LIBRARY OF THE WRITTEN WORD 22 *The Handpress World 16*

READING THE ROMAN REPUBLIC IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

Freyja Cox Jensen

BRILL *Series edited by* Andrew Pettegree

Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England

Library of the Written Word

VOLUME 22

The Handpress World

VOLUME 16

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.nl/lww

Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England

By

Freyja Cox Jensen

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2012

Cover illustration: The Head of Pompey Presented to Julius Caesar (oil on canvas) Artist: Giovanni Antonio Pellegrini (1675-1741). Musée des Beaux-Arts, Caen, France. Permission XIR 174836, The Bridgeman Art Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cox Jensen, Freyja, 1984-
Reading the Roman republic in early modern England / by Freyja Cox Jensen.
p. cm. -- (Library of the written word ; v. 22) (The Handpress world ; 16)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 978-90-04-23303-4 (hardback : alk. paper) -- ISBN 978-90-04-23321-8 (e-book) 1. Great Britain--Civilization--Roman influences. 2. Rome--History--Study and teaching--England. 3. Great Britain--Civilization--16th century. 4. Great Britain--Civilization--17th century. 5. Rome--Historiography. 6. Books and reading--England--History--16th century. 7. Books and reading--England--History--17th century. I. Title.

DA320.C69 2012
937'.02072042--dc23

2012021093

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1847-4834
ISBN 978 90 04 23303 4 (hardback)
ISBN 978 90 04 23321 8 (e-book)

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS, AND A NOTE ON THE TEXT

The following abbreviations have been used:

BL	British Library, London
CUL	Cambridge University Library
CWE	Desiderius Erasmus, *The Collected Works of Erasmus,* ed. Craig Ringwalt Thompson (Toronto, 1978)
ELH	*English Literary History*
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* ed. Colin Matthew, Brian Harrison and Lawrence Goldman (Oxford, 2004)
OUA	Oxford University Archives
PLRE	*Private Libraries in Renaissance England: a collection and catalogue of Tudor and early Stuart book-lists* edited by R. J. Fehrenbach and Elisabeth Leedham-Green (Binghamton, NY, 1992-)
PMLA	*Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*
STC	*A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*, compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave; edited by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson and Katharine F. Pantzer, 2nd edition (London, 1991)
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
Wing	*Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed In Other Countries 1641–1700* edited by Donald Wing, 2nd edition (New York, 1998)

When works written by more than one author are cited, the work has been attributed to the author of interest for the purposes of this discussion. Therefore 'Lucan, *Hero and Leander: begunne by Christopher Marloe: whereunto is added the first booke of Lucan translated line for line by the same author* (London, 1600), *STC* 17415', rather than 'Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*…'

The names of classical authors have been given in their most simple form, according to the convention by which each is commonly known. Therefore 'Pliny, the Elder', rather than 'C. Plinius Secundus'.

Contractions and abbreviations in manuscript sources have been silently expanded. Printed works have been left as they stand, other

than the modernisation of 'ſ' and 'ß', 'u', 'v', and 'w', and the correction of 'i' to 'j' except in initial cases, in quotations in the body of the text.

Translations from standard classical works in Latin are taken from the Loeb editions; all others are my own, as are any errors contained therein.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much of the research for this project was funded by the AHRC. I owe a debt of gratitude to the many librarians and archivists who welcomed me to their places of work, to the owners of the collections I have used, and to the audiences at the many conferences and seminars at which parts of this work have been presented; most especially, in no particular order: the Dean, Canons and Students of Christ Church, Oxford; the staff of the Bodleian Library, the British Library, and Cambridge University Library; the President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge; the Master and Fellows of St John's College, Cambridge; the *USTC* project team in St Andrews; delegates at the 'Rome in Early Modern England' conference at the Huntington Library, CA; and the audiences of the Oxford and Cambridge Early Modern British History seminars.

Profound thanks to Felicity Heal, for her invaluable guidance throughout this project; to Susan Brigden, for her suggestions and comments; to Paulina Kewes and Andrew Pettegree for their constructive criticism; to Mary Clapinson and Malcolm Smuts for providing me with copies of their work in progress, and permitting me to quote from these essays here; to Katya Andreyev, Chris Haigh and Brian Young at Christ Church for their support over the years; to Susan Doran and Norman Jones for giving me the opportunity to think more widely about intellectual culture; to Oskar Cox Jensen, Laura Barrosse-Antle, Sophie Carp and Alan Rimmer, for their orthographical contributions ('greater love hath no man than this'); and to my parents, *sine quibus non*...

INTRODUCTION

I

Early modern England was fascinated by ancient Rome. Writings, pictures, buildings and coins inspired by classical Rome proliferated over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and an interest in Latin history permeated English society ever deeper as the expansion of printing and education brought more men and women into contact with both ancient and contemporary texts about the Romans and their world.

The reasons for Rome's importance are many and various, connected to wider European developments, and to a specifically English self-fashioning in an age of expansion and exploration. English humanists drew upon the political philosophy of Roman Stoic writers for the formulation of their own language of politics, using ideas from the late republic to build a theory of civic, Christian duty in a princely commonwealth.[1] A Roman vocabulary had long been important in constructing the English intellectual environment, in which words inspired by the Latin tradition came to embody central concepts such as the 'commonweal' and a senatorial model of counsel.[2] In the wake of the Reformation and Elizabeth's Protestant settlement, this civic vocabulary was employed to give legitimating weight to the loyalties and expectations on which the new structures of authority depended, with Roman history providing examples and terms through which these ideas might be expressed.[3] England itself had, of course, once been subject to Rome, brought within its civilising sphere of influence by Julius Caesar and his successors. As a small state which expanded to conquer the known world, Rome provided a model of

---

[1] Margot Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 22–5.; Richard Tuck, 'Humanism and Political Thought' in Anthony Goodman and Angus Mackay (eds), *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe* (London, 1990), pp. 43–65; S. K. Heniger Jr, 'The Literate Culture of Shakespeare's Audience' in J. F. Andrews (ed.), *William Shakespeare: his world, his work, his influence* vol. I (New York, 1985), pp. 159–74.

[2] J. Watts, 'The Policie in Christen Remes: Bishop Russell's Parliamentary sermons of 1483–84' in G.W. Bernard and S.J. Gunn (eds), *Authority and Consent in Tudor England* (Aldershot, 2002), p. 43.

[3] A. H. Williamson, 'An Empire to End Empire: the dynamic of early modern British expansion' in P. Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006), p. 232.

imperial expansion for Britannia as the New World horizons became ever broader.[4] England also had a special connection with Rome according to the enduringly popular Brutus myth, which held that the Trojan Brutus, descendant of Aeneas, was the first king of England; this linked England's destiny neatly with that of Rome by way of Julius Caesar, who also claimed descent from Aeneas' mother, Venus Genetrix.[5]

The period of Roman history with which early modern commentators engaged most frequently and sustainedly was the ending of the Roman republic and the establishment of the Empire under Augustus. In the second half of the first century BC, a new, imperial monarchy replaced a republican government which had endured for centuries, providing early modern readers with a perfect example of constitutional anacyclosis as represented by Polybius and other ancient writers.[6] This specific turning point in Rome's political development held numerous lessons for readers in the later Elizabethan and early Stuart years; the formal educational system and the habits of reading it engendered shaped a broadly 'Roman' frame of mind among literate men and women, which, in its turn, influenced responses to Roman history and allowed its deployment in the support of a wide range of religious, social and political agendas.

The late republic and early empire held a particular relevance in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart era. Many thought that the ageing Elizabeth and her successors were adopting an increasingly arbitrary style of monarchy; this was especially the case in the early seventeenth century, when Tacitean analyses of power became increasingly popular.[7] Traditional historiographies of the 'four monarchies' and the 'nine worthies' further emphasised this point in Roman history; both of these traditions were embraced in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England. Julius Caesar was a prime Roman representative among the gathering of worthies, while in the theory of the four monarchies, each one – Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian and Roman – was an empire with universal hegemony, providing a model of rise and fall which the fifth, elect monarchy

---

[4] Anthony Pagden, *Lords of all the World: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France* c. *1500* - c. *1800* (New Haven and London, 1995), ch. 1 *passim.*

[5] On the continuing popularity of the Brutus myth in Elizabethan England, see Stan A. E. Mendyk, *'Speculum Britanniae': regional study, antiquarianism, and science in Britain to 1700* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 15–17.

[6] Frank Walbank, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: essays and reflections* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 295–309.

[7] Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians c. 1590–1630' in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 41–3.

would surpass. This encouraged a focus on the time of Julius Caesar and Augustus, since this was the beginning of Rome's imperial rule, and, when combined with the larger availability of classical texts on this period compared with previous centuries in the city's history, the tradition helped to deflect scholarship away from consideration of the earlier, high-republican years.[8]

Part of the importance of Roman texts derived from their very antiquity: classical authority was venerated in the Renaissance as never before. More than merely making recourse to the ancient, in the early modern period, authority *was* that which was ancient, or rather, the ancient inevitably possessed a kind of authority.[9] The classical Roman past formed a particularly important source of authoritative learning as the upheavals of Renaissance and Reformation challenged traditional religious orthodoxies, and humanist ideologies privileged the classical canon. Ancient historiography comprised an authority all its own, providing the pattern of the universe and a guide to future events, an authoritative function mirroring that of prophetic texts in the ancient world. In classical Rome, prophecy had made venerated texts relevant to the present day by isolating episodes in contemporary life that had been foretold in the past, and prophecies validated the workings of the empire by assuring men that the current way of life was part of a divine plan, forming an essential part of the informal structure of authority that preserved the social order. In early modern England, history fulfilled a similar role, providing a set of ideals by which modern achievements could be measured.[10]

Readers were encouraged to place their trust in the writings of past authors by the commonplacing tradition. An uneasy *concordia discors* prevailed between the *ad fontes* insistence on a return to the primary texts, and an increasing belief that *florilegia* generated their own intrinsic authority. At the same time as students of Roman history were adjured to 'harvest' and excerpt what *they* judged note-worthy – preserving in manuscript form the ideas they personally attributed to, or discovered in, their texts – printed collections of *sententiae* drawn from classical writings were

---

[8] J. L. Barroll, 'Shakespeare and Roman History', *Modern Language Review* 53, (1958), pp. 332–4.

[9] Cf. John Guillory, *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton, and literary history* (New York, 1983), p. viii.

[10] See David Potter, *Prophets and Emperors: human and divine authority from Augustus to Theodosius* (Cambridge, MA, 1994), pp. 2, 216.

circulated and privileged as truths in their own right.[11] Imitation, encouraged by the primacy of rhetoric, on the one hand created a body of recyclable epigrams and epithets possessing an inherent authority because they were old and had been relied upon before. But, as Robert Weiman has pointed out, it simultaneously generated concerns about "base authority from others' books" - the contemptible, unquestioning reliance on the prescribed textual authorities.[12] Francis Bacon's *Novum Organum* denounced the reliance on the ancients as a source of truth and authority, demonstrating the extent to which this attitude was prevalent in society:

> Besides it is a great weakness to attribute so much to ancient Authors, for Truth is the Daughter of Time not of Authority.[13]

And as Thomas Heywood wrote in his introductory preface to the translated Sallust of 1609:

> wee ought to remember the wise counsell of *Aristotle*, not onely in our choise, but also in our reading, *That an Author ought not to be accepted with an ouer-weening credulity, nor rejected with peremptorie incredulity*.[14]

Indeed, Heywood stressed that each and every reader should be guided by his teachers and his own good sense, and "take the middle course, so shal he cul out of everie good *Author* singuler purity."[15]

So what did history, and specifically Roman history, mean in the early modern world? It was certainly closer to the Collingwoodian quest for objective facts than the subjective search for signs and symbols that prevailed in the medieval period; humanist historicism did aim to find truth in the past, however the nature of this truth might be defined.[16] This was particularly the case where the teaching of history was concerned. A sense of the past was central to the construction of meaning in the present,

---

[11] Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: early modern Humanism in theory and practice* (Ithaca, 1996), pp. 117–9; W. J. Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody: Ravisius Textor, Zwinger and Shakespeare' in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), 91–4.

[12] Robert Weimann, *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse* (Baltimore and London, 1996), p. 87; William Shakespeare, *Loves Labours Lost*, I.i.87 (the words are spoken by Berowne).

[13] Francis Bacon, *The novum organum of Sir Francis Bacon, ...* (London, 1676), Wing B310, sig. C3r (original italics).

[14] Sallust, *The two most Worthy and notable histories which remaine unmained to posterity ...* (London, 1609), *STC* 21625, sig. ¶-1r.

[15] Ibid., sig. ¶-1v.

[16] Dean, 'Tudor Humanism', p. 93; E. H. Carr, *What is History?* (Harmondsworth, 1964); R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 10–11; Anthony Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007).

articulated most coherently in the didacticism of humanist pedagogy, but equally important outside the institutions of organised education.[17] Both official and informal conceptions of history recognised the value of the past for contemporary society. Erasmus' works stressed that:

> Above all, however, history must be grasped. Its application is very widespread… In short, there is no branch of knowledge, whether military, agricultural, musical, or architectural, which is not useful for those who have undertaken an exposition of the ancient poets or orators.[18]

His *De Copia*, written for use at St Paul's School, emphasised the importance of the classical texts as sources of the past with which readers should actively engage, turning the ideas found within them into personal property by imitation and repetition; here he was drawing on the Ciceronian belief that abundance of matter produces abundance of expression.[19]

History held within it a series of models and lessons which bore real relevance to the present. These were expressed not only in literary forms but in more practical terms, such as the incorporation of elements of Roman triumphs in representations of authority under the early Stuarts.[20] This modelling held implications for the ways in which historians, publicly and privately, sought meanings in the story of Rome: the past was significant not in its own right, but because of its relationship to the present. In turn this determined the kinds of questions readers asked of their texts, and the lessons they looked to learn. This is, of course, true of all history and all historiography, but is particularly the case in early modern England when the legacy of centuries of a particular kind of historical study exerted a strong 'pressure of the myth' of Rome upon readers and writers.[21] Thus readers were predisposed to study the fall of the republic, and especially its great politicians, in the tragic *de casibus* mould, which the *Mirror for Magistrates* and subsequent similar volumes encouraged anew.[22] Certain prior expectations competed for acknowledgment,

---

[17] Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities' in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. IV: seventeenth century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 327–31.

[18] Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, *De Ratione Studii* trans. Brian McGregor in *CWE* vol. 24, p. 675.

[19] Erasmus, *De Copia* trans. Betty I. Knot in *CWE* vol. 24; Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.125: 'rerum copia verborum copiam gignit'.

[20] Anthony Miller, *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern English Culture* (Basingstoke, 2001).

[21] Hunter, 'A Roman Thought', p. 93.

[22] Larry Scanlon, *Narrative, Authority and Power: the medieval exemplum and the Chaucerian tradition* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 81–8, 119–23.

increasing the ambiguity of readers towards their histories; tensions between discourses which mutually contradicted one another were resolved by the fragmented approach encouraged by a commonplacing tradition.[23] Some elements of Roman tragedies, for example, could be interpreted as part of a monitory historical trope; Julius Caesar could stand for the Prince who fell from grace because of his avarice and pride, a model from whom magistrates might learn to avoid these sins. Yet the same character could also be read and represented as the founder of civilised England and the modern monarchical tradition, a man to be admired and emulated.

The series of exemplars contained within Roman history, upon which readers were encouraged to draw in order to better their own lives, were often far distanced from the Christian moral code of early modern England. This is a question which vexes modern scholars just as it preoccupied the great educational theorists in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Erasmus justified the study of the best of the ancients thus:

> [It] contains so much that is illuminating, beautiful and morally instructive that to reject it would be utter folly…

and in order to avoid injury, a Christian reader was to use "tropological (moral) and allegorical interpretation", a long-standing recommendation.[24] Here, then, was another reason for readers to pick and choose their subject matter carefully. A dual focus on utility and virtue, in accordance with the humanist tradition, therefore found itself strongly expressed in early modern conceptions of history. The student of ancient Rome was advised to:

> enquire into the Causes of every Action and Counsel; let him consider the circumstances of it, and weigh the success; and let him in each of these search out wherein any thing is well or prudently, ill or imprudently managed; and let him from thence draw up to himself a general Precept, Rule or Direction, and then prove or illustrate it with many Sentences or Examples. For there is a two-fold use of Examples: the first for our imitation of what is done by good men, and that we may learn to shun the ill actions of wicked men: The second is, that from particular Stories we may deduce and extract some Sentence, which may be generally usefull to us.[25]

---

[23] Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity*, pp. 81, 89.

[24] See Wallace K. Ferguson on *Antibarbari* in *CWE* vol. 23, p. 156.

[25] Degory Wheare, *De ratione et methodo legendi historias …* (London, 1623), *STC* 25325; this translation is taken from later English edition (London, 1685), Wing W1592, sig. Z3v-4r.

Conceiving of history as a storehouse of examples encouraged a fragmented view of the events of the Roman past. This is not to say that there was no 'bigger picture', no sense of moral degeneration along the lines suggested by Sallust, Tacitus and Livy, but these long-term readings of history were separate from the 'snapshot' views taken by readers as they combed their Roman texts for warnings or suggestions about moral probity and good living. This way of proceeding was particularly the case in formal education, where historical examples were subservient to rhetorical goals. Pedagogical techniques gave impetus to the generally disintegrative approach to texts suggested by humanist philosophy. Erasmus, in his *de Ratione Studii*, exhorted the reader to focus on the important passages in a text, rather than the whole: "[I] would like you to confine yourself to those points alone which are relevant to the interpretation of the passage under consideration".[26] He called for readers to use a variety of coded marks to indicate "if there is any adage, historical parallel, or maxim worth committing to memory"; these were to be extracted from the text and kept in memory, "the storehouse of our reading", while the rest was discarded.[27]

Erasmian theory informed the reading of history throughout the early modern period. Fragmentation and excerpting replaced the need to read everything; the whole was less important than the individual parts from which it was constructed.[28] Scholarly commentators on ancient texts discerned within them multiple and diverse meanings, reading the classics in ways which could twist the literal sense of the words, as if by some "interpretative schizophrenia", as Anthony Grafton has put it.[29] If learned and wise humanist scholars could find any number of potential meanings in ancient history, the possibility that fanciful young men would stumble upon the 'wrong' interpretation must have been so much the greater. History held many moral and political lessons: it was a source of examples on which young men were supposed to draw in order to learn how to conduct their own lives properly, and it was believed that history showed not only the good and bad in the past, but reflected the same in its readers.[30] If there were ambiguities in history, opinion held that the virtuous would discern the 'correct' meaning, while the bad would 'misread' the text:

---

[26] Erasmus, *De Ratione Studii, CWE* vol. 24, p. 682.

[27] Ibid., pp. 670–1.

[28] Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching*, pp. 127–9.

[29] Anthony Grafton, 'Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: comments on some commentaries', *Renaissance Quarterly* (Winter, 1985), p. 637.

[30] Feingold, 'The Humanities', 331–48. See also Rosemary O'Day, *Education and Society 1500–1800* (London, 1982), pp. 65–7 for the moralising treatment of classical texts in grammar schools.

> the good, virtuous and well disposed spirits will construe the best, the other will shew their kinde: what faults soever there be espied, my intent is to surprise vertue, and subjugate vice.[31]

Thus the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries saw the production of manuals, such as Degory Wheare's 1623 *De ratione et methodo legendi historias*, which prescribed how history should be read.[32] Such works were necessary if history was to be truly valuable, and different historical episodes to be usefully compared; they also aided an understanding of geography and chronology, which were needed to contextualise historical examples.[33]

Roman history could therefore be used to exemplify manifold scenarios and situations, both in support of the dominant reading of a specific text, and for opposing readings. For example, Tacitus was read for his relevance to a wide variety of existing forms of political culture: military tactics, colonialism, state identity, as well as the more traditional Machiavellian courtly machinations and manoeuvrings.[34] The same is equally true of the classical sources for the ending of the Roman republic, and of their early modern counterparts. The ways in which history could be disaggregated and used at will for a variety of purposes increased the potential for subversive or at least competing readings of ancient Rome, and it is the multiplicity of these with which this study concerns itself.

II

In recent years, a body of work with what can loosely be called a 'neo-Roman' focus has been produced by scholars working in the historical and literary fields. Studies of Roman influences upon the early modern period often take as their starting point Thomas Hobbes's famous analysis of the

---

[31] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*…(London, 1596), *STC* 21296, sig. A4r.

[32] Degory Wheare, *De ratione et methodo legendi historias …* (London, 1623), *STC* 25325. Based on his inaugural lecture as Camden Professor of Ancient History at the University of Oxford, the text was expanded in its 1625 and 1637 editions, then translated and further expanded by Edmund Bohun in 1685 as *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories. In which the Most Excellent Historiansare Reduced into the Order in which they are Successively to be Read; and the Judgments of Learned Men, Concerning each of them, Subjoin'd* (London, 1685), Wing W1592. For ease of citation, the work is referred to throughout as Wheare's 'Method', and quotations are taken from the 1685 English translation unless otherwise indicated.

[33] Joad Raymond, 'John Hall's *Method of History*, a Book Lost and Found', *English Literary Renaissance* (Nov. 2008), p. 273.

[34] Malcolm Smuts, 'Varieties of Tacitism'.

role played by Roman history in stimulating republican political thought during the mid-seventeenth century:

> there were an exceeding great number of men of the better sort, that had been so educated, as that in their youth having read the books written by famous men of the ancient Grecian and Roman commonwealths concerning their polity and great actions; in which books the popular government was extolled by the glorious name of liberty, and monarchy disgraced by the name of tyranny; they became thereby in love with their forms of government.[35]

Historians, political philosophers and literary critics have argued long and hard about whether men were indeed "in love" with the government of republican Rome, and whether this contributed to the causes of the wars of the three kingdoms in the 1640s, and the nature of the constitution established under the Protectorate. The classic statement of the case is Zera Fink's *The Classical Republicans*, although the debate in recent years has centred on the work of Quentin Skinner. John Morrill, for one, has argued against a Roman influence on English republicanism, stating in his opening Ford lecture in 2006 that he intended to "firmly place the Bible over Cicero."[36] Debate has also attempted to trace the germination of English republican thinking, and in particular a republican literary culture, back to the reign of Elizabeth I, whether this be through a moderated 'monarchical republicanism' or a classically-derived theory of civic humanism; *pace* John Morrill, there has been a growing acceptance over recent decades that strains of republican thought, derived at least partly from classical models, existed in England even in the mid-sixteenth century.[37] And historians of political thought and intellectual culture such as Quentin Skinner and Markku Peltonen have been assiduous in tracing the aforementioned 'classical republican' elements in political discourses to a 'Roman' frame of mind inspired by the ethos of civic humanism.[38]

---

[35] Thomas Hobbes, *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, ed. Ferdinand Tonnies (Chicago and London, 1990), p. 3.

[36] Zera S. Fink, *The Classical Republicans: an essay in the recovery of a pattern of thought in seventeenth century England* (Evanston, Ill., 1945); Quentin Skinner, *Hobbes and Republican Liberty* (Cambridge, 2008).

[37] J.G.A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine political thought and the Atlantic republican tradition* (Princeton, NJ, 1975); Patrick Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* (1987), pp. 394–424; John F. McDiarmid (ed.), *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: essays in response to Patrick Collinson* (Aldershot, 2007).

[38] For example, Quentin Skinner, 'Classical Liberty and the Coming of the English Civil War', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European*

Mine is not a work much concerned with republicanism. I do not propose to ignore such questions entirely, or to pretend that they do not exist, but I do wish to show that the reception of this particularly fraught era in Rome's history may be used to illustrate something other than the development of an English republican tradition. A preoccupation with republicanism has caused some of the more nuanced responses to episodes in the fall of the Roman republic to be overlooked, and has diverted attention away from the role of Roman history in creating an English latinate culture which encompassed far wider debates and ideas than the purely political.

Nor do I wish to present a work of literary criticism: this is, primarily, an historical study. David Norbrook has examined the debt owed by early modern authors to Roman models such as Lucan, while Andrew Hadfield has examined Shakespeare's republican leanings through his use of Roman history.[39] The vogue for Tacitus that was developing in the late-1590s and in the early seventeenth century has been well-documented, and continues to stimulate much interest in scholars tracing the links between literature, politics and the court.[40] Focusing on specific elements in Rome's history, work by Howard Erskine-Hill and Howard Weinbrot explored the use of the emperor Augustus as an exemplar in literature and culture, while more recently Anthony Miller has demonstrated how the Roman

---

heritage, Volume II: the values of republicanism in early-modern Europe (Cambridge 2002), pp. 9–28; also his *Visions of Politics II: Renaissance virtues* (Cambridge, 2002); Markku Peltonen, 'Citizenship and Republicanism in Elizabethan England', in van Gelderen and Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage,* Volume I (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 85–106; also his *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, 1995) .

[39] David Norbrook, 'Lucan, Thomas May, and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture' in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp. 45–66; *Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric and politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 2000). See also Blair Worden's rejoinder, 'Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: the English experience' in van Gelderen and Skinner (eds), *Republicanism* I, pp. 307–27; James Holstun, *Ehud's Dagger: class struggle in the English revolution* (London, 2000); Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics* (London, 2004), and his *Shakespeare and Republicanism* (Cambridge, 2005).

[40] Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics', pp. 21–44; Alexandra Gajda, 'Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex and Political Culture, c.1595-c.1601' (University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 2005); Peter Burke, 'Tacitism, Scepticism, and Reason of State' in J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie (eds), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 479–98; Alan T. Bradford, 'Stuart Absolutism and the "Utility" of Tacitus', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 46 (1983), pp. 127–55; David Womersley, 'Sir Henry Savile's Translation of Tacitus and the Political Interpretation of Elizabethan Texts', *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 167 (Aug., 1991), pp. 313–342.

triumph influenced Elizabethan and Stuart drama and pageantry.[41] Over twenty years ago, J. W. Binns attempted to bring the rich canon of early modern Latin writings to the attention of mainstream literary historical study, although few scholars have followed his lead; Sarah Knight's work on academic drama is one of the few exceptions, and forms a valuable addition to the literature on drama, which usually deals only with works in the vernacular.[42]

My concern is not so much with how writers crafted their works about ancient Rome, as with why they did so, and what this reflects about their own culture: this is a study of reception, rather than of rhetoric. Work on the latter abounds, not only explicitly in considerations of the methods by which classical models were used to construct modes of thought and speech, but also implicitly in the literary criticism.[43] More has been written on the drama of the late Elizabethan and early Stuart era than can possibly be comprehended here, and the Roman plays have been subjected to no less scrutiny than others of their kind. Of course, this applies particularly to the famous texts by Shakespeare and Jonson, but the less popular Roman dramatic creations and translations by Thomas Kyd, Samuel Daniel, and William Alexander, or by the playwrights of the universities, have also received their share of attention.[44] The Roman plays represent a rich vein of writing on the ending of the Roman republic,

---

[41] Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (London, 1983); Howard D. Weinbrot, *Augustus Caesar in 'Augustan' England: the decline of a classical norm* (Princeton, 1978); Anthony Miller, *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern English Culture* (Basingstoke, 2001).

[42] J. W. Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin writings of the age* (Leeds, 1990); Sarah Knight, '"It was not mine intent to prostitute my Muse in English": academic publication in early modern England', in David Adams and Adrian Armstrong (eds), *Print and Power in France and England, 1500–1800* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 39–52; also her 'Fantastical Distempers: the Psychopathology of early modern scholars', in Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert (eds), *Early Modern Academic Drama* (Aldershot, 2008).

[43] Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: theory and practice* (Cambridge, 2002); James J. Murphy, *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Aldershot, 2005). Literary scholars have examined in overwhelming detail the techniques writers used to construct their Roman plays: see, for one example among many, Jeffrey J. Yu, 'Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Erasmus's *De Copia*, and Sentential Ambiguity', *Comparative Drama* 41.1 (2007), pp. 79–106.

[44] For example, Robert Garnier, *Cornelia* (London, 1594), *STC* 11622, translated by Thomas Kyd; Samuel Daniel, *Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra. By Samuel Daniel. AEtas prima canat veneres postrema tumultus* (London, 1594), *STC* 6243.4; William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, *The monarchicke tragedies Croesus, Darius, The Alexandraean, Iulius Caesar. Newly enlarged by William Alexander, Gentleman of the Princes privie chamber* (London, 1607), *STC* 344; Anon., *The tragedie of Caesar and Pompey or Caesars revenge Privately acted by the students of Trinity Colledge in Oxforde* (London, 1607), *STC* 4340.

offering the potential for consideration of a latinate culture that was publicly available to a wide audience, both literate and unlettered. I use the drama as a guide to the depth of meanings with which Roman history was credited, and as a standard against which to test the interpretations of the Roman story found in the lesser prose works and in the notebooks and commonplace books which provide evidence of readers' ideas and reactions.

The existing 'neo-Roman' scholarship has emphasised the centrality of the Roman past for early modern society and culture, and the authority which Roman ideas were thought to possess.[45] Roman 'history' itself has, however, received little attention until now. Much of the focus of previous studies has been instead on the historiography, on key Roman historians who are perceived to be critical of tyrannical monarchy and nostalgic for the glory days of the republic; historians such as Livy, Lucan or Tacitus.[46] Certain shifts in attitudes towards Roman history over time can be discerned through the production of different kinds of texts. Vanna Gentili has argued that, after James I's peaceful succession, the preoccupation with civil war diminished, and interest focused instead on more court-centred historical issues. This trend is discernible in the drama, in the move away from republican themes towards considerations of pernicious emperors and their courts, which, Gentili argues, were more suited to the cultural context in which Roman history was discussed.[47]

I would like to suggest that the picture is more complex than this. While it is true that there was an increased output of dramatic literature on imperial Roman topics after the death of Elizabeth I, a generalisation about the changing nature of approaches to the Roman past does not stand up to closer examination. The reception of Roman history cannot easily be systematised or regularised. When a broad range of diverse textual material is examined in depth, it becomes clear that many various and often inconsistent attitudes towards Rome could be expressed simultaneously. These resulted from different readings of the classical material,

---

[45] Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: early modern Humanism in theory and practice* (Ithaca, NY, 1996), 117–9; W. J. Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody: Ravisius Textor, Zwinger and Shakespeare' in Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture*, pp. 91–4; John Guillory, *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton, and literary history* (New York, 1983), p. viii.

[46] For example, J. H. Whitfield, 'Livy>Tacitus' in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 281–93; Peter Burke, 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians,' *History and Theory* (1966), pp. 135–52.

[47] Vanna Gentili, 'Thomas Lodge's *Wounds of Civil War*: an assessment of context, sources and structure', *REAL: Yearbook of English and American Literature*, vol. 2 (1983), pp. 125–8.

or from a concentration on different sources. The way a reader approached the ending of the republic was influenced by habits formed early on in life, and by the questions a reader asked of his or her texts. Different points of focus meant that readers brought their attention to bear on different sections of the corpus of literature.

It is therefore important to understand the availability of the ancient source material in the early modern period. Knowledge of the Roman republic and its demise was neither universal nor unified in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. The fashion for one style of reading, or a strong appreciation of one author in a particular social circle, led to the circulation of competing historical 'truths'.[48] Interpretation was directed by motivation, and the "patchwork of praise and blame of Roman achievement" was accordingly matched to the standards of the early modern world by each individual reader.[49] In the following chapters, I seek to use previously neglected sources to demonstrate how Roman history could be manipulated by writers who used their classical texts in ways which often diverged from the now-established 'trends' which modern historiographical studies have highlighted.

III

A focus on specific characters and events in the ending of the republic characterises this study. In this respect, it differs from much of the existing literature, which tends to use a model of general 'Roman thought', relating it to a specific 'moment' in the early modern world.[50] This broad-brush approach has been encouraged by the received wisdom that Shakespeare's Latin was small, and therefore that his knowledge of Rome was questionable; Shakespeare scholars have tended to see Rome itself as being of little relevance, focusing instead on the universality of human nature.[51] This is entirely at odds with the early modern disintegrative conception of history. I have chosen to look instead at individual episodes in Roman history,

---

[48] Whitfield, 'Livy>Tacitus', pp. 281, 285.

[49] Hunter, 'A Roman Thought', p. 93.

[50] Ibid., passim. A rare exception is Paul Cantor, whose draws attention to Shakespeare's use of Rome as a political setting and argues that we can learn something about Rome from the Roman plays, as well as about Shakespeare: Paul Cantor, *Shakespeare's Rome: republic and empire* (Ithaca, NY, 1976), p. 7.

[51] T.J.B. Spencer, 'Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans', *Shakespeare Survey* 10 (1957), pp. 27–38; J. C. Simmons, 'Shakespeare's Treatment of Roman History' in Andrews, *William Shakespeare*, pp. 143–57.

just as early modern readers and writers did, rather than using a more nebulous notion of *Romanitas*, and I wish not only to consolidate knowledge about the particular importance of this period of Roman history in the early modern age, but to offer a detailed analysis of the reception of certain key figures in a critical half-century in Rome's past.

The discussion focuses in detail on how students of this most popular period of Roman history responded to particular ideas and instances depicted in the ancient sources, either in formal educational environments, or in their 'private' reading and writing. Despite years of literary research into 'Roman' works in the Elizabethan and early Stuart period, we do not yet have a satisfactorily broad view of the reception of the ending of the republic and the establishment of the Roman empire; the bigger picture, approached through minor prose works and evidence of reading, rather than through the canonical texts, is still lacking. Our understanding of a latinate culture informed by the reception of Roman history is therefore incomplete, biased as it is towards the major drama and political writing of the age.[52]

This is what I propose to address. Rather than looking only at the views of individual authors, I have used a variety of sources to try to build up a picture of how sets of readings and interpretations represented early modern concerns. Through their writings about ancient Rome, whether translations, new creations or the commonplacing and note-taking which accompanied much reading, early modern students of the late republic and early empire reveal to us how ideas were transmitted over the centuries, and how they adapted these ideas to reflect their own *Weltanschauung*.

I also seek to place the reading and writing of Roman history in its cultural and educational context, reconsidering the place Roman history occupied in formal education. The grammar schools and universities provided the young men who attended them with a grounding in the classics,

---

[52] Shakespeare's Roman plays have provided scholars with a focus which has so far failed to translate to lesser poets. For example: Barroll, 'Shakespeare and Roman History', pp. 328–343; Jan H. Blits, 'Caesarism and the End of Republican Rome: Julius Caesar, Act I, scene I', *Journal of Politics* 43, no. 1 (February 1981), pp. 40–55; Paul A. Cantor, *Shakespeare's Rome: republic and empire* (Ithaca, NY, 1976); Paul Dean, 'Tudor Humanism and the Roman Past: a background to Shakespeare', *Renaissance Quarterly* 41, No. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 84–111; George K. Hunter, 'A Roman Thought: Renaissance attitudes to history exemplified in Shakespeare and Jonson' in Brian S. Lee, Brian (ed.), *An English Miscellany presented to W. S. Mackie* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 93–115; R. P. Kalmey, 'Shakespeare's Octavius and Elizabethan Roman history', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 18, no. 2 (Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama) (Spring, 1978), pp. 275–287; P. Kewes, 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England', *The Seventeenth Century* XVII no. 2 (October, 2002), pp. 155–186; Barbara L. Parker, *Plato's Republic and Shakespeare's Rome: a political study of the Roman works* (Newark, 2004).

upon which foundation they continued to build as they read throughout their lives. A reassessment of the way the history of Rome was learned provides a platform from which to approach ideas about history and education in a more detailed and specific way; by looking at evidence of reading as well as writing, at the records of individuals rather than institutional structures and statutes, the interconnected nature of history, education, and culture becomes more clearly visible.[53] It is this interaction between reading, reception and education that I hope to elucidate, examining the evidence offered by readers' notes in commonplace books and student notebooks, and comparing this with the detailed representations of characters and events in printed prose and dramatic sources. In this way, I aim to show how education shaped England's literate culture through its emphasis on the study of Roman history, and by the methods and practices it encouraged in its students.

Any attempt to offer this kind of perspective on early modern texts must take into account the structures by which ideas about this moment in Roman history were made available to the literate members of society, and I therefore also wish to consider the various editions and translations of the classical sources that were available to readers, the languages in which these were printed, and the points at which new offerings entered the marketplace. All these considerations affected how ideas about Rome were received, and by whom; the publication of a classical text or translation was not a neutral act, but was motivated by practical, political, financial or social concerns. The appearance of a new edition or, particularly, a new translation, at a specific time or in a certain context, could affect the way a text was perceived by readers and writers, and the ancient authors themselves demonstrate a wide range of opinion on the ending of the republic. Peter Burke has highlighted the way that histories were 'reframed' for particular ends by their translators.[54] This necessarily affected the reception of each particular history by readers, and thus the availability of different editions at different points in time has a clear bearing on the reception of certain aspects of the Roman history by readers in early modern England.

I have also tried to approach the subject, Rome in England, from a new angle, examining both reading and writing in an integrated manner, and

---

[53] Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: the politics of reading in early modern England* (New Haven and London, 2000), p. 307.

[54] Peter Burke, 'Translating Histories' in Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia (eds), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 133–7.

considering education and the processes of thought that shaped reception, as well as the finished written article. This methodology highlights the complexity of reception, reading and representation, emphasising how several competing interpretations of the ending of the republic coexisted across the period and at certain points within it. Students' manuscript records of reading provide a different perspective on the history of Rome's republic and empire from that offered by printed texts, self-proclaimed histories and creative dramatic inventions, as the history is moderated through each individual reader's interpretation during the reading process. The study of these kinds of sources allows a fuller appreciation of the ways in which participants in intellectual culture used Roman history to discuss important contemporary concerns, and how men and women conceived of their relationship with the Roman past; by looking at how they perceived this particular period and its various events and personalities, we can come closer to understanding what history meant to them.

History was not a distinct discipline in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; writers of histories were engaged in creative, poetical acts, which could also carry connotations of active political service. Within an apparently cohesive set of discursive writings, too, varied and complex ideas and opinions could be expressed, because categories and barriers were permeable; in the early modern period, boundaries were far less 'thick' than they seem today, and historical culture was remarkably flexible.[55] I have attempted, as far as possible, to avoid the artificial categorisation of disciplines and genres which modern society imposes upon the past. Drama is considered alongside introductions to classical translations, and with note-taking from prose works, since all these overlapped and interacted to make up early modern historical culture. And although each kind of source material has its own individual problems and opportunities which cannot be overlooked, an integrated approach allows for the constant state of flux in which literature and history existed.[56] The discourses with which texts and notes engage have been treated in a similar fashion, allowing for the possibility that, while literature and history are sometimes political, this is not always the case.[57]

---

[55] Deborah K. Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: religion, politics and the dominant culture* (Berkeley, CA, 1990), pp. 1–14.

[56] Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–4; also Blair Worden, 'Historians and Poets', *passim*.

[57] Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity*, p. 8.

Contradictions were what characterised history, as historical thought reshaped itself according to the private and public circumstances in which it existed. This means that there cannot be one idea of history, or one particular way in which this period of Roman history was perceived in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The very opposite is usually true, which makes any sustained argument for one early modern consensus on Julius Caesar, for example, impossible. Indeed, the following chapters demonstrate precisely how fluid meaning and interpretation were – as they still are – and how multivalent in their values texts and stories could be, not only for different readers, but also for one reader at different points in time.

Even within one text, there is not necessarily any consistency of opinion. In order to construct arguments, modern scholarship often imposes uniformity where there is none, or looks for consensus where none exists in order to make sense of the past. One such example is the tendency to attribute to Elizabethan historians of Rome an approval of Caesar Augustus, because he ended civil war and brought the stability which was such a concern in the late sixteenth century.[58] Shakespeare, in particular, is often thought to have taken from Plutarch the sense that Rome's troubles before Augustus' accession stemmed from the lack of an absolute ruler; this is in contrast to the prevailing Renaissance humanist thought which allegedly idealised republican Rome for its anti-tyrannical attitudes.[59]

These statements are too sweeping and too general to be substantiated. The same applies to schools of historical thought which associate a particular classical source with one set of readings. While it may well be true that an author was often interpreted in a certain way, or utilised to illustrate specific contemporary concerns, this should not blind modern scholars to the possibility that other groups or individuals might appropriate the same source and the same material for entirely different ends. Work on Tacitus has tended to emphasise, quite rightly, the Machiavellian ideas which certain readers discerned within his words, and this has encouraged the widespread association of Tacitus with anti-constitutional thinking and subversive politics, a view supported by James I's alleged suspicion of Tacitus, and the suspension of Isaac Dorislaus, Professor of Ancient History at Cambridge University, in 1627, over fears about the

[58] Barroll, 'Shakespeare and Roman History', p. 341.
[59] J. C. Simmons, 'Shakespeare's Treatment of Roman History', p. 477.

content of his lectures on the historian.[60] This certainly was true *in some cases*: some readers found these ideas in Tacitus. But the opposite was equally true in other situations when Tacitus was used to demonstrate chivalric ideas and martial virtues, concepts which were by no means radical or innovative. Here, again, as new work by Malcolm Smuts demonstrates, the retrospective divisions and boundaries imposed by twentieth-century scholarship have led to a simplistic approach which distorts the untidy reality into a series of excessively sharp divisions, such as that between constitutionalism and reason of state.[61] An appreciation of permeability and overlap, of multiplicity and mutability, is essential if we are to understand properly how readers responded to Roman history, and why.

Diverging ideas and opinions were enhanced by the nature of the sources available to early modern students of ancient Rome. Readers of Latin could access the classical sources directly; they could read medieval compendia, which generally emphasised one Roman historian's account; or they could read works written in the sixteenth century. Those with only English reading ability were more limited in their choices, but they could still interact with a variety of opinions on the events at Rome in the first century BC. Moreover, the classical sources were moderated by later commentaries and the amendments made by editors and translators, while the interaction between early modern, medieval and classical writings further complicated the transmission of ideas. It is therefore informative, when examining a text or episode, to consider what the writer aimed to do by producing it, or in which context, and for what purpose, each reader used the particular work he or she was reading.

To facilitate this approach, this study treats the chronology of the ending of the Roman republic in sections. While this does mean that the broader sweep of history is given less attention, it allows a consideration of the different kinds of evidence as they relate to one example or occasion in a holistic and integrated way. Furthermore, from the extant manuscript records of reading, it is clear that this way of looking at historical events as a series of often unconnected 'episodes' or stories was the predominant approach to Roman history among students and readers, reflected in and encouraged by the commonplacing tradition. Some themes were unquestionably more important in the period than

[60] Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics'; Gajda, 'Robert Devereux'; Womersley, 'Sir Henry Savile's Translation'.

[61] This essay, under the working title, 'Varieties of Tacitism in Britain', has not yet appeared in print at the time of writing. I am very grateful to Professor Smuts for an advance copy of the piece, and for allowing me to use it here.

others, demonstrated by the degree to which they recur in all forms of writings: the assassination of Caesar is one such example. For reasons of space, I have concentrated on these themes, and tried to show why they might have been so central to the reception of this moment in Roman history. Issues interesting to the modern mind, such as the paradoxical use of Cato as an example of moral virtue despite, or perhaps because of, his most un-Christian suicide, have not been fully represented here, since they appear to have excited only marginal interest in the early modern sources.

I have attempted, as far as possible, to discuss what early modern opinion deemed to be important, and to approach the subjects in the fluid way that characterises the sources themselves. Sometimes, this results in ahistorical writing: for instance, applying the language of sovereignty to the government of Caesar and Augustus is not a practice of which scholars of ancient history would approve without significant justification – kingship was a delicate subject in ancient Rome, and sovereignty is a modern concept which differs substantially from classical ideas.[62] Early modern readers and writers conceived of power in this way, however, so it is useful to apply the terms to their discussions of Rome. Similarly, the Latin term *virtus* does not translate as the English word 'virtue'; the latter derives from the former, but *virtus* held very complex and specific meanings in the classical world, expressing quite different ideas from virtue when conceived in a Christian sense.[63] However, if we put ourselves in the mindset of the early modern reader or writer, we find that they often equate one with the other, and conceptualise Roman *virtus* in this framework of Christian virtues, and my discussion therefore sometimes treats the two as if they are more closely related than is in fact the case. In seeking to recover early modern attitudes to the ending of the republic, I have tried to take all these things into account, considering each action or story separately to find what lessons were taken from it, how it was appropriated and redeployed for certain reasons by certain men, and how their own experiences predisposed them to reconstruct the Roman past in particular ways.[64]

---

[62] Tim Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome* (London, 1995), pp. 141–7; Elizabeth Rawson, 'Caesar: civil war and dictatorship' in J. A. Crook, Andrew Lintott and Elizabeth Rawson (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 9: the last age of the Roman republic, 146–43 B. C.* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 462–4.

[63] Anna J. Clark, *Divine Qualities: cult and community in republican Rome* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 26–9; L. R. Lind, 'Concept, Action, and Character: the reasons for Rome's greatness', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103 (1972), p. 236.

[64] For example, William J. Bowsma, 'Intellectual History in the 1980s: from history of ideas to history of meaning', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 12 (Autumn 1981),

As will be seen, this lays bare the overwhelming multiplicity of meanings that were available to readers in their ancient history, the fragmentary nature of Roman history in the early modern period, and the ways in which readers and writers manipulated their texts to reflect a diverse range of opinions in the name of history.

I hope to make clear, by examining the educational role of Roman history in society alongside broader cultural uses, how the practices learned by boys and youths at school and university shaped their reception of the ending of the republic throughout their lives. The notes readers made in blank work books as they read their Roman history provide a very interesting corrective to the printed texts produced in the period, and illuminate these published sources' evidence of how classical works were read. An active early modern reader began to take notes early in life, as he read at school or under the care of a private tutor. The focus of school education was a grounding in the classical languages; grammar and rhetorical techniques were the main components of the syllabus, and the texts used to teach boys these skills were derived from the works of the Latin and Greek authors, particularly in the more advanced forms.[65] Ancient history was absorbed by the boys as they read these texts, since classroom exercises frequently involved the use of classical examples. These were constructed using sentences collected from predominantly Latin texts into commonplace books and notebooks, making a familiarity with the details of Roman historical events both essential and inevitable. Latin was a second language for all its early modern users; the material excerpted from the ancient texts was very self-consciously appropriated with the aim of creating a body of knowledge and expressions which would form the linguistic basis for all learned conversation and writing. A schoolboy would have no everyday sayings or phrases with which to express himself in Latin, other than those he drew from his texts; the Roman phrases and examples therefore became the building blocks with which he constructed the latinate intellectual climate in which the reading of history took place.[66] In this way, from the earliest days of a boy's educational career, he was engaged in the process of creating anew a classical culture in which Roman history

---

pp. 279–280, 283; John E. Toews, 'Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: the autonomy of meaning and the irreducibility of experience', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 92, No. 4 (Oct., 1987), pp. 879–907.

[65] Kenneth Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England* (London and Toronto, 1965), pp. 109–112.

[66] Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody', p. 103.

played a central part, and he would continue this process as he read classical texts at university and throughout his life.

Much of this reading was undertaken with the aim of constructing rhetorical arguments, and while I do not wish fully to analyse the impact of Renaissance rhetoric here, it is important to note the impact of this approach on the reading of history.[67] Imitation was a central concept in the study of rhetoric, and texts were deconstructed into their 'individually conceived parts' in order that the skilful manipulation of ideas and important material could be learned and re-used. This same approach was therefore also applied to the history which formed the content for rhetorical exercises; incidents and examples were taken from the whole that was the historical progression, and utilised in isolation as required. Originality was less important than relating parts of the store of general human historical knowledge to the task in hand in a meaningful manner. The practice of history was envisaged as an important part of the commonplacing tradition, "an organized trafficking" in that which was already known.[68]

Through the habits of thought and reading instilled in boys in schools and disseminated through literate society by manuals, handbooks and treatises, a Roman literary culture based on the reading of classical, historical texts came to form an important element in early modern social and political thought. The Roman past and its examples were very much a part of everyday life for the reading orders in society, and the ancient and the early modern coexisted and interrelated; as they were understood by contemporaries, each informed the other, illuminating both high politics and the personal qualities necessary for virtuous participation in society.

---

[67] Lisa Jardine, 'The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge', *Studies in the Renaissance*, Vol. 21, (1974), pp. 31–62; Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*.

[68] Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody', pp. 120, 124, 94.

PART ONE

READING THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

CHAPTER ONE

"THE ATTAINING OF HUMANE LEARNING": EDUCATION AND ROMAN HISTORY

> Gladly I would wish you should read the Greek & Roman writers for they were the wisest, & fullest of excellent examples, both of discipline and stratagems.[1]

This was the advice of Philip Sidney when he recommended to his friend Edward Denny a course for "the directinge of your studies" in May 1580. Sidney's words were noted by likeminded men including John Mansell, later President of Queen's College, Cambridge, who copied it into the notebook he kept as a student between 1599 and 1601: testimony to the central place occupied by Greek and Roman texts in the humanist vision of education.

The Grammar Schools

For most readers in early modern England, the process of assimilating classical learning began in the grammar schools. Here, boys as young as six were exposed to a largely Latin education which prepared them for more advanced learning in adulthood, an experience so intensely focused on the writings of the ancient world that it has been described as "the inculcation of an almost intemperate love of the classics."[2] Students at the grammar schools were immersed in the works of the Roman past, in the belief that its lessons were important and useful enough to provide enlightenment as to the nature of humanity, and to shape their characters for the rest of their lives. Regardless of whether a boy went on to any kind of formal education after his school days, the books he read there were to be the foundation for a life-time of independent learning, a classically-based, private and personal education which was essential if a man was to fulfil his potential as a human and a Christian.[3]

---

[1] Bodleian, Dm. MS d.152, fol. 4r.

[2] Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities' in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: seventeenth century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), p. 229.

[3] Joan Simon, *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 333–6; Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: theory and practice* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 75.

The grammar schools provided total immersion in the Latin language, and the effects upon young minds of constant contact with the writings of Caesar, Cicero, Sallust and other classical authors should not be underestimated. The very intensity of the learning experience ensured an all-encompassing exposure to a Latinate culture; a typical school day at the end of Elizabeth's reign was arduous by any standards. Records of the timetable at Eton show that boys woke at 5 a.m., and began their learning an hour later with morning prayers, the conjugation of Latin verbs, and reading out loud. The following hour consisted of repetition of the material that had just been read, and 8 o'clock saw boys translating Latin of varying degrees of difficulty according to their form. At 9 o'clock, they were read a lecture, and were required to write in Latin the main themes; this might be taken from Cicero or from Caesar's commentaries, depending on age and ability. Prayers and dinner followed, and afternoon school recommenced at midday, with lessons in Latin grammar, composition and translation, until supper at 5 o'clock. This meal lasted for an hour, followed by more Latin lessons until 7 p.m., after which the boys must have fallen, exhausted, into bed at 8 p.m. Terms were long, and holidays short; boys were required to speak only Latin with one another during their few breaks in study. There was no removal into higher forms until the required standard had been achieved, and no corners were to be cut. An usher drilled Latin grammar into the lower forms, while the master proceeded to instruct boys in epistolary composition, prose and rhetorical composition, and then verse composition. Only when they had perfected these were boys permitted to study Greek, Hebrew and Logic, and in the majority of schools, these subjects were studied hardly at all, reserved instead for the universities.[4]

Despite the huge variation in size and finances of the grammar schools, their curriculum was remarkably consistent, creating a shared literary culture among the pupils who attended these institutions. Statutes and treatises on education stress the continuity with continental humanists and teachers across England.[5] Following the recommendations of continental humanists, their founders provided for an educational programme designed to instill in boys both eloquence and virtue, delivered by methods of rote learning and the parallel translation of predominantly classical

[4] The most detailed study of the school day in the late sixteenth century is found in Baldwin, *Small Latine* vol. I pp. 353–7, 372.

[5] For example, William Kempe, *The Education of Children in Learning* (London, 1588), sig. D3v.

material. The reading of texts which imparted a flavour of the late Roman republic was a constant feature of even the smallest establishments; although some grammar schools had only one teacher, they used the same pedagogical methods as the major public schools, aiming to teach exactly the same material.[6] The minor schools supplemented the small teaching staff with ushers or pupil-teachers, boys more advanced in their studies, who kept the book with the correct translation in and helped those less able if it was required; this allowed the master more time to concentrate on those who really needed his assistance.[7] While is doubtful that a universally high standard of Latin was achieved throughout the country, the very system that required boys to spend a large part of every day in contact with Roman writings demonstrably contributed to the formation of a literate sector of society whose values and mental world were of a strongly classical bent.

Peter Mack has demonstrated the broadly congruent nature of the English grammar school syllabi.[8] While the study of Greek was patchy, Cicero, Caesar and Sallust were universally taught, along with Terence, Vergil, Ovid and Horace. The material might be presented in English or Latin, for translation, or to present an example of rhetorical excellence, but in all cases, boys were using texts written during, and inevitably coloured by, the years of the late republic and the early imperial age. Roman ideals and civic virtues entered the minds of boys very early in their educational careers; the *de Officiis*, for example, was used in translation at Eton in the second form because the precepts it contained were so desirable for boys to learn, and material from the work was one of the first things with which they came into contact, through abstracts in English and Latin.[9] The statutes of Sandwich Grammar School in the mid-Elizabethan period required that:

> The master shall … deliver to his first form some epistle which he hath Englished out of Tully; the second from some matter translated out of Tully, Caesar or Livy.[10]

---

[6] Baldwin, *Small Latine*, vol. I p. 429.

[7] Foster Watson, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: their curriculum and practice* (Cambridge, 1908), pp. 349–55.

[8] Mack, *Elizabeth Rhetoric*, pp. 13–4.

[9] T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, Ill., 1944), vol. I, pp. 374–5.

[10] The statutes of Sandwich Grammar School in Kent, *c.* 1580, quoted in David Cressy, *Education in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1975).

Ascham's *Scholemaster* recommended for grammar schools three great models of Latin prose writing, Cicero, Caesar and Livy:

> by this diligent and spedie reading over, those forenamed good bokes of *Tullie, Terence, Caesar*, and *Livie*, and by this second kinde of translating out of your English, tyme shall breed skill, and use shall bring perfection.[11]

As writers, he asserts, these men are great, because they come from the great period of Rome, the period at the end of the republic, the so-called 'golden age' of the Latin language; their works formed the basis for much of the reading curriculum for older boys.[12]

These authors were selected for grammar school learning because their prose was the best model of Latin that could be provided.[13] Caesar and Livy were prized by Ascham as exemplars of excellent rhetorical style:

> ...For what proprietie in wordes, simplicitie in sentences, plainnesse and light, is cumelie for these kindes, *Caesar* and *Livie*, for the two last, are perfite examples of Imitation.[14]

By the end of the sixteenth century, the scripturally-derived methods of schooling of the Erasmian years fell into disuse, and rather than biblical vulgars being used for teaching the Latin language, it became more common to provide English translations of Cicero for boys to turn back into Latin, which could then be compared with the original.[15] This trend towards an almost exclusively Ciceronian method of translation is exemplified in the works of the educationalist John Brinsley. In his *Ludus Literarius* of 1612, perhaps the most influential educational work of the period, Brinsley agrees with his predecessor Ascham in condemning the translation of passages from the Bible as leading to poor Latin style. If a boy is to translate, he should use the best, which is to say that he should use Cicero, and in particular the *de Officiis*:

> I thinke and finde Tullies sentences the fittest... This booke I doe account of all other to be the principall: the Latine of Tully being the purest and best, by the generall applause of all the Learned: and because that book is a most

---

[11] Ascham, *Scholemaster*, sig. Kiiiir.

[12] Ascham, *Scholemaster*, sig. Diiir.

[13] For a thorough discussion of the question of excessive 'Ciceronianism' in late sixteenth-century culture, see Binns, *Intellectual Culture*, pp. 270–97. Slavish imitation of Cicero to the detriment of sense and meaning was more of a problem in more advanced educational circles than the grammar schools, however, and the matter need not greatly concern us here.

[14] Ascham, *Scholemaster*, sig. Riv.

[15] Baldwin, *Small Latine*, vol. I, pp. 690–6.

> pleasant poesie, composed of all the sweet smelling flowers, picked of purpose out of all his works.[16]

Moreover, Cicero's work contained the best lessons "belonging to all Morall matters whatsoever."[17] Brinsley also composed sentences for translation which frequently used characters from Roman history whom students would encounter elsewhere as the moral example to be followed or avoided, encouraging boys to read lessons into their classical texts in a way they would continue to do throughout their lives:

> Caesar did great wrong to Pompey in this point.
> Hac una in re magnam Caesar Pompeio iniuriam fecit.[18]

And Brinsley went further than simply prescribing Cicero for the less skilful schoolmasters who formed the intended audience of his *Ludus Literarius*. In 1616, he produced a translation of the first book of the *de Officiis*, a translation made "for the perpetuall benefit of Schooles, by the more speedie and certaine attayning of the singular matter and Latine" of the work, which he intended to be used with the *Ludus Literarius*.[19]

The learning in the grammar schools was thus unquestionably Ciceronian, Caesarian, and Sallustian: it was therefore necessarily both classical and republican.[20] Complete familiarity with the landscape of Roman history would be inevitable for a boy who had, from an early age onward, studied texts written within the period, which commented upon its political and practical developments. To base school learning so solidly upon the language and moral principles of Roman writers was to encourage early modern men to think along Roman lines; Roman ideas inherited

---

[16] Brinsley, *Ludus literarius*, sig. Xir.

[17] Idem.

[18] John Brinsley, *Ludus literarius: or, the grammar schoole shewing how to proceede from the first entrance into learning, to the highest perfection required in the grammar schooles, with ease, certainty and delight both to masters and schollars; onely according to our common grammar, and ordinary classical authours: begun to be sought out at the desire of some worthy fauourers of learning, by searching the experiments of sundry most profitable schoolemasters and other learned, and confirmed by tryall: intended for the helping of the younger sort of teachers, and of all schollars* (London, 1612), STC 3768, sig. Yir. This is but one example among many on the preceding and following pages, all placing Caesar as the central figure in the situation.

[19] John Brinsley, *The first book of Tullies Offices translated grammatically* (London, 1616), *STC* 5288. For the quotation, see the 'epistle dedicatorie', p. iii.

[20] This is not to say that it was 'classically republican' in the political sense. I mean rather that the politics of the Roman republic, the importance of *negotium* rather than *otium* and a sense of active civic duty to the commonweal, are central to the works of these authors and, consequently, to the curriculum as it was studied in the grammar schools.

in early education were an ever-present background against which any thinking about society and politics in adult life would take place.

A practical intention lay behind this profoundly Roman curriculum, derived from the humanist discourse which reinterpreted and applied classical learning to the contemporary world. The precise definition of this educational philosophy is a problem which continues to vex scholars, and I do not wish to rehearse the arguments here; suffice it to say that the label 'humanism', when used in its Renaissance sense of the followers of the *studia humanitatis*, is useful in focusing attention onto a theory of learning founded upon history, rhetoric and grammar, emphasising the difference between the logic-centric methods of scholasticism and humanism's contextualising trends.[21] At the heart of this humanist discourse as it evolved in England in the later sixteenth century was the concept of virtue, and the link between learning and living. The key to understanding the powerful influence of humanism upon education is the recognition of the importance of reading the classics within their historical framework, relating them to contemporary circumstances and the business of virtuous living in order to derive universal lessons for mankind. In this, humanism was far removed from scholasticism's logical, internal analysis of a text, less concerned with education for the sake of learning than with the uses of education for humanity, and the development of a classical concept of civic duty which simultaneously reflected the Christian virtues.[22]

Humanism, then, was at least in part a form of education aiming to provide men with learning they could use in life and not simply in the classroom, based on Roman models which highlighted a man's need for

---

[21] Exactly how far Elizabethan and early-Stuart education was 'humanist' rather than 'scholastic' one, and the tension between 'humanism' and the 'humanities', are questions long debated by those attempting to understand the influence of formal schooling upon wider culture.. For example, Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: education and the liberal arts in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe* (London, 1986), p. xiii, opine that the shift from scholasticism to humanism was 'like murdering something living'; by the 1550s, humanism had effectively become 'the humanities', the practical application and the theory behind the programme being inextricably entwined (p. 162). Helen M. Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (London, 1998), emphasises the practical uses of a humanist education, while Rosemary O'Day, *Education and Society 1500–1800* (London, 1982) stresses the continuity in Aristotelian studies at the universities despite the impact of humanism: Ramist approaches codify and rationalise scholastic learning but the focus of study changes less than is sometimes implied (p. 127). For the difficulties of the term 'humanism' when used too loosely, see, for example, Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1987), vol. I, p. xxiii.

[22] Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: early modern humanism in theory and practice* (Ithaca, NY, 1996), pp. 8–11.

rhetorical skills in order to assume his part in civic government.[23] In a Roman context, participation in politics occurred through the practice of oratory, and began in the law courts, and this Roman model provided the inspiration for the theory of training for public service.[24] Cicero's works – particularly those on the nature of a man's duty to himself and others – strongly emphasise the community of mankind and the importance of active service to the commonwealth. "*Non nobis solum nati sumus*," Cicero explains in the *de Officiis*, an ideal which exerted a strong influence upon the cultural assumptions of the literate classes who grew up with the text, reinforcing as it did Christian notions of charity and brotherhood.[25]

A classical conception of civic duty and the *vita activa* encouraged a duty of obligation to political action in the educated orders in early modern England, who were taught the importance of serving the commonwealth from boyhood. From the reign of Henry VIII on, educational theorists conceived of a classical education as a means to creating a political class that would serve the crown, and were keen to stress the importance of education in creating men who would work for the good of the commonweal, as Roger Ascham's *Scholemaster* makes clear:

> in the end, the good or ill bringing up of children, doth as much serve to the good or ill service, of God, our Prince, and our whole countrie, as any one thing doth beside.[26]

By good and wise education, Ascham continues, a boy "maie most easelie be brought well to serve God, and contrey both by vertue and wisedome".[27] Similarly, Richard Mulcaster, headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School between 1561 and 1586, and high master at St Paul's from 1596 onwards, observed in his educational treatise of 1581 that boys:

> be set to schoole, to qualifie themselues, to learne how to be religious and loving, how to governe and obey, how to forecast and prevent, how to

---

[23] Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 8; Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism*, pp. 7, 12.

[24] Joy Connolly, *The State of Speech: rhetoric and political thought in ancient Rome* (Princeton, NJ, 2007), pp. 33–5.

[25] Cicero, *de Officiis* 1. 22: We are not born for ourselves alone.

[26] Roger Ascham, *The scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong but specially purposed for the priuate brynging vp of youth in ientlemen and noble mens houses, and commodious also for all such, as haue forgot the Latin tonge* (London, 1570), STC 832, sig. Ciiir. See also J. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics* (Oxford, 1965).

[27] Ibid., sig. Ciiiir.

> defende and assaile, and in short, how to performe that excellently by labour, wherunto they are borne but rudely by nature.[28]

Brinsley, too, makes explicit the link between virtue and contribution to public life, and the relationship between education and service to the commonweal:

> That by studies wee suffer not our selves to bee drawne away from more necessarie imploiments. And that because all the praise of virtue consisteth in action or performing Duties, from which yet there may be intermissions and returning to studie.[29]

On a more personal and pragmatic level, Brinsley also gives three reasons why it is vital that boys should learn to speak, read and write perfect Latin:

> to the end, to fit them to answer any learned man in Latin, or to dispute *ex tempore*: also to traine them up to be able to speak purely when they come in the Universities; as in some Colledges they are onely to speak Latin: or to fit them, if they shall go beyond the seas, as Gentlemen who goe to travell, Factors for Merchants and the like.[30]

Latin in the early modern world was a universal language, the language of learning and a medium in which men of different nations could communicate, and it was important that boys should learn it at school for use in later life, in higher education, in politics, or in business. Latin was both an end in its own right as an academic distinction, and a necessary tool for a man wishing to prove himself in public life: it was a prerequisite for the active exercise of civic virtue.[31] Concerns related to the utility of a classical education exerted a strong influence upon the way boys were made to learn at school, and consequently on the way educated readers approached their works of history, both in private, independent reading, and in the universities, and this would remain the case at least until the mid-seventeenth century.[32]

---

[28] Richard Mulcaster, *Positions Wherin those primitive circumstances be examined, which are necessarie for the training up of children, either for skill in their booke, or health in their bodie. Written by Richard Mulcaster, master of the schoole erected in London anno. 1561. in the parish of Sainct Laurence Pountneie, by the Worshipfull companie of the merchaunt tailers of the said citie* (London, 1581), STC 18253, sig. Riiir.

[29] Brinsley, *Offices*, sig. D6v. Brinsley offers this as a gloss on Cicero's opinion that learning, however valuable, should not draw men from the active life (*de Officiis*, I.xvi.19).

[30] Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, sig. Ee2r.

[31] Grafton and Jardine, *Humanism*, p. 185.

[32] Todd, *Christian Humanism*, p. 78.

