The Polybian Text: Historiography in the Margins of Ben Jonson's Quarto *Sejanus*.

by

Brock Cameron MacLeod.
B.A., University of Victoria, 2001
M.A., Queen's University, 2002

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department of English

© Brock Cameron MacLeod, 2010
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This dissertation may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopying or other means, without the permission of the author.

The Polybian Text: Historiography in the Margins of Ben Jonson's Quarto *Sejanus*.

By

Brock Cameron MacLeod.
B.A., University of Victoria, 2001
M.A., Queen's University, 2002

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Janelle Jenstad, Supervisor
(Department of English)

Dr. John Tucker, Department Member
(Department of English)

Dr. Cedric Littlewood, Outside Member
(Department of Greek and Roman Studies)

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Janelle Jenstad, Supervisor
(Department of English)

Dr. John Tucker, Department Member
(Department of English)

Dr. Cedric Littlewood, Outside Member
(Department of Greek and Roman Studies)

Abstract

Since its 1605 quarto publication, Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* has inspired much critical commentary. Although criticism credits Jonson with a compositorial role in the Quarto's production, critics continue to assess its marginalia as a defense against application or a scholarly pretense. Editors have pared down the marginalia, setting them as footnotes or endnotes; others have relegated them to appendices; still others have abandoned them entirely. Neither critics nor editors have weighed Jonson's marginalia beside the dramatic text they inform. Reading the Quarto *Sejanus* as a composite of margins and centre, within its bibliographical, theoretical, and literary contexts, shows it to be a learned study in emergent theories of historiography. In its innovations, the composite redresses the inefficacies of contemporary historians and editors.

To understand *Sejanus*'s textual interactions, the opening chapter examines the quarto itself. In each feature of its composition – from its title page, through its prefatory epistle, laudatory poems, and argument, to its very *mise-en-page* – the Quarto *Sejanus* declares itself the learnedly innovative product of long labour, and demands to be read as such. Chapter 2 considers the impact upon Renaissance historiographers of historiographic

models, ranging from Gildas Sapiens to North's Plutarch, and theoretic models, from the Florentine to the Polybian. The composite *Sejanus* is innovatively Polybian in its comprehensive attention to human cause and circumstance. *Sejanus*'s historiographic claims are tested against Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar.* Chapter 3 begins the process of investigating *Sejanus*'s bibliographical innovations. The investigation begins with the reception of the scholarly text in 1605 through three interdependent early-modern practices – margination, education, and reading – to show that, having no conception of supplementarity, the Renaissance reader read the whole page. Chapter 4 produces something of the Quarto *Sejanus*'s bibliographical context through two contemporary marginated texts – Matthew Gwinne's Latin drama *Nero* and Sir John Harington's translation of *Orlando Furioso.* Chapter 5 tests my claims to the Quarto *Sejanus*'s bibliographical innovation within the context created in Chapter 4. The Quarto's composite form transcends the limits of the text to a degree unmatched by its dramatic or historiographic contemporaries, allowing Jonson to model right and ill-reasoned action through psychologically realized characters within vividly historicized events.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee ii

Abstract iii

Table of Contents v

List of Figures vii

Preface viii

Acknowledgments x

Introduction: Reading into the Margins 1

Sejanus: Genesis 24

Chapter 1: The Material Text as Semiotic Context 49

What's in a Name: Titular Claims to Innovation 68

Epistolary Claims: The Letter "To the Readers" 79

Laudatory Poems: The Early-modern Peer Review Process 101

Chapter 2: Historiography and the Polybian Text 140

The Practice and History of Historiography 144

The Bishops' Ban: An Historiographic Conflagration 145

Learning Historiography: The Fount 151

Learning Historiography: Florence and the English Polybians 157

Dramatic Historiography: Shakespeare and Parallelography 186

Dramatic Historiography: Motive and Circumstance in *Sejanus* 198

Terentius: The Quarto's Polybian Historiographer 211

Chapter 3: Marginalia and the Beleaguered Text: An Overview 234

Annotation: The Roman Fount 236

Annotation: Scholastic Programmatics 239

Annotation: Humanist Comprehension 243

Annotation: Ubiquity, the Market, and Decline 252

Annotation: Theory and Practice 259

Chapter 4: Annotative Uses and Abuses in *Nero* and *Orlando* 271

The Functions of *Nero*'s Marginalia 272

The Functions of *Orlando Furioso*'s Marginalia 292

Chapter 5: The Functions of *Sejanus*'s Marginalia 321

Conclusion: Beyond the Polybian Text 366

Appendix 1: Figures – *Nero*, *Orlando*, and *Sejanus* 374

Appendix 2: Conjectured Bibliography of *Sejanus*'s Marginal Resources 395

Works Cited 400

List of Figures

Figure 1, *Sejanus* A4r 370
Figure 2, *Sejanus* B2r 371
Figure 3, *Sejanus* K4v 372
Figure 4, *Nero* P2v 373
Figure 5, *Nero* P3r 374
Figure 6, *Nero* Q2v 375
Figure 7, *Nero* Q3r 376
Figure 8, *Nero* A3v 377
Figure 9, *Nero* A4r 378
Figure 10, *Nero* D2v 379
Figure 11, *Orlando* 77/G4r 380
Figure 12, *Orlando* 142/M6v 381
Figure 13, *Orlando* 160/O3v 382
Figure 14, *Sejanus* B1r 383
Figure 15, *Sejanus* B2v 384
Figure 16, *Sejanus* I3r 385
Figure 17, *Sejanus* I3v 386
Figure 18, *Sejanus* I1r 387
Figure 19, *Sejanus* N1r 388
Figure 20, *Sejanus* N2r 389
Figure 21, *Sejanus* K4v 390

Pages from *Seianvs His Fall* (Ashley 3464) have been reproduced with the generous permission of The British Library Board.
Pages from *Nero* (STC 12551) have been reproduced with the generous permission of the Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Columbia University in the City of New York.
Pages from *Orlando Furioso* (RB 62722) have been reproduced with the generous permission of the Huntington Library.

Preface

I first came upon the Quarto during my MA. In one evening I began reading *Sejanus* for a course on closet drama and Tacitus for a Latin class. It quickly dawned on me that Jonson had translated Tacitus. I hunted out the Quarto and found the marginalia and the direction to read Dio Cassius. From the first time reading Tacitus and Dio together with *Sejanus*, I suspected something more was at play than a plagiary's reliance on sources. The reliance was too patent, and Jonson had just damned the plagiary (and helped coin the term) in *Poetaster*. My interest piqued, I committed myself and my PhD work to tracing every note to its source. After thousands of miles, hundreds of hours, and innumerable discoveries, I had compiled every excerpt to which the Quarto's margins direct the reader in a 370-page document comprising transcriptions and translations. Compiling this document showed the comprehensive genius of Jonson's historiographic and satiric labours. In the Quarto he truly had accomplished "integrity in the *Story*." With the "what" revealed to me, the "why" remained. To discover why Jonson had gone to such lengths to offer the whole story, I had to situate the "what" in the fullest scholarly context possible. No critic or editor has previously attempted such a situation – perhaps because no other has followed the margins faithfully to the fullness of "what." Critics have discussed Jonson's employment of Tacitus; others have discussed his invocation of Juvenal; others his debt to Machiavelli; still others his reliance on Lipsius. Most often critics argue that Jonson drew Tacitus or Juvenal or Machiavelli into *Sejanus* for pointedly politic reasons. Yet what critics have missed and the margins insist upon is that no single source prevails in *Sejanus*. *Sejanus* is a symphony. The study that follows interprets that symphony.

In compiling the collection of translations and transcriptions from which I draw my conclusions, I consulted those sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions of the histories for which Jonson has provided publication details, and Renaissance editions of those humanist texts he cites. I have provided an appendix listing all of the Quarto's marginal resources. For the convenience of future study, I cite Loeb editions of those classical texts for which "the chapter doth sufficiently direct, or the edition is not varied." Wherever possible, I include bibliographical information for modern editions of Jonson's

Renaissance humanist sources. Modern citation information (from the Loeb series) accompanies each translation from Renaissance editions of his classical sources. Following Jonson's use of the Latin side of Henri Estienne's Dio Cassius, I employ sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Latin translations (in facing-page texts when possible) of Jonson's other Greek sources. All translations are my own and are composed to manifest Jonson's attention to his sources. The transcriptions reflect the punctuation, abbreviations, spelling conventions, and errors of their sources. I have parted all but vocular ligatures.

Acknowledgments

First above all others I thank my wife, Vicky, who never abandoned ship, even when the rats had folded their paper boats and sailed off, then my babies, Tallulah and Dashiell, who did not cry all the time, and my mother and brother, who supported me without really knowing what I was doing. Next, I thank the Special Collections librarians who helped me in my compilation of Jonson's marginal resources, without which this study would not have been possible: Pablo Alvarez, Curator of Rare Books at the University of Rochester, who generously provided me with photocopies of fifty pages of Henri Estienne's 1592 Dio Cassius: Των Διωνος Του Κασσιου Ρωμαικων Ιστοριων βιβλία πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι; Lynne Farrington, Curator of Printed Books at the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg Rare Book & Manuscript Library, who granted me three-days of tea and access to the 1600 *C. Cornelii Taciti Opera Qvæ Exstant. Ivstvs Lipsivs postremùm recensuit*, which is too fragile to photocopy; Special Collections librarians from Phoenix to Göttingen, who searched indices and sent off scans and photocopies of likely pages; and, finally, the Special Collections librarians of the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Library of Congress, who brought me Brisson, Giraldi, Panvinio, Rhodriginus, Rosinus, Stuck, Suidas, Turnebus, Zonaras, and interest. Special thanks goes to The British Library Board for use of its *Sejanus*, Columbia University's Rare Book & Manuscript Library for use of its *Nero*, and the Huntington Library for use of its *Orlando Furioso*.

I thank Patrick Grant, who got me started, and Janelle Jenstad, John Tucker, and Cedric Littlewood who got me finished.

I thank the University of Victoria, English Department Graduate Student Support Fund Travel Grant and the University of Victoria, Graduate Studies Travel Grant, which together helped finance my travel to Washington and Philadelphia.

INTRODUCTION: READING INTO THE MARGINS

His Learning such, no Author old nor new,
Escapt his reading that deserv'd his view,
And such his Iudgement, so exact his Test,
Of what was best in Bookes, as what bookes best,
That had he joyn'd those notes his Labours tooke,
From each most prais'd and praise-deserving Booke,
And could the world of that choise Treasure boast,
It need not care though all the rest were lost.[1]

— Lucius Cary, "An Eclogue on the Death of Ben Jonson."

In the critical imagination, *Sejanus* lives a intriguing double life. It is both a play and a material artifact. Jonson's autobiographical bent only intensifies the pull of *Sejanus*'s duality. Critical assessment of *Sejanus* is varied. There are, however, a few questions most critics invoke. What is *Sejanus* thematically, or what was the end result toward which Jonson composed *Sejanus*? Is *Sejanus* a play or a book? What is *Sejanus* generically – is it a history or a tragedy? How was *Sejanus* received by its contemporaries? How does the Quarto, with its sources ostentatiously displayed, inform, affirm, or complicate questions about *Sejanus*? These inextricable questions have been posed in various ways by other critics, but few have invoked or discussed the Quarto's numerous and richly various marginalia in their answers to those questions. Throughout what follows, my practice is to capitalize Quarto and Folio when referring these two editions of *Sejanus*. From their front matter to their *mise-en-page*, the material form of *Sejanus*, in both the 1605 Quarto and 1616 Folio, is integral to its textual transactions. In other texts "quarto" is little more than a bibliographical format; in the 1605 *Sejanus*, Quarto is tantamount to part of its title.

Critics accept that the Quarto *Sejanus* is a readerly text, as distinct from a play text. Suggesting little thematic distinction between Quarto and Folio, critics generally feel that Jonson composed *Sejanus* as a piece of didactic historiography on the Machiavellian or Florentine model, and that *Sejanus*'s historiography is aimed at contemporary persons or events. Criticism has settled upon four possible topical applications: *Sejanus* is a cautionary tale directed at James; it is a chastisement of Elizabeth; it is an indictment of artistic and social repression in Tudor/Stuart England; or it is a personal statement of Jonson's religious or political affiliations. Daniel Boughner, in *The Devil's Disciple*, views *Sejanus* as a cautionary tale, a Florentine historical example warning James of the dangers posed to sovereignty by overreaching traitors. For Boughner, Jonson illustrates by the example of Tiberius's Machiavellian stealth how James might protect himself.[2] Katherine Duncan-Jones offers that "Tiberius's retirement to private pleasure on Capri could easily be seen as analogous to the newly-acceded King's frequent escapes to the reserves of Royston."[3] For those who read *Sejanus* as chastisement of Elizabeth, Elizabeth becomes Tiberius. Annabel Patterson suggests that Elizabeth's repressive reign is figured in Jonson's intentional parallel of Essex with Sejanus or Silius, or that the Elizabethan environment of censorship and surveillance is figured in Cordus's defense and Sabinus's entrapment.[4]

If those critics who see James or Elizabeth "in" *Sejanus* see Jonson's message as pointedly political, those who see England "in" *Sejanus* see that message as more personal – that of the citizen. Treating Jonson's historiography as moralizing more than admonishing and, therefore, more broadly applicable, Jonas Barish argues that *Sejanus*

"dramatizes the decline of Roman liberty, and warns Englishmen against allowing it to happen to them."[5] Patterson suggests that *Sejanus*'s caution might address the intimate concerns of its author – literary or personal repression. Cordus's defense speech is intended as a direct letter to James and his Privy Council. Cordus's speech is not a statement of the disinterestedness of historical writing, but rather of the necessary disinterestedness of the state, with Augustus as the model.[6]

Robert C. Evans suggests that Jonson's early praise of James likely reflects more the climate of optimism surrounding the new king's first years than the poet's wont to flatter.[7] Indeed, Evans argues that Jonson would have been showing an "acute prescience" were he paralleling, at this early date, the iniquities that would come to characterize James' reign.[8] Instead, Evans makes a convincing argument from parallel political ideals that *Sejanus* is pro-James. In 1603 James republished his *Basilikon Doron*.[9] James of the *Basilikon* is a self-identified moral James. Evans observes striking similarities in the moral and ethical spirit of James' *Basilikon* and Jonson's *Sejanus,* as well as of the entertainments he penned to welcome the new monarch.[10] That Evans is able to see *Sejanus* and the *Basilikon* as alike in spirit is due to the role of Tacitus in both.

Critics see in *Sejanus* a further ideological agenda that is political, but more broadly so than those politic portraits of Elizabeth and James. For Joseph Bryant, *Sejanus* is a meditation on Jonson's "classical republicanism."[11] This reading, too, is a cautionary tale directed at James, although the tone of this caution is considerably more menacing. In *Ben Jonson's Theatrical Republics*, Julie Sanders agrees with Bryant, suggesting that the play's "ostensibly" Roman world becomes a stage for an enactment of a contemporary

ideological debate, a debate in which Jonson is advising James towards a more popular form of monarchical rule.[12] For Sanders, the crux of this argument is that Jonson was brought before the Privy Council for *Sejanus* on a charge of treason. *Sejanus*'s violent conclusion depicts the political energies of a population mobilized into violent action and makes *Sejanus* threateningly republican; treason lies within this portrait of republican political violence. In Jonson's Rome the corruption and absolutism of imperial power are represented as "grim fact." The failure of those noble Germanicans who pay lip-service to republicanism is not the failure to critique that corruption in the proper political forum but the failure to quell that corruption by insurrection. For Sanders the commons' raging dismemberment of Sejanus suggests "a residual power in the multivalent figure of the populace."[13]

Critics tie Jonson's politics in *Sejanus* to Tacitus's own republican views, what Albert Tricomi calls "his detestation of absolutism and allegiance to Roman republicanism."[14] Throughout its margins, the Quarto attests to the central role Tacitus's *Annals* plays in *Sejanus.* The importance of Tacitus to such notorious republicans as Essex and his circle and Jonson's own connections with that circle reinforce the argument for Jonson's republicanism. In *Margins and Marginality*, Evelyn Tribble argues that Jonson's conspicuously republican use of Tacitus gestures firmly toward Essex and situates *Sejanus* in the field of dangerously topical commentary.[15] In *Ben Jonson His Craft and Art*, Rosalind Miles suggests that this Florentine didacticism spells *Sejanus*'s dramatic failure. By deploying Sejanus throughout the story as an "*exemplum*, Jonson denied the possibility of unraveling the wider applicability of his story."[16] In Miles's

estimation, at least, *Sejanus* is an ineffective history play.

Much of the critical debate surrounding *Sejanus* pertains to its genre. It is read variously as a tragedy, a history, and a satire. Critical analyses most often tie *Sejanus* to Jonson's satiric comedy *Volpone*, suggesting that if he did not write *Sejanus* as a satire, he at least intended it to be associated with his satires. Miles remarks that *Sejanus* is "the first example of the fusion of satire and dark intrigue that proved so fruitful for *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*."[17] In *The Devil's Disciple*, Boughner notes that the scene in which Eudemus and Livia discuss cosmetics "has a dramatic function in the maintenance of an intellectual detachment that differs fundamentally from the emotions appropriate to tragedy. The abrupt contrast of these frivolous details to the deadly action anticipates the vein of serious farce in *Volpone*."[18] Finding elements of satire in tragedy is not in itself noteworthy. Satiric commentators, such as *Coriolanus*'s Menenius or *Troilus and Cressida*'s Pandarus, are quite comfortable on the Renaissance tragic stage. Critics do not see that the satire in *Sejanus* is of a character; the object of the dark satire in *Sejanus* is Rome itself, and the vehicle of the satire is the body politic. In *Ben Jonson his Art and Craft*, Miles suggests that the satire targets Tiberian Rome's failure to live up to the Renaissance moral ideal of the chain of being.[19]

What appears most often in criticism tying *Sejanus* to Jonson's satiric comedies is commentary on his display of artifice, the trope of *theatrum mundi*. In *Ben Jonson's Poesis*, Jongsook Lee parallels *Sejanus*'s tragic world with the comic worlds of *Volpone, The Alchemist*, and *Bartholomew Fair*.[20] Tiberius is the playwright, the great manipulator of events, the puppet master pulling at strings behind the scene – like John Little-wit in

Bartholomew Fair – whether the strings control Sejanus from behind the Emperor's feigned impotence or the Senate and Macro from Capreae. For Arthur Marotti, both Sejanus and Tiberius play the puppet master.[21] For Katharine Eisaman Maus, the relationship between Sejanus and Tiberius is the "highly economic and psychological intimacy between a creative servant and his patron," the master *servus callidus/parasitus* relationships of Volpone and Mosca, Subtle and Face.[22] For Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J Summers in this relationship Sejanus is the comic overreacher "blinded by his own self-delusion."[23] Barish suggests that what Jonson has created with *Sejanus*'s over-determined characters is something more akin to comedy in plot, a play inhabited by characters "conforming too severely to the self-imposed laws of their own existence."[24] For Marotti, it is because of this "overt display of its own artifice" that Sejanus fails as a tragedy.[25] The presence of these comic elements comes down to one thing: whatever *Sejanus*'s generic identity might be, it is carefully constructed as a social satire. Richard Dutton supplies a summation of *Sejanus* as satire:

> In as much as *Sejanus* depicts the failure of any single individual to act both rationally and virtuously it is, in effect, a satire, measuring all its characters against an ideal – in this case, not an Asper or a Crites present in the action, but the dead Germanicus. It is a tragic satire precisely because it depicts a society which fails to live up to his memory, however much they play lip-service to it.[26]

Despite their broad consensus on the nature of the satire in *Sejanus*, critics offer different answers to the question of genre. In the Quarto's letter "To The Readers," Jonson writes that he "discharg'd the . . . offices of a tragick writer." But he insists upon that one element that his contemporaries took as the keystone of both tragedy and history

– "truth of Argument" – which complicates our reading of Jonson's own generic intentions.[27] Yet by many modern critical accounts *Sejanus* lacks the necessary elements of tragedy: attention to historic detail sets Jonson's tragedies apart from what a Renaissance audience would consider tragedy. Douglas Duncan argues that *Sejanus* is not a tragedy as the times dictated: Jonson "challenged his public to rise to his level and see the truth as he saw it himself; hence the didacticism, the refusal to probe into mysteries of human behavior or destiny, which disqualify [*Sejanus* and *Catiline*] by usual tragic criteria."[28] Anne Barton suggest that, in *Sejanus*, Jonson intended to compose a tragedy that was not as the times would dictate. He was a social satirist, an innovative dramatist. For Barton, refusal to adapt to the expectations of tragedy is part of Jonson's satiric statement: "Tragedy normally draws in towards a centre, vested either in an individual or family. But *Sejanus* flies out in all directions, providing no clearly defined focal point."[29] In *Sejanus*'s Rome, tragedy, like heroic nobility, is something of the past – having departed with Augustus.[30] Dutton and Barton do not so much deny that *Sejanus* is a tragedy as they deny that it is a typical Renaissance tragedy. With *Sejanus*, they argue, Jonson attempts to alter the conventions of tragedy. Criticism has settled upon Shakespeare as the model for how Renaissance historic tragedy is meant to behave. Miles suggests that Jonsonian tragedy is not Shakespearean tragedy; it is, in fact, in many respects anti-Shakespearean tragedy.[31] It is how Jonson felt historic tragedy should be composed. Barish further articulates this assessment, writing that what Jonson attempted in *Sejanus* is a median between the formality of the overtly-political, academic, Senecan drama and the "chaos" of popular chronicle plays, and that Jonson's purpose for his

tragedy was to fulfil the Horatian requirement to educate and delight, while avoiding "the promiscuous sensationalism of the chronicle play."[32]

At the center of the debate over whether *Sejanus* is tragedy or history are Jonson's adjustments of tragedy's dramatic boundaries. Jonson's characterization of tragic figures receives most comment. *Sejanus*'s Rome lacks tragic figures. There is no single preeminent character fallen by some tragic misplay or slip of judgment. Though Sejanus descends from happiness to misery, it is through the monumental vice of a vicious man. Sejanus is no tragic hero, but, to paraphrase Barish, he is at best a tragic villain, a glorying titan with an appetite for evil.[33] Pebworth and Summers offer a variation on this reading: "even in his villainy, he remains petty, a creature of the emperor rather than a person in his own right and certainly not a great man."[34] In Barton's assessment, Sejanus is "a hollow bogeyman. . . always verging on the absurd."[35] The overreacher's fall is not tragic. Whatever their critical assessment of Sejanus's character, the critics agree Jonson did not take this Sejanus from his historical sources. Whatever reaction Tacitus's blunt soldier may have elicited from his readers, few tears would have been shed when Jonson's Sejanus falls prey to the superior Machiavellian skills of his emperor. Jonson's Sejanus is the character necessary to his tragedy's satire. If there is a moment of anagnorisis in the reading out of Tiberius's letter in the senate, it has none of the effect for which Aristotle would have hoped. But then Sejanus is no more *Sejanus*'s tragic hero than he is the subject of its satire. As Philip Ayres writes, "Sejanus is merely an ignoble symptom of an incurable social malaise."[36]

Critics find little convincingly tragic in Jonson's characterization of the

Germanicans. All are too ineffectual to fit any definition of a tragic hero. However much this band of republican stoics may play the choric observer in recognizing and declaring imperial iniquities, in all but a few assessments they provide no choric value. They are untrustworthy: however much what they say has ethical value, in Jonson's Rome it has no truth value. Maus suggests that this is "perfectly orthodox [Tactitean] stoicism" in action, in that Jonson "separates entirely the rewards of fortune from the rewards of virtue."[37] Nevertheless, in most assessments the Germanicans march towards their own demise too willingly, with only their impotent ethical assumptions to keep them company. For Pebworth and Summers "that the Germanicans are aristocrats only exacerbates their failure of responsibility."[38] For Dutton, the very memory of Germanicus, their own republican ideal, paradoxically damns *Sejanus*'s Germanicans. All their vociferous inaction stands in stark contrast to their memories of Germanicus's brave words and actions: "While Arruntius only appeals to the gods (e.g.. IV.259-71), Germanicus himself wrought god-like deeds."[39] In the final summation, Arruntius and the Germanicans only talk. However virtuous they may be, impotence rather than fatal judgement precipitates their falls from happiness to misery. In "The Seeds of Virtue," Marvin Vawter sums up the predominant reading of Arruntius, Agrippina, Silius, Sabinus, and Cordus: "by acting as stoics – either by committing suicide, or, as in the case of the other Germanicans, by merely acting as 'good-dull-noble lookers on' – the Germanicans contribute directly to the decline of their civilization."[40]

Verging slightly from the critical consensus, Tricomi suggests that Silius is "utterly without recourse" in his suicide, and that in that act Silius "teaches the feckless

Senate to mock Tiberius's tyranny."[41] In *Managing Readers*, William Slights agrees with Tricomi's assessment, calling Silius "the noblest of Jonsons' Romans."[42] Ayres suggests that Jonson's suppression of the fact that Augustus had earlier considered Arruntius for the imperial diadem was intended to "account for the lack of what the spy Latiaris calls 'active valour' in the Germanicans by turning [acquiescence to Tiberius's claim to the imperium by lineal decent] into civic virtue."[43] Nevertheless, as Tricomi and others argue, to critique Jonson's tragedy in tightly defined Aristotelean terms is to miss his point. This play is driven not by tragic character but by the social commentary of tragic satire. Rome's broader society stands in for the tragic hero. Rome has fallen from its happiness under Augustus into misery under Tiberius.[44]

Where did Jonson hope that this would leave his readers? Vawter argues that when the tragedy ends, and the falls are all tallied up, assessed, and found lacking, the intellect must be called in to absolve the tragedy.[45] Maus adds that the poet and audience become the virtuous characters left to judge the respective virtues of good and evil.[46]

In its original form, *Sejanus*'s unique and ostentatious fidelity to history complicates its generic distinction. However much they might not find the source of any single character in the historic record, critics agree that *Sejanus* is built upon an historic foundation. Jonson, himself, expected success for this innovative tragedy because he adhered to what both the ancients and his contemporaries deemed the essence of tragic exposition, the "truth of Argument." Barish argues for many critics when he writes that, in his fidelity to history, Jonson "follows the dictates of Italian Renaissance critics, who had judged history to be the only proper basis for tragedy."[47] In practice this precept was,

among his contemporary tragedians, more honoured in the breach than the observance. Observing historic truth was not producing something that was historically verifiable in its every number, but finding a source in something broadly considered to be historical. As Bryant points out, this was not truth *per se* but "the illusion of truth."[48] Bryant adds that, in the extent to which Jonson follows his sources, documenting them at every step, he intended his *Sejanus* never to be fully divorced from the histories that engendered it, that it is to be read as both history and tragedy,[49] and that "Jonson's view about the function of tragedy, to delight and instruct through the medium of an authentic reconstruction of the past, implies a transfer to drama of the traditional function of history."[50]

Attempting to bridge the gap between the mandates of history and drama was itself a step outside of audience expectations. To Jonson's contemporaries, expectations of the poet and historian were defined by Sidney's precept that the poet's and the historian's provinces were distinct: the poet's "what should be," the historian's "what is." When Jonson illustrates his fidelity to sources he plays the historian; when he adjusts sources for moral clarity he plays the poet. The child of this union of writerly parts is what John Jowett calls "a tension between veracity and the fidelity of verse, translation, and art in general."[51] Bryant argues for many critics when he offers his assessment that in *Sejanus* poetry perfects history, removing all those messy human details that threaten to complicate the clear dissemination of an historic event's moral educative value.[52] For Barish, the notes that hold such sway on the Quarto's pages are seen as a visual representation of Jonson's will to join what Sidney hath put asunder.[53] Yet one need only

compare *Sejanus* with its sources to see that Jonson took the principle of historic truth at its word – to an extent never before accomplished.

