English Renaissance Readers and the *Appendix Vergiliana*

A paper given to the Virgil Society on 17 January 2004

Very little of note has been written about the reception history of the *Appendix Vergiliana* in England. Perhaps this is what one should expect, given that this group of poems has traditionally inspired debates about their date and their authorship rather than about their intrinsic interest or their reception. But there are two reasons why this gap in the study of Virgil's reception in English literature is notable, and perhaps even deplorable. The first of these reasons is reasonably dull: that the *Appendix* did have rather an interesting history in the sixteenth century, as these things go. The second reason why we should be uneasy about the present state of scholarship in this area is slightly less dull: many standard histories of Virgil in the Renaissance say or imply that 'Virgil' meant effectively only the *Aeneid*, the *Georgics*, and the *Eclogues*. This has led many literary historians, and even very good literary historians, to see the figure of Virgil in the sixteenth century as much simpler than in fact it was. Even a polymath such as Alastair Fowler, for instance, in *Kinds of Literature* outlines (and criticises) the stable form of the *rota Virgilii*, in which particular varieties of style and even allusions to particular kinds of trees are associated with particular phases in Virgil's career. Not even a spoke of the wheel allows for the possibility that anyone might ever have thought that Virgil wrote poems apart from the big three.[1] And literary historians who have focussed on literary careers often adopt an extremely simple model of the *cursus Virgilii*, which moves from pastoral to epic. Some slot in to that career-structure, more or less convincingly, some room for sonnets, hymns or other Christian forms. But very few indeed of those who have discussed literary careers in the Renaissance take at all seriously the fact that for most Renaissance readers Virgil's career was not a simple wheel or a simple *cursus* through the genres. Students of Edmund Spenser have had particular difficulty in this area. Few critics have been able to explain why Spenser produced a volume of *Complaints* in 1591, twelve years after the Virgilian *Shepheardes Calender* and a year after the appearance of the first three books of the epic *Faerie Queene*. Patrick Cheney, for instance, in his valuable study of Spenser's poetic career, finds almost no room at all for the *Complaints* volume,[2] while for Joseph Loewenstein the *Complaints* volume represents a 'serious interruption to a specifically

Virgilian cursus' – and that way of putting it implies that the volume represents an untoward bump in the road which buckles the wheel of a Virgilian career.[3] As we shall see, the *Complaints* volume makes a lot more sense as part of Spenser's career if one takes due account of the fact that throughout the sixteenth century a significant number of poems from the *Appendix Vergiliana* were regarded not as appendices to Virgil, but as *opuscula*, or little early works.

There are other reasons why the neglect of the *Appendix Vergiliana* has distorted critical understanding of English sixteenth century writing. It is a commonplace voiced by legions of scholars that there was some kind of stylistic incompatibility between sober Virgil and randy Ovid in the Renaissance, and that allusions to Ovid might simply undercut or qualify allusions to Virgil. This cliché too does not take account of the possibility that many poets in the Renaissance thought that Virgil started his career writing in what now looks like an Ovidian vein, in the *Culex* and the *Ciris*. The idea that the *Culex* or the *Ciris* or the satirical epigrams attributed to Virgil might be interesting for what they tell us about the reception of Virgil in the Renaissance, let alone in themselves, is almost entirely absent from secondary literature on the relationship between Renaissance English, and so far as my investigations have gone, European Renaissance literature more generally, and the classics. There are, as this paper will show, reasons, as well as a case, for that neglect; but there are also strong reasons for thinking that the *Appendix Vergiliana* mattered a great deal, at least for some Renaissance poets. What I will present here is a start of an attempt to show why and how the Appendix mattered. No doubt there will be further appendices to add as further aspects of the subject come to light.

*

The first question to ask in this investigation is how widely was the *Appendix* read, and in what form was it read, in the sixteenth century? The first of these questions can be answered with a cautious 'not much'. Girolamo Vida does recommend the young poet to try his arm with 'the fearsome fates of a gnat' in his *De Arte Poetica*.[4] But I know of no evidence that any of the poems customarily included in the *Appendix* were ever read in schools. They are not mentioned in the statutes or surviving timetables of St Paul's and Westminster or any other school in sixteenth century England, and there is no evidence that any measure of attention was accorded to them at the Universities. So where Shakespeare, for example, read quite a lot of Ovid and some of the *Aeneid* at school, there is no evidence of any kind that he ever read any of the poems from the *Appendix*.[5] John Stockwood, a schoolmaster at Tonbridge, preached a sermon in May 1579 in which he complained that among 'horrible beastly Authors [which] are taught in some schooles' are 'the most horrible beastliness of *Priapus* ioyned to the end of euery Virgil'. Stockwood, however, can scarcely be described as a proselytizer for reading the *Appendix*, since he suggests that good parents should rather see their children 'murthered and slaine before your eyes' than let them read such filth.[6] Adversaria and marginalia on editions of the *Appendix* from the sixteenth century are suspiciously rare, and some sixteenth-century Virgils which do contain manuscript annotations on the *Aeneid* have eloquently blank margins on the pages devoted to the *Appendix*. This does not necessarily mean that the *Appendix* remained unread, of course, but it may well indicate that the poems included in it were not routinely included in the systematic or semi-systematic readings of classical literature undertaken by humanist scholars to stock their commonplace books.

There was good reason for not reading these poems in this period. Quite apart from any more reputable reasons for their neglect, in the sixteenth century, as now, they always figure, if at all, at the back of collected editions of Virgil. As a result readers do have to plough through a lot to get to them. But readers who did persist in their journey through the majority of folio editions of Virgil before the 1570s would find major reasons for taking the poems in the Appendix seriously. Before this date they tend to

be given the same level of commentary as the canonical poems. This level of commentary, in volume if not always in quality, was high. Virgil's poems would be physically surrounded by commentary on the page. This practice is the origin of Pope's gorgeous line on annotators: they 'write about it, Goddess, and about it :| So spins the silk-worm small its slender store',[7] where 'about' does not just mean 'on the subject of', but also 'physically around it', sweetly choking the text in fine filaments of speculation. On several pages of early modern Virgils you can find occasions on which the commentators have virtually filled entire pages with swathes of annotation. The many variorum editions in folio provide the most muscle-bound commentaries, which often almost squeeze Virgil off the page entirely by surrounding him with glosses and comments by Lambinus, Ascensius, Servius, and Melancthon and others. One particularly influential commentator took a surprising degree of care over the *Appendix*. This was Jodocus Badius Ascensius, whose heavily annotated edition of Virgil's works first appeared in 1501.[8] (It was this edition which was extensively used in Gavin Douglas's translation of the *Aeneid* into Middle Scots). Ascensius' notes were frequently reprinted and pirated throughout the sixteenth century. His model readers included school-children, so as a result his commentary often consists of little more than careful paraphrases and advice on how to construe the text. But he does sometimes venture onto larger-scale interpretative flights. From 1517 onwards his edition was ornamented with handsome woodcuts, which had been originally carved to embellish Sebastian Brant's edition of 1502.[9] These continued to be printed with Ascensius' text well into the sixteenth century, and there are indications that these influence the woodcuts used in 1579 for the publication of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*.[10] Ascensius' commentary does not stop when he comes to the *Appendix* – although he, in common with all editors before the 1570s, does not term it the *Appendix*, but the *Opuscula*, or minor early works, which are given a volume to themselves in the edition of 1501. The woodcuts also continue to reflect the contents of the works which they illustrate with reasonable accuracy. The *Culex* is illustrated by a fine picture of a shepherd swatting his ear, while a snake (reared up in the posture familiar from many medieval representations of the temptation of Eve) stands ready to strike. (Presumably it is simply realism that makes the artist present the gnat as attacking the shepherd's ear, rather than his eye as he does in the poem; gnats are more audible than visible.) The *Ciris* has a close-up of Scylla cutting the lock in her father's castle, while Minos' troops encircle the city. These images ensure that for a reader of Ascensius the *Opuscula* look every bit as compelling as the *Aeneid*. In the case of the *Dirae* the woodcut makes the poem look perhaps even more canonical than some of the earlier poems in the volume, since it presents a picture of Virgil complete with his laurel wreath reciting his curses against a backdrop of Mantua. This woodcut illustrates how keen Renaissance editors and printers were to embed the *Appendix* in the life of Virgil, and to relate the poems in it to his status as *vates*.