The Universities

A grammar school education prepared boys for the learning they would undertake at university, and those who continued with formal studies met in their reading the same focus on Roman history that was found in the school syllabi. While history was not a formal element of the syllabus at either English university, it formed a significant part of any undergraduate degree, perhaps precisely because it was not prescribed, and therefore limited, by statute.[33] The statutes shed little light on the majority of undergraduate teaching, but this very vagueness implies a resistance to any pressures towards specifying a uniform course of study for all men. As long as certain core texts such as Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Organon* were covered, tutors and their students were permitted a large degree of latitude in determining the direction that learning should take. The Cambridge Arts syllabus in the 1570s, defined by statute, specified that the first year would be primarily devoted to rhetoric, the second and third years to dialectic, while the fourth year should include the study of philosophy; no other stipulations were made, and notebooks and booklists demonstrate a broadly humanist curriculum including the reading of many Roman authors.[34] At Oxford, the compulsory grammar and rhetoric components of the BA, amounting to a total of six of the sixteen terms, required the reading of Vergil, Horace and Cicero in addition to Aristotle.[35]

In the late sixteenth century, too, teaching in colleges became an increasingly important part of a university education, with the rise in undergraduate numbers and the expansion of the universities. The decline of the faculties of Law and Theology in the wake of the Reformation coincided with, and contributed to, the growth in prestige and power of the Arts faculty, changing the demography of the universities, which increasingly became the providers of education to younger men: the undergraduates. The central lectures still formed the basis of the bachelor's degree, and covered the statutory elements on the curriculum, but within individual colleges there was a growing acceptance that a university education should provide the knowledge of history, geography,

---

[33] Victor Morgan, *A History of the University of Cambridge, Volume II: 1546–1750* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 438.

[34] Ibid., p. 512.

[35] Strickland Gibson (ed.), *Statuta antiqua universitatis oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1931), pp.389–90.

modern languages and so forth that an educated gentleman would be expected to possess.[36] Oxford college statutes of the later sixteenth century provided for lectures in 'humanity', which usually comprised rhetoric, Latin poetry, and history.[37] A shift to more college-based teaching allowed tutors greater freedom from the statutes to adjust their teaching as they saw fit, and a definite change in the ways the universities were used can be identified in the Elizabethan years, contributing to the evolution of the tutorial system, and an increased concentration on personal reading, either alone or in groups, in the colleges. The flexibility afforded to individual tutors and colleges to provide the humanist learning the richer students demanded led to the separation of the statutory, 'university' education and the individually-tailored, strongly classically-focused reading happening in private studies.[38]

The very paucity of the material required by statute encouraged tutors to develop additional courses of independent reading for their pupils, reading which formed the bulk of the work actually undertaken by students in the universities. Inventories of books owned by those members dying in residence, notebooks kept by students, and study directives written by their tutors show that students read mainly classical texts, and read them in a humanist framework, for the lessons in morality and ethics they contained, and for their precepts of political philosophy and civic virtue.[39] The reading of these works provided a constant communication with the Roman past in the same unconscious way that was encouraged in the grammar schools. Undergraduates "imbibed" history from Caesar, Sallust, Plutarch, Valerius Maximus and the other authors who formed the core of the unofficial programme of reading.[40]

The importance of the reading of ancient history is emphasised in the instructions of Richard Holdsworth, a Cambridge tutor during the first half of the seventeenth century, to his students:

> The necessity of this studie above the rest is the cause that it is to be continued through all the four yeares in the after noons, wheras other studies have each a parcel of your time alotted to them.[41]

---

[36] James McConica, 'Studies and Faculties: introduction' in McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume III: The Collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986), p. 152; J. M. Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts' in ibid. pp. 173–4.

[37] McConica, *The Collegiate University*, pp. 21, 46, 56, 342.

[38] Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts', pp. 179–80.

[39] Todd, *Christian Humanism*, pp. 63–4.

[40] James McConica, 'Elizabethan Oxford: the collegiate society' in McConica *The Collegiate University*, pp. 700, 702.

[41] Transcribed in H. F. Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development of John Milton* (Urbana, Ill., 1961), vol. II, p. 637.

The works were read contextually, often with commentaries to explicate the historical and literary implications of the text. Erasmian educational theory held that close, contextual reading was intrinsically a morally valuable exercise, though Erasmus himself was vague as to how a course of reading was to lead to the acquisition of virtue.[42] Dealing with the deeds of great men, and the workings of great civilisations, classical history held many moral and political lessons; indeed, it was a source of examples on which young men were supposed to draw in order to learn how to conduct their own lives properly.

But nowhere was it clearly stated how reading the classics practically resulted in the assimilation of virtuous ideas, and with the extension of private reading at university level came a recognition of the dangers of history. If, through youth and inexperience, students chose the wrong examples, and learned the wrong lessons, history could be a danger, rather than inculcating in them the good morals which their elders intended.[43] Educational safeguards were required to ensure that young men did not fall into wrong thinking; these often took the form of manuals on the processes by which history should be studied. The educational theorists believed that history should be given to students in small parcels, and should be studied in a natural sequence, with the epitome being approached before the full work, the introduction before the detail. Livy should not be attempted before Florus had been read, for Florus' epitome provided the basic framework in which Livy's more complex ideas should be understood.[44] As Daniel Heinsius, professor of history at Leiden from 1613 onwards, wrote in his manual, *The Value of History*:

> No one rightly comprehends the full grandeur of Roman history unless he has entered upon it from the beginnings. This, gentlemen, ye shall do with me in Lucius Annaeus Florus….As in a picture, we shall behold the life of the Roman people, its manners, efforts, but especially its wars and battles. These our Florus has minuted with care, so far as his concise brevity permitted.[45]

Similarly, Degory Wheare recommended:

> I would by all means perswade young men to begin the Study of History with Epitomes and short Histories, till the Foundations being well laid.[46]

---

[42] Grafton and Jardine,*From Humanism to the Humanities*, pp. 141, 145–8.

[43] Feingold, 'The Humanities,' pp. 331–348.

[44] J.H.M. Salmon, 'Precept, Example and Truth: Degory Wheare and the *ars historica*,' in Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (eds), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: history, rhetoric and fiction, 1500–1800* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 11–36.

[45] Daniel Heinsius, *The Value of History*, trans. G.W. Robinson (Cambridge, MA, 1943), pp.18–20.

[46] Wheare, *Method*, sig. D4r.

Despite the incomplete survival of many classical works:

> the body of the *Roman* History may yet be beautifully built up, the Picture of which in *Little* is most Artfully drawn by our *L. Annaeus Florus*... Very Learned men, and well acquainted with the *Roman* History exhort the Students of it, with an intent eye and mind to run through, look into and contemplate this curious Representation, and not without good cause, it being (in the Judgment of *Lipsius*) a *Compendium* of the *Roman* History written finely, plainly and Eloquently. Nor does he stop here, but adds his Censure; *the accurateness and brevity of it are very often wonderfull, and there are many shining Sentences like Jewels inserted here and there, both with good Judgment and truth*.[47]

The keen concern over the correct 'method and order' of reading histories is clearly demonstrated by the distinction which this author, Florus, was accorded in the early modern period. His *Epitome of Roman History*, a digest of the works of Livy, has won little attention from modern scholars; the late Ronald Syme dismissed Florus as "an elementary and miserable compiler".[48] Florus' condensed version of Livy's monumental (and incomplete) work, however, was exactly the introduction early modern pedagogues believed their students needed if they were to tackle successfully the problems of Livy's more involved Roman history.[49] Accordingly, when William Camden established his chair in history at Oxford in 1622, the ex-schoolmaster bore contemporary educational theory in mind, and chose Florus as the author on whom Degory Wheare was to lecture.

Florus is also mentioned as essential reading in several directives and study manuals, such as the one written by Richard Holdsworth.[50] Afternoons in July, August and September during the second year of university study were to be devoted to close reading of Florus, along with Sallust and Quintus Curtius; students were to write down "as you goe along all the useful phrases" and to mark in the margin or record in a separate book "remarkable passages" and difficult sections. Florus was to be studied for longer than the other authors. Holdsworth allotted three months in

---

47 Ibid., sig. F6v.

48 Ronald Syme, 'Roman Historians and Renaissance Politics' in *Society and History in the Renaissance: a report of a conference held at the Folger Library on April 23 and 24, 1960* (Washington, 1960), p. 3.

49 Idem.

50 The 'Directions' are traditionally attributed to Richard Holdsworth, who is thought to have written them in the mid-1640s. It has also been suggested that they were written by John Merryweather of Magdalene College, *c.*1649, but this view is now largely discredited. See J. A. Trentman, 'The Authorship of *Directions for a Student in the Universitie*', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, vol. 7 (1978), pp. 170–83.

total for the reading of Florus, Curtius and Sallust; half this time was to be spent on the *Epitome*, with the remaining weeks divided between the other two works. This period was intended as preparation for the more detailed fourth-year study of history, which included Livy, Plutarch and Tacitus amongst others.[51] More advanced students, too, were guided in their reading of Roman history. Thomas James, the first librarian of the Bodleian library who held office from its opening until 1620, compiled a *Guide to Arts Books in the Bodleian, by Category*, which he intended as an aid for readers for the MA, so that they might locate books in the Arts end of Duke Humfrey's library. James's *Guide* demonstrates an engagement with the precise content and details of the classical past, and he divided the section devoted to history into separate subject areas under headings such as "Caesar", "De Bello Civili", and "De Roma".[52] The precision of reading aids like the *Guide* tallies with the detail of Holdsworth's instructions, pointing to a widespread awareness of the nuances of classical history, and the sensitive nature of the topics described within the ancient texts.

Note-Taking and Commonplacing

Precisely how young men interpreted the classical authors they read at school and university, and whether they found meanings in the texts that might be judged 'dangerous', can be seen in the way they recorded their reading. The commonplacing tradition was an important element in the early modern reading process, and the study of Roman history is closely reflected in manuscript notebooks and commonplace books. As an educational strategy, commonplacing was instrumental in helping the student organise material from his reading, which in turn enabled him to achieve the 'end' of formal education: the acquisition of a body of humanistic knowledge that would allow him to participate actively and virtuously in the political world. Commonplacing habits were thought not only to improve oratory and prose composition, but to expose the truth within ancient texts, particularly by those of an organisational bent such as the followers of Ramus. Erasmus himself emphasised the importance of *copia*, material available for convincing argument, taken from the masterpieces of classical learning; otherwise, he warned, "if we are not instructed in these techniques, we shall often be found unintelligible, harsh, or even

[51] Fletcher, *John Milton*, pp. 624–8.
[52] The *Guide* survives as Bodleian MSS Rawl. D.984 and Add. A.68.

totally unable to express ourselves".[53] In the Elizabethan and early Stuart universities, students were intended to draw from the ancient authors all manner of examples on virtuous living and more practical everyday matters, and this practice is reflected in the notebooks they compiled as they read.

Readers were advised on the ways they should take notes from their books by the treatises that directed them in their study of history. They were encouraged to 'harvest' and excerpt what they judged note-worthy, preserving in manuscript note and commonplace form the ideas they attributed to, or discovered in, their texts.[54] Degory Wheare's *Method* explained how students were intended to select and store the best examples from the books of ancient history they read by using commonplacing methods, and why this was such an important practice:

> This is the most healthful and profitable attendance of the knowledge of history, that you may contemplate the instructions or variety of examples united in one illustrious monument, and from thence take out such things as are useful to thee, or to thy country, and that thou mayst wisely consider that what has an ill beginning will have an ill end, and so avoid it.[55]

The surviving manuscripts allow us to attempt to reconstruct what readers experienced as important aspects of the ancient histories, for their notes represent a locus where the interaction between print and manuscript may be observed. Indeed, the very process of note-taking enhanced the act of reading history, for studying a text with the aim of selecting valuable words and useful information could not help but encourage extra vigilance when perusing a passage, and point a reader towards points of conflict or connection within a text, and between texts.[56] Different readers were encouraged to choose different things from their texts, depending on their purpose. The schoolboy constructing a speech for a disputation naturally looked for something other than that sought by the private gentleman reading to improve his knowledge of how to live a virtuous existence; certain texts were prescribed by educational directives and works of courtesy literature depending on the nature of the reader and his aims. Ideas that readers had in mind when they approached their texts

---

[53] Erasmus, *De Copia*, *CWE* vol. 24, p. 302.

[54] Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching*, pp. 117–9; Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody', pp. 91–4.

[55] Wheare, *Method*, sig. B8r-v. In the original, the whole section is italicised for emphasis.

[56] This is discussed further by Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 137, 145–6.

dictated the way they perceived examples recurring through time, all exemplifying variations upon the same theme.

In commonplace books, this is reflected in the way notes are organised under thematic headings, and characters and situations are compared and cross-referenced according to the virtue or vice they display. The habit also informs contemporary works on topics of Roman history composed in the early modern period, where pressing concerns – such as an unstable succession and the possibility of civil war – recur in a variety of essays, using different examples from Roman history to illustrate the same point. So William Fulbecke's *Continuall Factions* includes not only a discussion of the power struggle between Caesar and Pompey and the wars after the murder of Caesar, but also a history in prose of the "civill slaughters of the Gracchi" and the social war between Marius and Sulla early in the first century BC, voicing the same anxieties with reference to a set of examples drawn from different points in Roman history.[57]

The extant notebooks demonstrate great depth and breadth of study of the classics, often running to hundreds of pages of closely-written notes on every aspect of life drawn predominantly from Roman history, emphasising the great value tutors and students placed upon note-taking concurrently with reading. Contemporary study directives specify in detail the method for taking notes; Richard Holdsworth's instructions, for example, amount to several pages of directions for the proper use of commonplacing techniques. Notes should be gathered, he explains, while a text is being read, because they are "useful to memorie" and lead to a "fuller, & clearer understanding of what you read." The processing of information that has been read will also personalise learning, for "By Noting you make it intirely your own for ever."[58] Moreoever, note-taking will prove to the tutor that progress is being made, and will keep the student from "growing dull & listless in yr studies."[59] Holdsworth prescribes the exact way in which a student should take notes because, he explains, he has observed many students trying to keep commonplace books and failing:

> Neither doe I much wonder at it, when I consid: the toyle & the interuption it must needs creat to theyr studies, to rise every foot to a great Folio book, & toss it and turn it for every little pasage yt is to be writt downe.[60]

---

[57] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. C3r.

[58] Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development*, vol II, p. 650. The transformation implicit in this process is of especial relevance to the study of reception of Roman history, the translation from text to notebook affording a window into the mind of the reader of Roman works.

[59] Idem.

[60] Ibid., p. 50.

Holdsworth is therefore unlikely to have been the tutor responsible for the students who kept the enormous Trinity commonplace books. Dating from the early seventeenth century, these are immense folio volumes of many hundred pages' length, ordered with commonplace headings and as arduous to read today as they must have been to compile; their very size must have rendered them unwieldy and unsuitable for their intended purpose.[61] Rather, Holdsworth recommends a simpler method:

> Get some handsome paper bookes of a portable size in Octavo, & rule them so with Inke or black lead that there may be space left of the side for a margin & at the top for a title: Into them collect all the remarkable things wch you meet with in your Hystorians, Oraters, & Poets.
>
> Ever as you find them promiscuously, especialy if out of the same book, in the title space set down the name of the Author with the book, or Capt: & after every Collection, the number of the page, or Sections whence it is taken, that so you may speedily recourse to the Authour him self upon occasion.[62]

Nor was a student's work done when the book was written. He was intended to learn its contents so that the material could be brought to mind whenever he might come to need it:

> These Collections you shall render so ready and familiar to you by the frequent reading them over on evenings, or times set a part for that purpose, that they will offer themselve to your memory on any occasion.[63]

In the classic commonplacing model, a student was to use two books simultaneously; one to take initial notes, and the second, commonplace book to order them under the name of a subject, such as Love, Duty, Betrayal.[64] The distinction between the two is not always clear, since many of the surviving examples make longer notes under commonplace headings, or combine the two methods to record what was read. Strictly speaking, a commonplace was a rhetorical device used where a speech or piece of writing called for a well-known example on a given topic; Cicero advised the orator to remember numerous such commonplaces and deploy them as necessary.[65] Like the short moral sentences boys learned at school as examples of Latin grammar, commonplaces exemplified not

---

[61] Trinity College, Cambridge MSS R.16.6–19.

[62] Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development*, vol. II, p. 651.

[63] Holdsworth in Fletcher II, p. 651.

[64] Erasmus, *De Copia*, pp. 635–41; Rudolph Agricola, *Lucubrationes* (Cologne, 1539, repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967), pp.198–200.

[65] Cicero, *De Inventione*, II.15.48.

only good rhetorical style, but also the principles of virtue and vice. In the early modern period, however, the notebooks of student readers show their tendency to harvest from their texts more shorter apophthegms and aphorisms, rather than the longer segments technically defined as true commonplaces, and consisting of a series of rhetorical components.[66] Holdsworth describes how a student should take his initial notebooks and "reduce such books of Collection to a Commonplace book"; this was intended to be no more than "a kind of large index to them, setting down with every Reference, a word or two of each Collection."[67] Used in academic disputations, in letters, in public speeches and in general conversation, these brief *sententiae* are now widely referred to as 'commonplaces', and it is this sense of any sentence excerpted, reused, and recycled, rather than its more precise, formal meaning, that I use the term throughout.

Evidence survives of one of Holdsworth's own students compiling just such a notebook while reading works of history, although its commonplace companion is lacking, if it ever existed. In his autobiography, Sir Simonds D'Ewes makes reference to his studies under Holdsworth at Cambridge *c*.1618, and his reading of the history of Florus in accordance with his tutor's instructions. He mentions explicitly the compiling of a university notebook which is now in the possession of the British Library:

> My other studies for the attaining of humane learning, were of several natures during my stay at the University, which was about two years and a quarter, although Mr. Richard Holdsworth, my tutor, read unto me but one year and a half of that time; in which… he read to me … of history, part of Florus, which I after finished, transcribing historical abbreviations out of it in mine own private study: in which also, I perused most of the other authors, and read over Gellius' Attic Nights, and part of Macrobius' Saturnals.[68]

The first fifty-five sides of the notebook are devoted to comprehensive notes on the text of Florus in a neat, very small hand with few crossings-out; they are followed by notes translated into Latin, taken from the first volume of Holinshed's *Chronicles*. It is certain that D'Ewes read and made notes on Florus privately at the same time as he read and made the notes on Holinshed, because he occasionally refers himself forward in the same

---

[66] Peter Mack uses Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* to elucidate the various elements comprising a true commonplace: *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p. 43.

[67] Holdsworth in Fletcher II, p. 652.

[68] Simonds D'Ewes, *The autobiography and correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the reigns of James I and Charles I, edited by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps* (London, 1845), p. 121. The notebook is BL, Harl. MS 192.

notebook to notes on Holinshed among the pages on Florus.[69] Holdsworth's instructions have clearly been taken to heart by this student: accompanying D'Ewes' notes are page numbers, chapter headings, and the title of the work from which the notes are taken.

But the making of notes while reading was more than an exercise undertaken at the behest of a university tutor. Commonplacing and note-taking formed an ingrained part of literate culture in this period. Traceable via the mediaeval compiling of *florilegia* to classical methods of storing information, commonplacing was also associated with the desire to safeguard against 'bad' or dangerous interpretations of the classics. Conceptions of rhetoric, built upon classical foundations of *imitatio*, encouraged the view that works of literature were essentially composed of many distinct particles arranged into a whole. These small parts were endlessly recycled, and originality had little to do with the process of writing. Rather than aiming at new creations, writers sought to reuse safe stock material in new ways, for this material was the sum total of inherited human wisdom, stored over centuries, and it could not be bettered.[70] Boys were taught to write Latin by imitating the great authors. They excerpted certain phrases, the phrases we find recurring in the commonplace books, then incorporated these into their own prose writing. Such "systematic felony" may seem alien in today's society, where plagiarism is a prominent concern and creativity is bound up with ideas of novelty and originality, but in early modern England, the process of learning by copying classical examples was highly respected; it was, in fact, nothing "stollen, but all wittily imitated".[71]

The *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* of Valerius Maximus, widely used in schools and universities, perfectly illustrates this relationship with ancient texts. Although no editions were produced in England during the period in question, this Roman work was frequently referred to in manuscript notebooks. It provided precisely the excerpts of memorable deeds and sayings that students required. Valerius Maximus selected and arranged exemplary anecdotes about famous Romans in order to provide a manual for his contemporaries, from which they could extract passages to furnish

---

[69] For example, BL, Harl. MS 192 fol. 18v: '+ Plur. de his vid. in com. et annal. Angl. … pag. 55, 56, &c.'

[70] For an amplified discussion of commonplacing culture, see Ong, 'Commonplace Rhapsody', pp. 118–24.

[71] Baldwin, *Small Latine*, vol. II pp. 259–62; Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, sig. Z2r.

their orations.[72] The early modern reader using the work fifteen hundred years later did so for exactly the same purposes as those which its author had originally envisaged. In the late sixteenth century, imitation was the best homage to the excellence of the past, and the best way to ensure that the wisdom of the ancients was preserved.

It was also a means by which Roman history entered everyday speech and thought.[73] Degory Wheare summarised neatly the role of imitation and the use of the classical *exemplum*, the appropriation of classical material for modern living. Paraphrasing Vives' approach to the 'electing' of material from history, he used Augustus himself as model of exemplar theory:

> It would be a shorter work yet if I should onely propose to our Student in History the Example of *Augustus* the *Emperour* for his imitation, of whom *Suetonius* writes thus. *In perusing the* Greek *and* Latine *Histories, he did not pursue any thing so much as the Collecting those Precepts or Examples which were salutary and usefull to the Publick or to private men; which transcribing word for word, he very often sent to his Domesticks, or to the Governours of Provinces, or Armies, or to the Magistrates of the City, as any of them had need of an Admonition*.[74]

A student was to imitate Augustus, and "Observe, Extract and Compare all the *Moral, Politick, Oeconomick* and *Military* Examples which he meets in Histories."[75] The extraction of these examples was to take the form of copying them into a notebook, which ought then to be used as a basis for analysis:

> let him enquire into the Causes of every Action and Counsel; let him consider the circumstances of it, and weigh the success; and let him in each of these search out wherein any thing is well or prudently, ill or imprudently managed; and let him from thence draw up to himself a general Precept, Rule or Direction, and then prove or illustrate it with many Sentences or Examples.[76]

---

[72] On Valerius Maximus and the contemporary uses of his work, see W. Martin Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1992).

[73] Robert Miola highlights the prevalence of the classical in early modern literature: 'The humanist emphasis on antiquity and the prevailing poetics of *imitatio* created a richly complex hermeneutic of intertextual writing and reading. Reading literature, learned and popular, in Elizabethan England almost always meant listening to the voices, sometimes faint and sometimes loud, of ancient authors.' R.S. Miola, 'Reading the Classics', p. 176.

[74] Wheare, *Method*, sig. Y1r.

[75] Ibid., sig. Z3r.

[76] Ibid., sig. Z3v.

Here Wheare was describing the kind of essay often seen in draft form in students' notebooks, an argument proving or disproving a hypothesis using a selection of examples copied word for word from the classical authorities, which provided the body of proof. This proving or illustrating was in itself an imitation, in that large portions of the essays would be culled from existing authorities, but it led on to a further and more important form of imitation:

> For there is a two-fold use of Examples: the first for our imitation of what is done by good men, and that we may learn to shun the ill actions of wicked men: The second is, that from particular Stories we may deduce and extract some Sentence, which may be generally usefull to us.[77]

Moreover, by directly lifting phrases from the Latin, a young student could be sure he had not misjudged its meaning, since the original would always be there to refer back to as he became wiser and more learned. This was of especial importance, since history was to be read as a guide for the present, interpreted using right judgement. In practice, students often copied large sections of classical works into their notebooks for use in future exercises, rather than emulating the great writers of the past in any more sophisticated or abstract sense.

The habit of commonplacing, of excerpting and imitating, was one that stayed with educated readers throughout their lives, and survived the transition from close 'harvesting' of books for profit during formal education to a wider, more informal noting of key passages in later, private reading.[78] Commonplacing preserved in manuscript form the ideas that early modern readers rediscovered in their texts. And whether they conducted this reading under the supervision of a teacher or tutor, or pursued an independent course of study for recreational purposes or with the aim of improving themselves, Roman history and the works of Rome's politicians and poets formed a significant part of the written landscape, "salutary and useful", a mirror for early modern England.

---

[77] Ibid., sig. Z4r.

[78] Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching*, pp. 117–9.

CHAPTER TWO

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS: THE PUBLISHING AND CIRCULATION OF ROMAN HISTORY

During the early modern period, the popularity of various classical authorities waxed and waned. Each ancient author presented Roman history in his own style, and according to his particular circumstances. The popularity of one source often meant that another was neglected for a while, and the histories were available to different readers, in different forms, at different points in time. As Robert Darnton has argued, an understanding of the way in which classical texts reached their audience, and of whom this audience was comprised, is a necessary foundation for any consideration of the texts' reception.[1] This chapter explores the nature of the sources of Roman history available to the early modern reader, and the form in which he or she might come across these histories.

The Historians of the Roman Republic

The demise of the republican constitution of ancient Rome, and its replacement with a monarchical system of government in the form of the principate, was the chain of events in Roman history most closely examined by early modern readers. It was also the period of history during which many of the greatest Latin authors were active: the orators, poets and politicians whose works were recommended for use in the schools on account of their grammatical excellence as well as their moral example.

After the political unrest of the 130s and 120s BC, and the civil wars of Marius and Sulla in 88–82 BC, Roman politics was increasingly becoming a struggle between the traditional aristocratic elements, known as the *optimates*, and the *populares*, demagogues who sought to bypass the traditional authority of the senate and win power for themselves.[2] 63 BC,

[1] Robert Darnton, 'First Steps Towards a History of Reading' in James L. Machor and Philip Goldstein (eds), *Reception Study*: *from literary theory to cultural studies* (New York and London, 2001), p. 175.

[2] The necessarily simplistic digest which follows is intended to give only the most basic outline of events in Roman history discussed by the early modern sources, so that the

the year of Cicero's consulship, saw the defeat of the conspiracy of Catiline, a plot by just such an aspiring demagogue to overthrow the senate and upset the republican constitution. By this point, Rome's territories covered vast portions of the globe, and the empire's expansion was placing the old methods of government under increasing strain. Traditional political procedures were no longer adequate, and a series of extraordinary appointments and circumventions of standard practices was setting dangerous precedents and consolidating power in the hands of a few men. In 59 BC, Julius Caesar was elected to the consulship. He formed a political alliance with the wealthy Marcus Crassus and the famous commander Gnaeus Pompeius (or Pompey), known as the First Triumvirate. Political manoeuvring ensured that Cicero was exiled, temporarily removing this most passionate defender of the old constitution from Rome and enabling some of the Triumvirate's reforms to be enacted.

Julius Caesar's military triumphs and canny self-promotion won him a reputation as the favourite of the Roman people. In 52 BC, the bid for sole consulship by Pompey was sponsored by the senate, who also demanded that Caesar resign command of his army. In December of 50 BC, Caesar agreed to do so, if Pompey would do likewise, a condition which provoked the senate into responding by ordering Caesar to disband his troops forthwith or be declared an enemy of Rome. Caesar refused to lay down his command, and assembled his forces for action against the senatorial faction, led by Pompey.

Caesar declared war by crossing the Rubicon into Italy, in January 49 BC. He marched on Rome, while Pompey retreated to Brundisium, where he was joined by his allies. They then crossed the Adriatic to Epirus, expecting to be able to consolidate their forces and mount a proper defence, while Caesar returned northwards and occupied Rome. In December 49 BC, he was appointed Dictator, enabling him to secure the consulship for the following year and continue to wage war upon Pompey's forces. Caesar followed Pompey to Illyrium, where they joined battle at Dyrrhachium in July 48 BC. Pompey failed to make the best of his initial victory, and a series of misfortunes led to his eventual defeat in the subsequent battle at Pharsalus.

---

reader might follow their treatment of events. For a thorough history of this period, see J. A. Crook, A. Lintott, and E. Rawson (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 9: the last age of the Roman republic, 146–43 B. C.* (Cambridge, 1992), and A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. Lintott (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 10: the Augustan Empire 43 B. C. – A. D. 60* (Cambridge, 1996).

Pompey fled to Egypt, where he was murdered by an agent of the king. Caesar was left to return to Rome and assume another Dictatorship; being elected consul once again, he followed Pompey's armies to Egypt, where he resolved the Alexandrine civil war by defeating King Ptolemy and leaving Cleopatra to rule in his place. Wars in Syria and Pontus followed, before Caesar finally defeated the remnants of the Pompeian forces led by Cato the Younger in Africa, in 46 BC. His victory over the sons of Pompey at Munda, in Spain, in 45 BC, secured his position; returning to Rome in 45 BC, Caesar was created Dictator in perpetuity, and set about enacting a wide-ranging series of social reforms.

On the Ides of March, 44 BC, Caesar was assassinated by a group of conspirators, led by Brutus and Cassius, who sought to end his king-like rule and restore the old republican constitution. They were prevented from doing so, however, by the tide of popular opinion drummed up by Marcus Antonius (Antony). The mob attacked the houses of Brutus and Cassius, precipitating civil war between Caesar's heir, Octavian, and Antony, on the one side, and Brutus, Cassius, and their supporters on the other. In 43 BC, the Second Triumvirate was formed, consisting of Octavian, Antony and Caesar's cavalry commander Lepidus. In order to raise the funds to mount their campaign against Caesar's killers, they initiated the proscription of large numbers of their political enemies, whose lives and estates were declared forfeit. Brutus and Cassius were defeated by the Triumvirate's troops at Philippi in Macedonia in 42 BC.

After the victory, Antony spent much of his time in Egypt with Queen Cleopatra, who bore him several children. This deepened the tension between Antony and Octavian, since Antony had married Octavian's sister Octavia, in 40 BC. Octavian, seeking sole control of Rome, manipulated public opinion against Antony, procuring his will and publicly reading it in the Forum; it transpired that Antony intended to leave crowns and dominions to his children by Cleopatra, thus raising alarm about the dispersal of Roman lands to 'foreign' powers. The senate declared war upon Egypt, with Octavian at the head of the army; Antony turned against Rome and sided with Cleopatra.

Octavian defeated the combined forces of Antony and Cleopatra at the battle of Actium in Greece in 31 BC, whence they fled to Alexandria. There, besieged by Octavian, first Antony, then Cleopatra committed suicide, in August 30 BC. Octavian was now in sole command of Rome's forces, and declared war at an end. He returned to Rome, where, with Marcus Agrippa, he was elected consul. By astute political machination, he contrived in a settlement whereby he ostensibly relinquished power to the senate,

maintaining the fiction of a return to the old republican constitution. In practice, the senate conferred upon him an extraordinary ten-year command of unstable provinces, which comprised most of the empire; acting as consul, and maintaining control of most of Rome's territories, his power was uncontested. In 27 BC Octavian was voted the titles *Augustus* and *Princeps* along with other privileges that marked him out as head of the Roman state. In 23 BC, Augustus, as he was now known, resigned his consulship while managing to maintain consular *imperium*, and was granted lifelong tribunician authority, sole *imperium* within the city of Rome, and unofficial censorial powers. He was appointed high priest of Rome, *pontifex maximus*, in 12 BC, and voted *pater patriae* in 2 BC. These numerous honorifics, his relatively peaceful rule and the large civic projects he initiated left little doubt as to who was the ultimate ruler of Rome. Augustus died in AD 14, succeeded as emperor by Tiberius.

There are a number of ancient authors who recount the events of this crucial half-century in Rome's story, and their works were the primary sources for the dissemination of information about the ending of the republic in the early modern period. Most were Roman, though not necessarily from the city itself or the area that forms modern Italy, and most were writing at the time of the events they described, or in the century following. Some wrote in Greek but were Roman citizens living within the empire, often at the courts of the emperors; many held some form of public office. The brief summary of their works which follows sketches the extant content of the texts from which early modern readers could recover parts of the history of the republic, and presents the texts in the form to which they will be referred in subsequent discussion.

Appian, *Roman History*

Appian of Alexandria (*c.*AD 95-*c.*AD 165) probably wrote his Roman history during the reign of Antoninus Pius, and the work was certainly finished before AD 165. Organised into twenty-four books, and written in Greek, the work provides a topographical history of the peoples of the Roman empire, each book charting the developments and wars in separate parts of the empire until the incorporation of a province, rather than providing a completely chronological account of Rome's fortunes from the city's inception. Books 13–17 survive in their entirety; these depict the civil wars at Rome, from Sulla to the defeat of Sextus Pompeius. Books 18–21 continued the history with the wars in Egypt between Octavian and Antony, under

the title, "The Egyptian War", ostensibly fought against Cleopatra VII Philopator, but in reality another form of civil conflict. One-sixth of the entire history was devoted to this subject, but unfortunately these books are lost.

Writing under the empire established by Augustus, Appian generally presents a picture of events in line with Augustan propaganda, although he is damning of the proscriptions of the second triumvirate. His sources are largely unattested, but he seems to have used several existing accounts on most occasions. When he could identify sources, Appian used them critically, and he presents a fine analysis of the social factors causing the civil wars at Rome.

Julius Caesar, *Commentaries on the Civil War*

This work is Caesar's account of his war against Pompey, 49–48 BC, beginning just before Caesar's entry into Italy and ending after Pompey's assassination. Written in just three books, the work is necessarily very partisan, providing detailed information about military matters from Caesar's point of view. Along with his work on the Gallic Wars, it is an example of the new *commentarii* that commanders were composing: records of military events, precise, detailed notes of campaigns, a form of 'report from the field', albeit revised for posterity. This was a different form of writing from earlier commentaries, which had been a form of *hypomnemata*, or sketches made for personal use to jog the memory, and Caesar has been credited with reinventing the genre.[3]

Cassius Dio, *Roman History*

This Greek-language narrative of Rome's history from the time of Romulus to the beginning of the third century AD was probably written during the reign of Septimius Severus's successor, Caracalla, during the years *c.*AD 211–229. Writing under this notoriously wicked emperor, it is likely that Dio saw Augustus as a pointed contrast to the present ruler, and this is reflected in the largely positive accounts of his rule. Accepting that some of Octavian's actions in securing the imperial title were ruthless, he nevertheless presents a picture of a canny, wise and just emperor who ruled in the best interests of the Roman people.

---

[3] Charles W. Fornara, *The nature of history in ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley and London, 1983), pp. 181–2.

Dio's sources include Seneca, Suetonius and Tacitus, but the work is very much his own, particularly the invented speeches he gives his characters. Substantial sections of the books on the ending of the Republic survive almost entirely, and Byzantine summaries provide a supplement to the lost parts. The civil wars begin at Book 41; Books 50–56, covering the years 32 BC to AD 14, are almost entirely extant. Dio places the transition from republican constitution to imperial monarchy at the end of Book 50, after the battle of Actium.

Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*

Florus used Livy and several other sources to construct a summary of Rome's history from the time of Romulus to 25 BC, when Augustus closed the temple of Janus and established universal peace. Probably written in the time of Hadrian, the *Epitome* was initially divided into two books, most of the chapters dealing with particular wars in a largely chronological order.

Augustus' accession is, to Florus, largely inevitable and a great occasion. Representing the history of Rome as the developments in a man's life, Augustus' reign is depicted as Rome's zenith, and a fitting conclusion to the work. The implication that Rome may have declined after this period is apparent, and is linked to the lack of potential for further expansion, termed the *inertia Caesarum*. A positive portrayal of Pompey as the defender of the republic is, for Florus, not incompatible with the triumph of monarchy under Augustus.

Lucan, *Pharsalia*

The *Pharsalia* was first circulated during the reign of Nero, shortly after AD 60, and tells the story of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey in the form of an epic poem. Lucan was a favourite of the emperor, until a serious rift developed between the two men; it is thought that the strongly pro-republican tone of the *Pharsalia*, and especially book IX, which vilifies Caesar, contributed to Nero's subsequent decision to outlaw Lucan's poetry.

Lucan's work ends abruptly with Caesar in Egypt after the death of Pompey; this is the end of the tenth book, and it is not possible to tell whether Lucan planned to continue the piece. The work becomes more vehement and condemnatory of Caesar's destruction of the republican constitution as it progresses, probably as Nero's tyranny increased while Lucan was writing. The anti-imperial nature of the later books of the poem

may also account for Lucan's joining the conspiracy against Nero in AD 65, which, when discovered, led to Lucan's suicide.

Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*

This work by Gaius Plinius Secundus is best described as an encyclopaedia rather than a history. It is included here because some of the anecdotes recounted by Pliny concern the characters of the ending of the Republic, and several early modern readers used it to excerpt commonplaces on the subject. The thirty-seven books of the compendium were finished in AD 77; Pliny died in the eruption of Vesuvius in August, AD 79.

Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*

These pairs of lives were intended as reflections on their common virtues or vices. One in each pair was Greek, one Roman; the work also contains four individual lives. More properly a work of biography than history, Plutarch's portraits of famous men are as much concerned with character as with the events of their lives, often to the extent that crucial political developments are omitted in favour of an intimate anecdote.

Plutarch initially wrote the lives of the emperors from Augustus to Vitellius, of which only those of Galba and Otho are still extant. The lives relevant to the ending of the republic are those of Crassus, Pompey, Julius Caesar, Cicero, Mark Antony, and Marcus Junius Brutus, composed rather later, during the first decades of the second century AD. Equivocal portraits are drawn of all the men, as Plutarch provides the reader with a wealth of detail in order to construe various moral points; thus Caesar and Pompey emerge as both virtuous and less admirable in different parts of their biographies.

Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*

Although not strictly dealing with the republic's eventual collapse, Sallust's history of the year 63 BC is important in its analysis of the flaws in the polity, which the author believed led inexorably to the final decline of the old constitution. Sallust had fought in Africa against the Pompeian faction, and Caesar protected him from condemnation for extortion as governor of Africa Nova. From the beginning of his public career, Sallust operated as a decided partisan of Caesar, to whom he owed such political advancement as he attained. Following his disgrace, he retired from public life and wrote his histories.

The *Conspiracy of Catiline* presents Catiline as the enemy of Rome, and may have been intended to vindicate Caesar of any accusations of being party to the plot. Although, as might be expected, Cicero, consul at the time and saviour of Rome, is not presented in a harsh and unjust light, nevertheless the piece reads as an attack on the traditional aristocracy, whom Sallust blames for much of Rome's moral decline. He paints a picture of a Rome riddled with rot, which fits well with his sympathies with Caesar's *populares.*

Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*

These biographies of the emperors from Julius Caesar to Domitian were probably written around AD 121, during the life of Suetonius' patron, the emperor Hadrian. Suetonius initially had access to the imperial archives, but while the work may have its roots in solid research, gossip and anecdote play a considerable part in his descriptions.

As a client of the emperor, it is unsurprising that Suetonius paints a flattering image of the establishment of imperial rule. The initial chapters of the life of Julius Caesar are lost, but Suetonius is the source for the famous story about Caesar and the pirates.[4] Suetonius also provides numerous instances of Caesar's personal charisma as a leader of his troops. Of Augustus, Suetonius writes that he lived modestly when he was emperor; he also provides details of the many portents that presaged his illustrious destiny. However, in the wealth of information about the personal lives and habits of the emperors, there are enough negative comments about Julius and Augustus Caesar to provide an early modern commonplacer with examples of vice if he were to look for them.

Velleius Paterculus, *Roman History*

This compendium charts the history of Rome from after the siege of Troy to the death of Augustus' wife Livia in AD 29, and was probably completed around AD 30. Velleius follows Sallust in taking the sack of Carthage in 146 BC as a watershed, after which civil war became inevitable. The work is divided into two books, the second of which is more detailed. The wars between Antony and Octavian, and the time of Augustus' principate, are treated in especial depth.

Velleius is extremely complimentary about Julius and Augustus Caesar, the founders of the empire under which he was writing in the reign of his

[4] See below, p. 102.

patron, Tiberius. He is, however, not unaware of their failings, and displays occasional scepticism towards Augustus' ability to rule well, but this is couched in conventional rhetoric, so that a superficial reading might only highlight the achievements of Augustus' reign.

* * *

Deciding which classical texts are 'histories', and who are the Roman 'historians', are no simple matters. Not all these authors wrote what we might think of as 'history', nor did they define their works thus. In the ancient world, history proper was a large-scale analysis of important events and developments, and the discussion of constitutional change over large periods of time, as exemplified by the works of Livy and Tacitus. Sallust's contextualised case-studies, strongly flavoured with moral opinion, were micro-histories, while Pliny's 'natural history' was a disciplinary melting-pot of history, geography, ethnography, and a host of other disciplines. The *Memorable Sayings and Deeds* of Valerius Maximus, omitted from the list above, was a storehouse of anecdotes about historical events and figures, intended as a kind of commonplace book for writers and orators of the first century AD, while Plutarch and Suetonius composed not history, but biography, profiling notable figures and often privileging moral commentary over historical detail. Lucan's *Pharsalia* is perhaps furthest removed from our modern understanding of 'history', written in verse rather than prose, and taking a strongly partisan stance.

Yet in the early modern period, all these could broadly be claimed as 'histories': historical writings, dealing with *historia*, narrating the deeds of men.[5] 'Literature' and 'history' were more or less synonymous, both providing moral lessons and examples on which a Christian man could draw in order to learn how to live a more virtuous life. Thus geography, military tactics, ethnography and natural philosophy were as much *historia* as the things we now call 'history', and because it is so explicitly an historical epic on the theme of a major turning point in Rome's constitutional evolution, Lucan's *Pharsalia* can similarly be called 'historical writing'. Lucan's motivation seems much the same as that of Sallust: to use historical events to illustrate the perils of moral collapse, and make clear the significance of past events for contemporary Roman society. It therefore seems necessary to include in the list of 'historians of the Roman republic' all those whom

[5] Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature. A history* (Baltimore and London 1994), pp. 441–3.

early modern men regarded as being engaged in the practice of *historia*, whatever form their writing might take; after all, when tracing an engagement with the history of Rome, all sources where readers might encounter the ancient world are instructive in helping us to reconstruct attitudes to the Roman past.

Printing and 'Popularity'

All these texts were available to the literate men and women of early modern England both directly, as printed books published either in England or in Europe, and indirectly, through the digests and compilations prepared in later antiquity and the medieval period. Anthologies and syntheses continued to be produced during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially on the continent, some designed as introductions for less advanced readers, others as scholarly works for use by the academic community. With the advent of the Renaissance and the humanist insistence on returning *ad fontes*, a concentration on the original classical sources was increasingly encouraged. The later collections were intended to be used as supplementary material, and it was the original, classical authors who formed the basis of any contemporary study of Roman history, as Erasmus himself explained:

> For in short, whence can one draw a draught so pure, so easy, and so delightful as from the very fountainhead? … First and foremost … recourse must be had to the sources themselves, that is, to the Greeks and the ancients.[6]

But the waters flowing from this fountainhead were not uniform; the representation of the Roman story in the ancient sources was far from consistent. As well as depending on the motivation of each individual reader, the way in which he interpreted the history of Rome was influenced by the editions available to him, the language in which these were printed, and the points at which new offerings entered the marketplace. Publishers and translators responded to social, political and financial pressures, which determined when a new translation was made, or when an edition was published; and the wider context in which this history then appeared might affect the way it was read. The place and time of publication, and the availability of different editions at various points in time, are

---

[6] Erasmus, *CWE* vol. 24, pp. 669, 673; Alister E. McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 42, 119, 125–7.

therefore important factors which affected how particular authors and texts were read, and how popular they became.[7] Furthermore, the importance of an author was rarely static, instead fluctuating in accordance with the dictates of fashion and politics; the respective influence of Livy and Tacitus, the two 'great' historians of Rome, is often cited as the chief example of this shifting popularity.[8]

Records of when and where the histories of the republic were produced can provide a useful comparison with the study directives and manuals on reading history, allowing us to check whether the recommended texts were as prevalent or popular as might be supposed. Peter Burke has used bibliometric statistics to trace the publication of ancient historians in print throughout Europe to 1700, and to draw conclusions about their relative popularities based on the number of editions produced; this work, and the revisions of its findings currently in progress, are important in understanding the pattern of reading Roman history in England in the Tudor and early Stuart years.[9] English presses only produced 4.5% of the total European output of printed material during the sixteenth century, not nearly enough to satisfy the literate population of the country. The rest of the books being read were imported from mainland Europe, a trade which remained strong until well into the seventeenth century, as the low number of Latin editions of classical histories printed in England testifies.

Precisely which continental Latin editions ended up in the collections of English readers, and in what quantities, is rather harder to establish, although the records of private libraries suggest an appetite for all kinds of continental literature. Certainly, the grammar schools relied upon European imports for their supplies of texts; it was only in the final three decades of the sixteenth century that any textbooks used in the English schools began to be printed domestically, and even then, these were almost exclusively reprints of works initially published on the continent.[10] An examination of the books recommended in the statutes and the

---

[7] Peter Burke,'Translating Histories' in Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia (eds), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 133–5.

[8] J.H. Whitfield, 'Livy>Tacitus' in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Iinfluences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 281; Peter Burke, 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians', *History and Theory* (1966), *passim.*

[9] Peter Burke, 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians', *History and Theory* (1966), 135–52.

[10] T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, 1944), vol. I pp. 448–9.

treatises on grammar school education, such as John Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius*, demonstrates just how dependent schoolmasters were in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart period on European printers for their textbooks.[11] The numerous works of Cicero, along with other authors such as Caesar, which Brinsley stipulated should be used to teach Latin grammar and rhetorical forms, were simply not available in the requisite quantities from English printers. Caesar's *Commentaries*, for example, were only published in single editions in England in 1585, 1590 and 1601, therefore the bulk of the books used in schools across the country must have been imported from France, Germany or the Low Countries. Indeed, it was not until after the Restoration that the balance was redressed, and English booksellers began to sell English books to English schools in any meaningful quantity.[12]

Editions Printed in England

But England did increasingly come to print some Roman histories. Performing a survey focused on the English example, similar to that conducted by Peter Burke, allows us to look more closely at the kinds of Roman history being produced and consumed in England. With growing frequency throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the classical texts recounting the fall of the republic were translated into English, and began to be published in Latin.

The table is qualitatively rather than quantitatively useful, but clearly demonstrates the rise in production of classical texts on Roman history by the English presses from the mid-Elizabethan years to the time of the Civil Wars.[13] Some trends in printing habits can be identified, most notably the

---

[11] John Brinsley, *Ludus literarius: or, the grammar schoole* (London, 1612), *STC* 3768.

[12] Foster Watson, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: their curriculum and practice* (Cambridge, 1908), pp. 368–9.

[13] Publication data are problematic for statistical analysis. The number of editions produced may not necessarily be proportional to the number of copies in circulation, and therefore to the popularity of a work, though it is the best indication available to us. Since print runs are unknown, it cannot be stated with any confidence that reprints and reissues within a calendar year are indicative of the seller running out. Nor does the table list details of all the impressions of a work; sometimes several imprints were produced in one year, and these are given in the *STC* as 'a' and 'b' variants of a text. Finally, since no information on the size of editions is available, the exact number of these texts in circulation cannot be stated with any certainty. Peter Burke has posited a figure of 1000 volumes on average per edition across the period 1450–1700; this is the best indicator available. Burke, 'A Survey', p. 136. This is supported by Robert Allan Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: culture and education 1500–1800* (Harlow, 2002), p. 175: "the average print run was probably about 1,000."

Table 1. Classical works of Roman history detailing the ending of the Republic, published in England, to 1640

Author, *title*	Date	STC no.	Language	Additional detail
Appian, *Roman History*	1578	713	English	Part I, trans. William Barker, with a new continuation; at least one other imprint in this year.
	1578	713.5	English	Part II, trans. William Barker
Caesar, *Commentaries on the Civil Wars;*	1530	4337	English	*Commentaries* 'as much as co[n]cernyth thys realm of England'
Commentaries on the Gallic Wars	1565	4335	English	*Gallic Wars,* trans. Arthur Golding
	1585	4332	Latin	*Commentaries*
	1590	4333	Latin	*Commentaries*
	1590	4336	English	*Gallic wars,* trans. Arthur Golding
	1600	7488	English	*Commentaries* books I-V trans. Clement Edmondes, with advice for modern warfare
	1601	4334	Latin	As 4332
	1604	7490	English	Clement Edmondes, observations on *Commentaries*: includes substantial text from the commentaries
	1609	7491	English	As 7490
	1640	4338	English	Abridgement of *Commentaries* with modern warfare treatise, originally by Duke of Rohan, trans. I.C.
Dio, *Roman History*	–	–	–	–
Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*	1600	16613	English	Trans. Philemon Holland, appended to his translation of Livy

(*Continued*)

Table 1. (*Cont.*)

Author, *title*	Date	STC no.	Language	Additional detail
	1619	11103	English	Trans. Edmund Bolton
	1621	11104	English	As 11103
	1631	11101	Latin	Ed. Stadius
	1636	11105	English	As 11103
	1638	11102	Latin	As 11101
Lucan, *Pharsalia*	1589	16882	Latin	Ed. Gryphius
	1600	16883.5	English	Book I, trans. Christopher Marlowe
	1600	17415	English	As 16883.5, appended to *Hero and Leander*
	1614	16884	English	Trans. Sir Arthur Gorges; another imprint issued in this year
	1618	16883	Latin	Marginal notes by Thomas Farnaby
	1626	16886	English	Books I, II and III, trans. Thomas May
	1627	16887	English	All ten books, trans. May
	1631	16888	English	As 16887
	1635	16889	English	As 16887
Pliny the Elder, *History of the World*	1566	20031	English	Trans. from the French by I. A.
	1585	20032	English	As 20031
	1592	20033	English	As 20031
	1601	20029	English	Trans. Philemon Holland; volume I.
	1601	20029.5	English	Trans. Philemon Holland; volume II.
	1634	20030	English	As 20029.5
	1635	20030a	English	As 20029.5
Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*	1579	20065	English	Trans. from Amyot's French edition by Thomas North
	1579	20066	English	As 20065; augmented with lives of Hannibal and Scipio.
	1595	20067	English	As 20065

(*Continued*)

Table 1. (*Cont.*)

Author, *title*	Date	STC no.	Language	Additional detail
	1603	20068	English	As 20065; extra lives added, including that of Caesar Augustus, using unspecified sources from the French of Simon Goulart. At least two other impressions in this year.
	1612	20069	English	As 20068
	1631	20070	English	As 20068
Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	1569	21622.2	Latin	Ed. Jacobus à Cruce (Bononiensis), with *Jugurtha*
	1573	21622.6	Latin	Ed. Manutius, with Cicero *In Catilinam* and related fragments; another imprint in this year.
	1601	21622	Latin	Ed. Petrus Ciacconius (Toletanus)
	1609	21625	English	Trans. Thomas Heywood
	1615	21623	Latin	As 21622
	1629	21624	English	Trans. William Crosse
Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*	1606	23423	English	Trans. and annotated by Philemon Holland
	1606	23422	English	As 23423, but with additional indices
Velleius Paterculus, *Roman History*	1632	24633	English	Trans. Sir Robert le Grys from Gruter's edition

lack of printing of several authors. Appian was not popular with English printers in the seventeenth century. This does not necessarily mean that he was not popular with readers, who may have acquired their Latin editions from the Continent, but it is obvious that English publishers saw little reason to produce many copies of his work in the early Stuart years. The same is true of Velleius Paterculus, whose *Roman History* was not

printed in England until 1632. Dio's *Roman History*, too, was available in England only in imported European editions. Given that he is consistently recommended in study directives, we can assume that imports were readily available. Philip Sidney told Edward Denny to read Dio:

> You should begin with Philip Melanchthon's Chronology, so to Justine, then to Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curtius, Polybius, Livy, Dionysius, Salust, Caesar, Dion, Tacitus, & then ye Emperor's Lives.[14]

Over 70 years later, Thomas Barlow's directions for students advocated Dio as a source to be used for filling in the *lacunae* in Livy:

> Farther supplyes of ye forementioned loss may be had from ye first & second books of Polybius, from Appian of Alexandria in Punicis et Illyricis, from Salust, Caesar's commentaries, Dion Cassius & Velleius Paterculus.[15]

Other authors, however, were a more attractive business venture, and English stationers printed their works in both Latin and English, though not necessarily consistently throughout the period. Caesar was most popular in the 1590s and early 1600s, after which the production of editions decreased. Latin editions of Sallust's monographs were printed earlier than texts by most other authors; Lucan, Sallust and Florus were popular in English throughout the first half of the seventeenth century. In the case of the two last, this is undoubtedly because they were accessible to a variety of readers on account of their brevity, and popular for a similar reason. They were an ideal introduction to Roman history, even more so perhaps in the vernacular than in Latin; Florus, especially, provided a summary of the whole of Roman history until the time of Augustus in a comparatively concise format. Lucan's growing popularity can be identified with increasing concerns over constitutional issues during the reigns of James and Charles; it is perhaps not insignificant that May's translation and vehemently anti-Caesarean, republican continuation should be reprinted so often as Caesar's own popularity fell into decline.[16] Lucan is strongly Pompeian; although a correlation is impossible to prove, it is striking that

---

[14] Bodleian, Dm. MS d. 152, fol. 4r.

[15] Bodleian, Rawl. MS D. 188, fol. 12r-13r.

[16] David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric and politics 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 39–44. Norbrook links Lucan with the development of a heightened sense of conflict between king and parliament. He cites the appearance of Gorges' English translation of Lucan during the fraught year 1614, the same year in which Ralegh's *History of the World* was recalled for 'irreverence towards monarchy', and the publication of May in the mid-1620s, when elements in parliament were agitating for an end to pacific foreign policy (pp. 41, 43).

during the years in which English publishing of Lucan was at its height, no editions of Caesar's own works were produced in England. We must assume, since Caesar was still being used in the grammar schools, that this market continued to be served by continental stationers; perhaps here, then, is an indication that English publishing trends were very strongly related to the non-academic market, and that private, rather than scholarly, readers were the primary consumers of this domestically-produced classical material.

Other Forms of Roman History

The printing of Roman history in England during the early modern period can, at best, be described as patchy, and accounts for only a small fraction of the works on the ending of the republic that were being read and studied. Moreover, the absence of these English editions from the surviving evidence of scholarly collections and school reading lists points to their being produced for a more diverse audience than those engaged in formal education. The vernacular editions being produced undoubtedly found a market, otherwise their printing would not have been a viable concern; this market was not, on the whole, that of the scholarly community.

For classical texts were not only read in an educational context. Ownership and reading of works of Roman history was popular among all the literate classes, whether it was in Greek, Latin, English translation, or through other supplementary texts, and a variety of alternative books appeared through which readers might engage with the Roman past.[17] Dictionaries and handbooks such as Thomas Goodwin's *An English exposition of the Romane antiquities* (1614) were published frequently during the early modern period.[18] Goodwin, a former master of Abingdon School, initially produced his work as a school textbook. It became hugely popular, appearing with striking regularity in twenty-two editions before the end of the seventeenth century, suggesting an audience beyond merely the grammar schools. The volume's appeal is explained by its full title, "An English exposition of the Romane antiquities, wherein many Romane and English offices are paralleld and divers obscure phrases explained"; it provided a gloss of the offices, places and terms encountered in classical texts

[17] Todd, *Christian Humanism*, p. 94.

[18] Thomas Goodwin, *Romanae historiae anthologia An English exposition of the Romane antiquities,* (Oxford, 1614), *STC* 11958. Similar works include John Rider's *Riders dictionarie, augmented* (London, 1606), *STC* 21032, which appeared in eleven editions in the seventeenth century.

on ancient Rome, and thus proved indispensible to the reader who sought to understand fully the context of Roman history. Goodwin's *Exposition* was also recommended by Richard Holdsworth to his students as reading for February afternoons in their first year. It was to be read "before you come to other Latin authors, as being very useful in the understanding of them", and would reduce the need for commentaries on other Roman texts, "this being as it were a general comment to them all."[19]

Compendia and collections of various kinds containing excerpts or phrases translated from classical authors were also popular. Through books of this kind, classical ideas and characters were disseminated widely, to a more diverse audience than that reading the original works by the ancient historians. These tended to favour the particular over the general, citing snippets from classical authors in the service of a broadly educational agenda. Thus Richard Brathwaite's *The Scholler's Medley* (1614) used history, including that of Rome, in fragmented pieces, as something which "truly demonstrates the life of the person, characters his vertues, or vices".[20] He quoted Caesar on Pompey to demonstrate martial management, and contrasted Catiline and Jugurtha, Caesar and Nero to show the inclinations of different leaders of men.[21] Similarly, George Whetstone's *English myrror* (1586) harnessed historical examples to essays on contemporary concerns, using a comparison between Caesar and Augustus, for example, to illustrate the need for peace and civil concord.[22] Illustrating his work with precedents from a variety of sources, he intended it to be:

> a fortris against envy, builded upon the counsels of sacred Scripture, lawes of sage philosophers, and pollicies of well governed common weales: wherein every estate may see the dignities, the true office and cause of disgrace of his vocation. A worke safely, and necessarie to be read of everie good subject.[23]

Collections like those by Brathwaite and Whetstone did not often cite their primary sources, nor did they present 'history' as such. Rather, they

---

[19] Holdsworth, 'Directions' in Fletcher, *John Milton*, vol. II, pp. 623–64.

[20] Richard Brathwaite, *The schollers medley, or, an intermixt discourse vpon historicall and poeticall relations* (London, 1614), *STC* 3583, sig. D3r.

[21] Ibid., 'vicisses, si te vicisse, cognovisses' i.e. 'he had conquered, if he had knowne when he had conquered', sig. E1v; sig. K1r.

[22] George Whetstone, *The English mirror. A regard wherein al estates may behold the conquests of enuy* (London, 1586), *STC* 25336, sig. G8r: in a chapter about the 'renowne of peacemakers', and after a lengthy list of Rome's troubles in the years of the civil wars, he concludes that 'they never attributed so much honor to *Cesar* for conquering of kingdoms, as they gave reverence to *Octauian,* for determining of y^{e} ciuil broiles.'

[23] Ibid., title page.

utilised examples taken from a number of authors and with a wide range of opinions on the characters in Rome's history, as best suited their own purposes, examples identical to those excerpted by students in the course of commonplacing activities.

Vernacular Translations

Throughout the Elizabethan and early Stuart era, there was a growing interest in Roman history, not only in the schools and universities, but among wider sectors of literate society. It also seems reasonable to suppose that those who had studied the ancient sources formally might continue to read classical material throughout their lives, either in Latin or in translation, for the morals and examples they might find there. A larger proportion of book users could read English than could read Latin or Greek to the standard required to appreciate the classical authors in the ancient languages, and the gentleman who had received his university learning many years previously might choose, for the sake of convenience, to use a translation or a digest rather than return to the original. English translations provided a more accessible form of classical history, more pertinent to the circumstances in which it was being read, and a short cut to learning, leading to a growing popular demand for such works throughout the seventeenth century. Indeed, from 1550 until the middle of the following century, nearly all the classical authors were made available in English for the first time.[24]

Although we cannot know exactly how many readers owned and used the translations of Roman history, nor exactly what manner of men and women read them, we can be certain that through the medium of translation, the Roman history of the ending of the republic reached a wider audience than those educated in the grammar schools and universities.[25] It was for those lacking the time, ability or inclination to digest Europe's classical learning in the original language that the translations were produced. Whether as new literary creations or as faithful reproductions, translations indicate a keen interest in the classics and in this particular period of Roman history. They also formed the means by which the classical literary culture of early modern England

[24] Skinner, *Visions of Politics II*, p. 313.
[25] Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 314.

became increasingly diffuse and pervaded ever broader sectors of literate society.

The importance of translations of the classics becomes especially clear if the publishing data of works of Roman history are examined in terms of language. The following two tables present more clearly the number of histories printed in England, in both Latin and the vernacular, highlighting the comparatively tiny number of scholarly Latin editions and the wealth of English translations being produced. None were printed in classical Greek.

Two chief conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, English translations of the classics did not appear until rather later than in other European countries; it was not until the 1630s, for example, that Velleius Paterculus and Pliny the Elder became available in English translation. Secondly, England printed far more editions of the Roman historians in the vernacular than in Latin, reflecting the trend in publication more generally. The translation of the classics into modern languages was an activity popular across the whole of early modern Europe: Peter Burke has shown that between 1450–1700, 2084 editions of Greek and Roman histories were published in Europe, and of these, 793 were translations into the vernacular.[26]

Table 2. Latin editions of Roman late-republican history published in England, to 1640

Date	Author and text	*STC* no.
1569	Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	21622.2
1573	Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	21622.6
1585	Caesar, *Commentaries*	4332
1589	Lucan, *Pharsalia*	16882
1590	Caesar, *Commentaries*	4333
1601	Caesar, *Commentaries*	4334
	Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	21622
1615	Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	21623
1618	Lucan, *Pharsalia*	16883
1631	Florus, *Epitome*	11101
1638	Florus, *Epitome*	11102

[26] Burke, 'A Survey', p. 138.

Table 3. English translations of of Roman late-republican history published in England, to 1640

Date	Author and text	Translator	*STC* no.
1578	Appian, *Roman History,* Part I	Barker	713
	Appian, *Roman History,* Part II + continuation	Barker	713.5
1579	Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*	North	20065
	Plutarch, *Parallel Lives,* with additions	North	20066
1590	Caesar, *Gallic Wars*	Golding	4336
1595	Plutarch, *Parallel Lives,* with additions	North	20067
1600	Caesar, *Commentaries,* with observations	Edmondes	7488
	Florus, *Epitome*	Holland	16613
	Lucan, *Pharsalia,* Book I	Marlowe	16883.5
	Lucan, *Pharsalia,* Book I, with *Hero and Leander*	Marlowe	17415
1603	Plutarch, *Parallel Lives,* with additions including the life of Augustus	North	20068
1604	Caesar, *Commentaries,* with observations	Edmondes	7490
1606	Suetonius *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*	Holland	23423
	Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars,* with extra indices	Holland	23422
1609	Caesar's *Commentaries* with observations	Edmondes	7491
	Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	Heywood	21625
1612	Plutarch, *Parallel Lives,* with additions including the life of Augustus	North	20069
1614	Lucan, *Pharsalia*	Gorges	16884
1619	Florus, *Epitome*	Bolton	11103
1621	Florus, *Epitome*	Bolton	11104
1626	Lucan, *Pharsalia,* Books I, II and III	May	16886
1627	Lucan, *Pharsalia*	May	16887
1629	Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	Crosse	21624
1631	Lucan, *Pharsalia*	May	16888
	Plutarch, *Parallel Lives,* with additions including the life of Augustus	North	20070
1632	Velleius Paterculus, *Roman History*	le Grys	24633
1634	Pliny the Elder, *History of the World*	Holland	20030
1635	Lucan, *Pharsalia*	May	16889
1636	Florus, *Epitome*	Bolton	11105
1640	Caesar, *Commentaries*	I. C.	4338

When all forms of writing are taken into account, the rest of Europe printed roughly the same proportion of titles in Latin as in the vernacular; England, on the other hand, printed over five times as many English translations as Latin titles.[27] As the tables show, only eleven Latin editions of late-republican histories were produced in England before 1640, by four authors: Caesar, Sallust, Florus and Lucan. Of these few Latin publications, all except the Lucan were standard textbooks, of the kind recommended for use in schools. In contrast, a far wider range of authors were translated into English, and their works were printed with much greater frequency.

Translations were a prime commodity in the English printing trade. One in eight books listed in the *English Short Title Catalogue* is a translation, and most of these are translations from classical Latin or Greek into the vernacular.[28] The later Elizabethan and early Stuart years were those in which the process of translation from the Latin began to comprise a significant part of the publishing trade, and translations became more widely read. Certain authors are notable for the frequency with which their works were produced. Translations of Lucan's *Pharsalia* appeared at regular intervals in the early seventeenth century, four editions of May's translation appearing in the 1620s and 1630s. Florus was popular in English from the end of the sixteenth century onwards, reflecting his prominence in the educational system, and suggesting the spread of ideas about Roman history from the elite universities into more mixed classical literary culture. Between 1570 and 1640, eight authors' works on the period of Roman history covering the ending of the republic were published in English, and only Cassius Dio remained untranslated. Of these eight, nearly all the translations were effected within this same period; only Golding's *Caesar*, first published in 1565, was the product of a previous decade. Earlier translations into English are uncommon: for example, the only previous example of any of Sallust's work into English was a version of the *Jugurtha* translated in the 1520s by Alexander Barclay.[29]

---

[27] Andrew Pettegree, 'Centre and Periphery in the European Book World', *TRHS* Volume 18 (December 2008), pp. 106, 118.

[28] Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 314.

[29] Sallust, *Here begynneth the famous cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had against Iugurth usurper of the kyngdome of Numidy. which cronycle is compyled in latyn by the renowmed romayne Salust. And translated into englysshe by syr Alexander Barclay preest, at co*[*m*]*maundement of the right hye and mighty prince: Thomas duke of Northfolke* (London, 1522), *STC* 21626. The work appeared again in 1525 and 1557; the 1557 edition also contains *The Catilinarian Conspiracie*, translated by Thomas Paynell, but this is taken from Costanzo Felici's account, rather than the original Sallust.