Critics differ in their assessments of how successfully Jonson performed the offices of the historiographer in *Sejanus*. For Miles, the "brisk way" he took with adjusting and compressing his sources argues against it.[54] Dutton sees that the necessary steps Jonson takes to make historic characters and events bend to the exigencies of dramatic representation "seriously affects the emphases of what purports to be authentic history."[55] However much these alterations to history were necessary for the clarity of his moral purpose, what they render, in Ayres' assessment, is not, "by Roman or for that matter Elizabethan standards, good history."[56] Nevertheless, if the role of the historiographer is to encompass a full understanding of the past – including its missteps – so that the reader might understand and thus impact upon the present, *Sejanus* promises to fulfil its historic obligations. As Bryant offers, "it is difficult to see how a dramatist-historian of any age could have done much better."[57]

For those who read *Sejanus*'s historiography as Florentine, Jonson performed his offices well. Tribble assumes that, being so full of interpretation and misinterpretation, spies, and informers, *Sejanus* must be read as parallelography,[58] which was the mark of Florentine historiography. In *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson,* Richard Peterson places *Sejanus* on the very frontier of Renaissance historiography.[59] The Ciceronian notion of historiography – style over matter, and the application of classical snippets to contemporary events – was giving way to moral and political didacticism – what might be termed the Tacitian notion. As Tricomi adds, in the Renaissance the

historic subject needed to inform the contemporary object: "Renaissance historiography is being rewritten with attention to the fictions that accompany truth telling endeavors."[60] Tricomi concludes that "in Sejanus, reformist, homiletic history is Jonson's truth."[61] The presentation of facts alone might not fulfil the duties of the historian: moral truth might need to be spotlighted or added. For Tricomi, in his adjustments to the historic record, Jonson was being the good post-Ciceronian humanist, ensuring that his historiography was an efficient and accessible locus of moral and political erudition. In *Jonson Versus Bakhtin: Carnival and the Grotesque*, Rocco Coronato disagrees that Jonson's Florentine historiography is effective, arguing that *Sejanus* would in fact fail as a moral or political exemplar as "the carnival [in *Sejanus*] does not perform any reconcilement. Jonson's parallelography is more radical: the inversion accomplished by *Sejanus* denies the repetition and predictability of history."[62]

Is *Sejanus* history in the terms his contemporaries would insist upon? The primary function of Renaissance historiography was to provide life lessons from a safe distance. Yet, as Patterson argues, for the humanist historian of 1590, parallelography was a necessary part of good history writing.[63] By 1603 historiographers were dividing into two camps: those who espoused the politic parallelography typified by Machiavelli, and those who espoused the "truly reportorial, non-evaluative history" typified by Polybius – historiography for the sake of its broad implications.[64] While most critics place *Sejanus* in the former, in "The War on History in Jonson's *Sejanus*," Bruce Boehrer hints that it might be better situated in the latter: *Sejanus* is Jonson's mediation upon "his nervousness about historical *telos*."[65] The history of renaissance historiography is one of

application and misapplication, of real or imagined parallelography. For critics such as Ayres, one of *Sejanus*'s greatest accomplishments is that it is Renaissance drama's one truly Roman Rome.[66] Yet, in "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources," Martin Butler is able to see London, in "the supplied trappings of a monarchical court, a court more English than Roman."[67] As so much of the application to which *Sejanus* continues to be subject illustrates, however Roman you make your Rome, it always threatens to become England.

Whether they view *Sejanus*'s historiography as parallelographic or reportorial, as successful or a failing, critics view the Quarto's marginalia as Jonson's most obvious statement of his historiographic intent. Jonson's contemporaries certainly saw his plays as glancing at contemporary persons and events. Critics list four run-ins Jonson had with the law by 1605: *The Isle of Dogs*, 1597, imprisonment; *Poetaster*, 1601, cited before Chief Justice; *Sejanus*, 1603, called before Privy Council; *Eastward Ho*, 1605, imprisoned. Jonson's history of legal troubles leads such critics as Joseph Loewenstein to consider the Quarto's margins as a defense against, if not the play's troubles, at least the possibility of the text's misapplication.[68]

The hardest piece of evidence critics offer for Jonson's trouble over *Sejanus* is a line from the memorial reconstructions of William Drummond: "Northampton was his mortall enemie for brailing on a St Georges Day one of his attenders, he was called befor ye Councel for his Sejanus & accused both of popperie & treason by him."[69] Critics most commonly settle upon Essex as the intended parallel.[70] Critics find reference to Essex in the much beleaguered Silius, by reading as feigned *Cynthias Revels*'s defense of

Elizabeth's part in Essex's disgrace and death, and by citing Jonson's own thin connections to the Essex circle. In *Censorship and Interpretation,* Patterson offers that Jonson's connection to the Essex circle is constructed from his telling Drummond that Essex was the A. B. who wrote the prefatory epistle to Savile's translation of Tacitus, to which Jonson himself wrote an accompanying verse.[71] Ayres argues that old-style dating places the original performance of *Sejanus* between 25 March 1603 and 24 March 1604.[72] This is a problem for those who see Essex portrayed in *Sejanus*, as the later the date the further from relevance. In *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought,* Kenneth Schellhase suggests that paralleling the dead "was hardly political, in an immediate sense," and unlikely to get the Privy Council's attention.[73] Critics also see Essex' rival, Ralegh, as Silius, which is more contemporary and convenient to the charges of popery. As Ayres points out, in "Jonson, Northampton, and the 'Treason' in *Sejanus*," Ralegh was imprisoned on 17 July 1603 and tried on 17 November, dates sitting nicely between the *ante* and the *post quem non* of Sejanus's original staging. And Northampton was a key figure in Ralegh's fall.[74] In *Mastering the Revels*, Dutton argues that, whether *Sejanus* is commenting on the fall of Essex or Ralegh, Jonson is addressing "the heirs and beneficiaries of their downfall, and it was these personal transgressions that stirred the Privy Council (or rather the individuals on it) to action."[75] Pebworth and Summers also suggest spy-master Robert Cecil as Sejanus, suspected by some of having used the Gunpowder Plot to his own advantage.[76] Loewenstein finds that with the marginalia making the historic record present on the page, "Jonson argues his political integrity by disclaiming responsibility for the plot."[77] Barish and others propose that Jonson himself

and his beleaguered Catholic brethren might be figured as the Germanicans.[78] Ultimately we can never know what the audience saw in Jonson's portrait of Tiberian Rome, only that what they saw did not please them enough to see it again.

More important for Jonson than either *Sejanus*'s popular or political reception was James' reception. Again, whatever the foundation of the charges, James must have seen in it little of offence. James himself employed Tacitus conspicuously in his own writing, and the politics he espouses in his early reign are in full agreement with one reading, at least, of Jonson's. Evans suggests that had James felt *Sejanus* smacked of traitorous republicanism, it seems unlikely that the new king would have rewarded Jonson's "treason" with a "pivotal role in the official celebrations" of his coronation: the *Entertainment at Althrop* for Queen Anne and Prince Henry, and Jonson's *Part of the King's Entertainment on Passing to His Coronation*. The *Entertainment at Althrop* was performed on 25 June 1603, after *Sejanus*'s theatrical *ante quem non*; the *Coronation Entertainment* was performed after the theatres reopened in mid-March 1604, following the plague, and after *Sejanus* the play's *post quem non*. Evans speculates that the *Coronation Entertainment* might have been commissioned after Jonson's appearance before the Privy Council.[79] Loewenstein offers a interesting note, one that makes the ties that bind *Sejanus* and James even tighter: in at least one copy, the Quarto *Sejanus* was printed on very rare paper, paper bearing as a watermark the royal initials. Loewenstein sees this is a clever part of Jonson's defense against any "state decipherer or politik picklock,"[80] but it is tempting to suppose Jacobean collusion. Finally Dutton reminds his readers that there is no official record of *Sejanus* ever having come up before the Privy

Council or the censors, as the play or the Quarto.[81]

The Quarto's material form and the implications for textual meaning entwined within Jonson's use, choice, and display of sources inspire much of the historic and contemporary reaction to *Sejanus*. I have already discussed Jonson's use of Tacitus in terms of its possible political and moral connotations. There is a paucity of critical commentary on Jonson's use of Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and Seneca – other than to say that Suetonius and Dio Cassius provide Roman context more than historical context, but for when Dio fills the lacuna in Tacitus's *Annals*. In "Juvenal, Horace and *Sejanus*," Boughner goes so far as to suggest that Jonson's claims to have employed Dio throughout were a "red herring," a product of his "luxuriating in the amplitude of his documentation."[82] Comment upon Jonson's use of such Renaissance classical sources as Stuck, Panvinio, Turnebus, or Brisson is all but nonexistent, extending only so far as to allow that they provide *Sejanus* its Roman texture. The one exception to this want is Boughner, who suggests that Lipsius directed Jonson to Turnebus.[83] Of the many sources Jonson cites, criticism offers only Tacitus and Juvenal any responsibility for meaning in *Sejanus*. Boughner calls Juvenal "a pervasive influence, but decidedly not a predominant source."[84] Although Jonson marginally cites his reliance on Juvenal as a source for both *Sejanus*'s historical action and contemporary texture, critics such as Miles see the Roman satirist's influence in *Sejanus* as more of flavour than of fact or texture.[85] Boughner sums up that influence thus: "In the words of Arruntius and his friends at the beginning of the play, the tone of moral aversion to the life of the Empire is Juvenalian."[86] Much of the Juvenal critics find in *Sejanus* is uncited. This Juvenalian influence is better likened to

the influence Senecan tragedy enjoyed upon the Renaissance tragic stage, and indeed upon *Sejanus*. Again quoting Boughner: "Juvenal remained an open and convenient quarry for verbal *coups de théatre* whenever any personage shot a sardonic sally."[87] As Chapter 1 discusses, 250 years worth of scholarly editions of *Sejanus* either omit or suppress Jonson's extensive marginal citation in favour of commentary upon such uncited debts.

Even more than Juvenal, Machiavelli receives critical comment as the Quarto's most important uncited source. This is the Florentine *Sejanus* that so many critics read. In *The Devil's Disciple*, Boughner posits that Tacitus and Dio Cassius, on one side, and Suetonius, on the other, vary on whether real power rested with Sejanus or Tiberius, and that Machiavelli's lack of hesitation on the point inspired Jonson to thread his political theories through *Sejanus*.[88] For Jonson to include Machiavelli required "a fundamental revision of Latin sources."[89] This revision is the Germanicans' outrage over the power of court spies, an outrage that Boughner argues is not found in Jonson's classical sources.[90] For Boughner, "Jonson develops this gem of drama by a series of climactic actions based on the devious skill in politics expounded in *The Prince*."[91] This debt is not limited to *The Prince* but includes *The Discourses on Livy*, where Machiavelli treats Sejanus and Tiberius.[92] In the process of producing this chain of debt Boughner illustrates how, through Jonson's use of Machiavelli, "From the *Annals* to *Sejanus* we go from the horror of tyranny to the horror of tyrannicide."[93] Boughner argues that *Sejanus* is a clear commentary on succession in Jacobean England, and that Tiberius is a good and a pious emperor, by the Machiavellian definition.[94] As in his treatment of Juvenal in *Sejanus*,

Boughner asserts that Machiavelli inhabits the work in both character and flavour. With Boughner, Tricomi suggests that "After Tacitus, Jonson's main source is . . . Machiavelli."[95] Miles calls Machiavelli Jonson's single most important Renaissance influence.[96] Sanders includes Machiavelli with Livy, Tacitus, and Lipsius as influences on the levels of story, language, and theory.[97] In *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*, Duncan suggests that this connection between Jonson and Machiavelli is quite natural, as both treat societal corruption, and both employ historic *exempla* to educate against corruption.[98] Patterson points out that both authors depended a great deal upon Tacitus, with Machiavelli's dependency rendering the Tacitian historian a politic historian.[99] Jonson's Machiavelli is not the Englished "Machiavel" of Renaissance popular tragedy but a scholar's response to "the Machiavellian texts in all their political complexity."[100]

For critics like Butler, as interesting as how Jonson uses those sources he does not cite is how Jonson uses those sources he cites.[101] Critics have found much to comment upon in Jonson's adjustments of character and incident. Jonson's adjustments to character are most often discussed. Jonson's alterations in characterization are pegged to dramatic, political, and moral exigencies. Dutton offers the critical suggestion that Jonson needed to simplify his historic characters in order to "concentrate on the essential aspects of a character, at the expense of confusing and contradictory details," creating out of history the ineffectual Germanicans and the Machiavellians who torment them.[102]

Most of the critical attention given to the Germanicans is directed at Arruntius and Silius. Arruntius is Jonson's most expanded character, and critics find much in that expansion. Boughner and Miles call Arruntius the voice of Tacitian morality.[103] For

Barish, he is the play's conscience.[104] For Tricomi he is "Jonson's commentator and choral spokesman."[105] Ayres argues that Jonson's adjustments to Arruntius's historical position in Rome render him the spokesman for the "legitimacy of descent."[106] In Tacitus Arruntius himself is proof otherwise: before his death Augustus had considered Arruntius a prime candidate for his successor. Ayres suggests that, in omitting this detail, Jonson accomplishes some justification for the ineffectual Germanicans' unwillingness to rise against Tiberius's brutal reign, turning their ineffectuality into a civic virtue.[107] Critics also find Ralegh in Jonson's adaptations of Silius. The Ralegh-ing of the much beleaguered Silius is produced by the alterations to the character and tone Jonson gives to his defense before the treason trial.[108] Finally, Barish finds Jonson's adjustments to character also provide the "dignity of Persons" he promises in *Sejanus*'s prefatory epistle.[109]

Those adjustments Jonson made to the story receive less modern critical scrutiny. Jonson's writerly play within and between his historical sources is a dramatic necessity when compressing almost a decade's worth of events into two hours' traffic. For Dutton these adjustments are a sign of Jonson's "workmanship."[110] For Slights, Jonson is not so much rewriting as, like an architect, "redrafting" history.[111] And for Bryant Jonson's is a "reconstruction of history."[112] All these terms suggest production not reduction, and reflect the acknowledgment amongst critics that there is a mastery to Jonson's historiographic labours.

One scene garners more critical attention than any other in *Sejanus* – and it is a scene in which Jonson adheres to the letter of history. Again, Drummond provides a

catalyst for this attention: "In his Sejanus he hath translated a whole oration of Tacitus The first four bookes of Tacit*us* ignorantly done in Englishe."[113] Dutton, with the majority of critics, holds the first part to mean Cordus's defense speech.[114] That Jonson should bother to add this detail to his remembrances to Drummond suggests to many that there must be something in it. And what many critics see in Jonson's verbatim inclusion of Cordus's defense oration is a paradox: Cordus insists that historiography is disinterested, that there is no truth in Sejanus's claim that he "paralells/ The times, the gouernments."[115] Yet, Jonson employs this speech as an argument for the disinterestedness of his *Sejanus*. And, therefore, a history can have application in a later age. As Barish writes: "We have, then, the odd spectacle of a manifesto of the disinterestedness of historical writing in a piece of historical writing that is itself anything but disinterested."[116] Yet as Patterson suggests, "disclaimers of topical intention are not to be trusted, and are more likely to be entry codes to precisely that kind of reading they protest against."[117] In *Jonson Versus Bakhtin*, Coronato examines Jonson's use of sources in terms of textual parallels and deviations; in doing so he maintains that "such an intentional adaptation exceeds the cautious usage of the sources as a self-serving disclaimer."[118]

For these critics Cordus's speech and Jonson's margins play a similar defensive role, either as a defense against previous trouble or as disclaimer against future trouble.[119] Critics generally view the defensive stance of these margins, whether genuine or feigned, as a function of Jonson's Florentine historiography. The Florentine historiography critics find operating in *Sejanus* practises clarifying adaptation – amplification, omission, and addition – in the service of parallelography and moral didacticism, all of which hides

behind the authority of the margins. Loewenstein suggests that the Quarto's margins "are as much a stipulative guide to the reader as a deference to authorities."[120] Jowett, like Loewenstein, founds this suggestion, in part, in the Quarto prefatory epistle: "least in some nice nostrill, the *Quotations* might seem affected, I doe let you know, that I abhor nothing more; and haue onely done it to shew my integritty in the story, and saue my selfe in those common torturers, that bring all wit to the rack."[121] The text's margins, with all those classical historians and all their weighty authority looming over the centered text, work to position Jonson as an innocent bystander. In Ayres' words, the "text was buttressed by the scholarly notes, its author's 'proof' against people like Northampton."[122] Yet, as Patterson suggests, the margins might be a sleight of hand, not the defense of an innocent author but a blind behind which parallelography is taking aim.

Critics not convinced of *Sejanus*'s intentional political parallelography have quite a different conception of the Quarto's margins. Jowett sees the margins as a defense not against misapplication but against charges of pretentiousness – "least in some nice nostrill, the *Quotations* might seem affected" – that is for the value of his poetic/academic exercise. Jowett argues that the marginalia, together with the Quarto's other bibliographical features, visually assert the value of Jonson's poetic/academic exercise against those in search of application: "the play's entire presentation . . . is influenced by the political necessity of establishing the play's claim to seriousness as of a specific and limitingly literary kind."[123] For Bryant, the Quarto's "careful documentation" verifies the centre's historicity: they announce that Jonson "wanted us to accept his play both as history and as drama."[124] Bryant suggests that the annotations might almost be read as

Jonson's intention that the events of his story, his version, are not to be fully abstracted from the larger history from which they were constructed.[125] Barish agrees with Bryant that the marginalia show that Jonson "took *Sejanus* seriously as history."[126] Again, Barish draws this out further to suggest that these marginal notations might be seen as a visual representation of Jonson's will to join what Sidney hath put asunder.[127]

Although not as rich as the critical discourse on *Sejanus* and the role of the Quarto's margins, there is some critical notice of the mechanics or operations of the Quarto's margins. In the construction of both the centered text and its margins *Sejanus* relies heavily on Justus Lipsius's, 1600, *C. Cornelii Taciti Opera Qvæ Exstant.* Recourse to *Sejanus* in tandem with its richest source illustrates the extent to which Jonson mines Lipsius's textual notes for his own use, directing and redirecting his reader from source to source suggested by the great humanist scholar and editor of Tacitus, often transcribing Lipsius's own notes verbatim into *Sejanus*'s margins. In "Ben Jonson, Neostoicism and the *Monita* of Justus Lipsius," Lynn Bryan and Evans provide a full account of Jonson's reading of Lipsius in *Sejanus* and throughout his scholarly life, and find him broadly indebted to the great Flemish humanist.[128] Boughner, in "Jonson's Use of Lipsius in *Sejanus*," makes much of Jonson's reliance on Lipsius and his Tacitus. Although Boughner only grudgingly acknowledges the extent to which Jonson's scholarship in *Sejanus* took him outside of the bounds of Lipsius's Tacitus,[129] Ellen Duffy, while acknowledging Jonson's debt to Lipsius, looks beyond that text with wonder to the comprehensive classical knowledge evidenced in *Sejanus*'s margins.[130] Whether or not Jonson's margins take their lead from Lipsius – in the details they offer and the expansion

of the scope and particulars of citations – it is clear that Jonson makes recourse to a wide range of classical and Renaissance encyclopedic texts.

Such critical assessments of the margins, whether they consider them a reified pretense or defensive gesture, seem to suggest that Jonson's marginalia are not, as this study insists, an integral part of the matter comprising meaning in the 1605 Quarto *Sejanus.* Bryant offers that "the reader cannot begin to understand either *Catiline* or *Sejanus* unless he is willing to bring a knowledge of history with him to the play and look before and after what he finds there."[131] For those of us lacking such a broad historic knowledge, in order to fully grasp Jonson's intentions for *Sejanus*, we ought read the text and the marginal resources simultaneously. This project calls for a reconception of the Quarto *Sejanus* as a unique historiographic artifact comprised of a composite text that makes manifest the fruits of Jonson's five-year course of scholarly reading. This introduction and the chapters to follow will tease out the various implications of this reconception for Jonson criticism.

SEJANUS: GENESIS

In the winter of 1601/02 Jonson presented his "apologeticall Dialogue" upon the Middle-Temple stage before *Poetaster*'s audience.[132] In the person of the dialogue's Author, Jonson vows to abandon ominous comedy and, in retirement, try a tragedy – something "That must, and shall be sung, high, and aloofe."[133] If by "ominous" Jonson had meant "indicative or suggestive of future misfortune" (OED, sv 1.a.), then comedy certainly had proven and would continue to prove ominous to those satiric comedies in which he had a

hand. I refer here to Jonson's being imprisoned, in 1597, with Gabriel Spencer and Robert Shaa, for his part in *The Isle of Dogs*, cited before the Chief Justice in 1602 for *Poetaster*, and imprisoned in 1604 with Chapman for his part in *Eastward Hoe*. In the fall of 1599, Jonson staged *Every Man Out of His Humour*, his first comical satire, a form he claims to have invented.[134] *Poetaster* was the last of Jonson's comical satires, written in response to the parallelography that had driven so much biting satire and caused Jonson and the government such trouble. Ultimately, comical satire saved neither Jonson nor satire from the censor's eye. Critics have long taken the *Poetaster*'s "high, and aloofe" to announce the nativity of *Sejanus*, composed around 1603, performed in the 1603/04 Michaelmas season, and printed in a heavily marginated quarto text in 1605.[135]

As I treat extensively in Chapter 1, most editions of *Sejanus* choose to disregard Jonson's scholarly marginalia, stripping them away altogether or relegating them to appendices or endnotes. However, this project contends that the marginalia and the dramatic dialogue (the centred text) work together as a "composite text" to fulfill the promises of *Poetaster*'s "apologeticall Dialogue." *Poetaster* does more than anticipate Jonson's change of generic focus; it also anticipates a new function for historiography.

Within the 227 lines of *Poetaster*'s apology, Jonson repudiates the parallelographic tendencies of Elizabethan historiography. In this repudiation, Jonson heralds his accord with shifting notions of the historiographer's social role. By the turn of the century humanist scholars were calling for change: phenomenistic historiography was to replace programmatic historiography. Florentine programmatic historiography attempted to teach political and moral lessons by adjusting what we would now call

"facts," in order to establish parallels between past and present figures or events. Phenomenistic historiography, as I shall call it, would present the "whole story" in order to question the human causes of events; it considers historic events as phenomena to be studied disinterestedly, with no view to parallels. This historiography that attempts to relate the whole event is the model called for by the so-called Polybians, including Bacon, Camden, and Concio. To the modern critic, historiography can no more be truly disinterested than it can truly present the "whole story." Indeed, the historiography of Camden and Bacon themselves fails on both counts – by ideal Polybian standards. Nevertheless, Concio admonished the Polybians that "of euery meane[,] we have to consider all the qualities and circumstances that make to the purpose, & from whence eueryone sprange, whither of industrie or of chance."[136] The 1605 quarto text of *Sejanus* embodies this change, I argue, through the interplay between marginalia and centred text.

The "apologeticall Dialogue" opens as an apology for *Poetaster*'s comical satiric vein – its Old Comedic response to the biting satyre, born of the satyr play.[137] Yet the dialogue gestures not only backward towards the abuses *Poetaster* had suffered, but also forward to the mode of historiography practised by *Sejanus*. The "apologeticall Dialogue" accomplishes its retrospective and prospective literary-critical assertions by dismissing Jonson's attackers as "detractors" – mere satirists in the biting vein of Hall and Marston – and as "practisers" – mere parallelographers who searched for application.[138] In this usage, by "practisers" Jonson intends "a plotter, a schemer, conspirator; a man of wicked or fraudulent devices," those who politically practise parallelography and see application everywhere.[139] The terms "application" and "parallelography" refer to two sides of a

single coin. Application is the claim by someone other than the author that a literary or historic text is composed to comment upon contemporary people or events. Jonson himself employs this term in his own defense in the dedicatory epistle to *Volpone*: "Application, is now, growne a Trade with many; and there are, that professe to haue a *key* for the decyphering of euery thing."[140] Parallelography is the act of composing a literary or historic text to comment upon contemporary persons, events or practices; the parallelographer is, in Sejanus's words, one who intentionally "parallels The Times, the Governments."[141] The "apologeticall Dialogue" repudiates parallelography: "My Bookes haue still beene taught/ To spare the persons, and to speake the vices."[142] Such claims of disinterestedness had become something of a trope that actually invited application even as it nominally eschewed the same. Jonson's claim glances towards the present *Poetaster* and the future *Sejanus*; it functions both as a trope in that *Poetaster* does attack Marston, and as a genuine rejection of parallelography in *Sejanus*. For 400 years, critics have read *Sejanus* as parallelography. I suggest, however, that we need to read the "apologeticall Dialogue" as a sincere statement, not just as a disingenuous trope. Jonson stresses that he could answer his satiric detractors in their own biting style, but that he considers it beneath his intellect and art to do so. Indeed, he argues that their own importunate lusts and satiric style have already damned them. The punishments these satirists have suffered – "their owne deedes haue already mark'd 'hem" – are the metaphorical "publike brands" set in their foreheads by the burnings that followed the Bishops' Ban.[143] In the dialogue's concluding sally, Jonson promises instead to answer them with novelty. He shall "'say,/ To strike the eare of time,[144] in those fresh straines,/As shall, beside the cunning of their

ground,/ Giue cause to some of wonder, some despight,/ And vnto more, despaire, to imitate their sound."[145] This new thing, *Sejanus*, will, he knows, not quiet those tongues accustomed to search for application, but he trusts that it will inspire some of his fellows to embrace the historiographer's new social role. The "apologeticall Dialogue" claims that *Sejanus* will redress the sins of the parallelographer with a new historiographical model; yet, the Quarto's complex composite of margin and dialogue accomplishes much more. In the face of this complexity, the principal question guiding the chapters to follow is: as he produced his overtly scholarly Quarto *Sejanus*, what motivated Jonson to diverge from the bibliographic and historiographic conventions deployed by his peers?