The corpus of the *Appendix* was of course substantially larger for Ascensius and for later Renaissance readers and editors than it is for us, including as it did a number of moral epigrams (the 'Vir Bonus', 'On the Letter Y', 'Rosae' and 'Hortus' among others). Ascensius' commentary continues to hug the texts of these implausible *opuscula* in a particularly expansive version of his usual genially pedantic embrace. The poems which are given the longest commentary are the 'Vir Bonus' epigram and the epigram on envy (neither of which will be found in editions of the *Appendix* today). Here Ascensius' schoolmasterly and late medieval preoccupations come through: straightforwardly sententious and moral poems by the great Virgil are of course a late medieval schoolmaster's dream, and would strike a direct hit on the taste-buds of most late medieval readers. They are broadly equivalent to the moral *ballades* of Chaucer, which are given little critical attention today, but which in the early sixteenth century were widely admired and imitated.[11] But Ascensius is not simply interested in Virgil's *moralitas* when he glosses the *opuscula*. He is interested in the question of when and whether Virgil wrote the

poems, and is reasonably careful to distinguish between poems which are more and those which are less likely to be by Virgil himself – so the elegy on the death of Maecenas is described as 'incerti auctoris' and is given very skimpy commentary. He regards the *Culex* as an 'opusculum' written by Virgil when he was young, and describes it as 'in re tenui non tenuem gloriam meritum', a poem on a slender subject which deserves more than slender glory. The *Ciris* is, according to Ascensius, a poem from which Virgil borrowed later in life, and should be regarded as a trial of his talent ('*Nam plurima ex hoc in alia opera transtulisse constat: vt sicut de culice diximus hoc opusculum quasi sui ingenii tentamentum atque periculum praelusisse credere par sit*').[12] It is not hard in these remarks to see the influence of that other notable schoolmaster, Donatus' life of Virgil, on Ascensius: the received text of Donatus, of course, suggested that Virgil wrote the *Ciris* and the *Culex* in his early youth (by the time he was fifteen, according to some manuscripts, sixteen or seventeen according to others): modern texts have it that 'deinde catalecton et priapea et epigrammata et diras, item cirim et culicem, cum esset annorum XXVI'[13]; 'After this – though he was only 26 – he composed the *Catalecton*, as well as pieces about Priapus, as well as epigrams, as well as curses, along with poems about the ciris and the gnat'. Twenty-six seems young enough, but even this was older than the majority of Virgil's early readers believed him to have been when he composed the poems in the *Appendix*. Before Joseph Scaliger (who, as we shall see, played a vital part in the history of the *Appendix Vergiliana* in the sixteenth century) proposed emending 'XVI' to 'XXVI', the majority of editors present the author of the *Culex* and *Ciris* as little more than a boy. Donatus' opinion that the *Appendix* contained very early works was widely accepted in the early sixteenth century, and his life was frequently printed among the prefatory matter of early modern Virgils.[14] This means that the majority of early modern readers would have thought of Virgil as having started his career as both a satirist and a moralist, and most of them with any kind of ear who read the *Ciris* would have also thought that Virgil started his poetic career sounding very like – indeed anticipating – Ovid as well as his own mature works. As we shall see, all of these beliefs have a major influence on the understanding of Virgil in the Renaissance.

But not everyone would have incorporated the *opuscula* into their sense of the Virgilian *corpus*. Ascensius was popular, but there was a rival editorial tradition of the *Appendix* in the early years of print. Aldus Manutius, no less, in 1517 produced *Diversorum Veterum Poetarum in Priapum Lusus. CVM Catalecta. Copa. Rosae. Culex. Dirae. Moretum. Ciris. Aetna. Elegia in Mecoenatis obitum. Et alia nonulla, quae falso Virgilii creduntur*. Aldus' famous anchor emblem figures prominently on the title-page to give this edition a seal of authority; but of course one notable name – that of Virgil himself – is shunted right down the title page in a way that allows for the possibility that the entirety of the *Appendix* has 'falsely been believed to be by Virgil'. The collection was reprinted in 1534 to take account of Bembo's emendations of 1531, but judging by the number of editions which survive, it does not seem to have been popular. It does, however, mark one extreme of the tendency to separate the *Appendix* from the rest of Virgil in the sixteenth century, since it presents the entire group of poems in a form that is physically separate from the remainder of the works. Cheaper quarto editions of Virgil often included the *opuscula*, and sometimes gave them sparse glosses in the margins, but those which do include them seldom have longer notes on these lesser poems. A representative edition from 1563 with notes by Melancthon and others has longer notes on the canonical poems at the back of the volume, but has no notes on the *opuscula* at all.[15] A desire on the part of printers to make economies in these cases had the effect of marginalising the *Appendix*. Printerly economies, though, sometimes also had the opposite consequence: the one collected edition of Virgil's works to be printed in sixteenth-century England, Bynneman's of 1570, is a relatively modest affair, with brief marginal notes.[16] These extend to the poems in the *Appendix*. And a desire to save paper here presses the *Opuscula* into close, perhaps

unhealthily close, proximity to the *Aeneid*. Turnus's spirit flees murmuring to the shades half way down page 478, and 'P. Virgilii Maronis aliorumque poetarum opuscula' begins immediately below on the same page, without comment or introduction. A clear hierarchy is established in the titles to the poems which follow in Bynneman's edition: the *Culex* is Virgil's, as is the *Dirae*, the *Copa*, the *Moretum*, the Epigrams and the *Ciris*; but the *Aetna* is ascribed to Cornelius Severus.