With the exception of Golding's *Caesar*, which in any case was published for the final time in 1590, the few translations that had been made prior to 1570 did not appear in second or third editions during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century; rather, new translations were prepared and published.

This was almost certainly due to the changing nature of classical translation toward the end of the reign of Elizabeth. Until the later sixteenth century, the more skilled translators of the classics, both in England and abroad, closely paraphrased their sources. North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives* prefaces the text with Amyot's letter to his readers, explaining his aims in translating the Greek into French:

> I beseech the readers to consider, that the office of a fit translater, consisteth not onely in the faithfull expressing of his authors meaning, but also in a certaine resembling and shadowing out of the forme of his style and the manner of his speaking.[30]

The degree to which North's English version, taken from the French which was derived from the Greek, resembled Plutarch's original work must be questionable, given the multiple stages of linguistic transformation to which it was subjected. Nonetheless, the intention to remain close in style to the original is clear, and in prefixing Amyot's statement about his translational objectives to his own work, North aligns himself with the same school of translation. Golding's rendering of Caesar's *Commentaries* is another example of this faithful approach. Translating Caesar phrase for phrase, he expands upon the rather compact Latin and renders it into idiomatic, readable English, but adheres closely to Caesar's terse, succinct prose style.[31]

It would not be true to say that after 1570, translators abandoned all sense of matching their style to that of the original. The three translators of Lucan in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Marlowe, Gorges and May, all responded to the verse original by translating likewise, and Marlowe at least translated "line for line".[32] Mary Sidney, translating Garnier's *Antonie* from French into English, worked almost word for word,

---

[30] Plutarch, *The lives of the noble Grecians and Romanes* (London, 1579), *STC* 20065, sig. *8r.

[31] James Wortham, 'Arthur Golding and the Translation of Prose', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Aug., 1949), p. 350.

[32] *Lucans first booke translated line for line, by Chr. Marlow.* (London, 1600), *STC* 16883.5.

producing a stilted English poem because of her fidelity to the French.[33] It is clear, however, that there was a change in attitudes to translation during the later decades of Elizabeth's reign. As far as prose was concerned, the 1570s saw the beginning of a tradition of 'expanded translation', a strongly rhetorical style with less concern for reproducing in the vernacular the idiom of the original Latin.[34] Modern theory holds that that translation, for a good translator, is never a simple process. It is a creative, compositional act of writing, not simply the glossing of a text in another language, and it involves a considerable degree of 'ownership' of the text by the translator, who assumes some of the literary authority of the original author as he transfers the words into a new linguistic context.[35]

In the later sixteenth century, English writers began to move closer to this kind of conception of translation. Increasingly, the Roman histories that were translated into English formed part of a complex communicational process, the "translingual act of transcoding cultural material."[36] By the seventeenth century, translators of classical works clearly made the texts their own, freely admitting this in their prefaces, and so the classics often became Anglo-centric, and England-specific.[37] Sir Robert le Grys, translator of Velleius Paterculus, stated that he did not feel "obliged to a literall and gramaticall construction."[38] Similarly, Clement Edmondes, in his address to the readers of his edition of Caesar's commentaries, explained that he had "not tied my selfe to a litterall translation of the history, but followed the sense," though this was more through modesty and "not daring to make any resemblance of the sweetness of that stile" than from any deeper-held notion of creativity.[39]

---

[33] Mary Sidney, *The Tragedie of Antonie, Doone into English by the Countesse of Pembroke* (London, 1595), *STC* 11623.

[34] Wortham, 'Arthur Golding', pp. 340–8.

[35] See, for example, Wortham, 'Arthur Golding', p. 344; John Guillory, *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton, and literary history* (New York, 1983), pp. vii-ix.; cf. John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 1–3. I do not propose to consider here the relationship between translations and politics. This question has been discussed by George Hunter in his 'A Roman Thought', pp. 97–8. He suggests that the 'major' historians, Livy and Tacitus, remain untranslated until the end of the Elizabethan period because they are essentially 'un-Tudor' in their republican social context, and that this inhibited contemporaries from making them more widely available in their entirety until republican concerns came to the fore in the late sixteenth century.

[36] Douglas Howland, 'The Predicament of Ideas in Culture: translation and historiography', *History and Theory* (Feb., 2003), p. 45.

[37] See, for example, Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions,* 314.

[38] *Velleius Paterculus his Romane historie in two bookes* trans. Robert le Grys (London, 1632), *STC* 24633, sig. A7r.

[39] *Observations upon the five first bookes of Caesars commentaries*, trans. Clement Edmondes (London, 1600), *STC* 7488, sig. *2v.

While this may have increased the readability of the works on Roman history, their pertinence to the contemporary political context, and thus their wider appeal, there were elements in society who resented this expansion of the literate 'franchise'. Writing about the benefits of translation, Degory Wheare noted the intellectual snobbery of certain educated men:

> But I must not expect this will please all. There is a sort of Morose Gentlemen in the World, who, having at the price of many a sore Lashment, possess'd themselves of the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues, would now very fain Monopolize all the Learning in them… …being now as I said in possession, they are very much displeased to see their pretious treasures made cheap, and exposed to the eyes of all that can read *English*. And whoever contributes to this invasion of their Privileges (as they think them) is sure to be branded as an Enemy to Learning and Learned Men, and a betrayer of the *Muses* and *Graces,* and a thousand fine things, to the scorn of the vulgar.[40]

This reluctance to share learning is a very different cause for caution from the fears about the dangers of history; Wheare's "morose gentlemen" are jealous of their privileges and resent sharing the classics with the literate among the masses.

Paratextual Material

There was, however, another reason why translations were not universally popular among all reading classes, as Wheare goes on to suggest:

> Men of extraordinary industry and curiosity, will be desirous to see these Authours in their Originals, and will be as little satisfied with the *English* Translations of the *Roman* Authours, as they are with the *Latin* of the *Greek* Authours, which have not been the less, but the more read (for being Translated in *Latin*) even in their proper Language.[41]

Important and influential as translations undoubtedly became towards the end of the sixteenth century, the more academically-inclined would continue to prefer good Latin editions, prepared by continental scholars. These 'good' editions were required to explicate a text thoroughly, so that every scrap of learning might be derived from it. The quality of editions was a matter of great concern to those of a learned disposition: Francis Bacon, for example, dedicating the second book of his *Advancement of*

[40] Wheare, *Method*, sig. A3v-4r.
[41] Ibid., sig. A4v-5r.

Learning to James I, called for "new editions of authors, with more correct impressions, more faithful translations, more profitable glosses, more diligent annotations and the like."[42] The classical histories recounting the fall of the Roman republic were no exception, and several of the editions published in this period demonstrate the recognition of editors and publishers that additional material was required in order to make the learning contained within the text easily available to the reader.

Thus the 1585 Latin edition of Caesar's *Commentaries* contains not only an index of names to help the reader locate pertinent sections of the text, but annotated maps and diagrams. Accompanying Caesar's description of the bridges and forts he built are drawings with explanatory notes, that the reader might better visualise Caesar's skilful engineering.[43] The acclaimed Latin editions of Florus's *Epitome*, printed in England in 1631 and 1638, is that of Johannes Stadius; the first half of the volume is Florus's text as edited by Stadius, and the second half comprises brief summaries of the argument of each chapter followed by Stadius' commentary. The latter provides alternative authorities for factual details, gives corroborating or deviating sources, shows how Florus derived his information, and explains the meaning of local customs, and so forth. At the back of the book, as well as a comprehensive index, is a chronology of the events contained within the work, for easy reference and to enable the reader to navigate the history.[44] Another example of diligent annotation is Farnaby's Lucan; indeed, this is so heavy with additional material that Lucan's verse is almost lost amid a sea of marginal notes. The top part of each page nearest the centre of the book is printed with the Latin verse in italics; dense footnotes surround it, printed on the outside edge and bottom third of each page, in tiny, non-italic font. Variant words from other sources are given, as are other authorities and numerous kinds of supplementary information.[45]

These commentaries and glosses did more than provide additional information for the reader. Rather than merely explaining the linguistic complexities, 'shutting down' or limiting the possibilities of a body of writing, marginalia and other printed paratexts could erode the authority of a text, 'opening it up' to alternative interpretations that were determined by the historical context of both the author and the reader.[46]

---

42 Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*, ed. G. W. Kitchin (London, 2001) p. 63.

43 Caesar, *Commentaries* (London, 1585), *STC* 4332, for example sig. *3v, the bridge at Avaricum.

44 Florus, *Epitome* (Oxford, 1631), *STC* 11101.

45 Lucan, *Pharsalia* (London, 1618), *STC* 16883.

46 William W. E. Slights, *Managing Readers: printed marginalia in English Renaissance books* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2001), p. 157.

Meric Casaubon, in the address accompanying his edition of Florus's *Epitome* published in 1658, tells of a printed edition of Florus which contains particularly political additions. He relates how, in the process of editing the text:

> having a desire to furnish my self with as many different Editions of Florus as came in my way: among others, I lighted upon that of *Leyden, Ex officina Adriani Wyngaerden*, an. D. 1648.[47]

Casaubon had two objections to this edition. Firstly, it purported to be a scholarly work and was advertised with the great names on the title page, such as Gruter and Salmasius. In fact, it was nothing of the sort, being a poor edition by one Mr N. Blanckardus. This was not the only crime of which the edition is guilty; for, where Casaubon expected to see explanations of how and why the text had been altered or corrected:

> instead of that, you may find perchance a long story of the *ligue* of *France* against *Henry* the III. or how the Palatinat was lost, and King *James* deluded by the Spaniard.[48]

Had the edition been textually sound, this would not have been so grave a failing, as Casaubon goes on to explain:

> I do not except against as of it self altogether impertinent or improper: but I doe not think the Margins of Books very proper for such politick Discourses and Speculations; when the Text it self is left in such obscurity and ambiguity.[49]

The translation of Florus by Edmund Bolton also contains marginal notes, but these are of the more scholarly kind, of which Casaubon would have approved. Bolton provides minimal extra material, only explaining necessary points, such as how pagan religions had different attitudes towards suicide from those of the Christian tradition, which is why suicide is positively portrayed in Florus. He also supplies the Latin phrase in the margin when he wishes to provide justification for his translation, allowing readers to consider the grammatical structure of the original text; thus, for example, beside a sentence about Caesar's wars in Spain which is translated as, "In the meanwhile by stopping the stream, which in the springtime used to swell," Bolton notes also "*verni fluminis abundatione*."[50]

---

[47] *The history of the Romans, By Lucius Florus, from the foundation of Rome unto Caesar Augustus* (London, 1658) Wing F1370, fol. B5r.

[48] Ibid., sig. B6r.

[49] Idem.

[50] *The Roman histories of Lucius Iulius Florus ... Translated into English* (London, 1619), *STC* 11103, sig. S12v.

Other kinds of additional material are even more open in their attempt to influence the reader's experience of the text. This is especially apparent in Clement Edmondes' Caesar, where passages of Caesar's prose are translated and then followed by observations upon the messages contained within the text as far as they relate to Edmondes' confessed agenda of providing examples to improve the military of his own day. A passage from the *Gallic Wars* describing Cicero besieged by the Nervii provides details of the ramparts and ditches of his defences, and depicts the heroic Romans continuing to fight even when burning arrows shot from siege towers set fire to the thatch roofs within the camp. Edmondes follows this with the observation, 'This one example may serve to shew the excellencie of the Romaine discipline' and then goes on to explain how a modern commander should inculcate a similar spirit of bravery and fortitude among his own troops.[51] The reader is left in no doubt whatsoever as to the moral he is intended to draw from the translation, for Edmondes spells it out clearly and precisely.

Edmondes had a didactic purpose in augmenting Caesar's text, believing that soldiers would learn much from reading history as well as from their personal experience of war. Other additional material had a less transparent objective, shaping the reading experience of the reader without directly stating that this was its aim. Prefatory material to some extent directed the ways in which a reader approached a work, while marginal notes might suggest interpretations for particular moments within the text. This could be motivated by a desire to prevent readers from interpreting texts in 'unsafe' ways, or might be because a text was produced at a point in time when it held increased relevance.[52] Edmondes' Caesar again provides a good example of a text that was moulded in this way. Before the main body of the text, several dedicatory verses are included, written by notable literary and historical figures of the day. A Latin verse by William Camden is followed by one in English by Samuel Daniel, in which Caesar is referred to as "the Man of men"; Joshua Sylvester's offering holds Prince Henry up as "a Caesar of our own."[53] Two epigrams from Ben Jonson praise Caesar, calling him "Master of the Warre," who "wrote with the same spirit that he fought."[54] Here are clear directions for the reader to look for the

---

[51] Edmondes, *Observations*, sig. Bbiir.

[52] Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 88, 94.

[53] Edmondes, *Observations*, sig. A3r.

[54] Ibid., sig. A3v.

heroic in Caesar's commentaries, and to read Caesar as an exemplar of manly virtues, a rightful ruler linked by Sylvester with the Stuart heir-apparent. There is no hint whatsoever that Caesar may have been a ruthlessly ambitious man who exploited his martial abilities to gain unconstitutional control of Rome, as there is in some of the Roman histories written in the early Stuart years.

* * *

Readers' responses to the ending of the Roman republic were shaped according to the experiences of the readers themselves, and the men who mediated the classical learning to them: the translators, editors and booksellers. By means of transformative translational techniques, in the paratexts surrounding scholarly and less learned editions, and through the various availabilities of classical texts circulating in different languages, the reception of Rome's constitutional struggles could be altered and directed. Men studying at the universities relied largely upon imported, original-language editions of Roman histories, while English translations or domestically-produced textbooks were probably used more by a lay audience, and by younger scholars in the grammar schools who were supposed to read them as aids to the classical authors. These different editions determined the precise view of ancient Rome that particular readers received, and it is to the nature of these readers that we must now turn our attention.

CHAPTER THREE

EVIDENCE OF READING: CATALOGUES AND INVENTORIES

It is easy to discern a growing interest in producing classical texts during the early modern period; it is rather harder to judge the extent of their readership. This question of readers is crucial to any study of reception, for until we know who interacted with which books, where, and when, we cannot begin to imagine how they might have done so. The main sources of evidence for book ownership correspond with the groups of people who might be expected to be reading histories of the ending of the Roman republic, that is, students and fellows at the universities, scholarly readers who might be said to be reading 'professionally'.[1] These records provide some clue as to which of the available texts were being bought by the academic community, and how they were being read, for within the academic context, the practice of reading could be performed in a variety of settings: in private studies or in libraries, in groups reading aloud together, or silently and alone.[2]

Inventories

The contents of private collections of books are most usually accessible to us in the form of inventories, giving a picture of a man's library at the time of his death, or through wills stipulating the bequest of books. *Private Libraries in Renaissance England*, edited by R. J. Fehrenbach and Elisabeth Leedham-Green, documents most of the extant evidence of such records of book ownership, but few inventories survive detailing the library contents of men unconnected with larger institutions.[3] The creation and preservation of the inventories of individuals, be they country gentlemen, city merchants or members of the clergy, are so imperfect and imprecise

---

[1] This, then, is primarily a discussion of 'reception' history, as defined by Jonathan Rose, rather than the history of 'audience' or the 'common reader'; Jonathan Rose, 'Rereading the English Common Reader: a preface to the history of audiences' in David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (eds), *The Book History Reader* (London, 2002), pp. 324–39.

[2] Roger Chartier, 'Labourers and Voyagers: from the text to the reader', *Diacritics* vol. 22, no. 2 (1992), pp. 49–51.

[3] R. J. Fehrenbach and Elisabeth Leedham-Green (eds), *PLRE* (Binghamton, 1992-).

that the only really useful material is that reflecting the book-buying habits of the members of Oxford and Cambridge.

The chief repositories of inventories containing information about books are the Chancellors' Courts of the two universities, which held the records in order to grant probate for members of the university and other privileged persons or associates who died while in residence. These included staff and servants of the universities and colleges, including printers, booksellers and binders, who matriculated but took no degree.[4] Stationers in Oxford and Cambridge supplied the university membership with academic texts, and their inventories provide evidence of the multiple copies of certain common works which they stocked for this purpose: an anonymous Cambridge stationer's legacy included "3 Salustius" and "2 commentarii Caesaris London" when he died in 1588–9.[5] While the lack of detail makes it impossible to draw conclusions about this edition of Sallust, the Caesar must be the Latin edition of the *Commentaries* published in London in 1585, and this entry represents the only certain ownership of this edition to be found anywhere in the extant sources. The association between stationers and the universities was a strong one, expressed not only through business transactions but in bequests after the stationer's death, as the will of the Oxford stationer, Joseph Barnes, proved in January 1620, testifies. Although he left his books to his widow, he made donations to the libraries of Oxford with which he had been connected, and which had bought his wares during his lifetime:

> And unto the universitie librarie in Oxforde five poundes and to my loving neighboures of Brasenose College to their libraries five markes. And to my loving landlordes of Magdalene College to their librarie five markes.[6]

Inventories are particularly valuable in showing who read which works of Roman history from the later sixteenth century onward, as books became less expensive and easier to purchase. Colleges did not usually buy cheap textbooks or pocket editions for their libraries, so members of the universities bought their own. The evidence is somewhat heavily biased in the direction of the older scholars resident in the cities, since

---

[4] N. R. Ker, 'The Provision of Books' in James McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. III: the collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 467–72.

[5] Elisabeth Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: book lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court probate inventories in the Tudor and Stuart periods* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. xviii, 411–13.

[6] Alphabetical transcript of Oxford University Chancellor's Court Inventories containing references to books, made by Walter Mitchell, OUA, GG 122r.

junior members were less likely to die while in residence, and therefore details of their libraries rarely appear in the court records. But the books owned by the older and more senior fellows indicate what the discerning scholar was willing to pay for, and what he kept in his private study, as opposed to the material he consulted in the college or central university library. The books found in inventories therefore represent the material being consumed in a personal space, alone and in private, or being read out loud in the company of a small group of students or fellow academics, practices of interpretation necessarily slightly different from those occurring in the more 'public' space of the library, with books still chained in place well into the seventeenth century.

Inventories cannot, however, reflect the habits of book-sharing and inheritance among members of the university. Undergraduates certainly shared books, while tutors quite often owned several copies either to lend or sell to undergraduates, a habit that might explain the instances of multiple copies in some inventories. John Whitgift's tutorial account book, which he kept at Trinity College, Cambridge in the 1570s, demonstrates this practice of buying books with the intention of selling them on to students. Among other titles, he procured and sold copies of Caesar's *Commentaries* for Antony and Francis Bacon, William Fowkes and Richard Therold. He also sold a copy of Valerius Maximus's *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium* to John Watton, and an edition of Sallust to the Bacons, whose book-sharing is further evidenced by the joint account they held with Whitgift.[7]

Quite apart from this difficulty, it is by no means certain that record-keeping at the universities was always reliable and efficient. Not all the books belonging to all those who died under the jurisdiction of the Chancellor's courts were recorded, particularly from the later sixteenth century onward. With the vast increase in the number of books owned by individuals, the makers of inventories increasingly failed to name the books in the possession of the deceased, rather entering only the total number of volumes owned. In the 1570s, fellows who had been in post for approximately six years usually kept about one hundred books in their personal libraries; by the late 1580s, senior fellows each owned hundreds of books, and even undergraduates had libraries as large as those of fellows had been half a century earlier.[8] Even when the title of an individual

[7] Philip Gaskell, 'Books Bought by Whitgift's pupils in the 1570s', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, vol. 7, no. 3 (1979), pp. 51–3.

[8] Ker, 'The provision of books', pp. 467–72; Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*, p. x.

book was recorded, the exact copy is almost always impossible to identify, since date and place of publication are rarely listed, and size and value are scant indicators of the edition to which a book belonged, given the vast quantity of books in circulation. Moreover, the quality of the evidence deteriorates after the end of the reign of Elizabeth: the courts' powers were largely a feature of the sixteenth century, with few records kept in the new Stuart era.[9]

Nonetheless, it is evident from the incomplete record that nearly all men whose estates were granted probate by the Chancellors' Courts owned some works of Roman history, and we may infer from the inventories that scholars predominantly kept copies of the Latin and Greek editions imported from the continent. Although the figures are little more than an indicator of the most basic interest in the authors listed, Sallust and Plutarch appear with the greatest frequency in both universities, corresponding with the trends suggested by the printing data across Europe.

As well as the ubiquitous Sallust and Plutarch, Caesar is well-represented in the inventories of both universities, while the fuller Cambridge evidence points also to the popularity of Suetonius and Pliny. Indeed, all the authors appear with enough frequency in the Cambridge lists to indicate that books of Roman history formed an important part of any learned man's private collection.

These inferences can be drawn despite the necessarily impressionistic view of book ownership given by the data. Owing to the nature of the inventory evidence, we cannot hope to reconstruct a wholly accurate picture. Some inventories are richer than others, and were compiled with far more care and attention to detail. Similarly, there are some years which record no inventories in which books are listed, or if they are listed, no title or author is given. All the works listed at Oxford in 1613, for example, are from the library of John English of St John's College; his collection numbered 520 books, all of which are named in the inventory. Similarly, all the Oxford books of 1614 are those of Edward Holmer, MA, who died leaving 46 named books, and 17 for which no title is stated. There must also be some missing evidence: it is inconceivable, for example, that not one person associated with the University of Oxford who died between 1580 and 1640 owned a single copy of Appian. But despite the limitations of the evidence, here is clear proof that all the authors writing about this period of Roman history were owned privately, not simply by the university

[9] Ibid., p. xiii.

Table 4. Classical works of Roman history detailing the ending of the Republic, found in Oxford and Cambridge inventories, 1580–1640[10]

Author, *title*	No. books in Cambridge inventories	Dates of Cambridge inventories	No. books in Oxford inventories	Dates of Oxford inventories (language, no. volumes, if recorded)
Appian, *Roman History*	8	1585–1605	0	–
Caesar, *Commentaries on the Civil Wars; Commentaries on the Gallic Wars*	5	1588–1599	9	1585–9, 1613, 1613, 1614
Dio, *Roman History*	5	1589–1598	2	1588, 1589
Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*	5	1585–1613	2	1610 1588
Lucan, *Pharsalia*	5	1585–1617	3	1613 1586, 1588
Pliny the Elder, *History of the World*	13	1585–1596	1	1589
Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*	10	1585–1601	10	1585–9 1587 (French) 1588 1591 (English) 1602 (English) 1607 (2 volumes) 1610
Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	11	1586–1621	8	1585–8, 1590, 1613, 1614
Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*	14	1587–1613	2	1613, 1614
Velleius Paterculus, *Roman History*	1	1589	1	1610

[10] Cambridge data derived from Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*. The statistics for Oxford were prepared using R. J. Fehrenbach and Elisabeth Leedham-Green

libraries. The works were important enough for these men to have owned them, and if they owned them, then so did many others of whom all traces have disappeared.

It may be instructive here to follow the fortunes of one author more closely. It is possible to gain a sense the kinds of men who owned copies of Florus' *Epitome* of Roman history, a key work in university teaching at undergraduate level, but evidently not scorned by the great and the good of the academic world. Philip Johnson, Principal of St Edmund Hall, Oxford, is one such owner; he died in 1576 and left a copy of an undated continental edition.[11] Robert Dowe of All Souls, who died in 1588, also had in his library an unspecified copy.[12] Sir Edward Dering, the Kentish baronet, who had been a fellow-commoner at Magdalene College, Cambridge between 1615 and 1617, owned two copies, both published in Leiden in the 1630s, to one of which was appended the universal history of Lucius Ampelius, the other of which was the acclaimed edition by Salmasius.[13] The Oxford man Abel Trefurie also owned a copy when he died in 1610, listed in the inventory of his possessions which appears in the Chancellor's Court Inventories for Oxford University; the edition is unidentifiable owing to lack of information, which is in keeping with the inconsistent spelling of the inventory. Nevertheless, his possession of a copy of Florus is a fact especially notable because, if the records are accurate, the total number of books in his personal library only numbered twenty-seven volumes, a very small collection by the standards of the time.[14] Two university students who must also at some point have owned copies, or at the very least borrowed them for a considerable period of time, are Samuel Foxe, son of John Foxe, the martyrologist, and Sir Simonds D'Ewes, who studied at St John's College, Cambridge under Richard Holdsworth from 1618.[15] We know that this was the case because university notebooks belonging to each man survive, in which are to be found substantial notes on Florus.[16] We also know that by 1624, D'Ewes owned a

(eds), *PLRE*, volumes V and VI (covering the period up to *c.* 1590). Figures from 1590 onwards were derived from the alphabetical transcript of Oxford University Chancellor's Court Inventories containing references to books, made by Walter Mitchell, OUA.

[11] *PLRE* II, p. 246.

[12] *PLRE* VI, p. 184.

[13] *PLRE* I, p. 231.

[14] Alphabetical transcript of Oxford University Chancellor's Court Inventories containing references to books, made by Walter Mitchell, OUA.

[15] J. M. Blatchly, 'D'Ewes, Sir Simonds, first baronet (1602–1650)', *ODNB*.

[16] BL, Lans MS 697; BL, Harl. MS 192.

copy of Florus published in Antwerp in 1615, but owing to the deficiency of the accounts from his time at Cambridge it is uncertain whether he possessed this book as a student.[17]

Library Catalogues

An examination of extant library catalogues of the period similarly reveals the predominance of European Latin editions of Roman histories in the universities: classical works of Roman late-republican history published in England do not often appear in college libraries. The colleges dealt with booksellers based in Oxford and Cambridge, who imported continental texts for them, and made special forays into Europe to buy in bulk important scholarly works for the provisioning of their collections. Although many college accounts are now lost, registers and records from Merton College, Oxford, show that large purchases were made at the book fairs in Italy and Frankfurt in 1589 and 1591, whither the Warden, Henry Savile, sent representatives specifically to augment the stocks of the college library.[18]

Library catalogues are often the only surviving source of information for the provenance of academic books in this period; we have already seen that inventories are often useless in this respect. The meagre output of the English presses indicates that the universities sourced their books from abroad, and it is in the catalogues that we often find details of the editions preferred by English consumers, since the better sort list the place and date of publication. Registers of donations and lists of books given to colleges provide a further source of information about the circulation of classical histories in early modern England. One such record of private donation is the list of books given to St John's College, Cambridge by Bishop Williams in 1632. Among the books he bestowed upon the College are several works of Roman history: they include two annotated volumes of Caesar's *Commentaries*, published in Frankfurt in 1575, an edition of Dio printed in Hannover in 1606, an Orleans editions of Florus' *Epitome*, dated 1609, a copy of the works of Sallust, and two copies of Velleius Paterculus, one published with a commentary in Paris in 1608, and the other printed at Orleans in 1609.[19] This donation list unfortunately also demonstrates

[17] Andrew G. Watson, *The Library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London, 1966), pp. 19, 62–3, 71.
[18] Ker, 'The Provision of Books', p. 445.
[19] St John's College, Cambridge MS U4.

the unreliability of library catalogues and lists, since books moved in and out of libraries with rather more frequency than library rules might suggest. Of the hundreds of books donated by the bishop in 1632, only twenty-five are still there today, and even by *c.* 1640, when the contents of the library were formally catalogued, some of the books he had given were no longer in the library, if indeed they ever reached its shelves. By 1640, at least the Caesar, Florus and both copies of Velleius Paterculus had been lost, lent, expropriated, or otherwise disposed of.[20]

Although it might not include some of Bishop Williams' gifts, the catalogue of St John's College, Cambridge, created at the end of the 1630s, nevertheless reveals a significant number of Roman histories. All are continental editions; no text matching any of the unidentifiable volumes

Table 5. Classical works of Roman history detailing the ending of the Republic in St John's College Library, Cambridge, c. 1640

Author, *title*	No. books	Place of publication, date (if recorded)
Appian, *Roman History*	4	1551; Antwerp, 1582; [unspecified]; 1592
Caesar, *Commentaries*	–	–
Dio, *Roman History*	2	Hannover, 1606; Hannover, 1606
Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*	3	Paris 1519; Orleans 1623; Orleans, 1623
Lucan, *Pharsalia*	1	Rome, 1569
Pliny the Elder, *History of the World*	3	Basel, 1531; Basel, 1568; Lyons, 1587
Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*	2	Basel, 1560; Frankfurt 1599
Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*	2	Frankfurt, 1607; Orleans, 1623
Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*	3	Lyons, 1552; Paris, 1610; [unspecified]
Velleius Paterculus, *Roman History*	3	Paris, 1588; Orleans, 1623; Orleans, 1627

[20] This is evident from a comparison of U4 with St John's College, Cambridge MS U1, the library catalogue *c.* 1640 – assuming, of course, that both lists are accurate, and books have not been overlooked.

was published in England at the appropriate date. The college held no copies of Caesar whatsoever, since the two volumes given by Bishop Williams were already absent by this point; here, perhaps, is an indication that standard texts were more likely to be privately owned by scholars by the mid-seventeenth century, rather than consulted in libraries. And, once again, the data show the strength of the import trade in Latin books between continental publishers and the academic community; the college did not possess any of the Latin editions published in England.

The library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, provides a comparative example of college library holdings of Roman histories. A far smaller collection than that at St John's, the catalogue drawn up on 27th April 1637 demonstrates the increasingly humanistic nature of the curriculum in the post-scholastic years. When Walter Mildmay founded the library in 1584 in the hope that it would produce "learned men for the supply of the church," he gave a small "seed-plot" of books. These included the 1535 Basel edition of Livy, and the 1551 Paris edition of Appian in Greek.[21] Greek was not an official part of the undergraduate curriculum until the mid-seventeenth century, but Mildmay clearly considered it an important part of an educated young man's studies. The library also acquired a Latin edition of Appian by 1597, as well as both Greek and Latin editions of Dio's *Roman History*, and a copy of Pliny's *Natural History*. A significant increase in the proportion of history books occurred with the expansion of the collection in the 1620s, and Tacitus was acquired in the early 1630s.[22] The 1637 catalogue also indicates the growing importance of private book ownership among academics. As at St John's, there were no copies of Caesar in the library, but neither were Florus, Lucan, Sallust, Suetonius or Velleius Paterculus to be found on the shelves. Plutarch's *Lives* was also lacking. Given the importance of history books in the college's collection, and the growing emphasis on history as a necessary part of scholarly learning, we may infer that fellows of the college were probably expected to buy their own copies of these most basic classical texts, or obtain them elsewhere. This, in turn, suggests a ready supply of affordable editions entering the market from abroad.

But the histories written by ancient authors were not the only sources from which scholars could draw their information about the ending of the Roman republic. Some classical works, although not strictly 'histories',

---

[21] Sargent Bush, Jr and Carl J. Rasmussen, *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge 1584–1637* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 10–11.

[22] Ibid., pp. 21–5.

were invaluable in providing the early modern reader with contextual information or opinion on Roman history; the writings of Cicero or the younger Seneca fall into this category. Students used Seneca's moral and philosophical essays to gather perspectives on characters and events, while the works of Cicero represented the most detailed record of politics, philosophy and intellectual culture in the late Roman republic. Cicero, in particular, was thought to be very important in the process of assimilation of information from wider reading. Through reading Cicero, students could gain a deeper understanding of the workings of Rome in the first century BC, and of the actors and issues most important in Rome's political developments. So Thomas Barlow, who was appointed keeper of Oxford's Bodleian library in 1652, recommended Cicero in his 'Directions for young students in the University':

> We come now to ye Roman monarchy … When you have read so far in ye Roman history, as ye times of Tully, 'twill be then most seasonable to read over all his works.[23]

The *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium* of Valerius Maximus was another ancient text which provided readers with a collection of the sayings and deeds of great figures in Rome's past. The work was widely read: eighteen copies are listed in Cambridge inventories between 1585 and 1614, while five appear in Oxford inventories from the same period.[24] Two editions are found in the catalogue of St John's College, Cambridge in the late 1630s, one an unidentifiable edition dating from 1544, the other, the Paris edition of 1575.[25] Numerous commonplace books also contain excerpts from the text.[26] Yet Valerius Maximus was never published in England during this period, and he remained the only author apart from Dio not to be translated into English, suggesting that his influence was felt most strongly in the organised education system where continental imports and Latin reading were the norm.

Scholarly compendia and dictionaries, too, contributed to the body of Roman historical knowledge available to early modern readers; these were the learned equivalent of the English glosses and handbooks printed for use by schoolboys. European classical learning available in England

---

[23] Bodleian, Rawl. MS D. 188, fol. 12–13.

[24] Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*; *PLRE* V and VI; alphabetical transcript of Oxford University Chancellor's Court Inventories containing references to books, made by Walter Mitchell, OUA.

[25] St John's College, Cambridge MS U4.

[26] For example, BL, Lans. MS 679, fol. 76; Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 16.7, fol. 198v.

through the medium of Latin was utilised extensively by those who could read the ancient languages; the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, in particular, possessed European books in abundance.[27] A manuscript book list of works on Roman history made at University College, Oxford in the mid-seventeenth century, demonstrates just how numerous these texts were.[28] The library from which the list has been derived is a large one; the list contains some 125 titles, some in multiple volumes. Some are editions of the classical sources by Sallust, Florus, and so forth, but the majority are works of secondary literature in Latin by continental scholars. To list but a few, they include a work on the history of the Senate, *de Romano Senatu liber* by Marcus Antonius Majoragius, published in Milan in 1564; a 1598 edition from Frankfurt of Wolfgang Lazius' *de Romanam Reipublicam*, first published in 1565, and a work on Roman numismatics, sculpture and epigraphy by Georgio Fabricius, first published in 1571 under the title *Romanam Antiquitatum*, with the edition listed published in Basel in 1587.

The library of St John's College, Cambridge, also owned numerous works on Roman history other than the classical texts. These were usually continental and from the mid-1500s. Bishop Williams gave at least thirty-three books on various topics of Roman history other than the ancient authors listed above, including primary works by writers of the later empire but also secondary works, such as Wolfgang Lazius' *de Republica Romana* published at Basel in 1550, and Hubert Goltz' *Historia Caesar*, published in Bruges in 1563. The collection of similar volumes at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, was also extensive. Between 1622 and 1626 alone, the college acquired numerous works of secondary continental scholarship on the history of Rome, including the 1598 Frankfurt edition of Wolfgang Lazius' work on the republic. Others among these acquisitions were a commentary by Onuphrius on the kings and consuls from Romulus to Charles V (Geneva, 1588), Cuspinian on the Caesars and military commanders (Strasbourg, 1540), Gruter's collection of Roman inscriptions (Heidelberg, 1616), and volumes by Sigonius on ancient Roman law (Paris, 1576) and on consular appointments and triumphs from Romulus to

[27] They are, however, not the only place such works were found. The only secular, historical Roman work found in the catalogue of Norwich City Library during this period was donated in 1613 by Joanna Blowe, daughter of the sheriff of the city who was three times mayor; it is a Latin dictionary of Roman information listed in the catalogue as *Romanas Antiquitates: Rosini*, a work published in Basel in 1583 compiled by Johannes Rosinus, Dompredigter in Nuremberg. Joy Tilley, *A Catalogue of the donations made to Norwich City Library 1608–1656* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 23.

[28] University College, Oxford MS 193.

Tiberius (Basel, 1559). All these works mediated classical sources, and drew upon them and upon other evidence of Roman history such as statuary and ruins in order to produce a digest of information for their readers.

Of course, there are also problems with library records as evidence of reception and reading. Catalogues themselves are unlikely to record all the books owned by a college, since the libraries had limited space, particularly before the shelving reforms of the 1590s. Old volumes were discarded as new ones were donated or bought; they were either sold or burned, or perhaps joined other floating college books in collections *ad usum sociorum*, that is, in circulating lending libraries for fellows.[29] The absence of volumes from official library lists, however, is an indication that these books were kept in such unidentifiable collections, and the exchanging of new copies for old testifies to the continued importance of such texts.

It is difficult to judge who used college libraries; undergraduates were banned from many of them, and there are few surviving records of readers. The regulations of some colleges addressing the abuse of libraries survive in some cases, and these usually regulate the removal of books without permission, which at least demonstrates that some members of the colleges used the collections. At Queen's College, Oxford in 1630, scholars were barred from the library on pain of a 12*d* fine, and new keys were ordered for the door. Exactly what the delinquent scholars read is unknowable, but the library was certainly frequented, however undesirable the actions of its visitors.[30]

Information on readers using the central university libraries is also hard to come by. The University Library at Cambridge, restored by Andrew Perne in 1574, contained approximately 450 volumes according to the catalogue made in 1583, a number which rose to almost 1000 volumes by the end of the century. It is possible to reconstruct their location and arrangement from this document, but this is little help in discovering which books were read by whom, since they were still largely chained to lecterns in the old fashion.[31] Of the Bodleian Library, there is only one record which details what was read: the 'entry book' for 1648–9, in which the librarian

[29] Ker, 'The provision of books', p. 445.

[30] I. G. Philip and P. Morgan, 'Libraries, Books and Printing' in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. IV: seventeenth century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 674–8.

[31] J.C.T. Oates, *Cambridge University Library: a historical sketch* (Cambridge, 1975), last accessed at <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/history/2.html> (2 September 2009).

recorded the shelfmarks of the quarto and octavo books fetched from the Arts End galleries, and the names of the readers who requested them.[32] Again, even for this late date the document is anything but a complete record of what was read, since the folio volumes in the main body of Duke Humfrey's Library were still securely chained; no record of who used them was needed, since they could not be removed and so could not be lost or stolen. The records of books fetched from the galleries appear to have been discarded when they were no longer current, and the surviving series only begins in the early eighteenth century.[33]

Nonetheless, even if the details are unknowable, the broad conclusion to be drawn from the catalogues, at least, is relatively clear: libraries were important places for the study of Roman history. With a little care, the pieces of this jigsaw can be put together with more direct evidence of reading to help reconstruct the bigger picture of the reception of Roman history.

[32] Bodleian Library Records MS e. 544.

[33] I am grateful to Mary Clapinson for sharing with me her unpublished work on reading in the Bodleian in the seventeenth century, from which this information is taken.

CHAPTER FOUR

EVIDENCE OF READING: COMMONPLACE BOOKS, NOTEBOOKS AND MARGINALIA

There was a growing interest in producing and owning classical texts during the early modern period; but what of the precise way in which they were used by those who read them? This question of audience is crucial to any study of reception, for until we know who interacted with which books, and when, we cannot begin to imagine how they might have done so. Classical histories of ancient Rome did not possess a defined set of meanings, or a fixed intellectual value. Important though they were held to be by the authoritative voices of humanist learning, at least part of the value of these texts derived from the way in which each individual reader interpreted the printed words, and the meaning they constructed from the physical marks and spaces on the page. Recovering how readers understood the histories of ancient Rome is only possible if we combine an analysis of the physical books, the 'texts' they contained, and the reading practices of the people who bought and borrowed them.[1]

Readers' Notes

To reconstruct reading practices requires an integrated understanding of early modern reading and writing habits in the context of the Renaissance commonplacing tradition, together with an appreciation of the overlap between literature and history. The notebooks of students at Oxford and Cambridge in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries survive in the archives of the colleges and in university collections. Commonplace books belonging to other readers are to be found in library collections around the country, and with the academic books, have much to reveal about the reading of Roman history in the period. A direct insight into readers' strategies, they highlight the importance of Roman history in an educated man's personal learning, and provide an opportunity to examine which texts individuals were using, and how they read them; a valuable

[1] Roger Chartier, 'Labourers and Voyagers: from the text to the reader', *Diacritics* vol. 22, no.2 (1992), pp. 49–51.

adjunct to the ideal theories presented in study directives. Notebooks also offer a more intimate perspective on the effects of education, separate from the study of more formal, 'institutional' educational evidence of statutes and booklists. Indeed, this is the means by which we can access most closely an early modern reader's personal relationships with the history of ancient Rome, be it in a formal or more private educational context.

The subject matter of readers' notes is, of course, not an entirely reliable record of all the Roman history that was being read, owing to the fragmented nature of the sources; but it does indicate how it was being used. An Erasmian predisposition to record the unusual rather than the useful, the *insigne verbum* rather than the wise moral message, characterises some of the notebooks of this period. Thus, among Latin exercises and Roman historical fragments recorded by Alexander Bolde of Pembroke College, Cambridge in his notebook of 1620 are not only references to political affairs, including Caesar's struggle for the consulship and Cicero's battle with Clodius, but also the information that "It was for Pompey to wear as rich a scarfe about his legge as other princes about their heads" and "Caesar first bound ye crocodile to ye palm tree."[2]

Indeed, part of the utility of the sources lies in the idiosyncratic nature of each reader's notes, which demonstrate precisely the individuality of each man's experience of his texts, and reveal the nuances of his personal interaction with the history he found there. Even if what is written cannot be traced to a particular source, or seems to have no relevance to what we might consider 'proper' history, it is an important record of a specific reader's experience of a 'Roman' text. In the early modern period, reading and writing overlapped, and were carried out simultaneously. Just as boundaries were blurred between genres of 'literature' and 'history', so there was no clear definition made between primary sources and secondary historical writing; readers possessed a strong sense of the value of their own opinions as equal to those of printed authors, evidenced through marginal annotations of their printed copies of texts as well as in notebooks. Therefore anything that was written while reading took place, and

[2] St John's College, Cambridge MS S.34, sig. 50v, 55r. Octavian/Augustus' victory over Eygpt at Actium was represented on coins and in his triumph by the symbols of Victory holding a palm branch, and a crocodile representing Egypt and the Nile, chained to a palm tree: R. A. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: the politics and emotions of civil war* (Ann Arbor, 1995), p. 64. Whether Bolde recognised this and was recording indirectly the numismatic evidence through some secondary source is impossible to know; he might well have found the phrase an interesting one purely because of its exotic content, and recorded it according to Erasmian principles.

anything that was omitted or considered unworthy of noting, acquires a special significance and may be used to reconstruct what an early modern mind experienced as an important aspect of a text.[3] This is equally the case in private reading as in formal study, as historical literacy increased, and the material found in commonplace books entered civilised conversation as a portable, 'anecdotal' form of history.[4]

The broad, humanist conception of lifelong education for the ends of virtue, with its emphasis on historical, contextualised reading, was influential far beyond the academic institutions in which its teaching took place. It shaped the private study habits of literate men long after they completed their formal education, and spread into wider educated culture beyond the circles of those who had attended the schools and universities. As an ideology, it reinforced the potential for multiple readings of texts, allowing each to be read separately as a legitimation of orthodoxy, a support for radical innovation, or anything in between. Roman history was approached and assimilated as a kind of 'local knowledge' that understood episodes in their isolated context, with readers abstracting these for deployment in the contemporary world.[5]

For such episodes and gleanings certainly were used. All the evidence we have about commonplacing and note-taking from the early modern period suggests that these collections of examples were read and re-read, and phrases were learned by heart for use in compositions and exercises, or for general conversation. Early modern readers read in the belief that they should take from their Roman texts that which was most relevant or useful to their own situation, for this was the purpose of history. Reading history could be a political act, related to contemporary events, or might be separate from it; readers might draw any of a number of possible conclusions from their reading, and their interpretations were not necessarily fixed. Some readers took Ciceronian messages from their Latin texts, which they perceived to endorse the classical theory of an ideal republican state, while others read the same works and derived from them stronger theories of monarchical government.

The fractured and fragmentary use of history as a source of commonplaces meant that the same situation or character could be many things at

---

[3] William Sherman, *Used Books: marking readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008), pp. 3–11.

[4] On the expansion of historical culture during the early Stuart period, see D. R. Woolf, 'Little Crosby and the Horizons of Early Modern Historical Culture' in Kelley and Harris Sacks (eds), *The Historical Imagination*, p. 129.

[5] Bushnell, *A culture of teaching*, pp. 21–2.

once to many people. Certainly, as early modern men (and, to a lesser extent, women) read and re-read works of Roman history, the messages they discerned within them changed according to the times and circumstances in which they were reading. Sometimes the classical author being read determined how students approached their reading; conversely, since many students of the classics were exposed to the whole canon of works, it was at other times the case that the individual reader's reasons and strategies in approaching a text shaped what they learned from it. Their classical education also encouraged figurative thinking and the impulse to the deriving of analogies, through its emphasis on the collection of ideas under organised categories and headings. The following pages provides examples of the contextual translations and transformations readers effected as they transferred into their notebooks the ideas they perceived in the printed histories of Rome, shaping and adding personal value to the original subject matter. Three key episodes in the fall of the Republic provide focal points for a comparison of readers' notes: the conflict between Pompey and Julius Caesar, the relationship between Antony and Cleopatra and their war with Octavian, and the establishment of Octavian's imperial monarchy and his adoption of the title, Augustus.

Caesar and Pompey

The sources of notes on Pompey and Caesar appear to have been chiefly Plutarch, Suetonius, Dio, Appian, Lucan, and Caesar himself, while references in the works of the younger Seneca and Valerius Maximus were sometimes also copied by readers. The *sententiae* expressed in this note form reappear as passing comments in printed texts on diverse topics, commonplaces utilised to illustrate an argument or make a moral point. Although in many classical histories, Pompey and Caesar assume equal importance and other figures such as Cicero, Cato of Utica, Brutus and Cassius are depicted in detail as key players on the stage of the late republic, early modern readers were overwhelmingly concerned with Julius Caesar. This is perhaps unsurprising: Caesar's eventual defeat of Pompey's forces assured him of the greater share of glory, and ensured that he won lasting renown as one of history's greatest military commanders. Moreover, although Caesar was never a monarch in name, he was regarded by many as the "founder of the empire and monarchie of Rome".[6]

[6] Pedro Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. B1r.

Following Suetonius, who includes a 'life' of Caesar with his biographies of the first eleven emperors, Caesar was often associated with monarchical government by early modern readers and writers, making him a fit exemplar for magistrates, mirroring vice or virtue in the texts which could be drawn upon as guides for correct living in a monarchical state.

Pompey or Cato, statesmen but not princes, were far less frequently selected as exemplars. Given the preeminence of Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus at Rome in the first century BC, it is surprising how little is recorded about him in early modern commonplace collections and notebooks. Here was a man who, from his youth, had been accorded marvellous privileges by the Senate: his remarkably successful exploits against the pirates and in the wars in Asia resulted in a series of extraordinary military commands being granted to him, going beyond any existing precedent, and he was looked upon as Rome's greatest hero for much of his lifetime. In the early modern period, however, he was eclipsed by Caesar, politically and more privately; indeed, Pompey was used chiefly as a foil for Caesar, and unlike his rival, he receives little consideration as a man. His personal traits go undocumented, and his moral qualities are typically referred to only when they affect the state and contribute to the outbreak of civil war.

Samuel Foxe, for example, wrote of Pompey only the unflattering note that "*Pompeius etiam non Augustus sed Aegistus*".[7] This, a judgement that Pompey was not great, as Augustus was, but merely a cuckold, is a reference to Caesar's alleged affair with Pompey's first wife Mutia, explained by Montaigne:

> [Caesar] also made love … unto *Mutia,* wife to great *Pompey,* which as Historians say, was the cause hir Husband was divorced from her. Which thing *Plutarke* confesseth not to have knowne. And the *Curios* both father and sonne twitted *Pompey* in the teeth, at what time he tooke *Caesars* Daughter to wife, that he made himselfe Sonne in law to one, who had made him Cuckold, and himselfe was wont to call *Aegystus*.[8]

This is hardly a positive representation of the great man, yet Foxe records nothing else of Pompey in this commonplace section of the notebook, despite his extensive academic notes on Caesar and Pompey's military clashes elsewhere in the volume.

---

[7] BL, Lans. MS 679, fol. 94r.

[8] Michel de Montaigne, *Essays* (London, 1613), *STC* 18042, sig. O06v.

A tale from Plutarch's life of Pompey was repeated in published collections of pithy stories or examples of virtue:

> Pompey dreadlesse of a great storme when he was sent by the Senate into Italie, was the first that went a shyp-board, and commaunded the sailes to be spred, saying: *It is necessary that I goe, but not necessary that I live*. *Plutarch*.[9]

The same episode is told in verse by William Leighton:

> Pompey the great and mightie Prince of power
> Prepar'de to sea, his ships hoist under saile,
> There rose a stormie tempest and a shower,
> That all his mariners began to quaile.
> He puts to sea, spreds saile, and speech doth give:
> It's good I goe; not fit I stay to live.[10]

This extract has not, however, been included in any extant manuscript commonplace book that I have found, and Pompey's bravery is nowhere recorded in the kind of detail as, or with the frequency of, that of Julius Caesar. Simonds D'Ewes makes only one incidental mention of his virtues, unconnected with the martial exploits for which he was famous, and linked instead to the subject of usury. D'Ewes excerpts an anecdote illustrating Pompey's magnanimity towards his enemies, which he contrasts with the grasping nature of ungodly usurers:

> Cn. Pompeius seeing Tigranes kinge of Armenia his enemy lying suppliant at his feete, tooke him upp, & gave him his diademe & his kingdome, though he had gotten it by right of armes; but our unmercifull usurers though they got mony unlawfully, yet will they not heere distressed debtors lying continually with teares at ther feete.[11]

But with the exception of this isolated example, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Pompey represented little more than an anti-Caesar, a figure who served as a paragon on occasions when Caesar was a model of iniquity, and a providentially necessary antagonist in the conflict which brought the republic to an end.

The reception of Pompey by readers was largely conditioned by the focus on the perils of civil dissent that preoccupied much of educated English society in the post-Reformation period. Pompey seems to have been thought worthwhile as commonplacing material by readers who were looking for lessons about the evils of civil war and of tyrants.

---

[9] Robert Allott, *Wits theater of the little world* (London, 1599), *STC* 381, sig. F4r.

[10] William Leighton, *Vertue triumphant, or A lively description of the foure vertues cardinall dedicated to the Kings Maiestie* (London, 1603), *STC* 15435, sig. F1v.

[11] BL, Harl. MS 182, fol. 25r.

As one of the leaders of the opposing armies in the battles leading up to the decisive day at Pharsalus, Pompey is judged partly responsible for the state of war in which Rome found itself, and therefore he, as well as Caesar, must share the blame for the suffering inflicted upon the Roman people and upon the constitution. Gathered in topical collections of moral categories, readers' interpretations of Pompey seem to have been taken from the more ambiguous classical sources; they are assembled almost entirely under less-than complimentary headings for use as illustrations of pride or tyranny.

Thus John Morris, compiling his commonplace book in 1604, recorded from the writings of Julius Caesar Scaliger that "*Pompeius tyrannus ad multis*".[12] Given the early Stuart preoccupation with tyrants, the use of the word "*tyrannus*" is probably intended in its most pejorative form, and the phrase reflects the power which Pompey wielded, as Scaliger implies, to ill effect. Edward Palmer, the Cambridge student compiling one of a series of vast commonplace books at Trinity College in the 1610s, condemned Pompey even more roundly. Rather than excerpting anything positive from any of the myriad other classical authorities cited in the volume, he chose to note the opprobrium with which Seneca loads his description of Pompey. Seneca, famous opponent of Nero and imperial corruption, might be expected to value Pompey as the champion of the old republic. However, the passage Palmer selected is clear in placing part of the blame for the civil wars on Pompey's head, because Pompey was jealous of his pride, and greedy for more honours. Had Pompey been willing to admit Caesar as an equal, Seneca implies, disaster might not have befallen Rome:

> Ingratus Cn. Pompeius, qui pro tribus consolaribus, pro triumphes tribus, pro tot honoribus, quos ex maxima parte immaturus invaseratque hanc gratiam Reip: reddidit, ut in possessionem eius alios quique induceret; quasi potentiae suae detracturus invidiam, si quod nulli licere debebat pluribus licuisset: dum extraordinaria concupisci[t] imperia, dum provincias ut eligat distribuit, dum ita triumviris remp: dividit ut tamen in sua domo due partes essent, nisi beneficio servitutiis.[13]

---

[12] BL, Royal MS 12.E.ix, fol. 35v: Pompey was a tyrant to many.

[13] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.16.6, fol. 314v. The passage quoted is Seneca's *De Beneficiis* V.16.iv: Such was the ingratitude of Cnaeus Pompeius: for his three consulships, three triumphs, and the innumerable public offices, most of which he assumed when he was under age, he repayed his country by leading others also to lay hands upon her, under the pretence of rendering his own power less hateful. As though something that ought to be done by nobody becomes right when it is done by more than one person! While he was coveting extraordinary commands, and arranging the provinces so he could choose which he pleased, and while he was dividing the whole empire between three in such a way as to

It is in the ambition and rivalry between Caesar and Pompey that most early modern readers perceived the origins of the discord which rent republican Rome asunder. Most notes indicate that, although Pompey may have represented republican virtue and defended the state against tyranny, without his antagonism, Caesar would never have resorted to civil war. Political upheaval and constitutional crisis are ascribed to personal character flaws, revealing a conception of history that is overwhelmingly concerned with the exercise of virtue or vice by individuals within a state, rather than with institutions or long-term decline. As these readers enquired into "the Causes of every Action and Counsel," they sought not to describe the ending of the republic as modern historians might, in terms of unmanageable expansion, or the failure of existing modes of government to meet the demands of a new age.[14] Rather, they followed exactly Degory Wheare's advice about the "two-fold use of Examples: the first for our imitation of what is done by good men, and that we may learn to shun the ill actions of wicked men."[15]

Tracing the civil wars to the ill actions of Caesar and Pompey with regard to each other's position, a rivalry in which each was convinced of his own supreme importance, readers noted how private ambition led to widespread ruin. The most common formulation, found in Florus' *Epitome*, is that "*Pompey* could abide no equall, and *Caesar* could suffer no superior."[16] Samuel Foxe noted it in his reading of Florus in the late sixteenth century: "*Nec Caesar ferre priorem pompeius ne parem*."[17] Simonds D'Ewes, studying the same text in the early-seventeenth century, recorded, "*Nec hic ferebat parem nec ille superiorem*," with the marginal annotation, "*ambitio*," accompanying the note.[18] The idea has its echoes, too, in the doodle made by John Morris on the flyleaf of his commonplace book, where the names of both men follow his own, as if he cannot separate the one from the other:

> Johannes Mauritius
> John Morris
> Caius Julius Caesar
> Cneius Pompeius Magnus.[19]

---

leave two-thirds of it in the possession of his own family, he reduced the Roman people to such a state that they could only save themselves by submitting to slavery.

[14] Wheare, *Method*, sig. Z3v.

[15] Ibid., sig. Z4r.

[16] N. L., *Politeuphuia: Wits common wealth* (London, 1598), *STC* 15686, sig. Ii7r.

[17] BL, Lans. MS 679, fol. 52v: Pompey could not bear an equal, nor Caesar a superior.

[18] BL, Harl. MS 192, fol. 22r: the meaning is as above, though the words are different.

[19] BL, Royal MS 12.B.v, fol. 1r.

It is perhaps demonstrated most fully in a dialogue between Caesar and Pompey, possibly taken from a play, noted by William Withye of Christ Church in the commonplace book he kept between 1570 and 1590. It reflects Caesar's overbearing pride and vanity, and his belief that his conquests make him Rome's natural ruler. Pompey, whose own triumphs were equally great, asks in disbelief what Caesar has done that is superior to his own achievements. Caesar seems determined to prove that his deeds are the greater; Pompey is incensed by Caesar's arrogance, but powerless to overturn this claim. He can only bid Rome farewell, knowing that the republic is lost and war is inevitable:

Pom. What makes ye crowd stand here soe thick to day
Tel mee you sons of Earth! for whome you stay
What means that flag –
Caes. – those colours sir are mine
Which you do see soe glorious yonder shine.
Pom. Yours? By what authority? Who did give
To you this great and large perrogative?
Caes. Room me but non has her great cheife decreed
And he yt mutinys by me shall bleed.
Pom. What ist young Caesar more than me you've done?
Then Pompey? -
Caes. – I have Rome by merits won
The Earths great crown to her I gave by war
And sent ye world for my Ambassadour
With frequent triumphs I her temples Crownd
I raise her bleeding eagles on ye Ground
What wonder then if she makes me her Sun
Pom. Farewell oh Rome thy glorys set apace.[20]

For many readers, Caesar, no less than Pompey, represented an example of wickedness to be shunned, and the early modern concern with the conduct of princes is reflected in the widespread references to Caesar as a tyrant. Readers' censure of Caesar's tyranny is deployed in various ways, and derived from several sources. For John Merbecke, collating a printed commonplace book in the 1580s, the example of Caesar was an analogy that he used to contextualise the brutality of the kings of the Philistines: "the Romane Emperours have borrowed the name of *Caesar* of *Iulius Caesar,* who made himselfe ye first tyrant among them."[21] Caesar's wrongdoing in destroying the liberty of the republic was noted by a Cambridge

[20] BL, Sloane MS 300, fol. 28v.
[21] John Merbecke, *A booke of notes and common places* (London, 1581), *STC* 17299, sig. B2v.

student reading his Seneca: "*Sylla, Marius, Catilina, Coriolanus, Caesar, Pompeius, perduellis et hostes patriae*," traitors and enemies of the state on account of their various war-mongering and power-hungry actions.[22]

"*Superbia*," pride, is commonly identified as one of Caesar's main failings, and it is under this heading that he often appears in the commonplace books. One Cambridge student referred himself to Brissoni's work for details of the titles and honours that were wrongfully made over to Caesar by the cowed people of Rome, while another noted that Lipsius provides details of the excessive and lavish honours the Senate gave Caesar.[23] But the pride and ambition which readers found in the classical sources were not the only sins of which Caesar was guilty. His prominence in the Roman story, and his extraordinary magistracy made him a prime study for readers looking to find illustrations of all kinds of moral dangers. Among the wealth of notes made by readers on Julius Caesar, there are certain recurring themes which illustrate the negative aspects of his character, and make him into a warning against personal vice as well as abuse of power, reflecting the deep and destructive character analyses to which he is subjected by ancient authors such as Plutarch.

Caesar is acknowledged to be guilty of sacrilege, lust and deceit. Several times, he is accused of the desecration of religious sites, which observations are often harnessed to Protestant arguments about the just deserts of those who profane God's laws. Edward Stanley, headmaster of Winchester School, recorded Caesar's vindictiveness, and his belief that he was above the gods: "Caesar destroyed the temple of Neptune because he suffered shipwreck."[24] Citing Suetonius as the authority for his examples of Caesar's "most notorious pillaging & sacrilege" in a work on God's providence, George Hakewill wrote that, "for love of booty," Caesar, "most dishonest":

> stole out of the *Capitoll* three thousand weight of gold, laying up asmuch gilded copper instead thereof. In *France* he robbed the *Oratories* & *Temples* of the *Gods,* stored with rich offerings & ornaments…[25]

---

[22] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.16.6, fol. 314r.

[23] Trinity College, Cambridge, MSR.16.6, fol. 428r: *Superbia. De honorificis salutationibus, et appellationibus, quibus Consules, et alii magistraus a Caesaribus maetabantur, vid. Brissoni*; Trinity College, Cambridge, MSR.16.10, fol. 215r: *Superba,* etc. *Caesar dictator facilis nimis in eligendo senatu, et honoribus dilargiendis. vide egregia Lipsii lib.2 Antiqua~ lectia cap.6.*

[24] BL, Sloane MS 892, fol. 53v.

[25] George Hakewill, *An apologie of the power and providence of God in the government of the world. …* (London, 1627), *STC* 12611, sig. Tt1v.

Caesar's sexual predilections are explicitly noted in a volume largely concerned with theological matters kept by the lawyer and politician Oliver St John in the 1620s. He records both Caesar's personal adultery, something which he seems to think typical of a "heathen" such as he, and his moral rectitude in punishing adultery in society at large. On one page, he writes that:

> *De Adulterio*: Whoredome permitted by some heathens… Caius Julius Caesar Dictator was much given both to active and passive uncleannesse – in Suet. yt Curio ye father in a certaine oration calleth him a woman for all men, and a man for all women. most especially he fancied Queene Cleopatra for wth her he sat up many night and feasted wth her till breake of day.[26]

Following this extract, under the heading "adulterie punished", he goes on to describe how:

> Caius Julius Caesar Dictator put to death a freeman of his own household for dishonouring by adulterie a Romaine Gentle-wife albeit no man had complained thereof.[27]

Vehement as some opposition to certain aspects of Caesar's career undoubtedly was, other exploits and character traits of the soldier, statesman and dictator were looked upon with distinct approbation by many early modern readers of Roman history. The habits of commonplacing, encouraged by educational training, allowed men to use Caesar to illustrate opposing ideas simultaneously. This disintegrative interpretive strategy, applied to ancient texts about the life of Caesar, resulted in his representation as a kind of paragon even while he was an embodiment of certain vices. The direct contrast between the two views of Caesar – hero and villain – is indicative of the intrinsic versatility of history in the early modern period, and testifies to the impact of approaches to reading learned in childhood on historical study in wider society. It was perfectly legitimate to seize upon flaws elsewhere in his character and condemn them as expressions of evil, without compromising the integrity of the exemplar. For St John, seeking to gather material on the sin of adultery, Caesar was an example both of virtue and of ungodly turpitude.

There is surprisingly little of Caesar's unsavoury sexual reputation in the student notebooks as a whole, however; given how extensively the sexual vices of men such as Antony were recorded by readers, it is striking

---

[26] BL, Add. MS 25, 285, fol. 42r.
[27] Idem. This is an English translation of Suetonius' *Life of Julius Caesar*, 46.

that the commonplace books choose to ignore similar accusations against Caesar. Many readers of the classics chose to privilege Caesar's positive qualities over the sexual failings recorded along with them in the ancient texts, judiciously ignoring unsavoury examples and recycling only positive elements in their notes. Certainly, they read the sources which explained the sordid acts in which Caesar participated; they record other references to Suetonius and Catullus' more polite verses, proving that these sources have been read, but that Caesar's vices have deliberately not been selected as fodder for the sections on 'lust' or 'adultery'. While Plutarch does not cast Caesar as an adulterer or a homosexual, Suetonius certainly does.[28] He details the invectives hurled against Caesar as the result of his stay in Bithynia as envoy to King Nicomedes, reporting how Curio called him "the brothel of Nicomedes and the stew of Bithynia." Cicero's aspersions are also noted: "We all know what he gave you, and what you gave him in return."[29] The poems of Catullus make reference to Caesar's womanising and his affairs with men, while Suetonius also reveals that the elder Curio referred to Caesar as "every woman's husband and every man's wife."[30] The only suggestion of any such idea in any of the commonplace material other than that of Oliver St John is a line in an anonymous Oxford commonplace book dating from the mid-1630s, which records that "*Caesar debellavit Galliam, sed idem et Patriam; viros subegit, verum et foeminas*."[31] The echo of Curio's words could, however, be no more than a coincidence, and the extract could simply refer to Caesar's thorough subjugation of his enemies both abroad and at home.

Caesar presented a fine source of anecdotes for the student searching for examples of valour and bravery. However inglorious his motives may have been, the ancient histories provided readers with glowing reports of the daring with which Caesar entered battle and led his troops. His undoubted heroism was manifest in any of the ancient sources; the most commonly recurring example of Caesar's courage is the tale of Caesar and the pilot. It is perhaps little to be wondered that readers in Armada-ridden England were most struck by Caesar's maritime exploits:

---

[28] Suetonius, *Julius Caesar*, 49–52.

[29] Ibid., 49.

[30] Ibid., 52.3. Catullus' poem 57 is particularly explicit. For further details, see Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: ideologies of masculinity in classical antiquity* (Oxford, 1999), p. 207.

[31] St John's College, Cambridge MS S.44, fol. 146r: 'Caesar subdued not only Gaul, but his own country: he subjugated not only the men, but truly the women, too.' The reference to women is what distinguishes an otherwise innocuous observation about the totality of Caesar's mastery. This sense is enhanced by the use of the verb *subigo*, which can mean 'to tame', 'to cultivate' or 'to break' as well as 'to subdue'.

> Julius Caesar… putting himselfe into a Fisher-mans boate, thrust off from the shore, and began to passe the straight, but the water being rough, and the tempest violent, his Pilot the poore Fisher-man feared drowning, & would faine have turned back againe, and was therein very obstinate; which Caesar by no meanes permitting him to doe, after many perswasions and threatnings, seeing him still persever in his feare: at last, be of good courage man (quoth he) and passe on without feare, for thou carriest with thee the good Fortune of Caesar.[32]

The story seems to have encapsulated the essence of daring and dash for the early modern student of Roman history, for it appears in numerous commonplace books and printed works. Both Samuel Foxe and Simonds D'Ewes record the episode in their notes on Florus, D'Ewes adding the marginal note, "*Dux bonus*," thereby connecting the tale with other instances of good generals similarly pointed.[33] It also appears in the commonplacing section of Foxe's notebook as "*Idem gubernatore navis in temptestatu consternato dixit quid debitas Caesarem vehis*."[34] John Ffitzjames noted the episode as an example of Caesar's virtue:

> Virtus Caesar: Caesar being at sea in a greate tempest, and his pylott, beinge affrayde: he sayd unto him, be not affrayd my pylott, thow carriest Caesar. As though the very sea shood not dare to hurte such A Conquror![35]

while one of the Cambridge commonplacers excerpted it from Lucan as a piece of advice in the face of death:

> Mors: Caesar to his pilot: Italiam si caelo authore recusas, me tet; sola tibi causa haec est iusta timoris, vectorem non morte tuum; perrumpe procellas tutella secure mei. Lucan lib.3. 579.[36]

Readers also found in Caesar a generous and diplomatic politician. In his notes on Leigh's Suetonius, Adam Airay recounts how:

> when he found many letters in Pompey's cofferes, wherin diverse testified their good will unto Pompey, and their hatred towards him, he neither read them, nor copied them out, but presently burnt them, least being exasperated by them, hee should have beene forced to have committed some greater evill. p.20 {The patience of Julius Caesar}.[37]

---

[32] Antonio de Torquemada, *The Spanish Mandevile of miracles*. … (London, 1600), *STC* 24135, sig. Cc3r.
[33] BL, Lans. MS 679, fol. 52v; BL, Harl. MS 192, fol. 22v.
[34] BL, Lans. MS 679 fol. 94r.
[35] Guildhall MS 777, fol. 80v.
[36] Trinity College, Cambridge, MSR.16.7, fol. 118v.
[37] BL, Add. MS 45154, fol. 36r.