Parallelography and Christian universalizing had been the primary mandates of the historiographer for centuries. A concise definition for the term universal history is difficult to tie down. For the purposes of this discussion, by universal historiography I intend any text, be it a history or historically based, that assumes the lessons of an historic event to be universally applicable, rendering the event in a way that it presents clear moral or political lessons. Universal historiography is not concerned with secondary causes only the primary or final cause. Universal historiography is historiography that figures all history as a manifestation of the battle between good and evil, God and Satan. Historiography is, itself, a problematic term in the context of this discussion. No single term captures the full scope of history writing that this study treats. This study does, however, suggest that Jonson conceived of himself as an historiographer in composing the Quarto. I, therefore, apply, perhaps more broadly than current definitions would allow, historiography and historiographer to all forms of history writing and all those who

write them. Post-classical historiography traditionally conformed to Christian ideologies, because clerics wrote the early histories and often did so under the aegis of the Catholic church. Historiography traditionally was broadly flattering to kings, because national treasuries often provided for those histories, and few people other than clerics, kings, and the nobility were reading historiographies. The monarchy believed that it owned history; in his *Richard III*, Thomas More was writing history *for*, not just *about*, the Tudor regime. But with the explosion of the print market, the expansion of public education, and the birth of the public theatre, histories were suddenly broadly popular and eminently marketable. The humanist movement freed the historiographer from the dictates of the Catholic church. The literary marketplace freed the historiographer from the need for royal patronage. Yet the dominance of the Florentine historiographic model kept the historiographer bound to parallelography as well as to producing clarified exemplars for moral and political edification. Nevertheless, historiography could now be profitably written about kings and princes without flattering them. Florentine historiography, such as Hayward's *Henrie IIII*, came to serve political factions, which the monarchy saw as a misuse of its property.

With the expanding market for historiography came the need to address the interests of a broader readership. In the 1590s, dramatic histories, at least, began to address this broader audience. Witness the expanded role of the common people in Shakespeare's English histories. Yet historiography continued to follow the Florentine model. Good historiography still universalized, and it still practised parallelography. Addressing a broader audience is not serving a broader audience. If historiography of the

1590s served its broader audience at all, it served its sense of national pride and its moral edification. The lessons offered by histories were still directed at kings. In the tradition of Machiavelli's *Prince,* interactions with the common people teach Shakespeare's young Henry to be a successful king. Historic events were still set out on a grand, national scale. And Christian universalism still ruled. God not Englishmen delivered victory at Agincourt.

The marketplace demanded writing on historiographic themes, and playwrights fed that demand with familiar matter, which had little productive influence on historiography. Playwrights of the 1590s turned to readily available and popularly known sources. The most popular source for English histories, Holinshed's *Chronicles* was in the *De Casibus* or *Mirror for Magistrates* tradition. Holinshed treated the broad sweep of English history. He selected events and constructed his chronicle so as to flatter the Tudor monarchy and model conventional religious and social values. The most popular source for ancient histories, Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* was, as its title attests, pure parallelography written to flatter Rome's emperors and inform its equestrian class in public rule and personal morality. Plutarch and Holinshed openly pursued parallelography, and, in the that pursuit, they produce idealized portraits not complex historical characters. However much such sources provided for popular tastes, in their emphasis on parallelography they engendered plays that welcomed politic application. In their emphasis on moral edification, they engendered plays that aimed at edification over education. Neither source provided the model or matter for a new mode of writing history. In 1599, a new mode became necessary.

In 1599 the bishops of England and London ordered an end to the unauthorized publication of satirical and historiographic works; the bishops confirmed their commitment to the ban with wide-scale confiscations and book burnings. Although criticism traditionally considered the 1599 ban to have been in reaction to libidinous satire, more recent criticism argues that the ban on satire was politically motivated. The gentry served as both the subject and the object of 1590s satire. The government feared that, depicting the gentry as vicious, such satire might lead the people to contemplate revolt. The wording of the ban and the events that followed its enactment argue that the bishops also sought to suppress historiography for its potential to inspire revolt.[146] As politic histories were gaining popularity and the government was reacting to that popularity, the critical and theoretic discourse upon historiography was exerting a more productive pressure for change. Was it all or some of these pressures that produced *Sejanus*? The short answer might be that *Sejanus* was the natural fruit of Jonson's learning, pressed into action by the 1599 ban.

Through his course of reading, Jonson had become a historiographic and bibliographic Polybian. Chapter 2 discusses Polybius, and the Polybian movement that the study of his *Histories* engendered, but some discussion is necessary here. Polybius's historiography is exhaustive and panoptic. It does not simply list events. In its ideal Polybian historiography would present historic events in the completest possible detail in order to encompass both cause and effect, achieving something like a psychological realism out of which motive can be understood. Polybian historiography is pragmatic. It does not provide universalizing analyses of historic events, but rather it presents events in

a systematic manner that requires the reader's thoughtful digestion, to the end that the reader will understand the human causes of events and learn from their outcome. To offer a twenty-first-century illustration, a Florentine historiographic treatment of the second gulf war would present the invasion of Iraq as a battle between a bold and virtuous George Bush, personifying all that is America, and the evil empire of the vicious buffoon Saddam Hussein. The impetus of that war would be the attacks of 9-11. The lessons of that history would be that good triumphs over evil and that the successful ruler strikes fast and hard when attacked. A Polybian historiographic treatment of those same events would present no heroes or villains, no single cause, and no explicit lesson. It would, instead, enumerate in the broadest possible detail what we know to be the myriad causes and circumstances of that decades-old conflict – from the human to the geopolitical: the role of the CIA in the Persian Gulf, the violence of both Christian and Muslim fundamentalism, the part oil, water, and mineral resources play in international politics, and the destabilizing effects of poverty, to name but a few. The lessons learned from that history would be as myriad as its causes. Today's historiographers continue to attempt the Polybian ideal. Today's propagandists continue to be Florentine.

The source of Jonson's Polybian historiography can be traced to two of early-modern England's most famous Polybians, William Camden and Robert Cotton. Jonson's intellect, to offer a literary-critical cliché, was not that of the ordinary playwright strutting his few ill-spent years at Oxbridge or the Inns of Court upon the stage; his was a powerhouse, driven by social and literary consciousness to heights of education usually denied those of his birth. Jonson's unique education was the guided self-education of a

man determined to number himself one of humanism's "understanders." This determination afforded him access to Cotton's library, one of England's greatest, and earned him Camden's mentorship. Jonson's reading of classical and humanist texts was expansive and his personal library nearly as large as those of England's wealthiest gentry and the most renowned amongst its humanist scholars.[147] More than two hundred extant books carry the imprint of Jonson's ownership; one wonders what the number might be but for the 1623 fire and subsequent losses.[148] The scholarly interests that produced *Sejanus* are evident in the contents of that collection. Close to half of the books known to have been in Jonson's library are poetry and literary criticism, two thirds of which are in Latin or Greek. Fully one quarter of his books were histories, twice as many ancient as British. He also owned books on philosophy and theology, as well as numerous anthologies. In sum, Jonson read and, at one time or another, owned every important classical author, as well as much of Renaissance criticism on classical literature and historiography, all of which came with extensive critical apparatuses. Although still very much a novice playwright in 1603, and unlikely to have compiled much of a personal library, he had spent the time between 1599 and 1605 at Cotton's library reading under Camden's direction. Jonson read much and read to learn. Given the reading list which Camden would likely have set for Jonson, it is not surprising that the humanist convictions apparent in his poetic and prose work should reflect those of the contemporary theoretical discourse rather than those of contemporary poets. These convictions converge in *Sejanus* as in no other place, save possibly the *Discoveries*.[149]

Whether Jonson adopted a new dramatic voice out of his fear of Privy Council

censors, or because of his extensive reading in Cotton's library, in the marginated *Sejanus* Jonson was responding to changing currents in historiographic thought. Humanist scholars were no longer describing efficacious historiography as Florentine, history peopled by clearly-depicted, static vices and virtues punished and rewarded upon Augustinian principles. Humanism had turned its focus toward human potential: secularization produced optimism. As I discuss in Chapter 2, in theoretical discourse the pessimism of teleological history and determinist concepts of vice and virtue were giving way to pragmatics and the ethics of human causation. The Polybian impulse to tell the "whole story" was to replace the final vestiges of providentialism remaining from Scholasticism's former hold over European thought. By the latter years of the sixteenth century, in historiography popular practice was falling behind theory. As my study argues, in the Quarto *Sejanus* practice caught up with theory.

The Quarto is a heavily marginated text. The Quarto exhausts the potential of marginalia, and, in doing so, it proves itself as bibliographically Polybian as it is historiographically Polybian. The margins are not an undifferentiated sea of authorial notations and glosses as many Jonson critics have characterized them. They are a space for collection and reflection, the place where both author/marginator and reader journey beyond the inward focus of the centred text. The Quarto's marginalia is a double-edged sword: marginalia as scholastic textual control and marginalia as the bounteous treasury of the humanist meta-text – a vast resource for intertextuality limited only by the literal width of the book's margins. The Quarto's Polybian margins draw the "whole story" into the centre to realize human events.

The following chapters treat the text itself first as a distinct bibliographic artifact. Both unique in itself and the bellwether of the bibliographical attention Jonson would pay to his future publications, every typographical and textual aspect of the Quarto attests to *Sejanus*'s literary novelty and historiographic purport.[150] From its title page and capacious front matter to the very *mise-en-page* of the play text proper, a close reading reveals that the Quarto's material form, as much as the composite text of which it is comprised, functions as part of the innovation: it is itself the thing.

Due to shifts similar to those affecting the cultural authority of marginalia, late sixteenth-century historiography on the Florentine model failed to meet its social obligations. When Bishop Bancroft's London residence saw the burning of 1500 copies of John Hayward's *Henrie IIII*, censorship threatened to increase the inefficacies of Tudor historiography. Chapter 2 argues that the Quarto *Sejanus* seeks to redress these inefficacies by manifesting the shifting notions of historiography and the historiographer's social role current at the turn of the seventeenth century; in the process, this chapter will illustrate how Jonson comments upon Tudor historiographic inefficacy. As a playwright cum historian, Jonson gained his understanding of historiography as any Renaissance historiographer would. In the sixteenth century, historiography was not taught as a subject, but only learned tangentially in studying rhetoric; the historiographer in search of a model turned to the histories themselves as well as appended and autonomous treatises on historiography. This chapter will contextualize *Sejanus* historiographically within the considerable sixteenth-century theoretical debate between Florentine and Polybian historiographers. Florentine historiography, most famously that

of Niccolò Machiavelli in Florence and that of Thomas Elyot in England, although espousing pragmatic historiography, nevertheless embraced historiography that was politically and morally didactic. To Florentine historiography, the historic record was a storehouse for exemplars of good and evil action on a grand scale, and thus of laudatory and disparaging parallelography. Both much older than and closely contemporary to the Florentine theories was historiography modeled upon Polybius's *Histories*. The Polybian, with its proto-psychoanalytic emphasis on human motivation and the small details of cause and circumstance, was making inroads on the Florentine by 1600. The second part of Chapter 2 makes the case for redefining *Julius Caesar* as an example of the Florentine concept of historiography that dominated the sixteenth century, and for redefining the Quarto *Sejanus* as both a reaction to the indiscretions of the Florentine mode and the first and only dramatic manifestation of Polybian historiography. The final gesture of Chapter 2 is to study Terentius as the composite's model of the Polybian historiographer operating in contrast to the centre's parallelographer, Cremutius Cordus.

Chapter 3 treats the Quarto's defining textual feature – the marginalia. The 306 notes and glosses filling the Quarto's margins do more than lend meaning to *Sejanus*.[151] The Quarto *Sejanus* is a composite of marginal and centred texts, two textual fields that operate in synergy. The argument of this chapter is founded upon three interdependent early-modern practices: margination, education, and reading. Into the early seventeenth century, when readers read a marginated page they read and considered the margins as an equal partner in the textual space. Growing out of the programmatic glosses and commentaries of Mediaeval Scholasticism, late Renaissance marginalia embraced a range

of markings – citations, inter- and intra-textual notes, deictic pointers, and authorial or editorial comments – many still functioning in keeping with their programmatic roots. In the years preceding the Quarto's composition, margination reached its apex. When Jonson set out to marginate his Quarto *Sejanus*, readers were beginning to regard such notations with suspicion, not as intrinsic participants in the text but as sometimes manipulative and sometimes frivolous impositions upon the text. In the face of the impotence this changing regard threatened, Jonson reimagined marginalia in the same way that he reimagined historiography.

Chapter four engages in a study of Matthew Gwinne's 1603 quarto *Nero* and John Harington's 1591 folio translation of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*. This study illustrates Jonson's conceptual novelty. Both Gwinne's *Nero* and Harington's *Orlando*, in their way, anticipate Jonson's marginating practices. *Nero*'s margins show Gwinne more the Polybian historiographer than Harington, while Harington's authorial voice occupies the margins in a way that Gwinne's does not. In Gwinne and Harington, the margins perform many literary and historiographic functions; yet none of those functions is indispensable to the centred text with which they interact.

The final chapter considers the Quarto's marginalia and its functions. The Quarto is unique among marginated play texts, indeed among texts, in that its centre – its dramatic dialogue – gestures outward, drawing in the margins. The Quarto has more in common with Scholasticism's marginated texts than it own contemporaries. This is not to say that the Quarto exhibits a programmatic agenda, but that its margins, enabled by superscripts, insist that they contain an equal share of meaning, and they dictate when and

how that meaning is to be accessed. The marginalia are integral to the composite text; indeed, they assert their own inexpendability. Out of this inexpendability, the Quarto is a vividly realized history, a Polybian study of the human causes and circumstances behind the rise and fall of Lucius Aelius Sejanus.

The Quarto *Sejanus* addresses the programmatic abuses of popular edification, by presenting itself as a most exhaustively efficacious text. Much in the centre text allows *Sejanus* to be read as Florentine historiography; nonetheless, the composite Quarto's historiography is emphatically Polybian. Read as Polybian composite, the Quarto's historiographic abundance makes it impossible to identify a Florentine clarifying tendency, while it offers the muddying complexity of motive and circumstance. Its fruitful margins not only inform meaning but engender meaning at every turn. Its historiography is holistic, showing in panoptic detail the causes and circumstances driving human events; and it is pragmatically secular, eschewing models of vice and virtue for psychologically complex human portraits of common error and reasoned action. The Quarto's composite nature is what makes it great; it is also where it fails. The Quarto asks too much labour of its reader. It must be read as a composite – sources must be traced. *Sejanus* is too big for the page, as it is too big for the stage. Jonson's intentions will continue to go unrealized too often, until a page can be designed that will contain those intentions. Finally, after 400 years, hypertext publishing might supply that page.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. *Ionsonus virbius: or, The memorie of Ben: Iohnson revived by the friends of the Muses* (London: Henry Seile,1638) 4/A4v; STC 14784. Claims to exceptional erudition are

commonplace in laudatory poems and epistles of the Renaissance and are, as often as not, hyperbolic. However, the encyclopedic knowledge present everywhere in Jonson's literary and critical works is witness to Cary's accuracy.

2. *The Devil's Disciple: Ben Jonson's Debt to Machiavelli* (NY: Philosophical Library, 1968) 91.

3. Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Just a Jiglot." *Times Literary Supplement* 5 Aug. 2005: 18.

4. "Roman-cast Similitude" 385-86; for arguments in the same vein see Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation* 50-53; and Evelyn Tribble, *Margins and Marginality* 147.

5. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1965) 19.

6. "'*Roman-cast Similitude*': Ben Jonson and the English Use of Roman History," *Rome and the Renaissance: The City and the Myth,* ed. P. A. Ramsey (NY: MRTS, 1982), 385-86; Patterson also sees Cordus's speech and trial as addressed to James (*Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* [Madison: Wisconsin U P, 1984] 50-53); as does Evelyn Tribble (*Margins and Marginality* [Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1993] 147).

7."*Sejanus*: Ethics and Politics" *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender Politics and the Jonsonian Canon*, ed. Julie Sanders (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 71-92. 82; in *Censorship and Interpretation*, Patterson also argues for Jonson's genuine feeling of optimism for James' reign (50).

8. "*Sejanus*: Ethics and Politics" 84.

9. *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* (NY: Routledge, 1990) 71.

10. *Passim.*

11. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 273-4.

12. *Ben Jonson's Theatrical Republics* (London: MacMillan, 1998), 15.

13. 31.

14. *Anticourt Drama in England 1603-1642* (Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1989), 73.

15. 148; Pebworth and Summers continue this line of argumentation (*Ben Jonson Revised* [NY: Twayne, 1999] 114).

16. 78.

17. *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* 70.

18. *The Devil's Disciple* 99.

19. *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* 74-5.

20. *Ben Jonson's Poesis: A literary Dialectic of Ideal and History* (Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1989) 19.

21. "The Self-Reflexive Art of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 12 (1970): 197-220, 209. See also Anne Barton, *Ben Jonson Dramatist* (Cambridge: UP, 1984) 104-5; Pebworth and Summers, *Ben Jonson Revised* 16; and Lee, *Ben Jonson's Poesis* 19.

22. *Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind* (Princeton: UP, 1984), 7; see also Barton, *Ben Jonson Dramatist* 105.

23. *Ben Jonson Revised* 115.

24. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 24.

25. "The Self-Reflexive Art of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*" 220.

26. *Ben Jonson, to the First Folio* (Cambridge: UP, 1983) 63.

27. ¶2r.

28. *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic tradition* (Cambridge: UP, 1979) 120-1.

29. *Ben Jonson, dramatist* 95.

30. 99-100.

31. *Ben Jonson his Craft and Art* 77.

32. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 2.

33. 9-10.

34. *Ben Jonson Revised* 114.

35. *Ben Jonson Dramatist* 96.

36. *Sejanus His Fall* (Manchester: UP, 1990) 24.

37. 37.

38. *Ben Jonson Revised* 117.

39. "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*: Jonson's 'integrity in the Story," *Studies in Philology* 75 (1978): 181-198, 189-90.

40. "The Seeds of Virtue: Political Imperatives in Jonson's *Sejanus*," *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 6.1 (April 1973): 41-60, 46.

41. 76-7.

42. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Books* (Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 2004) 549.

43. *Sejanus His Fall* 35-6.

44. *Anticourt Drama* 75; Ayres, *Sejanus His Fall* 24; and Bryant, "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 275-6.

45. "The Seeds of Virtue" 52. Dutton expresses this same thought in *Ben Jonson, to the First Folio* (60-1), and in slightly different words in a more expanded context in "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" (190).

46. *Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind* 34.

47. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 3; Dutton, *Ben Jonson: To the First Folio* 54; Bryant, "The Significance of Ben Jonson's First Requirement for Tragedy" *passim*, esp. 198; and Dutton, "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 183.

48. "The Significance of Ben Jonson's First Requirement for Tragedy: 'Truth of Argument,'" *Studies in Philology* 49 (1952): 195-213, 199-200.

49. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable," *PMLA* 69.1 (1954): 265-277, 266.

50. "The Significance of Ben Jonson's First Requirement for Tragedy" 204.

51. "'Fall before this Booke': The 1605 Quarto of *Sejanus*," *Text* 4, ed. D. C. Greetham and W. Speed Hill, (NY: AMS Press, 1988): 279-296, 286.

52. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 5-7; for further treatments of *Sejanus* and Sidney's distinctions see Bryant, "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 265-6; see also Bryant, "The Significance of Ben Jonson's First Requirement for Tragedy" passim, esp. 204-5; Dutton, "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 182-3; Dutton, *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio* 54; Ayres, *Sejanus His Fall* 28.

53. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 5-7.

54. *Ben Jonson His Craft and Art* 71-2.

55. *Ben Jonson to the First Folio* 57-8; see also Dutton's "The Sources, Text, and Readers of *Sejanus*" (184-5).

56. *Sejanus His Fall* 30. In "The Nature of Jonson's Roman History" Ayres offers a more complete treatment of Jonson's Tragedies as history (*English Literary Renaissance* 16.1 [1986 winter]: 166-181, *passim*).

57. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 271.

58. *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1993) 147. Dutton offers a nice concise summary of the usual suspects in the *Sejanus*/Privy Council affair (*Mastering the Revels* 10ff); see also De Luna, *Jonson's Romish Plot* 7-98

59. *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1981) 54.

60. *Anticourt Drama* 211, n.21.

61. 77.

62. *Jonson Versus Bakhtin: Carnival and the Grotesque* (NY: Rodpoi, 2003) 64.

63. "'Roman-Cast Similitude,': Ben Jonson and the English Use of Roman History," *Rome and the Renaissance: The City and the Myth,* ed. P. A. Ramsey (NY: MRTS, 1982), 381.

64. Patterson, "'*Roman-cast Similitude*'" 381-2.

65. "The War on History in Jonson's *Sejanus*," *Studia Neophilologica* 66.1 (1993): 209-11.

66. *Sejanus His Fall* 30; Barish, *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 4; Bryant, "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 275; Dutton, "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 184; Miles, *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* 71.

67. "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources," *Re-presenting Ben Jonson: Text, History, Performance*, ed. Martin Butler, (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999) 152-73, 154.

68. *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* (Cambridge: UP, 2002) 550; see also Slights, *Managing Readers* 59, 107; and Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 164-5.

69. Drummond, "Conversations," *Ben Jonson, Discoveries. 1641 * * Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden. 1619*, ed. G. B. Harrison (NY: E. P. Dutton, 1923), 14.

70. De Luna, *Jonson's Romish Plot: A study of Catiline and its Historical Context* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 7-98; Dutton, *Mastering the Revels* 10ff; Tribble, *Margins and Marginality* 147.

71. 55. See also Patterson on this observation ("'*Roman-cast Similitude*'" 385). It should be said that Jonson also contributed to, and wrote verse for, Ralegh's *The History of the World*.

72. "Jonson, Northampton, and the 'Treason' in *Sejanus*," *Modern Philology* (May 1983): 357-363, 359.

73. *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought* (Chicago: UP, 1976) 161. This observation only becomes truer with every month that passes within the play's uncertain dating. Yet is must be borne in mind that dating the play's inception with the *Poetaster*'s publication, in 1601, does suggest Essex's fall as that "something come into my thought,/ That must, and shall be sung, high, and aloof."

74. 356-8 *et passim*: see also Ayres, *Sejanus His Fall* 22.

75. 171

76. *Ben Jonson Revised* 113.

77. *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* 155-56.

78. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 16-18; Dutton, "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 195-6; and Jowett, "'Fall before this Booke'" 291.

79. "*Sejanus*: Ethics and Politics" 76-7.

80. *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* 158.

81. *Mastering the Revels* 14.

82. 550.

83. "Jonson's Use of Lipsius in *Sejanus*" 253.

84. "Juvenal, Horace and *Sejanus,*" *MLN* 75. 7 (1960): 545-550, 545; see also Boughner, "Jonson's Use of Lipsius in *Sejanus*," *MLN* 73 (April 1958): 247-255, 248; and Boughner, *The Devil's Disciple* 89.

85. *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* 72.

86. "Juvenal, Horace and *Sejanus*" 546.

87. 547.

88. 90-91.

89. *The Devil's Disciple* 89.

90. *The Devil's Disciple* 89. This statement is questionable given the multiple examples offered in *Sejanus*'s margins, in which Jonson offers almost a dozen historical excerpts illustrating the presence of, indignation towards, and awards for court spies: see the note at I.421: "c *Tyrannis fere oritur ex nimiâ procerum adulatione, in principē*. Arist. *Pol. lib.* 5. *ca.* 10. 11. *et Delatorū auctoritate. Lege* Tac. Dio. Suet. Tib. *per totū. Sub quo decreta accusatoribus præcipua præmia. Vid.* Suet. Tib. *cap.* 61 & Sen. *Benefi. lib.* 3 *cap.* 26" (C3v).

91. *The Devil's Disciple* 90.

92. *Ibid.*

93. *The Devil's Disciple* 94.

94. 93. Yet it must be said that, in his "Discoveries," Jonson offers Tiberius as an example of an "evill *Prince*" (49).

95. *Anticourt Drama* 74.

96. 74.

97. 12-15.

98. 119-20.

99. *Censorship and Interpretation* 54; see also Patterson, "'*Roman-cast Similitude*'" 382; and Norman P. Miller, "Style and Content in Tacitus," *Tacitus*, ed. T. A. Dorey. (London: Routledge, 1969) 99-116, 115.

100. Sanders, *Ben Jonson's Theatrical Republics* 14.

101. "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources" 153.

102. "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 184-6; and Dutton, *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio* 57-9; see also Barish, *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 8-9; Butler, "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources" 165; Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic tradition* 140-2; and Miles, *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art*, 72.

103. *The Devil's Disciple* 89; and *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* 72-3.

104. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 14; Barish also supplies a useful breakdown of all Jonson's alterations to characterization (8-15).

105. *Anticourt Drama* 75.

106. "The Nature of Jonson's Roman History" 178.

