes requires separate lists of bibliographical *comparanda*. In Valla's case, we must distinguish the 1498 edition from other works by Valla or by other authors whom Valla had to that date uniquely translated. Yet this is complicated still further by the fact that several of Valla's other published works also comprised collections of translations and short works, such that a volume bearing Valla's name might commonly be catalogued as 'opera Georgij Vallae' or 'valla cum alio' – descriptions that are of some use in distinguishing between Valla's collections of multiple works and his editions or translations of single works, but of little use in distinguishing between various collections of multiple works, only some of which

Oxfordshire (Oxford), no. 65.85.

[109] For further examples, compare no. OL97, 'Aristotelis vol. 2', with no. OL140, 'Aristotelis pars quaedam', in Philip Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*; see also the notes to Appendix I, *s.vv.* Bacon, Francis; Cambridge, Pembroke College; Hawes, Henry.

contained the *Poetics*. In some of these ambiguous cases, sixteenth-century cataloguing rubrics work to our advantage: we can deduce from the bibliographical record that an entry for 'dialecta nicephori' made in the 1558 probate inventory of William Brown, Fellow of Merton, could only correspond to the 1498 volume – 'invariably catalogued', as Jill Kraye notes, 'under Nicephorus Blemmydes, the author of the first work in the volume'[110] – in which Valla's translation of Nicephorus's *Logica* accompanied that of the *Poetics*. In Valla's case I have also relaxed a little the rule that all entries reproduce the text itself, and included records of the posthumous and popular encyclopaedic work *De expetendis ac fugiendis rebus opus* (Venice, 1501), which does not contain a translation of the *Poetics* proper but, in book 38, Valla's lectures 'de poetica' which drew on ideas from the *Poetics* only made widely available to a reading public in his own translation printed three years previously. *De expetendis* represents, at least, access to some of the influential ideas of Aristotle's *Poetics* if not to the text itself, and seemed to me worthy of mention on account of its early availability. It is apparent from these records, especially those in the day-book of John Dorne, that Valla, largely forgotten to modern scholarship in favour of his more-famous homonym,[111] was an important presence in sixteenth-century Oxford and Cambridge; as late as 1620, Thomas James's catalogue of the Bodleian's holdings records fully seven of Giorgio's works to Lorenzo Valla's nine.[112]

In Aphthonius's case the task is even harder, as records of 'Aphthonius' or 'progymnasmata' offer little with which to differentiate the 1508 *Rhetores graeci* from the many editions of the exercises in schoolbooks and rhetorical collections published later in the sixteenth century; the indication 'grece', should it appear, is of only limited help, as in the

[110] Kraye, 'The Printing History of Aristotle in the Fifteenth Century', 190.

[111] Tigerstedt, 'Observations', 14: 'Giorgio Valla is not one of the great luminaries of Italian Renaissance Humanism, and the very name of Valla evokes today his greater namesake and countryman Lorenzo Valla.'

[112] James, *Catalogus vniuersalis librorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana omnium librorum, linguarum, & scientiarum genere refertissime...* (Oxford, 1620).

absence of a publication date one usually needs at least two physical descriptors – format, language, binding – to begin to narrow the spectrum of possible editions.[113] Indeed, the *Rhetores graeci* edition is paradigmatic of the difficult triangular relationship between modern rubrics, sixteenth-century rubrics, and the minimal detail of probate records. When Leedham-Green published her edition of the Cambridge probate inventories, the temporal span of the inventories enabled her (as it enabled Henry Turner) to use H. M. Adams's *Catalogue of Books Printed on the Continent of Europe, 1501-1600, in Cambridge libraries* (1967) as a convenient index to most of her identifications, while stressing that 'these identifications vary greatly in their certainty'.[114] But the bibliographical scope of the inventories, 'books in sixteenth-century Cambridge libraries', is not quite the same as Adams's 'sixteenth-century books in Cambridge libraries', and the use of Adams as an index can, despite an editor's best efforts and supplementation of Adams with other indices where necessary, tend to occlude late fifteenth-century books that remained popular into the sixteenth century; for our limited purposes, a category containing the Aldine Aristotle of 1495-98 (the only Greek *opera omnia* that omitted the *Poetics*) and Valla's 1498 collection of *opuscula*, discussed above. Still further blind-spots appear among sixteenth-century books when Adams is read alongside a contemporary library catalogue: Adams records the *Rhetores graeci* as R447, which apparently does not appear in any Cambridge inventory; but the work, its title-page not in fact reading *Rhetores graeci* (a colloquial title) but *Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi. Aphthonii sophistae Progymnasmata...*, would be found in sixteenth-century lists under 'Aphthonius', the author of the first item in the collection, and may match several of the

---

[113] The *Progymnasmata* was available in a second Greek edition (which did not include the *Poetics*) just seven years after the publication of the *Rhetores graeci*, again accompanying Hermogenes's *Rhetoric*, in Aphthonius and Hermogenes, *In hoc volumine haec continentur. Ausonij* [*sic*] *sophistae praeludia. Hermogenis Rhetorica* (Florence, 1515). This Giunta edition was octavo as opposed to the Aldine's quarto, but indications of format are not often given in probate records. An indication of 'latine', of course, is sufficient to rule out the Aldine edition.

[114] *BCI*, II.xi.

fifteen possible entries from 1545-1609 in the Cambridge inventories.[115] Identifications are further complicated by the fact that Aldus's volumes appear folio in size but quarto in format, and could be listed as either according to the rubric of the cataloguer.[116] Attempting to account for the persistent popularity of the *Rhetores graeci* and the difficulty of precisely identifying Valla's various publications, therefore, I have included in Appendix II such records as do not contraindicate an identification with those works containing the *Poetics* mentioned here.

A final mention should be given to records of the physical dimensions of a book or set

---

[115] *BCI*, II.29, *s.v.* 'Aphthonius', subtracting those recorded as octavo editions; cf. Lawrence D. Green and James J. Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue 1460-1700*, 2nd ed. (Aldershot, 2006), 27-32, for a full bibliography of the work. The difficulties surrounding the *Rhetores graeci* do not stop here. In a letter to a friend in York around November 1544, Ascham mentions a Greek work entitled 'Decem Rhetores' which he is unable to find: 'Est liber Graecus, qui *Decem Rhetores* nominatur; continet enim orationes AESCHINIS, LYCURGI, DINARCHI et aliorum; hunc vehementer expeto, quia apud nos parabilis non est' (Letter XXIV, Giles I.i.59). The title 'Decem Rhetores' could refer to Harpocration's lexicon of the Attic orators, *Lexicon decem rhetorum graece*, first published by Aldus (1503, repr. 1527) and variously reprinted later in the century (for the Aldine editions see Renouard, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Alde*, 41.6, 104.4), but the lexicon does not contain their 'orationes' proper. The Aldine *Rhetores graeci* (1508) did not contain the works of these authors, although some are enumerated in Aldus's dedicatory letter to Janus Lascaris 'ex dece*m* illis clariss*imis* oratoribus, qui Demosthenis temporibus floruere' (Orlandi, *Aldo Manuzio editore* [Milan, 1975], LXV). They appeared together in a later Aldine collection of Greek orators (Venice, 1513), where the construction 'decem oratores' is used again, but in confusing apposition to the Plutarchan phrase cited as an authority: 'ex hac vero copia sunt decem illi oratores, quorum vitas scripsit Plutarchus eo libello, cuius titulus *βίοι τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων*' (*ibid.*, LXXV). Subsequently known as 'Oratores Graeci' or 'Rhetorum Graecorum Orationes', this edition has thus frequently been referred to as 'Rhetores' (e.g. by Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius* [Oxford, 1979], 162). This can be misleading: for example, in his B.Litt. thesis on the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and its donors, J. R. Liddell recorded a gift from Richard Fox of 'Rhetores Antiqui Graeci Isocrates &c. Venice 1513 Ald.' ('The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1517-1617', 18, no.10); when the thesis was reworked into an article five years later, however, Liddell followed the title and recorded the work under the earlier date, despite describing its contents as those of the later volume: 'Isocrates Alcidamus Gorgias Aristides, Eschines Lysias, caeterique graeci oratores, graece. *Venice 1508*' ('The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century', 406, no.98). Deno Geanakoplos points out that the *Rhetores* contains works on how to compose an oration, the *Oratores* the orations themselves (*Greek Scholars in Venice* [Cambridge, MA, 1962], 227n14); the works are described in Renouard, 54.4 and 60.2. It is safe to assume, given the similarity of contents and the history of misprision, that Ascham sought the 1513 *Oratores Graeci*.

[116] The *Rhetores graeci* is by any bibliographical measure a quarto volume: its chain-lines are horizontal, and its watermark is bisected at the quire-fold. Nonetheless, it appears larger and less square than a typical quarto volume, and has thus often been recorded as a folio; size was more important than format proper to sixteenth-century cataloguers, in any case, as an indication of a book's placement in a physical library. It is important for our purposes to recognise that this volume may be identified in catalogues either as 'folio' or as 'quarto'; I record it in the appendices as 'Royal quarto', indicating its likely printing on Royal ('reale') paper: see Paul Needham, 'Aldus Manutius's Paper Stock: the Evidence of Two Uncut Books', *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 55.2 (1994), 287-307, to whom I am grateful for suggesting the fruitful comparison of the volumes' descriptions in *The Aldine Press: Catalogue of the Ahmanson-Murphy Collection* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2001), nos. 99, 104, with Aldus's edition of Plutarch (no. 101), at least partly printed on the same paper-stock. On the complex variables of format and paper-size, see G. Thomas Tanselle, 'The Bibliographical Description of Paper', *Studies in Bibliography* 24 (1971), 27-67, and 'The Concept of Format', *Studies in Bibliography* 53 (2000), esp. 82-91.

of books. Though sometimes definitive when given, usually as an estimate of size, format is not often mentioned except in catalogues of larger private libraries; it is rare in college catalogues, and almost unheard of in probate records. The number of volumes in which a set is bound is one of the few pieces of evidence recorded with any frequency, if only because so many inventories and other catalogues amounted to sequential enumerations of the physical contents of shelves, trunks, or cases. These records present themselves as valuable guides to the identity of holdings: since among the Greek *opera*, for example, the Aldine Aristotle had five volumes, the Erasmus/Grynaeus editions two, Camozzi's Aldine *editio minor* six, and Sylburg's eleven, we might hope to match records of Greek *opera* based on their binding alone. But we hope in vain: these figures, as found in modern catalogues, describe the number of parts in which the work was printed, not those in which it arrived finally bound on library shelves, and while books would not likely be bound in more volumes than parts, they were frequently bound in fewer. Thus John Dee owned two copies of the Erasmus/Grynaeus editions: one is bound in one volume, the other in two; the record in John Denys's 1578 inventory of a one-volume Aristotle 'bas*iliae*' must indicate an edition that we would consider as having two, three, or four parts; surviving books at Merton and St John's, Oxford indicate bindings of eleven-volume editions in four, and three in two; at Christ's, Cambridge, a record of a seven-volume Aristotle must represent a conglomerate of two or more editions; at St John's, Cambridge, a ten-volume Greek Aristotle recorded in 1544 has gained a volume by 1557, neither corresponding directly to single editions, and indicating, moreover, that Aristotelian works may have been imagined by some librarians as a single agglomerative holding. These anomalous cases are dealt with individually in the appendices. If binding is a useful guide at all, it supplies only more likelihoods and tendencies rather than certain evidence. The five-part Aldine Aristotle of 1495-98 may have been bound in four, five, or six volumes, but I have not found it anywhere bound in one or two: an *opera* bound in four to six

volumes, then, might indicate the Aldine edition.[117] Yet again the waters are muddied by the fact that other multi-part *opera* could also be bound in five volumes: Andrew Perne's five-volume *opera*, because still extant at Peterhouse, can be identified as the eleven-part edition of Sylburg (Frankfurt, 1584-87). Only further evidence will do in such cases; I have been as solicitous as time has allowed in probing this often unyielding archive.

Since lists bring with them the rhetorical illusion of completeness, these appendices must be accompanied with some words of caution concerning the extent to which they form a basis for generalised conclusions. The absence of evidence, here as in all historical research, is not the evidence of absence. These findings are of value exclusively as positive data, and do not bear much statistical extension; in short, while inclusion in Appendix I definitely proves ownership of the Poetics within the parameters I have described, exclusion from Appendix I in no way disproves ownership of the *Poetics*; and it must be stressed again that neither inclusion in, nor exclusion from, Appendix I has any necessary correlation with *readership* of the *Poetics*.

This is the case for several reasons. Most important is to recognise that the appendices do not represent a subset of book owners in sixteenth-century England; they represent a subset of book owners whose libraries, for one reason or another, happen to have been catalogued in sixteenth-century England and survived to the present, or in rare cases book owners of broader historical fame, whose marks of ownership have proved sufficiently consistent and identifiable for their libraries to be reconstructed by modern scholars, and whose reputations have independently justified the labour. We can be certain, indeed we must insist, that there were many owners of books whose libraries were never catalogued or who did not mark their books, just as there were many owners of books whose books have disintegrated, whose libraries are dispersed, and whose library catalogues are lost to us. Ben Jonson, to cite a

[117] cf. Needham, 'Aldus Manutius's Paper Stocks', 295: 'Complete sets are perhaps most commonly bound in six volumes, with the massive volume IV divided in two.'

dramatic example, by Drummond's account 'devoured his bookes', selling them for necessity, and more were devoured by fire in 1623; the approximately 206 books assigned to him by McPherson from surviving marks of ownership can represent only a fraction of the library considered 'well-furnisht' by John Selden.[118] Nor is the provision of a catalogue always a matter of personal agency: as we have seen, a book owner who died earlier in the sixteenth-century stood a good chance of having his books listed individually, while one who died later would be more likely to have a total number of books recorded without further detail. The date of one's death, however, does not correlate with ownership of the *Poetics* beyond very broad parameters, and this alone seriously limits the value of probate records as a statistical guide to ownership of the text. Moreover, the proportions of social categories represented in the list (of scholars, noblemen, literary figures, or the like) afford us no statistical basis from which to project the likely makeup of those lost records: since we simply do not know how many book-lists have not survived or not been found, the sample represented here cannot be ascribed reliable statistical significance. The fact that Lord Lumley, Sir Thomas Knyvett, Henry Hawes, Ben Jonson, and Edward VI owned copies of the *Poetics* proves only two things: self-evidently, that the text was owned by those named people, and axiomatically, that it *could* have been owned in England by book-collectors and courtiers, country gentry, scholars, poets, and kings.

As for people not found in the lists, even those whose catalogued libraries survive and do not contain the *Poetics*, we should not assume they wanted for access to the text. For readers then as now, many books are owned and never read, many read and never owned; Samuel Daniel implies as much in his eulogy for the Earl of Devonshire, who 'hadst not bookes as many haue | For ostentation, but for vse'.[119] Library catalogues thus make for poor

118 McPherson, 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia', 6. Henry Woudhuysen's view is that it was the contents of Jonson's desk – i.e. his manuscripts – that perished, and he informs me that some fifty to sixty books may now be added to McPherson's catalogue (personal correspondence, July 2013).

119 Samuel Daniel, *A Funerall Poem vppon the Death of the late noble Earle of Deuonshyre* (London, 1606), sig.

evidence of readership.[120] John Donne's library is predominantly 'concerned with theological controversy', and contains none of his poetic influences;[121] in Ben Jonson's depleted library, no copy is found of Heinsius's 1610-11 editions of the *Poetics*, containing the essay *De tragoediae constitutione* on which Jonson drew so extensively in the composition of *Discoveries*.[122] Still closer to our subject, it is uncontroversially held that Sidney had some contact with Castelvetro's *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta* (1570), but the book does not appear in those holdings of the Sidney family library that may have been his; nor does Scaliger's *Poetices* (1561) or Minturno's *De poeta* (1559), widely regarded as formative of the *Defence*; nor do the several books by Tarcagnota, Ruscelli, and Contarini recommended by him to Languet in 1573; nor does the Italian translation of Cicero's *Epistles* we know him to have used in Padua.[123] Clearly, neither sixteenth-century readers nor their books were bound within the walls of their libraries. University and college libraries were available to many of them; private libraries of considerable size might be open to curious visitors – John Dee, for example, insisted that his library be open for consultation by his wide circle of acquaintances and pupils, although 'we cannot, alas, point to any books which were used by

---

A3.

120 For a previous caution to this effect, which should be more widely acknowledged, see Margery H. Smith, 'Some Humanist Libraries in Early Tudor Cambridge', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 5 (1974), 16: 'In analyzing these lists one is always tempted to assume a direct relationship between possession and readership, treating the book titles as an absolute reflection of the owner's personal scholarly or literary tastes. Mere ownership, of course, does not guarantee readership. However, the lists covered here do point to larger differences in tastes and interests, leading one to speculate whether and to what degree they do reflect the owners' tastes.'

121 Geoffrey Keynes, 'Books from John Donne's Library', 263.

122 Daniel Heinsius's edition of the *Poetics* was printed twice in 1610, in Aristotle, *Aristotelis De poetica liber* (Leiden, 1610), and appended to Horace, *Q. Horatij Flacci opera omnia; cum notis D. Heinsij* (Leiden, 1610); the edition was reproduced the following year as Aristotle, *Aristotelis De poetica liber* (Leiden, 1611) accompanied by the essay *De tragica constitutione*, as it is listed on the main title page; the essay was reprinted separately in the same year as Heinsius, *De tragoediae constitutione* (Leiden, 1611). Of Heinsius's works, Jonson's library as it has been reconstructed holds only *Aristarchus Sacer, siue ad Nonni in Iohannem Metaphrasin exercitationes* (Leiden, 1627): see McPherson, 'Ben Jonson's Library', no. 75.

123 See James M. Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney, 1572-1577* (New Haven, London, 1972), for epistolary references to the Cicero (135) and Tarcagnota *et al*.: 'It is interesting that this volume and those by Ruscelli... were published in Venice in the 1560s and thus were considered current topics of conversation in Venetian circles' (121-22). Germaine Warkentin, 'Sidney's Authors' in *Sir Philip Sidney's Achievements*, ed. M. J. B. Allen *et al.* (New York, 1990), 68-89, lists all books recorded the 1660s catalogue of the Sidney family that may have belonged to Philip by virtue of having been printed before his death in 1586. 15% of these are of English origin; the rest are continental (73).

Philip Sidney'[124] – and books were, as we have seen, ever lent and borrowed, handed down and copied. If the text had not been available at all in England, as has been so often implied, we might consider it unlikely to have been read except through travel; since, in fact, it was widely available, we need not invent any further domestic obstructions for its readers, especially when we can instead perceive in the circulation and availability of up-to-date Aristotelian texts fragmentary evidence of active and engaged intellectual *milieux* in sixteenth-century England.

Some clusters in ownership, nonetheless, can be identified even from the positive record without much extrapolation. One such cluster takes in the friends and correspondents of Erasmus, a circle almost coterminous with the spread of English humanism in the early sixteenth century. We have records for John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, whom Erasmus had instructed in Greek and Hebrew, and through him a connection to St John's College and Christ's College, Cambridge, which he was so influential in founding;[125] for Christopher Longolius, one of the main targets of Erasmus's *Ciceronianus*, and through him Cardinal Pole;[126] for Corpus Christi, whose president, John Claymond, and whose mission were so dear to Erasmus; and perhaps for Thomas Linacre, closest of all to Erasmus, teacher of Greek to Thomas More, member of the Aldine academy, and himself involved in the editing of the great 1495-98 Aldine Aristotle.[127] Likewise, there is a cluster of ownership among mid-century Cambridge humanists: John Cheke, first Regius Professor of Greek at St John's, who used Segni's translation to teach Edward VI, borrowed the text from the 'unknown scholar',

[124] Roberts and Watson, *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, 42.

[125] Unless otherwise indicated, all the denizens of this paragraph may be found in Appendix I.

[126] See the introduction to *Ciceronianus* in *CWE* XXVIII, 324-30.

[127] On the many connections that link Linacre's circle with ownership of the Aldine Aristotle, see Ford, 'Private Ownership of Printed Books', 225-7. On Linacre's circle, treated more fully in Chapter III, see further P. S. Allen, 'Linacre and Latimer in Italy', *EHR* 18.71 (1903), 514-517; Arthur Tilley, 'Greek Studies in England in the Early Sixteenth Century', *EHR* 53.210-211 (1938), 221-239, 438-456; and the essays in Francis Maddison, Margaret Pelling, and Charles Webster, eds., *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460-1524* (Oxford, 1977), especially that of Charles Schmitt, 'Thomas Linacre and Italy' (36-75).

and quotes it in his letters to Stephen Gardiner on the correct pronunciation of Greek;[128] Sir Thomas Smith, a renowned Grecian at Queens' and later a powerful public servant; Andrew Perne, and perhaps William Cecil, alumni of St John's from the Cheke years; and perhaps Sir Richard Morison, friend and student of Ascham and Cheke. There is a cluster, too, around scientific learning, as indicated by holdings from John Caius, and Gonville and Caius College through him; Henry Walker, Regius Professor of Physic to 1564 and Caius's friend, who donated two modern *opera* to Caius College library; Thomas Lorkin, who succeeded Walker in the post; Thomas Savile and his elder brother Henry, president of Merton, philosophers and mathematicians both; and, of course, Dr. John Dee and his wide circle of fellow scientists.[129] A cluster spanning most of the century is comprised by those who spent a stint of time studying or buying books in Italy: Caius, who earned his medical degree from Padua; Humphrey Llwyd, who spent 1566-67 in Italy with Arundel and whose inscription appears on books in Lumley's library; Henry Cole, student of law in Padua and subsequently Warden of New College and Dean of St Paul's, who donated books to St John's and New College, Oxford; the Saviles, acquaintances of John Rainolds and Thomas Bodley, both of whom spent time in the great library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli at Padua.[130] And we should not overlook the broad cluster indicated by a commitment to educational reform, supported so vigorously at Corpus Christi, Oxford, at first, and at St John's, Cambridge, in the mid-century. More clusters could

---

128 See Marvin T. Herrick, 'Sir John Cheke and Aristotle's Poetics', *The Classical Weekly* 18.17 (1925), 134-135; treated at length in Chapter V.

129 On Dee's circle and the uses of his books, see in general French, *John Dee*, and the recent work in Stephen Clucas, ed., *John Dee: Interdisciplinary Studies in English Renaissance Thought* (Dordrecht, 2006), including R. Julian Roberts's corrections to his and Watson's catalogue. Roberts and Watson list the men known to have used the library in *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, 41-45.

130 Sir Richard Morison would also fall into this category; see Tracey Amanda Sowerby, 'A Brave Knight and Learned Gentleman: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison (c.1513-1556)', D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (2005), 356, for his 'book-sharing circle'. On these English visitors to and students at Padua, see Jonathan Woolfson, *Padua and the Tudors: English Students in Italy, 1485-1603* (Cambridge, 1998); K. R. Bartlett, 'Worshipful Gentlemen of England: The *Studio* of Padua and the Education of the English Gentry in the Sixteenth Century', *Renaissance and Reformation* 6 (1982), 235-48; and in general, Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*.

doubtless be added, and indeed more book-owners to each cluster.[131] In short, the *Poetics* was brought into England by precisely the parties we might expect to have brought it into England: scholars and humanists, educators and hellenists, travellers and bibliophiles. Most, if not all, of which are epithets that describe Sir Philip Sidney.

On the face of it, our evidence for Sidney's access to books has been blighted with bad luck. His family library was catalogued only in 1652-1665, by which time Philip's few surviving books had become difficult to isolate among the much more numerous acquisitions of his brother Robert, first Earl of Leicester, and nephew Robert, the second earl, who inherited the library.[132] The only Aristotle among the books published in Sidney's lifetime and listed therein is Lambinus's translation of the *Ethics* (Basel, 1582). Shrewsbury School was promised a library in the ordinances of Thomas Ashton, a fellow of St John's College, Cambridge contemporary with John Cheke, and first headmaster during Sidney's education there from 1564-68. But the library was only built, and the ordinances satisfied, in 1596, under the headmastership of John Meighen.[133] Sidney then attended Christ Church, Oxford, from 1568 to about 1571; but Sears Jayne's remark that Christ Church was one of the three great sixteenth-century Oxford libraries refers properly to the manuscripts it absorbed along with Canterbury College.[134] In fact, no catalogue for Christ Church's sixteenth-century library survives independently of the list of 174 volumes which Neil Ker reconstructed from datable inscriptions in surviving books. None of the twenty-four volumes inscribed before 1571 is an

---

131 The various humanist circles discussed by James K. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford, 1965), for example, intersect at many points with the book-owners listed in the appendices.

132 In addition to 'Sidney's Authors', see Germaine Warkentin's 'The Library of the Sidney Family', *Sidney Newsletter & Journal* 15.1 (1997), and 'The World and the Book at Penshurst: The Second Earl of Leicester (1595-1677) and His Library,' *The Library* s.6, 20.4 (1998); her catalogue of the Sidney library, *The Library of the Sidneys of Penshurst Place, ca. 1665*, co-edited with Joseph L. Black and William R. Bowen (Toronto, 2013), appeared too late for me to consult for this thesis.

133 See J. B. Oldham, *A History of Shrewsbury School, 1552-1952* (Oxford, 1952), and more specifically his essays 'Shrewsbury School Library: Its Earlier History and Organization', *The Library* s.4, 16.1 (1935), 49-60, and 'Shrewsbury School Library', *The Library* s.5, 14.2 (1959), 81-99.

134 Jayne, *LCER*, 41.

Aristotle.

Yet the evidence we have surveyed for the bibliographical presence, acquisition, ownership, and circulation of Aristotelian texts suggests that Sidney had ample access to the *Poetics*, should he have wanted to read it, almost everywhere he went. As we have seen, the ordinary operation of sixteenth-century institutional libraries and private book collections more or less guaranteed that anyone with a reasonable amount of contact with the book-owning world would have no trouble finding a text he sought. We know that Sidney studied Aristotle at Christ Church in rhetoric and dialectic, at least, and the books he studied with must have come from somewhere. No less than an average student, and probably rather more, Sidney would have had a wide network of access to books held across the university through peers and teachers alike. When he went abroad, too, from 1572-75, he made the acquaintance of continental scholars and printers whose access to the *Poetics* is beyond question, including Henri Estienne, who met Sidney in Heidelberg, Strasbourg, and Vienna, and André Wechel, with whom Sidney lodged in Frankfurt and perhaps earlier in Paris prior to the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre: Wechel's father, Christian, had printed Greek and Latin texts of the *Poetics* at Paris in 1538,[135] and André would go on to print Sylburg's edition of 1584-87. When Sidney reached Padua and Venice in 1573, study and book-buying were on his itinerary. Access to the *Poetics* in the Veneto of all places may be taken for granted, as the majority of sixteenth-century editions of the *Poetics*, especially before the mid-1570s, came out of Venice: in 346 various publications of Aristotelian works printed in Paris from 1541 to 1580, the *Poetics* appeared only three times; of the ninety-eight printed in Venice over the same span, ten contained the *Poetics*, and at least nine major commentaries on the text were produced besides.[136] Neither the university library at Padua nor the libraries of the 'nations' of

[135] Aristotle, Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς. *Aristotelis Poetica* (Paris, 1538), *IAAr* 107.973; Aristotle, *Aristotelis Poetica, Alexandro Paccio interprete* (Paris, 1538), *IAAr* 107.794.

[136] Net publication figures for Aristotelian works are collated by Cranz in *IAAr*, xix.

the student-body had yet been constructed,[137] but Sidney's advice to his younger brother Robert in 1580 – 'in *Italy* yow*r* greatest expence must be vpon worthy men'[138] – implies that access to books through teachers and contemporaries did not escape him; among the numerous collections to which Sidney, like the Saviles after him, could have had access was the magnificent Venetian library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli, who owned, by Marcella Grendler's estimate, 'at least a substantial minority of printed Greek Aristotle works'.[139] It is from Padua that Sidney wrote to Languet of his desire to read Aristotle in the original Greek:

> Of Greek letters I should like to learn enough properly to understand Aristotle, for even if there are translations made every day, I suspect them of not expressing the author's meaning clearly and properly enough. In this regard I am quite ashamed, as Cicero says, to follow only the brooklets and not to see the wellsprings of things themselves.[140]

Sidney goes on to commend Aristotle's *Politics* to Languet, just as he would direct his brother towards the *Ethics* years later.[141] If Sidney had access to those texts at all, he had access to the *Poetics*, in Greek, Latin, and Italian besides. And even after he returned to England, library access still posed no problem. As a member of John Dee's extensive circle,[142] Sidney had the use of one of the finest scientific libraries in Europe, which for its part contained at least two

[137] Inspired by the Bodleian, the university library of Padua was founded in 1629; the earliest formations of 'national' libraries had begun in the art school of the German nation in 1586, but were slow to develop and have left little trace; the library of the English nation was founded on the model of the German in 1649. See L. Rossetti, 'Le biblioteche delle « nationes » nello studio di Padova', *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 2 (1969), 53-67; for Paduan library access in general, see Tiziana Pesenti Marangon, *La biblioteca universitaria di Padova: dalla sua istituzione alla fine della Repubblica veneta (1629-1794)* (Padua, 1979), esp. 4: 'In quegli anni lo Studio di Padova poteva disporre invece solo delle biblioteche delle « nationes »: le grandi biblioteche della nazione germanica artista e legista e la piccola biblioteca della nazione polacca, riservate però agli studenti delle nazioni stesse, delle biblioteche private dei professori e delle numerose e ricche biblioteche ecclesiastiche, aperte agli studiosi.' Many private and institutional libraries were catalogued in the 1630s by Giacopo Filippo Tomasini, in *Bibliothecae Patavinae manvscriptae pvblicae & privatae: quibus diuersi scriptores hactenus incogniti recensentur, ac illustrantur* (Udine, 1639).

[138] Sidney to Robert Sidney, Leicester House, 18 October 1580, *Correspondence* II.1006.

[139] Marcella Grendler, 'A Greek Collection in Padua: The Library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601)', *RQ* 33.3 (1980), 411.

[140] Sidney to Hubert Languet, Padua, 4 February 1574, *Correspondence* I.105-7.

[141] Sidney to Robert Sidney, s.l., s.d. <?1579>, *Correspondence* II.878.

[142] On Sidney's place in the Dee circle, see Peter French's chapter on 'John Dee and the Sidney Circle' in *John Dee*, 126-59, and the evidence amassed for Sidney's 'pupillage' to Dee by Roberts and Watson, *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, 44-45.

or three complete works of Aristotle containing the *Poetics*: among them, the 1538 Latin *opera* of Simon Grynaeus that Cornell March Dowlin suggested almost seventy years ago as an edition representative of the sort 'one can be pretty confident that Sidney knew'.

Discussions such as Noam Reisner's or Henry Turner's of the circulation of the *Poetics* in sixteenth-century England are thus misleading on several counts. 'Separate editions' of the *Poetics* may indeed have been somewhat unusual in English libraries, but they constitute only one form, and far from the most important, in which the work circulated and was read. The *Ethics* was a more common holding than the *Poetics*, true, but this by no means indicates the absence of the *Poetics* from those libraries; proving the work less read than the *Ethics* is not the same as proving it not read at all, nor need its influence have been as widespread as that of the *Ethics* in order to have been felt by the few literary men whose knowledge is in question. Turner uses Adams to estimate sixteenth-century Cambridge library holdings, but Adams's list of surviving books represents only a fraction of the evidence we have for those holdings, and his cataloguing rubric presents methodological problems when applied to the sixteenth-century. The text circulated among readers, moreover, far more widely than its ownership alone, though that was substantial, would suggest. Most importantly, Turner's argument that the *Poetics* was a scarce text, for all its detail, is simply not born out by the evidence.

Indeed, this evidence might resolve long-standing problems concerning texts other than the *Poetics* as well. Among some 'preliminary remarks about the reception of classical eloquence in Renaissance England', Quentin Skinner points out the surprising omission of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* from a list of books prescribed for study in 1566 at Norwich:

> This neglect... is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that Aristotle's text was hardly available outside Italy for much of the sixteenth century. Although George of Trebizond's Latin translation of 1445 had been in print since 1472, and although a further translation by Ermolao Barbaro was published

> in 1545, it was not until Jacob Sturm's long-meditated edition appeared at Strasbourg in 1570 that an accurate Latin version became widely available in northern Europe. Even more important, it was only after Theodore Goulston's facing-page translation was published in London in 1619 that a Latin version began to circulate at all widely in England.[143]

It was not, Skinner continues, 'wholly or chiefly due to ignorance' that the *Rhetoric* received little attention in England, as we can see from citations in Roger Ascham and the lectures of John Rainolds. A series of intellectual-historical reasons is then provided to explain the 'relative lack of interest in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*': Aristotle's claims may have appeared commonplace; his far-reaching definition of rhetoric may have been too 'hard to assimilate'; his analysis of rhetoric in combination with the passions was too psychological for 'the outlook of the Roman theorists and their Renaissance followers'.[144]

But the *Rhetoric* was not unavailable in England; its print history most closely parallels, and its manuscript history far exceeds, that of the *Poetics*.[145] Neither Greek text was printed in the Aldine Aristotle of 1495-98; both *editiones principes* appeared in Aldus's *Rhetores graeci* (1508); the *Rhetoric* entered the Greek *opera omnia* simultaneously with the *Poetics* in Erasmus and Grynaeus's Basel edition of 1531, the two were often printed together independently, as in Zanetti and Trincavelli's (1536) and Gryphius's (1546) editions, both Venetian,[146] and often as members of multi-volume sets by the same printer.[147] And in

[143] Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996), 35.

[144] *Ibid.*, 36-7.

[145] For the Greek manuscripts see Rudolf Kassel, *Der Text der Aristotelischen Rhetorik* (Berlin, New York, 1971); for the Latin, see Lacombe *et al.*, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, Bernhard Schneider, ed., *Rhetorica. Translatio anonyma sive vetus et translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka*, Aristoteles Latinus XXXI.1-2 (Leiden, 1978), and updates in Charles F. Briggs, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Later Medieval Universities: A Reassessment', *Rhetorica* 25.3 (2007), 243-68; for the print history, see Paul D. Brandes, *A History of Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Metuchen, London, 1989), and Green and Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric STC*, 33-44.

[146] Zanetti/Trincavelius, *IAAr* 107.955; Gryphius, *IAAr* 108.121.

[147] Conrad Neobar printed *Rhetoric* (Paris, 1539), *IAAr* 107.985, and two years later his widow issued the *Poetics* from the same press (Paris, 1541), *IAAr* 108.015F; Christian Wechel, similarly, issued a set of independent Aristotelian works from his Paris press in 1538, including both the *Poetics* (*IAAr* 107.974) and the *Rhetoric* (107.976). It should be noted that these records refer to the *Rhetorica ad Theodecten*, and not to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, now atributed to Anaximenes, whose earlier but smaller print history is detailed in Green and Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric STC*, 16: the Greek *editio princeps* also appeared in the *Rhetores graeci* (1508), but its 1424 Latin translation by Filelfo (Lacombe, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, no. 1935) was printed in Aristotle, *et al.*, *Orationes cum quibusdam aliis eiusdem operibus*

translation the *Rhetoric* outstripped the *Poetics* by some distance: its first Italian translation by Felice Figliucci preempted Bernardo Segni's by only a year,[148] but the printing of Latin translations began with George of Trebizond's in 1476 and never slowed, entering the Latin *opera omnia* with the *Poetics* in Grynaeus's Basel edition of 1538.[149] Every *opera omnia* listed in Appendix I, therefore, and a number of other volumes besides, such as Segni's translations (1549/1551) and Alexander Achillinus's 1515 edition juxtaposing Aristotelian texts and their Averroistic commentaries,[150] also contained the *Rhetoric*, as of course did a great number of libraries independently of their holdings of the *Poetics*: *PLRE* lists about twenty independent printings of the *Rhetoric*, Leedham-Green a further twenty-nine, and I have come across the work in the libraries of Henry VIII at Westminster in 1542, Sir Thomas Smith at Hill Hall in 1566, John Dee at Mortlake, and Trinity College, Cambridge, merely in the course of searching for the *Poetics*.[151] Such access to the work better situates the *Rhetoric*'s frequent prescription in university and college statutes[152] – at Oxford in 1431 and 1564/5, for example, or in St John's College's foundational statutes of 1555, not to mention the majority of statutes which mandate instruction in rhetoric without specifying a text[153] – than the glancing citations of an Ascham or a Rainolds or a Harvey which Skinner and others

(Milan, 1483-4), *ISTC* ip00607000.

148 Aristotle, *Tradottione antica de la rettorica d'Aristotile nuovamente trovata* (Padua, 1548), *IAAr* 108.143.

149 Aristotle, *Ad reverendum in Christo Patrem... Georgii Trapezoncii in libros rhetoricorum Aristotelis* (Paris, 1476-7), *ISTC* ia01045500. William of Moerbeke's c.1270 translation of the *Rhetoric*, unlike that of the *Poetics*, was widely known: it survived in 101 manuscripts, and was printed early in Aristotle, *Declaratio compendiosa...* ed. Lancillotus de Zerlis (Venice, 1481), *ISTC* ia01046000: see Briggs, 'Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the Later Medieval Universities', 253-4. Abraham de Balmes's translations of Averroes's Epitome and Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, moreover, are printed in the same volumes as his translations of Averroes on the *Poetics*.

150 Segni, *IAAr* 108.157, 108.221; Achillinus, *IAAr* 107.828.

151 *PLRE* and *BCI*, *ad indicem*; James P. Carley, ed., *The Libraries of Henry VIII* (London, 2000), no. H2.571; J. Strype, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith Kt.* (London, 1698), Appendix VI, 144; Roberts and Watson, *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, no. 908; Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, Appendix A, no. OL100.

152 The literature resituating the *Rhetoric* is large, beginning with the work of James J. Murphy, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 52.2 (1966), 109-115, and subsequently *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley, London, 1974); important subsequent scholarship is reviewed in Briggs, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Later Medieval Universities'.

153 Murphy, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', 112 (for 1431); Strickland Gibson, ed., *Statuta antiqua Universitatis oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1931), 378 (for 1564-5); *SCO*, III (part 12), 50 (for St John's College).

have read as transparent indices of the work's imagined absence. There is simply no absence to explain; Theodore Goulston's translations of the *Rhetoric* in 1619 and the *Poetics* in 1623 could hardly be less important in the history of either work as watersheds of English access, much less mark, as Marvin Herrick had it, 'a new era for Aristotelian scholarship in England'.[154]

'Any study of intellectual history in Britain', observed Margaret Lane Ford in 1999, 'which relied primarily on the bibliography of books printed in England, exemplary as it is, would be based on only very partial evidence'.[155] This was instinctively understood by Charles Schmitt twenty-five years earlier, as he began overhauling the intellectual history of Aristotelianism across Europe. Book-buyers from all over Europe came to the great fairs of Frankfurt and Lyon; books from Venice were shipped to northern Europe through the Straits of Gibraltar; 'we know all of these facts', Schmitt concluded; 'books really did change the situation'.[156] Literary scholarship has been slower than intellectual history to integrate these facts, as though 'book-history' need be an arcane sub-specialism of its own rather than, in the first instance at least, simply accurate bibliography. Yet most of the sources for the bibliography surveyed here have been available since long before 1996. Skinner's work of that date on the *Rhetoric*, no less than Henry Turner's a decade later on the *Poetics*, purports to explain the bibliographical absence of Aristotle's works by the light of a citational record which suggests Aristotle's ideas were a poor fit for the Latinate Renaissance. Some suspicion arises, however, in the light of the data here reviewed, that this may be a rhetorical inversion, and that bibliographical data have in fact been cited in support of an inherited reading of the citational record; that just as decades of intellectual history had been based on vociferous (and

[154] cf. Marvin Herrick, 'The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England', *Philological Quarterly* 5 (1926), 257: 'By 1620 there was no excuse for any educated Englishman's not knowing the Rhetoric – if he cared to make its acquaintance – for in 1619 Theodore Goulston published the first edition of the treatise in England...'

[155] Ford, 'Private Ownership of Printed Books', 227.

[156] Schmitt, 'Philosophy and Science', 532.

exceptional, and partisan) humanist attacks on a so-called barren scholasticism when Schmitt began his work of proving it fertile, so here accidental citations ill-suited to bearing the weight of historical demonstration have called for and been supplied with a bibliography to fit.[157]

Yet the historiography of the *Poetics* in England is not so easily divided into enlightened historical and benighted literary methods. It should not escape notice that for all the empirical evidence amassed in the appendices, the evidence for Sidney's real knowledge of the text – from the letters to Languet and Robert Sidney, to the numerous references throughout the *Defence* itself – far outstrips that for anyone else in the period, even those who have left records of ownership as detailed here. Familiarity with the bibliographic archive, far from overwriting traditional literary sources, indicates that the discussion of the *Poetics* Sidney left in his works is greater proof of his access to the text than an archival record of his ownership could ever be. The pageantry of data exhibited here should be seen not as the substance, but as the mute spectre, of literary history: words, it turns out, speak louder than actions in this line of work.

Mindful of Dr. Routh's counsel, I shall draw to a close. This chapter addresses only one of the three critical commonplaces invoked against English knowledge of the *Poetics*. Some of the tenets of the remaining two – linguistic access (English ignorance of Greek), and mediation (through the commentaries to the exclusion of the primary text) – even at this early stage can be seen to be challenged by the bibliographical history of the work. It should be clear from these findings that Greek was not strictly necessary, since the text could be read in Latin throughout the sixteenth century, and in Italian from 1549. It should also be clear that these translations were often accompanied by parallel Greek texts, thereby providing not only philological *comparanda* for fluent Greek readers, but also a translative key to the Greek text

[157] The roots of this rhetorical inversion are discussed further in Chapter IV.

itself for readers whose Greek was less than fluent, playing just the role that parallel texts were supposed to play in the language pedagogy of the time. As for commentaries mediating the primary text, it is suggestive if not firm evidence that, with the exception of a couple of the largest sixteenth-century collections, such works are very scarce in English libraries, far scarcer than the primary text. And perhaps more importantly, the Italian commentaries cannot seriously be thought substitutes for the primary text when for the most part, as might be expected from the genre of textual commentary, they *contained* the primary text in one or more translations.[158] Far from supplanting it, the argument that Sidney was well versed in the Italian commentary tradition in fact entails his access to and detailed knowledge of the primary text. But these considerations will be examined at greater length in subsequent chapters. For now, we must conclude that the issue of textual access posed no obstacle to English knowledge of the *Poetics*, and that English readers, at Oxford and elsewhere, had ample opportunity to acquaint themselves with the central text of Renaissance poetics.

[158] A survey of the commentaries, excluding merely annotated texts, reveals that the text of the *Poetics* was reproduced in Greek and Latin in Robortello (1548), Maggi and Lombardi (1550), and Vettori (1560, repr. 1573); in Greek and Italian, in Castelvetro (1570, repr. 1576); in Latin only, in Riccoboni (1587, uniting his Latin translation of 1579 with his commentary of 1585); in Italian only, in Piccolomini (1575). This industry continued into the early seventeenth century: Heinsius (1610) prints Greek and Latin texts, and Beni (1613) reproduces the Greek with not one, but two parallel Latin translations. Some works, of course, discussed the *Poetics* without reproducing the text itself, such as Minturno's *De poeta* (Venice, 1559) and Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* (Geneva, 1561).

Chapter II

Sidney's Greek *Poetics*

A thing well said will be wit in all Languages; and though it may lose something in the Translation, yet, to him who reads it in the Original, 'tis still the same...

John Dryden, 'An Essay of Dramatick Poesie'[1]

Aristotle wrote the *Poetics* in Greek, and this has long been invoked to qualify the work's influence on Sidney and the rest of the reputedly Greekless English. For John Churton Collins, near the beginning of the twentieth century, Sidney, who had 'carefully studied' the *Poetics*, must have done so 'chiefly in Latin'; 'it may be doubted', he writes, 'whether, with the exception of Ben Jonson, any distinguished man of letters read these works in the Greek till late in the eighteenth century'.[2] Sarah Dewar-Watson, at the beginning of the twenty-first, agrees: 'Jonson's knowledge of Greek – and indeed, his first hand knowledge of the *Poetics* – places him in a very small minority in England during the period.'[3] These judgements concerning the literary-critical field originate in a settled narrative about the depressed state of Greek learning in sixteenth-century England. In a recent companion to English Renaissance literature, Mary Thomas Crane summarises the view that in Italy as well as England, 'claims about the importance of Greek learning often exceeded actual knowledge of the Greek language and its literature',[4] echoing a judgement already standard more than a century

1 *Prose 1668-1691: An Essay of Dramatick Poesie and Shorter Works*, ed. Samuel Holt Monk, The Works of John Dryden XVII (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1971), 28.

2 John Churton Collins, *Greek Influence on English Poetry*, ed. Michael MacMillan (London, 1910), 87-88.

3 Dewar-Watson, 'Shakespeare and Aristotle', 2; 'Literacy in Greek was extremely limited in the sixteenth century,' she continues, 'and throughout this time, the Renaissance of classical learning operated almost exclusively in terms of Latin literature, rather than Greek.'

4 Mary Thomas Crane, 'Early Tudor Humanism' in *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2010), I.93.

before, as in J. Bass Mullinger's history of the University of Cambridge: 'there was a certain smattering acquired, even in the grammar schools... but there was but little real acquaintance either with the language or its literature.'[5] In this, his biographers and critics agree, Sidney is again no more than a representative Elizabethan: despite his schooling at Shrewsbury (where Greek was taught) and attendance at Oxford, Wallace accords him no more than Mullinger's 'smattering', Duncan-Jones finds contemporary claims of his Greek competence as 'exaggerated' as Crane, and editors of the *Defence of Poesy* have often commented that Sidney never gained real competence in the language.[6] These are just some of the more explicit statements underpinning what Neil Rhodes could still identify in 2013 as the 'tacit assumption that Greek had little impact on English writing in the late sixteenth century'.[7] Even among those few critics, such as Dowlin and Dewar-Watson, who argue for the currency of the *Poetics* in England, the argument rests on the availability of Latin translations of the work for anyone other than Jonson and a tiny minority of others.[8]

Now, our survey of contemporary English libraries confirms, first of all, that Englishmen indeed had no need of Greek to gain a thorough familiarity with the *Poetics*. Texts of the *Poetics* were readily available in Latin and Italian as well as Greek, in bilingual and monolingual editions; Italian versions were rarer than editions in the classical languages, for the lack of a comprehensive vernacular *opera omnia* which might have brought with it the *Poetics*.[9] There was no language in which the *Poetics* was printed in the sixteenth century in which it was not available in England. Few scholars doubt the facility of English readers in Latin, at least, which was the common tongue of the educated west; if anything it is

---

5 Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1873), II.419.

6 M. W. Wallace, *The Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge, 1915), 43; Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier-Poet*, 78; see, e.g. Shepherd, *Defence* (1965), 4; Robinson, *Defence* (1970), viii.

7 Neil Rhodes, 'Marlowe and the Greeks', *RS* 27.2 (2013), 199.

8 Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 266.

9 See Sir Michael Dormer's bequest to the Bodleian of Segni's mid-century translations as a set (Appendix I, *s.v.* Oxford, Bodleian Library, A.1.* and note) for the closest parallel available to a uniform collection of Italian texts.

underestimated amid the 'philo-vernacularism' of literary history, as Charles Schmitt, J. W. Binns, and (with Italy in view) Christopher Celenza have forcefully argued from atop the broad shoulders of Ernst Curtius.[10] On these grounds alone, the *Poetics* must be assumed linguistically accessible to Englishmen.

But when it comes to Greek, the stakes are higher. If Latin was the currency of humanism, Greek was its aspirational cynosure. Knowledge of Greek, in the work of the scholars cited above, connotes more than simply linguistic or translative facility. It is a yardstick of classical learning in general: it affords or denies the sixteenth-century reader a certain learned pedigree that would guarantee not only breadth of reference and critical judgement, but also the seriousness, originality, and unmediated purity of his engagement with a given text. This complex of association is made explicit in a recent essay by John Considine entitled 'How Much Greek Did Philip Sidney Know?' Many of Sidney's contemporaries classed him a 'scholar', but what, Considine asks, 'does the word *scholar* mean when it is applied to Sidney?'

> Nobody has ever claimed seriously that he was a scholar in the same way that Isaac Casaubon was a scholar; he could not, for instance, have written a commentary on an ancient text. The question is whether he was a man of unusual learning compared to other English university graduates of his day: was he, like Hamlet... simply a scholar in the very weak sense of being a bookish and intelligent gentleman, or can he be shown to have had more substantial academic accomplishments?[11]

Evidence of such accomplishments is not fruitfully sought in the internal evidence of Sidney's highly allusive works, where 'what appears to be a learned reference may turn out to be taken

---

10 Schmitt, 'Philosophy and Science', 501; J. W. Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin Writings of the Age* (Leeds, 1990); Christopher S. Celenza, *The Lost Italian Renaissance: Humanists, Historians, and Latin's Legacy* (Baltimore, London, 2004); Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, 1953). On many theoretical aspects of educated, literary multilingualism see Leonard Forster, *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature* (Cambridge, 1970).

11 Considine, 'How Much Greek Did Philip Sidney Know?', *Sidney Journal* 20.2 (2002), 58.

from a florilegial tradition'. But Greek provides 'a clear criterion by which to evaluate the learning of an early modern reader.' 'To be proficient in Greek', Considine reiterates, 'was to go beyond the level of grammar-school boy or the average undergraduate':

> This question is not simply one about Sidney's reputation. It also affects our understanding of his intellectual life: of the reading and thinking from which his imaginative, critical, and political writings developed. Although our knowledge of Sidney's sources is imprecise, knowing which sources he could actually read without a translation will give it a precisely drawn boundary.[12]

The smooth transition here from Greek to Sidney's 'intellectual life' should give us pause. At first, knowledge of Greek is in principle for Considine a matter of linguistic 'proficiency'. This level of proficiency alone would require exposure to the language far beyond that provided in the Tudor grammar-schools and universities; Considine adduces in support of this J. W. Binns's assessment that 'at university Greek seems to have occupied a fitful place, and proficiency in the language was the ideal rather than the norm for the average student.'[13] Proficiency in Greek, therefore, can only be measured by private, post-university endeavour, for which there 'tends to be external evidence'. But by this stage in the argument, the historical criteria for Greek 'proficiency' have been conflated with those for Greek *scholarship*: we should not expect to find Sidney writing 'a commentary on an ancient text', true – whether for want of ability or because he chose to spend his time differently – but it is not clear what else, for Considine, would suffice, as the occasional non-scholarly evidence of Greek Sidney did leave is deemed insubstantial. Greek proficiency is equated here with the external evidence of Greek scholarly productivity, the 'more substantial academic accomplishments' left as evidence of a Greek reader's expertise in excess of what was shared among his educated peers. This is confirmed by the invocation of Casaubon: even if 'nobody

[12] *Ibid.*, 59.

[13] Binns, *Intellectual Culture*, 217.

has ever claimed' equity between his accomplishment and Sidney's, Casaubon's name paraliptically sets a high water mark for scholarship that in practice was not attained by anyone in Europe save, perhaps, for Henri Estienne (Stephanus), author of the monumental *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (1572) and prolific editor of classical texts, and a little later Joseph Scaliger; even in the twentieth century, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff reflects, 'we are all still living on the capital accumulated by the industry of Casaubon and Stephanus'.[14] Invoking Casaubon's staggering accomplishments in connection with what purports to be a question of Greek literacy gestures towards a spectrum of classical learning at the bottom end of which most of the major scholars in western history would find themselves grouped; comparable, perhaps, to assessing the numeracy of an A-level mathematician by declaring him 'no Newton'.

So if Sidney had been a Greek reader, by Considine's measure, he would have left evidence of it in the form of Greek scholarly activity; in the absence of such scholarly activity, commutatively, he was no Greek reader. Yet this test, apparently of Greek literacy but respecting only the evidence of advanced Greek scholarship, is elevated still further into an estimate of Sidney's 'intellectual life'. At stake in the question of Sidney's Greek learning is, implicitly, his independence from the scraps and derivative commonplaces of Elizabethan florilegial erudition, the location of the 'precisely drawn boundary' of his reading and thinking. At stake, in short, is Sidney's status as an original thinker and reader – someone who might both incorporate intellectual matter into his thinking, and in turn contribute his thinking to intellectual matters. Considine's 2002 article in this respect takes up on a different front the old critique begun with Joel Spingarn's demotion of the *Defence* to 'a veritable epitome of the literary criticism of the Italian Renaissance', and continued through Kenneth Myrick's assessment that Sidney was 'not so much a thinker as a persuasive advocate of other men's

[14] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *History of Classical Scholarship* (1921), ed. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, trans. Alan Harris (London, 1982), 54.

thought'; as Dowlin paraphrased it in 1944, an argument that portrays Sidney as 'a careless reader, and... an unoriginal thinker, i.e. as no thinker at all.'[15]

Little surprise, given this critical pedigree, that Sidney falls short. Having ruled internal evidence out of consideration, Considine examines Sidney's correspondence with Hubert Languet, in which in 1573-74 Sidney expresses dissatisfaction with his Greek and his intention to improve it, as well as including some Greek sentences;[16] two dedications to Sidney, from 1576 and 1581, from Henri Estienne, the leading Greek scholar in Europe, in which Estienne praises Sidney's Greek and suggests that he has no need for a translation;[17] and posthumous elegies which make mention of Sidney's learning. But for Considine Sidney's dissatisfaction implies neither 'an ambition to read Greek fluently', nor that he followed through on his desire to learn Greek; the occasional Greek words and phrases in his works and letters, such as the fourteen Greek words that appear in the *Defence of Poesy*, 'might have been tags repeated from a Latin or vernacular source'; the chronology, wording, and supplicant posture of the dedications imply that Estienne's estimate was of Sidney's *promise* to learn Greek, not his accomplishment; and the posthumous elegies are too conventional and circumstantial to be a reliable index of Sidney's learning.[18] Sidney's only period of small work on Greek was 'the year from February 1574 to February 1575'; 'his study of Greek, such as it was, belongs to the period before his twenty-first birthday.' Considine concludes:

> If the knowledge of Greek is taken as an index of serious learning for an early modern English reader, then Sidney was by no means learned, and

---

[15] Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 258, also citing Spingarn and Myrick.

[16] Sidney to Hubert Languet, Padua, 15 January 1573/4, and 4 February 1574, *Correspondence*, I.90-93, 105-7.

[17] Estienne, ed., Ἡ *καινὴ διαθήκη*. *Nouum Testamentum* ([Geneva], 1576); Estienne, ed., Ἡ*ρωδιανοῦ ἱστοριῶν βιβλία* Η. *Herodiani histor. lib. VIII.* ([Geneva], 1581), sig. ¶ii^v: 'Quamuis autem is sis (si modò te aula non mutauit ab illo quem in Germania primùm, deinde in Austria cognoui) qui, si hunc scriptorem in manus sumas, interpretis opera carere possis'.

[18] Considine, 'How Much Greek Did Philip Sidney Know?', 64, 66, 71, 76.

> references to him as a scholar are only true in the weakest sense of that word; his command of the language was not more substantial than that of an ordinary undergraduate... proficiency in Greek was an ideal to which Sidney at one time aspired, but which he, like the average student, never reached.[19]

As we shall see, Considine underestimates the command of Greek attained by an 'ordinary undergraduate', and does not even recognise that which could be gained by a schoolchild. His quotation from Binns looks rather different, and more nuanced, in its original context: the place of Greek at university may have been fitful, but, continues Binns, 'instruction in the language was however given'.[20] In less abbreviated form as an essay in 1978, in fact, Binns's argument was more favourable to grammar-school instruction: 'although Greek authors were read only in the upper forms, nonetheless, given the thorough methods of Elizabethan instruction, a child who had pursued the course would come out with a fair command of the language.'[21] Plainly, there is a question to be settled about the approximate command of Greek that would follow from a sixteenth-century education, and we may independently agree to a greater or lesser extent with Considine's analysis of the circumstantial evidence for Sidney's Greek.[22] First, however, we should question Considine's dismissal of internal evidence as an

---

19 *Ibid.*, 77-78.

20 Binns, *Intellectual Culture*, 217.

21 Binns, 'Latin Translations from Greek in Renaissance England, 1550-1640', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27 (1978), 131.

22 Most, if not all, of the passages analysed by Considine could certainly be read sceptically as he suggests; equally, they could be read at face-value, and there is very little to recommend one reading over another. Whether or not his professed desire to read Aristotle in the original aspired to fluency or not (the letter gives no indication either way), Sidney could very well have proceeded to improve his Greek. Sidney was under no obligation to record anything in particular in his letters (many of which are lost: see *Correspondence*, Appendix A, 1330-33), and indeed Languet's strongly-stated opposition to Sidney's Greek aspirations in a letter of 19 February, 1574 (*Correspondence*, I.120-23) may have been reason enough for Sidney not to mention the subject again. Sidney's Greek phrases and words 'might have been tags repeated from a Latin or vernacular source', or they might not. Sidney's remark to Languet concerning Greek, 'quae iam diu supremis tantum labris attigi' [which I have long touched upon only superficially] (thus translated in *Correspondence*, 92; Considine stresses that 'iam diu' could have the force either of 'long ago' or 'for a long time') could indicate 'the slightest possible degree of knowledge', or it could be the same modesty that describes the *Arcadia* as 'a trifle, and that triflingly handled', or indeed an indication of Sidney's awareness that, having met a number of magnificent scholars on his travels, he was indeed no Casaubon. Estienne's qualification of Sidney's lack of a need for translation, 'si modò te aula non mutauit ab illo quem in Germania primùm, deinde in Austria cognoui' [if at least the court has not changed you from him whom I knew in Germany first, then in Austria], may indicate (*pace* Considine) that the man Estienne knew '*will have followed through on his earlier interest in learning Greek*', or it may simply mean that when Estienne knew Sidney in Heidelberg

index of Sidney's Greek proficiency, as close analysis of a passage in the *Defence of Poesy* demonstrates not only that Sidney read the *Poetics* first-hand: it shows he read it in Greek.

The passage editors most frequently agree may be traced to Aristotle occurs towards the end of Sidney's comparison of the arts of philosophy, history, and poetry:

> Aristotle himself, in his discourse of poesy, plainly determineth this question, saying that poetry is *φιλοσοφώτερον* and *σπουδαιότερον*, that is to say, it is more philosophical and more studiously serious than history. His reason is, because poesy dealeth with *καθόλου*, that is to say, with the universal consideration, and the history with *καθέκαστον*, the particular: now, saith he, the universal weighs what is fit to be said or done, either in likelihood or necessity (which the poesy considereth in his imposed names), and the particular only marks whether Alcibiades did, or suffered, this or that. Thus far Aristotle: which reason of his (as all his) is most full of reason.[23]

It is on this passage that R. W. Maslen comments, after following Geoffrey Shepherd in quoting its source in *Poetics* 9, that 'it is not certain that Sidney knew the *Poetics* at first hand'; for C. S. Lewis, Aristotle is here 'misunderstood and pressed into the service of a *Poetics* different from his own'.[24] Several other editors and critics have described the passage as a 'paraphrase'.[25] But this is no paraphrase: it is a direct translation that proves conclusively that Sidney *did* know the *Poetics* first hand. Aristotle's passage runs as follows in Kassel's standard edition:

---

and Strasburg, and met him again in Vienna a year after Sidney had written to Languet of learning Greek, he was impressed by his Greek. I agree with Considine that the evidence of the elegies is too circumstantial to be useful, but useless evidence certainly does not imply that Sidney did *not* know Greek. In general, without further evidence, we are in no position to judge the extent of rhetorical inflection either of Sidney's letters or of the judgements of others, both of which Considine reads as largely rhetorical performances when they support Sidney's Greek, and as direct and complete indices of biographical experience when they oppose it.

23 *Defence* 87.34-88.9; note should be taken of the significant textual variants recorded for this passage.

24 Maslen, *Defence* (2002), 92n20-21; C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama* (Oxford, 1954), 343.

25 e.g. Van Dorsten, *Defence* (1966), 35.6n, 'quotes and paraphrases'; Kathy Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction* , 164, 'paraphrases'; Wesley Trimpi, 'Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry*', *CHLC-III*, 191, 'carefully paraphrases'. Gavin Alexander is, as so often, an exception, in keeping with his conviction that Sidney *did* have the *Poetics*: 'Sidney, for once perhaps, has the book open in front of him as he writes' (Alexander, *Defence*, 19n76). The point may seem trivial, but one searches in vain for references to, for example, Jonson's 'paraphrase' of Horace's *Ars Poetica*.

... ἀλλὰ τούτῳ διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα
λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ 5
σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις
μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἡ δ᾽ ἱστορία τὰ καθ᾽ ἕκαστον λέγει.
ἔστιν δὲ καθόλου μέν, τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποῖα ἄττα συμβαίνει
λέγειν ἢ πράττειν κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, οὗ
στοχάζεται ἡ ποίησις ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθεμένη· τὸ δὲ καθ᾽ 10
ἕκαστον, τί Ἀλκιβιάδης ἔπραξεν ἢ τί ἔπαθεν.[26]

[... but in this it differs, in that the one speaks of such things as have occurred, the other such things as might occur. Because of this, poetry is both more philosophical and *spoudaioteron* than history: for poetry speaks more of universals, and history of particulars. The universal is a certain kind of thing which falls to a certain kind of man to say or do, according to likelihood or necessity, at which poetry aims when it imposes names; the particular, what Alcibiades did or what he suffered.][27]

Sidney brackets the passage with two Aristotles, introducing the quotation with 'Aristotle himself, in his discourse of poesy, plainly determineth this question, saying that'; the sentences following, up to 'thus far Aristotle', are directly translated from the *Poetics*, preserving some of the key terms in their places in the original Greek. Olney's printing of 1595 is the only early witness to transliterate those terms into English characters: Ponsonby (1595) and the numerous subsequent folio editions based on his text print them in Greek characters, in which form they are also recorded in Robert Sidney's manuscript at Penshurst and the Norwich Manuscript.[28] Sidney departs from Aristotle's text in only three ways: he glosses the Greek terms in English, which serves only to supply what is transparent in the

[26] *Poetics* 1451b4-11.

[27] The purposely literal translation is my own. *Spoudaioteron* is discussed below.

[28] The *Defence* was published twice in 1595, by William Ponsonby (*STC* 22535), and by Henry Olney (*STC* 22534). Ponsonby had entered the work in the Stationers' Register on 29 November 1594, as '*A Treatize in commendacon of Poetrie or the defence of posey*' (Arber, *Transcript*, II.666); Olney entered it on 12 April 1595 as '*an Apologie for Poetrie*' (Arber, II.295), but his entry is crossed out with the note: 'This belongeth to master ponsonby by a former entrance And an agrement is made between them whereby Master Ponsonby is to enioy the copie according to the former entrance'. The episode has been much debated: for a careful account of the evidence, see H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford, 1996), 233-34. When it transpired that Ponsonby had the prior claim, Olney's copy appears to have been recalled, and the title-pages of at least some of his copies replaced with Ponsonby's (*STC* 22534.5). For descriptions of these and the manuscript witnesses, see in the first instance *Defence* 65-70; for the Norwich Manuscript, see Mary Roberta Mahl, ed., *The Norwich Sidney Manuscript: The Apology for Poetry* (Northridge, 1969). Van Dorsten bases his text on the Penshurst MS and Ponsonby's print edition, 'the two most authoritative texts' (the Penshurst MS was owned by Robert Sidney, and Ponsonby was the Sidney family's authorised printer), although a majority of the *Defence*'s editors have based their texts on Olney's edition, which has less authority but was more carefully printed.

Greek; he inserts 'saith he' into his clause-by-clause rendering of the original, further marking the passage out as quotation; and he resorts to a small circumlocution for the most difficult section to translate into English, *τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποῖα ἄττα συμβαίνει λέγειν ἢ πράττειν*, difficult not because the Greek is difficult Greek, but because it relies on inflections of indeterminate pronouns, difficult to render closely in a weakly inflected language such as English, that have driven almost all of its translators to circumlocution.[29] Quite contrary to the Oxford editors' belief that Sidney 'refused habitually to check his sources, even when he wished to quote *verbatim*',[30] Sidney's divergences from the original here are better explained by the challenges of translation, and by the basic devices of quotation, than by any carelessness or imprecision in his reading and comprehension of the text.

If the Greek lexicon and the airtight molding to the sequence of Aristotle's passage are not enough to show that Sidney is translating here, the inclusion of the parenthetical *οὗ στοχάζεται ἡ ποίησις ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθεμένη*, 'which the poesy considereth in his imposed names', is decisive. At this point, the clause is as cryptic in Aristotle's Greek as it is in Sidney's English; Aristotle has not previously discussed names or naming, and the thrust of the comment is initially unclear. He immediately proceeds to explain what he means in the next four lines. That poetry aims at the universal when it imposes names, he says, is already clear in comedy: comedians, composing their plots out of likely events, supply whatever

29 Even the barbarism of my own literal translation, '[the universal is] a certain kind of thing which falls to a certain kind of man to say or do', takes certain liberties: both *τῷ ποίῳ* and *τὰ ποῖα* should properly take definite articles, and the latter is plural; in English this would read something like '[the universal is] the which kinds of things that fall to the which kind of man to say or to do' - meaning, of course, 'the universal weighs what is fit to be said or done'. S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (London, 1895), has 'by the universal I mean how a person of a certain type will on occasion speak or act' (35), collapsing *τὰ ποῖα... συμβαίνει* into 'how'; Halliwell, *Poetics* (1987), ingeniously preserves most of the Greek by translating the infinitives *λέγειν* and *πράττειν* as articular infinitives qualifying *τὰ ποῖα*, which he makes singular, rather than complementing *συμβαίνει*: 'a 'universal' comprises the *kind* of speech or action which belongs by probability or necessity to a certain *kind* of character' (41). Despite their translative circumlocutions, it nonetheless seems likely that Butcher and Halliwell knew Greek. I am indebted to David Crane of the University of California, Berkeley, for an entertaining discussion of this clause no less than for teaching me Greek in the first place.

30 Van Dorsten, *Defence* (1973), 84.45n, cf. 60, 62 ('he avoids quoting his sources *verbatim*'), 66; Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet*, 236: 'it was rapidly written... quotations have not been checked'; cf. Alexander's view, quoted above, n25.

names occur to them (the stock names of New Comedy), unlike the iambic satirists, who write about specific individuals (the term for 'individuals' here, *τὸν καθ' ἕκαστον*, mirrors that used for 'particulars' earlier, in lines 7 and 10).[31] A discussion ensues of the merits and demerits of using known names, such as those of heroes and other mythical subjects, in composing tragedies. In the *Poetics*, that is, the mention of *ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθεμένη* primes the immediately ensuing discussion of names and naming in drama of various types. In the *Defence*, however, Sidney's quotation of Aristotle ends at *Poetics* 1451b11, before this discussion begins, and consequently the phrase 'which the poesy considereth in his imposed names' has no local explanatory context. Fifteen pages later in the *Defence*, in the course of excusing poets from the charge of lying, Sidney seems to pick up the thread, drawing an analogy to lawyers who present cases 'under the names of *John-a-stiles* and *John-a-nokes*'[32] – do they then lie? They do not, Sidney confirms: 'their naming of men is but to make their picture the more lively, and not to build any history'.[33] The argument that the stock names imposed by lively fictions work differently from the particulars of 'history', to which neither lawyers nor poets lay claim, is essentially identical to that of the earlier passage from the *Poetics*, and may imply that Sidney is here recalling the section of *Poetics* 9 he did *not* translate, immediately following the section he did, even if he is not quoting it as such.[34] Indeed, in a still later discussion of comedy citing Aristotle's prohibition in *Poetics* 5 of 'laughter in sinful things', Sidney suggests that comic scenes and the laughter they provoke can be exonerated through the

[31] *Poetics* 1451b11-15: '*ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς κωμῳδίας ἤδη τοῦτο δῆλον γέγονεν· συστήσαντες γὰρ τὸν μῦθον διὰ τῶν εἰκότων οὕτω τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα ὑποτιθέασιν, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ἰαμβοποιοὶ περὶ τὸν καθ' ἕκαστον ποιοῦσιν*.'

[32] *Defence* 103.18-20. Van Dorsten explains: 'Originally 'John (who dwells) at the stile' and 'John (who dwells) at the oak', fictitious names traditionally used for the two parties in a legal action' (103.19-20n). See Shuckburgh, *Defence* (1891), 39.29n, for some literary uses.

[33] *Defence* 103.18-23.

[34] Other than Wesley Trimpi's brief comparison of the 'John-a-Nokes' passage to Aristotle's 'imposed names' in *Muses of One Mind: The Literary Analysis of Experience and its Continuity* (Princeton, 1983), 33n8, the Aristotelian affiliations of this passage have to my knowledge received little attention from editors and critics.

application of 'stage-names'.[35] Once again, Sidney's understanding of fictional or stock names is proximate to his memory of Aristotle, and to his familiarity with the local context of a passage in the *Poetics* he knew thoroughly enough to translate *verbatim*. These later passages may be seen in a larger view as glossing the earlier fragmentary mention of 'imposed names'. But in the first instance, Sidney does not go so far as to translate the context Aristotle provided for *ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθεμένη*; his mention of 'imposed names', undeveloped and extraneous, makes no sense in the *Defence* except as part and parcel of a direct translation of Aristotle's passage.

This is not, in fact, news. As long ago as Dr Joseph Warton's seminal 1787 edition of the *Defence* – in which he declared that Sidney was versed in even 'the best Latin and Italian commentaries on *Aristotle's* Poetics'[36] – editors were so certain that this passage was a direct quotation from Aristotle that they placed the section beginning 'now, saith he...' in quotation marks (i.e. "Now," saith he, "the universal..."), closing the quotation after 'this or that', even though this punctuation departed from the texts on which they based their editions:[37] none of the eighteen editions of the *Defence* printed to the end of the seventeenth century punctuates the passage in this way.[38] A scattering of nineteenth century editors even went so far as to emend Sidney's '*φιλοσοφώτερον* and *σπουδαιότερον*' to '*φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον*', as it appeared in the *Poetics* but never in the *Defence*; that is, they *restored*

[35] *Defence* 116.5-20; cf. *Poetics* 1449a34-37, and perhaps *Ethics* 1128a4-9ff.

[36] Warton, *Defence* (1787), sig. a2^{v}.

[37] Editions of the *Defence* introducing quotation marks into this passage begin with Warton (1787), and include Thurlow (1810), Gray (1829), Young (1831), Morley (1889), Cook (1890), Shuckburgh (1891), Gregory Smith (1904), Churton Collins (1907), Jones (1922), Needham (1931), Gilbert (1940), Hebel *et al*. (1952), Bate (1952), Rollins and Baker (1954), Enright and de Chickera (1962), Shepherd (1965) and consequently Maslen (2002), Kimbrough (1969), Porges Watson (1997), and Vickers (1999).

[38] In practice, editors have followed one of either Ponsonby (1595) or Olney (1595), becoming more likely to include variant readings from the other the more recent the edition; a few incorporate readings from Sidney's first folio of 1598, although only the Everyman edition of Porges-Watson (1997) claims to be based on it. Since Van Dorsten's 1973 critical edition (largely based on the Penshurst MS and on Ponsonby), a handful have followed his critical edition; another handful, from Warton (1787) to Morley (1889) follow the folios printed after 1621, which for the passage in question read 'more ingenious then history'.

Sidney's translation to the original Greek text that so clearly underpinned it.[39] After Van Dorsten's critical Oxford editions of 1966 and 1973 the use of quotation marks to set off this passage has diminished: since 1970 only two editions out of nine – Vickers's Oxford anthology of *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, and Porges Watson's for Everyman – have punctuated the passage as a quotation.[40] This gradual shift, of course, coincides as much with increasing editorial fidelity to the base text of the *Defence* as it does with increasing scepticism as to Sidney's first-hand familiarity with the *Poetics*; to Sidney and his contemporary readers the question of punctuation would have been moot, as 'saying that', 'sayth he', and 'thus far...' were stock phrases substituting for punctuation and transparently indicating quotation in medieval and sixteenth-century citational practice.[41] Scepticism as to the passage's origins is a predominantly modern malady: until recently it was broadly categorised by editors as quotation, implying Sidney's direct translation from the *Poetics* rather than paraphrase.

Having established that Sidney was reading a text of the *Poetics*, can we tell *which* text he was reading? The text of this passage remained relatively stable through the nineteen various printings of the Greek text of the *Poetics* that Sidney could have read before his death in 1586.[42] The variant readings in the major editions are as follows, keyed, once again, to Kassel's edition:

---

39 First printed thus by Gray, *Defence* (1829), 22; Gray was followed by Young, *Defence* (1831), 29, and Morley, *Defence* (1889), 47, whose printing of '*πσουδαιότεοον*' remained uncorrected by the 1909 reprint. Urie, *Defence* (1752) is alone in printing '*φιλοσοφώτερον* et *σπουδαιότερον*' (34).

40 Vickers, *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 354; Porges Watson, *Defence* (1997), 97.

41 Providing examples of this ubiquitous practice would be supererogatory, as a search under these terms on *EEBO* readily demonstrates; for just one convenient example, see Perceval Wiburn, *A checke or reproofe of M. Howlets vntimely shreeching in her Maiesties eares* (London, 1581), which sets apart a quotation from the *Rhetoric* in Roman fount, bracketing it (in blackletter) with 'Aristotle... writeth thus:' and 'thus farre Aristotle' (108).

42 See Schrier, *Bibliography*, 279 (Index of Editions). I have not checked the texts of Anonym 1 (1536), Paccius (repr., 1537), Erasmus (repr., 1539), Anonym (1541), Anonym (1546), Anonym 1 (1550), Anonym [= Morelius] (1555), Vettori (repr., 1564), Sylburgius (1584).

4	*τούτῳ*] *τοῦτο*	Ducas 1508; Erasmus/Grynaeus 1531; Paccius 1536; Robortello 1548; Maggi 1550; Camozzi 1551-53
8	*τὰ ποῖα ἄττα*] *τὰ ποῖ' ἅττα*	Ducas 1508; Erasmus/Grynaeus 1531; Paccius 1536; Erasmus/Grynaeus 1550; Maggi 1550; Camozzi 1551-53; Castelvetro 1570
9	*τὸ ἀναγκαῖον*] *τὸ ἀναγαῖον*	Ducas 1508
9	*οὗ*] *οὐ*	Ducas 1508; Erasmus/Grynaeus 1531; Camozzi 1551-53
10	*τὸ δὲ καθ'*] *τὰ δὲ καθ'*	Ducas 1508; Erasmus/Grynaeus 1531; Paccius 1536; Robortello 1548; Erasmus/Grynaeus 1550; Maggi 1550; Camozzi 1551-53; Vettori 1560; Castelvetro 1570

Obvious orthographical errors (*ἀναγαῖον*, line 9) were eliminated early, and the two most common variants are fine points of grammar that make little difference to the meaning of the text: the difference in aspiration in line 8 between Kassel's *τὰ ποῖα ἄττα* and *τὰ ποῖ' ἅττα* is one between an indefinite pronoun, and a relative indefinite pronoun made redundant by the already relative *ποῖα*; that between *τὸ δὲ καθ'* and *τὰ δὲ καθ'* (line 10) is a real but trivial difference between a singular and a plural demonstrative pronoun that troubled few other than Maggi, who prints the latter but comments 'in the bit **τὰ δὲ καθ'ἕκαστον*, I don't understand what the word *τὰ* means. If, however, it were to read *τὸ δὲ*, all is plain'.[43] The most consequential variant, in line 9, has *οὗ*, the universal 'at which' poetry aims, read *οὐ*, potentially implying that poetry did *not* aim at the universal, but in such an awkward way that the effort of translation itself appears to have provoked a rectification of the text: it is cleared up by 1536, in Pazzi's seminal Greek-Latin edition (Camozzi's Aldine *editio minor* of 1551-53 is an outlier in this case). Sidney was evidently not troubled by the variant, and if he was reading from the Greek a marginal claim might be made that he was not working from Ducas's *editio princeps* of 1508, Erasmus/Grynaeus's 1531 edition (later editions of which corrected the error), or Camozzi's. But this still leaves the majority of the Greek texts available to him, and overall these minor variants do little to obscure the gist of Aristotle's

[43] Maggi, *In Aristotelis librum de poetica*, 131: 'in ea particula * *τὰ δὲ καθ'ἕκαστον*, uox *τὰ*, quid significet non intelligo. si uerò legatur *τὸ δὲ*, omnia plana sunt'.

passage. Assuming Sidney was reading a Greek text, we cannot determine which from the evidence of his translation alone.

I have proceeded thus far as though Sidney was working from Greek, mostly on the basis of his preservation of certain Greek terms from the original. Certainly Sidney wants to project his source as a Greek one. Yet it may be objected that he could have been quoting from a translation or commentary that *itself* quoted those words in Greek. This is Considine's view: 'most of the fourteen isolated Greek words in the *Defence of Poetry*,' with the exception of two 'simple coinages' of Sidney's own, 'might have been tags repeated from a Latin or vernacular source'.[44] Sidney's Greek lexis would then indicate only transcription of Greek and translation from Latin or Italian, rather than translation directly from Greek itself. But we need not rest at 'might have been': we can enumerate all of the possible sources and test the proposition. To this end we must examine the Latin and Italian translations available to Sidney at the time – in deference to the range of dates possible for the *Defence*'s composition, we may as well consider all translations before 1586.[45]

The *Poetics* had enjoyed four Latin translations by 1586: Giorgio Valla's (1498), Alessandro Pazzi's (1536), Pietro Vettori's (1560), and Antonio Riccoboni's (1579). Yet these dates are only a small part of the story, as each of these translations was many times reproduced among the various print formats of the work. The sixteenth-century *Poetics* could be printed as a stand-alone volume, whether in Greek, in translation, or both;[46] it could be

[44] Considine, 'How Much Greek Did Philip Sidney Know?', 66.

[45] The date of the *Defence*'s composition is commonly held to fall between 1579 and 1583. Van Dorsten, *Defence* (1973), 59-63, concludes that 'although no absolute proof is available, an accumulation of circumstantial evidence suggests that Sidney did so during the winter of 1579-80' (62). In this he largely agrees with Arthur Kinney, 'Parody and its Implications in Sydney's Defense of Poesie', *SEL* 12.1 (Winter, 1972), 1-19, placing its composition immediately after the publication of Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse* in 1579, which was dedicated to Sidney and has been seen as the catalyst for the *Defence.* The *terminus ante quem* has been ventured as late as 1585: Arber, *Defence* (1868), 7, takes Sidney's final departure from England in 1585 as the absolute limit; Duncan-Jones, *Defence* (1989), 371, similarly suggests 1580-1585 based on 'when William Temple became Sidney's secretary and prepared his *Analysis* of the work'. Van Dorsten reviews several further estimates (59n1).

[46] Greek-only printings outside *opera omnia* are few and all date from before 1560: Aristotle, *Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνης ῥητορικῆς... Aristotelis de arte rhetorica lib. tres.* (Venice, 1536); *Ἀριστοτέλους Περὶ ποιητικῆς. Aristotelis poetica* (Paris, 1538); *Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri III... De poetica lib. I* (Venice, 1546);

included as one item among many in compendia of Aristotle's *opera omnia*, in Greek, in Latin, or both; and it could be published in commentaries, complex works in a long scholarly tradition that split the Greek text into *particulae*, printed it entire (often newly edited by the commentator) *particula* by *particula*, supplied a translation in Latin or Italian for each *particula*, and then provided commentary notes immediately following each *particula* in its place (see **fig. 1**, p.107).[47] The inclusion of translations in so many of these print formats produced a substantial demand for new Latin and Italian renderings of the *Poetics*, and in the case of the commentaries often produced the translations themselves.[48] In this way, for example, Pazzi's 1536 translation, originally printed at the Aldine press in Venice in a bilingual Graeco-latin stand-alone edition, became the standard Latin text for most of the century, printed twenty-four times by the 1580s in Latin and bilingual stand-alone copies and *opera omnia* from Lyon to Basel to Paris, and was the translation of choice to accompany the Greek in the great commentaries of Robortello (Florence, 1548) and Maggi (Venice, 1550).[49] Similar if less illustrious diasporas could be mapped for Vettori's (1560) and Riccoboni's (1579) translations, each of them appearing in a multitude of different formats through the century.[50] What this means, in effect, is that there were far fewer *translations* than there were *editions* of the *Poetics*, and so – no matter which edition he had before him – if Sidney read a Latin translation of *Poetics* 1451b4-11 it could only have been one of the following:

Aristotelis Stagiritae Poetica (Louvain, 1551); *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber graece, cum variis lectionibus* (Paris, 1555). There are numerous Latin-only translations: see F. Edward Cranz and Charles B. Schmitt, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions, 1501-1600*, 2nd ed. (Baden-Baden, 1984), 215-16.

47 For the commentary tradition as one of 'fragmentation and of methodological insouciance', see Bernard Weinberg, 'From Aristotle to Pseudo-Aristotle', *Comparative Literature* 5 (1952), 97-104, and his *History of Literary Criticism*, 38-70; a fairer hearing is given by Danilo Aguzzi-Barbagli, 'Humanism and Poetics' in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia, 1988), III.85-169.

48 The new translations of Vettori (1560), Castelvetro (1570), and Riccoboni (1579) were presented for the first time in their commentaries.

49 Cranz for the most part does not list commentaries; to the printings of Pazzi listed in *IAAr*, p.216, should be added: Francesco Robortello, *In librum Aristotelis De arte Poetica explicationes* (Florence, 1548); Vincenzo Maggi, *In Aristotelis librum De poetica communes explicationes* (Venice, 1550); and the second edition of Robortello (Florence, 1555).