Bynneman's edition preceded by two years the most significant event in the reception of the *Appendix* in the sixteenth century, and perhaps the biggest event in the reception history of the poems – a gnat-bite, of course, in comparison with major events in the reception history of the *Aeneid*, but still an event of note. This was the publication in 1572 of Joseph Scaliger's edition of the *Appendix*, which here, for the first time, was called the *Appendix*: *Publii Virgilii Maronis Appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum Poematum veterum Poetarum*. Anthony Grafton has described the text of this edition as 'a fascinating but confused hodge-podge of clever but unconnected insights and remarkably elementary mistakes',[17] and notes its debts to the edition of the *Appendix* by Theodore Poelman (Antwerp, 1566), from which it even reprints misprints. Despite the textual shortcomings of this early work by Scaliger, his edition of 1572 marks an important moment because in its very title it creates a hierarchy of Virgilianness: the whole group of works is an *Appendix*; but it is an appendix *cum supplemento*, with a supplement of never before printed poems by ancient poets. Scaliger's tone in the volume is defensive, since he is anxious about the morality of the *Priapea* in particular; but he is also insistent that some of the poems in the *Appendix* are by Virgil, and that they are not just *opuscula*. It is not quite clear why Scaliger termed the collection an appendix, but it may have been to avoid that potentially pejorative term *opusculum*, and to make his collection appear newer in its content than it actually was. Scaliger was indeed less original than he wished to appear: he expresses views about the authorship of the poems which are in one crucial respect very similar to those of Ascensius a generation before. He hardens up the tradition that Virgil wrote the *Ciris* and the *Culex*. In other respects he is much more of a sceptic than Ascensius: he denies Virgil wrote the *Aetna*, ascribes the *Dirae* to Cato Grammaticus, shares the *Priapea* among Catullus, Tibullus and Petronius, and denies that Virgil composed the *Copa*. It is Scaliger's comments on the *Culex* and the *Ciris* which are of particular interest, however. He argues for Virgil's authorship of the *Ciris* and gives it high praise:

> *Est autem prorsus cultissimum poematium, & quod nulli Latinorum neque nitore, neque elegantia cedat: atque adeo quod venustate sua merebat, vt minus ad nos deprauatum veniret.*[18]
>
> It is a most cultivated poem, and is second to none in Latinity, polish, or elegance, and so its beauty deserves that it should come down to us less corrupted.

But his comments on the *Culex* are even more significant. He launches a withering attack on the tradition stemming from Donatus that Virgil had written the poem very early in his life, on the grounds that it shows far too high a level of knowledge of the arts and sciences to have been written when he was a mere teenager:

> *Quanquam hoc poematium quo anno aetatis suae scripserit Virgilius, plane compertum non habemus: tamen maiorem natu scripsisse satis constat, quam voluerit eius vitae auctor, ignobilis Grammaticus: qui annos tantum quindecim natum vult hoc poematium confecisse.*[19]
>
> Although we have not certainly discovered the year in which Virgil wrote this poem, nonetheless it's likely that he wrote it when he was older than that dumb schoolteacher who wrote his life believes, who wants him to have written this poem when he was only fifteen.

The *Culex* and the *Ciris* emerge from Scaliger's edition as not just *opuscula* or *dubia*; they emerge as significant works of a poet on the threshold of maturity, albeit works which it is hard to pin down within an absolutely reliable chronology of Virgil's verse.

Although Scaliger's edition was a major event, its longer-term consequences were not what one might expect. It did *not* lead to the incorporation of the *Ciris* and the *Culex* into the larger body of Virgil's works, nor did it result in the discarding of the penumbra of supplementary elements in the *Appendix*. This is partly because of a law of attribution studies which has near universal force: that the force required to remove a work from the body of an author's *dubia* is directly proportional to the status of that author. The other reason why it did not lead to a more divisive treatment of different poems in the *Appendix* is because Scaliger's work itself came to enjoy such enormous respect. This meant that his edition had curious consequences for the reception of the *Appendix*. The first was that a number of folio editions of Virgil after 1572 incorporate Scaliger's commentary more or less in its entirety. The earliest folio edition of this type which I have seen appeared in 1575, a mere three years after Scaliger's *Appendix* was first printed, and boasts of its appendix on its title-page*: P Virgilius Maro, et in eum Commentationes, & Paralipomena Germani Valentis Guellii, eiusdem Virgilii Appendix, cum Josephi Scaligeri Commentariis & castionibus*. That phrase *eiusdem Virgilii Appendix* is deeply relishable, and differs notably from the modern preferred title, '*Appendix Vergiliana*'. It means 'the appendix of the same Virgil': it consists, presumably, of works which are both part of the *corpus* and separable from it. Scaliger's labour did much to augment the scholarly tradition of commentary to the *Appendix*. But the weight of Scaliger's scholarly reputation was also sufficient to enforce a graphic separation of the *Appendix* from the rest of Virgil's *oeuvre*. The physical form of the 1575 Antwerp folio enforces the effect of the appendix as both part and not part of the volume in which it appears. The major works are surrounded with commentary in the orthodox way. The poems in the *Appendix*, however, are printed without any commentary on the same page. Scaliger's notes are reproduced in full, but they are reproduced on separate pages after the text, as endnotes. These features typographically encode the message that the *Appendix* is a separate body of material from the poems which have gone before.

The effect of Scaliger's edition on how readers might have responded to Virgil in the later sixteenth century might be summed up in this way: the *Appendix* would have been more, rather than less, detached from the corpus of Virgil than it was before, but it would have enjoyed a higher status as the subject of fashionable scholarly debate. The *Ciris* and the *Culex* would appear to those who read Scaliger's notes to be by Virgil, but it was still not clear when they were composed: were they juvenilia, or just earlier works on which the mature Virgil drew? Was Virgil 15, or as Scaliger would later prefer, 26? An up-to-the minute person who read Virgil after 1572 would think that the great poet started his career not as the author of Eclogues in imitation of Theocritus, but as a poet who started off looking as though he was imitating Virgil. Careful readers of the entire Virgilian corpus (and it is of course not possible to be sure how many of these there actually were) would believe that satirical epigrams and *Priapeia* were also possibly part of the works of Virgil. Now, if we accept R.O.A.M. Lyne's view that the *Ciris* in particular is something approaching a cento of lost neoteric epyllia which influenced Ovid and others,[20] then we have the further enticing thought that scholars and at least some poets in the late sixteenth century would have believed that Virgil began life sounding not only as though he was imitating Virgil, but also as though he was one of Ovid's sources. This is a particularly significant possibility, since it implies that for some readers of Virgil in the Renaissance literary history would have appeared to go backwards as well as forwards, with a set of late derivatives of Virgil appearing to be the origins not only of some of Virgil's works but also of some of Ovid's too.

As a result the *Appendix Vergiliana* in the sixteenth century made mischief for literary history: it made Virgil into his own source, and made Virgil appear to belong to the same poetic universe as Ovid. This was a major aspect of its literary influence.