107. "The Nature of Jonson's Roman History" 177-9. Here Ayres also discusses how, by adjusting historical his portrait, Jonson "whitewashed" Drusus (180).

108. "Jonson, Northampton, and the 'Treason' in *Sejanus*" 360, *et passim.* On Silius and Northampton see also Ayres, *Sejanus His Fall* (17-19).

109. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 9.

110. *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio* 56-7.

111. *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy* (Toronto: UP, 1994) 48.

112. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 271.

113. "Conversations" 24.

114. "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 196.

115. *Sejanus His Fall* E_1r.

116. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 18. In agreement with Barish's assessment are Barton (*Ben Jonson, dramatist* 102-3), Dutton ("The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*," 196-7), John Jowett ("'Fall before this Booke'," 288-9), and Tribble (*Margins and Marginality* 147).

117. *Censorship and Interpretation* 57; see also Dutton *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio* 63.

118. 35.

119. N. B. De Luna, *Jonson's Romish Plot* 87-8; Dutton, *Mastering the Revels* 164-5; Pebworth, and Summers, *Ben Jonson Revised* 114, *et passim*; Slights, *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy* 48; Slights, *Managing Readers* 59 &107.

120. *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* 155-6.

121. "'Fall before this Booke'" 287. The quotation is from "To the Reader" (¶2v).

122. *Sejanus His Fall* 22.

123."'Fall before this Booke'" 287.

124. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 266.

125. *Ibid.*

126. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 5-7.

127. *Ibid.*.

128. *Passim*.

129. *Passim*; see also Boughner, "Juvenal, Horace and *Sejanus*" 550.

130. "Ben Jonson's Debt to Renaissance Scholarship in 'Sejanus' and 'Catiline'" *passim*.

131. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 272.

132.The dialogue was presented only once, in response to libels *Poetaster* suffered following one of its initial performances. The "aplogeticall Dialogue" first appears in the 1616 folio (*The Workes of Ben Ionson* [London: Richard Meighen, 1616] 348-53/Ff6v-Gg3r; STC 14751). Tom Cain offers a convincing argument for revising the conventional dating of *Poetaster*'s first performance from spring/summer 1601 to the Michaelmas/winter season of 1601-02 (*Poetaster* [Manchester: UP, 1995] 28). Line numbers are taken from Tom Cain's text. *Poetaster* was entered in to the Stationers' Register December 21, 1601.

133. 353,Gg3r, 209-25.

134. *Every Man Out of His Humour* (London: William Holme, 1600) B2v, 227; STC 14768.

135. Tom Cain points to this broadly accepted detail in a note to this line, in his edition of *Poetaster* (*ad loc*).

136. Concio is translated in Thomas Blundeville's *The true order and methode of wryting and reading hystories according to the precepts of Francisco Patricio, and Accontio Tridentino, two Italian writers, no lesse plainly than briefly, set forth in our vulgar speach, to the great profite and commoditye of all those that delight in hystories* (London: William Seres, 1574) G2r; STC 3161.

137. The dialogue was suppressed with those other parts that appear in the folio but are absent from the quarto – those abusing lawyers and players. Jonson addresses these suppressions in the folio version of the play's dedicatory epistle, to Mr. Richard Martin, as that "which so much ignorance, and malice of the times, then conspir'd to have suppresed" (*Workes* 273/Z5r). In the epistle "To the Reader" prefacing the dialogue itself,

Jonson makes no mention of its being part of the matter suppressed, but, rather, it makes quite clear that it was spoken in response to the very libels that inspired the suppressions: "it was all the answer I euer gaue to sundry impotent libells then cast out (and some yet remaining) against me and this play" (*Ibid.* 348). In the epilogue to the 1602 quarto *Poetaster* Jonson complains that the dialogue,"the reasons for his publishing of this booke," too, had been suppressed: "he is no lesse restrain'd, then thou depriv'd of it, by Authority" (*Poetaster or The arraignment* [London: M. Lownes, 1602] N1v; STC 14781). I must also note here that the apology Jonson refers to in this epilogue might well be that between Horace and Trebatius (translated out of Horace Satires 2.1), missing from the quarto but appearing in the folio at Act III Scene V, asserting that the satiric voice was natural to him, and that he never attacked anyone but in defense (*Workes* 308-12/Cc4v-6v).

138. 350/Gg1r, 92.

139. OED, sv practiser/practicer, *n.* † 2.

140. *Ben: Ionson his Volpone or The foxe* (London: Thomas Thorppe, 1607) ¶2[v]; STC 14783.

141. *Sejanus* II.310-11. Coronato coins this term in his discussion of Jonson's socio-political intentions for *Sejanus* (*Jonson Versus Bakhtin: Carnival and the Grotesque, passim*).

142. "apologeticall Dialogue" Gg2r/351, 71-72; from Martial: *Hunc servare modum nostri novere libelli,/ Parcere personis, dicere de vitiis* (*Martial Epigrams*, ed. and trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993] X.xxxiii. 9-10).

143. "apologeticall Dialogue" 352/Gg2v, 144-64.

144. Although my various readings little impact the purport of these lines, explicating the reference to "To strike the eare of time" has robbed me of much time. Is the ear of time a) the *status quo*, the popular appetite, that against which Jonson is insistently striking? or is it b) posterity – a nineteenth-century usage – that within which what lingers is validated, that within which *Sejanus* will last? or c) is the ear that part of a bell by which it is wrung, and time is this historiographic epoch, and Jonson is announcing what ought to be contemporary tastes? or d), if we comprehend space with the eye and time with the ear, is the eare of time the historic record, that bell he will wring?

145. "apologeticall Dialogue" 353/G3r, 215-19.

146. Richard McCabe provides a brief and cogent discussion of this new critical consensus ("Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599," *The Yearbook of English Studies*. 11 [1981]: 188-93). Cynthia Susan Clegg provides a longer treatment of the ban's political dimensions in her Chapter "The Bishops' ban 'shreud suspect of ill

pretences'" (*Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* 198-217). The Elizabethan censors did not ban Juvenal, Ovid and Martial, with all their characteristic licence. Juvenal, Ovid, and Martial existed in numerous authorised editions and English translations and were commonly taught in schools.

147. For the following discussion of Jonson's library I am indebted to David McPherson's "Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: An Annotated Catalogue," *Studies in Philology* 71-5 (1974): 1+3-106.

148. Although he makes no direct reference to his books, Jonson poetically laments the loss of his writing to fire: "An Execration upon Vulcan" *Ben Jonson The Complete Poems*, ed. George Parfitt (Baltimore MD: Penguin Education, 1975) 181-87, *passim*.

149. I acknowledge that the *Discoveries* is not a Jonson text in the conventional sense but, at best, a print version of his personal commonplace book, or, as likely, a posthumous and arbitrary collation of his notes. I use this source with caution.

150. *Sejanus* is not first but the second of Jonson's heavily marginated texts. *Ben Ion: His Part of the King's Entertainment on Passing to His Coronation* (STC 14756), published a year earlier, prefigures something of Jonson's intentions for the Quarto and its margins. The entertainment itself – that described in the centred text – marked a shift in the representational mode of royal entries. Jonson abandoned the broadly accessible medieval model of religio-allegorical representation for the humanist model of classical allusion. The allusions described in centred text attest to James's qualifications as a king. The abundant margins explicate the symbolism behind each allusion and authorize each explication with excerpts from Latin and Greek sources. They fill out the reader's classical knowledge to provide fuller access to textual meaning. Once the reader references the margins, James's qualifications become even more evident.

151. Herford and Simpson (*H&S*) set out the Quarto's notes in such a way that they number 306 (*Ben Jonson* Vol. IV, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson [Oxford: Clarendon, 1932] 472-85).

CHAPTER 1: THE MATERIAL TEXT AS SEMIOTIC CONTEXT

Come forth SEIANVS, fall before this Booke, / And to thy Falles Reviver, aske forgivenesse,That thy lowe Birth and Merits, durst to looke / A Fortune in the face, of such uneuennesse.[1]

— George Chapman, "In Seianvm Ben. Ionsoni Et Musis, et sibi *in Delicijs*."

Jonson tells Drummond that he had been working in Cotton's library with Camden present when James entered England, in April or May of 1603.[2] The Folio *Sejanus*'s title page states that the play was first performed in 1603, so between March 25 1603 and March 25 1604, by old-style dating. Philip Ayres argues for a first Globe performance of *Sejanus* shortly after the reopening of the theatres on April 9, 1604.[3] It is tempting to think of Jonson surrounded by scholarly texts, composing a *Sejanus* which was every bit as erudite as the centred text we have today. We do not know what exactly the audience witnessed when *Sejanus*'s "fresh strains" appeared upon the Globe's stage in the spring of 1604. We do know that, whatever it was, it was not well received. On November 2 of that same year Edward Blount paid his few pence to the Stationers' Company and registered his right to publish *Sejanus*.[4] Fortunately, on August 6, 1605 the right to publish was transferred to Thomas Thorpe, a bookseller particularly open to allowing playwrights a high degree of control over the *mise-en-page* of their texts.[5] Then, with an amenable publisher secured, Ben Jonson walked into George Eld's print shop and oversaw the composition of *Sejanus*. Thorpe's willingness to grant Jonson a compositorial role resulted in a Quarto that announces itself the scholarly work of the new stamp of historian – and it does so from the composition of its title page, to the authorizing epistle and prefatory poems, to the *mise-en-page* of the composite text.[6] Providing "all the qualities

and circumstances" of an historical event called for a level of scholarly *exercitatio* that eclipsed that required by even a *Julius Caesar* or *Henry V*, both of which are based on a single popularly accessible source. With composing out of the familiar a proven recipe for dramatic success, the norm had been to employ a single popularly accessible source, such as North's translation of *Plutarch's Parallel Lives* or Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* for history, or Astemio's two *Hecatomythia* or Cinthio's *Hecatommithi* for tragedy. Openly and intently indebted to humanist scholarship and its classical texts, *Sejanus*'s ground is embellished with the fruits of Jonson's prior five-year course of humanist reading. Jonson's reading on historiography – in Bacon, Blundeville, Machiavelli, and Polybius – is involved in the Quarto's innovative substance. Where the centred text would reveal its scholarly debts to the most learned reader, the Quarto's material form renders Jonson's intellectual labours patent – a pattern reproduced in the masques he wrote during the same period, 1605-1609. Beginning in 1605, with *The Masque of Blackness*, Jonson's masques begin to marginally exhibit their academic influences. Of those masques Jonson composed with patent classical erudition and published with marginal annotation, all but two were produced during the years in which his plays openly display the same qualities – 1605-1609. Close inspection of the Quarto's material form – from its title page, through its epistle, laudatory poems, and argument, to the very *mise-en-page* of the play text proper – reveals that the form itself is part of the innovation of the 1605 *Sejanus*. The text is the thing.

Since its first material appearance in the 1605 Quarto, *Sejanus* has enjoyed a long and varied publication history. It appears with new front matter, marginalia, and *mise-en-*

page, with only few accidentals in the three seventeenth-century folios, and the 1716 Booksellers' Edition. *Sejanus* fares only slightly less well in the eighteenth-century's cut, corrected, and collated collections. In that century *Sejanus* was twice altered and published by Thomas Gentleman, once as *Sejanus a Tragedy: As it was Intended for the Stage* and once as *The Favourite: An Historical Tragedy.* Until Peter Whalley's critical notes to the 1756 collection, *The Dramatic Works of Ben Jonson*, editors had made no mention of the Quarto. In the two hundred and fifty years since Whalley, editing of *Sejanus* has seen steady progress. Acknowledgment of the marginalia as a feature of Jonson's original composition has been part of that progress. Editors have, however, traditionally shown deference to the more explicitly theatrical Folio text when compiling each new edition of *Sejanus*.

This is not to say that the scholarly Quarto receives no comment. Virtually all critical editions since Whalley open with discussion of the historiographic labours that went into the writing of *Sejanus*, as well as Jonson's representation of those labours in the Quarto's margins. However, even those editions that acknowledge the importance of the marginal notes and include them take the Folio as the typographical and compositorial model for the play text itself, relegating the Quarto's marginalia to footnotes, endnotes, or appendices. Although the practice amongst twentieth-century editors of *Sejanus* is to collate multiple copies of the Quarto when composing their own texts, the Folio always exerts its influence, and the editions that result from these collations are Folio versions that subsume certain informative features of the Quarto. Each act of editorial subsumption disregards Jonson's compositorial plan for the Quarto, none more so than

that for its marginalia.

Whalley's preface to his 1756 *Dramatic Works* offers a statement of the editorial principle that has influenced editors of *Sejanus* for 300 years: "a folio of Jonson's works was printed in his life time, and under his own inspection; so that we have an authentic copy for our pattern, and which we found of great use in correcting the mistakes of subsequent editions."[7] Two assumptions have grown out of this statement: the first is that Jonson played a compositorial role in the 1616 Folio; the second is that "Folio *Sejanus*" and "Quarto *Sejanus*" are somehow synonymous, and that, therefore, one can be held in authority over the other. From this statement, the "authority" of the Folio *Sejanus* remained unchallenged for almost 200 years, until challenged by W. W. Greg's *Rationale of Copy-Text*. In his discussion of the *H&S Sejanus*, Greg comments that "[Dr Simpson's adoption of apostrophes from the quarto] amounts to an admission that in some respects at least the quarto preserves the formal aspect of the author's original more faithfully than the folio."[8] Situated in very a different editorial tradition than Greg's, Whalley follows his authoritative Folio, employing "*Act*," where the Quarto uses "ACTVS," and breaking *Sejanus*'s metrical lines with indented speech prefixes, where metre determines the Quarto's line length. Whalley excludes the Quarto's letter "To the Readers" and includes the Folio's scant critical marginalia in his margins. This inclusion has an awkward result as Whalley's columns allow for only cramped margination. Although Whalley evidently took the Folio as his copy text, he made some recourse to the Quarto in his composition of *The Fall of Sejanus*. In his preface, he acknowledges his use of the Quarto *Sejanus* when thanking Dr Rawlinson for the use of his copy.[9] The only speculation the preface

offers on the motivation behind Jonson's marginalia is tangentially directed at the translations in *Catiline*: "he, in truth, considered them as beauties, and prided himself upon his translations, as so many real excellencies, and the chief ornaments of his play."[10] Whalley provides excerpts from the histories in his own footnoted commentaries. In doing so, he reproduces none of the Quarto's original marginalia, nor indeed does he mention the Quarto's marginalia at all. He introduces his debt to those margins with such statements as "consulting the original, I find this," or "Jonson himself informs us."[11] Opening with the Argument, not "To the Readers," the Quarto in its material complexity exists nowhere in Whalley's *The Fall of Sejanus*.

In 1816, William Gifford's magisterial nine-volume *The Works of Ben Jonson* first reproduced the Quarto's marginalia – although it presents them as footnotes.[12] As might be expected of a nineteenth-century editor, Gifford borrows much from Whalley's text. Unlike Whalley, Gifford includes the letter "To the Readers" and addresses Jonson's use of marginalia directly, although briefly: *"Sejanus* is entirely founded on the Greek and Latin historians, who are carefully quoted in the margin of the first copy: and the author values himself on the closeness with which he has followed his origins."[13] Gifford also offers a brief statement of the editorial principle guiding his own reproduction of the marginalia: "as Jonson is very profuse in his explanatory references, I have contented myself with bringing them back . . . and again left the play, as the author left it, 'to the judgement of the learned.'"[14] The only statements he offers regarding his copy text are to cite Whalley's works and to write that he has removed the "officious impertinence" of Simpson, Seward, and Grey for "discovering allusions which Jonson himself had pointed

out more than a century before."[15] Although Gifford acknowledges the presence of the notes in the Quarto, he follows the eighteenth-century editorial practice of relying on recent "authoritative" editions as the foundation of his own. With his predecessors' editions, the pages of his *Sejanus* bear a much closer resemblance to those of the Folio than to those of the Quarto.

Gifford presents the Quarto's notes at the foot of the page, connected to the text by superscripts, and dwarfed by his own critical notes. While Gifford provides no transcriptions nor translations from the Quarto's marginal resources, he paraphrases the historians at places within his own critical notes. Gifford offers nothing from the Quarto's Renaissance humanist resources. He shows none of the attention C. H. Hereford and Percy Simpson's Oxford *Ben Jonson* (*H&S*) would show to correction of *Sejanus*'s notes.[16] Nor does he show any of the attention *H&S* would show to faithful transcription of the notes. Gifford exchanges Roman numerals for Arabic, at times incorrectly; adds and removes italics; replaces ampersands; exchanges minuscules for capitals in reference imperatives *Leg, Vid,* and *Cons*; reduces *pag./pa.* to p.; and employs "etc." where the margins list multiple pages. What in the Quarto is "*Lege* Tac. *Ann. lib.* 1. *pag.* 24. *de* Romano Hispane, & *cæteris. ibid.* et *lib.* 3 *Ann. pag.* 61 & 62. Iuuen. *Sat.* 10 *ver.* 87. Suet. Tib. *cap.* 61," Gifford renders "*Lege Tacit. Ann.* Lib. i. p. 24. *de Romano Hispano, et cæteris, ibid. et* Lib. iii. *Ann.* p. 61 *etc. Juv. Sat.* x. v. 87. *Suet. Tib.* cap. 61."[17] Although tacitly acknowledging the importance of the marginalia as a feature of the original publication, in his *Sejanus*, Gifford follows the nineteenth-century norm, creating a genealogical edition, in an effort to produce not a faithful representation of an original

but an authoritative text out of all available versions. What he accomplishes is a text founded in the Folio that has brought certain features of the Quarto under its control. Gifford's is, ultimately, a text that bears a deeper stamp of his own scholarship than of Jonson's.

The first substantial twentieth-century collection of Jonson's plays, the 1910 Everyman *Ben Jonson's Plays in Two Volumes*, owes much to Gifford, taking up his page with its typographical and compositorial preference for the Folio. In his introduction to Volume One, Felix E. Shelling supplies a statement of the editorial principle in regard to the Quarto's margins: Jonson "wrote his Sejanus like a scholar, reading Tacitus, Suetonius, and other authorities, to be certain of his facts, his setting, and his atmosphere, and somewhat pedantically noting his authorities in the margins when he came to print."[18] By mentioning the notes in his introduction's brief treatment of *Sejanus*, Shelling acknowledges that the margins are an important feature of the Quarto; however, his "pedantically noting" suggests that he viewed the contents of the margin's themselves as extraneous to the Quarto's meaning. Reflecting Shelling's impression of the marginalia as an important feature of *Sejanus*'s original publication form, if not an important participant in its meaning, the only notes the Everyman editors provide are those from the Quarto's margins, presented as footnotes keyed to the text by superscripts, with no further comment. *Jonson's Plays* copies the Quarto's footnotes from Gifford and perpetuates both his practices and errors, while adding new errors or adjustments to the Quarto's typography. What in the *Quarto* is "*De* Macro *isto, vid.* Dio. *Rom. Hist. lib.* 58. *pag.* 718 & Tac. *Ann. lib.* 6 *pag.* 109. 114. 115.," *Jonson's Plays* renders "De Macro isto, vid. Dio.

Rom. Hist. lib. lii. p. 718 et Tac. Ann. Lib. vi. p. 109, etc."[19] Although moving Jonson's notes to the bottom of the page denies them the parallel value implied in the original *mise-en-page*, Everyman's editors do not overwhelm those notes with commentary. Holding sole possession of foot of the page, the Quarto's marginalia can still play a scholarly part in this *Sejanus*, however much that part is subsumed by the Folio's dramatic form.

In his 1911 *Sejanus by Ben Jonson*, W. D. Briggs provides the first critical treatment of the marginal notes, a treatment that is cited still. In composing his text, Briggs collated the Quarto, the Folios of 1616, 1640, and 1692, the Booksellers' edition of 1716-17, two editions of Whalley, and one of Gifford. Following his eighteenth- and nineteenth-century models, Briggs reproduces the Folio's use of "Act" and its indented speech prefixes. Adding to Gifford and the Everyman editors, Briggs further subsumes the Quarto beneath the "authority" of the Folio, setting the Quarto's letter "To the Readers" and its laudatory verse between the Folio *Sejanus*'s title page and its truncated Argument. In his introduction to the text, Briggs offers his rationale for treating the Quarto's notes: "Jonson's own notes to *Sejanus* could not be omitted, nor a satisfactory notion of his methods of writing tragedy be conveyed without frequent display of the material employed . . . moreover, some explanation of Roman usages, social and other, seemed necessary."[20] Within that rationale is Briggs's only explicit critical evaluation of the marginal notes. As suggested in this evaluation, Briggs understood the need to transcribe both the notes and the sources to which they direct the reader. This is not to say that he endeavors to reproduce in his text the reading experience of the Quarto's first

readers, for he takes the Folio as his copy text. Despite recognizing the role of the notes and their contents, Briggs includes only the Folio's scant commentary notes in the margins, while drawing its original stage directions into the text itself. He divorces the original Quarto notes from the play text by setting them at the back of the volume, and he provides no key of any sort within the play text to suggest their presence. Briggs further distinguishes the Quarto's notes from the play text by providing them with a dedicated introduction and intermingling them with his own critical notes.

Briggs admits that he deals only "somewhat fully with the relation of Jonson to his sources."[21] He relies on modern editions for Tacitus, Dio Cassius, Suetonius, Seneca, and Juvenal. Had Briggs' conception of the play not been so folio-centric, one might wonder why an editor who put such effort into collation should stop short of comprehensiveness when compiling his list of Jonson's marginal resources: "every reasonable demand is satisfied when necessary information is supplied from modern books. Most of his abbreviations . . . have been on first occurrence expanded . . .. In one case (Rodig., 133, 51) I have not been able to identify the work."[22] Briggs' "every reasonable demand" suggests that he deemed somewhat wasted the labours an exhaustive edition of the Quarto would ask of its editor. Briggs further qualifies his lack of comprehension: "Special philological works of Jonson's own day have not been easily accessible, nor did it seem of the highest importance that his references to them should be examined."[23] This editorial valuation of Jonson's Quarto marginalia is present throughout Briggs's notes. He is very selective in transcribing from the sources. Most often he simply transcribes the marginal note itself. Where he transcribes from the historic record, he

often does not transcribe all the sources to which the margins direct the reader – the note will cite Tacitus and Dio Cassius but he provides a transcription only from Tacitus. Safely assuming much, but not too much, of his reader, where Briggs transcribes from the Latin record, he provides only the Latin, where he transcribes from Dio Cassius's Greek, he provides only an English translation. Where in places he offers long quotations from the histories, in most instances he transcribes short passages, while, in others still, he merely paraphrases. With Briggs' *Sejanus*, the Quarto's notes draw away from nineteenth-century objectification; nevertheless, subject to their editor's valuations, relegated to the back of the book, and set amongst their editor's own critical notes, the Quarto's marginalia cannot function as a necessary part of reading. In Briggs's *Sejanus*, as in those editions it precedes and succeeds, the Folio's dramatic page still reigns over the Quarto's scholarly page.

In 1932 Oxford published Volume IV of *Ben Jonson*, containing "Sejanus" as edited by C. H. Hereford and Percy Simpson. *H&S* collates *Sejanus* from seven copies of the Quarto. The textual introduction to the play attests to the degree of effort that went into creating this "ideal" edition.[24] Despite its reliance on an "ideal" Quarto, the *H&S* *Sejanus* uses the Folio version as its copy text and draws key features of the Quarto into what is essentially a reprint of the Folio. It opens the play text with four states of *Sejanus*'s title page, occupying four pages: the first and last are from the Quarto, the first a photo facsimile, the latter a photo plate. The second and third, from the 1616 and 1640 Folios, are on facing pages and, attesting to the text's folio-centricity, command a much greater share of the reader's attention. *H&S* continues the practice begun by Gifford of

setting the Quarto's epistle "To the Readers" between the Folio's dedicatory epistle to Esmé Lord Aubigny and its truncated Argument. Following the Folio, *H&S* excludes the laudatory poems from the play's front matter. *H&S* adopts the Folio's use of "*Act,*" and its indented speech prefixes. And *H&S* includes the Folio's marginal notes. Although, by providing "To the Readers," the *H&S Sejanus* acknowledges the importance of the marginal annotation to Jonson's original composition, the text itself severs the link with that most salient feature. The *H&S* play text provides no indication where the Quarto's marginal notes originally resided. Further, *H&S* transcribes the Quarto's notes with a dedicated introduction and corrections in Appendix XI, as "Jonson's Historical Notes in the Quarto." However carefully the editors may have transcribed the Quarto's notes, they did so not without error: *H&S*'s"Romano Hispone"[25] goes unmarked by "<>" as a correction for the Quarto's "Romano Hispane."[26]

The full commentary to *Sejanus*, with its transcriptions from the Quarto's historical sources, appears in 1950, with Oxford's *H&S* Volume IX. No single modern scholarly resource receives as much critical citation from scholars and editors of *Sejanus* as *H&S* Vol IX. *H&S* Volume IX records the editorial principle guiding the treatment of the Quarto's notes: "Where Jonson is indebted to the early texts, we have quoted the passage in full, prefixing an asterisk to the note."[27] *H&S* has determined what constitutes a debt, and therefore Volume IX does not provide passages from every classical source the Quarto cites, and it pays little attention to the Quarto's Renaissance humanist resources. As had Briggs' introduction, *H&S* Volume IX betrays a certain valuation, judging where Jonson's debts begin and end, which is, fairly, a part of the editor-centric,

pre-Greg bibliographic landscape.

Volume IV severs the Quarto's marginal notes from the centred text and relegates them to an appendix. With Volume IX, *H&S* relegates the matter contained within the those notes to a separate volume and a separate decade. Volume IX does not treat each of the Quarto's 306 notes at length, but selects some and intermingles those transcriptions with its own editorial commentary. What transcriptions it supplies are brief, but for those that illustrate Jonson's close translation of certain passages from the histories. And the histories alone find transcription in Volume IX. Like Briggs, whose text it often cites, Volume IX seems to judge Jonson's humanist resources to be not of the highest importance. Like Briggs, *H&S* provides only the Latin; unlike Briggs it supplies only Dio Cassius's Greek. To access the Quarto's page as Jonson composed it, the reader must first find reason to inquire of Appendix IV if a note exists and then pick up Volume IX to see if that note's content is traced therein. The process of accessing the margins denies the reader the meaning provided by the Quarto's composite page.