50 See *IAAr*, p.216.

Giorgio Valla, *Hoc in volumine hec continentur...* (Venetiis, 1498), sig. riii^v
… sed differe*n*tia e*st* in dice*n*do q*uae* facta sunt & qualiter facta sint ideo ét philosopha*n*tius quiddam & probius poesis est quam sit historia na*m* poesis magis uniuersalia at historia magis singularia dicit: sunt uero uniuersalia qualia. Quaecu*m*q*ue* dicere contingit aut agere ut modestia aut necessitas postulat nomi*n*a impone*n*do poesis no*n* co*n*iectat at quod singulare q*ui*d alcibiades egit aut quid perpessus sit.

Alessandro Pazzi, *Aristotelis Poetica … in latinum conversa* (Venetiis, 1536), 12
Sed hoc differunt, quòd hic quidem res gestas, ille ut geri potuerunt exponit. Quo sit, ut sapientius atque praestantius poësis historia sit: siquidem illa circa ipsum uniuersale plurimum uersatur: haec verò singulare sectatur. Est autem uniuersale, quae cui conueniat, dicere, uel facere, uerisimiliter quidem, seu necessariò, id quod spectat poësis, cum nomina imponat. Contrà singulare, quid ipse Alcibiades fecerit, tulerit'ue.

Pietro Vettori, *Commentarii in primum librum Aristotelis De arte poetarum* (Florentiae, 1560), 92-93
Uerum hoc discrepat, quia hic dicit ea, quae facta sunt: hic autem, qualia fieri debuerunt. Quare & philosophum magis, & magis studiosum poesis, quàm historia est: poesis enim potius quae in vniuersum: historia verò, quae singillatim fiunt, dicit. est autem vniuersale quidem quali homini qualia contingit dicere aut facere secundum verisimile aut necessarium: quod propositum habet poesis, nomina imponens. Singulare autem, quid Alcibiades fecit, aut passus est.

Antonio Riccoboni, *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica... latine conversa … Aristotelis Ars poetica ab eodem in latinam linguam versa* (Venetiis, 1579), 397
Sed in hoc est differentia, quòd unus quidem facta dicit: alter uero qualia fieri debent. Quamobrem & res magis philosophica, & studiosior poesis est, q*uam* historia. Nam poesis magis uniuersalia: historia singularia dicit. Est aut*em* uniuersale, cum exponitur, quemadmodum tali talia contingat dicere, aut facere secu*n*dum uerisimile, aut necessarium, id quod spectat poesis nomina imponens. Singulare uero, quid Alcibiades fecerit, aut passus sit.

There were also three Italian translations available by 1586: Bernardo Segni's (1549), Castelvetro's (1570), and Piccolomini's (1572). Unlike the Latin, mercifully, none of these was much reprinted anywhere other than in subsequent editions of the translator's own work. So Sidney's Italian options read as follows:

Bernardo Segni, *Rettorica e Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina* (Firenze, 1549), 299
Ma sono differenti l'uno, & l'altro per questa cagione; perchè l'uno cioè dice le cose seguite: & l'altro le dice come elle douerebbono essere seguite. Onde auuiene, che la Poesia ha più del filosofo, & più del virtuoso, che non ha l'Historia; conciosia che la Poesia dica più l'uniuersale, & l'Historia più il particulare. Dicesi vniuersalmente, quando e'si dicono le cose, che conuenientemente interuengono à questi, & à quegli; ò che si operano nel modo che sia, ò verisimile; ò necessario. Ilchè la Poesia va conietturando, & mette i nomi per questa cagione. Particularmente si dice, quando e'si raccontano le cose, che fece Alcibiade; ò quelle, che gli incontrarono.

Lodovico Castelvetro, *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta* (Vienna d'Austria, 1570), 101^{v}-102
Ma in questo sono differenti, che l'vno dice le cose auenute, & l'altro quali possono auenire. Laonde anchora la poesia è cosa piu da philosophante, & da assottigliato negli studi, che non è l'historia. Per cio che la poesia dice piu le cose uniuersali, & l'historia le particolari. Hora il dire le cose vniuersali s'è (quando si dice) che auiene ad vn cotale il dire e'l fare cotali cose secondo la verisimilitudine, o la necessita. A che mira la poesia, che impone i nomi. Ma il dire le cose particolari (s' è quando si dice) quello che Alcibiade fece o pati.

Alessandro Piccolomini, *Il libro della Poetica d'Aristotele. Tradotto di greca lingua in volgare* (Siena, 1572), 22
… ma in questo consiste la differentia loro, che l'vno dice, & pon le cose, ch'auuenute sono; & l'altro tali le dice, & le pone, quali douerebber'esser'accadute. Et per questo la poesia è cosa più degna di filosofo, & che maggiore studio, & consideration ricerca, che non fa l'historia. concio sia cosa che la poesia dica le cose più nel lor'vniuersale; & l'historia più le cose singolari, & particolari riguiardi. Et il dir più in vniuersale consiste in dir tali le cose, quali alle tali, & alle ta[l]i persone debban'accascar di dirsi, ò di farsi seco*n*do'l verisimile, o'l necessario: il che s'ingegna se*m*pre il poeta d'asseguire; & quindi poi le applica à persone singolari, & assegna lor'i nomi. Ma le cose dette nel lor particolare, saran (per essempio) che cosa ad Alcibiade accadesse di fare, ò di sostenere.

It will be immediately apparent that none of these translations does reproduce Aristotle's words in Greek, as, indeed, we might have expected: the very purpose of a translation, *stricto sensu*, is to get Aristotle *out* of Greek. For a translation to preserve the original language would amount to a failure of genre. This holds true, too, for the longer essays on poetics, that

paraphrased the work without explicitly providing a source text: neither Valla,[51] Lionardi,[52] Giraldi Cinzio,[53] Sigonio,[54] Minturno,[55] Scaliger,[56] Pigna,[57] Trissino,[58] nor Viperano,[59] several of whom have been proposed as Sidney's sources elsewhere in the *Defence*, transcribes the Greek terms of this passage even if they do paraphrase it (often quite loosely, a couple even substituting their own stock names, 'M. Antonius', 'Giouanni, ò Marco', 'Cesar o Pompeio',

---

[51] Giorgio Valla, 'De Poetica' in *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus*, 2 vols. (Venice, 1501), book 38, does not address the passage.

[52] Alessandro Lionardi, *Dialogi della inventione poetica et insiene di quanto alla istoria et all'arte oratoria s'appartiene, et del modo de finger la favola...* (Venice, 1554): e.g. 'Et accioche io non uada ogni particolar cosa racco*n*tando, dico, che se non ci fosse altra ragione, à prouar tutto ciò che detto habbiamo dell'inuentione, à bastanza sarebbe quello, che dice Aristotile nella poetica, oue egli pone la differenza, che è tra l'istorico e'l poeta dicendo, che questi non è poeta per li uersi, ma per la fauola, cioè per la qualità dell'inuentione & imitatione, & quando egli non uiene ad imitare le cose, subito diuenta narratore, & non piu imitatore' (14); 'Credo che quando egli toccherà à me, ben mi potrò far'honore con le cose uostre, nè sarò solamente interprete, ma ammiratore, così bene parmi che habbiate detto, non gia piu di quello che si aspettaua da uoi, che nel uero agguagliate con l'opera uostra la nostra credenza. Ma bene haurei piacere che diceste piu chiaramente & piu distintamente quello, che in poche parole come in picciolo fascio hauete ristretto, cioè che cosa s'appartiene alla istoria, et l'ordine che dee tenere l'istorico, et in che si serue poi il Poeta di lui, & similmente dell'Oratore' (16); 'Ma narrando il tutto per ordine, fa bisogno che l'istorico dica il uero, conciosia che la istoria sia un testimonio delle cose passate, fatte, dette, ò auenute, composta di piu uere narrationi & di molte descrittioni, si come si serue anco l'oratore di molti luoghi, & argomenti' (19); 'La forza & uirtù dell'istoria è narrare le cose fatte, ò dette da gli huomini illustri...' (20); 'Confesserei tutto questo, che dite dell'istoria, se non ci fossero quattro conditioni. L'una è, che non trouerete mai, che colui si possa chiamare ueramente poeta, il quale narri per ordine tutte le cose da lui scritte, come fa l'istorico. L'altra è, che le dice non come state sono fatte, ma fa come il pittore, il quale ua raccogliendo le piu eccellenti, & doue mancano, le arricchisce, & adorna' (51).

[53] Giambattista Giraldi Cinzio, *Discorsi ... intorno al comporre de i romanzi, delle comedie e delle tragedie, e di altre maniere di poesie* (Venice, 1554), e.g. 'Et disse Aristotile, che il fine del Poeta era indurre buoni costumi ne gli animi de gli huomini: & però pur ch'egli questo fine consegua con la sua compositione, sia ella di cose false, o di cose uere con le finte mescolate, ha egli fatto ciò, c'ha lui si apperteneua. Perche oue l'Historico dee solo scriuere i fatti & le attioni vere, & come in effetto sono; il Poeta non quali sono, ma quali esser debbano le mostra ad ammaestramento della uita. Et questo è anco stato cagione, che anchora che i Poeti scriuano cose antiche, non di meno cercano che conuengano a i costumi, & a l'età loro, introducendo cose dissimili a tempi antichi, & conueneuoli a i loro' (57-58); 'Nella qual cosa è da sapere, che quantunque il Poeta queste persone tali si pigli dalla historica, non è egli nondimeno astretto a disporre in guisa la fauola, che egli serui l'ordine della historia, & con tutti que nomi la conduca al fine, co quali descrisse la Attione l'historico. che anchora che le fauole non si possano mutare, quando sono accettate da buoni auttori, nondimeno è in arbitrio del Poeta, seruate nelle parti essentiali, alterarla come pare a lui che meglio conuenga, perche quali sono le attioni, le si piglia il Poeta, ma poi cerca egli di farle tali, quali deuerebbono essere, attendendo all'uniuersale, cio è a quello, che è co*n*ueneuole, che ci faccia, o che si dica uerisimilmente, non a quello c'habbia fatto, o detto un'huomo particolare: la onde il Poeta mira alla natura della cosa, la quale è tuta su l'uniuersale, ma l'historico ha solo da scriuere la particolare attione, come a punto ella è auenuta. Appresso non è tenuto il Poeta seruare tutti i nomi, che l'Historico ha usato in descriuere la attione; ma solo que due o tre senza i quali non si potrebbe conoscere l'attione. il resto de i nomi sono in sua mano; et tali, quali egli uuole, tali fingergli egli si puo. Nelle fauole finte del tutto è in suo arbitrio cosi il nome, come la materia. Me dee pero anco in cio il Poeta cosi segui re l'uniuersale, come s'egli si pigliassela fauola dall'historia' (226).

[54] Carlo Sigonio, *Emendationum libri duo* (Venice, 1557) does not address the passage.

[55] Minturno, *De poeta*, e.g. 'Iam uerò Poetae munus est non res gestas exponere, sed quemadmodum geri potuissent, uti uel consentaneum erat, uel necesse. Hoc enim inter poetam & historiarum scriptorem interest,

for 'Alcibiades').[60] Among essays drawing on, rather than reproducing, the *Poetics*, Sidney's *Defence* in fact renders Aristotle much more closely than its continental counterparts.

The scholarly commentaries proper, on the other hand, do reproduce the Greek terms in their detailed *annotationes* on the passage. But in such cases, the terms are alienated from their immediate context, and would require comprehension of the Greek to recombine with the primary text above (one would not gain much, in any case, from the primarily philological material of a commentary without a working command of Greek). The telling feature of Sidney's passage, in comparing it with all the available sixteenth-century arrangements of the

---

quòd alter quae euenerunt. Alter explicat uti euenisse oportebat, aut uerisimile uidetur, non quod hic soluta oratione, numeris, pedibusq*ue* constricta ille utatur... Itaque poesis praeclarius, ac sapientius quiddam est, quàm historia. Poeta enim uniuersa, Historicus singula pertractat. Nam exponitur uniuerse, cùm personae quod uel dicere, uel facere conueniat, enarratur. Quod nominibus imponendis uel maximè ille praestat. Singillatim autem explicare quid aliud est, quàm quod. M. Antonius fecerit, quod tulerit, narrare? Ac tanquam philosophi rem ipsam poetae reuocant ad genus, & ad naturam uniuersam. Historici quasi oratores cùm causas agunt, ad singulos deducunt' (123); *L'Arte Poetica* (Venice, 1563), e.g. '*Vesp*. In qual modo narra il Poeta quel, che nella fauola si contiene. *M*. Non qual auuenne, ma come possibil fù, che ò uerisimilmente, ò necessariamente auuenisse. Percioche tra l'Historico e lui è questa differe*n*za. perche l'Historico narra le cose, come sono auuenute; costui, come conuenia, o par verisimile, che douessero auuenire; non già perche il parlar dell'uno sia con tempo, e con misura certa ristretto, e legato: dell'altro libero, e sciolto... Laonde la poesia è uiâ piû nobil cosa, dell'historia, e piû eccellente. Conciosiacosa, che'l Poeta l'uniuersale & il general discriua, non già il particolare. & intendo la cosa allhora generalmente trattarsi, quando si narra quel, che dire, ò fare alla persona si conuenga; il che far' il poeta chiaramente si uede, imponendo i nomi, e particolarmente narrarsi, quando quel, che Giouanni, ò Marco sofferse, ò fece, si scriue' (39).

[56] Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, I.i, compares the fictiveness of poetry and the truth of history, but does not substantially reproduce Aristotle's passage.

[57] Giovanni Baptista Pigna, *Poetica Horatiana* (Venice, 1561), e.g. 'Quo ad historiam *ἅμα* [*sic*] *πραττόμενα* sola recipiuntur, & quaelibet secundum naturalem enarrationem: minime verò *ἐπαγγελείαν* si quidem artificium huiusmodi delectationem respicit, qua*m* poeta sibi proposuit. Historicus autem si veritatis lege neglecta tempora peruertat, & voluptati potius qua*m* veritati studeat, in nostros animos de falsis suspicione*m* immittet' (22); 'historia in poesi est diminuta, & suspecta, & falsis adiuncta. quae tamen tota debet ad verum dirigi: & non modo non esse falsa, sed omni carere impuritatis suspitione' (76).

[58] Trissino, *La quinta e la sesta divisione*, e.g. 'è differente lo historico dal Poeta in questo, che lo Historico dice le attioni, come si furono fatte, & il Poeta le dice come si deueno fare, et però Aristotele uuole, che la poesia sia cosa piu philosophica, & piu dotta che la historia, percioche la poesia segue lo uniuersale, & la historia il particulare, essendo uniuersale che ad alcuno uerisimilmente, o di necessità sia accaduto a fare la tale, & la tale cosa, è particulare che Cesare o Pompeio habbia fatto quella, & quella altra cosa' (11).

[59] Giovanni Antonio Viperano, *De poetica libri tres* (Antwerp, 1579): e.g. 'Quòd si res gestas interdum enarrat, non ea ratione explicat qua gestae sunt, sed qua vel potuerunt, vel quidem geri debuerunt. Quamobrem historicus singulorum res, poëta rerum naturam persequitur, & argumenta fabularum, & nomina personarum confingens. Quocirca ille inquit,

> Respicere exemplar vitae, morúmq*ue* iubebo
> Doctum imitatorem.

Quo igitur vniuersae & communis rerum naturae scientia melior est, quàm rerum singularium cognitio; certè hoc magis poëticam nos, vel Diodoro repugnante, historiae praeferemus' (29-30).

[60] Minturno, n55, and Trissino, n58, above. For general bibliography on this passage, see Hathaway, *The Age of Criticism*, 132-34.

Greek text of *Poetics* 1451b4-11, its translations, and its glosses, is that Sidney not only deploys the terms in Greek, but also translates *verbatim* the passage as an integral whole. Sixteenth-century translations of the *Poetics* provide the whole passage, and may present a parallel Greek text, but do not embed the Greek terms in their non-Greek translation; commentaries on the *Poetics* reproduce these translations, which do not embed the Greek terms, and provide philological notes which do, but without preserving the integrity of the passage. No secondary text provides sufficient access both to the specific Greek lexicon and to the totality of the passage for a reader without Greek to render it as Sidney does. Sidney must thus have understood Greek well enough to refer himself back to a local point in the Greek original, or to re-integrate whatever gloss was being provided into the passage as a whole; even if he had been reading a translation, he must have been reading it in parallel and with constant first-hand reference to a Greek text – a Greek text which, in his own work of translation, he presents as primary.[61] We cannot identify the edition Sidney used from the Greek text alone, but we can be confident that, whatever else he was reading, he was at least reading the *Poetics*, first-hand, in Greek.

On the evidence of this survey of the Latin and Italian translations, however, we may be able to come still closer to Sidney's reading. Duncan-Jones and Maslen both comment that Sidney glosses these Greek terms 'accurately'.[62] Considered in the context of the sixteenth-century literature, however, Sidney's glossary translations are not just accurate, but very good indeed; so unusually good, in fact, that they depart from and rather outshine most of the competition. Sidney, we may recall, has for *φιλοσοφώτερον* 'more philosophical', for *σπουδαιότερον* 'more studiously serious', for *καθόλου* 'the universal consideration', and for

[61] It is just possible, in the most byzantine construction, that Sidney, lacking Greek, could have rendered his version from a Latin translation, compared that Latin translation with contextual discussion in a commentary's *annotationes*, thereby (perhaps) gleaning the Greek characters, and then inserted the Greek into his own English translation without comprehension; but here Occam's razor begins to fall and, as the following analysis will show, it does not explain Sidney's precise translative choices.

[62] Duncan-Jones, *Defence* (1989), 223.475n; Maslen, *Defence* (2002), 92.13-16n.

καθέκαστον 'the particular'. *Φιλοσοφώτερον* is straightforwardly the comparative degree of *φιλόσοφος*, 'philosophical', and appears in the continental translations with relatively little semantic variation: 'philosopha*n*tius', 'sapientius', 'philosophum magis', 'magis philosophica'; 'più del filosofo', 'piu da philosophante', 'più degna di filosofo'.[63] But *σπουδαιότερον*, the comparative of *σπουδαῖος*, has a wide semantic range, the local sense of which is debated to this day. *Σπουδαῖος* is an adjective formed from *σπουδή*, which is cognate with Latin *studium*:[64] it is the root for English 'study' (and thus 'studious'), but also means 'zeal' as well as 'speed' or 'haste', and by extension denotes things we deem 'serious' (things we consider worthy of zeal or study); Cicero calls it 'animi assidua... occupatio', the assiduous employment of the mind.[65] Cicero's definition was much quoted in Renaissance Greek, Latin, and polyglot dictionaries, a glance at the foremost of which displays the full range of the word's possible meanings, moving from Greek into Latin.

Henri Estienne [Stephanus], *Θησαυρὸς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης. Thesaurus Graecae linguae*, 5 vols. (Geneva, 1572), *s.v.* ΣΠΕΥΔΩ

Σπουδή, *ῆς*, *ἡ*, Festinatio, Acceleratio... *Σπουδὴ* significat etiam Studium, Diligentia. Xen. Paed. 4, pag. 57, *πολλῇ σπουδῇ τὰ παρηγγελμένα ἔπραττεν*, Magno studio, Summa cum diligentia... Opponitur interdum *τῇ παιδιᾷ*, & tam de verbis dicitur quàm de rebus, significans Dictum serium, Studium seu labor serius... Quibus opponitur *χωρὶς σπουδῆς*, Ioco, apud Aristot. in Rhet...

Σπουδαῖος, *ου*, *ὁ*, Studiosus, Diligens... Significat etiam Bonus, Probus: oppositum habens *φαῦλος* apud Aristotel. De arte poetica. Sic apud Xenoph. Paed. 2, *πλείονας ὁμογνώμονας λαμβάνουσιν οἱ φαῦλοι ἢ οἱ σπουδαῖοι*, quàm viri probi & boni... Item & res *σπουδαῖαι* dicuntur, itidem Bonae, seu Probae, Probatae, Laudatae... Itidémque homo aliquis *σπουδαῖος* dicitur qui grauis est, nec in rebus leuibus aut ludicris operam ponit. Xen. Paed. 2...

[63] See the extracts above. The variation between nominal and adjectival forms is a feature of the Greek: cf. Liddell and Scott, *A Greek English Lexicon*, rev. Jones *et al.*, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1996), *s.v.* '*φιλόσοφος*', II.2.

[64] Alfred Ernout and Alfred Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1951), *s.v. studeo*.

[65] Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.36: 'studium est autem animi assidua et vehementer ad aliquam rem adplicata magna cum voluptate occupatio, ut philosophiae, poeticae, geometricae, litterarum'.

Item Serius. Xenoph. Paed. 2...[66]

More complicated still, *σπουδαίος* fills in as the adjective of *αρετή*, 'virtue' or 'good', and so in perhaps its primary sense *σπουδαιότερον* can simply mean 'better'. There is a good argument to be made for understanding this sense of the word to be active in the *Poetics*, as the first excerpt from Henri Estienne's great *Thesaurus Graecae linguae* shows: Aristotle quite clearly uses it in this sense earlier in the *Poetics*, in a well-known passage comparing comedy, which concerns men worse than us, to tragedy, whose proper subjects are *σπουδαίους*, glossed as *βελτίονας... καθ' ἡμᾶς*, 'better than us'.[67] Indeed, many Renaissance dictionaries make a special case of the adjective when applied, as here, to men, 'bonus vir' often being accorded a narrower semantic range than 'bonus' alone: Morel's Latin-Greek dictionary, revised in 1583 by Abraham Fleming to include English glosses, records no Greek glosses derived from a *σπουδ*- (or *σπευδ*-) root under 'bonus' except for 'bonus vir'.[68] Throughout his influential 1895 commentary on the *Poetics*, S. H. Butcher insists that this sense, 'better', is exclusively active at both points in Aristotle – tragic characters are 'better' than us, and poetry is 'better' than history – adducing numerous references from the *corpus aristotelicum* in support of his point.[69] In this he is in agreement with Estienne, who of all the lexicographers available to Sidney is the only one to cite the *Poetics* directly in glossing *σπουδαῖος*; we may note that Estienne further supports the senses 'probus', 'bonus', and 'serius' with the authority of Sidney's beloved Xenophon, whose *Cyropaedia* Sidney had read at Shrewsbury school and refers to numerous times in the *Defence*. If Sidney had consulted the recent work of Estienne, the leading classical scholar-printer in Europe at the time – and

[66] This entry has been heavily excerpted, as Estienne's definitions under *σπεύδω* occupy eight columns over four folio pages.

[67] *Poetics* 1448a1-5.

[68] Guillaume Morel, and Abraham Fleming, *Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglicisque coniunctorum, locupletissimi commentarij* (London, 1583), *s.v. bonus*.

[69] Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, 228-33, 241-42.

whom he knew personally[70] – he would have found, amid *festinatio*, *acceleratio*, *studium*, *diligentia*, and *labor serius*, a clear recommendation to take σπουδαῖος to mean *bonus* or *probus*, 'good', and σπουδαιότερον thus 'better', in the *Poetics* of all places.

But Sidney's 'studiously serious' takes a different path, idiosyncratically preserving some of the semantic multiplicity of σπουδαῖος against not only the aptest definition to be found in the dictionaries, but also almost all precedent in sixteenth-century translations.[71] For σπουδαιότερον Valla, as we have seen, has 'probius', poetry 'better' than history; Pazzi and all his reprints have 'praestantius', 'more excellent', to which Robortello, confident that he 'would translate this better and more lucidly', adds 'graue', 'serious' or 'weighty', in his *annotationes*;[72] Segni's Italian reads 'più del uirtuoso', 'more virtuous'; Vettori has 'magis studiosum', 'more studious'; Castelvetro, 'piu... da assotigliato negli studi', 'more subtle in studies'; Riccoboni's 1579 translation, hot off the press when Sidney came to write the *Defence*, has 'studiosior', 'more studious', which a decade later he revised to 'melior', simply 'better'. In none of the published translations proper do we find a conjunction of the studiousness *and* the seriousness of σπουδαῖος that would authorise Sidney's translation.

The rarity of this conjunction, in fact, is witnessed in contemporary Greek, Latin, and Italian lexicography as much as in the Latin and Italian translations of the *Poetics*, and may provide a final confirmation that Sidney was working primarily with the Greek.[73] The reason

[70] Alan Stewart, *Philip Sidney: A Double Life* (London, 2000), 94, 101; Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney*, 88-89; and see n22, above.

[71] It should be noted that 'studiously serious' is omitted in Ponsonby (1595), which reads 'more then history'; the folios 1598-1613 follow Ponsonby (1595), then from 1621-1674 supply 'more ingenious then history' or a close orthographical variant; Warton, *Defence* (1787), apparently on his own authority, prints 'more instructive than history', in which he is followed only by Thurlow, *Defence* (1810). Olney and the Norwich MS both read 'studiously serious', however, and the Penshurst MS 'studiouse seriouse'. In concert, the evidence of these early witnesses make it all but certain that the phrase was omitted from Ponsonby and subsequent folio printings through printer's error; certainly it is the reading that with very few exceptions Sidney's editors, including those working primarily from Ponsonby, have chosen.

[72] Robortello, *In librum Aristotelis De arte poetica explicationes*, '72' [*recte* 92]: 'Haec ego sic aptius, dilucidiusque verterem… "quare sit, vt magis philosophicum quiddam, & graue sit poësis, quàm historia, quia illa circa vniuersale plurimu*m* versatur, hęc circa particulare..." '

[73] In compiling this evidence I have been limited to the dictionaries immediately to hand; the dates of print I

for its rarity is that the semantic richness of *σπουδή* flows, as it were, only downstream: the wide range on show in Estienne's definition of *σπουδή* is not equally present in any of the Latin glosses into which the Greek word may be translated. The better Greek dictionaries define the word with sufficient range to embrace, though without stressing, the senses Sidney encapsulates in 'studiously serious'. Thus 'studiosus', 'serius', and their close relatives appear in conjunction to gloss *σπουδή* and its various derivative forms in Estienne, as above, and thence in Scapula's 1580 abridgement,[74] in Jacques Toussain's *Lexicon Graecolatinum*, incorporating material from Budé's *Commentarii*,[75] in Edward Grant's edition of Jean Crespin's lexicon, itself compiled from Constantinus's 1562 Greek-Latin lexicon,[76] and in the

provide therefore rarely indicate the first edition. Where multiple editions were available I attempted to choose those printed closest in time to Sidney's composition of the *Defence*, around 1580. Bibliographical overviews of Greek lexicography in the sixteenth century are given by G. Autenrieth, 'Griechische Lexikographie' in *Griechische und Lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, ed. Karl Brugmann *et al.*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1890), 587-607, by Leopold Cohn, 'Griechische Lexicographie' in *Griechische Grammatik*, ed. Karl Brugmann and Albert Thumb, 4th ed. (Munich, 1913), 679-730, and in Paul Botley, *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts* (Philadelphia, 2010), Appendix 2: 'Printed Greek Lexica, 1478-1529'; John Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage* (Cambridge, 2008) contains much of the history of the Renaissance dictionaries; Eleanor Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford, 2007) details pre-Renaissance lexica. For Latin and English dictionaries, especially in the English context, see DeWitt T. Starnes, *Renaissance Dictionaries: English-Latin and Latin-English* (Austin, Edinburgh, 1954). For some examples of the derivation of dictionaries from one another (a problem when using them in source studies), see James Sledd, 'A Note on the Use of Renaissance Dictionaries', *Modern Philology* 49.1 (1951), 10-15, and John M. Steadman, 'Renaissance Dictionaries and Manuals as Instruments of Literary Scholarship: the Problem of Evidence' in *New Aspects of Lexicography: Literary Criticism, Intellectual History, and Social Change*, ed. Howard D. Weinbrot (Carbondale, Edwardsville, London, Amsterdam, 1972), 17-35.

[74] Joannes Scapula, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum nouum* (Basel, 1580), *s.v.* ΣΠΕΥΔΩ *et seq.* On Scapula's scurrilous theft of Estienne's material see Ladislav Zgusta, *Lexicography Then and Now: Selected Essays*, ed. Fredric S. F. Dolezal and Thomas B. I. Creamer (Tübingen, 2006), 266.

[75] Jacques Toussain, *Lexicon Graecolatinum* (Paris, 1552), *s.vv.* *σπουδάζω*, 'studeo, aliquid diligenter facio, seriò ago vel dico, do opera*m*, satago, apparo, instituo, conor, studium pono, studiu*m* & operam impendo, curam geno, adhibeo diligentiam, seriò sequor, dedita opera & seriò exequor, seriò elaboro, studiosè sector, sum studiosus, studio incumbo, in studium incumbo, annitor, contendo...'; *σπουδαῖος*, 'sedulus, attentus, studiosus, diligens, industrius, strenuus, res serias tractans, serius, grauis, laudabilis, honestus, praeclarus, qui virtutem habet, *χρηστὸς*, bonus, probus, ingenuus, studio dignus...'; *σπουδαίως*, 'seriò, bona fide, citra vllum figmentum, diligenter, attentè, accuratê'; *σπουδή*, 'studium, diligentia, festinatio, celeritas, sedulitas, cura, *μελετὴ*, solicitudo, *ἀρετὴ*, sedulitas exhibe*n*di officii, animi inte*n*tio, negotiu*m* serium...'. This lexicon was one in a series that 'eventually became known as the 'lexicon of the seven' (*λεξικὸν τῶν ἑπτά*/*dictionarium septemvirale*), after its successive contributors, Budé, Toussain, Gesner, De Jonghe (Junius), Constantin, Hartung and Hopper' (John A. L. Lee, *A History of New Testament Lexicography* [New York, Oxford, 2003], 330). On Toussain's relationship to Budé, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 37-38.

[76] Jean Crespin, *Lexicon Graecolatinum Ioannis Crispini*, ed. Edward Grant (London, 1581): there is no conjunction of 'serious' and 'studious' *s.v.* *σπουδή*, but see *s.vv.* *σπουδαῖος*, 'sedulus, attentus, studiosus, diligens, res serias tractans...'; *σπουδαίως*, 'studiosè, seriò diligenter, attentè...'. On the use of this volume in England, see Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.530.

much-reprinted *Dictionarium* of Crastonus;[77] the conjunction of senses is absent only from the older Greek lexica.[78] Of course, we need not assume that Sidney had one or another of these dictionaries to hand, nor even that he used a dictionary at all. The point is rather that these definitions taken *en masse* adumbrate the sixteenth-century scope of the word as it might have been available to a comprehending reader. If that reader had been working from Greek, 'studiously serious' would certainly have been an imaginable translation for *σπουδαῖος*, although, as we have seen, perhaps not the top recommendation for Aristotle's passage.

Working from Latin, however, our reader's semantic map looks very different. The range of meaning for each of the individual Latin glosses into which *σπουδαῖος* flows is much narrower than the Greek: *σπουδαῖος* is regularly glossed, in Greek-Latin lexica, by both *serius* and *studiosus*, but in Latin and Latin-English dictionaries *serius* and *studiosus* almost never gloss each other. This applies equally to the various words chosen by Aristotle's sixteenth-century translators, who add to the corpus *probus*, *praestans*, and from Robortello's commentary notes, *gravis*. Thus the foundational *Latinae Linguae Thesaurus* of Robert Estienne, the ubiquitous, agglomerative, polyglot *Dictionarium* of Friar Ambrogio Calepino,[79]

---

77 Johannes Crastonus, *Dictionarium Graecum cum interpretatione Latina* (Venice, 1524), *svv. σπουδάζω*, 'studeo, aliquid diligenter facio, apparo, conor serio ago'; *σπουδαῖος*, 'sedulus, studiosus'; *σπουδαίως*, 'serio'; *σπουδή*, 'studium, diligentia, festinatio, serium'. For Crastonus, see L. Delaruelle, 'Le Dictionnaire grec-latin de Crastone. Contribution à l'histoire de la lexigographie grecque', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* nuova serie 8.3 (1930), 221-46, and Botley, *Learning Greek*, 64-66.

78 e.g. Varinus Phavorinus, *Λεξικόν* Βαρίνου *Φαβωρίνου* Καμήρτος *του της* Νουκαιρίας Επισκόπου. *Dictionarium Varini Phauorini Camertis, Nucerini Episcopi* (Basel, 1538); Girolamo Aleandro, *Lexicon Graecolatinum* (Paris, 1512), on which see Botley, *Learning Greek*, 67-68; and Marcus Musurus and Zacharias Kallierges's edition of the Byzantine Ε*τυμολογικὸν μέγα κατὰ ἀλφάβητον, πάνυ ὠφέλιμον* [*Magnum etymologicum*] (Venice, 1499), on which see Botley, 58-59, Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, 124-5, Concepción Serrano Aybar, 'Historia de la lexicografía griega antigua y medieval' in *Introducción a la lexicografía griega*, ed. Francisco Rodríguez Adrado and Elvira Gangutia Elícegui (Madrid, 1977), 104, and Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 91-92. The ancient sources, for example Hesychius and Pollux, are monoglot, and the *Suda* has no relevant entry: for their ancient history see Dickey, 88-90, 96, for their Renaissance publication history see Botley, 55-61, and for the scant help they gave early sixteenth-century translators see Lee, *History of New Testament Lexicography*, 44.

79 Ambrogio Calepino, *Dictionarium... Adiectae sunt Latinis dictionibus, Hebraeae, Græcae, Gallicae, Italicae, Hispanicae & Germanicae* ([Lyon], 1570); for a full bibliography of Calepino, see Albert Labarre, *Bibliographie du dictionarium d'Ambrogio Calepino (1502-1779)* (Baden-Baden, 1975): this edition corresponds to Labarre's no.117.

the Latin-English *Bibliotheca* of Sir Thomas Elyot[80] and the *Thesaurus* of Thomas Cooper,[81] even the Latin-Greek-English dictionary of Morel-Fleming,[82] supply no 'serius' under *studium* or *studiosus*, no 'studium' under *serius* or *gravis*, and have nothing but good to say for *bonus*, *probus*, and *praestans*. One searches in vain, too, in the English-Latin dictionary of Huloet-Higgins and Baret's *Alvearie*, even with the help of the latter's Latin index.[83] Finally, the two Italian-English dictionaries available by the 1580s – William Thomas's *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer* (1567) and Florio's *First Fruites* (1578)[84] – offer the narrowest options of all for the Italian of Segni, Castelvetro, and Piccolomini: here *uirtuoso* means only 'virtuous', and *studio* only 'study' or 'care'. The balance of plausibility, drawn from contemporary lexicographical sources, strongly implies that whether Sidney translated the passage directly into English, or evaluated and selected from a number of potential glosses, he did so through linguistic comparison primarily with a Greek, not a Latin or Italian, text. Either 'studiously serious' was Sidney's own best fit in English for *σπουδαιότερον*, that is, or it was through comparison to the Greek that it struck him among the many lexical choices available as the aptest phrase.

The latter option is made possible by one source that bears a more than passing resemblance to Sidney's unusual locution. We have seen that no translation proper unites these two senses of *σπουδαιότερον*; we have also seen, independently, that no set of

80 Thomas Elyot, *Bibliotheca Eliotae. Eliotes dictionarie*, ed. Thomas Cooper, 3rd ed. (London, 1559).

81 Thomas Cooper, *Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae* (London, 1578).

82 Morel-Fleming, *Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglicisque coniunctorum*. Starnes, *Renaissance Dictionaries*, 112, shows that the English definitions of Morel-Fleming were taken from Cooper's *Thesaurus*. For this reason the English glosses here still do not exhibit the range of the Greek: *studiosus* here points immediately to *σπουδαῖος*, as do *serius* and *bonus vir*, but in the absence of a Greek index such connections would be lost unless one were already aware of the semantic range of *σπουδαῖος* and were consciously searching for its Latin derivatives already on the basis of the Greek.

83 Richard Huloet and John Higgins, *Huloets dictionarie newelye corrected, amended, set in order and enlarged* (London, 1572); John Baret and Abraham Fleming, *An Aluearie or Quadruple Dictionarie, containing foure sundrie tongues: namelie, English, Latine, Greeke, and French* (London, 1580). See the relevant chapters in Starnes, *Renaissance Dictionaries*.

84 William Thomas, *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer, with a Dictionarie for the better vnderstandynge of Boccace, Pethrarcha, and Dante* (London, 1567); John Florio, *Florio his firste fruites which yeelde familiar speech, merie prouerbes, wittie sentences, and golden sayings* (London,1578).

annotationes alone could account for the whole of Sidney's translation without a text of the whole passage nearby. Nonetheless, a passage in Vettori's 1560 commentary notes, rather than in his translation proper, is a very good fit for Sidney's translation (see **fig. 1**, p.107):

> Cum ostendisset poëtae munus esse, neglecta plerunq*ue* veritate rerum, co*m*memorare illas vt fieri debuere, non vt factae sunt, hinc elicit corollarij loco. poesim esse re*m* magis philosopha*m* & magis studiosam grauemq*ue*, quàm historiam.
>
> [Since he has shown that the gift of the poet is, the truth of things aside, to record things as they must (or should) be, not as they have been, from this he elicits in the place of a deduction, that poetry is a thing more philosophical and more studious and serious, than history.][85]

'Studiosam grauemq*ue*': 'studious and serious', or, quite legitimately, 'studiously serious'.[86] Indeed, it may be worth noting here that the Penshurst manuscript, which remained in the Sidney family's possession at Penshurst and has the greatest circumstantial authority of the four early witnesses, in fact reads 'studiouse seriouse'.[87] Vettori's annotatory locution, uniting the studiousness of poetry with its seriousness, is a very close match for Sidney's unusual and otherwise unprecedented translation. And as Vettori's edition, being a commentary, reproduces the Greek text, it is consistent with what we have seen of Sidney's reading of the Greek original, here alongside Latin notes that represent the advanced learning assumed by Dr Warton.

Could an argument be made, then, that Sidney's edition of the *Poetics* was Vettori's?

---

85 Vettori, *Commentarii, in primum librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetarum*, 93.

86 Henry John Roby, *A Latin Grammar for Schools* (London, 1882), §860: '**et** simply connects, whether words or sentences: **que** marks the second member as an appendage or supplement to the first, and is often used in joining two words, which together make up one conception'; cf. Gildersleeve and Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed. (London, 1894), §476; Allen and Greenough, *A Latin Grammar*, rev. ed. (Boston, 1882), §156a; Hale and Buck, *A Latin Grammar* (Boston, 1903), §307.1. John Stanbridge, *Accidentia Stanbrigiana* (London, 1532), sig. Diii, and William Lily, *A Short Introduction of Grammar* ([Geneva], 1557), 34, go into less detail, grouping all conjunctions together indiscriminately; but it should be noted that these grammars were introductory, and educated adults in the more Latinate literary culture of the sixteenth-century would have grasped Latin usage in a way described much better by our modern grammars – which themselves serve to synthesise Latin usage for a population decreasingly intimate with it – than by contemporary introductions.

87 The variant is recorded in *Defence*, 88.

When S. K. Heninger proposed Sidney's familiarity with Henri Estienne's 1578 edition of Plato, accompanied by the Latin translation of Jean de Serres, he began by justifying at length Sidney's encounter with the work. The edition was a 'magnificent three-volume folio', an 'altogether elaborate and handsome production'; its popularity, and probable presence in England, is witnessed by the British Library's four copies; the first volume is dedicated to Elizabeth, and the second to James VI of Scotland; Sidney and Estienne were well-acquainted; de Serres had ties to English humanists and neo-Latinists, and sent Sidney a copy personally.[88] This is a rich hoard of authorising circumstance entirely lacking for Vettori. Pietro Vettori, or Petrus Victorius (1499-1585),[89] 'the ablest textual critic of his generation and the true successor to Poliziano',[90] rose at Florence from the professorship of Latin (1538) to that of Greek Language and Literature (1543) and of Moral Philosophy (1548). His philological emendations of the Greek works of Aristotle and his commentators, largely from manuscripts in the Laurentian Library, were published in twenty-five books in 1553, and by 1583, the year of his retirement, had swelled to thirty-eight. In addition to his work on the *Poetics*, he wrote commentaries on Aristotle's *Ethics*, *Politics*, and most famously the *Rhetoric*, as well as on Cicero's letters. The last two, at least, may be found in booklists from Cambridge[91] and Oxford[92] colleges, and other private collections[93] in sixteenth-century

[88] S. K. Heninger, Jr., 'Sidney and Serranus' Plato', *ELR* 13.2 (1983), 146-53. It might be added, as the evidence surfaced after Heninger's essay went to press, that a copy of the work, presumably Sidney's own, survives in the Penshurst library catalogue: see Warkentin, 'Sidney's Authors', 85.

[89] The following biographical abstract draws primarily on Charles H. Lohr, 'Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors So-Z', *RQ* 35.2 (1982), 220-22; Mario Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1962), V.1887-9; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 30-31; John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1908), II.135-40.

[90] Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, 232-3.

[91] Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, Appendix A, OL100: 'Victorius in Aristotelem', i.e. *P. Victorii commentarii in tres libros de arte dicendi* (Florence, 1548).

[92] Merton: N. R. Ker, 'The Provision of Books', Appendix II [Merton College inventory for Royal Commissioners, 1556], no.502: 'Petrus Victorius in Rhet. Arist.'.

[93] *BCI*, 52: Robert Pickering I, 1551, 106: ' victori*us* sup*er* cicerone*m*'; *BCI*, 63: John Bernard, 1553/4, 83: 'castigac*ion*es victorij'; *PLRE* 64, Edward Beaumont, Scholar (B.A.), 1552, 64.3: 'Victorii commentaria in rethoricam Ciceronis'; *PLRE* 98, Austin, Scholar (probable), 1572, 98.12: 'castigaciones victorii in Ciceronem'; John Rainolds donated the edition of the *Rhetoric* to Thomas Sutton at Queen's College, Oxford (see Appendix I, *s.v.* Rainolds, John, *s.v.* p.74, and n75).

England, and the Bodleian had an extensive library of Vettori's works in 1605,[94] but his edition of the *Poetics* does not appear among the booklists surveyed in the appendices. He was well-known to the leading lights of continental humanism, including Estienne;[95] many of them he educated in the course of his long professorial career, such as Justus Lipsius and Benedetto Varchi; but we have no correspondence recommending him or his edition to Sidney. His *Poetics* is dedicated to Cosimo de' Medici – Italian royalty, not English – and despite its scholarly significance could not be described as a 'magnificent' volume.[96]

Yet the want of trumpets and pageantry in no way lessens the likelihood of Sidney's using Vettori's edition. Rather, it serves to reiterate the fundamental distinction between Aristotelian and Platonic publication in the sixteenth century: Platonic works were 'elaborate and handsome'; Aristotle's were, comparatively, workmanlike and plain. Vettori's Aristotle was highly respected, certainly, and had an excellent pedigree to recommend its use, but remained essentially a working commentary. Aristotle was probably the most widely published author in the sixteenth century, underpinning university syllabi across Europe in almost every discipline – logic, natural philosophy, moral philosophy, rhetoric, mathematics[97] – as well as being the purported author of popular manuals such as the *Problemata* and *Secreta Secretorum*. Charles Schmitt estimates that three or four thousand editions of *Aristotelica* had been published by 1600, compared with fewer than five hundred of Plato.[98] Sidney would have needed, in other words, neither special motive nor special opportunity to refer in particular to what is still recognised as 'the single most important commentary' on the

94 James, *Catalogus Librorum*, 405, *s.v.* V.3.8, 9, 10, ¶ [with A.3.8.], 11, * [in 8º.A.9.]: the holdings include Vettori's commentaries on the Rhetoric, Ethics, Politics, and the *Variae Lectiones*, among other works. His commentary on the *Poetics* had been acquired by the 1620 catalogue, 513 *s.v.* 'P. *Victorius*'

95 Estienne consulted him, for example, about the *Anacreontea*: see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 74, 99.

96 For further particulars on Vettori's *Poetics*, see Antonietta Porro, 'Pier Vettori editore di testi greci: la *Poetica* di Aristotele', *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 26 (1983), 307-358.

97 For a broad summary see Charles B. Schmitt, *Aristotle and the Renaissance* (Cambridge, MA, 1983), 2-8.

98 *Ibid*., 14.

major text of Renaissance poetics by ‘the best Italian Hellenist of the sixteenth century, and... also the best Aristotelian scholar of that period’.[99] A reasonable argument could be made, then, for Sidney’s use of Vettori’s edition: it would have provided him with the Greek text, and with an idiosyncratic scholarly gloss for *σπουδαιότερον* that may have appealed to him, even if he avoided Vettori’s translation proper.

Should we wish to make this argument, however, it would hold only locally. Reading further into Vettori’s commentary, we see that he consistently translates and glosses *καθ’ ἕκαστον* (line 7 in the Greek) as ‘singillatim’ or ‘singulare’. This is a standard translation across the Latin texts: the translations and commentaries of Valla, Pazzi, and Riccoboni, too, all have ‘singillatim’ (or its synonyms ‘sigillatim’ or ‘singulatim’) or ‘singulare’ for *καθ’ ἕκαστον*; its antonym in the Greek, *καθόλου*, is always translated as some form of ‘universale’, which ‘singulare’ clearly opposes, again on the authority of Cicero.[100] Latin lacks cognates as close to *καθόλου* and *καθ’ ἕκαστον* as *studium* is to *σπουδή*, but neither of the former Greek terms has the semantic complexity of the latter, so the translation is straightforward. Yet Sidney has ‘particular’ here, not ‘singular’, seemingly in line rather with the Italians, Segni, Castelvetro, and Piccolomini, who are themselves entirely consistent in rendering the term as ‘particulare’, ‘particularmente’, or ‘cose particolari’. And in this case, the lexicographical record provides little help. The Greek-Latin dictionaries mostly gloss *καθ’ ἕκαστον* with ‘singula’ or ‘sigillatim’,[101] or ‘quotidie’, ‘quilibet’;[102] but Toussain’s 1552 lexicon, along with others based on the work of Budé, Toussain, and Constantinus, glosses it

---

[99] Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 53; cf. Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II.135.

[100] Cicero, *In Verrem*, 2.5.143: ‘nam quid ego de ceteris civium Romanorum suppliciis singillatim potius quam generatim atque universe loquar?’ Cited widely, e.g. by Calepino, *Dictionarium* (1570), *s.v. universe*, Cooper, *Thesaurus* (1578), *s.v. sigillatim*, Baret, *Aluearie* (1580), *s.v.* General / *vniuersalis*.

[101] cf. Estienne, *Thesaurus* (1572), Crespin, *Lexicon* (1581), and Scapula, *Lexicon* (1580), often as an entry *s.v. ἕκαστος*.

[102] Thus the older lexica: cf. Aleandro, *Lexicon* (1512), Crastonus, *Dictionarium* (1524).

as 'singillatim, particulatim', leaving open both options.[103] The Latin and Latin-English dictionaries are then evenly split: in Robert Estienne's *Latinae Linguae Thesaurus* and Calepino's polyglot, Huloet-Higgins and Elyot's *Bibliotheca*, *singularis* and *particulatim* do not gloss one another, but in Baret's *Alvearie*, Morel-Fleming, and Cooper's *Thesaurus*, all of which have English glosses, it is easy enough to find one's way between them.[104] And once again, William Thomas's Italian-English dictionary is narrowest, offering 'singuler or speaciall' for *singulare* and 'perticulerly' for *particolarmente*.[105] Either translation, that is, for *καθ' ἕκαστον* into Latin, Italian, or English, and independently for either of its Latin or Italian glosses into English, is lexicographically plausible for the period.

And so our picture of Sidney's lexical options, in the end, cannot be fixed beyond a certain point. His translation of *σπουδαιότερον* as 'studiously serious' is shared by Vettori and not by the Italians, and his translation of *καθ' ἕκαστον* as 'particular' is cognate with the Italians and not with Vettori – but remains a plausible translation of either. Indeed, the lexicographical sources suggest that while hunting cognates across languages was respectable translative practice, synonyms etymologically dissimilar to their source-words were also perfectly acceptable as glosses,[106] just as translating 'sense for sense' rather than 'word for word' had strong classical, patristic, and contemporary precedent.[107] We might thus say that if

[103] Toussain, *Lexicon* (1552), *s.v. ἕκαστος*; cf. Budé, Constantin, Toussain, *Lexicon sive Dictionarium Graecolatinum*, 2 vols. ([Geneva], 1562).

[104] cf. Baret, *Aluearie* (1580), *ad indicem*, *s.v.* particularlie, 'singulatim, singillatim... particulariter'; Morel-Fleming, *Verborum Latinorum* (1583), *s.v. singulatim / singillatim / sigillatim*, 'particularly'; Cooper, *Thesaurus* (1578), *s.vv. singulatim*, *singillatim siue sigillatim*, 'particularly'.

[105] Florio's *First Fruites* (1578) uses 'singular' and 'particular' only as terms of grammar.

[106] Lee describes definition by gloss as 'the method on which the whole edifice of Greek lexicography has been built... At its heart lies the simple process of explaining an unfamiliar word in a text by means of a better-known equivalent' (*A History of New Testament Lexicography*, 16); for a more theoretical analysis of glossography and its history, see Werner Hüllen, 'In the Beginning was the Gloss: Remarks on the Historical Emergence of Lexicographical Paradigms' in *Lexicographers and Their Works*, ed. Gregory James (Exeter, 1989), 100-16.

[107] In his letter to Pammachius on the best method of translation, Jerome adduces the examples of Cicero *De optimo genere oratorum* 23ff. ('.. non pro uerbo uerbum necesse habui reddere, sed genus omnium uerborum uimque seruaui') and Horace, *Ars Poetica* 133-4 ('nec uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres'): *Saint Jérôme: Lettres*, ed. and trans. Jérôme Labourt, 8 vols. (Paris, 1949-63), III, Letter LVII, 59-60. Jerome's advice and his sources informed sixteenth-century writings on translation, such as those of Laurence

Sidney was gleaning readings from the scholarly literature, he was reading widely and inclusively, and that if we respect the methods that led us to identify Vettori's edition as a potential source, we must also respect that they lead us away from Vettori as an *exclusive* source. Our conclusion is thus twofold: either Sidney looked in his heart and translated, alone, from the Greek, or, if Sidney was reading the wider literature surrounding the *Poetics*, he was actively moving between his many sources without being in thrall to any, adopting a source when he felt it served the Greek and ignoring it when it didn't.

For even Vettori's – and it is only Vettori's – provision of 'studiosam grauemq*ue*' does little to disrupt a model in which we can be sure that Sidney was reading the whole passage, and reading it in Greek. Let us say Sidney was using Vettori's edition: in the translation proper he would see 'magis studiosum', and in the *annotationes* immediately below it he would see 'studiosam grauemq*ue*'. On what basis would Sidney opt to follow the *annotationes* rather than the translation? The translation, after all, has greater authority as a crib of the original than the commentary notes; if Vettori had felt that 'studiosam grauemq*ue*' were a better primary translation of *σπουδαιότερον*, he would presumably have placed it in his translation, and placed 'magis studiosum' in the *annotationes*. As the edition is arranged, however, Sidney would have no reason at all to follow 'studiosam grauemq*ue*' unless he felt it were the apter phrase – and its aptness could only be measured alongside the Greek. The Greek is, finally, the only ground of comparison available to Sidney in choosing between two, or many, different translations. So we may be sure that these Greek words are not, as Considine suggested, merely 'tags repeated from a Latin or vernacular source', in part because the Greek words are not the only proof that Sidney is translating, in part because Sidney's idiosyncratic gloss is matched only, if at all, by Vettori's, and in part because even Vettori presents that gloss as a *secondary* option which Sidney would only choose if it lived up to his sensitive,

---

Humphrey and John Christopherson; see Binns, *Intellectual Culture*, 211, 221.

precise understanding of the semantic range of the Greek.

Of course, the primacy of Sidney's encounter with the Greek text should not imply that Sidney read *exclusively* the Greek – only that he read *at least* the Greek. We need not limit Sidney to reading only one source, even if that source was the original. Indeed, the sixteenth-century critical tradition on the *Poetics* was always bilingual: from Robortello onwards, the text was presented in that tradition with running translation as well as commentary. Learned men read the *Poetics* bilingually in parallel texts, just as we now read Butcher's critical translation and commentary of 1895, or a Loeb. Reading thus in parallel – accessing one language through another, rather than in place of it – was second nature to sixteenth-century readers, inculcated through the rigorous pedagogy of grammar-school language instruction;[108] Sidney himself writes to Languet of his intention to strengthen his Italian, French, and Latin simultaneously by cyclically reading and translating Cicero's letters through those languages.[109] Parallel Greek texts invite engagement through translation, stand as an implicit challenge to the reader and the translator to compare their natural reading language with the source, insist that whatever translations they face are only ever provisional and imperfect. Paolo Beni's 1613 commentary, the last of the 'great' commentaries, underscores just this when it prints the Greek text facing not one, but two Latin translations, Pazzi's and Riccoboni's, along with Beni's *annotationes*.[110] On one hand this is an act of scholarly

---

108 Sophisticated recent work on multilingual language training in the period has been done by Jason Lawrence, *'Who the Devil Taught Thee so Much Italian?': Italian Language Learning and Literary Imitation in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2005), esp. 11-12, 45-6, who describes the methods of Italian teaching through parallel texts as a 'deliberate development' from the Latin pedagogy of Ascham's *Scholemaster* (25ff.). These methods can be seen in detail in the tuition around 1581 of William Paget, whose father Thomas had been tutored directly by Ascham: 'texts were selected to consolidate William's Latin grammar, introduce him to versification and rhetoric and ease the transition from Latin to Greek, French and Italian', including parallel texts in Latin and Greek, Latin and French, Italian and English (Andrew Anderson, 'The Books of Thomas, Lord Paget (c.1544-1590)', *TCBS* 6 [1975], 229).

109 Sidney to Hubert Languet, Padua, 15 Jan. 1573/4: 'first I will translate some letter of Cicero's into French, then it will go from French to English, and then full circle... back into Latin. Perhaps I will strengthen my Italian with the same [kind of] exercise: for I have some letters translated by Paolo Manuzio, a most learned man, and by someone else into French' (*Correspondence*, 92).

110 Beni, *In Aristotelis poeticam commentarii*.

encyclopaedism; on the other, however, it insists that the reader not take any given translation as adequate, but constantly compare them with the Greek and with each other as acts of translative interpretation.

The body of sixteenth-century commentary on the *Poetics* and contemporary lexicography alike emerge from the imperfection of linguistic mapping; indeed, recent work on the more radical departures from Aristotle's text by Syriac and Arabic translators has tended to stress the interpretive dimensions of what have previously been considered solely lexical errors.[111] The commentator's challenge as much as the glossator's, after all, is not just to render the sense of (in this case Aristotle's) words, but to render it in a different language, inextricably superimposing the acts of definition and translation – a challenge as evident in the dual senses of the Latin 'interpres' as in the fact that no single English word suffices to translate it.[112] The semantic space between a *lemma* and its translingual gloss becomes as much the motivator of commentary as the need to clarify a word's local function in a sentence, an idea, and a philosophical system.[113] Acts of translation, therefore, do not necessarily imply impediments to understanding original texts, even if that understanding registers historically, becomes recognisable to us, primarily through acts of translation. The better Sidney comprehends his text, paradoxically, the further the original recedes from sight. Recording that comprehension for posterity is therefore a slippery business. 'A thing well said' loses nothing in translation to him who reads it in the original, acknowledges Dryden,

---

111 See Alberto Rigolio, 'Aristotle's Poetics in Syriac and Arabic Translations: Readings of "Tragedy"', *Khristianskii vostok* 6 (2013), 140-149.

112 George Steiner, comparing French and English, considers this *lemma* the 'vital starting point' in examining the intersection between translation and meaning: *After Babel* (London, 1975), 28.

113 Lee, *A History of New Testament Lexicography*, goes into more detail: 'The underlying reason why this [glossary] method does not work is simple: each language divides up the world in its own distinctive way, and words in different languages rarely if ever match exactly in their semantic range. Though they may and often do overlap in the areas of meaning covered, complete equivalence is a rarity. It is therefore no use to say *κατανοῶ* "means" *consider*: for one is only partially equivalent to the other... The effect of this method is to create at least imprecision and uncertainty. It makes the classification of meanings more difficult and haphazard, and invites mistaken splitting and lumping, since the number of different translation equivalents in different contexts is no proper guide to the number of lexical meanings' (19).

the arch-translator, but not without qualification: ‘He has an Idea of its excellency, though it cannot pass from his mind into any other expression or words then those in which he finds it.’[114]

And so it is wholly possible, indeed quite likely, that Sidney read widely, navigating from Greek to English by synthesis of his understanding of the Greek and of the several divergent translative choices available to him. This model restores to Sidney the first-hand knowledge and wide reading of the *Poetics* that Warton saw fit to accord him more than two centuries ago, which amounts to more than the ‘paraphrase’, the uncertainty of his access, the habitual refusal to check his sources, the halting Greek, with which he has recently been burdened – the fruits of ‘nearly half a century of determined debunking’, as Roger Kuin described it in 2002.[115] Indeed, it should be noted that we have gained from this detailed examination very little that is not reasonable to assume from first glance. Considine describes Katherine Duncan-Jones’s remark in 1985, that ‘classical sources, in a work of this period, may to some extent be taken as read’, as one made ‘incautiously’; when in her 1991 biography she instead paints Estienne’s praise of Sidney’s Greek as ‘exaggerated’, Considine feels she has sounded ‘a sensible note of caution’. But in fact, when Sidney cites Aristotle’s *Poetics* six or more times by author, by text, and by precept in a single work, the responsible scholarly position – the *cautious* position, as opposed to a doctrinally sceptical one – is to assume that he is telling us he knew it. The ramifications of this caution for our understanding of English readers’ access to classical texts more generally will be examined in the next chapter. At very least, the evidence of this passage is decisive in dispelling the questions surrounding both Sidney’s first-hand reading of the *Poetics* and his facility in Greek, neither of which can seriously remain in doubt.

[114] Dryden, ‘An Essay of Dramatick Poesie’, 28.

[115] Roger Kuin, ‘The Text of the Plural, the Plural of the Text’, *Sidney Journal* 20.2 (2002), 80. Kuin’s piece, appropriately, follows immediately on Considine’s.

la vera foret, amitteret tunc historici nomen Herodotus, ac poeta fieret: quod tamē non fit: non minus enim illa post, immutatione illa in se suscepta: numerisq; ornata, quàm prius illis destituta, historia est. Constat igitur hoc non esse, quo discrepat historicus à poeta: deceptosq; magnopere esse illos, qui ita crediderunt: quare discrimen illud uerum est, quod indicauit Aristoteles. Non debet igitur, quod alterius studij proprium est, improbè & cum damno etiam sui usurpari à poetis. Valet uero quod inquit. Non nullos existimasse uerū certumq; discrimen esse inter poetas & historicos, quod poetæ uterentur oratione metrica: historici uerò ipsa uacua à metris, quia uidebant hoc perpetuo illos seruare: valet inquam ad refellendam opinionem eorum, qui falsò putant extare genus quoddam poetices, quod vtatur soluta oratione: idq; traditum supra ab hoc auctore fuisse arbitrantur: nam quin discrepēt in hoc etiam ab historicis, dubium non est, quamuis existat aliud firmius discrimen, & quod magis naturam illarum rerum attingit: quod etiam non multo post auctor ipse testatur, qui inquit. ὅτι τὸν ποιητὴν μᾶλλον τῶν μύθων εἶναι δεῖ ποιητὴν, ἢ τῶν μέτρων. Animaduertendum autem, quod ad elegantiam orationis facit, ut hic Aristoteles inquit εἰς μέτρα τιθέασι, ita etiam Platonē in ij. de legibus dixisse λόγους ψιλοὺς εἰς μέτρα τιθέντα, cuius loci sententia multo supra à me citata est.

Διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου· ἡ δ' ἱστορία τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον λέγει. ἔστι δὲ καθόλου μὲν τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποῖ' ἄττα συμβαίνει λέγειν ἢ πράττειν κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, οὗ στοχάζεται ἡ ποίησις, ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθεμένη· τὰ δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον, τί Ἀλκιβιάδης ἔπραξεν, ἢ τί ἔπαθεν.

Quare & philosophum magis, & magis studiosum poesis, quàm historia est: poesis enim potius quæ in vniuersum: historia verò, quæ singillatim fiunt, dicit. est autem vniuersale quidem quali homini qualia contingit dicere aut facere secundum verisimile aut necessarium: quod propositum habet poesis, nomina imponens. Singulare autem, quid Alcibiades fecit, aut passus est.

Cum ostendisset poetæ munus esse, neglecta plerunq; veritate rerum, cōmemorare illas vt fieri debuere, non vt factæ sunt, hinc elicit corollarij loco. poesim esse rē magis philosophā & magis studiosam grauemq;, quàm historiam. Philosopham autem rem intelligo, vt ipse accepit, qui neutro genere, secundaq; collatione, φιλοσοφώτερον inquit, in qua sapientiæ studiosus libenter versetur, & quæ digna sit materia studij ipsius: valet enim φιλόσοφον, quod inferioris ætatis homines, uersati in Latinis literis, philosophicum dixerunt, id est aptum & conueniens viro philosopho, ac studioso bonarum artium. Apud Ciceronemq; in v. quæstione Tusculana illo modo scriptum est in melioribus exemplaribus: A quo non modo impulsi sumus ad philosophas scriptiones: & quæ sequuntur: non philosophicas, vt aliis etiam non nullis in locis. Nam quin ita à Græcis etiam capiatur hoc nomen dubitari non potest. Non vno tamen eiusdem auctoris exemplo contenti erimus: nam & in j. libro de moribus ad Eudemum inquit. φιλόσοφον γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον περὶ ἑκάστην μέθοδον. & in vij. de rep. λέγω δὲ δύο βίους, τόν τε πολιτικὸν, καὶ τὸν φιλόσοφον. Non igitur tantū homines dediti grauioribus subtilioribusq; literis, φιλόσοφοι appellantur, sed quæstiones etiam non nullæ: resq; dignæ animaduersione illorum, ita uocatæ sunt, vt priore exemplo patefactum: & uitæ etiam hominum, totæ occupatæ in quærenda veritate rerum, ita nominatæ, quod posteriore intelligitur. σπουδαιότερον igitur significat, maiore studio dignum: magisq; refertum omni uirtute ac laude. Rationem verò eius reddens, inquit. Poesis enim potius, quæ in vniuersum: historia autem, quæ singillatim fiunt, dicit. quibus uerbis putat, si rectè accepta illa sint, declarari: verumque esse

intelligi,

fig. 1: Pietro Vettori, *Commentarii in primum librum Aristotelis De arte poetarum* (Florence 1560), 93. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Meerm. 106.

Chapter III

Reading Greek in Renaissance England

Quis hodie nescit Graece? sed quis est doctus Graece?

Joseph Justus Scaliger to Isaac Casaubon, Leiden, 10 July 1602[1]

Finding evidence of Sidney reading and translating from Greek in the early 1580s, aged twenty-six or more, challenges John Considine's conclusion that Sidney's study of Greek belongs to the period 'before his twenty-first birthday'. Moreover, it raises questions about the relationship between Sidney's official and unofficial study, and his retention of that knowledge: if Sidney was reading the *Poetics* in Greek around 1580, then either his studies at Shrewsbury and Oxford reached the level of reading the *Poetics*, and remained with him, or they were insufficient to read the *Poetics*, and Sidney was able substantially to improve his Greek on his own. Indeed, several issues emerge from this analysis which should cause us to reconsider the broader terms of the debate over Greek learning in England. Considine begins by asking 'what does the word *scholar* mean?' But what, for that matter, does it mean to 'know Greek'? Knowledge of Greek is not a binary state, though it is often treated as such in scholarly accounts. One may know less Greek, or more Greek, and one need not be Casaubon to read a single short treatise by Aristotle.[2] Nor are all the tasks to which Greek may be put equally demanding: as we have seen, the play of access between Greek and its parallel texts

1 'Who today is ignorant of Greek? But who is *learned* in Greek?' Epistola LXXII in *Illvstriss. viri Iosephi Scaliger... Epistolae omnes* (Frankfurt, 1628), 201.

2 The *Poetics* is approximately 1150 lines long, two or three times the length of the shortest of the *parva naturalia* such as *De motu animalium* or *De coloribus*, but certainly among the short works at about a fifth the length of the *Rhetoric*, *Ethics*, or other works widely known in the Renaissance; it takes up about 46 pages at twenty-five lines per page, the measure used by R. R. Bolgar in estimating the extent of classical reading at grammar schools (discussed below).

was intricate and complementary. The 'scholarship' displayed by Sidney here amounts to the ability to construe in Greek and express in his own language a short work by the most familiar of authors, which, like almost all other Greek literature by the 1580s, sat at the centre of a web of translation and expositions – not to resolve textual *lemmata* through precise knowledge of manuscript evidence and philological mastery of the Greek *corpus*.

This sets Considine's question in a different light. Histories of scholarship and their literary derivatives have adduced many different definitions of what it means to be a 'scholar'. At one extreme, we have from Considine the spectre of Casaubon, next to whom only a small pantheon from the sixteenth to twenty-first centuries can be considered scholars; rather lower down, Considine considers 'scholarship' any learning in excess of that of a 'regular undergraduate'. For Arthur Tilley, on the other hand, in his extensive and detailed work on early Greek studies in England, Sir John Cheke – the first Regius Professor at Cambridge, whose grasp of the Greek language, we may assume, somewhat exceeded that of his regular undergraduates – 'cannot be mentioned in the same breath as Turnèbe, or Dorat, or Henri Estienne, or Scaliger in France, or as Victorius in Italy, or as Camerarius in Germany'.[3] Indeed, Cheke is a useful test case, since his command of the Greek language is not in question. For M. L. Clarke, mid-century Oxford 'had no Greek scholar of the calibre of Cheke', and Neil Rhodes has recently attempted to correct the 'tacit assumption' that Greek had little literary influence in England by citing Cheke's teaching.[4] Yet for Tilley, neither Cheke nor the other Greek scholars he describes 'devoted themselves entirely to what we call scholarship, that is to say, to the intensive study of the Greek language and literature'; for Joan Simon, 'there was nothing equivalent to the work of leading scholars abroad' among Cheke's set, which included Ascham, William Bill, James Pilkington, and Thomas Lever

[3] Tilley, 'Greek Studies in England', 454.

[4] M. L. Clarke, *Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900* (Cambridge, 1959), 28; Rhodes, 'Marlowe and the Greeks', 201-3.

(among others);[5] in Victor Morgan's recent history of Cambridge, Cheke, Sir Thomas Smith, and Roger Ascham are 'among the pre-eminent teachers of Greek... in mid-century Europe', but 'Cambridge had to wait for Bentley to make any deep mark on the history of classical scholarship'.[6] If there is a consensus as to the definition of Greek scholarship, then, it is based on the evidence solely of the production of scholarly editions or contributions to classical philology.

How this can be useful as a standard of Greek literacy, when Cheke himself falls outside that category, is unclear. Yet it is that standard which has been inherited and cited by literary scholars, often from these very studies, either explicitly (as Considine or Crane) or implicitly (as Wallace, Duncan-Jones, Dewar-Watson), by way of assessing merely the linguistic access enjoyed by sixteenth-century English readers to classical texts, including the *Poetics*. When Brian Vickers introduces his anthology of English Renaissance literary criticism by remarking that Italian literary criticism developed 'more fully and profoundly than English' because of 'the far more advanced state of philology and textual criticism in Italian schools and universities'; that even Latin digests, such as Scaliger's *Poetices* (1561), 'were for the use of scholars, professional classicists, or historians'; that Sir John Cheke was revered as a teacher of Greek, 'but he published little or no original scholarship'; that the absence from England of 'any tradition of literary discussion comparable to that found in Italian courts, universities, and academies' meant that English works of literary criticism 'were addressed not to scholars but to general readers, and to practising writers', and that English (vernacular) rhetorical treatises were 'not intended as scholastic texts', but address 'an ideal reader – a lawyer, parliamentary officer, courtier, or poet – who will be speaking and writing in the vernacular';[7] and at the same time refers to 'the slow reception of the *Poetics*' in

5 Joan Simon, *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge, 1966), 204.

6 Victor Morgan and Christopher N. L. Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge, II: 1546-1750* (Cambridge, 2004), 437-8.

7 Vickers, *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 5-6.

England;[8] we are left to wonder what the common ground is, precisely, between classical literacy, classical scholarship, and the reading of classical works of poetic theory, presented as we are with a straitened England in which one's linguistic access is determined by one's career, one's intellectual interests are determined by one's linguistic access, educated lawyers, parliamentary officers, courtiers, and poets could not manage Latin, let alone Greek, and the *Poetics* was the generic preserve of those who published substantial amounts of original philological scholarship alone.

The history of Greek *literacy* in England, in short, overlaps but is not the same as the history of Greek *scholarship*, and while we require the former meaningfully to estimate access to classical texts among English readers, only the latter is provided by the standard accounts on which literary scholarship predominantly draws. In this traditional history of exceptional individuals, the first glimmers of Greek appear in the mid-fifteenth century, when several distinguished Englishmen passed between Oxford, Cambridge, and Italy in pursuit of Greek.[9] Guarino da Verona, himself a pupil of Manuel Chrysoloras, taught several Englishmen at Ferrara before his death in 1460: William Gray, chancellor of Oxford, in the 1440s; Robert Fleming, Dean of Lincoln, in 1437-8; John Gunthorpe, warden of the King's Hall in Cambridge, perhaps in 1458-60, when he was joined by John Free.[10] By the 1460s, Damian Leader estimates, there were a few men at both universities who could have taught Greek, including William Sellyng, prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, who after securing leave to study abroad in 1464 took a doctorate in Divinity from Bologna, and whose later diplomatic mission back to Italy would take Thomas Linacre in its train.[11] There was evidently

8 *Ibid.*, 11n16.

9 For this period in general see Tilley, 'Greek Studies in England', 221-239, 438-456. I have cited *ODNB* only for specific points in the sections that follow, but its use throughout should be taken as read.

10 Leader, *HUC*, 237-8; William H. Woodward, *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600* (Cambridge, 1906), 107.

11 Cecil H. Clough, 'Thomas Linacre, Cornelio Vitelli, and Humanistic Studies at Oxford' in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre*, ed. Maddison *et al.* (Oxford, 1977), 3.

some demand for Greek manuscripts from the late 1460s, when the first Byzantine scribes are found working in England: Emanuel of Constantinople in 1468, and George Hermonymos of Sparta *c*.1475, were employed by George Neville, archbishop of York, thrice chancellor of Oxford, and chancellor of England, at the same time that Demetrius Cantacuzenus was working in London.[12] At this point, William Latimer would later report to Erasmus, William Grocyn acquired the rudiments of Greek at Oxford, although his teacher is unknown.[13]

But it was among the Oxford generation of the 1480s that Greek truly took root. Thomas Linacre arrived in Oxford in 1481; by 1484 he had been elected fellow at All Souls, and the following year he and Grocyn probably began learning Greek from Cornelio Vitelli of Cortona, praelector at New College from 1485, who may have been the first to introduce Theodore Gaza's grammar into England.[14] The first of the scribe John Serbopoulos's several dated copies of Gaza was made in England a year earlier, in 1484; he could still be found in 1500 at St Mary's Abbey in Reading, copying Greek manuscripts for an Oxford clientele which may have included Grocyn.[15] Meanwhile, Linacre travelled to Italy with Sellyng. Arriving in Florence in 1487-88, he was joined by Grocyn a year later, and the two Oxford men studied with Italy's foremost teachers and scholars of Greek, Angelo Poliziano and Demetrius Chalcondyles, until at least 1490.[16] Grocyn subsequently gave the first public lectures on Greek at Oxford, renting a room at Exeter College from 1491-2; a decade later, in

---

12 Roberto Weiss, 'The Private Collector and the Revival of Greek Learning' in *The English Library before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright (London, 1958), 129; on Greek scribal activity see also M. R. James, 'Greek Manuscripts in England Before the Renaissance', *The Library* s.4, 7.4 (1927), 337-353.

13 *CWE*, IV, letter 520 from William Latimer, Oxford, 30 Jan. [1517], 201-2; cf. Erasmus's response, *CWE*, IV, letter 540 to Latimer, Antwerp, [Feb. 1517], 259-60. Grocyn's teacher has been thought to be Cornelius Vitelli, based on a tradition that Vitelli was in Oxford before 1475, but this is disproven by Clough, 'Thomas Linacre, Cornelio Vitelli', 7.

14 Botley, *Learning Greek*, 19, although J. B. Trapp in *ODNB* has Vitelli arrive in England only in January 1485, after Serbopoulos's copy was made; a list follows in Botley of English owners of Gaza's grammar, including Richard Pace and Cuthbert Tunstall (19-21).

15 Botley, *Learning Greek*, 19; Weiss, 'The Private Collector', 129-30.

16 Schmitt, 'Thomas Linacre and Italy', 37-8; for Grocyn, and Poliziano's marginal lecture notes confirming his instruction of 'Britannis', see Clough, 'Thomas Linacre, Cornelio Vitelli', 6.

London, he would teach Greek to Thomas More.[17] Linacre gained greater renown in Italy as a Greek scholar, taking a medical degree from Padua in 1496 and earning membership of Aldus's Greek-speaking *neakademia*; Aldus named Linacre a witness to the quality of the great Aristotle edition of 1495-98, and in 1499 printed his edition and Latin translation of Proclus's *Sphaera*.[18] The route taken by Linacre was followed by several younger Oxford men at the close of the century: William Latimer was in Italy from 1496-1502/3, and was joined at Padua after two years by Richard Pace and Cuthbert Tunstall, all of them studying Greek under Niccolò Leonico Tomeo, who in 1497 filled the first university chair dedicated to teaching natural philosophy in Aristotle's original Greek.[19] An unusual exception to this model was Grocyn's godson William Lily, a graduate of Oxford, who on returning from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1490 remained for several years in Rhodes, learning Greek there among refugees from Constantinople.[20]

Already we see Greek being studied as part of the *studia humanitatis* on one hand, for its language and literature, and on the other as a linguistic auxiliary to particular fields of scholarship, such as the medical studies in which Padua, where these early English scholars honed their Greek, was pre-eminent.[21] The English tradition of medical humanism begun by Linacre would continue well into the sixteenth century, and involve many of England's

[17] More, *The Correspondence of Thomas More*, ed. Elizabeth Frances Rogers (Princeton, 1947), letter 2 to John Holt, [London, c.Nov. 1501], 4.

[18] Schmitt, 'Thomas Linacre and Italy', 42, 69-70; Aldus's dedicatory letter to the *Physics* volume (1497) is in Orlandi, *Aldo Manuzio editore*, I.16; the Proclus was printed in a collection of astronomical works, *Iulii Firmici Astronomicorum libri octo*... (Venice, 1499). On the *neakademia* see Martin Lowry, 'The "New Academy" of Aldus Manutius: a Renaissance Dream', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 58.2 (1976), 378-420; his later qualifications in 'The Proving Ground: Venetian Academies of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries' in *The Fairest Flower: The Emergence of Linguistic National Consciousness in Renaissance Europe* (Florence, 1985), 47; and N. G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1992), 129-31. The *Neacademiae lex*, stipulating conversation in Greek on pain of fines and not dissimilar to later English mandates – at Wolsey's Cardinal College, for example – is quoted in Renouard, *Annales*, 499-501.

[19] On Leonico, his chair, and the English students with whom he continued to correspond, see Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, 272-4; Woolfson, *Padua and the Tudors*, 103ff.

[20] Tilley, 'Greek Studies in England', 223.

[21] See Woolfson, *Padua and the Tudors*, 73-102.

leading Greek scholars: the editors of the Aldine Galen (1525) included John Clement, Thomas Lupset, and Edward Wotton, all of them among the first Greek teachers at England's universities.[22] George Day, elected Greek reader at St John's College, Cambridge, in 1526, where he taught John Cheke, initially held the first Linacre professorship of medicine;[23] John Caius, a little later, gained a doctorate in medicine at Padua in 1541, and occupied the chair of philosophy there from 1542-3, lecturing on the Greek texts of Aristotle.[24] One might even trace the line as far as William Harvey, whose medical doctorate was earned at Padua in 1602. This small group of medical humanists and expert linguists enabled the introduction of Greek into England; as we have seen, they were also among the earliest English owners of books containing the *Poetics*.

But for the most part, Greek was promulgated in England in the service of a different cause, and its early development was guided by a different master. On Erasmus's first visit to England in 1499, he became acquainted at Oxford with John Colet, Grocyn, and More, with whom he would translate Lucian in 1505-6.[25] Over the next decade he transformed himself into one of the leading Greek scholars of Europe, and developed a brand of Christian humanism that would determine the course of classical studies in England. Returning in 1509, Erasmus mobilised the Greek expertise that had developed in England over the past two decades in the interests of classical literacy. In 1510, Colet founded St Paul's School in conversation with Erasmus's educational theories, his statutes requiring the master to be 'learnyd in good and clene laten litterature and also in greke yf suyche may be gotten'.[26] Such

[22] McConica, 'The Rise of the Undergraduate College', 21-6; G. D. Duncan, 'Public Lectures and Professorial Chairs' in *HUO-III*, 337-40.

[23] Leader, *HUC*, 313.

[24] Woolfson, *Padua and the Tudors*, 86.

[25] C. R. Thompson, 'The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and S. Thomas More', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 18.4 (1939), 869 and *passim*.

[26] Michael F. J. McDonnell, *A History of St Paul's School* (London, 1909), 35; for Clarke, Colet's foundation of St Paul's 'may be taken as the date of the introduction of humanism to English education' (*Classical Education*, 4).

was gotten: William Lily, with his Rhodian Greek, was appointed master in 1512, and taught John Clement and Thomas Lupset.[27] By 1511, Erasmus had accepted a lectureship in Greek at Cambridge at the invitation of the chancellor, Bishop John Fisher, where he gave lessons without charge, using the grammars of Chrysoloras and Gaza, to both graduates and undergraduates.[28] The latter would turn out the more distinguished: John Bryan, who served as Erasmus's scribe, and Thomas Lupset, who helped Erasmus with his *Novum Instrumentum* in 1513 in exchange for private Greek lessons, would shortly number among England's first teachers of Greek at the universities.[29]

Erasmus did not, in the end, spend long teaching Greek in Cambridge – he had left by early 1514 – but his influence was lasting on classical studies at the grammar schools and both universities. Richard Fox's foundation of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1517 was a watershed moment for this new learning. The college would support a daily public lecture in Greek (as well as in humanities and theology), the first such institutional position in England,[30] to cover Gaza's or another approved grammar, Isocrates, Lucian, Philostratus, Aristophanes, Theocritus, Euripides, Sophocles, Pindar, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Plutarch; competition for the post was effectively international, since Fox allowed for the election of a reader from outside the college, provided he was born in England, Greece, or Italy beyond the Po.[31] This condition itself codifies the new geography of Greek expertise, at least from the English perspective: Erasmus would write to Latimer in

---

[27] Tilley, 'Greek Studies in England', 225.

[28] *CWE*, II, letter 233 to Andrea Ammonio, Cambridge, 16 Oct. 1511, and letter 296 to Servatius Rogerus, Hammes Castle, 8 July 1514, 299; cf. Leader, *HUC*, 292.

[29] For Bryan, see *CWE*, II, letter 262 to Andrea Ammonio, Cambridge, 9 May [1512], 230, and letter 282 to Andrea Ammonio, Cambridge, 28 Nov. [1513], 266; for Lupset, see *CWE*, II, letter 270 to John Colet, Cambridge, 11 July [1513], 249, and letter 271 to Thomas More, Cambridge, [July 1513], 249; cf. Leader, *HUC*, 296.

[30] These lectures were 'public' in the sense of being endowed and thus free to student auditors: see F. D. Logan, 'The Origins of the So-Called Regius Professorships: An Aspect of the Renaissance in Oxford and Cambridge' in *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford, 1977), 277.

[31] *SCO*, II (part 10), 49, 53.

February 1517 that he himself ‘should not feel the need for Italy’ with Linacre, Tunstall, or Latimer as a teacher.[32] Cardinal Wolsey’s public readerships at Oxford were founded around the same time. In practice it is difficult to distinguish Wolsey’s from Fox’s lectures, since both were to be housed and delivered at Corpus; it seems that Wolsey’s humanity lectures were filled in place of Fox’s for several years, John Clement holding the post from 1518-20, to be succeeded by Erasmus’s student Thomas Lupset, who lectured with great success on Linacre’s texts of Proclus’s *Sphaera*, until 1523, at which time Juan Luis Vives took over.[33] By this time, Corpus had employed its first Greek reader: Edward Wotton was paid to read Greek and logic from 1521/2, John Donne from 1528.[34] At Cambridge, meanwhile, John Bryan, Erasmus’s pupil, taught Aristotle from the Greek text,[35] and Richard Croke was appointed Cambridge’s first Greek lecturer by Fisher in 1518. A servant-pupil of Grocyn’s around 1510, Croke had won considerable renown on the continent, occupying the new Greek professorship at Leipzig in 1515 at the age of 26, and translating the notoriously obscure fourth book of Gaza’s grammar into Latin the following year.[36] By the early 1520s, then, Greek had gained institutional recognition and was being regularly taught at both universities; in 1521, the first books to emerge from the press of John Siberch at Cambridge, and the first in England to employ Greek type, were the productions of Erasmus’s students.[37]

We may estimate the impact of these Greek studies by both the loyalty and the odium they inspired. ‘Here they are keenly studying Greek’, Erasmus’s student Henry Bullock wrote to him from Cambridge in 1516, ‘and they are great supporters of your edition of the New Testament; what a book it is!’ A week later, Erasmus responded with news that one

---

[32] *CWE*, IV, letter 540 to William Latimer, Antwerp, [Feb. 1517], 259.

[33] On Wolsey and Fox’s collaboration, see P. S. Allen, ‘The Early Corpus Readerships’, *The Pelican Record* 7.5 (1905), 158. On the appointments, see McConica, ‘Rise of the Undergraduate College’, 21.