*

How did all of this affect sixteenth-century England? A variety of strange things happened to Virgil in England in this period: a cento by Lelio Capilupi (*Cento ex Virgilii de vita monachorum*) was reprinted in 1565,[21] and a Greek translation of Book 2 was printed in 1553. There was also, of course, a flourishing tradition of translating the major works.[22] But there was in this period no translation of the *Appendix*, although individual poems from it do crop up in odd places and at odd times through the century. These are very various, but they do suggest that the poems in the *Appendix* were perhaps perceived as more accommodating than their fully canonical brethren, and that they these poems could fit quite comfortably into a literary system that was generically more fluid than its Roman equivalent. This is true of the earliest example of an English translation from the *Appendix*. This is found in a particularly surprising place. Henry Parker, Lord Morley's *Tryumphes of Fraunces Petrarcke, translated out of Italian into English* is famous as the first printed example of a substantial body of translations from Petrarch. It was probably printed in 1565; although there is a great deal of uncertainty about when it was written the recent consensus is that the translation was first undertaken in the early 1520s.[23] Morley's volume ends with a very free translation of an epigram printed in the majority of editions of the *opuscula* in this period, 'De Venere et Vino'. This was described in the old *Dictionary of National Biography* as 'an original poem' by Morley, which it is not. Morley's translation is not an uplifting work, and even the briefest comparison with the original shows that it is an expansive moral commentary rather than a literal translation. Morley transforms the direct speech of the 'Virgilian' epigram into indirect speech: 'Virgil says that ...' precedes a broad, moralising and, it must be said, undistinguished paraphrase of the original:

> That wonderous wytty Virgil that so wel cold endight
> The wayes to wyne to virtue righte harde for to attayne
> In his sententiouse verses declareth with reason right
> Howe that both wyne and women doth put a man to payne
> He sayth in passyng measure with eyther of these twayne
> It is a thyng abhominable. Nowe here what he doth tell
> Although my ryme be rude to touche so high a vayne
> Yf that ye marke this doctrine doubtles ye shall do well.[24]

This in its general method if not its precise detail almost certainly derives from Ascensius's commentary, which is prefixed by a general description of what Virgil is saying in the poem (*Nunc vero de Venere & vino locuturus, quorum abusus, non usus, malus est: inquit*)[25] and which then goes on to say that drink and sex in excess un-man us (*At quantum ebrietas detestanda sit facillime constabit: si hominem potum inspexeris: qui iam omne id ... quo a belluis ferisque differimus, exuit*).[26] Although it is impossible to pin down a precise source for such flabby paraphrase, it is very likely that Morley had Ascensius in front of him as he translated. The important thing about Morley's translation, though, apart from showing us that the *opuscula* could be used to present Virgil as a moral sage, is its strange position in the printed volume. It acts as a form of generic segue from the *Trionfi*, which precede it, to the epitaph on Morley which follows it. In this respect it is perhaps an early example of a tendency in English Renaissance poetry to show an interest in texts which stand in a questioning or transitional generic relationship to the poems either side of them. In later sonnet sequences, including Spenser's

Amoretti and Daniel's *Delia*, such segue poems were quite frequently used as a way of bridging the divide between Petrarchan poems and works in other genres – complaints or epithalamia – and the generically transitional poems themselves could be anacreontics, odes, or English versions of neo-Latin pieces. Morley's volume gives an impression that the uncertainties surrounding the dates and canonical status of poems in the *Appendix* might have extended in the early sixteenth century to their genre: they were poems which no-one quite knew how to place, because they could not be fitted within a clear career structure or hierarchy of genres, and could not even be reliably contained within a single corpus. They were as a result, oddly enough, the most assimilable poems in the Virgilian canon: to imitate the *Aeneid* was to engage with a clear set of generic expectations; but to translate the 'Virgilian' epigrams was a far less clearly defined kind of activity, and the poems could be freely dressed anew.

A glance forward to the 1620s shows that the epigrams later allowed Virgil to be re-dressed in a very literal way. He is presented in the woodcut which precedes John Penkethman's translation of the epigrams as a Jacobean gallant (the woodcut is very similar to several used in rogue pamphlets from the 1590s, and clearly was not purpose-made).[27] Penkethman's preface is of some interest, even though his translations are very undistinguished: it says that he regarded translating Virgil's epigrams as an alternative to writing epigrams of 'scandalous and reprehensive invective', for which there had been a vogue since the mid-1590s. He also says that his translation is a slap in the face for 'self-conceited grammarians' who had sought to keep the epigrams to themselves.[28] This is further evidence that the poems in the *Appendix* were not widely read in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England, and indeed were regarded as little better than bedtime reading for Holofernes and his ilk. But the vital point to carry away from the interest in the Virgilian epigrams is that for Renaissance readers and writers it was entirely possible to be a satirist and a laureate poet if not at the same time, then at least in sequence: after all, Virgil had done it.

*

Edmund Spenser is the only English poet in the sixteenth century who provides an extensive and sophisticated response to the poems in the *Appendix*. His response does not just show him to have been a careful reader of the poems themselves: it also indicates that he was aware of the arguments which surrounded these poems in the sixteenth century. Spenser, like his contemporaries, was not sure how young Virgil was when he wrote them, and knew that they occupied a slightly odd position in the canon. Like other Renaissance readers he noticed many of the echoes in the *Appendix* of the canonical works (which scholars today might read as signs that the poems are Virgilian pastiches), but he, like his contemporaries, probably thought these were signs that these poems were early works on which Virgil later drew. We have also seen that poems in the *Appendix*, and especially the epigrams, could serve to bridge the divide between genres and different aspects of a poet's career, and that the *Appendix* in general did something to straddle the perceived divide between epic and satire in this period. All of these things mattered to Spenser.

Spenser's first engagement with the *Appendix* probably came when he rendered the *Culex* into a poem entitled *Virgils Gnat*. The poem appeared first in volume called *Complaints*, which appeared in 1591. This volume has given rise to a fair amount of debate among Spenserians.[29] Published between the two printed instalments of *The Faerie Queene*, the collection contains a miscellany of complaints of various forms, ranging from specific political satires, through beast fable and metamorphic narrative, to laments for the world's mutability. People who have written overviews of Spenser's career have often been puzzled by this volume, or have overlooked it entirely. What was Spenser doing in

publishing a volume of miscellaneous complaints in between the publication of the first three books of *The Faerie Queene* in 1590 and the final three books in 1596? How could he intercalate satire into a laureate career?[30] The most radical argument about this matter to date has been put forward by Jean Brink, who claimed that Spenser himself probably had nothing to do with the printing of the volume, which, she argues, was put together piecemeal by its printer William Ponsonby.[31] Ponsonby does indeed include a preface saying that he has gathered the collection together in Spenser's absence, but Brink is perhaps naïve to assume that the printer should be taken literally when he makes this claim, and she may also be too quick to assume that the sharper edges of satire were incompatible with Spenser's laureate career. The *Complaints* is very clearly set forth as a collection of juvenilia, and as being semi-separate from Spenser's corpus: it shares a printer with *The Faerie Queene*, but its author is partially detached from the volume. The prefatory and dedicatory matter of several of the separate sections of the collection are keen to emphasise that the works which follow were composed some time before their publication. So *Mother Hubberds Tale* is presented as having been 'long sithens composed in the raw conceipt of my youth',[32] and *Virgils Gnat* itself is introduced on its title-page as having been 'Long since dedicated to the most noble and excellent Lord, the Earl of Leicester, late deceased'.[33] This dedication has given rise to a number of speculations – which are unlikely ever to be satisfactorily resolved as a result of the paucity of evidence – about the allegorical and biographical significance of *Virgils Gnat*. (Leicester failed to reward his poor servant Edmund Spenser for some unspecified warning, and sent him instead to Ireland, that swampy hell on earth; this is the basic gist of most of these theories, some of which throw in the notion that Spenser was responsible for leaking news of Leicester's ill-advised marriage to Lettice Knowles to add a trace of sexual scandal to the speculation.)[34]

The most important words in the preliminary description of *Virgils Gnat* are, however, not 'The Earl of Leicester' but 'long since'. As we have seen, arguments were going on since 1572 about when Virgil composed his *opuscula*. Was he sixteen? Was he 26? The dedication to Spenser's translation is designed to parallel this uncertainty about when the poem was composed; and the uncertain time-frame of the poem's composition has the further benefit of introducing a possibility of personal or political satire, whilst not giving its readers enough of a clue to be able to penetrate the heart of the mystery. The presentation of *Virgils Gnat* is part of a pretty consistent policy in the *Complaints* volume to invent satirical and metamorphic juvenilia for Spenser: it is, as it were, an *Appendix Spenseriana*.