Three years after *H&S* Volume IV appeared, Henry de Vocht published his quasi facsimile of *Ben Jonson's Sejanus His Fall.* De Vocht uses the Bodleian's Malone copy as his copy text. De Vocht's 1935 text reproduces the marginalia with all the errors and accidentals of its copy text. While the editor provides no expansion or commentary on individual notes, in his 120 page discussion of the Quarto and Folio texts, he comments on the marginalia in general. De Vocht insists that the 1616 Folio's lack of marginalia and inclusion of "childish stage-directions" – among other "ineptitudes" – argue that Jonson had no part in the composition of that text.[28] The value of de Vocht's edition is

not in his exhaustive bibliographical comments but in the publication of a text that reproduces the page as Jonson composed it.

Jonas A. Barish's 1965 *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* provides criticism with a much quoted introduction to Jonson's play. Taking the Folio as his copy text, Barish's introduction makes little comment on the Quarto's original material form, other than to state that the marginalia attest to how seriously Jonson took *Sejanus* as a history.[29] Barish's edition is based on the Folio, which he argues supersedes the Quarto's authority.[30] Despite his use of the Folio, Barish follows the practice begun by Gifford of including the Quarto's "To the Readers" in his edition's front matter. Barish's own footnotes provide glosses only. In his endnotes, Barish offers insight into the extent of Jonson's use of the historic record, through numerous extended translations from Tacitus, which he admits are "not presented complete."[31] He also supplies a few excerpts from Suetonius and Dio Cassius. Nowhere in the text does Barish provide transcriptions of the Quarto's original marginal notes, for the reason that they are too various and too numerous.[32] In his "Appendix: The Text," Barish provides the rationale for giving way to their variety and number: "the extensive marginal notes of the quarto, in which Jonson cites his sources, have neither been reproduced nor recorded, the page references to sixteenth-century editions making them useful only to scholars wishing to consult those same editions."[33] As with all such rationales, Barish's represents an editorial valuation of the margin's role in *Sejanus*'s original form. Barish judges that, for the readers of his text at least, the Quarto's marginalia are ephemerae, part of one moment in *Sejanus*'s history only, and necessary only to scholars who are interested in that moment. Their value is not

in their presence on the page, nor in their power to draw in meaning from beyond the perimeter of the page.

The year following Barish's edition, W. F. Bolton published his New Mermaids edition, *Sejanus his Fall: Ben Jonson.* Although he uses the Folio as his copy text, Bolton continues the tradition of subsuming the Quarto beneath the Folio in the play's front matter. He includes both the Folio's dedication to Esmé and the Quarto's "To the Readers" behind Folio's title page. Bolton breaks with tradition by including the Argument in its original, un-truncated Quarto form. Instead of continuing the Folio's practice of indented speech prefixes, *Sejanus his Fall* indents each speech as a block. In the front matter, at least, Bolton maintains a better balance of Quarto and Folio than any edition in 350 years. Having said this, Bolton's play text furnishes none of the Quarto's notes, supplying their place with his own footnotes, a few of which make reference to the Folio's scant marginalia and point out variants between Quarto and Folio. Despite this lack of attention to the Quarto's marginalia in the play text, Bolton's introduction deals with the notes and their sources at greater length than any of his predecessors. It must be added that when he transcribes an example from the Quarto in that introduction, he represents Jonson's marginal notes as footnotes.[34] In his Appendix A, Bolton argues that it would be pointless for him provide excerpts from the histories, since Briggs and *H&S* have already done so. He does, however, supply thirty-four selected lines out of Juvenal's Satire X to illustrate that Jonson's employment of that poem is not merely "*verbatim*" or "*seriatim*." Bolton illustrates with this selection both Jonson's cited and uncited uses of Satire X and, in general, the sort of use he made of his classical sources.[35] Bolton's text

is the culmination of 250 years in which editors have assured that reading S*ejanus* – whether in a collection or a critical edition – is equal to reading the Folio *Sejanus*, whatever deference they might show to the original marginalia and front matter.

Philip Ayres' *Sejanus his Fall: Ben Jonson* breaks with the convention of subsuming the features the Quarto under the Folio. Ayres separates *Sejanus* from the Folio. Editing Jonson's play for the Revels Plays series, Ayres draws together the best qualities of his predecessors, and, in doing so, he produces a reading experience closer to the original than any of them. In accord with the stance of W. W. Greg, Fredson Bowers, and G. Thomas Tanselle that the Quarto is as authoritative as the Folio, Ayres collated twenty-three copies of the Quarto for his copy text and amends substantives only from the Folio.[36] In his introduction to the edition, Ayres dedicates two pages of text and two of figures to the Quarto, its composition, and his collation. Aryes reproduces the Quarto's title page. He includes the Quarto's laudatory poems and its un-truncated Argument. Ayres turns into conflation the most dominant feature of the traditional subsumption of the Quarto under the Folio: he sets the Folio's dedication to Esmé between the Quarto's title page and its letter "To the Reader." While Ayres' *Sejanus* resumes the Quarto's use of "ACTUS," he does not retain the Quarto's mass entrances nor does he set speech prefixes within the metrical line as Jonson had done when composing the original.

Ayres makes the editorial decision not to reproduce the Quarto's notes. As he writes in his introduction, "*Q*'s marginal annotations are useless to most modern readers, who cannot go to the early editions Jonson cites, and may not read Latin."[37] This statement is, as for as it goes, true. As my project argues, the Quarto's marginalia project

greater meaning than that offered within the individual note. At the foot of each page, Ayres presents, mingled with his own extensive footnotes, paraphrases and excerpts from the Quarto's classical sources out of modern Loeb editions. He introduces these paraphrases and excerpts with "Jonson cites." Ayres records in his footnotes where Jonson cites his Renaissance humanist resources. He does not elaborate upon their contents or relevance. In an appendix, Ayres transcribes five lengthy translations from the Roman histories, three from Tacitus, one from Dio Cassius, and one from Claudian, whom the Quarto does not cite. Ayres' *Sejanus*, although not wholly divested of the Folio, is expressly not founded upon the Folio. Ayres' *Sejanus* is not a modern edition of the Quarto, as this project would imagine such a text.

This project makes the argument that the Quarto's material form is important. From front matter, to *mise-en-page*, to marginalia, the material form plays an equal role in the Quarto *Sejanus*'s production of meaning. The fullness of that meaning is present only in the form in which Jonson originally composed it. As this publication survey illustrates, based on the principle that the last version produced in an author's lifetime (or under his supervision) is the most authoritative, editors traditionally take the Folio *Sejanus* as their copy text, and editors traditionally subsume features of the Quarto *Sejanus* beneath the authority of the Folio. These traditions are based on the two assumptions inspired by Whalley. The first is that Jonson played a compositorial role in the 1616 Folio *Sejanus* equal to that he played in the 1605 Quarto *Sejanus* – an assumption against which de Vocht offers textual evidence. The second is that "Quarto *Sejanus*" and "Folio *Sejanus*" denote the same thing. Even if this first assumption were

correct, I would still argue firmly against the second assumption.

Henry de Vocht represents one of the few critics who argue against the basis of Whalley's authorization of the 1616 Folio *Sejanus*. He begins his argument against Jonson's compositorial role in the Folio *Sejanus* by pointing out that "no concluding authority on the subject, except that of constant tradition, seems to be known."[38] Where de Vocht agrees with the critical consensus that the successful execution of the Quarto's material complexity is evidence for Jonson's close attention, he finds cause to doubt Jonson's compositorial involvement in virtually every aspect of the Folio *Sejanus*'s composition – punctuation, brackets, apostrophes, metre, notes, and stage directions.[39] Ultimately, without irrefutable testimony, Jonson's involvement in the printing of either text remains speculative. Having said this, we know that Jonson reworked *Every Man in his Humour* from its 1601 quarto state for publication in the Folio. It is reasonable to assume, on no other evidence, that he did the same for *Sejanus.*

Assuming, then, that Jonson had close oversight over the composition of the Folio *Sejanus*, the issue of relative authority remains. Does it follow that in altering the Quarto's form and content for inclusion in the Folio, Jonson was necessarily asserting the authority of Folio over Quarto? Greg suggests that he was not, at least not in any conventional sense:

> In the case of a work like *Sejanus*, in which correction or revision has been slight, it would obviously be possible to take the quarto as the copy-text and introduce into it whatever authoritative alterations the folio may supply; and indeed, were one editing the play independently, this would be the natural course to pursue.[40]

Whereas it would be "possible" to use the Quarto as a copy text in any edition, Greg

implies that *Sejanus* published in collection should follow the Folio *Sejanus*, whereas *Sejanus* published independently can follow the Quarto *Sejanus*. Greg is referring to the two versions of the play text, not of their material form. The "authoritative alterations" are those at the levels of punctuation and the word. What is important in Greg's proposition is that Folio and Quarto both possess the authority of copy texts. In qualifying his choice of Quarto as copy text, Ayres quotes Greg on this point.[41] Ultimately Ayres uses the liberty Greg's proposition allows to produce a non-Folio *Sejanus* instead of a Quarto *Sejanus*. It is as if, through the inertia of its many editions, the Folio exerts enough cultural presence to subsume or at least mute the Quarto. To judge purely on the publication history of *Sejanus*, editors do not judge the Quarto as a distinct text worthy of a critical edition.

The Quarto *Sejanus* constitutes a text distinct from the Folio *Sejanus*. This simple statement of fact is both unexceptionable and revolutionary; revolutionary, as the fact seems to have escaped the notice of most editors; unexceptionable, as the two are so materially different. If Jonson oversaw the composition of both, the material differences between the Quarto and Folio are the products of a change in authorial intention. As the products of distinct intentions, the Quarto *Sejanus* and the Folio *Sejanus* must constitute distinct texts. None of this has escaped critics of Jonson. Critics attribute the material differences to the different purposes to which Jonson composed his two versions of *Sejanus*. Although opinions vary on why Jonson fills the Quarto *Sejanus*'s margins with citation, there is agreement that the result is a scholarly edition. And critics agree that the Folio *Sejanus* is a dramatic text. For Jowett, in the Folio "*Sejanus* loses its specificity and

becomes part of the orderly master-narrative of Jonson's progress as a dramatist."[42] Peter Wright builds upon Jowett, adding that, in his *Workes*, Jonson shifts the focus to the plays' dramatic qualities and as such he re-theatricalizes *Sejanus.*"[43] Jonson reworked his original composition into the dramatic Folio *Sejanus* as a testament to his authority to produce so grand a volume as the 1616 *Workes*. Jonson produced the Quarto *Sejanus* after a period of intense learning. *Sejanus* was inspired by the inefficacies of historiography; and the Quarto's material form was inspired by the inefficacies of bibliography.

If we take the Quarto and the Folio as two distinct texts, the material form of each is equally important. I treat the Quarto's material form at length below; suffice it to say that it is in all points a scholarly text in the continental tradition. Where the Quarto divorces itself from its theatrical past, the Folio embraces it: what had been "SEIANVS HIS FALL" becomes "SEIANVS his FALL *A Tragedy*"; the Folio announces on its title page that it had been acted; its opening epistle refers to its original theatrical failure and subsequent success. The Folio play text exchanges the Quarto's scholarly conventions for the more reader friendly conventions of popular dramatic texts; ACTVS becomes Act; lines lengths determined by metrics are exchanged for lines beginning with speech prefixes, as if the actor not the author were determining the reading.

There is nothing unusual about single titles existing in more than one distinct text. Indeed, were Jonson Shakespeare, *Sejanus* would likely already exist in a Quarto and Folio variorum. We are quite accustomed to see *The History of King Lear* and *The Tragedy of King Lear* presented side by side, as the *Norton Shakespeare* does, and as do variorum editions going back to the nineteenth century. The debate over authorship aside,

similarities between *The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Taming of the Shrew* warrant side by side treatments in single texts. The Everyman edition prints the two distinct version of *Every Man in his Humour*, albeit at opposite ends of the Volume. Granted, Jonson's re-imagining of *Every Man in his Humour* is different than his re-imagining of *Sejanus* – anglicizing the one while theatricalizing the other. The 1601 quarto of *Every Man in his Humour* is set in Italy and peopled by Italians. When the play appears again in the 1616 Folio it is set in London and peopled by Englishmen. Jonson also put this play through a close revision, making many improvements to the text. Nonetheless, these changes are different more in quality than in kind. Both are adjustments to setting – one the play's dramatic setting, the other the play's bibliographical setting. Both the changes to *Every Man in his Humour* and those to *Sejanus* are intended to adjust the play to the playwright's purposes. In 1601, following popular convention, Jonson was setting his comical satires in Italy. In 1609, with *Epicoene* he changed his settings to London. Like *Sejanus*, *Every Man in his Humour* was reimagined to harmonize with the other works of a great English poet.

WHAT'S IN A NAME: TITULAR CLAIMS TO INNOVATION

Even on the title page, Jonson signals that the Quarto *Sejanus* will be generically and bibliographically unique.

> SEIANUS| HIS FALL| Written| by| BEN: JONSON| Mart. Non hîc *Centauros*, non *Gorgonas*, *Harpyasque*| Inuenies: Hominem pagina nostra sapit| AT LONDON| Printed by *G. Ellde*, for *Thomas*| *Thorpe*. 1605.[44]

At the centre of the page, Jonson claims sole creative responsibility for *Sejanus*. In 1605 popular plays were considered ephemera, and play texts were bought by playgoers, not by literary readers. Buyers acquired play texts as a record of a collaborative event, not as a product of an artistic imagination. Publishers sold plays as the production of a troupe of players, and their title pages advertised them as such. If the author was named at all, it was as an additional marketing ploy. In his discussion of Shakespeare's plays and the marketing ploys of Renaissance publishers, David Scott Kastan suggests that, understanding their buyers, publishers advertised texts of plays by the name of the playhouses in which they were performed and the companies who performed them. Kastan reminds us that "drama was still subliterary, its audience, even for the published play, understood primarily as theatergoers" not literary readers.[45] It was within this milieu, surely repugnant to so egocentric and longsighted a playwright as Jonson, that Jonson insisted upon the compositional integrity of his Quarto. Shakespeare, with sixteen plays produced and eight published by 1605, was already the prolific and popular author of plays and poetry; nevertheless, as late as 1598, he was yet to be named on any of the texts produced from his plays. The title pages of three of Jonson's earliest quartos exemplify the formula of the common play text:

> EVERY MAN IN | His Humor. | As it hath beene sundry times | *publickly acted by the right* | Honorable Lord Cham- | *berlaine his seruants* | Written by BEN IOHNSON. | *Quod non dant proceres, dabit Histrio.* | *Haud tamen inuidias vati, quem pulpita pascunt.*[1] | Imprinted at London for

---

[1] The Latin motto reads "An actor will give you what princes will not. Nonetheless, do not begrudge poets who take their living from the stage."These lines are constructed out of Juvenal VII. 90-93. This and the following mottos will be discussed below. All translations are my own.

> *Walter Burre*, and are to *be sould at his shoppe in Paules Church-yarde.* | 1601.[46]
>
> THE FOVNTAINE | *OF SELFE-LOVE.* | *Or* | *CYNTHIAS* | *REUELS.* As it hath beene sundry times | *privately acted in the* Black- | Friers *by the* Children | *of her* Maiesties | *Chappell.* | Written by BEN: IOHNSON. | *Quod non dant Proceres, dabit Histrio.* | *Haud tamen inuideas vati, quem pulpita pascunt.*[2] Imprinted at London for *Walter Burre*, and are to be | *solde at his shop in Paules Church-yard, at the signe* | of the Flower de-Luce and Crowne. 1601.[47]
>
> 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 Ionson.* | *Et mihi de nullo fama rubore placet..*[3] | ¶ Printed for *M. L.* and are to be sould in | Saint Dunstans Church-yarde. | 1602.[48]

The addition of Jonson's name on the title pages above testifies to the popular success of *Every Man in his Humour, Every Man out of his Humour,* and *Cynthias Revels*; evidently there was marketing value in including the author's name, though the title of the company of players was clearly more important, as is evident in the position and relative type size for each. Spenser's *Faerie Queene* provides an interesting point of comparison. In William Ponsonby's 1590 and 1596 printings, Spenser's name does not appear on the title page, although it does appear in diminutive font on the second 1696 state as *by Ed. Spenser*[49]; does it does not appear in Matthew Lownes' 1609 edition[50]; by 1611 the poet's posthumous fame was such that in that year Matthew Lownes republished the *Faerie Queene* as Spenser's: "*The Faerie Queen: The Shepheards Calendar: Together with the*

---

[2] As above.

[3] The Latin motto reads "And fame gained without disgrace pleases me" (Martial *Epigrams,* ed. and trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993] VII.12.4).

Other Works / of England's Arch-Poët, Edm. Spenser."[51] It is notable that Spenser's is the smallest name on the page.

Jonson's first extant published play, *Every Man out of his Humour*, breaks with the formula of selling to the playgoer. It has become something of a literary critical commonplace that *Every Man out of his Humour* was the first contemporary English play to be published as an explicitly literary text. Zachary Lesser offers as evidence of the quarto *Every Man out of his Humour*'s unique claims to literary value that it was the first English play to employ typographical markers to emphasize vernacular *sententiae*.[52] We do not know what if any role Jonson played in the composition of *Every Man out of his Humour*, or for that matter in any of those text published before the Quarto *Sejanus*. Edward Blount's 1604 publication of Jonson's *Entertainment* contains so much marginalia that it suggests some authorial input. Joseph Loewenstein suggests that Jonson had some small part in the composition of the 1601 *Cynthias Revels*, although he argues that it was with the Quarto *Sejanus* "Jonson [exploited] his control over the printed text."[53] Perhaps due to the play's popularity or its playwright's determination to innovate, *Every Man out of his Humour* addresses the literary reader, and prefigures *Sejanus*'s title page in some interesting ways.

> *A Comicall Satyre of* | EVERY MAN | OVT OF HIS | HVMOR. | AS IT WAS FIRST COMPOSED | by the AUTHOR B. I. | *Containing more than hath been publikely Spo- | ken or Acted.* | With the seuerall Character of euery Person | *Non aliena meo pressi pede* | **si propius stes* | *Te capient magis* | **& decies repetita placebunt:*[4] | *LONDON,* | Printed *for William*

---

[4] The Latin motto reads "I did not follow in others' foot steps; if you should stand closer, my words will captivate you more, and revisited ten times they will continue pleasing" ("Epistles," *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica,* ed. and trans. H. Rushton

> *Holme, and are to be sold at his shoppe* | *at Sarieants Inne gate in Fleetstreet.* | 1600.[54]

Here the playwright is mentioned in place of the players, by initials, but, given the popularity of the play, the publishers might safely assume that playgoers would untangle the knot. The title page announces, as does *Sejanus*'s address "To the Readers," that this "is not the same with that which was acted on the publike Stage."[55] Yet, despite the conspicuous absence of the name of the playing company, the quarto *Every Man out of his Humour* is up front about its being a published text of something that was publicly played. *Every Man out of his Humour* was played at The Globe, a public theatre or amphitheatre, as opposed to Blackfriars, a private theatre or hall playhouse, as had *Cynthias Revels* and *Poetaster* been. What Jonson (Holme and Linge) included that was "more then hath been publikely spoken or acted" might be nothing more than "the severall Character of every person," in the form of character sketches included in the quarto's front matter. Whatever the additions might be, this advertizement seems calculated to attract a readership broader than those playgoers who normally purchased published plays. Jonson and/or his publishers spent the next forty years playing with the various permutations of the title page formula. Throughout the remainder of Jonson's quartos, the placement of his name shifts about the title pages, from asserting his proprietorship over the title and its dramatic production at the head of the page, to the more conventional placement beneath the title, albeit without mention of dramatic

---

Fairclough [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978] I.19.20-22; and "Ars Poetica," *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica,* ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978] 361-65).

production. On the other hand, those plays first published in the Folio all include details of their dramatic productions.[56]

Setting itself apart from both early-modern expectations and Jonson's other published plays, the title page of the Quarto *Sejanus* markets itself as an academic edition. It is decidedly not a play text; and it is not, for that matter, explicitly a tragedy. It is an academic exercise in historiography. The first and second quarto *Hamlet* provide points of comparison for discussion. For the first quarto, publishers Ling and Trundel rely on the marketability of *Hamlet*'s considerable theatrical popularity: "*The tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke by William Shake-speare. As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the cittie of London: as also in the two vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where.*"[57] For the second quarto, merely a year later, Ling exchanges theatrical history for the marketability of it author: "*The* | Tragicall Historie of | HAMLET, | *Prince of Denmarke.* | By William Shakespeare."[58] Like that of the literary second quarto *Hamlet*, *Sejanus*'s title page implies that that which is to follow is not necessarily a dramatic text: it makes no reference to a history of dramatic production. Unlike the second quarto *Hamlet*, the Quarto *Sejanus* avoids generic stipulation: whereas the first block of text on *Hamlet*'s title page states that it is a "Tragicall Historie," *Sejanus*'s title page merely hints that it might be a tragedy in the Aristotelian sense – this is the story of "SEIANUS HIS FALL." In its title page, for the 1616 folio *Workes*, *Sejanus* reconfirms its affiliation with the stage. Critics attribute this change of affiliation to the different purposes to which Jonson set his quartos and folios. With the Folio, the title becomes SEIANUS | his | FALL | *A Tragœdie.* | Acted, in the yeere

1603. | By the K. MAIESTIES | SERVANTS. | The Author B.I.[59] In 1605, a "fall" was still considered a history, as were Shakespeare's various uses of "Life and Death." Compare also Thomas Heywood's *The first and second partes of King Edward the Fourth Containing his mery pastime with the tanner of Tamworth, as also his loue to faire Mistrisse Shoare, her great promotion, fall and miserie, and lastly the lamentable death of both her and her husband*[60]; and the anonymous ballad *The Lamentable fall of Queene Elnor, vvho for her pride and vvickednesse, by Gods iudgment, sunke into the ground at Charing crosse, and rose vp againe at Queene hiue. To the tune of, Gentle and curteous.*[61] Taken as models of contemporary play titles, all but one of Shakespeare's tragedies – *The Life of Timon of Athens* – are nominally tragedies. This is not to suggest that a tragedy need necessarily be titled such; indeed, many Jacobean revenge tragedies contained no generic stipulation in their title. In the fourth block of text, the second quarto *Hamlet* informs the reader, in one quarter the font size, that the play is "By William Shakespeare." In the central position on its title page, *Sejanus* boldly informs the reader that this text was "Written by BEN: IONSON." "Written," in full capitals and minuscules and in the same font size as "HIS FALL," claims equal billing with the title. Ling trusted that the second quarto *Hamlet* would gain currency by announcing itself as the work of William Shakespeare; yet, Ling is himself present as a second pen on the title page, declaring his *Hamlet*: "Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much again as it was, according to the true and perfect coppie." In claiming for his source a copy and not the playwright and for himself the authority to judge what is true and perfect, Ling coopts some measure of the authorial role. It could also be argued that in promising a true and

perfect reproduction of the playwright's original script, Ling was still selling the performance not the author, promising his readers to reproduce the original theatrical performance. "Written by BEN: IONSON," the Quarto *Sejanus* is wholly Ben Jonson's creation. Jonson (or his publisher) streamlines this maneuver of claiming and controlling origin in his next quarto: BEN: IONSON| his| VOLPONE.

Below the author's name, the Quarto *Sejanus*'s motto is a quotation promising scholarly attention to truth will follow: *Non hic Centauros, non Gorgones, Harpyasque. Inuenies: Hominem pagina nostra sapit* (You shall discover here no Centaurs nor Gorgons and Harpies: my page smacks of Man).[62] In Jonson's early title-page epigrams, the young playwright makes declarations that reverberate throughout his dramatic, poetic, and prose works all the way to *A Tale of a Tub* and beyond. There is also a progression in Jonson's selection of title-page mottos that mirrors his dramatic progression. In 1600, *Every Man Out of his Humour*'s epigram patched together two of Horace's most influential works, the *Epistles* and the *Ars Poetica*[63] – both key influences upon Jonson's own work : *Non aliena meo pressi pede| *si propius stes te capient magis| *& decies repetita placebunt* (I did not follow in others' foot steps; if you should stand closer, my words will captivate you more, and revisited ten times they will continue pleasing). This cobbled-together motto claims that artistic innovation alone will pass the test of time. For the well-read humanist, this motto accomplishes much more: employing the *Epistles* signals Jonson's affiliation with Horatian "poetry of manners and society"[64]; the broadly-accessible *Ars* lends the prestige of the plastic arts (*ut pictura poesis*) to ephemeral dramatic poetry. Then, a year later *Every Man in his Humour* marked the first of many

calls for a return to a world where Maecenian (*quis tibi Maecenas*)[65] patronage rewarded poets: *Quod non dant proceres, dabit histrio. Haud tamen invideas vati, quem pulpita pascunt* (An actor will give you what princes will not. Nonetheless, do not begrudge poets who take their living from the stage).[66] With no patronage forthcoming, Jonson reiterated the call and the epigram with *Cynthias Revels*. In a gesture befitting its playwright's frustration, *Poetaster*'s motto proclaims the disinterestedness of the new stamp of satirist: *Et mihi de nullo fama rubore placet* (And fame gained without disgrace pleases me).[67] This motto is an interesting choice for *Poetaster*, given Jonson's claims in its *apologeticall Dialogue* to refuse, with all the disinterestedness of the new historian, to fight scorching satirical fire with fire: the line preceding this in Martial is *ut mea nec iuste quos odit pagina* (my page does not even injure those it justly hates). Appended to the quarto *Poetaster*'s "THE PERSONS THAT *ACT*" are four lines slightly altered from this Epigram's final four lines, 9-12: *Iudimus innocui verbis, hoc iuro potentis/ Per Genium Famæ, Castaliumque gregem:/ Perque tuas aures, magni mihi numinis instar,/ Lector inhumana liber ab Inuidia* (I mock with harmless words; this I swear by the genius of omnipotent Fame and by the Castalian chorus, and by your ears; you are to me the image of a mighty god, Reader free from inhuman jealousy).[68] Despite these repeated statements of disinterestedness, Dekker felt the need to reply, on *Satiro-Mastix*'s title page, from Martial XIII.2.4-8: *Ad Detractorem. Non potes in Nugas dicere plura meas,| Ipse ego quam dixi. – Qui se mirantur, in illos| Virus habe: Nos hæc nouimus esse nihil* (To a Detractor. You cannot say more against my trifles than I myself have said. . . . Spend your poisons on those who marvel at themselves: I am aware that these are nothing).[69] As I

offer above, *Sejanus*'s title page insists that "You shall discover here no Centaurs nor Gorgons and Harpies: my page smacks of Man" – a *sententia* well suited to this text, given the nature of the enterprise that is the Quarto *Sejanus*. The motto is to be taken literally; it declares that the historiography in the Quarto *Sejanus* is neither of fabulous events nor is it founded upon extra-human portraits of virtuous or vicious action. The Quarto "smacks of Man." It is poetic historiography based upon the Polybian notion that the truth of history is found in the human motivations and circumstances behind historic events. Polybian historiographic truth agrees with the Horatian dictate that truth, or as near to truth as possible, is a keystone poetic decorum: *Ficta uoluptatis causa sint proxima ueris* (Let those things created for the sake of delight come as near truth as possible).[70] Following Aristotle, by way of Scaliger and Sidney, English Renaissance criticism separated truth/fact from poetry.[71] The poetic historiography in the Quarto is the tragic history of human folly, a phenomenistic rendering of an historic event providing insight into Bacon's "small matter."