[34] McConica, ‘Rise of the Undergraduate College’, 25-7.

[35] Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, I.518.

[36] Botley, *Learning Greek*, 22.

[37] Tilley, ‘Greek Studies in England’, 237-9; Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II.227.

Cambridge college ‘steeped in theology’ had banned the *Novum Instrumentum* from transfer into the college grounds ‘by horse, boat, wagon, or porter’.[38] The humanist return to Greek sources propelled curricular changes that unsettled many university scholars, and Fox’s foundation of Corpus Christi, whose members called themselves ‘somatochristiani’ after their college,[39] became a catalyst for resistance. More wrote to the University of Oxford in March 1518, concerned at the recent unrest: a revanchist ‘Trojan’ faction had formed, its members taking the names of ‘Priam’, ‘Hector’, ‘Paris’, and the like, one of whom had preached a Lenten sermon in a ‘bacchanalian travesty’ condemning the study of Greek literature. More was compelled to the defence, playing on the university’s anxieties by praising the reception of Greek studies at Cambridge, where ‘even those who are not learning Greek are each moved by a common devotion to their school’ personally to support Greek lectures.[40] Much the same varsity incentive was used at Cambridge: Richard Croke’s inaugural lecture of 1519 urged Cambridge students to keep up with the Oxonians, ‘whom previously you excelled in every kind of knowledge’, but who now ‘keep vigil, fast, sweat and freeze to defect to Greek letters’.[41] More’s version was probably truer, since the advocacy of Bishop Fisher eased the introduction of Greek at Cambridge,[42] but humanist circles at court were powerful enough, as Erasmus reported in 1519, to secure the intervention against Oxford’s Trojans of King Henry himself, who ‘declared that those who wished should be welcome to follow Greek’ at the behest of More and Richard Pace.[43] More important than the details of Oxbridge rivalry, of

---

[38] *CWE*, IV, letter 449 from Henry Bullock, Cambridge, 14 Aug. [1516], 34; letter 456 to Henry Bullock, Rochester, [22?] Aug. 1516, 44.

[39] Liddell, ‘The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1517-1617’, 4.

[40] More, ‘Letter to the University of Oxford’ in *In Defense of Humanism: Letters to Dorp, Oxford, Lee, and a Monk*, ed. Daniel Kinney, The Complete Works of St Thomas More XV (New Haven, 1986), 133-5, 145.

[41] Croke, *Orationes Richardi Croci duae*... (Paris, 1520), sig. c.iij.[v]: ‘Oxonienses, quod ante hac in omni scie*n*tiarum genere vicistis, ad literas Graecas perfugere, vigilant, ieiunant, sudant & algent: nihil non faciunt, vt eas occupent.’

[42] *CWE*, VI, letter 948 to Petrus Mosellanus, Louvain, 22 Apr. 1519, 316.

[43] *Ibid*.; on the court circles supportive of university reform, see McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics*, 76-105.

course, is the apparent consensus that Greek provided the competitive edge, and that the cultivation of Greek at both universities would bear the standard of their reputations.

Most histories of scholarship describe this period, from the 1490s to the 1520s, as the zenith of Greek learning in England. Greek would gain further institutional recognition over the next two decades: Bishop Fisher's 1516 foundation of St John's College, Cambridge, received new statutes in 1524 based on Fox's for Corpus Christi, which instituted daily lectures for 'iuniores' on Greek grammar and authors;[44] Wolsey employed Mattheus Calphurnius in 1525 to lecture in Greek for the nascent Cardinal College, whose projected statutes provided for six public lectureships, including one in Greek, and required table-talk at commons to be in Greek or Latin alone;[45] revisions to Fox's statutes at Corpus Christi in 1528 stipulated that the logic lectures mandatory for undergraduate *discipuli* be on Porphyry and Aristotle, 'first in Latin and then in Greek', and college accounts show lecturers paid to deliver them from 1529 onwards;[46] once the *discipuli* became bachelors, they were in turn required to lecture on a work of Greek logic or philosophy in order to earn the master's degree.[47] These developments brought the teaching of Greek into the colleges, where responsibility for the education of undergraduate fellows and commoners increasingly fell to personal tutors and was no longer limited to attendance (even if compulsory) at public lectures. The most sweeping change, however, came with Cromwell's visitations in 1535, which promulgated essentially identical injunctions to the two universities demanding, in line with a reformed curriculum, immediate investment in Greek teaching from the wealthier

---

[44] J. E. B. Mayor, *Early Statutes of the College of St. John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1859), 344-5, i.e. with small textual variations provisions identical to the statutes in 1530 'de praelectoribus duobus', 250-2; noted in Leader, *HUC*, 289, on the contrary to McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 21n4, and Tilley, 'Greek Studies in England', 225.

[45] *SCO*, II (part 11), 70, 127; McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 32; Duncan, 'Public Lectures', 341.

[46] McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 24-27; *SCO*, II (part 10), 56: 'qui diligenter Porphyrium et Aristotelem, primo Latine et postea Graece, discipulis explanabit'.

[47] *SCO*, II (part 10), 59.

colleges at least.[48] Thus Magdalen, New, and All Souls Colleges, among the wealthiest in Oxford, were mandated to provide daily public lectures in Greek; at Cambridge, fully fourteen houses faced similar requirements.[49] Cromwell's injunctions also established 'King Henry VIII his lecture', a public readership in either Greek or Hebrew supported at a university level, which Oxford funded by collecting an annual amount from colleges according to their wealth, while Cambridge transferred money from the mathematics lecture.[50] There is sufficient evidence to suggest that most of these colleges and halls complied over the next five years.[51] The King Henry VIII lectures were then absorbed into the regius professorships of 1540; at first these were funded by Westminster Abbey, but from 1546 the financial burden for the professorships in Greek, Hebrew, and divinity fell to the new royal foundations of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Christ Church College, Oxford, while those in medicine and civil law were supported by the state.[52] The first appointment to the Greek chair at Cambridge was John Cheke, through whose earlier teaching of Greek St John's College had become a powerhouse of Greek learning in the 1530s and the centre of mid-century English humanism. In October 1542, Roger Ascham wrote to Richard Brandisby of the extensive Greek curriculum already in place under Cheke:

> Aristotle and Plato are now being read in their own language by the boys, something we had been doing amongst us for five years. Sophocles and Euripides are now better known here than Plautus was when you were here. Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon are more on our lips and in our

48 The most detailed study of the visitations is Logan, 'The First Royal Visitation', 861-88.

49 The discrepancy in numbers is due to the fact that the text of the injunctions for Oxford does not survive, but we have better evidence there for the colleges' provisions, whereas at Cambridge the statutes survive, but we have less evidence of subsequent appointments. See Logan, 'The First Royal Visitation', 884.

50 Logan, 'The Origins of the So-Called Regius Professorships', 274.

51 At Cambridge Nicholas Ridley was appointed the first public professor of Greek in 1535; he was succeeded in 1537/8 by John Ponet, and briefly by Roger Ascham in 1538/9; Gonville Hall and the King's Hall supported Greek lectures from 1535-40; Queens' College paid Thomas Smith for a Greek lectureship from 1535/6, and King's paid Henry Pamplyn, 1535-7 and 1541 onwards (Leader, *HUC*, 335-8). At Oxford, New College began to support an intramural lecture in Greek from 1537/8, and in 1539 Magdalen paid Michael Drome and John Armstrong for intramural Greek lectures (McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 55).

52 Logan, 'The Origins of the So-Called Regius Professorships', *passim*.

> hands than Titus Livy was then. What you once heard about Cicero, you would now hear about Demosthenes. The boys have more copies of Isocrates in their hands than they had of Terence then. Yet we do not reject the Latin writers, but cherish the best of those who flourished in the golden age. Our Cheke's effort and example has lit and fed this flame of literary zeal, for without pay he has publicly lectured on all of Homer, all of Sophocles, and that twice, as well as all of Euripides, and nearly all of Herodotus.[53]

By the 1540s the *translatio studii* from Oxford to Cambridge in the second and third generations of England's Greek scholars was plain to see: Cheke was experimenting with new theories of Greek pronunciation with Thomas Smith, who had given lectures on Aristotle's *Politics* and Homer's *Odyssey* at Queens', John Redman was lecturing on Greek texts in divinity, and at Trinity College, which in addition to the regius professorship supported two internal lectures in Greek, a young John Dee (at this time assistant Greek reader) staged a student production of Aristophanes's Ε*ιρήνη*.[54]

At this point, the histories of scholarship agree, Greek learning in England was already in decline. We have seen that Cheke and his colleagues, despite their commanding institutional positions, appear in this narrative already to indicate a falling-off. With the exception of one or two late luminaries, such as John Rainolds, writes M. L. Clarke, 'on the whole both in Oxford and in Cambridge the promise of the first half of the century was hardly fulfilled, and whatever other achievements may have made Elizabeth's reign glorious, it was not noted for Greek scholarship.'[55] In the last quarter of the century, Mullinger found 'scanty evidence of genuine attainments in the language';[56] for Ingram Bywater, the foundation of Corpus Christi in 1517 is the moment at which Greek was 'regularly established and endowed

53 Giles, I.26; as translated in Hatch-Vos, 32. For a comparison of Ascham's account, 'rosy' but not inaccurate, with the stock of contemporary book sellers in Cambridge, see Leedham-Green, 'University Libraries and Book-sellers', 347.

54 Thomas Smith, *De recta & emendata linguae Graecae pronuntiatione* (Paris, 1568), 41-2.

55 Clarke, *Classical Education*, 29.

56 Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, II.419.

as a part of the higher education in England', but 'the Elizabethan age is almost a blank in the history of Greek learning in England. It produced a few translations – mostly of books bearing on matters of theological controversy – but there is hardly a trace in it of that larger interest in Greek antiquity which characterized the humanists of the early part of the century.'[57] In part, Clarke points out, this was because many of the leading Grecians of the early period were drawn away from the textual scholarship held as the criterion for Greek learning: Thomas Smith was a prominent lawyer by the 1540s, when he joined Cheke in championing the Erasmian pronunciation of Greek, and Greek continued to be an entry into medical studies, which claimed two of the early regius professors in Greek, George Etheridge of Oxford and Nicholas Carr of Cambridge, both elected in 1547.[58] Teaching is also often cited as a drain on these scholars' energies, whether within universities or schools, or the education of princes.[59]

But when teaching Greek is proposed to explain the *decline* of Greek learning in England, it should be clear that linguistic proficiency is not, in fact, being addressed at all, and a few methodological qualifications must be raised. It has been possible to reconstruct the history of Greek in England from the 1490s to the 1540s in such rich detail largely because so much survives in the evidence of the letters and memoirs of Erasmus and his circle in the early period. From More we hear that Linacre taught Aristotle's *Meteorologica* after he returned to England,[60] and of the wild success first of Clement's humanity lectures, then of Lupset's;[61] from Latimer, of Grocyn and Linacre's study under Chalcondyles and Poliziano.[62] These letters and recollections preserve not just the basic biographical record, but the great scholarly reputations, of Grocyn, Linacre, Tunstall, Latimer, Lily, Croke, Lupset, Clement,

[57] Bywater, *Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England* (Oxford, 1919), 11-13.

[58] Clarke, *Classical Education*, 30.

[59] See, for example, Bywater, *Four Centuries of Greek Learning*, 9; Morgan and Brooke, *History of the University of Cambridge*, 437-8.

[60] More, 'Letter to Martin Dorp' in *In Defense of Humanism*, ed. Kinney, 101-3.

[61] *CWE*, VI, letter 907 from Thomas More, [London? 1518?], 215, and VII, letter 1087 from Thomas More, [Greenwich? March-April 1520], 254.

[62] *CWE*, IV, letter 520 from William Latimer, 201.

Pace, and the rest. But this alone is historiographically problematic: the absence of a committed diarist or epistolographer is no index of the decline of Greek in England. Rather, it reflects the changing conditions under which Greek studies developed: we know so much about England's early Greek scholars not because there were so many of them, but because there were so few. Their numbers and achievements do not bespeak widespread Greek, but insurgent Greek at the hands of a small circle of fellow-workers in the inexhaustible epistolary (and tutorial) orbit of Erasmus, deriving mutual benefit from advertising one another's accomplishments. Whole generations of Greek positions were filled by men who had studied together in Italy or under Erasmus, and whose reputations were thus closely imbricated. Fewer memoirs survive as the century wears on; it is no coincidence that the history of Greek in England seems to lose its lustre as its records fall in number, and dulls entirely after the 1540s. But full many a Cheke may be born to teach unseen, for want of an Ascham to play Plato to his Socrates.

Similarly, the provision of Greek at Corpus Christi College, Oxford in 1517, or St John's College, Cambridge by 1524, appears magnificent precisely because it is unusual for the time. But collegiate foundations from the 1540s onwards, starting with the royal foundations of 1546, provided Greek lectures as standard, and many of the older colleges would supply tuition in the language by the end of the century: King's, Queens', and St John's colleges at Cambridge maintained Greek lecturers after 1546, and the new statutes of 1551 for Clare College included lectures in Latin and Greek;[63] at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1555 Greek studies were 'clearly regarded as desirable but improbable',[64] but at St John's College, founded in the same year, a domestic lectureship was instituted to teach Greek grammar and a prescribed list of authors;[65] Queen's College, Oxford, has records of lectures in Greek given

63 Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, II.51n4; Simon, *Education and Society*, 257.

64 McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 44.

65 *SCO*, III (part 12), 49-50.

first in 1563/4, and then 1581/2 onwards,[66] and similar lectures were added later by Merton (1565), Balliol (1571), and Brasenose (1572).[67] Indeed, as a result of increasing collegiate provision of Greek, Leader observes, even 'the Royal Injunctions of 1535 and the first regius professorships were less a real change than an apparent one'.[68] The occupants of these collegiate posts, no less than many of those holding regius professorships later in the century – William Chedsey, Hugh Good, Henry Pamplyn, Michael Drome, Giles Lawrence, Nicholas Balguay, Bartholomew Dodington, to name a little-known few[69] – are barely footnotes in the history of Greek scholarship, if their names are not lost altogether; certainly they are never invoked in the literary history of sixteenth-century England. But in the history of Greek literacy they must be seen as central.

A second qualification is that Greek literature, as it is now construed, and its philological investigation, were never more than ancillary to Erasmus's Christian humanist programme of Greek studies in England. Erasmus's was from the outset a pragmatic Greek for theological purposes; as T. W. Baldwin put it, 'Greek was first Reformation, and only in its upper stages, if at all, Renaissance'.[70] The *locus classicus* of Erasmus's curriculum, *De ratione studii* (1511), reveals little of this, being a practical document written for Colet at St Paul's and concerned with the best pedagogical method for teaching the classical languages. But insight into the larger project of reform can be gleaned from his other writings. In his letter to Latimer of 1517, Erasmus praised the achievement of a man who gains a 'working

---

[66] McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 59.

[67] *Ibid.*, 60, 57, 15.

[68] Leader, *HUC*, 246.

[69] Chedsey and Good taught Greek logic to undergraduates at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the 1530s, Drome was one of two Greek lecturers paid in 1539 by Magdalen College, Oxford, and Balguay was Greek lecturer at Magdalen in the 1560s, and subsequently headmaster of Magdalen's grammar school (McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 27, 55, 56); Pamplyn lectured in Greek at King's College, Cambridge, following the royal visitation of 1535 (Leader, *HUC*, 338); Lawrence was third regius professor in Greek at Oxford from 1551-53 and, after the reign of Mary, 1559-85 (Duncan, 'Public Lectures', 354-6); Dodington was regius professor in Greek at Cambridge from 1562 to 1585.

[70] Baldwin, *Small Latine*, II.617.

knowledge' of Greek, 'for the only reason why he wishes to learn Greek is to be able to spend his time with more profit and more sure judgement on the Scriptures.'[71] The point was repeated by almost every English propagandist for the Greek cause. Richard Croke's orations (1519) stressed the value of Greek to those intending to proceed upon theological studies;[72] More's letter to Oxford (1518) reminds the university that 'that language is one which the Church has decreed should be taught in all universities', and his letter to Martin Dorp, defending Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum*, urges Dorp to learn Greek in particular for the access it gives him to the Church Fathers, who have been badly translated or not at all.[73] Greek 'literature' in its modern sense was certainly pedagogically important, under the familiar rubric that the best linguistic education was found in the best writers, but even here Erasmus's programme emphasised pragmatic, working literacy and wide reading, rather than fine linguistic detail. 'Our sole object in learning Greek,' Erasmus wrote in a 1528 treatise on classical pronunciation, which would deeply influence the Cambridge men of the 1530s, 'is to be able to read ancient literature, not to converse with ordinary Greeks';[74] contemporary theorists, such as Vives, agreed.[75] By 1551, these principles had so formed English practice that Petrucio Ubaldini, an Italian soldier in England, wrote that 'the rich cause their sons and daughters to learn Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, for since this storm of heresy has invaded the land they hold it useful to read the Scriptures in the original tongue.'[76]

The Greek reading inculcated in the northern Renaissance, that is, was a means more than an end, aiming at reading access to classical and theological texts and the latest advances

---

[71] *CWE*, IV, letter 540 to William Latimer, 260. On the theological inflection of Erasmian education in England see Clarke, *Classical Education*, 19; Woodward, *Studies in Education*, 122-3; Baldwin, *Small Latine*, II.617-26; Simon, *Education and Society*, 316; Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts', 196; Leader, *HUC*, 246, 265, 291.

[72] Croke, *Orationes*, sig. [c.vii^{v}-viii]: 'unde quaeso orta religio, nisi e Graecia?'

[73] More, 'Letter to the University of Oxford', 145; 'Letter to Martin Dorp', 97-105.

[74] Erasmus, *De recta pronuntiatione* (1528) in *CWE*, XXVI, 409.

[75] Vives, *Vives: On Education: A Translation of the De Tradendis Disciplinis of Juan Luis Vives*, trans. Foster Watson (Cambridge, 1913), 112: 'in Greek we need not be so anxious about speaking the language as about understanding it, as we only want to know the literature.'

[76] Quoted in Baldwin, *Small Latine*, II.617.

in other fields of expertise, rather than the philological study and 'interest in Greek antiquity' called for in Bywater's traditional history of scholarship. Such a dichotomy would likely have been meaningless to northern Grecians. Philip Melanchthon's oration on the study of languages, delivered at Wittenberg in 1533, presents almost the whole university curriculum as dependent on Greek, embracing philosophy, history, politics, theology, medicine, and generally 'performing great things'.[77] On a still more practical level, Joan Simon points out that the men named by Croke (Pace, Tunstall, and More) were at the time of his oration pursuing successful political and ecclesiastical careers, enabling Croke 'to stress the value of Greek as a passport to office'.[78] Given these various applications, we should expect the 'external' evidence of scholarly activity to provide only a limited picture of the real extent of Greek learning in England.

To estimate Greek literacy we must be more concerned with the linguistic education available to undergraduate scholars and commoners than the researches of their teachers or, for the most part, the work of post-graduates. The evidence for this is harder to come by, partly because the experience of reading is 'internal' and must remain to some extent invisible, and partly because the universities continued to imagine themselves as providing an integrated seven-year master's degree course towards which undergraduate learning was merely preparatory, despite the increasing collegiate focus on undergraduates. Nonetheless, a fuller account of the Greek learning inculcated at university may be pieced together from a few disparate, though significant, statutory and manuscript sources, many of them analysed in the modern institutional history of education that reached its pinnacle in the 1980s but has been slow to reach the mainstream of literary scholarship. Where was Greek taught, and how, and to whom?

[77] Melanchthon, 'On the Study of Languages' (1533) in *Philip Melanchthon: Orations on Philosophy and Education*, ed. and trans. Sachiko Kusukawa and Christine F. Salazar (Cambridge, 1999), 33-4.

[78] Simon, *Education and Society*, 88.

First we must reinterpret the diffusion of Greek across the syllabus, derived from Erasmus's instrumentalism, as a strength. University students would encounter Greek in a wide range of lectures, which they were often required by statute to attend. The statutes for St John's College, Oxford, as we have seen, support a daily Greek lecture at 9am on Isocrates, Lucian, Homer, and the usual list of Greek authors. But they also support a daily rhetoric lecture at 1pm, which will cover Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Cicero, Hermogenes, Quintilian, Demosthenes, Isocrates, and others.[79] This advanced rhetorical curriculum includes numerous Greek authorities and overlaps substantially with the teaching of the Greek reader. It seems likely that this fluidity in coverage was quite ordinary, especially in 'humanity' lectures: Wolsey's statutes for Cardinal College of 1526 provided for a single professor of 'humaniores literas', to lecture twice a day, in the morning on Latin and in the afternoon on Greek.[80] Based on Wolsey's statutes, the draft statutes for Christ Church College in turn called for a single public lector in 'lingua greca et artibus humanioribus'.[81] These sources suggest the extent to which Greek material had joined Latin 'humanity' lectures by the mid-century. Similarly easy movement between Latin and Greek teaching can be seen in the earliest appointments of Wolsey and Fox: John Donne, who succeeded Edward Wotton as Fox's Greek reader at Corpus Christi, also completed Nicholas Udall's term as Wolsey's humanity lecturer in 1527/8.[82] This effective yoking of Greek and Latin lectureships into a single position is consistent with university practice in Italy at the time, whence many more examples may be adduced and, indeed, whence institutional precedent as well as linguistic expertise might have been derived by English scholars.[83] Greek was also absorbed, as we have seen, into the

---

79 *SCO*, III (part 12), 49-50.

80 *SCO*, II (part 11), 123, 127-8. The statutes confusingly refer to the election of a single humanity professor in the first instance, then to 'artium vero humaniorum lectores', but 'lectores' must here have the sense of 'lectiones'; McConica and Duncan both understand the statutes as referring to a single professor, lecturing twice a day ('Rise of the Undergraduate College', 30; 'Public Lectures', 339-41).

81 Duncan, 'Public Lectures', 346.

82 McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 26-7.

83 See Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, 233ff.: 'the University of Padua had one or two

teaching of higher faculties affected by humanist reform, such as theology, at least after the early opposition had died down in the 1520s, and medicine, where the new humanist editions of foundational classical texts, such as Galen, were even being produced by Englishmen.[84] George Etheridge's career epitomises the interdisciplinary value of Greek: after receiving his M.A. from Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1543, Etheridge was successively appointed college lecturer in Greek, took the degree of bachelor of medicine, resigned his collegiate post to become a physician, was elected King Henry VIII praelector in philosophy in 1546/7, and the next year became Oxford's regius professor of Greek. We may safely assume that Etheridge's Greek expertise was brought to bear in his lectures on philosophy as well as his medical studies, considering how many of the central texts of those disciplines were Greek. Recognising this, it is difficult to imagine a student pursuing any course of study at the university for long without receiving some instruction in or exposure to Greek.

Did undergraduates attend Greek lectures? We must remember that commitment to Greek was coterminous at the universities with a broader emphasis on undergraduate instruction in general, as the modern foundations, from the mid-fifteenth century onwards, provided for many more junior scholars than the medieval houses.[85] There is thus a clear

professors in the humanities in a faculty of 50 to 60 from 1517 until the end of the century: a professorship of Latin rhetoric, considered the higher post, and a professorship of Greek at a lower salary. However, about half the time the two posts were combined into one position, called 'Greek and Latin Humanities' (*ad Humanitatem Graecam et Latinam*)'.

84 S. L. Greenslade, 'The Faculty of Theology' in *HUO-III*, 314-15; Gillian Lewis, 'The Faculty of Medicine' in *HUO-III*, 219; Leader, *HUC*, 312-15.

85 The literature on the numbers and social constitution of the student body is large, and has been reviewed by McConica, 'The Prosopography of the Tudor University', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 3.3 (1973), 543-554. The three essential problems are, firstly, that although matriculation records began to be kept at Cambridge in 1544, Oxford in 1564/5, for a long time they were either not mandatory or insufficiently enforced; secondly, that the number of 'gentleman-commoners', individuals not supported by a collegiate foundation but under the charge of a college tutor and paying for room, board, and tuition, is very difficult to estimate; and thirdly, that the terminology in these records even when they do exist is not standardised: the term 'gentleman' had a wide semantic range, covering the sons of reasonably wealthy merchants as well as landed gentry, and, since university fees were charged on the basis of status, might not have been recorded disinterestedly. In addition to the literature surveyed by McConica, see McConica, 'The Social Relations of Tudor Oxford', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 27 (1977), 115-134, and 'Scholars and Commoners in Renaissance Oxford' in *The University in Society*, ed. Lawrence Stone, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1975), I.151-81; Elizabeth Russell, 'The Influx of Commoners into the University of Oxford before 1581: An Optical Illusion?' *EHR* 92.365 (1977), 721-745; and McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', *passim*.

correlation between the 'modernity' of a foundation, numbers of undergraduates, provision of Greek teaching, and, indeed, provision of intramural teaching in general. Reforms effected within the walls of a few forward-looking colleges registered widely; the numerous older colleges may have been more conservative, but they were also much smaller, and their conservatism was thus limited in its impact on the student body as a whole. Greek teaching in the larger colleges, meanwhile, adapted to meet the needs of students at all levels: by the 1570s, St John's College, Cambridge, offered three Greek classes, from beginner to advanced.[86] Attendance at intramural and very often public lectures was mandatory for scholars on these new undergraduate foundations, sometimes on pain of flogging, as at Corpus Christi, or denial of commons, as outlined in Cromwell's injunctions; the revised Elizabethan statutes of 1576 stipulate that every bachelor 'if he heare not everye Day the Greeke Reader, shall forfaite for everye fault iiij*d*.'[87]

It is not clear whether these fearsome sanctions were applied equally to commoners, whose relationship was primarily with their tutors rather than the college, and even when it comes to scholars on the foundation, Mordechai Feingold has cautioned against reading statutes as a transparent account of teaching that actually took place.[88] That said, records of book ownership corroborate the impression given by the statutes of widespread undergraduate instruction in Greek. These have been analysed in most detail by Lisa Jardine, whose survey of one hundred and fifty Cambridge inventories proved between 1535 and 1590 demonstrates common pre-specialist ownership of multiple Greek volumes: Lucian's dialogues, Aesop's fables, a work each of Homer and Euripides, Ceporinus's Greek grammar, some edition of

---

86 Clarke, *Classical Education*, 33.

87 For Corpus Christi see *SCO*, II (part 11), 50, 54 (cf. McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', 655); for the Cromwellian injunctions, see Thomas Wright, *Three Chapters of Letters Relating to the Suppression of Monasteries* (London, 1843), 70, and cf. Logan, 'The First Royal Visitation', 873; for the 1576 statutes, see Gibson, *Statuta*, 408.

88 Mordechai Feingold, *The Mathematicians' Apprenticeship: Science, Universities and Society in England, 1560-1640* (Cambridge, 1984).

Calepino's *Dictionarium*, a Greek-Latin lexicon, and a Greek New Testament.[89] It is worth repeating that the shared occurence of these works, each of which occurs in thirty or more of the probate inventories (often many more: Jardine finds over 130 Greek grammars), in collections whose owners represent a wide range of careers, indicates their acquisition as part of the preliminary arts course common to almost all undergraduates. Comparable results may be shown for Greek materials at Oxford, where approximately 22 Greek lexica, 35 Calepines, and 63 grammars of either Clenardus and Ceporinus were inventoried for probate before 1602.[90] The inventory of Nicholas Clifton, an Oxford bookseller, similarly indicates the high demand for Greek materials: his will of 1578 records five grammars of Ceporinus and seven of Clenardus, as many copies as he stocked of 'Grammers english & latin' (7) and of Erasmus's *Colloquia* (7), as well as three of a 'compendium gram. grec'; he held a Graeco-latin Aphthonius, Greek texts of Aristotle's and Hermogenes's rhetorics, and a Greek lexicon.[91] In the second even more than the first half of the century, Greek was a matter of ordinary instruction for undergraduates.

How did that instruction proceed? We are reliant here on surviving teaching materials and student accounts. Two of Gabriel Harvey's Greek lectures survive from his stint as lecturer in humanity from 1573-75 at Pembroke College, Cambridge, appended to Edward Grant's edition of Crespin's Latin-Greek lexicon. In the first, Harvey describes to his 'humanissmi adolescentes' the manifold advantages they will derive from Greek ('auctores, non interpretes legere debetis: id est, fontes, non riuulos consectari'[92]), and then outlines how it seems to him most expedient to proceed: 'first I will translate the Greek, but doubly, for I will both translate word for word, as an *interpres*, and also attempt to say in good Latin what

[89] Jardine, 'Humanism and the Sixteenth Century Cambridge Arts Course', *History of Education* 4.1 (1975), 16-17.

[90] *PLRE*, *ad indicem s.v.* 'lexicon' (selected for Greek), 'Calepino', 'Clenardus', 'Ceporinus'.

[91] Strickland Gibson, *Abstracts from the Wills and Testamentary Documents of Binders, Printers, and Stationers of Oxford, from 1493 to 1638* (London, 1907), 11-14.

[92] 'You ought to read authors, not translators; that is, to follow the font, not the streams'.

is said in good Greek; so in the first place, I will enumerate the words, and in the second, as it were, evaluate them.’[93] He will explain his texts *παραφραστικῶς* (periphrastically), consider words in isolation according to their *ἐτυμολογία* (etymology), and together according to their *σύνταξις* (syntax). Harvey thus sustains in its important details the pedagogical methods of John Cheke, as reported by Thomas Wilson, who heard Cheke’s lectures on Demosthenes at Padua in 1555:

> maister Cheekes iudgement was great in translating out of one tongue into an other, and better skill he had in our English speech to iudge of the Phrases and properties of wordes, and to diuide sentences: than any else had that I haue knowne. And often he woulde englyshe his matters out of the Latine or Greeke vpon the sodeyne, by looking of the booke onely without reading or construing any thing at all: An vsage right worthie and verie profitable for all men, aswell for the vnderstanding of the booke, as also for the aptnesse of framing the Authors meaning, and bettering thereby their iudgement, and therewithall perfiting their tongue and vtterance of speach.[94]

Here, with a few alterations, is an extempore variety of the technique of double-translation pioneered in England by Cheke, Sturm, and Ascham, that met with such success in Latin schooling across Europe; the substantial difference appears to be that at university the ‘double’ phase, retranslating from the vernacular back into the source language, was implicit, taking place in the already adept mind of the listener. At a still more advanced level, but at many points similar in their glossary method, are John Rainolds’s celebrated lectures on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, delivered for the Greek readership at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, around the same period.[95] Reflecting on one hand the minute philological focus of the

---

[93] Harvey, ‘G. H. de discenda Graeca lingva oratio prima’ in Jean Crespin, *Lexicon Graecolatinum Ioannis Crispini* (London, 1581), sigs. Nnnn.vi. - Oooo.ii; ‘Quam ad rem, hunc ego expeditissimum, ut mihi saltem uidetur, cursum in legendo tenere statui. Primum quidem Graeca conuertam: sed dupliciter: nam & verbum pro uerbo reddam, ut interpres, & benè Latinè dicere conabor, quae benè Graecè dicuntur: atque in altero fere annumerabo uerba: in altero quasi appendam’ (sig. Nnnn.vi.[v]).

[94] Sir Thomas Wilson, *The three Orations of Demosthenes chiefe Orator among the Grecians... Englished out of the Greeke by Thomas Wylson Doctor of the ciuill lawes* (London, 1570), sig. *.j.

[95] Rainolds, *John Rainolds’s Oxford Lectures on Aristotle’s Rhetoric*, trans. Lawrence D. Green (Newark, London, 1986); Rainolds was Greek reader at Corpus Christi from 1573-8.

Aristotelian commentary tradition, on the other the proven techniques of Latin schooling, this rigorous parsing, paraphrase, and examination was apt to provide, with time, a thorough reading knowledge of Greek among its listeners.[96]

Two rare student accounts draw together these records of undergraduate studies in Greek and the shape they took. Conrad ab Ulmis, at Broadgates Hall, a commoners' annexe for Christ Church, detailed his studies in a letter of 1552: 'I devote the hour from six to seven in the morning to Aristotle's Politics, from which I seem to receive a twofold advantage, both a knowledge of Greek and an acquaintance with moral philosophy.'[97] Here is clear evidence of Greek training at an undergraduate level, as well as of its pragmatic application to contiguous fields. We see articulated, as well, the dual ends of textual comprehension and linguistic improvement instinct in the teaching methods of Harvey and Cheke. More evidence appears in the diary of the Cornish brothers Richard and Matthew Carnsew, at Broadgates Hall two decades later. The diary records Matthew entering commons at Christ Church in August 1574; on the following (undated) leaf, he is reading Cebes's *Tabula*, and Petrus Martyr on Aristotle's *Ethics*.[98] Cebes was a favourite Greek school text for its morality, and Petrus Martyr, in Latin, at least employs Greek in its commentary on the Aristotelian text. We could not get closer to Sidney's Oxford experience than these records, both of them describing the studies of commoners, at Christ Church, on either side of Sidney's time there, using Greek to study the two Aristotelian texts that Sidney recommended most enthusiastically in his own correspondence.[99]

Learning Greek in the English universities in the second half of the sixteenth-century

---

[96] See Lawrence, *'Who the Devil Taught Thee So Much Italian'*, 45-6; William E. Miller, 'Double Translation in English Humanistic Education', *SR* 10 (1963), 163-74.

[97] Cited in McConica, 'Rise of the Undergraduate College', 40.

[98] PRO SP 46/15, f. 217. The manuscript is described in McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', 697-701.

[99] Sidney expresses his admiration for the *Politics* to Hubert Languet, 4 February 1574, *Correspondence*, 107, and recommends the *Ethics* to his brother Robert Sidney, <February 1579?>, *Correspondence*, 878.

looked like Harvey's and Rainolds's lectures, like Conrad ab Ulmis's letters and the Carnsews' diary, like the university probate inventories and like the increasingly standard provision of Greek tuition for undergraduates at the great majority of colleges; it did not look like a 'fitful' smattering, nor is it sensibly measured by Considine's demand that a man possess 'unusual learning compared to other English university graduates of his day'. Few of England's Greek teachers were philologists whose names would echo through the lapidary volumes of Sandys or Wilamowitz. But they were teaching Greek, at the universities, and their undergraduate students were learning it. If we were to posit a *terminus post quem* for widespread, routine teaching of Greek at the universities, it might fall in 1540: after this point – after the colleges had effectively accommodated the Cromwellian injunctions by establishing intramural lectures, and just as the regius professorships were being founded – we should expect a student, commoner or scholar, to have gained from any substantial time spent at university a reasonable familiarity with Greek.

This estimate is reflected in the progress of Greek in England's schools. We have seen that Greek was valued in the original statutes of St Paul's, and William Lily, the first master, probably taught it to some degree after his appointment in 1512. But the first substantial evidence we have of Greek being taught at school dates from Alexander Nowell's tenure at Westminster. Nowell had determined B.A. at Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1536, incepted M.A. in 1540, and lectured publicly for a year or two on logic when in 1543 he was appointed master at Westminster school, aged twenty-seven. Once a week, by his own testimony, he would read 'S. Lukes gospell, or the Actes of the Apostles... in greeke so well as I could, to such of my scholers as I had, a good number almost at mans state'.[100] Nowell gave individual lessons, too: his notebook, which records the accounts of several Westminster boys, shows that he was reading 'mosellans dialogue in greke', 'Lucians dialogue in greke', and 'a Nue

[100] Quoted and discussed in Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.171-9.

testament in greke of Step*h*anus', with one William Boyar, apparently before 1544,[101] and these and other standard grammar school Greek texts appear repeatedly in the various lists of Nowell's books recorded in the manuscript.[102] The absence of Greek material from the subsequent accounts of Thomas Grenfield and a master 'Goodakar', however, and the infrequency of the readings from Greek scripture to the oldest students, suggest that Nowell's Greek instruction was ahead of its time and even at Westminster was somewhat extra-curricular.[103]

But Nowell's career also foresees the gradual percolation of Greek into the schools as more university graduates became available to teach it, and indeed, about two decades after our *terminus* for university teaching, Greek begins to appear routinely at the better grammar schools. Greek was ordained in the statutes of Bury St Edmund's (1550), although without curricular detail;[104] the earliest reference to specific Greek authors is at East Retford (1552), an 'impracticable' curriculum which showed the influence of Johann Sturm's educational programme in proposing to teach Greek and Hebrew simultaneously.[105] But Greek teaching came to be expected in the grammar school curriculum after 1560, when Eton and Westminster both established Greek classes for the top two forms, to be followed shortly by Shrewsbury (1561-2), St Saviour's (1562), Norwich (1566), Bangor (1569), Rivington (c.1570), Merchant Taylors' (1572), Thame (1574), Ruthin (1574), and more.[106] Many of these

[101] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Brasenose College 31, ff.32-33 (f.34 is dated 1544). 'William Boyar' almost certainly grew up to be the antiquary William Bowyer, whose will of 1569 acknowledges Nowell's influence on his young development, and whose manuscript collection included a transcription by Laurence Nowell, Alexander's brother (*ODNB*).

[102] *Ibid.*, ff.38, 41^{v}-47: the other books include 'calepinus', 'clenardi grammatica', 'Ceporini grammatica', 'theodori grammatica tota greca' (probably a remnant of Nowell's own university study, as it fell out of fashion for primary instruction over the 1520s: see Botley, *Learning Greek*, 24), 'demosthenes ad leptines grece', 'Luciani dialogi aliquot', 'novum testamentum grece', and others.

[103] *Ibid.*, ff.34-35^{v}.

[104] Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.296, II.625.

[105] The assessment is from Clarke, *Classical Education*, 17; cf. Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.313, II.625.

[106] See Baldwin, *Small Latine*, *ad indicem*; Clarke, *Classical Education*, *ad indicem*, and 180-1 for a bibliography of sources for the statutes. On the dating of the Eton, Westminster, and Ruthin statutes, see R. R. Bolgar, 'Classical Reading in Renaissance Schools', *Durham Research Review* 6 (1955), n4. The ordinances for Shrewsbury were ratified only in 1578, with Thomas Ashton's co-operation but after he had stepped down

shared a standard syllabus of Greek texts to parallel the Latin sequence: the most common, after grammars, the New Testament, and Cebes or Aesop, were Isocrates and Demosthenes (opposite Cicero) and Homer (opposite Virgil).[107] And just as Greek settled into collegiate teaching in time, so in schools it was brought forward in the standard curriculum – to encompass the top three forms for the first time at Westminster (1576) – following the original recommendations of Erasmus, Vives, Thomas Elyot, and Sturm, and ultimately Quintilian, to teach Greek as concurrently as possible with Latin.[108] Intimately connected to these schools through statutory and customary affiliation as well as alumni, the colleges increasingly considered Greek facility when electing scholars for entry: Pembroke College, Cambridge, established seven Greek scholarships in 1570, for which Merchant Taylors' school was competitive, and there are further records of Mulcaster's boys being examined in Greek for entry to St John's College, Oxford.[109] But perhaps the most vivid evidence that 1560 was a watershed for grammar school Greek was the fate of the hapless Thomas Freeman. When Freeman took up the headmastership in 1549, the curriculum of St Paul's had no room for Greek. But times changed rapidly. From April 1559 a number of visitations were made to the school by its learned overseers, evidently unimpressed with the boys' achievements, and Freeman himself was set Latin themes to compose despite his indignant bluster at being thus

---

as headmaster, and are generally assumed to summarise school practice dating back to Ashton's arrival in 1561/2: see Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.388, and Oldham, *History of Shrewsbury School*.

[107] Sturm's system of corresponding Greek and Latin texts is examined in detail in Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.285-292, and approximate frequency of curricular texts discussed at II.649.

[108] Quintilian recommended that boys begin with Greek, in principle because Latin learning was seen as deriving from Greek, and in practice because Latin would be spoken natively by Roman children (*Institutio Oratoria*, 1.1.12). Elyot followed Quintilian directly in *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531), book I, chapters 10-11, believing that his seven-year-old gentleman-pupil might keep Latin 'as a familiar la*n*gage... hauynge none other persons to serue him or kepyng hym company / but suche as can speake latine elegantly' (f.30), and Sturm concurred when it came to educating the nobility, in *Nobilitas literata* (Strasburg, 1549), Englished by Thomas Browne as *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie for Nobilitye and Gentlemen* (1570). But other educational theorists, concerned more with standard schooling, commenced the Greek sequence only after Latin grammar and intermediate reading had been completed: cf. Erasmus, *De ratione studii* in *CWE*, XXIV, 667; Vives, *On Education*, 98; Sturm, *De literarum ludis recte aperiendis liber* (1538), quoted in Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.285-292.

[109] Simon, *Education and Society*, 306; H. B. Wilson, *The History of Merchant-Taylors' School* (London, 1812), 37-40.

humiliated. His efforts did not pass muster. On 27 May, 1559, the visitors demanded of Freeman 'whether he was seen or learned in the Greek tongue or no, to the which he solemnly answered No and that was well known at his first entrance and beginning'; and on 17 July, Freeman was summarily fired, warned 'to avoide from his office for insufficiency of learning and lack of the Greek tongue'.[110] When the founding statutes of Merchant Taylors' school in 1561 copied Colet's original demand for St Paul's (1510) that the master be 'learned, in good & cleane Latine l*ite*rature, & also, in Greeke, yf such may be gotten',[111] it is clear that the expectations encoded in that qualification, along with the conditions of Greek learning in England, had changed entirely in the intervening forty years.

What level of Greek might be attained at school? The methods used to teach Greek were identical to the Latin pedagogy that made educated men in sixteenth-century England functionally bilingual, with the exception, as we have seen, of training in conversation.[112] In the Westminster curriculum, for example, the master would read a passage from the text on the mornings of Monday to Thursday, and analyse its accidence and syntax with the boys; they would then learn the passage by heart, and be drilled on it the same afternoon. For the upper forms (the top two or, later, three classes) an additional passage was set in the afternoon. On Friday, the morning classes were displaced to the afternoon, so the upper forms received no second passage. The testing of these passages might involve double translation, recitation, and metaphrase, in addition to the composition of verses and epistles on set themes.[113] On the basis of this schedule, a detailed examination of representative curricula –

[110] The episode is recounted, with quotation from the original sources, in Michael McDonnell, *The Annals of St Paul's School* (Cambridge, 1959), 76-80.

[111] Wilson, *Merchant-Taylors' School*, 11.

[112] On the bilingualism inculcated by Latin pedagogy see Ann Moss, 'Being in Two Minds: The Bilingual Factor in Renaissance Writing' in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis*, ed. Rhoda Schnur *et al.* (Binghamton, 1994), 61-74; Moss's focus is on France, but the methods she describes were shared throughout Europe.

[113] See Clarke, *Classical Education*, 8, and Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.345-9 for the statutes at Rivington which describe Latin-Greek double-translation most explicitly, and Baldwin I.359 for Laud's reminiscence of his schooling at Westminster, dated by Baldwin to 1630 (when it was written), but by Bolgar, 'Classical Reading', n4, to 1587-9.

from Eton and Ruthin, and two from Westminster – and a few estimates as to how much time might be allotted an average reading and how many lines it might therefore cover, R. R. Bolgar in 1955 calculated the approximate volume of classical material a pupil after about 1560 would have read over the full course of his grammar-school career. 'The total amount read', he concludes, was 'in region of 750 pages if only Latin was studied and somewhat more if Greek was studied as well.'[114] The extent of that 'somewhat more' depends predominantly on the level of detail to which a curriculum was recorded:[115] using the most specific statutes, Bolgar calculates that between 135 and 165 pages of Greek, at 25 lines/page, would have been read by a pupil at one of the best grammar schools who finished his schooling in the 1570s.[116]

This seems a fair number of pages; by way of comparison, Aristotle's *Poetics* is about 46 pages long by Bolgar's standards. By the time a student left Westminster, then, he would have read, manipulated, parsed, learned by heart, and been constantly drilled upon, a quantity of Greek three or four times the length of the *Poetics*. But even more salient than this total is Bolgar's opinion of it:

---

[114] Bolgar, 'Classical Reading', 23.

[115] Bolgar's interest is in *classical* reading, i.e. the reading of classical as opposed to post-classical Latin and Greek, a distinction which he makes in his tables but which I elide here as irrelevant to the broader question of Greek literacy. For this reason, Bolgar precisely distributes available reading time among the authors (or texts) mentioned in the statutes, the better to estimate the distribution of different kinds of Latin and Greek. The disadvantage of this for our purposes is that when a curriculum stipulates the reading of Greek but does not specify texts, it is not included in Bolgar's calculations. Thus it appears that at Eton (1560) and Westminster (1568) no Greek was read despite its being mandated by the statutes. We need not assume that this was, in fact, the case, since such specificity is properly a function of how *standardised* a Greek course was, rather than whether it existed at all, and there are sufficient analogous cases of curricula following the Eton-Westminster model to suggest that Greek was read when time was reserved for it, even when authors were not specified; we should not imagine, for example, that Westminster's pupils and teachers went from seeing no Greek at all in 1568 to reading 165 pages of it in 1576. For this reason the Westminster curriculum is more representative than it appears from Bolgar's statistics, since its high numbers reflect specificity in the statutes rather than an unusual provision of Greek *per se*; similarly, its closest neighbour – Ruthin (1574) – exhibits less Greek because its course was a year shorter than those more numerous schools on the Eton-Westminster model.

[116] *Ibid.*, 22. The range is due to a literal reading of the conjunctions in the statutes, such that when the fifth form calls for 'Ovid or Plutarch' Bolgar presents two sets of figures, one reflecting *only* Ovid and the other *only* Plutarch.

> At Westminster (c.1576) the boys read about as much of the Greek classics as would now be considered usual for the Ordinary Level of the G.C.E. But their Latin reading was more extensive and approximates much more closely to the present-day Advanced Level requirements... The general use of Latin tends indeed to blind us to the real character of classical learning in this period. The number of classical scholars (as distinct from experts in rhetoric) was not great, and they owed their knowledge to their own enterprise or private help rather than to the educational system.[117]

It is comments like this, if nothing else, that should give the literary historian pause. A great many of the histories of scholarship and of philology that have been cited in assessing the access of English readers to Greek were written in the 1950s and before, for many reasons, including the shift in historical fashion away from the *chansons de geste* model and towards social or institutional or intellectual history, but including, too, the fact that the philological training required to master the material in bulk has now all but vanished from secondary education. Granted that the GCE was a different and more rigorous examination than the present-day GCSE, it was nonetheless taken at the same age and connoted the same relative stage of development between primary and tertiary education. We must thus adjust Bolgar's estimation of Greek learning in sixteenth-century England for the fact that he considered Greek exposure in the region of 135-165 pages 'usual' for a grammar-school-educated boy of about sixteen in the 1950s. By way of comparison, students taking the GCSE in Classical Greek in June 2011 were examined on 300 lines of Greek prose, from Herodotus and Plato, and 275 lines of verse, from Homer and Euripides;[118] even if we double this to account for additional reading in class,[119] we are left with 46 Bolgar-pages after '120-140 guided learning

[117] *Ibid.*, 23-25.

[118] OCR, *GCSE Classical Greek* (July 2009), online at http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/81358-specification.pdf, §3.3, 3.4.

[119] It is difficult to estimate the additional reading a class might cover in the course of the GCSE, and even more difficult to compare that reading to sixteenth-century practice (and hence Bolgar's estimates). The standard textbook in 2011 was John Taylor's *Greek to GCSE*, 2nd ed. (Bristol, 2008), which consists of many exercise sentences and heavily adapted passages as part of a grammatical primer, and at the end of the second volume a set of 'lightly adapted' passages for reading practice. Those nineteen brief passages, which come closest to the unadulterated Greek read by Elizabethan grammar-schoolchildren, add up to 284 lines, or about half as much again as the examined passages. To estimate total reading at double the examination passages would doubtless seem a generous overestimation to Bolgar, who is interested only in 'classical reading' and

hours in total',[120] a maximum of half of which would satisfy Bolgar's criteria for 'classical reading' and little or none of which would have been learned by heart. For that matter, a full A-level in Classical Greek (containing every available Greek unit) in 2010 covered 60 Bolgar-pages of Greek;[121] if we double that, too, to account for wider reading and preparation for an unseen passage, then a generous estimate for a student who completed both GCSE and A-level Greek would be 165 pages of Greek reading, around the quantity Bolgar's Westminster student would have memorised and been drilled upon daily. A sixteenth-century schoolchild from one of these elite grammar schools, that is, had at least as much and probably significantly more Greek than a just-matriculated undergraduate studying Greek at university does today. Nor did the universities solely accommodate those with such rare schooling: the very close similarity between the set texts at the elite grammar schools and at the universities – from Cebes and Aesop to Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Homer – may imply that the training received by the average undergraduate with no previous Greek substantially recapitulated that of a full grammar-school education, although the undergraduate would soon start applying his Greek to texts beyond the grammar schools' scope.[122] We must be aware that when Bolgar attributes the knowledge of classical scholars to 'their own enterprise or private help', when J. B. Oldham says of Shrewsbury's curriculum of Isocrates, Xenophon, the Greek New Testament, and Cleonardus's grammar that 'the meagreness and narrowness of the Greek repertoire are very noticeable', and when Bywater considers the Elizabethan age 'almost a blank in the history of Greek learning in England', the broad cultural calculations underlying their estimates and pursuant conclusions are very different from those we might make now.

discounts the grammar itself from his own calculations. I am grateful to Dr Jane Masseglia of St John's College, Oxford, for insight into modern-day GCSE and A-level courses.

120 OCR, *GCSE Classical Greek*, §5.8.

121 OCR, *GCE Classics v6* (2008), online at http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/82461-specification.pdf, §3.4, 3.15, 3.16. The same reservations apply to doubling this total as are discussed above, n118.

122 Given some variation, the standard texts drawn from probate inventories by Jardine, 'Humanism and the Cambridge Arts Course', broadly agree with those listed by Baldwin, *Small Latine*, e.g. II.649-50. It is difficult, however, to assess with confidence the standard of Greek attained on the basis of curricular texts alone.

The urge to confirm these earlier opinions that late sixteenth-century England was a backwater has led some scholars to exaggerate the force of negative reports of Greek learning in the latter half of the century. The oft-cited testimony of John Bois that there was only one other than him at St John's College, Cambridge, in the 1570s, who could write Greek, has been questioned by M. L. Clarke, who points out that there were regular, well-attended Greek lectures at St John's at the time under Andrew Downes, who in 1586 would be elected regius professor of Greek.[123] J. W. Binns reports that 'in 1594, Isaac Casaubon wrote to Johann Camerarius that Greek was neglected and despised at Cambridge';[124] but Casaubon's letter was sent from Geneva, where he was Professor of the Greek Language, to Joachim Camerarius, Dean of the Collegium Medicum in Nuremberg, and makes no mention at all of Cambridge.[125] The inference comes from Mullinger, who cites it in a rather melodramatic passage to which is appended the marginal note attesting 'scanty evidence of genuine attainments in the language.'[126] A more complicated case is that of Petrus Ramus. Jan van Dorsten has Ramus writing to John Dee in December 1563, apparently confessing that he 'could not name one single English scholar'; and his response when Ascham sent him greetings in 1564 was 'positively sarcastic': 'Who in Britain,' he said, 'could possibly be such an admirer of me that he should have taken the trouble to forward good wishes across the very Ocean and all the way to Paris?'[127] To read this as sarcasm, however, rather than as a jocular rhetorical greeting, belies the sincere delight in hearing of Ascham which Ramus next

[123] Clarke, *Classical Education*, 28-9.

[124] Binns, *Intellectual Culture*, 217-18. The qualification 'at Cambridge' was introduced by Binns when he revised his 1978 article in *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27 for inclusion in the monograph; both versions have 'Johann' for Joachim.

[125] Casaubon, *Isaaci Casauboni epistolae* (Roterodami, 1709), letter 996 to Joachim Camerarius, 13 Jan. 1594.

[126] Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, II.419-20.

[127] Van Dorsten, *The Radical Arts: First Decade of an Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden, London, 1970), 12; the translations here are his. Van Dorsten's passage has been closely followed, for example by Andrew Pettegree, 'Art' (chapter 25) in *The Reformation World*, ed. Pettegree (London, New York, 2000), 485-6, and Jane Stevenson, 'The Court Culture of England under Elizabeth I' in *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650*, ed. M. Gosman *et al.*, II (Leiden, Boston, 2005), 198, and *Women Latin Poets: Language, Gender, and Authority from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 2005), 260.

relates,[128] and relies on a consistency of opinion with the earlier letter to Dee. Yet the letter to Dee was in fact written in 1565, later than that to Ascham, and has 'professores mathematum' in its scope more than scholars in general.[129] In any case, as van Dorsten later points out, in 1567 we find Ramus comparing mathematical scholarship in England favourably to that in France;[130] even if we are to take the letter to Ascham entirely literally as Ramus's first sighting of a rare breed, it may reveal more of Ramus than of English scholarship, since Ramus plainly changed his mind once he actually knew something of England and its scholars. Finally, closer to the problem of the *Poetics*, we should not take Gabriel Harvey too seriously when he laments to Spenser in 1579 that at Cambridge Aristotle is 'muche named, but little read... the *French* and *Italian* when so highlye regarded of Scholiers? The *Latine* and *Greeke*, when so lightly?'[131] Because the letters to Spenser often appear among literary critical anthologies, this comment has been cited in support of the view that the *Poetics* was little known at Cambridge (and by extension elsewhere) in the 1580s.[132] But if true, this would contradict everything we know of the university curriculum from the Cromwellian injunctions onward: by the 1580s the commitment to Aristotle had only hardened, and the Oxford statutes of 1586 reinforced that in Lenten disputations 'either Aristotle, according to the ancient and laudable university

[128] Ramus to Ascham, Paris, 1 March 1564, Giles, II.96-7: 'Quum salutem nobis tuo nomine dixisset nobilis quidam Britannus, qui in aula nostri regis forte nobis occurrisset, rogavi quisnam in Britannia nostri tam studiosus esset, ut etiam trans Oceanum Lutetiam usque hoc animi benevoli signum perlatum curasset: tumque de tua virtute atque eruditione multa jucunde ac libenter accepi, quae me desiderio incenderunt, ut prima quaque occasione salutis gratiam referendam putarem, juberemque hominem nostri cupidum et amantem pro mutuo amore valere plurimum, ac reciperem, si quid in otio Musae nostrae tu caussa possent, nullum a nobis tibi benevolentiae studium vel officium defuturum.'

[129] Ramus to John Dee, Paris, 14 Jan. 1565, in Ramus, *Collectanae praefationes, epistolae, orationes* (Paris, 1577), 204-5: 'Didici á nostris hominibus, qui Angliam bene nosse sibi videbantur, academias in Anglia duas esse, Cantabrigiensem & Oxoniensem, atque utriusque, collegia nominatim descripta teneo: sed professores mathematum vel scriptores insignes quinam essent nondum per discere potui.'

[130] Van Dorsten, *Radical Arts*, 19n24.

[131] Harvey and Spenser, *Three proper, and wittie, familiar Letters: lately passed betweene two Vniuersitie men* (London, 1580), 27-8.

[132] e.g. J. W. H. Atkins, *English Literary Criticism: The Renascence* (London, 1947), 345: 'one of the most striking features of English criticism at this date is the slight acquaintance shown with Aristotle's teaching... compared with the volume of Aristotelian doctrine available, but little use was made of his teaching by English writers. 'He was much named but little read', as Harvey, writing in 1579, complained of the study of Aristotle at Cambridge at that date.' Harvey is quoted to similar effect in Herrick, 'The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England', 252, and Horton, 'Aristotle and his Commentators', 58.

statutes, or other authors supporting Aristotle, are to be defended'.[133] Reading further in the letter it becomes clear that Harvey is writing hyperbolically, and his comment on Aristotle is as faithful an index of history as the complaint that Cambridge is full of 'ouer-manye Clawbackes, and Pickethanks: Reedes shaken of euerie Wind: Iackes of bothe sides: Aspen leaues: painted Sheathes, and Sepulchres: Asses in Lions skins: Dunglecockes: slipperye Eles: Dormise'.[134]

Might the *Poetics* in particular – in Greek or in Latin, for that matter – have featured amidst this curricular learning? Certainly Aristotle was not read in schools, which concentrated mostly on the literary texts on which good usage was founded. But the standard university curriculum had long been essentially Aristotelian, and would only become more so as the sixteenth century wore on, bolstered by the concurrent movement towards Greek texts, and the replacement of medieval with classical and humanist commentators.[135] Aristotelianism remained the framework within which new thinking could take place; its continuing dominance was due to its very systematicity, the fact that despite its flaws 'Aristotelianism still represented a more comprehensive and internally coherent system than any that was

[133] Gibson, *Statuta*, 437; cf. 389-90 for a list of texts and authors standing in 1564/5.

[134] Harvey, *Three proper, and wittie, familiar Letters*, 29. A contemporaneous letter, recorded in the *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey, A.D. 1573-1580*, ed. Edward John Long Scott (London, 1884), moreover implies that the 'Aristotle' Harvey here considered neglected may have been limited to the logic, as his works of practical science (among which the *Poetics* would have numbered) were widely read: 'Aristotles Organon is nighhand as litle redd as Dunses Quodlibet. His oeconomicks and politiques every on hath by rote. You can not stepp into a schollars studye but (ten to on) you shall litely finde open ether Bodin de Republica or Le Royes Exposition uppon Aristotles Politiques or sum other like Frenche or Italian Politique Discourses' (79). Taken as literally as his lament on Aristotle, Harvey's point about 'dormise' may, of course, have been true of 1580s Cambridge.

[135] Much work has been done on Aristotelianism in the English university curricula, which I will not detail at length here. The most important works are those of Schmitt, *John Case*, 'Philosophy and Science', and for the broader European context his seminal *Aristotle and the Renaissance*. For Oxford, see McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford', *EHR* 94.371 (1979), 291-317, and Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts'. For Cambridge, see Lisa Jardine's work: 'The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge', *SR* 21 (1974), 31-62; 'Humanism and the Sixteenth Century Cambridge Arts Course', 16-31; 'Humanism and Dialectic in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge: A Preliminary Investigation' in *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 1500-1700*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1976), 141-54. See also in general Hugh F. Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Pre-Industrial Britain, 1500-1700* (London, 1970), and the essays in Charles B. Schmitt *et al.*, eds., *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988); for a recent survey of work in this field as it extends, beyond the scope of this study, into the seventeenth century, see Michael Edwards, 'Aristotelianism, Descartes, and Hobbes', *The Historical Journal* 50.2 (2007), 449-464.

available to replace it'.[136] As we have seen, it was this consistent demand for Aristotelian texts that drew the *Poetics* into England, through the purchase of *opera omnia* and other works that contained the text. Yet the *Poetics*, discovered and promulgated so late, remained an outlier in the *corpus aristotelicum*, and as far as I can tell was never studied on the university curriculum: it is not mentioned in the student notebooks of the time, nor does it appear in college or university statutes.[137] A glance at surviving *quaestiones* for disputation helps to explain its absence. Incepting masters contended with such questions as 'an pisces respirent sub aquis' (whether fish breathe underwater), 'an foelicitas acquiratur in hac vita' (whether happiness might be acquired in this life), 'an terra sit habitabilis sub aequatore' (whether the earth is habitable below the equator), 'an melancholici sint ingeniosissimi' (whether melancholic people are the most brilliant).[138] Records of bachelor's disputations are harder to come by, but to the extent that they emerged from the standard curriculum we can assume that they involved more basic questions on logic, rhetoric, and philosophy.[139] Charles Schmitt's close analyses have shown that the masters' *quaestiones* often reflected contemporary concerns despite their traditional form: many dealt with the rule or education of women, with post-Copernican astronomy, atomism, occultism, scepticism, and the like.[140] Nonetheless, it is clear that none of the fields of knowledge they questioned would have been much illuminated

---

[136] Schmitt, 'Philosophy and Science', 490; cf. McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford', 708.

[137] I have checked the sources mentioned by McConica in 'Elizabethan Oxford', 709ff.: BL Add. MS 6251 (letters of Simon Tripp, at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from 1559); Bod. MS Rawlinson D 273 (exercises of John Rogers, matric. Christ Church College, Oxford, 1578); Bod. MS Rawlinson D 274 (commentary on Aristotle's *Physics* of John Day, matric. from St Alban's Hall 1583, fellow of Oriel from 1588); Bod. MS Rawlinson D 1423 (notebook with analysis of *Physics* from the 1590s); Bod. MS Lat. misc. E 114 (notebook of Randolph Cholmondley, matric. Lincoln 1577); and the Carnsews' diary, PRO SP 46/15, fos. 212-20. Several of these, for example Cholmondley's notebook, contain an enormous amount of commentary on Aristotelian texts; I cannot guarantee that no mention is made of the *Poetics* at any point, only that it was not studied independently as part of the student curriculum.

[138] See the lists in Fletcher, ed., *Registrum annalium Collegii Mertonensis*, *1521-67* (Oxford, 1974), and *1567-1603*; the above *quaestiones* appear in the latter volume, *s.a.* 1568-9 (13, 22). Further lists from outside Merton may be found in Charles William Boase and Andrew Clark, eds., *Register of the University of Oxford*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1885-9), II.i.169-217.

[139] Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts', 171-81.

[140] Schmitt, 'Philosophy and Science', 500-1.

by the latest opinions on dramatic form or *peripeteia*. Poetry was studied, of course, in humanity and Greek lectures, mostly under the rubrics of broad reading or linguistic training; it was important preparation for the non-academic careers a university education increasingly incubated, but not integral to progress through the university course itself. Even if some additional Aristotelian reading was taking place, the requirements for progress towards a bachelor's or master's degree focused on the official curriculum in which the *Poetics* had no definite place.[141]

Yet there is some indication that the *Poetics* might have been read, if not officially studied, by students in the university context. One opportunity for such reading may have been presented by sixteenth-century changes in the foundational field of logic, which Jardine has shown evolved over the sixteenth-century from the medieval, scholastic logic of Peter of Spain into 'essentially a humanist progamme of study' based on Cicero and Quintilian, through the dialectical manuals of Lorenzo Valla and Rudolph Agricola, and their followers Melanchthon, Seton, and Ramus.[142] This latter dialectic, on Agricola's model, was reimagined as 'ars disserendi', 'the practical study of the ways in which we communicate knowledge to others' – in practice, it emphasised 'nontechnical, literary discourse' and more closely resembled the art of rhetoric.[143] Ironically, the *Poetics* may have fitted more naturally into logic once logic became less Aristotelian. Throughout the sixteenth-century, as we have seen, the *Poetics* was classified a part of logic, but this always seemed to work better in principle than in practice; there is no evidence in statutes, records of disputations, surviving lectures, or student notebooks to suggest that the traditional study of logic was ever concerned with questions of poetry. But the *Poetics* may have been more relevant to a reformed logic which concerned primarily 'literary' discourse, admitting, on Valla's and Agricola's model, 'the

141 cf. Schmitt, *John Case*, 52-7: 'logic, moral and natural philosophy, and metaphysics were being taught per statuta.'

142 Jardine, 'Humanism and Dialectic', 153.

143 Jardine, 'The Place of Dialectic Teaching', 51-2.

weaker forms of argument commonly used in oratory' such as induction, enthymeme, and example,[144] and, after Ramus, elevating even poetic texts to the status of logical arguments.[145]

Though the *Poetics* never found a place in the curricular studies of sixteenth-century English universities, therefore, in this intellectual context it seems to have proved germane on at least one occasion, in the celebrated set of lectures on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* John Rainolds delivered during his tenure as Greek reader at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, from 1572-78. These lectures, writes Rainolds's modern editor, 'did not represent a mechanical satisfaction of the statutory curriculum, but rather a choice from a wide range of possibilities reflecting his personal interest', in line with what we have seen of the fluid disciplinary boundaries of lectures and their contents; they are one of the best sources we have for the application of humanist method to an Aristotelian text, presented directly from the Greek to an audience that 'was familiar with, or had a copy of' the Greek passage analysed in each lecture.[146] In his lecture on chapter 3 of the *Rhetoric* (1.1.12-13), Rainolds makes transparent reference to the *Poetics*:

> True and good things, in actual fact, can be handled with more eloquence and greater probability than false and bad things. Quintilian even teaches (book 6, chapter 3) that "For the most part, arguments arise from the case, and more arguments are always on the better side." Still, as Livy says, sometimes "the greater part vanquishes the better." And Aristotle says some falsehoods are more probable than some truths.[147]

This passing comment offers as little by way of detail as any of our evidence, apart from

---

[144] Jardine, 'Humanism and Dialectic', 144.

[145] The literature even on this aspect of Ramism is enormous, although to my knowledge it has not been considered in relation to the *Poetics*. See Tamara A. Goeglein, '"Wherein hath Ramus been so offensious?": Poetic Examples in the English Ramist Logic Manuals (1574-1672)', *Rhetorica* 14.1 (1996), 73-101.

[146] Lawrence Green's remarks in Rainolds, *Oxford Lectures on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, 22, 91.

[147] *Ibid*., 156-7: 'Vera & bona, falsis & malis, ornatius & probabilius reipsa tractari posse docet etiam Fab. 1. 6. c. 3. Argumenta plerumque nascuntur ex causa & pro meliore parte plura sunt semper. Quanquam aliquando, ut inquit Liuius, pars maior meliorem vincit. Quaedam falsa probabiliora quibusdam veris. Ar.'; cf. *Poetics* 1460a27, 1461b15.

Sidney's, for knowledge of the *Poetics* in sixteenth-century England. Yet we are now in a better position to understand the kind of acquaintance with the text it might connote. The conditions of true and false arguments was a crux of concern for rhetoric, logic, and poetics alike,[148] but Rainolds's reference is not simply a brief animadversion from one of the outstanding scholars of 1570s Oxford. Rather, we can see it as a gloss imported into a well-attended collegiate Greek lecture on a curricular Aristotelian text, the very brevity of which presupposes the audience's at least basic familiarity with its source, just as, in Italy at the time, professors of humanity 'often added Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* to aid in the theoretical analysis of literature'.[149] The *Poetics* was not a part of the university curriculum proper, but Rainolds's lecture provides a rare glimpse into a programme of wider reading at university into which the *Poetics* fitted and may have been encountered as an auxiliary to curricular Aristotelianism. It was known to Rainolds and – if the popularity of his lectures is a guide to his judgement as a teacher – to his audience as contextual knowledge; we may recall the several volumes containing the *Poetics* distributed by Rainolds's executors to his students across Oxford, including a rare sighting in England of a commentary specifically on the *Poetics*, as further evidence of the work's presence in the intellectual orbit of Rainolds and his students.[150] The *Poetics*, plainly, was accessible both physically and linguistically to any university student who might have taken an interest in it.

The conditions of Greek literacy and of exposure to Aristotle at university here surveyed appear especially significant when we consider that the great majority of writers featured in anthologies of English Renaissance literary criticism, whose occasional mentions of the *Poetics* have been so often doubted, minimised, or dismissed as negligible evidence of their knowledge of the work, went to the better schools and the universities. Sidney's

[148] Discussed in Chapter V; see also Heikki Mikkeli, *An Aristotelian Response to Renaissance Humanism: Jacopo Zabarella on the Nature of Arts and Sciences* (Helsinki, 1992), 59-66.

[149] Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, 241.

[150] See Appendix I, *s.v.* Rainolds, John.

education has been exhaustively detailed: he studied Greek at Shrewsbury from 1564-68, where Xenophon, whose Cyrus features so extensively in the *Defence*, was an unusual curricular presence; he then enrolled as a commoner at Christ Church College, Oxford, until 1571. His master at Shrewsbury was Thomas Ashton, a fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, from the time of Cheke, to whom Andrew Downes, appointed regius professor in Greek at Cambridge in 1586, attributed 'whatever there is in me of letters or humanity or of any good at all';[151] we have seen in Conrad ab Ulmis and Matthew Carnsew some example of the nature of his Oxford studies; and we have independently seen the uses to which he put his Greek.

Yet the access to Greek Sidney received through his education was not unusual in literary circles. If we take the authors appearing before 1605 in Brian Vickers's *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, and add to them any further authors represented in Gregory Smith's older collection of *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, our sample should include the majority of writers usually considered canonical in English Renaissance critical thought: Elyot, Henry Howard, Thomas Wilson, Alexander Neville, William Baldwin, Ascham, Richard Wills, Gascoigne, Whetstone, Thomas Lodge, Spenser, Stanyhurst, Sidney, King James I, William Webbe, Abraham Fraunce, Puttenham, Nash, John Harington, Shakespeare, Harvey, Richard Carew, Chapman, Francis Meres, Robert Southwell, John Hoskyns, Thomas Campion, Samuel Daniel, and Jonson.[152] Subtracting from this list William Baldwin and Sir Thomas Elyot, the evidence of whose attendance at Oxford can neither be proven nor disproven, and also those who were educated in fundamentally different systems – James I and Henry Howard, who received their noble educations at the hands of humanist tutors, and Robert Southwell, whose B.A. (1584) was from the English College at Douai – we come to a

[151] Downes, *Eratosthenes, hoc est, Breuis et luculenta defensio Lysiae pro caede Eratosthenis* (Cambridge, 1593), sig. ¶3.

[152] Biographical data in the following paragraphs derives from *ODNB* unless otherwise indicated.

list of twenty-five critical writers, fully twenty of whom matriculated at university. Nineteen of these matriculated after 1540, the point after which Greek became routine at the universities; the one to matriculate prior to 1540 was Roger Ascham (matric. 1530), whose command of Greek is not in doubt. Of the twenty in total to attend university, seven took no degree, although many of them continued their studies in some other capacity: Campion, Carew, Puttenham, and perhaps Alexander Neville moved to the Inns of Court, while Richard Wills joined the Jesuits in Mainz, earned an M.A. (1568) which he later incorporated at both Oxford and Cambridge, and was appointed Professor of Rhetoric at Perugia from 1569-71; the remaining two who took no degree were Sidney and Samuel Daniel.

At the very least, then, twenty out of twenty-five of our literary critics would have received the Greek education we have surveyed here. But even more revealing are the exceptions: the five critics who did not attend university were Gascoigne (who joined Gray's Inn), Whetstone (who joined Furnivall's Inn), Shakespeare,[153] Jonson, and Chapman. Yet Jonson, as we have seen, has been considered the only writer of the period who *did* have Greek, and Chapman gained renown for translating both the *Iliad* (completed 1611) and the *Odyssey* (1614-15) on the basis of self-taught Greek. Plainly, a university education was not the only road to Greek literacy; Jonson's education at Westminster school around 1580 would have stood him in good stead, but his Greek evidently much improved through his own reading. And if Jonson and Chapman could learn Greek more or less independently, there is no reason to imagine that other able and committed students could not: elementary Greek grammars, texts, and lexica had much improved over the sixteenth-century to the point at which, as the case of Chapman proves, autodidacts might prevail.[154] The history of Greek

[153] Shakespeare enters Vickers's anthology on the basis of a scene attributed to him in *The Raigne of King Edward the Third* (1596), drawing on the tropes of love poetry in copious fashion. He is not thought to have had any Greek in Baldwin's exhaustive study, *Small Latine*, II.661.

[154] See Botley, *Learning Greek*, 115: by the end of the fifteenth century, 'the ready availability of bilingual grammars, elementary Greek texts, and Greek-Latin lexica made it easier for determined scholars to teach themselves the language. For most of the fifteenth century, the teacher of Greek was valued not only because

literacy suggests that the *Poetics* was in no way beyond the linguistic capabilities of English readers. Indeed, it suggests that their linguistic access followed, rather than delimited, their interests; and England's theorists and writers of literature were in general a highly educated subset of readers, whose interest in the *Poetics* we may in principle assume.

Sidney and his fellow English critics – not to mention other university-educated writers of the late sixteenth century – would have had ample access to the *Poetics*, widely available as it was in Latin, in which all educated English readers were functionally bilingual, and Italian. What this review of Greek literacy in England and brief prosopographic survey should demonstrate is that they had every opportunity, too, to read it in Greek – opportunities neither necessarily reflected in their letters or offhand, marginal, occasional reports of their reading, nor in what miniscule quantities of that reading they chose, for one reason or another, to index in their written work. We must not forget, on one hand, that sixteenth-century writers were under no compulsion to record anything in particular for posterity, and as such the anecdotal, citational record that has been used for the most part to reconstruct literary history reflects only a tiny proportion of its real conditions and events; and on the other, that the traditional histories of scholarship on which literary history has drawn operate by criteria that are in no way apt to its purpose, if that purpose is simply to estimate the linguistic access of English readers and writers to classical material. Literary scholars, while confidently making tacit and less tacit assumptions about access to Greek among the literary figures of the English Renaissance, have considered neither how much Greek was needed to read a text like the *Poetics*, nor how much Greek those literary figures truly had, nor, indeed, the various modes

of his knowledge of the language but also because he had Greek manuscripts and the ability to multiply them. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, students were no longer dependent on their teachers for the elementary texts of the language. One consequence of this development was that self-instruction became an increasingly common alternative to formal lessons.' The title-page of Ascham's *Scholemaster* recommends it in this vein 'for all such, as haue forgot the Latin tonge, and would, by themselues, without a Scholemaster, in short tyme, and with small paines, recouer a sufficient habilitie, to vnderstand, write, and speake Latin'; see Lawrence, *'Who the Devil Taught Thee So Much Italian'*, 23ff.

of reading Greek that served as widely and as well in the sixteenth century as they do now: ‘for the Greeke is as it was,’ writes Thomas Wilson in his translation of Demosthenes, ‘and those that weare Grecians may read the Greke stil notwithstanding my English. And such as haue no Greeke, may goe to the Latine for all my doings, or any other translation else in any other strange tongue or language’.[155]

Only loose thinking and bad history lies beneath comments like Brian Vickers’s, that Scaliger’s Latin *Poetices* was ‘for the use of scholars, professional classicists, or historians’, that English literary criticism was addressed ‘not to scholars but to general readers, and to practising writers’, that the ‘ideal reader’ of a rhetorical treatise, a lawyer, parliamentary officer, courtier, or poet, would be ‘speaking and writing in the vernacular’ – and that the *Poetics* simultaneously suffered a ‘slow reception’ in England.[156] When it comes to sixteenth-century literacy in the classical languages, the boundaries between ‘scholars’, ‘practising writers’, ‘lawyers’ and ‘poets’ were porous at their most solid, better articulated as a function not of the linguistic access by which one was bound, but of how one earned a living or chose to spend one’s time after school. A sixteenth-century English writer who cites or otherwise declares his knowledge of the *Poetics* may or may not have known it in reality, of course, as would be the case with anyone’s citation of any text. But if we are to be responsible historians, taking the ‘cautious’ view, we have no reason to deny him a thorough understanding of the text in any of its languages: our reader’s knowledge must be presumed until he is proven ignorant, for he had the books, and he could read them.

---

[155] Wilson, *Three Orations*, sig. *.i.^{v}.

[156] Vickers, *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 5-6, 11n16; discussed above, p.110.

CHAPTER IV

SYNCRETISTS, SYSTEMATIZERS, AND THE CRITICAL TRADITION

Well, how so thou interpret the contents,
I am resolu'd thy errour to maintaine,
Rather then by more truth to get more paine.

Sir Philip Sidney, *Astrophil and Stella* 67[1]

Since Sidney's direct use of the *Poetics* has been proven, perhaps the question of mediation – the filtration of the *Poetics* through continental, usually Italian, intermediary sources – may be considered settled in his case, if not for his contemporaries. But mediation is a harder charge to refute outright than obstacles of textual or linguistic access, because though much more widely voiced in the scholarly literature it remains nonetheless a matter of critical opinion rather than historical evidence. For mediation there is only internal evidence to go on: how we read that evidence is determined more by our own methods and models for charting the evolution of criticism in the sixteenth century, than are the detailed but methodologically quite straightforward issues of whether certain books were in England or not, or what level of Greek a university student might have gained. Where only the original source is directly cited, the interpolation of intermediaries is, right or wrong, a modern one.

Viewed soberly, mediation should not in principle undermine the ability of English readers to work intelligently with the *Poetics*. Much creative and sophisticated thinking was done in the English Renaissance with texts originally Greek, such as Plutarch, despite their being accessed in the French of an Amyot or the English of a North. Much was done, too, with texts thickly encrusted with post-classical tradition, as Renaissance moralisations of

1 *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William A. Ringler, Jr. (Oxford, 1962), 199.

Ovid and Virgil, not to mention the practical philosophy of the *Ethics* or *Politics*, would suggest.[2] The presence of such living interpretive traditions is usually taken to denote a thorough absorption, even a certain naturalisation, of the text, and certainly is not imagined to be somehow 'not-Virgil' or 'un-Ovidian'; the classical sub-discipline of reception studies has in these cases overtaken 'positivistic modes of interpretation (with their teleological assumptions)' following Charles Martindale's creed that '*meaning... is always realised at the point of reception*'.[3] In the case of the *Poetics*, however, meaning is thought to have been, as it were, misrealised at the point of reception: Italian criticism has been described by modern scholars as an exegetical tradition different enough from its source to substitute for it entirely, as if the apple had fallen so far from the tree as to be an orange. When Sidney's editors refer his use of *ab ovo*, 'as Horace saith', primarily to Horace, but his use of *μίμησις*, 'so Aristotle termeth it', primarily to Scaliger or an undifferentiated soup of Renaissance commonplaces, we are in the presence of a double-standard not entirely explained by imagined obstacles to access.[4]

This chapter interrogates the emergence, rise, and persistence of the critical methods and models, from the nineteenth century to the present, that have given rise to this double-standard. While the argument of mediation is usually posed as a logical consequence of pragmatic problems of access – if the English couldn't read the original, they must therefore have read something else – it will be seen that historiographically the opposite is true:

---

2 See among recent work, for example, David Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2010), esp. 3-6 on method, and the essays in Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp, eds., *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Toronto, 2007); one searches in vain for arguments coordinate to those reviewed in this chapter, such as (to paraphrase Bernard Weinberg) that a commentary on Virgil would have been 'completely unacceptable to a sound Virgilian'.

3 Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (1993), xiii, 3, cf. 10: 'what else indeed could (say) 'Virgil' be other than what readers have made of him over the centuries?' See also the articles in *Classical Reception Journal* 5.2 (2013), a special issue on the twentieth anniversary of *Redeeming the Text*, especially Martindale, 'Reception – a New Humanism? Receptivity, Pedagogy, the Transhistorical', 169-83; Philip Hardie, 'Redeeming The Text, Reception Studies, and the Renaissance', 190-198.

4 *Defence* 114.14 (*ab ovo*), 79.36 (*μίμησις*); the citations appear in this way in Van Dorsten's edition (1973), and more recently in Porges-Watson's (1997) and Herman's (2001).

problems of access have been supplied to *explain* Elizabethan critics' perceived debts to Italian intermediaries, to explain their preference, as Sidney would put it, for the stream over the Aristotelian font.[5] The genealogy of this view reaches back to the seminal account in the field, Joel Elias Spingarn's *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (1899). Divided into three parts covering the literary-critical activity of sixteenth-century Italy, France, and England respectively, the book was primarily intended for English scholars to whom, Spingarn recalled in the preface to his fifth edition years later, the Italian critics 'were quite unknown'; little attention had been paid them, in fact, 'even in Italy'.[6] The field could not look more different after more than a century of Spingarn's influence: most of England's criticism is now thought to have been mediated by the Italian literature, which has more than once received monographic, almost encyclopaedic treatment in English.[7] At the time, however, Spingarn's work was a revolutionary critical intervention. Precisely because it has been so thoroughly naturalised in the discipline, we must first understand the shape of Spingarn's epochal study of 'the beginnings of critical activity in modern Europe and... the gradual introduction of the Aristotelian canons into modern literature', and the firm pattern it inscribed for future work in the field, in its own context as a response to the critical truisms of the 1890s.

Accounts of pre-Jonsonian literary criticism in England had long congregated around Sidney and *The Defence of Poesie*. Thomas Rymer had assigned the rudeness of seventeenth-century tragedy to the small English impact of the *Poetics*, which 'was perhaps Commented upon by all the great men in *Italy*, before we well know (on this side of the *Alps*) that there was such a Book in being'; Nicholas Rowe's Shakespeare had been excused for the 'great many Faults' his tragedies would exhibit by Aristotelian standards, because he 'had never

5 Sidney to Hubert Languet, Padua, 4 February 1574, *Correspondence* I.105-7.

6 'Preface to the Fifth Impression' in Spingarn, *History*, iii.

7 See e.g. Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*; Hathaway, *The Age of Criticism*, and *Marvels and Commonplaces: Renaissance Literary Criticism* (New York, 1968).

been made acquainted with the Regularity of those written Precepts, so it would be hard to judge him by a Law he knew nothing of', and Pope had similarly objected that 'to judge therefore of *Shakespear* by *Aristotle's* rules, is like trying a man by the Laws of one Country, who acted under those of another'.[8] When attention turned in the late-eighteenth century to English critical literature, however, it transpired that Sidney had first introduced the 'Aristotelian canons' into England, and the encomia of the period held the *Defence*'s achievement inseparable from its erudition, its erudition from its Aristotelianism. Dr Joseph Warton, the *Defence*'s first modern editor, struck the key-note in 1787:

> there are few rules and few excellencies of poetry, especially epic and dramatic, but what Sir *Philip Sydney*, who had diligently read the best Latin and Italian commentaries on *Aristotle's* Poetics, has here pointed out and illustrated with true taste and judgement...[9]

Warton's praise of Sidney's Aristotelian learning was copied *verbatim* by William Gray and Alexander Young in their editions of the *Defence*, as interest in English criticism grew in the first decades of the nineteenth century.[10] So was his pairing of Sidney with Ben Jonson, aligning the *Defence* as a forerunner of English neo-classicism. Young's edition printed Sidney alongside John Selden, perhaps the greatest English philologist of the seventeenth century, and Edward Arber's edition, observing that 'the science of definitions progressed after Sidney's death', illuminated Sidney's tract by the light of Jonson's.[11] The achievement of the *Defence* was its learning, classicism, Aristotelianism, intellectual system. Thus Fox Bourne's account of Sidney's life had the *Defence* exhibiting 'the strength and beauty of his

---

8 Thomas Rymer, *The Tragedies of the last Age Consider'd*... (London, 1678), 142; Nicholas Rowe, ed., *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear*, 6 vols. (London, 1709), I.xxvi; Alexander Pope, ed., *The Works of Shakespear*, 6 vols. (London, 1725), I.vi.