Before I develop this claim it is worth pausing to say something very simple about Spenser's translation of the *Culex*: that it is an extremely lovely poem (although its first half, which reads as though it is more worked up, is better than its later sections). This would not be worth saying if the poem had attracted any significant amount of commentary or any sympathetic criticism, but it has not.[35] Lottspeich determined many years ago now that the text from which Spenser translated it was an edition similar to or deriving from a Dumaeus edition of 1542 (Spenser incorporates Bembo's emendations, but does not take any account of Scaliger's); but apart from that critics have found little to say about what makes the poem worth reading. Richard Brown concludes merely that 'It is a text which articulates the tensions between Elizabethan writers and their classical models'.[36] No-one has made the straightforward observation that it contains some ravishing phrases: its 'whelky pearles' (105) are echt Spenserian beauties, and the description of the gnat as 'a little noursling of the humid ayre' (282) makes the gnat a child of wetness, just emerging from the air as a solidification of the damp, which is just how gnats feel until they bite you. This phrase 'a little noursling of the humid ayre' is part of what is not only beautiful but also significant in the poem: it gives a strong sense of beginnings, and of tender new growth. This is

the main way in which Spenser makes up for his lack of a ready equivalent for the neoteric code-word *tenuis* on which the Latin plays twice in its proem (2, 35). English has no equivalent for the promise of slightness and neoteric elegance which is promised by that word, which is why Spenser has to turn it into a term for youth and delicacy. The 'thin-spun task' of the opening of the *Culex* becomes 'Tuning our song vnto a *tender* Muse' (2; my emphasis); a little later the same word *tenuis* is rendered by 'An easie running verse with *tender* feete' (53; my emphasis). These are not just misprisions of a promise of elegance in the Latin. They are part of a consistent process of stressing that Spenser's poem deals in beginnings, in earliness and freshness: the Latin *coepta* (41), too, takes on not just an exordial force in the sense 'the job that I have begun'; it is translated in a way that suggests the poem could be Spenser's (or Virgil's) very first beginning: 'O come (thou sacred childe) come sliding soft, | And fauour *my beginnings* graciously' (37-8; my emphasis).

The poem seeks to be not *tenuis* (sophisticatedly slight), but tender, a young man's poem. As a result its best passages are places which seem fresh and newly alive. It can use the superabundance of syllables provided by feminine rhymes to evoke an overpacked fresh abundance to a deliciously engaging effect:

The verie nature of the place, resounding
With gentle murmure of the breathing ayre,
A pleasant bowre with all delight abounding
In the fresh shadowe did for them prepayre,
To rest their limbs with wearines redounding. *(185-9)*

Echoes and murmurs expand uncontrollably from their pretext in the *Culex*, as though they reverberate with something in Spenser. And here it is possible to inch beyond the pre-critical naivety of saying that the poem is beautiful, and say something which sounds even more obvious. The poem sounds Spenserian; it can do bowers, even if not yet Bowers of Blisse and, as has been frequently noted, it takes every chance the original offers to bewail the mutability of the world in a manner which was to become a trademark of Spenserianism:

Well may appeare by proofe of their mischaunce,
The chaungfull turning of mens slipperie state,
That none, whom fortune freely doth aduaunce,
Himselfe therefore to heauen should eleuate:
For loftie type of honour through the glaunce
Of enuies dart, is downe in dust prostrate;
And all that vaunts in worldly vanitie,
Shall fall through fortunes mutabilitie. *(553-60)*

The pretext in the Latin for this is slight, and puts the emphasis on envy rather than mutability, and fortune is a positive force:

illa uices hominum testata est copia quondam,
ne quisquam propriae fortunae munere diues
iret ineuectus caelum super: omne propinquo
frangitur inuidiae telo decus. (*Culex* 339-42)[37]

That force bore witness in its time to human vicissitudes, lest anyone, enriched by his own Fortune's bounty, should mount exalted above the heavens; all glory is shattered by Envy's nigh-awaiting dart.

Spenser's translation of this passage does more than show that he is unable to resist any opportunity to bewail the mutability of the world, or that he is under the doleful enchantment of the *Mirror for Magistrates*. Rather Spenser's elaboration makes the *Gnat* seem imaginatively cognate with the complaints on the world's vanity which have preceded it in the *Complaints* volume. As a result, it insinuates the poem into the Spenserian corpus. And this makes it one of a large number of moments at the start of the poem which recall other moments in Spenser's works. And should 'recall' more properly be 'anticipate'? We cannot be sure if this poem is, as it were, pre-Spenserian or post-Spenserian, whether it tenderly anticipates *The Faerie Queene*, or whether part of the lexis of that poem is fed back into the language of what is presented to us as a belatedly printed early work. The catalogue of trees (193-224) certainly points back to one Spenserian beginning: in 1591 it would remind even the least tenacious reader of the start of Spenser's epic, since very near the start of Book I Canto i of *The Faerie Queene* the Redcrosse knight journeys through the forest of error, and his journey is beset by a similar catalogue of trees (1.1.8-9). When the list of trees in the *Gnat* gets to the ivy which defends the poplar from the sun, readers of the poem in 1591 might well have felt that they have already traced the trails of this particular plant across earlier Spenserian pages, and that this is both a beginning and an innocent pre-echo of the falsely twining ivy in the Bower of Bliss. 'Emongst the rest the clambring Yuie grew, | Knitting his wanton armes with grasping hold', we read in *Virgils Gnat* (217-18). Wanton Ivy repeatedly winds through Book II of *The Faerie Queene* 'Ouer the which was cast a wandring vine, | Enchaced with a wanton yuie twine' (2. 9.24.5),[38] which eventually becomes the sophisticatedly artificial twines in the Bower of Blisse:

> *And ouer all, of purest gold was spred,*
> *A trayle of yuie in his natiue hew:*
> *For the rich mettall was so coloured,*
> *That wight, who did not well auis'd it vew,*
> *Would surely deeme it to be yuie trew:* (2.12.61)

Here a reader might feel *Virgils Gnat* is a beginning;[39] a fresh and simply wanton swirl of ivy, ripe to turn into a piece of studied artifice, just as the catalogue of trees is awaiting its later metamorphosis into a moralised forest of Errour. Elsewhere the *Gnat* offers traces too of the sterner side of Spenser. In *The Faerie Queene* Spenser's heroes are often subject to fits of galvanic passion, which stimulate them to action. One of these galvanic moments is evoked when the Shepherd kills the gnat: 'Wherewith enrag'd, he fiercely gan vpstart' (289). There is no precise parallel to this in *The Faerie Queene*, but it is an unmistakable Spenserianism: Cymocles 'fiercely gan approch' (2.8.44.3) his adversary, and there are all but innumerable moments when starts of rage lead to the 'upstarting' of characters in *The Faerie Queene*. Spenserian trademarks are being inserted into the Virgilian poem.