The final part of the print area of the Quarto *Sejanus*'s title page provides the details of publication, and leads to speculation on the process by which Jonson settled on his printer and publisher: "AT LONDON Printed by *G. Ellde*, for *Thomas Thorpe*. 1605." The title pages of *Every Man in his Humour, Every Man out of his Humour, and Cynthias Revels* stipulate that they were printed in London. A scan of the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) shows that, although not universally done, displaying the name of the city of publication was common practice and one far more often than not practised upon the title pages of books published by Blount, Burre, Holme, and Thorpe. The inclusion of

Thorpe's name has allowed speculation upon Jonson's compositorial role and Thorpe's willingness to allow an author to take on such a role.[72] The name of the printer appears in less than a third of those texts published in 1605, then often by initial only. This paucity is due in part to the nature of Renaissance publishing: sometimes the publisher was the printer, and sometimes the publisher "jobbed out" the printing; yet the seeming arbitrariness with which printers' names are included where the printer is not the publisher suggests other considerations were at play. Eld is first mentioned on a title page in 1605 with George Buck's *Daphnis Polystephanos* (STC 3996) and *Sejanus*; whereas he is recorded in the STC from 1603 and had printed twenty texts by 1605, including Jonson's *Entertainment* and four editions of *Eastward Hoe*. Two years later, on the *Volpone* he printed for Thorpe, he goes unmentioned. Perhaps Eld's name is included on *Sejanus*'s title page as he was instrumental in facilitating Jonson's compositorial input. Eld had previously printed *Daphnis Polystephanos*, Matthew Sutcliffe's *The Supplication of Certaine Masse-Priests*,[73] and, for Blount, Jonson's *Entertainment,* all heavily marginated texts. Eld worked almost exclusively with Edward Blount and William Aspley until 1605, but he had printed Chapman's *Al Fooles* for Thorpe earlier that year.[74] Where Holger Schott Syme's suggestion that *Sejanus* shifted from Blount to Thorpe as he was more amenable to a playwright's input seems a reasonable one,[75] Eld was the publishers' common denominator. Eld's print shop was eminently suited to the complex construction of Jonson's play *cum* academic text. Of the 398 texts (with second editions and reprints) the ESTC attributes to Eld's print shop seventy-one are scholarly or academic, and sixty-seven are plays – including works of Forde, Hayward, Marston,

Middleton, Tourneur, and Shakespeare. It is tempting to speculate that Jonson, wanting Eld's involvement, insisted that his Quarto go to Thorpe when Blount declined publication. Whatever the reason Blount transferred *Sejanus*'s publication to Thorpe, and however willing Thorpe might have been to allow authorial input into its composition, without a highly competent print shop so complex a set of compositor's proofs would not have so successfully found their way onto the page.[76]

EPISTOLARY CLAIMS: THE LETTER "TO THE READERS"

Composed to define and defend his scholarly labours, while instructing and defining the capable reader, the Quarto's epistle "To the Readers" marks another shift in the manner by which Jonson addresses his potential reader.[77] The early quartos are not without markedly non-dramatic determinative comments. The 1601 *Cynthias Revels* contains prefatory materials that would instruct, although the quarto insists these are to be read as part of the play. There are the *Prœludium* (literally that which comes before the play) and the *Prologus* (literally he who speaks before). The former is a satiric explication of the play's Argument, the incursive habits and ineptitude of its tobacco reeking audience, and Jonson's witless peers. The latter is a call, on the author's behalf, for a wise audience and a poet's due rewards. In the 1601 quarto *Cynthias Revels,* someone – most likely the poet, but possibly the publisher – set in above the *Prœludium* an epigram from Martial XII.xxxvii: *Ad Lectorem. Nasutum volo, nolo polyposum* (To the Reader. I like a man with a keen nose; I don't like a man with a cancerous one).[78] I suggest that this epigram to the reader might be allographic, as the 1601 *Cynthias Revels* quarto's other prefatory

materials, beyond the title page epigram, claim to be the work of someone other than the poet. In the 1602 quarto *Poetaster,* someone set beneath THE PERSONS THAT *ACT* an epigram slightly adjusted from Martial VII.xii.9-12: *Ad Lectorem. Iudimus innocui verbis, hoc iuro potentis/ Per Genium Famæ, Castaliumque gregem:/ Perque tuas aures, magni mihi numinis instar,/ Lector inhumana liber ab Inuidia* (To the Reader I mock with harmless words; this I swear by the genius of omnipotent Fame and by the Castalian chorus, and by your ears; you are to me the image of a mighty god, Reader free from inhuman jealousy).[79] These brief epigrams do only a small part of the work accomplished by the Quarto's opening epistle.[80] Of the four quartos that follow the Quarto *Sejanus,* three continue with its mode of prefatory instruction: the 1607 *Volpone* includes a six-page instructional letter "To the Reader"[81]; the 1611 *Catiline* includes one "To the Reader in Ordinary" and another "To the Reader Extraordinary"[82]; and in his 1612 *Alchemist* a two-page "To the Reader" occurs.[83]

Such prefatory epistles are not Jonson's invention, nor do all of Jonson's opening letters set out to accomplish all that the Quarto *Sejanus*'s does, but their presence in so much of what Jonson would go on to publish argues for the success of their primogenitor in the Quarto. The masques Jonson published in quartos after 1605 include tracts that instruct and define their readers and defend their author and his erudition: in the prefatory epistle of his *Hymenaei* (Q:1606, F1 & F2), Jonson offers hopeful praise of the education of nobles and princes, defence of his erudite compositions, and satirical indictment of those without the wit necessary to comprehend them[84]; in the prefatory letter to *Masques of Blackness and Beauty* (Q:1608, F1 & F2), "The Queenes Masques" opens with the

insistence that their published form (i.e. erudite and marginated) is intended to save the masques as performed from ignorance/censure and envy/oblivion[85]; in the preface to the *Haddington Masque* (Q:1608, F1 & F2), the opening paragraph of the "Description of the Masqve," Jonson complains that his work "hath labour'd since vnder censure" by those of "tyrannous ignorance . . . who haue neuer touch'd so much as to the barke, or vtter shell of any *knowledge*"[86]; in the epistle to *The Masque of Queenes* (Q:1609, F1 & F2), Jonson opens with a conventional dedication, praising Prince Henry's wisdom, virtue, and learning, but then he shifts to a defense of his own erudite composition: here accounting Henry's request for a marginated copy the spur of this edition, in which he details the sources of those things he "writ out of fulnesse, and memory of [his] former readings," with which he will "decline the stiffenesse of others originall ignorance, already arm'd to censure."[87] The work of defending Jonson from the harsh judgments of his readers neither began nor ended with the Quarto's epistle; in fact, it seems that following *Sejanus,* with so much of the audience having missed its innovative brilliance, Jonson felt that all his publications required full epistolary support.

Outside the composite pages of *Sejanus* proper, the Quarto's epistle to the reader is the strongest statement of its scholarly innovations. The entry upon this statement is marked by a businesslike "Now, I need onely vse three or foure short, and needfull Notes, and so rest."[88] Before proceeding to these notes the epistle offers a rather intriguing and little-noted comment: "The following, and voluntary Labours of my Friends, prefixt to my Booke, haue relieued me in much, whereat (without them) I should necessarilie haue touched."[89] This line, I would argue, constitutes the first link in a cognitive chain yoking

the Quarto's epistle, through another intriguing line on the epistle's second page, to the substance of those laudatory poems to follow, and, beyond, to *Sejanus* proper. On the epistle's second page, its second short and necessary note defends the Quarto's employment of scholarly apparatus: because the marginalia "are in *Latine*, and the worke in *English*, it was presupposd, none but the Learned would take the paynes to conferre them."[90] As I will discuss in more length at the proper place below, this notion of presupposition is intriguing. An author ever willing to speak for himself, Jonson is otherwise adamant throughout that his unmediated voice is addressing his reader. In 533 words, Jonson uses the personal pronoun, in one form or another, thirty-six times. Yet "presupposd" is not presented as a past indicative subjective "I presupposd," but as the passive "it was presupposd," as if this prior postulation was offered by some other voice or voices. Those voices, I would argue, are the voices of his "Friends," the first of whose "voluntary Labours" stands with patient italic authority on the facing page. This "presupposd" suggests that one or more of *Sejanus*'s contributory poets saw the Quarto in a prepublication form, either in a marginated manuscript or a printed prepublication state or issue – not a press copy, a poet copy – and discussed it with its author. Much of *Sejanus*'s poetic praise seems to acknowledge the Quarto's material form as it has come down to us. If the idea of creating a complete manuscript version of so thoroughly marginated a text seems a waste of effort, when the author was to be so integral to the composition of the print version, it must be remembered that four years later Jonson created a detailed marginated manuscript copy of *Masque of Queens* for Prince Henry.

What might, then, have motivated this prepublication preview? Jonson was not one

to pay deference lightly: he denied Inigo Jones his due share of the laurels; he refused to admit that Dekker had the creative gifts necessary to welcoming a new king with any skill; and he denied Shakespeare real talent until a decade after his death. It is hard to imagine Jonson inviting a few playwrights and poets around so that he might run by them his overtly erudite historiographic experiment, in case any of them took exception to the complex form of this scholarly endeavour. It is certainly more tempting to go back again to *Poetaster*'s "apologeticall Dialogue" and suppose that Jonson wished to inspire some of his fellows to drop their unfruitful satiric styles and "to imitate [the Quarto's] sound."[91] This "presupposd" argues that those Friends offered their critical judgements concerning the Quarto's overtly academic form. Indeed, a sense pervades these epistolary notes that Jonson is not so much anticipating general criticisms as addressing specific, previously articulated concerns. The assumption under which I proceed, then, is that those voluntary labours of friends touch upon issues directly related to the Quarto's bibliographic and generic innovations – the main issues that the epistle's "three or foure short, needfull Notes" address.

Even the fact that Jonson cannot decide whether these are three or four notes is intriguing. Does "Whereas, they are in *Latine* and the worke in *English*" constitute a third and distinct bibliographical note to his better sort of reader, or is it a continuation of his claims to have included the notes to show his "integrity in the *Story,*" in order to save his text from those "common Torturers"? Or does this indecision lend a casual air that asserts that his epistle is instructive rather than defensive?

The first of these notes raises the question of genre, claiming that in *Sejanus*'s

composition Jonson discharged the offices of a *Tragick* writer. Having discharged the offices of a tragic writer in no way debars *Sejanus* from also being a history, as the next note insists it is. For the humanist author, comedy, history, and tragedy all have the same ethical end goal: to move the auditor/reader away from wrong action and towards right action – safely by example. Wrong action is no more necessarily vicious than right action is necessarily virtuous. Wrong action stems from human error and ends in disaster – whether national or personal. History of the Polybian stamp details that error. What better vehicle than phenomenistic history to present enough detail to approximate the truth. The note opens with what *Sejanus* is not: "if it be obiected, that what I publish is no true *Poëme*, in the strict Lawes of *Time.* I confesse it: as also in the want of a proper *Chorus*, whose Habit, and Moodes are such, and so difficult, as not any, whome I have seene, since the *Auntients*, (no, not they who haue most presently affected Lawes) haue yet come in the way off."[92] This first note is less the confession of want it purports to be than a vehicle by which the humanist playwright asserts his right to prescribe to readers and not be schooled by them. Palpable in this first note is Jonson's disdain for what is popularly and generically expected of a work such as *Sejanus*. No successful Renaissance tragedy conforms to the "Lawes" or unities, outside of those academically successful offerings composed for matriculation exams in the schools. A "proper *Chorus*" seems to be the subject of the remainder of this excerpt, but, in fact, the note moves on to other matters following a reference to the heavily determined "Habite and Moodes" of the classical chorus.[93]

Composed before the start of Jonson's course of reading, the quarto *Every Man out*

of his Humour's induction provides an interesting parallel to the Quarto *Sejanus*'s discussion of ancient dramatic laws:

> If those lawes you speake of, had beene deliuered vs *ab initio*; and in their present vertue and perfection, there had beene some reason of obeying their powers; but 'tis extant, that that which we call *Comœdia,* was at first nothing but a simple and continued Satyre, sung by one only person, . . . every man in the dignity of his spirit and iudgment supplied something: and (though that in him this kind of Poeme appeared absolute, and fully perfected) yet how is the face of it chang'd since, in *Menander, Philemon, Cecilius, Plautus,* and the rest; who haue vtterly excluded the *Chorus,* [and] altered the property of the persons, . . . I see not then, but we should enjoy the same *Licentia*,. . . and not bee tied to those strict and regular forms, which the nicenesse of a few (who are nothing but Forme) would thrust vpon vs.[94]

The influence Jonson's guided reading would find upon his dramatic compositions is already evident in this brief discussion of classical dramatic theory, as articulated by early-modern literary critics from Julius Caesar Scaliger to Philip Sidney.

The Quarto's opening discussion of the dramatic *Lawes* is a statement of the attention Jonson paid to the literary critical discourse in its composition. In this case it is the discourse surrounding the so-called Aristotelean unities of time, place, and action. The learned dramatic poet asserts his authority to employ them as his judgment dictates. It is also a condemnation of those poetasters "who haue most presently affected Lawes." Discussion of Jonson's thoughts on the "three unities" is anachronistic (Dryden and Corneille had yet to be born); nonetheless, these "Lawes" were a part of late-Renaissance literary criticism. Jonson's own thoughts on the subject reflect a scholarly progression. In the *Discoveries*, Jonson discusses Aristotle's reasoned anatomization of life and art, and he disagrees with the extent to which poetry's theorists had since built upon the

Aristotelean foundation: "I am not of that opinion to conclude a *Poets* liberty within the narrowe limits of lawes, which either the *Grammarians* or *Philosophers* prescribe."[95] Despite this eventual unwillingness to be bound by dramatic laws, prior to 1601 Jonson was their champion. In the prologue to the 1616 folio *Every Man in his Humour* Jonson levels an attack against playwrights who abandon these laws:

> th'ill Customs of the Age.
> . . .
> To make a child, now swadled, to proceede
> Man, and then shoot vp, in one beard, and weede,
> Past threescore yeeres: or, with three rustie swords,
> And helpe of some few foot-and-halfe-foote words,
> Fight ouer *Yorke*, and *Lancasters* long iarres,
> And in the tyring-house bring wounds to scarres.
> Me rather prayes, you will be pleas's to see
> One such, to day, as other playes should be.
> Where neither *Chorus* wafts you ore the seas.
> Nor creaking throne comes downe, the boyes to please.[96]

Although this prologue postdates the Quarto by eleven years, *Every Man in his Humour* was first played in 1598 and first printed in 1601. The claims the 1616 prologue makes of that edition of *Every Man in his Humour* are demonstrably true of the 1601 *Every Man in his Humour,* if not the 1598.[97] Moving beyond his promise to adhere to popular expectations and contain the action within the prescribed bounds of time and space, the prologue attests to Jonson's familiarity with Renaissance humanism's primary classical authority on poetics: Horace in his *Ars Poetica.* The prologue insists that there will be no breaches of decorum. *Every Man in his Humour* eschews stage trickery for decorous language and character.[98] What seems to be the problem for Jonson, here (and below), is as much the idea of the fantastic conclusion, as it is the very role of such stage

mechanism.[99] This emphasis on decorum addresses those playwrights who pander to their audience's needs: whether it be to request their audience suspend disbelief – as does the Chorus of Shakespeare's *Henry V* – or to take refuge in stagecraft's clamorous spectacle. This insistence that decorous language and character can carry meaning without stagecraft is Jonson beginning to assert the supremacy of his art over the physical artifice of the likes of Inigo Jones. However much *Every Man in his Humour* would insist upon the necessity of the laws of time and place in 1598/1601, in 1605 Jonson was at the end of his five-year course of reading in Cotton's library under Camden's watchful tutelage. When composing the Quarto Jonson was no longer the neophyte employing the rules to the letter of contemporary models; he was now the learned poet, with the confidence of his education, setting popular expectation aside and creating under the guidance of the ancients. In this confidence, the Quarto insists that it is the carefully constructed product of Jonson's scholarly reading. Ultimately, unfathomable ingenuity would be required to compose a play that adheres to the strict rules of time and place, while including the complexities of cause and circumstance required by Polybian historiography.

As does each of these notes, the opening note defends Jonson against a preconceived set of potential criticisms – first that *Sejanus* does not adhere to the law of time. The defence is against poetasters who aspire to laws that Jonson's education had proved invalid. The letter's disdain for those who might object on such grounds is tangible. Jonson would have been aware that Aristotle clearly articulates the need only for a unity of action.[100] There is no statement in the *Poetics* (nor in the *Ars*) concerning the unity of place. Aristotle never articulates an immutable law of time; indeed, there is only

one statement in the *Poetics* regarding a need to delimit a tragedy's temporal scope. Aristotle suggests that, where possible, tragic action should be limited to a single revolution of the sun, but this comment is in the context of a contrast with epic's limitless time span. As with much of his discussion in the *Poetics*, Aristotle makes this observation upon his anatomization of common Greek dramatic practice.[101] The notion of the poetic laws came to Jonson's England by way of the Italian Renaissance. Giraldi Cintio's, ca. 1540-45, *Discorso sulle Comedie e sulle Tragedie* was the first to turn Aristotle's passing observation into law.[102] This law came to be, by Jonson's time, the popular line of demarcation between dramatic poets and mere playwrights for the vulgar stage. Lodovico Castelvetro determined that all the rules of dramaturgy must coincide with necessities of the play space. The physical and temporal dimensions of the stage were to circumscribe dramatic time, action, and place.[103] Julius Caesar Scaliger, although in not so many words (nor it seems intentionally), introduced the idea of a unity of time when he insists that events must play out in a manner very nearly approaching the truth: *ut quam proxime accedant ad veritatem*.[104] Scaliger seems to be addressing Horace's *Ficta uoluptatis causa sint proxima ueris*. For Scaliger, as for Horace, truth must guide every aspect of tragedy. Only when the illusion of real life prevails can the poet hope to access the necessary emotions in the audience.[105] Sidney, following Scaliger, profoundly impacted popular expectations of dramatic laws, when *The Defence of Poesie* indicts *Gorboduc* for failing to adhere to the laws of time and place.[106] Yet, Jonson would have it that Elizabethan playwrights who affect these laws were following "*Grammarians* and *Philosophers,*" formulating laws in the name of Aristotle with little recourse to his substance. Jonson

does not present himself as an Aristotelean anatomizing what has been written for its technical merit; he is an Horatian advising his reader on why he wrote *Sejanus* as he did – and, by extension, how all others should write by his example. Jonson maintains that imposed laws must be sacrificed to make way for Horace's prime dictate: "Nor is it needful, or almost possible, in these our Times, and to such Auditors, as commonly Things are presented, to obserue the ould state and splendour of *Drammatick Poëms*, with preseruation of any popular delight"[107] – *Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci* ("He wins every vote who mixes profit with delight").[108]

The epistle now abandons this posture of surliness, and answers the neo-Aristoteleans' laws with the Horatian principles of decorum, as articulated in the *Ars Poetica.* Jonson will take "seasonable cause" to speak further to dramaturgical concerns when he publishes his now-translated *Ars Poetica* and its "Obseruations vpon Horace."[109] But "In the meane time,"[110] he will put that first objection to rest. He informs us of his *exercitatio,* the processes by which he composed *Sejanus*. Maus has much to say about how, like Horace, Jonson emphasizes the procedure and artistry of the work's production over that of its presentation.[111] Throughout his paragraph, Jonson's contention to "haue discharg'd the other offices of a *Tragick* writer"[112] reflects his intimacy with the *Ars*: "truth of Argument" (*proxima veris*), "dignity of Persons" (*dignitas*), gravity (*gravitas*), elocution (*eloquentia*) and "sentence" (*sententia*) are Horatian keystones of decorous poetic construction. The first note ends with a terse reminder that his scholarly efforts have made Jonson the one best able to prescribe.

The epistle's second "needfull note" is a preemptive defence of the material

manifestations of those scholarly efforts upon the composite page, its marginalia: "least in some nice nostrill [they] might sauour affected."[113] The note insists that the quotations are no pretence. They are only present in order that Jonson might show his "integrity in the Story," and save his text from those naturalized tongues in search of application.[114] This reference to "integrity in the *Story*" has received a great deal of critical attention from those considering *Sejanus*'s historiographical virtues, as will be discussed in Chapter 2. The metaphor driving this diatribe manifests the contempt felt by an author besieged by application: in their search for libellous allusion, practisers begin upon the surface as rooting swine; once no patent parallelography appears, they become moles, undermining the author's meaning, to obliterate it with the filth of their own moil. These swine-cum-moles are those to whom Jonson had anticipated this new thing would give cause for "despight."[115] This acerbic introductory paragraph concludes with "*Vertue,*" a word that will gain meaning in discussion of Chapman's laudatory poem. This italicized *Vertue* bears added meaning; indeed, there is nothing random about any of Jonson's typographical choices. Henry de Vocht points out, in his interpretation of the variants between the Quarto and Folio, that Jonson employed such typographical markers as italics and capitals in order "to call the attention on the particular meaning of some words."[116] One need only glance at the epistle to begin reaching conclusions about this practice: *Poëme*, *Time*, *Chorus*, *Auntients*, *Drammatick Poëms*, *Horace*, *Art of Poetry*, *Tragick*, *Formes*, *Quotations*, *Story*, *Muses*, *Vertue*, *Latine*, *English*, *Tongues*, *Tacit. Lips*, *Antwerp. edit*, *Dio*. *Folio*. *Hen.Step*, *Sueton*, *Seneca*, *Genius.* In this epistle, typography ties "*Vertue*" with the scholarly labours that eventuated in the Quarto. *Vertue* is the

salubrious efficacy of the new historian, his labours working for good upon human life and conduct.[117] Like belabouring a play with classical *Formes,* publicly rooting around beneath virtuous purport for non-existent parallelography stands in the way of popular delight.

Either the main body of the second note of three or the whole of the third note of four, the next paragraph continues the epistle's defence of its conspicuous scholarship. It opens by mocking Jonson's uninvited critics: concerning these *Quotations*, "whereas, they are in *Latin* and the worke in *English*, it was presupposd, none but the Learned would take the paynes to conferre them."[118] The reader who complains about the composite form of the text proves this presupposition wrong, as the reader who complains is necessarily not learned. In concert with whom did Jonson make this presupposition? As I broached above, I would suggest the Quarto's laudatory poets. In order to praise the work, they must have seen the work; if this chapter's assumption holds, and the text's the thing, with its scholarly apparatus and *mise-en-page*, they must have seen it in something like its final state. George Chapman and John Marston are most likely candidates, as they collaborated with Jonson on *Eastward Hoe* that same year; and there are Hugh Holland and William Strachey; the cryptic CYGNVS (the Swan)[119] and ΦΙΛΟΕ (misprint of ΦΙΛΟΣ/Friend); and the men behind the ciphers *Th. R.* and Ev. B.[120]

Who, then, are these men to "presuppose" the reception of the Quarto's generic and bibliographic innovations? Chapman, as the translator of both Virgil and Homer, is classicist enough for the task, and his own marginated *Ouids Banquet of Sence* argues that

he was something of a bibliographical authority. Marston, with an Oxford BA and time served at Middle Temple, surely had the necessary scholarly influences. Hugh Holland would undoubtedly be worthy to postulate upon the matter. Holland was a pupil of William Camden and a recipient of a Cambridge BA and MA who wrote verse in Greek and Latin. William Strachey could have offered a fair opinion. Strachey is a more clouded figure: he attended both Cambridge and Gray's Inn and wrote a history of the Virginia colony. If *Th. R.* is Thomas Roe, he should be both capable and worthy of the task.[121] Roe spent four years at Oxford without taking a degree and moved on to the fashionable world of the Middle Temple, where he likely learned more about writing poetry and plays than about law. If Ev. B. is the poet, antiquary, philologue, and historian, Edmund Bolton, he would be among the most likely candidates for Jonson's trust. Bolton went from a Cambridge BA to the Inner Temple and composed laudatory Latin verse for *Volpone*.[122] The potential connection of each of these contributory poets with the Quarto's generic and modal innovations will be considered at the discussion of their laudatory poems.