9 Warton, *Defence* (1787), sig. a2^{v}. Warton's was the first modern edition of the *Defence*; Urie, *Defence* (1752) is a reprint rather than an edition proper. The earliest critical editions to 1815 have been surveyed by Rodney M. Baine, 'The First Anthologies of English Literary Criticism, Warton to Haslewood', *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950), 262-265.

10 Gray, *Defence* (1829), 37-38; Young, *Defence* (1831), xxxi, 'chiefly abstracted from the Life prefixed to Gray's edition' (xv, n1).

11 Arber, *Defence* (1868), 9-10.

unfettered intellect';[12] for Henry Morley, who would later edit the text, the *Defence* was 'the first piece of intellectual criticism in our language';[13] in Isaac Disraeli's character sketch, 'Sidney, in this luminous criticism and effusion of poetic feeling, has introduced the principal precepts of Aristotle, touched by the fire and sentiment of Longinus; and, for the first time in English literature, has exhibited the beatitude of criticism in a poet-critic.'[14] There was at this time no doubt, needless to say, that Sidney in any way lacked knowledge of the *Poetics*. Quite the opposite: the editions of Cook (1890), long afterwards a *textus receptus*,[15] and Shuckburgh (1891) carried Sidney's learning, his familiarity with Aristotle's *Poetics*, and his position at the wellspring of English classicism, through to the end of the century.[16]

Appreciation for Sidney's classicism was complicated, however, by a larger cultural struggle over the contours of the English canon. For the post-Romantic critics of the nineteenth century, Sidney's classical standards ran counter to the 'romantic' drama of Shakespeare – as opposed to the 'classical' of Jonson, a binary largely promulgated by Jonson himself[17] – and thus to the very heart of the English claim to poetic greatness. In vindicating the unities and denouncing mixed genres, Sidney was 'laying down exactly the two principals, a fortunate abjuration and scouting wherof gave us the greatest possession in mass and variety of merit that any literature possesses', Saintsbury declared; 'follow Sidney, and good-bye to *Faustus*, to *Hamlet*, to *Philaster*, to *The Duchess of Malfi*, to *The Changeling*, to *The Virgin Martyr*, to *The Broken Heart*'.[18] This romantic abjuration of classical principle, crucially, did

12 H. R. Fox Bourne, *A Memoir of Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1862), 383.

13 Henry Morley, *A First Sketch of English Literature* (London, Paris, New York, 1873), 394; Morley's edition appeared in 1889.

14 Isaac Disraeli, *Amenities of Literature, Consisting of Sketches and Characters of English Literature*, 3 vols. (London, 1841), II.364.

15 Much to the chagrin of Marvin Herrick, *JEGP* 47.2 (1948), 196: 'It is high time now... that historians of literary influences quit relying upon George Kittredge and A. S. Cook for leading information about the critical background of Elizabethan poetry.'

16 Cook, *Defence* (1890), e.g. xviii, xxxvi; Shuckburgh, *Defence* (1891), e.g. x, xxxii.

17 See Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.1-74.

18 George Saintsbury, *A History of Elizabethan Literature* (London, 1887), 41.

not stop at the borders of literary history; it became a standard under which rallied all the Jingo of Victorian cultural exceptionalism. Hence the first of J. A. Symonds's four stages of England's dramatic literature witnessed 'the efforts of our national genius to form for itself, instinctively, almost unconsciously, its own peculiar language of expression':

> There was a danger lest invention should be crushed by imitation at the outset. Pedantic rules, borrowed from Aristotelian commentators and the apes of Seneca, were imposed by learned critics on the playwright... [but] the native genius of the English people, though menaced by these divers dangers, was so vigorous, the race itself was so isolated and so full of a robust tempestuous vitality, the language was so copious and vivid in its spoken strength, the poetic impulse was so powerful, that all efforts to domesticate alien styles, all inducements to degrade or scurrilise the theatre, all factious opposition to the will and pleasure of the people, ended in the assimilation of congenial and the rejection of repugnant elements. The style of England, the expression of our race in a specific form of art, grew steadily, instinctively, spontaneously, by evolution from within.[19]

The second stage in this racial autogenesis was dominated by Shakespeare, through whose untrained art was articulated 'what the nation struggled to express'. Sidney's adherence to classical precept was in this atmosphere tantamount to treason, and his associations with the Italians virtually papist; it was only his failure, along with that of Sackville, Jonson, Bacon, Seneca's translators, university scholars and court purists, 'to force upon the genius of the people a style alien to the spirit of the times and of the race' that delivered England from 'a danger which threatened her theatre with a failure like to that of the Italian.'[20]

Further complication resulted from the fact that the standards of aesthetic merit active in the nineteenth century were themselves substantially classical standards, from which English art diverged the more 'native' it became. These critics thus fell between their divided loyalties: on one hand, to England's insular, organic genius; on the other, to the monumental purity of the classics. The resulting accounts could be somewhat schizoid. For Collier,

[19] John Addington Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama* (London, 1884), 4-5.

[20] *Ibid.*, 12, 37, 211.

England's disregard for the 'trammels of the unities' was laudable on one hand, but on the other a sign of England's barbarism: those unities had evolved in Greece and Rome, after all, 'so as not to offend the understanding of more refined spectators', while in England 'appeal was made only to the imagination of a ruder auditory, which willingly believed that the same boards in the same play represented two different quarters of the globe'.[21] Even Symonds cannot quite decide whether he is for or against classicism, given that the emergence of the drama among the English people 'embodied a whole European phase of thought and feeling' and 'the recovery of Greek and Latin culture'. Reviewing the 'unique achievement' of the English literary genius, Symonds's critic is 'puzzled not only by its complexity, but also its incompleteness as a work of art'; whatever its merits, the romantic drama has 'no Attic purity of outline, no statuesque definition of form, no unimpeachable perfection of detail.'[22] And the proposed solutions to this classical-romantic binary were no less contorted. Symonds has the English drama (working with a classical 'sound method' to gentrify its romantic madness) sharing 'the spirit of the Greeks more fully than the pseudo-classics', and thus emerging more classical in reality the less classical it was in appearance;[23] for Charles Edwyn Vaughan, similarly, the English inherited 'not the regularity but the richness, not the self-restraint but the freedom, of the classics', even though in Vaughan's own work and that of his contemporaries classicism was synonymous with regularity and self-restraint.[24] Saintsbury made perhaps the most tortuous manoeuvre when he described Sidney – elsewhere lionised, as we have seen, for his erudition – as possessing enthusiasm for poetry 'not at all according to knowledge': not that Sidney lacked knowledge, that is, but because the knowledge he had

---

[21] John Payne Collier, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare, and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration*, 3 vols. (London, 1831), I.xi. Collier's work, later proven to have been based on fabricated documents in important parts, 'served most Victorians as a blameless authority and the principal guide to its subjects' (Arthur Freeman and Janet Ing Freeman, 'Collier, John Payne (1789-1883)', *ODNB*).

[22] Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors*, 13-14.

[23] *Ibid*., 226.

[24] Vaughan, *English Literary Criticism* (London, 1896), x.

was of a classical poetics itself ignorant of what every Victorian knew: the Romantic superiority of *Faustus* and *Hamlet*.[25]

For its nineteenth-century historians the entire critical enterprise was thus intrinsically suspect, evidence of an 'alien style' poisoning the native ink that flowed through English veins. At the heart of the problem was an unhelpful notion of imitation and consequently of influence, invariably imagined as submission and subordination to a model and never as a creative or interlocutory act, an aping or a crushing, as Symonds had it, in binary opposition to invention. 'Aristotelian commentators' were particularly culpable, both because imitation itself was in some sense or another the first principle of Aristotelian aesthetics, and because the 'pedantic rules' that characterised Aristotelian works lent themselves so comfortably to the metaphors of law, freedom, and national jurisdiction that had characterised the debate since Rowe's remarks on Shakespeare. This had far-reaching methodological consequences which, as we shall see, continued to determine the field long after its vociferous nationalism had ebbed: imitation and influence have long been perceived to register only through similarity in the appearance of the finished work, rather than (for example) as stimulus, or similarity in intention or technique or materials.

Criticism was classicism, classicism was Italian, and so only ignorance such as that of Rowe's Shakespeare, 'a Man that liv'd in a State of almost universal License and Ignorance', could save English literature from the taint.[26] In the *völkisch* retrospect of the Victorians it was difficult to be influenced and English at the same time; difficult, perhaps, even to be intelligent and English, since in Collier's account the triumph of England's native romantic art relied on the credulous stupidity of its 'ruder auditory';[27] all this, one way or another, because

[25] Saintsbury, *History of Elizabethan Literature*, 41.

[26] Rowe, *Shakespear*, I.xxvi.

[27] cf. Pope, *Works of Shakespear*, I.v, and Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors*, 75: 'Men of learning were not the national poets of England, as they were of Italy; nor did the universities give laws of taste to the people. Our poets were not scholars in the strict sense of that term...'

Shakespeare never attended university. Fortunate for England, then, that the Victorian critics found negligible Italian influence in Sidney's critical work. Fox Bourne confirmed that 'very little had been written in foreign languages, and there was nothing in English, which could rob him of renown as the foremost literary critic of real worth'; Scaliger's *Poetices*, 'though it may possibly have suggested the writing of the *Defence of Poesie*, can have done no more'.[28] Symonds, 'much as the Italians had recently written upon the theory of poetry', could not remember any treatise which 'supplied the material or suggested the method' of Sidney's apology,[29] and opined for good measure that Sidney himself had a 'specifically English nature' one could hardly fail to appreciate in comparison with contemporary Italians;[30] Vaughan's 1896 anthology of literary criticism 'as it has grown up on English soil' overlooked Italian influences altogether.[31] Few opportunities were missed on this score to cite Ascham, himself canonised as the father of a robust native prose style,[32] on the perils of Italian books, 'inchantementes of Circes, brought out of Italie, to marre mens maners in England'.[33]

Here the young Spingarn, twenty-four years of age and just appointed Professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia when his *History* came out in 1899, found the record ripe for correction.[34] A public-schooled, first-generation Jewish immigrant, doctrinaire literary comparatist, and lifelong liberal whom W. E. B. Du Bois labelled a 'natural anarchist of the spirit' – from 1914 he was successively Chairman, Treasurer, and President of the just-founded National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, and established the prestigious Spingarn Medal to recognise outstanding achievement by African Americans[35] – it

---

28 Fox Bourne, *Memoir*, 383.

29 Symonds, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 168.

30 Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors*, 215.

31 Vaughan, *English Literary Criticism*, x.

32 See e.g. Disraeli, *Amenities of Literature*, II.203.

33 *Scholemaster* 26v; cited, e.g., in Symonds, *Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1886), 29.

34 Spingarn, *History*, 257: 'How great was their [English critics'] indebtedness to the Italians the course of the present study will make somewhat clear; but it is certainly remarkable that this indebtedness has never been pointed out before.'

35 See in general Marshall Van Deusen, *J. E. Spingarn* (New York, 1971), in which Du Bois is quoted (49), and

is tempting to imagine Spingarn's critical intervention a response to the xenophobic and somewhat patrician insularity of the English literary-historical academy, much as, with rather higher stakes, Ernst Curtius's *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* would challenge German narratives of cultural autogenesis fifty years later.[36] The first edition of Spingarn's work announced itself as 'a history of literary criticism in the Renaissance: with special reference to the influence of Italy in the formation and development of modern classicism';[37] it thus refocused the field as a cosmopolitan one, demonstrating that the 'Aristotelian canons, as restated by the Italians' formed the foundation of critical developments in France and England with a breadth of reference still cited today.[38] Taking on Symonds directly, Spingarn established that 'it can be said without exaggeration that there is not an essential principle in the *Defence of Poesy* which cannot be traced back to some Italian treatise on the poetic art':[39]

> [Before Sidney] the Aristotelian canons had not yet become a part of English criticism... The introduction of Aristotelianism into England was the direct result of the influence of the Italian critics; and the agent in bringing this new influence into English letters was Sir Philip Sidney. His *Defence of Poesy* is a veritable epitome of the literary criticism of the Italian Renaissance.[40]

---

on Spingarn's racial activism B. Joyce Ross, *J. E. Spingarn and the Rise of the NAACP, 1911-1939* (New York, 1972). Spingarn's literary and political goals were always imbricated: he remarked in an interview in 1909, a year after an unsuccessful run for Congress, that 'it is not at all extraordinary in England to see college professors sitting in Parliament. Why not in America?' (van Deusen, 25); the Spingarn Medal, similarly, offered from March 1913, served as 'a reminder that America was not solely a country of, by, and for Anglo Saxons' (Ross, 28). Spingarn's most influential teacher, George Woodberry at Harvard, later edited the *Defence* (Boston, 1908) and was also committed to the 'plight of the American Negro' (van Deusen, 60).

36 On Curtius, see his 'Author's Foreword to the English Translation' in *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, 1953), vii-x; cf. William Calin, 'Ernst Robert Curtius: The Achievement of a Humanist' in *Medievalism and the Academy I*, ed. Leslie J. Workman, Kathleen Verduin, and David Metzger (Cambridge, 1999), esp. 220-21.

37 Spingarn, *History*, 1st ed. (New York, 1899).

38 Spingarn, *History*, 198. For recent citation of Spingarn as an active authority in the Italian field, see Marrapodi, 'Shakespeare Against Genres', 2n4; for a critique of that continued authority see Javitch, 'The Assimilation of Aristotle's *Poetics*', 58.

39 Spingarn, *History*, 257-8.

40 Spingarn, *History*, 268.

In the same passage, and elsewhere, Spingarn demonstrated his point with proof 'beyond doubt' that Sidney had borrowed extensively from Minturno's *De Poeta*, which despite later challenges in detail[41] inaugurated a long line of similar source studies that over the course of the twentieth century would add Amyot's preface to Plutarch's *Lives*,[42] Plato, specifically Serranus's Latin translation of 1578,[43] various neo-Platonists including Proclus,[44] and Robortello and a changing cast eventually collapsed into 'various Italian theorists',[45] to Sidney's already clear debts to Castelvetro and Scaliger.[46]

Spingarn's arguments rapidly became mainstream. Within three years, Saintsbury judged Spingarn decisively victorious over Symonds on the matter of Italian influence; two years after that, G. Gregory Smith recorded in his classic anthology of Elizabethan critical essays that 'whatever objections may be taken to the detailed evidence advanced by enthusiasts for the Italian origin of Elizabethan criticism, there can be no doubt as to the

41 Spingarn's proof (*History*, 268n2) was based on a comparison of the 'list of poets' in *Defence* 74.16-75.21, with Minturno, *De Poeta* (Venice, 1559), 14-15. In fact, about two-fifths of the names in Sidney's list do not appear in Minturno, while about half of Minturno's are not replicated in Sidney. Such lists were commonplace, as shortly became apparent: Frederick Morgan Padelford noted a similar list in Sébillet's *Art Poetique François* (Paris, 1548) in 'Sidney's Indebtedness to Sibilet', *JEGP* 7.1 (1908), 81-84, while affirming Sidney's general debt to Minturno; revisiting Padelford's work, Marguerite Hearsey, 'Sidney's *Defense of Poesy* and Amyot's *Preface* in North's *Plutarch*: a Relationship', *SP* 30.4 (1933), denied the possibility of proving 'specific borrowing' in this case (537-8), and J. S. P. Tatlock detailed Boccaccio's similar list in 'Bernardo Tasso and Sidney', *Italica* 12.2 (1935), 78. In broader terms, Sidney's debt to Minturno has been most extensively argued by Kenneth Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Cambridge, MA, 1935).

42 Hearsey, 'Sidney's *Defense of Poesy* and Amyot's *Preface*'; later extended in Elizabeth Story Donno, 'Old Mouse-eaten Records: History in Sidney's *Apology*', *SP* 72.3 (1975), 275-98.

43 Serious attention to Sidney's Platonism began with Irene Samuel, 'The Influence of Plato on Sir Philip Sidney's Defence of Poesy', *MLQ* 1 (1940), 383-391; Heninger, 'Sidney and Serranus' *Plato*', 146-161, investigated the close similarities first noted by Van Dorsten in 1973 (*Defence* 64) between the *Defence* and Henri Estienne's edition of Plato's *opera omnia* (Geneva, 1578), featuring Jean de Serres's Latin translation and commentary.

44 Trimpi, 'Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry*', 187-98.

45 Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 257-271, provides Robortello; the quotation is from Duncan-Jones, ed., *Sidney: Major Works* (1989), 371 (headnote to *Defence*).

46 Scaliger is named several times in the *Defence*: he was earliest noted as a source in Fox Bourne's *Memoir*, 383-4 and Flügel, *Defence* (1889), xlv.n1, and extensively in Shuckburgh, *Defence* (1891), e.g. xxxii, 85n10.6 and following notes. Castelvetro is not named, but he was first credited as the source of Sidney's framing of the three unities by Spingarn, *History*, 290. All of these discoveries were incorporated into editions of the *Defence*, most fully in Shepherd, *Defence* (1965), which in turn became an encyclopaedic source for later scholarship.

validity of the general contention'.[47] Transposing Spingarn's work directly into an English context, however, created more problems than it solved – though this may not have troubled Spingarn, who felt the methods of English as divergent from comparative literature as biology was from the history of religion.[48] The *History* circulated as a work on 'literary criticism in the Renaissance' in general – the subtitle qualifying its 'special reference' to Italy was removed in the second edition of 1908 – but despite the lip-service it paid to a division into Italian, French, and English criticism, it was nonetheless no English or French writer but 'the poet Carducci' whose letter thanking him 'in the name of Italian literature' Spingarn proudly recalled in the preface to the fifth printing.[49] Spingarn's work was in the first place an essay on Italian criticism, and only then on 'the influence of Italian criticism on the critical literature of France and England'; the Italian tradition alone was treated as generative.[50] Indeed, the structure of the book itself conflates Italy's precedence in *time* with its precedence in *status*: Spingarn's search for 'the beginnings of critical activity in Europe' cast his Italian material (part I) as the model by which light later French and English developments (parts II and III) were illuminated. Critical positions encountered in the latter parts are redacted from their more detailed paraphrases in the Italian context, formally recapitulating Spingarn's reading of literary criticism in the structure of what would become its standard history. English criticism was thus subordinate both because it was belated and because it was repetitious; indeed, Spingarn treats it as important precisely to the extent that it resembles the Italian model, which 'furnished the source of all the accepted critical doctrines of western Europe'.[51] In a

[47] George Saintsbury, *A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe from the Earliest Texts to the Present Day*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, London, 1900-1904), II.171n1; Gregory Smith, ed., *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.lxxviii.

[48] Spingarn compared the merger between Columbia's Comparative Literature and English departments in November 1910 to 'putting a professor of the history of religion in the department of biology' (Ross, *Spingarn*, 8).

[49] Spingarn, *History*, iii.

[50] *Ibid*., 147.

[51] *Ibid*., 172; cf. 254: 'its study loses in importance and perspicuity according as it is kept distinct from the consideration of the critical literature of France, and especially of Italy'.

final revenge against Victorian nationalism, the decisive account of English criticism became one primarily of Italian criticism, in which the English tradition was either a 'twice-told tale' when it followed the Italians, or merely nugatory when it departed from them.[52]

The first and most obvious of two logical fallacies latent in Spingarn's account, this is recognisably a causal fallacy: the assumption that all criticism subsequent in time to Italy's was thus its consequence, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. Of course, the 'general contention' of Italy's importance is a reasonable comparative account of literary criticism on a European scale – certainly no one would claim that criticism flourished in England as it did in Italy – but as Spingarn moves north to a more local account of England his duplex sense of precedence begins to distort his accounts of the evidence. Spingarn observes five stages of critical development in England: the first, featuring the 'purely rhetorical study of literature', was dominated by Ascham (although for his critical writing he seems 'directly indebted to the rhetorical treatises of the Italians'), and ends with Gabriel Harvey; the second was a period of classification and metrical studies, 'directly or indirectly' drawn from the Italian prosodists, including Gascoigne, Puttenham, Harvey, and Webbe; the third, a period of 'philosophical and apologetic criticism' and 'the first period of the influence of the Italian critics', is Sidney's, Harington's, and Daniel's, all of whom 'consciously or unconsciously sought aid from the critics of Italy'; the fourth, advancing into the first half of the seventeenth century and no longer 'romantic', was that of a 'strict though never servile classicism' under Jonson; and the fifth, proceeding to around 1700 and falling outside Spingarn's (and our) remit, was that of French influence under Davenant and Dryden.[53] Even allowing for haziness at his periods' borders, however, Spingarn here attempts to make a chronological and genealogical hierarchy

[52] *Ibid.*, 261: 'Those who have some acquaintance, however superficial, with the literary criticism of the Italian Renaissance will find an account of the Elizabethan theory of poetry a twice-told tale... The first four stages of English criticism have therefore little novelty or original value; and their study is chiefly important as evidence of the gradual application of the ideas of the Renaissance to English literature.'

[53] *Ibid.*, 254-60.

out of what are clearly coterminous movements. Harvey appears both in the first and the second stages; Sidney, in the third stage, was writing *before* Puttenham and Webbe in the second. And these boundaries are similarly permeable to influence: Puttenham is clearly influenced by Sidney, Sidney by Ascham, and William Scott (though Spingarn did not know of his *Model of Poesy*) by Sidney,[54] even though Ascham is in the first period, Puttenham the second, Sidney the third, and Scott would have been in the fourth. Yet Spingarn defined each of these periods according to their production of a different *kind* of criticism. And as for the continental context, Ascham's discussions at Cambridge of the *Poetics* around 1540 notably precede the work of the Italian critics to which Spingarn renders him indebted.[55] If these periods are in fact coterminous and in dialogue, English criticism and its relations to continental criticism appear rather to be a heterogeneous, complexly concurrent field of classical and mutual influence, to which Spingarn's synthetic method, superimposing precedence in time and precedence in importance, is maladapted.[56]

Nothing more decisively determined the course of the field over the next century, however, than Spingarn's account of Aristotle's *Poetics* itself. 'The first problem of Renaissance criticism', Spingarn opens, 'was the justification of imaginative literature': from Plato to the Middle Ages, literature had been judged according to 'unaesthetic' categories, 'the criteria of reality and morality'.[57] 'Until some rational answer to the objections urged against poetry in antiquity and in the Middle Ages was forthcoming, literary criticism in any true sense was impossible; and that answer came only with the recovery of Aristotle's *Poetics*', which took place first and most importantly, as we have seen, in Italy; its major period of

54 For Sidney's influence on Puttenham, see e.g. the annotations of Gregory Smith, *Defence* (1904); for Ascham's on Sidney, see e.g. the introduction to Maslen, *Defence* (2002); the discovery of Scott's *Model of Poesy*, and Sidney's influence on it, will be treated in Gavin Alexander's edition, forthcoming from Cambridge.

55 Ascham's account is treated more fully in Chapter V.

56 Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1908), I.iv: 'my own interests as a scholar happen to lie chiefly in the syntheses of literary history...'

57 Spingarn, *History*, 3-4.

influence began in 1536, with Alessandro Pazzi's Latin translation of the work, and the industry of Aristotelian aesthetics really gathered speed from the 1548 publication of Robortello's seminal commentary.[58] Yet Spingarn's Italians, French, and English spend as much time getting Aristotle wrong as they do getting him right. Fracastoro, among the earliest of Spingarn's authorities, is one of the first to explain 'what Aristotle really meant', and Castelvetro is largely in accord with 'the true Aristotelian conception', but others are not so perceptive: the moralistic Renaissance understanding of poetic justice is 'of course entirely un-Aristotelian', as 'un-Aristotelian' as Renaissance distinctions between tragedy and comedy; and in formulating the doctrine of the three unities, which for Spingarn should not rightly be called 'Aristotelian' unities, even Castelvetro bases his dramatic system on 'certain modifications and misconceptions of the Aristotelian canons'.[59] Though ostensibly writing a history of reception, Spingarn has a very fixed sense of what Aristotle and his properly 'aesthetic' treatise 'really meant'; at many points it apparently differs from what sixteenth-century critics thought Aristotle 'really meant', and what for them constituted 'true' criticism, which raises questions about the extent to which Spingarn's work should be thought of as reception history at all.

Spingarn's *Poetics*, in fact, is explicitly a *modern Poetics*, as indeed it had been for his nineteenth-century predecessors. In his essay on Pope (1756), Warton had declared that 'to attempt to understand poetry without having diligently digested this treatise, would be as absurd and impossible, as to pretend to a skill in geometry, without having studied Euclid', a judgement echoed by Lessing in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1768).[60] Even when the Victorian critics were repudiating Aristotle's baleful influence, their critical vocabulary and hermeneutic strategies remained Aristotelian: when by tragedy and comedy Collier means

[58] *Ibid.*, 15-18.

[59] *Ibid.*, 33, 44, 51-2, 64, 67, 71, 100.

[60] Joseph Warton, *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope* (London, 1756), 170; Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 2 vols. ([Leipzig], 1769) II.396 (parts 101-4, 19 April 1768).

‘theatrical productions the characters in which are intended to represent life’, and when Symonds states that the romantic playwrights were correct to think that ‘not ethical wisdom and not description, but action, was the one thing needful to their art’, both critics invoke commonly-held Aristotelian positions emphasising mimetic action above all.[61] Spingarn was of a piece with these critics: the keynote, after all, of the *History* is that it is ‘to the rediscovery of the *Poetics* that we may be said to owe the foundation of modern criticism’, and so Castelvetro, when he develops Aristotle’s ideas even further along the path they cleared – that is, develops Aristotle’s conclusions as we have developed them – is ‘in keeping with a certain modern feeling in regard to the meaning of poetic art’ and to that extent his argument has a ‘modicum of truth’.[62]

Where Spingarn differed from his predecessors was that his modern *Poetics* was just four years old, having been set out in S. H. Butcher’s still enormously influential one-volume critical edition, translation, and commentary, *Aristotle’s Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (1895). Butcher’s commentary – really a monographic work of modern Aristotelian aesthetics in its own right – is in no doubt as to what Aristotle ‘really meant’: Aristotle ‘was the first who attempted to separate the theory of aesthetics from that of morals’, and in doing so ‘severs himself decisively from the older didactic tendency of Greece’.[63] In Butcher’s Aristotle Spingarn found support for his proto-modernist thesis, heavily influenced by Benedetto Croce but not much credited in America at the time, that works of art were aesthetically autonomous, and must be valued intrinsically rather than by their impact on a viewer.[64] Spingarn’s

---

61 Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, 414; Symonds, *Shakspere’s Predecessors*, 226; cf. *Poetics*, *passim*, e.g. 1450a16-17: ‘*μέγιστον δὲ τούτων ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων σύστασις. ἡ γὰρ τραγῳδία μίμησίς ἐστιν οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ πράξεων καὶ βίου*...’ [the greatest of these [the six parts of tragedy] is the composition of actions, for the tragedy is a mimesis not of men but of actions and life...]. Symonds’s analyses of *Gorboduc* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (230-43) are similarly Aristotelian to the extent that he rates them at all.

62 Spingarn, *History*, 145, 56.

63 Butcher, *Aristotle’s Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (1895), 221-2.

64 See Van Deusen, *J. E. Spingarn*, 74ff., on Spingarn’s Crocean philosophy, and 142ff. on contemporary resistance to this thesis and its subsequent influence on the ‘New Critics’ of the 1920s and ’30s.

Renaissance Italians, therefore, freed themselves from from the older didactic tendency of the Middle Ages to the extent that they adopted Aristotelian positions, which were already opposed in Spingarn and Butcher to Horace's 'rhetorical' arguments, though not as exclusively as they later would be. These broad judgements may even seem quite reasonable, given their consonance with many interpretations of the *Poetics* over the centuries. But subsequent historiography of the field has suggested that Butcher's association of Aristotle with a purely non-didactic theory of poetry, strengthened in subsequent editions, was itself primarily responsible for 'the dissemination in English-speaking lands of the belief that Aristotle's theory is aesthetic rather than moral'; after Butcher, that view became 'almost axiomatic', substantially inventing the perception of a serious rift between Horatian and Aristotelian poetics and consequently necessitating the invention of a Renaissance 'fusion' between them.[65] Whatever the merits of the argument, Spingarn 'in general followed the interpretation' of Butcher, as acknowledged in the preface to the first edition and witnessed in numerous citations throughout the text.[66] This we might call the 'anachronistic fallacy', the second of Spingarn's methodological bequests to the field: Spingarn's test of a Renaissance writer's understanding of the *Poetics*, in essence, is whether that writer agrees with Butcher's purely aesthetic, anti-didactic, anti-rhetorical, *contra*-Horatian, post-Romantic Aristotle of 1895.

The anachronistic fallacy foreclosed discussion of a properly Renaissance Aristotle. Spingarn's application of Butcher judged Renaissance readings of the *Poetics* by the light of a tradition that had developed and cohered after and partly in response to those readings – by a

---

65 Allan H. Gilbert and H. L. Snuggs, 'On the Relation of Horace to Aristotle in Literary Criticism', *JEGP* 46 (1947), 246-7: 'Butcher is apparently responsible for the spread in English-speaking countries of an aesthetic interpretation of the *Poetics*. In America, indeed, Aristotle has been until recently, or even still is, the thinker Butcher presents in his essays; even students who have turned to the original text have tended to read it through Butcher's spectacles.' Butcher's modernity was noted with approval by James Hutton, in his translation of *Aristotle's Poetics* (New York, 1982), 33: the *Poetics* 'needs elucidation to recommend it to modern ways of thinking. This service was admirably performed by S. H. Butcher in the essays of his *Aristotle on Poetry and Fine Art*...'

66 Spingarn, *History*, vii-viii, and e.g. 47n3, 64, 75n2, 80n2, etc.

light, that is, in which they could not but appear undeveloped and incoherent. Though he made a substantial advance over the Victorians in detail, therefore, Spingarn did not make a similar advance in method. Influence still registered for him – and through him, more importantly, for his followers – as a binary, either absent or overwhelming, and his intervention thus simply replaced the 'crushing' influence of the Greek and Latin classics with that of the Italian classics. Sidney's belatedness among Italian treatises was enough to establish his total dependence on them, as well as his concomitant adherence to any errors they might be considered to have made in their own readings of Aristotle. It must be stressed that Spingarn at no point explicitly claimed that Sidney knew the Italians *instead of* the *Poetics*. Yet this was the obvious drift of a statement such as 'there is not an essential principle in the *Defence of Poesy* which cannot be traced back to some Italian treatise on the poetic art'; only very few later critics read Spingarn critically enough to note the inherent methodological problem that if this is true of the *Defence*, and if, by Spingarn's own account, there are few essential principles in the Italian treatises which *themselves* cannot be traced back to the *Poetics*, there would then be few in the *Defence* which could not be traced back to the *Poetics*.[67] Instead, the long legacy of Spingarn's causal fallacy would be to justify considering Italian parallels alone sufficient to supplant the *Poetics* as Sidney's proximate source.

Spingarn and Butcher were immediately canonised in Saintsbury's magisterial *History of Criticism and Literary Taste* and Gregory Smith's *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, though in different ways these later works proposed more nuanced models of influence. Saintsbury makes explicit his indebtedness to Butcher, a crucial resource for those 'who do not care to

[67] One of the few was Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 271: 'If what the *Apology* contains seems somewhat less than revolutionary, at least in comparison with Italian treatises, we may properly observe that no Italian except Castelvetro made astonishing strides beyond the positions taken by his predecessors. Unless we dismiss all of them as unoriginal, we may not so dismiss Sidney'. J. C. Eade, *Aristotle Anatomised: The Poetics in England, 1674-1781* (Bern, 1988), 1-2, recognised the problem posed by the lack of a 'stable point of reference' for the *Poetics*, but continued to defer to Spingarn's authority.

"grapple with whole libraries"', despite 'occasionally differing' with him as to the interpretation of the *Poetics*.[68] Saintsbury's *Poetics*, *contra* Butcher, is 'double and trebly ethical', but it is again a difference in detail and not in method, since Aristotle is still read teleologically: 'He is the very Alexander of Criticism, and his conquests in this field... remain practically undestroyed, though not unextended, to the present day'.[69] The same debts and differences characterised Saintsbury's relationship to Spingarn, whom he criticises for holding a simplistic view of the medieval 'distrust of literature', while agreeing, as would Gregory Smith, on the 'general contention' of Italian mediation.[70] Yet certain of Saintsbury's comments do suggest tacit differences in method from Spingarn and the Victorians, especially on the matter of indebtedness: 'after all,' he asked in a later edition, 'in the vulgar sense of "originality," how much original criticism is there in the world?'[71] Where previously the controlling metaphor for literary influence was 'debt', Saintsbury opts for that of 'case-law': the system of sixteenth-century English criticism seems to him to coagulate into 'a sort of general critical creed, every particular article of which would probably have been signed by no two particular persons – perhaps by no one'; it 'comes into existence by a process of haphazard accretion – by... an accumulation of individual judgements at common law'.[72] This has the advantage of answering the jurisdictional objections of the Victorian period, in which Saintsbury still had one foot, stressing the 'native' English system of literary legislation in contradistinction to the constitutionalism of Italian rules; its demerit is 'inconsistency and apparent irrationality', still recognisably Victorian concerns.[73] Nonetheless, it brilliantly suggests a model adaptive to the unruly accidence of English criticism, and at least gestures towards a criticism in process of becoming rather than judged by neo-classical retrospect.

[68] Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, I.38n1, 31n2.

[69] *Ibid.*, I.37, 59.

[70] *Ibid.*, II.3n1, 8, 61.

[71] Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, 2nd ed. (1902-4), II.209n1.

[72] Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, II.215, 230-234.

[73] *Ibid.*, 234.

Dispensing with these remnants of Victorian debates, Gregory Smith went even further than Saintsbury towards embracing the unruliness of English criticism. Saintsbury's 'predilection for theoretic criticism' had been noted in a contemporary review, and his disdain for the controversialist roots of works like Sidney's, indeed for 'the obscure, dull, and disgusting history of these literary squabbles' more recently labelled 'combative criticism' by Colin Burrow, was everywhere plain to see.[74] For Gregory Smith, however, whose introduction at about eighty pages was effectively the first non-comparative monograph on the subject, 'Elizabethan criticism arose in controversy' and should not be measured by 'later experience' of neo-classical canons.[75] By including such *ad hoc* texts as Lodge's response to Gosson, Nash's prefaces to Greene's *Menaphon* and *Astrophil and Stella*, and Harvey's correspondence with Spenser, as well as the more canonical theoretical works of Sidney and Puttenham, Gregory Smith's anthology both argued and manifested this inductive approach to the English tradition. Where Spingarn has 'debt', and Saintsbury has 'case-law', Gregory Smith supplies 'experiment', the critical polemics and controversies representing 'the laboratory experience of independent workers in a young science'.[76] Ever sensitive to the anachronism of projecting orthodoxy across from the continent, or backwards from the seventeenth century, Gregory Smith even admits a model of classical imitation closer to those of Renaissance, one that was truer as it adapted, rather than adopted direct.[77]

Yet on the question of English knowledge of Aristotle, Gregory Smith's foundational

---

[74] John White Chadwick, 'The Rev. John White Chadwick's Impression of Vol. II of Saintsbury's Work on Literary Taste', *New York Times*, Dec. 6, 1902; Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, II.92; Burrow, 'Combative Criticism'. Saintsbury's distaste for controversy betrays his late-Victorian roots: cf. Vaughan, *English Literary Criticism*, '[the *Apology*] was not written for controversy, but for truth' (xvi-xvii); Ernest Rhys, *Literary Pamphlets Chiefly Relating to Poetry from Sidney to Byron*, 2 vols. (London, 1897), 'Sidney disdained the meaner parts of the pamphleteer's equipment, so freely used by Gosson, Lodge, and the rest' (I.14).

[75] Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.xiv.

[76] *Ibid.*, I, xii, xxxvii, xli.

[77] *Ibid.*, I, xl, xlix, lxi (anachronistic orthodoxy), lii (classicism); for a still valuable outline of Renaissance models of *imitatio*, see G. W. Pigman III, 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance', *RQ* 33.1 (1980), 1-32, and cf. *Scholemaster*: 'this *Imitatio*, is *dissimilis materei similis tractatio*: and also, *similis materei dissimilis tractatio*' (47), discussed further in Chapter V.

account of English criticism declared the record thin. Of the ten or twelve passages based on the *Poetics* apparent in his anthology, Gregory Smith found that 'only a few imply any knowledge of the text or discuss its doctrine'; nearly all of those occur in the *Defence*, but 'there is a suspicion even in these that Sidney had reached Aristotelian theory in a roundabout way'.[78] Sidney has the credit of introducing Aristotle to English criticism, but his discussion of the unities, for example, 'derives its importance from its relationship to recent Italian views rather than to the original'. Among other writers, needless to say, the record was even thinner: Harington 'merely alludes', Webbe's allusions are 'accidental' and 'valueless', Puttenham 'does not seem to have known the *Poetics*', and Daniel's reference is at 'second-hand'. Instead it is Horace, present but not cited, who stands behind 'much that stands to the credit of Aristotle', cited but not present.[79] Here the vocabulary of much twentieth-century criticism – 'knowledge of the text', 'recent Italian views', 'suspicion', 'rather than the original', 'second-hand' – is first aired. Despite Gregory Smith's generally inductive method, his model of Aristotle's *Poetics* and its influence is nonetheless deductively parallel to Spingarn's anachronistic fallacy: it is still possible, even usual, for a writer anthologised by Gregory Smith to get Aristotle wrong, rather than contribute to whatever it meant in the sixteenth century to get Aristotle right. Indeed, so comprehensive was Spingarn's account of Renaissance criticism that it was coming to substitute for the primary sources altogether. When Gregory Smith claims that 'it is open to any one to dispute Sidney's debt in each case, but we cannot escape the lesson of the whole body, even if they are only possibilities', and when Saintsbury allows a 'general critical creed' every particular article of which may have been signed by no one at all, they betray what was actually written in the Renaissance, the usual standards of proof demanded in its analysis, and their own inductive methods, in the name of agreement with the overview given by a single, powerful work of turn-of-the-century

[78] Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.lxxiii-iv.

[79] *Ibid.*, I.lxxiv-v.

scholarship.

Saintsbury's work proved too backward-facing and general in scope to be more than referentially useful to the more specialised scholarship to come, but it could reasonably be argued that in the remaining triumvirate – Butcher, Spingarn, and Gregory Smith – most of the methods and texts had been mapped out that would determine the shape of later twentieth-century criticism. Butcher was the touchstone for literary scholars on the *Poetics*, Spingarn on continental criticism, Gregory Smith on English criticism, and each reinforced the findings of the others. In fact, this was fellow-work of the most influential kind, a little Erasmian reformation of the field: with the exception of the American Spingarn, the works of Butcher, Saintsbury, and Gregory Smith all issued within the space of few years from Edinburgh, where Butcher held the chair of Greek from 1882-1903, Saintsbury that of Rhetoric and English Literature from 1895-1915, and Gregory Smith lectured in English from 1892-1905.[80] Yet Gregory Smith's example also prefigures the disciplinary blind spots this triumvirate would bequeath to the specialist scholarship to come. Spingarn's *History* came as a package: it spoke for England to scholars of continental criticism, for the continent to scholars of English criticism, and for Butcher's Aristotle to all of them. Thus when scholars of continental criticism came to develop more inductive accounts of the Aristotelian inheritance primary to their field, they neglected its derivative treatment in England on Spingarn's authority; and when scholars of English criticism developed more inductive accounts of theirs, they maintained Spingarn's anachronistic model of a fixed Aristotle received first in Italy, which English writers could only either fail to comprehend, or comprehend derivatively.

Over the next twenty-five years Spingarn's presence was ubiquitous. He himself extended his studies to Jonson's borrowings (and consequent lack of originality) in 1905, and

[80] For Butcher and Saintsbury, see *ODNB*; for Gregory Smith, see Felicitas Corrigan, *Helen Waddell: A Biography* (London, 1986), 72-4. Though the frontrunner to inherit Saintsbury's chair in 1915, Gregory Smith was passed over for Herbert Grierson. Saintsbury's second (Renaissance) volume emerged in 1902, giving notice of Gregory Smith's forthcoming anthology of 1904 (*History of Criticism*, II.144n1).

reinforced his narrative in an anthology of seventeenth-century criticism which continued where Gregory Smith's left off.[81] But the secondary influence of his methods and broad narrative over the field was even more notable. The sections surveying the *Poetics* and its reception in J. E. Sandys's *History of Classical Scholarship* were mostly a crib of Spingarn's *History*, and lent it a leading classicist's *imprimatur*;[82] Friedland's account of the dramatic unities in England drew extensively on Spingarn's book and personal help, and consequently 'the true lesson of Aristotle's example was lost' on his Renaissance critics.[83] Spingarn himself remarked in 1909 that 'all the world knows' how the Italians passed the legacy of classical poetics to France, France to 'Stuart England', and it seems he was right: Donald Lemen Clark remarked in 1922 that 'no writer today, who would treat of the criticism of the renaissance, can escape his deep indebtedness to Dr. Joel Elias Spingarn' (and, indebtedly, referred Sidney more than once to 'the Aristotelian theories of the Italian critics').[84] Elsewhere, Sidney's linguistic access to the *Poetics* began to be questioned: in an edition of the *Defence* and a set of lectures at Birmingham, John Churton Collins sent Sidney directly to Latin translations of the *Poetics*,[85] and Wallace's great biography confirmed that he never acquired more than a smattering of Greek, though exhibiting 'a perfect familiarity with Aristotle and Scaliger'.[86] Yet even in translation 'a first-hand knowledge of Aristotle... seems to have been exceptional', as J. W. Draper put in in 1921. Doubt had been seeded, and by the 1920s it was commonplace

---

81 Spingarn, 'The Sources of Jonson's "Discoveries"', *Modern Philology* 2.4 (1905), 460; Jonson declared unoriginal in Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, xix.

82 Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II.133-5, 188.

83 L. S. Friedland, 'The Dramatic Unities in England', *JEGP* 10 (1911), 64; cf. 59, 60, 68, 70.

84 William Temple, *Sir William Temple's Essays on Ancient and Modern Learning and on Poetry*, ed. Joel Spingarn (Oxford, 1909), iv; Clark, *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance: A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism* (New York, 1922), vii, 83-6, cf. 160.

85 Churton Collins, *Defence* (1907), xxiv; *Greek Influence on English Poetry*, 88. Since there is no internal evidence to suggest a Latin source for Sidney rather than a Greek, Churton Collins's judgement probably derives from his view of the depressed state of Greek at the time (46, 58); he appears not to have read Gregory Smith closely, though in the preface he acknowledges the use of Gregory Smith's text, since he wonders at the source of Sidney's attribution to Aristotle of the opinion that poets were 'ancient treasurers of the Grecians' divinity', identified as Boccaccio in Gregory Smith, *Defence* (1904), I, lxxix and 402n206.6.

86 Wallace, *The Life of Sir Philip Sidney*, 43, 239.

to direct any reference to Aristotle to the nearest Italian mediator despite the fact that, still, the evidence for this belief was primarily the structure of Spingarn's *History*.[87]

In fact, more English sources pertaining to the *Poetics* were then coming to light. A slender book on the *Poetics* by Lane Cooper, a professor at Cornell University, introduced some of these in 1923: Cooper noted references in Roger Bacon, Martin Bucer's *De Honestis Ludis* (presented to Edward VI in 1551), and an extended treatment of imitation in *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie for Nobilitye and Gentlemen* (1570), a translation of Sturm's *Ad Werteres fratres nobilitas literata* (Strassburg, 1549) by Thomas Browne of Lincoln's Inn (though attributed in Cooper's time to Thomas Blundeville), none of them known to Spingarn's generation.[88] These and more – notably Bruno's discussion in *De Gli Eroici Furori* (1585) – were shortly incorporated as 'commentaries and allusions' into Cooper's collaboration with Alfred Gudeman, *A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle* (1928), which remained standard until Omert Schrier's bibliography of 1998.[89] Yet even as the canon of the English *Poetics* was beginning to take shape, Spingarn's model maintained overall dominance. Cooper expresses his great debts to Spingarn, Saintsbury, and Gregory Smith, and defers throughout to 'Aristotle as interpreted by the Italians'; when Castelvetro asserts his independence, Cooper's teleological reading of Aristotle is evident in his comment that the Italian 'understands Aristotle almost as well as we do'.[90]

Cooper's single chapter on England was the fullest account of the English *Poetics* thus

87 J. W. Draper, 'Aristotelian "Mimesis" in Eighteenth-century England', *PMLA* 36.3 (1921), 373 (with reference to the seventeenth century).

88 Cooper, *The Poetics of Aristotle*, 131-4. The title page of *A ritch Storehouse* names the translator as 'T. B. Gent.', identified by Arthur Henry Bullen in the first edition of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, 66 vols. (London, 1885-1901), as Thomas Blundeville, 'writer on horsemanship' and of numerous other instructional, mathematical, and logical manuals. The translator's dedicatory letter to Lord Philip Howard, Earl of Surrey, however, is signed 'Thomas Browne, from Lyncolnes Inne' (sig. A.2^{v}), to whom the work has since been attributed. See Tessa Beverley, 'Blundeville, Thomas (1522?-1606?)', and L. G. Kelly, 'Brown, Thomas (fl. 1570)', *ODNB*.

89 Cooper and Gudeman, *A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle*, nos. 431, 434, 452, 461, 464, 471, 487, 494, 504, 529, 531. Cooper had already acknowledged Gudeman's influence in his *Poetics of Aristotle*, ix.

90 Cooper, *The Poetics of Aristotle*, 109-12.

far. His lasting impact on the field, however, was made through his direction at Cornell of the doctoral thesis of Marvin T. Herrick, completed in 1925 and published in 1930 as *The Poetics of Aristotle in England*, to this day the only monographic treatment of the subject.[91] By its publication Herrick had already begun to expand the archive of references to the *Poetics* in two essays, adding a letter of Sir John Cheke's and charting the somewhat parallel fortunes of the *Rhetoric* in the same period.[92] These and Cooper's findings were then gathered together in the first chapter of his book, covering the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, where Herrick examined Aristotle's English influence not only in greater detail than had yet been essayed, but also with what appeared to be a more liberal understanding of the many forms such influence might take and the many routes along which it might travel: 'since the question of Aristotle's influence upon English writers is inextricably bound up with innumerable intermediate translations, commentaries, and criticisms, Latin, Italian, Dutch, French, and German', Herrick aimed to discover 'who in England has known and used the *Poetics* and the Aristotelian doctrines of poetry, whatever the direct sources of information may have been – Greek text, translation, commentary, criticism, or even hearsay'.[93] On this basis Herrick proposed a fuller account of the Cheke-Ascham circle at Cambridge, reaching out as far as men such as Walter Haddon, and bringing in the criticism of Sturm; added to the record Robert Peterson's translation of Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo*, in which he found 'an intelligent expression of the Aristotelian tragic *catharsis*'; and fleshed out the references already noted from Harvey to Harington.[94]

Herrick's book, therefore, might be seen as the fruition of Gregory Smith's inductive approach to English criticism, gathering evidence wherever it lay. But like Gregory Smith,

---

[91] Herrick, *The Poetics of Aristotle in England*, vii: 'Professor Cooper has already outlined the subject in chapter 12 of his book... it was at his suggestion that I attempt a more detailed treatment'.

[92] Herrick, 'Sir John Cheke and Aristotle's Poetics'; 'The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England'.

[93] Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 6.

[94] *Ibid.*, 15-19.

too, Herrick represented his English critics as mostly ignorant of the Aristotle they cited. So Browne's translation of Sturm makes frequent mention of Plato and Aristotle on *mimesis*, 'but here again is meant emulation, a copying of the patterns of the ancients'; by the mid-century, Italian critics were studying classical structure, 'but the scanty allusions to Greek poetical theory in England were hardly more than echoes from the Continent'; Lodge cites Aristotle on men's delight in imitation, but 'when he adds, however, that "it were good to bring those things on stage that were altogether tending to virtue," we see that, as usual, the Horatian influence is much the more important'; Webbe's 'first-hand knowledge' is made doubtful by the fact that he is a 'consistently unoriginal person', and 'in any case, however, a reading of the *Discourse of English Poetrie* readily shows that the author failed to grasp a single one of the important principles in Aristotle's treatise'; Puttenham's treatise is significant, 'but not a guide book for the student of Aristotle'.[95] Yet Herrick's 'buts' and 'howevers' are ventured in almost every case on the basis of no firm evidence at all, beyond the fact that England came after Italy in Spingarn's *History*. When Herrick asserts that England's 'scanty allusions' were 'hardly more than echoes from the Continent', he not only fails to provide any particular continental source for those echoes that could be reliably proven to exclude the *Poetics* itself, but also seems to feel the number of references that were *not* made in England somehow to impinge on the nature of the references that *were* made; as though Puttenham's *Treatise* would have needed to be a 'guide book', registering the influence of the *Poetics* in every part, in order to register the influence of the *Poetics* at all.

The working assumptions of this totalising paradigm are immediately recognisable. Vives lectured at Oxford, Herrick recalls, and elsewhere shows a knowledge of the *Poetics*, but 'the chief interest in the critical treatises of Aristotle, however, seems to have turned to the *Rhetoric* rather than the *Poetics*, for Oxford was still more devoted to logic than poetry'.[96]

[95] *Ibid.*, 8-34.

[96] *Ibid.*, 22. Oxford's devotion is hardly surprising, considering the content and purpose of a university arts

Rhetoric and logic are here imagined as antagonistic to poetry and the *Poetics*: so much so that reading the *Rhetoric*, or being devoted to logic, is apparently exclusive of a reading of or devotion to the *Poetics*. But we have seen the *Poetics* in use in the context of lectures on rhetoric at Oxford, and there were perfectly respectable sixteenth-century traditions classifying the *Poetics* under logic; and besides, the boundaries between logic and rhetoric in any case lost their distinction over the course of the century through their various post-Agricolan reformulations as *artes disserendi*. Logic and rhetoric were certainly not antagonistic to the Renaissance *Poetics*; the motive for Herrick's antithesis is rather that logic and rhetoric were antagonistic to his *Poetics*, and Cooper's and Spingarn's and Butcher's, since the *Poetics*, as everyone knew, contained within it the modern principles of aesthetic autonomy and nothing else.

This, finally, may be thought of as the exclusive fallacy, and as codified by Herrick for English criticism it served to calcify Spingarn's earlier anachronistic and causal fallacies into the rigid methodological exoskeleton that now supports the field. Here Aristotle's positions (always in their modern form) are treated as so revelatorily self-evident that only the exclusion of all other aesthetic principles is sufficient to prove their influence; the presence of other interpretations of Aristotle, or ideas drawn from alternative poetic theories, are thus taken only to imply a *Poetics* misunderstood or adulterated. According to the exclusive fallacy, Aristotle is either everywhere or nowhere. This argument appears everywhere from Herrick's 1930 denial of Puttenham's knowledge of the *Poetics* on the grounds that the *Arte* was 'not a guide book' to Aristotle, and of Harvey's because, after all, 'if he knew the Poetics, why did he not himself make more use of it?', to Henry Turner's 2006 objection that Jonson's second-hand *Poetics* 'never fully displaced' the Roman rhetorical tradition; from Gregory Smith's 1904 indebting of Sidney's unities to 'recent Italian views *rather than* to the original',

degree was a training in logic; cf. Chapter III.

to Reisner's 2010 denial of Sidney's first-hand reading of the *Poetics* in favour of 'only a summary of its ideas in a number of possible Italian sources'.[97]

Herrick moreover simplified the theoretical map somewhat by making Horace's *Ars poetica* a shorthand, as it was already becoming in Spingarn and Cooper, for all the ethical, rhetorical, didactic, 'unaesthetic' antitheses to Aristotle's perceived meaning. Cooper's classical Renaissance was 'essentially Latin... moral, rhetorical, Ciceronian'; Horace was also 'a conservative Roman'; and 'so the commentators on the *Poetics*... remained at heart Horatian'.[98] 'The mutual influence or antagonism of these traditions would require an elaborate discussion', Cooper concludes; 'the subject possibly is too complex to be resolved.'[99] Just as he developed his teacher's work on the *Poetics* in England, Herrick would take the exclusive fallacy to great lengths in an influential later work on the 'fusion' of Aristotelian and Horatian currents in mid-century continental criticism, cited ever since as final confirmation that the Renaissance *Poetics* was constitutionally impure and as explanatory context for the apparently aberrant rhetorical readings given it by Renaissance critics.[100] This later work would prompt a careful, detailed review by Alan Gilbert and H. L. Snuggs, one of the few inductive accounts to be found of Renaissance Aristotelian poetics. Gilbert and Snuggs argued that even the hypothesis that there was a 'fusion' of (aesthetic) Aristotelian and (ethico-rhetorical) Horatian criticism anachronistically presupposes an

---

[97] *Ibid.*, 30; Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 86; Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.lxxiv (my emphasis); Reisner, 'The Paradox of Mimesis', 334.

[98] Cooper, *The Poetics of Aristotle*, 103.

[99] *Ibid.*, 105.

[100] Herrick, *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555* (Urbana, 1946). Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*, took issue with Herrick's method but substantially agreed with his conclusions (111ff.); Herrick is still widely cited as shorthand for the 'fusion' hypothesis in, to name only standard works in the field, broad surveys, e.g., Nicholas Cronk, 'Aristotle, Horace, and Longinus: the Conception of Reader Response', 201, Javitch, 'The Assimilation of Aristotle's *Poetics* in Sixteenth-Century Italy', 56, and George K. Hunter, 'Elizabethan Theatrical Genres and Literary Theory', 254, all in *CHLC-III*; anthologies of English criticism, e.g. Vickers, *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 53-4; commentaries on the *Poetics*, e.g. Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics*, 296, and editions that touch, however briefly, on its reception, e.g. Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 40n187; and innumerable essays on particular topics touching on how, in Vickers's phrase, 'in general Aristotelian ideas became absorbed into the dominant rhetoricized poetics'.

antagonism between them, which before Butcher's Aristotle was never really present. Vincenzo Maggi, for example, 'felt no distinction between the didactic theory of the *Ars Poetica* and the didactic notions he attributed to its supposed source'; Horace was widely thought to have derived his theory from Aristotle, as indeed Gilbert and Snuggs argue he may well have, and the *Poetics* itself 'has enough of a didactic tinge' to enable it to be read quite legitimately to those ends.[101] Gilbert and Snuggs's Aristotle, in other words, 'came to the sixteenth century to enrich and not to destroy'; he does not represent one faction, Horace the other, in a zero-sum game of gladiatorial aesthetics. But as early as 1930 Herrick had substantially allied the perceived antagonism between Horatian and Aristotelian poetics to the widely-accepted continent-wide failure adequately to understand Aristotle, by which England was infected in turn: 'from the first these English interpretations of Aristotle's theories were hopelessly adulterated with Horatian maxims and Continental scholarship, first with Italian, then with Dutch, and finally, and most influential of all, with French'.[102] Gilbert and Snuggs's objections sat uncomfortably within this larger entrenched narrative, and received none of the attention given Herrick's work; the typical Elizabethan critic remained, in Herrick's words, one who 'seldom tried to discriminate between Horace and Aristotle, and usually trusts to the Italian critics for his knowledge of the latter'.[103]

Though Herrick compiled much new evidence for English usage of the *Poetics* that had not been united before, he seems not to entertain the possibility that his findings might have challenged the earlier paradigm of Aristotle's small and mediated influence had they been known to scholars of Spingarn's generation. That paradigm was set by the time Herrick

[101] Gilbert and Snuggs, 'On the Relation of Horace to Aristotle in Literary Criticism', 240, and on Butcher cf. n65, above.

[102] Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 34.

[103] *Ibid.*, 31. Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics*, 295-7, is one of very few to cite Gilbert and Snuggs alongside Herrick. In 1988 J. C. Eade still felt Herrick did not go far enough in making it clear that 'right from the beginning of European commentary on it in late fifteenth-century Italy, the *Poetics* never stood a chance of being interpreted on its own terms' (*Aristotle Anatomised*, 2).

joined the argument, and he was not a thinker forceful enough to oppose the consensus. Yet it must be stressed that in the cases of Cheke and Sidney Herrick made explicit exceptions to his standard model of a 'hopelessly adulterated' *Poetics*. Cheke's direct knowledge could be seen in his citation of Aristotle on diction, and was circumstantially attested by Ascham; when it comes to Sidney – though he 'could not fully comprehend' the central principle of organic unity, and though the *Defence* was a 'typical blend of Aristotle and Horace, with a good measure of Plato thrown in', and though it was, as Spingarn had it, an 'epitome of literary criticism in the Renaissance', and though 'with the other Elizabethan apologists and defenders of poetry... the evidence usually points to second-hand information, or worse' – when it comes to Sidney, nonetheless, 'one hesitates to doubt the first-hand knowledge of the treatise'.[104] Herrick's critics, that is, travel in two classes: Sidney and Cheke (and later Jonson), who 'probably examined the actual text of the treatise', and the other Elizabethan critics, for whom the evidence suggests only 'second-hand information'.[105]

Given this clear distinction, the extraordinary misrepresentations to which Herrick has been subjected, in the scholarly literature quoted in the introduction to this thesis, can only represent either casual or wilful misreading. Noam Reisner cites Herrick in direct support of the view, first, that 'Sidney most likely never read the *Poetics* first hand', seemingly oblivious to the fact that this is precisely the opposite of what Herrick says about Sidney, and second, that Sidney 'would not have had access [at Oxford] to the *Poetics*', apparently reading Herrick's remarks on Oxford's greater interest in logic as a transparent and exclusive account of the contents of its bookshelves.[106] Ronald A. Horton's citation in the *Spenser Encyclopedia* similarly elides the crucial distinction between Sidney and his contemporaries to imply that though the *Defence* was 'the first treatise in English to make substantial use of the *Poetics*',

[104] Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 16-17, 24-29.

[105] *Ibid.*, 35, 29.

[106] Reisner, 'The Paradox of Mimesis', 334.

Sidney's own knowledge, like that of Spenser and the rest, was second hand, 'adulterated by syncretists and systematizers'.[107] Henry Turner cites Herrick for the opinion that Sidney, Cheke, Ascham, and, 'somewhat surprisingly', Thomas Blundeville were 'the only sixteenth-century English writers possibly acquainted with the *Poetics* directly', although he judges that 'in each case the evidence finally remains inconclusive', despite the fact that Herrick's evidence that other Elizabethan critics were *not* directly acquainted with the *Poetics* is just as inconclusive; he locates the evidence for Blundeville's acquaintance with the *Poetics* in *The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories* (1574), 'somewhat surprisingly', because Herrick found it in *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie for Nobilitye and Gentlemen* (1575), since reascribed to Thomas Browne;[108] and later insists that 'Jonson's awareness of Aristotle is at second or even at third hand' through Heinsius, despite Herrick's accurate description of Heinsius's work as a translation as well as commentary, and ascription of first-hand knowledge to Jonson.[109] Apparently Turner considers Herrick a reliable source only when he denies knowledge of the *Poetics* and not when he confirms it. Moreover, it appears that Herrick's exclusive paradigm, among his critical heirs, overshadowed both his local conclusions and the positive evidence he brought to light. Thus Brian Vickers has the *Poetics* 'used virtually for the first time in English' by Sidney, despite the primary evidence to the contrary that might be found in Herrick, and cites Herrick directly on the matter of its 'slow reception', a trope apparently originated by Herrick in an essay of 1926 and echoed by Burrow and Reisner as well.[110] Herrick was easy to paraphrase at a distance as the culmination

[107] Horton, 'Aristotle and his Commentators', 58-9.

[108] Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage*, 85; cf. Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 18 on Blundeville, who Herrick agrees did not know Aristotle despite the extensive discussion of imitation in his translation of Sturm. Since *A ritch Storehouse* is no longer listed in modern bibliographies such as *ESTC* under Blundeville, it is possible that Turner thought Herrick's title, rather than his author, cited in error. It is thus not at all surprising that Turner should find no evidence of Blundeville's acquaintance with the *Poetics* in *The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories*, which makes no mention of imitation, but somewhat surprising that he should cite Herrick on the matter, who in effect makes no mention of Blundeville.

[109] Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage*, 276; cf. Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 37, 45.

[110] Vickers, *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 11 and n16; Herrick, 'The Early History of Aristotle Rhetoric in England', 253 ('Aristotle's day was coming, but his conquest in England was slow'), cf. *Poetics*

of a thirty-year entrenchment of opinion since Spingarn: fossilised, his work presented a much more unexceptional account of the 'hopelessly adulterated' *Poetics* in England, and its finer details were lost in the 'general contention'.

Back in the 1930s and '40s, meanwhile, Sidney's use of Italian intermediaries at least, if not that of other Elizabethans, still was not often declared exclusive of the original *Poetics* outright, even if the interpolation of those intermediaries had widely become reflex. Though his 'expositions and illustrations of classical theory and practice are in the main derivative', nonetheless, for Mona Wilson, Sidney 'had certainly read Aristotle and Horace'.[111] Marcus Goldman was aware that 'one may exaggerate in opposing the Italians to the ancients', and found 'nothing unreasonable in assuming that when Sidney sat down to write, he had a Horace and an Aristotle on his table beside a Minturno and a Scaliger, and that he turned from the ancient to the modern and again from the modern to the ancient'.[112] Kenneth Myrick, perhaps the strongest voice in arguing Sidney's debt to Minturno, clearly imagined Sidney reading the Italian critics alongside Aristotle, as did J. W. H. Atkins, and granted him the Greek to do so; John Buxton's Sidney 'knew the *Poetics* through and through'.[113] And Cornell March Dowlin, one of the most clear-sighted critics both of Spingarn's causal and Herrick's exclusive fallacies, took aim at 'statements which too casually assign an Italian source for any parallels that appear in the *Apology*' on methodological grounds: to say, as Spingarn did, that

of Aristotle in England, 17 ('the modern assimilation of the *Poetics* has been a long process'); Burrow, 'Combative Criticism', 487 ('the criticism of Aristotle and Horace was slow to naturalize in England'); Reisner, 'The Paradox of Mimesis', 331 ('the slow recovery of Aristotle's *Poetics* through several influential Italian commentaries'). Such views exhibit the exclusive fallacy inasmuch as they expect the *Poetics* necessarily to operate as a revelatory scripture, the reading of which can only register as wholesale and exclusive adoption.

[111] Mona Wilson, *Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1931), 156-7.

[112] Marcus Selden Goldman, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia* (Urbana, 1934), 68n74. Goldman was unusually alert to methodological issues, cautioning that 'the possession or even use of a translation did not indicate ignorance of the original language in the sixteenth century any more than it does now'; one suspects the investigation he deemed necessary of 'the whole question of the sources of the *Defence*' would have been most enlightening, but he ceded to the prior claim of his fellow-student Constance Syford, who was already working on the subject, and wrote his doctoral thesis instead on the *Defence*'s relationship to the *Arcadia*. Syford died in 1965 with her Ph.D., now Yale University Library, MS 1134, unfinished.

[113] Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman*, 95-7, 108; Atkins, *English Literary Criticism*, 116-27, 345; Buxton, *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (London, 1954), 146.

the *Defence* was an epitome of Italian Renaissance criticism, to Dowlin's eye 'claims only that Sidney's thinking and that of the Italians coincide to a remarkable degree and not that Sidney's theories are derived exclusively or nearly so from the Italians'.[114]

Dowlin's essay, to be sure, was a reaction against the critical mainstream, the consensus inherited from Spingarn through Gregory Smith and Herrick, but when it came out in 1944 that mainstream opinion differed in one crucial respect from today's: Dowlin could still reasonably claim that 'no one doubts that Sidney had read Minturno's *De Poeta*, but no one doubts that he had also read Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's *Poetics*.'[115] Yet twenty-five years later, Morris Partee could revisit Dowlin's claim that Sidney read Plato and Aristotle with the qualification that 'unfortunately, no proof for this conjecture exists'.[116] As much of this criticism as I have read, it remains a mystery to me how the centre of critical gravity moved from Dowlin's premises to Partee's, from an eclectic model to an exclusive, except through the vague entropy of received opinion. No substantial evidence-based historical work had been done since Herrick on the reception of the *Poetics* in England; when Stephen Halliwell included a chapter on the *Poetics*'s *Nachleben* in his 1986 commentary, the authorities were still Cooper, Spingarn, and Herrick.[117] There is no smoking gun. The post-war proliferation of published criticism, for that matter, filled the field with smoke to the point at which it ceased to be a reliable indicator either of the presence or the location of a gun. Given the absence of any scholarly work venturing historical evidence (rather than mere calcified suspicion) that Sidney and other Englishmen did *not* know the *Poetics* directly, I can only conjecture some possible routes by which that opinion might have evolved.

Firstly, any progress that had been made towards an inductive history of the *Poetics* in

---

[114] Dowlin, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 257-8.

[115] *Ibid.*, 266.

[116] Morriss Henry Partee, 'Sir Philip Sidney and the Renaissance Knowledge of Plato', *English Studies* 51.5 (1970), 414; Partee's particular target is the *Republic*, but his qualification of Dowlin holds equally for the *Poetics*.

[117] Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics*, 287n1, 292n14, 308n36.

England, however modest and oppositional, was set back by the work of Bernard Weinberg. This may seem a counter-intuitive proposition: Weinberg's encyclopaedic *History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* did more than any other single work to recover the fine detail of Italian *seicento* criticism as it exhumed the texts of Plato, Aristotle, and Horace, and moreover said nothing at all about England. But for just those reasons, when it came to England Weinberg's work was Spingarn redux. Precisely because Weinberg's history was more encyclopaedic than Spingarn's – Weinberg criticised Spingarn for his 'limited bibliography' of only thirty or so sources, where he considers hundreds – it was all the more readily accepted as the final word on the matter of Aristotle's place as the 'signal event' in the development of literary criticism.[118] If Weinberg didn't mention it, it wasn't worth mentioning; and, never mind that his book was explicitly limited to Italy, Weinberg did not mention England. Given Weinberg's enormous subsequent influence on the field, that alone was sufficient to cement England's ignorance of the *Poetics* for decades to come.

For all the finer detail in which he described its Italian reception, moreover, and for all that his Renaissance was 'not a period of intellectual purity and orderliness', Weinberg's Aristotle was prescriptive even more anachronistically than Spingarn's and exclusively than Herrick's. For Weinberg, the theory of the *Poetics* is 'not a rhetorical one', because whatever audience it imagines is 'general and universal', not a particular situated audience apt to be affected by the 'particular effect of persuasion'; its sense of 'imitation' is not Horace's verisimilitude, but an expression of 'relationships of a strictly structural character'.[119] The authorities cited for further explanation of these positions – Ronald S. Crane, Richard P. McKeon, and Elder Olson – also appear as the dedicatees of the book as a whole, and with

[118] Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*, vii, 349.

[119] *Ibid.*, 351-2. Even Brian Vickers, himself an outspoken proponent of the view that 'the major commentaries on the *Poetics* in the Italian sixteenth century are all basically rhetorical', found Weinberg's antithesis between Horace and Aristotle 'too extreme': 'Rhetoric and Poetics' in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Schmitt *et al.*, 720.

Weinberg constituted the school of 'Chicago Aristotelians'. This group of mid-century critics revived Aristotle for active use in literary analysis, finding in him the tools, as Weinberg's analysis suggests, for a strictly structural approach to literature, asking 'by what means can a poem of a given kind be made as beautiful as possible, so that it will produce the proper artistic effect?'[120] What the Renaissance Aristotle looked like under this regime is apparent from Weinberg's work throughout the 1950s. Weinberg was particularly affronted by what he saw as Renaissance commentators' 'habits of fragmentation and methodological anarchy', their readings of the work 'in the light of a rhetorical tradition', their enthronement of Aristotle as 'a kind of Ur-Horace', and their attempts to '"modernize" Aristotle, to adapt him to their own times and their own peoples': on these grounds, though they thought of their theories as going back to Aristotle, 'never did they realize that their ideas would be completely unacceptable to a sound Aristotelean'.[121] Thus in 'Robortello on the *Poetics*', Weinberg found that 'the fundamental conceptions of the *Poetics* escape him'; 'unfortunately,' he comments, 'this will be the procedure for all of Robortello's successors', such as Castelvetro, who in a paired essay is found to present 'an essentially un-Aristotelian system of poetics, one which was even farther removed from the presuppositions of the original text than had been the theory contained in the commentary of Robortello'.[122]

If this is how the Italians fared, England was worse than an afterthought. Weinberg did not write directly about English criticism, but his position can be reconstructed from a review he wrote of Herrick's *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century* (1950), not a book, it should be

---

[120] Weinberg, 'From Aristotle to Pseudo-Aristotle', 98; cf. *History of Literary Criticism*, 350. The Chicago Aristotelians have been treated elsewhere; Ronald S. Crane, ed., *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern* (Chicago, 1952), and especially Crane's introduction (1-24), was effectively their manifesto. See Stephen Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics*: 'the resulting reading of the Poetics was, in the narrow sense, aesthetic and formalist, and, despite reactions against the critical stance of the Chicago school, their interpretation of Aristotle has, I believe, done much to spread the dominant modern belief that the Poetics embodies a clean separation of poetic and ethical standards' (317 and n48 for further bibliography).

[121] Weinberg, 'From Aristotle to Pseudo-Aristotle', 103-4.

[122] Weinberg, 'Robortello on the *Poetics*', 348, and 'Castelvetro's Theory of the *Poetics*', 370, both in *Critics and Criticism*, ed. Crane, 319-48., 349-71.

remarked, which itself does more than touch upon English criticism. Weinberg is entirely out of sympathy with 'certain matters of method' in Herrick's work: he holds that 'what Mr. Herrick calls "fusion" is really "confusion"', that 'the addition of disparate terms to a critical tradition, far from enriching it, tends to invalidate its whole basis of procedure'. He accuses Herrick of attributing sense to these 'confused' farragos:

> … [the book's] usefulness would have been enhanced many times had Mr. Herrick kept his central problem more clearly in mind, maintained a more objective and a more philosophical attitude toward his materials, and devoted to the central issues time and space which have been spent on matters which must be regarded, I fear, as extraneous.[123]

By 'extraneous' Weinberg refers to Herrick's tendency, as he sees it, frequently to assume 'the role of a Renaissance commentator' in his attempts to seek in Terentian comedies 'examples of the kinds of practice which the Renaissance commentators might have sought there'. Weinberg's later critique of the Renaissance commentators, that they provide 'no synthesis to correct the fragmentation, no philosophical reading of the text',[124] is thus prefigured here in his requirement of a 'more objective and more philosophical attitude' in Herrick, and is transparently revelatory of his own method. Weinberg finds Herrick's method *too* inductive, here caricatured as wholly surrendering the essence of the source text to the accidents of its transmission. For Herrick, at least as Weinberg construes him, Aristotle is a tradition rather than a text, even if we ourselves might consider his model relatively dogmatic; for Weinberg, on the other hand, a deviation from Aristotle results in not-Aristotle, and, as Howard Cole admitted, 'it is certainly preferable to believe that the wise and witty Sidney and Harington knew Aristotle secondhand, than that they knew him directly and then wrote nonsense'.[125] Like Spingarn's, therefore, Weinberg's great work remains a study of 'reception', even in

[123] Weinberg, review of Herrick, *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century*, *Modern Philology* 48.4 (1951), 271-3.

[124] Weinberg, 'From Aristotle to Pseudo-Aristotle', 99.

[125] Howard C. Cole, *A Quest of Inquirie: Some Contexts of Tudor Literature* (Indianapolis, 1973), 128.

Italy, in a narrow sense, although unlike Spingarn the sheer weight of detailed evidence Weinberg presented may for his followers have proved more useful than his conclusions.

Secondly, beginning in the 1940s, essays emphasising the Platonic strains in Sidney's aesthetic philosophy were written against the still mainstream assumption that the *Defence* was primarily Aristotelian.[126] But these essays differed from their predecessors in that they were concerned less with the historical conditions of influence than with internal philosophical affinities between Sidney's text and Plato's, perhaps encouraged by the Chicago school's promulgation of an ahistorical philosophical approach to these ancient texts.[127] On a purely philosophical level, absent the eclectic realities of Elizabethan reading, it was easy to overstate the exclusivity of differing traditions: in 1962 John P. McIntyre reflected that 'recent studies have proposed to examine the Platonism in the *Apology*, which, were it vindicated, would destroy the claim for an Aristotelian mimetic'.[128] This is perhaps a little strong. But by the laws of critical thermodynamics the reaction to this position was equal and opposite, and similarly 'philosophical' essays were written insisting on Sidney's greater affinity with

---

[126] e.g. Irene Samuel, 'The Influence of Plato', 383-391; Cornell March Dowlin, 'Sidney's Two Definitions of Poetry', *MLQ* 3 (1942), 573-581; F. M. Krouse, 'Plato and Sidney's *Defence of Poesie*', *Comparative Literature* 6.2 (1954), 138-147; John P. McIntyre, 'Sidney's "Golden World"', *Comparative Literature* 14 (1962), 356-365; Thomas C. Kishler, 'Aristotle and Sidney on Imitation', *Classical Journal* 59.2 (1963), 63-4; Mark Roberts, 'The Pill and the Cherries: Sidney and the Neo-Classical Tradition', *Essays in Criticism* 16.1 (1966), 22-31; Walter R. Davis, *Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction* (Princeton, 1969); Partee, 'Sir Philip Sidney and the Renaissance Knowledge of Plato'.

[127] See e.g. Elder Olson, ed., *Aristotle's Poetics and English Literature: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Chicago, 1965), v: 'the present volume is not intended as a collection of references to Aristotle's *Poetics* or of incidental employments of his doctrines. That function has been served, very ably indeed, by Professor Marvin T. Herrick's *The Poetics of Aristotle in England*. Instead... I was interested in works which exhibited some philosophical affinity with the *Poetics*, in the sense that they were concerned with concepts and problems of an Aristotelian order. These seem to me to represent an important, and hitherto almost neglected, aspect of Aristotle's influence'. The first text of English literature considered by Olson to exhibit 'some philosophical affinity' with the *Poetics* dates from 1744.

[128] McIntyre, 'Sidney's Golden World', 356.

Aristotle[129] or with Protestant theology (often itself tinged with Platonism).[130] And in time irenic compromises emerged, supported by the agglomeration of sources in Sidney's editions, to refer each of Sidney's ideas to an homogeneous morass of commonplaces,[131] to stress the 'hybridity' of his theory,[132] or to avoid the question entirely by attributing the *Defence*'s force to 'sophisticated exercises in audience psychology' rather than 'intellectually cogent argumentation'.[133]

But this large and growing body of work did nothing to clarify the historical conditions of reading the *Poetics* even for Sidney, let alone in sixteenth-century England more

---

[129] e.g. Forrest G. Robinson, *The Shape of Things Known: Sidney's Apology in its Philosophical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA, 1972); Thomas Clayton, 'Catharsis in Aristotle, the Renaissance, and Elsewhere', *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association* 2 (1981), 87-95; Donald V. Stump, 'Sidney's Concept of Tragedy in the *Apology* and in the *Arcadia*', *SP* 79.1 (1982), 41-61; Trimpi, *Muses of One Mind*; Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*. The most important proponent of Sidney's Aristotelian affinities was S. K. Heninger, who began as a syncretist, describing Sidney's definition of imitative poetry as 'screamingly eclectic' in *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino, 1974), 301, but whose views quickly evolved towards Aristotelianism: Heninger was teaching seminars on Sidney's poetics in an explicitly Aristotelian light at least as early as 1982 (as recorded by his student, Elise Salem Manganaro, 'Plato and Aristotle in Sidney's Poetics: Theory and Practice', Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (1985), 139 and note), and this position is represented in 'Speaking Pictures: Sidney's Rapprochement between Poetry and Painting' in *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture*, ed. Gary F. Waller and Michael D. Moore (London, 1984), 3-16, and most of all *Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker*, esp. 223-306, e.g. 238: 'in the *Defence* Sidney's debt to the *Poetics* is immediate, pervasive, and readily acknowledged... it is unlikely that Sidney read the *Poetics* in the original Greek; but the text was available in both Latin and Italian versions, and there were any number of paraphrases and digests'.

[130] Argued most strenuously by Andrew D. Weiner, 'Moving and Teaching: Sidney's *Defense of Poesie* as a Protestant Poetic', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1972), 259-278, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Protestantism: a Study of Contexts* (Minneapolis, 1978), and 'Sidney, Protestantism, and Literary Critics: Reflections on Some Recent Criticism of The Defense of Poetry' in *Sir Philip Sidney's Achievements*, ed. Allen *et al.*, 117-26; and by Alan Sinfield, e.g. *Literature in Protestant England, 1560-1660* (London, Totowa, 1983), and 'The Cultural Politics of the Defence of Poetry' in *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture*, ed. Waller and Moore, 124-143.

[131] Numerous editions adopt this broad position, following Herrick, e.g. Soens, *Defence* (1970), though Soens's reading is primarily Christian-Platonic.

[132] O. B. Hardison, 'The Two Voices of Sidney's Apology for Poetry', *ELR* 2.1 (1972), 83-99; D. H. Craig, 'A Hybrid Growth: Sidney's Theory of Poetry in An Apology for Poetry', *ELR* 10.2 (1980), 183-201; John C. Ulreich, Jr., '"The Poets Only Deliver": Sidney's Conception of Mimesis', *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15.1 (1982), 67-84; H. A. Mason, 'An Introduction to Literary Criticism by Way of Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie', *Cambridge Quarterly* 12.2-3 (1983), 77-173; a recent example stressing Sidney's 'inclusive' theory is Kinney, 'The Position of Poetry'.

[133] Catherine Barnes, 'The Hidden Persuader: The Complex Speaking Voice of Sidney's *Defence of Poetry*', *PMLA* 86.3 (1971), 422; cf. Margaret W. Ferguson, 'Sidney's *A Defence of Poetry*: A Retrial', *boundary 2* 7.2 (1979), 61-95; Virginia Riley Hyman, 'Sidney's Definition of Poetry', *SEL* 10.1 (1970), 49-62; Ronald Levao, 'Sidney's Feigned Apology', *PMLA* 94.2 (1979), 223-33, expanded in *Renaissance Minds and Their Fictions: Cusanus, Sidney, Shakespeare* (Berkeley, 1985). See Reisner, 'The Paradox of Mimesis', 332n1, for further bibliography.

generally. Inherited accounts of the nugatory influence of the *Poetics* were recapitulated as evidence that it was unavailable. Even if they were not everywhere held, commonplace objections that the *Poetics* was not known, or could not be read, or if read was not understood, remained available, as we have seen in the Introduction, as a rebuttal to any account that attempted to venture the substantial influence of the text in England, a rebuttal which has never itself been thoroughly debunked. As a result of the philosophical rather than historical turn of literary scholarship, the salutary excavations of Renaissance Aristotelianism inaugurated by Charles Schmitt's work in the 1970s were largely ignored in the discipline, despite the correctives they provided to many of its spurious underpinnings: with Schmitt the intellectual context of Renaissance peripatetic philosophy as a whole was historicised and enriched, and it became rapidly apparent that Aristotle's position as 'the supreme philosopher' was not to any great degree, as Spingarn had suggested, from the mid-sixteenth century 'challenged more and more', nor that, as Weinberg had it, the text of the *Poetics* was published at the turn of the sixteenth century 'at a time when Aristotle's repute in the scholarly world was not of the highest', when 'the rigorous construction and logic of Aristotle's treatises was neither understood not esteemed' and his champions 'were often men of insufficient training and improper intellectual habits'.[134] Schmitt brought a level-headed inclusiveness to the question of Aristotle's *fortuna* in England that might justly be applied to the *Poetics*: 'the general level of interest in the Aristotelian tradition was far below what we find in continental Europe', but nonetheless 'the influence of Aristotle in England... was more

[134] Spingarn, *History*, 137, citing the standard example of Ramus's 1536 university defence of the thesis *Quaecumque ab Aristotele dicta essent commentitia esse* [whatever Aristotle might have said is false/inconsistent]; Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*, 349-50. For a decisive reassessment of the significance of Ramus's thesis see Walter Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, MA, 1958), 36-49. Schmitt's transformation of the field, developing earlier works of Kristeller such as 'Renaissance Aristotelianism', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 6 (1965), 157-74, began with 'Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism', *History of Science* 2 (1973), 159-93, entered the mainstream with *Aristotle and the Renaissance*, and extended into England with *John Case*. For a recent account of late sixteenth-century British Aristotelianism see Marco Sgarbi, 'Towards a Reassessment of British Aristotelianism', *Vivarium* 50 (2012), and for a survey of recent scholarship on seventeenth century see Edwards, 'Aristotelianism, Descartes, and Hobbes'. This enormously rich body of work clarifies at every point Aristotle's international place at the heart of Renaissance education and knowledge.

significant than has previously been realized'.[135] As an intellectual historian, however, Schmitt had little interest in the relatively minor, certainly extra-curricular tradition of Aristotle's *Poetics* as opposed to the vast reach of logic and natural philosophy.[136] Thus literary historians who engage with Aristotle have followed Weinberg and mostly ignored England as small fry; intellectual historians who engage with Aristotle have followed Schmitt and mostly ignored the *Poetics* as small fry; and R. W. Maslen's 2002 revisions of Geoffrey Shepherd's eclectic *Defence* could introduce the qualification that 'it is not certain that Sidney knew the *Poetics* at first hand' as a mystifying but all-too-accurate digest of critical opinion in 'the three and a half decades since Shepherd first published his edition', despite the fact that no work had been done since Herrick in 1930 to determine the question one way or the other.