Other commonplacers cited his behaviour towards the pirates who captured him as an example of his laudable nature. John Morris notes from his reading of Plutarch the story of the young Caesar's spirited actions when captured by pirates in order to illustrate his bravery, under the heading, "*Audacia*":

> Jul. Caesar cum captus a Piratis solus ipse cum e uno amico et duobus familis int. eos ageret ita tamen eos spreuit et quotios quieti se dedisset mitteret qui eos tacere iuberet.[38]

Later in the same notebook, he revisits the story, this time quoting Suetonius on Caesar taking his revenge mercifully, crucifying the pirates as he had sworn to do, but slitting their throats first to spare them greater agony:

> Clementia: Suet Jul. Cap. 74. Julius Caesar cum a piratis quibusdam captus est, et lytrum persolvere coactus cumque eos in deditionem redegisset quoniam suffixurum se cruci ante iuverat, iugulari prius iussut, deinde suffig:[39]

Edward Palmer of Trinity College, Cambridge, referred himself to Lipsius as he noted that this behaviour was marvellously kind, and that Caesar acted in like fashion towards all his enemies, '*Clementia, Tyrann*[*is*]*: Julius Caesar in hostes et Piratus mirifece clement, vid. Lipsius*'.[40] And Adam Airay found similarly admirable qualities important when he recorded in his "Observations selected out of Leighs 12 Caesars" the dual claim Caesar had to power:

> In eloquence, and warlicke feates together, hee either equalled, or excelled the glory of ye very best. He held a sword in one hand, and a booke in ye other, with this motto, ex utroque Caesar, by both Emperour. p. 5.[41]

It is perhaps worth noting that Airay used Leigh's abridged and highly censored digest of Suetonius to make these notes, rather than the original; Leigh's work is by far the more complimentary of the two.

---

[38] BL, Royal MS 12 B.v, fol. 28r: Courage. Julius Caesar, when he was captured by the pirates, and was left among them with only one friend and two servants, he scorned them and, when he wanted to sleep, he sent word to them that he ordered them to be quiet.

[39] BL, Royal MS 12 B.v, fol. 34r: Clemency. Julius Caesar, after he was captured by the pirates, and when he was released on the shore, gathered a fleet and forced them to surrender. He then had them nailed to crosses, but first he ordered that their throats be cut, in order to be merciful, before they were crucified.

[40] Trinity College, Cambridge, MSR.16.6, fol. 709r: Clemency, tyranny. Julius Caesar was displayed marvellous clemency towards his enemies and the pirates.

[41] BL, Add. MS 45154, fol. 36r.

Toward the subject of Caesar's death, and the sensitive subject of regicide, readers' notes demonstrate a variety of approaches. One Cambridge students recorded that Brutus, Cassius and their fellow conspirators were known as 'parricides', on account of Caesar being given the appellation, *pater patriae*: "*Qui Iulium Caesar in Senatu confoderunt, Parricidae appellati: quia nempe Caesar Pater Patriae*."[42] Some noted the personal dimension to Caesar's fate, emphasising his awareness of his own sins and shortcomings, and the danger in which they placed him, drawing on contemporary histories of Rome as well as the classical sources. Another Cambridge student recorded almost verbatim from the 1613 English translation of Montaigne's essays that "Julius Caesar was wont to scratch his head with one finger, where is the countenance of a man surcharged with painfull imaginations; Montaigne lib.2 cap.17 pag.357, 358."[43] John Ffitzjames, in his Jacobean commonplace book, described Caesar's labours in achieving his position, and the high price he paid:

> Julius Caesar, neare the end of his tyme said, that hee wyst not well, whither sith more care, calamyty, and travell hee had obtayned his empire, or wth suspicyon, payne + danger he had enyoyed it after hee had gotten yt.[44]

And when Simonds D'Ewes read his Florus at Cambridge in 1618–19, the conspiracy against Caesar in the heart of his own city reminded him of the Gunpowder Plot against James I, giving rise to a diatribe condemning the Catholic attack on the king in the heart of Westminster; a clear example of the way that readers' interpretations of texts could be conditioned by their own experiences and preconceptions. D'Ewes drew especial attention to the parallel between the presaging of Caesar's demise, which he ignored, and the warning letter Mounteagle brought to James I; as much as James identified himself with Caesar, there were crucial aspects in which the two differed, as D'Ewes observed:

> …et Aliter vero rex noster semper invictis. Jacobus. A'D' 1605 cum inferna et inaudita illa sulphuria projectio a papistis moliebatur: non te[ ]it libellum a Domino de Mounteagle sibi deletam, ut Caesar illum ab obvio quod […] sibi

---

[42] Trinity College, Cambridge, MSR.16.6 fol. 319r: They who stabbed Caesar in the senate house were known as parricides: for Caesar without a doubt was the father of his country.

[43] Trinity College, Cambridge, MSR.16.7, fol. 68v. The original is: '*Iulius Caesar* was wont to scrath his head with one finger, which is the countenance of a man surcharged with painefull imaginations', in Montaigne, *Essays*, sig. Hh5r. Here we can clearly see how texts were subject to alterations during the notetaking process: there are orthographical differences and 'where' is substituted for 'which' by the reader.

[44] Guildhall MS 777, fol. 63v.

deditum… fideles et serve[…] mittit quaesitores, unde oppressi sunt proditores, detecta conjuratio, liberata respublica, florida ecclesia, et salvi omnes …haec igitur sit gloria Deo triuno in saecula saeculorum.[45]

Antony and Cleopatra

The assassination of Julius Caesar heralded the dawn of a new age of disorder at Rome, as Caesar's heirs waged war first on his assassins, and then upon each other. Thirteen years elapsed between the Ides of March in 44 BC, on which Caesar was stabbed to death, and Octavian's victory over the forces of Antony and Cleopatra at the battle of Actium; a further four years passed before Octavian entered Rome as Augustus Caesar.

The most famous tale of this period of Roman history is the ill-fated love between Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, and Mark Antony. Renowned today at least partly because of the enduring popularity of Shakespeare's play, the love theme for which the story is now noted was balanced in early modern interpretations by less romantic elements, following the classical sources, which mostly dwell on the political ramifications of the relationship between the ill-fated pair. Plutarch is the exception, embroidering the events with emotional interest, according to his role as a biographer, but other ancient versions of the tale of Antony and Cleopatra focus on the political, the struggle for power, and questions of empire. Dio, for example, reads as an analytical, objective history, with a clear debt to Thucydides; he examines the origins of events, and dispassionately assesses cause and effect.[46]

---

[45] BL, Harl. MS 192, fol. 25r-v: And also our true king, James, was ever invincible. In AD 1605, the dastardly, hellish brimstone of the Catholic plot was put into action. He heeded Mounteagle's letter, warning of the conspiracy, which Caesar had failed to do… Faithful and trusty magistrates condemned the traitors, and the plot was foiled, the state set free, and the Church allowed to flourish. All were saved…for which be glory unto the triune God, now and for ever after.

[46] For example, Dio LI.15. After a matter-of-fact description of the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra, Dio succinctly analyses the impact of their lives and the reasons for their demise: 'The nature of their characters and the fortunes of their lives were thus: Antony understood his duty as no other man did, yet he was guilty of many foolish acts. Sometimes he was notable for his courage, yet he often failed through his own cowardice. The greatness of his soul and the servility of his mind characterised him equally. He made free with the possessions of others and frittered his own away. He was compassionate to many without good reason, and unjustly punished more. Therefore, although he rose from weakness to great might, and from utter poverty to great wealth, he gained nothing from either circumstance; after hoping to gain sole control of the Roman empire, he took his own life. Cleopatra was of insatiable passion and greed; she was motivated often by praiseworthy ambition, but often by excessive aspiration. Through love, she gained the title of Queen of

Some students sought to emulate these methods as they made notes on the story of Antony and Cleopatra. Reading William Fulbecke's *Continuall Factions*, which he called "Fulbeck's continuance of Livy," shortly after it was published in 1601, Edward Pudsey noted that the historian should report things in order to "unfold" their secrets, so that the reader might know the true workings of time:

> To report things that bee done it is easie because the eye and the tounge may dispatch it, but to discover & unfold the causes of things, requyreth brayne.... The causes of things are so misticall & secret being the most remote obiect to wch our understanding may aspyre that wee may easilye be deceived by disguysed & pretended reasons whiche wee seek for the trew and essentiall causes.[47]

He later explains in the same volume how, apart from truth, a perfect history requires:

> explanation in discovering not onely ye sequells of things but also ye causes & reasons [and] judgment in distinguishing things by approving ye best & disallowing the contrarye, enterlacing ye tale with judiciall breef sentences.[48]

Fulbecke's account closely follows these criteria for good history, privileging the significantly political over the more personal and therefore trivial events. We do not know whether Pudsey was a student at the university, although his cousin had been educated at St John's College, Oxford, and so we cannot use Pudsey's notetaking from a newly-published, contemporary work rather than a primary source to reflect upon the nature of undergraduate study; nevertheless, it seems that Pudsey found in Fulbecke a semblance of the classical style, and framed his notes on Antony and Cleopatra accordingly.[49]

The reception of Antony and Cleopatra is necessarily different from interpretations and figurings of Julius Caesar and Octavian. All are implicated in the civic turmoil occasioned by the various contests for power at Rome, but while Caesar and Augustus were victorious, at least for a time, Antony and his Egyptian queen never succeeded in winning

---

the Egyptians, and when she hoped to win that of Queen of the Romans by the same means, she failed to do the latter, and lost the former as well. She ensnared the two greatest Romans of her day, and because of the third, she destroyed herself.'

47 Bodleian, Eng. MS Poet. d.3, fol. 10r-v.

48 Bodleian, Eng. MS Poet. d.3, fol. 53r.

49 David Kathman, 'Pudsey, Edward (*bap.* 1573, *d.* 1612/13)', *ODNB*.

the Roman state. For this reason, the quantity of readers' notes on Antony and Cleopatra is small when compared with the number of excerpts concerning Julius and Augustus Caesar. Readers seeking reasons for the development of history read the ancient sources that focused on the constitutional impact of the struggle between Antony and Octavian, and may well have been exposed to contemporary analyses of events in the form of contemporary published histories, as Pudsey was. On the whole, however, they chose to dismiss Antony as a political player because of his defeat, and directed their attention to the victorious Octavian, who was to control the course of history for nearly half a century. No matter how gripping the Egyptian story may have been for playwrights and audiences, it did not possess the same degree of importance for the students of Roman history engaged in private or institutional reading.

Nevertheless, the tale of Antony and Cleopatra fulfilled at least one function for early modern readers. The tragic ends of the lovers may have made them the focus of love stories in later ages, but for early modern readers, their deaths were the result of unrestrained and unsuitable passions which effectively removed them from the political stage at Rome, and thus provided a warning against excessive and inappropriate emotion. Far from being a testament to the power of love, the relationship between queen and general was largely approached with disapproval by students of the ancient sources. In their fall, readers perceived warnings about the qualities which bred personal success, and those which occasioned failure. The only "causes of things" readers noted with regard to Antony and Cleopatra were the reasons for their demise, and these were judged to be ones of private morality, or the lack thereof.

Figures notable by their absence from readers' notes also have something to reveal about the perception of Roman history in the early modern period. Just as Crassus, the third member of the First Triumvirate, receives barely a mention anywhere in the manuscript sources, so Lepidus, the third arm of power in the Second and Third Triumvirates, is almost entirely ignored. The ancient sources have little juicy biographical detail to offer about Lepidus, focusing instead on his political importance; no 'life' was written by Plutarch, and he died a peaceful death in exile in 13 or 12 BC after being removed from the political arena by Octavian in 36 BC.[50] The absence of any real interest in such tertiary figures reveals a

[50] Plutarch did write a life of Crassus, but this seems to have attracted very little attention on the part of early modern students. On the career of Lepidus, see Richard D. Weigel, *Lepidus: the tarnished triumvir* (London, 1992).

preoccupation with those characters who afford the most lessons, both moral and political, on account of the depth of their depictions in the Greek and Roman sources. Men and women who were 'visible' not only for their contribution to constitutional affairs but also because of their private behaviour, virtuous or otherwise, were the most attractive exemplars for early modern readers as they studied their Roman history.

The most common lessons students and commonplacers found in the story were therefore ones which could be applied to their own quotidian existence, rather than those which explained any grander scheme of world history. The characters of Antony and Cleopatra stood as mirrors for the lives of ordinary Christian men, more than they contained messages about the conduct of high politics. This represents a very specific appropriation of history for readers' own ends, as the focus of early modern readings is very different from the constitutional bent of the majority of the classical sources. The political events of this decade and a half are rarely found excerpted in the notebooks, unless they could be made applicable to everyday life: although the commonplace books all record public, political extracts from Roman history under headings such as good leadership, clemency and ambition, there are almost no notes at all relating Antony and Cleopatra to these topics. Instead, readers paid strong attention to the sexual vices of the protagonists, excerpting *sententiae* on the personal sins and the wasteful conspicuous consumption of Antony and Cleopatra in Egypt.

Readers utilised Antony and Cleopatra as examples of personal moral laxity, in accordance with biblical standards. Antony's great virtue is shown to have been overcome by common dangers which can overthrow any man who fails to be on his guard: his downfall is at least partly his own fault. Wine and the sensual weaknesses resulting from imbibing too much alcohol, along with love of Cleopatra, defeated Antony, as Edward Palmer noted from Seneca's epistle on drunkenness:

> Bacchus, Vinum, Ebrietas, Luxuria: M. Antonii magnum virum et ingenii nobilis, quae alia res perdidit, et in externos mores ac vitia non Romana traiecit, quam ebrietas, nec minor vino Cleopatra amor. Haec illum res hostem Reip:, haec hostibus, [suis] imparem reddidit. Seneca ep. 83.[51]

[51] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 127r: Bacchus, wine, inebriation, luxury. Mark Antony was a great man, of noble spirit and ability; but what ruined him and drove him into foreign ways and unRoman vices, was drunkenness, and, no less intoxicating than wine, the love of Cleopatra. This was what made him an enemy of the Roman state; this was what rendered him no match for his enemies.

In such circumstances, Christian and classical morality were of one accord: Antony's behaviour was reprehensible both by Christian moral codes, retrospectively applied to the Roman story, and by the standards of traditional republican values, which prized abstention and self-discipline in leaders and generals.

Moralising interpretations are especially prevalent in the books of men of identifiably godly persuasion, such as Simonds D'Ewes. D'Ewes chose to excerpt the sections of Florus that focus on lust, luxury, and licentiousness, rather than the practical details of the battles between Antony and Octavian, to which Florus himself devotes far greater attention.[52] With marginal notes warning of the dangers of lust, "*libidinis*," D'Ewes truncates and abbreviates, adapting Florus for his own ends. Unlike the more generous prose historians who exonerated Antony to some degree, blaming Cleopatra for bewitching him, D'Ewes makes it plain that Antony is responsible for his actions and deserves no mercy. For example, in the discussion of the promise Antony makes of giving royal power to Cleopatra and her children, Florus writes, "*Hinc mulier Aegyptia ab ebrio imperatore pretium libidinum Romanum imperium petit; et promisit Antonius*."[53] The implication is that Cleopatra is holding the drunken and incapacitated Antony to ransom; intoxicated, he capitulates, and promises her the empire in return for her favours. D'Ewes, however, records, "*Et Cleopatrae suae inter ebrietatem et libidinem Romanum imperium promisit*."[54] Florus places the emphasis on Cleopatra demanding the empire, something which D'Ewes does not mention; rather, by making Antony the subject of the sentence, D'Ewes renders him more culpable in promising the empire to Cleopatra amid drinking and debauchery, as if he is the initiator of the scheme. Thus he increases the severity of Antony's crime by removing any external pressure from Cleopatra, and the fault seems Antony's alone.

But Cleopatra's vices, too, were the focus of scholarly attention. She is depicted as having unnatural characteristics, appetites no woman should possess, and the manipulative powers of a she-devil. Oliver St John, in a commonplace book devoted largely to theology, judged that Cleopatra's death was a punishment for her sins, emphasising her immoral conduct by the image of the asps suckling at her breast rather than biting her, in a manner reminiscent of the imagery associated with witchcraft:

---

[52] BL, Harl. MS 192, fol. 27r.

[53] Florus, II.xxi: the Egyptian woman demanded from the inebriated commander the empire of Rome, as the price of sexual gratification; and Antony promised it to her.

[54] Ibid., fol. 27r: And to Cleopatra, in the heat of lust and drinking, he promised the Roman empire.

> *De Poenae:* See Cleopatra, an Aegyptian Queene, her lewd life and her dismall death, she inclosed her selfe in a tombe and having two serpents sucking at her papps so died. All men are inexcusable in their sinnes.[55]

Several of the Trinity commonplace books note Cleopatra's sexuality and predatory nature. Listed under the heading 'love', the entries emphasise the dangers of sex, which they judge to have caused Antony's servitude and downfall. For example, one entry in Edward Palmer's book reads, "*Amor: Cleopatra Romanos ad turpissimam servitutem adduxit*."[56] Further on, the domination of Cleopatra over the unfortunate Antony is again noted, "*tuam mox dominam et arbitram, et apud quam fatalem servios servitutem,*" while the book of another student draws, from Martial, an example of her gross promiscuity, "*Libido, Amor, Nuptiae: Cleopatra centum, et sex viris exhausit*."[57]

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the desirability of Cleopatra preoccupied some of our academic readers. The Oxford man, Adam Airay recorded a discussion of the attractions of Cleopatra, taken from his reading of the third book of *The mirror which flatters not.*[58] They are represented as sufficiently strong to overcome even Octavian's virtue, and his escape is fortuitous, dependent on Cleopatra's suicide rather than his own resistance:

> What honour had Caesar borne away if he had ioyned to his Trophies ye slavery of Cleopatra? He had exposed to view a captive Queene, who otherwise had subjected him to her lone dominion. But if ye fortune of ye warre had delivered him this princesse, ye fate of love would have given even himselfe into her hands. Insomuch, yt ye death of Cleopatra, immortaliz'd ye renowne of Caesar.[59]

In the classical sources, much is made of Octavian's refusal of Cleopatra's charms. For example, Florus explicitly states how "Cleopatra, throwing herself at the feet of Caesar tried in vain to attract his gaze; her beauty was not able to overcome his self-control."[60] Notorious for his evangelical

---

55 BL, Add. MS 25285, fol. 71v.

56 Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 8r: Love. Cleopatra led the Romans into the most foul servitude.

57 Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 13v: Love. To the miserable Antony: it is fated that you shall be enslaved to Cleopatra, your ruler and mistress; Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.10, fol. 271r: Desire, love, marriage. Cleopatra exhausted one hundred and six men.

58 Jean Puget de la Serre, *The mirrour which flatters not* trans. Thomas Carey, (London, 1639), STC 20490. Airay refers himself to p. 143, which is sig. L6r.

59 BL, Add. MS 45154, fol. 13r.

60 Florus, II.xxi.

Calvinism, Airay might well be expected to focus on the perils of lust.[61] Following de la Serre, he judges Octavian to be as prone to the temptations of the flesh as any other man, lucky in his escape rather than virtuous, noting from the printed marginalia in the text, "he triumphs with an ill grace, over whom his vices triumph."[62]

Early modern readers connected the personal failings of the protagonists with their inability to rule well; the question of what made a good prince was inextricably bound up with a ruler's personal virtue, in much the same way as the classical concept of the '*dux bonus*' depended upon the general's personal abilities. Thus the personal and the political are very much intertwined in the Antony and Cleopatra story, and the moral meanings are important not only in their implications for the characters of the actors, but also for the impact they have upon history. Dr South of Christ Church, in a seventeenth-century book of academic notes, conflates two parts of Velleius Paterculus' *Roman History* to describes Antony's flight at Actium as the result of Cleopatra's influence over him:

> Antony was led by Cleopatras counsel, fought at sea as shee counseld. Put agst yt of his souldiers, she led ye fight & flight wth 60 ships. Antony proclaimed himself victor because not conquered.[63]

In Edward Palmer's Cambridge commonplace books, too, Velleius Paterculus is the source cited for two entries concerning Antony's bad leadership, which is a stain upon the glory of Rome. "*Antonius perduellis = qui Caesaris = eadem probavit = qui exteris Romanum imperium mancipabat,*" he writes, of Antony's treasonable disposal of Roman territories. Later on the same page, he records:

> Ingratus Antonius in dictatorem suum, quem iure caesum pronuntiavit, interfectoresque eius in provincias, et imperia dimisit, patriam vero proscriptionibus, incursionibus bellis lacerabit, post tot mala destinavit ne Romanis quidem regibus.[64]

---

[61] A. J. Hegarty, 'Airay, Henry (1558x60–1616)', *ODNB*.

[62] BL, Add. MS 45154, fol. 13r.

[63] BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 30v.. The first two sentences echo II. 85, a description of Actium, with the detail about the sixty ships taken from Plutarch, *Antony*, 66. The final sentence is translated more exactly from II.82, describing Antony's adventures in Media and Parthia: Yet Antonius called this flight of his a victory, because he had escaped with his life.

[64] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 314v: Antony was a public enemy of Caesar's, which he proved when he gave the Roman empire away into foreign hands. Ungrateful Antony, who, in his dictatorship, did violence to justice. He proclaimed the proscriptions, sending the killers forth with their orders in Rome and in the provinces, and wounded the nation with the injuries of war. Not even under the kings were so many evils done to the Roman people.

Antony's vicious actions made him an undesirable ruler, and an unfit prince. For Palmer, he was worse even than the kings, making him the greatest oppressor Rome had ever seen. His cruel actions were inexcusable in one in such a position of authority; great offences indeed, which ultimately led him to his ruin.

Augustus

Antony's defeat resulted in the reign of Octavian as Augustus, first emperor of Rome. A victor whose rule was long and largely peaceful, Augustus is necessarily represented in relatively fair terms by most of the ancient sources, and this is reflected in the commonplaces readers drew from their texts. For the attributes he brought to his exercise of sovereignty, Augustus was often acclaimed as a good ruler in the notebooks: clement, kind, not excessively concerned with the pursuit of glory, but not lacking ambition either. Edward Palmer of Trinity College, Cambridge made this point in a section entitled "*Patria. Magnitudo Romana ab Augusto dilatata.*"[65] He recorded many examples of Augustus' clemency, found in Suetonius, Seneca and Lipsius, among other places. Moreover, Augustus is absent from the list of emperors he compiled as examples of rulers who were guilty of tyranny, a list including names such as Caligula, Domitian and Nero, but not that of Caesar Augustus.[66] For Palmer, seeking instances of magnanimity and generosity in his ancient histories, Seneca's *De Clementia* was a rich source of complimentary anecdotes, yielding many instances of Augustus' embodiment of this virtue. "*Ffuerit Augustus moderatus, et clement. Seneca, de Clement, cap. 15*" is but one among many such entries on the page.[67]

A determinedly positive attitude, such as that demonstrated by Palmer, often governed readers' selection of excerpts. Whereas the sexual immorality of Antony was extensively noted by readers, they seem to have turned a blind eye to similar criticisms of Augustus, as they largely did with his adoptive father. Readers were uninterested in the accusations levied against Augustus by ancient sources such as Aurelius Victor that

---

[65] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol.98r: Of the commonwealth. Rome's greatness increased by Augustus.

[66] Ibid., fol. 709r.

[67] Ibid., fol. 719r.

"he was wont to lie betwixt twelve Zodomiticall boyes, and so many maides."[68] Suetonius, too, had criticisms of Augustus' relations with men:

> Sextus Pompey accused him of effeminacy, Mark Antony with having been adopted by his uncle because of unnatural acts; and Lucius, Antony's brother, said that after giving his virtue to Caesar he had sold himself to Aulus Hirtius in Spain for three hundred thousand sesterces

and his predilection for younger girls:

> even in his later years he liked to deflower young virgins, who were brought for him from all over the place, even by his own wife.

Yet although references taken from elsewhere in these sources are readily to be found, no trace of these sentiments appears in any of the manuscripts.

Augustus was regarded as a highly adept political leader. Readers recorded in depth how Augustus led by example in political life, taking a personal interest in the workings of justice and the state. Under the heading, "*De iustitia politica*," Oliver St John noted that:

> Octavius Caesar Augustus himselfe sat dayly in judgment yon till it was darke, and he administered justice not only wth exceeding severity, but also wth as great levity

referring himself to Suetonius for further details.[69] Richard Rainolde, writing his life of Augustus based on Suetonius, was so complimentary about Augustus' goodness as emperor that he declared the impossibility of doing justice to him in words. "To make a full discourse how, when, where, how happely he governed the most eloquent shall want meanes to utter," he wrote, and rather than tackle the impossible task of chronicling exactly how "so worthy a Prince, so fortunate a Captayne, so wyse a counsellor, and so victorious an Emperour" went about ruling, he described instead the prodigies predicting Augustus' reign.[70]

As with Caesar and Antony, the notebooks provide evidence of a concern with Augustus' personal actions and moral qualities, rather than the bigger historical or political picture. Many examples of his magnanimous rule can be found in the records of readers who combed their classics looking for *sententiae* and interesting phrases. The emperor's kindness to

---

[68] Marcus Junianus Justinus, *The historie of Iustine* trans. G. W. (London, 1606), *STC* 24293, sig. Ee5v; Suetonius, *Augustus*, 68, 71.

[69] BL, Add. MS 25, 285, fol. 114r.

[70] Rainolde, *Chronicle*, sig. Cvr-v.

his subjects was recorded by Dr South in the form of an anecdote about a wounded soldier, whom Augustus defended in court:

> A poor fellow arraigned, shewd Augustus yt wounds he had in his service, wrefore Augustus pleadding cause & wun it.[71]

When noting his "Observations gathered out of a manuall of essayes Morall, Theologicall, Historicall and Politicall by P.T.," Adam Airay wrote that:

> We ought to deal with our adversarys as Augustus did wth Cinna: once more (said he to him) I give ye life, first as to an Enimy, now as to a Traytor and a parricide: let love and frindshipp from this day forward begin betwixt us: let us contend, *utrum ego meliore fide vitam tibi dederim, aut tu debeas*; whether ye creditor or ye debter be ye honester man.[72]

In the margin is the note, "We may make our best friends, of our greatest foes, by forgiving them." Oliver St John, a man who recorded much about Augustus, lauded his upholding of stringent laws against adulterers, contrary to the more scurrilous reports found in some of the ancient sources. He recorded "Their punishment. Octavius Caesar Augustus established ye law enacted by Julia, yt adulterers should be put to death."[73]

But it was as the man who brought peace to a troubled world that Augustus received the most attention. The *pax Romana* was acclaimed in ancient times, but held an especial attraction for early modern readers concerned with civic stability and the threat of international confessional warfare. Augustus "raigned very godly 47 years," John Ffitzjames wrote in the late sixteenth century.[74] "*Augustus rex pacificus*" declared Edward Palmer, referring himself to Horace's secular odes: "*Sub illo pax, et foelicitas caetera florebat*."[75] He echoed a sentiment expressed by Richard Rainolde in his *Chronicle* of 1571, who noted "Howe happye had the Romaine Empyre beene if so quiet a Prince, or if the rare vertues of so vertuous a governour had continued amonge them."[76]

Moreover, the late sixteenth century appreciation of Augustus as peacemaker, and ruler at the time when Christ was born, encouraged a focus on his deeds as emperor in contrast with those of the aspiring young Octavian.

---

71 BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 30v. This echoes Heylyn's *Augustus*, sig. H1v-2r.
72 BL, Add. MS 45154, fol. 27v.
73 BL, Add. MS 25285, fol. 42r.
74 Guildhall MS 777, fol. 28r.
75 Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 98v: Augustus was the King of Peace; under him there was peace, and happiness flourished.
76 Rainolde, *Chronicle*, sig. C3r.

That the birth of Christ, and thus the reign of Augustus, marked a turning point in world history is an idea expressed in two commonplace books. Oliver St John noted the significance of Augustus' reign for Christianity, recording in a list of emperors that "Caius Octavius raigned Emperour and governed ye common welth 44 yeares. in ye 29 yeare of his raigne, of ye world 3954, was our Savious J. Xt. borne."[77] Meanwhile, Dr South of Christ Church, dating the assumption of imperial powers to 27 BC, opined that "The Romans latter era was from ye 26 year of Augustus Empire," seeing the nativity of Christ as a demarcation between Rome's golden age and the beginning of the end of the Roman empire.[78]

But not all Augustus' good qualities could blind readers to some of the ambiguities concerning his rise to power, and the means by which he maintained his influence. Some commonplace books demonstrate a degree of ambivalence. Partly as a result of the nature of the commonplacing habit, it is sometimes it is hard to know what to make of readers' records: in 1604, for example, John Morris thought it worthwhile to note "in praise of swimming" how Suetonius records in chapter 64 of his life of Octavian that "*Octavius Augustus Imperator Nepotes et literas et natare aliaque rudimenta per se plerumque docuit*," that is, he personally taught his grandsons reading, swimming and other rudimentary knowledge.[79] One Cambridge student recorded that Augustus was Julius Caesar's adopted son and inherited not only his name but his empire, "*Augustus, Iulii Caesaris filius adoptiuus: cui nomen et imperium transcripsit*" and the source from which he drew the information, "*vide Morellum in statium libr. 1 Sylvarum, pag. 25 ex Auson.*"[80] Another noted from Vergil that Augustus, "*qui 50 annon renovit: Imperium sine fine dedit.*"[81] This reference, connected to the prophecy of a new Rome, is followed later in the book by the gnomic, unattributed quotations allegedly by Augustus, "It is better to be Herods pigg then his sonne" and "I love the treason but I hate the traytor"; whether these sayings are positive reflections on Augustus or otherwise is hard to tell without more contextual information, and they may simply have sparked some interest in the reader for no particular reason.[82]

The illustrations of Augustus which predominate in readers' commonplaces and notebooks, however, are ones addressing his abilities as a

---

77 BL, Add. MS 25, 285, fol. 67r.
78 BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 44v.
79 BL, Royal MS 12.B.v, fol. 100r.
80 Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.10, fol. 209v.
81 CUL MS 9221, fol. 12v.
82 Ibid., fol. 23v, 40v.

statesman and politician, and while many were positive, some excerpts reveal more circumspection. There is no doubt that Augustus was a wily, canny ruler, and his political adroitness was noted as an example of the means by which rulers govern: these were sometimes good, and at other times far from it. Despite the pro-Augustan bias of the ancient sources, Octavian does not escape readers' criticism for his part in the proscriptions of the political enemies of the second triumvirate. John Ffitzjames noted with distate how both Antony and Octavian were responsible for Cicero's murder:

> M T Cicero who for his excellent lerninge and vertues passes all other in his tyme, was so trewe a lover of the comon wealth that he hated all enimies therunto and therfore proclaymed Antonius as an enimye. Who laide warres against Octavius (whom Cicero had brought up, and placed to be govnor of the commonwealthe) Antonius therfore hated Cicero so deadly that in treaty of peace betweene him and Octavius his chiefe demande was to have Cicero to do wth him what he wld. Wch thinge Octavius most unnaturally and unkyndlye granted. and presently Antonius sent out herenius (whom Cicero not long before by his eloquence had saved from death) to pursue him as he fled. wch thinge when Cicero perceyved, he aboad his cumminge and wyllingly prepared his throate for herrennius who assoone as he came to him, did strike of his head and his hande and brought them to Antonius who rejoysinge therat, most dispightfully used yt.[83]

The manuscript with most to say about Augustus is that compiled by Robert South while he was at Christ Church, Oxford. South was a staunch Anglican, attending illegal services as a student under the Protectorate government, and he later achieved a degree of success within the Church under Charles II and James II, wholeheartedly espousing the cause of the divine right of kings.[84] It may be that South's views on kingship, which were repeatedly challenged throughout his life and which underwent difficult adjustments with the accession of William III, caused him to concentrate on Augustus in his note-taking, since for some reason he bothered to take more notes on Augustus than earlier, highly diligent students of Roman history such as those at Trinity College, Cambridge. It seems likely that South was reading a life of Augustus, probably Heylyn's essay, and selected numerous commonplaces on government for his book; all the notes cast light upon the emperor's abilities to lead and persuade, and keep control of his dominion. "Augustus feared not traters but close

[83] Guildhall MS 777, fol. 44r.
[84] Burke Griggs, 'South, Robert (1634–1716)' *ODNB*.

fellows," notes South, and "Augustus employed his soldiers to change boggs, yt they might not be idle and mutinous," demonstrating Augustus' astute approaches to military and political affairs.[85] South notes how Augustus could act clemently when it furthered his political aims, and links the observation to a general statement about dictators, of whom Augustus is implicitly one:

> The Romans in extremity ran to ye monarchy of dictators. Caesar, by erecting ye broken images of Pompey, made his own statue stand ye firmer. And Augustus, by pardoning those of ye factions of Brutus and Antony, setled himself more firmly in ye state.[86]

Other examples of this interest in the processes of leadership include the notes that "Augustus forbad any noble man to travel out of Italie" and "Augustus, to supress all theeves, ordained a watch of 7000 firemen, yr captain a senator of Rome."[87] We can only surmise what South thought of the fact that "Augustus made use of whores to fish out ye secrets of statesmen."[88] The idea appears in Heylyn, who declines to comment on the propriety of the fact that Augustus "used a variety of women, not so much to satisfy a disordinate appetite, as by so many women to fish out the secret designes of many men."[89] This is not a practice of which a godly Christian should approve, but one which seems to have been effective for the emperor, and which South therefore thought worth noting. South also observed how Augustus "publickly burnt ye coffers of Antony wherein were his secrets," something which Dio cites as an example of the political acumen Octavian demonstrated in neutralising threats against him. If these documents were destroyed, Octavian would not use them later as evidence against his former enemies, so he was sending a public message that he intended to pardon the faults of the past.[90] The idea seems to have struck South as so worthy of note that he recorded it again some thirty sides later: "Augustus in ye forum burnt ye cofferes of Antony wherein were his secrets."[91] Most significant is South's recognition that Augustus'

---

85 BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 30v.
86 BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 45r.
87 Ibid., fol. 45r. cf. Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. G3r, H9r.
88 BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 30v.
89 Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. K10r-v.
90 Dio, LII.42.
91 BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 45r.

success as emperor depended upon his persuading the people of Rome that they had granted him his power:

> Augustus took a lease of ye government every Decennium, knowing well yt not ye title of Dictator but perpetual destroyed Caesar. He rents his clothes at ye name of Dictator.[92]

This analysis of Caesar's demise and the contrast with Augustus' canny pretensions doubtless held especial significance for one who had recently seen his own king executed.

Robert South's notebook also shows that, as he read, he paid especial attention to another representational tactic: the deification of Augustus. The Roman emperor, he commented, "was called Augustus by ye senate as if more yn a mortal."[93] South made a conscious link between the posthumously deified Augustus and the divine right theories espoused by the Stuart monarchy, as did the Stuart kings themselves. Unfortunately for the Stuarts, their parliaments did not acquiesce in the illusion as readily as Augustus' Senate, and nor did the Cambridge students who compiled the Trinity commonplace books in the latter years of James I's reign. Two explicitly critical judgements made about the proximity of Augustus to the gods occur in Edward Palmer's volume, and that of one of his fellows. Both cite Lipsius as one of the sources, both accuse Augustus of pride or aspiration, and both concern the sacred nature of his kingship. The first notes simply, "*Superbia: Domus Augusto, domus Iovis*. *Lipsius, Seneca*," pointing out how Augustus was numbered among the gods and his house was as a temple; it is the classification by the reader of this fact as 'pride' that gives it its negative connotation and turns it from neutral observation into moral judgement.[94] The second refers the commonplacer to works detailing the honours given to Augustus, and the priests who served him as *dives Augustus*:

> Superba etc: Divi honores Augusto decreti. vid. Bernartius et Suet. in Aug. cap.8… De sacerdotibus Augusti, et Liviae, vide aurea Lipsii in Tacitum.[95]

---

[92] BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 45r. This echoes Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. E12r-v: 'Not the title of *Dictator*, but the Epithite, *Perpetuall*, was the destruction of Caesar…When the people called him *Dictator*, he rent his garments'.

[93] BL, Lans. MS 695, fol. 45r.

[94] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 428v.

[95] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.10, fol. 221r.

Suetonius, Lipsius on Tacitus, and Bernatius are all sources for the divinity of Augustus, which the reader again describes negatively, as evidence of the sin of pride. Although divine right theory differs substantially from sacral kingship as practised in ancient Rome, the two are connected, and this reader's clear decision to ascribe Augustus' deification to his proud intentions may be more than simply a Christian judgement on any man setting himself up as an idol.

PART TWO

RE-IMAGINING ROME

RE-IMAGINING ROME

The final decades of the sixteenth century saw an acceleration of the interest in ancient Rome, which was to continue during the reigns of James I and Charles I. The strength of this interest is indicated by the unprecedented quantity of printed material concerning ancient Rome that was being produced in England. A concentration on the origins of the principate is demonstrated by the majority of these texts; they are new creations drawing on the classical sources, or mediating European scholarship for an English audience, choosing to focus on the political upheavals at Rome in the first century BC. These works include John Sleidan's *Brief chronicle of the foure principall empires* (1563; also in Latin 1584; then 1627, 1631, 1636 and 1661), and William Fulbecke's *An historicall collection of the continuall factions of the Romanes* (1601, 1608).[1] Richard Rainolde's *A chronicle of all the noble emperours of the Romaines* (1571), *Romes Monarchie* by the unidentified E.L. (1596), and the *Observations upon the lives of Alexander, Caesar, Scipio* by Giovanni Botero (1602) also focus on the particular importance of the lives of Julius and Augustus Caesar as either an end or a beginning of great events at Rome.[2] The predominance of late-republican interests among early modern writers is evidenced especially strongly in the drama: the Roman civil wars between Caesar, Pompey and Pompey's heirs between 49 and 44 BC formed the subject-matter for a great many dramatic works in the late-Elizabethan and Jacobean years, as did Caesar's assassination and the tragic revenge served upon his killers.

It is not hard to detect the significance of these events for readers and writers living in post-Reformation Europe. Rome could be used as an antique case-study on which the modern world could improve, or it could

---

[1] Johannes Sleidanus, *A briefe chronicle of the foure principall empires…* (London, 1563), *STC* 19849; William Fulbecke, *An historicall collection of the continuall factions, tumults, and massacres of the Romans* (London, 1601), *STC* 11412. The 1608 edition appeared as *An abridgement, or rather, a bridge of Roman histories to passe the neerest way from Titus Liuius to Cornelius Tacitus…STC* 11413. Hereafter *Continuall Factions.*

[2] Richard Rainolde, *A chronicle of all the noble emperours of the Romaines from Iulius Caesar…*(London, 1571), *STC* 20926; E. L., *Romes monarchie, entituled the globe of renowned glorie..,* (London, 1596), *STC* 21296; Giovanni Botero, *Observations upon the Lives of Alexander, Caesar, Scipio* (London, 1602), *STC* 3397.

represent an ever-present possibility for repetition, depending upon a reader's perception of the Roman past, or a writer's attitude to historical exemplars.[3] In the light of enduring concerns about the instability and mutability of constitutions and bodies politic, the history of the Roman republic provided a background for the exploration of possible political courses a modern state might follow. Rome was a model for early modern England. The Sallustian-Livian myth of a Rome which conquered the world by its virtue, and which fell because of the increasing sway of vice, was a yardstick by which educated society judged itself, and to whose standards it referred its own mores.[4] While the decade 1598–1608 saw the most prolific production of 'great' plays on Roman themes, other forms of historical writing, including written records of reading on Roman history, were produced steadily throughout the Elizabethan and early Stuart period. History was expected to repeat itself, and the example of Roman history certainly seemed to be recurring in the early modern world: the transition from limited to absolute monarchical government across Europe mirrored the imperial dynasties at Rome after the fall of Julius Caesar, while the growth of Rome's empire could be interpreted as being reborn in the colonisation of the New Worlds. The belief that trends and patterns would follow Roman precedents gave rise to concerns, based on Roman historiography, that a corresponding moral laxity and decline in order might be seen in Europe as it had been at Rome.[5]

History was better placed than any other kind of study to educate. So William Traheron, the translator of Pedro Mexia's *The history of all the Roman emperors*, explains his motivation in undertaking the work as "to write something for the common good of my countrey, as in satisfaction and account for the time which I have spend in reading," which he can best do by translating "some great and notable historie":

> Truly I had reason and sufficient ground to do so, for that indeede no kinde of literature can be written, which may be beneficiall to so many, and be

[3] D. R. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English historical culture 1500–1730* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 59–61, 66–7.

[4] Hunter, 'A Roman Thought', p. 96.

[5] See, for example, Blair Worden, 'Historians and Poets' in Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History*, p. 75, including a thought-provoking consideration of how far the anticipation of the future based on past examples influenced events.

> generally acceptable and pleasing to all; neither that hath bin so much extolled and commended by wise and great men, as Historie.[6]

He goes on to cite the authorities from antiquity who have demonstrated the importance of history: "Aristotle affirmeth it to be profitable for Councels, Senates, and Assemblies," while Zeno writes that, if a man is to be wise and fortunate, "he should converse with the dead: which is as much as if he should have said, let him by reading histories understand and know the acts of the ancients." Finally he quotes the extract from Cicero most frequently used to express the value of history: that it is "the record of times, the light of the truth, the Mistris of mans life, the life of memorie, the messenger of antiquitie…"[7]

Traheron then explains the precise uses to which history may be put in the modern age by men of all degrees:

> this fruite and profit is common to all sorts of men: for Kings and Princes in Histories may finde others whom they may imitate, and with whom they may emulate and contend in vertues and excellencies: and other wicked ones, whose fashions and conditions they may shew and abhorre, and by whose ends and fame they may take example: Captaines, advice, policies, acts of fortitude and magnanimities, which they may use and make profit of: and seeing the errors and daungers, may know how to avoide them. Governours and Magistrates, lawes, customes, and manner of government, which they may hold for a rule. Finally, there is not any kind of people, but out of Historie may draw a rule and example under which they may live wisely and vertuously, and warning to beware of the contrarie. For the true histories…is a testimonie against the wicked, a reward to the just, and a treasurie and depositorie of heroicall vertues and noble acts.[8]

Such a desire to expose the 'true' history of Rome in order to explicate certain important concerns pertaining to early modern England lies behind all the re-imaginings of the Roman republic. But, as each author understood wisdom and virtue in subtly different ways, so each new 'history' reflects the ways in which he sought to educate his readers, and it is to the variety and multiplicity of these retellings of the Roman story that we now turn.

---

[6] Pedro Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors …*(London, 1604), *STC* 17851, sig. A2r. Edward Grimeston also produced an extended version in 1623 which continued 'to these times' (*STC* 17852). The earlier version is the one cited, unless otherwise specified.

[7] Ibid., sig. A4r.

[8] Ibid., sig. A4v-5r.

CHAPTER FIVE

FROM PHARSALUS TO PHILIPPI: STORIES OF POMPEY AND CAESAR

As Rome struggled with piracy at sea, an unwieldy empire abroad, and problems of slavery and enfranchisement at home, a series of extraordinary military commands were granted to talented commanders in the early decades of the first century BC, in an attempt to regain peace and stability. But the political process did not allow for the consequences of awarding so much power to so few individuals, giving rise to the rivalry between Caesar and Pompey which effectively tore the constitution apart. Their civil wars culminated in the consolidation of power in the hands of Julius Caesar, who sat at the head of the Roman state as no man had done since the expulsion of the Tarquins. Yet the spirit of the republic was not entirely dead, and Caesar's extraordinary position led to his assassination, as men loyal to the old constitution sought to reinstate traditional ideals of government by the Senate and People of Rome.

Early modern opinion differed as to the legitimacy of Caesar's rule and the validity of the attempt to restore the republic by removing him from power, and a variety of attitudes towards the protagonists in these civic upheavals are represented in the works of prose and drama composed in the Elizabethan and early Stuart years. Direct and loaded rewritings of the events in question appear in the histories composed in early modern England, and in the new translations; in this age when originality was less relevant to concepts of creativity than was a desire to make available to new audiences the wisdom of the past, translation was a transformative process, and each author or translator reworked his material into a new exposition of the republic's end. According to the connection the author perceived between the history of the Rome and his own world, comparisons between ancient and modern personalities were strategically deployed in order to provide counsel or illustrate moral examples. Perhaps the texts most freighted with meaning were the 'poesies' treating the wars between Caesar and Pompey, or Caesar's assassination, the plays and poems which strikingly manipulated the classical sources into selective retellings of the story, directing the focus onto a certain episode or

character in order to magnify what they perceived to be the most important or interesting element.[1]

The Roman civil wars made an apt subject for historians and poets. The clash between Caesar and Pompey afforded lessons both for individuals and the nation as a whole, and was presented as an admonitory tale by several writers seeking to draw attention to the political parallels between ancient history and the contemporary situation. The wars between the *populares,* led by Caesar, and Pompey's *optimates* were the most significant and protracted of the civil upheavals which afflicted Rome, and represented a state of affairs abhorrent to many English writers; Rome, with its martial traditions and bloody history, provided a warning for an England lately delivered from the threat of Spanish invasion and facing an uncertain future under an aged, heirless queen.

When John Lydgate's *Serpent of Division* was reissued in 1590, annexed to the tragedy of Gorboduc in the reprint of John Stow's 1559 edition, it underlined for Elizabethans the need for both national and personal virtue in times of trouble. His only known prose work, dating from 1422, and the most detailed treatment of Julius Caesar surviving in the corpus of Middle English literature, its publication in this format represented a literary expression of the desire for internal harmony in a state. This was an unsettled time in England's history, shortly after the first Armada crises and with the succession still undecided, as it had been insecure at the time of its composition, when Henry VI inherited the throne as an infant. The message is clear: pride and ambition on the part of great men lead to ruin and destruction. Lydgate's work warns England that:

> Three thinges brought ruine unto Rome,
> That ragned in Princes to their overthrow:
> Avarice, and Pride, with Envies cruell doome,
> That wrought their sorrow and their latest woe.
> England take heed, such chaunce to thee may come:
> Foelix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum.[2]

---

[1] Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: the culture of seventeenth century politics* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 426–35, and Herbert Lindenberger, *The History in Literature: on value, genre, institutions* (New York, 1990), esp. pp. 189–219.

[2] John Lydgate, *The serpent of devision Wherein is conteined the true history of mappe of Romes overthrowe, governed by avarice, envye, and pride, the decaye of empires be they never so sure. Whereunto is annexed the tragedye of Gorboduc, sometime king of this land, and of his two sonnes, Ferrex and Porrex. Set foorth as the same was shewed before the Queenes most excellent Maiesty, by the Gentlemen of the Inner Temple* (London, 1590), *STC* 17029; the quotation is found on the title page.

As if to emphasise the point further, there is no mention of the history that follows Caesar's civil wars, no mention of Augustus, his enduring empire, or the universal peace which he established. It clearly preaches a lesson to the readers to:

> consider in their harts the contagious harmes and importable dammages of the serpent of division, and let them see advisedlye how the ambitious pride of hautie Julius Caesar, the fretting envye of Pompeius, and the unstaunchable greedye covetise of Marcus Crassus: were the cheefe causes of their destruction, executed and accomplished by cruell death.[3]

The story continued to be used as a mirror for the English situation throughout the troubled 1590s. When the author of *Romes Monarchie* dedicated his work to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs of London in 1596, it was because Roman history was especially useful to those "called to the administering of justice in the publike weale," those in positions of magistracy who bore a responsibility to the commonwealth.[4] As he asserted in his title, E. L. sought to present "the principall warres and conquests of the Romanes" in order to demonstrate:

> how insurrections, rebellion, strife, civill discord and discention prevaling, was the onely plague, ruine, and utter destruction of many great monarchies, kingdomes, cities, and countries.[5]

Caesar's Rome was perceived to have especially close links with early modern Europe, and provided a means of understanding contemporary events through the reflection of the past. A desire to make clearer these direct connections lay behind the text, whose author drew a direct parallel between the civic turmoil engulfing Rome under Caesar and the religious wars on the continent, likening the threat of Catholic Spain to a Protestant England to Julius Caesar's abuse of the republic. The introduction to the work takes care to communicate this to the reader:

> by reading of which they may consider in these thundering dayes, the great threatnings of our mightie and mortal foe, the insatiable Monarch, whome the worlds Empire wil not suffice, Cesar like with his adherents, seeking daily by many craftie conveniances, treasons, treacheries, and other inhumane and unchristianlike meanes, to kindle the fire of strife and civill discention among us, the easier to prevaile, to the utter ruine, and overthrowe,

---

[3] Ibid., sig. D6r-v.
[4] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. A2r.
[5] Ibid., title page.

> both of Prince, people and countrie, which God of his good grace, hath most mightily and miraculously defended a long time.[6]

The equation of the republic with Elizabeth's England was a warning against civic dissent, and against war, whether civil or otherwise. Julius Caesar's ambition and lust for power brought ruin to the *status quo* at Rome, and E. L., like many of his contemporaries, feared that religious warfare could do the same to late sixteenth-century England, particularly if no Protestant heir was nominated by Elizabeth.

Similarly, the margins of Fulbecke's "*Historicall collection of the continuall factions, tumults, and massacres of the Romans*," a history bridging the gap between Livy and Tacitus, are full of sententious annotations, indicating "The fruits of civill discord" and "civill strife a destroyer."[7] What better example of the ills that befall a state when men allow pride and ambition to rule them than the story of Caesar and Pompey, which brought the end of Rome's republican glory? Here was not only a lesson for England as a whole, but for each individual subject, who had a duty to keep the peace for the good of the commonweal. Fulbecke's history not only reveals the "mischief of discord and civill discentions" and makes plain the cause, "which is nothing else but ambition"; the author also stresses that he hopes to provide a "declarying of the remedie." This, he states, is the opposite of the arrogance and pride of Caesar and Pompey; the virtuous man should be content with his lot in life, possessed of Christian humility, achieved through a:

> humble estimation of ourselves, by living well....Let Rome in this history be a witnesse, that a slipperie ascending was always accompanied with a headlong discent.[8]

William Traheron, translating Pedro Mexia's work on the lives of the Roman emperors for an English market at the start of the reign of James I, chose the material because it was:

> the truest subiect and most honourable; full of vertue and valour, the changes of times, the chaunces of wars, the instabilitie of fortune, the force of magnanimity, and reward of honor.[9]

---

[6] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. A3r.
[7] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. G2r, H2r.
[8] Fulbecke, sig. A2r-v.
[9] Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. A3r.

Received wisdom held that Julius Caesar was the first of these emperors from whom so much could be learned. His rise from the state of a private citizen to lord of Rome whose fortune then failed him, and Rome's alteration from republic to principate – these were the greatest transformations of all, the vicissitudes of fortune and the perils of hubris writ large in true *de casibus* style, appropriate subject matter for the beginning of the new, Stuart monarchy.

But Caesar and Pompey were more than a simple warning against civil strife and personal pride. The rule of Julius Caesar marked a turning point in the constitutional development of Rome, and in the lifetime of that great empire, suggesting a pattern for modern principalities. In both the providential linear conception of history, and the recurrent model of Polybian anacyclosis, Caesar's sole rule and gory demise represented an inevitable alteration in Rome's fortunes. Early modern writers used the example of Caesar to illustrate the inevitable collapse that befell states which expanded too far, and the demise to which all monarchies were subject until the empire of Christ should arrive.[10] Caesar's dictatorship came at the end of a century of unprecedented expansion and conquest at Rome, accompanied increasingly by political violence in the city. For the author of *Romes Monarchie*, it was the just deserts of a state more concerned with war and the lust for glory than with virtuous living:

> When bloud, when fire, when slaughter, spoyle & sack,
> Throughout the world had run to raise Rome hye,
> (Alas) what woe, what miserie, and wrack,
> (Vile wretchednes, and torments cruelly
> Her Empire causde, causles many to dye)
> Through treasons usde, with subtiltie and craft,
> And slye deceits since in the world laft.[11]

Not here the triumphant, all-encompassing empire spanning the known world, but a bringer of death and disrupter of civic harmony in pursuit of material gain and universal power. In this text, at least, warfare and the acquisition of new territories by brute force are portrayed as less desirable than a more irenic way of living in the interests of national stability.

---

[10] On the dual conception of history as ineluctably proceeding towards the *eschaton* and simultaneously cyclical, see D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: erudition, ideology, and the light of truth from the accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, 1990), p. 5. For the importance of anacyclosis in intellectual thought, see G.V. Trompf, *The Idea of Recurrence in Western Thought: from antiquity to the reformation* (Berkeley, CA, 1979).

[11] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. I3v.

Excessive expansion brings dangers, the author argues, and overreaching ends in disaster; Spain's ruthless attempts to re-Catholicise England by armed invasion and consolidate its conquests in the New World prompted the representation of Rome's imperial endeavours as vicious, rather than victorious.

For William Fulbecke, the beginning of Rome's end arrived at the start of Caesar's dictatorship. He saw Rome's end as imminent after the usurpation of senatorial power by Caesar, and the structure he imposed upon his text indicates how he shaped his history to reflect concerns for England in a Europe rent asunder by ideological conflicts. The work is divided into three books, each named after one of the Fates; the third, which commences with Caesar's defeat of Pompey's army, is entitled "Atropos", after the oldest of the three sisters. Known as the 'inevitable' one, Atropos cut off a mortal's thread of life with her shears, the same thread which had been spun by her sister Clotho (after whom Fulbecke names the first book) and which was measured by Lachesis (book II). Others authors believed Caesar's assassination to be the crucial moment; in their reworkings, this act led to general moral degeneration, and the assassins who struck Caesar down relinquished their republican virtue as they committed the deed, after which there was no hope for Rome. This is the view presented in a new translation of John Sleidan's *Key of* History published in 1627, and which appeared in subsequent editions in 1631 and 1636.[12] Caesar started a new era in Rome's history, "[t]he fourth monarchie begun by Caius Caesar," and he was killed because "supreame government" had been "reduced to one mans principalitie."[13] Caesar's assassination marks the end of the golden years at Rome, and Book One ends when Caesar dies, the rest of the work serving as an exegesis of the decline of Rome.[14]

Gnaeus Pompeius: Magnus?

Sententiae and moral lessons about Pompey found in the ancient sources were redeployed by authors of plays and prose histories to a greater extent than they were excerpted by students in the universities. Perhaps the most

[12] Johannes Sleidanus, *The key of history* (London, 1627), *STC* 19850, sig. G9r. The work had previously appeared in English in 1563, in a translation by Stephan Wythers (STC 19849) and in the original Latin in 1584 (STC 19847), in addition to the copies published across Europe.

[13] Ibid., sig. G7v.

[14] Ibid., sig. G9r-v.

famous instance of Pompey's history being recycled and harnessed to a new objective is in Nicholas Hilliard's Elizabethan miniature, *Young Man Among Roses*, painted sometime between 1585 and 1595. Here, the idea of Pompey is utilised as a symbol of greatness and constancy. The motto at the top of the painting, "*Dat poenas laudata fides*," taken from Lucan's *Pharsalia*, refers to Pompey's fidelity, not only to his wives, but to the republic.[15] Robert Devereux, the subject of the portrait, is thus identified with Pompey, assimilating to himself the Roman's military heroism and trueness of heart, as well as his professed love for his queen.[16] The parallel was probably intended to be a particularly pointed one, given that Pompey had achieved his first extraordinary command at the age of twenty-three, the age which Essex was when the portrait was painted.[17]

As champion of the republican constitution in the classical sources, Pompey was often depicted in art and literature as a figure of virtue. For those undertaking a more subtle analysis of the ending of the republic than a simple 'anti-war' reading, Pompey came into his own as the defender of the republic and leader of the Senate, the "piller whereupon Romes greatnesse was propped."[18] This pillar was the last defence of civic virtue against tyranny, which, when it perished, led to the degeneration of Rome under an increasingly corrupt imperial regime. *Romes Monarchie* eulogises Pompey, lauding him as being greater even than Caesar. The author asks, "What one did ever match thee since, or before [for] noble mind, valour, bountie love…honour…Constancie?"[19] The defender of the commonwealth against the usurping Caesar, he is "the worlds flower chiefe," while his assassins are cursed with direct apostrophe:

> Vile wretches that durst on him so lay hand,
> Whose noble hart relieved your wretched State.[20]

The long lament which follows, detailing all Pompey's achievements, reinforces the image of a hero who could do no wrong, great in nature, as well as name.

---

[15] Lucan, *Pharsalia*, Book VIII, l. 485: The faith for which I am praised is the cause of my pain.

[16] On Essex as the subject of the portrait, see R. C. Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan portraiture and pageantry* (London, 1977), pp. 66–8.

[17] Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd earl of Essex, 1585–1597* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 208.

[18] Olivier de la Marche, *The resolved gentleman. Translated out of Spanishe into Englyshe, by Lewes Lewkenor Esquier* (London, 1594), *STC* 15139, sig. D2r.

[19] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. I1v.

[20] Ibid., sig. I1r.

The reception of Pompey in the Elizabethan and early Stuart era, however, was by no means uniform across educated society. While he may have been a great and glorious figure in ancient Rome, he was frequently represented as a sinful man, culpable in the fomentation of Rome's civil wars, and anecdotes derived from classical literature were repeated by writers advising against the crimes of which he was guilty. Everard Digby, writing in 1590 on a topic of church policy ostensibly unconnected with Roman history, used the example of Pompey to reinforce his argument about the concomitant dangers of ambition. He expressed no regret at the general's unhappy end, rather adjudging that an ignominious death is just reward for those who make war upon their fellow men unnecessarily, and who overreach themselves:

> he was slaine in a bote, his head being stricken off, and his body cast on the straund, where it was but poorely buried. Thus died *Pompey* when he had lived thrée score yeares, spending his time in sheding bloud, whose proude minde in his aged time, would not suffer his body to rest, but in striving and contending for superioritie, he most shamefully lost his life. Thus (good friend) it is manifest what aspiring mindes gaine in the end.[21]

Although Pompey, unlike Caesar, "came to his honor and greatnesse, by his integritie and so advanced him selfe," he was also shown to be guilty of wrongdoing, albeit that "the injuries that *Pompey* did unto the common weale, were done of necessitie, to please *Caesar* and *Scipio*, both of them his fathers in law."[22] John Taylor emphasised Pompey's ruthless pursuit of supremacy, casting him as the chief malefactor who wrecked the republic, while Caesar hoped to work together to reach a compromise:

> Fellow-SHIP: this ship was once of that estimation, that *Iulius Caesar* would have beene content to hauv sayled in her, but that the great *Pompey* scorn'd any equality, and would by no meanes boord the Fellow-SHIP with any man.[23]

Taylor is unique in exonerating Caesar. More common is the commonplace, recorded in the student notebooks, that neither Pompey nor Caesar could bear to have his authority challenged by the other. It found its way into several works, published across the period. Peter Heylyn, in his *Augustus*, opined of Pompey that, "could he have brooked an equall," he

---

[21] Everard Digby, *Everard Digbie his dissuasive From taking away the lyvings and goods of the Church*. (London, 1590), *STC* 6842, sig. E3v.

[22] Plutarch, *Lives*, sig. OOOvir.

[23] John Taylor, *All the Workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet* (London, 1630), *STC* 23725m sig. I1v.

would never have found a superior in Caesar, and never have been defeated.[24] Thomas Fenne interpreted the arrogance of both men in a very similar way, echoing the language of Florus with the opinion that:

> the hautie minde of *Caesar,* as the auncient Romanes report, could abide no equall, neither could *Pompey* abide or tolerate any péere or superior, whereby the whole world was troubled by their dissention and strife.[25]

He repeats the idea on a subsequent page:

> then coulde not *Caesar* and *Pompey* agrée, for the stately pride of the one could not brooke or digest the haughty mind of the other.[26]

Likewise, John Jewel incorporated a slightly adapted phrase into one of his sermons, to demonstrate the misery of the Roman people as a result of Caesar and Pompey's arrogance. Presenting a succinct analysis of the Roman civil wars in a sermon warning of the evils accompanying sins such as pride and lack of humility, he opined that:

> *Iulius Caesar* was a man of so haught courage, that he could abide no péere, *Pompey* was of such an high mynd, that hée could suffer no man to be his egall. And thus for dominion, strove these two together: and thus thorough their dissention, was not onlie the whole Citie, but the kingdome it selfe brought to destruction.[27]

William Fulbecke writes in a similar vein of two men's destructive aspirations, attributing the republic's collapse to their implacable rivalry, and using the same passage. He depicts the historian Sallust offering a speech of counsel to Caesar after his victory, in which he explains that "if [Pompey] could have brooked an equall, the world had not bene set on fire with warre." Sallust is in no position to criticise Caesar directly, but Fulbecke shows him offering counsel which, by implication, recognises in Caesar the same sins. He urges Caesar toward concord, warning of the destructiveness of "covetousnesse," a "savage and devouring beast, immane and intolerable."[28] And *Romes Monarchie*, written in verse, does not use the exact wording of the phrase from Florus, but takes the idea and presents it as the underlying cause of the civil wars:

---

[24] Peter Heylyn, *Augustus. Or, An essay of those meanes and counsels, whereby the commonwealth of Rome was altered, and reduced unto a monarchy* (London, 1632), *STC* 13268, sig. B6r.

[25] Thomas Fenne, *Fennes frutes* (London, 1590), *STC* 10763, sig. D1r.

[26] Ibid., sig. E3v.

[27] John Jewel, *Seven godly and learned sermons* (London, 1607), *STC* 14611, sig. D8r.

[28] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Y1r-2r.

> Yet neverthelesse, he yeelded to agree,
> If *Pompee* would, release as well as he,
> His power also, which *Pompee* would not yeeld.[29]

This placing of Pompey in direct opposition to Caesar is most typical of the plays on the civil wars that were written toward the end of the sixteenth century and in the reigns of James and Charles. Indeed, as in the commonplace books, Pompey is nowhere represented without Caesar as his antitype; his function apparently does not merit individual treatment, and all the plays in which Pompey figures are composed upon the bifold theme of Caesar and Pompey. In 1580, *The Third Blast of Retreat from Plays* mentions a staged representation of "the life of Pompeie and the martial affaires of Caesar" while in 1581, *The Storie of Pompey* was played at Whitehall before the Queen on Twelfth Night by the Children of Paul's; it is inconceivable that this drama, now lost, did not include Caesar, although it is remarkable for the focus of its title. Another version of *The History of Caesar and Pompey* seems to have appeared at Burbage's playhouse in 1582, while according to Philip Henslowe, a work by the name of *Seser and Pompie* was first performed by the Admiral's Men on 8th November 1594.[30] Other offerings on this dual theme include *The tragedie of Caesar and Pompey or Caesars revenge*, and Kyd's translation of Robert Garnier's *Cornelia*, first published in 1594, and reissued in 1595.[31] George Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey* is the only play of his that was never performed on the stage, for reasons that are unclear.[32] Not published until 1631, in the last

---

[29] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. H4r.

[30] T. M. Parrott, 'The Academic Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey', *Modern Language Review*, 5 (1910), p. 438.