This note concludes with a partial list of those texts the "Learned" need at hand to accomplish the Quarto's satiric and historiographic designs. The Quarto's bibliographic note does not simply provide a list of classical authorities, as the title page of Gwinne's *Nero* does: *è Tacito, Suetonio, Dione, Seneca.* Nor does Jonson allow, as Gwinne does, *Num ergo tragice sufficio? Pro me loquantur Tacitus, Suetonius, Dion Seneca*: *nam et loquuntur ipsi fere omnia* (Am I qualified to write tragedy? Let Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio and Seneca speak for me; for they say almost everything themselves).[123] While Jonson is patently and heavily indebted to these same authors, he composes his *Sejanus* out of their

words. Jonson lacks even the false modesty to suggest that they could speak for him: they are the raw material from which he constructs something emphatically original. The Quarto's note is explicit: "it may be required, since I haue quoted the Page, to name what Editions I follow'd. *Tacit. Lips.* in 4°, *Antwerp. edit.*600. *Dio. Folio. Hen.Step* 592. For the rest, as *Sueton. Seneca.* &c. the Chapter doth sufficiently direct, or the Edition is not varied."[124] There is much in this specificity. Jonson expects the learned reader to access his sources; indeed, the Quarto's historiographic innovations are constructed upon that expectation. Abiding in the margins, the historic record negates any charges that the Quarto *Sejanus* is a parallelographic product of selection, adjustment, and invention.

Against the epistle's intentions, critics have looked beyond those specified sources in the learned *Tongues* to one it does not name: "with whose English side I haue had little to doe."[125] If this bibliographic note is intent on accessibility, why not name this text? The critical consensus has been since Gifford that this translated source is Richard Greneway's *Annals*.[126] The argument in *H&S* runs that this is the text to which Jonson alludes in his conversations with Drummond: "The first four bookes of Tacit*us* ignorantly done in Englishe."[127] Various problems reduce the certainty of this argument. As they have come down to us, Drummond's 1619 remembrances are not Drummond's remembrances, as such, but a copy of his manuscript made at the far end of that century by Scottish historian Robert Sibbald. Sibbald records Drummond remembering "In his Sejanus he hath translated a whole oration of Tacitus The first four bookes of Tacit*us* ignorantly done in English."[128] The second clause leads critics to Greneway, although it is at best vague – lacking clarifying punctuation as well as both subject and verb. There

is, indeed, no necessary reference to Greneway in this clause. The margins illustrate that much of *Sejanus* is, itself, the first four books of Tacitus done in English, suggesting that the comment Drummond recalled is nothing more than a conventional statement of authorial modesty. The second problem with identifying this "saue one" with Greneway is that, unlike many Renaissance translations, Greneway's *Annals* is not a bilingual facing-page edition. Greneway's *Annals* is an English translation: it has no sides. That Jonson is supposed to have said "English side," suggests that he is referring to a facing-page edition that displays one language on one side, another on the other; otherwise, it would have sufficed Jonson to say "with whose Englished book I haue had little to doe."[129]

In the introduction to his *Sejanus*, Philip Ayres suggests several illustrations of Jonson's debt to Greneway.[130] The margins and their Dio Cassius illustrate that there is no need to assume Greneway as an intermediary. Consider note 1.21.f: Sabinus greets Latiaris "SAB. Good Cossen [f] *Latiaris*.)" the note directs the reader to "[f] *De* Latiari, *cōs*. Tac. *Annal*. *lib*. 4. *pag*. 94. *&* Dion. Step. edit. *fol*. *lib*. 58. *pag*. 711."[131] Ayres takes Jonson's "cossen" to be evidence of what he sees as Jonson's misguided reliance on Greneway's Tacitus: Greneway's translation of Tacitus's *qui modico usu Sabinum contingebat* is "who was somewhat allied to Sabinus."[132] Whatever else one might say of Jonson's use of Greneway, his use here of Estienne's Latin side accounts for "cossen." In Tacitus, Latiaris is "related to Sabinus by some minor association" (*qui modico usu Sabinum contingebat*); in Dio he is a "fellow of Sabinus" (ἑταῖος Σαβίνου, *Sabini . . . socius* on Estienne's Latin side). According to Estienne's Latin side, Latiaris and Sabinus were *socii,* cousins in the Renaissance sense of intimates or fellows. Note 2.610 offers a

second instance: "(Larded with ease, and pleasure) did auoid; Tac. *ibid*," the preceding notes have already provided all contained within this *ibid*. Here *H&S* and Ayres suggest that in Sejanus's lines, at 619-20, "And these that hate me now, wanting access,/ To him, will make their enuie none, or less" Jonson switches the focus of Tacitus's "with the crowds deprived of his receptions" (*adempta salutantum turba*) from Sejanus's receptions to Tiberius's. Ayres offers this line as another example of Jonson's – mistaken – reliance on Greneway's translation of Tacitus.[133] Is this a deliberate switch, a confusion over a tricky bit of Latin syntax (the subject of *salutantum* is vague at best), or, as Ayres suggests, an infelicitous reliance on Greneway? The tone and sentiment that the margins supplied from Dio, at ca.580/1, is still present in the context of this speech, and whatever happened at 619-20, Dio is supplying the haughtiness behind Sejanus's plans for the suitors at his door. It is Dio who provides the colour for 617-22. Although it contradicts Jonson's claims to Greek erudition, it seems as likely as not that this "saue one" refers not to Greneway but to the English side of one of those Greek authors not mentioned in the epistle's bibliographical statement, such as the various facing-page editions of Aristotle.

The terms of this note complicate its own claims to bibliographic specificity. The epistle claims to provide exact bibliographical references for Lipsius's Tacitus[134] and Henry Estienne's Dio Cassius as the margins cite them by page number. However, Lipsius's Tacitus and Henry Estienne's Dio Cassius are not the only texts that the notes cite by page number; the margins offer book and page numbers for Paterculus, Bude, and Giraldi (the two former available in several editions) and book number for Brisson and Rosinus.[135] The safe assumption might be that all other cited sources come with such

detailed appendixes and marginal epitomes that the reader would easily find any references. Although these sources are less often employed than Tacitus and Dio, they are no less integral to the Quarto's historiographic purport. Why then would Jonson include only these two bibliographical citations? The simplest answer might be that Tacitus and Dio Cassius are the Quarto's two most cited sources: 159 and 93 mentions respectively. Certainly, much of Quarto's Polybian historiographic complexity is compounded of the divergence between these two contributions to the historic record.

There are a few other reasons that Jonson may have cited his Tacitus and Dio so exactingly, reasons that illustrate something important about Jonson's *exercitatio*. Jonson's overt use of Lipsius's Tacitus and Estienne's Dio Cassius marks the Quarto as a model of the sort of inquiry that characterizes the shifting notions of historiography. While Tacitus's historiography, however slanted, is, itself, inclusive historiography on the Polybian ideal, Lipsius's *C. Cornelii Taciti Opera Qvæ Exstant* exemplifies exhaustive historiographic editing: Curis Secundus's authoritative commentary (*Commentarii meliores pleniorésque*) and Lipius's own historical notes (*auctoribus Notis*) ever draw the reader outside of the text to augmentative, auxiliary, and alternate voices from the historic record as well as a wealth of Renaissance encyclopedic texts. Jonson openly mines the great Flemish historian's textual notes and employs them, often word for word, in his own margins. Jonson displays his own *exercitatio* when extending beyond Lipsius to draw from a broader compass of classical and Renaissance scholarship. The Quarto's margins seem to have taken their functional lead from Lipsius's Tacitus; nevertheless, the sort of comparative scrutiny that these margins demand reveals an astonishing range of

classical and Renaissance encyclopedic texts – forty in total – as well as Jonson's own impressive historical knowledge. The scope of these texts and this knowledge comprises the foundation of the Quarto's phenomenistic historiography.

The Quarto's use of Estienne's Dio Cassius betrays something quite different although no less revealing of the nature and potentials of Jonson's labours. To the humanist playwright ca. 1600, Dio Cassius was an important source for the historical reconstruction of ancient Rome, both for his concise (even cursory) and unabashed treatments of historic events as well as for his filling of the historic gap left by the three-year lacuna in Tacitus.[136] Considered by scholars of the Byzantine Empire as the standard authority on Roman history, Dio Cassius's *Roman History* had been in constant use for more than a thousand years. In his history of Rome, Dio makes every effort to submit a balanced historic view drawn from as many sources as possible, always attempting to present the truth of those historic events he treats.[137] When the margins cite Henri Estienne's Dio Cassius, they ensure the success of the Quarto's historiographic innovations. Those innovations crystalize in the admixture of Tacitus's and Dio Cassius's contributions to the historic record. In selecting Estienne's Ρωμαικων Ιστοριων/*Romanarum Historiarum* for its Dio Cassius, the Quarto addresses the potential reader's linguistic limitations. Few of the Quarto's readers would have had Greek enough to access Dio Cassius in its original form. Early sixteenth-century grammar school statutes' claims to comprehensive language training in Greek and Latin seem to have been nothing more than claims or rarely-attained ideals. Although Greek came to be included in late sixteenth-century schools, it was given considerably less time

than Latin. But writing statutes did not mean they were carried out efficiently, or that a professor would find an audience, especially when the only lectures in Greek were held as early as 4 a.m.[138] For the 1592 Dio Cassius, Henri Estienne corrected Guillielmus Xylander's Greek text and paired it with Guillaume Blanc's Latin version to create a Greek/Latin facing-page edition. Evidence that Jonson employed Blanc's Latin side is everywhere in the Quarto. Consider the note at 1.214.c.: "He [e] prostituted his abused bodie." The note directs the reader to "[e] Tac. *ibid*. & Dio. Hist. Rom. 57. pag. 706."[139] This note is the first piece of evidence that Jonson employs Henri Estienne's Latin columns when translating Dio's history into English. Tacitus records that Sejanus practised "debauchery at a price" *stuprum veno dedisse*, and Dio's Greek offers that Sejanus was once Apicius's favourite or darling (παιδικὰ). Only Blanc's Latin offers *prostituerat*. Two lines later, at 1.216, the centre offers evidence against Jonson's sole reliance on Blanc's Latin. There is no suggestion in the sources of Arruntius's comment that Sejanus "was the noted Pathike of the time." It might be argued that "pathic" is Jonson's misreading of παθικός (catamite) for Dio's παιδικὰ (favourite). Or it might be that in reading between the columns Jonson conflated Dio's παιδικὰ and Blanc's *prostituerat*, producing the Latin *pathicus*, out of which he rendered "pathic." According to the OED, Jonson coined the term "pathic," in the sense of catamite. Or it might be argued that Jonson does not mean "pathic" at all but is simply transcribing παιδικὰ; into Roman script as Pathike, a plausible pronunciation of the Greek. Were the latter the case, there is perhaps some measure of deprecatory irony in Arruntius's use of the term: Sejanus would never be anything grander than a favourite – then by debauchery, now by

murder. All this, of course, adds irony to Sejanus working Drusus's cup-bearer to his designs. In defense of Jonson's own claims of Greek erudition, his use of Estienne's Latin side might have been expedient, as the great French humanist's marginal epitomes are in Latin and placed adjacent to the Latin columns. Nevertheless, patently relying on Blanc's Latin, the Quarto insists that the task this epistle sets its readers is realizable at a time when Greek was accessible to few, even among the university educated.

The epistle's final note makes certain claims for the centred text. Its first claim again denies the Quarto *Sejanus*'s affiliation with the theatre, and, therefore, its value to those theatergoers who buy such texts: "Lastly I would inform you, that, this Booke, in all nūbers, is not the same with that which was acted on the publike Stage."[140] The second claim – "wherein a second Pen had good share" – has garnered a great deal of critical attention, beginning in Whalley with Shakespeare and settling upon Chapman.[141] The third claim is a completely orthodox profession of authorial modesty: "in place of which I have rather chosen, to put weaker (and no doubt lesse pleasing) of mine own."[142] Who that second pen was and what the theatrical *Sejanus* might have read like are unknowable and immaterial to the Quarto's final form.

The Quarto's letter to the reader concludes as the first note had begun – insisting on its learned poet's right to expend his academic prowess as he saw fit and expressing his poor opinion of popular approbation:

> Fare you well. And if you read farder of me, and like,
> I shall not be afraid of it though you praise me out.

Neque enim mihi cornea fibra est.[5]

But that I should plant my felicity, in your generall saying *Good*, or *Well*, &c. were a weaknesse which the better sort of you might worthily coutenme, if not absolutely hate me for.

BEN. IONSON. and no such.

Quem Palma negata macrum, donata reducit opimum.[6]

This farewell prepares the reader for the complexity to follow. On the surface, this seems a straightforward enough sentiment – *Ars Gratia Artis*; yet, there are these two interposing Latin *sententiae* complicating this simple claim to abhor praise. The first is out of Persius's *Satire I*, in which the poet defends his own learned content, in the face of the imbecile public, and his biting attacks against literary corruption, in the face of general disdain. The conclusion of this excerpt and the satire itself is that Persius only seeks the applause of the intelligent and virtuous. With this first quotation the epistle accomplishes an exquisite diachronic itinerary. Thomas Greene applies this term to "Renaissance imitation in its richest," that which does not simply point allusively to a simplified past, for the sake of dressing the host text, but creates etiological constructs, introducing conscious subtexts that inform the meaning of the host texts.[143] Including this piece of Persius in its conclusion, the epistle draws a direct conceptual line between itself and *Satire I* to attract meaning to the Quarto's substrata:

---

[5] "certainly my soul is not made of stone" (Aulus Persius Flaccus, "The Satires of Persius," *Juvenal and Persius* ed. and trans. G. G. Ramsay [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1961] I.47-48).

[6] "Whom the prize denied makes lean, the prize bestowed makes fat" (Horace, *Epistles* II.1.181).

> You, whoever you are, whom I now made speak on behalf of my opponent,
> If, when I write, by luck something more apt comes out,
> Since this is such a rare bird, if, nevertheless, something more apt comes out,
> I will not fear praise, certainly my soul is not made of stone,
> But to the end and extreme of right I deny
> Your 'well done' and 'good.' For examine this whole 'good':
> What does it not have within it?[144]

The obvious lexical connection between the epistle's farewell and Persius's first satire suggests a philosophical corollary. And what is not within popular praise? This same "generall saying *Good,* or *Well*, &c" also praises the labours of poetasters. So it is not really *ars gratia artis*; it is just not *ars gratia vulgi*. This farewell suggests that what follows will be *ars gratia intellegentis*, those able enough to perceive the poet's wit. And the second excerpt? This second quotation, from Horace, is taken from an epistle on the frustration/vanity of a vocation in the dramatic arts. The epistle slightly adjusts Horace: V*aleat res ludicra, si me/ palma negata macrum, donata reducit opimum* ("Farewell foolish labour [of writing plays],/ if the prize refused brings me home lean, the prize bestowed brings me home fat").[145] Yet, as the Quarto's subtle employment of Jonson's scholarship makes plain, this poet has not abandoned the writing of plays. What he has abandoned is pandering to popular tastes. The scholar cannot look for sustenance in the palms of the vulgar multitude.

LAUDATORY POEMS: THE EARLY-MODERN PEER REVIEW PROCESS

What then follows in the Quarto are ten pages of poetic recommendations of the Quarto

Sejanus, its poet, and his scholarly *exercitatio*. Almost ten percent of the Quarto's pages are assigned to allographic authorization. Playing the role of the discretionary and supplementary introduction to a work, the laudatory remarks of acknowledged authorities substantiate valuative claims implicit in the act of publishing – objectifying what is subjective; in doing so, such poems of praise confirm the value of the readers' selection. A common enough feature of published texts, the laudatory poem is an unnatural beast. Ostensibly presented as impartial opinions calculated to certify artistic value, these prefatory paratexts are, in fact, potent allies, as formative of textual meaning as any other aspect of the Quarto's material form. The epistle refers to the Quarto's laudatory poems as the voluntary labours of his friends. In any literal sense, it seems unlikely that such labours were voluntary: a friend witnesses a work in some public (or private) prepublication form – be it in performance or manuscript – and spontaneously composes a poem of praise; a friend assumes the publication of an admired work is imminent and volunteers an unsolicited poem to adorn that publication's front matter; or, an author, intending publication, requests "voluntary" offerings from his friends and colleagues. The latter option seems the most likely. This is certainly the manner by which such praise finds its way into the front matter of modern texts – although it is as often as not the publisher who puts out the requests. Also arguing for the latter is the degree of reciprocity with which these ostensibly free and spontaneous poetic praises are offered. Jonson praises Chapman's *Hesiod* with his "To My worthy and honour'd Friend, Mr George Chapman, on His Translation of Hesiods Works, & Days"[146] and he praises Holland's *Pancharis* with his "Ode. ἀλληγορική."[147]

The prefatory material of the 1605 Quarto is comprised of firsts. The ten pages of poetic praise that consume over two-thirds of *Sejanus*'s front matter are no exception. This is the earliest of Jonson's extant quartos to include laudatory poems. In the four quartos that precede *Sejanus* – *Every Man out of his Humour, Every Man in his Humour, Cynthias Revels*, and *Poetaster* – the list of players and the play text follow directly after the title page. Quarto play texts had been considered mere ephemera – something bought and read by playgoers, not the literati. With the Quarto *Sejanus*, Jonson raised the quarto play text – his own at least – to the level of estimable literature. After the Quarto *Sejanus*, Jonson's subsequent quartos and folios exhibit their share of such solicited praise, although none of his subsequent publications seem to have needed quite so much support.[148]

As much as any feature of the Quarto, in both content and placement, these poems are calculated gesture. Jonson arranged the eight poems that fill the Quarto's ten pages of praise to take full advantage of both primacy and recency. The most instructive laudations appear first – before the reader's mind is cloyed. At the centre of these eight poems sits Marston's enigmatic offering. Following Marston's ambivalence, is William Strachey's redundance. The final page contains the offerings by the cryptic ΦΙΛΟΕ and the ciphered Ev. B., both of which seem only tangentially connected to the Quarto; yet, these two are the most difficult and, in their insight into Jonson's labours, the most rewarding of the Quarto's laudatory poems. These eight poems can be further divided into two groups: those which refer primarily to the theatrical production and those which insist upon their conversance with the Quarto in all its complexity. As a unified gesture this selection of

poems authorizes the epistle's claims to innovation. Ideal readers have weighed and approved the Quarto's erudite form; they now applaud its novelty and acknowledge its author's labours.

The first of these poems, that by George Chapman, is of the latter sort, arguing familiarity with the Quarto's complexity. The epistle testifies that Jonson had granted a select group of his peers access to the Quarto's composite text prior to publication. Chapman is thought by most to be the sometime wielder of that famous "second Pen."[149] If Chapman was the co-author of *Sejanus*, in its original theatric form, it is conceivable that Jonson would have kept him abreast of his innovations. Or perhaps since the two playwrights were working with Marston on their *Eastward Hoe* Jonson might have previewed for Chapman and Marston the marginated manuscript copy he had prepared as a guide at the printers.[150] Jonson might even have sought Chapman's advice in the Quarto's composition, as Chapman had, in 1595, published *Ouids Banquet of Sence,* a text with many material similarities.[151] By whatever means the Quarto came into Chapman's hands, it and its author are the objects of praise, in his laudatory "In SEIANVM BEN. IONSONI ET Musis et sibi *in Delicijs*" (On Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, His Own and the Muses' Favourite). Chapman's poem comprises a series of forty-eight metaphor-rich quatrains rhyming abab.[152] The first 174 italicized lines address the playwright, his labours, and his text; the fourteen Roman lines that follow address Jonson's subject, Sejanus, and Jonson's historiographic innovations. For the most part these forty-eight quatrains address the same issues raised in the Quarto's prefatory epistle. This is not the place to offer a close reading of Chapman's 188-line poem.[153] Discussion

of a few structural and thematic points will illustrate the intimacy of the poem with the Quarto's material and scholarly innovations.

The opening five quatrains reveal the degree to which Chapman was aware of the wealth of historical and literary variety Jonson had amassed for the Quarto's composition. And they show him equally aware of the specific terms upon which Jonson had put that variety to use:

> *So brings the wealth-contracting Ieweller*
> *Pearles and deare Stones, from richest shores and streames,*
> *As thy accomplisht travaile doth confer*
> *From skill-inriched Soules, their wealthier Gems;*
> *So doth his Hand enchase in ammeld Gould,*
> *Cut, and adornd beyond their Native Merits,*
> *His solid Flames, as thine hath here inrould*
> *In more than Goulden Verse, those betterd Spirits;*
> *So he entreasures* Princes *Cabinets,*
> *As thy Wealth will their wished Libraries;*
> *So, on the throate of the rude Sea, he sets*
> *His ventrous foote, for his illustrous Prise;*
> *And through wilde Desarts, armd with wilder Beasts;*
> *As thou adventurst on the Multitude,*
> *Vpon the boggy, and engulfed brests*
> *Of Hyrelings, sworne to finde most Right, most rude:*
> *And he, in stormes at Sea, doth not endure,*
> *Nor in vast Desarts, amongst Woolves, more danger;*
> *Than we, that would with* Vertue *live secure,*
> *Sustaine for her in every* Vices *anger.*[154]

These twenty lines comprise an allegory indebted to Seneca's apian analogy:

> We should imitate the bees and separate whatever we have gathered from our varied course of reading – for such things kept separate are better conserved – then, summoning the care of our natural capacities, we should combine their various flavours into one delicious compound that, even though it shows its origins, nevertheless it will show itself to be manifestly different than that origin.[155]

This apian notion of production – selection, collection, combination, excogitation, and creation – is an integral part of Jonson's work and his own collected thoughts on poetry. Jonson borrows from Seneca's apian analogy in his discussion of proper imitation:

> The poet must imitate not as a creature that swallows what it takes in crude, raw, or undigested, but that feeds with an appetite, and hath a stomach to concoct, divide, and turn all into nourishment. Not to imitate servilely, as Horace saith, and catch at vices for virtue, but to draw forth out of the best and choicest flowers, with the bee, and turn all into honey, work it into one relish and savour; make our imitation sweet.[156]

Chapman pairs Jonson's masterful composition of the Quarto *Sejanus* not with the ranging honey bee but rather with the jeweler's labours. The analogue is present not merely in the combination of disparate materials into a valued object but in the careful process of far-flung selection, collection, and artful combination that results in something unique and worthy to grace the finest homes and palaces while subtly revealing its origins. Like the jeweler, Jonson does not work from a single element, be it gold or Plutarch, nor does he rely upon the epitomes and collected aphorisms so popular with his humanist peers, but, rather, he gathers his materials "*from richest shores & streames*" of ancient Rome and from the "*skill-inriched soules*" of humanist encyclopedists. Where the jeweler cuts to reveal the glory of his many-faceted stones, Jonson constructs out of his amassed variety a many-faceted history, each face lighting a distinct perspective of a single historic moment, producing something beyond the *Native Merits* of each single source. Neither the jeweler nor Jonson rests upon what has been safely done, but rather he seeks his *illustrious Prise* amongst innovation's perils, setting his *"ventrous foote*" "*on the throate of the rude Sea*," to face wholly anticipated dangers, be they "*wilde Desarts,*

armed with wilder Beasts" or *Hyrelings* bent on rooting application out of "Vertue." This last point both thematically and typographically echoes the Quarto's prefatory epistle.

Chapman then claims that Jonson might school Minerva, goddess of arts and sciences, in story-telling,[157] as his many-faceted history has bettered the work of his ancient sources. Jonson was "*scarce addressed to draw/ The Semicircle of Seianvs life*," the theatre's myopic view of a man's brief rise and fall, but instead made a "*whole Sphære*," a panoptic view of all that motivated and contributed to that rise and fall. For this reading of sphere I intend "*Geom.* A figure formed by the complete revolution of a semicircle about its diameter; a round body of which the surface is at all points equidistant from the centre."[158] Ayres reads this line differently, when he separates *Semicircle* and *whole Sphære* into two notes: the first suggests that *Semicircle* addresses the brevity of Sejanus's life; the second connects *whole Sphære* and *Lawe* with *all state Lives*, intending that *Sejanus* deals with the entire sphere of state, and its lessons are for all involved with statecraft.[159] I would contend that "*whole sphære*" is Jonson's "integrity in the *Story*," creating a Polybian history to counsel not merely the ambitious and those who would raise them to power, but every reader.

Between these initial two thematic blocks and the centre of Chapman's poem, a series of "allegories" first address Jonson's retirement and his awaiting the ripeness of his academic pursuits to create his *Sejanus*, and then upbraid those envious critics who argue that knowledge itself is incapable of making a man worthy of rank. Then, having complimented Jonson's vivid style with lines borrowed from Plutarch's praise of Thucydides – "*Were the Athenians more famous in war or in wisdom?*" – Chapman sets

another knowing line before the Quarto's reader: *"So deare is held, so deckt thy numerous Taske,/ As thou putt'st handles on the* Thespian *Boules."*[160] This simile might merely be a conventional praise of Jonson's poetic skills, were it not for the presence of "*numerous Taske,*" rendering meaningful what might otherwise be hackneyed formulae. Awkwardly modifying a singular *Taske, numerous* seems to refer to the multiple labours Jonson has set for this single text and, thus, broadens the purpose of these classical allusions.[161] This awkward *numerous* gives pause, spurring the reader to consider Chapman's lines more closely. Whether suggesting that he drank two fisted from "Thespian *Boules*," or that he ought quaff from the "Castalian *Head*," Chapman would have Jonson drinking waters sacred not just to Melpomene but to all the nine Musae: Cleio (history), Euterpe (lyric poetry), Thaleia (comedy), Melpomene (tragedy), Terpsichore (choral dance), Erato (erotic poetry), Polymnia (sublime hymn), Urania (astronomy), and Calliope (epic poetry). Called to mind in this, their canonic order, the Musae of this doubled allusion expand an uninteresting metaphor to breathe inspiration into the full breadth of literary skills required in composing the Quarto's poetic historiographic innovations. In the midst of this invocation of the Musae, again glancing at the *sus Minervam* trope – "*struckst rich plumes in the* Palladian *Caske*" – Chapman reminds his reader that Jonson's textual and literary innovations trump those of his classical sources.[162] Leaving this praise, Chapman attacks the poet-haters. Once more employing Plutarch, he admonishes those myopes hunting down parallelography for searching too closely to see Jonson's meaning.[163] The flower's perfume, held "*too neere the Sensor of our Sence,*" is accompanied by too much that is earthly and corrupt, it seems

"*not pure, nor so sincere.*" When that same flower is removed "*A little space, the Earthly parts do fall*" and "*is to our powers of Savor purely borne.*"[164] So *Sejanus* loses Jonson's manifest purpose when studied too closely by those who root about in the earth for application. When the Quarto's innovative literary substance is given a broad perspective, what previously seemed ill-intended – *not pure* – reveals itself to be disinterested – *purely borne*. With its insistently polymathic breadth manifest upon each page, the Quarto erects a bulwark against application, while its panoptic perspective accomplishes its historiographic aims.