Even when historical research into the circulation of the *Poetics* in England has been ventured, it has been as a handmaiden to this inherited model of mediation, as the final example of Henry Turner, an exception to these 'mostlies', should demonstrate. Turner's work, which we first encountered in a bibliographical context in Chapter I, takes into account (as most other literary studies have not) the paradigm-shift in scholarship on Renaissance Aristotelianism since the 1980s. His detailed and subtle central argument pursues continuities between stagecraft, poetics, and the Aristotelian 'practical spatial arts', such as geometry and architecture, to demonstrate their shared roots in early scientific thought. The *Defence* is a key text for Turner, but because his innovation is to trace English Renaissance poetics specifically to an Aristotelian tradition of 'practical knowledge', he needs first to distance Sidney from the literary-theoretical ambit of the *Poetics* proper, which would otherwise suggest itself by the weight of citation as the proximate source. His discussion of the *Defence* thus begins, in a section entitled 'Sidney and English "Aristotelianism"', 'by reassessing what way English

[135] Schmitt, *John Case*, 76.

[136] A disciplinary bias not apparent in earlier work on Renaissance Aristotelianism, as remarked by Haugen, 'The Birth of Tragedy in the Cinquecento', 351-2 and n1.

literary theory, and Sidney specifically, may be called 'Aristotelian', for Sidney is Aristotelian in a *literary* way only in a limited sense'. The first *desideratum*: 'to establish clearly how familiar he and his contemporaries were with key Aristotelian texts and thus also with the fundamental epistemological categories to be found there':

> The genuineness of Sidney's *respect* for Aristotle's *Poetics* is not in question (cf. 88.8-9, 109.16-17): the doubt lies in how extensively he actually knew the work, by what means, and how immediately it influenced his analysis of the means and ends of the poetic image.[137]

Turner's analysis is unusual in attempting to establish English access to the *Poetics* inductively, history-first, rather than being satisfied simply to let the matter rest on a circumambient 'doubt'. Yet, significantly, his argument begins with the inherited consensus on mediation. Thus on Sidney's invocation of Aristotle in the *Defence*'s central concept of *mimesis*, Turner explains:

> The definition is 'Aristotelian' only in the broadest sense and is equally Ciceronian, Horatian, and Neoplatonic; as such it reflects the more immediate influence of Continental critics such as Scaliger and Minturno, whose own discussions of poetics had been formatively shaped by these traditions and from whom Sidney has in fact taken most of his discussion in these passages.[138]

Even if we had not demonstrated Sidney's direct use of the *Poetics*, the purely methodological problems with this analysis should by now be clear. True, Sidney's definition has Ciceronian, Horatian, and Neoplatonic elements (although it names only Aristotle and privileges his position); true, continental critics provided agglomerative definitions shaped by these traditions; but it does not follow that Cicero, Horace, and continental critics are necessarily Sidney's exclusive sources. Scaliger and Minturno read Cicero, Horace, and Neoplatonic

[137] Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 84, citing Sidney's general praises of Aristotle: 'thus far Aristotle: which reason of his (as all his) is most full of reason', and 'Aristotle writes the Art of Poesy; and why, if it should not be written?'

[138] *Ibid.*, 84-5.

works, and were still capable of reading Aristotle too: since citations of each of these appear independently in the passage in question as well as elsewhere in the *Defence*, could Sidney not have done the same without compromising his direct citation here of Aristotle?[139] The editions and scholarly works Turner cites as 'in fact' demonstrating Sidney's direct debts to these works, as we have seen, in most cases prove no more than similarity; yet even if a direct debt to a continental source were proven in this case, would the same source equally supply all of Sidney's other uses of Aristotle? Even if every one of Sidney's citations of Aristotle could be traced to a specific continental source (whether one or many) – would this demonstrate that he had *not* read Aristotle, or only that he *had* read those continental sources? And since, in fact, we *have* demonstrated Sidney's direct use of the *Poetics*, what is now the status of Turner's conclusions? What of his 'in fact'?

Turner pursues this line of reasoning into the wider field of the work's English influence, mostly drawing on Herrick, still under the rubric of assessing 'how familiar [Sidney] and his contemporaries were' with the *Poetics*. Cheke's *De pronuntiatione graecae* (1555) refers directly to the *Poetics*, but includes 'little discussion of the work'; the few structural terms that follow Ascham's description of the *Poetics*'s place in 'pleasant talkes'

[139] Cicero's claim as a source for this passage comes through the identification of 'teach and delight' as the prime qualities of the orator, e.g. *De optimo genere oratorum* I.3, 'optimus est enim orator qui dicendo animos audientium et docet et delectat et permovet' (cf. *Brutus* 69, *De oratore* II.121); Horace voices a similar sentiment in *Ars Poetica* 333-44, 'aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae... omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci', and suggests Sidney's 'speaking picture' in 'ut pictura poesis' (361), which can also be traced further back to Plutarch's citation of Simonides of Chios in *De gloria Athenensium* III.346f, echoed in *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 3; I am unsure which Neoplatonic sources Turner has in mind for this passage, but S. K. Heninger, 'Sidney and Serranus's Plato', demonstrates parallels between some terms in this passage and Serranus's preface to Plato's *Ion*. It is noteworthy that none of these parallels impinges on the term Sidney *does* attribute to Aristotle, namely that poetry is 'an art of imitation, for so Aristotle termeth it in the word *μίμησις*'. Gregory Smith declared it 'more probable that Sidney is drawing here... from Scaliger's *Poetice*', and that 'Sidney, like his contemporaries is Horatian rather than Aristotelian in his co-ordination of the *utile* with the *dulce*' (*Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.386n158.5-6), neatly collocating in one note most of the fallacies we have seen in this chapter: Sidney elsewhere plainly knows the *Poetics* first-hand (and so why not here?), and Sidney's debt to Horace for 'teach and delight' need have no bearing on his express attribution to Aristotle of '*μίμησις*', since it is, as one imagines Gregory Smith himself knew, quite possible to have read both Horace and Aristotle. On the sources of this passage see in addition James A. Devereux, S.J., 'The Meaning of Delight in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*', *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15.1 (1982), 85-97; Shepherd, *Defence* (1965), 47-71, 159n101.33ff., 181n30ff.; Dowlin, 'Sidney's Two Definitions of Poetry'.

about imitation at Cambridge 'derive from Donatus and Terence rather than from the *Poetics*', and in further discussions of imitation Ascham admires the *Topics* and cites Plato's *Republic*; Herrick himself, reports Turner, 'doubts that Harvey actually knew the *Poetics*, since it never appears in his other works or annotations'.[140] But again, these objections require us to read the accidents of citation as a transparent index, simultaneously, both of the work's influence and of whether it was read at all, and moreover to imagine the presence of other texts or thoughts or traditions as exclusive of the *Poetics*. Does the brevity of Cheke's citation actually make it 'inconclusive' evidence that he was 'acquainted with the *Poetics* directly' – or is it better explained by the fact that he is quoting the work locally on the subject of pronunciation, not aesthetics?[141] Does the fact that Ascham *did* know Donatus and Terence on dramatic structure, and admire the *Topics* and cite Plato on imitation, mean that he did *not* know, admire, and cite the *Poetics* when he referred to 'the trew touch of *Aristotles* preceptes and *Euripides* examples'?[142] True, Harvey mentioned the *Poetics* only once: does that mean he did not really mention it on that one occasion? Ben Jonson translated the *Ars Poetica* twice, and for Turner his Aristotelianism 'remained at second hand, and never fully displaced the Roman literary and rhetorical tradition with which he was more immediately familiar': yet would the *Poetics* really have needed to 'fully displace' another system of thought simply to be judged 'familiar' to Jonson? Henry Dethick's *Oratio in laudem artis poeticae*, composed at Oxford while Sidney was a student at Christ Church, 'provides an excellent sense of the range of authorities that an advanced student was expected to know',[143] and, as William Ringler observed in an edition which mistakenly attributed the *Oratio* to John Rainolds, contains not one statement traceable to the *Poetics*.[144] But Ringler's misattribution of the *Oratio* to Rainolds is revealing,

[140] Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 85n5; cf. Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 21.

[141] *Ibid.*, 85.

[142] *Scholemaster* 57.

[143] Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 86n6.

[144] John Rainolds, *Oratio in laudem artis poeticae [circa 1572]*, ed. William A. Ringler and Walter Allen (Princeton, 1940). J. W. Binns showed that the *Oratio* edited by Ringler was in fact Dethick's, and printed in

for Rainolds *does* mention the *Poetics* in his lectures on the *Rhetoric* – as we have seen in Chapter III – in just such a manner as implies it may have been among 'the range of authorities that an advanced student was expected to know', not to mention the distribution of copies of and commentaries on the *Poetics* among his students across Oxford after his death; Dethick may indeed not have known the *Poetics*, or cared much for it if he did know it, but what Dethick knew does not look much like an indication of what Rainolds, Rainolds's 'advanced students', or his Oxonian contemporary Sidney might have known.

These inherited critical opinions on the work's influence masquerade as history, but are never more than inherited critical opinions. Requiring corroboration in a properly historical field, Turner moves from mediation and the citational record to the question of textual access – on which score, as we saw in Chapter I, his arguments and evidence are simply wrong. Turner provides an exhaustive conspectus of the methods and arguments, specific and general, underpinning the field today, and attempts to justify those methods and arguments on historical grounds. In conclusion, he gathers these investigations into the individual fields of textual access and mediation into a summary judgement of Sidney's access:

> Certainly [Sidney's] view of poesy is compatible with Aristotle's analysis of drama in the *Poetics*. But if we look more closely at the *Defence* and consider it in light of contemporary book inventories, Sidney's own private correspondence, his reading habits, and his social contacts, it becomes obvious that he has arrived at his analysis of poesy by way of his formation *first* in the ethical, rhetorical, and dialectical tradition rather than from a foundational immersion in the *Poetics*, a text that he knew less well than he did Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Nicomachean Ethics*, Horace, Cicero, Quintilian, Livy, or even contemporaries such as Jean Bodin... However much Sidney tries to associate this new 'poietic' epistemology with Aristotle, it is one that he has adapted from other sources – books, people, activities – that are more proximate and contemporary to him...[145]

---

error among Rainolds's works: 'Henry Dethick in Praise of Poetry: the First Appearance in Print of an Elizabethan Treatise', *The Library* s.5, 30.3 (1975), 199-216; cf. *Intellectual Culture*, 146-48 and Appendix C.

[145] Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 89-90.

Since we have seen in Chapter II that Sidney knew the *Poetics* at least as intimately as he knew, for example, Jean Bodin – certainly he quotes it *verbatim* and at length from the original Greek, and with Aristotle's name and the title of the work attached – what is then the status of all this history invoked to demonstrate his distance from the text? And since we have seen in Chapter I that the *Poetics* was widely available in England, what is the status of all these postulated intermediaries? Turner presents the greater proximity of other sources to Sidney as a logical, even 'obvious', consequence of an agglomerate of historical fact: the evidence of inventories, letters, reading habits and social contacts requires that we replace his apparent debt to the *Poetics* with a raft of less apparent debts. It appears, that is, that these arguments draw their legitimacy from historical problems of access. Yet in fact the contrary is true. In Turner's work we can see that the inherited presumption of a mediated or little-known *Poetics* has itself, circularly, created a demand for bespoke historical data in order to justify the forced commensuration of citation, influence, and reading.

I have reconstructed the historiography of the field in such detail in order to show that scholarship to date on the influence of the *Poetics* in England, however valid it may be in other respects, shares a complex of fallacious methodological premises that have been passed down as consensus since the turn of the twentieth century. Italian and continental criticism is declared a misunderstanding of Aristotle by anachronistic fallacy; by causal fallacy that criticism is then interposed between English criticism and Aristotle as a matter of general principle transcending specific proof; having been invoked, it is declared a substitute for Aristotle by exclusive fallacy, as are any tendencies in the same work towards any other school of poetic thought, Horatian, Platonic, or the like; and historical conditions of textual or linguistic access are finally invented to explain the otherwise bewildering English preference for 'second-hand' works over the original.

Not one of these positions bears scrutiny. Firstly, the variety of interpretations of Aristotle in Italy and the Continent must be taken inductively to *constitute* the Renaissance *Poetics*; the extent to which they disagree with modern aesthetics is simply irrelevant in a primary historical account, however much we may enjoy debating the teleology of the 'early modern'. Comparison of modern and Renaissance poetics may have great value, of course – but we must at least be sure that the 'Renaissance poetics' in question is not prejudicially defined as a pale misunderstanding of our own.

Secondly, we must require a higher standard of specific proof – starting with any proof at all – before referring an English reference to the *Poetics* to an Italian source. Mere general resemblance is rarely sufficient, since both the Italian and English arguments will also resemble Aristotle's. This is not to say that Italian criticism was not influential in England: many passages of English criticism with no ultimate source in Aristotle have been shown to derive closely from Italian sources, and many passages with Aristotelian sources doubtless may as well. There is no doubt that Sidney read Scaliger, for example.[146] But where Aristotle is cited, at the very least, our grounds for interpolating some other source in his place are unstable. Moreover, the presence of other critical traditions does not imply the absence of an Aristotelian one, and not only because Renaissance critics did in fact find it possible to reconcile Aristotelian and other traditions while (obviously) being familiar with both. A Renaissance critic who cites Aristotle's *catharsis*, say, alongside Horace's 'teach and delight', has still cited Aristotle's *catharsis*. It is not incumbent upon him to swallow Aristotle whole merely to have read him; indeed, any historical method that required influence to be present *in toto* would in the end accept only scribal facsimile as evidence. If we accept that multiple ideas can be held at one time, sometimes dominant, sometimes recessive, sometimes in

[146] cf. Dowlin, not one casually to confirm a debt, in 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', 261: 'so many passages in the *Apology* closely parallel the Italian treatise or are exact quotations that it can be agreed that Sidney must have had the *Poetices* before him as he wrote.'

dynamic equilibrium, and accept, too, that the meaning of the *Poetics* has always been somewhat plastic, we need neither deny the heavy ethico-rhetorical emphasis of much Renaissance criticism, so extensively detailed by Herrick, Weinberg, and Vickers, nor imagine Aristotelian ideas brittle with purity. Disagreement with Aristotle is evidence as good as agreement if our work is to describe the influence of the *Poetics*; all the more so, if our work is simply to map its readership.

Finally, to imagine secondary sources as *replacing* the primary source is, on several counts, supreme gibberish. There are common-sense reasons to consider: in a case like Sidney's, it invariably prescribes a reading list of potentially thousands of pages of secondary works in Latin or Italian simply to piece together the arguments conveniently amassed in a single forty-or-so page treatise strongly recommended by those secondary works and also available in Latin and Italian. There are bibliographical reasons to consider: commentaries are in fact far scarcer than the primary text in surviving English booklists. Moreover, most of the commentaries to which Sidney and others are casually referred seem not to have been examined by critics, who would find that, as is standard for commentaries, they reproduce and translate the original text and can hardly therefore be thought to occlude it. Sufficient attention to the bibliographical realities of the field, rather than to some imagined general opposition between Horatian and Aristotelian theory, would suggest that the more commentaries an English writer is referred to, the *more* access that writer would have to the primary text. And there are intellectual-historical reasons to consider that one might imagine more familiar to modern scholars, whose own work, after all, involves reading both primary and secondary works and negotiating the relationship between them. Commentaries and critical works enter the field both as texts in their own right, and also as authorised readings of the texts on which they are founded. A modern scholar's familiarity with Lukas Erne's recent distinction between 'theatrical' and 'literary' texts of *Hamlet*, that is, does not usually imply

that scholar's ignorance of *Hamlet* itself.[147] Among the oddest illusions of modern scholarship on the issue is this: that familiarity with cutting-edge scholarship, a prerequisite for mastery of a field in current academic practice, should have precluded it then.

Perhaps a brief case-study will bear out these methodological concerns. Since Spingarn first introduced the notion that English criticism had Italian sources, Sidney's debt to Castelvetro's *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta* (1570) has been widely recognised in his citation of what would later become known as the 'unities': *Gorboduc* 'is faulty both in place and time... both by Aristotle's precept and common reason'.[148] Now, Aristotle insists on the unity of action, makes some remarks that could be interpreted as a unity of time, and doesn't mention the unity of place at all.[149] Certainly, therefore, Sidney must have been familiar in one way or another with Castelvetro's argument, on the strength of his reference to the unity of place at least. Indeed, the absence of a direct source in the *Poetics* would seem to render this a fairly clear instance of mediation: Gregory Smith established that Sidney's passage 'derives its importance from its relationship to recent Italian views rather than to the original', and for Katherine Duncan-Jones this was the one instance of Aristotelian reading suitable to be mentioned at all in her biography of Sidney, given the exemption of the *Poetics* from the *Defence*'s major influences in her Oxford World's Classics edition.[150] But even if Sidney's direct use of the *Poetics* had not been otherwise demonstrated, to suggest that Sidney knew Castelvetro *instead of* Aristotle, as became common after about the mid-twentieth

---

[147] Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge, 2003), 23-7.

[148] *Defence* 113.8-13; the nomenclature of the 'three unities' in English criticism dates to Dryden's 1668 'Essay of Dramatick Poesie', 17, cf. *OED s.v.* 'unity', sense 7b.

[149] Action: *Poetics*, *passim*, e.g. 1451a30-35: '*χρὴ οὖν, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις μιμητικαῖς ἡ μία μίμησις ἑνός ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ τὸν μῦθον, ἐπεὶ πράξεως μίμησίς ἐστι, μιᾶς τε εἶναι καὶ ταύτης ὅλης*' [so, as in the other mimetic arts a single mimesis is of a single man, thus the plot, since it is a mimesis of actions, must be of a single action and a whole one]. Time: *Poetics* 1449b12-13: '*ἔτι δὲ τῷ μήκει· ἡ μὲν ὅτι μάλιστα πειρᾶται ὑπὸ μίαν περίοδον ἡλίου εἶναι ἢ μικρὸν ἐξαλλάττειν*' [as for its length, tragedy mostly attempts to occur within a single period of the sun or to vary a little]; this was interpreted as an applying to the *action* of a drama (as opposed to its performance) by Scaliger and others, and from there evolved into a general statement of dramatic verisimilitude: see Friedland, 'The Dramatic Unities in England'.

[150] Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney, Courtier Poet*, 237; Duncan-Jones, *Defence* (1989), 371; Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.lxxiv.

century,[151] disregards not only the fact that Castelvetro's commentary, like every other commentary, both reproduced and translated Aristotle's primary text, but also that Castelvetro, though far from uncontroversial, represented the *avant-garde* of scholarship on Aristotelian poetics in Europe. Castelvetro's commentary was published in 1570 in Vienna and polarised debate especially in Padua, just in time for Sidney's arrival in both towns. By the second edition of 1576 his opinions had become a staple of controversies over the *Poetics*, vehemently defended and opposed by Piccolomini, Giacomini, Sassetti, and Tasso.[152] And these are just the written sources, hardly the only forums of debate in Italy's thriving academies and universities: among Castelvetro's critics, too, was Antonio Riccoboni, lecturer in Rhetoric during Sidney's time at Padua, whose later commentary on the *Poetics* was marketed as a refutation of many of the deceptions of Castelvetro ('nonnullas Ludouici Casteluetrij captiones refellens').[153] Sidney's use of Castelvetro meant only that he was reading Aristotle alongside the most recent authorities and in the light of the most recent analysis, in much the same way that Spingarn's adherence to Butcher's commentary of 1895 signalled his own place at the forefront of scholarship, without implying that he had not read

[151] Following Spingarn, Gregory Smith summarised the genesis of the three unities in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.398-9, and it was exhaustively treated by Friedland, 'The Dramatic Unities in England', who considered that 'Sidney's indebtedness to neo-classicism is summed up in his acceptance of the three rules' (70n46). Despite Gregory Smith's reservations, for a while the Italians sat (however uncomfortably) alongside classical authorities, as discussed above. Sidney's debt to Castelvetro came to seem *exclusive* of that to Aristotle only around the mid-twentieth century, e.g. in Atkins, *English Literary Criticism*, 128; Frederick Boas, *Sir Philip Sidney, Representative Elizabethan: His Life and Writings* (London, 1955), 53; Hardison, 'The Two Voices of Sidney's Apology for Poetry', 95; Cole, *A Quest of Inquirie*, 108; and so on.

[152] For summary accounts of these controversies see Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*, 502-511 (on Castelvetro); 517-19, 543-53, esp. 553 (Piccolomini); 523-27 (Giacomini); 553-59, 573-80 (Sassetti); 570-72 (Tasso). The extent to which the most important of these texts, Piccolomini's, was intended as a refutation of Castelvetro has been debated: Toffanin, *La fine dell'umanesimo* (Milan, Torino, 1920), 121-2, 187-93, believed it was primarily a direct rebuttal, but Piccolomini's motives have been complicated by Florindo V. Cerreta, 'Alessandro Piccolomini's Commentary on the *Poetics* of Aristotle', *SR* 4 (1957), 139-168, and *Alessandro Piccolomini, letterato e filosofo Senese del cinquecento* (Siena, 1960), 119-67, esp. 123-4. Piccolomini's antagonism to Castelvetro's translative and hermeneutic methods is nonetheless notable, as judged by Alessio Cotugno, 'Piccolomini e Castelvetro traduttori della Poetica (con un contributo sulle modalità dell'esegesi aristotelica cinquecentesca)', *Studi di lessicografia italiana* 23 (2006), 113-219, which should be consulted for extensive further bibliography.

[153] Sidney arrived in Vienna for the first time in the summer of 1573, and was in Venice and Padua from November 1573 until at least July 1574. Riccoboni's position as Professor of Rhetoric at Padua from 1571 to 1599, lecturing on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (among other texts) in the early 1570s, has not previously been recognised in connection with Sidney, and is discussed in Chapter V.

the *Poetics* itself. Castelvetro's position on the unities, codifying and developing the numerous earlier writings of Giraldi Cinzio, Robortello, Segni, Maggi, Minturno, Scaliger, and Trissino,[154] was a sanctioned, even enlightened reading of the *Poetics* at the time. The uncritical eagerness of modern scholars to take Sidney's knowledge of this recent development in Aristotelian poetics as an indication of his ignorance rather than his learned interest is extraordinary. Nonetheless, it is a direct inheritance of Butcher's and Spingarn's work at the cusp of the twentieth century, the former describing an Aristotle who would brook no unities, the latter pointing the way to a Sidney who would brook no Aristotle.[155] One can only hope that historians four hundred years hence will consider our own scholarly debts less philistine.

Reading the *Poetics* teleologically as a figure of contemporary aesthetics, as it has from the first been read, results in the marginalisation of any historical aesthetics that *differ* from the modern, though one might imagine this to be rather the difference between literary history and literary typology. Yet such readings have rarely achieved perspective on themselves as historically conditioned. Setting the pace for the evolving field of aesthetics, the *Poetics* has meant different things to different periods, but in each period has nonetheless appeared a transparent account, axiomatic as Euclidean geometry, of how aesthetics 'really' works. A position on the *Poetics* thus remained throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and perhaps still remains, a *shibboleth* revealing a critic's tribal affiliations in the literary academy, and the *Poetics* itself has consequently eluded the methodological advances that characterise recent reception studies on other classical sources. In the absence of a consistent standard of familiarity with the *Poetics*, critics have been able simply to dismiss as

[154] Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.398.

[155] This position is still common in scholarship on the *Poetics*: e.g. Hutton, *Poetics* (1982), 31: 'Needless to say, the three unities were unknown to Aristotle and should always be referred to Castelvetro, who invented them... in England, Sir Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* shows direct contact with the text of the *Poetics*, but also advocates the unities of time and place and misses the importance of the unity of action'; cf. Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 41.

mistaken or ignorant any historical position that disagrees with their own historically conditioned, sometimes professionally motivated, interpretation of Aristotle's evergreen standard.

The current consensus that the *Poetics* was absent from sixteenth-century England is therefore not simply indefensible because contradicted by all the bibliographical and historical facts amassed in previous chapters; it has always been indefensible, because it was founded on and continues to promulgate spurious methods rejected everywhere else in the discipline, methods taken for facts, methods which like Cremonini's at the telescope have precluded the very observation of facts over the many decades during which they have been visible. For evidence that the availability of the *Poetics* was promoted into use we need only look again through the catalogues of references to the work provided by Cooper and Herrick, while disregarding their *a priori* conclusions that those references were 'hopelessly adulterated'. Such evidence has largely been dismissed by modern scholarship as lacking the robustness to contradict more than a century's received opinion of a *Poetics* inaccessible or confused in England. Yet when we find possible citations of the *Poetics* in Vives, Ascham, Cheke, Bucer, Thomas Browne, Robert Peterson, Harvey, Sidney, Rainolds, Lodge, Bruno, Webbe, Harington, and others, we have no general grounds at all on which to declare them somehow false or empty, and every reason to believe they are exactly what they look like: citations of the *Poetics*. Of course they may vary in their testimonial value as interpretations of the work, and one or another may be thought on specific grounds insufficient to support a substantial knowledge of the *Poetics*. But 'there can be no doubt', to adapt Gregory Smith, 'as to the validity of the general contention': the burden of proof now lies firmly on those who would judge them insufficient or insubstantial, not on those who would read them straight, and we would do well to remember that such citations represent only the occasional written excrescences of reading and thinking and not their exhaustive index.

Since we now have a firm historical baseline for access to the *Poetics*, we need no longer presume mediation in order to account for English citations to the work. If we are to reconstruct the uses and influence of Aristotle's *Poetics*, it must be inductively from first principles, not inherited or imagined notions of what Aristotle should or shouldn't, can or can't be made to say, on the premise that sixteenth-century Englishmen had a rather better sense than we of what the sixteenth-century *Poetics* might mean, and what ideas might meaningfully be gathered under the authority of Aristotle in sixteenth-century England. Needless to say, a synthesis of this kind, if synthesis were even appropriate to materials whose strength might be found to lie in their eclecticism, experimentalism, idiosyncrasy, would require another thesis entirely, one that could begin with a clean slate. In conclusion, therefore, I will briefly examine only a handful of the more interesting episodes in the reception of the *Poetics* in sixteenth-century England, with all the conjecture and speculation a first reading deserves. Relieved of the burden of demonstrating basic historical fact, the literary record may now be read as the articulate evidence of reading, thinking about, and responding to the *Poetics* that from the first it constituted: evidence not as fragmentary remains of a static body of thought, but as the ductile traces of a poetics in process of becoming.

Chapter V

Prolegomena

> *Perhaps enough has been said about necessity... We proceed to discuss that which is possible, when and how and by what means it can be proved. I use the terms 'to be possible' and 'the possible' of that which is not necessary but, being assumed, results in nothing impossible.*
>
> Aristotle, *Prior Analytics*[1]

We must start by setting the *Poetics* on a new and historically-appropriate footing. Logic, rhetoric, and grammar, the subjects of the *trivium*, are too often thought of as discrete entities or disciplines. Rather, they should be seen as divisions along the spectrum of a single field, the language arts; as an archipelago of disciplinary islands which, though separate to look at, below sea-level belong to the same tectonic landmass, sharing the more flora and fauna the less anciently they were isolated. As another discipline of the language arts, ever-present but of uncertain affiliation, poetics sails between these islands, setting anchor by one or another in different ages and different pedagogical systems.

That is not to say that the subjects of the *trivium* do not conform to a stable hierarchy. Grammar has always been propaedeutic to rhetoric, rhetoric to logic, carrying the student through the construction of words, to speeches, to reasoned truth.[2] But where the boundaries between them are drawn is a matter of some flexibility: grammar treats the parts of speech, but also figures, style, and the explication of poets, sometimes considered the domain of

---

1 Chapter 13, 32a15-20, trans. A. J. Jenkinson, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1995), I.51.

2 For accounts of education in the language arts see James J. Murphy, 'The Key Role of Habit in Roman Writing Instruction' in *A Short History of Writing Instruction*, ed. James J. Murphy, 2nd ed. (Mahwah, 2001), 35-78; Ruth Webb, 'A Slavish Art? Language and Grammar in Late Byzantine Education and Society', *Dialogos* 1 (1994), 81-103.

rhetoric or poetics; rhetoric treats figures and style, but also the formulation of arguments, often considered the domain of logic. As grammar treats more complex lexical constructions, that is, it draws closer to rhetoric, and as rhetoric focuses on the mechanics of combining thoughts it draws closer to logic; and the same drift can be seen in the other direction, as logic concerns itself with the linguistic frameworks within which its demonstrations are accommodated, and as rhetoric pays more minute attention to lexis and syntax.[3]

Aristotle's works on the language arts in particular are closely interwoven. The middle term of Aristotle's *trivium*, the *Rhetoric*, has more 'logical' or 'philosophical' characteristics than most other ancient rhetorics. Its opening sentence declares rhetoric the *antistrophos* (counterpart) of dialectic; it treats *logos*, the rational argument used by the orator to persuade his audience, as a subset of logic structured around a 'rhetorical syllogism', the *enthymeme*; and its coverage of the topics around which rhetorical argument is structured has close ties to other of his logical works, such as the *Topics*.[4] And perhaps most importantly, these treatises gain through their shared authorship an implicit unity of system which Aristotle's followers in successive ages have strained to reflect in their arrangement and interpretation of his works.

The history of the language arts and its pedagogical frameworks from fifth-century Athens to the Renaissance is, of course, a huge field which I lack both space and expertise to treat appropriately here. My remarks will be limited to a consideration of the *Poetics* as it has intersected the arts of the trivium – as poetics condensed out of diffuse intellectual vapours into a cognitive artefact in its own right – and as those intersections, in time, came to condition its reception in sixteenth-century England.

First, grammar. Considering the *Poetics* in the context of grammar is perhaps most

[3] Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 2.1, bemoans the marginalisation of rhetoric proper at the hands of a grammar so far advanced as to embrace the knowledge of almost all the highest arts (*prope omnium maximarum artium scientiam*); cf. George A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton, 1983), 53.

[4] On the complex interrelations between Aristotelian rhetoric, logic, and 'dialectic', see James Allen, 'Aristotle on the Disciplines of Argument: Rhetoric, Dialectic, Analytic', *Rhetorica* 25.1 (2007), 87-108, and his 'Rhetoric and Logic' in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington (Malden, Oxford, 2007), 350-64.

counter-intuitive to readers accustomed to defining the *Poetics* by its 'literary' principles – unity, *mimesis*, *katharsis* – and grammar as a matter of accidence and syntax. Yet the *Poetics* was closely affiliated to grammar from antiquity to the Renaissance in at least two ways. Firstly, grammar itself contained more than simply accidence and syntax. In late antiquity, and thus in the sources from Quintilian to Donatus fundamental to medieval and Renaissance education, *grammatica* was defined as 'the art of interpreting the poets and other writers and the principles for speaking and writing correctly'. The field thus exhibited what Martin Irvine has called 'definitive' and 'exegetical' modes: in the definitive mode, *grammatica* was concerned with analysing and prescribing the norms of written language; in its exegetical mode, termed *scientia interpretandi* or *enarratio poetarum*, it governed what we now call close-reading, as well as the emendation (*emendatio*) and critical evaluation (*iudicium*) of texts, and thus canon-formation – indeed, the term *grammatica* was interchangeable with *litteratura*, the etymological ancestor of modern 'literature'.[5] It is not difficult to see how the *Poetics* might have contributed to grammar in its exegetical mode, since it is, obviously, concerned with reading and understanding the poets. Secondly, the *Poetics* itself contains some of Aristotle's most substantial remarks on grammar (in its definitive mode). Aristotle composed only one treatise directly concerned with grammar, the *On Interpretation* (Περὶ ἑρμηνείας), which traditionally follows the *Categories* in his logical works. *On Interpretation* is very brief, however, and reconstructions of Aristotle's views on grammar draw equally on *Rhetoric* 3.1-12, and chapters 19-22 of the *Poetics*; the material in the *Poetics* overlaps substantially with subsequent works devoted explicitly to grammar, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus's *De compositione verborum* and the grammar of Dionysius Thrax.[6] Indeed,

[5] Martin Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge, 1994), 1-7; see also his essay, with David Thomson, '*Grammatica* and Literary Theory' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, II: The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), 15-41. Kathy Eden's excellent *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy & its Humanist Reception* (New Haven, London, 1997), traces the *enarratio poetarum* from antiquity to its Christian application to scriptural interpretation.

[6] The best reading of the *Poetics* as and alongside other works of grammar is Pierre Swiggers and Alfons

these late chapters, in concert with chapter 25 of the *Poetics* (which summarises in some degree Aristotle's lost work *On Homeric Problems*) and several fragments, indicate just what a grammatical poetics, or a poetic grammar, might have looked like, solving lexical ambiguities and contradictions through emendation, or through appeals to figurative language, historical usage, inflection in delivery, or the standard of correctness (*ορθότης*) or end (*τέλος*) particular to poetry.[7]

Rhetoric is a more intuitive affiliation. Aristotle signals the connections between the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics* with cross-references in both works, and the *On Interpretation* refers to them in the same breath as treating significant statements unconcerned with truth or falsity;[8] the two have thus often travelled in close proximity to one another, and together drifted in and out of the *Organon*, as we shall see momentarily. Classification aside, the *Poetics* might be associated with rhetoric, just as it was associated with grammar, in two ways. The first is simply that both poetics and rhetoric treat similarly complex linguistic objects. Oratory has a long history of cross-pollination with poetry – 'an affinity in the wordish consideration', as Sidney has it – whether it be through epideictic genres, a training in (often quite sensational) narrative and dramatic techniques from elementary *progymnasmata* to full declamations, or simply what George Kennedy calls the *letteraturazzione*, the gravitation towards written form, typical of all rhetorical genres.[9]

Wouters, 'Poetics and Grammar: From Technique to Τέχνη' in *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*, ed. J. G. J. Abbenes *et al.* (Amsterdam, 1995), 17-41; Peter Struck's piece in the same volume, 'Allegory, Aenigma, and Anti-Mimesis: a Struggle against Aristotelian Rhetorical Literary Theory', 217-24, places this aspect of the *Poetics* in its philosophical context.

7 On the relations of the *Poetics* to *On Poets* and *On Homeric Problems*, see Stephen Halliwell, 'Aristotle's *Poetics*' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism I: Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), 149-51, and his *Aristotle's Poetics*, 387-8.

8 *Poetics* 1456a35; *Rhetoric* 1372a1, 1404a39, 1404b7, 1405a5, 1419b5; *On Interpretation* 17a5; cf. *Politics*, 1341b39. These references have been used in attempts to date the *Poetics* within Aristotle's *oeuvre*: see Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics*, 324-30, and Tarán and Gutas, *Poetics* (2012), 20-21.

9 *Defence* 119.6-7. Epideictic, which dominated sophistic oratory, if not rhetorical theory, has in revisionist accounts of the history of rhetoric since the 1990s been replaced at the centre of the discipline: see Jeffrey Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (New York, Oxford, 2000). *Progymnasmata* and declamation: D. A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge, 1983); Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 54-73; Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Leiden, 2003). *Letteraturizzazione*: Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 18-19, and 'The Classical Tradition in Rhetoric' in *Byzantium and the Classical*

Though the ends of oratory and poetry may finally differ, it should be remembered in any case that Aristotle is always conscious that poetry has an audience and a readership, and in that respect may work on its audience through 'rhetorical' channels. The *Poetics*, in other words, may be considered as a work on rhetoric to the extent that it deals with materials also governed by rhetoric. Secondly, poetry as described by Aristotle *contains* rhetoric whenever it represents spoken arguments. Aristotle makes it clear that the discipline governing *διάνοια* ('thought'), one of the six parts of tragedy defined as 'the ability to make relevant and fitting arguments', is rhetoric; it is for *διάνοια* that Aristotle refers his audience to the books of the *Rhetoric* at the beginning of *Poetics* 19, before expanding on *λέξις in situ* because he has no dedicated grammar.[10] Emotions such as pity and fear defined and discussed in the *Rhetoric* are made operational in the *Poetics*; sections of the *Poetics* on the pleasure of mimesis are virtually summarised in the *Rhetoric*.[11] These and other connections are well known and need not be catalogued here.

The relations of the *Poetics* to logic are both the most recondite, and the most historically specific. It was long known that tenth-century Arabic commentators on Aristotle, such as Al Farabi, Avicenna, and Averroes, had included the *Poetics* (as well as the *Rhetoric*) among the logical works of the *Organon*, and consequently interpreted it as an instrument (*ὄργανον*) of demonstration, characterised by the use of a 'poetic syllogism' to parallel the other kinds of logical syllogism described in the *Categories*, *On Interpretation*, *Prior Analytics*, *Posterior Analytics*, *Topics*, and *Sophistical Refutations*.[12] As Aristotelian works drifted west, the Arabic tradition was adopted by Latin writers and translators such as Gerard

Tradition, ed. Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott (Birmingham, 1981), 22-3.

[10] *Poetics* 1450b4-12, 1456a33-b8.

[11] *Rhetoric* 1371a31ff.

[12] Details of this extremely rich field can be found in Deborah L. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy* (Leiden, 1990); Salim Kemal, *The Philosophical Poetics of Alfarabi, Avicenna and Averroes: the Aristotelian Reception* (London, 2003); F. W. Zimmermann's introduction to *Al-Farabi's Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle's De Interpretatione* (London, 1981).

of Cremona and Dominicus Gundissalinus, and thrived well into the sixteenth century. In 1934, however, Richard Walzer demonstrated that the Arabic sources were themselves drawing on fifth- and sixth-century Alexandrian Neoplatonic commentators on Aristotle's works;[13] and the subsequent work of Paul Moraux showed that even the Alexandrian tradition had roots in 'a tradition so ancient that it is not discussed'.[14] The association of poetics with logic seemed to date back as far as the Greeks themselves.

What seems to have happened is this. When a rationale of the earliest catalogues of Aristotle's works was attempted, the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* alone stood apart, falling into a distinct category between the 'practical' and the 'theoretical' writings. Drawing support from Aristotle's own remarks in the *Rhetoric* and *On Interpretation* aligning the *Rhetoric* with logic, the Alexandrian commentators' source (or sources) chose sense over tradition: they reclassified the *Rhetoric* as a logical work, and the *Poetics* came along as its closest relation.[15] But this taxonomy, declaring the *Poetics* a work of logical demonstration, then demanded explanation.[16] Thus Ammonius in the fifth century proposed to divide logic in two, into syllogistic works – containing the apodeictic, dialectic, and sophistical syllogisms described in the six regular members of the *Organon* – and asyllogistic works, concerned with demonstration but neglecting to use syllogism: the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*.[17] Later, sixth-century commentators, Simplicius, Olympiodorus, Philoponus, and Elias, refined Ammonius's model

---

[13] Richard Walzer, 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Aristotelischen Poetik', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* nuova serie 11 (1934), 5-14. Subsequent scholarship has filled in the Syriac interstices between the Alexandrian Arabic commentators: see Dimitri Gutas, 'Paul the Persian and the Classification of the Parts of Aristotle's Philosophy: A Milestone between Alexandria and Baghdad' *Der Islam* 60 (1983), 231-267; the essays in J. W. Watt, *Rhetoric and Philosophy from Greek into Syriac* (Farnham, 2010), especially no. VII, 'Syriac Rhetorical Theory and the Syriac Tradition of Aristotle's Rhetoric'; and Rigolio, 'Aristotle's Poetics in Syriac and Arabic Translations'.

[14] Paul Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain, 1951), 145-53, 172-83: the quotation is on 177.

[15] Moraux, *Les listes anciennes*, 177-9.

[16] *Ibid.*, 180: 'La multiplicité des façons dont est justifiée la présence de la *Rhétorique* et de la *Poétique* dans l'*Organon* indique d'ailleurs que les commentateurs cherchent eux-mêmes l'explication d'un fait bien établi.'

[17] Ammonius, *In Aristotelis analyticorum priorum librum i commentarium*, 11.22-12.1, quoted and discussed in Walzer, 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte', 10-11.

into a tripartite division, consisting, first, of the apodeictic method of the *Posterior Analytics*; second, introductions to apodeictic; and third, corrective works discussing errors in demonstration (*παραλογισμοί*), the *Topics*, *Sophistical Refutations*, *Rhetoric*, and *Poetics*.[18] Elias goes so far as to place the various logical works on a spectrum between 'apodeictic syllogism', representing absolute truth, and 'poetic syllogism', representing absolute falsehood, and it is this system that appears in Al Farabi – though there are indications that it was not universally credited.[19]

Whatever the historical accidents associated with this affiliation, it is not merely arbitrary: its foundation in Aristotle's own remarks suggests that 'there existed a real relationship between the rhetoric and the logical sciences';[20] and of course, just as in the cases of grammar and rhetoric, poetry can contain logic simply by virtue of representing a verbal argument composed logically. But for the most part, the disposition of the *Poetics* among the logical works was a traditional inheritance, for which commentators well into the sixteenth century, especially at Padua, were compelled to account. Thus Maggi and Lombardi in the 1540s placed poetry with logic for the concerns they broadly shared, such as truth, verisimilitude, falsehood, absurdity, ambiguity, syllogism, paralogism;[21] Zabarella had poetry make logical arguments by 'example', defined in the *Posterior Analytics* as a kind of inductive reasoning;[22] Riccoboni, disagreeing with Zabarella on the basis that 'example' is a

---

18 Moraux, *Les listes anciennes*, 180; *παραλογισμοί* is from John Philoponus, *In Aristotelis categorias commentarium*, XIII 1.5.10; cf. Walzer, 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte', 11-12.

19 Elias, *In Aristotelis categorias commentarium*, 116.29-117.8; Moraux, *Les listes anciennes*, 180; Walzer, 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte', 12-13; see Rigolio, 'Aristotle's Poetics in Syriac and Arabic Translations', n36, for further bibliography regarding Elias's Syriac and Arabic reception, and n38 for a riotous early-thirteenth-century refutation of such 'drivel': 'These things are merely concepts that have been invented... they are, as the saying goes, "futile bubbles of air, like the poetry of al-Abīwardī".'

20 Moraux, *Les listes anciennes*, 178.

21 Maggi and Lombardi, *In Aristotelis librum de poetica communes explanationes*, 2, cf. 8. Lombardi's lectures, in which these comments appear, were delivered in and after 1541: see Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*, 373-83.

22 *Posterior Analytics* 71a9-11: '*ὡς δ' αὔτως καὶ οἱ ῥητορικοὶ συμπείθουσιν· ἢ γὰρ διὰ παραδειγμάτων, ὅ ἐστιν ἐπαγωγή, ἢ δι' ἐνθυμημάτων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ συλλογισμός*'; Mikkeli, *An Aristotelian Response to Renaissance Humanism*, 63-6; W. F. Edwards, 'Jacopo Zabarella: a Renaissance Aristotelian's View of Rhetoric and Poetry and Their Relation to Philosophy' in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen age*

faculty of rhetoric and not unique to poetry, aligned Aristotle's analysis of *agnitio* (ἀναγνώρισις) in *Poetics* 16 with a variety of different types of syllogism.[23] But this is a topic to itself, and must be pursued elsewhere.

It may be objected at this point that, with the possible exception of logic, these are mostly analytical, not historical, accounts, and that the market-shares of grammar, rhetoric, and logic had a particular configuration in the Latin west which might render these traditions alien to the Renaissance experience of the language arts. Following the recovery of Aristotle's logical works in the twelfth century and his natural philosophy in the thirteenth, logic had come to occupy so central a place in the western university that it relegated grammar to merely lexical concerns and rhetoric to mere ornament; indeed, the western predominance of logic, the most advanced branch of the *trivium*, is more or less coterminous with the rise of the universities themselves, as institutions cultivating a logical mastery which became the *milliarium aureum* of all other training.[24] How could the *Poetics* have been received as a trivial art if the western *trivium* did not accommodate it?

The answer, I think, is threefold. Firstly, though the extent of the humanist revolution of education has often been overestimated – especially when characterised as displacing the continuing authority of Aristotle – it is nonetheless true that humanists introduced many 'new' ancient sources into school and university education, Cicero and Quintilian foremost among

(Montréal, Paris, 1969), 843-854.

23 Aristotle, *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica ab Antonio Riccobono... latine conuersa... Aristotelis Ars poetica ab eodem in latinam linguam versa*, trans. Riccoboni (1579), 375-83: 'Iamuero cum agnitio fiat per syllogismum, aut tacitum, aut expressum, & de hoc syllogismo, ex quo existit agnitio, nihil praecipiatur in Rhetorica, operę precium fuit docere huiusmodi syllogismum, qui est proprius ipsius Poeticę... Plura quidem exempla attulit Arist. ad species agnitionis declarandas: sed nobis satis sit demonstrasse illud, quod uolebamus, Poetica*m* tradere usum argumentandi potissimum in agnitione, & hoc modo esse partem Logicae' (380, 382).

24 On speculative grammar (the *modi significandi*), see Terence Heath, 'Logical Grammar, Grammatical Logic, and Humanism in Three German Universities,' *SR* 18 (1971), 9-64; Irvine and Thomson, '*Grammatica* and Literary Theory', 20-26. For grammar and rhetoric as they entered the sixteenth century, see Damian Riehl Leader, 'Grammar in Late-Medieval Oxford and Cambridge', *History of Education* 12.1 (1983), 9-14; W. Keith Percival, 'Grammar and Rhetoric in the Renaissance' in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley, 1983), 328-9. On the western tendency towards 'logical' rhetoric see Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1991), 38-40.

them, which predated the medieval classification of the sciences. The reintroduction of those sources did not overthrow Aristotle, as was long imagined – quite the opposite, since Cicero's foundational *De inventione* was sympathetic to the Peripatetic system[25] – but they did reshape the disciplinary relations of his and other ancient works on pre-medieval premises, and prompted a large-scale reintegration of logic and rhetoric by George of Trebizond, Lorenzo Valla, Agricola, Melanchthon, and Ramus.[26] Secondly, when Greek itself was reintroduced into the west, the Byzantine émigrés responsible for teaching it brought with them disciplinary and pedagogical structures preserved continuously from late antiquity through the middle ages, similarly predating many of the curricular reconfigurations that occurred in the west after the twelfth century. Western printings of Greek grammars and school-texts such as Manuel Moschopoulos's *Περὶ σχεδῶν* well into the sixteenth century suggest an early period of Greek instruction whose pedagogy itself was Greek.[27] And finally, closely related to this second issue, there are the peculiar circumstances of the *Poetics* itself. The *Poetics* was rediscovered so late as never to have been involved in the rise of university logic; it had no substantial Latin tradition prior to its printing in Greek; and it was brought to the west by the same Byzantine émigrés as were promulgating Greek, as indicated by the owners and scribes we can attach to fifteenth-century manuscripts of the work, Cardinal Bessarion, Theodore Gaza, Janos Laskaris, Andronikos Kallistos, John Rhosus, John Plousidadenos, Michael Suliardus, George the Cretan, Zacharias Kallierges, Michael Apostolis, and humanists of a

[25] Cicero's and Quintilian's rhetorics may appear somewhat at odds with Aristotle's within the western tradition, but compared to the Hermogenic alternative they are decidedly Peripatetic, as argued by Friedrich Solmsen, 'The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric', *American Journal of Philology* 62 (1941), 35-50, 169-90, with qualification by Kennedy, 'Peripatetic Rhetoric as It Appears (and Disappears) in Quintilian' in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. Fortenbaugh and Mirhady, 174-82.

[26] See John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond* (Leiden, 1976), 300-316; Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, *1380-1620* (Oxford, New York, 2011).

[27] Manuel Moschopoulos, *Τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου Μανουήλου τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου περὶ σχεδῶν*. *Manuelis Moschopuli de ratione examinandae orationis libellus* (Paris, 1545); discussed in Webb, 'A Slavish Art?', 85-93. See also R. H. Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History* (Berlin, 1993), 235-62, and Botley, *Learning Greek.*

Hellenist bent such as Poliziano and Giorgio Valla.[28] Before the 1530s – before it began to be printed widely in Pazzi's Latin, and in volumes of Aristotle's *opera omnia* – the *Poetics* circulated as a text with Byzantine curricular and intellectual affiliations.

How does this change our picture of the *Poetics*? The contents of the volume in which the *Poetics* was available before the 1530s, Aldus's *Rhetores graeci* (1508-9), are remarkably similar to those of the earliest surviving manuscript exemplar of the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS grec 1741. Copied in the mid-tenth century, Paris 1741 was assembled with the intention of forming an 'anti-corpus' to the standard rhetorical corpus dominant in Byzantium.[29] That standard corpus, as witnessed by several other manuscripts, comprised 'a treatise on progymnasmata, usually that of Aphthonius, plus all or part of the Hermogenic corpus, with prolegomena and extensive commentary material'.[30] But the compiler of Paris 1741 pointedly excluded those standard works, preferring a number of minor rhetorical works – in which category the *Poetics* was apparently included – given short shrift in contemporary rhetorical theory. It has often been assumed that Aldus's omission of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* from the great Greek Aristotle of 1495-98, and his publication of them in the *Rhetores graeci* a decade later, was due to a lack of manuscripts, but the affiliation of Aristotle's works to what Aldus calls 'these books of rhetoric', from their earliest surviving witness to their *editio princeps*, provides, I think, a more convincing argument.[31] The

[28] Lobel, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics*, *passim*.

[29] On Paris 1741, see Rabe, 'Rhetoren-Corpora', 321-57, esp. 337-43; Harlfinger and Reinsch, 'Die Aristotelica des Parisinus Gr. 1741', 28-50, whence 'Anti-Corpus' (32); Aubrey Diller, 'Notes on the History of some Manuscripts of Aristotle' in *Studia Codicologica*, ed. Kurt Treu (Berlin, 1977), 147-50; Thomas Conley, 'Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Byzantium', *Rhetorica* 8.1 (1990), 29-44, and 'Notes on the Byzantine Reception of the Peripatetic Tradition in Rhetoric' in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. Fortenbaugh and Mirhady, 217-42.

[30] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 54. The manuscripts are detailed in Rabe, 'Rhetoren-Corpora', the standard Byzantine corpus described in Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 52-132, and further outliers discussed in Conley, 'Notes on the Byzantine Reception'.

[31] 'Hisce rhetoricis libris', as reproduced in Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1885-1906), I.83, with the other prefatory material from which I quote here. For the integration of Byzantine rhetoric into the (western) Renaissance see John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, 241ff., and 'The Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition and the Renaissance' in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. Murphy, 174-87.

similarity between the two codices is reflected in Table 3, where the contents of Paris 1741 have been reordered to parallel those of Aldus's volume.

Table 3: Contents of Paris 1741 and the Aldine *Rhetores graeci*, vol. I

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS grec 1741[32]	***Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi...*, vol. I (Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi, 1508)**[33]
	I.1. *Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata*
	I.19. *Hermogenis ars Rhetorica*
ff.120-184. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*	I.161. *Aristotelis Rhetoricorum ad Theodecten libri tres*
	I.235. *Eiusdem Rhetorice ad Alexandrum*
ff.184-199. Aristotle, *Poetics*	I.269. *Eiusdem ars Poetica*
	I.287. *Sopatri Rhetoris quaestiones de componendis declamationibus in causis praecipuae iudicialibus*
	I.456. *Cyrie Sophistae differentiae statuum*
ff.1-37. Ps.-Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Ars rhetorica*	I.461. *Dionysii Alicarnasei ars Rhetorica*
ff.102^{v}-106. Dionysius Halicarnassus, *De Thucydide epistula ad Ammaeum*	
ff.200-225. Dionysius Halicarnassus, *De compositione verborum*	
ff.226-245^{v}. Ps.-Demetrius Phalereus, *De elocutione*	I.545. *Demetrii Phalerei de interpretatione*
ff.106^{v}-115^{v}. Alexander, *De figuris*	I.574. *Alexandri Sophistae de figuris sensus & dictionis*
ff.115^{v}-119^{v}. [Phoibammon], *De figuris*	I.588. *Adnotationes innominati de figuris Rhetoricis*
ff.38-71^{v}. Menander, *De genere demonstrativo*	I.594. *Menandri Rhetoris diuisio causarum in genere demonstratiuo*
ff.72-102^{v}. Ps.-Aristeides, *Ars rhetorica*	I.641. *Aristeidis de ciuili oratione*
	I.663. *Eiusdem de simplici oratione*
ff.246-287. Apsines, *Ars rhetorica*	I.682. *Apsini de arte Rhetorica praecepta*
ff.287-290. Apsines, *De problematis figuratis*	
ff.290-293^{v}. Minucianus or Nicagoras, *De argumentis*	I.731. *Minuciani de epicheirematibus*
ff.294-297^{v}. Maximos, *De obiectionibus insolubilibus*	
ff.297^{v}-298^{v}. Anon., *De communione et differentia statuum*	
ff.299-301. Dionysius Halicarnassus, *De veteribus scriptoribus censura*	

[32] Contents taken from Harlfinger and Reinsch, 'Die Aristotelica'; the contents of the manuscript were conveniently tabulated by reference to the *Rhetores graeci* by Omont, ed., *La Poétique d'Aristote*.

[33] My listing of the contents here follows the title-page of the *Rhetores graeci*, supplying corrected page numbers and occasional subdivisions (put in Latin where necessary) from within the work; for example, Minucianus/Nicagoras (I.731) and the divisions between Dionysius Halicarnassus's works (I.502, I.507) are omitted from the title-page. For a full description see *The Aldine Press: Catalogue of the Ahmanson-Murphy Collection*, nos. 99, 104.

The contents of the two codices are obviously very similar. Most of the works printed by Aldus not represented in Paris 1741 – Aphthonius, Hermogenes, Sopatros – are those of the *standard* rhetorical syllabus, as filled out in Aldus's second volume, which reprinted the prolegomena and Hermogenic commentaries of Syrianus, Sopatros, and Marcellinus. The similarity is even more marked given that Paris 1741 was not Aldus's copy-text, though it was the ultimate source for several of the works he printed:[34] the correlation between the tenth-century manuscript and the early sixteenth-century volume is rather an indication that the organising principle of Aldus's volume was the conceptual unity of its contents with the Byzantine rhetorical corpus.

Three preliminary observations may be made regarding the attitude of Aldus and his Greek partners in the venture – Demetrius Ducas, Janus Lascaris, and Marcus Musurus – towards their publication and thus towards the *Poetics*.[35] The first is that the *Rhetores graeci* consciously unites the major and minor traditions of Byzantine rhetoric in a single volume for a western audience, reintegrating the works in Paris 1741, *Poetics* included, with the dominant Hermogenic tradition they had been assembled to counteract. Ducas, in his prefatory letter to Musurus, depicts the book as a 'great capacious receptacle of all the streams of rhetoric':[36] the Aldine's irenic encyclopaedism places the *Poetics* firmly within the domain of Byzantine grammar and rhetoric. Secondly, the status of Aristotle's works (*Poetics* and *Rhetoric* alike) within that domain has risen by the time they are printed in Italy at the turn of the sixteenth century. In Paris 1741, the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* were subordinate to the 'Menander-series' identified by Rabe as the 'core and beginning' of the codex, even within a

[34] Aldus's copy-texts are detailed in Martin Sicherl, *Griechische Erstausgaben des Aldus Manutius* (Paderborn, 1997), 310-40, and summarised in Dieter Harlfinger and Martin Sicherl, *Griechische Handschriften und Aldinen* (Wolfenbüttel, 1978), no.53; for the *Poetics* in particular, see Lobel, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics*, 31-3 and stemma, 46.

[35] On the role of these and other Cretan émigrés at Aldus's press, see Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 127-56; Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, 111-66, 223-55; and Geanakoplos, *Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (330-1600)* (New Haven, London, 1976), 200-212.

[36] Legrand, I.88: '*ταύτην τὴν βίβλον οἱονεί τινα πάντων τῆς ῥητορικῆς ῥείθρων εὐρυχωροτάτην δεξαμενὴν*'.

tradition already considered marginal;[37] in the *Rhetores graeci*, Aristotle is the representative figurehead of the alternative tradition, second in the canon only to Aphthonius and Hermogenes themselves – perhaps by attraction to his already authoritative status in other areas of the western curriculum. And finally, the *Rhetores graeci* is both explicitly and circumstantially associated with the fundamentals of Greek language instruction. ‘These books of rhetoric’, Aldus writes in a prefatory letter to Janus Lascaris, are here collected and edited for the first time ‘to propagate and augment the Greek language, which, almost extinguished by barbarian incursions or the vicissitudes of time, now lives again’.[38] More specifically, both Ducas’s prefatory letter to the first volume, and Aldus’s to the second, are addressed to Marcus Musurus, as a result of whose teaching of ‘Greek letters’ at Padua from 1503, as Aldus puts it, ‘many in just a few years have emerged skilled in the Greek language’ – ‘as from a wooden horse’, Ducas adds in Greek.[39] Ducas recommends the volume in particular for its pedagogical value to Musurus’s Greek teaching. He exhorts Musurus to interpret Hermogenes from this volume to his friends and disciples because it is ‘the most useful and best for teaching of all such works as profess to impart the arts of rhetoric’;[40] Musurus, who allows his students ‘to draw plentifully from your sweet spring’, may now draw from within this volume, ‘lest you toil to water the great and noble trees of your Hellenic garden’.[41] The *Rhetores graeci*, that is, amalgamates the tradition of Byzantine

[37] Rabe, ‘Rhetoren-Corpora’, 340, comprising Menander, Ps.-Aristeides, Dionysius *ad Ammaeum*, Alexander, and Phoibammon. Geanakoplos felt that Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* had a ‘distinctly minor place’ in the Aldine volume, but coming second only to Hermogenes-Aphthonius seems to me a substantial promotion considering the extent of the work’s prior neglect (‘Italian Renaissance Thought and Learning and the Role of the Byzantine Emigré Scholars in Florence, Rome, and Venice: A Reassessment’ in *Constantinople and the West* [Madison, WI, 1989], 29).

[38] Legrand, I.83-4: ‘ut propagetur augeaturque graeca lingua, quae vel incursione barbarorum, vel injuria temporum prope extincta, nunc reviviscit’.

[39] Aldus: ‘unde paucis admodum annis multi, te docente, periti graecae linguae evaserunt’ (Legrand, I.88); Ducas: ‘*ὥσπερ ἔκ τινος ἵππου Δουρείου*’ (Legrand, I.86).

[40] Legrand, I.87: ‘*καὶ τὴν Ἑρμογένους ῥητορικὴν... τοῖς σοῖς ἑρμήνευε γνωρίμοις τε καὶ φοιτηταῖς, οὓς οἶδα λίαν ἀσμένως ἁναλεξομένους τε καὶ ἀκροασομένους ταυτηνὶ τὴν πραγματείαν, ὡς χρησιμωτάτην τε καὶ διδασκαλικωτάτην ἁπασῶν, ὅσαι μεθόδους ῥητορικὰς ἐπαγγέλλονται παραδιδόναι.*’

[41] Legrand, I.86, 88: ‘*Σὺ γὰρ ἅπασι τοῖς εὐφυέσι τῶν νέων τῆς σῆς γλυκείας πηγῆς ἀφθόνως ἀρύεσθαι συγχωρεῖς... Σύ δ’ ἐντεῦθεν ἀρυόμενος, τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ σου κήπου τὰ καλὰ καὶ γενναῖα δένδρα μὴ κάμνῃς ἀρδεύων.*’

rhetoric for a western audience; it draws the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* of Aristotle towards the centre of that tradition; and it is promoted as a work of value to the teaching of the Greek language. Before and into the 1530s, these were the dominant associations of the *Poetics* in the west.[42]

What this has to do with England is simply this: the *Rhetores graeci* was owned by English readers; we have a direct record of the book in the hands of John Cheke; and Cheke's explicit reference to the *Poetics*, appearing in the course of an epistolary argument concerning the proper pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge in 1542, is clearest in the light of the tradition preserved in the *Rhetores graeci* of the *Poetics* as a work of Greek grammar.

Cheke and Thomas Smith had begun to reform the pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge around 1535, when Cheke was Greek reader at St John's College, and Smith had for several years been lecturing on Aristotle's *Politics* in Greek.[43] Frustrated at the difficulty of teaching the language with the pronunciation inherited by western scholars from their Byzantine teachers, they began to collaborate on a reformed system. Modern Greek pronunciation bore little relation to its orthography; indeed, it was bewilderingly contradicted by ancient works on the matter.[44] Diphthongs were pronounced with a single sound; *αι*

---

[42] This may, however, be only part of the story. A full codicological analysis of print and manuscript anthologies containing the *Poetics* is in my view the first *desideratum* for further research into the early reception of the *Poetics*; it has been set back by the death of Paul Moraux with only the first volume completed of his *Aristoteles Graecus: die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles* (Berlin, 1976). Analysis of the *Poetics*'s travelling-companions across fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts, Abraham de Balmes's translations from Arabic logical and medical works, and Giorgio Valla's translations from Greek logic, mathematics, and cosmology, would cast new light on the pre-settled affiliations of the treatise in the west before the 1530s.

[43] The primary sources are Cheke, *De pronuntiatione Graecae potissimum linguae disputationes cum Stephano Wintoniensi Episcopo* (Basel, 1555), and Thomas Smith, *De recta & emendata linguae Graecae pronuntiatione* (Paris, 1568): much of the history here draws on Smith's third book, 40^{v}ff. These letters are calendared in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. J. S. Brewer *et al.*, 21 vols. (London, 1862-1932), XVII [1542], nos. 327, 482-3, 611, 742, 803, 891-2; further relevant letters of Gardiner's are printed in *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. James Arthur Muller (Cambridge, 1933). Valuable accounts of the controversy may be found in Strype's Lives of *Thomas Smith*, 9-34, and *John Cheke*, 15-24; Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, II.50-62; James Arthur Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (London, 1926), 121-4; Paul S. Needham, 'Sir John Cheke at Cambridge and at Court', Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 2 vols. (1971), I.132-51; W. S. Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham, NC, 1980), 43-60; E. J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation, 1500-1700*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Oxford, 1968), I.39-50.

[44] Details of the Byzantine pronunciation and humanist reforms may be found in W. Sidney Allen, *Vox Graeca*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, 1987), 140-49; Ingram Bywater, *The Erasmian Pronunciation of Greek and its*

sounded the same as ϵ; no difference in length was observed between *ο* and *ω*, ϵ and *η*; this played havoc with prosody, whose ancient quantitative principles had themselves been replaced by a broadly accentual system; rough breathing had vanished; *β* was pronounced as [v], *υ* as [v] or [f]. Worst of all, the letters *ι*, *η*, *υ*, *ϵι*, *οι*, and *υι* had come to be pronounced identically as *ι* through a process now called 'iotacism'; 'all the Greek letters now sound the same,' Ascham wrote in October 1542, 'so weak and subdued and thin, and so enslaved to the domination of a single letter, the *iota*, that all you can hear is the idle chirping of sparrows and the offensive hissing of snakes.'[45] Thus a joke recorded by the Byzantine scholar Maximus Planudes turns on the fact that *ἐρήμην*, *ἐροίμην*, *αἱρεῖ μιν*, *ἐρεῖ μιν*, *αἱροίμην*, *ἐρρίμμην*, *ἀιροίμην*, *ἐρρύμμην*, *ἐρρύμην*, and *αἰ ῥύμην* were by the fourteenth century all pronounced 'irimin', and the *βὴ βὴ* of Cratinus's bleating sheep, Aldus famously observed, was no longer *bē bē*, but *vi vi*![46] The advantage of this system was consistency and convention: Hellenists continent-wide could understand each other with an ease that centuries of vernacularism had eroded in the case of Latin. But its disadvantages were keenly felt by the teachers and students of the language, who could barely distinguish between different words in lectures – 'deprived of the resource of our ears', as Ascham put it, 'unless our eyes are constantly glued to the letters' – and since the late fifteenth century, in any event, its divergence from ancient practice had been increasingly noted.[47]

Working alone and uncertainly, ignorant at first of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and recent humanist literature on the subject, Smith and Cheke were heartened to discover

Precursors: Jerome Aleander, Aldus Manutius, Antonio of Lebrixa (London, Oxford, 1908); D.-C. Hesseling and H. Pernot, 'Érasme et les origines de la prononciation érasmienne', *Revue des études grecques* 32 (1919), 278-301; Maurice Pope's introduction to his translation of Erasmus, *De recta pronuntiatione*, in *CWE* XXVI (1985), 348-62.

45 Letter XII to Richard Brandisby, Giles I.i.26; Hatch-Vos, 31-33.

46 Planudes's joke is edited by M. Treu, 'Antistoichien', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 5 (1896), 337-338; Aldus's remarks were printed on blank pages facing Constantine Lascaris, *In hoc libro haec habentur... De octo partibus orationis...* (Venice, 1512), on which see Bywater, *Erasmian Pronunciation*, 12-13, 24n12.

47 Letter XII, Giles I.i.27; Hatch-Vos, 33.

Erasmus's dialogue *De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione* and the *De litteris syllabis et metris Horatii* of the second-century grammarian Terentianus Maurus; sped by these authorities they settled on the lineaments of a reformed pronunciation, and revealed it to a select few, including Smith's pupil John Ponet, shortly to be appointed Cambridge's public lecturer in Greek. But where Erasmus had confined himself to written remarks, Cheke and Smith were more audacious. Smith contrived to introduce the *nova pronuntiatio* bit by bit in his lectures at Queens' on Homer's *Odyssey*, pretending to slip in his reading often enough that his pupils solicited explanation. Thus the reformed pronuntiation spread; Aristophanes's *Plutus*, performed at St John's in 1536, was the first of a series of plays to use it; Ascham was cautious at first but later acceded, and John Redman, then Professor of Divinity, adopted it whenever he quoted in lecture from a Greek text. By 1542 Smith had been appointed Regius Professor of Civil Law and was in France, Cheke had inaugurated his Regius Professorship of Greek with six lectures on the reformed pronunciation, and his students were more likely, by Ascham's report, to have in hand Isocrates and Demosthenes than Terence and Cicero.

Such innovations brought the simmering resentment of Greek newfangledness to a boil, however, and Cheke bore the brunt of the reaction. The protests of one Ralph Radcliffe, then schoolmaster of Jesus College's grammar school, reached Stephen Gardiner, who as newly-appointed Chancellor of the University commanded Cheke to desist and in May 1542 promulgated a detailed edict forbidding the new pronunciation on pain of expulsion from the academic senate, loss of scholarships and denial of degrees, or caning, depending on the status of the offender.[48] A fierce epistolary debate ensued between Cheke and Gardiner between May and October 1542, printed at Basel in 1555: Cheke insisted on the accuracy of his reconstruction of ancient pronunciation, his right of academic freedom, and the inanity of his opponents; Gardiner adduced Cheke's arrogance and scholarly isolation, his own authority as

[48] On Smith and Cheke's contempt for Radcliffe see Needham, 'Sir John Cheke', I.146-7 and notes.

Chancellor, and the centrality of custom in questions of normative language usage. Smith, for his part, contributed a letter to Gardiner in three books, written in August 1542 and published in 1568, reiterating their arguments and claiming equal responsibility for the reformed system. But the archbishop was not for turning. Gardiner's edict 'utterly extinguished practically all the fire we had for learning the Greek language', wrote Ascham, and within a few months the numbers at Cheke's Greek lectures fell from two hundred to just forty.[49]

Regrettably, there is not enough space here to expand upon the fascinating details of this conflict. Gardiner has been declared unanimously the loser, both by right and by eventual circumstance: he was 'outmatched in scholarship', and Cheke's reformed pronunciation was adopted in England until the nineteenth century;[50] the episode is usually taken, not without good reason, as a parable of scholarship prevailing over crass government oversight. Never credited, as far as I know, is the fact that however officious, stubborn, and ornery Gardiner was – and he certainly was – his arguments by modern linguistic standards are nonetheless rather the stronger. Gardiner's insistence that correct language is delineated from the bottom up, from usage and custom, rather than top down by abstract constitution, underlies modern English lexicography, especially as it has shaken itself free of notions of 'standard English'; underlies the *OED*; explains, in short, not only why we do not think 'bread', 'meat', 'great', 'heat' to contain phonetically equivalent vowels, as did Cheke, but also why we do not consider Cheke wrong for thinking so.[51] Smith's rebuttal on this score was that Greek was a dead language, fossilised and thus susceptible to analysis; but this seems a lame argument considering the fact that the 'new' pronunciation was in place precisely because it was being taught as a living tongue. This is an argument for another time, however. The episode has

---

49 Giles I.i.26; Hatch-Vos, 33; Cheke, *De pronuntiatione*, 306.

50 Dobson, *English Pronunciation*, I.40; this may have been true in Gardiner's case, but the conservative position was in fact supported by scholars of the calibre of Reuchlin, Melanchthon, and John Caius.

51 Cheke, *De pronuntiatione*, 120: 'Sic homines men *μεν*. Mediu*m* mean *μην* dicimus, quę uerba no*n* sono, sed soni te*m*pore discrepant. Ex quo facile qui nam sit *η* sonus, in lingua nostra cernitur. Omnia enim quę per ea scribimus, sonum *η* habent. Sic bread *βρηδ*, meat *μητ*, great, heat, *γρητ ἡτ* dicimus.'

purchase here because in an account of ancient vowel length, Cheke's first response to Gardiner contains the earliest written reference in England to Aristotle's *Poetics*:

> De *ο* & *ω* Plato in Cratylo similiter & in Phaedro loquitur de longitudine & breuitate eorum. Similiter Aristoteles in Poetica. Eadem Dionysius Halicarnasseus in Rhetorica.[52]

This may not seem like much; even Marvin Herrick, who first noticed it, found little other than priority to recommend Cheke's reference, and reflected that without further evidence 'we might reasonably doubt Cheke's knowledge of the *Poetics*'.[53] We are now in a better position, however, to understand Cheke's seminal reference within a well-defined intellectual context. The *Rhetores graeci* we know Cheke had, though it was not his only path to the *Poetics*: we also have the volume containing Segni's translation of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* that he used to teach Edward VI. In the Aldine volume the *Poetics* is understood to be a work on the grammatical-rhetorical spectrum, and that is the context in which Cheke uses it here, as an ancient account of the mechanics of the Greek language, of a piece with such treatments as Plato's and Dionysius's of topics including phonology, word formation, and metrics. The *Poetics* is useful to Cheke, in other words, in the same capacity in which Ducas thought it useful to Marcus Musurus: as an authority for use in the instruction of the Greek language.

But the connections between Cheke's citation of the *Poetics* and the world of the *Rhetores graeci* run still deeper. The history of humanist engagement with the question of Greek pronunciation technically dates back perhaps as far as 1486, to the remarks of the Spaniard Antonio of Nebrija, variously reprinted over the next several decades.[54] Nebrija seems to have worked alone, however, and few links have been found between his work and

[52] *Ibid.*, 121-2: 'concerning *ο* and *ω*, similarly, Plato in the *Cratylus* and in the *Phaedrus* speaks of their length and brevity. Similarly Aristotle, in the *Poetics*; and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in his *Rhetoric*.'

[53] Herrick, *Poetics of Aristotle in England*, 16; first noted in 'Sir John Cheke and Aristotle's *Poetics*'.

[54] See Bywater, *Erasmian Pronunciation*, 13ff., for the rather fragmentary publication history of Nebrija's views.

later developments. Those developments instead emerged and multiplied from a single source: Aldus's printing house, in the very period from 1507-8 during which the *Rhetores graeci* was being set and inked, and the Aldine *neakademia* was alive with linguistic debate. This short period saw a confluence of independent projects. To his own small *Institutionum grammaticarum*, printed in 1508, Aldus appended a technical treatise *De literis graecis, ac diphthongis*, introducing the Greek alphabet and its pronunciation, setting conventions for its printing, crystallising the belief that ancient pronunciation differed markedly from the modern, and gesturing towards a fuller treatment to come; Aldus states his view that both the Greeks and their (mostly Italian) students mispronounce their diphthongs, and touches on the replacement of quantity by accent 'such that we seem to cut short the *θρω* in *ἄνθρωπος* and lengthen the *μο* in *σιμόεις*', precisely the point on which Cheke adduces Aristotle.[55] At the same time, Girolamo Aleandro was resident with Aldus, enjoying membership of the *neakademia* and synthesising the views on the Greek alphabet and its pronunciation that he would print in 1512: 'we can deduce from the reason and authority of both Greeks and Latins that many of the vowels and diphthongs and of other letters were customarily pronounced among the ancients differently from now'.[56] Aleandro's remarks were published widely; they gained passage to England early on, when Richard Croke lifted them directly into his instructional *Tabulae* (1516), shortly before returning to inaugurate Cambridge's Greek professorship in 1518.[57] Sharing Aleandro's bed during this period was none other than Erasmus himself, busy composing and printing the vastly-expanded second edition of his

[55] Aldus, *Institutionum grammaticarum libri quatuor* (Venice, 1508), sig. [aa.vi]: 'pronuntiandis accentibus no*n* seruata syllabarum quantitate fieri iudicamus, ut *θρω* in *ἄνθρωπος* corripere, & *μο* in *σιμόεις* producere uideamur propter accentum'. In this 1508 grammar Aldus promises further comments on pronunciation in 'fragmentis nostris', which do not survive; they are similarly referred to in the notes printed in Lascaris's grammar (see n46, above), which constitute the fullest published statement of Aldus's views on the subject.

[56] Aleandro, *Tabulae sanequam vtiles Graecarum musarum adyta compendio ingredi cupientibus* (Paris, 1513), sig. Aij^{v}: 'Multas vocaliu*m* / & diphthongorum / necnon aliarum literarum secus q*uam* nunc / apud veteres p*ro*nunciari solitas / cum ratione tum graecorum & latinorum auctoritate colligimus'.

[57] Croke, *Tabulae, Grecas literas compendio discere cupientibus, sane quae vtiles* (Leipzig, 1516), sigs. Aij^{v}-[Aiv], advertised as 'De pronuntiatione literaru*m* grecaru*m* ex Aleandro'.

Adagia, and absorbing the doctrines of Greek pronunciation which would take root in his New Testament of 1516, surface throughout his theological controversies over the next twenty years, and culminate in the lengthy *De recta... pronuntiatione* (1528) on the merits of which the reformed pronunciation would forever be called 'Erasmian'.[58] And behind all this intense grammatical industry were the figures of Musurus, Ducas, and Lascaris, all of them deeply involved in the teaching of Greek, and the collection, dissemination, and printing in this period of its foundational linguistic treatises in the *Rhetores graeci*.[59]

A bold line can thus be drawn from Aldus's Venetian print studio to Cheke's lecture hall. Cheke was an eager audience for such a body of work. Remarkable among England's Greek scholars for his recondite interest in Byzantine writers – such as John Chrysostom, two of whose homilies he translated in 1543 as a Christmas gift to Henry VIII and ushered into print, and emperor Leo VI, a translation of whose *Tactica*, 'probably one of the first translations of specifically Byzantine literature made in Europe', he presented to Henry the following year[60] – Cheke's yen for post-classical Greek would have been well-served by Aldus's Byzantine rhetorical anthology. Moreover, Cheke's grammatical responsibilities at Cambridge stretched from his Greek lectures as far as the Mastership of the Glomery, an all-but-obsolete university faculty which seems to have provided a professional grammarian's

[58] Printed in tandem with the *Ciceronianus*: Erasmus, *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione, D. Erasmi Roterodami Dialogus. Eiusdem Dialogus cui titulus, Ciceronianus, siue, De optimo genere dicendi* (Paris, 1528).

[59] Hesseling and Pernot, 'Érasme', 298-301, argue persuasively for 'un accord de principe entre humanistes grecs et occidentaux' regarding pronunciation reform, and even suggest that the 'Ianus Graecus' whom Smith reported meeting in Paris (*De recta*, 6^{v}) was none other than Janus Lascaris, as indeed Smith's description implies, though Smith's trip occurred in 1539 and Lascaris died at the end of 1535. Nonetheless, the proposition of Cretan sources for the reforms is easily reconcilable with Botley's astute location of the pronunciation controversies at 'the end of the predominance of the Byzantine exiles in Greek instruction' (*Learning Greek*, 2).

[60] Needham, 'Sir John Cheke', I.162; see I.156-63 and notes on these translations. Cheke's autograph presentation manuscript of Chrysostom's homilies survives at Cambridge, St John's College, MS H.18; his translations were printed in a Graeco-Latin edition, Τοῦ *ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ὁμιλίαι δύο... D. Ioannis Chrysostomi homiliae duae* (London, 1543). The presentation copy of the *Tactica* survives as Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 880; its composition is mentioned in Ascham's *Toxophilus* (Giles II.67-8), and it was reproduced alongside the *editio princeps* (Leiden, 1612) of the Greek text (Needham, II.86n89).

accreditation;[61] and it may be worth mentioning that his later instruction of Edward VI included, in 1548, the composition of *chreiai*, maxims or short moral essays typical of the Aphthonian programme of *progymnasmata* printed by Aldus.[62] The *Rhetores graeci*, and the Byzantine rationale of its seminal printing of the *Poetics*, directly connects the grammatical industry of the Aldine academy in 1508 with Cheke's citation – unprecedented in all of these prior works on pronunciation – of the *Poetics* in Cambridge in the early 1540s, and firmly enlists Aristotle's work in answering the questions: 'how do we read and recover the Greek language?', and, more precisely, 'how do we read and recover the Greek poets?'

So Cheke's *Poetics* was a work of grammar; but that does not mean it was only a work of grammar. We also see Cheke reading the *Poetics* in an anecdote recounted by Roger Ascham in the *Scholemaster*, considered by Gregory Smith 'the first known reference in English to Aristotle's *Poetics*':[63]

> Whan *M. Watson* in S. Iohns College at Cambrige wrote his excellent Tragedie of *Absalon*, *M. Cheke*, he, and I, for that part of trew Imitation, had many pleasant talkes togither, in comparing the preceptes of *Aristotle* and *Horace de Arte Poetica* with the examples of *Euripides*, *Sophocles*, and *Seneca*. Few men, in writyng of Tragedies in our dayes, haue shot at this marke. Some in *England*, moe in *France*, *Germanie*, and *Italia* also, haue written Tragedies in our tyme: of the which not one I am sure is able to abyde the trew touch of *Aristotles* preceptes and *Euripides* examples, saue onely two that euer I saw, *M. Watsons Absalon* and *Georgius Buckananus Iephthe*.[64]

The *Scholemaster* was published in 1570, two years after Ascham's death.[65] But these 'pleasant talkes' can be dated thirty years earlier, to the same galvanic moment in Greek studies at Cambridge that gave rise to the *nova pronuntiatio*. Thomas Watson, a contemporary

[61] Leader, 'Grammar in Late-Medieval Oxford and Cambridge', 13; George Peacock, *Observations on the Statutes of the University of Cambridge* (London, Cambridge, 1841), Appendix A, xxx n1, xxxii n1.

[62] Needham, 'Sir John Cheke', I.187-9; cf. Baldwin, *Small Latine*, I.222-4.

[63] Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I.354.

[64] *Scholemaster* 57.

[65] On the details of its composition see George B. Parks, 'The First Draft of Ascham's *Scholemaster*', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 1.3 (1938), 313-327, and L. V. Ryan, *Roger Ascham*, 250-54.

of Ascham's at St John's and 'one of the best Scholers, that euer S. Iohns Colledge bred',[66] graduated B.A. in 1533, incepted M.A. in 1535-6, and left Cambridge in 1545; Cheke was in Cambridge almost continuously between incepting M.A. in 1533 and being called to court in early July, 1544; Ascham was elected a fellow in March 1534 and in residence at least until 1540, but we know that he was absent in the academic year 1541-2.[67] Watson's *Absalom* cannot be dated much more precisely than 1536-44, and the mention of Buchanan's *Jephthes*, composed at the Collège de Guyenne in Bordeaux some time between 1539 and 1544, may narrow this range: if Ascham 'saw' *Jephthes* – in manuscript, as it was only published in 1554, or in an otherwise undocumented performance – we may be more certain in dating the 'pleasant talkes' to 1539-40. That said, Ascham's narration shifts to the present tense halfway through, suggesting two temporal layers to the anecdote: the 'pleasant talkes' at Cambridge, probably in the late 1530s, in which the precepts of Aristotle and Horace were compared with Euripides, Sophocles, Seneca, and Watson's *Absalom*; and Ascham's recollection of those talks in the 1560s, assessing *Absalom* and Buchanan's *Jephthes* by the streamlined and specifically Greek criteria of '*Aristotles* preceptes and *Euripides* examples'.

Whatever its precise date, it is evident that the 'pleasant talkes' at Cambridge offer a remarkably early application of Aristotle's *Poetics*, set against their continental context. We have isolated records of the *Poetics* being taught earlier in Italy: Ermolao Barbaro's plans in 1485 to teach the *Poetics* in a comprehensive program of Aristotelian lectures at Padua were never realised, but Giorgio Valla's remarks *De poetica*, printed in his encyclopaedic *De expetendis* in 1501, originated in lectures delivered fifteen years earlier at St Mark's Hospital in Venice,[68] and Musurus apparently taught the *Poetics* while at Padua from 1503 to 1509.[69]

[66] *Scholemaster* 23^{v}.

[67] John Hazel Smith, in Watson, *A Humanist's 'Trew Imitation': Thomas Watson's Absalom*, ed. and trans. John Hazel Smith (Urbana, 1964), 31-41 and Appendix C (272-3), has a full discussion of the dating of this anecdote and thus of *Absalom*.

[68] Tigerstedt, 'Notes on the Reception', 12-16.