We do not know when Spenser composed *Virgil's Gnat*. We do not know if he revised it, although he manifestly did revise for the *Complaints* volume several of the sonnets in *The Ruines of Rome*, from versions he had originally composed in the 1560s. It is possible that he retouched at least its early sections in order to make it resound as closely as it does at several points with the first three books of *The Faerie Queene*. The alternative hypothesis, which is the simpler and therefore the one that Occam would prefer, is that *Virgil's Gnat* was an early and foundational poem in his career, in which he began to sound like Spenser. It is probably neither possible nor desirable to decide between these alternatives, since the poem as it is presented to its readers in 1591 is both early and later Spenser; it is presented as having been composed 'long since', and yet anyone reading it after the publication of the first three books of *The Faerie Queene* would have heard in it echoes of the longer and greater and both subsequent and precedent poem,

and would have experienced it as a beginning of a story of which they knew the middle if not the end (*The Faerie Queene* of course remained unfinished in 1590, and even remained unfinished after the posthumous publication of the *Mutabilitie Cantos* in 1609).

How does this relate to the position of the *Appendix Vergiliana* in the Renaissance? Sixteenth century readers generally regarded these post-Virgilian poems as early Virgil; as a result they had an extraordinarily topsy-turvy view of how Virgil wrote. They had good grounds to believe that he began by quoting Virgil, that he did the epic journey to the underworld in the minor key first, sung by the shrill voice of a gnat, before he did it for real in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*. In the *Gnat,* Spenser is picking out these notes and doing something similar: he almost makes it appear that he began his literary career by imitating Spenser. What both *Virgils Gnat* and the Virgilian *Appendix* as it was read in the Renaissance give you, then, is a style that *starts* with self-pastiche, in which a pre-write masquerades as a rewrite, or in which a pre-write and a rewrite are indistinguishable.

*

There is another major imitation from the *Appendix Vergiliana* in Spenser's works to which I would now like to move either backwards or forwards, depending on one's point of view. This occurs in Book III Canto ii of *The Faerie Queene*, which had been printed in 1590, the year before the *Gnat*. It relates how Britomart, the heroine of Book III, fell in love with her future dynastic partner Arthegall when she saw him in a magic mirror. The detail of her passion, and her relationship with Glauce, her nurse, have been recognised as imitations of the *Appendix* ever since Thomas Warton said that Spenser 'copied' the love of Scylla from the *Ciris*.[40] More recently the episode has been described by Nelson as a 'perverse' imitation of the Virgilian poem.[41] It is clearly no copy, and clearly is the product of a form of aggressive imitation of a kind quite different from Spenser's (presumably) earlier treatment of the *Culex*. 'Perverse' is probably not the right word for it, though. What Spenser does in his version of the love of Scylla is to take a sledgehammer to the motivational centre of the Virgilian poem. Instead of describing the passion of Scylla for the enemy of her city Minos, he adopts the name of Charme's daughter Britomartis for his heroine. Britomartis in the *Ciris* fled away from Minos and, according to some versions of the story, fell off a cliff. As Scaliger notes, quoting from Solinus, Britomartis was a Cretan name for Diana:

> *Cretes Dianam religiosissime uenerantur,* Βριτόμαρτιν *gentiliter nominantes: quod sermone nostro sonat uirginem dulcem.*[42]

What Spenser does is write what is effectively a twinned alternative tale of Scylla's passion, in which a *virgo dulcis* associated with Diana is put in the place of Scylla. As a result he rewrites the *Ciris* from the inside out, forcibly excising moments from it which allude to the anti-civic passion of Scylla. The result risks creating a motivational void at the centre of the imitation on which Spenser's version of the tale actively plays: without its antisocial passion, what *is* the *Ciris*? In Spenser's revision of it, it becomes the tale of a passionate love of the chaste Britomart for a man in a mirror who may not even exist at all. The motivational vacuum has a point made of it: the figure of Arthegall in the mirror may not even have a carnal being. This transformation is not 'perverse'; in sexual terms it is trying to be as un-perverse as you can get by founding itself on a passion so chaste that its object may not even exist; but in literary terms it is also not simply blasting the centre out of the *Ciris*. Rather it is feeding on the imitative poetics of the *Ciris*. The *Ciris* emphasises the fact that it is not like Ovid's tale of Myrrha (and possibly also that it is not like earlier epyllia which had incest as a theme).[43] Carme asks Scylla if she loves her father incestuously, and she retorts: *nil amat hic animus, nutrix, quod oportet amari, | in quo falsa tamen lateat pietatis imago* (262-3). This is Scylla's way of establishing her own distinctiveness: she denies that she feels the kind of incestuous passion that had characterised Ovid's Myrrha (or perhaps one of the neoteric sources of Ovid's

Myrrha). As a result, her love is a kind of nothing, not even a false *imago pietatis* like that of Myrrha in Ovid. Now that Virgilian phrase *pietatis imago* – no need to chart its uses in the *Aeneid* (6.405, 9.294, 10.824) here – is clearly being warped by the poet. And the same phrase has a strong bearing on how Spenser transforms the tale. Britomart falls literally and hard for an *imago*, a man in a mirror. And this in turn guarantees the distinctiveness of her passion, which in its turn is defined negatively, as being not like those of her predecessors:

> But mine is not (quoth she) like other wownd;
> For which no reason can finde remedy. (3.2.36)

The stress falls on 'not'; this passion, the parenthesis insists, is as distinctive as Scylla's. What she describes is not not incest; it's not even for a man ('Nor man it is, nor other liuing wight'). The insistence on the negative uniqueness of her passion continues in the next stanza 'For no no vsuall fire, no vsuall rage | Yt is, O Nourse, which on my life doth feed'. There is perhaps something going on here that one might call *kenosis*, the sucking out of the motivational centre of a source and its replacement by pure emptiness:[44] Britomart is not like her source, indeed not like anyone. But this negativity in Britomart's passion does not go the whole way down, since there is a little hint of salvation which grows out of that Virgilian phrase *imago pietatis*. *Imago* can mean 'image' of course, and an image is exactly what Britomart does love. That Virgilian phrase comes finally to be retranslated back from a description of incestuous passion (into which the author of the *Ciris* has mischievously transformed it, the parody of *pietas*) into a description of affection which is rootedly civic. I think Spenser is rolling this phrase around his mind, and is attempting to transform the *imago pietatis* back from what he would have seen as a youthful abuse of *pietas* by the young Virgil into something of which the grown up Virgil might have approved. Britomart, it transpires, is not just in love with an *imago* in a mirror, but with the man who is to be her dynastic partner; it is finally a pious love for an *imago pietatis*, which will be translated ultimately into a fit motive for a dynastic epic.