[31] Anon., *The tragedie of Caesar and Pompey or Caesars revenge Priuately acted by the students of Trinity Colledge in Oxforde* (London, 1607), *STC* 4340. Hereafter *Caesars Revenge*. On the play's performance, which has been dated variously to the mid-1590s or to 1605/6, see F. S. Boas, *University drama in the Tudor age* (Oxford, 1914), p. 267; also F. S. Boas (ed.), *The Tragedy of Caesars Revenge* (Oxford, 1911); Parrott, 'The Academic Tragedy', p. 435. More recently, William Poole has argued for 1593 as the year of the play's composition; William Poole, '*Julius Caesar* and *Caesars Revenge* Again', *Notes and Queries* vol. 49, no. 2 (2002), pp. 227–28. Robert Garnier, *Cornelia* (London, 1594), *STC* 11622. This was reissued the following year as *Pompey the Great, his faire Corneliaes tragedie effected by her father and husbandes downe-cast, death, and fortune. Written in French, by that excellent poet Ro: Garnier; and translated into English by Thomas Kid* (London, 1595), *STC* 11622a. Hereafter referred to as Kyd, *Cornelia.*

[32] George Chapman, *Caesar and Pompey a Roman tragedy, declaring their Warres. Out of whose events is evicted this proposition. Only a iust man is a freeman. By George Chapman* (London, 1631), *STC* 4993; Anon., *Chapman's Dramatic Works: the comedies and tragedies of George Chapman now first collected with illustrative notes and a memoir of the author* (London, 1873), p. xxiv.

years of Chapman's life, the play was probably composed in 1604, and is the first of the author's more obviously political pieces.[33]

The relationship between the two men represented the dichotomy within the Roman state itself, the tension between the old ways of the senatorial faction and the new demagogic methods of Julius Caesar. Pompey was used by playwrights as one side of the coin, the foil for Caesar, a necessary component in the constitutional wrangling at Rome, essential to maintain dramatic tension on stage or in print. Most of the playwrights adopt a dualistic, Lucanic conception of Pompey, in order to demonstrate how the civil war came to be fought so bloodily; although they do not strictly follow the Latin poet who "shews himself openly in the *Pompeyan* Faction, inveighing against *Caesar* throughout his Poem," they do emphasise the difference between the two men in the interests of plot direction.[34] The plays depict Caesar as the anti-hero who triumphs, while Pompey plays the tragic figure whose virtues are not sufficient to save him.

The conflict between the two men is at the heart of each of the extant works. Some authors choose to blame Pompey for his part in the struggles, and taint him with the same ambition as Caesar, using the terms "Prince" and "princely" to refer to both men, implying that the two great commanders were already set on the road to monarchy of a sort before Caesar's victory.[35] Pompey symbolises one half of Rome's tragedy: the unhappy coincidence that two great leaders arose simultaneously. Without both of them, the wars could not have occurred; the presence of Pompey as well as Caesar is what causes the downfall of the republic:

> A state devided cannot firmely stand.
> Two Kings within one realme could never rest.
> Thys day we see, the Father and the sonne,
> Have fought like foes Pharsalias miserie.[36]

In other works, Caesar tends to be painted blacker in the plays detailing his conflict with Pompey than in works focusing solely on his own fall. Pompey, meanwhile, is portrayed as the great hero of the republic. Considerable artistic licence is responsible for shaping the story in ways contrary to that suggested by the ancient sources: Chapman is notable for

---

[33] Mark Thornton Burnett, 'Chapman, George (1559/60–1634)', *ODNB*.

[34] Thomas Hobbes' preface to *Homer's Odysses translated by Tho. Hobbes of Malmsbury; with a large preface concerning the vertues of an heroique poem written by the translator* (London, 1675), Wing H2556, sig. B7r.

[35] Anon., *Caesars Revenge*, sig. D1v.

[36] Kyd, *Cornelia*, sig. A1v.

his deviation from the classical texts in order to highlight Pompey's virtue and Caesar's iniquity. In his *Caesar and Pompey*, it is Caesar who tries to remove Cato unlawfully from the Senate, whereas Plutarch tells us that it was Pompey and Metellus who did this.[37] Thus Caesar's power is shown to be Pompey's and Rome's destruction, even before the final defeat of his enemies, highlighting the difference between monarchical ambition and the Pompeian, republican ideal.[38]

"This Caesar was a Tyrant": Villainy and Vilification

Julius Caesar, Pompey's nemesis, was judged by most authors to be personally responsible for the outbreak of civil war at Rome. The fault was shared by Pompey, but Caesar's role in the republic's downfall was indisputable. A preoccupation with civil stability on the part of both readers and writers encouraged a focus on Caesar as the chief culprit in the disruption at Rome, which in turn led to an increased emphasis on his other personal failings. His eventual victory and subsequent unprecedented sole rule also laid him open to accusations of tyranny by authors ancient and modern, and negative interpretations and representations of Caesar, dictator, abound.

The drama provides the most obvious example of the early modern perception of Caesar as a tyrant. The plays on Caesar provide clear examples of a Lucanic or Tacitean despot, exhibiting contemporary concerns about the abuses of monarchical government. Naturally, this is not the whole story, but the habits of reading ingrained by commonplacing methods ensured that uncomplimentary assessments of Caesar could sit alongside more charitable interpretations in the same work, especially in the drama, which by nature was a medium in which contradictions and oppositions could be simultaneously expressed. In Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey,* Caesar is portrayed as conniving and deceitful, attempting to subvert Cato's goodness and corrupt him by any means possible:

> But might we not win *Cato* to our friendship
> By honoring speeches, nor perswasive gifts....
> Nor by enforcive usage?[39]

---

[37] Chapman, *Caesar and Pompey*, sig. B2r -v.

[38] Richard S. Ide, 'Chapman's 'Caesar and Pompey' and the Uses of History', *Modern Philology* Vol. 82, No. 3 (Feb., 1985), p. 261.

[39] Chapman, *Caesar and Pompey*, sig. B2r.

Kyd's work is full of indictments against the state of politics at Rome now that Caesar's star is in the ascendant. "Under a Tyrant see our bastard harts/ Lye idely sighing," laments Cicero at the opening of the play, and "poysoned Ambition (rooted in high mindes)" is what Cicero, ever the champion of the republican constitution, blames for the piteous state of affairs.[40] The language of yokes of servitude, debasement and conquest recurs throughout the text; Rome yields her "proud necke to a miserable yoke," is "tam'd" and "signiorizd."[41] Caesar, "Monster-like wyth his ambition" is responsible for the bloodshed of the civil wars, a "wilfull follie" which has left "more Tombes then ground to lay them on."[42]

In Fletcher and Massinger's *The False One*, Caesar epitomises the ruthless pursuit of power even more clearly than in the earlier works, a reflection of the increased anxieties about the Stuart courts.[43] The recent series of translations of Lucan's *Pharsalia* had a strong influence on Fletcher and Massinger's reading of the conflict between Caesar and Pompey and, as the court of James I became ever more decadent in the eyes of outsiders, the authors of *The False One* joined the growing ranks of those who appropriated Lucan for anti-court purposes, reflecting contemporary concerns for James' perceived closeness with Spain, and the crisis in the Palatinate.[44] In this play, Caesar alone is responsible for the Civil Wars, as Photinus points out: his is a "rebellious cause" contrary to the laws of Rome, and nothing can excuse him.[45] Furthermore, he is depicted as having no respect for the ancient institutions of Rome, intending to subjugate the Senate to his own will. The last thing the audience sees before the play ends is Caesar boasting how he can "give Kingdomes," and that whatever he decides, the Senate will ratify without further ado. This is a resonant final note, especially when James I's clashes with Parliament during the early 1620s are borne in mind.

Not only is Caesar a tyrant who causes civil war and destroys the constitution; he is, for the dramatists, also a murderer. Replete with pathos and

---

[40] Kyd, *Cornelia*, sig. A1v.

[41] Ibid., sig E1r-2v.

[42] Ibid., sig. A2v, G2v.

[43] John Fletcher and Philip Massinger, *The False One* in Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Comedies and tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and Iohn Fletcher* (London, 1647), sig. Qq1r -2v.

[44] P. Kewes, 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England', *The Seventeenth Century* vol. XVII, no. 2 (October, 2002), p. 173; David Norbrook, 'Lucan, Thomas May, and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture' in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994), *passim*.

[45] Fletcher and Massinger, *The False One*, sig. Ss2r.

a strong visual image, the death of Pompey represents the perfect opportunity for the playwrights to consider Caesar's scelerous soul. Pompey's assassination, which seems not to have been of interest to commonplacers, features prominently in the plays, adapted from a variety of the ancient sources. Caesar is presented with Pompey's severed head by the assassins, who imagine they are doing him a favour: Caesar's reaction differs according to the ancient history. The episode is related in Appian, Plutarch's *Life of Pompey*, Lucan, Florus and Dio.[46] Appian and Plutarch describe Caesar weeping in distress, and even Lucan's Caesar is shocked at the blasphemy of the separation of head from body.[47] Dio is sceptical of Caesar's tears, while Florus does not mention Caesar's tears, implying quite the opposite: the assassins made a "treaty of friendship with Caesar and sealed it with Pompey's head."[48]

Caesar's disgust is represented in all the plays, largely following Plutarch and Appian, rather than Florus or Dio. Apparently expressing genuine gried, Chapman's Caesar exclaims of the severed head:

> Cursed monsters,
> Wound not mine eyes with it, nor in my camp
> Let any dare to view it.[49]

In the anonymous *Caesars Revenge*, he mourns Pompey's "undeserved death" and castigates the "traitorous" assassins.[50] Massinger and Fletcher's Caesar is equally disgusted by the grisly gift, lamenting at length the loss of him "Whose braverys all the worlds-Earth cannot ballance."[51] Dio's disbelief of Caesar's grief is adduced only by Kyd, whose heroine Cornelia believes that although Caesar beheads the murderers and outwardly bewails Pompey's death, his "Words are but winde, nor meant he what he spoke."[52]

However genuine Caesar's reaction, he is implicitly made ultimately responsible for Pompey's death, since Pompey was the only thing standing between Caesar and the fruition of his ambitions:

---

[46] In standard modern editions, the story is found in the following sources: Appian (2.86) Plutarch's *Pompey* (80.5), Lucan (8.663–91), Florus (2.13.54) and Dio (42.4–5).
[47] Lucan, 9.1089–93.
[48] Florus, 2.13.55.
[49] Chapman, *Caesar and Pompey*, sig. K1r.
[50] Anon., *Caesars Revenge*, sig. C4r.
[51] Fletcher and Massinger, *The False One*, sig. Qq3v.
[52] Kyd, *Cornelia*, sig. F1r.

> Who murdred hym but hee that followd *Pompey* with the sword? He murdred *Pompey* that pursu'd his death.[53]

By Pompey's death, Caesar gained supremacy, and even though his was not the hand that wielded the sword, it was "Th'inextinguible thyrst of signiorie" within Caesar's breast that killed Pompey.[54] For Fletcher and Massinger's Egyptians, it is fear of Caesar's wrath that leads them to this desperate deed. So fierce an enemy is he, and so afraid are they of his displeasure, that they feel they have "no way left us to redeem his favour/ But by the head of *Pompey*."[55] The depiction of the murder is most political in this play, where overtones of the Overbury affair of 1616 have been detected in the death of Pompey; it has also been suggested that Pompey is a parallel for the exiled Elector Palatine, or for Oldenbarnevelt, or for Ralegh, and that the work is critical of James' apparent pandering to the Spanish.[56]

It was not just in bringing about the death of a hero like Pompey that writers found Caesar to be wicked and tyrannical. On numerous occasions, his example was used to emphasise the wickedness of contemporary figures, as William Struther did in a sermon on the occasion of Prince Charles' birth:

> So the Pope, though hee *pretend* a love of peace and reformation, yet hee keepeth still his Monarchie and proves more like *Iulius Caesar,* keeping the Dictatorship, than like *Sylla* in laying it downe.[57]

Perhaps the most damning indictment of Caesar is found in the translation of Jean de l'Espine's treatise on God, death and the Devil. Explaining that Caesar's behaviour was deeply sinful, and driven by Satan, the translator renders the French text thus:

> some ambitiously purchase the honours and promotions of this world, and in climbing unto them violate all law and right, forget all pietie and humanitie, care not what trouble and confusions they make, stirre up, favour, and enterleague with the wicked, hate and reject the good and vertuous, warre upon the countrie wherein they have béene begotten, brought up, and

---

53 Ibid., sig. F1v.

54 Idem.

55 Fletcher and Massinger, *The False One*, sig. Qq2v.

56 See, for example, Doris Adler, *Philip Massinger* (Boston, 1987), pp. 17, 31–2; Baldwin Maxwell, *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1939), pp. 170–4.

57 William Struther, *A looking glasse for princes and people Delivered in a sermon of thankesgiving for the birth of the hopefull Prince Charles. And since augmented with allegations and historicall remarkes. Together with a vindication of princes from Popish tyranny. By M. William Struther preacher at Edinburgh* (London, 1632), *STC* 23369, sig. Y1r.

> suckled, deprive it of libertie if they can, and by a cruell tyrannie which they use, bring into a miserable slaverie, as *Iulius Caesar* did his.[58]

Part of Caesar's iniquity stemmed from the way he came to be dictator. No ordinary tyrant, he had come by his powers unlawfully, and not by right of victory in combat, something which was of great import to authors discussing Roman history in the climate of political insecurity at the end of the sixteenth century. By such men, Caesar is sometimes depicted as a usurper of the powers which rightfully belonged to the Senate and People of Rome:

> When now the world was wholly *Romes,* and *Pompei* overcome,
> Then *Iulius Caesar* did Usurpe the Common-wealth of *Rome*.[59]

It was his own failure to overcome his passions that resulted in these sinful actions, which made him an example of vice to be excerpted and repeated in the interests of educating contemporary society against the dangers of pride and avarice. Richard Jones wrote in 1590 that "*Iulius Caesar* usurped the title of Emperour…[and] aspired from lowe degree to excessive glorie," a warning to any men foolish or wicked enough to think of doing likewise.[60] Jones is not the only one to accord Caesar the title of Emperor, which he never actually assumed; Caesar's "unnatural" and unlawful aspiration is interpreted thus by Everard Digby:

> *Iulius Caesar*... through daily practise of shedding bloud, by force of armes, his heart was so hardened, that unnaturally he drew out his sworde, and lifte up his armes against his owne country, from whence he had his chiefe beginning. But afterwardes when he had helde foorth his swoorde against his mother (which gave him it first into his handes) and had dissolved the most famous and renowned state of the Romane Senate, and by force made himselfe Emperour or *Rome*.[61]

Thomas Fenne echoes Digby's disgust at Caesar's assumption of imperial honours:

---

[58] Jean de L'Espine, *The sicke-mans comfort against death and the devill, the law and sinne, the wrath and iudgement of God. Translated out of Frenche into English, by I.E.* (London, 1590), *STC* 17238, sig. R5r.

[59] William Warner, *Albions England a continued historie of the same kingdome, from the originals of the first inhabitants thereof: and most the chiefe alterations and accidents there hapning: unto, and in, the happie raigne of our now most gracious soveraigne Queene Elizabeth. With varietie of inventive and historicall intermixtures. First penned and published by William Warner: and now revised, and newly inlarged by the same author* (London, 1597), *STC* 25082a, sig. V8v.

[60] Richard Jones, *The booke of honor and armes* (London, 1590), *STC* 22163, sig. H4r.

[61] Digby, *Everard Digbie his dissuasive*, sig. N4v.

> making himselfe Emperour over the *Romane* State, which was never subject to Emperour before his time. Thus did the pride of his minde still clime for dignitie, not béeing satisfied but catching at the verie heavens, if his power had extended so farre, being fleshed with so manie bloudie broyles, and animated with such lordly statelinesse, that no *Roman* péere or potentate might stirre or speak against his wilfulnes.[62]

Pride and ambition are usually given as the motivations for Caesar's wickedness. Ignoring the complexities and ambiguities within the Roman republican tradition whereby the winning of *gloria* contributed to a man's *virtus*, and ambition was partially seen as a healthy, manly virtue, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century commentators interpreted Caesar's aspirations in a Christian manner. They identified in his actions the evidence that he was dissatisfied with his lot, and in aspiring, he ultimately overreached himself, a belief which coloured the way they portrayed him in their works. The irreligious, unreasonable passion of Caesar is explained as unlawful lust for power in a translation from the French in 1592, which, like *Romes Monarchie*, associates Caesar with Philip II of Spain:

> Is it not ambition and greedy desire to reigne, that in this sort transporteth men of high courage, being madded with their enterprises, that without feare and reverence of Religion, (which dooth defend them from such tyrannies) or care of their faith and love to their Countrey, they strive to attaine the soveraigne place of commanding? …as *Iulius Caesar* did, and other Usurpers.[63]

Sometimes a comparison is explicitly made with more godly behaviour, as in Richard Robinson's translation of Strigel; unlike King David, the virtuous ruler who fought for the glory of God, "*Iulius Cesar* warred because he would not be spoiled of his dignitie by the envyous" and is therefore an unfit example to follow.[64] Caesar's lack of true religion is involved in his downfall in the opinion of Richard Lloyd, who in his discourse on the nine worthies explains how Hector, Alexander, "And *Iulius Caesar* painyms all,/ their God they did forgeat," for which reason "when they were highest of all,/ Ambicion, Pride, and Avarice, gave each of them a fall".[65] Pride is the

---

[62] Fenne, *Fennes frutes*, sig. D1r.

[63] L.T.A., *The masque of the League and the Spanyard discovered* (London, 1592), *STC* 7, sig. R4r.

[64] Victorinus Strigel, *Part of the harmony of King Davids harp …Newly translated into English by Rich. Robinson* (London, 1582), *STC* 23358, sig. N1r.

[65] Richard Lloyd, *A brief discourse of the most renowned actes and right valiant conquests of those puisant princes, called the nine worthies wherein is declared their severall proportions and dispositions, and what armes everie one gave, as also in what time ech of them lived,*

reason for Caesar's fall, and Caesar must bear the blame for Pompey's death, William Averell insists, warning how not to live in his "glasse for all disobedient sonnes to looke in":

> O howe many hath pride béene the destruction of, which have suffered themselves to be carried away thereby? yea and what mischéefe is there, which hath not béene through pride provoked? … through this *Iulius Caesar* pursued *Pompei* unto death, with whome he had many battailes, and all through pride and covetousnesse of rule.[66]

And Thomas Fenne, providing more examples for virtuous early modern living, views Caesar as a veritable monster of irrational pride and unsated ambition:

> O good God, what meant the unsatiable *Caesar* by his inordinate coveting, and by the uncessant climing for vaine superioritie had he delight and pleasure in such cruell slaughters, and miserable murders of so many destressed people: was his gréedie appetite, so hungrie after honour, that his minde could never be satisfied: would not so manie pitiful murders, so manie lamentable chances, so manie cruell acts, so manie hard escapes in his warres, which he both beheld in others, & also felt himselfe, mollifie and abate the hautie pride, and loftie courage of his aspiring minde, wherein he might have perceived himselfe as mortall as the rest?[67]

William Fulbecke, too, is deeply critical of Caesar, choosing carefully from the less partisan primary sources, to depict episodes in which Caesar is unequivocally haughty and cruel, or dissembles in order to achieve his dubious goals. He describes Caesar entering Rome, purporting to be "desirous of unitie" and peace. "But Caesars Diamond was nothing else but glasse, and his words nothing but wind" and he went on to wickedly "ransack" the treasury at the temple of Saturn.[68] Leigh's digest of Suetonius repeats the incident, adding that Caesar remarked to the tribune who attempted to stop him, "*Silent leges inter arma*."[69] This phrase acquired particular meaning in an age where the political nation was increasingly concerned with the potential to place legal checks upon the seemingly

---

and how at the length they ended their lives. Compiled by Richard Lloyd gentleman (London, 1584), *STC* 16634, sig. A3r.

66 W. Averell, *A dyall for dainty darlings, rockt in the cradle of securitie A glasse for all disobedient sonnes to looke in. A myrrour for vertuous maydes. A booke right excellent, garnished with many woorthy examples, and learned aucthorities, most needefull for this tyme present. Compiled by W. Averell, Student in Divinitie, and Schoolemaister in London* (London, 1584), *STC* 978, sig. B4v.

67 Fenne, *Fennes frutes*, sig. D1v.

68 Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. S1r.

69 Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. A10v.

ceaseless expansion of royal prerogatives, under the spurious justification that war required more funding. Under Charles, many believed the *leges* to be suffering as new taxes and loans were levied to support the war on the continent. Leigh continues the tale with details, taken from Pliny, describing how Caesar used the money he had stolen. He recounts how Caesar owed "1963125 pounds" more than he was worth, and made excessive gestures such as giving Servilia a jewel worth 46,875 pounds, then goes on to tell how lavish his public shows were and how much was spent on entertainment, which cannot have been lost on readers familiar with the excesses of the early Stuart courts.[70]

More damningly, Fulbecke chooses to follow Lucan in some of his darker descriptions of Caesar's wrongdoing. In book 7 of his *Pharsalia*, Lucan presents Domitius Ahenobarbus as the only named senator who dies for Pompey and the republican cause at the battle of Pharsalus; Fulbecke selects the scene as an example of Caesar's wickedness. "[L]ooking upon [Domitius] like a tyrant," Caesar insults the defeated man in a typically "scorneful" manner; Domitius welcomes death, echoing Cato as he cries, "Caesar I dy a free man…not seeing thee as a conqueror," and perishing with the hope that Caesar lives "to be subdued by the rigor of destinie, which wil take revenge both for us, and for thy sonne in law."[71] Fulbecke also raises ghosts which appear after Pharsalus to the Caesarians, to punish them; perhaps most tellingly, he omits any mention that Caesar ever wept at the sight of Pompey's head, the redeeming grace with which virtually all other authors, credit him. Indeed, Fulbecke throughout is concerned to present Caesar as more wicked than Pompey. At Pharsalus, Pompey is the more virtuous party, in whom "there was this desire and thought to overcome with as little bloudshed as might be." Caesar is represented as a direct contrast, emphasised by the author's unusual apostrophe to the villain of the piece:

> But what fiends and damned spirits diddest though invocate Caius Caesar? what stygian furies, what infernall hagges, and what nightly terrors didest thou intreat? to what Eumenides diddest thou sacrifice, intending such a generall slaughter?[72]

---

[70] Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. A11r.
[71] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. T4r.
[72] Ibid., sig. T2r.

Dux Bonus: Caesar Vindicated

Yet by other authors, and in some cases, by the same authors at other points within the same text, Caesar's valour and nobility were held up as models for all to follow: he was *dux bonus*, high praise indeed. In its original republican formulation, the Latin '*dux'* referred to a leader or general; the "*dux bonus"* was any good general, connected to the definition of an orator by Cato the Elder, *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, since Roman generals necessarily proved themselves as orators before being given military commands. The title became associated with a narrower, princely concept in the Augustan era, an idea which prevailed in subsequent centuries; Horace, for example, hails Augustus in these terms, "*Lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae*."[73]

Far from vilifying Caesar as a tyrant, many writers chose to present Caesar in this glowing form, as a good prince, who brought order and stability to Rome. George Abbott asked his listeners in late-Elizabethan sermon, "Where see we a man comparable, with that worthy Iulius Caesar?"[74] For his advancement of the causes of the Roman empire, and his victories across the known world, Caesar was praised as virtuous:

> vertue raigned in them that guyded this great worke unto perfection; especially in IULIUS CESAR, and AUGUSTUS, who surpassed all the rest that were either before, or after them in felicity, power and glory.[75]

Everard Digby found in Caesar a model of virtuous bravery which the true Church would do well to emulate:

> Let [the Church] ... adventure the battaile with *Iulius Caesar,* who where the greatest danger was, there in person he would give the first charge: *Non est nisi in summis victoria,* In greatest dangers, true vertue atchieveth the greatest victorie.[76]

The story of Caesar and the pilot, beloved of so many commonplacers and student note-takers, was widely repeated by authors writing on a

---

[73] Horace, *Odes* IV.5. Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1960), p. 519, discusses the virtue and authority which the terms implies.

[74] George Abbot, *An exposition vpon the prophet Ionah Contained in certaine sermons, preached in S. Maries church in Oxford. By George Abbot professor of divinitie, and maister of Universitie Colledge* (London, 1600), *STC* 34, sig. Ee5v.

[75] Louis Leroy, *Of the interchangeable course, or variety of things ...translated into English by R.A.* (London, 1594), *STC* 15488, sig. O1r.

[76] Digby, *Everard Digbie his dissuasive*, sig. A4v.

range of topics as an exhortation to fortitude. Leroy's translator turned the tale into English:

> having by night time alone in a little boate espied the passage, hee bid the Master of the shipp set saile to the winde; and to put more confidence in the fortune of CESAR, then in the sea.[77]

In a funeral sermon preached in May 1605, Thomas Playfere related to his audience how:

> Iulius Caesar, when Amyclas the Pilot was greatly afraid of the tempest, spake to him thus, What meanest thou to feare base fellow, dost thou not know thou cariest Caesar with thee? As if he should say, Caesars bodie may well be drowned, as any other mans may, but his minde, his magnanimitie, his valour, his fortitude, can never be.[78]

Meanwhile, John Weever recounted the tale as he read it in Lucan, as one of "one of *Caesars* rodamantadoes, or thundring declamations in a storme, onely to his poore Bargeman *Amyclas*, being as then out of all hope or helpe for buriall, save in the bottome of the sea." Caesar declares:

> O Gods I crave
> No Funerall: let the seas utmost wave
> Keepe my torne carcase, let me want a Tombe
> And funerall pile, whilest look't for still to come
> Into all Lands I am, and ever fear'd.[79]

Fearlessness in the face of adverse elements appears to have been greatly admired as a sign of faith in the will of the gods, and assimilated to a Christian willingness to trust in God's providence.

Positive images of Caesar could be created by omitting scurrilous scandal found in the ancient sources, as much as by including glowing tales of his heroism, and, just as the commonplacers failed to excerpt details of his sexual vices, so authors writing new prose compositions chose to discount records of his homosexuality or lustful behaviour. Edward Leigh's *Observations* on Suetonius were nothing if not 'selected' and 'choice'; love and sex are entirely absent from his digest of the biography, despite the salacious gossip presented in the original. William Segar similarly focused on Caesar's strengths and observed from Suetonius that "*Iulius Caesar* likewise caused a speciall favorite of his to be capitally punished,

---

[77] Leroy, *Of the interchangeable course, or variety of things*, sig. Q6r.

[78] Thomas Playfere, *Ten sermons Preached by that eloquent divine of famous memorie, Th. Playfere Doctor in Divinitie* (Cambridge, 1610), *STC* 20005, sig. O4r-v.

[79] John Weever, *Ancient funerall monuments…* (London, 1631), *STC* 25223, sig. C6r.

for dishonoring the wife of a Romane gentleman, though no complaint was made thereof."[80] Robert Greene insisted that "nothing getteth more honour & glory then chastity. The consideration whereof, moved *Iulius Caesar* rather to suffer a divorce, then an incontinent wife."[81] The author of *Romes Monarchie*, too, seems to have been unconcerned with Caesar's amatory adventures, since he makes absolutely no mention of Caesar's dalliance with Cleopatra in Egypt, let alone his reputed youthful dalliance with King Nicomedes in Bithynia.

Gentler qualities were praised in Caesar by those who recreated his character as one to be emulated by their readers. His clemency and generosity of spirit are widely attested; his weeping at the death of Pompey nowhere meets with the scepticism displayed by Kyd's Cornelia, or possible through the staging of plays which might read differently. In contrast, in the prose works in which the story appears, Caesar's grief is accepted as genuine. One interpretation gives us:

> although the generous and haughty mindes do rejoyce in victories, they do yet neverthelesse grieve at others calamities: and therefore *Alexander* wept for *Darius*: and *Iulius Caesar* for *Pompeius*[82]

while another uses other rulers as a comparison:

> King *David* shed teares at the sight or hearing of his sonne *Absoloms* death: *Iulius Caesar,* at the sight of *Pompeys* head: *Vespasian,* seeing the holy and magnificent *Sanctum Sanctorum* on fire.[83]

Leigh, in his *Observations,* also tells of Caesar weeping when presented with Pompey's head, and burying him honourably amid much lamenting; *Romes Monarchie* depicts how Caesar "bewailes with teares, and griefe" this loss, while Mexia's translator describes how "[Pompey's head being] presented to *Caesar,* he wept."[84]

---

[80] William Segar, *Honor military, and civill …*(London, 1602), *STC* 22164, sig. B5r. The English translation is most probably Segar's own, since no translations of Suetonius were published by this date.

[81] Robert Greene, *Penelopes Web …* (London, 1601), *STC* 12294, sig. E3v. This refers to Suetonius, 4.2, and Caesar's divorce of Sulla's granddaughter Pompeia, for her suspected affair with Publius Clodius.

[82] Robert Barret, *The theorike and practike of moderne Warres* (London, 1598), *STC* 1500, sig. Q4v.

[83] David Person, *Varieties: or, A surveigh of rare and excellent matters necessary and delectable for all sorts of persons* (London, 1635), *STC* 19781, sig. N5v.

[84] Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. A8r; E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. I1r; Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. B1v.

Clemency, as well as compassion, is a virtue several writers attribute to Caesar. John Lyly used Caesar's historical example, derived from Dio, as a mirror with which to illustrate Elizabeth's queenly forgiveness:

> This mightie and mercifull Quéene, having manye billes of private persons that sought before time to betray hir, burnt them all, resemblyng *Iulius Caesar,* who being presented with the lyke complaints of his Commons, threwe them into the fire, saying: that he had rather not know the names of Rebelles, than have occasion to revenge, thinking it better to be ignorant of those that hated him, than to be angry with them.[85]

The dictator's clemency is depicted liberally in the translation of Mexia, mirroring the attributes that were desirable in early modern princes: Caesar acts with:

> great magnanimitie and clemencie, which Caesar marvellously used in all his actions…wherewith (in my opinion) he wan no lesse honour, then by his victories.[86]

Moreover, the author is "certaine that among all the many vertues and singularities wherewith CAESAR was endued, his clemencie and liberalitie were most glorious."[87] The creator of *Romes Monarchie* also makes much of Caesar's forgiving nature, describing how in Italy he "took many townes by love and composition" and held open court at Rome, "offring Peace the Romane state along," giving a benign example to readers of good behaviour in a magistrate in an otherwise unfavourable representation of Caesar's character.[88]

Numerous writers also selected from their classical sources examples of Caesar's immense popularity, which was due to his generosity and magnanimity. His inspirational leadership of his troops was attested by Leroy's translator, who wrote that Caesar:

> made himselfe so well beloved of his people, who were so earnestly affectioned to doe him service, that albeit they were but as other men when they fought for any other; yet when the question was of the honour or glory of Caesar, they were invincible, and ran headlong on all daunger with such furye, that none was able to abide them.[89]

---

[85] Lyly, *Euphues and his England*, sig. Hh3r. The episode is presented in Dio, Book 4, 17.4, as part of a speech given by Julius Caesar, who claims that he burned the private documents found in the tents of Pompey and Scipio, so that he should not know who else was involved in conspiring against him.

[86] Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. B5r.

[87] Ibid., sig. B5r, C4v.

[88] *Romes Monarchie*, sig. H4r.

[89] Leroy, *Of the interchangeable course, or variety of things*, sig. O1v.

Another admirer described how:

> he used incredible liberalities to the people, pardoning his greatest enemies, and those that had been sharpest in warre against him, yea, and some of them he honored with great dignities: as among others, *Cassius* and *Brutus,* who were both made Pretors.[90]

Yet another proponent of Caesar's statecraft and magnanimity uses Plutarch to explain how these qualities resulted in his attaining the highest honour possible:

> Did not this vertue Iulius Caesar show,
> In reconciling Senators of Rome,
> By whome he learn'd the perfect way to know
> For Consulship, to have the peoples dome?
> Then Prudence ioyn'd with bounty, worth and wit,
> Brought him in Rome an Emperour great to sit.[91]

"[H]ee did Extreamely Affect the Name of King": Representations of Caesar's Sovereignty

Opinion and understanding of Caesar was influenced by centuries of tradition assuming him to be the founder of the Roman empire, which lived on in early modern Europe as the Holy Roman Empire. The Reformation and subsequent tension between Protestant England and the Hapsburg empire may have added to the reasons for which Caesar as emperor could be held up as a bad example – we have already seen English and French writers equating him with Philip II of Spain – but it did not entirely break the connection between Caesar and early modern imperial monarchy more generally. The model of *imperium* constructed by Caesar, and developed by his successors, remained a foundation for modern conceptions of kingship, and, for many early modern readers and writers, Caesar represented the triumph of monarchical government over the uncertainties of a mixed constitution. Edward Leigh's *Observations* on the Caesars, for example, emphatically states of Caesar, "hee did extreamely affect the name of king." Leigh's source was Suetonius, and he undoubtedly knew of Caesar's famous refutation, "I am not king, but Caesar"; nevertheless he

[90] de la Marche, *The resolved gentleman*, sig. Q2v.

[91] Leighton, *Vertue triumphant*, sig. D1v. The marginal note 'Plutarc. in Pompeio' accompanies the verse and attests Leighton's source.

chose to discern in the work a modern version of kingship which reflected the links between Julius Caesar and the early Stuart monarchy.[92]

English translations of continental histories reinforced the prevailing European notion that Julius Caesar was the "original and beginning of the Romane Emperours."[93] Mexia's translator goes on to explain how Caesar was king in all but name:

> Contenting himselfe to be called perpetuall Dictator and also Emperor; although not with a name of such dignities, as his successors have done since… but after Iulius Caesar, al his successors tooke that name, and gloried to he called Emperours, which was sacred for the most high title and dignitie in the world.[94]

The text also refers to Caesar's refusal of the diadem offered to him by Antony, highlighting the problematic nature of kingship at Rome. It is pointed out that Caesar:

> would not be called King (for the name of King was odious to the Romans above all things, ever since the Kings were chased from *Rome*) but contented himselfe to be called perpetuall Dictator and also Emperor; although not with a name of such power and dignitie as his successors have done since; but as by a name w^{ch} signified he had been a conqueror in the warres, which in this sense was given to the Romane Captaines, when they had obtained any notable victorie: but after IULIUS CAESAR, all his successors took that name, glorying to be called Emperors, which was held for the highest title and dignitie in the world.[95]

At Rome, the term *imperator* was one given to all triumphing generals, and did not signify monarchy in any way; Mexia and his translator navigate the gulf between ancient and early modern and explain how Caesar and contemporary emperors are the same in all but the meaning of the name. Indeed, the whole work is very true to history, with a subtle appreciation of the differences between ancient and early modern values. Wholehearted praise is bestowed upon Caesar, who acts within the republican model in pursuit of *virtus* and *gloria*:

> he in the most hath excelled all others, and had fewer imperfections and vices then any other.[96]

---

[92] Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. A8v. Suetonius, 79.2 is the source of the famous refutation: 'I am not "king", but "Caesar"'.

[93] Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. C4r.

[94] Ibid., sig. C4v.

[95] Ibid., sig. C2v.

[96] Ibid., sig. C4v.

The attempts of James I to associate himself with Julius Caesar in various representations are well-known, and need little rehearsal here, other than to demonstrate how the predisposition to find in Caesar a model for modern monarchs was encouraged.[97] Inaccurately identifying Caesar as a monarch by means of equating his *imperium* with contemporary imperial kingship allowed the assimilation of Caesar's glory to the king of England and his line. Thus poets often hailed a link between Caesar and the Stuarts. Henry Petowe's coronation poem stated the connection in its title, *England's Caesar*, and Samuel Rowland welcomed the new king to England with an offering entitled *Ave Caesar*.[98] When the second edition of Clement Edmondes' *Commentaries* appeared in 1604, it was dedicated to Prince Henry, and prefaced with verses by Samuel Daniel calling Caesar "the Man of men," while Joshua Sylvester's poem referred to Prince Henry as "a Caesar of our own."[99]

The Stuart connection with Caesar also utilised the praise of the dictator for his eloquence and erudition. We know that James himself recommended Caesar to Prince Henry for his elegance of style.[100] The notion that kings should rule not only by the sword but by the pen was one in which James believed very strongly. Given the prominence of Caesar's prose in the educational syllabus as a guide to elegant Latin writing, the parallel is an obvious one, but it is evident that readers and writers found the sentiment persuasive from the references circulating more widely at the time. John Eliot, in a work designed to facilitate the learning of elegant French, praises Caesar's Latin as second only to Cicero, going so far as to say that:

> he hath taken the pen out of the hands of all learned men, and discouraged them from writing of Histories, seeing they cannot once come neere his perfection by farre.[101]

And Francis Bacon famously expressed his belief that Caesar was a model fit for the king to imitate at least as far as his learning went, because of his peerless writing of history:

---

[97] See especially Kewes, 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England'.

[98] Henry Petowe, *Englands Caesar His Maiesties most royall coronation. ...* (London, 1603), *STC* 19806; Samuel Rowlands, *Ave Caesar. God saue the King ...*(London, 1603), *STC* 21364.

[99] Edmondes, *Caesar*, sig. A3r.

[100] 'And among al prophane histories I must not omit most specially to recommend unto you, the Commentaries of Caesar...'. *Basilikon Doron* (1599), quoted in Kewes, 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England', p. 160.

[101] John Eliot, *Ortho-epia Gallica Eliots fruits for the French: ...* (London, 1593), *STC* 7574, sig. G2v.

> As for *Iulius Caesar,* the excellencie of his learning…doth declare it selfe in his writinges and workes…For, first we see there is left unto us that excellent Historie of his owne warres, which he entituled onely a Commentarie, wherin all succeeding times have admired the solide weight of matter, and the reall passages, and lively Images of actions, and persons expressed in the greatest proprietie of words, and perspicuitie of Narration that ever was.[102]

But Caesar's authoritative status was also problematic for writers, especially as they grappled with the ending of his 'monarchy': his murder by Brutus, Cassius and their fellow-conspirators. The question of the validity of his claim to government, the names by which his authority was constructed and comprehended, and the very nature of his *imperium* were matters as relevant to Caesar's removal from power as to his exercise of it. The assassination of Caesar was interpreted and represented in early modern England in very different ways, as men sought to understand the significance of this revolutionary moment in the context of a world very different from ancient Rome; it was a source of difficulty for men living in a monarchy and negotiating models of duty to their prince in the light of ancient examples. Antony Grafton and Lisa Jardine have shown Gabriel Harvey's appreciation of the fundamental problem of applying Roman example unquestioningly to early modern England, as he wrote in a marginal note in his Livy, "Many things were said and done with the greatest prudence in the Roman Republic, which it would be absurd to do in a kingdom and nowadays."[103] Readers had been trained to approach history not as a simple representation of the past, but as a complex subject, which could be made subservient to rhetoric in order to illustrate abstract principles, or which could practically instruct and guide. Caesar's death was itself the topic of schoolboy exercises: Melanchthon prescribed for discussion the question, "Was Brutus right or wrong in murdering Caesar?"[104] The variety of retellings of the death of Caesar is testament to the lingering legacy of the education received in the grammar schools, where the curriculum promoted contrary arguments and interpretations of history. The motives behind the deed found approval in some quarters, while the killing itself was alternately reviled, or condemned for failing to restore the republic. Some men approved of the murder, understanding it as a just

---

[102] Francis Bacon, *The twoo bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and advancement of learning, divine and humane To the King* (London, 1605), *STC* 1164, sig. K4r.

[103] Antony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, '"Studied for Action": how Gabriel Harvey read his Livy', *Past and Present* no. 129 (November, 1990), p. 66.

[104] S. F. Kistler, 'The Significance of the Missing Hero in Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey*', *Modern Language Quarterly* vol. 40, no. 4, (Dec. 1979), p. 341.

tyrannicide in a world very much apart from the England they knew. For others, it represented the worst kind of rebellion: regicide.

The question of the killing of a ruler, lawful or otherwise, was a sensitive one in early modern England; this is attested not only by the preoccupation with avoiding civil strife seen in the Elizabethan prose histories, but by contemporary discourses on passive obedience and the theory of divine right, and by the homilies on obedience. The collection of *Certain Sermons*, known as *The Book of Homilies*, included in the 1562 edition "An Exhortation to Obedience" in three parts; after the excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius V in 1570, *An Homily against Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion* in six parts, penned by Archbishop Parker, was added.[105] For those seeking to validate resistance to tyrants, their arguments could be justified either using notions of consensual magistracy, where a king ruled by the consent of the people, or by reference to divine sanctions of earthly rule. Tyrannicides were either acting with God's grace, or in support of the people's authority, or both.[106] Not even subversive works of resistance theory such as Buchanan's *De Jure Regni apud Scotos* and the *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, both published in 1579, used Caesar's example as an incitement to tyrannicide. Buchanan makes no mention of Caesar, while the *Vindiciae*, although written under the pseudonym Junius Brutus, is careful to make the point that Caesar was not a king, did not yet rule by the consent of the people, and was a tyrant just starting his reign of terror.[107] The assassination was justified, but would not have been if Caesar had formally been established as a ruler comparable to early modern monarchs, who had the force of centuries of tradition behind their claim to power.

---

[105] *Certain Sermons* (London, 1570), *STC* 13679.

[106] See, for example, J. H. Burns, 'George Buchanan and the Anti-Monarchomachs' in N. T. Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (eds), *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 3–22; Robert Miola, '*Julius Caesar* and the Tyrannicide Debate', *Renaissance Quarterly* 39 (1985), pp. 271, 284. See also the forthcoming article by Martin Dzelzainis, 'The Ciceronian Theory of Tyrannicide from Buchanan to Milton', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe and the Atlantic World*, ed. Roger Mason and Caroline Erskine, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Ashgate); this is available in a preliminary form at http://recherche.univ-lyon2.fr/carma/IMG/pdf/Dzelzainis_-_T.pdf (accessed 11th July 2009). Dzelzainis argues for a more widespread Ciceronian theory of resistance to wicked princes than has previously been allowed; Cicero, of course, was not part of the conspiracy to murder Caesar but believed that the deed had been a noble one, even if the results were not as satisfactory as he wished (*Ad Att.* XIV.12.1, 14.2, 21.3).

[107] Lucius Junius Brutus had expelled the Tarquin kings from Rome; Marcus Junius Brutus was one of Caesar's assassins. See also M.L. Clarke, *The Noblest Roman* (London, 1981), pp. 87–8.

Indeed, ancient sources applauding the killing of Caesar were largely ignored, even when they had the most impeccable pedigree. Cicero's explicit approval of the conspiracy in the second Philippic recommends the deed as "glorious" and "divine," providing "a clear example to be imitated"; yet this opinion seems to have had little influence on any recorded example of early modern thinking.[108] The imperial classical sources available to early modern readers – Velleius Paterculus, Appian, Dio, Valerius Maximus – all condemned the killing with various degrees of enthusiasm, and although their attitudes towards the conspirators themselves are more ambiguous, these are the sources whose opinions were preferred. The nature of English classical humanism, as instilled in literate men throughout their formal education, blended the most innocuous elements of republican civic theory with the strongest Protestant insistence on the primacy of monarchy. This ensured that early modern readers seeking to find examples and lessons in their texts generally interpreted their texts under the assumption that no virtuous man would kill his king - and we have already seen that Caesar was frequently conceived of in just this way.

Little wonder, then, that Caesar was often thought to have been unjustly killed by those jealous of his success, who would rather be rid of him than admit they were unequal to his greatness. "But lo, whom millions could not match…the same hath envie slaine," exclaimed Richard Lloyd in his *Nine Worthies*.[109] In the anonymous *Caesars Revenge*, Discord addresses the audience on the subject of the ambition not only of Caesar, but of Brutus too. In Caesar's aspiring to political supremacy, "ambition now doth vertues seat usurp," but Brutus is equally guilty of pride, and cannot bear to be outdone by Caesar. Envy rages in "discontented Brutus boyling brest."[110] Lewis Lewknor laments how, "in the height of his greatnesse, most glorious *Caesar,* having vanquished all publique enemies, was by a private conspiracie of his dissembled freendes, stabbed & murthered in the senate house"; the word 'murder' is one which recurs in other sources, describing a great crime rather than a reason of state. Later in the same work Lewknor repeats the story, this time adding that Caesar was "inhumanely murdered," thereby making the offence even worse.[111]

---

[108] Cicero, *Philippics* II. 114.
[109] Lloyd, *A brief discourse of … those puisant princes, called the nine worthies*, sig. E3v.
[110] Anon., *Caesars Revenge*, sig. E1v.
[111] de la Marche, *The resolved gentleman*, sig. D2r, Q2v.

Some interpreters explicitly connected Caesar's death with the matter of monarchy:

> The Romanes said, we have no king, and therefore they slewe Caesar: the Iewes said, we have no king but Caesar, and therefore they slewe Christ'

expounds Playfere; both actions are reprehensible.[112] This is a constitutional problem also addressed by Robert Fletcher in his version of the *Nine Worthies*, which recognises the problematic nature of the concept of kingship at the end of the republic:

> If *Iulius Caesar* could have beene a King
> With conquest which his Romaine Legions made,
> By blody bodkins he should not the sting
> Have felt of death in powrefull Senates shade.
> *Brutus* his sonne nor *Cassius* had conspir'd
> His death, had he not kingly state requir'd.[113]

Caesar is king in all but name; but kingship is anathema to the Romans. Had Caesar been king in fact, enshrined in tradition and law with all the accompanying hereditary implications, Fletcher opines, his assassins would not have wished to murder him, or at least would have had nothing to gain by doing so. Here is the same distinction that is made in the *Vindiciae*, that early modern hereditary monarchy was a solid and stable institution which, unlike Caesar's regime, could not be overcome by regicide.

The Elizabethan works, especially, reflect the ubiquitous concerns about civic stability in their analysis of Caesar's demise. An emphasis on the evils that befell Rome as the result of Caesar's ambition leads some authors to depict the assassins in a way that acknowledges some justice in their actions, which is a reasonable response to Caesar's war-mongering. The episode stands as a lesson to contemporary readers, stressing the importance of keeping peace and order within the state. Firmly siting their argument in the republican context and not in the early modern, even Caesar's death is turned into a recommendation of traditional forms of government relevant to an individual state; the assassination is an act undertaken by men seeking to preserve the state in its proper form, and is in no way presented as a regicide. These authors are keen to show that the

---

[112] Playfere, *Ten sermons*, sig. G1v-2r.

[113] Robert Fletcher, *The nine English worthies: or, Famous and worthy princes of England being all of one name; beginning with King Henrie the first, and concluding with Prince Henry, eldest sonne to our Soveraigne Lord the King* (London, 1606), *STC* 11087, sig. I3v.

killers are pursuing the restoration of the *status quo*, and not aiming at revolution: they are maintaining constitutionalism, which in this case happens to be republican, but which, transferring the lesson to the early modern readership, would be a constitution of hereditary monarchy. "Hate, envie and disdain" began to appear in Rome when Caesar was sole "monarch," the writer of *Romes Monarchie* explains, because new monarchy brings inequality:

> But here began hate, envie, and disdaine,
> The Monarch new, his greatnes to despise,
> His equals late, now vassals, he to raigne
> Alone, and they, as base before his eyes.[114]

This is not the case when monarchy is the form of government in place at the time, as it is in England, the author implies, but it is one of the evils that accompanies an unlawful change of regime or constitution.

William Fulbecke uses Caesar to caution his readers against vanity and striving after empty titles, for although Caesar made himself dictator:

> [his] fortunes did soone after begin to decline, and these diverse coloured titles were but as reunebowes, which do glitter gallantly for a time, but are suddenly extinct: his fatall houre was now approaching, and envie stayed in the cloudes expecting his end.[115]

Listing the various honours given to Caesar and the privileges he took upon himself, such as not rising before the Senate, and conspiring with Antony to make himself king, Fulbecke goes on to explain that "many causes were pretended of the conspiracie bent against him" but it was these excessive tributes and privileges that "did cause him to be envied of the Nobles."[116]

Fulbecke represents Caesar's death as his just reward, emphasising, as Lipsius does, that Caesar "fell as a sacrifice under the statue of Cn. Pompeius Magnus" who stands as a symbol of the republican constitution. However, Fulbecke has an additional point to make with this Roman example, as well as the warning against greed and pride. He is unable to praise the manner in which the republic was avenged, "for had the cause of quailing him been just, yet the course and manner of killing him, doth apparantly seeme unlawfull," and he goes on to explain how the

---

[114] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. I4r.
[115] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Y3v.
[116] Ibid., sig. Y4r-v.

conspirators broke the *lex Portia* and *lex Cornelia de maiestate*.[117] For Fulbecke, it is not a case of the end justifying the means; the laws of the country must be upheld, however pressing the need to break them may seem, for if laws are forgotten, disorder will rule. He impresses upon the reader the idea that tumult must not be ended with tumult, saying of contention that "discord…can never end it." He depicts Brutus as a good, wise and clever man, but one who acted wrongly and foolishly in trying to stop Caesar being king by force. He compares Brutus with his namesake to reinforce his point, saying that they were:

> both fatall to the estate of the Romane Common-weale: for the former of them did expel the last king of the Romanes, and the later did murder their first Emperour. But if Caesars death had bene attended, till naturall dissolution, or just proceeding had caused it, his nephews entrie into the monarchie might well have bene barred and intercepted: because these honors were annexed and appropriated to Ceasars person.[118]

Had the conspirators only been patient, "though there had bene a Caesar, yet should there never have bene an Augustus"; the observing of law and order even under an unlawful ruler would yet have saved the constitution.

Indeed, Fulbecke goes on to use the story of Caesar to express his firm belief that "to commit the murder of a soveraigne Magistrate… & if the most barbarous and immaine tyrant, should treacherously, that is without warrant of justice be slaughtered," only more civil strife will come of it. Here, at the end of the work, is the heart of the argument. The whole text builds to the question of whether Caesar was a tyrant, and therefore whether his assassins were justified in killing him. For Fulbecke, concerned with preserving the state and the *status quo* in a Europe troubled by religious war, the problem is a complex one, but has an inevitable answer. He is willing to admit that "Cesar I graunt was a traitour to the State before the victorie" at Pharsalus, and "questionlesse the Romanes should not have nourished this lyon in their Citie." Everything changes, however, when Caesar "exchanged that base name, with the best title of dignities, and of a traitour…became an Emperour," because he now represents monarchy as it was known in early modern England. Moreover, the change was nominally consensual: "yet did he not aggravate to himselfe that type of honor, the people offred it unto him, he accepted it with

[117] Ibid., sig. Z1r.
[118] Ibid., sig. Z1v-2r.

thankes." That the people had no choice but to offer it to him if they wanted peace is neither here nor there to Fulbecke: they offered, and he took, and all were bound to respect that monarchy. As sole ruler, Caesar was no tyrant, because, "which is incompatible to tyrannie, he shewed self-will in nothing, when he was invested with supremacie." Here is the most loyal of early modern expressions of allegiance to the state of monarchy, against which Fulbecke believes no man may stand. This is the whole purpose of his writing a Roman history: to make his readers understand that:

> He which attaineth to an imperiall or regall soveraigntie, by warlike industrie and victorious exploit, is no lesse a Monarke, then he which cometh to it by election, succession or descent.[119]

Great opprobrium is reserved for Brutus and Cassius, chief among the conspirators who attempted to restore the republic by removing Caesar, by those who interpret Caesar's rule as the great beginning of monarchy at Rome. These men approached the ancient sources seeking to discover evil in Cassius and Brutus, and their early modern moral framework is imposed upon the often ambivalent classical texts, which they adapt to reflect their own contemporary predispositions. The leaders of the conspiracy are often seen as irredeemable villains, as Allott implies:

> Brutus and Cassius, the murtherers of Caesar, held great leagues and confederacie together; but in no sort they could be called friends, for there can bee no true amitie, where is no vertue.[120]

This sentiment was echoed by one commonplacer, who recorded that Brutus said to Cassius on the subject of "Friendshipp + alyance":

> It ys one thinge to make alyance & another to make amitye since to proceed from severall causes must needs produce diverse effects. Ffor allyance groweth by bringing one kindred to the matches of an other, but frendshipp eyther by long conversing together or by a grownded opinion of good desert or by lykenes of qualityess when there is no inequalitye of estate: hee that seeketh friendshipp out of thees precincts, will never fynde it.[121]

The conspirators' wickedness in 'envying' Caesar is frequently depicted as being rightly punished by their infamous deaths. "Those that murdered

---

[119] Ibid., sig. Z2r-v.
[120] Allott, *Wits theater*, sig. K4v.
[121] Bodleian, Eng. MS poet. d.3, fol. 10v.

Caesar in the Senatehouse, never prospered" is a maxim that appears in *Wit's Commonwealth*, while other texts evince a definite belief in the workings of divine retribution:

> That great fortune, and favour of heaven, that had accompanied him all his life long, continued in the avengement of his death; pursuing by land, and by sea, all those which had conspired against him: insomuch that there remained not one unpunished of all those, which either in deed or in counsaile, were partakers of the conspiracy of his death. But of all things which have happened to men on earth, the most wonderful, was that of Cassius; who after he had bin defeated, & lost the day in the battaile of Philippi, slue himselfe with that very sword, wherewith he had stricken Caesar.[122]

Leigh's *Twelve Caesars* utilises the idea that the assassins were punished for their act of "cruell murther" to enhance the glory and rightful place of Julius as first of the Caesars, making it clear that the conspirators were 'condemned' by the fates for what they had done; none survived Caesar by more than a mere three years.[123] This idea is expressed most vividly in the drama, not only in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, but also in the academic tragedy, *Caesars Revenge*, where the wretched ends of Brutus, Cassius and the son of Cato are depicted in all their horror, after the ghost of Caesar has returned to haunt the guilty parties. Brutus realises the error of his ways as he goes to meet his end, "death the guerdon that my deeds deserve."[124]

There is, however, another interpretation which occurs in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century texts. Caesar's death was also represented as a warning, on both an individual and a political level. In this alternative retelling, Caesar was understood to have been killed because people were jealous of him: but this jealousy was justified, because he had overreached himself and arrogated to himself honours and powers to which he had no right. The men taking this view are in accord with, and are often the same men as, those who regard Caesar as a usurper, and therefore not a real ruler or monarch; the published works in which this idea is found do not go so far as to commend tyrannicide, but they do portray the killing in a positive light.

Here, then, is proof that readers and writers possessed the ability to distinguish between what was right in Rome, and what was acceptable in

---

[122] N. L., *Wits common wealth*, sig. Mm6r ; Leroy, *Of the interchangeable course, or variety of things*, sig. O2r.

[123] Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. B3r-v.

[124] Anon., *Caesars Revenge*, sig. I1v.

early modern England, as Gabriel Harvey did. These re-imaginings of Roman history are sympathetic responses to constitutional republicanism in the context of the ancient history: they express an understanding that, given the constitution which was nominally in place in Rome at the time, Caesar had acted unlawfully, and his killers were acting to uphold the order of the state. Caesar's personal flaws are shown to have resulted in his end, in the finest *de casibus* tradition. Thus Thomas Fenne lays the blame firmly on Caesar for his pride and ambition:

> In the end *Cassius* & *Brutus* extreamely hating the unquenchable pride of his aspiring minde, brought prively into the Senate (in their pockets and sléeves) small bodkins, little knives, and such other fit instruments for their purpose, and sodainely in the Senate house set upon him unlooked for, stabbing him into the bodie most miserably untill he died. This was the end of mightie *Caesar,* which happened through the default of Temperance: which gift if he had possessed, he had not so died.[125]

There is clear condemnation of Caesar, but no approval of the assassination or advocating of following this example, merely a recognition that the deed arose from its constitutional contexts, and from Caesar's own human error. Fenne also believes that Caesar was aware of his unpopularity, and the danger in which his sins had placed him:

> Neither was it unknowen to him, that by his aspiring minde and stately behavior, he was growen into deadly hate amongst the *Romanes:* for which cause fearing the destruction of expected hap, he made a law, and instituted a decrée, that no *Romane* should come into the Senate house with anie weapon at all under paine of death.[126]

A specifically classical way of thinking can also be discerned in the less condemnatory responses to the tyrannicide. These would be known to erudite readers of the history of Caesar's life and death from their wider literary studies, and they contributed to the formation of the intellectual framework in which these readers interpreted the events. One such idea is found in a commentary on Aristotle, translated from the French, which interprets Brutus' killing of Caesar as a duty to the state inspired by Greek traditions of honouring those who rid the land of tyrants:

> Many were pushed forwards by this ambition, to conspire against them, to get glory and reputation: such a one was …Brutus amongst the Romanes,

[125] Fenne, *Fennes frutes*, sig. Dıv.
[126] Ibid., sig. Dır.

> who slew Iulius Caesar, to free the Commonweale from Tyranny, and to purchase the renowme and reputation of a good Citizen.[127]

This reveals an understanding of the motivations for tyrannicide in the classical period derived from ancient sources, such as Cicero's *Pro Milone*, where Cicero waxes lyrical about the cult of the tyrannicide and the kinds of honours given to such men.[128]

Meanwhile, John Stradling saw fit to translate Justus Lipsius' *Two Books of Constancy* in such a manner as to make available in English that author's interpretation of Caesar's death as a sacrifice upon the altar of Pompey:

> Doth it grieve thee y^{t} Pompey should be overthrowne in Pharsalia, and his army almost consisting of Senatours? That the Tyrant shoulde take his pleasure and pastime awhiles in the bloud of citizens…[C]ast your eies a little aside, you shall see one thing that will bringe you into good liking with God againe. Behold that Cesar, statly, A conquerour, in his own and some other folks opinion, a very god; Slaine in, and of the Senate. And that not with one simple death, but wounded with three and twenty severall thrusts, and rouling in his own bloud like a beast. And (what more could you wish?) this was donne even in the courte of Pompei, the Image of Pompei standing there on high, celebrating a greate sacrifice to the ghost of that Greate one.[129]

May's continuation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* also uses this concept, ending with the resonant image of Caesar as a divinely-sanctioned sacrifice. Caesar:

> with his owne blood embrew'd
> The seat of wronged Iustice, and fell downe
> A sacrifice t' appease th' offended gowne.[130]

An idea expressed in Plutarch's life of Brutus, where he describes how Cassius decides to invite Brutus to join the conspiracy, the deed needs someone as renowned for justice as Brutus to lend it credibility, "as it were to consecrate the victim for the sacrifice and guarantee the justice of the act by virtue of his presence."[131]

---

127 Aristotle, *Aristotles politiques* (London, 1598), *STC* 760, sig. Gg2v.

128 Cicero, *Pro Milone*, 80.

129 Justus Lipsius, *Two bookes of constancie. Written in Latine, by Iustus Lipsius. Containing, principallie, A comfortable conference, in common calamities. And will serve for a singular consolation to all that are privately distressed, of afflicted, either in body or mind. Englished by Iohn Stradling, gentleman* (London, 1595), *STC* 15695, sig. N6v.

130 Thomas May, *A continuation of Lucan's historicall poem till the death of Iulius Caesar by T M.* (London, 1630), *STC* 17711, sig. K8r.

131 Plutarch, *Brutus*, 10.1–2.

Grimestone's translation of Mexia's work on the emperors displays a similar contextual understanding, discussing in detail the motivation for the assassination, and coming out firmly with the opinion that Caesar's tyranny had everything to do with it:

> Many set down the causes wherefore they desired to kill him. Some say, that it was for the hatred they had long born him: some others say, that it was for the desire of liberty, houlding him for a tyrant. But the most part are of opinion, that it was for suspicion that hee would have made himself King of *Rome;* a thing in the highest degree hatefull to the Romans: whereof he gave many signes and causes to suspect; which PLUTARCH and others do write at large. Heerunto was added, that he began to have men in contempt, and all other things: whereby he became hatefull to many. For, he used to say, that the Common-wealth was but a voice and a name without a body or substance; and that it well appeared, that CORNELIUS SYLLA had no learning, seeing that hee resigned the perpetuall Dictatorship.[132]

The passage contains a clear explanation of the difference between the Roman conception of kingship and early modern monarchy, and the way in which Caesar's rule was wrong and extraordinary, and departed from tradition and precedent. The inclusion of embellishments and details not found in the cited source, Plutarch, such as Caesar's disregarding of the commonwealth and his cold-blooded intent to hold onto all the power he could, make clear the author's desire to portray his rule as a thing utterly abhorrent to all right-thinking men.

Regicide and republicanism are complicating factors in any assessment of the reception of Caesar's death in early modern England. The conflict between the classical cult of praising tyrannicides, which educated readers understood in its historical context, and the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century concerns with upholding order in a monarchical state, make for divergent readings and representations of the murder, depending on the ideological framework in which the act was interpreted. Authors with more artistic freedom, and audiences to entertain, sought to contribute to the tyrannicide debate without taking a firm stance. Thus Shakespeare explores the motivations of all parties in the affair, shaping and manipulating Plutarch to create what Robert Miola calls a "supremely ambivalent" piece of drama.[133] Contradictory ideas could be, and often were, expressed within the same work, underpinned by the the mental

[132] Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. C3r.
[133] Miola, *Julius Caesar*, p. 271.

habits derived from contemporary educational processes. While shadowing James I in Julius Caesar, William Alexander, a member of the royal household, still found it possible to debate whether his killing was a crime or a virtuous action. His Brutus argues that Caesar is no king, and that:

> It's easier as a God t'adore him dead,
> Then as a king t'obey him whilst he lives.[134]

Indeed, Rome's ancient laws require that Caesar dies:

> for affecting wrongfully the crowne,
> He lawfully may perish by the sword.

But Caesar's very existence calls those ancient certainties into question, and there must be no delay in acting:

> least that which acted would b'a vertue thought,
> Be (if prevented) consterd as a crime.[135]

This episode was one which prompted men to think about the relationship between Rome and their own time more than any other; some drew parallels, and used the episode as an example for England, while others left the affair firmly in its original context. Yet everyone who read the accounts of the killing, and all those who used it to argue for one course of action or another, found it stimulating to further consideration in one way or another. The peace that followed the civil wars prompted as much diversity of opinion as the conflicts themselves had done:

> Of warrs thus peace insues, of peace more harmes,
> Then erst was wrought by tragick wars alarmes.[136]

More tragically still, further harm was to follow Caesar's death, as his heirs struggled for supremacy in an echo of the earlier rivalry between Caesar and Pompey.

---

[134] William Alexander, *The monarchick tragedies. By William Alexander of Menstrie Paraenesis to the Prince* (London, 1604), *STC* 343, sig. Z1v.

[135] Ibid., sig. Z2r.

[136] Anon., *Caesars Revenge* sig. E1v.

CHAPTER SIX

"YOU ARE HIS HEIRS": ANTONY, OCTAVIAN AND CLEOPATRA AFTER THE IDES

There is a notable difference between scholarly readers' interpretations of Antony and Cleopatra, and the representations of the story in literature in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Unlike the schoolboys and scholars, the writers of the plays and histories reflect the political emphasis placed on the story in most of the classical sources, representing in their works Rome's constitutional developments and the affairs of state that figure so prominently in the ancient texts.

In mirroring this political focus, most authors show themselves to be striving to fulfil the criteria laid down for producing the best kind of history, that is, an exposition of the causes of constitutional alterations. Indeed, writers of prose accounts largely used the tale of the two lovers to discuss political matters relevant to their own day. Fulbecke's account, for example, privileges the significantly political over the more personal and therefore trivial events. He only very briefly mentions the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra, according them little importance in the broader political scheme to which the episode contributes, and the 'romance' and tragedy of their end are less relevant to the account than the implications of their actions upon the Roman state. Similar concerns are borne out in the drama on Antony and his Egyptian queen, but this kind of writing exhibits more of a dual emphasis than is found in the prose works. In the plays, the public realm of politics intersects with the private lives of the actors, as the dramatists use soliloquy and dialogue to explore the personal motivations which spur the characters on in their official decisions, and the lovers' emotions serve to enhance the more political plot.

Most of the drama on Antony and Cleopatra was conceived of as 'closet drama', with the exception of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. The first known dramatisation of the story of Antony and Cleopatra in England is the Countess of Pembroke's *Tragedie of Antonie,* first published in 1592 with her translation of Philippe de Mornay's *Discourse of Life and Death*, then reissued in 1595.[1] This is a faithful, if uninspired, translation of Robert

[1] Mary Sidney, *The Tragedie of Antonie,* (London, 1595), *STC* 11623. This, the second edition, is the one referred to throughout.

Garnier's *Marc Antoine*, in the refined Senecan tradition; purged of the violence of the original, the play focuses on politics rather than the details of battle and bloodshed.

The Tragedy of Cleopatra by Samuel Daniel was written as a companion piece to *Antonie*, continuing the story from the point where Garnier had stopped at the eponymous hero's death.[2] Concerned with the responsibilities of rulers, Daniel used the work to demonstrate how the personal choices of princes shape the course of the wider world thereafter, for better or for worse. The history of the text is problematic. The play evolves substantially through subsequent editions, a process of mutation which has led critics to classify three separate generations of *Cleopatra*, with further variation within each generation. In 1594, 1595 and 1598, it was printed as part of *Delia and Rosamund Augmented*; it appeared again in a collection of Daniel's *Poetical Essayes* in 1599, with a wholly revised Act I and further minor changes. The work was included in the folio collection, *The Works of Samuel Daniel* in 1601, which was reissued in smaller format in 1602 and 1605, with more alterations each time. Finally, it was published in a volume dedicated to Lady Anne Clifford, entitled *Certain Small Works*, in 1607, and in another edition in 1611; by this time, it had been revised so thoroughly since its initial publication that it is almost an entirely new version of the play.