[69] Geanakoplos, *Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures*, 205; *Greek Scholars in Venice*

But the closest Italian analogues to the kind of extramural reading described by Ascham are themselves from the early 1540s, when the *Poetics* began to be discussed in semi-formal literary *accademie* orbiting the universities. In December 1541, Bartolomeo Lombardi and then Vincenzo Maggi began to deliver lectures on the *Poetics* to the *Accademia degli Infiammati* at Padua;[70] Maggi then continued those lectures after he took up a professorship of philosophy at Ferrara in 1542, at which point we see Giraldi Cinzio promising Giulio Ponzoni, a friend and actor in his plays in Ferrara, to 'explain Sophocles' *Oedipus tyrannus* and compare it (as you have asked me to do) to Seneca's, all the artifice of which we'll be able to discover, with Aristotle's *Poetics* in hand'.[71] We should not forget that the Italian industry so often assumed antecedent to English encounters with the text, from lectures to commentary to vernacular translations, was for the most part a mid-century phenomenon contemporaneous with or even subsequent to the discussions at Cambridge. The first major commentary, Robortello's, was published in 1548, Maggi's in 1550; Bernardo Segni's seminal vernacular translation appeared in 1549. That is, though it was rediscovered in the 1450s, printed in Greek in 1508, and translated effectively in 1536, the *Poetics* gained steam in Italy

137-8. Geanakoplos's source dates from the mid-nineteenth century, however, and I have not had the chance to check it independently.

[70] The complex chronology of these lectures is described in Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism*, 373-83. On this period in the *Infiammati* see in general Richard S. Samuels, 'Benedetto Varchi, the Accademia degli Infiammati, and the Origins of the Italian Academic Movement', *RQ* 29.4 (1976), 599-634; Heikki Mikkeli, 'The Cultural Programmes of Alessandro Piccolomini and Sperone Speroni at the Paduan Accademia degli Infiammati in the 1540s' in *Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Conversations with Aristotle*, ed. Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusukawa (Aldershot, 1999), 76-85; Lowry, 'The Proving Ground', 48-9.

[71] Giraldi Cinzio, *Discorsi*, 202: '... quando io u'isporrò l'Edipo Tiranno di Sophocle, confrontandolo con quel di Seneca, come uoi mi hauete ciesto: oue con la Poetica di Aristotile in mano, uedremo di scoprirui tutto l'artificio, che ui si troua'; as translated by Daniel Javitch, 'Discourse or Letter on the Composition of Comedies and Tragedies', *Renaissance Drama* 39 (2011), 207. Spingarn (*History*, 62) and Cooper (*The Poetics of Aristotle*, 102) take Giraldi's letter as an indication that the comparison of Greek and Senecan drama via the *Poetics* was by 1543 a 'regular academic exercise', for Spingarn 'a part of university study', but in a strict sense this was probably not the case. Giraldi was Professor of Philosophy at Ferrara, but it seems more likely that his promise to explain Terence's *Andria* 'a uoi, & a gli altri miei discepoli' refers to informal mentorship and discussion in literary academies rather than the lecture hall; Giraldi's dedication of the letter as printed in 1554 to Ercole Bentivoglio, with whom he had shared membership of the short-lived Ferrarese *Accademia degli Elevati* in 1540-41, may similarly suggest an academic (as opposed to university) context for his remarks. See Javitch's introduction, 197-206; Giraldi's entry in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*; Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, 232; Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary*, V.829-30.

in the literary coteries of the 1540s, as Ascham – whose letters and published works, for all his legendary animus towards Italy, contain references to Bernardino Tomitano (of the *Infiammati*), Giovanni Battista Pigna (Cinzio's nemesis at Ferrara in the '50s), Carlo Sigonio (Robortello's nemesis at Padua in the '60s), and Pietro Vettori[72] – may well have known. Certainly Ascham is conscious that this method of filling out Aristotle's 'preceptes' with 'the examples of other Authors' was practised in Italy and had been introduced to Cambridge by Cheke, Smith, Watson, and presumably Ascham himself, among the pedagogical innovations of the 1530s.[73] The 'pleasant talkes' of Ascham, Cheke, and Watson, setting the *Poetics* to work at the seams between ancient models and new dramatic composition, were firmly in the continental *avant garde*.

How did they use it? The immediate context Ascham supplies for these discussions is metrical. Unlike 'one man in Cambridge' who used inappropriate metres in what he claimed were tragedies, the perfectionist Watson 'would neuer suffer, yet his *Absalon* to go abroad, and that onelie, bicause, *in locis paribus*, *Anapaestus* is twise or thrise vsed in stede of Iambus'.[74] Watson has already been introduced to us as a translator of at least some of the *Odyssey* into English using the 'trewe order of versifying', that is, observing 'right quantitie

[72] *Scholemaster* 52 (Vettori), 57^{v} (Sigonio), 53^{v} (Tomitano); in letter XCIX to Sturm, Cambridge, c. December, 1568 (Giles II.174-91), essentially a *précis* of the *Scholemaster*, Ascham mentions Vettori (178), Sigonio and Pigna (188). Gregory Smith found Ascham's catalogue of critics 'provokingly disappointing' (*Elizabethan Critical Essays*, I, lxxx-lxxxi, 347-9), and it is true that in both the *Scholemaster* and the letter to Sturm Ascham sticks to Tomitano's logic, Vettori's *ciceroniana* and philology, Sigonio's *De dialogo*, and Pigna's *Poetica Horatiana*, *Quaestiones Sophocleas*, and views on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. But the *Poetics* was segregated from such 'rhetorical' concerns far more for Gregory Smith than for Ascham and his contemporaries, and we must be wary here as elsewhere of assuming that Ascham's local citation of such figures represented the sum of his knowledge, since his aim was not to compile a catalogue: Ascham was plainly familiar with a whole critical *milieu*, not just with individual critics and their works, and his Cambridge parallel to Italian academic practice around 1540 is the kind of coincidence we should not dismiss.

[73] *Scholemaster* 53^{v}: 'Cambrige, at my first coming thither, but not at my going away, committed this fault in reading the preceptes of *Aristotle* without the examples of other Authors: But herein, in my time thies men of worthie memorie, *M. Redman*, *M. Cheke*, *M. Smith*, *M. Haddon*, *M. Watson*, put so to their helping handes, as that vniuersitie...'; cf. 53, where Ascham calls for a book 'wholie filled with examples of Imitatio*n*', such as Seneca's of Sophocles and Euripides.

[74] *Scholemaster* 57^{v}. John Hazel Smith's analysis of *Absalom*'s metre confirms this metrical perfectionism: Watson, *Absalom*, 273-4.

of sillables', and Ascham now recalls his 'pleasant talke' with Cheke and Watson of prosodic faults, 'not onely in the olde Latin Poets, but also in our new English Rymers at this day' – faults which could be corrected, as Virgil and Horace had in Latin, 'by right *Imitation* of the perfit Grecia*n*s'.[75] In this respect, the Cambridge circle would appear to have been reading the *Poetics* with the same broadly lexical or grammatical force as we have independently seen invoked by Cheke; the *Scholemaster*, after all, is more than once defined as 'this booke of the first Principles of Grammer', and its primary interest is in providing young noble children with a sterling education in Latin. Cheke's extraction from the *Poetics* of the proper length of Greek letters, without which Greek metre would be indecipherable, is plainly consistent with these metrical discussions aimed at the imitation of the 'perfit Grecia*n*s'.

If the *Poetics* were simply considered, presumably on the strength of its chapters on *lexis*, as a guide to the metrical experiments Saintsbury called 'mere mid-summer madness', one could argue that the work was given only a shallow reading at St John's College – especially considering Aristotle's unequivocal dismissal of verse as the sole discriminant of poetry.[76] But such a reading would be unnecessarily restrictive. Ascham has already excused himself from discussing the complex, 'literary' questions to which Aristotle might contribute: 'the whole doctrine of Comedies and Tragedies, is a perfite *imitation*, or fair liuelie painted picture of the life of euerie degree of man', but such a concern 'doth not moch belong at this time to our purpose'.[77] Ascham is writing to the purpose when he writes of verse, rather than setting out an account of his reading of a particular work, as is Cheke when he writes of Greek pronunciation, and we should not confuse these brief comments with a full transcription of their views on the *Poetics*. Moreover, association with prosodic criticism is no wooden spoon. Metrical experiment throughout the sixteenth-century catalysed the emergence of a vernacular

[75] *Scholemaster* 23^{v}-24, 59^{v}-60.

[76] Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, II.156, who nevertheless recognises quantitative experiment as a 'necessary, if morbid stage in the development of English prosody and English criticism'.

[77] *Scholemaster* 47, citing Plato, *Republic* 3.

praxis for English poetry, and marks one of the meeting points between scholarship and new literary composition; it was important enough, at least, to come with vernacular bragging rights, as indicated by Ascham's crowing that 'euen poore England preuented Italie, first in spying out, than in seekyng to amend this fault in learnyng'.[78] 'Trew versifying', in the *Scholemaster*, is not a straightforward matter of imitating the Latin masters, but a *via Romana* to Greek models. All good language and learning in every tongue is 'either lerned, borowed, or stolne, from some one of those worthie wittes of *Athens*'; Cicero's wit is tested against his '*Greke* Author, the first Patterne of all'; praise accrues to Virgil and Horace because they 'by trew Imitation of *Homer* and *Euripides*, brought Poetrie to the same perfitnes in Latin, as it was in Greke'.[79] Metre, for Ascham, is a means of becoming truly Grecian; even in a purely metrical context the *Poetics* emerges as a significant document of that aesthetic archaeology.

Yet it seems unlikely, in the wider context of the *Scholemaster*, that the *Poetics* did remain for the Cambridge circle a purely metrical – or grammatical – concern. Ascham does not understand the 'perfitnes' of Virgil and Horace's 'trew imitation' of Homer and Euripides simply as a function of correct metre, since elsewhere he holds them and other classical poets in high esteem independently of their mastery of metre; Plautus and Terence, openly criticised for their 'verie meane' verse, are nonetheless storehouses of the Latin tongue, and evaluated as much by non-metrical criteria, 'the matter, the vtterance, the words'.[80] And as much as the *Scholemaster* is projected as a grammatical work whose highest aim is to bring 'a perfite Scholer out of the Schole, and [place] him in the Vniuersitie, to becum a fitte student, for Logicke and Rhetoricke', the majority of its second book – in which the reference to the *Poetics* appears under 'Imitatio' – is explicitly devoted to elements of *rhetorical* education considered 'fitter, for the Master, than the scholer: for men, than for children: for the

[78] *Scholemaster* 62.
[79] *Scholemaster* 17^{v}, 39^{v}, 62.
[80] *Scholemaster* 59.

vniuersities, rather than for the Grammer scholes'.[81] When Ascham adduces the *Poetics* 'for that part of trew Imitation', he has already defined 'trewe imitation' in terms that encompass larger linguistic and structural units than would typically fall under grammar. Analysing Plato's *metaphrasis* of Chryses's oration in book I of the *Iliad*, an exercise Plato calls 'μίμησις, that is, *Imitatio*', Ascham remarks:

> And therfore would I haue our Scholemaster wey well together *Homer* and *Plato*, and marke diligentlie these foure pointes, what is kept: what is added: what is left out: what is changed, either, in choise of wordes, or forme of sentences: which foure pointes, be the right tooles, to handle like a workeman, this kinde of worke: as our Scholer shall better vnderstand, when he hath bene a good while in the Uniuersitie: to which tyme and place, I chiefly remitte this kinde of exercise.[82]

This list of analytical categories is repeated and slightly enlarged in a later analysis of Cicero's relationship to Demosthenes: they are the 'necessarie tooles and instruments, wherewith trewe *Imitation* is rightlie wrought withall in any tonge'.[83] At a basic level, it is clear that the grammatical concerns of the first book, in which double translation is introduced as the confluence of reading, writing, and practical habituation, develop in the rhetorical second book into an advanced program of analytical reading, based around the particular qualities of *genera dicendi*, which Ascham divides into *poeticum*, *historicum*, *philosophicum*, and *oratorium* – genres in the modern sense rather than the classical stratification of low, middle, and grand style. As a work of 'trew imitation', the *Poetics* describes the 'preceptes' of the *genus poeticum* from 'grammatical' issues of word choice and metre to 'rhetorical' issues of structure, style, and poetic tradition, though either of those disciplinary affiliations could, as we have seen, be taken to encompass the whole field of literary analysis. The *Poetics* is revealed in Ascham, in other words, to be a guide to reading Greek literature, to

[81] *Scholemaster* 30^{v}, 33^{v}.
[82] *Scholemaster* 40^{v}-41.
[83] *Scholemaster* 48.

understanding Euripides, and thus, before being codified in the seventeenth century into rigid prescription, a subtle and vanishing text through which Greek models become available to new English composition; an Aristotle perceptible not in the record of citation and annotation, but in the image of a Euripides created in Aristotle's own image.

Such a reading calls for a different method of assessing the reception and impact of the *Poetics* entirely. Encounters with the *Poetics*, in fact, had often been instigated by those similarly invested in translating Greek drama: in the years around his translation of the *Poetics* (1524, published posthumously in 1536), Alessandro Pazzi translated Sophocles's *Electra* into Latin; Sophocles's *Oedipus*, and Euripides's *Iphigenia in Tauris* and *Cyclops*, he translated via Latin into Italian dodecasyllables.[84] Much of the work of the *Poetics* was transmitted, similarly, in the prefaces and practice of new Italian tragedies written after Greek models, such as Trissino's *Sofonisba* (1513-14) and Cinzio's *Orbecche* (1541), even if they have been subsequently considered 'Senecan' on the whole. Buchanan himself translated Euripides's *Medea* and *Alcestis*, in addition to his new compositions along classical lines, *Baptistes* and the *Jephthes* Ascham singles out for praise.[85] But I need not rehearse here the well-known history of translation from classical drama, in England and abroad, simply to suggest that it was quite natural for Aristotelian precepts to emerge in practical forms, in which the kind of citation and annotation so often insisted upon as the only respectable evidence of influence – Martindale's 'positivistic modes of interpretation' – were not repertory devices. Ascham's own account is sophisticated enough to recognise that imitation can manifest as '*dissimilis materei similis tractatio*: and also, *similis materei dissimilis tractatio*' (similar treatment of dissimilar material, and dissimilar treatment of similar

84 Angelo Solerti, ed. *Le tragedie metriche di Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici* (Bologna, 1887), 22-42; Marvin Herrick, *Italian Tragedy in the Renaissance* (Urbana, 1965), 62-4.

85 On *Jephthes* and its Aristotelian qualities see P. G. Walsh, 'Buchanan and Classical Drama' in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Sanctandreani*, ed. I. D. McFarlane (Binghamton, 1986), 99-112; I. D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London, 1981), 196.

material);[86] this recognition of *treatment* as an aspect of imitation, of imitation as 'workemanship', seems to me to justify a reading of the English Renaissance *Poetics*, now that its presence can be safely ventured, as a technical manual whose transparent influence may emerge most powerfully in the evidence of the poet's craft.

But Ascham and the considerable influence of the *Scholemaster* on later assessments of vernacular and neo-Latin drama, models of *imitatio*, metrical experiment, and English prose, are the Mount Nevo of this thesis. There is really no space here to give either an adequate account of Ascham's model of imitation, or of his notion of the relation of '*Aristotles* preceptes and *Euripides* examples', though both are key to understanding his reading of the *Poetics*. Such an account may now be premised on the findings this thesis does claim: that the *Poetics* was, in fact, circulating and directly known in sixteenth-century England, several generations earlier than has previously been thought, and that its readers were fully and complexly conversant with the continental *avant garde*.

And so there is much to be done, from an historical as much as from a literary angle: Cheke's and Ascham's citations show, whatever else they show, that the *Poetics* was positioned at a confluence of scholarship and literature, a unified and curious field of inquiry. More may be done, in connection with the *Poetics*, on the long afterlife of Ascham's remarks: Sidney and Francis Meres both echoed his high esteem of Buchanan,[87] and Sidney's similar preoccupations with imitation, with classical versification, and with the relation of precept to example – as Sidney would put it, Pugliano's 'demonstration of his practice' and the 'contemplations therein', 'strong affections and weak arguments'[88] – may illuminate his

[86] *Scholemaster* 47.

[87] *Defence* 116.19-20: if Sidney's judgement that Buchanan's tragedies 'do justly bring forth a divine admiration' has its source in Ascham, as I think it probably does, 'admiration' (elsewhere in the *Defence* a substitute for Aristotle's cathartic 'fear') is 'divine' in the sense that Buchanan's *Jephthes* applied Aristotelian precept to a biblical theme. Meres, *Palladis Tamia, Wit's Treasury* (London, 1598), 285; Sidney's Aristotelian definition of *μίμησις* was also quoted in *Palladis Tamia*'s twinned publication, Nicholas Ling's *Politeuphuia Wits Common wealth* (London, 1597), 52.

[88] *Defence* 73.1-33.

conception of the *Poetics* a decade after Ascham's death.[89] More may be done on William Temple's *Analysis* of the *Defence*, composed in 1585 for Sidney's own perusal, which suggests that a logical dimension may legitimately be perceived in Sidney's *Poetics*, perhaps deriving from his formative period in Padua, where Riccoboni, who would later compose an essay 'Quomodo ars poetica sit pars logicae' in his translation of the *Poetics*, was lecturing on rhetoric.[90] More may be done on Giordano Bruno's *De gl'eroici furori* (1585), which begins with a critique of poets who rely on the *Poetics* to imitate Homer: its dedication to Sidney 'because the Italian reasons with those who understand him' and in the hope of 'the censure and protection of a poet' might be set alongside Sidney's contemporaneous admission in the *Defence* to 'having slipped into the title of a poet', and expectation that his more metaphysical arguments for poetry will, in England in the 1580s, 'by few be understood, and by fewer granted'.[91]

More may be done on the reformist circles in which the *Poetics* was read. Lambasting the university study of Aristotle's works in 1520, Luther made an exception for the *Logic*,

---

[89] Ascham's praise of 'that excellent perfitnesse, which was onely in *Tullie*, or onelie in *Tullies* tyme' (*Scholemaster* 59^{v}) may have been a little Ciceronian for the taste of Sidney, who considered Ciceronianism 'the cheafe abuse of Oxford' (letter to Robert Sidney, Leicester House, 18 October 1580, *Correspondence*, 1009); but Sidney and Ascham in general agree that 'diligent imitators of Tully and Demosthenes' should 'by attentive translation (as it were) devour them whole, and make them wholly theirs' (*Defence* 117.23-8). Sidney's views on versification appear in the *Defence* (119-20), and in the 'Nota' contained in Cambridge, St John's College, MS I. 7, f.40^{v}, printed in *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Ringler (1962), 391; the 'Nota' are copied under the heading 'Rules in mesured verses in English w*hi*ch I observe' in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Ottley papers, as described in Peter Beal, 'Poems by Sir Philip Sidney: The Ottley Manuscript', *The Library* s.5, 33.4 (1978), 284-295. In a letter to Harvey of April 1580, Spenser refers to 'Rules and Precepts of Arte, which you obserue in Quantities... that *M. Philip Sidney* gaue me, being the very same which *M. Drant* deuised, but enlarged with *M. Sidneys* own iudgement, and augmented with my Obseruations', which cannot be identified with certainty but may well be represented to some extent by Sidney's 'Nota': *Three proper, and wittie, familiar Letters*... (London, 1580), 6-7.

[90] Temple, *William Temple's Analysis of Sir Philip Sidney's Apology for Poetry*, ed. and trans. John Webster, (Binghamton, 1984), e.g. 81, on Sidney's definition of poetry as *μίμησις*, 'on which, like a foundation, this treatise *On Poetry* that you teach almost entirely stands': 'when Aristotle, therefore, defines poetry as a "fiction-making", he puts poetry, as it were, in the house of logical invention, mixing these two disciplines' (80-83). Riccoboni: *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica ab Antonio Riccobono... latine conuersa...*; on his career, see Grendler, *Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, 239; Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary*, V.1537-1538; on the logical colour of the *Poetics* at Padua, see Mikkeli, *An Aristotelian Response to Renaissance Humanism*, 61-3, and bibliography therein.

[91] Giordano Bruno, *De gl'heroici furori* (Parigi [i.e. London]: Antonio Baio [i.e. John Wolfe], 1585), sigs. [*vi^{v}]-[*vii]; *Defence* 73.29-30, 79.26-7.

Rhetoric, and *Poetics*, which might be retained 'to practise young people in speaking and preaching'.[92] The *Poetics* maintained this privileged place in Reformation thought: Martin Bucer's *De regno Christi*, presented in 1550 to Edward VI via his tutor John Cheke, harnessed the *Poetics* in recommending an effective, modern, pious dramatic art on scriptural themes – much as it had been harnessed in connection with Watson's *Absolom* and Buchanan's *Jephthes* in the 'pleasant talkes' at Cambridge a decade earlier.[93] Indeed, the pronunciation controversy itself split along confessional lines in ways I have not been able to detail here.[94] Gardiner was not opposed to the study of Greek *per se*, but at several points in the debate it is apparent that he, Smith, and Cheke were well aware that the Catholic church was erected on the grounds of 'custom' no less than was the Byzantine pronunciation of Greek, and that ancient Greek revivalism threatened both alike with apparently originary standards of scriptural and lexical correctness. Cheke's and Bucer's use of the *Poetics* in this context thus takes on an added sharpness, as they use Aristotle's work to revive pre-Christian dramatic norms, developing a reformed religious drama to adorn a reformed church.[95]

More may be done on the unexpected association of the *Poetics* with manuals of gentlemanly conduct and education. Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo*, Englished in 1576 by Robert Peterson, contains a description of the action of tragedies:

---

[92] Martin Luther, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung* in *Schriften 1519/20*, ed. D. Knaake, D. Martin Luthers Werke VI (Weimar, 1888), article 25, 458: 'Das mocht ich gerne lenden, das Aristoteles bucher von der Logica, Rhetorica, Poetica behalten, odder sie in ein andere turk form bracht nußlich geleszen wurden, junge leut zuuben, wol reden und predigen'; trans. C. A. Buchheim in *Luther's Primary Works*, ed. Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim (London, 1896), 229-30.

[93] Martin Bucer, *De regno Christi* (Basileae, 1557), book II, ch.54, (*De honestis ludis*), 206-13; trans. Wilhelm Pauck, *Melanchthon and Bucer* (London, 1969), 346-52.

[94] For some indication of this, see Jeremy J. Smith, 'Ideology and Spelling in Sixteenth-Century England', *Il confronto letterario* 40 (supplemento) (2004), 11-24; Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection*.

[95] Watson, a staunch Catholic who became Gardiner's chaplain in 1543, Master of St John's under Mary in 1553, and eventually Bishop of Lincoln (1556), is of course an exception to this narrative: his scriptural tragedy plainly contains no subtextual opposition to the established Church. But then, Ascham too would later greatly benefit from the patronage of Gardiner. The years before Gardiner's election as Cambridge's Chancellor in 1542 may truly have been the golden period Ascham describes, before doctrinal differences calcified on both sides. On the complex politics of Ascham's reminiscence of Watson, see Parks, 'The First Draft of Ascham's *Scholemaster*', 321-2.

> Albeit, not long since I heard it said to a worthy gentleman our neighbour, that *Men haue many times more needed to weepe then to laugh*. And for that cause hee said, these dolefull tales, which wee call *Tragedies, were deuised at first, that when they were plaid in the Theatres (as at that time they were* won*t) they might draw fourth teares out of their eyes, that had neede to* spend them. *And so they were by their weeping, healed of their infirmitie*.[96]

This was of course della Casa's material first, and it probably would not merit much attention were it not that such arguably Aristotelian ideas appear elsewhere in England in similar contexts: on 'the forme of Poeticall lamentations', Puttenham too describes the poet as a physician, 'not onely by applying a medicine to the ordinary sicknes of mankind, but by making the very greef it selfe (in part) cure of the disease.'[97] Into the same category might fall Thomas Browne's translation of Sturm's *Nobilitas literata*, *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie for Nobilitye and Gentlemen* (1570), the final section of which deals at length with the imitation of Greek models.[98] So-called 'medical' theories of poetry have a long history, and such passages, may not, in the end, add much to our understanding of the English *Poetics*. But we might find that the *Poetics* adds something to our understanding of them, bound up as they are in a broader application of *imitatio* to life and manners, and the codification of proper emotive responses to poetry in which a working poetics is inherent. The notion that 'weeping', or other passionate expression, heals infirmity, widespread in England from Sidney's Eclogues to Greene's *History of Orlando Furioso* (1594), is an important formulation of a cathartic principle from which we can no longer rule out Aristotle's influence.

And more may be done on Harington's express use of the *Poetics* in the preface to his

[96] Robert Peterson, *Galateo of Maister Iohn Della Casa, Archebishop of Beneuenta* (London, 1576), 31.

[97] Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589), ch. 24, I.37-8. On the *Arte* as a manual of courtly manners, see Daniel Javitch, *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England* (Princeton, 1978).

[98] Browne, *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie*, sigs. Gi-[Hvi^{v}]. On the attribution of this translation to Browne, see Chapter IV, n88. If L. G. Kelly's identification (*ODNB*) of Thomas Browne, the Lincoln's Inn translator of *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie*, with the Thomas Browne who signed verses prefaced to the *Galateo* of Peterson, also a Lincoln's Inn man, further connections might be traced between the reception of the *Poetics* and the literature of gentlemanly conduct.

own *Orlando Furioso* (1591),[99] so heavily influenced by Sidney and exhibiting substantial knowledge of mid-century Italian debates over the generic taxonomy – even propriety – of the *Orlando*, such as Daniel Javitch has shown existed in symbiosis with developing interpretations of the *Poetics* itself.[100] Harington enters the fray at the same moment that by the offices of Giacopo Castelvetro (nephew of the Aristotelian theorist Ludovico), and the printer John Wolfe, whose imprint advertised him as 'servitore de l'illustrissimo Filippo Sidnei', Guarini's *Il pastor fido* was published in England, having inflamed and refocused those debates in Italy around the issue of tragicomedy and pastoral.[101] The publication of Guarini's play produced a spate of dramatic imitations, and saw the *Poetics* into the seventeenth century amid heated debates over genre essentially similar to those invoked in Harington's preface. Widening our focus into the 1590s, it is thus possible to perceive a complex of relationships between the *Poetics*, generic innovation, the market for and imitation of Italian literature, the work of translation, fashions for romance and pastoral in writers such as Thomas Lodge and Abraham Fraunce, and England's ascendant dramatic literature; and over them all the figure of Philip Sidney, casting a long shadow over all these sites of advanced poetic experiment. Jonson, in this context, was indeed a signal thinker and an important codifier of poetic theory in his prefaces and the *Discoveries*. But by no means was he first, greatest, or only.

Much to be done. But there is still more to be done with a different method entirely, a literary method better adjusted than it has been to the eclectic realities of Renaissance reading,

99 John Harington, *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse* (London, 1591), sigs. [¶vii^{r-v}].

100 For example in Javitch, 'The Emergence of Poetic Genre Theory in the Sixteenth Century', *MLQ* 59.2 (1998), 139-169: 'the unprecedented interest in the Poetics was generated by a new desire to define poetry according to the form and function of its genres. It was the compatibility of Aristotle's approach to poetry with this new need that gave the Poetics relevance and value... The very perception of the Poetics as a systematic treatise on genre was itself the creation of Renaissance interpreters' (140-41).

101 On Castelvetro see *ODNB*, and Eleanor Rosenberg, 'Giacopo Castelvetro: Italian Publisher in Elizabethan London and His Patrons', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 6.2 (1943), 119-148; on John Wolfe, see Harry R. Hoppe, 'John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher 1579-1601', *The Library* s.4, 14.3 (1933), 241-287, and John L. Lievsay, *The Englishman's Italian Books, 1550-1700* (Philadelphia, 1969), 14-23.

writing, and composition, *dissimilis materei similis tractatio* and *similis materei dissimilis tractatio*, a method confident enough speculatively to reconstruct the thinking behind writing and to analyse actual art for evidence of its 'workemanship'. This method may find its evidence in the unlikeliest of forms and the strangest of places; it may find, indeed, that we have been so frustrated in our search for Aristotelian theory in English Renaissance literature because we have expected it to look like theory, attended by the scholarly apparatus of index and annotation. We may recall that for the scene in which Gloucester and Poor Tom stand atop the cliffs at Dover, Shakespeare's source was a passage in Sidney's *Arcadia* in which the princes Pyrocles and Musidorus hear the story of an old blind man led by his young son, ousted from his kingdom and left with 'nothing but the name of a king', wandering the country of Paphlagonia, 'a fit place enough to make the stage of any tragedy'.[102] In the *Defence*, other than having tragedy work by 'stirring the affects of admiration and commiseration', Sidney records no substantial definition of *katharsis* – certainly nothing as precise as Poor Tom's. But the *Arcadia* is full of stagings, as it were, of the reactions of expectant audiences to such tragic scenes as that of the Paphlagonian king. Might Shakespeare have seen in Sidney an Aristotelian praxis – a working model of aesthetic affect bearing neither Aristotle's name nor his terminology – ripe to be set in motion on the stage? Such a question cannot be pursued here: it will require sophisticated and durable tools of analysis, sensitive to the rich variety of channels through which imitation and influence may flow, through and across different texts, and genres of texts, and modes of expression. And perhaps, indeed, it must remain speculative. Yet it may no longer be dismissed before it is attempted; such a question may now be founded on the work done in this thesis to make the *Poetics* available once more to readers and scholars, then and now, in our joint work of

[102] Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The New Arcadia)*, ed. Victor Skretkowicz (Oxford, 1987), 179-84; cf. Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, 8 vols. (London, New York, 1957-75), VII.283-6.

making and remaking the English literary Renaissance.

Conventions for Appendices I and II

Appendices I and II list owners of volumes containing the *Poetics* from a variety of sources. If an entry is numbered in the catalogue source I have used, that numbering has been preserved here for ease of reference. Entries take the following form:

Owner Source Record of book as cited in source Identification of volume(s)	Location and/or shelfmark, if extant

If an entry has no catalogue source, but is derived from indications of provenance in surviving books, the entry is arranged as follows:

Owner Location and/or shelfmark of volume Identification of volume(s)

An asterisk indicates a speculative identification, of owner or of volume as applied.

Annotations

- Remarks on identification or biography of a book-owner are appended to 'owner'.
- Discussion pertaining to the archival source itself or to the source catalogue as a whole is appended to 'source'.
- Comments on the specific catalogue entry are appended to 'record of book as cited in source', or to 'location/shelfmark', as appropriate.
- General issues of identification are appended to 'identification of volume'.

Sources for annotations should be assumed to derive from the source listed in the entry unless otherwise indicated.

Chronology

Ownership of books takes place over spans of time: dates of ownership can thus be complex to delimit. When a volume is known to have belonged to more than one identifiable owner in the sixteenth-century, the full listing has been placed under the *latest available contemporary record* and cross-referenced for earlier owners.

Biographical information

Redacted biographies are provided for entries not found in the *ODNB*. Unless otherwise indicated, biographical information should be assumed to derive from the source listed in the entry.

Appendix I: Verifiable owners of the *Poetics*

Acworth, George (1534-1581/6)[1]

Early Bookowners in Britain

Lincoln Cathedral Library, RR.2.6-7

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531. 2 vols. fº. IAAr 107.928.

Alan, Richard[2] (bequest 1552), see **Oxford, Corpus Christi College**, 51

Anon. 1, (d.<1558)[3]

BCI, 81: Anonymous, 1. <1558

41. op*er*a arist*otelis* grece in 2b*us*

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.

Anon. 2, (d.<1558)[4]

BCI, 83: Anonymous, 3. <1558.

17. op*er*a arist*otelis* grece in 2b*us* volum*inibus*

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.

Bacon, Anthony (1558-1601), see **Bacon, Francis**

Bacon, Francis (1561-1626)

Philip Gaskell, 'Books Bought by Whitgift's Pupils in the 1570s', *TCBS* 7.3 (1979), 284-93.

---

1 A Cambridge scholar from Peterhouse, Acworth matriculated 1548, proceeded B.A. in 1553, was elected Fellow (1554), and incepted M.A. in 1555 before studying civil law at Louvain, Paris, and Padua and returning to an ecclesiastical career with close connection to Archbishop Matthew Parker (*ODNB*).

2 I am grateful to Julian Reid, archivist at Corpus Christi College, for furnishing the following biographical details. According to Thomas Fowler, *The History of Corpus Christi College* (Oxford, 1893), Alan was born in Gloucestershire and admitted Probationary Fellow to Corpus Christi College on 19 Oct., 1546; a religious conservative, Alan was committed to the Fleet Prison in June 1552, but later conformed and was restored to his fellowship. The college's record of a 'Dmnus Allen' who served as bursar and died around Pentecost 1569 could equally indicate another Richard Allen (B.A. 1566) then at the college. Reid's researches also turned up a bequest from John Lawern/Laugherne, alias Pecock, canon and 7th prebendary of Worcester, on his death in 1551 of 'all my laten books' to 'sir Ric. Alen scoler and felowe of Corpus Christi in Oxford'; Reid suggests that the bequest of a Latin Aristotle in 1552 (presumably prehumously, whether the record of 1569 applies or not) may coincide with this inheritance, indicating duplication of books already in Alan's personal library.

3 'Internal evidence suggests a date late in the reign of Edward VI' (*BCI*, I.175).

4 'This list appears to date from the early 1550s; it is certainly later than 1546' (*BCI*, I.179).

p.286. A. and F. Bacon, ‘2 aristotells’ (i.e. 2 copies), 36s.[5]

Bacon, Sir Nicholas (1510-1579), see **Cambridge, University Library**

Bernard, John (d.1553/4)[6]

BCI, 63: John Bernard, 1553/4.

33. op*er*a arist*otelis* grece in 2b*us*

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.

Brown, William (d.1558)[7]

PLRE 67, ed. Stuart Gillespie: Brown, William (M.A.). Scholar. d. 1558. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire (Oxford).

67.92. dialectica nicephori

Valla, Giorgio. *Hoc in volumine haec continentur: Nicephori logica... Aristotelis ars poetica...* Venetiis: Per Simone*m* Papiensem dictum Beuilaquam, 1498. fº.[8]

Caius, John (d.1573)

Philip Grierson, ‘John Caius’ Library’ in *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*, VII, ed. M. J. Pritchard and J. B. Skemp (Cambridge, 1978), 509-525.

75. Item Aristoteles grece 2° Lower Library, G.32.4 – 5

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928[9]

[5] John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, from 1567-1577, kept an account book from 1570-77 which shows that he acted as Tutor to at least 46 junior members of Trinity, including Anthony and Francis Bacon and their companion Edward Tyrrell, who shared a joint account from April 1573 to December 1575. Any *opera omnia* purchased 1570-77 would have contained the *Poetics*; it is almost certain, given the volumes’ high cost, the nature of the Bacons’ other book purchases, which include a high number of *Works* (e.g. of Cicero, Livy, Plato, Sallust, Xenophon) as opposed to selections, and the distinction made in Whitgift’s accounts between the Bacons’ ‘aristotells’ and volumes of the *Ethica*, *Organon*, and *Physica* listed in particular for other students, that this purchase was of an *opera omnia*.

[6] Elected scholar of Queens’ College, Cambridge, 1541; B.A. 1543/4; elected Fellow, 1545; M.A. 1547.

[7] Scholar of St Alban’s Hall, Cambridge; B.A. 1533; elected Fellow of Merton College, 1537, thereafter holding several administrative posts at the college; M.A. 1539; appointed Clerk of the Market by the University, 1539; appointed prebendary of Barton and Canon of Wells, 1554.

[8] Gillespie identifies this as ‘the only recorded printing of Nicephorus’s *Logica*, a large collection of texts on various subjects’; though not the only recorded printing of the work, it was the only sixteenth-century printing that Brown might have owned before his death. Subsequent editions were not printed with the *Poetics*, e.g. *Nicephori... dialecticae elementa absolutissima G. Valla interprete* (Basel, 1558); *Nicephori Blemmidae Epitome logica… jamprimùm Graecè editae*, ed. Johann Wegelin ([Augsburg], 1605). Note that Brown’s inventory elsewhere records ‘67.50 Opera Aristotelis’, which cannot be identified with certainty but may well by this date indicate a volume containing the *Poetics*; see Appendix II, **Brown, William**.

[9] Bears the inscription of Joanes Caius, 1566; this volume made its way into Caius College library after Caius’s death in 1573, and so is not recorded in the catalogue of 1569 (see **Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College**).

Cambridge

Gonville & Caius College

Elisabeth Leedham-Green, 'A Catalogue of Caius College Library, 1569', *TCBS* 8.1 (1981), 29-41.

p.36 *[hortum spectante] subsellio 2º*

A. Opera Aristotelis latinè lib. 2 — Lower Library, G.9.16 – 17

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed., *Aristotelis Opera post omnes quae in hunc usque diem prodierunt editiones...* Lugduni: apud Ioannem Frellonium, 1549. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.160

B. Aristotelis op*er*a grecè, lib. 2 — Lower Library, G.32.9 – 10

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel & Michael Isingrinius, 1539. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.980[10]

Christ's College

Libraries of Cambridge, UC10: Medieval donors in a register of donors, 1623. Christ's College Old Library, Donor Register.

UC10.41. Aristotelis opera graece uol: 7[11]

Clare Hall, see **Oxford, Bodleian Library**, A.¶ *Ae*gidius super poetria Arist.

Corpus Christi College

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 575.[12]

---

[10] Provenance: (A) Henry Walker; (B) Henry Walker, previously inscribed 'John Culpeper'. Leedham-Green, 30: 'Henry Walker, M.D., Fellow of the College, left to the Library in 1564 all his 71 volumes (70 titles) of which there survive certainly only a two-volume Aristotle in Greek and another in Latin. By the terms of his Will, Walker left "to the Librarye of gunvyll and Caius colledge all my bookes excepte that george Walker, my sonne, shall have the custodye and vse of theim for terme of hys lieff'. George Walker was to be bound with his executors for the delivery of the books intact after his death. When this occurred, however, in 1597, the college, according to Professor Grierson, made no attempt to collect the bulk of the bequest. The Aristotles appear already in the 1569 catalogue.' For these entries in the context of Henry Walker's probate inventory, see *BCI*, *s.v.* 119: Henry Walker, entries 4, 40; for the will, see Caius, *The Annals of Gonville and Caius College*, ed. John Venn (Cambridge, 1904), 118-19; the library had already received 'Aristotelem, in 3 vol.', i.e. some or all of the Aldine edition of 1495-8, a gift of Thomas Wendy in 1560 (85, 421).

[11] Clarke, 117: 'The Aldine *editio princeps* of Aristotle's *Opera* comprises five volumes: pr. Venice 1495-98. Erasmus's later edition is divided into two: pr. Basel 1531, &c. The two sets were perhaps combined here, though editions of individual works may have supplemented the Venice edition.' In fact, there was often no standard bound format for multi-volume editions (compare, for example, the Giunta edition of Aristotle-Averroes (Venice, 1550-52), 11 vols. bound in 6 at **Oxford, St John's College**, Θ.1.9 – Θ.1.14, and in 4 at **Oxford, Merton College**, 121.A.4 – 121.A.7), which complicates their identification from catalogue entries; it is unclear here as elsewhere whether the cataloguer is describing the number of 'volumes' as defined internally by the printer or editor, or externally by a particular binding. It is nonetheless likely that a Greek *opera omnia* not in five or six volumes (the five volume Aldine Aristotle of 1495-98 was often bound in six) at this date indicates or included a post-1531 edition which therefore would have contained the *Poetics*. This holding was donated by John Fisher, bishop of Rochester (1469-1535), under whose influence Lady Margaret Beaufort had founded Christ's in 1505; Fisher's friendship with and study of Greek under Erasmus may further support the identification of an Erasmus/Grynaeus edition in this entry.

[12] This manuscript (previously known, as in *LCER*, as Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS SP 13) contains a list of approximately 300 manuscripts and 475 print books from Matthew Parker's library, bequeathed to Corpus Christi after his death in 1574. This manuscript is the fullest of several copies, including, at Corpus,

p.28 *Philosophica*

Opera Aris*tote*lis gr. Bas. 1 vol. fo: lig 1550 G.3.1

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel & Michael Isingrinius, 1550. 2 vols. f°. *IAAr* 108.174.

Aristotelis. 3. Tom. Latine. 1 vol. fo: rar 1548[13] G.3.4

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera...* Basileae: ex officina Oporini, 1548. 3 vols. f°. *IAAr* 108.137

Emmanuel College

Sargent Bush and Carl J. Rasmussen, *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1584-1637* (Cambridge, 1986).

Books permanently lost or replaced between 1622 and 1626

1622.8.I.2. Ar*is*t*ote*lis opera Lat. [acquired 1584-97][14]

Peterhouse

Peterhouse, Ward Library, MS 405.[15]

f.29ᵛ. 'Classis 6a'

8-12. *Ἀριστοτέλους των ἑυρισκομένων βιβλ*: { *α.* / *β.* / *γ.* / δ. / *ε.* Peterhouse, D.5.19-23

Sylburg, F., ed. *Ἀριστοτέλους τὰ εὑρισκόμενα*. *Aristotelis Opera quae extant*... Francofordi a.M.: apud Andreae Wecheli heredes, Claudium Marnium, & Ioannem Aubrium, 1584-87. 11 vols. 4°. *IAAr* 108.664

6-7. Aristotelis oper: cu*m* com*m*ent Graecor*um*, vol: { Primum. / Secundu*m*. Peterhouse, M.7.13-14

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera*... Basileae: ex officina Oporini, 1548. 3 vols. f°. *IAAr* 108.137

MSS 490 and 576, and BL Royal App. MS 66.

[13] Only the third volume of this three-part edition survives in Corpus Christi Library, which raises the possibility that '1 vol.' may refer not to the binding of three volumes in one but to an incomplete set; the *Poetics*, in Pazzi's Latin, was in any case printed in this surviving part.

[14] Seven inventories made after the founding of the college in 1584 (c.1597, 1621, 1622, 1626, 1628, 1632, 1637) make it possible closely to trace the development of the library across its first four decades. This volume was replaced by 1637.9.S.2, i.e. 'Aristot: op*er*a gr lat 2 vol. [acquired 1625]' ed. Isaac Casaubon (Geneva, 1605), now Emmanuel College Library 310.1.57-58; any Latin *Opera* newly acquired as late as 1584-97 certainly contained the *Poetics*. It is worth noting that in the period of the volume's replacement the college library elsewhere contained 1637.9.S.17, 'Aristot Poetica Lat', acquired 1622-6.

[15] This shelf-list of the Peterhouse library, compiled between 1596 (when construction on the library was completed) and 1610, with later additions, records the volumes received in the bequest of Andrew Perne in 1589 (cf. **Perne, Andrew**). A subsequent list on f.34v, 'Catalogus librorum typis excusorum in Bibliotheca D. S*anc*ti Petri, qui a D*oct*ore. Perne collati non fuere', apparently comprising additions to the library between 1610 and c.1620, enters a further bilingual edition: nos. 18-19, 'Aristoteles Graeco.lat. Tom {1 / 2'. An earlier manuscript catalogue, recording 'Nomina libroru*m*, qui erant in bibliotheca Collegij ante doctore*m* Pearne mortuu*m*', records Peterhouse's extensive holdings of Aristotelian texts and commentaries in manuscript before the arrival of Perne's bequest (Peterhouse, Ward Library, MS 400). See in general Scott Mandelbrote, 'The library of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and the problem of the spatial arrangement of knowledge during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' in *Museum, Bibliothek, Stadtraum. Räumliche Wissensordnungen 1600-1900*, ed. Robert Felfe and Kirsten Wagner (Berlin, 2010), 23-76, esp. 27-29, which supersedes the description of MS 400 given by Jayne, *LCER* 78; I am grateful to Mr Mandelbrote for his assistance in dating MS 405, and to Elisabeth Leedham-Green for sharing some of her findings in MS 400.

St John's College

Libraries of Cambridge, UC55: Inventory of the library, 23 September 1544. St John's College Archives, MS C.7.2, f.79r.

UC55.62. Imprimis opera Aristotelis grece in decem uoluminibus

Libraries of Cambridge, UC56: Inventory of books drawn up for the Marian commissioners, '12 January 1557'. St John's College Archives, MS C.7.2, f.124v.

UC56.62. Opera Aristotelis grece in xi uolum. [= UC55.62][16]

Trinity College

Philip Gaskell, 'Appendix A: A Catalogue of the College Library in 1600' in *Trinity College Library, Cambridge: The First 150 Years* (Cambridge, 1980), 147-212.

OL97. Aristotelis vol. 2[17]

University Library

Elisabeth Leedham-Green and David McKitterick, 'A Catalogue of Cambridge University Library, 1583' in *Books and Collectors 1200-1700: Essays Presented to Andrew Watson*, edited by James P. Carley and Colin G. C. Tite (London, 1997), 153-235.

90. Aristoteles graece. R*.1.21 (B)

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel & Michael Isingrinius, 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.174.

91. Aristoteles Latine. P*.8.3 (B)

Curione, Celio Secondo, ed., *Aristotelis Stagiritae Tripartitae philosophiae Opera omnia absolutissima...* Basileae: per Ioannem Heruagium, 1563. 4 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.457.

202.1-2. Georgiae vallae Placentinae opus expetendorum et fugiendorum

Sel.1.2-3 perhaps; formerly S*.1.10-11

Valla, Giorgio. *De expetendis, et fugiendis rebus opus.* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Romani, impensa, ac studio

---

16 See also David McKitterick, 'Two Sixteenth-Century Catalogues of St John's College Library', *TCBS* 7.2 (1978), 135-155. The only pre-1544 Greek *opera omnia* are the Aldine Aristotle (Venice, 1495-98) in five parts, and those edited by Erasmus/Grynaeus (Basel, 1531/1539; *IAAr* 107.928/107.980), in two parts. It is not possible, therefore, to identify a single edition that correlates with this entry; cf. **Cambridge, Christ's College**, UC10.41. Since the holding appears in a subsequent St John's catalogue of around 1620 as 'Aristotelis opera graec: 11 vol. folio' (Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd.5.54, f.14, accompanied by 'Eiusdem opera Latin: 2 vol. folio'), the addition in the St John's catalogues of one volume between 1544 and 1557 could indicate an error in the earlier record; more likely, it indicates the growth or rebinding of a collection of Aristotelian texts recorded (as was the case at Christ's College) as a single multi-volume holding.

17 Gaskell's note that this edition of the *opera* was in '*Greek and Latin*' gives no rationale for the identification of a bilingual edition; no such indication is given in the Donors Book, or *Memoriale*, on which Gaskell's catalogue is based (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.17.8, p.88). Trinity College Library proper dates from 1546, on the foundation of the older library of Trinity Hall (founded 1350); Gaskell observes that Trinity was among the Oxford and Cambridge colleges more affected by the upheavals of the mid-sixteenth century: 'at Cambridge the libraries of Clare, Michaelhouse and the King's Hall (as Trinity), Trinity Hall, Corpus, King's, Queens', and St Catharine's had few or none of their older manuscripts in 1600' (p.7). Given this rate of replacement and change, and the thorough coverage of Aristotelian texts and Greek commentaries in the Library by 1600, it is all but certain that a two-volume Aristotle recorded in 1600 would contain the *Poetics*; no other complete Aristotle was among the early donations to the library until one was purchased with the gift of Sir William Sedley in 1618 ('Aristoteles cu*m* co*m* vol 2', *Memoriale* p.103).

Ioannis Petri Vallae filii pientiss., 1501. 2 vols. fº.[18]

*** Cecil, William (1520/21–1598), Lord Burghley,**[19] see **'Unknown scholar'**

Cheke, Sir John (1514-1557), see (1) **'Unknown scholar'**, f.115v: 'Rhetores'; (2) **Edward VI**

Clere, Edward (mid-c16)[20]

Early Bookowners in Britain

Lincoln Cathedral Library, Pp.4.17

Segni, Bernardo. *Rettorica e Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina*. Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549. 4º. *IAAr* 108.157.

Cole, Henry (1504/5-1579/80), see (1) **Oxford, New College**; (2) **Oxford, St John's College**, Aristotelis opera Latine

Cranmer, Thomas (1489-1556), see **Lumley, John**, Eton College Library, Fb.2.1

Dee, Dr John (1527-1609)

R. Julian Roberts and Andrew G. Watson, eds., *John Dee's Library Catalogue* (London, 1990).[21]

17. Fr– Aristotelis opera graecè fº. Basileae. unus volumine.

---

[18] All three volumes were donated by Sir Nicholas Bacon, whose gift was one among an important group which arrived in 1574; Bacon's benefaction distinctively leaned 'towards the sciences and philosophy' (Leedham-Green and McKitterick, 163). Note that previous Cambridge University Library catalogues of 1556-7, 1573, and 1573-4 do not record any volumes containing the *Poetics*; see J. C. T. Oates and H. L. Pink, 'Three Sixteenth-Century Catalogues of the University Library', *TCBS* 1.4 (1952), 310-40.

[19] The books and manuscripts of William Cecil formed part of a large auction that took place in November 1687, recorded in *Bibliotheca illustris., sive, catalogus variorum librorum* (London, 1687), but it is not possible to ascertain which of the auctioned books had been his (see *LCER*, 132). A substantial number of sixteenth-century Aristotelian volumes were sold in the auction, including in folio Erasmus's 1550 Greek edition *(IAAr* 108.174), a Latin *opera* from Basel, 1543 (probably in error for one of Gemusaeus's editions of 1542 and 1548, *IAAr* 108.033; 108.137), and in octavo Camozzi's Aldine *editio minor* of 1551 (*IAAr* 108.218). It is also possible that Cecil has some connection to the library recorded in BL, Add. MS 40676: see **'Unknown scholar'**.

[20] Venn lists an Edward Clere (d.1606) who matriculated pensioner from St John's College, Cambridge, in Easter, 1553, was admitted to the Inner Temple in 1555, and was knighted (1578) in the course of his political career (*Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I). The volume also bears the monogram of Michael Honywood (1596-1681), dean of Lincoln and its library's greatest benefactor, suggesting its arrival in the late-seventeenth century.

[21] Catalogued in 1583. Roberts and Watson suggest that 'Fr' indicates that the book remained with Nicholas Fromond, who cared for Dee's house and goods in Mortlake during Dee's travels to Poland, while 'T' is defined by Dee as a book 'taken with me'; 'John Davis spoyle' was Dee's indication that 'Jo. Davis toke (with other) by violence out of my howse after my going' (Roberts and Watson, 49-50).

Northampton, MA, Smith Coll. Library Rare Book Room, 885 A8 1550

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel & Michael Isingrinius, 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.174.

19. Fr– Aristotelis opera graecè fº. 2. voluminib. Basil.[22]

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.

137. Fr– Aristotelis opera lat fº. 2. vol. 1538.

Grynaeus, Simon, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae... opera quae quidem extant omnia...* Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1538. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.968.

230. J. Davis spoyle– Georgij Vallae opera fº. Ven. 1501. Dublin, Trinity College, EE.aa.30

Valla, Giorgio. *De expetendis, et fugiendis rebus opus.* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Romani, impensa, ac studio Ioannis Petri Vallae filii pientiss., 1501. 2 vols. fº.[23]

Denys, John (d.1578)[24]

BCI, 142: John Denys, 1578.

20. Opera Ar*istoteli*s bas*iliae* in vno vol*umine*[25]

Edward VI (1537-1553)

Catalogue of the Old Royal Library (BL, C.120.h.6)[26]

p.43. Aristoteles Rhetorica & Poetica Ital. per Segni 4 Fir 1549 E[dward]. 6. BL, 519.d.17[27]

---

[22] Roberts and Watson, 81, n.17: ‘It is not clear whether 17 and 19 are of the same edn. and bound differently. There are Basel edns. of 1531, 1539 and 1550. Dee’s copy of the edn. of 1550, printed by J. Bebel and M. Isengren, is Northampton, Massachusetts, Smith College Library Rare Book Room, 885 A8 1550, inscribed ‘Joannes Deëus 1550 Maij. 15. Antwerpiae. 45 floreni renenses.’ It has scattered Dee notes.’

[23] See R. Julian Roberts, ‘Additions and Corrections to “John Dee’s Library Catalogue”’ in *John Dee: Interdisciplinary Studies in English Renaissance Thought*, ed. Stephen Clucas (Dordrecht, 2006), 336: ‘Correctly, *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus*. Dee’s copy is now TCD [i.e. Dublin, Trinity College], EE.aa.30. At head of titlepage is ‘Joannes Deëus /1550 .24: julij / Parisijs. praetium 10 franch. 4s:’ This was bought four days after Dee’s arrival in Paris and two days after the purchase of three other books. Lightly annotated throughout, with notes usually correcting or criticising Valla.’

[24] Bookbinder and bookseller in Cambridge; this inventory thus records not his personal possessions but books for sale (for further discussion of the inventory, see *BCI*, I.326-7).

[25] Though no indication is given as to the language of this edition, none of the *opera* that exclude the *Poetics* was printed in Basel; in 1578 this record could therefore indicate any of the three Erasmus/Grynaeus Greek editions of 1531-1550 (*IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174) or the Grynaeus Latin edition of 1538 in two volumes (*IAAr* 107.968), the Gemusaeus Latin editions of 1542 and 1548 in three volumes (*IAAr* 108.033; 108.137), or Curione’s four volume edition of 1563 (*IAAr* 108.457); the latter may be less likely to be bound as a single volume.

[26] The Royal Library was passed down through, and expanded by, the English monarchs from Edward IV until its donation to the British Museum in 1757 under George II, having incorporated the libraries of John, Lord Lumley, Isaac Casaubon, and John Morris. See B. C. Bloomfield, ed., *A Directory of Rare Book and Special Collections in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland*, 2nd ed. (London, 1997), 136-37, and T. J. Brown and M. Scheele, *The Old Royal Library* (London, 1957). A manuscript catalogue of the collection (now BL, C.120.h.6) was begun apparently at the end of the seventeenth century, and substantially completed around 1761: see Jayne and Johnson, *The Lumley Library*, Appendix B: ‘History of the Royal Collection, 1471-1761’, 292-96.

[27] This volume is identified as Edward’s by Baldwin, *Small Latine*, 241: ‘Ascham says on December 14, 1550, that Edward was about to complete Aristotle’s *Ethics* and thence would proceed to the *Rhetoric*. He evidently did so, for he had a copy of the *Rettorica*... [as indicated here]. I find nothing in his copy to indicate that he

Segni, Bernardo. *Rettorica e Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina*. Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549. 4º. *IAAr* 108.157.

Elizabeth I (1533-1603), see **Edward VI**[28]

Fisher, John (1469-1535), bishop of Rochester, see **Cambridge, Christ's College**

Fox/Foxe, Richard (1447/8-1528), see **Oxford, Corpus Christi College**, 99, 101.

Hatcher, John (d.1587)[29]

BCI, 154: John Hatcher, 1587.

237. georg*ius* valla de expetend*is* / et fugiend*is*

Valla, Giorgio. *De expetendis, et fugiendis rebus opus.* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Romani, impensa, ac studio Ioannis Petri Vallae filii pientiss., 1501. 2 vols. fº.

Hawes, Henry (d.1559/60)[30]

BCI, 110: Henry Hawes, 1559/60.

22. Aristotel*is* op*er*a in 2 vol*uminibus*

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.[31]

Henry, Prince of Wales (1594-1612), see **Saint Andrew's Colleges**

---

read this Italian translation systematically. Presumably, however, Edward had proceeded to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in 1551, and had used Segni's Italian translation and comments as he had used similar materials on the *Ethics*.' Paul Needham voices an important corrective, however, to Baldwin's too-ready assumption that Edward's books were part of 'his working, or student's library' ('Sir John Cheke', II.96n7).

28 Inheriting the Royal Library, Elizabeth had access to the copies of Segni's translation acquired under Edward. While no new text of the *Poetics* was acquired for Royal Library during Elizabeth's reign, it is worth noting that the manuscript catalogue of c.1761 attributes to her ownership copies of Scaliger's 'Ars Poetica' (or *Poetices*; [Geneva], 1581), p.723, and Benedetto Varchi's *Lezzioni* (Florence, 1590), p.863, the latter erroneously dated 1560.

29 B.A. 1531/2; elected Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, 1533; M.A. 1535; M.D. 1543/4; appears briefly to have been Regius Professor of Physic around 1554; served as Vice-Chancellor, 1579-80; very wealthy, 'in 1545 he acquired the site and remaining buildings of the Augustinian Friary in Cambridge where... he lived in palatial style' (*BCI*, I.367). Some of his books, including possibly the Valla volume listed here, were inherited by his son-in-law: see **Lorkin, Thomas**, below. Hatcher's inventory also contains records which cannot be identified certainly but may have contained the *Poetics*; cf. Appendix II, **Hatcher, John**.

30 Matriculated as a pensioner from Trinity, 1551; awarded a scholarship, 1552; elected Fellow, 1555; B.A. 1555/6; M.A. 1559.

31 There is good reason to consider this a Greek *opera*, thus containing the *Poetics*, by comparison to no. 23, 'Aristotel*es* lat*ine* in 2 vol*uminibus*' (cf. Appendix II, **Hawes, Henry**): 'latine' here indicates a rubric used by the cataloguer to disambiguate a Latin *opera* from the alternative, a Greek.

James VI and I (1566-1625)

George F. Warren, 'The Library of James VI, 1573-1583, from a Manuscript in the Hand of Peter Young, his Tutor' in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society I* (Edinburgh, 1893), ix-lxxv.

Bukes gottin fra Arthur Wode the 18 of Marche, 1577

p.xxxviii. In Aphthonii progymnasmata commentarii, gr., 4o.

Ducas, Demetrius, ed. *Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi: Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata...* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi, 1508-9. 2 vols. Royal 4º.[32]

Catalogue of the Old Royal Library (BL, C.120.h.6)[33]

p.41 Aristoteles Opera 2 vol. Fol. Lugd. 1590 I[acobus]. R[ex].

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. *Operum Aristotelis nova editio graece et latine.* Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium, 1590. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.708

p.43 Aristoteles Poetica Ital per Castelvetro 4o Ven. 1570 I[acobus]. R[ex].

Castelvetro, Lodovico. *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta per Lodovico Castelvetro*. Vienna d'Austria: Gaspar Stainhofer, 1570. 4º. *IAAr* 108.560

Jonson, Ben (1572-1637)

David McPherson, 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: An Annotated Catalogue', *SP* 71.5 (1974), 1-106.

9. Aristotelis opera omnia.... Gr. & Lat. 2 vol. Typis Regiis: Paris, 1619. fol.
Cambridge, St John's College, Upper Library Cc.7.3-4

[32] For the dispersal of the library of Mary, Queen of Scots and its recovery by James, see in general Warren, xvii-xx, and John Durkan, 'The Library of Mary, Queen of Scots' in *Mary Stewart, Queen in Three Kingdoms*, ed. Michael Lynch (Oxford, 1988), 71-104; the inventories made on dispersal were first printed in *Inuentaires de la Royne Descosse Douairiere de France*, ed. Joseph Robertson (Edinburgh, 1863), and edited with identification of volumes in Julian Sharman, *The Library of Mary, Queen of Scots* (London, 1889). Mary's library, considered by Sharman 'probably the most considerable collection of books that had yet been accumulated north of the Tweed' (p.19), was dispersed following her downfall in 1568, under the oversight of the acting keeper of Holyrood Palace, Servais de Condé. In 1573, Peter Young, tutor to the young James VI, began indexing the remaining books and charting the return of Mary's library; his manuscript inventory (BL, Add. MS 34,275) is printed by Warren. We can piece together the *fortuna* of this volume by following it through the various available catalogues. It appears in Robertson under *GRECA VOLUMINA* as no. 7, 'Commentarij in Aphthonij Progymnasmata', in a list entitled 'The Inventareis off the Buikis, Ornamentis, and Maskyn Cleiss ressauit be Maister Jhone Wod and James Murray vpoun the xv day of November the yeir of God j[m] v[c] lxix [i.e. 1569] yeiris frome Serues Franchmane', signed 'resauit fra Serwais. 25. Novembris. 1569. / Mr Johnne Wod' (cf. Sharman, 171). This list records 87 books received under warrant from Regent Murray by John Wood of Tilliedavy, who later 'borrowit' additional volumes. Both Murray and Wood were assassinated in 1570; John Wood's brother, Arthur, over the years returned fewer than half of those listed (see Warren, xxxiii, xxxvii, xliii), including this volume in 1577. The consistency of the title throughout the various catalogues leaves open the possibility that this was only the second volume of the Aldine edition (*In Aphthonii Progymnasmata commentarii innominati autoris. Syriani Sopatri Marcellini Commentarii in Hermogenis Rhetorica* [Venice, 1509]), while the *editio princeps* of the *Poetics* appears only in the first volume; it would not be unusual, however, for both volumes to be listed under a single title, or indeed bound together (cf. **Unknown scholar**, f.115v, for another complex record of these volumes). On the volume's ambiguous size and format, see Chapter I, n116. I cannot agree with Durkan in identifying this volume as 'the rhetorical exercises of Aphthonius, edited by Marsilio Ficino and Pietro Angelio' (Durkan, 83): as far as I know, Ficino (1493-1499) and Angelio (1517-1569) appeared together only when the former's Latin translation accompanied the latter's Greek edition of the Hermetic *Poimandres* (Paris, 1554), and neither edited Aphthonius or a volume of his commentators independently.

[33] For details of the Royal Library and this catalogue, see **Edward VI**.

Du Val, Guillelmo, ed. *Aristotelis Opera omnia quae extant Graecè & Latinè*... Lutetiae Parisiorum: Typis Regiis, 1619. 2 vols. fº.[34]

10. Aristotelis De poetica.... Typis Thomae Snodhami: London, 1623. 4o.[35]

Knyvett, Sir Thomas (c.1539-1618)

David McKitterick, ed., *The Library of Sir Thomas Knyvett of Ashwellthorpe* (Cambridge, 1978).

951. Aristotelis Stagiritae opera omnia Basil. 1563. fol

Curione, Celio Secondo, ed., *Aristotelis Stagiritae Tripartitae philosophiae Opera omnia absolutissima...* Basileae: per Ioannem Heruagium, 1563. 4 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.457[36]

* Linacre, Thomas (c.1460-1524)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, D 2.13(2) Art.Seld.

Valla, Giorgio. *Hoc in volumine haec continentur: Nicephori logica... Aristotelis ars poetica...* Venetiis: Per Simone*m* Papiensem dictum Beuilaquam, 1498. fº.[37]

Lloyd/Llwyd, Humphrey (c.1527-1568), see Lumley, John, first Baron Lumley

---

[34] Variously annotated, but according to McPherson very little by Jonson.

[35] i.e. Theodore Goulston's Latin translation, the first English printing of the *Poetics*. McPherson suggests that this was 'bound with Goulston's edition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (No. 11)', but Henry Woudhuysen informs me that the copy is as yet unlocated.

[36] The library of Sir Thomas Knyvett, 'a not over-wealthy member of the country gentry who spent almost his entire life at his home in Ashwellthorpe, three miles south of Wymondham in Norfolk' (McKitterick, 2), was catalogued at his death in 1618; it contained elsewhere '968 Iulij Caesaris Scaligeri poetices lib. VII. 1561 fol.'

[37] See Bod. Inc. Cat. N-017. The volume D 2.13 Art.Seld consists of two works bound together: (1) Johannes Franciscus Picus de Mirandula, *De Providentia Dei* (Cortemaggiore: Benedictus Mangius Dulcibellus, 1508); (2) Valla as listed here. The inscriptions by which Coates *et al.* attribute ownership of the volume to Thomas Linacre, and subsequently Richard Sparkford/Sparcheford, archdeacon of Shropshire from 1537 (d. 1560), and Ludlow parish church of St Laurence, appear only on sig. A1 of (1); the motto of John Selden (1584-1654), whence the volume reached the Bodleian, appears on both sig. A2 of (1) and sig. A1r of (2). An inscription along the fore-edge in a sixteenth-century hand, reading '[. . . Mi]randula . . .', is noted by Coates on palaeographical grounds as an indication that the two works travelled together before they were owned by Selden. Comparison with other books owned by Sparkford (e.g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, L.1.13.Jur[1]), Selden (e.g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° L 9 Th.Seld.; S 1.20 Jur.Seld.), and Linacre (descriptions in Giles Barber, 'Thomas Linacre: A Bibliographical Survey of his Works', nos. 6, 7, 13, 18, in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre*, ed. Maddison *et al.*, 290-336), does not reveal a traceable practice of fore-edge inscription; from the available evidence it is therefore not possible to specify the owner in whose possession the items first travelled together. Circumstantially, it could well have been owned by Linacre, whose books, interests, and associates reflect his time in Italy in the circle of Aldus Manutius; Valla, too, can be linked to the Aldine circle through Aldus's patron, Alberto Pio, to whom Valla dedicated the 1498 volume and who later acquired his library, and through Aldus's 1501 printing of *De expetendis* (see Charles Schmitt, 'Alberto Pio and the Aristotelian Studies of His Time' in *Società, politica e cultura a Carpi ai tempi di Alberto III Pio* [Padua, 1981], 44-5, 53, and 'Thomas Linacre and Italy' in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre*, ed. Maddison *et al.*, 36-75; see also Tigerstedt, 'Notes on the Transmission', 16). Item (2), Valla's 1498 collection of *opuscula*, thus cannot be ascribed to Linacre with the same certainty as item (1), but its presence in sixteenth-century England seems beyond doubt.

Lorkin, Thomas (d.1591)[38]

BCI, 168: Thomas Lorkin, 1591.

10. G. Vallae op*er*a 2. vol*uminibus*

* Valla, Giorgio. *De expetendis, et fugiendis rebus opus.* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Romani, impensa, ac studio Ioannis Petri Vallae filii pientiss., 1501. 2 vols. fº.[39]

Lumley, John (c.1533-1609), first Baron Lumley

Sears Reynolds Jayne and Francis R. Johnson, *The Lumley Library; the Catalogue of 1609* (London, 1956).

Artes Liberales et Philosophi / Folio

1528. Aristotelis opera latine, duobus voluminibus. Basle, 1542. 3 vols. bound as two. BL C.76.f.5

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed., *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera quae in hunc usque diem extant omnia...* Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1542. 3 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.033

1532. Aristotelis opera omnia graece. Basle, 1550.[40] BL C.76.f.4

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel & Michael Isingrinius, 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.174.

1540. Averrois in Aristotelis [...] Averrois epitome in logica Aristotelis, rhetorica, et poetica.

De Balmes, Abraham. *Index illorum que in hoc volumine continentur...* Venetiis: per Io. Antonium & fratres de Sabio, 1523. fº. *IAAr* 107.887[41]

---

[38] Matriculated as a pensioner from Pembroke College, Cambridge, 1549; moved to a scholarship at Queens'; elected to a Fellowship there, 1551, shortly before proceeding B.A.; moved to a Fellowship at Peterhouse, 1553; thence M.A., 1555; licensed to practice medicine, 1559; M.D. 1560; married in 1560 to Catherine, the daughter of John Hatcher (see above and in Appendix II), which led to his inheriting some of his father-in-law's books; Regius Professor of Physic from 1564. Lorkin's inventory also contains records which cannot be identified certainly but may have contained the *Poetics*; cf. Appendix II, **Lorkin, Thomas**.

[39] This identification is suggested by Leedham-Green from Adams's *Catalogue of Books*; see Chapter II for a discussion for the difficulties involved, and the potential problems of using Adams as a source, in identifying catalogue entries for Valla. Leedham-Green also notes that this item can probably be traced to the inventory of John Hatcher, two of whose Valla holdings may match it (no. 157, 'vall: placeij:'; no. 237, 'geor*gius* valla de expetend*is* / et fugiend*is*'); if Lorkin's entry corresponds to the latter of Hatcher's, this identification would be more firm.

[40] Provenance: 1528 and 1532 are inscribed by Lumley; 1532 is also inscribed by Humphrey Lloyd/Llwyd (d.1568). John, Lord Lumley, inherited the accumulated libraries of Thomas Cranmer, confiscated by the Crown after the accession of Mary, and Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, who had received Cranmer's books and kept them at Nonesuch. Arundel and subsequently Lumley were aided in the collection of the library by Humphrey Lloyd, an Oxford M.A. employed as physician to the Arundel household and later Lumley's brother-in-law; on Lloyd, see further R. G. Gruffydd, 'Humphrey Llwyd: some documents and a catalogue', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society* 17 (1968), 54-107, no. 4. For the library's complex history see in general Jayne and Johnson, and David Selwyn, *The Library of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1996), esp. 326. A full catalogue of the Lumley library made in 1596 is now lost, but 'the 1609 Lumley catalogue is in reality only a copy of the 1596' (Jayne and Johnson, 27). Incorporated into the Royal Library under James I, the Lumley library was donated to the British Museum in 1757; nos. 1528 and 1532 are thus listed in the manuscript catalogue, completed c.1761, of the Old Royal Library (BL, C.120.h.6), 41, on which see **Edward VI**. Lumley's donation of the same volumes to the Bodleian in 1599 seems not to survive: see **Oxford, Bodleian Library**, *s.v.* 'Bodleian Benefactors Register', and note.

[41] Lumley's catalogue entry in full reads as follows, as reproduced by Jayne and Johnson:

Averrois in Aristotelis { *Posteriora* / *Topica* } { *Elenchos* / *Rhetorica* } } *Poemata*

Eiusdem Averrois et aliorum logica.
Abrahami de balneis interpres in paraphrases logicales.
Abrah: de Balneis de demonstratione liber.
Averrois epitome in logica Aristotelis, rhetorica, et poetica. } *Abualkasis Benadari. Alpharabis Abuhabadhalradman ben Iohar Abualilidh*

Medici / In Folio

2408.d. Georgius Valla interpres operum subsequentium: Nicephori logicae...

Valla, Giorgio. *Hoc in volumine haec continentur: Nicephori logica... Aristotelis ars poetica...* Venetiis: Per Simone*m* Papiensem dictum Beuilaquam, 1498. fº.

Early Bookowners in Britain

Eton College Library, Fb.2.1

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera*. Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531. 2 vols. fº. IAAr 107.928.[42]

Mary, Queen of Scots (1542-1587), see **James VI and I**

*** Morison, Sir Richard (c.1513-1556)**, see **'Unknown scholar'**

Oxford

All Souls College

N. R. Ker, ed., *Records of All Souls College Library, 1437-1600* (Oxford, 1971), List XVI (c.1548) from the Vellum Inventory, ff.32v-34v, comprising books acquired in 1544-5.

1156. Aristoteles latine primum volumen 2 fo de vita — Gallery, i.1.6: vols. 1 & 2

1157. secundum volumen 2 fo clarissimo — Gallery, i.1.7: vol. 3

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed., *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera quae in hunc usque diem extant omnia...* Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1542. 3 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.033

Jayne and Johnson identify this book speculatively as 'Abraham de Balmes. Probably Venice, 1552, no size, cited by Gesner [*Bibliotheca... in epitomen redacta...* Zurich, 1583], p.2.' De Balmes's translations from Arabic did appear in 1552 in *Compendium necessarium ex lib. Aristotelis De generatione et corruptione...* (Venice, 1552), but clearly a volume of medical works is indicated neither here nor by Gesner; the 1552 publication referred to by Gesner is rather the Giunta edition of Aristotle-Averroes (Venice, 1550-1552), *IAAr* 108.193, into the first two volumes of which several of De Balmes's translations of Averroes's logical and rhetorical commentaries were incorporated. The emphasis in Lumley's catalogue on De Balmes's translations in particular, however, makes it highly improbable that this record indicates the 1552 Aristotle-Averroes, which, moreover, lacks De Balmes's '*de demonstratione liber*'. The record matches in order and phrasing the contents of De Balmes's 1523 volume indicated here, the catalogue's '*Averrois epitome in logica Aristotelis, rhetorica, et poetica*' being a more detailed description of '*Epithoma Auerroys omnium librorum logice*'. Indeed, it reveals close study of the volume's contents: 'Abualkasis benadaris', 'Alpharabis', 'Abuhabadhalrahman ben Iohar', and 'Abualilidh' (an errant rendering of Abu al-Walid, i.e. Averroes) appear as authors only in the index for the sixth section of the book, '*Quesita logica Auerroys & aliorum*' (sigs. [AA7^{r-v}]), and in the relevant chapter headings (pp.95-112); 'Alhagiag bintalmus' and 'Abualkasim mahamath ben rasam' are listed in the book's contents but not by the Lumley cataloguer. Several of these works and authors have not been identified, and are first witnessed in this volume: see Charles Burnett, 'Arabic into Latin' in *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, ed. Peter Adamson and Richard C. Taylor (Cambridge, 2004), n.68 and *s.v.* Ibn Rushd (1-9a, 15a, 16, 17b, 18b, 19a, 40b), Ibn Tumlus, Abu al-Qasim ibn Idris, Abu al-Qasim Muhammad, Abu 'Abd al-Rahman (?) ibn Jawhar. I am indebted to Theodor Dunkelgrün for his expert decryption of 'Abualilidh'.

[42] Not listed in Selwyn, *The Library of Thomas Cranmer*, the signatures of both Thomas Cranmer and Lumley are bleached from the title-page of this volume.

Gallery, i.10.1-6

Camozzi, G. B., ed. *Aristotelis Opera omnia, graece, studio Ioannis Baptistae Camotii*. Venetiis: apud Aldi filios, 1551-3. 6 vols. 8º. *IAAr* 108.218[43]

Bodleian Library

Thomas James, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae publicae quam vir ornatissimus Thomas Bodleius eques auratus in Academia Oxoniensi nuper instituit...* (Oxford, 1605).[44]

Libri Artium

A.1.7. [Arist.] Opera Gr. & Lat. *Lugd* 1590.[45] B 3.13 Art.

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. *Operum Aristotelis nova editio graece et latine.* Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium, 1590. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.708

A.1.*. [Arist.] opuscula Italicè. 1549. in 4o. A.19.20. & 21. et in 8o. A.1. *e*t 4.[46] 4° A 20 Art.

Segni, Bernardo. *Rettorica e Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina*. Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549. 4º. *IAAr* 108.157

A.1.12-17. *Arist.* oper. cu*m Auerrois* Com. *Ven*. 1552.[47]

---

43 Provenance: John Hawkins, 16th century, from inscription in sixteenth-century hand on first end leaf: 'Jo: Hawkins Esq.' It is not possible to trace the owner from the inscription; the Early Book Cataloguer at All Souls observes, moreover, that the inscription does not indicate a direct donation to the College. The volumes were doubtless present in sixteenth-century England, but it may not be possible to determine where.

44 The sign ¶ was used by James to indicate a volume bound with another (cross-referenced at the end of the entry after Q[uaere]) for want of space; * indicates a quarto or octavo volume kept in the library's Closets. I have listed the Bodleian's holdings of works related to poetics more generally, in part because of the unusual extent of the list, and in part because James's inclusion of commentators on the *Poetics* in his index of Aristotelian commentaries is the earliest example I have seen of the *Poetics* being categorised independently in an English library catalogue. The index '*Interpretes... In Lib. de Arte Poetica*' (p.425) lists 'Aueeroes', 'Barth. Lombardus, M 5.8', and 'Vincent. Madius, M 5.8'. It has proved possible, when a volume was recorded in 1605 as bound with another (named) volume, to compare that unique combination with the Bodleian's current holdings. It has also been possible to identify many of the donors of these volumes by comparison with the Bodleian Benefactors Register, compiled from earlier records from 1602-4 and receiving manuscript additions after printing; for the shortcomings of the Register – its bias, its coverage, its accuracy and its completeness – see Kristian Jensen, 'Problems of Provenance: Incunabula in the Bodleian Library's Benefactors' Register 1600-2', in *Incunabula: Studies in Fifteenth-century Printed Books Presented to Lotte Hellinga*, ed. Martin Davies (London, 1999), 559-602. I have corrected in parentheses dates listed in the Register which disagree with W. D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library, Oxford,* 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1984).

45 Probably purchased with the donation of Sir Alexander Hampden, '1603' (*recte* 1601). See Bod. Ben. Reg., 27: 'Alexander Hampden Armiger donauit x. libras... Aristotelis Opera Grae. Lat. fol. Lugd. 1590.' The Bodleian copy now shelved at B 3.13 Art. records the earlier cancelled shelfmark, A.1.7. Art., on the title-page.

46 Donated by Sir Michael Dormer, '1604' (Bod. Ben. Reg., 73-4; *recte* 1603), among a large bequest of Italian books (Macray, *Annals*, 16, 30). The individual *opuscula* in this record can be identified by the shelfmarks they still bear: 4° A 19 and 20 Art. are Segni's two companion volumes of vernacular translation, *Trattato dei governi di Aristotile* (Firenze, 1549) and *Rettorica e Poetica* respectively; 8° A 1 Art. binds together Antonio Brucciolì's Aristotelian translations, *La Meteora* (Venice, 1555) and *Della generatione & corrutione* (Venice, 1552); 8° A 4 Art. binds together the 1551 reprint of Segni's *Trattato dei governi* with Brucciolì's translation of the *Politics*, *Gli otto libri della republica* (Venice, 1547). Currently shelved at 4° A 21 Art. is Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (Ferrara, 1532), but since the 1620 catalogue lists only a 1548 edition of Ariosto (as can also be found in Dormer's bequest) at 4° A.12, and the binding of the current 1532 edition is not of a kind with the other *opuscula* in this set, we may surmise that the Aristotelian *opusculum* shelved at 4° A.21 in 1605 has been lost rather than being listed in error; it probably corresponded originally to the third in Segni's series of translations, bequeathed by Dormer but not currently held by the Bodleian, 'L'Ethica di Arist. commentata per il Segni. 4. Fir. 1550.'

47 Purchased with the donation of Alice Chamberlaine, 1601. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 26: 'Alicia Chambrelaine Domina de Sherborne in Comit. Oxon. donauit xl. libras... Auerrois Opera 6 vol. fº. Ven. 1552.'

Bagolinus, Giovanni Baptista, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae Omnia quae extant opera...* Venetiis: apud Iuntas, 1550-1552. 11 vols. f°. *IAAr* 108.193

A.1.¶ [Auerroes] in Poeticam *Arist. Ven.* 1515. Q.M.4.6.[48] K 1.20 Art.

Achillinus, Alexander, ed. *Rhetorica Aristotelis ... Addita eiusdem Aristotelis Poetica, cum Auerroys...* Venetiis: Georgium Arriuabenum, 1515. f°. *IAAr* 107.828

B.6.11. Discorsi Poetici in difesa d'Arist. por M. Fr. *Buonimici*. *Flor.* 1597.[49] 4° B 47 Art.

M 5.8. Vincent. *Madius* in Arist. et Horat. de Arte Poetica. *Ven.* 1550.[50]

Maggi, Vincenzo, and Bartholomeo Lombardi. *In Aristotelis librum De poetica communes explicationes*. Venetiis: In officina Erasmiana Vincentii Valgrisii, 1550. f°.

M.¶. ¶. An. Seb. *Minturnus* de Poeta. 1559. Q.V.4.13[51] 4° V 32 Art.

P.5.8. Io Bapt. *Pignae* Poetica Horatiana. *Ven*. 1561.[52]

Pigna, Giovanni Battista. *Poetica Horatiana*. Venetiis: Vincentium Valgrisium, 1561. f°.

R.2.13 *Rhetores* Graeci in vno Vol. *Ven*. 1508.[53]

Ducas, Demetrius, ed. *Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi: Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata...* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi, 1508-9. 2 vols. Royal 4°.

---

48 Purchased with the donation of Sir Valentine Knightley, 1604. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 77: 'Valentinvs Knightley Miles donavit x. libras... Egid. de Roma super Rhetor. Arist. f°. Ven. 1515.' Bound by 1605 with M.4.6., i.e. Menghus Blanchellus, *Menghi Faventini subtilissime expositiones questionesque super summulis magistri Pauli Veneti* (Venice, 1542), it was previously shelved at M.7.1.Art, under which shelfmark it was already recorded in James's 1620 catalogue, and survives in this configuration.

49 Purchased with the donation of Martin Heton, Bishop of Ely, 1603, with V.***.¶., below. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 64: 'Martin Heton Episc. Eliensis, donauit xl. libras... Lezzioni de Ben. Varchi. 4. Fir. 1590... Discorsi poetici di F. Buonamici. 4. Fir. 1597.' The two volumes were bound together by 1605 and survive in this configuration.

50 Purchased with the donation of Sir Maurice Barkeley, 1604. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 81: 'Mavricius Barkeley Miles, donauit xxx. libras... Madius & Lombardus in Arist. de Poetica &c. fo. Ven. 1550.'

51 Purchased with the donation of Sir John Scudamore, 1603. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 74: 'Ioannes Scvdamorvs Miles donauit xl. libras... Sebastianus Minturnus de Poeta. 4. Ven. 1559.' Bound by 1605 with V.4.13 ('Discorsi Grammaticali del Batt. Vangelista Fermano. Ven. 1596'), it survives in this configuration.

52 Purchased with the donation of Sir George Cary, 1603, with R.* below. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 60: 'Georgivs Cary Miles, & Thesaurarius pro bello in *Hibernia*, donauit Lxxxxv. libras... Pignae poetica Horatiana. fo. Ven. 1601 [in error for 1561]... Robertellus in Arist. Poeticam. fo. Bas. 1555 / Robertellus in Horat. de Arte Poetica &c.' The two volumes were bound together by 1605. In the same bequest was a copy of Francesco Patrizi's *Della poetica* (Ferrara, 1586), recorded in the 1605 catalogue under P.2.¶. The identity of 'Georgivs Cary Miles' has frequently been mistaken: Macray and Jayne (*LCER*, 133) both attribute the donation to George Carey (1548-1603), second Baron Hunsdon, who had previously donated books in 1600 (Macray's note on the donation of Lord Hunsdon is indexed under Henry, first Lord Hunsdon, but identified as 'Geo. Carey' in the marginal annotations to Bodleian Librarian Edward B. Nicholson's copy of the *Annals* formerly in Duke Humfrey's Library, 2590 d.Oxf.1.9, and corrected by Kristian Jensen, 'Problems of Provenance', 585, n.134). But a case of mistaken identity in the Register is not likely, as Hunsdon was an important donor, and the Register entry for 1603 does not feature among the several errors Bodley notes in correspondence with Thomas James. 'Thesaurarius pro bello in Hibernia' points not to Hunsdon but to Sir George Carey (c.1541-1616), Lord Deputy in Ireland and treasurer-at-war from 1599-1606; the identification is confirmed in the *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to the University of Oxford 1598-1611*, ed. G. W. Wheeler (Oxford, 1927), nos. 9-10.