Now Book III is perhaps best regarded as a book of beginnings (forms of the word 'begin' occur significantly more frequently in that book than in any other part of *The Faerie Queene*; it contains eighteen such forms, while Book IV comes next with eleven usages). It is so in a number of senses. A particular feature of its narrative structure is a tendency to regress to moments prior to the literal time of the main narrative. It does this extra-diegetically when it relates the contents of chronicle histories read by characters within the fiction. It also recoils to consider the birth of Belphoebe and Amoret in Canto vi. I have argued elsewhere that such moments of temporal disruption in the poem are associated with a peculiarly violent release of imitative energy; that is, Spenser's sources tend to be more radically transformed at such moments of retrospection than they are at moments within the main temporal sequence of the narrative.[45] Put simply, locating events in the past gives Spenser an imaginative licence to transform earlier texts. It has also been suggested that Book III is best regarded as a book of beginnings in another sense: Josephine Waters Bennett argued many years ago now that it contained material from the earliest stages of composition of the poem. Her argument, which no one has seriously attacked, but which few have seriously explored either, rests on the fact that we know Spenser was thinking about Ariosto hard in the 1570s, and that Book III contains an unusually high number of borrowings from Ariosto.[46] Bennett also showed that several of those moments deriving from Ariosto were spliced with audible awkwardness into Book III. Now the story of Britomart's early love for Arthegall is a beginning; it partakes in a sense in the etiological preoccupations of the *Ciris* in that it tells not of the origins of a sea-bird but the origins of a state of mind. It is also spliced with audible awkwardness into the main narrative sequence, and the sleight of hand required to stitch it into the poem is both considerable and visible. Britomart sets off, we are told in the argument, with

the Redcrosse knight; in the text of the poem she is with Guyon. The confusion over names may well indicate a rough edit. Redcrosse (or Guyon) praises Arthegall. Then the narrator says:

> By straunge occasion she did him behold,
> And much more straungely gan to loue his sight,
> As it in bookes hath written beene of old. (3.2.18)

This is evasive writing: the books 'of old' presumably are the books which record the magic mirror in which she sees her lover, but they also presumably mark some kind of allusion to the deep indebtedness of what follows to the *Ciris*. I think it is extremely likely that the *Ciris* episode was among the earlier sections of *The Faerie Queene* to have been composed. It is possible that Spenser translated the poem as he had done the *Culex* and then mined his translation when he came to write the *Faerie Queene*, just as Ascensius had suggested Virgil did with his earlier works. Certainly there are moments when you can feel the surgeon's knife slicing away a section of ethically dubious matter from the heroine before Spenser proceeds to follow the *Ciris* very closely. But the more powerful point is that the episode imitated from the *Ciris* is framed and staged for readers of the poem as a beginning. It is the start of her love, which is described by Glauce as having had a 'strange beginning' and it disrupts the forward movement of the narrative by a recoil into the past. It is another of Spenser's original fictions, fictions about origins which at the same time make claims to originality by marking their radical transformation of an earlier work.

How does Spenser's response to the *Ciris* mesh with early-modern conceptions of what went on in the *Appendix Vergiliana*? There are some obvious things to say here and some less obvious things to say. The most obvious thing to say would be that here we have evidence that Spenser knew of Donatus' belief that the *Ciris* was early. He may have engaged with it early in his own career, and he certainly tags it within his poem as a work about an 'early' state of mind; the imitation of it occurs not in the epic present of his heroine's life but in her proto-epic phase, a phase where she might just have ended up trapped within an epyllion (and the allusions to the subjects of Ovidian tales of metamorphosis in the early part of the tale of Britomart are more than ornamental: the allusions to Myrrha and Byblis and Narcissus, that other great specular lover, lay out possible options for her future in a manner which suggests both a personal and a generic threat – she could end up in the wrong kind of poem entirely). A less obvious thing to say would be that the episode suggests that Spenser may well not just have known what Donatus said about the *Ciris* being a piece of juvenilia. He may also have known what Ascensius said: that the poem was a fine work on which Virgil drew later in his career. And he might have known what Scaliger said, that it is a poem for which it is impossible to determine finally a date, and which might actually be a more or less mature product of the poet. Spenser's story of the beginnings of Britomart's love is a passage of hazy age, recorded in books of old, and yet it is sufficiently close in its temporal relation to the time scale of the main narrative to be joined almost but not quite seamlessly onto it; so the tale of Britomart's past is related onwards in time through her departure to seek Arthegall, and through her prophetic encounter with Merlin, up to the moment when she meets Redcrosse who tells her about Arthegall. At this moment we return, temporally speaking, to the point from which we started (3.3.62). In the 'real' time of the poem it is not that long ago that Britomart lived in the world of the *Ciris*; and perhaps in the 'real' time of Spenser's poetic career it was not that long ago that Spenser imitated it. Spenser's borrowing from the *Appendix* is uncertainly pitched between the juvenile and the adult, just as Scaliger had suggested the *Ciris* itself was. (It is an obstacle to any claim that Spenser knew about Scaliger's work that Spenser in his translation of the *Culex* does not show any sign of adopting Scaliger's emendations, but not an insuperable one. It is perfectly possible that Spenser did not work from Scaliger's text when he first was attracted to the *Culex*, but that he had access to Scaliger's opinions about the later date of the poems by the time he thought seriously about how to weave the elements he had imitated from the *Appendix* into his own career; but on this there can be no certainty.)

There is another unobvious thing to say about the generic status of the *Ciris* episode in Britomart's history. I said earlier that there are slight signs in earlier English responses to poems in the *Appendix* that they were regarded as generically fluid, and that in Morley's *Triumphs* a pseudo-Virgilian epigram could act as a segue from Petrarch to a meditation on mortality. Spenser's response to the *Appendix* very much bears out and augments this suggestion. For him, poems from the *Appendix* are transitional; they are neither old nor young, they are beginnings which can feed later works and perhaps be revised in the light of later works. They are also generically pivotal works. In this respect, it is an absolutely crucial fact that the transformed version of the tale of Scylla is used to describe not just any old process, but a process of growing up. By this I mean both the growing up of Britomart and the generic transformation of her into someone around whom an epic might form. Spenser may well have thought that in imitating the *Ciris* he was making not just Britomart but Virgil too grow up before his reader's eyes. The early poem about uncivic passion is turned into a story of transition at once psychological and generic, about the emotional and generic development of a heroine. If Spenser did incorporate some of his own earlier work in translating the *Ciris* into the poem, here too there is perhaps an excessively tidy three-way process of transformation going on: Spenser rewrites Virgil's juvenilia at the same time as he rewrites his own juvenilia at the same time as he writes about a civic heroine setting aside earlier and indeed juvenile erotic moods and the genres in which they are customarily articulated. I think in doing all these things at once Spenser showed himself to be the most acute of the Renaissance readers of the *Appendix Vergiliana*. He responded to the edginess of these poems, their odd relation to the canon and career of Virgil, and he tried to weave them back into the Virgilian canon by transformative imitation. He did in his poetry everything which the scholarly understanding of the *Appendix Vergiliana* in the Renaissance was telling him to do.

All Souls College, Oxford **COLIN BURROW**

NOTES

1 Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982) 240-1.

2 Patrick Cheney, *Spenser's Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career* (Toronto, 1993).

3 Joseph Loewenstein, 'Spenser's Retrography: Two Episodes in Post-Petrarchan Bibliography', in *Spenser's Life and the Subject of Biography*, ed. J. H. Anderson, D. Cheney and D. A. Richardson (Amherst, 1996) 117.

4 *Iam poterit culicis numeris fera dicere fata*, Marco Girolamo Vida, *The De Arte Poetica*, trans. R. G. Williams (New York, 1976) 32-3 (1.461).

5 See T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols. (Urbana, Ill., 1944) and Colin Burrow, 'Shakespeare and Humanistic Culture', in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, ed. C. Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge, England, 2004) 9-27.