This, of course, poses problems when trying to locate a single 'text', but matters are somewhat simplified when the nature of the revisions is examined. The subject matter and its treatment do not change; Daniel still relies on the same sources, and the play retains in each version the same 'political' content. Daniel's various revisions concern the structure, the proportion of action compared with soliloquy, and the characters; his 1607 version is substantially recast. While never re-written in the 'popular' mode of Shakespeare, for example, it seems that the reworkings were intended to intensify the audience's identification with Cleopatra, and to encourage more involvement with the plot; he was hereby trying to make it more suitable for performance, in order to make money, as he explained in the introduction to his *Philotas* when it was prepared for performance in 1604. Daniel's inspiration for the revisions has been variously attributed to seeing Shakespeare's play on the same subject, to closer readings of Mary Sidney's *Antonie*, and to Daniel's own general dissatisfaction with all the products of his pen - he also revised most of his other works at some

[2] Samuel Daniel, *Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra. By Samuel Daniel. AEtas prima canat veneres postrema tumultus* (London, 1594), *STC* 6243.4.

point.[3] Since his portrayal of the key events and characters, his use of the classical sources, and the general sentiments of the piece do not change substantially from one edition to the next, the 1594 text will be used here, representing as it does the time of its conception as a piece concerned with late-Elizabethan politics.

The politicisation of the passion of the lovers in the drama is also suggested by the lost play by Fulke Greville, the manuscript of which he claims to have burned because his readers interpreted the lovers' "irregular passions, in forsaking Empire to follow sensuality", as a comment on the relationship between Elizabeth I and Essex.[4] Thomas May's *Cleopatra* is similarly concerned with political lessons, and exhibits a focus on the difficult choices that have to be made in times of political uncertainty, and a scepticism of more romantic interpretations of the affair.[5] This work first appeared in print in 1639, and was reprinted posthumously in 1654; it also survives in manuscript form. Both the manuscript and the printed first edition state on the title page that the play was first performed in 1626, although it is not clear where; it may be assumed, then, that the play was composed in, or shortly before, 1626. May's chief sources are Plutarch and Dio; while taking detail from the former, he chiefly uses Dio to construct a work concerned with Cleopatra's scheming and politicking rather than with her emotional condition.

Samuel Brandon's *The Tragicomoedi of the Vertuous Octavia* is the only play to focus on the personal and largely disregard questions of politics.[6] In Dio's history, Antony's wife Octavia is hardly mentioned. Instead, Brandon takes as his source North's translation of Plutarch, especially the life of Antony, where Octavia appears as an active party in the avoidance of war, and an emotional enhancement to the story; he frequently echoes North's wording, when it is not borrowed *verbatim*. Indeed, Brandon shows a corresponding preoccupation with morality which bears more resemblance to the tenor of readers' commonplace notes that to the rest of the drama. Appended to the play, and dedicated to Maria Thynne, are two

[3] See Russell E. Leavenworth, *Daniel's 'Cleopatra': a critical study* (Salzburg, 1974); Joan Rees, 'Samuel Daniel's *Cleopatra* and Two French Plays', *The Modern Language Review* Vol. 47, No. 1 (January, 1952), p. 4; Ernest Schanzer, 'Daniel's Revision of His Cleopatra', *The Review of English Studies* vol. 8, no. 32 (November, 1957), pp. 376, 381.

[4] *Sir Fulke Greville's Life of Sir Philip Sidney* etc.*, first published 1652 with an introduction by Nowell Smith* (Oxford, 1907), pp. 155–56.

[5] Thomas May, *The tragedie of Cleopatra Queen of AEgypt. By T.M. Acted 1626* (London, 1639), *STC* 17717. See Denzell S. Smith, *'The Tragoedy of Cleopatra Queene of Aegypt' by Thomas May, a critical edition* (New York, 1979).

[6] Samuel Brandon, *The Tragicomoedi of the Vertuous Octavia* (London, 1598), *STC* 3544.

invented letters between Octavia and her husband. The play itself is dedicated to Lady Audley, mother of the aforementioned Maria, and the roles of wives and mothers are the chief interests of the work.

"There Did They Sporte a Time in Great Excesse": A Warning Against Libidinous Luxury

The themes of sexual immorality, luxury and the vices of courts in the story of Antony and Cleopatra pervade the drama and the histories. Concerned primarily with the failings of the individual actors as examples of personal vices of leaders, they tell the story as a warning of the ills that befall those who sin against God, and fail to conform to acceptable standards of virtuous living, faults which have political ramifications.

In their reflection of the moral dimension of the stories of Antony, Cleopatra, and Octavian, the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries craft rather different works from those produced in the classical period. The ancient sources are relatively restrained in their condemnation of the behaviour of Antony and Cleopatra, compared with the early modern uses to which they were put. The love between the Roman general and the Egyptian queen is not condoned, and is certainly not praised, but the issues of adultery, unnatural lust and the perils of sybaritic living are mentioned as considerations subordinate to the more important political implications of events and actions. Although several sources describe Antony's weakness, and the magnificence of the lifestyle he led with Cleopatra in Egypt, they usually do so only once, and then only briefly. Velleius Paterculus alludes to Antony's failings implicitly, taking care always to link them to his political role. For example, "as his love for Cleopatra became more ardent and his vices grew upon him — for these are always nourished by power and licence and flattery — he resolved to make war upon his country."[7] And at Actium, "Antony chose to be the companion of the fleeing queen rather than of his fighting soldiers, and the commander whose duty it would have been to deal severely with deserters, now became a deserter from his own army."[8] Florus only states that the "madness of Antony…could not be laid to rest by the satisfaction of his ambition," but that it was ended only "by his luxury and licentiousness."[9]

---

[7] Velleius Paterculus, II.82.
[8] Velleius Paterculus, II.85.
[9] Florus, II.21.

In Dio, speeches have been inserted into the body of the history, and it is Octavian, his arch-enemy, who describes Antony's love for Cleopatra, saying, "He has passed his prime and become effeminate. His strength of mind? But he plays the woman and has worn himself out with unnatural lust."[10] That the accusation is made by an opponent lessens the impact of the criticism considerably. And Plutarch, ambiguous as ever, portrays Antony as a victim of the madness of love, blaming Cleopatra for making matters worse:

> the last and extreamest mischiefe of all other (to wit, the love of *Cleopatra*) lighted on him, who did waken a stirre up many vices yet hidden in him, and were never seene to any: and if any sparke of goodnesse or hope of rising were left him, *Cleopatra* quenched it straight, and made it worse then before.[11]

In contrast, the histories written in the early modern period, though largely concerned with the political messages of the Antony and Cleopatra episode, include copious information about the debauchery of the lovers, and their inappropriate conduct. History is used not only as a source of messages about the nature of regimes and states, but of personal lessons as well, since the private failings of the rulers compounded their constitutional difficulties. Monitory, moralising observations accompany descriptions of the love story; "Delightes, with carelessnes, brings wracke and wretchednes," observes the author of *Romes Monarchie*.[12] Further on, next to long descriptions of their lavish lifestyle, he notes disapprovingly of Antony and Cleopatra, "liking and lust cause of dishonour."[13] Samuel Brandon's *Octavia* also notes the self-indulgence of the lovers in Egypt:

> There did they sporte a time in great excesse
> Of all delights which any eye hath seene.[14]

He explains the dangers of enjoying such sins, warning of the outcome of such a dereliction of virtuous duty:

> The path of errour, is so grac'd,
> With sweetest seeming pleasures:
> As if delight had therein plac'd,
> The store house of her treasures.
> But who to proove the same are bent,

[10] Dio, 50.27.
[11] Plutarch, *Lives* (1579), sig. NNNN4r.
[12] E.L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. K2v.
[13] Ibid., sig. K2r.
[14] Brandon, *Octavia*, sig. B7r.

In sinfull maze encluded:
In vaine at last will sure repent,
with shamefull end deluded.[15]

Written solely by men, the histories are united in their misogyny, following the ancient sources in warning their readers against the dangers of women. They blame the Egyptian queen for seducing the Roman general; he is merely a weak and foolish man, the victim of Cleopatra's evil designs. Antony is guilty only of stupidity, and of lust, whereas Cleopatra is "very wittie and full of artificiall devises, and had the caste to beguyle Antonie, who was easie to be ledde."[16] Thus "when Cleopatra comes, like a foolishe yong man, he gave himselfe to wantonnes and riot."[17] Antony is utterly powerless, and the language used by several writers is that of enslavement; the effect is to echo contemporary *sententiae* about the dangers of falling prey to the enchantments of women. "Antony was made a tame foole," asserts William Barker in his continuation of Appian, with accompanying marginal notes about the "craft of Cleopatra" and how "Antony doteth."[18] He is explicit in his condemnation: "the authoritie taken from Antonie, bicause he had committed it to a womans lust, and not in his right wits, beyng bewitched by hir."[19] Grimestone's translation of Mexia shows a similar selection of loaded language, stating that Antony "was so much blinded and besotted with the love and companie of Cleopatra Queene of *Egypt,* as he thought of nothing but how to satisfie her humor, being unable to leave her."[20]

The unmanning of Antony through his subjugation to Cleopatra is an example of just the sort of reversal of gender roles feared by early modern moralists, who associated femininity with the tendencies towards tyranny and irrational passions, dangerous in any man, but particularly one in power.[21] Nor was Antony the first to be preyed upon in this way. William Fulbecke describes how Julius Caesar, too, was taken in and taken over by Cleopatra's beauty, emphasising the sinfulness of this unnaturally

---

15 Ibid., sig. C6r.
16 Appian, *An Auncient Historie*, sig. Ccc2v.
17 Ibid., sig. Ddd4v.
18 Ibid., sig. Ddd2r.
19 Appian, *An Auncient Historie*, sig. Ddd3v.
20 Mexia, *Imperiall Historie*, sig. D3v.
21 On misogyny in early modern England and the belief that women were usually the prime culprits in sexual offences, see, for example, Laura Gowing, *Domestic dangers: women, words, and sex in early modern London* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 2–3; Bernard Capp, *When Gossips Meet: women, family, and neighbourhood in early modern England* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 3–15.

lecherous female. Euphemistically, he says that she was "another Calphurnia unto him," before correcting himself, asking "what proportion can there be betwixt a chast matron and a shamelesse curtizan?"[22]

"Kings Small Faults be Great Offences": The Political Dangers of Personal Vices

In the histories and the drama, however significant the personal vices of Antony and Cleopatra may be, they are inextricably linked to the world of the court. The virtue of rulers was of immense concern to early modern subjects, since private sins in rulers were thought to have a detrimental effect upon the entire state they ruled; it was this assumption that lay beneath the rich *de casibus* tradition. Roman models from the years predating the principate, modified through the *speculum* of Seneca and other ancient writers, contributed to Renaissance concepts of virtuous kingship no less than examples from the true 'imperial' period following the reign of Augustus.[23] Princes and their countries existed not simply in a symbiotic relationship, as common sense suggests, but were part of the same body politic, with the prince at the head and the people as the body, and so "Kings small faults be great offences," since they affect not only the princes themselves but the whole state.[24]

Cleopatra, as queen, is therefore deeply implicated in any criticisms of her country, as is Antony, because of his protracted residence there. Antony could also stand for a Rome corrupted: Rome was used in plays and histories as a symbol of the political, and of duty and reason. It was represented as a direct contrast to Egypt, land of vice and luxury. In the eyes of the Roman moralists, Egypt, a Greek kingdom, was infected with the same loose morals and taste for corrupting luxury as the rest of the Hellenistic world.[25] Sallust bemoaned the corrupting influence of the East, "those charming and voluptuous lands," which infected the soldiers who fought there under Sulla's command, observing that "prosperity tries the souls of even the wise":

> there it was that an army of the Roman people first learned to indulge in women and drink; to admire statues, paintings, and chased vases, to steal

---

[22] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. V3r.

[23] See, for example, Peter Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (Cambridge, 2007).

[24] Daniel, *Cleopatra*, sig. M4v.

[25] On the ill effects of Hellenic influence at Rome, see Catharine Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 92–3.

> them from private houses and public places, to pillage shrines, and to desecrate everything, both sacred and profane.[26]

Livy, too, decried the scandalous effects of Asian upon Roman society, after conquests in the East and the importation of habits and goods from the Hellenic world.[27]

These ideas, transmitted through the classical sources, were embraced in the early modern world, which aligned itself with the martial virtues of Rome rather than with the Attic states. Indeed, the very word "Roman" carried with it connotations of discipline, reasonable control over the passions, and an upright moral character.[28] In this deployment of the ancient Roman mistrust of the East can be discerned something of the growing national, Protestant consciousness of England under Elizabeth, which associated foreign threats, moral decline and a faintly repulsive opulence with Catholicism.[29]

Thus North's Plutarch, for example, has marginal annotations about the "wonderfull sumptuousnes" and the dangers of luxurious living beside descriptions of Cleopatra's court in Egypt, to guide the reader in his or her interpretation of the scenes described.[30] In this way, he highlights the moral aspect which Plutarch leaves implicit. A prejudice against the Egyptian court is likewise discernible in *Romes Monarchie*, which depicts Egypt as a vicious society. While Rome is the seat of virtue, the Egyptians are "sprong from the stocke of some vile rascall minde" and the author curses them, damning them all to the gallows.[31] Samuel Daniel's Cleopatra recognises the relationship between herself and her corrupt people, admitting the justice of her punishment for their moral iniquities, for which she must assume some responsibility:

> …the sinnes of Egipt have deserv'd,
> The *Ptolomeyes* should faile, and none succeed.[32]

---

[26] Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 11.5–7.

[27] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 36–40.

[28] Hunter, 'A Roman Thought', p. 94. He explains that the "value-bearing content" of the word Roman is demonstrated in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, for example, as in I. ii, when Antony is frolicking with Cleopatra until "on the sudden/A Roman thought hath struck him" and he recalls his obligations.

[29] See, for example, John F. Danby, *Elizabethan and Jacobean poets: studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher* (London, 1965), pp. 140–1; also Derek Hirst, 'Text, Time, and the Pursuit of 'British identities'' in Baker and Maley, *British Identities* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 256–8.

[30] For example, Plutarch, *Lives* (1579), sig. NNNN4r.

[31] E.L. *Romes Monarchie*, sig. Iir.

[32] Daniel, *Cleopatra*, sig. I4r.

In the play, the Egyptian philosophers Arius and Philostratus acknowledge the truth of this fact; the present ills have come upon the nation as a punishment for its luxury and dissolute impiety. Egypt has been a land glorying in "the wanton pomp of Courtes" and now the gods are exacting their retribution.[33] For Daniel, the pollution of national virtue is the fault of both prince and people: the taint of each rubs off on the other. So a chorus of Egyptians laments the impact Cleopatra's sins have had upon the people of Egypt; "thus shee hath her state, her selfe and us undunne," and later, the same idea recurs: "the wanton luxurie of Court/ dyd forme the people of like sort."[34] Antony, having chosen love or lust over duty, is responsible as much as Cleopatra, and the repercussions for both Egypt and Rome are great:

> …grapling in the Ocean of our pride,
> To sinke each others greatnes both together,
> Both equall shipwrack of our states t'abide,
> And like destruction to procure to eyther…..
> Sith both our errors did occasion give,
> And both our faults haue brought us both unto it.[35]

It is Thomas May, however, who makes more of the iniquities of Antony than any other author, emphasising the events of the 30s BC as a real reversal of all that the republic had stood for. His play discusses at length how wrong Antony's actions are: for example, he gives to Cleopatra crowns and kingdoms which are not his to give. The contrast between Roman, republican virtue and Antony's imperial debauchery is stressed:

> Cyprus, Phoenice, Coelosyria,
> Three wealthy Kingdoms got with Roman bloud,
> And our forefathers valour, given away
> As the base hire of an adulterous bed.
> Was *Cyprus* conquer'd by the sober vertue
> Of *Marcus Cato*, to be thus bestow'd?[36]

In the mirror of Antony, dispensing Rome's patrimony lightly and carelessly to his foreign favourites, there are reflections of James I, who notoriously spent vast quantities on favours at court, and was resented for giving English wealth to 'foreign' Scots. Thus Antony's lieutenants discuss the need to resist their leader if he shows signs of giving them all up to

[33] Ibid., sig. I5r.
[34] Ibid., sig. I6v, M5r.
[35] Ibid., sig. I4v.
[36] May, *Cleopatra*, sig. B6v.

Cleopatra, and their worry about her growing grip on Rome through Antony is clear:

> Shall our valour toile in sweat and bloud
> Only to gain a Roman Monarchy
> For *Cleopatra*…?
> …..Shall her timbrels fright
> Romes Capitoll, and her advanced pride
> Tread on the necks of captive Senators?[37]

Fit to Rule? Queen Cleopatra

Antony and Octavian are not the only princes in the Roman story at this point. Cleopatra is a queen in her own right, and her portrayal as a political ruler is important in understanding the way the different writers use this episode in Roman history. When the ancient sources specifically address the issue of gendered rule, they make reference to Cleopatra's womanly attributes affecting her actions or shaping her character. The Cleopatras found in Plutarch, Dio, and Florus are broadly similar: they are strongly sexualised, highly able women who use their wiles to negotiate the best possible outcome for their own interests, but are ultimately unfit to rule, being female and Egyptian and thus steeped in vice and luxury. In Florus, for example, Cleopatra attempts to salvage her situation after Actium by seducing Octavian, "throwing herself at the feet of Caesar to attract his gaze," but in vain, because "her beauty could not defeat self-control."[38] Octavian is strong and resolved, typically Roman, and Cleopatra's feminine assets and manipulation are not sufficient to win the battle. And Dio, describing Cleopatra's flight from the naval battle of Actium, writes that she "could not bear the lengthy and anxious waiting" and, "true to her nature as a woman and an Egyptian," rather than endure the suspense waiting for the outcome, she turned to flee, taking her subjects with her.[39] Significant here is the identification of impatience, cowardice, inability to endure with both women and the Egyptian race, who are often presented as possessing the feminine characteristics of inconstancy and weak will in the Roman texts, in opposition to manly, virtuous Rome.

---

[37] May, *Cleopatra*, sig. B7v.
[38] Florus, II.xxi.
[39] Dio, 50.33.

The issue of female rule is an element in the story of Antony and Cleopatra that does not seem to have captured the imagination of the prose writers of the time, nor does it appear in readers' notes, other than in the general sense that for a man to be ruled by a woman is a reversal of the natural order. The indignity of Antony's Romans serving under a barbarian female is noted by a Cambridge student, for example: "*Sub Antonio Romani Cleopatrae, Barbara foeminae, quod indignandum, serviebant*."[40] In the plays, on the other hand, multiple expressions of the conflict between Cleopatra's sex and her role as a ruler can be found, reflecting the judgements made in the ancient texts. The drama engages with the problems of queenship in a way that the other contemporary sources do not, each playwright shaping his raw material in a very specific way.

Even if the drama written in the reign of Elizabeth and shortly after contains nothing so crude as simple allegorical representations of Gloriana, still, the presence of a queen upon the stage carried some resonance in an age that had experience female rule as never before. The Cleopatra plays are at least partly an exploration of how a woman can hold power effectively in a patriarchal world, and all of them discuss to a certain extent the conflict between a queen's body natural and her body politic, an idea made more complex by the fact that the actors playing Cleopatra would have been boys.[41] Queenship was further complicated by the prevailing opinion that unmarried women were a threat to social order since they were ungoverned; when they were married, women were subservient to their husbands. An unmarried woman was outside the social norms, and an unmarried queen was doubly dangerous because of the powers invested in her. Elizabeth's solution was to make her body natural serve her body politic by opting to remain a virgin and forsake the traditional roles of wife and mother; she represented her country as her dowry, portrayed herself as being married to her subjects with her people as her children, and so forth. This eliminated the threat that a husband would pose to her sovereignty, a subject of great controversy throughout her

[40] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 98r: Under Antony, the Romans were most contemnably made to serve Cleopatra, that barbarian female.

[41] Ibid., p. 73. Michael Shapiro, 'Boying Her Greatness: Shakespeare's use of coterie drama in *Antony and Cleopatra*', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 77, No. 1. (January, 1982), p. 11, suggests that this would not have undermined any connections made between real and represented female monarchs, but might rather have underscored the audience's "dual consciousness", enhancing their appreciation of the several planes of reality, heightening parallels or contrasts with their own world by reinforcing the 'otherness' of events on the stage.

reign. Elizabeth was careful to create these illusions, promoting the image of herself as "the virgin queen" and thereby removing herself from being seen as a 'normal', powerless woman.[42] The Cleopatra plays make use of similar ideas about self-representation to explore how a female monarch can safeguard her sovereignty in an essentially patriarchal society, and how her private life relates to her public function.

The various Cleopatras created by the playwrights resemble Elizabeth in that they are dominant, female rulers, the opposite of the traditional early-modern female. Where they differ is in the way they show how the strategies employed by Cleopatra are worlds apart from those of Elizabeth. The Cleopatras of Shakespeare and May exhibit a strong sexuality, and classically female traits, which they use to extend their power over friends and enemies. Cleopatra is variously represented as goddess and whore, and in both guises, she stands in opposition to the virtuous Octavia, who is devoutly uxurious even after Antony betrays her. While Elizabeth made virginity her strength, Cleopatra is shown, especially by Shakespeare, as using her sexuality to subjugate her political enemies, the Roman generals, by ensnaring them and holding them fast by bearing their children. She makes both Julius Caesar and Antony "lay their swords to bed", symbolizing both her sexuality and their relinquishing of the sword of rule to her power.[43]

May's representation of Cleopatra, constructed considerably later than the rest, owes much to the well-documented Jacobean mistrust of women.[44] Thus he takes the less sympathetic characteristics of Dio's Cleopatra, rather than relying on the more traditional Plutarchan portrait: Plutarch's queen is loyal to Antony and truly grieves for him when he dies, whereas Dio's Cleopatra is selfish and treacherous, plotting with Octavian to preserve herself. Similarly, May's Cleopatra is entirely self-seeking, rather than a selfless lover; after Actium, she plots with Octavian against Antony in order to save herself and Egypt. Just as tyranny was supposed in the early-modern era to be in some way 'womanish', so the queen of Egypt set down by May is capricious and selfish, aspects of tyranny which he seems to have deemed fitting for a woman to possess.[45]

---

[42] Jankowski, *Women in Power*, p. 62; see also Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: drama and the Elizabethan succession* (London, 1977), especially pp. 12 -14, and Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: the Courtships of Elizabeth I* (London, 1996).

[43] Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, 2.ii.228.

[44] R. W. Bushnell, *Tragedies of Tyrants*: *political thought and theater in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY, 1990), pp. 20 -3.

[45] On the femininity of tyrants, see ibid., p. 27.

If Cleopatra differs from early modern queens in her blatant use of sexuality, similarities were certainly perceived between her strategies of self-representation and those of Elizabeth. The parallel was one noted by readers no less than the dramatists. Plutarch describes Cleopatra thus:

> Now her beawtie (as it is reported) was not so passing, as unmatchable of other women, nor yet suche, as upon present viewe did enamor men with her: but so sweete was her companie and conversacion, that a man could not possiblie but be taken. And besides her beawtie, the good grace she had to talke and discourse, her curteous nature that tempered her words & dedes, was a spurre that pricked to the quick. Furthermore, besides all these, her voyce and words were marvelous pleasant: for her tongue was an instrument of musicke to divers sports and pastimes, the which she easely turned to any language that pleased her. She spake unto few barbarous people by interpreter, but made them aunswere her selfe, or at the least the most parte of them…[46]

Edmund Pudsey, in his commonplace book, adapted this idea:

> Histories, &c. Plutarche writes of Cleopatra yt she had so pleasant and delectable a phrase in talking yt when she would dispose her tounge to entertain any great Lord, she framed her reasons so tuneable as tho it had bin an harmonious instrument of many strings. ye pearl yt she dissolved and drunk to anthony waighed halfe an ounce. Plinye.[47]

The same passage inspired Guillaume Telin's description of Cleopatra, translated into English in 1592:

> When *Anthonie* sent to invite her to sup with him, she sent to commaund him to come and sup with her, so much did shee stande upon the priviledge of her beautie, behaviour & quaintnesse in speech: which she delivered with such maiestie, and had so delicate a pronounciation, as her tongue seemed like a curious instrument of manie stringes.Shee could alter her speech to what language shee pleased, or as occasion served: she spake to the *Arabians, Sirians, Hebrewes, Medes, Parthians, Ethiopians,* and *Troglodites,* without any Interpreter.Then was *Anthony* so ravished wyth the grace which she had in devise and urbanitie, her heavenly wordes, gesture and most exquisite demeanour, as also the royaltie and magnificence of her feastes: as beeing confounded with mervaile and astonishment, he saide and confessed, that the estate of hys house, and the manner of his assemblies, was but rusticall in comparison of *Cleopatraes*. After which time, they lived together in such pleasures, aboundance and delights, as it is unpossible to be expressed: such as beheld theyr extraordinary vanitie, even the verie chiefe of theyr

[46] Plutarch, *Lives* (1579), sig. NNNNiv.
[47] Bodleian, Eng. MS Poet. d.3, fol. 82r.

> favourers and wel-wyllers, sayde that they led a most hatefull and contemptible kind of life.[48]

Much of Elizabeth's campaign of self-representation was designed to project exactly such an image to her people. Contemporary accounts of Elizabeth make strikingly similar observations about England's queen to those Plutarch records of Cleopatra.[49] Simonds D'Ewes recorded the received wisdom that at Elizabeth's coronation, "the people again wer wonderfully ravished with the loving answers and gestures of theyr princesse," because of her "merie countenaunce to such as stode farre of, and most tender and gentle language to those that stode nigh."[50] Plutarch's sentiments are echoed in the description of Elizabeth by an anonymous contemporary, who perceived her to be:

> of a great spirit yet tempered with moderation, in adversity never dejected, in prosperity rather joyful than proud; affable to her subjects but always with due regard to the greatness of her estate, by reason whereof she was both loved and feared.... Touching these commendable qualities whereto, partly by nature and partly by education and industry, she had attained, there were few men that (when time and occasion served) could make better use of more show of them than herself. The Latin, French, and Italian she could speak very elegantly, and she was able in all those languages to answer ambassadors on the sudden. Her manner of writing was somewhat obscure and the style not vulgar, as being either learned by imitation of some author whom she delighted to read, or else affected for difference's sake, that she might not write in such phrases as were commonly used. Of the Greek tongue she was not altogether ignorant...[51]

There are undeniable similarities between accounts of this sort, and the version of Cleopatra constructed by the playwrights. Both queens are dramatists and inventors, creating the fictions of their courtly worlds; Plutarch's Cleopatra, read in an Elizabethan context, would surely have

---

[48] Guillaume Telin, *Archaioplutos. Or the riches of elder ages Prooving by manie good and learned authours, that the auncient emperors & kings, were more rich and magnificent, then such as live in these daies. Heereto is annexed, the honours of the brave Romaine souldiours; with the seaven wonders of the worlde. Written in French by Guil. Thelin, Lord of Gutmont and Morillonuilliers: and truely translated into English* (London, 1592), *STC* 23867, sig. D3r-v.

[49] Helen Morris, 'Queen Elizabeth I "Shadowed" in Cleopatra', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (May, 1969), pp. 274–5.

[50] Simonds D'Ewes, *Journals of All the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1682), pp. 659–660; quoted in idem., pp. 274–5.

[51] James Harvey Robinson, *Readings in European History* (Boston, MA, 1906), vol. 2, pp. 191–193. Elizabeth displayed these linguistic abilities at court: see, for example, Janet M. Green, 'Queen Elizabeth I's Latin Reply to the Polish Ambassador', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 31, no. 4 (Winter, 2000), pp. 987–1008.

struck a chord when Shakespeare, or Daniel, used the account in North's translation of the *Lives*, the chief source for their plays.[52] The famous rages of Elizabeth and of Cleopatra, their iconic status in the eyes of their subjects, their luxurious barges and pageants, and their accomplishments all appear in *Antony and Cleopatra*. These were part of the image Elizabeth projected to her subjects, especially those living in London, and mirror closely the tactics employed by Cleopatra as she sought to maintain sovereignty in Egypt.

"An Enemie to Peace, and Troublesome to the Commonweale": Warmongers at Work

Antony, Octavian and Cleopatra, the three princes in this story, possessed multiple meanings for the readers who discovered their lives in the ancient sources, and could be figured in a multitude of ways by the writers seeking to express a particular truth through their recreation of Roman history. The dramatists presented a complex picture, where politics was complicated by personality, but the writers of early modern prose histories, concerned with good governance and the avoidance of armed conflict, primarily depicted Cleopatra and the heirs of Caesar as warmongers. They were therefore enemies of their people and their countries, as well as enemies of one another and themselves.

Antony was the character judged most harshly by the commentators. He was, in Edward Grimeston's translation of Mexia's words, "by nature an enemie to peace, and troublesome to the common weale."[53] Indeed, Antony's trouble-making was judged by William Barker to be "the only cause why the Romane state was not restored to a common wealth agayne."[54] This interpretation of his role as that of chief agitator was a common one:

> all the provinces being divided, there was a great likelyhood of peace…But Marcus Antonius, as one who also thought to become a tyrant, ever sought meanes to incense the people

against the other triumvirs.[55] The histories echo the sentiments of Velleius Paterculus, that the "mad ambition of Antony" for "unholy despotism"

---

[52] See, for example, the introduction in Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (eds), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke, 2003).

[53] Mexia, *Imperiall History* (1623), sig. C6r.

[54] Appian, *An Auncient Historie*, sig. Fff2r.

[55] Mexia, *Imperiall Historie* (1623), sig. C3v.

meant that the "state languished under Antony's oppression."[56] Ancient views of Antony combined with early modern prejudices against men in power who destabilised the state to produce depictions of a character who met an end appropriate to his iniquity and the pain he inflicted upon Rome, as the author of *Romes Monarchie* sententiously declares: "Great is their fall, that seeke to climbe on hie."[57]

The proscriptions of 43 and 42BC, alluded to by Edward Palmer in his commonplace book as one of the greatest evils ever done to the Roman people, provided commentators reimagining the histories with a concrete example of the stirring of civil strife. These killings were widely interpreted as a political manifestation of the personal moral degeneration of their instigators, Antony, Lepidus and Octavian. Antony, in particular, was condemned for the blood-lust he displayed in ordering the deaths of his supposed political enemies. His guilt is described in the classical sources, most of which emphasise his role and go some way towards exonerating the future Caesar. Dio describes how Antony "killed savagely and mercilessly" not only those whose names were on the list, but others besides. Octavian, on the other hand, is shown as being reluctant to take part; Dio tell us that he did so "merely because of his sharing the authority, since he himself had no need at all to kill a large number; for he was not naturally cruel and had been brought up in his father's ways." He justifies this by explaining that, when Octavian was sole ruler, no such purges occurred.[58] Velleius Paterculus goes further, stating that Octavian "protested in vain, being outnumbered two to one," and was almost entirely innocent.[59]

Taking his cue from Velleius Paterculus, Peter Heylyn glosses over Octavian's part in the slaughter, citing Antony and Lepidus as the chief movers behind the scheme; they "glutted themselves with bloud" while Octavian "showed himselfe much grieved at this barbarous cruelty."[60] This tallies with Heylyn's royalist ideology; a vindication of Augustus, in many ways the model for early-Stuart kingship, is no less than might be expected. Both Heylyn and Fulbecke represent Antony as a monster of cruelty, echoing Plutarch in describing Antony's glee at the death of Cicero. Fulbecke then goes further, depicting the truly disgusting abuse of Cicero's remains by Antony and his wife Fulvia. Not content with killing Cicero, "the head

---

56 Velleius Paterculus, II.60; II.61.
57 E.L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. K1v.
58 Dio, 47.7.
59 Velleius Paterculus, II.66.
60 Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. C2r-3r.

was served in mease unto [Antony]" - an embellishment not found in the classical sources - and was then defiled by Fulvia. Taking his details from Dio, Fulbecke shows how she spat upon Cicero's tongue and pierced it with her hair pins, and the marginal note emphasises for the reader the revulsion he is intended to feel: "Fulviaes despiteful dealing with Ciceroes tong."[61] The author departs from his normal style to adopt his source's use of apostrophe in order to better condemn Fulvia and Antony:

> thou didst nothing by taking away the publike voice of the City...but the fame and the glorie of his vertues and excellent learning...thou hast augmented.[62]

This section is borrowed almost entirely from Velleius Paterculus, complete with the direct address to Antony, whose vile actions immortalise the virtue of Cicero. In his account, Fulbecke selects the most pejorative elements from each ancient author and combines them to create a monstrously cruel Antony, deeply unfit to rule.

Edward Grimestone, translating Mexia, shared the blame among the triumvirs, explaining that "so great power had ambition & hatred in the hearts of these three Citizens," that they:

> concluded each of them to kill his enemies, and the one delivered them into the others hands, having more respect and care to bee revenged of an enemie, then to the saving of a friend; and so was made the most cruell and in humane proscription and butcherie that ever was seene or heard of, giving and exchanging friends and kinsmen, for enemies and adversaries. For Marcus Antonius gave his fathers brother; and Lepidus, Lucius Paulus, his owne brother; and Octavianus, Marcus Tullius Cicero, whom hee called father, and by whom hee had beene intreated and honoured as a sonne.[63]

Fulbecke, too, makes Octavian partly culpable, describing how, thanks to his conduct, "many of the Senators and Romane Knights were sacrificed upon the altar of Iulius Cesar."[64] North's translation of Goulart's additional *Life of Augustus* is even less forgiving of Octavian, who, "when the sword was once drawne, he was no lesse cruell then the other two." Appian's history is then cited to further attest the future emperor's bestial cruelty, "which will serve to shew, how much a man is a furious beast, being lift up in authoritie in the commonwealth, and given to revenge."[65] Goulart

---

[61] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Bb2r.
[62] Idem.
[63] Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. D1r.
[64] Ibid., sig. Bb3v. This is a paraphrase of Velleius Paterculus, II.66.
[65] Plutarch, *Lives* (1603), sig. e5r.

follows this with extraordinarily copious detail on the proscriptions, unmatched by any other early modern source. North, as translator, seems keen to show the full horror of this political slaughter, in order to convey its importance as a demonstration of rulers' faults. This is in marked contrast to the translator of Lipsius's *Two Bookes of Constancie*, who shows an awareness of the dangers of history as an example, refusing even to mention the proscriptions:

> I omit that which y^e^ TRIUMVIRI & other Tyrants practised, least by the rehersall thereof I should instruct them of our time.[66]

* * *

In the plays, the overreaching of the greedy Antony is portrayed as the cause of his demise. References to the deadly sins, Pride and Wrath, abound in the drama on Antony and Cleopatra. Pride in rulers leads them to overstep moral boundaries and ride roughshod over their subjects; it is the cause of civil war. In Mary Sidney's *Antonie*, there are various grim predictions of the woes to come when Antony and Octavian fight for supremacy, failing to observe the laws in their greed and pride. Antony knows that war, at whatever price, is inevitable, so desperate are both he and Octavian for supremacy:

> A monarchie to gaine
> None cares which way, so he may it obtaine.[67]

Octavian's motives in doing battle with Antony are of interest to all the dramatists. It has become common for literary critics to place Octavian in the role of the ideal prince, compared with the dissolute Antony; Octavian therefore deserves to be emperor of Rome as he is morally superior.[68] This is certainly the view put forward by Brandon in his *Octavia*. Although we only glimpse him on the sidelines, Octavia's brother is inspired by rightful brotherly indignation to attack Antony; he is doing it to defend his sister's honour, avenging her betrayal by Antony as he dallies with Cleopatra. Octavian's motives, in Brandon's estimation, are highly honourable, as he makes clear in the introduction and exposition of the plot: "Whereupon, hir brother *Caesar* disdaining that she should suffer so great an indignitie:

---

[66] Lipsius, *Two bookes of constancie*, sig. Q3v.
[67] Sidney, *Antonie*, sig. D6r.
[68] J. L. Barroll, 'The Characterisation of Octavius', *Shakespeare Studies* 6 (1972), p. 252.

maketh warre upon *Antony*."[69] Here is a clear legitimation of Octavian's supremacy over Antony, since all tradition and morals are on his side: the side of fidelity and chastity rather than lust and adultery.

Brandon, however, is the only dramatist who portrays Octavian thus. The other plays all make explicit reference to Octavian beginning the wars with Antony because both of them desired too greatly to be the sole ruler at Rome. In this judgement, the plays echo the narrative histories; although both men profess to make war for just reasons:

> the truth is, they both desired to be Lords of the whole: and in my opinion, vaine-glorie, ambition, covetousnesse, and envie, moved them thereto.[70]

Mary Sidney portrays Octavian as a warmonger who seeks any pretext to make trouble and defeat his rival Antony. In her introduction, she explains that he seized upon the opportunity presented by Antony's return to Cleopatra: "This occation *Octavius* toke of taking armes against him."[71] This is not a vindication of Antony; he is an adulterer, and has wronged his wife. Nevertheless, Octavian had been waiting for just such a slip to give him the chance to challenge Antony in the pursuit of supremacy.

Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* likewise shows Octavian plotting bloody civil war even before the events of the 30s BC; this comes to pass in *Antony and Cleopatra*, as he betrays his pact with Antony. And Octavian's transgressions are emphasized by May, the most critical of the dramatists, who shows a group of senators discussing the ills that have befallen Rome in the wake of Octavian's attack on Antony:

> Now…laws
> Are put to silence, and the Senate forc'd,
> The Consuls sacred priviledge infring'd
> By rage and lawlesse armes, we are expell'd.[72]

The senators have come to support Antony in Egypt, because he was the wronged party, attacked by Octavian in direct contravention of their prior agreement. Antony's lieutenants, too, although they later desert him, know Antony is the one who has acted better in this instance; Plancus calls his "A nature here, honester then *Caesars*."[73] Octavian, in this retelling,

---

[69] Brandon, *Octavia*, sig. Aivr.
[70] Mexia, *Imperiall Historie* (1623), sig. D4v.
[71] Sidney, *Antonie*, sig. A3v.
[72] May, *Cleopatra*, sig. B8v.
[73] Ibid., sig. B3v.

would have brought Rome to war sooner or later, whatever Antony's actions had been.

After his victory over Antony, too, Octavian is represented as a wicked tyrant. Daniel depicts him as a ruthless despot, trampling kingdoms and princes, and committing murders in order to assure his success. He wants to bring Cleopatra to Rome to boast of his greatness, for it would be "a great ornament to his Tryumphes."[74] Indeed, several of the works make a point of showing the godlike aspirations of Octavian, who is at this point not even a monarch, only a pretender to a throne that has not yet been created. Mary Sidney gives her readers a gloating Octavian who likens himself to the king of the gods:

> Yet at this day this proud exalted *Rome*
> Despoil'd, captiv'd, at one mans will doth bend:
> Her Empire mine, her life is in my hand,
> As Monarch I both world and *Rome* commaund;
> Do all, can all; foorth my command'ment cast
> Like thundring fire from one to other Pole
> Equall to Iove: bestowing by my word
> Happs and mishappes, as Fortunes King and Lord.[75]

May's Octavian is the most devious and wicked of them all. Even the corrupt Egyptians know that the time of Rome's republic is over now that Octavian's star is in the ascendant:

> Alas, my sonne, there need no prodigies
> To shew the certain losse of Italy.
> For on both sides do Roman Eagles stand,
> And Rome must bleed who ere be conquerour,
> Besides her liberty for ever lost
> When this sad field is fought.....[76]

Caesar's heir is presented by May in a similar way to Kyd's Julius Caesar, as the wolf-cub reared by a shepherd that will only grow up to attack him and his flocks:

> ...rais'd a power, which now thou canst not rule,
> Nourish'd a Lion to devoure thy self?[77]

The note on which the play ends reveals just what Octavian thinks about being the only powerful one left:

---

[74] Daniel, *Cleopatra*, sig. H7v.
[75] Sidney, *Antonie*, sig. E6r.
[76] May, *Cleopatra*, sig. C2r.
[77] Ibid., sig. C2r-v.

Heer let our labours end: advance brave friends
Our prosperous Eagles home to Italy,
To reap the fruit of all our wars and toils,
And fill great Rome with conquer'd Aegypts spoils.[78]

"The People all the Smart Do Bear": The Desire for Stability

The most pressing concern exhibited by all the works is that of the perils of civil war and divided government. That prevailing theme in early modern literature, civic stability, is inspected through the magnifying glass of the Antony and Cleopatra story. Government at Rome in the aftermath of Caesar's death is divided, as Antony, Octavian and Lepidus vie for power. Egypt is a complicating factor: it is supposedly governed by Rome, yet Cleopatra remains on the throne, providing a further point of governmental division. The resolution of the conflicts within government which occurs as Antony and Cleopatra self-destruct and leave the field to Octavian is a theme which appears in the plays and the histories, emphasised more in some than in others, yet always present.

The drama, as ever, is the most forceful in its presentation of the concern. The need for strong, single government is reinforced in the dramatic works by their choruses. Italicised for emphasis, in several of the works they repeat sentiments along these lines:

When one selfe pow're is common made to two
Their duties they nor suffer will, nor doe.
In quarell still, in doubt, in hate, in feare;
Meane while the people all the smart do beare.[79]

Worries over Octavian's future conduct are also expressed. Sidney, for instance, is keen to stress that good princes do not rule without regard for the welfare of their state. Agrippa warns the victorious Octavian that his power comes with weighty responsibilities, and he must justify his sole rule with integrity and clemency:

Neither must you (beleeve, I humblie praie)
Your victorie with crueltie defile.
The Gods it gave, it must not be abus'd,
But to the good of all men mildely us'd,
And they bethank'd: that having giv'n you grace

[78] Ibid., sig. E3r.
[79] Sidney, *Antonie*, sig. F1v.

> To raigne alone, and rule this earthly masse,
> They may hence-forward hold it still in rest,
> All scattered power united in one brest.[80]

Brandon, too, is keen to convey the necessity of rulers acting to maintain peace at all costs:

> …it is a brave and Princely thing,
> With fire and sword to ruinate our foes:
> But greater glory is it for a King,
> To save his subjects from wars common woes.[81]

And Thomas May's *Cleopatra* is firm in its assertion of the evils that war has inflicted upon Rome. Although the solution the piece presents as the most desirable is the restoration of consensual government along the lines of the old republican constitution, rather than monarchy, it is no less condemnatory of the pains which the Roman people have undergone than the other plays. The Romans have:

> …endur'd our Consuls state and power
> To be subjected by the lawlesse arms
> Of private men, or Senators proscrib'd.[82]

It is the discord between Antony and Octavian that has perpetuated these troubles, and even the staunchly republican Titius and Plancus:

> Rather then Rome should still obey two Lords,
> Could wish that all were *Anthony's* alone.
> Who would, I think, be brought more easily
> Then *Caesar*, to resigne the government.[83]

In William Barker's continuation of Appian's history, peace is connected with godliness and with monarchical rule, in contrast with what the writer portrays as the chaos and crimes of the republican constitution. The end of the republic and the fall of Antony are cited as evidence that Rome's destiny was divinely ordained, and the peace and freedom that followed Antony's death were the rewards bestowed upon a society that had chosen rightly at last. This episode in Roman history was the beginning of Christianity, "the end of the Romanes wo, & the beginning of our joy."[84]

---

[80] Ibid., sig. F3r.
[81] Brandon, *Octavia*, sig. E3v-4r.
[82] May, *Cleopatra*, sig. B2v.
[83] Idem.
[84] Appian, *An Auncient Historie*, sig. Bbb3r.

Republican chaos had given way to providentially ordained monarchy, a lesson for all men and all nations:

> In this we be taught: The Gods vengeance is sharp, although it be slow, and that peoples rule must give place, and princely power prevayle.[85]

The wars are presented as a punishment for Rome's sins as well as Antony's, and for the war that has been waged both at home and abroad:

> Eyther for that God woulde plague Antonies evill life: or that he would chaunge the state of that mighty common wealth…whose outragious dealings as wel in foreine as civill murders, it pleased God to punish with so great alteration.[86]

The time of power-sharing is over, the author emphasises. So, too, is the strife that inevitably follows divided rule. Peace is established, and peace brings liberty, the state in which God intended man to live. For early modern interpreters such as Barker, Rome was finally fulfilling her destiny, putting behind her the flawed 'democracy' of the republic and the wars that had accompanied its fall, and entering a golden age of peace in accordance with God's will. It is to this universal peace, established by Octavian, that we now turn, and to Octavian's transformation from pretender to Rome's monarchy, into the supreme emperor, Caesar Augustus.

[85] Ibid., sig. Bbb2r.
[86] Ibid., sig. Fff2r.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CAESAR AUGUSTUS: "HOW HAPPELY HE GOVERNED"?

After the defeat of Antony at Actium in 31 BC, and a series of victories over other troublesome nations, Octavian returned to Rome in 27 BC as the triumphant ruler of the known world. A universal peace was established, and the Senate hailed him as "Caesar Augustus," the title by which he was to remain known. Received wisdom tells us that this establishment of an empire which was to endure for centuries under sole monarchical rule, and this peace which ended decades of civil war, was hailed by early modern readers and writers as the great example of strong monarchy, and a model for their own time.[1]

This theory is not always borne out by the evidence of reading which remains, nor by the histories that were composed during the Elizabethan and early Stuart period. While Augustus was indeed hailed as an ideal prince by some early modern men, this was by no means the only interpretation of his story. The ancient sources from which early modern readers and writers could draw knowledge of Octavian/Augustus are numerous, fragmented, and very different in their presentation of events. Appian's *Civil Wars* is not a useful source, since the account ends in 35 BC. Florus and Velleius Paterculus give details of the wars under Augustus, usually in a way that flatters the emperor, but make little mention of politics at Rome. Pliny's *Natural History* contains some anecdotes about Augustus, largely concerning monuments erected by him or military fashions which he instigated. Tacitus' *Annals* begins in AD 14, and describes very briefly Augustus' rise to power in negative terms, before giving some account of his failings in his later years; the young Augustus "subjected to the yoke of empire a world wearied by civil war" and appointed his advisors "as supports to his despotism," so that "not a trace of the old, solid morality remained."[2]

---

[1] For example, R. P. Kalmey, 'Shakespeare's Octavius and Elizabethan Roman history', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* vol. 18, no. 2 (Spring, 1978), pp. 275–287; Barbara L. Parker *Plato's Republic and Shakespeare's Rome: a political study of the Roman works* (Newark, 2004), pp. 109 -11.

[2] Tacitus, *Annals*, book 1.

Another uncomplimentary account is Cassius Dio's history of Rome from 36 BC onwards. It is unclear what his own sources were, but his work demonstrates a clear distinction between Octavian, the ruthless and aspiring young man, and Augustus, the ideal *princeps* on whom the Severan monarchy, the regime under which Cassius was writing, was modelled. At the court of Hadrian, Suetonius wrote his *Life of Augustus*, using Augustan documents from the imperial archives. His work supplies more anecdotal evidence than it does a clear chronology, but presents both friendly and more critical opinions of the emperor; Aurelius Victor's *Caesares,* an epitome of Suetonius' *Lives* written in the fourth century AD and published as part of the *Historia Augusta*, was also used by early modern readers.

Another major source of evidence is the Augustan literature, including works by Horace, Ovid, and Vergil. The *Aeneid* has been read as a paeon to Rome's imperial glory, while Horace's poetry gives more concrete details about life during the civil wars and under Augustus. His *Secular Hymn*, for example, written for performance at Augustus' 'Secular Games' in 17 BC, glorifies contemporary Rome by linking military triumphs with mythology and the deeds of the gods. Poets seeking to align themselves with policies of Jacobean 'monarchical pacifism' invoked comparisons with Horace to strengthen their cause; Horace was a strong supporter of Augustus and his peaceful policies, as James I was keen to advertise.[3] It is clear from some of the commonplace books that Horace was also regarded as a valuable commentator on the events of the late-first century BC.

With such a multiplicity of sources on which to draw, it is unsurprising that the representation of Augustus was never entirely straightforward. It is true that Augustus was sometimes explicitly connected by writers with contemporary rulers; his founding of the empire, his settling of Rome's troubled succession, and his role as chief patron of the arts were all elements of the Augustan image that were harnessed by writers who sought to draw flattering parallels between the Roman empire and their own monarch.[4] But the difference between England, a monarchical state for many centuries, and Rome, where Octavian established himself as emperor of a new regime, made the question of how to interpret the life of Augustus a highly complex one for readers and writers in early modern England. Just as Julius Caesar could be used as an emblem of both virtue

[3] Discussed in Adrian Streete, 'Frances Quarles' Early Poetry and the Discourses of Jacobean Spenserianism', *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring, 2009), pp. 88–108.

[4] Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics', pp. 38–40.

and vice, so Augustus was a multivalent symbol, employed by writers with varying views to legitimate the moral or political stance they sought to promote. His story itself encouraged a dichotomous interpretation of his character; the distinction between the wars that characterised Octavian's years as an aspirant to power, and the peace that he maintained as emperor, found its reflection in early modern portraits of his personality. But even a model of the arrogant and unscrupulous pretender made good is too simplistic an interpretation of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century understandings of Augustus, the complexity of which defies easy categorisation.

Octavian and Augustus: "A Mighty Contrast"

Rome's troubled transition from republic to empire at the hands of Octavian was problematic for those seeking to present Augustus, statesman and peacemaker, as a model for contemporary magistrates. He was no hereditary king, and Rome no established monarchy; instead, Julius Caesar's heir plotted and fought his way to power in a series of bloody conflicts and political manoeuvres. Octavian was guilty of many despicable actions which prevented him from being a fit exemplar for emulation; we have already seen condemnation of his part in the proscriptions, to give but one example. This is a very different image from that of Augustus, the wise and virtuous emperor who ruled Rome alone for nearly fifty years.

In order to overcome this problem, and rescue the model prince from the taint of his misspent youth, some early modern commentators separated Octavian from Augustus in order to endorse the programme of strong monarchical rule to which they subscribed. For these readers and writers, Augustus, the emperor, was a changed man from that most manipulative and headstrong youth, Octavian, and imperial majesty endowed him with the monarchical virtues he had lacked before he attained to that estate. In accepting this idea of Augustus, readers followed Dio, who makes very clear the difference between the actions of Octavian and his conduct as emperor. As a young man, the people of Rome had not trusted him; malingering and delaying on the pretext of being ill, the citizens suspected this was not true, but that "he was devising some mischief."[5] Making war upon Antony, Octavian was keen for battle to commence on whatever

[5] Dio, XLVIII.3.

pretext was necessary, but he "did not want to be seen to be starting the war."[6] After the death of Augustus, however, Dio makes plain the change that came about when all his enemies were defeated:

> Augustus had been accessible to everyone, and had given financial help to many. He displayed great honour toward his friends, and was exceedingly glad when they spoke frankly to him… But it was not just for these reasons that the Romans felt his loss. By marrying monarchy with democracy, he had preserved their liberty for them, at the same time as establishing safety and order. Thus they were free both from the disruptions of democracy and the injury of tyranny, and lived freely and moderately in a monarchy without fear. They were royal subjects but not slaves, citizens without civil discord. If anyone remembered Octavian's deeds in the civil wars, they excused him on account of his circumstances. They believed it fairer to find his real character in his actions when he was sole and uncontested in his rule – and truly, this was a mighty contrast.[7]

This same differentiation between Octavian's rise to power and Augustus' exercise of imperial authority is shown in Goulart's *Augustus*, rendered into English by Sir Thomas North. No life of Augustus appears in Plutarch, and the first three editions of North's translation of the *Lives* lack a supplementary version; indeed, Amyot's epistle to the readers describes how he searched the libraries of Venice and Rome for the lives of Augustus, Nero and Scipio which were rumoured to exist, but failed to find them.[8] However, the editions published from 1603 onwards added, without any introduction or preface, "*the lives of Epaminondas, of Philip of Macedon, of Dionysius the elder, tyrant of Sicilia, of Augustus Caesar, of Plutarke, and of Seneca: with the lives of nine other excellent chiefetaines of warre*." The additional material was a straight reprint of a volume of the works of Nepos, translated by Thomas North and published in 1602, most of which were taken from a French compilation made by Simon Goulart of Senlis. This had itself been compiled from the *Vitae excellentium imperatorum*, handed down from antiquity under the name 'Æmylius Probus'.[9] The 'life' of Augustus was in fact composed by Goulart himself, and with the lives of Plutarch and Seneca,was added to his 'enriched' 1603 edition of Plutarch.

---

[6] Ibid., L.3.
[7] Ibid., LVI.43–4.
[8] Plutarch, *Lives* (1595), sig. *7r.
[9] *The lives of Epaminondas, of Philip of Macedon, of Dionysius the Elder, and of Octavius Caesar Augustus…*(London, 1602), *STC* 20071. On Cornelius Nepos, see Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, MA, 1971), pp. 97–8.

Goulart attributed some of his detail about Augustus' personal modesty and family life to Suetonius, but his other sources are not mentioned.[10] The very fact that they were not deemed worthy of note by the author, translator, or publisher, and that the English editions did not represent the sections by Goulart any differently from those by Plutarch himself, attests the lack of any need for factual accuracy in early modern histories or 'biographies'. This reflects the same attitude towards history as does the early modern preference for the speeches put into characters' mouths in the ancient histories, the very sections which were necessarily inaccurate.[11]

Here, then, is a vision of history as a synthesis, a compilation of extracts from diverse sources into a novel whole, often comprehending several competing versions within one text. North's translation of Goulart's account shows extreme disgust at Octavian's behaviour in the years before he defeated Antony; we have already seen the exceptionally detailed translation of his part in the proscriptions. A completely different picture is painted of Augustus' government as emperor, however:

> It is a wonderful thing that he could…restore againe into so good estate the commonwealth of Rome, turmoiled and troubled with so many proscriptions and civill warres as it was. And that afterwards so long as he commaunded alone, he did so firmely establish this Monarchie, that notwithstanding the infinite troubles received under other Emperours, yet it stood upright and in so great prosperitie for so many hundred years.[12]

Octavian may have been wicked, but Augustus is a model prince, praised with direct apostrophe:

> Thy youth Augustus, and thy tongues good gift,
> Thy valour, wisedome, and thy worthy feats,
> Thy countries love, thy lawes, and statutes, lift
> Thy throne above all other princely seates.[13]

For Peter Heylyn, the young Octavian was a devious and disruptive character, whose manipulation of individuals and institutions was astute

---

[10] *Les vies des hommes illustres Grecs et Romains…* (Genève, 1583). For further details, see Olga van Marion, 'The reception of Plutarch in the Netherlands: Octavia and Cleopatra in the heroic epistles of J. B. Wellekens (1710)' in Karl Enenkel, Jan L. De Jong, Jeannine De Landtsheer and Alicia Montoya (eds), *Recreating Ancient History: episodes from the Greek and Roman past in the arts and literature of the early modern period* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 226–7.

[11] Peter Burke, 'Translating Histories' in Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia (eds), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 133; Enenkel *et al.*, *Recreating Ancient History*, pp. vii-x.

[12] Plutarch, *Lives* (1603), 'Additional' lives, sig. e5r.

[13] Ibid., sig e4r.

but less than decent. In Heylyn's account, he appears as a master of Machiavellian statecraft, employing strategies to remove his opponents: he arranged for Antony to be sent to Egypt on an honourable pretext, knowing that he would neglect public affairs to dally with Cleopatra and thus disgrace himself in the eyes of the people and the Senate.[14] He encouraged his sister, Octavia, to make more of her role as the dutiful, abandoned wife, so that the nobles at Rome would hate Antony all the more. He was highly devious, persuading the consuls Hirtius and Pansa to take on the initial war against Antony, knowing that if they triumphed, Octavian would receive the glory, but if they lost, he would be able to blame the loss upon them and escape with his pride and reputation intact.[15] According to William Fulbecke, too, Octavian had severe faults. He obtained Antony's last will and testament from the Vestal Virgins and read it in the Forum, telling the people how Antony intended to make his sons by Cleopatra his heirs, leaving all his wealth to Cleopatra. As Fulbecke explained, "that was done by Caesar, to the end that he might avoyd the hatred of manie noble men" who preferred Antony.[16]

Other authors implied the same distinction by omitting all mention of Octavian, and focusing instead on the reign of Augustus. A sympathetic portrayal of Augustus as providentially-chosen, and a lack of acknowledgment of the nefarious deeds of Octavian, could be employed to strengthen arguments for the preservation of a strong and unified English Church, a religious context of no small importance, given the confessional conflicts continuing across Europe. The author of *Romes Monarchie*, for instance, took a very generous and implicitly teleological stance on the principate of Augustus, emphasised in his division of the work into discrete chapters. Until the death of Julius Caesar, no mention is made of Octavian whatsoever. Immediately following the assassination of Caesar, however, the

[14] Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. C8v. These criticisms of Augustus might appear odd, given Heylyn's overt support of Charles I and Laud. Published in 1632, as Charles was commencing his personal rule, the work is far from being as supportive of absolute monarchy as some of Heylyn's other works. This is perhaps because the essay was written, as the author claims, 'long since' in the 1620s, and is not a direct 'mirror' reflecting Heylyn's advice for Charles I. Both positive and negative comments on Augustus are found throughout the work, much as they are in the biography by Suetonius, another royal client. Moreover, Heylyn published his essay anonymously, further distancing himself from direct alignment with either pro- or anti-Augustan thinking. For recent opinion on the subject, see Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: the career and writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007), especially pp. 32–4.

[15] Ibid., sig. B10r-v.

[16] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Cc1–2r.

author begins a new chapter, entitled "The fortunate and prosperous raigne of Octavius Augustus Caesar, in whose time our Saviour Christ was born."[17] The first lines of the chapter herald a new, Christian age, overlooking the decade of bloody civil war that was to follow Caesar's death in favour of emphasising the association between Augustus and Christ's birth:

> Octavius spring began the world anew.
> So fresh a spring as never was before
> Upon the earth, nor ever shall be more.[18]

A marginal note, "This spring, the comfort of all Christians," accompanies the rhyme. That the first mention made of Octavian in the whole work is one linking him with Christianity, is in keeping with the praise given to Augustus throughout the brief pages that follow, charting his success and his talent for peaceful, monarchical rule. Here is an example of strong, providentially-ordained monarchy that stood as a guide to Elizabeth in the fourth decade of her reign, when fears over the succession and another possible Spanish invasion were still high.

This separation between Octavian and Augustus has been widely accepted by modern historians and commentators on literature. Keen to attribute to Tudor and early Stuart historiography the desire to condemn civil war at all costs and present a glowing depiction of monarchy, critics have been quick to take at face value the apparent distinction between Octavian as an instigator of civil war and a vicious tyrant presiding over a reign of terror, and Augustus, the ideal prince.[19] Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* has traditionally been cited as the work most clearly expressing this understanding of Octavian: that by the end of the play, Shakespeare has shown that he has reached a new level of understanding, and is fit to rule. Andrew Hadfield has recently challenged this view.[20] Far from being portrayed as a model prince, Octavian in fact continues to be self-serving and manipulative throughout Shakespeare's text. The tribute he pays to the defeated Antony and Cleopatra, and the monument he orders to be built to their memory, is deliberately shown by Shakespeare to be more in the interests of his own glorification than the respect of his vanquished opponents. Rather than commemorate Antony's life or Cleopatra's love,

---

[17] E. L., *Romes Monarchie*, sig. Kɪr.

[18] Idem.

[19] The definitive statement is Kalmey, 'Shakespeare's Octavius'; Barbara L. Parker, in her *Plato's Republic and Shakespeare's Rome*, also subscribes to this theory, see p. 109.

[20] Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare and Republicanism* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 221, 228–9.

it will instead reflect all the more upon 'his glory which/Brought them to be lamented'. Shakespeare's continued insistence on Octavian/Augustus' preoccupation with his own image undermines the idea that Octavian shows himself to be merciful and statesman-like, a fit ruler. Perhaps, as Hadfield has suggested, Shakespeare is very far from seeking to identify Augustus with James as an embodiment of ideal monarchy, as most critics assume to be the case. Hadfield convincingly argues that Shakespeare's Octavian/Augustus is a consistent character, always cool and rational, but not in a way that accords with Stoic virtue: rather, he suppresses his passions, the better to grasp power and succeed in the battles he initiates. This is in direct contrast to the irenic James I, who in no way seemed to subjugate his desires to his reason; although this might not be ideal in a king, at least, Hadfield suggests, James is not the power-hungry machine that Octavian was, and Augustus, at the end of *Antony and Cleopatra*, demonstrably will be.

Caesar Augustus: "so Worthy a Prince, so Fortunate a Captayne, so Wyse a Counselor"

But Shakespeare does not show us Octavian in power, and it is undeniable that many early modern representations of Augustus as emperor were extremely positive. The reasons for this are not hard to find: in periods when the succession was unsettled, or religious war raged on the continent, Augustus' example of strong, unified and peaceful monarchical rule was the perfect model for England's ideal state, and the man himself was often credited with the personal qualities that brought about an end to war, and initiated decades of settled prosperity at Rome.

Most commentators writing prose histories approved of Augustus' universal peace and his strengthening of the state. Peter Heylyn's essay, *Augustus*, might be sceptical of the methods by which Octavian rose to power, but it applauded what Augustus did when the civil peace was settled:

> although that hee obtained it by meanes hardly justifiable, yet truely, he afterwards governed it most justly and wisely, and was one of the best Princes that ever was in the world; gentle, mercifull, liberal, just, valiant.[21]

William Fulbecke, writing during the years of the Spanish invasion threat and not during James' irenic early years, was, as we have seen, an

[21] Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. Dd6r.

especially strong advocate of peace. His *Continuall Factions* closes with a powerful reminder of the joys peace can bring to a state:

> civill enmities extinguished, forreine warres fully ended, iustice recalled… strength was restored to lawes, authoritie to Magistrates, dignitie to the Nobles, maiestie to the Senate, safetie to the people …and with this harmonie peace pleased the Romanes.[22]

Perhaps the strongest endorsement of the virtuous stability of Augustus' Rome is found in Ben Jonson's *The Poetaster*. The play, first performed in 1601, represents Augustus as the ideal prince ruling over a peaceful commonwealth in which the value of poetry as a tool of virtue is understood, and where justice and morality are embodied by an emperor who seeks to educate his citizens by example. In its treatment of Roman history, the work demonstrates a highly selective use of the classical sources by Jonson, the rigorous classicist and self-fashioned scholar, in order to depict Augustus as a hero-prince who values poets as counsellors above all others.

It has become usual to see *The Poetaster* as the first expression of an 'Augustan idea' or programme in English literature, one which developed fully after the Restoration of Charles II.[23] This Augustan tradition is often an explicit rejection of opposing republican ideals, and celebrates the role of Augustus as stabiliser and settler of nations, the father of modern monarchy; the Augustus of *The Poetaster* is represented in just such a way, a decision that was clearly deliberate on the part of the author. Jonson, after all, makes detailed references to classical texts throughout his works, demonstrating a deep familiarity with the ancient authorities who painted a very different picture of the Roman emperor. His is a conscious and distinctive manipulation of history, the better to serve the playwright's preoccupation with the role of poetry in society, and his desire to comment upon the court and crown of his own day.

The Poetaster is at least in part a discussion of authority, the means by which a monarch retains power, and the duty of counsellors to shape the policy of their prince in a virtuous manner. Augustus' Rome, as Jonson chose to recreate it, was the perfect location for his purposes; this was a time when "wit and arts were at their height in Rome", and the poets whom Jonson most admired practised their arts at court, as Jonson himself hoped

---

[22] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Eeiir.

[23] For example, Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea.*

to do.[24] Jonson selected information from Suetonius' *Divus Augustus* in order to set a scene in which absolute moral values set the standard by which poets and princes, ancient and modern, could be judged.

This 'Augustan' ethos bears little resemblance to the reality as it appears in most of the ancient sources. The play, although set in a real historical place and time, with 'real' historical characters, does not follow chronology as established in the sources. The banishment of Ovid, for example, actually took place in AD 8, when most of the characters in Jonson's play who witness the exile were dead. Most significantly, the character of Augustus in the play is pure and virtuous: not a shade remains of the devious statesman or ruthlessly ambitious ruler found in Dio, Tacitus (whom Jonson was to use shortly afterwards when writing *Sejanus*), or even Pliny. The allegations of sexual licentiousness made by Suetonius have been deliberately altered, and Jonson's Augustus overreacts violently to suggestions of immorality on the part of other characters, so upstanding a man is he.[25] This is most clearly demonstrated in the 'banquet of the gods' scene, which represents a significantly different version of events from that found in the ancient sources. Augustus did indeed enact the *Lex Iulia* against adultery, as Jonson shows, but his personal conduct was far from blameless. Accusations against him are so widespread as to make any critical reader question the difference between his outward display and private life; Suetonius, for example, quotes an anonymous libel about Augustus' 'banquet of the gods':

> Caesar sacrilegiously plays the feigned part of Apollo and feasts amid new, god-like debaucheries.[26]

Jonson's Augustus has no such pretensions. He despises flatterers, preferring the simple and unaffected poetry of Horace; perhaps here is a hint to Elizabeth, at whose court poets wrote verses declaring their devotion to their queen, a part of the 'cult' of Elizabeth from which Jonson was materially excluded. The Augustus of *The Poetaster* encourages free speech at his court, in contrast to Elizabeth, whose censorship of unwelcome counsel was notorious.[27] And Jonson's emperor is so virtuous that he does not

---

[24] Ben Jonson, *The workes of Beniamin Ionson* (London, 1616), *STC* 14752, sig. Gg1v.