53 Donated by Sir John Fortescue or Nicholas Bond, President of Magdalen College, 1601. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 23: 'Donum Ioannis Fortescve Militis, Reg. Ma. à Consiliis... Rhetores Graeci. 4. Ald.'; 28: 'Nicolavs Bondvs Praeses Coll. Magd. donauit xviij vol. praeter x. libras in pecunijs... Rhetores Graeci. fo. Aldus. 1518' (in error for 1508, or perhaps for 1513, in which case the donor was Fortescue; see Chapter I, n115, for a discussion of this problem). In the same benefaction Fortescue donated the 1495-8 Aldine edition of Aristotle's *opera*, which appears in the 1605 catalogue under *Libri Artium*, A.1.1-6; a duplicate of this set was donated by Henry Stanford, but 'it seems probable that this copy has been alienated and that of John Fortescue retained' (Jensen, 'Problems of Provenance', 567-8).

R.* [Fr. Robortellus] in Arist. & Horatium de arte Poetica, &c. 1555. Q.P.5.8.[54]

Robortello, Francesco. *In librum Aristotelis De arte Poetica explicationes...* Basileae: Ioannem Heruagium iuniorem, 1555. fº.

S.4.9. Iul. Caes. *Scaligeri* Poetices. L.7.1561.[55] M 2.17 Art.

V.1.4. Georg. *Vallae* de expet. & fugiendis rebus opus. *Ven* 1501[56]

V.***.¶. Lezzioni di M. Benedetto *Varchi*. *Flor.* 1590. QB.6.11.[57] 4° B 47 Art.

Varchi, Benedetto. *Lezzioni.* Fiorenza: Filippo Giunti, 1590. 4º.

Appendix ad Lib. Artium

A.¶. *Aegidius* super poetria Arist. MS.Q.H.3.10[58] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Bodl. 300

Bodleian Benefactors Register

p.11. *Donum Ioannis Lumley, Baronis de Lumley*[59]

Arist. Opera Lat. 2. vol. fo. Bas. 1542.

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed., *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera quae in hunc usque diem extant omnia...* Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1542. 3 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.033

Arist. Opera Grae. fo. Bas. 1531.

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928.

Corpus Christi College

J. R. Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century', *The Library* s.4, 18.4 (1938), 385-416.

51. Aristotelis opera, latine, duobus voluminibus. *Basle 1538.* Fol. I.22 – 23

[54] See note *s.v.* P.5.8, above.

[55] Probably purchased with the donation of Sir Robert Sidney, 1600. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 12: 'Robertvs Sidney Miles, donauit summam C. librarum... Scaligeri Poetic. fo. Gen. 1561.' By the compilation of the 1620 catalogue this volume had been moved along to S.5.9; the volume at M 2.17 Art. still bears this cancelled shelfmark.

[56] Probably purchased with the donation of Dr. Daniel Dun, 1601. See Bod. Ben. Reg., 27: 'Daniel Dvn Armiger a Libellis Supplicum Reg. Maiest. donauit x. libras... Georgij Vallae Opera fo. Ven. 1501.'

[57] See note *s.v.* B.6.11, above. The volume contains Varchi's lectures 'Della poetica' and 'Della poesia', of 1553-4.

[58] Fifteenth century manuscript, bearing inscription 'Ex dono magistri Yngham quondam huius collegii socius' on f.1v. ff.90-98v contain a commentary on the *Poetics*, misattributed to Aegidius Romanus by James and in the *Summary Catalogue*, but correctly identified by Georges Lacombe (*Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, no. 323; cf. I.103-4) as Hermannus's translation of Averroes's commentary on the *Poetics*. The volume was donated by John Ingham (on whom see *Libraries of Cambridge*, 704-5) to Clare College, Cambridge, where it was seen by Leland (c.1535) and subsequently John Bale; later purchased by Sir Robert Cecil and donated to the Bodleian by 1605. See *Summary Catalogue*, 2474; Neil Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 2nd ed. (London, 1964), 25, 237; *Libraries of Cambridge*, UC15.22-3; and for Leland and Bale, R. W. Hunt, 'Medieval Inventories of Clare College Library', *TCBS* 1.2 (1950), 123.

[59] These books appear in Bod. Ben. Reg. in the '1600' bequest (*recte* 1599: Jayne and Johnson, *The Lumley Library*, 12) of duplicates from the library of John, Lord Lumley, but unlike most books recorded in the Benefactors Register they do not appear in James's 1605 catalogue. Why this should be the case is unclear: these editions of *opera omnia* do not duplicate the Bodleian's other holdings at the time, which included, under *Liber Artium*, the Aldine 1495-8 edition (A.1.1-6), the Giunta Aristotle/Averroes edition of 1550-52 (A.1.12), and Casaubon's 1590 Graeco-latin edition (A.1.7). It is possible that James, inundated with large volumes, decided to retain only the prestigious *editio princeps* and the most modern editions, respectively, and so sold Lumley's gifts; the likelihood that the record is in error (as discussed by Jensen, 'Problems of Provenance') is low, as Lumley was an important donor and the volumes were well known.

Grynaeus, Simon, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae... opera quae quidem extant omnia...* Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1538. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.968[60]

99. Aphthonius Hermogenes, Aristotelis rhetorica et poetica, Dionysius Halicarnasseus Demetrius Phalerius caeterique graeci Rhetores. *Venice 1508.* Δ.5.11 – 12

101. In Aphthonii progymnasmata commentaria authoris incerti, et Syriani Sopatri Marcellini commentaria in Hermogenis Rhetorica, grece. *Venice 1510.*

Ducas, Demetrius, ed. *Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi: Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata...* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi, 1508-9. 2 vols. Royal 4º.[61]

J. R. Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1517-1617', B.Litt. thesis, University of Oxford (1933).

p.101. Aristotelis Opera per Casaubon. 2 vols. Orleans. Fol. I.15/1 – 2

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. *Operum Aristotelis nova editio graece et latine...* Aureliae Allobrogum: apud Samuelum Crispinum, 1605. 2 vols. fº.[62]

Merton College

121.A.4 – 7

Bagolinus, Giovanni Baptista, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae Omnia quae extant opera...* Venetiis: apud Iuntas, 1550-1552. 11 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.193[63]

121.B.8(1) – (2)

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. *Operum Aristotelis nova editio graece et latine...* Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium, 1590. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.708[64]

New College

Restricted BT1.37.3

Valla, Giorgio. *Hoc in volumine haec continentur: Nicephori logica... Aristotelis ars poetica...* Venetiis: Simone*m* Papiensem dictum Beuilaquam, 1498. fº.[65]

Restricted BT1.63.11, 12

Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928[66]

---

60 Bequest of Richard Alan, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, 1552 (Liddell, 400).

61 Bequest of Richard Fox, Founder of Corpus Christi College, 1517-28 (Liddell, 401).

62 Liddell reads 'Orleans' ('Aurelia') but 'Aureliae Allobrogum' indicates Geneva. This book was purchased by the College on February 10, 1609-10.

63 Donated by Thomas Savile (d.1593), from the title-page inscription: 'Thomas Sauile, Procurator, ac socius huius domus iuuenis moriens gratitudinis ergo dono dedit Collegio'. Savile, a fellow of Merton from 1581 and a Master of Arts from 1584, was a Greek philologist with particular interest in Aristotelian philosophy (see Robert B. Todd, 'Savile, Thomas (d.1593)', *ODNB*).

64 The sixteenth-century binding of this volume probably narrows the reference of the final free endpaper recto inscription, 'Georgius Dux Buckingamiae' to George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham (d.1628).

65 Provenance: Christophorus Longolius (1488-1522); Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500-1558). Inscription at head of title page: 'Christophorus de longueil ... emi xxij *s*....' See A. B. Emden, 'Longolius's collection of books', appendix XXVIII to Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, XI.379-83, no. 3. Shortly before his death in 1522, Longolius bequeathed his collection of books to his friend and patron Cardinal Pole. During Pole's lifetime they remained part of his personal library at Lambeth; they were donated after his death to New College by the offices of Alvise Priuli, the sole executor of Pole's will of 4 Oct. 1558.

66 Donated by Henry Cole (1504/5-1579/80), fellow (1523) and later Warden (1542) of New College and Dean

St John's College

Θ.1.9 – Θ.1.14

Bagolinus, Giovanni Baptista, ed. *Aristotelis Stagiritae Omnia quae extant opera...* Venetiis: apud Iuntas, 1550-1552. 11 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.193[67]

Oxford, St John's College, Benefactors Book.

col. 9. Aristotelis opera Latine 2obus volum: Basil 1542

Gemusaeus, Hieronymus, ed., *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera quae in hunc usque diem extant omnia...* Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1542. 3 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.033[68]

Parker, Matthew (1504-1575), see **Cambridge, Corpus Christi College**

Percy, Henry (1564-1632), Ninth Earl of Northumberland

G. R. Batho, 'The Library of the Wizard Earl: Henry Percy Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)', *The Library* s.5, 15.3 (1960), 246-261.

Appendix I: Books Annotated by the Ninth Earl of Northumberland

p.259. Aristotle, *Operum, quotquot extant, Latina editio,* Frankfurt, 1593, 11 vols., 8°, of which only vol 1, part 1, of *Physica* (vol 2) and vol 1 of *Ethica* (vol 10) annotated. Pet.

i.e. Francofurti: apud Andreas Wecheli heredes, Claudium Marnium & Io. Aubrium. *IAAr* 108.721

p.259. [Aristotle], *Rettorica et Poetica,* tr. B. Segni, Firenze, 1549, 8°. Pet[69]

Segni, Bernardo. *Rettorica e Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina*. Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549. 4º. *IAAr* 108.157

Perne, Andrew (1519?-1589)[70], see **Cambridge, Peterhouse**

---

of St Paul's, from the title-page inscription: 'Liber collegij b[ea]tae mariae wynton in Oxon dono Henrici Cole ... 1565.'

67 Donated by William Paddy (c.1553-1634), from the college *ex dono* inscription, dated 1600.

68 Donated by Henry Cole (1504/5-1579/80); see **Oxford, New College**. Cole's donation is undated: the latest date of a listed volume provides a *terminus post quem* of 1555; the closest prior donation with a date is Thomas Paynell's (cols. 3-7), which bears the running title of 'MDLV' over cols. 3-4. T. F. Mayer estimates that the bequest was made around 1559, Cole 'perhaps seeing the end coming' before his conflict with John Jewel sent him to the Tower in 1560 (see T. F. Mayer, 'Cole, Henry (1504/5-1579/80)', *ODNB*).

69 Segni's seminal Italian translation was first printed in 1549 in quarto (*IAAr* 108.157), and reprinted in 1551 in octavo (*IAAr* 108.221); since the book survives and was examined by Batho, either the 1549 printing was not limited to quarto, or the entry is in error. 'Pet.' indicates a volume in the collection of Mr. John Wyndham at Petworth House.

70 B.A. 1539 and M.A. 1540 from St John's College, Cambridge; five-term Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, first elected 1551; Master of Peterhouse from 1554; Dean of Ely 1557, but remained mostly in Cambridge; library left to Peterhouse on his death in 1589 (see Patrick Collinson, 'Perne, Andrew [1519?-1589]', *ODNB*). Perne's inventory can be found in *BCI*, 164: Andrew Perne, 1589; the volumes subsequently shelved at Peterhouse appear as no. 959 'Aris*toteles* in 5 vol*uminibus* grec*e* 4o', and no. 1578, 'Aristoteles in duobus lat*ine* fol.' Note that Perne's inventory elsewhere records an Aristotelian work impossible to identify with certainty, but, in common with other Cambridge inventory records, likely containing the *Poetics*: cf. Appendix II, **Perne, Andrew**.

Pickering, Robert (d.1551)[71]

BCI, 52: Robert Pickering I, 1551.

3. op*er*a arist*otelis* grece in 2b*us* vol*uminibus*

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. f°. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.

Pole, Cardinal Reginald (1500-1558), see Oxford, New College

Rainolds, John (1549-1607)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Wood D. 10.[72]

p.43. Aristotelis opera grae. vol. 7. 4o.[73]

Sylburg, F., ed. *Ἀριστοτέλους τὰ εὑρισκόμενα. Aristotelis Opera quae extant*... Francofordi a.M.: apud Andreae Wecheli heredes, Claudium Marnium, & Ioannem Aubrium, 1584-87. 11 vols. 4°. *IAAr* 108.664[74]

p.47. Aristotelis opera omnia graecolat. fo.[75]

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. *Operum Aristotelis nova editio graece et latine.* Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium, 1590. 2 vols. f°. *IAAr* 108.708[76]

p.74. Petrus Victorius in Aristotelis Rhetorica*,* unà cu*m* Roburtello in Arist. poetica, & lib. Horatij de arte poëtica. & Borrhaio in Aris. Rhetorica. fo.[77]

Robortello, Francesco. *In librum Aristotelis De arte Poetica explicationes...* Florentiae: Lorenzo Torrentino,

---

[71] Scholar at Eton; to King's College, Cambridge, aged 16, in 1531; elected Fellow, 1534; B.A. 1535/6; M.A. 1539; M.D. 1548.

[72] According to the terms of his will, Rainolds's magnificent library was distributed in late 1607 among friends, colleagues, and nephews (William Rainolds, Charles and Matthew Cheriton), as well as, in the words of Anthony Wood, who discovered this manuscript in the hands of Henry Jackson, Rector of Hampton-Meysey in Gloucestershire and once a fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 'divers stude*n*ts of severall colleges & halls in Oxon, especially such th*a*t had sat at his feet & were his admirers, & had also for severall yearis returnid to him (as to an oracle) for the resolution of doubts' (first flyleaf recto). Those groups of students, recorded in MS Wood D. 10 by Rainolds's executors, were from Magdalen (pp.19-23), St John's (25-7), Balliol (29-31), Gloucester Hall (33-4), Corpus Christi most of all (35-58), All Souls (61-3), Lincoln (65-6), Queen's (69-77), Exeter (81-4), Brasenose (85-94), Trinity (95-9), Oriel (101-2), Merton (103-6), New (107-9), and University (110-11) Colleges, with the addition of individual students from other colleges. For further discussion of the bequests, and a detailed list of books assigned to Corpus Christi College in particular, see Liddell, 'The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1517-1617', 74-83.

[73] Delivered to 'Sr Hampton', i.e. John Hampton, gent., of Southants; matriculated at Corpus Christi College, 1601-2, aged 16; B.A. 1605; M.A. 1608-9; B.D. 1617. See Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* (Oxford, London, 1891). It is worth noting that Rainolds also bequeathed to Hampton a copy of 'Julii Scaligeri Poemata. 8o.'

[74] The quarto size given for this Greek *opera* identifies it as Sylburg's edition of 1584-7, bound here in seven volumes; see **Perne, Andrew**, 959, for a record of the same work bound in five.

[75] Delivered to Thomas Holte, of Surrey, pleb. Merton College; matriculated 1603, aged 10; B.A. from Corpus Christi College, 1611; M.A. 1614-15, B.D. 1624.

[76] Of the two bilingual *opera* printed in the 1590s, the format of this volume indicates that it was Casaubon's folio rather than Pace's octavo edition (Geneva, 1597; *IAAr* 108.755).

[77] Delivered to Thomas Sutton, of Westmorland, pleb. Queen's College, Oxford; matriculated 1602, aged 17; B.A. 1606; M.A. 1609; fellow 1611; B.D. 1616; D.D. 1620. See Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*; Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, 3rd ed. (London, 1813-20), II.338; *ODNB*. 'Petrus Victorius in Aristotelis Rhetorica', i.e. *Petri Victorii Commentarii in tres libros Aristotelis De arte dicendi* (Florence, 1548, 1579); 'Borrhaio in Aris. Rhetorica', i.e. Martin Borrhaus, *In tres Aristotelis de arte dicendi libros commentaria* (Basel, 1551).

1548, repr. Basileae: Ioannem Heruagium iuniorem, 1555. fº.

p.75. Orationes ex Graecis Latinisque historicis excerptae, una cu*m* poëtica Horatiana Baptistae Pignae. fo.[78]

Pigna, Giovanni Battista. *Poetica Horatiana*. Venetiis: Vincentium Valgrisium, 1561. fº.

Shirwoode, Reuben (c.1542-1599)[79]

James Hannam, 'The Library of Reuben Shirwoode (c1542-1599)', *TCBS* 13.2 (2005), 175-186.

9. Opera Arist. duobus voluminibus[80]

Saint Andrew's Colleges

Maitland Club, 'Inventories of Buikis in the Colleges of Sanctandrois, 1588-1612', *Maitland Club Miscellany* 1.2 (1834), 303-329.

p.323. Aristotelis Opera, Graeco Lat. fo.[81]

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. *Operum Aristotelis nova editio graece et latine.* Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium, 1590. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.708

Savile, Thomas (d.1593), see **Oxford, Merton College**, 121.A.4 – 121.A.7

Smith, Sir Thomas (1513-1577)

J. Strype, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith Kt.* (London, 1698), Appendix VI, 139-47.

p.143. Ἀριστοτέλης, vol. ii.

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.[82]

---

[78] Delivered to 'Adam Airay', or Ayray, of Westmorland, pleb. Queen's College, Oxford; matriculated 1604-5, aged 19; B.A. 1608; M.A. 1611; B.D. 1619. See Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*.

[79] Schoolmaster and physician, son of a groom of the privy chamber under Edward VI; educated first at Eton; scholarship to King's College, Cambridge, 1558; elected Fellow, 1561; B.A. 1562; M.A. 1566; filled several administrative posts in the College; also incorporated M.A. at Oxford, 1566; University Proctor at Cambridge, 1569/70; Headmaster of Eton, 1571; M.D. from Cambridge, 1581; candidate for the College of Physicians, 1584, later a Fellow.

[80] If, as Hannam suggests, the booklist inscribed on the inside front cover of Shirwoode's commonplace book consists of 'books that belonged to Shirwoode during and shortly after his M.A. studies', i.e. 1566-71, this two-volume *opera* certainly would have contained the *Poetics* (Hannam, 178).

[81] Recorded under the heading: 'Libri quos Serenissimus Princeps Henricus Magnae Brittaniae Haeres et Princeps Valliae, Academiae Andreapolitanae donavit, 4 August 1612.' Prince Henry inherited the Lumley library in October, 1609; this donation was made just three months before his death on November 6, 1612 (see James M. Sutton, 'Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales (1594-1612)', *ODNB*). As the Lumley library contained no truly bilingual edition of Aristotle's *Opera*, this was almost certainly a newly-purchased bequest, although see the notes on **Cambridge, Pembroke College**, UC45.35, and **Cambridge, Trinity College**, OL97 for the problems involved in interpreting records of bilingual books. It is not possible to identify with any certainty the entry in a subsequent list: 'Ex Donatione M. Gulielmi Edmistonii, Angli, SS. Theologiae Baccal. et in Collegio quod est Oxoniae Socii. Aristotelis et Theophrasti Opera, 4 vol. fol.'; its format may indicate the Aldine Aristotle of 1495-8, five volumes bound here in four.

[82] The class catalogue of Sir Thomas Smith's books at Hill Hall was compiled on 1 August, 1566; a two-volume Greek *opera* at this date could indicate any of the three Erasmus editions.

Tresham, Sir Thomas (1534-1605)

BL, Add. MS 39,830, ff.155v-214r.[83]

f.180v. *Rhetorici libri in 4to*

4. Rettorica, et poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di Greco in lingua volgare Fiorentina Da Bernardo Segni / Firenze.1549 /.[84]

i.e. Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549. 4º. *IAAr* 108.157

f.205r.

50. Opera Aristotelis noua editio grece et Latine. Lugduni. An*n*o 1590.. fol.mag[85]

Casaubon, Isaac, ed. Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium, 1590. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 108.708

Sinclair, Henry (1508-1565)[86]

Early Bookowners in Britain

Edinburgh, University Library, JA 1029-1033[87]

Camozzi, G. B., ed. *Aristotelis Opera omnia, graece, studio Ioannis Baptistae Camotii*. Venetiis: apud Aldi filios, 1551-3. 6 vols. 8º. *IAAr* 108.218.

'Unknown scholar' (second quarter of sixteenth century)

BL, Add. MS 40,676, ff.110r.-119v.[88]

---

[83] This manuscript contains two copies of a catalogue of Sir Thomas Tresham's library, estimated by Jayne to comprise around 2600 manuscripts and print books, none later than 1589; subsequent folios list acquisitions up to 1605. I have here used the second, more detailed, copy (f.167ff.) as a base text.

[84] Appears in the first copy of the catalogue, f.162v., *s.v.* 'Libri Rhetorici / In 4to': '4. Rettorica, et poetica Aristotelis. Ital/'.

[85] This leaf records additions to the library in another hand, dated on f.204v '31 decembri.. 160[5]' and on f.205v '30 dec. 1605'.

[86] Scottish judge and bishop of Ross; matriculated at St Leonard's College, St Andrews, 1524; probably took a law degree elsewhere; sworn in as ordinary lord of session, 1537; comissioner of parliament, 1539; abbot of Kilwinning, 1541; dean of Glasgow, 1550; lord-president of court of session, 1558; bishop of Ross, 1561; sat on Queen Mary's privy council from 1561 (*ODNB*).

[87] Listed in *Early Bookowners in Britain* with the shelfmark N22.11-14 but since moved, these volumes bear the signature of Sinclair at the beginning and the end of the text. I am grateful to Denise Anderson, Curatorial Assistant at Edinburgh University Library, for assistance with this entry.

[88] The identity of this extensive library's owner has been much debated. He is identified as Cuthbert Tunstall by Wyman H. Herendeen and Kenneth R. Bartlett, 'The Library of Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham: British Library Add. 40,676', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 85 (1991), 235-296; Herendeen and Bartlett further suggest parallels between the scribal hand of this manuscript and others issuing from the household of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, in the 1687 sale of whose library the manuscript appeared (238-9). Tracey A. Sowerby, however, identifies the owner as Richard Morison, in *Renaissance and Reform in Tudor England: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison, c.1513-1556* (Oxford, 2010), 240-53, and summarises arguments against attribution to Tunstall and Richard Pace (242-3). Sowerby's evidence – ownership of the manuscript in 1566 by Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, who married Morison's widow; an antipapal epigram in Morison's hand elsewhere in the manuscript; a list of goods to be purchased by one 'Weston', proposed by Sowerby to be William Weston, Morison's trusted servant – is more concrete but remains circumstantial; many of these attributions rely ultimately on the library's containing the kind of books such men might own, on which basis, of course, they may also have been owned by other such men. Though I agree that there is little reason to attribute the library to Tunstall and even less to Pace, and that the strongest case currently lies with Morison's ownership, I preserve the owner's anonymity here. The booklist is transcribed and edited in Herendeen and Bartlett, but many of their identifications are questionable, as discussed in the ensuing notes;

f.113[r]. *Oratores & grammatici la.*

Georgius Valla. in magno vol.[89]

f.114[v]. *Cosmogra. astrolo. et id ge. la.*

Multa & varia opera Georgio valla int*er*p.

Valla, Giorgio. *Hoc in volumine haec continentur: Nicephori logica... Aristotelis ars poetica...* Venetiis: Simone*m* Papiensem dictum Beuilaquam, 1498. f°.[90]

f.115[r]. *Philos. gre.*

Aris. politica.
Aris. phisyca.
Aris. de natura. philoso.
Aris. de a*nim*alibus cu*m* aliis } o*mn*ia in paribus vo.

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. *Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. f°. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.[91]

f.115[v]. *Oratores. gre.*

Rhetores. Chaekus habet.

Apthonii progymnasmata cu*m* Syriano Sopa. cu*m* com*m*e in Hermo. bis.

Ducas, Demetrius, ed. *Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi: Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata...* Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi, 1508-9. 2 vols. Royal 4°.[92]

Sowerby discusses and transcribes the catalogue in 'A Brave Knight and Learned Gentleman: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison (c.1513-1556)', D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (2005), 352-67, 373-414.

89 Herendeen, no. 191: '*De expetendis*, Rome 1501?' This attribution is possible: *De expetendis* was printed in two volumes, although it could certainly have been bound in one; it seems in England to have been the most widely circulating of Valla's works; and some of its sixteen treatises do address the grammatical and oratorical concerns of this *classis*. A more likely attribution based on *classis* would be *Grammatica Georgij Vallae Placentini* or *Rhetorica Georgij Vallae Placentini* (Venice, 1514), printed as a pair, were it not that those volumes are quarto and thus unlikely to be described as *magni*. That said, 'in magno vol.' could conceivably indicate those two works bound together into one large work, not unlikely given their evident concurrence, which would have occasioned the qualification in the first place. An unusual number of works by Valla are listed elsewhere in the catalogue.

90 Herendeen speculatively identifies this volume (no. 387) as '*De expetendis*? 1501', but it seems certain, given its *classis* of cosmography, astrology, and other Latin works of that kind, to be the volume indicated here, which in all respects fits the description of *multa & varia opera*, *interpretata* by Valla, containing among other translated works Proclus, *De astrolabi*; Aristarchus, *De magnitudinibus et distantiis solis et lunae*; 'Timaeus Locrus', *De mundo*; Cleomedes, *De mundo*; Aristotle, *De caelo et mundo*; and medical works by Galen and others. Herendeen's identification of the collection of discursive essays *De expetendis* might be justified by the unstable duality of 'int*er*p.' (equally 'interpreter' or 'translator'), but the work is more general and less distinctively cosmographical, and a less convincing fit in this *classis*. Sowerby's identification of the volume ('A Brave Knight', 408, no. 372) as *Claudii Ptolemaei Pelusiensis Alexandrini Omnia, quae extant, opera, Geographia excepta...* (Basel, 1541), a collection of translations of Ptolemy, is extremely unlikely to have been catalogued as a volume of Valla's translations, since Ptolemy was its first (and most important) author, and within it Valla was responsible for translating only Proclus's *Hypotyposis astronomicarum positionum*, among several other well-known translators and works.

91 Herendeen (no. 431-4) plausibly suggests 'Erasmus? Basle, 1531?'; certainly these commonly bound works in two volumes must represent a collected edition.

92 The annotation 'Chaekus habet' beside 'Rhetores' is in a different hand from the cataloguer's, identified by Herendeen as John Cheke's but by Sowerby as Morison's (*Renaissance and Reform*, 242; 'A Brave Knight', 355). Herendeen identifies the volumes as '*Rhetores Graeci...*' and 'Hermogenes, *De Arte Rhetorica Aphthonii Praexercitamenta*, Lyon: Grypheus, 1538' (nos. 455-6); Sowerby supplies the *Rhetores graeci*, and as an unspecified holding of Aphthonius with two copies of Syrianus's commentary on Hermogenes ('A Brave Knight', 412, nos. 440-41). But in fact these entries must represent the two volumes of the Aldine *Rhetores graeci*, listed separately in close proximity (likely indicating a contiguous shelfmark: cf. **Oxford, Corpus Christi College**, 99, 101). The volume suggested by Herendeen, containing the *Rhetoric* of

Villiers, George (1592-1628), first duke of Buckingham , see **Oxford, Merton College**, 121.B.8(1)–(2)

Walker, Henry (d.1564)[93], see **Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College**

Walsall, Godwin (d.1608)[94]

BCI, 185: Godwin Walsall, 1608.

8. Aristotelis op*er*a. gre*ce*. 2ob*us* fol. vet*us*

* Erasmus, Desiderius, and Simon Grynaeus, eds. *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis... Opera.* Basileae: Iohannes Bebel, 1531; & Michael Isingrinius, 1539; 1550. 2 vols. fº. *IAAr* 107.928; 107.980; 108.174.

Hermogenes and Aphthonius's exercises, would likely be catalogued under its first author, Hermogenes, not Aphthonius, and in any case does not contain the commentaries of Syrianus, Sopatros, or other 'com*me* in Hermo.'; indeed, Syrianus and Sopatros were printed in the sixteenth century uniquely in the *Rhetores graeci* (see Green and Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric STC*, 407, 422). Recorded as two volumes, the Aldine *Rhetores graeci* contains all of the described works, Aphthonius's *Progymnasmata* in the first volume and '*in Aphthonii Progymnasmata commentarii innominati autoris; Syriani Sopatri Marcellini Commentarii in Hermogenis Rhetorica*' in the second; 'bis' here must therefore indicate the second of the two volumes.

[93] B.A., probably from Gonville Hall, 1524/5; M.A. 1528; M.D. from Angers, 1531/2; appointed Regius Professor of Physic, 1555.

[94] Matriculated as a pensioner from Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 1598; B.A. 1601/2; moved to Pembroke, where he graduated M.A., 1605; there elected Fellow. 'He appears to have been the college Hebrew lecturer' (*BCI*, I.557).

Appendix II: Possible owners of the *Poetics*

Anderson, William (d.1586)[1]
BCI, 151: William Anderson, 1586.
73. Apthonius

Anon. 3, (d.<1558)[2]
BCI, 86: Anonymous, 6. <1558.
23. geor*gius* valla e{ }

Anon. 4, (d.<1558)[3]
BCI, 91: Anonymous, 14. <1558.
6. op*er*a Arist*otelis* latine in 2b*us*

Anon. 5, (d.1588)
BCI, 163: Anonymous 22. <1588/9.
531. apthonius

Arundell, George (d.1554/5)[4]
BCI, 65: George Arundell, 1554/5.
3. aphtoni*us* sophista

Beaumont, Robert (d.1567)[5]
BCI, 126: Robert Beaumont, 1567.
106. Op*er*a Aristot*elis* grec*e*

---

1 Matriculated sizar from Trinity, 1576; B.A. 1581/2; elected Fellow of St Catharine's; M.A. from there, 1585; ordained deacon and priest at Peterborough in the same year.

2 'This inventory cannot be dated, with any confidence, more closely than as between 1542 and 1558... the books suggest a canonist' (*BCI*, I.189).

3 'Probably the inventory of a Johnian... on internal evidence the inventory would appear to date from the early 1550s' (*BCI*, I.198).

4 Matriculated pensioner from Queens', 1549; no graduation recorded. 'His books suggest a budding student of the laws' (*BCI*, I.146).

5 Attended Westminster School; admitted to Gray's Inn, 1541; student of Peterhouse; B.A. 1543/4; M.A. 1550; fled Marian persecution to Zurich; in Geneva among Knox's congregation, 1556; returned to Cambridge as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, 1559-61; ordained priest, B.D., appointed Archdeacon of Huntingdon, 1560; Master of Trinity 1561; Vice-Chancellor, 1564-65 and 1566-67. See also *ODNB*, and Gaskell, *Trinity College Library*, 215-17, who reprints the list and identifies some of his books among those listed in the 1600 catalogue of the library.

Brown, Walter (d.1613)[6]

PLRE 159, ed. Joseph L. Black: Brown, Walter (B.Th.). Scholar. d. 1613. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire (Oxford).

159.7. Aristotels workes fo: i vol

Brown, William (d.1558)[7]

PLRE 67, ed. Stuart Gillespie: Brown, William (M.A.). Scholar. d. 1558. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire (Oxford).

67.50. Opera Aristotelis

Buckley, Miles (d.1559)[8]

BCI, 107: Miles Buckley, 1559.

50. Op*er*a aristotelis grec*e*

Cambridge, King's College

Catalogus librorum, lib. 1

f.43. Aristotelis opera Graecé[9]

Cambridge, Pembroke College

Libraries of Cambridge, UC45: Inventory of books drawn up for the Marian commissioners, 1557. Pembroke College Archives, College Box Q6.

UC45.35. Opera Aristotelis Latini.[10]

---

6 Born 1575-6; matriculated from Corpus Christi, 1590; B.A. 1595; elected Fellow; M.A. 1598; B.Th. and licensed to preach, 1606; appointed Rector of Kiddington, Oxford, 1611. It is highly improbable that a volume recorded so late, in a library containing works in so many languages, including Greek, would not have contained the *Poetics*.

7 cf. Appendix I, **Brown, William**.

8 Matriculated pensioner from St John's, 1548; B.A. 1551/2; M.A. 1555; elected Fellow, 1552.

9 *s.v.* 'Thomas Hatcher Medicinae D. Dedit'; see **Hatcher, Thomas**, below. The donation must post-date 1555, when Hatcher entered the college, but it is not possible more precisely to date nor to identify the volume; it does not appear in the 1556/7 inventory of King's Library made for the Marian commissioners (see W. D. J. Cargill Thompson, 'Notes on King's College Library, 1500-1570', *TCBS* 2 [1954], 38-54). As the son of John Hatcher, first Regius Professor of Physic (see below and Appendix I) and friend of scientists such as John Caius (see Appendix I, and Chapter I), Hatcher probably owned a modern, post-1531 volume, which would thus have contained the *Poetics*.

10 A contemporary copy of this inventory (Pembroke College Archives, College Box Q7) has here 'Opera Heristotilis greco latina'; Clarke remarks that 'one is probably a draft for the other; Q6 is apparently the fair copy' (399). The difference between these two entries importantly reveals the absence of a standard rubric in cataloguing practice. The only two bilingual Graeco-Latin editions of Aristotle's *Opera* listed in *IAAr* are Casaubon, ed., *Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ Σταγειρίτου τὰ σωζόμενα. Operum Aristotelis Stagiritae philosophorum omnium longè principis noua editio, Graecè & Latiné* ([Geneva], 1590), *IAAr* 108.708, repr. Geneva, 1605; and Pace's edition of the same title (Geneva, 1597), *IAAr* 108.755. Neither of these, of course, could have been recorded in this inventory of 1557. Some overworked cataloguers (especially those hurriedly preparing inventories for the Marian commissions), opening a volume to its first few pages, glancing at the rubric of its title, or flipping through it in haste, may have recorded a Greek Aristotle with some Latin apparatus, or a

Cambridge, Pembroke College, Benefactors Book.

f.21v. Aristotelem graecé[11]

Cockroft, Henry (d.1567)[12]

BCI, 127: Henry Cockroft, 1567.

24. Apthonius

Cowell, John (d.1562)[13]

BCI, 115: John Cowell, 1562.

3. Op*er*a aristotelis duobus voluminibus

Crosse, Henry (d.1565/6)[14]

BCI, 122: Henry Crosse, 1565/6.

13. Apthonius

Cryer, Thomas (d.1568)[15]

BCI, 129: Thomas Cryer, 1568.

25. progymnasmata

Dorne, John (listed 1520)

Madan, Falconer, 'Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller in Oxford, A.D. 1520' in *Collectanea I*, ed. C. R. L. Fletcher, OHS 5 (Oxford, 1885), 71-177.

'Aug. 15. 1520'

1070. 1 georgi*us* valla de mo*do* argu[*mentandi*] . . . 3*d*.

Latin Aristotle with some Greek material, as bilingual. A comparable trace of scribal haste or confusion may be recorded in the Donors Book of Trinity College, Cambridge (MS R.17.8), p.88, where in the entry for 'Homerus graeco-Latine' the 'o' of 'graeco' has visibly overwritten an 'e', implying that the entry originally read 'Homerus graece' and was subsequently corrected. These examples further betray the extent of the historical record's occlusion to modern research; it is worth noting that when, as in most cases, we have only one record without a contemporary comparand, we may be following a false trail unwittingly. In such cases we can only cite probability: it is likely, though not certain, that a volume recorded in 1557 contained the *Poetics*. For other pertinent examples, see Appendix I, **Cambridge, Trinity College**, OL97, and **St Andrew's Colleges**.

[11] Donated at his death in 1559 by **Richard Edyll**, fellow of the college (see below); also appears in Edyll's probate inventory, *BCI*, 104, no. 10: 'opera Aristotelis gr*ece*'.

[12] Chaplain of Trinity. Matriculated sizar from Christ's, 1544, B.A. 1545/6; elected Fellow at Trinity, 1547; M.A. from there, 1549; ordained deacon at York, 1551.

[13] B.A. 1552/3; M.A. 1556; Charter Fellow of Gonville and Caius, 1557-1560; subsequently Fellow at Clare; later Rector of North Creake, Norfolk. Inherited books of physic from **Raven, Edward**.

[14] Scholar of Peterhouse; matriculated 1561.

[15] Scholar from the King's School, Canterbury; B.A. from Queens', 1539/40; may have served as Rector of Southchurch, 1556; M.A. 1561.

'Aug. 19. 1520'

1087. logica georgij valla ba[*sil*] 3 q*ua*[*terni*] . . . 3*d*

'Oct. 28. 1520'

1500. 1 dyalectica georgij valla . . . 4*d.*[16]

———————, 'Supplementary Notes to Collectanea I, Part III, Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller in Oxford, 1520' in *Collectanea II*, ed. Montagu Burrows, OHS 16 (Oxford, 1890), 453-478.[17]

2079. 2 cu*m*t . . e*n*tu*m* georgi val [*le*] . . . 2*s*.

Edyll, Richard (d.1559)[18], see **Cambridge, Pembroke College**

Framyngham, William (d.1537)[19]

BCI, 3: William Framyngham, 1537.

36. op*er*a aristotelis grec*e*

59. Georgi*us* valla \cu*m* alio/[20]

---

[16] Madan's edition and indexing of the records of John Dorne's book sales in Oxford for 1520 provides insight into the Oxford book market as a whole, rather than into individual scholars' collections. While suggesting significant demand for Valla's works, however, these entries are typically difficult to identify. Madan, following the bibliographical record, felt that all attributions of 'logica' or 'dyalectica' to Giorgio Valla were in error and should rather be attributed to the now better-known Lorenzo Valla, whose *Dialecticae disputationes* was also much in demand (cf. entries 649, 'dyalectica laure*n*tij vale*n*[*sis*] . . . 1*s*'; 924, 'dyalectica laure*n*tij vale*nsis* . . . 2*s*'; 1127, '1 dyalectica lau[*r*]e*n*tij val[*ensis*] . . . 1*s*'): 'unless the bibliographers err, *Georgius* Valla does not seem to have issued separately any work on Logic' (note to no. 1087). It is not easy to ascertain, however, what element of a work was settled on for notation in such brief entries: Giorgio's *De expetendis* (Venice, 1501) includes a section '*de dialectica libri iii*'; Giorgio's name prominently headed his collection of translated *opuscula*, including the *Poetics* (Venice, 1498), which as we have seen could be recorded under the title of 'dialectica nicephori' after its first, and longest, item (cf. Appendix I, **Brown, William**); and Giorgio was, in fact, the author of a treatise *De expedita ratione argumentandi libellus*, printed in *Compendiaria et facilis disserendi ratio* (Basel, 1522). This volume could not, of course, have been sold by Dorne in 1520 (i.e. as no. 1070), but it does attest the generic associations attaining to Giorgio's work on this subject; it may thus be relevant that the second item in Giorgio's 1498 collection was his own *Libellus de argumentis*, which by the same token may have been considered a logical work. It should be pointed out in response to Madan's argument, in any case, that the very presence of records differentiating between 'Laurentius' and 'Georgius' Valla itself is testimony to Dorne's competence in telling the two apart; his stock should here be considered a primary source for our retrospective bibliographical record, not our records for his stock.

[17] The discovery of two additional leaves in Dorne's handwriting led to the publication of this supplement; while the date of the record is unknown, Madan speculates that 'it may belong to a rather earlier period, say 1518-19' (454).

[18] Matriculated pensioner from Christ's, 1544; B.A. 1546/7; elected Fellow at Pembroke, 1547; M.A. from there, 1549; B.D. 1556; elected Fellow at Jesus, 1558/9.

[19] Scholar at Pembroke and Queens'; B.A. 1531; M.A. 1533; elected Fellow of Queens', 1530; acted as Bursar from 1534. Framyngham left his books to his schoolfriend and colleague John Caius, but Caius lost possession of them when he removed to Italy in 1539; see Cathy Shrank, 'Framyngham, William (1512-1537)', *ODNB*. His booklist is also printed and described in Smith, 'Some Humanist Libraries in Early Tudor Cambridge', 15-34.

[20] This entry somewhat exemplifies the difficulty in identifying volumes by Valla given the breadth of his literary activity and the multitude of collaborative volumes in which his work was printed. 'Cu*m* alio', here inserted into the manuscript, could indicate a volume in which a translation by Valla appeared alongside contemporary translations of works by other authors, such as Aristotle, *et al.*, *Orationes cum quibusdam aliis*

Gearing, William (d.1607)[21]

PLRE 157, ed. R. J. Fehrenbach: Gearing, William (M.A.). Cleric (chaplain), Scholar. d. 1607. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire (Oxford).

157.6. Aristot. opera duob. vol. lat.

Greenwood, Thomas (d.1546/7)[22]

BCI, 31: Thomas Greenwood, 1546/7.

6. op*er*a Arist*otelis* grece

Hartley, Thomas (d.1557)[23]

BCI, 75: Thomas Hartley, 1557.

1. op*er*a arist*otelis* latine

Hatcher, John (d.1587)[24]

BCI, 154: John Hatcher, 1587.

157. vall: placeij:

Hatcher, Thomas (d.1583)[25], see **Cambridge, King's College**

Hawes, Henry (d.1559/60)[26]

BCI, 110: Henry Hawes, 1559/60.

22. Aristotel*is* op*er*a in 2 vol*uminibus*

eiusdem operibus (Milan, 1483-4; Brescia, 1488; Venice, 1491, 1492, 1496), containing translations by Francesco Filelfo of Aristotle and Plutarch, and by Valla of Galen; a volume in which an original work by Valla appeared alongside original works by contemporary or recent authors, such as Johannes Tortellius's *Orthographia*, ed. Pyrrhus Pincius (Venice, 1493, 1495, 1501, 1504), in which Valla's *Tractatus de orthographia* was also printed; or some combination of the two. But it could also plausibly indicate a volume such as Valla's 1498 collection of *opuscula*, in which he acts both as translator of others' works and as contributor of his own.

[21] Matriculated from St John's at 17, 1594; B.A. 1600; M.A. 1603; appointed Chaplain at Queen's College.

[22] Pensioner or Fellow at Clare Hall; incorporated M.A. from Paris, 1543.

[23] Scholar of St John's, 1549; B.A. 1552/3; elected Fellow, 1553; M.A. 1557.

[24] cf. Appendix I, **Hatcher, John**.

[25] Son of **John Hatcher** (see above, and Appendix I); schooled at Eton; matriculated from King's, 1555; B.A. 1559-60; M.A. 1563; Fellow, 1558-66; admitted to Gray's Inn, 1565. An antiquary and friend of **John Caius** (see Appendix I). See further *ODNB*; Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses.*

[26] cf. Appendix I, **Hawes, Henry**.

Johnson, Philip (d.1576)[27]

PLRE 110, ed. D. V. N. Bagchi: Johnson, Philip (BTh). Scholar. d. 1576. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire (Oxford).

110.3. opera Aristotelis grece[28]

Kynge, Richard (d.1566/7)[29]

BCI, 125: Richard Kynge, 1566/7.

22. Apthonius

Kytbalde, Benedict (d.1545)[30]

BCI, 17: Benedict Kytbalde, 1545.

52. apthonius

Layton, Thomas (d.1565)[31]

BCI, 121: Thomas Layton, 1565.

13. Op*er*a Arist*otelis* lat*ine* in 2 Vol*uminibus*

Lorkin, Thomas (d.1591)[32]

BCI, 168: Thomas Lorkin, 1591.

72. Aristotelis opera 2 vol*uminibus*

221. Aphthonius

Lyffe, William (d.1569)[33]

BCI, 131: William Lyffe, 1569.

3. op*er*a Arist*otelis* lat*ine* 2 vol*uminibus*

---

[27] B.A. at Queen's, 1566; M.A. 1568; elected Fellow, 1569; principal of St Edmund Hall, 1572; B.Th., 1575; before death, briefly domestic chaplain to Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal.

[28] Bagchi, p.219: 'Either the Aldus Manutius (Venice, 1495-1498) edition... or, more likely, Erasmus's Basle edition of 1531-1552.'

[29] Perhaps matriculated as pensioner from Jesus, 1559/60; Fellow there 1559-61; M.A. 1563. 'In the heading to his inventory, however, he is described as M.A. and Fellow of Christ's College' (*BCI*, I.125).

[30] B.A. 1540/1; M.A. 1543; Fellow of Gonville Hall at death.

[31] B.A. 1558/9; then elected Fellow of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, to 1565; M.A. 1562; 'it is possible that 1565 marks the year of his removal rather than of his death' (*BCI*, I.282)

[32] cf. Appendix I, **Lorkin, Thomas**. It is extremely unlikely that these volumes in the library of Lorkin, Regius Professor of Physic following the death of Henry Walker in 1564, do not represent modern editions, especially considering the earlier collections of Walker and John Caius contained several such editions, and Grierson's comment that 'Caius, in his later years, was acquiring few new books, and his library looked backwards, not forwards, while Lorkin kept up to date' (Grierson, 'John Caius's Library', 513).

[33] Matriculated as a pensioner from Trinity College, Cambridge, 1560; awarded a scholarship within the year; B.A. 1562/3; elected Fellow, 1563; M.A. 1566.

121. Aristoteles grec*e* 3 vol*uminibus*[34]

Maltby, [John?] (d.1543)[35]

BCI, 13: ------ Maltby, 1543.

68. op*er*a aristo*telis*

Mayhew, Anthony (d.1559)[36]

BCI, 108: Anthony Mayhew, 1559.

9. op*er*a Aristo*telis* grec*e*

Napper, William (d.1569)[37]

PLRE 82, ed. David C. McPherson: Napper, William (BA). Scholar. d. 1569. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire (Oxford).

82.4. opera Aristotelis

Oxford, Magdalen College

C. Y. Ferdinand, 'Magdalen College and the Book Trade: The Provision of Books in Oxford, 1450-1550' in *The Book Trade and its Customers, 1450-1900*, ed. Arnold Hunt *et al.* (Winchester, 1997), 175-87.

p.182. Solutum Domino Blincowe pro operibus Georgij Vallae - x s[38]

Parkin, Matthew (d.1569)[39]

PLRE 150, ed. R. J. Fehrenbach: Parkin, Matthew (BA). Scholar. d. 1589. Probate inventory, Oxfordshire

[34] Since no Greek *opera* pre-1569 was printed in three volumes, and it would be unusual for Erasmus/Grynaeus's two-volume editions to be bound in three, this record probably indicates either a partial holding or an irregular binding of one of the Aldine editions, either the five-volume folio *editio princeps* (Venice, 1495-98) or the six-volume octavo *editio minor* (Venice, 1551-53; *IAAr* 108.218), the latter of which contained the *Poetics*.

[35] 'Probably John Maltby, scholar of Christ's 1537, B.A. 1538/9, M.A. 1541 and Fellow of St John's, 1539-42; assumed to have then died... the contents of the library are compatible with a date c.1543' (*BCI*, I.31).

[36] Fellow and tutor of Pembroke Hall; matriculated pensioner from Queens', 1544; B.A. 1546/7; elected Fellow at Pembroke, 1547; M.A. from there, 1549; fled Marian regime to Frankfurt, then to Basel; matriculated at Basle 1558/9; perhaps reinstated on return to England. Known by a surviving inscription to have given a book of physic to **Lorkin, Thomas**, as his tutor (*BCI*, I.250).

[37] Born around 1544; matriculated from Brasenose, *c.*1562; B.A. 1565; M.A. 1568; admitted to Corpus Christi as probationer fellow, 1568/9, but died a few months later.

[38] After a long fallow period, Magdalen's library made a 'dramatic recovery' in 1538-9 which saw several purchases of new books by its Fellows (Ferdinand, p.182). Reimbursements for book puchases are recorded in the College's domestic accounts to the Vice-President and to Michael Drumme, at the time Reader in Greek and Dean of Arts. Neither this volume, however, nor 'Dominus Blincowe', can be identified more precisely, and there is no physical evidence to indicate that the volume corresponds to either of the college's extant works in Valla's name, *De expetendis* (Magdalen, Old Library, q.16.14) and *De simplicium natura* (Arch.B.II.1.19[3]). I am grateful to Dr. Robin Darwall-Smith, archivist at Magdalen, for his generous assistance in researching this entry.

[39] Matriculated from Christ Church aged fourteen, 1583; B.A. 1588; died about a year later.

(Oxford).

150.8. Aristotelis opera uno volumine

Perne, Andrew (1519?-1589)[40]

BCI, 164: Andrew Perne, 1589.

1597. Aristotelis opera grece fo.

Pilgrim, Nicholas (d.1546)[41]

BCI, 25: Nicholas Pilgrim, 1545/6.

301. Pre execitamenta Aphtonij

Raven, Edward (d.1558)[42]

BCI, 97: Edward Raven, 1558.

3. opera Aristo*telis* latine \ij voluminibus/

45. opera Aristotelis grece

80. progy*m*nasmata gr*ece*

Salt, John (d.1558)[43]

BCI, 96: John Salt, 1558.

71. op*er*a aristotelis

Sharpe, Nicholas (d.1576)[44]

BCI, 138: Nicholas Sharpe, 1576.

6. Aristoles <sic> lat*ine* 2 vol*uminibus*

8. Arist*oteles* grec*e*

Simpson, Nicholas (d.1560/1)[45]

BCI, 112: Nicholas Simpson, 1560/1.

75. op*er*a Aristotilis latine

---

[40] cf. Appendix I, **Perne, Andrew**.

[41] Bookseller and bookbinder in Cambridge; appointed a University stationer, 1539.

[42] Pupil and friend of Roger Ascham, later a physician; B.A. from St John's College, Cambridge, 1546/7; M.A. 1549; elected Fellow, 1551; licensed to practice physic, 1557.

[43] Matriculated pensioner from St John's, 1544; B.A. 1546/7; elected Fellow; M.A. 1549; moved to Fellowship at Pembroke, 1555.

[44] Matriculated as a pensioner from Trinity College, Cambridge, 1566; awarded a scholarship, 1568; B.A. 1570/1; elected Fellow, 1573; M.A. 1574.

[45] B.A. from Trinity, 1549/50; M.A. 1553; books variously bequeathed at death, including to **Lorkin, Thomas**, and perhaps **Walker, Henry** (Appendix I): see *BCI*, I.261.

Soresby, Roger (d.1546)[46]
BCI, 26: Roger Soresby, 1546.
70. Aphthonius Sophista

Thomas, John (d.1545)[47]
BCI, 20: John Thomas, 1545.
33. georgius valla

Williams, ? (d.1588)[48]
BCI, 158: Mr Williams, 1588.
15. Aphthonij progymnasmata

Wood, John (d.1557/8)[49]
BCI, 79: John Wood, 1557/8.
11. aphtoni*us* cu*m* scholijs

Wygan, Edward (d.1545)[50]
BCI, 18: Edward Wygan, 1545.
64. aphtoni*us*
120. op*er*a Arist*otelis* grece

---

[46] B.A. from Peterhouse, 1537/8; elected Fellow, 1540; M.A. 1541.

[47] 'John Thomas was a practising surgeon. We know little of his background except that he was licensed as a surgeon by the University in 1513/4' (*BCI*, I.44).

[48] Described in his inventory as 'master of arte, late of magdalen colledge in Cambridge'. For possible identifications, see *BCI*, I.390.

[49] B.A. of Trinity at death; teacher of Henry Hawes (above, and cf. Appendix I). 'He is, perhaps, to be identified with the John Wood who graduated B.A. from Queens' in 1556' (*BCI*, I.171).

[50] B.A. 1508/9; B.D. 1512; M.A. 1514; D.D. 1523/4; at King's Hall from 1538; first Regius Professor of Divinity, 1540; in 1529, appointed among the delegates composing the University's answer on the question of the validity of Henry VIII's marriage, and examined printed books for heresy in London.

Works Cited

Due to the complex demands of citing Aristotle and Sidney, works under their names are listed chronologically to aid in the location of references given in the text. The works of other authors are listed alphabetically as standard.

While in the text I have translated Latin place-names into English, here it is more important, where possible, to represent details as they appear in the imprint and/or colophon of the original publication, with the following exception: I have preserved the wording of publishers' imprints only where they record particular relationships to the work or between business partners. For ungrammatical entries that result, e.g. 'haeredum Aldi, et Andreae Asulani soceri', *sc*. 'in aedibus' *vel sim*. A brief list of translated place-names follows for convenience:

Antverpiae = Antwerp
Argentorati = Strassburg / Strasbourg
Augustae Vindelicorum = Augsburg
Aureliae Allobrogum = Geneva
Basileae = Basel
Florentiae = Florence
Firenze / Fiorenza = Florence
Francofordi = Frankfurt
Lipsiae = Leipzig
Lovanii = Louvain
Lugduni = Lyon
Lugduni Batavorum = Leiden
Lutetiae / Lutetiae Parisiorum = Paris
Padova = Padua
Papie = Pavia
Patavii = Padua
Parisiis = Paris
Roterodami = Rotterdam
Tiguri = Zurich
Venetiis / Venetia / Vinegia = Venice
Vtini = Udine

It seems to me unhelpful to differentiate between 'primary' and 'secondary' sources in a study concerned with disciplinary historiography. Both are listed together in section III, below.

I. Manuscripts

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 490.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 575.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 576.

Cambridge, King's College, *Catalogus librorum*, lib. 1.

Cambridge, Pembroke College, Benefactors Book.

Cambridge, Peterhouse, Ward Library, MS 405.

Cambridge, Peterhouse, Ward Library, MS 400.

Cambridge, St John's College, MS H.18.

Cambridge, St John's College, MS I. 7.

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 880.

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.17.8.

Eton, College Library, MS 129.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, MS gr. 46.

London, British Library, Add. MS 6251.

London, British Library, Add. MS 34,275.

London, British Library, Add. MS 39,830.

London, British Library, Add. MS 40,676.

London, British Library, C.120.h.6.

London, British Library, Royal App. MS 66.

London, PRO, SP 46/15.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodleian Benefactors Register.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 300.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Brasenose College 31.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lat. misc. E 114.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 273.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 274.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 1423.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Wood D. 10.

Oxford, St John's College, Benefactors Book.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS gr. 1741.

Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, MS 47.10.

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Codex Marcianus gr. 200.

II. Specific print-books

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, G.3.1.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, G.3.4.

Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College, Lower Library, G.9.16-17.

Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College, Lower Library, G.32.4-5.

Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College, Lower Library, G.32.9-10.

Cambridge, Peterhouse, D.5.19-23.

Cambridge, Peterhouse, M.7.13-14.

Cambridge, St John's College, Upper Library Cc.7.3-4.

Cambridge, University Library, P*.8.3 (B).

Cambridge, University Library, R*.1.21 (B).

Cambridge, University Library, Sel.1.2-3, *olim* S*.1.10-11.

Dublin, Trinity College, EE.aa.30.

Edinburgh, University Library, JA 1029-1033.

Eton, College Library, Fb.2.1.

London, British Library, 519.d.17.

London, British Library, C.76.f.4.

London, British Library, C.76.f.5.

Oxford, All Soul’s College, Codrington Gallery, i.1.6-7.

Oxford, All Souls College, Codrington Gallery, i.10.1-6.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° A 19 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° A 20 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° A 21 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° B 47 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° L 9 Th.Seld.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 4° V 32 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 8° A 1 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 8° A 4 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 2590 d.Oxf.1.9.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, B 3.13 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, D 2.13(2) Art.Seld.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, K 1.20 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, L.1.13.Jur[1].

Oxford, Bodleian Library, M 2.17 Art.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, S 1.20 Jur.Seld.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, Fol. I.15/1-2.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, Fol. I.22-23.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, Δ.5.11-12.

Oxford, Magdalen College, Old Library, Arch.B.II.1.19(3).

Oxford, Magdalen College, Old Library, q.16.14.

Oxford, Merton College, 121.A.4-7.

Oxford, Merton College, 121.B.8(1)-(2).

Oxford, New College, Restricted BT1.37.3.

Oxford, New College, Restricted BT1.63.11-12.

Oxford, St John's College, Θ.1.9-14.

III. Print works

Abbenes, J. G. J., S. R. Slings, and I. Sluiter, eds., *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: a collection of papers in honour of D. M. Schenkeveld* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1995).

Adams, H. M., *Catalogue of Books Printed on the Continent of Europe, 1501-1600, in Cambridge Libraries*, 2 vols. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

Adamson, Peter, and Richard C. Taylor, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Adrados, Francisco Rodríguez, and Elvira Gangutia Elícegui, eds., *Introducción a la lexicografía griega* (Madrid: Instituto Antonio Nebrija, 1977).

Aeschines, *et al.*, *Λόγοι τουτωνὶ τῶν ῥητόρων... Orationes horum rhetorum. Aeschinis. Lysiae. Alcidamantis...* 3 vols. (Venetiis: Aldi, et Andreae soceri, 1513).

Aguzzi-Barbagli, Danilo, 'Humanism and Poetics' in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia, 1988), III.85-169.

The Aldine Press: Catalogue of the Ahmanson-Murphy Collection (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2001).

Aleandro, Girolamo, *Lexicon Graecolatinum: multis et preclaris additionibus locupletatum* (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Aegidium Gourmontium, 1512).

——————, *Tabulae sanequam vtiles Graecarum musarum adyta compendio ingredi cupientibus* (Luteciae Parisiorum: Aegidius Gormontius, 1513).

Alexander, Gavin, ed., *Sidney's The Defence of Poesy and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism* (London: Penguin, 2004).

Allen, James, 'Aristotle on the Disciplines of Argument: Rhetoric, Dialectic, Analytic', *Rhetorica* 25.1 (2007), 87-108.

——————, 'Rhetoric and Logic' in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington (Malden, Oxford, 2007), 350-64.

Allen, Joseph Henry, and James Bradstreet Greenough, *A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges*, rev. ed. (Boston: Ginn, Heath, & Co., 1882).

Allen, M. J. B., Dominic Baker-Smith, Arthur F. Kinney, and Margaret M. Sullivan, eds., *Sir Philip Sidney's Achievements* (New York: AMS Press, 1990).

Allen, P. S., 'The Early Corpus Readerships', *The Pelican Record* 7.5 (1905), 155-159.

——————, 'Early Documents Connected with the Library of Merton College', *The Library*

s.4, 4.4 (1924), 249-276.

——————, ‘Linacre and Latimer in Italy’, *English Historical Review* 18.71 (1903), 514-517.

Allen, W. Sidney, *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Anderson, Andrew H., ‘The Books of Thomas, Lord Paget (c.1544-1590)’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 6 (1975), 226-242.

Aphthonius, and Hermogenes, *In hoc volumine haec continentur. Ausonij sophistae praeludia. Hermogenis Rhetorica* (Florentiae: Philippi Iuntae Florentini, 1515).

Arber, Edward, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.*, 5 vols. (London: Stationers Company, 1875-94).

Argyropoulos, Roxane D., and Iannis Caras, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs: contribution à l'histoire du texte d'Aristote: supplément* (Paris: Société d'édition les belles lettres, 1980).

Aristotle, *Ad reverendum in Christo Patrem... Georgii Trapezoncii in libros rhetoricorum Aristotelis*, trans. Georgius Trapezuntius (Paris: Petrus Caesaris & Johannes Stol, c.1476-7).

——————, *Incipit prefacio leonardi arretini in libro ethicorum*, trans. Leonardo Bruni (Oxoniis: [Theodore Rood], 1479).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, 4 vols. (Augsburg: Ambrosius Keller, 1479).

——————, *Declaratio compendiosa per uiam diuisionis alfarabii super libris rethoricorum Aristotilis...* ed. Lancillottus de Zerlis (Venetiis: Philipum Venetu*m*, 1481).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, 2 vols. (Venice: Filippo di Pietro, 1481-2).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, ed. Nicoletus Vernia, 3 vols. (Venice: Andreas Torresanus and Bartholomaeus de Blavis, 1483).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, ed. Nicoletus Vernia (Venice: Andreas Torresanus and Bartholomaeus de Blavis, 1483).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, 5 vols. (Venice: Bernardinus Stagninus, 1489).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, ed. Agostino Nifo, 2 vols. (Venice: [Johannes and Gregorius de Gregoriis, de Forlivio], for Octavianus Scotus, 1495-96).

——————, *Opera [Greek]*, 5 vols. (Venetiis: Aldi Manucii Romani, 1495-98).

——————, *Opera [Latin]* (Venice: Johannes and Gregorius de Gregoriis for Benedictus

Fontana, 1496).

——————, *Opera [Latin]: Expositiones textuales dubiorum*, 2 vols. ([Cologne]: Heinrich Quentell, 1497; repr. *c*.1503).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, 2 vols. (Venice: Paganinus de Paganinis / Ioa. & Gregorius de Gregoriis, 1501).

——————, *Accipe lector studiose Aristotelem peripatheticorum principem ac eius fidelissimum interpretem Auerroem...* 2 vols. (Venice: mandato et expensis her. Octaviani Scoti, per Bonetum Locatellum, 1507-8; repr. sumpt. her. Octaviani Scoti et sociorum, 1516).

——————, *This present boke called the gouernaunce of kynges and prynces imprynted at the commaundement of the good and honourable syre Charles Somerset Lorde Herbert: and chaumberleyne vnto oure soueraygne lorde kynge Henry the. viii*, trans. John Lydgate and Benedict Burgh (London: Rycharde Prynson [Pynson], 1511).

——————, *Rhetorica Aristotelis cum fundatissimi artium & theologi doctoris Egidij de Roma luculentissimis commentariis nunc primum in lucem editis... Addita eiusdem Aristotelis poetica cum magni Auerroys in eandem summa...* ed. Alexander Achillinus (Venetijs: Georgium Arriuabenum, 1515).

——————, *Opera [Latin]*, ed. Marco Antonio Zimara, 6 vols. (Papie: Jacobus Paucisdrapis de Burgofranco, 1520-1).

——————, *De cursione lune. Here begynneth the course and disposicion of the dayes of the moone in laten and in Englysshe whiche be good: and whiche be badde after the influentes of the moone drawen out of a boke of Aristotiles de astronomiis* ([London?]: R. Faques, 1528).

——————, *[Thus endeth the secrete of secretes of Arystotle]*, trans. Robert Copland (London: Robert Copland, 1528).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους ἅπαντα. Aristotelis summi semper philosophi opera quaecumque impressa hactenus extiterunt omnia summa cum vigilantia excusa*, ed. Desiderius Erasmus and Simon Grynaeus, 2 vols. (Basileae: Iohannes Bebelius, 1531; repr. Iohannes Bebelius & Michael Isingrinus, 1539, 1550).

——————, *Aristotelis Poetica, per Alexandrum Paccium, Patritium Florentinum, in Latinum conuersa*, trans. Alessandro Pazzi (Venetiis: haeredum Aldi, et Andreae Asulani soceri, 1536; repr. 1537; Parisiis: Iacobum Bogardum, 1542).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνης ῥητορικῆς... Aristotelis de arte rhetorica lib. tres. Ad Alexandrum de Rhetorica lib. unus. De Poetica lib. unus* (Venetiis: in aedibus Bartholomaei Zanetti Casterzagenzis, aere uero, & diligentia Ioannis Fra*n*cisci Trincaueli, 1536).

——————, *Aristotelis de arte Rhetorica libri tres* (Parisiis: Chr. Wechelius, 1538).

——————, *Aristotelis Poetica, Alexandro Paccio interprete* (Parisiis: Chr. Wechelus, 1538).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera quae quidem extant omnia...* ed. Simon Grynaeus, 2 vols. (Basileae: [Johannes Oporinus], 1538).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς. Aristotelis Poetica* (Parisiis: Christiani Wecheli, 1538).

——————, *Commentarius anonnymi in Aristotelis Rhetoricen...* (Parisiis: Conradum Neobarium, 1539).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους ποιητική* (Παρισίων [Paris]: δαπανήμασιν Ἐμώνδης τουσανῆς, τῆς χήρας γυναικὸς Κοῤῥάδου Νεοβαρίου [at the expense of Edmond Toussain, by the the widow of Conrad Neobar], 1541).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae, philosophorum omnium facile principis, opera quae in hunc usque diem extant omnia*, ed. Hieronymus Gemusaeus, 3 vols. (Basileae: Io. Oporinum, 1542; repr. 1548).

——————, *Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri III. Ad Alexandrum De rhetorica lib. I. De poetica lib. I.* (Venetijs: Ioan. Gryphius, 1546).

——————, *The ethiques of Aristotle, that is to saye, preceptes of good behauoute and perfighte honestie, now newly translated into English*, trans. John Wilkinson (London: Richard Grafton, 1547).

——————, *Gli otto libri della republica, che chiamono Politica. Nuouamente tradotti di greco in uulgare italiano* (Venetia: Alessandro Brucioli et i frategli, 1547).

——————, *Here begynneth the nature, and dsyposycyon of the dayes in the weke, and sheweth what the thondre in euery moneth in the yere, chaunsynge, doth protende & sygnyfye, with the course and dysposycyon, of the dayes of the moone: whiche be good, and whiche be bad: after the influentes of ye moone, drawen out of a laten boke of Aristotiles de Astronimis* ([London]: Robert wyer, c.1547).

——————, *Tradottione antica de la Rettorica d'Aristotile nuouamente trouata*, trans. Felice Figliucci (Padoua: M. Giacomo Fabriano, 1548).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae opera, post omnes quae in hunc usque diem prodierunt editiones*, ed. Hieronymus Gemusaeus (Lugduni: Ioannem Frellonium, 1549; repr. Frellonium / A. Vincentium, 1561, 1563).

——————, *Rettorica et Poetica d'Aristotile, tradotte di Greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina da Bernardo Segni gentil'huomo, & Accademico Fiorentino*, trans. Bernardo Segni (Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549; repr. Vinegia: per Bartholomeo detto l'Imperador, & Francesco suo genero, 1551).

——————, *Trattato dei governi di Aristotile tradotto di Greco in lingua uulgare Fiorentina*, trans. Bernardo Segni (Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549; repr. Venetia: Bartholomeo detto l'Imperador, & Francesco suo genero, 1551).

——————, *L'Ethica d'Aristotile tradotta in lingua uulgare Fiorentina*, trans. Bernardo Segni (Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae Omnia quae extant opera nunc primum selectis translationibus collatisque com graecis emendatissimis exemplaribus, margineis scholiis illustrata... Averrois Cordubensis in ea opera omnes qui ad nos pervenere commentarii*, ed. Giovanni Baptista Bagolino, 11 vols. (Venetiis: Iuntas, 1550-52; repr. 1562, 1575).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς. Aristotelis Stagiritae Poetica* (Lovanii: Seruatij Sassenus, 1551).

——————, *Aristotelis Opera omnia, graece, studio Ioannis Baptistae Camotii*, ed. Giovanni Battista Camozzi, 6 vols. (Venetiis: apud Aldi filios, expensis nobilis uiri Federici de Turrisanis eorum auunculi, 1551-3).

——————, *Aristotile Della generatione et corruttione, tradotto dal greco in volgare italiano*, trans. Antonio Bruccioli (Venetia: Bartholomeo Imperadore & Francesco suo genero, 1552).

——————, *Here begynneth the nature, and dysposycyon of the dayes in the weke, and sheweth what the thondre in euery moneth in the yere, chaunsynge, doth protende and sygnyfye with the course and dysposycyon, of the dayes of the moone: whiche be good, and whiche be badde: after the influentes of the moone, drawen out of a laten boke of Aristotiles de Astronimis* (London: Robert wyer, 1554).

——————, *Here begynneth the dyfference of astronomye with the gouernayle to kepe mans body in helth, all the foure seasons of the yeare* (London: Robert Wyer, 1555).

——————, *La Meteora, tradotta di greco in vulgare toscano*, trans. Antonio Bruccioli (Venetia: Bartholomeo Imperatore, 1555).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς. Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*, ed. Guillaume Morel (Parisiis: Gu. Morelium, 1555; repr. 1558).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae omnia, quae extant, opera: nunc primum selectis translationibus, emendationibus ex collatione graecorum exemplarium, scholiis in margine illustrata... Auerrois Cordubensis in ea opera omnes, qui ad nos peruenere, commentarii*, ed. Zacaria Zenarus, 11 vols. (Venetiis: Cominum de Tridino Montisferrati, 1560).

——————, *[Opera]*, 8 vols. (Lugduni: haeredes Iacobi Iuntae, 1561; repr. Ioannem Iacobum Iuntae, 1579).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae Tripartitae philosophiae Opera omnia absolutissima...* ed.

Celio Secondo Curione, 4 vols. (Basileae: Ioannem Heruagium, 1563).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς. Aristotelis De arte poetica. Ad exemplar libri a Petro Victorio correcti*, ed. Pietro Vettori (Florentiae: heredes Bernardi Iuntae, 1564).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae peripateticorum principis Opera omnia in partes septem diuisa...* 7 vols. (Venetiis: ad signum Seminantis, 1572; repr. Gaspar Bindoni, 1576).

——————, *Il libro della Poetica d'Aristotele. Tradotto di greca lingua in volgare, da M. Alessandro Piccolomini. Con una sua epistola ai lettori del modo del tradurre*, trans. Alessandro Piccolomini (Siena: Luca Bonetti, 1572; repr. 1573).

——————, *The secrete of secretes containing the most excellent and learned instructions of Aristotle the prince of philosophers: vvhich he sent to the Emperour, King Alexander: very necessarye and profitable for all maner of estates and degrees. VVith some instructions in the ende of this booke, touching the iudgement of phisognomie* (London: W. Williamson for Anthony Kitson, 1572).

——————, *Aristotelis opera, post omnes quae in hunc usque diem prodierunt editiones, summo studio emaculata et ad Graecum exemplar diligenter recognita*, ed. Iacobo Martino, 2 vols. (Lugduni: S. Michaëlem, 1578; repr. 1581).

——————, *Aristotelis Ars rhetorica ab Antonio Riccobono... latine conuersa... Aristotelis Ars poetica ab eodem in latinam linguam versa. Cum eiusdem de re comica disputatione*, trans. Antonio Riccoboni (Venetiis: Paulum Meiettum, 1579).

——————, *Opera omnia...* 6 vols. (Lugduni: Iacobus Berjon, 1580).

——————, *Aristotelis ethicorum ad Nicomachum libri decem, in gratiam & vsum studiosorum, breuiter & perspicuè, per quaestiones expositi, per Samuelem Heilandum, Tubingensis Scholae Professorem Ethices* (Londini: H. Bynneman, 1581).

——————, *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomachiorum libri decem ex Dion. Lambini interpretatione Graecolatini*, trans. Denys Lambin (Basileae: Eusebii Episcopii, 1582).

——————, *Andreae Hyperii Compendium physices Aristoteleae. Cum locupleto rerum & verborum memorabilium indice*, ed. Andreas Hyperius (Londini: excudebat Henricus Midletonus impensis Georgii Bishop, 1583).

——————, *Problemata Aristotelis ac philosophorum medicorúm complurium. Marc Antonij Zimarae sanctipetrinatis Problemata, vnà cum trecentis Aristotelis & Auerrois propositionibus. Item Alexandri Aphrodisei super quaestionibus nonnullis physicis solutionum liber, Angelo Politiano interprete*, ed. Marc Antonio Zimara (Londini: Geor. Bishop, 1583).

——————, *Aristotelis Stagiritae Peripateticorum principis operum omnium*, ed. Giovanni Marinelli and Curzio Marinelli, 7 vols. (Venetiis: Ioachimum Bruniolum / Nicolai Moretti, 1584-5).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους τὰ εὑρισκόμενα. Aristotelis Opera quae extant...* ed. Friedrich Sylburg, 11 vols. (Francofordi a.M.: Andreae Wecheli heredes, Claudium Marnium, & Ioannem Aubrium, 1584-7).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ Σταγειρίτου τὰ σωζόμενα. Operum Aristotelis Stagiritae philosophorum omnium longè principis noua editio, Graecè & Latiné*, ed. Isaac Casaubon, 2 vols. (Lugduni [Geneva]: Guillelmum Laemarium & Iacobum Bubonium, 1590; repr. Aureliae Allobrogum: Petrum de la Rouiere, 1605).

——————, *Operum, quotquot extant, Latina editio...* 2 vols. (Francofurti: Andreas Wecheli heredes, Claudium Marnium & Io. Aubrium, 1593).

——————, *The problemes of Aristotle with other philosophers and phisitions. Wherein are contayned diuers questions, with their answers, touching the estate of mans bodie* (Edenborough: Robert Waldgraue; London: The Widdow Orwin, 1595; repr. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1597).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ Σταγειρίτου τὰ σωζόμενα. Operum Aristotelis Stagiritae Philosophorum omnium longè principis noua editio, Graecè & Latinè...* ed. Giulio Pace, 2 vols. ([Geneva]: Guillelmus Laemarius, 1597; repr. Petrus de la Roviere, 1607).

——————, *Aristotles politiques, or Discourses of gouernment. Translated out of Greeke into French... By Loys Le Roy, called Regius. Translated out of French into English* (London: Adam Islip, 1598).

——————, *Aristotelis de poetica liber, Daniel Heinsius recensuit, ordini suo restituit, Latine vertit, notas addidit*, ed. Daniel Heinsius (Lugduni Batauorum: typis Io. Balduini, impensis Bonaventurae Elzevirii, 1610).

——————, *Aristotelis de poetica liber. Daniel Heinsius recensuit, ordini suo restituit, Latine vertit, notas addidit. Accedit eiusdem de tragica constitutione liber*, ed. Daniel Heinsius (Lugduni Batauorum: apud Ioannem Balduinum. Prostat in Bibliopolio Ludouici Elzeverij, 1611).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνης ῥητορικῆς βιβλία τρία... Aristotelis de Rhetorica seu arte Dicendi Libri tres, Graecolat.*, trans. Theodore Goulston (Londini: Eduardi Griffini, 1619).

——————, *Aristotelis De poetica liber, Latine conversus, et analytica methodo illustratus*, trans. Theodore Goulston (Londini: Thomae Snodhami, 1623).

——————, *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ποιητικῆς: Aristotle on the Art of Poetry: A Revised Text with Critical Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, ed. Ingram Bywater (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).

——————, *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*, ed. Rudolf Kassel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

——————, *Aristotle's Poetics*, trans. James Hutton (New York: Norton, 1982).

——————, *The Poetics of Aristotle: Translation and Commentary*, trans. Stephen Halliwell (London: Duckworth, 1987).

——————, *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

——————, *Poetics: editio maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries*, ed. Leonardo Tarán and Dimitri Gutas (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2012).

Aristotle, *et al.*, *Orationes cum quibusdam aliis eiusdem operibus...* trans. Francesco Filelfo and Giorgio Valla (Milan: Leonardus Pachel and Uldericus Scinzenzeler, 1483-4; repr. Brescia: Jacobus Britannicus, 1488; Venice: Bartholomaeus de Zanis, 1491; Philippus Pincius, 1492, 1496).

Ascham, Roger, *Letters of Roger Ascham*, ed. Alvin Vos, trans. Maurice Hatch and Alvin Vos (New York: Peter Lang, 1989).

——————, *The Scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong...* (London: Iohn Daye, 1570).

——————, *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham*, ed. J. A. Giles, 4 vols. (London: J.R. Smith, 1864).

Atkins, J. W. H., *English Literary Criticism: The Renascence* (London: Methuen, 1947).

Autenrieth, G., 'Griechische Lexikographie' in *Griechische und Lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, ed. Karl Brugmann *et al.*, 2nd ed. (München, 1890), 587-607.

Averroes, *Compendium necessarium ex lib. Aristotelis De generatione et corruptione, De anima, De sensu et sensato, De memoria et reminiscentia, deque somno et vigilia, conuersum ex Arabico in Latinum sermonem, ab accuratiss. interprete Abraham de Balmes*, trans. Abraham de Balmes (Venetijs: Nicolaum de Bascarinis, 1552).

Avicenna, *Avicenna's Commentary on the Poetics of Aristotle: a critical study with an annotated translation of the text*, ed. Ismail M. Dahiyat (Leiden: Brill, 1974).

Baine, Rodney M., 'The First Anthologies of English Literary Criticism, Warton to Haslewood', *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950), 262-265.

Baker, Derek, *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History: papers read at the fifteenth Summer Meeting and the sixteenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1977).

Baker, J. H., 'Common Lawyers and the Inns of Court' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 448-460.

Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield, *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944).

Barber, Giles, 'Thomas Linacre: A Bibliographical Survey of His Works' in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre*, ed. Francis Maddison *et al.* (Oxford, 1977), 290-336.

Baret, John, and Abraham Fleming, *An Aluearie or Quadruple Dictionarie, containing foure sundrie tongues: namelie, English, Latine, Greeke, and French* (Londini: excudebat Henricus Denhamus typographus, Gulielmi Seresij vnicus assignatus, 1580).

Barnes, Catherine, 'The Hidden Persuader: The Complex Speaking Voice of Sidney's Defence of Poetry', *PMLA* 86.3 (1971), 422-427.

Bartlett, K. R., 'Worshipful Gentlemen of England: The *Studio* of Padua and the Education of the English Gentry in the Sixteenth Century', *Renaissance and Reformation* 6 (1982), 235-48.

Bate, Walter Jackson, *Criticism: The Major Texts* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1952).

Batho, G. R., 'The Library of the Wizard Earl: Henry Percy Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564–1632)', *The Library* s.5, 15.3 (1960), 246-261.

Beal, Peter, 'Poems by Sir Philip Sidney: The Ottley Manuscript', *The Library* s.5, XXXIII.4 (1978), 284-295.

Beni, Paolo, *In Aristotelis Poeticam commentarii...* (Patauii: Franciscum Bolzettam, 1613).

Bensel-Meyers, Linda, 'Empowering the Audience: The Rhetorical Poetics of Renaissance Drama', *Style* 23.1 (1989), 70-86.

Bevington, David, 'Tragedy in Shakespeare's Career' in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy*, ed. Claire McEachern (Cambridge, 2002), 50-68.

Bianchi, Luca, 'Continuity and Change in the Aristotelian Tradition' in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge, 2007), 49-71.

Bibliotheca illustris., sive, catalogus variorum librorum in quâvis linguâ & facultate insignium ornatissimae bibliothecae viri cujusdam praenobilis ac honoratissimi olim defuncti (London: T. Bentley & B. Walford, 1687).

Binns, J. W., 'Henry Dethick in Praise of Poetry: the First Appearance in Print of an Elizabethan Treatise', *The Library* s.5, 30.3 (1975), 199-216.

——————, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin Writings of the Age* (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990).

——————, 'Latin Translations from Greek in Renaissance England, 1550-1640',

Humanistica Lovaniensia 27 (1978), 128-159.

Black, Deborah L., *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill, 1990).

Blackwell, Constance, and Sachiko Kusukawa, eds., *Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Conversations with Aristotle* (Aldershot, Brookfield: Ashgate, 1999).

Blanchellus, Menghus, *Subtilissime expositiones quaestionesque super summulis magistri Pauli Veneti* (Venetiis: heredes Luceantonij Iunte Florentini, 1542).

Blemmydes, Nicephorus, *Nicephori Blemmidae epitome logica... jamprimùm Graecè editae*, ed. Johann Wegelin (Augustae Vindelicorvm: Dauid Francus, 1605).

——————, *Nicephori philosophi dialecticae elementa absolutissima*, trans. Giorgio Valla (Basileae, 1558).

Bloomfield, B. C., ed., *A Directory of Rare Book and Special Collections in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland*, 2nd ed. (London: Library Association Publishing, 1997).

Boas, Frederick S., *Sir Philip Sidney, Representative Elizabethan: His Life and Writings* (London: Staples Press, 1955).

Boase, Charles William, and Andrew Clark, *Register of the University of Oxford*, OHS 1, 10-12, 14, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885-9).

Boggess, William F., 'Aristotle's *Poetics* in the Fourteenth Century', *Studies in Philology* 67.3 (1970), 278-294.

——————, 'Hermannus Alemannus and Catharsis in the Mediaeval Latin *Poetics*', *The Classical World* 62.6 (1969), 212-214.

Bolgar, R. R., ed., *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 1500-1700: Proceedings of an International Conference held at King's College, Cambridge, April 1974* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

——————, 'Classical Reading in Renaissance Schools', *Durham Research Review* 6 (1955), 18-26.

Bond, Edward Augustus, ed., *Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford: with royal patents of foundation, injunctions of visitors, and catalogues of documents relating to the University, preserved in the Public Record Office*, 3 vols. (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1853).

Borrhaus, Martin, *In tres Aristotelis de Arte dicendi libros Commentaria* (Basileae: ex officina Iacobi Parci, impensis Ioannis Oporini, 1551).

Botley, Paul, *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529: Grammars, Lexica, and*

Classroom Texts (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 2010).

Brandes, Paul D., *A History of Aristotle's Rhetoric: with a Bibliography of Early Printings* (Metuchen, London: Scarecrow, 1989).

Briggs, Charles F., 'Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the Later Medieval Universities: A Reassessment', *Rhetorica* 25.3 (2007), 243-268.

Brown, T. J., and M. Scheele, *The Old Royal Library* (London: British Museum, 1957).

Browne, Thomas, *A ritch Storehouse or Treasurie for Nobilitye and Gentlemen, which in Latine is called Nobilitas literata, written by a famous and excellent man, Iohn Sturmius, and translated into English by T.B. Gent. Seene and allowed according to the order appointed* (London: Henrie Denham, 1570).

Brugmann, Karl, *Griechische Grammatik*, ed. Albert Thumb, 4th ed. (München: Beck, 1913).

Brugmann, Karl, Friedrich Stolz, and J. G. Schmalz, eds., *Griechische und Lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2nd ed. (München: Beck, 1890).

Bruno, Giordano, *De gl'heroici furori. Al molto illustre et eccellente caualliero, Signor Phillippo Sidneo* (Parigi [i.e. London]: Antonio Baio [i.e. J. Charlewood], 1585).

Bucer, Martin, *De regno Christi Jesu seruatoris nostri, libri II* (Basilease: Ioannem Oporinum, 1557).