6 Cited in Baldwin, *Small Latine*, 1.109-10.

7 'The Dunciad in Four Books', IV.253-4. Quotation from Alexander Pope, *The Poems: A One-Volume Edition of the Twickenham Text with Selected Annotations*, ed. J. Butt (London, 1963).

8 Virgil, *Buccolica et Georgica ... Aeneis Virgiliana* (Paris, 1501); see Priscilla Bawcutt, *Gavin Douglas: A Critical Study* (Edinburgh, 1976) 99.

9 *De Operibus Virgilii Sebastianus Brant* (Strasburg, 1502).

10 Cf. Ruth Luborsky, 'The Allusive Presentation of *The Shepheardes Calender*', *Spenser Studies*, 1 (1980) 29-67, 43-4; Luborsky seems unduly cautious in suggesting only that *The Shepheardes Calender* was indebted to editions of Virgil in its presentation of arguments before each eclogue.

11 See Helen Cooper, 'Wyatt and Chaucer: A Reappraisal', *Leeds Studies in English*, 13 (1982) 104-123.

12 Virgil, *Opuscula* (Paris, 1501) fol. 33v.

13 Aelius Donatus, *Vitae Vergilianae*, ed. J. Brummer (Leipzig, 1912) 4.

14 R. M. Greer argued in 1926 that the passage which included reference to the Appendix was not by Suetonius, but a later interpolation; see R. M. Greer, 'Non-Suetonian Passages in the Life of Virgil Formerly ascribed to Donatus', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 57 (1926), 107-15, 110-12.

15 Virgil, *Poemata quae extant omnia* (Zurich, 1563).

16 *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera* (London, 1570). Further editions followed in 1572, 1580, 1583, 1597, 1616, 1632, and 1634.

17 Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983) 1.124.

18 *Publii Virgilii Maronis Appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum Poematum veterum Poetarum*, ed. J. Scaliger (Lyons, 1572) 304.

19 Virgil, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum Poematum veterum Poetarum*, 265.

20 Virgil, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*, ed. R. O. A. M. Lyne (Cambridge, 1978) esp. 55-6.

21 On this work, see G. Hugo Tucker, 'Mantua's "Second Virgil": Du Bellay, Montaigne and the Curious Fortune of Lelio Capilupi's Centones ex Virgilio ([Romae, 1555])', in *Ut Granum Sinapis: Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Jozef IJsewijn*, ed. G. Tournoy and D. Sacré (Leuven, 1997) 264-91.

22 See, e.g., Colin Burrow, 'Virgil in English Translation', in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale (Cambridge, 1997) 21-37.

23 See Marie Axton, 'Lord Morley's Tryumphes of Fraunces Petrarcke: Reading Spectacles', in *'Triumphs of English': Henry Parker, Lord Morley, Translator to the Tudor Court*, ed. M. Axton and J. P. Carley (London, 2000) 171-200. Earlier studies tend to see the work as the product of Morley's old age, as Carnicelli does in Henry Parker, Lord Morley, *Lord Morley's Tryumphes of Fraunces Petrarcke; the first English Translation of the Trionfi*, ed. D. D. Carnicelli (Cambridge, Mass., 1971). Axton shows how unlikely this hypothesis is, but she does not comment on the Virgil translation.

24 Henry Parker, *Lord Morley, Tryumphes of Fraunces Petrarcke*, translated out of Italian into English (London, ?1565), sig. N3r.

25 Virgil, *Opuscula*, fol. 60v.

26 Virgil, *Opuscula*, fol. 61r.

27 John Penkethman, *The Epigrams of P. Virgilius Maro, and others* (London, 1624), sig. A1v

28 Penkethman, *The Epigrams of P. Virgilius Maro*, and others, sig. A4r.

29 Critical studies include Richard Danson Brown, *'The New Poet': Novelty and Tradition in Spenser's Complaints*, Liverpool English Texts and Studies 32 (Liverpool, 1999), who argues for the unity of the collection, and Indraneel Mukherjee, *Edmund Spenser and the Complaint* (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2000).

30 This combination is perceived as a problem in Richard Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton and the Literary System* (Berkeley, 1983) 127-32, and the poems in the *Complaints* volume are seen as simply an interruption of Spenser's laureate career (82-9).

31 J. R. Brink, 'Who Fashioned Edmund Spenser: the Textual History of 'Complaints'', *Studies in Philology*, 88 (2) (1991) 153-168. Brink may too rapidly exclude the possibility that Spenser was in London for the setting of the volume (the press corrections to which do appear to be exceptionally careful) and that he had left for Ireland by the time Ponsonby's preface was set, at the very end of the printing process.

32 Dedication to the Lady Compton and Mounteagle, in Edmund Spenser, *The Shorter Poems*, ed. R. A. McCabe (Harmondsworth, 1999) 234. All quotations from Spenser's shorter poems from this edition.

33 Spenser, *The Shorter Poems*, 210.

34 Greenlaw argues that Spenser warned Leicester of the perils of a French match in 1579; Charles E. Mounts, 'Spenser and the Countess of Leicester', *ELH* 19 (1952) 191-202, favours the view that Spenser was indiscreet about his patron's relationship to Lettice Knollys in the March Eclogue, a view developed by Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge, 1993) 19-24.

35 Notable studies include H. G. Lotspeich, 'Spenser's *Virgil's Gnat* and its Latin Original', *ELH* 2 (1935) 235-41, David Lee Miller, 'Spenser's Vocation, Spenser's Career', *ELH* 50 (1983) 197-231, Brown, *'The New Poet'*, 39-62.

36 Brown, *'The New Poet'*, 61.

37 Texts from Virgil, *Appendix Vergiliana*, ed. W. V. Clausen, F. R. D. Goodyear, E. J. Kenney and J. A. Richmond (Oxford, 1966).

38 All quotations from Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton, H. Yamashita and T. Suzuki (Harlow, 2001).

39 Miller, 'Spenser's Vocation, Spenser's Career' notes (210) that the beginnings promise future epic designs, and 'evoke the context of Spenser's Virgilian ambitions.'

40 Quoted in Edmund Spenser, *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition Volume 3*, ed. E. Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood and F. M. Padelford (Baltimore, 1934) 330.

41 William Nelson, *The Poetry of Spenser: A Study* (New York, 1963) 142-3; see also Merritt Y. Hughes, *Virgil and Spenser* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), 348-54, and Colin Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993), 104-6.

42 Virgil, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum Poematum veterum Poetarum*, 330.

43 See Virgil, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* 41-5; the relationship is complicated by the possibility that both Ovid and the Ciris poet are imitating Cinna's Zmyrna.

44 I borrow the term from Harold Bloom, *A Map of Misreading* (New York and Oxford, 1975) 72, without subscribing to Bloom's psychoanalytic superstructure. Bloom's association between *kenosis* and regression, however, is suggestive in this context (ibid.): 'Most crucially, influence as a metonymy defends against itself by regression, by a return to earlier periods of supposed creativity when poetic experience seemed more an unmixed pleasure, and when the satisfactions of composition seemed more complete.

45 Colin Burrow, 'Original Fictions: Metamorphoses in 'The Faerie Queene'', in *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, ed. C. Martindale (Cambridge, 1988) 99-119.

46 Josephine W. Bennett, *The Evolution of 'The Faerie Queene'* (Chicago, 1942).