[25] *Poetaster*, IV.iii; Ben Jonson, *Poetaster or The arraignment as it hath beene sundry times privately acted in the Blacke Friers, by the children of her Maiesties Chappell. Composed, by Ben. Iohnson* (London, 1602), *STC* 14781, sig. G2r -v.

[26] Suetonius, *Augustus*, 70.

[27] Here, in contrast to the 'banquet of the gods' scene, Jonson follows Suetonius: for example, *Augustus*, 54, 'no one suffered for his insolence or free speech' and 56, 'he vetoed

hesitate to act to punish those who have offended the gods and the moral laws. Those who "think gods but feigned and virtue painted," he says, should "know we sustain an actual residence,/ And with the title of an emperor/ Retain his spirit and imperial power," a power which Augustus wields with dignity and authority.

Jonson's Augustus, then, had direct relevance to the methods of monarchy adopted by Elizabeth I. More generally, any treatment of Augustus, Rome's first 'official' emperor, in the early modern period could hardly fail to take account of the appropriation of Augustus' persona by Elizabeth and the early Stuart kings. We have seen how portrayals of Cleopatra were read and styled with Elizabeth in mind; the analogy between Roman and English rulers was even more strongly drawn where Augustus was concerned, as monarchs and their critics and counsellors actively sought to identify them with the first imperial ruler of Rome.

As the first 'hereditary' monarch at Rome since the expulsion of the Tarquins, Augustus was, with humanist hindsight, the logical end to the turmoil of the last decades of the republic, the completion of the cycle of governments. Most importantly, he was the man who brought peace and stability to the empire, and bequeathed to his successors a divinely-sanctioned sole sovereignty, forming a pattern for all early modern princes. In an age of imperial expansion, European mythology drew on Vergilian prophecies from the Aeneid and the eclogues about Rome rising again in the West, and monarchs represented themselves as the embodiment of the prophecies, presiding over an age of peace and prosperity, just as Augustus had done. Charles V, as Holy Roman Emperor, had harnessed these claims for the purposes of his imperial propaganda. Spenser and Foxe, utilising Vergil's insistence that a virgin should bring the renewal of Rome, painted Elizabeth as the virgin who would give her empire peace and *imperium sine fine*.[28]

Elizabeth invited explicit comparisons with Augustus' regime, especially as she grew older, with her enduring Protestant settlement following the religious changes under Edward and Mary, and her lack of a natural heir. Augustus, too, had ushered in a new peace after several unsettling changes of rule, and had no son to follow him. As Rome's first great prince,

---

a law to check freedom of speech in wills'. This is in strong contrast to Elizabeth's court: see, for example A. N. McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth 1558–1585* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 27 on Peter Wentworth, John Stubbs, Philip Sidney and the freedom to express critical counsel to Elizabeth.

[28] Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: the culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42* (Manchester, 1981), pp. 16–17.

Augustus provided a natural model for writers seeking to flatter Elizabeth. Philemon Holland, in the prefatory material to his translation of Livy in 1600, stressed how Livy had enjoyed the patronage of Augustus and his wife, "the speciall favour wherein hee stood with his prince *Augustus*, and *Livia* the Empresse," as he dedicated his work under the royal blazon to Elizabeth:

> ALL my labour whatsoever, in translating another mans worke, I present here unto your Highnesse, and consecrate to the happie and immortall memorie of your most sacred Majestie.[29]

He followed the dedication with *Ad Anglicam Livianae Historiae versionem, Interpretis Prosopopoea*, a verse glorifying Livy and Elizabeth together in its thirty-odd lines.

Such current analogies made Augustan Rome an ideal setting in which Jonson could discuss the less glorious side of contemporary courtly life, in his *Poetaster*. Setting the play at the court of Augustus partly distanced it from the sensitive political situation in England, and partly enhanced the value of the comparison, and it permitted a comparison between Elizabeth and Jonson's idealised patron of poetry, with criticism of Elizabeth implicit therein. Believing that a dramatic comedy such as *Poetaster* should be "neere, and familiarly allied to the time," Jonson placed Augustus side by side with Elizabeth. The Roman emperor he depicted was one who took notice not of informers and libels, but of wise poets, in contrast to Elizabeth, in whose prison Jonson himself had languished in 1599 after enemies had informed upon him.[30] In the misreading of Horace's emblem and the libels circulated at Augustus' court, too, was reflected another topical allusion: the circumstances surrounding the Essex rebellion of 1601.

Parallels between Elizabeth and Augustus were not only drawn within the queen's lifetime. With the hindsight of more than a quarter of a century, Edward Leigh made explicit comparisons between Elizabeth and Augustus in his *Observations upon the Twelve Caesars*. Drawing upon the Stuart identification of their dynasty with Augustus Caesar, he wove it back into the myth of Elizabeth, portraying Augustus as a model ruler, and an unequivocally good example. Leigh's is a conservative work committed

---

[29] Livy, *The Romane historie Written by T. Livius of Padua…* (London, 1600), *STC* 16613, sig. A4r.

[30] Ibid., p. 41; Ben Jonson, *The comicall satyre of every man out of his humor. As it was first composed by the author B.I. Containing more than hath been publickely spoken or acted. With the severall character of euery person* (London, 1600), *STC* 14767, sig. K1r.

to patriarchal and monarchical ideals, in which he exalted the last Tudor queen and thereby the early Stuarts who were her heirs. The text itself is an offering of filial duty, dedicated to his father and inspired by gratitude for the author's education at Magdalen Hall and Middle Temple.[31] Leigh has chiefly followed Suetonius, as he tells the reader in the preface, because his tutor William Pemble did so, and because his phrasing is "pure and polite" and he is a "faithful historian".[32]

Leigh's understanding of historical fidelity is typically early modern: let us not forget that Suetonius was Hadrian's court archivist with a vested interest in writing favourably of Hadrian's acceptable predecessors, supporting the regime as Leigh sought to praise that of Elizabeth. Leigh therefore approves of Julius Caesar and Augustus, as well as the early Flavians, but condemns emperors such as Nero and Domitian who wished rather to be great than good, and so "rather raged then raigned".[33] He is explicit in his comparisons. Augustus was "almost peerlesse in his government"; cities were named 'Caesarea' in his honour, as Virginia was named for the Virgin Queen.[34] Indeed, Augustus was:

> the just measure of our late famous Queene Elizabeth, who as shee matched that reverend Emperour in happinesse, and duration of Reigne, so did shee likewise in the stature of her body.[35]

James I, too, was linked with Augustus, both at the king's own instigation, and as a form of compliment to his majesty. The *Entertainment* written for James's entry into London in 1604 hailed him as a new Augustus, bringing peace to England. Andrew Willet's sermon, *Ecclesia Triumphans*, welcomed James's accession to the English throne as the beginning of "a golden time: such as the like (as his Maiestie saith) hath not been read nor heard of since the daies of the Romane Emperor Augustus".[36] Figuring James also as a new King David, as Willet did, allowed further figuring of the peaceful union of the Scottish and English kingdoms under one monarch as both a biblical peace (*Beati Pacifici*, as James's motto, was a frequently evoked idea) and an Augustan *pax Romana*. Henry Petowe's panegyric, *England's Caesar*, described James as "King of Peace and Plentie," being awarded "Great Caesar's Crowne," that "what he hath

---

[31] Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. *3r-v.
[32] Ibid., sig. *4v-5r.
[33] Ibid., sig. *5r, *7r.
[34] Ibid., sig. b5v.
[35] Ibid., sig. c3v, b5r.
[36] Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd*, pp. 20, 232.

won/By true succession."[37] Rubens' *Apotheosis of King James I* on the ceiling of the banqueting hall in Whitehall drew on Augustan imagery for its allegorical representation of James enthroned in heaven as Augustus had been on earth. Equally, John Williams' funeral sermon on the death of James I likened him to Augustus as a poet-king.[38] And addressing the Stuart kings as 'Caesar' was common practice: as several of the student exercise books show, orations made in the universities customarily hailed Charles I "*augustissime Caesar*."[39]

Augustan Ambiguities: "Would He had Never Beene Borne, or Never Died"

To say that there was one early modern 'idea' of Augustus, one that understood him as an improvement on the vicious Octavian, is, however, impossible; the argument is too simplistic and cannot be substantiated by either printed or manuscript sources. Critics who have taken this view have failed to account for the complexities in the reception of Augustus demonstrated by both readers' notes and writers' texts. In fact, the story defies generalisations, because of the way that Roman history was used in diverse ways simultaneously by different writers, and by the same readers within a single notebook. Octavian was sometimes understood as being a virtuous character, not an out-and-out villain. This is shown by Samuel Brandon's *Octavia*, where Octavian is forced into war for the honour of his sister, Antony's wife. "[D]isdaining that she should suffer so great an indignitie" as to be betrayed by her husband, who forsook her for Cleopatra, Octavian had little choice but to avenge the wrong done to her by Antony.[40] And Augustus was by no means always positively received by the early modern audience: this depended very much on how readers sought to interpret his actions, which classical sources they used to select their examples, and how writers wished to represent him.

William Barker, in his continuation of Appian, for example, discusses the implications of Augustus' authority at the time of Christ's nativity. He presents an ambiguous understanding of the connection between Octavian, Augustus and the coming of the son of God. Octavian is rescued from much of the blame heaped upon him by other authors, on account of

---

[37] Petowe, *England's Caesar*, sig. B1r-v.

[38] Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their contemporaries* (Stanford, CA, 1989), p. 47.

[39] For example, St John's College, Cambridge, MS S.44, fol. 150v.

[40] Brandon, *Octavia*, sig. Aivr.

his prefiguring Christ, and becoming first in a line of emperors who will one day impose Christianity upon the world.[41] All the responsibility for the civil wars is shifted onto Antony, who was "the only cause why the Romane state was not restored to a common wealth agayne," and was the "cause of the alteration of the Romane estate."[42] But this does not mean that Augustus' imperial regime is uncritically recommended to the reader. Barker does not adjudge the Roman model of monarchy to have been a great success in its own right, and he makes no attempt to connect it with England. Indeed, the religious connection here is anything but flattering to Augustus, who was made to pay the price for Rome's sins. "Antonies evill life" and Rome's "outragious dealings as wel in foreine as civill murders" were the cause of divine retribution: these were sins which "it pleased God to punish with so great alteration" that he "would chaunge the state of that mighty common wealth." God, Barker implied, was responsible for condemning Augustus' line to failure, and his murky death:

> for now is Caesar the only monarche without any competitor at all, and yet had no childe to whom to leave it, but adopted Tiberius his wives sonne, whome, that she might see Emperour, it is thought shee holpe to dispatche Caesar before his time.[43]

Moreover, it was not Octavian's success which resulted in his promotion to the position of emperor. God was responsible for the honours accorded to him, "for some secrete determination for the nativitie of his only sonne Jesus Christ our Lord." Octavian:

> had the title of Augustus given him, a thing never done before to any Romane, not onely for augmentyng and encreasing the Empire of Rome, but also for the devination and destinie, by which it was assigned unto him.[44]

By making Augustus emperor, Barker explains, the way was paved for the "coming of a greater Prince than he, the Prince of Princes & king of kings."[45] This was a circumstance entirely divorced from considerations of either Octavian's iniquity, or Augustus' virtuous action. Barker, at least, did not understand Augustus' role in Roman history as illustrative of ideal kingship, and did not employ Octavian as a warning against vice: rather, he used the political changes at Rome as a guide to the workings of the hand of God.

---

41 Appian, *An auncient historie*, sig. Fff3v.
42 Ibid., sig. Fff3r.
43 Idem.
44 Idem.
45 Idem.

Some writers went further than Barker, and openly condemned Augustus. Making use of the potential for multiple textual analogues within one piece of writing, some authors advocated strong monarchy and peace on the one hand, while simultaneously exposing certain of Augustus' less desirable characteristics in a way doubtless inspired by Machiavelli and Tacitus. The older Augustus was often judged to be wanting in moral rectitude. We have already seen numerous instances of political manoeuvring he employed before he came to power; this continued throughout his life, and even after Augustus' death. Several early modern writers seem to have subscribed to the idea that Augustus cared less for the security of Rome than for his own image. Goulart's account demonstrates his constant manipulation of politics to appear in the best possible light. Augustus named Tiberius his successor not for the good of Rome, but "to make his memorie to be so much the more desired," because he knew Tiberius could never rule Rome as well as Augustus had done.[46] Heylyn raises the same point; Augustus appointed Tiberius:

> as it was afterwards, & not improbably conjectured: neither in care to the State, nor in love to the party: but to win honour to himselfe, and to make the Roman people, againe wish for him.[47]

Throughout Heylyn's essay, there are clues that he is less than convinced of Augustus' goodness. He gives numerous hints about selfishness and ulterior motives, and opines that:

> he was too exact a Statesman to be perfect in *Soldiery*: and in all his wars, was prosperous by fortune rather than by valor, or his *Captaines* valour, than his owne.[48]

Moreover, it was not his personally-motivated policies which led to the establishment of an empire which endured for so many years; it was simply the length of Augustus' life:

> The last (though not the least) helpe of the *Empires* establishment was the long life and reigne of our *Augustus*.[49]

And William Fulbecke, for all his apparent approval of the "peaceful empire of Augustus" announced in the title, nevertheless places the story of the establishment of the empire in the book entitled "Atropos," making

---

46 Plutarch, *Lives* (1603), 'Additional Lives', sig. g2v.
47 Heylyn, sig. K9r.
48 Ibid., sig. K9v.
49 Ibid., sig. K9v.

the connection with death and the ending of Rome's glory unmistakably clear. The trite ending, "peace pleased the Romans," might be seen as an endorsement of the peace he recommends in the preface, but any early modern reader with the slightest historical knowledge would have been aware of the troubles which lay in store for Rome under the tyranny of Augustus' successors.[50]

No author, however, is as harsh in his judgment as the translator of, and commentator upon, Lipsius' *Two Bookes of Constancie*. John Stradling, in keeping with his tendency to Christianise further Lipsius' synthesis of religious and stoic philosophy, criticises Augustus sharply. He cites the unhappiness of Augustus' personal life, and his ignominious death (accepting unquestioningly the theory that he was poisoned by Livia), as divine retribution for a life lived wickedly:

> he suffered in himselfe the punishment of his youthfull misdeedes; But yet more apparantly in all his progenie. Let him be happy and mighty Caesar, and truly *Augustus*: But with all let him have a daughter Iulia, and a neece; Also some of his nephewes let him lose by false accusations. Others let him banish out of his favour: And with loathsomnes of these let him wish to die with fower daies hunger, and not bee able. Finally, let him live with his *Livia* unhonestlie maried, unhonestlie kepte: And upon whom he doted with unlawfull love, let him die a shamefull death by her meanes. In conclusion (saith *Plinie*) *He being made a god and gaining heaven* (*but I wot not whether he deserved it*) *let him die, and let the sonne of his enemie be his heire*. These and such like things (*Lipsius*) are to be thought upon whensoever we begin to breake forth into any complaintes of unrighteousnes in god.[51]

Indeed, although this is an extreme and unusual example of strongly anti-Augustan sentiment, very few of the printed prose works present an unequivocally complimentary picture of Augustus. Nor was Octavian universally vilified. His rule appears to have provoked mixed feelings in many authors, and careful attention is paid to the strategies he used to rule, and the careful representation of Augustus' monarchical authority is a matter noted with interest in numerous contemporary works. Aware that in ancient Rome, kingship was associated with tyranny, early modern commentators observed the importance of the right terminology for government, while emphasising the monarchical aspects of imperial rule. The delicacy of the relationship between the representation and the reality of government was a point clearly understood by sixteenth- and

[50] Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Ee1r.

[51] Justus Lipsius, *Two bookes of constancie*…(London, 1595), *STC* 15695, sig. N6v-O1r.

seventeenth-century governors no less than the Romans. For example, the political theorist Giovanni Botero's *Observations*, discussed how Augustus carefully represented his authority in terms acceptable to the people. His English translator describes how the emperor:

> shunning of hatred, and avoiding of envy, caused the soveraigne authoritie to be tearmed *Tribunalis potestas*, Tribunitial authority... that he might not take upon him that odious and most hatefull name of King or of Dictator, invented a word of lesse significancie, but not of lesse sovereignty; altering the words, but not the authority.[52]

This idea could, of course, be harnessed to arguments for Augustus as a good king. Additional material in the 1606 translation of the history of Justin makes the same point in the very brief sketch of Augustus' life:

> in the 480. yeare after the time of the Kings, the auncient custome of *Rome* was restored againe, to the obedience of one alone, and to an Emperor in stead of a king, being otherwaies called by a more honorable name *Augustus*.[53]

This was originally taken from the text of Aurelius Victor, but expanded to include the lives of the emperors until the reigning Rudolf II. That the translator produced an edition which included more modern emperors and therefore explicitly demonstrated how the institution of the Emperor of Rome has survived from the time of Augustus until the time of publication, added further weight to the idea of monarchy being the best form of government.

Here was being circulated not only an awareness that the title 'king' was a dangerous one at Rome, but that political anacyclosis had turned full circle, and Rome's destiny to return to her original form of government had been fulfilled under the virtuous leadership of Augustus. This was certainly Richard Rainolde's belief when he attributed Octavian's desire to be sole ruler of Rome to an altruistic wish to safeguard the state against the divisions caused by more than one ruler. He understood Augustus as a strong ruler, in the manner of the determinedly complimentary commonplacers, with their detailed observations of the emperor's good deeds. His Octavian wished only for peace, and to govern alone so that Rome might be safe from the factionalism that inevitably arose under republics:

---

[52] Botero, *Observations upon the Lives of Alexander, Caesar, Scipio* (London, 1602), *STC* 3397, sig. M7v.

[53] Justinus, *The historie of Iustine*, (London, 1606), *STC* 24293 sig. Ee4v.

> he was divers times minded to render uppe that dignitye of hye estate, but hee altered hys minde in consideringe more deepelye…that at that present leavinge that state of government, it would be ruled by many governours, whereby *Octavius* a moste godlye Prince foresawe what factiones mighte aryse, what devision by partes takinge, what tumultes mighte followe and uprores, no man bearinge with an others estate, but eche one clyminge, who maye be beste and of highest power to commaunde, to rule, not to be ruled, to rule the wyll of other at commaundemente: wherein it seemeth that *Octavius* preferred for worthynes and happynes of continuinge estate, a Monarche accordinge to the sayinge of *Ulisses* the wyse Grecian. Multorum principatus mala res est, Rex unicus esto.[54]

In Rainolde's re-telling, Augustus not only represented himself as having Rome's interests at heart, but he dedicated his life to the service of peace within the state without the slightest notion of self-aggrandisement. Octavian, for Rainolde, was an enlightened ancient, seeking stability and unity for the good of his people, in much the same way that many early modern writers hoped that their own rulers would do in a Europe threatened by confessional division.

The relationship between the reality of kingship and the representation of monarchical authority was thoroughly explored by both readers and writers through the person of Caesar Augustus. Augustus' use of certain titles provided a mode of analysis with which readers could proceed. In ancient Rome, the title *pater patriae* was accorded to a man who saved the republic from danger, or rendered some other extraordinary service which placed him in a paternalistic role to his citizen-children; therefore Cicero was hailed as *pater patriae* when he defeated the Catilinarian conspiracy in 63 BC. Augustus, too, was accorded this title, an honour noted by several early modern readers and writers. Rainolde did so in his *Chronicle*, using the honour to emphasise the virtue of the emperor. With the marginal note, "*Pater patriè,* ye title of vertuous Princes," he explained how under Augustus:

> the whole Iurisdiction of the Romaine Empyre was so excellently governed, that they gave unto him this title and name *Pater patriè,* that is, the father of the countrye.[55]

---

[54] Rainolde, *A chronicle*, sig. Ciiiir. Rainolde translates the Latin as: 'Where many peares as right do hold/ one lande to rule at will:/ There feeble state doth smart their lore,/ and deadly Mars that kingdomes spill', with the marginal note, 'One governor beste in a kingdome.'

[55] Rainolde, *A chronicle*, sig. Cvr.

We have already seen how Edward Palmer recorded the importance of a prince acting as father to his country, with references to contemporary works and notes that Augustus and Julius Caesar could both be used as an exemplar for this maxim; he was referring to the Senate proclaiming Augustus *pater patriae* in 2 BC.[56] Edward Leigh's *Observations* on Suetonius explored the implications of the title, and the relationship of a prince to his people:

> Macrobius writes of him that he carried such an entire, and fatherly affection to the Common-wealth that hee called it *Filiam suam* his owne Daughter, and therefore refused to be called *Dominus*, The Lord, or Maister of his country, and would onely be called *Pater Patriae*, The Father of his Country, because hee governed it not *per timorem, sed per amorem*, not by feare, but by love.[57]

This was a matter significantly important for Leigh to add a lengthy quotation from Suetonius in the margin, to describe the strength of Augustus' feelings on the subject:

> Suetonius, lib. 2.6.5. The Senate and People of Rome iointly saluting him by the name of *Pater Patriae* hee with teares standing in his eyes made answere unto them in these words, Now that I have (mine honourable Lords) attained to the height of all my vowes, and wishes, what remaineth else to me to crave of the Immortall Gods, but that I might carry with me this universiall consent of yours unto my lives end.[58]

Augustus' representation as *pater patriae* was familiar to early modern educated men not only through the classics, but from the way in which their own monarch described his or her interaction with the political nation. A strong and emotive connection between prince as father and subjects as children was promoted by the early Stuarts, as well as by Augustus, while the representations of Elizabeth, during the second half of her reign especially, as a virgin queen 'wedded to her country' aimed at the evocation of similarly loyal responses. James I's *Basilikon Doron* utilised patriarchal rhetoric to emphasise the nature of the obedience his subjects owed him: aiming to "win all mens hearts to a loving and willing obedience," James wanted to inspire filial devotion in his subjects to counter any theories of resistance they might adopt.[59]

---

[56] Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.16.6, fol. 44r.
[57] Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. B8r.
[58] Ibid., sig. B7v.
[59] James I, *Basilikon Doron* p. 20, quoted in Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature*, p. 117.

But not every student of the classics understood Augustus in the same way. There was a fine line between monarch and tyrant, and various readers came to very different conclusions about which label most accurately described Rome's first emperor. Augustus' manipulation of representations of his power also laid him open to criticism, and provided readers with parallels to England's monarchy which could be less complimentary than those of Leigh and Rainolde. An awareness of the similarity between the tactics adopted by Augustus and those of their own princes allowed some readers and writers to undertake a more cynical analysis of the implications of the metaphorical roles adopted by rulers. Peter Heylyn describes the political utility of Augustus accepting the title *Pontifex Maximus*, which "made him a little more reverenced, not more potent."[60] It did, however, place him in the position of chief priest, or "*Byshop*," as Heylyn explains to his readers, which had an altogether more significant part to play in his maintenance of power:

> The light of Reason taught him, that it was convenient for him, beeing a Prince, to have command on all his people He had beene else but halfe a *Monarch*. Such as some Princes are with us, who quit their *Clergy* to be governed by a *foreigne head*. [61]

Augustus himself made much of the element of consent in the various titles to which he laid claim, and had a keen appreciation of the important of the language in which power was discussed, as numerous anecdotes and passing references demonstrate. *Wit's Theatre*, for example, recorded how:

> Augustus, when he entered Rome in a tryumph, one in a certaine Comedy, said, *O good Lord*, and every man turned that word to Augustus, flattering, & clapping their hands for ioy, but he gave a token, that he liked it not, and made prohibitions, that men should not use the name of Lord unto him.[62]

The acclamation *pater patriae* at Rome differed from claims made by early modern monarchs to a connection with the divine, in that it could not be assumed, but had to be conferred by the Senate on behalf of the state as a whole. This element of consent, like election to the consulship, was exploited by Augustus, who claimed to rule at the behest of the Senate and people of Rome. It was an aspect of Augustan rule stressed, too, by those wishing to defend early modern monarchy against accusations of

---

[60] Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. F4v.
[61] Ibid., sig. F5r.
[62] Allott, *Wits theater*, sig. G4v.

tyranny, and using early Roman imperial rule as a legitimating precedent to do so. John Hayward, answering Robert Persons' *Conference* and refuting his use of Augustan Rome as a model of elective monarchy, was quick to explain how Augustus was no tyrant. He represents Octavian as being very reluctant to take upon himself the whole mantle of government:

> *Augustus* was never chosen dictator; *Suetonius* writeth that hee entreated the people upon his knee, not to charge him with that office…*Augustus*, after his victorie was made perpetuall tribune, as *Suetonius* hath written. *Dio*. saith, that he was freed from the power of the lawes; as *Pompeie* also had beene before him.[63]

Hayward portrays Augustus as doing nothing more nor less than following precedents laid down by his predecessors. In this way, he defended the estate of hereditary monarchy against Persons' assaults in order to strengthen the position of the crown.

Hayward's words, however, exhibit an awareness of the dangerous ground that was being trodden by Augustus when he negotiated power with the Senate. Likewise Louis Leroy, describing Augustus' Rome, realised the importance of the representation of power, compared with the reality. The English translation of his text depicted an imperial monarchy couched in consensual terms and erected with reference to representative assemblies like the Senate, whose early modern equivalent was, of course, the English parliament, and the work sought to describe political decline and fall "thorough the first and famousest nations," the "famousest" of which was naturally ancient Rome.[64] Monarchy was recommended as the best form of government for Rome and indeed any other state, supported with frequent assertions that "there is not found any time wherein it hath bin so wealthy, and well ordered, and established in peace, and obedience as it was in [Augustus'] time."[65] Augustus' monarchical government, however, was shown by Leroy to have been moderated by existing consultative assemblies, "the forme of government, which he brought into the state of his house, the traine of his Court, into the Senate, or counsaile, the course of Iustice."[66] Individual emperors may have been less successful than Augustus, but his consensual monarchical constitution, in Leroy's

---

[63] John Hayward, *An answer to the first part of a certaine conference, concerning succession, published not long since under the name of R. Dolman* (London, 1603), *STC* 12988, sig. Iir.

[64] Leroy, *Of the Interchangeable Course, or variety of things … thorough the first and famousest nations…*

[65] Ibid., sig. O2v.

[66] Idem.

opinion, worked; indeed, "the chiefe cause of the ruine of the Romain Empire, ought to be attributed to CONSTANTINE surnamed the great; who … *chaunged the fourme of governement, in which it had bin maintained sithence Augustus time*."[67]

All this indicates how contemporaries read the fine line between astute politicking in the interests of governing well, and the manipulation of people and institutions in the rapacious pursuit of power. We have already seen readers taking note of how Augustus contrived to hold onto power once he had it, and some of the methods he used to gain the favour of the Senate and the people of Rome, such as his public burning of Antony's private papers after his death. Peter Heylyn's essay *Augustus* also picked this episode out as one worthy of especial note in the discussion of tactics used by Octavian to win over his enemies.[68] The episode is neutrally presented; the example, in itself, is not particularly vicious, and could be seen as an instance of good judgment and clemency. There is, however, an awareness in several of the prose histories that this and other means by which Octavian gained power and maintained his sovereignty as Caesar Augustus, were not always as honourable as the peaceful ends which resulted. The very same evidence could be used by critics of Augustus who wanted to show how deviously he annexed ever more honours and privileges. Motivation is one factor which influences writers' opinions. Actions taken by Octavian/Augustus to spare lives and care for his citizens are good, but his motives in so doing are sometimes more selfish than honourable, and some accounts depict Octavian as a greedy and grasping individual prepared to use any methods available to consolidate his position. A degree of negativity can be read into the accounts of writers who choose to examine why Octavian/Augustus behaves as he does, and who emphasise the personal advantages of the choices he makes.

Peter Heylyn falls very clearly into this category, and his work is an ambiguous one. No sources are referred to either marginally or in the body of the text, although Suetonius' account is clearly an influential one. The commentary on Augustus, however, is not presented merely as a history; in his introductory material, the Tacitean inspiration for the piece is made plain as Heylyn explains how he hopes to clarify "reasons of state" adduced from conjecture and his own knowledge, as well as diverse ancient texts.[69] Rome, Heylyn writes, stands for every commonwealth, a "mirror of all".

---

[67] Ibid., sig. P4r (my emphasis).
[68] Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. D7r.
[69] Ibid., sig. A3v.

It was probably intended to be compared with the English state; consequently the example of Augustus is used as both criticism and compliment for the early Stuart regime.[70]

Published in the early years of Charles I's reign, Heylyn's essay displays the fashion for exploring the behaviour of princes through both Machiavellian and Tacitean lenses. Thus Octavian's discussion with his advisers about restoring the commonwealth to the Senate is represented in terms which show the cunning behind the pretence of altruism. Agrippa, the more honest and upstanding of Octavian's two counsellors, urges him to hand power back to the Senate and return to the old republican ways. Maecenas, wily and devious, persuades Octavian that single rule is safest in times of trouble, and advises Octavian to curry favour with the people. Julius Caesar, he argues, would have remained in power had he not been so foolish as to dismiss his guards, "seeking to retain by fair means, what he had got by violence."[71] Heylyn explicitly shows Augustus heeding this advice, instigating policies which are designed to win the favour of his people and keep him in power. He therefore instigates a corn dole and rebuilds the city, erecting glorious temples, all of which is very popular with the citizens. He pensions off his soldiers in Italy, keeping them happy with grants of land and money, while persuading the nobles that he has dismissed his army and thus presents no military threat: the soldiers are easy to recall, however, should it become necessary. Finally, when he has established himself as a popular ruler, he tactically and astutely returns power to the Senate, refusing all titles but *princeps senatus*, knowing that if he is seen to give away his authority, the Senate will be all the more eager to hand it straight back to him on legal and binding terms.[72]

Fulbecke's *Continuall Factions* draws a similarly sceptical, Tacitean portrait of Augustus, examining the motives and methods behind the moves to consolidate power.[73] Fulbecke, like Heylyn, depicts the manoeuvrings behind the Senate's ceding power to Augustus, explaining how he therefore managed to have "not confirmed the auncient Empirie, but in deed created a new Monarchie, that he might seeme popular." This is a very

---

[70] Ibid., sig. A7r.

[71] Ibid., sig. E2r.

[72] Ibid., sig. E2v-3r.

[73] Paulina Kewes, in her forthcoming book, will argue for the radicalism of Fulbecke, who believed in upholding the interests of the commonwealth even at the expense of hereditary monarchy. She quotes from Fulbecke's *Pandectes,* fol. 17v, to demonstrate the writer's belief that "the good estate of the kingdome and subiectes, the profite, peace, and safetie of the same, is more to be heeded *quam sanguinis series*, the course of bloud."

different state of affairs than would have obtained had Augustus "purposed to depose the Empirie, & to bring the common-weale to a good & perfect constitution."[74] Augustus is careful not to agree to a perpetual settlement, however, but to make the agreement one that renews itself every ten years, "that he might void out of their minds all suspition of Monarchie."[75]

The additional *Life of Augustus* in the 1603 edition of North's Plutarch reflects the same preoccupation with Augustus' pretence of ruling at the behest of the Senate, depicting a man in a dilemma over whether to "keepe (for the good of the state, and under the title of a Prince) the Empire which he had in his hands: or whether he should render it up unto the people." Augustus' actions were at least partly dictated by an appreciation of how he was seen by Rome's citizens: as he tried to decide what to do, "He found himselfe grieved for that Antonius had oftentimes accused him of tyranny and unjust invasion." The canny Augustus therefore rendered power unto the senate "hoping that…they would thanke him the more…and that the people would esteeme and love him so much the more."[76] Moreover, the account explains how the senators who owed their rank to Augustus' patronage felt bound to support him, while others were cowed into agreement because they feared Augustus' wrath if they did otherwise.[77]

The idea of the prince buying his place at the head of the state is one echoed throughout the prose works. In the judgment of several commentators, Augustus effectively bribed people to support him. Fulbecke notes how Augustus' rule was initially unpopular, and plots abounded. The emperor:

> being thereby too severe in punishing both the worthie and unworthy, upon suspition and surmise without anie formall proceeding against them, he did indeed minister oile unto the flame of their malice.[78]

Persuaded by Livia, he realised the error of his ways, and therefore pardoned all those who might have a quarrel against him, "Whereby he purchased the entire love of the Romanes and all his life time after there was never anie treason attempted against him."[79] This is a significantly less charitable depiction of Augustus' actions than is found in some of the

---

74 Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Cc4r.
75 Ibid., sig. Cc4v.
76 Plutarch, *Lives* (1603), 'Additional Lives' sig. F2v-3r.
77 Idem.
78 Fulbecke, *Continuall Factions*, sig. Dd1r.
79 Idem.

ancient sources; Velleius Paterculus, for instance, attributes a more generous nature to the emperor. Himself a man who grew up under Augustus' principate and served under Tiberius, he judged it to be "in keeping with Caesar's fortune and his clemency that not one of those who had borne arms against him was put to death by him, or by his order."[80] Fulbecke obviously had no qualms about including the less flattering details that it was imprudent for Velleius to describe.

North's translation of Goulart shows a similarly sceptical interpretation of Augustus' apparently generous actions: after his military victories, Augustus gave lavish entertainments for the people of Rome, and "by a world of pleasures he appeased the sorow of proscription, and of so many civill warres."[81] "The *lyberalitie of the Emperour* Augustus" is also depicted in the English translation of Guillaume Telin's *Archaioplutos*, who cited the emperor's financial generosity and his impressive building projects as an example of activities which magnified Augustus' magnificence.[82] Heylyn describes him covering his past ill deeds with the same sort of liberalities as those noted by Telin; when he entered Rome at the end of the civil wars, Augustus "with all varietie of pleasure banished …aswell sorrow for the old proscription, as feare of a new."[83] This was exactly the policy he had pursued in his earlier years in the conflict with Antony, when he bought allegiance by dispensing money and presents to all and sundry. When he was forced to march upon Rome by an intractable Senate, Augustus pacified the people and his troops by yet more gift-giving:

> He therefore applyed himselfe so to them, that giving that among them which he had in present, and promising them greater favours, according as his fortune and their valour should advance him: he bound them to him in an eternall bond of allegiance; and made them the first step by which he ascended the Royalty.[84]

* * *

The reception of Augustus was never a simple matter in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England. It is not always true to say that readers and writers disapproved of Octavian, and applauded Augustus; and while, for some readers and writers, Augustus was a model prince, for others, he was a political actor whose deeds required careful analysis.

---

[80] Velleius Paterculus, II.87.
[81] Plutarch, *Lives* (1603), 'Additional Lives', sig. f2r.
[82] Telin, *Archaioplutos*, sig. D3r-v.
[83] Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. D7r.
[84] Ibid., sig. B11–12v.

Sometimes, interpretations of Augustus are clear cut, and at other times they are almost entirely ambiguous. Richard Rainolde, in 1571, wished to emphasise only the peace and stability in which Augustus left Rome, ignoring how short-lived this peace and goodness actually was:

> Hee lefte his Realme in greate quietnes, and also in great felicitye, great were his victories, and his large Dominions, his people not to be nombred, they lost fortunate *Augustus* when hee dyed, Rome lost her father, the golden worlde, and of *Augustus* a victorious Prince.[85]

Other accounts leave more questions than answers in the minds of their readers, most commonly by the expression that is would have been better if Octavian had never been born, or Augustus had never died. This may be interpreted as regret for the harm Octavian did to Rome, in being born to attain sole sovereignty at Rome, and in leaving the empire in unsafe hands; or as a lament for the good done by so great a prince, which could never hope to be repeated. In William Baldwin's *A Treatise of Morall Philosophie*, the Senate greets Augustus' death with the opinion that "they would either he had not been borne, or else being borne that he had not died."[86] Peter Heylyn's essay concludes with the words, "spoken of Severus," that "It had beene an ineffable benefit to the commonwealth of Rome, if eyther he had never dyed, or never beene borne"; here the reversal of the clauses moves the emphasis firmly onto the consideration of the ills that came upon Rome because Octavius was born: this is the last thing upon which the reader of the work looks.[87] Edward Leigh observes that:

> all the People much lamented his Death, using that speech [marginal note: Aurel Vict.], *utinam aut non nasceretur, aut non moreretur*, would he had never beene borne, or never died.[88]

The most complete formulation of the idea, with an explanation, is found in the translation of Justin published in 1606:

> all men commonly saying, *I would he had never beene borne, or might never have died*. For the one was of a very bad beginning, and the other of an excellent ending. For in obtaining the Empyre, he was accounted an oppressor of the liberty and yet in ruling the same, he loved the Cittizens.[89]

---

85 Rainolde, *Chronicle*, sig. C6r.

86 William Baldwin, *A Treatise of Morall Philosophie contayning the sayings of the wise. ...* (London, 1600), *STC* 1265, sig C1v.

87 Heylyn, *Augustus*, sig. K11r.

88 Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. C4v.

89 Justinus, *The historie of Iustine*, sig. Ee6r.

The reign of Augustus represented an episode in Roman history that could be utilised to discuss the stability of governments, by men of any political persuasion, or none at all. Augustus could be a model of constitutional stability because of the way he ended the civil wars of the first century BC. His monarchy might be seen as an inevitable product of unstable oligarchy, which was reformed into monarchy or tyranny, depending on perspective. Or he could be interpreted as the author of the subsequent evils which befell Rome under later emperors. He could also be used by authors embodying a combination of all three points of view. Augustus, lover of his people, *pater patriae*; Octavian, greedy and aspiring tyrant; or the man who was one and the same: he remained a riddle for early modern readers to solve each time they told his story. Indeed, attitudes towards Augustus and the fate to which he left his empire are representative of only one thing, and that is the diversity and complexity of the meanings classical history held for its early modern audience. Augustus, in bringing the curtain down upon the final act of the Roman republic, could stand as a symbol of strong monarchical rule as represented by Elizabeth and the early Stuarts, or as an example of what these princes should have been, but were not. He could also be seen as the nemesis of liberty and the oppressor of the commonwealth. The reception of this episode in Rome's history, and of its central actor, demonstrates nothing more clearly the early modern idea of history which sought individual examples to illustrate moral lessons, as well as seeking to understand "the causes of things" in order to reflect upon contemporary society, and the world in which men lived.

CONCLUSION

"[A]NOTHER *ROME* IN THE WEST?"

The role of ancient Rome in the learning and intellectual life of early modern England should not be understated. A vital, classical literary culture was encouraged by the educational practices learned in boyhood: the 'Roman' frame of mind which their early schooling engendered in young men fostered intellectual habits that became ingrained in the higher ranks of society, as latinate learning pervaded both explicitly historical literature and a far broader range of reading material. Furthermore, the prevalence of Roman history in numerous and varied kinds of printed texts meant that ideas about the ending of the republic and Rome's transition to an imperial form of monarchy reached a wider audience than merely those men who had attended the grammar schools and universities.

It is clear, from the way that references to characters from classical history were presented, that a knowledge of ancient history was assumed to be already present in a large proportion of the reading audience, be the readers publicly or independently educated. To take but one example: *Wit's Theatre of the Little World*, "a collection of the flowers of antiquities and histories" "gathered out of divers learned Authours," and first published in 1599, presented its excerpts and moral illustrations utterly out of context. Arranged under commonplace-style headings, anecdotes about Caesar and Christ sat side by side. A certain degree of context, or prior knowledge, would be necessary to understand why, in the section "Of prayers and thanksgiving," it was significant that "Brutus not satisfied in killing Caesar, made his prayers unto Iupiter, and the hoast of heaven, to plague Caesar and his posterity," for instance.[1] The reader needed to know at least who the actors were and something of their circumstances in order to derive from each entry "[t]he profit that ariseth by reading these epitomized histories is, to aemulate that which thou likest in others, and to make right use of theyr examples."[2] That such familiarity was assumed by the producers of these collections and compendia testifies to the centrality of Roman history in the grammar schools, and the popularity of books

[1] Albott, *Wits Theater*, sig. C8v.
[2] Ibid., sig. A3v.

about Rome in the vernacular among readers who never progressed beyond the petty schools.

It is equally apparent that the decline and demise of the Roman republican constitution, though common historical knowledge, was in some respect problematic for early modern readers and writers. A complex series of events, it was received in many different ways during the reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles. This was largely due to the manner in which classical history was disseminated; the numerous different editions, translations and digests that broadened educated culture, especially over the course of the seventeenth century, ensured that diverse understandings of the events of the first century BC were circulating simultaneously in England. Rome had always been present in the reading of the Latin-literate scholars of England, but with the rediscovery of texts in the Renaissance, and the advent of printing, the competing accounts of the ancient historians were available to readers as never before. Indeed, successive editions usually contained new commentaries and paratexts, directing the reader in the understanding of the texts, and as these differed in their directions, so too did readers' interpretations. Moreover, the growing interest in translation, and the production of vernacular histories of Rome by English stationers, meant that Roman history was no longer exclusively the preserve of those with the ability and opportunity to read the Latin and Greek works imported from the continent. Ancient history was now an English concern, moderated and reinterpreted by English commentators, for any literate Englishman to access and use as he saw fit.

Nor were the historical syntheses and vernacular summaries confined to a non-academic readership; in fact, it appears that some students at the universities chose to make notes from English epitomes rather than from the original classical texts. For example, the seventeenth-century commonplace book of Adam Airay contains copious notes on Leigh's *Selected and Choice Observations* on Suetonius, rather than references to the text of Suetonius itself.[3] Peter Heylyn's essay *Augustus*, too, was a source used by university students as well as by private readers. An anonymous Oxford notebook dating from 1635–6 contains a reference to Heylyn in its records of academic disputations and orations made by members of the university. Alongside a note about the competition for offices at Rome:

> So ambitious were the Romanes of the Honour of being consuls, that when Maximus died in the last day of his consulship, Canidius Rebilius petitioned Caesar for that part of the day that remained: whence that so memorated

[3] BL, Add. MS 45, 154.

> jest of Tully, O vigilantem Consulem qui toto consulatus sui tempore somnium oculis non videt[4]

is a marginal note referring the compiler to page 145 of Heylyn's *Augustus*. Why this student felt that a disquisition on Augustus' provision of games and tournaments, which is what this page contains, would be appropriate here, is not clear. It is likely that the student perceived a link between the means by which Augustus curried favour among the people, and the circuses and celebrations that candidates for office in the republican period were required to provide in order to secure enough votes to succeed. In any case, the reference is unmistakable, and we have also seen how Robert South, who later obtained the degree of Doctor of Divinity, used Heylyn's work for his notes on Roman history while he was at Christ Church. His notebook provides a perfect example of the transmutation of texts during the note-taking process, a further degree of transformation after the rearranging of the classical sources into Heylyn's own digest.

The reception of the ending of the republic was diverse precisely because each reader looked for something different within a text, depending on his background and his purpose. The notebook of Alexander Bolde, compiled in 1620, demonstrates this perfectly; when drafting the argument for an exercise about the justification of Caesar's assassination, he turned to certain sources in order to support the view that Caesar did not deserve such a death.[5] Republicanism and the killing of magistrates were evil things in Bolde's eyes: "*o sceleratem civitatem*" is a frequent lament of his on the wickedness of those who stabbed Caesar in the name of the republic. Bolde looked to excerpts information from Cicero, Plutarch and Suetonius to lend weight to his depiction of Caesar as a good man:

> Cicero: L: Plutarch: Sueton. aliisque: Caesaris munificentiam, velli fortitudinem scientia militari commendatum, domi vel liq. comitatem, facilitatem in amicos, indulgentiam in inimicos, aequitatem in omnes.[6]

He also cited the same examples quoted in *Wits Commonwealth* and Leroys' *Interchangeable course of things* that demonstrate the wickedness of the deed:

---

[4] St John's College, Cambridge MS S.44, fol. 6v.

[5] St John's College, Cambridge MS S. 34 fol. 31r-v, 'an C J Caesar iuste trucidatus'. This difficult question seems to have been much in vogue as an academic problem, appearing in several notebooks.

[6] Ibid., fol. 31v: Cicero, Plutarch, Suetonius and others: Caesar's generosity, his courage, knowledge and military skill were commended, evidenced both in public and private; he was courteous to his friends, merciful towards his enemies, and fair to all.

> Damnati omnes, alius alio casu periit, pars naufragio, pars proelio, nonnulli eodem ipso pugnere se, quo Caesarem violas verant interemerunt.[7]

In their original contexts, the extracts he selected do not directly concern Caesar's death, but Bolde excerpted them and placed them into an argument for Caesar's inherent virtue, a virtue so great as to render his killing unjust.

This rigorous academic utilisation of Roman history for the purposes of training in the rhetorical arts, in the best tradition of textual disintegration, comes from the mind of the very same man who, when reading his classics for commonplaces, recorded such peculiar gems as these:

> It was for Pompey to wear as rich a scarfe about his legge as other princes about their heads.[8]

> Caesar first bound ye crocodile to ye palm tree.[9]

> the first letter of Caesars name being strucken wth thunder nothing was left but Esar, whch in ye Hetruscan tongue was a god, denoting yt he should die to be deified.[10]

> Cleopatra send unto her good freinde Marcke Anthony a poudred crane from Asia to Rome the wch he so esteemed yt he eate every day a morsell of yt meate.[11]

Owing to the fragmented evidence that survives, the subject matter of commonplace and academic notes may not be an entirely reliable record of all the Roman history that was being read, but it does indicate how it was being used in different situations. It also emphasises how an Erasmian predisposition to record the unusual rather than the useful, the *insigne verbum* rather than the wise moral message, characterises some of the notebooks of this period. Thus these oddities sit alongside Bolde's observations on Caesar's struggle for the consulship, and Cicero's battle with Clodius. Exactly what such strange phrases reveal of Bolde's reading of histories on the ending of the Republic is uncertain, but it is clear that he found them as worthy of note as details of the more significant political

---

[7] Idem. All of them were damned, some perishing in accidents at sea or in battle, some even as they fought one another, all those men who so wickedly slew Caesar. cf. N. L., *Wits common wealth*, sig. Mm6r; Leroy, *Of the interchangeable course, or variety of things*, sig. O2r. Leigh, *Selected and choice observations*, sig. B3r-v.

[8] St John's College, Cambridge MS S. 34, fol. 50v.

[9] Ibid., fol. 55r.

[10] Ibid., fol. 56r.

[11] Ibid., fol. 59r.

conflicts of the day: Roman history, then, was both edifying, and interesting.

Just as Bolde could take lessons in Pompey's sartorial style at the same time as noting Caesar's political machinations, so the ending of the Republic could be used very differently by a range of writers with a variety of objectives. Here, the potential for a transformation in the essentials of the historical story was even greater. A writer first had to decide which ancient source to draw upon, before selecting the relevant parts to include or ignore, and deciding which sections he would alter to suit his purposes. Rome could be deployed for polemical ends. Richard Rainolde's *Chronicle* of 1571, for example, was a self-avowed exposition of the divine nature of the monarchical estate, providentially ordained; it was a tribute to England's good fortune in being ruled by Elizabeth, and a warning to any who might consider sedition. Rainolde saw his role as encompassing the deployment of historical example in order to educate his contemporaries. He believed that he showed, in setting forth:

> the great providence of God in preserving common wealthes, in raysing and exalting to governement godly princes, in thrawing downe tyrauntes, rebelles, and all mainteiners of rebellion, howe God by his mighty hande overthroweth the persecutors of his churche, and all develishe practises, the devil hath his limites and bondes appointed which he shal not passe.[12]

Rome, here, was harnessed to religion; indeed, to Elizabeth's Church of England. But it was used by other authors to advance Catholic ends, such as Mexia's legitimation of the Holy Roman Empire, and, later, to support radical Protestant and republican policies, so that Milton could lament:

> where is this goodly tower of a Common-wealth which the *English* boasted they would build, to overshaddow kings and be another *Rome* in the West?'[13]

Well might we cry, then, with Cicero, "*O tempora! Oh mores!*"[14] In late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England, the reception of Roman history was very much a product of the times and habits of the age. The times provided the circumstances that determined how history would be interpreted: it created the conditions necessary for readers to perceive certain meanings in their readings, as Simonds D'Ewes did when he likened the conspiracy against Caesar to the Gunpowder Plot. The same is

[12] Rainolde, *Chronicle*, sig. *9r.

[13] John Milton, *The readie and easie way to establish a free commonwealth* (London, 1660), Wing M2174, pp. 21–2.

[14] Cicero, *In Catilinam* I.

true in the case of writers making a point. The age in which they lived provided the context in which a play might be interpreted as critical of royal policy – as Greville suspected of his *Antony and Cleopatra* – or in which it seemed appropriate to produce a history legitimating a certain kind of monarchical rule or warning against civil discord. And the *mores* dictated the methods by which history was studied: the commonplacing, the search for *sententiate* or "the causes of things," the excerpting, and the synthesysing. In all these ways, the ending of the Roman republic became a very early modern topic: "beneficiall to so many, and be generally acceptable and pleasing to all," "the wisest, & fullest of excellent examples."[15]

[15] Mexia, *The historie of all the Roman emperors*, sig. A4r; Bodleian Dm. MS d.152, fol. 42.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Primary Sources

Cambridge Manuscripts

CUL MS Gg. 1. 29	Anon., Emmanuel College, 1583–1628, notes on history and theology.
CUL MS Add. 84	John Patrick, 1630–50, book catalogue.
CUL MS Add. 22	Samuel Ward, late C16th-17th, documents concerning University affairs.
CUL MS Add. 9221	Anon. commonplace book, *c.*1600–1630s.
CUL MS Add. 4138	Anon. student commonplace book, *c.* 1624.
Trinity MS R. 16. 6	Edward Palmer, Trinity College, Cambridge, commonplace book, notes on ancient authors.
Trinity MS R. 16.7	Anon., similar to above.
Trinity MS R. 16. 9	idem.
Trinity MS R. 16. 10	idem.
Trinity MSS R.16.11–19	Anon., similar to above but predominantly Greek, all in early C17th hands.
St. John's MS I.34	Anon., undated commonplace book.
St. John's MS K.38	Henry Vaughan, Oriel and Jesus College, Oxford, commonplace book, notes on ancient history, rhetoric, 1634–9.
St. John's MS S.34	Alexander Bolde, Pembroke College, Cambridge, commonplaces, sermon notes, verses, 1620.
St. John's MS S.44	Anon., commonplace book from Oxford, notes on theology, 1635–6.
St. John's MS U.5	Catalogue of books given to St John's by Bishop John Williams, 1638.
St. John's MS U.1	Library catalogue, late 1630s.
St. John's MS U.4	Library catalogue, late 1630s.
Sidney Sussex MS 44	Samuel Ward, Christ's College, commonplace book, 1590.
Sidney Sussex MS 45	Samuel Ward, commonplace book, 1596–9, with some extracts from 1601, '21, '25, '29; diary.
Sidney Sussex MS Ward A	Samuel Ward, lists of book loans, logic notes, 1596–9.
Sidney Sussex MSS Ward B-I	Samuel Ward, Emmanuel College, notes on grammar, logic, history, theology, *c.*1600–10.

London Manuscripts

BL, Add. MS 4246	Biographical notes by Thomas Birch, relating to British. and foreign persons, arranged alphabetically, with references to printed works concerning their lives and works. The MS. was originally an anonymous C17th commonplace book with ethical headings and some entries.
BL, Add. MS 4821	Commonplace book of Sir James Ware (1594–1666), with historical notes.
BL, Add. MS 22,176–22,179	Commonplace books of John Mallacke, of Axmouth, Devon, classical, legal and theological, temp. James I.

BL, Add. MS 21, 935 Nehemiah Wallington, 1630–49, historical notes and meditations.

BL, Add. MS 25, 285 Oliver St John, commonplace book.

BL, Add. MS 29, 308 Thomas Clarke, college exercises, verses, etc..

BL, Add. MS 36,354 Commonplace book of John Milton, chiefly autograph; extracts from books under headings classified as *Ethicus*, *Oeconomicus* or *Politicus*.

BL, Add. MS 38, 823 Commonplace book of Sir Edward Hoby (1560–1617); includes times of the day according to methods of study.

BL, Add. MS 44, 963 Anthony Scattergood, commonplace book, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1632–40, academic exercises etc..

BL, Add. MS 45, 154 Commonplace book [Adam Airay?]; notes and extracts, with page references, from early C17 printed books, mainly historical.

BL, Add. MS 57, 555 Notebook of Sir Walter Ralegh including library-lists, *c.*1606–1608.

BL, Add. MS 70, 505 Commonplace and letter-book of John Holles, 1st Earl of Clare; 1597–1614.

BL, Add. MS 72, 441 Family and personal correspondence, etc. of William Trumbull the younger; *c.*1611–1637. Included are some academic exercises and language-notes.

BL, Eg. MS 2877 Commonplace book of Gilbert Frevile, of Bishop Middleham, co. Durham, [1591], including miscellancous historical matter, etc..

BL, Eg. MS 3536 Commonplace book of William Pierrepont: Emmanuel College, Cambrdge,1624; Lincoln's Inn 1627.

BL, Eg. MS 3537 Commonplace book of William Rayner, including 'Gesta Romanorum'. Mid-C16th.

BL, Harl. MS 118–21 Simonds D'Ewes, school notebooks, 1615–17.

BL, Harl. MS 182 Simonds D'Ewes, St John's College, Cambridge, commonplace book.

BL, Harl. MS 186 Simonds D'Ewes 1622–3, 1646, commonplaces, notes on history, genealogy.

BL, Harl. MS 190 Simonds D'Ewes,*Collectanea philosophia*, 1618.

BL, Harl. MS 192 Simonds D'Ewes, notes on history, 1619.

BL, Harl. MS 977 Anon., Exeter, 1615, lecture, disputation and sermon notes, scripture commentary.

BL, Lans. MS 695 Dr. South, Christ Church, academic notes and exercises.

BL, Lans. MS 679 Commonplace book of Samuel Fox, eldest son of the martyrologist, and afterwards of his son Dr. Thomas Fox, including extracts from classical poets and histories.

BL, Royal MS 8 B.XX Commonplace book of John Harpsfield, D.D., 1575–7.

BL, Royal MS 12 B.V Commonplace book of Johannes Mauritius (John Morris) 'Anno 1604' containing anecdotes, apophthegms, etc. from classical and recent authors.

BL, Royal MS 12 E.IX Probably also John Morris; historical commonplace book.

BL, Sloane MS 78 Barker (-). M.D. of Shrewsbury; commonplace book 1595–1605.

BL, Sloane MS 108 Commonplace book of Sherwood (Reuben). M.D. of King's College, Cambridge; Physician at Bath, *c.*1590.

BL, Sloane MS 131 Commonplace book of John Townshend, 3rd son of Sir Henry Townshend, of Cound, co. Salop; Second Justice of Chester; *c.*1620–1630.

BL, Sloane MS 138 Anon. sizar, Magdalene, 1614, commonplace book.

BL, Sloane MS 144 Commonplace book of [Christopher] Coniers, 1585–6.

BL, Sloane MS 300 William Withye, Christ Church, commonplace book 1570–1590.

BL, Sloane MS 892 Commonplace book of Stanley (Edward). D.D., Head Master of Winchester College; C17th.

BL, Sloane MS 897	Commonplace book of Francis Lodwick FRS, early C17th.
BL, Sloane MS 1883	Commonplace book of – Ponder, MD, C17th; includes observations on Cicero.
BL, Stowe MS 1047	Commonplace book of Francis Thynne, Lancaster Herald [1602–1608] relating to English history and antiquities; extracts from chronicles, monastic registers, etc..
Guildhall MS 00777	'Omnegatheru[m] Johannis ffitzjames', commonplace book of John Fitzjames in Latin and English; includes extracts from classical authors and a biographical list of Roman emperors, *c.*1575.

Oxford Manuscripts

Balliol MS 438	Thomas Laurence, Balliol College, letter and commonplace book, notes on ancient authors, 1615–17.
Bodleian MS Add. A.68	Thomas James, guide to Arts books in the Bodleian.
Bodleian MS Add. B. 109	Anon., Christ Church, notebook and letter book 1635–53.
Bodleian MS Dm.d.152	John Mansell, student notebook.
Bodleian MS Eng. poet. d.3	Edmund Pudsey, commonplace book.
Bodleian MS Eng. misc. f.87	Anon., school notebook.
Bodleian MS Lat. misc. e.115	John Greaves, student notebook.
Bodleian MS Rawl. *C*. 753	Daniel Featley, student notebook.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 188	Thomas Barlow, 'Directions for young students in the Universitie', mid-C17th.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 273	John Rogers, Christ Church, notes on theology, sermons, recent historical events, 1576–85.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 278	Edward Benlowes, exercise book.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 947	Thomas Kearn, Oriel College, commonplace book, *c.*1620.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D.984	Thomas James, guide to Arts books in the Bodleian.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 985	Robert Batti, Brasenose College, lecture notes, verses, letter book, 1581–4.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 986	N. Dudson, student notebook.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 1063	Griffith Price, school exercise book.
Bodleian MS Rawl. D. 1423	John English, St John's College, Oxford, commonplace book, 1601.
Bodleian MS Rawl.	Anon., King's College, Cambridge, commonplace book, 1597.
Bodleian MS Sancroft 87	William Sancroft, Emmanuel College, Cambridge, commonplaces and logic notes, 1630–40.
Bodleian MS Tanner 467	William Sancroft, letter book, notes on ancient authors.
Bodleian MS Top. Oxon. e.5, f .359	Richard Eedes, *Caesar Interfectus*.
Corpus Christi MS 191	Catalogues and booklists, 1556, 1558.
Corpus Christi MS 214	Edward Wilson, Balliol College, probationer's book, C17th.
Corpus Christi MS 154	Bryan Twynne, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, miscellaneous documents *c.*1583.
Corpus Christi MS 267	Miles Windsor, notes.
Corpus Christi MS 314	William Fulman, notes, including a list of writers on ancient subjects, C17th.
Corpus Christi MS 319	Miscellanea including a list of notes on Roman history by William Fulman.

Corpus Christi MS 353 Anon., commonplace book, C17th.
Lincoln MS 84 Anon., Latin commonplace book, C16th.
Oxford University Archives, transcripts of Chancellor's Court wills and inventories containing books, made by Walter Mitchell.
Queen's MS 390 Anon., diary and notes; list of books printed in Oxford *c.*1625.
Queen's MS 438 Richard Seymes, Wadham College, commonplace, notes on ancient authors, 1622.
University MS 186 Translation of *de Officiis*.
University MS 193 Loose papers: item b), fol. 13 ff., alphabetical list of books on Roman history, with additions in the hand of Obadiah Walker.
Wadham MS 7 Nicolas Faye, Latin notes, C17th.

Printed Primary Sources

Anon., *The tragedie of Caesar and Pompey or Caesars reuenge Priuately acted by the students of Trinity Colledge in Oxforde* (London, 1607), *STC* 4340.

A., L.T., *The masque of the League and the Spanyard discouered wherein, 1. The League is painted forth in all her collours. 2. Is shown, that it is not lawfull for a subiect to arme himselfe against his king, for what pretence so euer it be. 3. That but few noblemen take part with the enemy: an aduertisement to them co*[*n*]*cerning their dutie. To my Lord, the Cardinall of Burbon. Faythfully translated out of the French coppie: printed at Toures by Iamet Mettayer, ordinarie printer to the king* (London, 1592), *STC* 7.

Albott, Robert, *Wits theater of the little world* (London, 1599), *STC* 381.

Abbot, George, *An exposition vpon the prophet Ionah Contained in certaine sermons, preached in S. Maries church in Oxford. By George Abbot professor of diuinitie, and maister of Vniuersitie Colledge* (London, 1600), *STC* 34.

Agricola, Rudolph, *Lucubrationes* (Cologne, 1539, repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967).

Alexander, William, *The monarchicke tragedies Croesus, Darius, The Alexandraean, Iulius Caesar. Newly enlarged by William Alexander, Gentleman of the Princes priuie chamber* (London, 1607), *STC* 344.

Appian, *An auncient historie and exquisite chronicle of the Romanes warres... by the noble orator and historiographer, Appian of Alexandrîa ... With a continuarion* [*sic*], *bicause that parte of Appian is not extant, from the death of Sextus Pompeius, second sonne to Pompey the Great, till the overthrow of Antonie and Cleopatra ...* (London, 1578), *STC* 713.5.

Aristotle, *Aristotles politiques, or Discourses of gouernment. Translated out of Greeke into French, with expositions taken out of the best authours, specially out of Aristotle himselfe, and out of Plato, conferred together where occasion of matter treated of by them both doth offer it selfe: the obseruations and reasons whereof are illustrated and confirmed by innumerable examples, both old and new, gathered out of the most renowmed empires, kingdomes, seignories, and commonweals that euer haue bene, and wherof the knowledge could be had in writing, or by faythfull report, concerning the beginning, proceeding, and excellencie of ciuile gouernment. By Loys Le Roy, called Regius. Translated out of French into English* (London, 1598), *STC* 760.

Ascham, Roger, *The scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong but specially purposed for the priuate brynging vp of youth in ientlemen and noble mens houses, and commodious also for all such, as haue forgot the Latin tonge* (London, 1570), *STC* 832.

Averell, W., *A dyall for dainty darlings, rockt in the cradle of securitie A glasse for all disobedient sonnes to looke in. A myrrour for vertuous maydes. A booke right excellent, garnished with many woorthy examples, and learned aucthorities, most needefull for this tyme present. Compiled by W. Auerell, Student in Diuinitie, and Schoolemaister in London* (London, 1584), *STC* 978.

Bacon, Francis, *The twoo bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and aduancement of learning, diuine and humane To the King* (London, 1605), *STC* 1164.

Bacon, Francis, *The Advancement of Learning* ed. G. W. Kitchin (London, 2001).

Bacon, Francis, *The novum organum of Sir Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Albans epitomiz'd, for a clearer understanding of his natural history / translated and taken out of the Latine by M.D.* (London, 1676), Wing B310.

Baldwin, William, *A Treatise of Morall Philosophie contayning the sayings of the wise. Wherin you may see the worthie and pithie sayings of philosophers, emperours, kings, and oratours: of their liues, their answers, of what linage they came of, and of what countrie they were: whose worthy sentences, notable precepts, counsels, parables, and semblables, doe heereafter follow. First gathered and partly set foorth by William Baudwin, & now the fourth time since that inlarged by Thomas Paulfreyman, one of the gentlemen of the Queenes Maiesties chappell.* (London, 1600), *STC* 1265.

Barret, Robert, *The theorike and practike of moderne warres discoursed in dialogue wise. Wherein is declared the neglect of martiall discipline: the inconuenience thereof: the imperfections of manie training captaines: a redresse by due regard had: the fittest weapons for our moderne warre: the vse of the same: the parts of a perfect souldier in generall and in particular: the officers in degrees, with their seuerall duties: the imbattailing of men in formes now most in vse: with figures and tables to the same: with sundrie other martiall points. Written by Robert Barret. Comprehended in sixe bookes* (London, 1598), *STC* 1500.

Beacon, Richard, *Solon his Follie, or a Politique Discourse touching the Reformation of Common-Weales Conquered, Declined or Corrupted* [*1594*] *ed. Clare Carroll and Vincent Carey* (Binghamton, NY, 1996).

Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John, *Comedies and tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and Iohn Fletcher* (London, 1647), Wing B1581.

Botero, Giovanni, *Obseruations vpon the Liues of Alexander, Caesar, Scipio* (London, 1602), *STC* 3397.

Brandon, Samuel, *The Tragicomoedi of the Vertuous Octavia* (London, 1598), *STC* 3544.

Brandon, Samuel, *Samuel Brandon's 'Octavia'* ed. Ronald B McKerrow (Oxford, 1909).

Brinsley, John, *Ludus literarius: or, The grammar schoole shewing how to proceede from the first entrance into learning, to the highest perfection required in the grammar schooles, with ease, certainty and delight both to masters and schollers; onely according to our common grammar, and ordinary classical authours* (London, 1612), *STC* 3770.

Brinsley, John, *The first book of Tullies Offices translated grammatically* (London, 1616), *STC* 5288.

Brinsley, John, *A consolation for our grammar schooles: or, a faithfull and most comfortable incouragement, for laying of a sure foundation of all good learning in our schooles, and for prosperous building thereupon More specially for all those of the inferiour sort, and all ruder countries and places; namely, for Ireland, Wales, Virginia, with the Sommer Ilands, and for their more speedie attaining of our English tongue by the same labour, that all may speake one and the same language.* (London, 1622), *STC* 3767.

Brinsley, John, *Ludus Literarius or the Grammar-Schoole, edited with an introduction and bibliographical notes by E T Campagnac* (Liverpool and London, 1917).

Brinsley, John, *A Consolation for our Grammar Schooles, with an introduction and bibliographical note by Thomas Clark Pollock* (New York, 1943).

Caesar, *The eight bookes of Caius Iulius Caesar conteyning his martiall exployts in the realme of Gallia and the countries bordering vpon the same. Translated out of Latin into English by Arthur Golding* (London, 1590), *STC* 4336.

Caesar, *Obseruations vpon the fiue first bookes of Caesars commentaries setting fourth the practise of the art military in the time of the Roman Empire: wherein are handled all the chiefest point of their discipline, with the true reason of euery part, together with such instructions as may be drawn from their proceedings, for the better direction of our moderne warres by Clement Edmunds* (London, 1600), *STC* 7488.