Budé, Guillaume, Robert Constantin, and Jacques Toussain, *Lexicon siue Dictionarium Graecolatinum*, 2 vols. ([Geneva]: Joannem Crispinum, 1562).

Bullough, Geoffrey, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, 8 vols. (London, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Columbia University Press, 1957-75).

Buonamici, Francesco, *Discorsi poetici nella Accademia fiorentina in difesa d'Aristotile* (Fiorenza: Appresso Giorgio Marescotti, 1597).

Burnett, Charles, 'Arabic into Latin' in *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, ed. Peter Adamson and Richard C. Taylor (Cambridge, 2004), 370-404.

Burrow, Colin, 'Combative Criticism: Jonson, Milton, and Classical Literary Criticism in England' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge, 1999), 487-499.

Bush, Sargent, and Carl J. Rasmussen, *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1584-1637* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Butcher, S. H., *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art: With a Critical Text and Translation of The Poetics* (London: Macmillan, 1895).

Buxton, John, *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (London: Macmillan, 1954).

Bywater, Ingram, *The Erasmian Pronunciation of Greek and its Precursors: Jerome Aleander, Aldus Manutius, Antonio of Lebrixa* (London: H. Frowde; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908).

——————, *Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England: inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 8 March 1894* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919).

Caius, John, *The Annals of Gonville and Caius College*, ed. John Venn (Cambridge: printed for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1904).

Calepino, Ambrogio, *Dictionarium... Adiectae sunt Latinis dictionibus, Hebraeae, Græcae, Gallicae, Italicae, Hispanicae & Germanicae* ([Lyon], 1570).

Calin, William, 'Ernst Robert Curtius: The Achievement of a Humanist' in *Medievalism and the Academy I*, ed. Leslie J. Workman *et al.* (Cambridge, 1999), 218-27.

Camerini, Paolo, *Annali dei Giunti* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1962-63).

Carley, James P., ed., *The Libraries of Henry VIII*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 7 (London: The British Library in association with The British Academy, 2000).

Carley, James P., and Colin G. C. Tite, eds., *Books and Collectors 1200-1700: Essays Presented to Andrew Watson* (London: British Library, 1997).

Casaubon, Isaac, *Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, ed. Theodoor Jansson ab Almeloveen (Roterodami: Casparis Fritsch et Michaelis Boehm, 1709).

Castelvetro, Lodovico, *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata, et sposta per Lodouico Casteluetro* (Vienna d'Austria: Gaspar Stainhofer, 1570).

——————, *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta, riveduta at ammendata secondo l'originale, & la mente dell'autore*, 2nd ed. (Basilea: Pietro de Sedabonis, 1576).

Celenza, Christopher S., *The Lost Italian Renaissance: Humanists, Historians, and Latin's Legacy* (Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

Cerreta, Florindo V., *Alessandro Piccolomini, letterato e filosofo Senese del cinquecento* (Siena: Accademia Senese degli Intronati, 1960).

——————, 'Alessandro Piccolomini's Commentary on the *Poetics* of Aristotle', *Studies in the Renaissance* 4 (1957), 139-168.

Chadwick, Rev. John White. 'The Rev. John White Chadwick's Impression of Vol. II. of Saintsury's Work on Literary Taste.' *The New York Times*, 6 December 1902.

Chaney, Edward, and Peter Mack, eds., *England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J. B. Trapp* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1990).

Chaucer, Geoffrey, *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson and F. N. Robinson, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Cheke, John, *Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ὁμιλίαι δύο... D. Ioannis Chrysostomi homiliae duae, nunc primum in lucem aeditae, et ad Sereniss. Angliae Regem latinae factae, a Ioanne Cheko Cantabrigiensi* (Londini: Reynerum Vuolfium, 1543).

Cheke, John, and Stephen Gardiner, *De pronuntiatione Graecae potissimum linguae disputationes cum Stephano Vuintoniensi Episcopo* (Basileae: Nicol. Episcopium iuniorem, 1555).

Clark, Donald Lemen, *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance: A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1922).

Clarke, M. L., *Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

Clarke, Peter D., ed., *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge* (London: The British Library in association with the British Academy, 2002).

Clayton, Thomas, 'Catharsis in Aristotle, the Renaissance, and Elsewhere', *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association* 2 (1981), 87-95.

Clough, Cecil H., 'Thomas Linacre, Cornelio Vitelli, and Humanistic Studies at Oxford' in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre*, ed. Francis Maddison *et al.* (Oxford, 1977), 1-23.

Clucas, Stephen, ed., *John Dee: Interdisciplinary Studies in English Renaissance Thought* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006).

Coates, Alan, Kristian Jensen, Cristina Dondi, Bettina Wagner, and Helen Dixon, eds., *A Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Cohn, Leopold, 'Griechische Lexicographie' in Karl Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, ed. Albert Thumb, 4th ed. (München, 1913), 679-730.

Cole, Howard C., *A Quest of Inquirie: Some Contexts of Tudor Literature* (Indianapolis: Pegasus, 1973).

Collier, John Payne, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare, and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration*, 3 vols. (London: John Murray, 1831).

Collins, John Churton, *Greek Influence on English Poetry*, ed. Michael MacMillan (London: I. Pitman & Sons, 1910).

Conley, Thomas, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric in Byzantium', *Rhetorica* 8.1 (1990), 29-44.

——————, ‘Notes on the Byzantine Reception of the Peripatetic Tradition in Rhetoric’ in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (New Brunswick, London, 1994), 217-42.

Considine, John, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

——————, ‘How Much Greek Did Philip Sidney Know?’, *Sidney Journal* 20.2 (2002), 57-78.

Cooper, Lane, *The Poetics of Aristotle: Its Meaning and Influence* (London: George G. Harrap, 1923).

Cooper, Lane, and A. Gudeman, *A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle* (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1928).

Cooper, Thomas, *Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae* (Londini: [Henry Denham], 1578).

Copeland, Rita, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Corrigan, Felicitas, *Helen Waddell: A Biography* (London: V. Gollancz, 1986).

Cosenza, Mario Emilio, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800*, 2nd ed. (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1962).

Costin, W. C., ‘The Inventory of John English, B.C.L., Fellow of St. John’s College’, *Oxoniensia* XI-XII (1946-7), 102-31.

Cotugno, Alessio, ‘Piccolomini e Castelvetro traduttori della Poetica (con un contributo sulle modalità dell’esegesi aristotelica cinquecentesca)’, *Studi di lessicografia italiana* 23 (2006), 113-219.

Craig, D. H., ‘A Hybrid Growth: Sidney’s Theory of Poetry in An Apology for Poetry’, *English Literary Renaissance* 10.2 (1980), 183-201.

Crane, Mary Thomas, ‘Early Tudor Humanism’ in *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2 vols. (Chichester, 2010), I.91-105.

Crane, Ronald S., ed., *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

Cranz, F. Edward, ‘Editions of the Latin Aristotle Accompanied by the Commentaries of Averroes’ in *Philosophy and Humanism*, ed. Edward P. Mahoney (New York, 1976), 116-28.

Cranz, F. Edward, and Charles B. Schmitt, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions, 1501-1600*, Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana 38, 2nd ed. (Baden-Baden: V. Koerner, 1984).

Crastonus, Johannes, *Dictionarium Graecum cum interpretatione Latina* (Venetiis: Aldi, et Andreae Asulani soceri, 1524).

Crespin, Jean, *Lexicon Graecolatinum Ioannis Crispini*, ed. Edward Grant (Londini: Henrici Bynneman, 1581).

Croke, Richard, *Orationes Richardi Croci duae* (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Simon Colinaei, 1520).

——————, *Tabulae, Grecas literas compendio discere cupientibus, sane quae vtiles* (Lipsiae: Valentini Schuman, 1516).

Cronk, Nicholas, 'Aristotle, Horace, and Longinus: the Conception of Reader Response' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge, 1999), 199-204.

Cunningham, J. V., *The Collected Essays of J. V. Cunningham* (Chicago: Swallow Press, 1976).

Curtis, Mark H., 'Library Catalogues and Tudor Oxford and Cambridge', *Studies in the Renaissance* 5 (1958), 111-120.

Curtius, Ernst Robert, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953).

Daniel, Samuel, *A Funerall Poem vppon the Death of the late noble Earle of Deuonshyre* (London, 1606).

Davies, Martin, ed., *Incunabula: Studies in Fifteenth-century Printed Books Presented to Lotte Hellinga* (London: British Library, 1999).

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

de Balmes, Abraham, *Index illorum que in hoc volumine continentur. Libri posteriorum analiticorum cum magnis commentarijs Auerroys. Libri thopicorum Paraphrases Auerroys. Libri elenchorum Paraphrases Auerroys. Libri rethoricorum Paraphrases Auerroys. Libri poetice Paraphrases Auerroys. Quesita logica Auerroys & aliorum. Liber de demonstratione Abrami de Balmes. Epithoma Auerroys omnium librorum logice* (Venetijs: Io. Antonium & fratres de Sabio, 1523).

Delaruelle, L., 'Le Dictionnaire grec-latin de Crastone. Contribution à l'histoire de la lexigographie grecque', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* nuova serie 8.3 (1930), 221-246.

Devereux, James A., S.J, 'The Meaning of Delight in Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*', *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15.1 (1982), 85-97.

Dewar-Watson, Sarah, 'Aristotle and Tragicomedy' in *Early Modern Tragicomedy*, ed. Subha Mukherji and Raphael Lyne (Woodbridge, 2007), 15-27.

——————, 'Shakespeare and Aristotle', *Literature Compass* 1.1 (2004), 1-9.

——————, 'Shakespeare's Dramatic Odysseys: Homer as a Tragicomic Model in *Pericles* and *The Tempest*', *Classical and Modern Literature* 25.1 (2005), 23-40.

Dickey, Eleanor, *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Diller, Aubrey, 'Notes on the History of some Manuscripts of Aristotle' in *Studia Codicologica*, ed. Kurt Treu (Berlin, 1977), 147-50.

Dillon, Janette, *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Disraeli, Isaac, *Amenities of Literature, Consisting of Sketches and Characters of English Literature*, 3 vols. (London: Edward Moxon, 1841).

Dizionario biografico degli italiani, ed. Alberto Maria Ghisalberti and Massimiliano Pavan (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1960-).

Dobson, E. J., *English Pronunciation, 1500-1700*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

Donno, Elizabeth Story, 'Old Mouse-eaten Records: History in Sidney's *Apology*', *Studies in Philology* 72.3 (1975), 275-298.

Dowlin, Cornell March, 'Sidney and Other Men's Thought', *The Review of English Studies* 20.80 (1944), 257-271.

——————, 'Sidney's Two Definitions of Poetry', *Modern Language Quarterly* 3 (1942), 573-581.

Downes, Andrew, *Eratosthenes, hoc est, breuis et luculenta defensio Lysiae pro caede Eratosthenis* (Cambridge: excudebat Iohannes Legatus, inclytae Academiae Catabrigiensis typographus, 1593).

Draper, J. W., 'Aristotelian "Mimesis" in Eighteenth-century England', *PMLA* 36.3 (1921), 372-400.

Dryden, John, *Prose 1668-1691: An Essay of Dramatick Poesie and Shorter Works*, ed. Samuel Holt Monk, The Works of John Dryden XVII (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1971).

Duncan, G. D., ‘Public Lectures and Professorial Chairs’ in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 335-61.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine, *Sir Philip Sidney, Courtier Poet* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).

Durkan, John, ‘The Library of Mary, Queen of Scots’ in *Mary Stewart, Queen in Three Kingdoms*, ed. Michael Lynch (Oxford, 1988), 71-104.

Eade, J. C., *Aristotle Anatomised: The Poetics in England, 1674-1781* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1988).

Eccles, Mark, ‘Bynneman's Books’, *The Library* s.5, 12.2 (1957), 81-92.

Eden, Kathy, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy & its Humanist Reception* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1997).

——————, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

Edwards, Michael, ‘Aristotelianism, Descartes, and Hobbes’, *The Historical Journal* 50.2 (2007), 449-464.

Edwards, W. F., ‘Jacopo Zabarella: a Renaissance Aristotelian's View of Rhetoric and Poetry and Their Relation to Philosophy’ in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen age: actes du quatrième congrès international de philosophie médiévale, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada, 27 août - septembre 1967* (Montréal: Institut d'études médiévales; Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1969), 843-854.

Edzard, Lutz, and Adolf Köhnken, ‘A New Look at the Greek, Syriac, and Arabic Versions of Aristotle's Poetics’ in *Grammar as a Window onto Arabic Humanism*, ed. Lutz Edzard and Janet C. E. Watson (Wiesbaden, 2006), 222-264.

Edzard, Lutz, and Janet C. E. Watson, eds., *Grammar as a Window onto Arabic Humanism: a Collection of Articles in Honour of Michael G. Carter* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006).

Elyot, Thomas, *Bibliotheca Eliotae. Eliotes dictionarie*, ed. Thomas Cooper, 3rd ed. (Londoni: Tho. Berthelm, 1559).

Elyot, Thomas, *The boke named the Gouernour* (Londini: Tho. Bertheleti, 1531).

Emden, A. B., ‘Longolius’ Collection of Books’ in *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen *et al*. (Oxonii, 1947), XI.379-83.

Endress, Gerhard, and Remke Kruk, *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism: studies on the transmission of Greek philosophy and sciences*v 50 (Leiden: Research School CNWS, Leiden University, 1997).

Enright, D. J., and Ernst De Chickera, *English Critical Texts, Sixteenth Century to Twentieth Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione, D. Erasmi Roterodami Dialogus. Eiusdem Dialogus cui titulus, Ciceronianus, siue, De optimo genere dicendi* (Parisiis: Simonis Colinaei, 1528).

——————, *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 1-141 (1484-1500)*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson, Collected Works of Erasmus I (Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1974).

——————, *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 142-297 (1501-1514)*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson, Collected Works of Erasmus II (Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1975).

——————, *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 298-445 (1514-1516)*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson, Collected Works of Erasmus III (Toronto, London: University of Toronto Press, 1976).

——————, *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 446-593 (1516-1517)*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson, Collected Works of Erasmus IV (Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977).

——————, *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 842-992 (1518-1519)*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson, Collected Works of Erasmus VI (Toronto, London: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

——————, *Literary and Education Writings, 2: De copia; De ratione studii*, ed. Craig R. Thompson, trans. Betty I. Knott and Brian McGregor, Collected Works of Erasmus XXIV (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1978).

——————, *Literary and Educational Writings 4: De pueris instituendis; De recta pronuntiatione*, ed. J. K. Sowards, trans. Beert C. Verstraete and Maurice Pope, Collected Works of Erasmus XXVI (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1985).

——————, *Literary and Educational Writings 6: Ciceronianus*, ed. A. H. T. Levi, trans. Betty I. Knott, Collected Works of Erasmus 28 (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1986).

——————, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen *et al.*, 12 vols. (Oxonii: in typographeo Clarendoniano, 1906).

Erne, Lukas, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Ernout, Alfred, and Alfred Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, 3rd ed. (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1951).

Estienne, Henri, ed., *Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη. Nouum Testamentum* ([Geneva]: Henricus Stephanus, 1576).

——————, ed., *Ἡρωδιανοῦ ἱστοριῶν βιβλία H. Herodiani histor. lib. VIII.* ([Geneva]: Henricus Stephanus, 1581).

——————, *Θησαυρὸς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης. Thesaurus Graecae linguae*, 5 vols. (Geneva: Henricus Stephanus, 1572).

——————, *The Frankfort Book Fair*, trans. James Westfall Thompson (Chicago: The Caxton Club, 1911).

Fehrenbach, Robert J., E. S. Leedham-Green, and Joseph L. Black, *Private Libraries in Renaissance England: A Collection and Catalogue of Tudor and Early Stuart Book-lists* (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1992-).

Feingold, Mordechai, *The Mathematicians' Apprenticeship: Science, Universities and Society in England, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Felfe, Robert, and Kirsten Wagner, eds., *Museum, Bibliothek, Stadtraum. Räumliche Wissensordnungen 1600-1900* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2010).

Ferdinand, C. Y., 'Library Administration (c. 1475 to 1640)' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 565-591.

——————, 'Magdalen College and the Book Trade: The Provision of Books in Oxford, 1450-1550' in *The Book Trade and its Customers, 1450-1900*, ed. Arnold Hunt *et al.* (Winchester, 1997), 175-87.

Ferguson, Margaret W., 'Sidney's A Defence of Poetry: A Retrial', *boundary 2* 7.2 (1979), 61-96.

Fletcher, John M., ed., 'The Faculty of Arts' in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 157-99.

——————, *Registrum annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1521-1567*, OHS 23 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

——————, ed., *Registrum annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1567-1603*, OHS n.s. 24 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

Fletcher, John M., and James K. McConica, 'A Sixteenth-Century Inventory of the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3 (1961), 187-99.

Florio, John, *Florio his firste fruites which yeelde familiar speech, merie prouerbes, wittie sentences, and golden sayings* (London: Thomas Dawson, for Thomas Woodcocke, 1578).

Ford, Margaret Lane, ‘Private Ownership of Printed Books’ in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, III: 1400-1557*, ed. Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp (Cambridge, 1999), 205-228.

Forster, Leonard, *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

Fortenbaugh, William W., and David C. Mirhady, eds., *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle* (New Brunswick, London: Transaction Publishers, 1994).

Foster, Joseph, *Alumni Oxonienses: the members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714: their parentage, birthplace, and year of birth, with a record of their degrees: being the matriculation register of the University*, 4 vols. (Oxford, London: Parker, 1891).

Fowler, Thomas, *The History of Corpus Christi College, with Lists of its Members*, OHS 25 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893).

Fox Bourne, H. R., *A Memoir of Sir Philip Sidney* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1862).

French, Peter J., *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972).

Friedland, L. S., ‘The Dramatic Unities in England’, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 10 (1911), 56-89, 280-99, 453-67.

Gardiner, Stephen, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. James Arthur Muller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933).

Gaskell, Philip, ‘Books bought by Whitgift’s Pupils in the 1570s’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 7.3 (1979), 284-93.

——————, *Trinity College Library: The First 150 Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

Geanakoplos, Deno John, *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962).

——————, *Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (330-1600)* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1976).

——————, ‘Italian Renaissance Thought and Learning and the Role of the Byzantine Emigré Scholars in Florence, Rome, and Venice: A Reassessment’ in *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison, 1989), 3-37.

Gessner, Conrad, *Bibliotheca instituta et collecta primum a Conrado Gesnero, deinde in*

epitomen redacta & nouorum librorum accessione locupletata (Tiguri: Christophorum Froschouerum, 1583).

Gibson, Strickland, *Abstracts from the Wills and Testamentary Documents of Binders, Printers, and Stationers of Oxford, from 1493 to 1638* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1907).

——————, ed., *Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931).

Gilbert, Allan H., ed., *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (New York: American Book Co., 1940).

Gilbert, Allan H., and H. L. Snuggs, 'On the Relation of Horace to Aristotle in Literary Criticism', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46 (1947), 233-47.

Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau, and Gonzalez Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed. (London: University Publishing Co., 1894).

Gilson, J. P., 'The Library of Henry Savile, of Banke', *The Library* Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, 9.1 (1906), 127-210.

Giraldi Cinzio, Giovanni Battista, *Discorsi... intorno al comporre de i romanzi, delle comedie, e delle tragedie, e di altre maniere di poesie* (Vinegia: Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari et fratelli, 1554).

——————, 'Discourse or Letter on the Composition of Comedies and Tragedies', trans. Daniel Javitch, *Renaissance Drama* 39 (2011), 197-255.

Glucker, J., 'Casaubon's Aristotle', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 25 (1964), 274-96.

Goeglein, Tamara A., '"Wherein hath Ramus been so offensious?": Poetic Examples in the English Ramist Logic Manuals (1574-1672)', *Rhetorica* 14.1 (1996), 73-101.

Goldman, Marcus Selden, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1934).

Gosman, M., A. Macdonald, and A. Vanderjagt, eds., *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650*, II (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005).

Green, Lawrence D., and James Jerome Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue 1460-1700*, 2nd ed. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

Greenslade, S. L., 'The Faculty of Theology' in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 295-334.

Gregory Smith, G., ed., *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904).

Grendler, Marcella, 'A Greek Collection in Padua: The Library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601)', *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.3 (1980), 386-416.

Grendler, Paul F., *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

Grierson, Philip, 'John Caius' Library' in *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*, ed. M. J. Pritchard and J. B. Skemp (Cambridge, 1978), VII.509-525.

Gruffydd, R. G., 'Humphrey Llwyd: Some Documents and a Catalogue', *Transactions of the Denbighshire Historical Society* 17 (1968), 54-107.

Gutas, Dimitri, 'Paul the Persian and the Classification of the Parts of Aristotle's Philosophy: A Milestone between Alexandria and Baghdad', *Der Islam* 60 (1983), 231-267.

Hale, William Gardner, and Carl Darling Buck, *A Latin Grammar* (Boston: Ginn, 1903).

Halliwell, Stephen, *Aristotle's Poetics* (London: Duckworth, 1986).

——————, 'Aristotle's Poetics' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism I: Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), 149-183.

Hamesse, Jacqueline, *Les auctoritates Aristotelis: un florilège médiéval: étude historique et édition critique* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1974).

Hamilton, A. C., ed., *The Spenser Encyclopedia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: Routledge, 1990).

Hankins, James, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Hannam, James, 'The Library of Reuben Shirwoode (c1542-1599)', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 13.2 (2005), 175-186.

Hardie, Philip, 'Redeeming The Text, Reception Studies, and the Renaissance', *Classical Receptions Journal* 5.2 (2013), 190-198.

Hardison, O. B., 'On the Place of Averroës' Commentary on the Poetics in the History of Medieval Criticism' in *Medieval and Renaissance Studies IV*, ed. John L. Lievsay (Durham, NC, 1970), 57-81.

——————, 'The Two Voices of Sidney's Apology for Poetry', *English Literary Renaissance* 2.1 (1972), 83-99.

Harington, John, *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse, by Iohn Harington* (London: Richard Field, 1591).

Harlfinger, Dieter, and Diether Reinsch, 'Die Aristotelica des Parisinus Gr. 1741. Zur Überlieferung von Poetik, Rhetorik, Physiognomonik, De signis, De ventorum situ', *Philologus* 114.1 (1970), 28-50.

Harlfinger, Dieter, and Martin Sicherl, *Griechische Handschriften und Aldinen* (Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 1978).

Harvey, Gabriel, ‘G. H. de discenda Graeca lingva oratio prima... secunda’ in Jean Crespin, *Lexicon Graecolatinvm Ioannis Crispini* ed. Edward Grant (London, 1581), sigs. Nnnn.vi-Oooo.ii.

——————, *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey, A.D. 1573-1580*, ed. Edward John Long Scott (London: Camden Society, 1884).

Harvey, Gabriel, and Edmund Spenser, *Three proper, and wittie, familiar Letters: lately passed betweene two Vniuersitie men: touching the Earthquake in Aprill last, and our English refourmed Versifying* (London: H. Bynneman, 1580).

Hathaway, Baxter, *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962).

——————, *Marvels and Commonplaces: Renaissance Literary Criticism* (New York: Random House, 1968).

Hattaway, Michael, *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

Haugen, Kristine Louise, ‘The Birth of Tragedy in the Cinquecento: Humanism and Literary History’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 72.3 (2011), 351-70.

Hearsey, Marguerite, ‘Sidney's *Defense of Poesy* and Amyot's *Preface* in North's *Plutarch*: A Relationship’, *Studies in Philology* 30.4 (1933), 535-550.

Heath, Terrence, ‘Logical Grammar, Grammatical Logic, and Humanism in Three German Universities’, *Studies in the Renaissance* 18 (1971), 9-64.

Hebel, J. William, Hoyt H. Hudson, Francis R. Johnson, and A. Wigfall Green, *Prose of the English Renaissance* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952).

Heinsius, Daniel, *De tragoediae constitutione liber, in quo inter caetera tota de hac Aristotelis sententia dilucide explicatur* (Lugduni Batavorum: apud Io. Balduinum, prostat in bibliopolio Ludovici Elzevirii, 1611).

Hellinga, Lotte, and J. B. Trapp, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, III: 1400-1557* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Heninger, S. K., ‘Sidney and Serranus’ Plato’, *English Literary Renaissance* 13.2 (1983), 146-161.

——————, *Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker* (University Park, London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989).

——————, ‘Speaking Pictures: Sidney's Rapprochement between Poetry and Painting’ in

Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture, ed. Michael D. Moore and Gary F. Waller (London, 1984), 3-16.

——————, *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1974).

Henryson, Robert, *The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson: Schoolmaster of Dunfermline*, ed. H. Harvey Wood (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1933).

Herendeen, Wyman. H., and Kenneth R. Bartlett, 'The Library of Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham: British Library Add. 40,676', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America,* 85 (1991), 235-296.

Herman, Peter C., *Squitter-Wits and Muse-Haters: Sidney, Spenser, Milton, and Renaissance Antipoetic Sentiment* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996).

Herrick, Marvin T., 'The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England', *Philological Quarterly* 5 (1926), 242-57.

——————, *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946).

——————, *The Poetics of Aristotle in England* (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1930).

——————, *Italian Tragedy in the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965).

——————, 'Review: Thaler, *Shakespeare and Sir Philip Sidney: The Influence of the Defense of Poesy*', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 47.2 (1948), 193-96.

——————, 'Sir John Cheke and Aristotle's Poetics', *Classical Weekly* 18.17 (1925), 134-135.

Hesseling, D.-C., and H. Pernot, 'Érasme et les origines de la prononciation érasmienne', *Revue des études grecques* 32 (1919), 278-301.

Hobbs, M., 'More Books from the Library of John Donne', *The Book Collector* 29 (1980), 590-92.

Hoppe, Harry R., 'John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher 1579-1601', *The Library* s.4, 14.3 (1933), 241-287.

Horace, *Q. Horatij Flacci opera omnia; cum notis Danielis Heinsii. Accedit Horatij ad Pisones epistola, Aristotelis de poetica libellus*, ed. Daniel Heinsius (Lugduni Batauorum: Plantiniana Raphelengii, 1610).

Horton, Ronald A., 'Aristotle and his Commentators' in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (Toronto, London, 1990), 57-60.

Hudson, Winthrop Still, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1980).

Hüllen, Werner, 'In the Beginning was the Gloss: Remarks on the Historical Emergence of Lexicographical Paradigms' in *Lexicographers and Their Works*, ed. Gregory James (Exeter, 1989), 100-16.

Huloet, Richard, and John Higgins, *Huloets dictionarie newelye corrected, amended, set in order and enlarged... Also the Frenche therevnto annexed, by vvhich you may finde the Latin or Frenche, of anye English woorde you will* (Londini: Thomae Marshij 1572).

Hunt, Arnold, Giles Mandelbrote, and Alison Shell, *The Book Trade and its Customers, 1450-1900: Historical Essays for Robin Myers* (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1997).

Hunt, R. W., 'Medieval Inventories of Clare College Library', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1.2 (1950), 105-125.

Hunter, George K., 'Elizabethan Theatrical Genres and Literary Theory' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge, 1999), 248-258.

Hunter, Lew, *Lew Hunter's Screenwriting 434* (New York: Perigee, 2004).

Hyman, Virginia Riley, 'Sidney's Definition of Poetry', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 10.1 (1970), 49-62.

Irvine, Martin, *The Making of Textual Culture: 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Irvine, Martin, and David Thomson, '*Grammatica* and Literary Theory' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism II: The Middle Ages*, ed. A. J. Minnis and Ian R. Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), 15-41.

James, Gregory, ed., *Lexicographers and Their Works* (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1989).

James, M. R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912).

—————, 'Greek Manuscripts in England Before the Renaissance', *The Library* s.4, 7.4 (1927), 337-353.

James, Thomas, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae publicae quam vir ornatissimus Thomas Bodleius eques auratus in Academia Oxoniensi nuper instituit...* (Oxoniae: Iosephum Barnesium, 1605).

—————, *Catalogus vniuersalis librorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana omnium librorum, linguarum, & scientiarum genere refertissime...* (Oxoniae: Iohannes Lichfield, &

Iacobus Short, 1620).

Jardine, Lisa, ‘Humanism and Dialectic in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge: A Preliminary Investigation’ in *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 1500-1700*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1976), 141-54.

——————, ‘Humanism and the Sixteenth Century Cambridge Arts Course’, *History of Education* 4.1 (1975), 16-31.

——————, ‘The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge’, *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974), 31-62.

Javitch, Daniel, ‘The Assimilation of Aristotle's Poetics in Sixteenth-Century Italy’ in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge, 1999), 53-65.

——————, ‘The Emergence of Poetic Genre Theory in the Sixteenth Century’, *Modern Language Quarterly* 59.2 (1998), 139-169.

——————, *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

Jayne, Sears Reynolds, *Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (Godalming: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1983).

Jayne, Sears Reynolds, and Francis R. Johnson, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1956).

Jensen, Kristian, ‘Problems of Provenance: Incunabula in the Bodleian Library’s Benefactors’ Register 1600-2’ in *Incunabula: Studies in Fifteenth-Century Printed Books Presented to Lotte Hellinga*, ed. Martin Davies (London, 1999), 559-602.

——————, ‘Universities and Colleges’ in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 345-362.

Jerome, *Saint Jérôme: Lettres*, ed. and trans. Jérôme Labourt, 8 vols. (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1949).

Jones, Edmund D., ed., *English Critical Essays (Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries)* (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1922).

Kassel, Rudolf, *Der Text der Aristotelischen Rhetorik* (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 1971).

Kearney, Hugh F., *Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Pre-Industrial Britain, 1500-1700* (London: Faber and Faber, 1970).

Keith, Alison, and Stephen James Rupp, eds., *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and

Renaissance Studies, 2007).

Kelly, H. A., ‘Aristotle-Averroes-Alemannus on Tragedy: The Influence of the *Poetics* on the Latin Middle Ages’, *Viator* 10 (1979), 161-209.

Kemal, Salim, *The Philosophical Poetics of Alfarabi, Avicenna and Averroes: the Aristotelian Reception* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

Kennedy, George A., ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism I: Classical Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

——————, ‘The Classical Tradition in Rhetoric’ in *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott (Birmingham, 1981), 20-34.

——————, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

——————, ‘Peripatetic Rhetoric as It Appears (and Disappears) in Quintilian’ in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (New Brunswick, London, 1994), 174-82.

——————, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

Ker, N. R., *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 2nd ed. (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1964).

——————, ‘Oxford College Libraries in the Sixteenth Century’, *Bodleian Library Record* 6 (1959), 459-515.

——————, ‘The Provision of Books’ in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 441-519.

——————, ed., *Records of All Souls College Library, 1437-1600* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

Keynes, Geoffrey, ‘Books from John Donne's Library’ in *Bibliography of Dr. John Donne*, 4th ed. (Oxford, 1974), 258-79.

——————, ‘More Books from the Library of John Donne’, *The Book Collector* 26 (1977), 29-35.

——————, ‘More Books from the Library of John Donne’, *The Book Collector* 27 (1978), 570-72.

Kinney, Arthur F., ‘Parody and Its Implications in Sydney's Defense of Poesie’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 12.1 (1972), 1-19.

——————, ‘The Position of Poetry: Making and Defending Renaissance Poetics’ in *A New*

Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2010), II.15-27.

Kishler, Thomas C., ‘Aristotle and Sidney on Imitation’, *Classical Journal* 59.2 (1963), 63-4.

Kostić, Veselin, ‘Aristotle’s Catharsis in Renaissance Poetics’, *Živa Antika* 10 (1960), 61-74.

Kraye, Jill, ‘Erasmus and the Canonization of Aristotle: The Letter to John More’ in *England and the Continental Renaissance*, ed. Edward Chaney and Peter Mack (Woodbridge, 1990), 37-52.

——————, ‘The Printing History of Aristotle in the Fifteenth Century: A Bibliographical Approach to Renaissance Philosophy’, *Renaissance Studies* 9.2 (1995), 189-211.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar, ‘Renaissance Aristotelianism’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 6 (1965), 157-74.

Krouse, F. Michael, ‘Plato and Sidney's *Defence of Poesie*’, *Comparative Literature* 6.2 (1954), 138-147.

Kuin, Roger, ‘The Text of the Plural, the Plural of the Text’, *Sidney Journal* 20.2 (2002), 79-86.

Labarre, Albert, *Bibliographie du dictionarium d'Ambrogio Calepino (1502-1779)* (Baden-Baden: Koerner, 1975).

Lacombe, George, ‘Medieval Latin Versions of the *Parva Naturalia*’, *The New Scholasticism* 5.4 (1931), 289-311.

Lacombe, George, Aleksander Birkenmajer, Marthe Dulong, Ezio Franceschini, and L. Minio-Paluello, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, 3 vols. (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1939-61).

Laing, David, ‘A Brief Account of the Hawthornden MSS in the Possession of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland’, *Archaeologica Scotica* IV (1857).

Lascaris, Constantine, *In hoc libro haec habentur... De octo partibus orationis...* (Venetiis: Aldus, 1512).

Lasinio, Fausto, *Il commento medio di Averroe alla Poetica di Aristotele, per la prima volta pubblicato in arabo e in ebraico e recato in italiano* (Pisa: Presso l'editore e traduttore, 1872).

Lawrence, Jason, *'Who the Devil Taught Thee so Much Italian?': Italian Language Learning and Literary Imitation in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

Leader, Damian Riehl, *A History of the University of Cambridge I: The University to 1546* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Lee, John A. L., *A History of New Testament Lexicography* (New York, Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003).

Leedham-Green, Elisabeth, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

——————, 'A Catalogue of Caius College Library, 1569', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8.1 (1981), 29-41.

——————, 'One That Got Away: The Inventory of Thomas Southwell, 1605', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 9 (1990), 526-530.

——————, 'University Libraries and Book-sellers' in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, III: 1400-1557*, ed. Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp (Cambridge, 1999), 316-353.

Leedham-Green, Elisabeth, and David McKitterick, 'A Catalogue of Cambridge University Library, 1583' in *Books and Collectors 1200-1700*, ed. James P. Carley and Colin G. C. Tite (London, 1997), 153-235.

Leedham-Green, Elisabeth, and Teresa Webber, eds., *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, I: To 1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Legrand, Émile, *Bibliographie hellénique: ou, Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs aux XVe et XVIe siècles*, 4 vols. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1885-1906).

Leland, John, *De rebus Britannicis collectanea*, ed. Thomas Hearne, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (Londini: Gul. et Io. Richardson, 1770).

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 2 vols. ([Leipzig]: J. Dodsley und Compagnie, 1769).

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. J. S. Brewer *et al.*, 21 vols. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1862-1932).

Levao, Ronald, *Renaissance Minds and Their Fictions: Cusanus, Sidney, Shakespeare* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

——————, 'Sidney's Feigned Apology', *PMLA* 94.2 (1979), 223-233.

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

Lewis, Gillian, 'The Faculty of Medicine' in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 213-56.

Liddell, Henry G., and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. Henry S. Jones *et al.*, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Liddell, J. R., ‘The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1517-1617’, B.Litt. thesis, University of Oxford (1933).

——————, ‘The Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the Sixteenth Century’, *The Library* s.4, 18.4 (1938), 385-416.

Lievsay, John L., *The Englishman's Italian Books, 1550-1700* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969).

——————, ed., *Medieval and Renaissance Studies IV: Proceedings of the Southeastern Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Summer, 1968* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1970).

Lily, William, *A short introduction of grammar generallie to be vsed* ([Geneva: C. Badius], 1557).

Ling, Nicholas, *Politeuphuia Wits Common wealth* (London: I. R[oberts], 1597).

Lionardi, Alessandro, *Dialogi... della inventione poetica. Et insieme di quanto alla istoria et all'arte oratoria s'appartiene, et del modo di finger la favola* (Venetia: Plinio Pietrasanta, 1554).

Lobel, Edgar, *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle’s Poetics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933).

——————, *The Medieval Latin Poetics* (London: Humphrey Milford, 1931).

Logan, Brian. ‘Arts Spotlight: Michael Lesslie - the boy can't help it.’ *The Independent*, 30 December 2007.

Logan, F. D., ‘The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities, 1535’, *English Historical Review* 106 (1991), 861-888.

——————, ‘The Origins of the So-Called Regius Professorships: An Aspect of the Renaissance in Oxford and Cambridge’ in *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford, 1977), 271-278.

Lohr, Charles H., ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors A-B’, *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974), 228-289.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors C’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 28.4 (1975), 689-741.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors D-F’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 29.4 (1976), 714-745.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors G-K’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 30.4 (1977), 681-741.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors L-M’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 31.4 (1978), 532-603.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors N-Ph’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 32.4 (1979), 529-580.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors Pi-Sm’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.4 (1980), 623-734.

——————, ‘Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors So-Z’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 35.2 (1982), 164-256.

Lowry, Martin, ‘The "New Academy" of Aldus Manutius: a Renaissance Dream’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 58.2 (1976), 378-420.

——————, ‘The Proving Ground: Venetian Academies of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries’ in *The Fairest Flower: The Emergence of Linguistic National Consciousness in Renaissance Europe* (Firenze, 1985), 41-51.

——————, *The World of Aldus Manutius: Business and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979).

Luther, Martin, *Luther's Primary Works*, ed. Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1896).

——————, *Schriften 1519/20*, ed. D. Knaake, D. Martin Luthers Werke VI (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1888).

Lydgate, John, *Lydgate's Troy Book, A.D. 1412-20*, ed. Henry Bergen, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 97, 103, 106, 126, 4 vols. (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1906-35).

Lynch, Michael, ed., *Mary Stewart: Queen in Three Kingdoms* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988).

MacDonald, Robert H., *The Library of Drummond of Hawthornden* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971).

Mack, Peter, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric, 1380-1620* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Macray, William Dunn, *Annals of the Bodleian Library, Oxford: with a Notice of the Earlier Library of the University*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1984).

Madan, Falconer, ‘Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller in Oxford, A.D. 1520’ in *Collectanea I*, ed. C. R. L. Fletcher, OHS 5 (Oxford, 1885), 71-177.

——————, ‘Supplementary Notes to Collectanea I, Part III, Day-Book of John Dorne,

Bookseller in Oxford, 1520' in *Collectanea II*, ed. Montagu Burrows, OHS 16 (Oxford, 1890), 453-478.

Maddison, Francis, Margaret Pelling, and Charles Webster, eds., *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460-1524* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

Maggi, Vincenzo, and Bartolomeo Lombardi, *In Aristotelis librum de poetica communes explanationes. Madii vero in eundem librum propriae annotationes. Eiusdem De ridiculis et in Horatii librum De arte poetica interpretatio. In fronte praeterea operis apposita est Lombardi in Aristotelis Poeticam praefatio* (Venetijs: in officina Erasmiana Vincentij Valgrisij, 1550).

Mahl, Mary Roberta, ed., *The Norwich Sidney Manuscript: The Apology for Poetry* (Northridge: San Fernando Valley State College, 1969).

Mahoney, Edward P., ed., *Philosophy and Humanism: Renaissance Essays in honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

Maitland Club, 'Inventories of Buikis in the Colleges of Sanctandrois, 1588-1612', *Maitland Club Miscellany* 1.2 (1834), 303-29.

Mandelbrote, Scott, 'The Library of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and the problem of the spatial arrangement of knowledge during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' in *Museum, Bibliothek, Stadtraum: Räumliche Wissensordnungen 1600-1900*, ed. Robert Felfe and Kirsten Wagner (Berlin, 2010), 23-76.

Manganaro, Elise Salem, 'Plato and Aristotle in Sidney's Poetics: Theory and Practice', Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (1985).

Manutius, Aldus, *Institutionum grammaticarum libri quatuor* (Venetiis: Aldum, 1508).

Marangon, Tiziana Pesenti, *La biblioteca universitaria di Padova: dalla sua istituzione alla fine della Repubblica veneta (1629-1794)* (Padova: Antenore, 1979).

Margoliouth, D. S., *Analecta orientalia ad Poeticam Aristoteleam* (Londini: D. Nutt, 1887).

Marrapodi, Michele, 'Shakespeare against Genres' in *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literary Theories: Anglo-Italian Transactions*, ed. Michele Marrapodi (Farnham, 2011), 1-22.

——————, ed., *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literary Theories: Anglo-Italian Transactions* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Martindale, Charles, 'Reception - a New Humanism? Receptivity, Pedagogy, the Transhistorical', *Classical Receptions Journal* 5.2 (2013), 169-183.

——————, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Mason, H. A., 'An Introduction to Literary Criticism by Way of Sidney's Apologie for

Poetrie', *Cambridge Quarterly* 12.2-3 (1983), 77-173.

Massa, E., 'Ruggero Bacone e la *Poetica* di Aristotele', *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 32 (1953), 457-73.

Mayor, J. E. B., *Early Statutes of the College of St. John the Evangelist in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1859).

McConica, James, ed., 'Elizabethan Oxford: The Collegiate Society' in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 645-732.

——————, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

——————, *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

——————, 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford', *English Historical Review* 94.371 (1979), 291-317.

——————, 'The Prosopography of the Tudor University', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 3.3 (1973), 543-554.

——————, 'The Rise of the Undergraduate College' in *The History of the University of Oxford, III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford, 1986), 1-68.

——————, 'Scholars and Commoners in Renaissance Oxford' in *The University in Society*, ed. Lawrence Stone, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1975), I.151-81.

——————, 'The Social Relations of Tudor Oxford', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 27 (1977), 115-134.

McDonnell, Michael, *The Annals of St. Paul's School* (Cambridge: privately printed for the Governors, 1959).

——————, *A History of St. Paul's School* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1909).

McEachern, Claire, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespearean Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

McFarlane, I. D., ed., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Sanctandreani: proceedings of the fifth international congress of Neo-Latin studies, St. Andrews, 24 August to 1 September 1982* (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1986).

——————, *Buchanan* (London: Duckworth, 1981).

McIntyre, John P., 'Sidney's "Golden World"', *Comparative Literature* 14.4 (1962), 356-365.

McKitterick, David, ed., *The Library of Sir Thomas Knyvett of Ashwellthorpe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1978).

McLeod, Margaret, Karen I. James, and David J. Shaw, *The Cathedral Libraries Catalogue: Books Printed Before 1701 in the Libraries of the Anglican Cathedrals of England and Wales* (London: British Library, 1984).

McPherson, David, 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: An Annotated Catalogue', *Studies in Philology* 71.5 (1974), 1-106.

Melanchthon, Philip, *Philip Melanchthon: Orations on Philosophy and Education*, ed. Sachiko Kusukawa, trans. Christine F. Salazar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Meres, Francis, *Palladis Tamia. Wits Treasury Being the Second part of Wits Common wealth* (London: printed by P. Short, for Cuthbert Burbie, 1598).

Middle English Dictionary, ed. Hans Kurath *et al.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954-2001).

Mikkeli, Heikki, *An Aristotelian Response to Renaissance Humanism: Jacopo Zabarella on the nature of arts and sciences*41 (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1992).

——————, 'The Cultural Programmes of Alessandro Piccolomini and Sperone Speroni at the Paduan *Accademia degli Infiammati* in the 1540s' in *Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Conversations with Aristotle*, ed. Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusukawa (Aldershot, Brookfield, 1999), 76-85.

Miller, William E., 'Double Translation in English Humanistic Education', *Studies in the Renaissance* 10 (1963), 163-174.

Minio-Paluello, Lorenzo, ed., *De arte poetica: translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka*, Aristoteles Latinus XXXIII, 2nd ed. (Bruxelles-Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968).

Minnis, A. J., and Ian R. Johnson, eds., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism II: The Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Minturno, Antonio Sebastiani, *De poeta, ad Hectorem Pignatellum, Vinonensium ducem, libri sex* (Venetiis: Franciscum Rampazetum, 1559).

——————, *L'Arte Poetica* (Venetia: Gio. Andrea Valuassori, 1563).

Monfasani, John, 'The Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition and the Renaissance' in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley, 1983), 174-87.

——————, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

Moore, Michael D., and Gary F. Waller, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture: The Poet in His Time and in Ours: A Collection of Critical and Scholarly Essays* (London: Croom Helm, 1984).

Moraux, Paul, *Aristoteles Graecus: die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1976).

——————, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain: Éditions universitaires de Louvain, 1951).

More, Thomas, *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, ed. Elizabeth Frances Rogers (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947).

——————, *In Defense of Humanism: Letters to Dorp, Oxford, Lee, and a Monk*, ed. Daniel Kinney, The Complete Works of St Thomas More XV (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

Morel, Guillaume, and Abraham Fleming, *Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglicisque coniunctorum, locupletissimi commentarij* (Londini: in aedibus Henrici Bynnemani, per assignationem Richardi Huttoni, 1583).

Morgan, Victor, and Christopher N. L. Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge, II: 1546-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Morley, Henry, *A First Sketch of English Literature* (London, Paris, New York: Cassell, 1873).

Morris, Jan, *The Oxford Book of Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

Moschopoulos, Manuel, and Robert Estienne, *Τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου Μανουήλου τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου περὶ σχεδῶν. Manuelis Moschopuli de ratione examinandae orationis libellus* (Lutetiae: Roberti Stephani, 1545).

Moss, Ann, ‘Being in Two Minds: The Bilingual Factor in Renaissance Writing’ in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis*, ed. Rhoda Schnur *et al.* (Binghamton, 1994), 61-74.

Mukherji, Subha, and Raphael Lyne, eds., *Early Modern Tragicomedy* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2007).

Muller, James Arthur, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1926).

Mullett, Margaret, and Roger Scott, *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition: University of Birmingham, Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, 1979* (Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, 1981).

Mullinger, J. Bass, *The University of Cambridge*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 1873).

Murdoch, J. E., and E. D. Sylla, eds., *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning: proceedings of the first International Colloquium on Philosophy, Science, and*

Theology in the Middle Ages - September 1973 (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1975).

Murphy, James J., 'Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 52.2 (1966), 109-115.

——————, 'The Key Role of Habit in Roman Writing Instruction' in *A Short History of Writing Instruction: from Ancient Greece to Modern America*, ed. James J. Murphy, 2nd ed. (Mahwah, 2001), 35-78.

——————, *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1983).

——————, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1974).

——————, *A Short History of Writing Instruction: from Ancient Greece to Modern America*, 2nd ed. (Mahwah: Erlbaum, 2001).

Musurus, Marcus, ed., *Ετυμολογικὸν μέγα κατὰ ἀλφάβητον, πάνυ ὠφέλιμον [Magnum etymologicum]* (ἐν ἐνετίαις [*sic*.; Venice]: Zacharias Kallierges, 1499).

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

Needham, Paul, 'Aldus Manutius's Paper Stocks: The Evidence of Two Uncut Books', *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 55.2 (1994), 287-307.

——————, 'Sir John Cheke at Cambridge and at Court', Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 2 vols. (1971).

Newman, C. E., 'The First Library of the Royal College of Physicians', *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of London* 3 (1968-69), 299-307

Norton, Glyn P., ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Oates, J. C. T., 'The Libraries of Cambridge, 1570-1700' in *The English Library before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright (London, 1958), 213-235.

Oates, J. C. T., and H. L. Pink, 'Three Sixteenth-Century Catalogues of the University Library', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1.4 (1952), 310-40.

Oldham, J. B., *A History of Shrewsbury School, 1552-1952* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1952).

——————, 'Shrewsbury School Library', *The Library* s.5, 14.2 (1959), 81-99.

——————, 'Shrewsbury School Library: Its Earlier History and Organization', *The Library* s.4, 16.1 (1935), 49-60.

Olson, Elder, ed., *Aristotle's Poetics and English Literature: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

Omont, Henri, ed., *La Poétique d'Aristote: manuscrit 1741 fonds grec de la bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1891).

Ong, Walter J., *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Orlandi, Giovanni, *Aldo Manuzio editore: dediche, prefazioni, note ai testi* (Milano: Il polifilo, 1975).

Osborn, James Marshall, *Young Philip Sidney, 1572-1577*5 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972).

Ovenden, Richard, 'The Publication of the Catalogues of the Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' in *History of Oxford University Press* (forthcoming).

Padelford, Frederick Morgan, 'Sidney's Indebtedness to Sibilet', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 7.1 (1908), 81-84.

Parks, George B., 'The First Draft of Ascham's *Scholemaster*', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 1.3 (1938), 313-327.

Partee, Morriss Henry, 'Sir Philip Sidney and the Renaissance Knowledge of Plato', *English Studies* 51.5 (1970), 411-424.

Patey, Caroline, 'Beyond Aristotle: Giraldi Cinzio and Shakespeare' in *Italy and the English Renaissance*, ed. Sergio Rossi and Daniella Savoia (Milano, 1989), 167-185.

Patrizi, Francesco, *Della poetica* (Ferrara: Vittorio Baldini, 1586).

Pauck, Wilhelm, *Melanchthon and Bucer* (London: SCM Press, 1969).

Peacock, George, *Observations on the Statutes of the University of Cambridge* (London, Cambridge: John W. Parker; J. and J. J. Deighton, 1841).

Pearson, David, 'A Cambridge Bookseller's accounts of 1572', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 9 (1988), 230-247.

Percival, W. Keith, 'Grammar and Rhetoric in the Renaissance' in *Renaissance Eloquence. Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley, 1983), 303-30.

Peterson, Robert, *Galateo of Maister Iohn Della Casa, Archebishop of Beneuenta. Or rather, A treatise of the manners and behauiours, it behoueth a man to vse and eschewe, in his familiar conuersation* (London: [Henry Middleton] for Raufe Newbery, 1576).

Pettegree, Andrew, ‘Art’ in *The Reformation World*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (London, 2000).

——————, ed., *The Reformation World* (London: Routledge, 2000).

Phavorinus, Varinus, *Λεξικόν Βαρίνου Φαβωρίνου Καμήρτος του της Νουκαιρίας Επισκόπου, το μέγα και πάνυ ωφέλιμον. Dictionarium Varini Phauorini Camertis, Nucerini Episcopi, magnum illud ac perutile multis uariiśque ex autoribus collectum, totius linguae Graecae commentarius..* (Basileae: Robert Winter, 1538).

Piccolomini, Alessandro, *Annotationi... nel libro della Poetica d'Aristotele; con la traduttione del medesimo libro, in lingua volgare* (Vinegia: Giouanni Guarisco, & Compagni, 1575).

Pigman, G. W., III, ‘Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.1 (1980), 1-32.

Pigna, Giovan Battista, *Poetica Horatiana* (Venetiis: Vincentium Valgrisium, 1561).

Plato, *Πλάτωνος ἅπαντα τὰ σωζόμενα. Platonis opera quae extant omnia*, ed. Henri Estienne, trans. Jean de Serres, 3 vols. ([Geneva]: Henr. Stephanus, 1578).

Pollard, Tanya, ‘Tragedy and Revenge’ in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy*, ed. Emma Smith and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (Cambridge, 2010), 58-72.

Pope, Alexander, ed., *The Works of Shakespear*, 6 vols. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1725).

Porro, Antonietta, ‘Pier Vettori editore di testi greci: la *Poetica* di Aristotele’, *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 26 (1983), 307-358.

Powicke, F. M., *The Medieval Books of Merton College* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931).

Press, Skip, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Screenwriting*, 3rd ed. (New York: Alpha, 2008).

Proclus, *et al.*, *Iulii Firmici Astronomicorum libri octo... Procli eiusdem Sphaera, Thoma Linacro Britanno interprete* (Venetiis: Aldi Romani, 1499).

Ptolemy, *Omnia, quae extant, opera, Geographia excepta...* ed. Hieronymus Gemusaeus, trans. George Trapezuntius *et al.* (Basileae: Henricum Petrum, 1541).

Puttenham, George, *The Arte of English Poesie. Contriued into three Bookes: The First of Poets and Poesie, the second of Proportion, the third of Ornament* (London: Richard Field, 1589).

Quaritch, Bernard, *Contributions towards a Dictionary of English Book-Collectors: as also of some foreign collectors whose libraries were incorporated in English collections or whose books are chiefly met with in England*, Part I (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1892).

Rabe, Hugo, ‘Rhetoren-Corpora’, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 67 (1912), 321-57.

Rabil, Albert, ed., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

Rainolds, John, *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, trans. Lawrence D. Green (Newark, London: University of Delaware Press, 1986).

——————, *Oratio in laudem artis poeticae [circa 1572]*, ed. William A. Ringler and Walter Allen (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940).

Ramsay, Nigel, and James M. W. Willoughby, eds., *Hospitals, Towns and the Professions*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 14 (London: The British Library in association with The British Academy, 2009).

Ramus, Petrus, *Collectanae praefationes, epistolae, orationes* (Parisiis: Dionysium Vallensem, 1577).

Reisner, Noam, ‘The Paradox of Mimesis in Sidney's Defence of Poesie and Marlowe's Doctor Faustus’, *Cambridge Quarterly* 39.4 (2010), 331-349.

Renouard, Antoine Augustin, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Alde, ou, Histoire des trois Manuce et de leurs éditions*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1834).

Rhetores in hoc volumine habentur hi: Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata. Hermogenis Ars rhetorica. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum ad Theodecten libri tres. Eiusdem Rhetorice ad Alexandrum. Eiusdem ars poetica... ed. Demetrius Ducas, 2 vols. (Venetiis: Aldi, 1508-9).

Rhodes, Neil, ‘Marlowe and the Greeks’, *Renaissance Studies* 27.2 (2013), 199-218.

Rhys, Ernest, *Literary Pamphlets Chiefly Relating to Poetry from Sidney to Byron*, 2 vols. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1897).

Riccoboni, Antonio, *Poetica Aristotelis ab Antonio Riccobono Latine conuersa, eiusdem Riccoboni paraphrasis in Poeticam Aristotelis, eiusdem Ars comica ex Aristotele* (Patavii: Paulum Meietum, 1587).

Riehl, Damian, ‘Grammar in Late-Medieval Oxford and Cambridge’, *History of Education* 12.1 (1983), 9-14.

Rigolio, Alberto, ‘Aristotle's *Poetics* in Syriac and Arabic Translations: Readings of "Tragedy"’, *Khristianskii vostok* 6 (2013), 140-149.

Roberts, R. Julian, ‘Additions and Corrections to "John Dee's Library Catalogue"’ in *John Dee: Interdisciplinary Studies in English Renaissance Thought*, ed. Stephen Clucas (Dordrecht, 2006), 333-344.

Roberts, R. Julian, and Andrew G. Watson, eds., *John Dee's Library Catalogue* (London:

Bibliographical Society, 1990).

Roberts, Mark, ‘The Pill and the Cherries: Sidney and the Neo-Classical Tradition’, *Essays in Criticism* 16.1 (1966), 22-31.

Robertson, Joseph, ed., *Inuentaires de la Royne Descosse Douairiere de France. Catalogues of the Jewels, Dresses, Furniture, Books, and Paintings of Mary Queen of Scots. 1556-1569* (Edinburgh, 1863).

Robins, R. H., *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993).

Robinson, Forrest G., *The Shape of Things Known: Sidney's Apology in its Philosophical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

Robortello, Francesco, *In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes* (Florentiae: Laurentii Torrentini, 1548; repr. Basileae: Ioannem Heruagium iuniorem, 1555).

Roby, Henry John, *A Latin Grammar for Schools*, new ed. (London: MacMillan, 1882).

Roe, John, ‘Theories of Literary Kinds’ in *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael Hattaway, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2010), II.3-14.

Rollins, Hyder Edward, and Herschel Clay Baker, *The Renaissance in England: Non-Dramatic Prose and Verse of the Sixteenth Century* (Boston: Heath, 1954).

Rosenberg, Eleanor, ‘Giacopo Castelvetro: Italian Publisher in Elizabethan London and His Patrons’, *Huntington Library Quarterly* 6.2 (1943), 119-148.

Ross, B. Joyce, *J. E. Spingarn and the Rise of the NAACP, 1911-1939* (New York: Atheneum, 1972).

Rosseter, Philip, *A Booke of Ayres, set foorth to be song to the Lute, Orpherian, and Base Violl, by Philip Rosseter Lutenist* (London: printed by Peter Short, by the assent of Thomas Morley, 1601).

Rossetti, L., ‘Le biblioteche delle « nationes » nello studio di Padova’, *Quaderni per la storia dell’Università di Padova* 2 (1969), 53-67.

Rossi, Sergio, and Dianella Savoia, eds., *Italy and the English Renaissance* (Milano: Unicopli, 1989).

Rowe, Nicholas, ed., *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear*, 6 vols. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1709).

Rozett, Martha, ‘Aristotle, the Revenger, and the Elizabethan Audience’, *Studies in Philology* 76.3 (1979), 239-261.

Russell, D. A., *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Russell, Elizabeth, ‘The Influx of Commoners into the University of Oxford before 1581: An Optical Illusion?’, *English Historical Review* 92.365 (1977), 721-745.

Ryan, Lawrence V., *Roger Ascham* (Stanford: Stanford University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1963).

Ryan, W. F., and Charles B. Schmitt, eds., *Pseudo-Aristotle, the Secret of Secrets: Sources and Influences* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1982).

Rymer, Thomas, *The Tragedies of the last Age Consider'd and Examin'd by the Practice of the Ancients and by the Common sense of all Ages in a Letter to Fleetwood Shepheard, Esq.* (London: Richard Tonson, 1678).

Saintsbury, George, *A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe from the Earliest Texts to the Present Day*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, London: Blackwood, 1900-1904; 2nd ed., 1902-4).

——————, *A History of Elizabethan Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1887).

Salter, H. E., ed., *Registrum annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1483-1521*, OHS 76 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923).

Samuel, Irene, ‘The Influence of Plato on Sir Philip Sidney’s Defence of Poesy’, *Modern Language Quarterly* 1 (1940), 383-391.

Samuels, Richard S., ‘Benedetto Varchi, the Accademia degli Infiammati, and the Origins of the Italian Academic Movement’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 29.4 (1976), 599-634.

Sandys, John Edwin, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 1903-1908).

Sargent, Clare, ‘Two Sixteenth-Century Book Lists from the Library of Queens' College, Cambridge’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12 (2001), 161-178.

Scaliger, Julius Caesar, *Poetices Libri Septem* ([Geneva]: Antonium Vincentium, 1561).

Scaliger, Joseph Justus, *Illustriss. viri Iosephi Scaligeri ... epistolae omnes* (Francofurti: sumptibus Aubriorum & Clementis Schleichii, 1628).

Scapula, Joannes, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum nouum* (Basileae: ex officina Heruagiana, per Eusebium Episcopium, 1580).

Schleiner, Louise, ‘Latinized Greek Drama in Shakespeare's Writing of *Hamlet*’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41.1 (1990), 29-48.

Schmitt, Charles B., ‘Alberto Pio and the Aristotelian Studies of His Time’ in *Società, politica e cultura a Carpi ai tempi di Alberto III Pio* (Padova, 1981), 43-64.

——————, *The Aristotelian Tradition and Renaissance Universities* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984).

——————, *Aristotle and the Renaissance* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

——————, *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983).

——————, 'Philosophy and Science in Sixteenth-Century Universities: Some Preliminary Comments' in *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning*, ed. J. E. Murdoch and E. D. Sylla (Dordrecht, 1975).

——————, 'Renaissance Averroism Studied through the Venetian Editions of Aristotle-Averroes (with particular reference to the Giunta edition of 1550-2)' in *Convegno internazionale L'Averroismo in Italia: Roma, 18-20 aprile 1977* (Roma, 1979), 121-42.

——————, 'Thomas Linacre and Italy' in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre*, ed. Francis Maddison *et al.* (Oxford, 1977), 36-75.

——————, 'Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism', *History of Science* 2 (1973), 159-93.

Schmitt, Charles B., Quentin Skinner, Eckhard Kessler, and Jill Kraye, eds., *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Schneider, Bernhard, ed., *Rhetorica. Translatio anonyma sive vetus et translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka*, Aristoteles Latinus XXXI.1-2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978).

Schnur, Rhoda, Ann Moss, Philip Dust, Paul Gerhard Schmidt, Jacques Chomarat, and Francesco Tateo, eds., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis: proceedings of the eighth international congress of Neo-Latin studies, Copenhagen, 12th August to 17th August 1991* (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1994).

Schrier, Omert J., *The Poetics of Aristotle and the Tractatus Coislinianus: a Bibliography from about 900 till 1996* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

——————, 'The Syriac and Arabic Versions of Aristotle's *Poetics*' in *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism*, ed. Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk (Leiden, 1997), 259-278.

Scott, William, *The Model of Poesy*, ed. Gavin Alexander (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

Sébillet, Thomas, *Art poetique françois* (Paris: Gilles Corrozet, 1548).

Selwyn, David, *The Library of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society,

1996).

Serrano Aybar, Concepción, 'Historia de la lexicografía griega antigua y medieval' in *Introducción a la Lexicografía Griega*, ed. Francisco Rodríguez Adrados and Elvira Gangutia Elícegui (Madrid, 1977), 61-106.

Sgarbi, Marco, 'Towards a Reassessment of British Aristotelianism', *Vivarium* 50 (2012), 85-109.

Shakespeare, William, *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, Original-spelling ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

——————, *Julius Caesar*, ed. David Daniell (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2003).

——————, *King Henry VI, Part 3*, ed. John D. Cox and Eric Rasmussen (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2001).

——————, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. René Weis (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2012).

Sharman, Julian, *The Library of Mary, Queen of Scots* (London: Elliot Stock, 1889).

Sicherl, Martin, *Griechische Erstausgaben des Aldus Manutius: Druckvorlagen, Stellenwert, kultureller Hintergrund* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1997).

Sidney, Philip, *The defence of poesie by Sir Phillip Sidney* (London: printed for William Ponsonby, 1595).

——————, *The defence of poesie. By Sir Phillip Sidney, Knight* (London: printed [by Thomas Creede] for William Ponsonby, 1595).

——————, *The Defence of Poesy* (Glasgow: R. Urie, 1752).

——————, *Sir Philip Sydney's Defence of Poetry. And, Observations on Poetry and Eloquence, from the Discoveries of Ben Jonson*, ed. Joseph Warton (London: G. G. J. and J. Robinson; and J. Walter, 1787).

——————, *The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Edward Hovell Thurlow (London: W. Bulmer and Co., 1810).

——————, *The Miscellaneous Works of Sir Philip Sidney, Knt.: With a Life of the Author and Illustrative Notes*, ed. William Gray (Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1829).

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney's Defence of Poesy. Selden's Table-Talk*, ed. Alexander Young (Cambridge: Hilliard and Brown, 1831).

——————, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. Edward Arber (London: Alex. Murray & Son, 1868).

——————, *A Defence of Poesie and Poems*, ed. Henry Morley (London, Paris, New York,

Melbourne: Cassell & Company, 1889).

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney's Astrophel and Stella und Defence of Poesie*, ed. Ewald Flügel (Halle a. S.: M. Niemeyer, 1889).

——————, *The Defense of Poesy, Otherwise Known as An Apology for Poetry*, ed. Albert S. Cook (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1890).

——————, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891).

——————, 'An Apologie for Poetrie' in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith (London, 1904), I.148-207.

——————, *An Apology for Poetrie*, ed. John Churton Collins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).

——————, *The Defence of Poesie; A Letter to Q. Elizabeth; A Defence of Leicester*, ed. George Edward Woodberry (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1908).

——————, 'An Apology for Poetry' in *English Critical Essays (Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries)*, ed. Edmund D. Jones (London, 1922), 1-64.

——————, *Sidney, An Apology for Poetry; Shelley, A Defence of Poetry*, ed. H. A. Needham (London: Ginn and Co., 1931).

——————, 'Defence of Poesie' in *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden*, ed. Allan H. Gilbert (New York, 1940), 404-61.

——————, 'An Apology for Poetry' in *Criticism: The Major Texts*, ed. Walter Jackson Bate (New York, 1952), 77-106.

——————, 'The Defence of Poesy' in *Prose of the English Renaissance*, ed. J. William Hebel *et al.* (New York, 1952), 267-304.

——————, 'An Apology for Poetry' in *English Critical Texts, Sixteenth Century to Twentieth Century*, ed. D. J. Enright and Ernst De Chickera (London, 1962), 3-49, 339-50.

——————, *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William A. Ringler, Jr. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

——————, *An Apology for Poetry: or, The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (London: Nelson, 1965).

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney: Selected Prose and Poetry*, ed. Robert Kimbrough (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969).

——————, *An Apology for Poetry*, ed. Forrest G. Robinson (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-

Merrill Company, Inc., 1970).

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney's Defense of Poesy*, ed. Lewis Soens (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970).

——————, *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones and J. A. Van Dorsten (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

——————, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The New Arcadia)*, ed. Victor Skretkowicz (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney: The Major Works*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

——————, *Defence of Poesie, Astrophil and Stella and Other Writings*, ed. Elizabeth Porges Watson (London: J. M. Dent, 1997).

——————, 'A defence of poetry' in *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford, 1999), 336-391.

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney's An Apology for Poetry and Astrophil and Stella: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Peter C. Herman (Glen Allen: College Publishing, 2001).

——————, *An Apology for Poetry, or, The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd and R. W. Maslen, 3rd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

——————, 'The Defence of Poesy' in *Sidney's The Defence of Poesy and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Gavin Alexander (London, 2004), 1-54.

——————, *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Roger Kuin, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Sigonio, Carlo, *Emendationum libri duo* (Venetiis: Aldus, 1557).

Simon, Joan, *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).

Sinfield, Alan, 'The Cultural Politics of the *Defence of Poetry*' in *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Renaissance Culture*, ed. Gary F. Waller and Michael D. Moore (London, 1984), 124-143.

——————, *Literature in Protestant England, 1560-1660* (London: Croom Helm; Totowa: Barnes & Noble, 1983).

Skinner, Quentin, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Sledd, James, 'A Note on the Use of Renaissance Dictionaries', *Modern Philology* 49.1 (1951), 10-15.

Smith, Emma, and Garrett A. Sullivan, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Smith, Jeremy J., ‘Ideology and Spelling in Sixteenth-Century England’, *Il confronto letterario* 40 (supplemento) (2004), 11-24.

Smith, Margery H., ‘Some Humanist Libraries in Early Tudor Cambridge’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 5.1 (1974), 15-34.

Smith, Thomas, *De recta & emendata linguae Graecae pronuntiatione* (Lutetiae: Roberti Stephani, 1568).

Società, politica e cultura a Carpi ai tempi di Alberto III Pio: atti del Convegno internazionale (Carpi, 19-21 maggio 1978) (Padova: Antenore, 1981).

Solerti, Angelo, ed., *Le tragedie metriche di Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici* (Bologna: Romagnoli-Dall'Acqua, 1887).

Solmsen, Friedrich, ‘The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric’, *American Journal of Philology* 62 (1941), 35-50, 169-90.

Sowerby, Tracey A., ‘A Brave Knight and Learned Gentleman: The Careers of Sir Richard Morison (c.1513-1556)’, D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (2005).

——————, *Renaissance and Reform in Tudor England: the Careers of Sir Richard Morison c.1513-1556* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Spingarn, Joel Elias, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908).

——————, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, 2nd [1908] ed., fifth printing (New York: Columbia University Press, 1925).

——————, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance: with special reference to the influence of Italy in the formation and development of modern classicism*, 1st ed. (New York: Macmillan, for the Columbia University Press, 1899).

——————, ‘The Sources of Jonson's "Discoveries"’, *Modern Philology* 2.4 (1905), 451-460.

Stanbridge, John, *Accidentia Stanbrigiana*, ed. Robert Whittington (London: Peter Treueris, 1532).

Starnes, DeWitt T., *Renaissance Dictionaries: English-Latin and Latin-English* (Austin: University of Texas Press; Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1954).

Statuta Academiae Cantabrigiensis (Cantabrigiae: typis academicis excudebat J. Archdeacon, 1785).

Steadman, John M., ‘Renaissance Dictionaries and Manuals as Instruments of Literary Scholarship: the Problem of Evidence’ in *New Aspects of Lexicography: Literary Criticism, Intellectual History, and Social Change*, ed. Howard D. Weinbrot (Carbondale, London, Amsterdam, 1972), 17-35.

Steiner, George, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Stephen, Leslie, and Sidney Lee, eds., *Dictionary of National Biography*, 66 vols. (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885-1901).

Stern, Virginia F., *Gabriel Harvey: His Life, Marginalia, and Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Stevenson, Jane, ‘The Court Culture of England under Elizabeth I’ in *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650*, II, ed. M. Gosman *et al.* (Leiden, Boston, 2003), 191-211.

——————, *Women Latin Poets: Language, Gender, and Authority, from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Stewart, Alan, *Philip Sidney: A Double Life* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2000).

Stone, Lawrence, *The University in Society*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).

Struck, Peter T., ‘Allegory, Aenigma, and Anti-Mimesis: a Struggle against Aristotelian Rhetorical Literary Theory’ in *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*, ed. J. G. J. Abbenes *et al.* (Amsterdam, 1995), 215-34.

Strype, John, *The Life of the Learned Sir John Cheke, Kt.* (London: John Wyat, 1705).

——————, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith Kt.* (London: A. Roper, 1698).

Stump, Donald. V., ‘Greek and Shakespearian Tragedy: Four Indirect Routes from Athens to London’ in *Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition*, ed. Donald V. Stump *et al.* (New York, 1983), 211-46.

——————, ‘Sidney's Concept of Tragedy in the *Apology* and in the *Arcadia*’, *Studies in Philology* 79.1 (1982), 41-61.

Stump, Donald. V., J. A. Arieti, L. Gerson, and E. Stump, eds., *Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition: Essays in Honor of John M. Crossett* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983).

Sturm, Johannes, *Ad Werteros fratres, Nobilitas literata* (Argentorati: Wendelinum Rihelium, 1549).

A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, ed.

Falconer Madan *et al.*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895-1953).

Swiggers, Pierre, and Alfons Wouters, 'Poetics and Grammar: From Technique to Τέχνη' in *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*, ed. J. G. J. Abbenes *et al.* (Amsterdam, 1995), 17-41.

Symonds, John Addington, *Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1884).

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney* (London: Macmillan, 1886).

Tanselle, G. Thomas, 'The Bibliographical Description of Paper', *Studies in Bibliography* 24 (1971), 27-67.

——————, 'The Concept of Format', *Studies in Bibliography* 53 (2000), 67-115.

Tatlock, J. S. P., 'Bernardo Tasso and Sidney', *Italica* 12.2 (1935), 74-80.

Taylor, John, *Greek to GCSE*, 2nd ed. (Bristol: Bristol Classical, 2008).

Temple, William, *Sir William Temple's Essays on Ancient & Modern Learning and on Poetry*, ed. Joel Elias Spingarn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).

——————, *William Temple's Analysis of Sir Philip Sidney's Apology for Poetry: An Edition and Translation*, ed. and trans. John Webster (Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1984).

Thomas, William, *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer, with a Dictionarie for the better vnderstandynge of Boccace, Pethrarcha, and Dante* (Londini: H. Wykes, 1567).

Thompson, C. R., 'The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and S. Thomas More', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 18.4 (1939), 855-881.

Thompson, W. D. J. Cargill, 'Notes on King's College Library, 1500-1570, in Particular for the Period of the Reformation', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2 (1954), 38-54.

Thomson, Rodney M., and N. G. Wilson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford* (Cambridge: published for Merton College, Oxford, by D.S. Brewer, 2009).

Tierno, Michael, *Aristotle's Poetics for Screenwriters: Storytelling Secrets from the Greatest Mind in Western Civilization* (New York: Hyperion, 2002).

Tigerstedt, E. N., 'Observations on the Reception of the Aristotelian Poetics in the Latin West', *Studies in the Renaissance* 15 (1968), 7-24.

Tilley, Arthur, 'Greek Studies in England in the Early Sixteenth Century', *English Historical Review* 53.210-211 (1938), 221-239, 438-456.

Toffanin, Giuseppe, *La fine dell'umanesimo* (Milano, Torino: Fratelli Bocca, 1920).

Tomasini, Giacomo Filippo, *Bibliothecae Patavinae manvscriptae pvblicae & privatae: quibus diuersi scriptores hactenus incogniti recensentur, ac illustrantur* (Vtini: Nicolai Schiratti, 1639).

Tortellius, Johannes, *Orthographia*, ed. Pyrrhus Pincius (Venice: Philippus Pincius, 1493; repr. Johannes Tacuinus, 1495; Bartolomeum de Zanis, 1501, 1504).

Toussain, Jacques, *Lexicon Graecolatinum* (Parisijs: apud Carolam Guillard viduam Claudij Cheuallonij... & Guilielmum Merlin, 1552).

Treu, Kurt, ed., *Studia Codicologica* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977).

Treu, M., ‘Antistoichien’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 5 (1896), 337-338.

Trimpi, Wesley, *Muses of One Mind: the Literary Analysis of Experience and its Continuity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

——————, ‘Sir Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry*’ in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, III: The Renaissance*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge, 1999), 187-98.

Trismegistus, Hermes, *Ἑρμοῦ τοῦ Τρισμεγίστου Ποιμάνδρης. Ἀσκληπίου ὅροι... Mercurii Trismegisti Poemander, seu de potestate ac sapientia diuina. Aesculapii definitiones...* ed. Pietro Angelio da Barga, trans. Marsilio Ficino (Parisiis: Adr. Turnebum, 1554).

Trissino, Giovanni Giorgio, *La quinta e la sesta divisione della poetica* (Venetia: Andrea Arriuabene, 1563).

Turner, Henry S., *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Ulpianus, *et al.*, *Οὐλπιανοῦ ῥήτορος, προλεγόμενα... Vlpiani commentarioli in olynthiacas, philippicasque Demosthenis orationes. Enarrationes saneque necessariae in tredecim orationes Demosthenis. Harpocrationis lexicon decem rhetorum graece* (Venetiis: Aldum, 1503; repr. Aldi, et Andreae Asulani soceri, 1527).

Ulreich, John C., Jr., ‘“The Poets Only Deliver”: Sidney’s Conception of Mimesis’, *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15.1 (1982), 67-84.

Valla, Giorgio, *Compendiaria et facilis disserendi ratio* (Basileae: Adamum Petri, 1522).

——————, *De expetendis, et fugiendis rebus opus*, 2 vols. (Venetiis: in aedibus Aldi Romani, impensa, ac studio Ioannis Petri Vallae filii pientiss., 1501).

——————, *Grammatica Georgij Vallae Placentini* (Venetiis: arte Simonis de Luere: sumptibus uero Laurentii Orii de Portesio, 1514).

——————, *Hoc in volumine haec continentur: Nicephori logica... Aristotelis ars poetica...* (Venetiis: Simone*m* Papiensem dictum Beuilaquam, 1498).

——————, *Rhetorica Georgij Vallae Placentini* (Venetiis: arte Simonis de Luere: sumptibus uero Laurentii Orii de Portesio, 1514).

Van Deusen, Marshall, *J. E. Spingarn* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971).

Van Dorsten, J. A., *The Radical Arts: First Decade of an Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden: Leiden University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1970).

Varchi, Benedetto, *Lezzioni di M. Benedetto Varchi accademico fiorentino* (Fiorenza: Filippo Giunti, 1590).

Vaughan, Charles Edwyn, *English Literary Criticism* (London: Blackie & Son, Ltd., 1896).

Venn, John, and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900*, 10 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922-53).

Vettori, Pietro, *Commentarii, in primum librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetarum* (Florentiae: Ivntarvm, Bernardi Filiorum, 1560; repr. 1573).

Vickers, Brian, ed., *English Renaissance Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

——————, 'Rhetoric and Poetics' in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt *et al.* (Cambridge, 1988), 715-45.

Viperano, Giovanni Antonio, *De poetica libri tres* (Antverpiae: Christophori Plantini, 1579).

Vives, Juan Luis, *Vives: On Education: A Translation of the De Tradendis Disciplinis of Juan Luis Vives*, trans. Foster Watson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913).

Walker, Jeffrey, *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Wallace, Malcolm William, *The Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915).

Walsh, P. G., 'Buchanan and Classical Drama' in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Sanctandreani*, ed. I. D. McFarlane (Binghamton, 1986), 99-112.

Walzer, Richard, 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Aristotelischen Poetik', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* nuova serie 11 (1934), 5-14.

Warkentin, Germaine, 'The Library of the Sidney Family', *Sidney Newsletter & Journal* 15.1 (1997), 3-18.

——————, ‘Sidney’s Authors’ in *Sir Philip Sidney’s Achievements*, ed. M. J. B. Allen *et al.* (New York, 1990), 68-89.

——————, ‘The World and the Book at Penshurst: The Second Earl of Leicester (1595-1677) and his Library’, *The Library* s.6, 20.4 (1998), 325-346.

Warkentin, Germaine, Joseph L. Black, and William R. Bowen, eds., *The Library of the Sidneys of Penshurst Place circa 1665* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).

Warren, George F., ‘The Library of James VI, 1573-1583, from a Manuscript in the Hand of Peter Young, his Tutor’ in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society I*, Publications of the Scottish History Society XV (Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable, University Press, 1893), ix-lxxv.

Wartelle, André, *Inventaire des manuscrits grecs d'Aristote et de ses commentateurs: contribution à l'histoire du texte d'Aristote* (Paris: Société d'édition les belles lettres, 1963).

Warton, Joseph, *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope* (London: M. Cooper, 1756).

Watson, Thomas, *A Humanist's "Trew Imitation": Thomas Watson's Absalom; a Critical Edition and Translation*, ed. John Hazel Smith (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964).

Watt, John W., *Rhetoric and Philosophy from Greek into Syriac* (Farnham: Ashgate/Variorum, 2010).

——————, ‘Syriac Rhetorical Theory and the Syriac Tradition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*’ in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (New Brunswick, London, 1994); repr. in Watt, *Rhetoric and Philosophy from Greek into Syriac*, VII, 243-60.

Webb, Ruth, ‘A Slavish Art? Language and Grammar in Late Byzantine Education and Society’, *Dialogos* 1 (1994), 81-103.

Weinberg, Bernard, ‘Castelvetro's Theory of the *Poetics*’ in *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern*, ed. Ronald S. Crane (Chicago, 1952), 349-71.

——————, ‘From Aristotle to Pseudo-Aristotle’, *Comparative Literature* 5 (1953), 97-104.

——————, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

——————, ‘Review: Herrick, *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century*’, *Modern Philology* 48.4 (1951), 271-273.

——————, ‘Robortello on the *Poetics*’ in *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern*, ed. Ronald S. Crane (Chicago, 1952), 319-48.

Weinbrot, Howard D., *New Aspects of Lexicography: Literary Criticism, Intellectual History, and Social Change* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press; London, Amsterdam: Feffer & Simons, Inc, 1972).

Weiner, Andrew D., 'Moving and Teaching: Sidney's *Defense of Poesie* as a Protestant Poetic', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1972), 259-278.

——————, 'Sidney, Protestantism, and Literary Critics: Reflections on Some Recent Criticism of The Defense of Poetry' in *Sir Philip Sidney's Achievements*, ed. M. J. B. Allen *et al.* (New York: AMS Press, 1990), 117-26.

——————, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Protestantism: a Study of Contexts* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978).

Weiss, Roberto, 'The Private Collector and the Revival of Greek Learning' in *The English Library before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright (London, 1958), 112-135.

Wheeler, G. W., ed., *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926).

Wiburn, Perceval, *A checke or reproofe of M. Howlets vntimely shreeching in her Maiesties eares...* (London: Thomas Dawson, for Toby Smyth, 1581).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, *History of Classical Scholarship*, ed. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, trans. Alan Harris (London: Duckworth, 1982).

Wilson, H. B., *The History of Merchant-Taylors' School, from its Foundation to the Present Time* (London: Marchant and Galabin, 1812).

Wilson, Mona, *Sir Philip Sidney* (London: Duckworth, 1931).

Wilson, N. G., *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London: Duckworth, 1992).

Wilson, Thomas, *The three Orations of Demosthenes chiefe Orator among the Grecians... Englished out of the Greeke by Thomas Wylson Doctor of the ciuill lawes* (London: Henrie Denham, 1570).

Wilson-Okamura, David Scott, *Virgil in the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, 3rd ed., 4 vols. (London: F. C. and H. Rivington, *et al.*, 1813-20).

Woodward, William Harrison, *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906).

Woolfson, Jonathan, *Padua and the Tudors: English Students in Italy, 1485-1603* (Cambridge:

James Clarke, 1998).

Workman, Leslie J., Kathleen Verduin, and David Metzger, eds., *Medievalism and the Academy I* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1999).

Wormald, Francis, and C. E. Wright, eds., *The English Library before 1700: Studies in its History* (London: University of London, 1958).

Worthington, Ian, *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Malden, Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).

Woudhuysen, H. R., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Wright, Thomas, *Three Chapters of Letters Relating to the Suppression of Monasteries* (London: J. B. Nichols and son, 1843).

Zgusta, Ladislav, *Lexicography Then and Now: Selected Essays*, ed. Fredric S. F. Dolezal and Thomas B. I. Creamer (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2006).

Zimmermann, F. W., *Al-Farabi's Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle's De Interpretatione* (London: Oxford University Press, 1981).

IV. Online sources

Early Bookowners in Britain, ed. Margaret Lane Ford, <http://ebob.cerl.org> [accessed 15 January 2014].

English Short Title Catalogue (British Library), <http://estc.bl.uk> [accessed 20 September 2013].

Incunabula Short Title Catalogue (British Library), <http://istc.bl.uk> [accessed 20 September 2013].

OCR, *GCE Classics v6* (2008), <http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/82461-specification.pdf> [accessed 20 September 2013].

OCR, *GCSE Classical Greek* (July 2009), <http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/81358-specification.pdf> [accessed 20 September 2013].

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford University Press), <http://www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 20 September 2013].

Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford University Press), <http://www.oed.com> [accessed 20 September 2013].

Perseus Digital Library (Tufts University), <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu> [accessed 20

September 2013].

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (University of California, Irvine), <http://www.tlg.uci.edu> [accessed 20 September 2013].