Caesar, *The complete captain, or, an abbridgement of Cesars warres with observations upon them; together with a collection of the order of the militia of the ancients; and a particular treatise of modern war: written by the late great generall the Duke of Rohan: Englished by I.C.* (Cambridge, 1640), *STC* 4338.

Chapman, George, *Caesar and Pompey a Roman tragedy, declaring their warres. Out of whose euents is euicted this proposition. Only a iust man is a freeman. By George Chapman*, (London, 1631), *STC* 4993.

Daniel, Samuel, *Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra. By Samuel Daniel. AEtas prima canat veneres postrema tumultus* (London, 1594), *STC* 6243.4.

D'Ewes, Simonds, *The journals of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth both of the House of Lords and House of Commons / collected by Sir Simonds D'Ewes ... Knight and Baronet ; revised and published by Paul Bowes ..., Esq* (London, 1682), Wing D1250.

D'Ewes, Simonds, *The autobiography and correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the reigns of James I and Charles I, edited by J. O. Halliwell- Phillipps* (London, 1845).

Digby, Everard, *Euerard Digbie his dissuasiue From taking away the lyuings and goods of the Church. Wherein all men may plainely behold the great blessings which the Lord hath powred on all those who liberally haue bestowed on his holy temple: and the strange punishments that haue befallen them which haue done the contrarie. Hereunto is annexed Celsus of Verona, his dissuasiue translated into English* (London, 1590), *STC* 6842.

Eliot, John, *Ortho-epia Gallica Eliots fruits for the French: enterlaced with a double new inuention, which teacheth to speake truely, speedily and volubly the French- tongue. Pend for the practise, pleasure, and profit of all English gentlemen, who will endeuour by their owne paine, studie, and dilligence, to attaine the naturall accent, the true pronounciation, the swift and glib grace of this noble, famous, and courtly language* (London, 1593), *STC* 7574.

Erasmus, Desiderius, *Antibarbari*, trans. Wallace K. Ferguson, in *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 23, ed. Craig Ringwalt Thompson (Toronto, 1978).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *De Copia*, trans. Betty I. Knot, in *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 24, ed. Craig Ringwalt Thompson (Toronto, 1978).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *De Ratione Studii*, trans. Brian McGregor, in *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 24, ed. Craig Ringwalt Thompson (Toronto, 1978).

de l'Espine, Jean, *The sicke-mans comfort against death and the deuill, the law and sinne, the wrath and iudgement of God. Translated out of Frenche into English, by I.E.* (London, 1590), *STC* 17238.

Fenne, Thomas, *Fennes frutes which worke is deuided into three seuerall parts; the first, a dialogue betweene fame and the scholler ... The second, intreateth of the lamentable ruines which attend on warre ... The third, that it is not requisite to deriue our pedegree from the vnfaithfull Troians, who were chiefe causes of their owne destruction: whereunto is added Hecubaes mishaps, discoursed by way of apparition.* (London, 1590), *STC* 10763.

Fletcher, Robert *The nine English worthies: or, Famous and worthy princes of England being all of one name; beginning with King Henrie the first, and concluding with Prince Henry, eldest sonne to our Soueraigne Lord the King* (London, 1606), *STC* 11087.

Florus, *The Romane historie written by T. Livius of Padua. Also, the Breviaries of L. Florus: with a chronologie to the whole historie: and the Topographie of Rome in old time. Translated out of Latine into English, by Philemon Holland, Doctor in Physicke Topographia antiquae Romae.* (London, 1600), *STC* 16613.

Florus, *The Roman histories of Lucius Iulius Florus from the foundation of Rome, till Caesar Augustus, for aboue DCC. yeares, & from thence to Traian near CC. yeares, divided by Flor[us] into IV. ages. Translated into English.* (London, 1619), *STC* 11103.

Florus, *L. Iulii Flori rerum à Romanis gestarum libri IV. A Iohanne Stadio emendati. Editio noua singulis neotericis purgatior & emendatior. Seorsum excusus in eos commentarius Ioan. Stadii, historiae & matheseos Louanij professoris primi: in quo obscura in lucem proferuntur, omissa supplentur, inuersa restituuntur, breviter denique, quicquid in Romana historia dignum est observatione annotatur; vnà cum variarum lectionum &*

castigationum rationibus. J. Stadii in L. Julii Flori historiarum libros IV commentarii. (Oxford, 1631), *STC* 11101.

Florus, *The history of the Romans, By Lucius Florus, from the foundation of Rome unto Caesar Augustus* (London, 1658) Wing F1370.

Fulbecke, William, *An historicall collection of the continuall factions, tumults, and massacres of the Romans and Italians during the space of one hundred and twentie yeares next before the peaceable empire of Augustus Caesar Selected and deriued out of the best writers and reporters of these accidents, and reduced into the forme of one entire historie, handled in three bookes. Beginning where the historie of T. Liuius doth end, and ending where Cornelius Tacitus doth begin* (London, 1601), *STC* 11412.

Garnier, Robert, *Pompey the Great, his faire Corneliaes tragedie effected by her father and husbandes downe-cast, death, and fortune. Written in French, by that excellent poet Ro: Garnier; and translated into English by Thomas Kid* (London, 1595), *STC* 11622a.

Gibson, Strickland (ed.), *Statuta antiqua universitatis oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1931).

Greene, Robert, *Penelopes web Where, in a christall mirror of feminine perfection represents to the view of euery one those vertues and graces, which more curiously beautifies the mind of women, then eyther sumptuous apparell, or iewels of inestimable value: the one buying fame with honour, the other breeding a kinde of delight, but with repentance. In three seuerall discourses also are three speciall vertues, necessary to be incident in euery vertuous woman, pithely discussed: namely obedience, chastity, and sylence: interlaced with three seuerall and comicall histories. By Robert Greene Master of Artes in Cambridge* (London, 1601), *STC* 12294.

Greville, Fulke, *Sir Fulke Greville's Life of Sir Philip Sidney* etc.*, first published 1652 with an introduction by Nowell Smith* (Oxford, 1907).

Goulart, Simon, *Les vies des hommes illustres Grecs et Romains... Plus, y ont esté aioustees de nouueau les vies d'Epaminondas, de Philippus de Macédoine, de Dionysius l'aisné tyran de Sicile, & d'Auguste Cesar, tirées des bons auteurs* (Genève, 1583).

Goulart, Simon, *The liues of Epaminondas, of Philip of Macedon, of Dionysius the Elder, and of Octauius Caesar Augustus: collected out of good authors. Also the liues of nine excellent chieftaines of warre, taken out of Latine from Emylius Probus, by S.G. S. By whom also are added the liues of Plutarch and of Seneca: gathered together, disposed, and enriched as the others. And now translated into English by Sir Thomas North Knight,* (London, 1602), *STC* 20071.

Hakewill, George, *An apologie of the power and prouidence of God in the gouernment of the world. Or An examination and censure of the common errour touching natures perpetuall and vniuersall decay diuided into foure bookes: whereof the first treates of this pretended decay in generall, together with some preparatiues thereunto. The second of the pretended decay of the heauens and elements, together with that of the elementary bodies, man only excepted. The third of the pretended decay of mankinde in regard of age and duration, of strength and stature, of arts and wits. The fourth of this pretended decay in matter of manners, together with a large proofe of the future consummation of the world from the testimony of the gentiles, and the vses which we are to draw from the consideration thereof. By G.H. D.D.* (London, 1627), *STC* 12611.

Hayward, John, *An answer to the first part of a certaine conference, concerning succession, published not long since vnder the name of R. Dolman* (London,1603), *STC* 12988.

Heinsius, Daniel *The Value of History*, trans. G.W. Robinson (Cambridge, MA, 1943).

Heylyn, Peter, *Augustus. Or, An essay of those meanes and counsels, whereby the commonwealth of Rome was altered, and reduced unto a monarchy* (London, 1632), *STC* 13268.

Hobbes, Thomas, *Behemoth, or the Long Parliament*, ed. Ferdinand Tonnies (Chicago and London, 1990).

Homer, *Homer's Odysses translated by Tho. Hobbes of Malmsbury ; with a large preface concerning the vertues of an heroique poem written by the translator* (London, 1675), Wing H2556.

Jewel, John, *Seuen godly and learned sermons preached by the Reuerend Father in God Iohn Iuel, late bishop of Salisburie. Neuer before imprinted* (London, 1607), *STC* 14611.

Jones, Richard, *The booke of honor and armes* (London, 1590), *STC* 22163.

Jonson, Ben, *The comicall satyre of euery man out of his humor. As it was first composed by the author B.I. Containing more than hath been publickely spoken or acted. With the seuerall character of euery person* (London, 1600), *STC* 14767.

Jonson, Ben, *Poetaster or The arraignment as it hath beene sundry times priuately acted in the Blacke Friers, by the children of her Maiesties Chappell. Composed, by Ben. Iohnson* (London, 1602), *STC* 14781.

Jonson, Ben, *The workes of Beniamin Ionson* (London, 1616), *STC* 14752.

Jonson, Ben, *Poetaster*, ed. Tom Cain (Manchester, 1995).

Justinus, Marcus Junianus, *The historie of Iustine Containing a narration of kingdomes, from the beginning of the Assyrian monarchy, vnto the raigne of the Emperour Augustus. Whereunto is newly added a briefe collection of the liues and manners of all the emperours succeeding, vnto the Emp. Rodulphus now raigning. First written in Latine by that famous historiographer Iustine, and now againe newly translated into English, by G.W.* (London, 1606), *STC* 24293.

L., E., *Romes monarchie, entituled the globe of renowmed glorie Briefly comprehending the first foundation and building of Rome by Romulus: the principall warres and conquests of the Romanes after the time of their first choosing consuls, till Iulius Caesar attaining soly to the Empire, and from him more briefly to Nero. Where in small compasse is described, manie most notable, and vertuous acts, atchieued in their said warres, and conquests; strange tragedies, secret practises and policies, ambition, hate, and reuenge: and how insurrections, rebellion, strife, ciuill discord and discention preualing, was the onely plague, ruine, and vtter destruction of many great monarchies, kingdomes, cities, and countries. Translated out of the French and Italian histories by E.L.,* (London, 1596), *STC* 21296.

L., N., *Politeuphuia: Wits common wealth* (London, 1598), *STC* 15686.

Leigh, Edward, *Selected and choice obseruations concerning the twelue first Caesars emperours of Rome. By Edward Legh Master of Arts of Magdalen Hall in Oxford* (Oxford, 1635), *STC* 15410.

Leighton, William, *Vertue triumphant, or A liuely description of the foure vertues cardinall dedicated to the Kings Maiestie* (London, 1603), *STC* 15435.

Leroy, Louis, *Of the interchangeable course, or variety of things in the whole world and the concurrence of armes and learning, thorough the first and famousest nations: from the beginning of ciuility, and memory of man, to this present. Moreouer, whether it be true or no, that there can be nothing sayd, which hath not bin said heretofore: and that we ought by our owne inuentions to augment the doctrine of the auncients; not contenting our selues with translations, expositions, corrections, and abridgments of their writings. Written in French by Loys le Roy called Regius: and translated into English by R.A.* (London, 1594), *STC* 15488.

Lipsius, Justus, *Two bookes of constancie. Written in Latine, by Iustus Lipsius. Containing, principallie, A comfortable conference, in common calamities. And will serue for a singular consolation to all that are priuately distressed, of afflicted, either in body or mind. Englished by Iohn Stradling, gentleman* (London, 1595), *STC* 15695.

Livy, *The Romane historie written by T. Livius of Padua. Also, the Breviaries of L. Florus: with a chronologie to the whole historie: and the Topographie of Rome in old time. Translated out of Latine into English, by Philemon Holland, Doctor in Physicke Topographia antiquae Romae.* (London, 1600), *STC* 16613.

Lloyd, Richard, *A brief discourse of the most renowned actes and right valiant conquests of those puisant princes, called the nine worthies wherein is declared their seuerall proportions and dispositions, and what armes euerie one gaue, as also in what time ech of them liued, and how at the length they ended their liues. Compiled by Richard Lloyd gentleman* (London, 1584), *STC* 16634.

Lucan, *Lucans first booke translated line for line, by Chr. Marlow.* (London, 1600), *STC* 16883.5.

Lucan, *Hero and Leander: begunne by Christopher Marloe: whereunto is added the first booke of Lucan translated line for line by the same author* (London, 1600), *STC* 17415.

Lucan, *Lucans Pharsalia containing the ciuill warres betweene Caesar and Pompey. Written in Latine heroicall verse by M. Annaeus Lucanus. Translated into English verse by Sir Arthur Gorges Knight. Whereunto is annexed the life of the authour, collected out of diuers authors.* (London, 1614), *STC* 16885.

Lucan, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia, siue, De bello ciuili Caesaris et Pompeii libri X. Adiectis ad marginem notis T. Farnabii, quae loca obscuriora illustrent* (London, 1618), *STC* 16883.

Lucan, *Lucan's Pharsalia or the civill warres of Rome, betweene Pompey the Great and Iulius Caesar. The three first bookes. Translated into English by T.M.* (London, 1626), *STC* 16886.

Lucan, *Lucan's Pharsalia: or The civill warres of Rome, betweene Pompey the great, and Iulius Caesar The whole ten bookes. Englished, by Thomas May. Esquire* (London, 1627), *STC* 16887.

Lucan, *Lucans Pharsalia: or The ciuill warres of Rome, betweene Pompey the great, and Iulius Caesar The whole tenne bookes, Englished by Thomas May, Esquire.* (London, 1631), *STC* 6888.

Lydgate, John, *The serpent of deuision Wherein is conteined the true history of mappe of Romes ouerthrowe, gouerned by auarice, enuye, and pride, the decaye of empires be they neuer so sure. Whereunto is annexed the tragedye of Gorboduc, sometime king of this land, and of his two sonnes, Ferrex and Porrex. Set foorth as the same was shewed before the Queenes most excellent Maiesty, by the Gentlemen of the Inner Temple* (London, 1590), *STC* 17029.

Lyly, John, *Euphues and his England Containing his voyage and his aduentures, myxed with sundrie pretie discourses of honest loue, the discription of the countrey, the court, and the manners of that isle. Delightful to be read, and nothing hurtfull to be regarded: wherein there is small offence by lightnesse giuen to the wise, and lesse occasion of looseness proffered to the wanton. By Iohn Lyly, Maister of Arte. Commend it, or amend it* (London, 1580), *STC* 17070.

Machiavelli, Niccolò, *Machiavels discourses. upon the first decade of T. Livius translated out of the Italian; with some marginall animadversions noting and taxing his errours. By E.D.* (London, 1636), *STC* 17160.

de la Marche, Olivier, *The resolued gentleman. Translated out of Spanishe into Englyshe, by Lewes Lewkenor Esquier* (London, 1594), *STC* 15139.

May, Thomas, *A continuation of Lucan's historicall poem till the death of Iulius Caesar by TM* (London, 1630), *STC* 17711.

May, Thomas *The tragedie of Cleopatra Queen of AEgypt. By T.M. Acted 1626* (London, 1639), *STC* 17717.

Merbecke, John, *A booke of notes and common places, with their expositions, collected and gathered out of the workes of diuers singular writers, and brought alphabetically into order. A worke both profitable and also necessarie, to those that desire the true vnderstanding & meaning of holy Scripture* (London, 1581), *STC* 17299.

Mexia, Pedro, *The historie of all the Roman emperors beginning with Caius Iulius Caesar, and successiuely ending with Rodulph the second now raigning. Wherein (in summe) are contained their liues and acts, together with the rising, greatnes, and declining of the Romane Empire: the original and successe of al the most famous nations of the world: the erecting and alterations of sundrie estates and kingdoms: and generally the most part of all the memorable warres and battailes that haue bin in the world since that time. / First collected in Spanish by Pedro Mexia, since enlarged in Italian by Lodouico Dulce and Girolamo Bardi, and now englished by W.T* (London, 1604), *STC* 17851.

Mexia, Pedro, *The imperiall historie: or The liues of the emperours, from Iulius Caesar, the first founder of the Roman monarchy, vnto this present yeere containing their liues and actions, with the rising and declining of that empire; the originall, and successe, of all those barbarous nations that haue inuaded it, and ruined it by peece-meele: with an ample relation of all the memorable accidents that haue happened during these last combustions. First written in Spanish by Pedro Mexia: and since continued by some others, to the death of Maximilian the Second; translated into English by W.T.: and now corrected, amplified and*

continued to these times by Edward Grimeston Sergeant at Armes (London, 1623), *STC* 17852.

Milton, John, *The readie and easie way to establish a free commonwealth and the excellence therof compar'd with the inconveniences and dangers of readmitting kingship in this nation* (London, 1660), Wing M2174.

de Montaigne, Michel, *Essays written in French by Michael Lord of Montaigne, Knight of the Order of S. Michael, gentleman of the French Kings chamber: done into English, according to the last French edition, by Iohn Florio reader of the Italian tongue vnto the Soueraigne Maiestie of Anna, Queene of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, &c. And one of the gentlemen of hir royall priuie chamber* (London, 1613), *STC* 18042.

Mulcaster, Richard, *Positions wherin those primitiue circumstances be examined, which are necessarie for the training vp of children, either for skill in their booke, or health in their bodie. Written by Richard Mulcaster, master of the schoole erected in London anno. 1561. in the parish of Sainct Laurence Pountneie, by the worshipfull companie of the merchaunt tailers of the said citie* (London, 1581), *STC* 18253.

Oglander, John, *A royalist's notebook. The commonplace book of Sir John Oglander, Kt., of Nunwell. Born 1585. Died 1655*; ed. Francis Bamford, with an introduction by C.F. Aspinall-Oglander (London, 1936).

Parker, Matthew, *An Homily against Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion* (London, 1569), *STC* 13679.

Person, David, *Varieties: or, A surveigh of rare and excellent matters necessary and delectable for all sorts of persons. Wherein the principall heads of diverse sciences are illustrated, rare secrets of naturall things unfoulded, &c. Digested into five bookes, whose severall chapters with their contents are to be seene in the table after the epistle dedicatory. By David Person, of Loghlands in Scotland, Gentleman* (London, 1635), *STC* 19781.

Petowe, Henry, *Englands Caesar His Maiesties most royall coronation. Together with the manner of the solemne shewes prepared for the honour of his entry into the cittie of London. Eliza. her coronation in heauen. And Londons sorrow for her visitation* (London, 1603), *STC* 19806.

Playfere, Thomas, *Ten sermons Preached by that eloquent divine of famous memorie, Th. Playfere Doctor in Divinitie* (London, 1610), *STC* 20005.

Pliny, the Elder, *The historie of the world: commonly called, The naturall historie of C. Plinius Secundus. Translated into English by Philemon Holland Doctor of Physicke. The first* [*-second*] *tome* (London, 1634), *STC* 20030.

Plutarch, *The liues of the noble Grecians and Romanes, compared together by that graue learned philosopher and historiographer, Plutarke of Chaeronea: translated out of Greeke into French by Iames Amyot, Abbot of Bellozane, Bishop of Auxerre, one of the Kings priuy counsel, and great Amner of Fraunce, and out of French into Englishe, by Thomas North* (London, 1579), *STC* 20065.

Prynne, William, *Independency examined, vnmasked, refuted, by twelve new particular interrogatories: detecting both the manifold absurdities, inconveniences that must necessarily attend it, to the great disturbance of church, state, the diminution, subversion of the lawfull undoubted power of all christian magistrates, parliaments, synods: and shaking the chiefe pillars, wherwith its patrons would support it. By William Prynne of Lincolnes Inne, Esquier* (London, 1644), Wing P3985.

Rainolde, Richard, *A chronicle of all the noble emperours of the Romaines from Iulius Caesar, orderly to this moste victorious Emperour Maximilian, that now gouerneth, with the great warres of Iulius Caesar,* [*and*] *Pompeius Magnus: setting forth the great power, and deuine prouidence of almighty God, in preseruing the godly princes and common wealthes* (London, 1571), *STC* 20926.

Rowlands, Samuel, *Aue Caesar. God saue the King The ioyfull ecchoes of loyall English hartes, entertayning his Maiesties late ariuall in England. With an epitaph vpon the death of her Maiestie our late Queene.* (London, 1603), *STC* 21364.

Sallust, *Here begynneth the famous cronycle of the warre, which the romayns had against Iugurth vsurper of the kyngdome of Numidy. which cronycle is compyled in latyn by the*

renowmed romayne Salust. And translated into englysshe by syr Alexander Barclay preest, at co[m]maundement of the right hye and mighty prince: Thomas duke of Northfolke (London, 1522), *STC* 21626.

Sallust, *C. Sallusti Crispi Opera omnia quae exstant cum Petri Ciacconii Toletani nouis ad eadem notis, denuo ex optimorum exemplarium collatione quamplurimis animaduersionibus scholis necessarijs excusa* (London, 1601), *STC* 21622.8.

Sallust, *Reverendissimi patris ac domini Iohannis Mortoni Cantvariensis olim Archiepiscopi, magni Angliae Cancellarii, trium regum consiliarij, viri prudentissimi, optimique, vita obitusque Quum maiorum imagines intuemur, vehementissimè tum animus ad virtutem accenditur. Salust. in bello iugurth.* (London, 1607), *STC* 4013.

Sallust, *The two most worthy and notable histories which remaine vnmained to posterity (viz:) the conspiracie of Cateline, vndertaken against the gouernment of the Senate of Rome, and the warre which Iugurth for many yeares maintained against the same state. Both written by C.C. Salustius.* (London, 1609), *STC* 21625.

Sallust, *The workes of Caius Crispus Salustius contayning the Conspiracie of Cateline The Warre of Iugurth. V. bookes of historicall fragments. II orations to Caesar for the institution of a co[m]monwealth and one against Cicero.* (London, 1629), *STC* 21624.

Savile, Henry, 'An autograph manuscript commonplace book of Sir Henry Savile' ed. John Roger Loxdale Highfield, *Bodleian Library Record* vol. 7, no. 2 (1963), pp. 73–83.

Segar, William, *Honor military, and ciuill contained in foure bookes. Viz. 1. Iustice, and iurisdiction military. 2. Knighthood in generall, and particular. 3. Combats for life, and triumph. 4. Precedencie of great estates, and others* (London, 1602), *STC* 22164.

Shakespeare, William, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. John Wilders (London, 1995).

Shakespeare, William, *Julius Caesar*, ed. David Daniell (London, 1998).

Shakespeare, William, *Love's Labours Lost*, ed. William C. Carroll (Cambridge, 2009).

Sidney, Mary, *The Tragedie of Antonie, Doone into English by the Countesse of Pembroke* (London, 1595), *STC* 11623.

Sleidanus, Johannes, *A briefe chronicle of the foure principall empyres To witte, of Babilon, Persia, Grecia, and Rome. Wherein, very compendiously, the whole course of histories are conteined. Made by the famous and godly learned man Iohn Sleidan, and englished by Stephan Wythers* (London, 1563), *STC* 19849.

Strigel, Victorinus, *Part of the harmony of King Dauids harp Conteining the first XXI. Psalmes of King Dauid. Briefly & learnedly expounded by the Reuerend D. Victorinus Strigelius Professor of Diuinitie in the Vniuersity of Lypsia in Germanie. Newly translated into English by Rich. Robinson* (London, 1582), *STC* 23358.

Struther, William *A looking glasse for princes and people Delivered in a sermon of thankesgiving for the birth of the hopefull Prince Charles. And since augmented with allegations and historicall remarkes. Together with a vindication of princes from Popish tyranny. By M. William Struther preacher at Edinburgh* (London, 1632), *STC* 23369.

Suetonius, *The historie of twelve Caesars, emperours of Rome: written in Latine by C. Suetonius Tranquillus, and newly translated into English, by Philêmon Holland, Doctor in Physicke. Together with a marginall glosse, and other briefe annotations there-upon*, (London, 1606), *STC* 23423.

Swetnam, Joseph, *The araignment of leuud, idle, froward, and vnconstant women or the vanitie of them, choose you whether : with a commendation of wise, vertuous and honest women : pleasant for married men, profitable for young men, and hurtfull to none* (London, 1615) *STC* 23534.

le Sylvain, Alexandre, *The orator handling a hundred seuerall discourses, in forme of declamations: some of the arguments being drawne from Titus Liuius and other ancient writers, the rest of the authors owne inuention: part of which are of matters happened in our age. Written in French by Alexander Siluayn, and Englished by L.P* (London, 1596), *STC* 4182.

Taylor, John, *All the workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet Beeing sixty and three in number. Collected into one volume by the author: with sundry new additions corrected, reuised, and newly imprinted* (London, 1630), *STC* 23725.

Telin, Guillaume, *Archaioplutos. Or the riches of elder ages Proouing by manie good and learned authours, that the auncient emperors & kings, were more rich and magnificent, then such as liue in these daies. Heereto is annexed, the honours of the braue Romaine souldiours; with the seauen wonders of the worlde. Written in French by Guil. Thelin, Lord of Gutmont and Morillonuilliers: and truely translated into English* (London, 1592), *STC* 23867.

de Torquemada, Antonio, *The Spanish Mandeuile of miracles. Or The garden of curious flowers Wherin are handled sundry points of humanity, philosophy, diuinitie, and geography, beautified with many strange and pleasant histories. First written in Spanish, by Anthonio De Torquemeda, and out of that tongue translated into English. It was dedicated by the author, to the right honourable and reuerent prelate, Don Diego Sarmento de soto Maior, Bishop of Astorga. &c. It is deuided into sixe treatises, composed in manner of a dialogue, as in the next page shall appeare* (London, 1600), *STC* 24135.

Velleius Paterculus, *Velleius Paterculus his Romane historie in two bookes. Exactly translated out of the Latine ...and rendred English by Sr. Robert Le Grys Knt.* (London, 1632), *STC* 24633.

Warner, William, *Albions England a continued historie of the same kingdome, from the originals of the first inhabitants thereof: and most the chiefe alterations and accidents there hapning: vnto, and in, the happie raigne of our now most gracious soueraigne Queene Elizabeth. With varietie of inuentiue and historicall intermixtures. First penned and published by William Warner: and now reuised, and newly inlarged by the same author* (London, 1597), *STC* 25082a.

Weever, John, *Ancient funerall monuments within the vnited monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland, and the islands adiacent with the dissolued monasteries therein contained: their founders, and what eminent persons haue beene in the same interred. As also the death and buriall of certaine of the bloud royall; the nobilitie and gentrie of these kingdomes entombed in forraine nations. A worke reuiuing the dead memory of the royall progenie, the nobilitie, gentrie, and communaltie, of these his Maiesties dominions. Intermixed and illustrated with variety of historicall obseruations, annotations, and briefe notes, extracted out of approued authors ... Whereunto is prefixed a discourse of funerall monuments ... Composed by the studie and trauels of Iohn Weeuer* (London, 1631), *STC* 25223.

Wheare, Degory, *De ratione et methodo legendi historias dissertatio habita Oxoniae in schola historica, 12. Iul. 1623. à D.W. primo historiarum praelectore publico, ex institutione clariss. viri, Gvlielmi Camdeni, clarentii* (London, 1623), *STC* 25325.

Wheare, Degory, *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories. In which the Most Excellent Historiansare Reduced into the Order in which they are Successively to be Read; and the Judgments of Learned Men, Concerning each of them, Subjoin'd* (London, 1685), Wing W1592.

Classical Texts Consulted in Modern Editions

In each case, the edition used is that in the Loeb Classical Library series, published by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. The series number of the volume in which the text appears has been given, though all other publication details have been omitted.

Appian, *Roman History*. IV volumes. No. 2–5.

Caesar, *The Gallic Wars*. No. 72.

Caesar, *The Civil Wars*. No. 39.

Catullus, 'Odes' in *Catullus. Tibullus. Pervigilium Veneris*. No. 6.

Cicero, 'De Oratore' in *Volume III:* and *Volume IV: Rhetorical Treatises*. No. 386, 348.

Cicero, 'De Officiis' in *Volume XXI: Philosophical Treatises*. No. 30.

Cicero, 'In Catilinam' 1–4 in *Volume X: Orations*. No. 324.

Cicero, 'Philippics' 1–14 in *Volume XVa:* and *Volume XVb:Orations*. No. 189, 507.

Cicero, 'Pro Milone' in *Volume XIV: Orations*. No. 252.

Dio Cassius, *Roman History*. IX volumes. No. 32, 37, 53, 66, 82–3, 175–7.
Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*. No. 231.
Livy, *History of Rome*. XIV volumes. No. 114, 133, 172, 191, 233, 355, 367, 381, 295, 301, 313, 332, 396, 404.
Lucan, *The Civil War* (*Pharsalia*). No. 220.
Plutarch, 'Pompey' in *Volume V: Lives V*. No. 87.
Plutarch, 'Brutus' in *Volume VI: Lives VI*. No. 98.
Plutarch, 'Caesar' in *Volume VII: Lives VII*. No. 99.
Plutarch, 'Antony' in *Volume IX: Lives IX*. No. 101.
Sallust, 'Bellum Catilinae' in *War with Catiline. War with Jugurtha. Selections from the Histories. Doubtful Works*. No. 116.
Seneca, 'De Beneficiis' in *Volume III: Moral Essays III*. No. 310.
Suetonius, 'Julius' and 'Augustus', in *Volume I: Lives of the Caesars I*. No. 31.
Various authors, *Historia Augusta*. III Volumes. 139, 140, 263.
Velleius Paterculus, *Compendium of Roman History*. No. 152.
Tacitus, 'Annals' in *Volume III: Histories*, *Volume IV:* and *V: Annals*. No. 249, 312, 322.

Printed Secondary Sources

Adams, D., and Armstrong, A. (eds), *Print and Power in France and England, 1500–1800* (Aldershot, 2006).
Adler, D., *Philip Massinger* (Boston, 1987).
Anderson, J., *Biographical Truth: the representation of historical persons in Tudor-Stuart writing* (New Haven, 1984).
Anderson, J., and Sauer, E. (eds), *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: material studies* (Philadelphia, 2002).
Andrews, J. F. (ed.), *William Shakespeare: his world, his work, his influence* (3 vols, New York, 1985).
Anon., *Chapman's Dramatic Works: the comedies and tragedies of George Chapman now first collected with illustrative notes and a memoir of the author* (London, 1873).
Axton, M., *The Queen's Two Bodies: drama and the Elizabethan succession* (London, 1977).
Ayres, H. M., "Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar in the Light of Some Other Versions", *PMLA* vol. 25, no. 2 (1910), pp. 183–227.
Ayres, H. M., "Caesars Revenge", *PMLA* vol. 30, no. 4 (1915), pp.771–787.
Baker, D.J. and Maley, W. (eds), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2002).
Baldwin, T. W., *William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, 1944).
Barroll, J. L., 'Shakespeare and Roman History', *Modern Language Review* vol. 53 (1958), pp. 328–343.
Barroll, J. L., 'The characterisation of Octavius', *Shakespeare Studies* vol. 6 (1972).
Bernard, G.W. and Gunn, S.J., *Authority and Consent in Tudor England: essays presented to C. S. L. Davies* (Aldershot, 2002).
Binns, J. W., *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin writings of the age* (Leeds, 1990).
Blatchly, J. M., 'D'Ewes, Sir Simonds, first baronet (1602–1650)', *ODNB*.
Blisset, W., 'Lucan's Caesar and the Elizabethan villain', *Studies in Philology* vol. 53 (1956), pp. 553–75.
Blits, J. H., 'Caesarism and the End of Republican Rome: Julius Caesar, Act I, scene I', *Journal of Politics* vol. 43, no.1 (February 1981), pp. 40–55.
Bloomer, W. M., *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1992).
Boas, F. S. (ed.), *The works of Thomas Kyd* (Oxford, 1901).

Boas, F. S., 'Edward Grimeston, Translator and Sergeant-at-Arms', *Modern Philology* vol. 3, no. 4 (April, 1906), pp. 395–409.
Boas, F. S. (ed.), *The Tragedy of Caesars Revenge* (Oxford, 1911).
Boas, F. S., *University Drama in the Tudor age* (Oxford, 1914).
Bolgar, R. R. (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976).
Bowsma, W. J., 'Intellectual History in the 1980s: from history of ideas to history of meaning', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* vol. 12 (Autumn 1981), pp. 279–90.
Bradford, A. T., 'Stuart Absolutism and the "Utility" of Tacitus', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 46 (1983), pp. 127–55.
Braunmuller, A. R. and Hattaway, M., (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 2003).
Brayman Hackel, H., *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005).
Brayman Hackel, H., 'The "Great Variety" of Readers and Early Modern Reading Practices' in D. Scott Kastan (ed.), *A Companion to Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 139–157.
Budra, P. V., *A Mirror for Magistrates and the de Casibus Tradition* (Toronto and London, 2000).
Bullough, G., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, *Volume 5: the Roman plays* (London, 1966).
Burgess, G., 'The "Historical Turn" and the Political Culture of Early Modern England: towards a postmodern history?' in R. Headlam-Wells, G. Burgess and R. Wymer (eds), *Neo-Historicism* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 31–47.
Burke, P., 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians', *History and Theory* (1966), pp.135–52.
Burke, P., 'Tacitism, Scepticism, and Reason of State' in J.H. Burns and M. Goldie (eds), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 479–98.
Burke, P., 'Translating Histories' in P. Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia (eds), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 125–62.
Burke, P. and Hsia, R. Po-chia (eds), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007).
Burnett, M. T.,'Chapman, George (1559/60–1634)', *ODNB*.
Burns, J. H., 'George Buchanan and the Anti-Monarchomachs' in N. T. Phillipson and Q. Skinner (eds), *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 3–22.
Burns, J. H. and Goldie, M. (eds), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991).
Bush, S. and Rasmussen, C Jnr, *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge 1584–1637* (Cambridge, 1986).
Bushnell, R. W., *Tragedies of Tyrants: political thought and theater in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, NY,1990).
Bushnell, R. W., *A Culture of Teaching: early modern Humanism in theory and practice* (Ithaca, NY, 1996).
Cantor, P. A., *Shakespeare's Rome: republic and empire* (Ithaca, NY, 1976).
Capp, B., *When Gossips Meet: women, family, and neighbourhood in early modern England* (Oxford, 2004).
Carr, E. H., *What is History?* (Harmondsworth, 1964).
Chambers, E. K., *The Elizabethan Stage* (4 vols, London, 1923).
Charlton, H. B., and Kastner, L. E. (eds), *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling* (2 vols, Edinburgh and London, 1921).
Chartier, R., 'Labourers and Voyagers: from the text to the reader', *Diacritics* vol. 22, no. 2 (1992), pp. 49–61.
Charlton, K., *Education in Renaissance England* (London and Toronto, 1965).
Chester, A. G., *Thomas May: man of letters, 1595–1650* (Philadelphia, 1932).
Chow, K-W., *Publishing, Culture, and Power in Early Modern China* (Stanford, CA, 2004).
Clare, J. (ed.), *Drama of the English Republic 1649–1660* (Manchester 2002).
Clark, A. J., *Divine Qualities: cult and community in republican Rome* (Oxford, 2007).

Clark, G. N., 'Edward Grimeston, the Translator', *The English Historical Review* vol. 43, no. 172 (Oct., 1928), pp. 585–598.
Clarke, M.L., *The Noblest Roman,* (London, 1981).
Cole, M. H. *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the politics of ceremony* (Amherst, MA, 1999).
Collingwood, R.G., *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1994).
Collinson, P., 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* vol. 69, no. 2 (1987), pp. 394–424.
Connolly, J., *The State of Speech: rhetoric and political thought in ancient Rome* (Princeton, NJ, 2007).
Conte, G. B., *Latin Literature: a history* (Baltimore and London, 1999).
Cornell, Tim, *The Beginnings of Rome* (London, 1995).
Cramsie, J., 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I' in R. Houlbrooke (ed.), *James VI and I: ideas, authority and government* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 43–60.
Cressy, D., *Education in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1975).
Crook, J. A., Lintott, and Rawson, E. (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 9: the last age of the Roman republic, 146–43 B. C.* (Cambridge, 1992).
Cuddy, N., 'The Revival of the Entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625' in D. Starkey *et al.*, *The English court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London, 1987), pp. 173–225.
Daly, J., 'The Idea of Absolute Monarchy in Seventeenth-Century England', *The Historical Journal* vol. 21, no. 2 (June, 1978), pp. 227–250.
Danby, J. F., *Elizabethan and Jacobean Poets: studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher* (London, 1965).
Darnton, R., 'First Steps Towards a History of Reading' in J. L. Machor and P. Goldstein (eds), *Reception Study: from literary theory to cultural studies* (New York and London, 2001), pp. 160–79.
Davies, C. S. L., 'Grimston, Edward (1507/8–1600)', *ODNB*.
Dean, P., 'Tudor Humanism and the Roman Past: a background to Shakespeare', *Renaissance Quarterly* vol. 41, no. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 84–111.
Dent, R. W., 'John Webster's Debt to William Alexander', *Modern Language Notes* vol. 65, no. 2 (February, 1950), pp. 73–82.
Dibdin, T. F. *An Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable Editions of the Greek and Latin classics, Together with an Account of Polyglot Bibles, Polyglot Psalters, Hebrew Bibles, Greek Bible and Greek Testaments, the Greek Fathers, and the Latin Fathers* (London, 1827).
Dobranski, S. B., *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2005).
Dollimore, J., *Radical Tragedy: religion, ideology and power in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries* (Basingstoke, 2004).
Doran, S., *Monarchy and Matrimony: the courtships of Elizabeth I* (London, 1996).
Doran, S., and Freeman, T. S. (eds), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke, 2003).
Dzelzainis, M, 'Anti-Monarchism in English Republicanism', in M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage* (Cambridge, 2002), volume I, pp. 27–46.
Edwards, C., *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 2002).
Edwards, P., *Thomas Kyd and Early Elizabethan Tragedy* (London, 1966).
Enenkel, K., De Jong, J. L., De Landtsheer, J. and Montoya, A. (eds), *Recreating Ancient History: episodes from the Greek and Roman past in the arts and literature of the early modern period* (Leiden, 2001).
Erskine-Hill, H., *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (London, 1983).
van Es, B., *Spenser's Forms of History* (Oxford, 2002).
Feingold, M., 'The Humanities' in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: seventeenth-century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 211–357.
Fehrenbach, R. J. and Leedham-Green, E. (eds), *Private Libraries in Renaissance England: a collection and catalogue of Tudor and early Stuart book-lists* (Binghamton, N.Y., 1992-).

Fink, Zera S., *The Classical Republicans: an essay in the recovery of a pattern of thought in seventeenth century England* (Evanston, Ill., 1945).
Finkelstein, D., and McCleery, A., (eds), *The Book History Reader* (London, 2002).
Fletcher, H. F., *The Intellectual Development of John Milton* (2 vols, Urbana, Ill., 1961).
Fletcher, I., *Beaumont and Fletcher* (London, 1967).
Fletcher, J. M., 'The Faculty of Arts', pp. 157–199 in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume III: the collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986).
Freeman, T. S., 'Foxe, John (1516/17–1587)', *ODNB*.
Gaines, J. F. and Roberts, J. A., 'Kyd and Garnier: the art of amendment', *Comparative Literature* vol. 31, no. 2 (Spring, 1979), pp. 124–133.
Gajda, A., 'Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex and Political Culture, *c.*1595- *c.*1601' (University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 2005).
van Gelderen, M., and Skinner, Q. (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage, Volume I: republicanism and constitutionalism in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2002).
van Gelderen, M., and Skinner, Q. (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage, Volume II: the values of republicanism in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2002).
Gaskell, P., 'Books Bought by Whitgift's Pupils in the 1570s', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society* vol. 7, no. 3 (1979), pp. 284–93.
Gentili, V., 'Thomas Lodge's *Wounds of Civil War*: an assessment of context, sources and structure', *REAL: Yearbook of research in English and American Literature* vol. 2 (1984), pp. 119–164.
Goldberg, J., *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their contemporaries* (Stanford, CA, 1989).
Goodman, A. and Mackay, A. (eds), *The impact of Humanism on Western Europe* (London, 1990).
Gowing, L., *Domestic Dangers: women, words, and sex in early modern London* (Oxford, 1998).
Grafton, A. and Jardine, L., *From Humanism to the Humanities: education and the liberal arts in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe* (London, 1986).
Grafton, A. and Jardine, L., '"Studied for Action": how Gabriel Harvey read his Livy', *Past and Present* no. 129 (November, 1990), pp. 30–78.
Grafton, A., 'Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: comments on some commentaries', *Renaissance Quarterly* vol. 38, no. 4 (Winter, 1985), pp. 615–49.
Grafton, A., *Commerce with the Classics: ancient books and Renaissance readers* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1997).
Grafton, A., *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007).
Greaves, R. L., 'Puritanism and Science: the anatomy of a controversy', *Journal of the History of Ideas* vol. 30, no. 3 (July, 1969), pp. 345–368.
Green, J. M., 'Queen Elizabeth I's Latin Reply to the Polish Ambassador', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 31, no. 4 (Winter, 2000), pp. 987–1008.
Greenblatt, S., *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1980).
Griggs, B., 'South, Robert (1634–1716)' *ODNB*.
Guillory, J., *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton, and literary history* (New York, 1983).
Gurval, R. A., *Actium and Augustus: the politics and emotions of civil war* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1995).
Hadfield, A., *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1994).
Hadfield, A., *Shakespeare and Renaissance Politics* (London, 2004).
Hadfield, A., *Shakespeare and Republicanism* (Cambridge, 2005).
Hammer, P. E. J., *The Polarisation of Elizabethan politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd earl of Essex, 1585–1597* (Cambridge, 1999).
Harbage, A., *Annals of English drama, 975–1700 : an analytical record of all plays, extant or lost, chronologically arranged and indexed by authors, titles, dramatic companies,* etc., revised by S. Schoenbaum (Philadelphia, 1964).

Harris, J. G. *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: discourses of social pathology in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1998).
Headlam-Wells, R., Burgess, G., and Wymer, R. (eds), *Neo-Historicism* (Cambridge, 2000).
Heinemann, M., 'Political Drama' in A. R. Braunmuller and M. Hattaway (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 164–196.
Heninger, S. K., 'The Literate Culture of Shakespeare's Audience' in J. F. Andrews (ed.), *William Shakespeare: his world, his work, his influence* (New York, 1985), vol. 1, pp. 159–174.
Hexter, J. H., 'Seyssel, Machiavelli and Polybius VI: the mystery of the missing translation', *Studies in the Renaissance* vol. 3 (1956), pp. 75–96.
Hexter, J. H., 'The Burden of Proof', *Times Literary Supplement* (24 October 1975).
Higgins, M. H., 'Chapman's "Senecal Man": a study in Jacobean psychology', *The Review of English Studies* vol. 21, no. 83 (July, 1945), pp. 183–191.
Hirst, D., 'Text, Time, and the Pursuit of "British Identities"' in D. J. Baker and W. Maley (eds), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 256–266.
Holstun, J., *Ehud's Dagger: class struggle in the English revolution* (London, 2000).
Houlbrooke, R. (ed.), *James VI and I: ideas, authority and government* (Aldershot, 2006).
Houston, R. A., *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: culture and education 1500–1800* (Harlow, 2002).
Howland, Douglas, 'The Predicament of Ideas in Culture: translation and historiography', *History and Theory* vol. 42, no. 1 (February, 2003), pp. 45–60.
Hunter, G. K., 'A Roman Thought: Renaissance attitudes to history exemplified in Shakespeare and Jonson' in B. S. Lee (ed.), *An English Miscellany presented to W. S. Mackie* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 93–115.
Ide, R. S., 'Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey* and the Uses of History', *Modern Philology* vol. 82, no. 3 (February, 1985), pp. 255–268.
James, H., 'Ovid and the Question of Politics in Early Modern England', *English Literary History* vol. 70, no, 2 (2003), pp. 343–373.
Jankowski, T., *Women in Power in the Early Modern Drama* (Urbana, Ill., 1992).
Jardine, L., 'Humanism and Dialectic in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge: a preliminary investigation' in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 141–54.
Jardine, L., 'The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge', *Studies in the Renaissance*, vol. 21 (1974), pp. 31–62.
Jondorf, G., *Robert Garnier and the Themes of Political Tragedy in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1969).
Jewell, H. M., *Education in Early Modern England* (London, 1998).
Kalmey, R. P., 'Shakespeare's Octavius and Elizabethan Roman History', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* vol. 18, no. 2 (Spring, 1978), pp. 275–287.
Kamps, Ivo, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge, 1996).
Kelley, D. R. and Harris Sacks, D. (eds), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: history, rhetoric and fiction, 1550–1800* (Cambridge, 1997).
Ker, N. R., 'Oxford College Libraries in the Sixteenth Century', *The Bodleian Library Record* vol. 6, no. 3 (Oxford, 1959).
Ker, N. R., 'The Provision of Books', in James McConica, *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume III: the collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 441–477.
Kewes, P., 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England', *The Seventeenth Century* vol. XVII, no. 2 (October, 2002), pp. 155–186.
Kewes, P., 'History and its Uses' in P. Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA, 2006), pp. 1–30.
Kewes, P. (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early-Modern England* (San Marino, CA, 2006).
Kistler, S. F., 'The Significance of the Missing Hero in Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey*', *Modern Language Quarterly* vol. 40, no. 4, (Dec. 1979), pp. 339–357.

Knight, J. (rev. E. Goldring), 'Brandon, Samuel (*fl.* 1598)', *ODNB*.
Knight, S., '"It was not mine intent to prostitute my Muse in English": academic publication in early modern England', in D. Adams and A. Armstrong (eds), *Print and Power in France and England, 1500–1800* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 39–52.
Knight, S., 'Fantastical Distempers: the psychopathology of early modern scholars' in J. Walker and P. D. Streufert (eds), *Early Modern Academic Drama* (Aldershot, 2008).
Koslow, J., 'Humanist Schooling and Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*', *English Literary History* vol. 73, no. 1 (2006), pp. 119–159.
Lake, P., 'The Politics of 'Popularity' and the Public Sphere: the 'monarchical republic' of Elizabeth I defends itself', in P. Lake and S. C. A. Pincus (eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 59–94.
Lake, P. and Pincus, S C. A.(eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007).
Lamb, M. E., 'The Myth of the Countess of Pembroke: the dramatic circle', *The Yearbook of English Studies* vol. 11, no. 2 (1981), pp. 194–202.
Leavenworth, R. E., *Daniel's 'Cleopatra': a critical study* (Salzburg, 1974).
Lee, B. S. (ed.), *An English Miscellany presented to W. S. Mackie* (Oxford, 1977).
Leech, C., *The John Fletcher Plays* (London, 1962).
Leedham-Green, E., *Books in Cambridge Inventories: book lists from Vice- Chancellor's Court probate inventories in the Tudor and Stuart periods* (Cambridge, 1986).
Lesser, Z., *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: readings in the English book trade* (Cambridge, 2004).
Levy, F. J., 'Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England', *The Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 50, no. 1 (Winter, 1987), pp. 1–34.
Lind, L. R., 'Concept, Action, and Character: the reasons for Rome's greatness', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103 (1972), pp. 235–283.
Lindenberger, H., *The History in Literature: on value, genre, institutions* (New York, 1990).
Marincola, J., *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997).
MacCallum, M. W., *Shakespeare's Roman plays and their Background* (London, 1910).
Machor, J. L. and Goldstein, P. (eds), *Reception Study: from literary theory to cultural studies* (New York and London, 2001).
Mack, P., *Elizabethan Rhetoric: theory and practice*, (Cambridge, 2002).
van Marion, O., 'The Reception of Plutarch in the Netherlands: Octavia and Cleopatra in the heroic epistles of J. B. Wellekens (1710)' in K. Enenkel, J. L. De Jong, J. De Landtsheer and A. Montoya (eds), *Recreating Ancient History: episodes from the Greek and Roman past in the arts and literature of the early modern period* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 213–35.
Martines, L., 'The Protean Face of Renaissance Humanism', *Modern Language Quarterly* (1990), pp. 105–21.
Maxwell, B., *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1939).
May, S. W., *The Elizabethan Courtier Poets: their poems and their contexts* (Ashville, NC, 1999).
McConica, J., *English Humanists and Reformation Politics* (Oxford, 1965).
McConica, J., 'Studies and Faculties: introduction' in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume III: the collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 151–156.
McConica, J., 'Elizabethan Oxford: the collegiate society' in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume III: the collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 645–732.
McConica, J. (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume III: the collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986).
McDiarmid, J. F. (ed.), *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: essays in response to Patrick Collinson* (Aldershot, 2007).
McGrath, A. E., *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford, 1987).
McLaren, A. N., *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: queen and commonwealth 1558–1585* (Cambridge, 1999).

Mendyk, S. A. E.,*'Speculum Britanniae': regional study, antiquarianism, and science in Britain to 1700* (Toronto, 1989).
Miller, A., *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern English Culture* (Basingstoke, 2001).
Miola, R. S., 'Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate', *Renaissance Quarterly* vol. 38, no. 2 (Summer, 1985), pp. 271–289.
Miola, R. S. 'Reading the Classics' in David Scott Kastan (ed.), *A Companion to Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 172–185.
Milton, A., *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: the career and writing of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2007).
Momigliano, A., *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, MA, 1971).
Morgan, J., 'Brinsley, John (*fl.* 1581–1624)', *ODNB*.
Morgan, V., *A History of the University of Cambridge, Volume II, 1546–1750* (Cambridge, 2004).
Morris, Helen, 'Queen Elizabeth I "Shadowed" in Cleopatra', *The Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 32, no. 3 (May, 1969), pp. 271–278.
Moss, A., *Printed Commonplace books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, 1996).
Mulryne, J. R., 'Kyd, Thomas (*bap*. 1558, *d*. 1594)', *ODNB*.
Murphy, J. J., *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Aldershot, 2005).
Norbrook, D., *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London, 1984).
Norbrook, D., 'Lucan, Thomas May, and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture' in K. Sharpe and P. Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp. 45–66.
Norbrook, D. *Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric and politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 2000).
Norbrook, David, 'May, Thomas (*b*. in or after 1596, *d*. 1650)', *ODNB*.
Norman, A. M. Z., 'Daniel's *The Tragedie of Cleopatra* and *Antony and Cleopatra*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* vol. 9, no. 1 (Winter, 1958), pp. 11–18.
Norman, A. M. Z., *'The Tragedie of Cleopatra* and the date of *Antony and Cleopatra*', *The Modern Language Review* vol. 54, no. 1 (January, 1959), pp. 1–9.
O'Callaghan, J. F., 'Chapman's Caesar', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* vol. 16, no.2 (Spring, 1976), pp. 319–331.
O'Day, R., *Education and Society 1500–1800* (London, 1982).
Ohlmeyer, J., 'Literature and the New British and Irish Histories' in D. J. Baker and W. Maley (eds), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 245–255.
Ong, W. J., 'Commonplace Rhapsody: Ravisius Textor, Zwinger and Shakespeare' in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 91–126.
Pagden, A., *Lords of all the World: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France* c.*1500* - c.*1800* (New Haven and London, 1995).
Parker, B. L., *Plato's Republic and Shakespeare's Rome: a political study of the Roman works* (Newark, NJ, 2004).
Parrott, T. M., 'The "Academic Tragedy" of "Caesar and Pompey"', *Modern Language Review* 5 (1910), pp.435–445.
Parry, G, *The Golden Age Restor'd: the culture of the Stuart court, 1603–42* (Manchester, 1981).
Patterson Hannay, M., 'Herbert [Sidney], Mary, countess of Pembroke (1561–1621)', *ODNB*.
Pearson, J., 'Shakespeare and *Caesars Revenge*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* vol. 32 (1981), pp. 101–4.
Peltonen, M., *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, 1995) .
Peltonen, M. 'Citizenship and Republicanism in Elizabethan England', in M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage* (Cambridge, 2002), volume I, pp. 85–106.

Pettegree, A., 'Centre and Periphery in the European Book World', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 18 (December 2008), pp. 101–128.
Philip, I. G., and Morgan, P, 'Libraries, Books and Printing' in N. Tyacke, *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: seventeenth-century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 659–685.
Phillipson, N. T. and Skinner, Q. (eds), *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).
Piatt, W. L., 'Politics and Religion in Renaissance Closet Drama' (University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1998).
Pitcher, J., 'Daniel, Samuel (1562/3–1619)', *ODNB*.
Plett, H. F., *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture* (Berlin and New York, 2004).
Pocock, J. G. A., 'The Sense of History in Renaissance England' in J. F. Andrews (ed.), *William Shakespeare: his world, his work, his influence* 3 vols (New York, 1985), vol. 1, pp. 143–157.
Pocock, J. G. A., *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine political thought and the Atlantic republican tradition* (Princeton, NJ, 1975).
Poole, W., '*Julius Caesar* and *Caesars Revenge* Again', *Notes and Queries* vol. 49, no. 2 (2002), pp. 227–28.
Rawson, E. 'Caesar: civil war and dictatorship' in J. A. Crook, A. Lintott and E. Rawson (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 9: the last age of the Roman republic, 146–43 B. C.* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 424–67.
Raymond, J., 'John Hall's *Method of History*, a Book Lost and Found', *English Literary Renaissance* (November, 2008), pp. 267–98.
Rees, J., 'Samuel Daniel's *Cleopatra* and Two French Plays', *The Modern Language Review* vol. 47, no. 1 (January, 1952), pp. 1–10.
Rees, J., 'Shakespeare's Use of Daniel', *The Modern Language Review* vol. 55, no. 1 (January, 1960), pp. 79–82.
Reid, D., 'Alexander, William, first earl of Stirling (1577–1640)', *ODNB*.
Robinson, J. H., *Readings in European History* (Boston, MA, 1906).
Robinson Shipherd, H., 'Play-Publishing in Elizabethan Times', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* vol. 34, no. 4 (1919), pp. 580–600.
Rose, J., 'Rereading the English Common Reader: a preface to the history of audiences' in D. Finkelstein and A. McCleery (eds), *The Book History Reader* (London, 2002), pp. 324–39.
Rose, M., 'Conjuring Caesar', *English Literary Renaissance* vol. 19, no. 3 (1989), pp. 291–304.
Rose, P. L., 'The Politics of *Antony and Cleopatra*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* vol. 20, no. 4 (Autumn, 1969), pp. 379–389.
Salmon, J. H. M., 'Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', *Journal of the History of Ideas* vol. 50, no. 2 (April, 1989), pp. 199–225.
Salmon, J. H. M., 'Precept, Example and Truth: Degory Wheare and the *ars historica*' in D. R. Kelley and D. Harris Sacks (eds), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: history, rhetoric and fiction, 1500–1800* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 11–36.
Salt, S. P., 'Dering, Sir Edward, first baronet (1598–1644)', *ODNB*.
Scanlon, L., *Narrative, Authority and Power: the medieval exemplum and the Chaucerian tradition* (Cambridge, 1994).
Schanzer, E., 'The Problem *of Julius Caesar*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* vol. 6, no. 3 (Summer, 1955), pp. 297–308.
Schanzer, E., 'Daniel's Revision of his *Cleopatra*', *The Review of English Studies* vol. 8, no. 32 (November, 1957), pp. 375–381.
Schelling, F. E., *Elizabethan Drama, 1558–1642: a history of the drama in England from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the closing of the theaters, to which is prefixed a résumé of the earlier drama from its beginnings* (Boston, MA,1908).
Schmidt, H., 'Seneca's Influence upon *Gorboduc*', *Modern Language Notes* vol. 2, no. 2 (February, 1887), pp. 28–35.
Schurink, F., 'Education and Reading in Jacobean England' (University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 2004).

Schuster, E. J., 'Pedro de Mexía and Spanish Golden Age Historiography', *Renaissance News* vol. 13, no. 1 (Spring, 1960), pp. 3–6.
Scott, A.V., *Selfish Gifts: the politics of exchange and English courtly literature, 1580–1628* (Madison, NJ, 2006).
Scott, J., 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands', in M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage* (Cambridge, 2002), volume I, pp. 61–81.
Seward, P., 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and the Civil Wars of Europe' in P. Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA, 2006), pp. 285–306.
Shapiro, M., 'Boying Her Greatness: Shakespeare's Use of Coterie Drama in *Antony and Cleopatra*', *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 77, no. 1. (January, 1982), pp. 1–15.
Sharpe, K. and Lake, P. (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994).
Sharpe, K., *Remapping Early Modern England: the culture of seventeenth-century politics* (Cambridge, 2000).
Sharpe, K., *Reading Revolutions: the politics of reading in early modern England* (New Haven, Conn., and London, 2000).
Sharpe, K., *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: authority and image in sixteenth-century England* (New Haven, Conn., and London, 2009).
Sherlock, P., 'Fulman, William (1632–1688)', *ODNB*.
Sherman, W., *Used Books: marking readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008).
Shuger, D., *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: religion, politics and the dominant culture* (Berkeley, CA, 1990).
Simmons, J. C., 'Shakespeare's Treatment of Roman History' in J. F. Andrews (ed.), *William Shakespeare: his world, his work, his influence* 3 vols (New York, 1985), vol. 2, pp. 473–488.
Simon, J., *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge, 1966).
Slights, W. W. E., *Managing Readers: printed marginalia in English Renaissance books* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2001).
Skinner, Q., *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1978).
Skinner, Q., *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1998).
Skinner, Q., 'Classical Liberty and the Coming of the English Civil War', in M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, *Republicanism: a shared European heritage* (Cambridge 2002), volume II, pp. 9–28.
Skinner, Q., *Visions of Politics II: Renaissance Virtues* (Cambridge, 2002).
Skinner, Q., *Hobbes and Republican Liberty* (Cambridge, 2008).
Smith, D. S., *'The Tragoedy of Cleopatra Queene of Aegypt' by Thomas May, a critical edition* (New York, 1979).
Smuts, M., 'Court-Centred politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, *c*.1590–1630' in K. Sharpe and P. Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp. 21–44.
Smuts, M., 'Occasional Events, Literary Texts and Historical Interpretations' in R. Headlam-Wells, G. Burgess and R. Wymer (eds), *Neo-Historicism* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 155–178.
Somerville, J. P., *Politics and Ideology in England 1603–1640* (Harlow, 1986).
Spencer, T. J. B., 'Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans', *Shakespeare Survey* vol. 10 (1957), pp. 27–38.
Stacey, P., *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (Cambridge, 2007).
Stockton, D., *Cicero: A political biography* (London, 1971).
Starkey, D., *et al.* (eds), *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London, 1987).
Streete, A., 'Frances Quarles' Early Poetry and the Discourses of Jacobean Spenserianism', *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring, 2009), pp. 88–108.
Stirling, B., 'Cleopatra's Scene with Seleucus: Plutarch, Daniel, and Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Quarterly* vol. 15, no. 2 (Spring, 1964), pp. 299–311.
Strong, R. C., *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan portraiture and pageantry* (London, 1977).
Sutton, J., 'Leigh, Edward (1603–1671)', *ODNB*.

Syme, R., 'Roman Historians and Renaissance Politics' in *Society and History in the Renaissance: a report of a conference held at the Folger Library on April 23 and 24, 1960* (Washington, 1960), pp. 8–10.
Syme, R., *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1960).
Tilley, J., *A Catalogue of the Donations Made to Norwich City Library 1608–1656* (Cambridge, 2000).
Toews, J. E., 'Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: the autonomy of meaning and the irreducibility of experience', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 92, no. 4 (October, 1987), pp. 879–907.
Todd, M., 'The Samuel Ward papers at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, vol. 8 (1985), pp. 582–92.
Todd, M., *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, 1987).
Trentman, J. A., 'The Authorship of *Directions for a Student in the Universitie*', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, vol. 7 (1978), pp. 170–83.
Trompf, G. V., *The Idea of Recurrence in Western Thought: from antiquity to the Reformation* (Berkeley, CA, 1979).
Tuck, R., 'Humanism and Political Thought' in A. Goodman and A. Mackay (eds), *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe* (London, 1990), pp. 43–65.
Tyacke, N. (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV: seventeenth-century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997).
Walbank, F., *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge, 2002).
Walcott Beauchamp, V., 'Sidney's Sister as Translator of Garnier', *Renaissance News* vol. 10, no. 1 (Spring, 1957), pp. 8–13.
Walker, J. and Streufert, P. D. (eds), *Early Modern Academic Drama* (Aldershot, 2008).
Ward, A.W., Waller, A. R., *et al.* (eds), *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature* (New York, 1907–21).
Warren, R. (ed.), *The Art of Translation: voices from the field* (Boston, MA, 1989).
Watson, A. G., *The Library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London, 1966).
Watson, F., *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: their curriculum and practice* (Cambridge, 1908).
Watson, F., *The Old Grammar Schools* (London, 1916).
Watts, J. 'The policie in Christen Remes: Bishop Russell's Parliamentary sermons of 1483–84' in G.W. Bernard and S.J. Gunn, *Authority and Consent in Tudor England* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 33–60.
Weigel, R. D., *Lepidus: the tarnished triumvir* (London, 1992).
Weimann, R., *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse* (Baltimore and London, 1996).
Weinbrot, H. D., *Augustus Caesar in 'Augustan' England: the decline of a classical norm* (Princeton, NJ, 1978).
Weis, R. A. J., '*Caesars Revenge*: a neglected Elizabethan source of Antony and Cleopatra', *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (Heidelberg, 1983), pp. 178–86.
Wentworth-Shields, W. F., 'Godwin, Thomas (1586/7–1642)', *ODNB*.
Wheale, N., *Writing and Society: literacy, print and politics in Britain, 1590–1660* (London, 1999).
Whitfield, J. H., 'Livy>Tacitus' in R. R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 281–93.
Whitfield, J. H., *Discourses on Machiavelli* (Cambridge, 1969).
Williams, C. A., *Roman Homosexuality: ideologies of masculinity in classical antiquity* (Oxford, 1999).
Williamson, A. H., 'An Empire to End Empire: the dynamic of early modern British expansion' in P. Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006), pp. 223–252.
Williamson, M. L., 'The Political Context in *Antony and Cleopatra*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* vol. 21, no. 3 (Summer, 1970), pp. 241–251.

Williamson, M. L., *Infinite Variety: Antony and Cleopatra in Renaissance drama and earlier tradition* (Mystic, Conn., 1974).
Witherspoon, A. M., *The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama* (New Haven, 1924).
Womersley, D., 'Sir Henry Savile's Translation of Tacitus and the Political Interpretation of Elizabethan Texts', *The Review of English Studies* vol. 42, no. 167 (August, 1991), pp. 313–342.
Woolf, D. R., *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: erudition, ideology, and the light of truth from the accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, 1990).
Woolf, D. R., 'Little Crosby and the Horizons of Early Modern Historical Culture' in D. R. Kelley and D. Harris Sacks (eds), *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: history, rhetoric and fiction, 1500–1800* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 93–132.
Woolf, D. R., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000).
Woolf, D. R., *The Social Circulation of the Past: English historical culture 1500–1730* (Oxford, 2003).
Woolf, D. R., 'Fulbecke, William (*b.* 1559/60, *d.* in or after 1602)', *ODNB*.
Woolf, D. R., 'From Hystories to the Historical: five transitions in thinking about the past, 1500–1700' in P. Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA, 2006), pp. 31–67.
Worden, B., 'Ben Jonson and the Monarchy' in R. Headlam-Wells, G. Burgess and R. Wymer (eds), *Neo-Historicism* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 71–90.
Worden, B., 'Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: the English experience', in M. van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a shared European heritage* (Cambridge, 2002), volume I, pp. 307–27.
Worden, B., 'Historians and Poets' in P. Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA, 2006), pp. 69–90.
Wortham, J., 'Arthur Golding and the Translation of Prose', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 4 (August, 1949), pp. 339–367.
Wright, L. B., 'The Elizabethan Middle-Class Taste for History', *The Journal of Modern History* vol. 3, no. 2 (June, 1931), pp. 175–197.
Wright, L. B., 'Translations for the Elizabethan Middle Class', *Library*, vol. XIII, (December, 1932), pp. 312–31.
Yachnin, P., 'Shakespeare's Politics of Loyalty: sovereignty and subjectivity in *Antony and Cleopatra*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* vol. 33, no. 2 (Spring, 1993), pp. 343–363.
Yu, J. J., 'Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Erasmus's *De Copia*, and Sentential Ambiguity', *Comparative Drama* vol. 41, no. 1 (2007), pp. 79–106.
Zagorin, P., 'On Humanism Past and Present', *Daedalus* vol. 132, no. 4 (Autumn, 2003), pp. 87–92.
Zwicker, S. N., and Bywaters, D., 'Politics and Translation: the English Tacitus of 1698', *The Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 52, no. 3 (Summer, 1989), pp. 319–346.

Electronic Secondary Sources

Dzelzainis, M., 'The Ciceronian Theory of Tyrannicide from Buchanan to Milton', forthcoming in *George Buchanan: political thought in early modern Europe and the Atlantic world*, ed. Roger Mason and Caroline Erskine, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Ashgate), accessed at: http://recherche.univ-lyon2.fr/carma/IMG/pdf/Dzelzainis_-_T.pdf (11 September 2011).
Oates, J. C. T., *Cambridge University Library: a historical sketch* (Cambridge, 1975) accessed at: http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/history/2.html (11 September 2011).

INDEX