Whether on his own behalf or jointly, over the next twenty-five lines (137-62) Chapman circuitously approaches the troubles over *Eastward Ho*e by way of Jonson's learned labours in composing the Quarto. Ayres suggests this section addresses some unrecorded help James rendered Jonson with the troubles over the original staging of *Sejanus*. In Ayres' timetable, the troubles with *Eastward Hoe* occurred after the publication of *Sejanus*. Our differences are, in part at least, the fault of *H&S*, in which the dates of Jonson and Chapman's imprisonment are severally offered as late 1604, following the staging of *Eastward Hoe* (II, 31), and late 1605, following its publication (XI, 578). *H&S* dates the publication of *Eastward Hoe* on its entry into the Stationers' Register, one month after *Sejanus* was entered for the second time; in *H&S* Chapman's cloying testimonials to members of the Privy Council are in reference to supposed (but unrecorded outside of Drummond) legal troubles suffered by *Sejanus* in its original theatric form. R. P. Corballis argues that this and the next dozen lines refer to Jonson and Chapman's shared – as the "second Pen" – troubles over the theatrical version of

Sejanus.[165] In the poem, Chapman advises Jonson to employ persistence in his labours (assiduity) in the face of the practisers' *scorne*, as learned King James will surely continue to take the side of learned poets. He then offers a saccharine address to the various members of the Privy Council involved (likely both for and against) in the troubles brought on by those "rooting vp the *Muses* Gardens."[166] Beginning with an adoring "O," the final four quatrains of the first part of Chapman's poem are an exclamation of joy for the virtuous poet working without reward on virtue's behalf.[167]

The second part of Chapman's laudatory poem reveals his understanding of Jonson's historiographic innovation. The poem's addressee is Sejanus himself; it is set in Roman type; and it employs italics for emphasis. For Chapman, the Quarto presents its historic event with all of the Polybian's attention to motivation, while maintaining due attention to Scaliger's *ut quam proxime accedant ad veritatem* and Horace's *Ficta uoluptatis causa sint proxima ueris*.

> Come forth SEIANVS, fall before this Booke,
> And to thy *Falles Reviver*, aske forgivenesse,
> That thy lowe Birth and Merits, durst to looke
> A Fortune in the face, of such uneuennesse.[168]

Chapman figures the Quarto as a new Fortuna, before whom Sejanus had formerly refused to kneel in supplication. This new Fortuna does not avert her face and damn him, but she casts her gaze upon him again and revives him. This new Fortuna lifts Sejanus from the ruin of his fall to the service of humanist optimism.[169] The Quarto does not merely picture Sejanus's fall but revives it, bringing back to life all its vital parts: "As if

thou hadst beene all this while in falling."[170] The Quarto's *Sejanus* is not a mere axiom plucked from the historic record, its vital qualities stripped away to serve a preexisting discourse; it is a complex, living, and real thing, a thing so realized that it becomes almost current. Chapman's concluding subscription – Hæc Commentatus est/ *Georgius Chapmannus*. – offers confirmation that this poem was born out of an intimate understanding of the Quarto's historiographic intentions and material form: "George Chapman has carefully weighed these things."[171]

The Quarto's second laudatory poem, Hugh Holland's sonnet, "*For his worthy Friend, the Author*," also addresses the text and its promise to raise Sejanus to new humanist heights: "In that this Booke doth deigne SEIANV'S name,/ Him vnto more [honours], then *Cæsars* Loue, it brings."[172] The sonnet's three stanzaic themes are a) as a complexity of disparate elements, the Quarto – not the author – gives Sejanus the eternal fame Caesar denied him; b) the popular tragic warning against overreaching and flattering kings, echoing the disclaimer appended to the Argument; and c) the misprision of those who search for application. The concluding couplet treats the seemingly inescapable charges of parallelography that haunted the historian: "The Men are not, some Faults may be these Times:/ He acts those Men, and they did act the Crimes."[173] Application circumscribed the potential of histories to address their fuller audience; the contemporary shift in notions of historiography set out to address this very charge. As Chapman asserts in his analogy of the flowers, when we look too closely we miss the point. Jonson the phenomenistic historiographer sought to avoid these charges with his Quarto, but, as criticism of *Sejanus* – so often performed outside of its original bibliographical context –

has shown, he ultimately failed.

As had the previous two poems, CYGNVS's sonnet, "*To the deserving Author*," addresses the Quarto not the play, although not so patently as the previous two. Within its opening stanza the Swan's verb choices – respect (to consider carefully) and view (to survey carefully) – acknowledge both the complexity of the text's material form and its historiographic aims: "When I respect thy argument, I see/ An image of those *Times*: but when I view/ The whit, the workmanship, so rich, so true,/ The *Times* themselves do seeme retriu'd to me."[174] Whether the reader carefully considers – "respect" as an intellectual process – *Sejanus* or its Argument, the Quarto reveals its historic accuracy[175]: it is, indeed, "An image of those *Times*." When the reader carefully surveys the Quarto's abundant material complexity – "view" as a visual process stimulating an intellectual process – the Quarto reveals that it is insisting upon truth. Throughout the remaining ten lines, Cygnus confirms his close connection with the Quarto and its four-year progress from inception to publication, as he validates the apologeticall Dialogue's boast that an impending historic tragedy would strike such fresh strains as to shame his fellows and impel them to "imitate their sound": "all *Tragedians*, Maisters of their Arte,/ Who shall hereafter follow on this tract,/ In writing well, thy *Tragedie* shall acte."[176]

At two key points, *Th. R.*'s "*To his learned and beloued Friend,*/ vpon his æquall worke" shows an intimate connection with the Quarto, but it is a somewhat dilute connection. Roe's poem is composed of five quatrains in iambic pentameter, rhyming abba, cddc, etc. Its title pronounces this praiseworthy work "æquall," here in the sense of the Latin *æquus*: fair, equitable, just, impartial.[177] Setting forth from this seeming nod to

the Quarto's insistent impartiality anticipates further support for the application-harried playwright. Instead, Roe launches into a three-quatrain brief of *Sejanus*'s dramatic action, one in which he offers nothing new: Sejanus tops the senate; Sejanus falls; the people's beastly rage annihilates his memory. Roe might well have assembled this synopsis from the play's theatrical version, assuming that the present culmination of Act 5 were present in that version. Roe lays out what might be termed the play-text's surface sentiment – Sejanus's rise and fall serve as a stark example to both tyrants and careful kings. It should be noted that Chapman and Holland included this sentiment in their commendations, and Jonson appends it as a closing statement to the Quarto's Argument. The fourth quatrain still offers no confirmation of Roe's connection with the terms upon which the Quarto operates. As had "æquall" at the poem's opening, the paired rhyme – "*industrious*" and "illustrious" – in the final quatrain confirms the poet's intimacy with the true extent and aim of Jonson's innovations. With "*industrious*," Roe recognizes the impartial Quarto as a designedly careful and ingenious work of great novelty. With "illustrious," the panoptic Quarto renders the circumstances and motivations of Sejanus's rise and fall manifest.[178]

John Marston's "*Amicis, amici nostri dignissimi, dignissimis*,/ Epigramma./ D./ IOHANNES MARSTONIVS" (An Epigram to the Most Worthy Friends of Our Most Worthy Friend, John Marston)[179] exhibits no definitive evidence of familiarity with the Quarto, although its "YEE ready Friendes, spare your vnneedfull Bayes" evidences familiarity with its accompanying poems. Marston's ambiguous poem comprises a trinity of rhyming couplets. Indeed, it is only with a concerted effort that one can avoid finding a note of ambivalence in Marston's equivocation. Whatever their relationship during the

composition of *Eastward Hoe*, it seems that when it came time to compose the Quarto, Marston might not have been privy to Jonson's innovations. If Marston did, in fact, run off in 1604/05 and leave Chapman and Jonson to face prison without him, his exclusion from Jonson's intimate circle might be expected. Ultimately, the complexity of Marston and Jonson's relationship must inform any reading of this poem. Marston's satiric style both inspired and finds comment in *Poetaster* and its "apologeticall Dialogue"; a year after penning this poem for the Quarto's front matter, he obliquely derides Jonson's historiographic efforts in the Quarto, in the preface to his *The Tragedy of Sophonisba*:

> Know, that I haue not labored in this poem, to tie my selfe to relate any thing as an historian but to inlarge euery thing as a poet, To transcribe Authors, quote authorities, & translate Latin prose orations into English black-verse, hath in this subject beene the least aime of my studies.[180]

Marston's laudatory epigram opens, paradoxically, as a call to these friends, whose lauding we have just read, to cease their praise, as "dispairefull Enuie" has already made it famous.[181] This reference to "dispairefull Enuie" addresses those poets and "practisers" to whom Jonson anticipates that *Sejanus* would give "cause to some of wonder, some despight."[182] This would suggest that Marston was intimate with Jonson's plans in 1601/02. Marston addresses the second couplet to Jonson himself, attesting that James's approbation of the text assures his future success.[183] If James is to be understood as Phoebus/Apollo, as he is in Chapman, this might help explain how this play, which many suggest brought Jonson before the Privy Council, also anticipated Jonson's success as a writer of court masque, and how the Quarto anticipates the form in which he would compose his early published masques. Addressing the poet in the third person, the final

couplet begins as hyperbolic praise of Jonson's literary skills, but then concludes with the most cryptic line: "He could say much, not more."[184] This is either a slight against Jonson's creative potential or a veiled acknowledgment of the Quarto's literary goals. If anywhere, evidence of Marston's association with the Quarto's material form is in this line: in his inclusive masterpiece of Polybian bibliography and historiography, Jonson has said it all – the whole story.

William Strachey's *Vpon SEIANVS* deals with the most conspicuous aspect of the tragedy's surface sentiment: know thy place, for overreachers are ever humbled by "*Fortunes* ruinous blastes."[185] Nothing in this metaphor-encumbered sonnet suggests that Strachey enjoyed knowledge of *Sejanus* beyond that presented upon the stage or centred page.

ΦΙΛΟΣ's "To him that hath so excell'd on/ *this excellent subject*" undertakes a critical discussion that seems the least specific to the work it praises, while, paradoxically, its understanding of the goals of that work is the most succinct and astute. Φιλος makes no specific reference to *Sejanus* by name, nor does he acknowledge any direct familiarity with the Quarto or its bibliographical innovations. His address to the Quarto's historiographic novelty merits closer inspection:

> Thy Poeme (pardon me) is meere deceat.
> Yet such deceate, as thou that dost beguile,
> Are juster farre then they who use no wile:
> And they who are deceaued by this feat,
> More wise, then such who can eschewe thy cheat.
> For thou hast giuen each parte so just a stile,

> That Men suppose the Action now on file;
> (And Men suppose, who are of best conceat.)
> Yet some there be, that are not moou'd hereby,
> And others are so quick, that they will spy
> Where later Times are in some speech en weau'd;
> Those wary Simples, and these simple Elfes:
> They are so dull, they cannot be deceau'd,
> These so vniust, they will decêaue themselves.[186]

The Friend's French sonnet speaks to that which those at the forefront of the contemporary shift in historiography are attempting to combat: the litigious and objective limitations of application. Φιλος introduces the Quarto through a reference to Jonson's "*Poeme.*" He (apologetically and, again, paradoxically) confirms the Quarto's action a "meere deceat." This deceit is not a deception that conceals truth but a careful stratagem (wile) that permits truth to be revealed; such a poem is, thus, "iuster." The programmatic historiographer deceives with poorly veiled commentary upon contemporary persons and events through adaptation – historic truth ceases to be true once adapted for moral or political clarity. This new deception is to tell a whole story, in which readers recognize true depictions of wrong and reasoned action, and out of which they can glean right action. Readers "of best conceit" who read the action as presented "on file" and nothing more are fooled by Jonson's deception and, yet, are wiser than those who miss the trick (cheat) and root about for application. The poem concludes with an indictment of both those "Simples," who miss the point entirely, and those "simple Elfes," malicious creatures who fool themselves into unjustly finding application.[187]

Ev. B.'s concluding sonnet, "*To the most Vnderstanding Poet*," at first glance

seems another of those poems that required little knowledge of the Quarto in its composition. Closer consideration reveals that Edmund Bolton enjoyed a remarkable understanding of the Quarto's innovativeness:

> Whē in the GLOBES faire ring, our Worlds best Stage,
> I saw *Seianus*, set with that rich foyle,
> I look't the Author should haue borne the spoile
> Of conquest, from the Writers of the Age:
> But when I veiw'd the Peoples beastly rage,
> Bent to confound thy graue, and learned toile,
> That cost thee so much sweat, and so much oyle,
> My indignation I could hardly' asswage.
> And many there (in passion) scarce could tell
> Whether thy fault, or theirs deserued most blame;
> Thine, for so shewing, theirs, to wrong the same:
> But both they left within that doubtfull Hell.
> From whence, this Publication setts thee free:
> They, for their Ignorance, still damned bee.[188]

Bolton opens with the thrill he felt in witnessing *Sejanus*'s original theatrical version and the indignation he felt in witnessing "the Peoples beastly rage" against it. Did the poet witness the performance and the rage as one event? With the opening reference, Bolton sets himself in the Globe, and, there, he seems to think *Sejanus* a great success. The people's rage was not, it seems, the whole audience's hissing of the play. Together "rage" and "passion" produce a picture of too violent an event for any witness to believe the play such an unmitigated success. The second quatrain's "But when" both parallels the opening line and differentiates itself from that line. With repetition of "when" comes the sense that the second quatrain relates an event distinct from that of the first. Following the

critical consensus that Jonson was called before the Privy Council for this performance, I would suggest that the "Peoples beastly rage" refers to the ferocity with which those pernicious swine afterwards rooted about for application. Bolton's indignation was not raised by an audience meaning to insult or disparage the play, as an audience might, but it was raised by a base anger intended to "confound" or confute Jonson's scholarly labours, his "so much sweat, and so much oyle," the true scope and weight of which labours Bolton seems fully aware. In Bolton's account, the people's fault was not their ignorance in disliking such a work of genius but in missing, with their habituated rush for application, the very thing Jonson had so laboriously designed *Sejanus* to deprive of legitimacy – application itself.

In his indignation, Bolton assigns Jonson his share of the blame, "for so shewing." What this theatrical expression of Jonson's "learned toil" looked like we will likely never know. If the theatrical version's novel historiographic aims only become visible within the Quarto's marginalia, perhaps the people were not so much to blame for missing the point. If the page struggles to contain Jonson's innovations, what hope is there for the stage being venue enough? Bolton's sonnet then assures Jonson that the Quarto will set him free from the rage that the play suffered at the people's hands. Such notions of publication saving a play or playwright were becoming almost commonplace: publishing playwrights frequently included prefatory letters steeped in disdain for inept audiences, or the publishers of pirated plays. Bolton's sentiment, here, seems somewhat different. The author is to be saved from the stage's "doubtfull Hell," but the people will "still damned bee." This is more than the usual indictment of inept theatrical audiences. The act of

publication alone would not remove *Sejanus* from its vulgar audience and their theatrical perdition. Playwrights would hope for their plays' continued dramatic production after publication. With its historiographic innovations made manifest upon its composite pages, the Quarto will save *Sejanus*'s purport from the stage's delimitation and its author from being the target of application. Meanwhile, the swine will still be damned, because they will still find cause for "despight." Prefacing the Folio *Sejanus*, Jonson's letter to Esme Lord Aubigne contains an echo of Bolton's poem suggesting that Bolton's concluding sentiment proved correct: *Sejanus* "*suffer'd no lesse violence from our people here, then the subject of it did from the rage of the people of* Rome*; but, with a different fate, as (I hope) merit: For this has out-liv'd their malice, and begot it selfe a greater favour then he lost, the love of good men.*"[189] The astounding degree of work Jonson put into making manifest in the composite Quarto what can merely be suspected in the naked play-text has earned *Sejanus* its greater favour. Ultimately, though, time has proved false Jonson and Bolton's estimation of the Quarto's liberating power. Publication did not free Jonson from public scrutiny for his *Sejanus*.

THE ARGVMENT is the final component of the Quarto's front matter (Figure 1).[190] There is nothing novel in prefacing a play with a detailed argument, or outline of the action. Indeed, there is nothing novel in the Quarto's argument: it elegantly and succinctly outlines the key historic points of the action, if not its more subtle motivations. Somewhat novel is its decision to translate Tacitus verbatim for the opening introduction to Sejanus: "ÆLIVS Seianus, Sonne to Seius Strabo, a Gentleman of Rome, and borne at *Vulsinium*." That the Argument takes its opening introduction from Tacitus is to be expected; that here

in Renaissance England's most heavily authorially annotated play, it does not cite the debt is surprising. Nevertheless, this weightily classical beginning effectively sets the tone for the remainder of the argument. Even with its brevity, the Argument shows a Polybian attention to the historic record, taking its sketch out of Tacitus, Dio, and Suetonius.

Seven lines awkwardly and conspicuously set at the foot of the Argument are its true claim to novelty and the final compositorial curiosity of the Quarto's front matter. Asserting that what follows is to show princes that the Heavens wreak vengeance upon traitors and treasons, these lines are a Florentine disclaimer, rather unconvincingly denying what the composite – in its front matter, marginalia, and material form – argues so convincingly for: the Quarto Sejanus is a model of Polybian historiography. The *mise-en-page* draws attention to the separation of the Argument and the disclaimer. The Argument proper consists of thirty-one tightly spaced lines of diminished type: majuscules 2 mm, minuscules 1mm to the Quarto's 3mm and 2mm norm. It, like the letter *To the Reader* and Tiberius's letter to the senate, is in the Quarto's full-justified epistolary norm. The argument's print area opens with a 10mm ligatured rubric, Æ, insetting the initial five lines to compensate. The visual impact of this opening is second only to the prefatory epistle's rubric, which is 27mm, insetting the initial six lines to compensate. Elsewhere in the Quarto, the rubrics are 5 to 7mm, insetting the initial two lines to compensate. The disclaimer, set beneath the argument, reverts to the Quarto's typographical norm of 3mm and 2mm. There is no opening rubric. Markedly all subsequent lines are inset. The result of this awkward juxtaposition of type size and format is a sense of appendication. Something business-like is set beneath the powerful

classical authority of the Argument. Visually, this disclaimer seems to be a supplementary "why" necessary to support the historical weight of the Argument's "what."

As its Florentine parallelographic and universalizing claims strike a very different note to what the preceding pages have established as the Quarto's historiographic mode, so this disclaimer's opening line strikes a very different note to what the prefatory epistle has established as Jonson's voice. Employing the personal pronoun thirty-six times, the epistle is adamant that the Quarto's innovations and intentions are Jonson's. Yet, in this disclaimer there is conspicuously no I: "This we aduance as a marke of Terror to all *Traytors, & Treasons.*"[191] This "we" gives the reader the same sense of an allographic addition as that disclaiming note appended to the quarto *Every Man out of his Humour*'s description of characters:

> It is not neere his thoughts that hath published this, either to traduce the Authour; or to make vulgar and cheape, any the peculiar & sufficient deserts of the Actors: but rather (whereas many Censures flutter'd about it) to giue al leaue, and leisure to iudge with distinction.[192]

Whether the Quarto's disclaimer is truly allographic or this "we" is merely an authorial pose, Jonson purposely set it into this page. The Quarto's inclusion, and the various Folios' subsequent exclusion, of this disclaimer has enjoyed much critical attention. Ayres suggests that Jonson includes this note to protect himself against application, as he had just, supposedly, been called before the Privy Council for the dramatic production of *Sejanus*. Ayres also offers the 1605 Gunpowder Plot and the Ralegh-Cobham plot of 1603, as possible sources of the note's allusion to traitors.[193] The troubles over *Eastward Hoe* might also have inspired this defense. Although *Eastward Hoe* is not a treasonous

play, it was accused of parallelography. There, a clear statement of authorial intent might have spared Chapman and Jonson imprisonment. Ayres' suggestion that we are to read this disclaimer as a defensive measure seems a reasonable one. And there is an ironic paradox in the inclusion of this Florentine defense.

Paradoxically, this statement of Jonson the Florentine historiographer's service to his prince functions as both an admission of parallelography – as the Florentine historiography openly parallels – and bulwark against application – as Ayres rightly suggests it does. This paradox, I argue, is as calculated as the disclaimer's vivid appendication. Historiography that asserts its proper role to be service to a preexisting discourse opens the floodgates to application. Once A can equal B, A can also equal C or D. As Annabel Patterson suggests, these sorts of statements are often an admission of "precisely that kind of reading they protest against."[194] Historiography that refuses to be axiomatic denies all application – A is A, make of it what you will. Sitting above this appended disclaimer, the Argument's non-evaluative historicity visually and conceptually overpowers the Florentine. As chapter 2 argues Terentius eclipses Cordus, quite literally, and in this disclaimer the Polybian eclipses the Florentine.

The Quarto's form and prefatory material manifest its bibliographic and historiographic innovations. The title page declares the Quarto's innovations; the title itself establishes Jonson's proprietorship over the Quarto; the epigram argues for the Quarto's historiographic innovations; the publication information provides insight into both the conditions of Jonson's compositorial role and the expertise that ensured the Quarto was printed to Jonson's exacting specifications. The Quarto's epistle "To the

Readers" makes claims for the Quarto's authority; the first note claims the scholarly authority of its learned author to school and not be schooled by popular expectations; the second note claims the bibliographic authority of marginalia to operate within scholarly conventions; the third note claims the historiographic authority of the Quarto's sources; the fourth note claims the authority of *Sejanus* to operate autonomously of its dramatic past and its author to operate autonomously of "a second Pen." The laudatory poems testify to the Quarto's scholarly and historiographic innovations and to its author's *exercitatio*. The Quarto's Argument and appended disclaimer complete the front matter by setting in motion one of the Quarto's defining conflicts, that between the Florentine centre and the Polybian composite. Throughout, the front matter returns to how Jonson and those who had prepublication knowledge of the Quarto's form construed its historiographic innovation. To say that the Quarto's material form insists upon its historiographic innovation requires a closer examination of that innovation. The next chapter therefore turns to Jonson's historiographic education and the innovative use to which he put his learning in the marginated Quarto *Sejanus*.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. *Sejanus* A1v, 179-83.

2. "Notes of Conversations with Ben Jonson," *Discoveries 1641, Conversations With William Drummond of Hawthornden 1619*, ed. G. B. Harrison (Edinburgh: UP, 1966) 12.

3. "Jonson, Northampton, and the 'Treason' in *Sejanus*," *Modern Philology* (1983): 589

4. *Stationers' Register* (*SR*) 1604 Nov. 2. *Ent. E. Blunt.* (*putt over to Thomas Thorp 6 Augusti* 1605)*: lic. Pasfeild*: *the tragedy of SEIANUS written by BENIAMIN JOHNSON.*

Transcript &c. (*A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; A.D. 1554-1640* Vol. III, ed. Edward Arber [Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1967] 115).

The generically ambiguous Quarto *Sejanus* was entered into the *Stationers' Register* twice as a tragedy, the second time, presumably, fairly close to its date of composition in Eld's print shop if not its publication.

5. *SR* 1605 Aug. 6. *Ent. T. Thorp.* by assignement of Edward Blunt *the tragedie of* *SEIANUS* which was entred to the said Edward *2 novembris ultimo* (127).

My "fortunately" is owed to Holger Schott Syme's helpful article, "Unediting the Margins: Jonson, Marston and the Theatrical Page," *English Literary Renaissance* 33.1 (2008): 142-71.

6. Collation: 4°, ¶-N2, first 3 leaves of each gathering signed [¶2 only signed, A-G3 fully signed, H3 unsigned, I-M3 fully signed, N2 unsigned] leaving 72 pages unsigned. Title "SEIANUS| HIS FALL| Written| by| BEN: JONSON| Mart. Non hîc *Centauros*, non *Gorgonas*, *Harpyasque*| Inuenies: Hominem pagina nostra sapit| AT LONDON| Printed by *G. Ellde*, for *Thomas*| *Thorpe*. 1605." ¶1 (verso blank). Note "*To the Reader*" [notes addressing several potential complaints] on ¶2-¶2v. Poem In SEIANVM |BEN. IONSONI |Et Musis, et sibi |*in Deliciis.* [by George Chapman] on ¶3-A1v. Two poems *For his worthy Friend, the Author* [by Hugh Holland] and *To the deserving Author* [signed *CYCNVS*] on A2r. Poem *To his learned, and beloued Friend,* |vpon his æquall worke on A2v. Two poems *Amicis, amici nostri dignissimi, dignissimis* | Epigramma. | *D.* [by John Marston] and *Vpon SEIANVS.* [by William Strachey] on A3r. Two poems To him that hath so excell'd on |*this excellent subiect.* [signed ΦΙΛΟΕ] on A3v. *THE ARGUMENT* on A4r. *The names of the Actors* on A4v. Dramatic text headed "SEIANVS" on B1r-N2r (verso blank). This collation was taken from the Folger Library copy: Seianus his fal*l*. VVritten by Ben: Ionson. Created/Published: At London : printed by G. Elld, for Thomas Thorpe, 1605. Description: [108] p. ; 4˚. Notes: In verse. Signatures: [par.]4 A-M4 N^2. imprint has variant "Ellde." Cited In: STC 14782.

7. Peter Whalley, ed., *The Dramatic Works of en Jonson: Printed from the Text, and With the Notes of Peter Whalley* (London: John Stockdale, 1811), Vol. I, ix.

8. W. W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950-1951): 19-37, 34.

9. xxi.

10. xviii,

11. 196, n.19 and 198, n.22.

12. William Gifford, ed, *The Works of Ben Jonson, in Nine Volumes: With a Biographical Memoir by William Gifford,* vol.3 (London: G. and W. Nicol; F. C. and J. Rivington; Cadell and Davies; Longman and Co.; Lackington and Co.; R. H. Evans; J. Murray J J.

Mawman; J. Cuthell J J. Black; Baldwin and Co.; Rodwell and Martin; and R. Saunders, 1816).

13. III, 8, n.6.

14. III, 9, n.6.

15. *Ibid.*

16. See *H&S* Vol. IV Appendix XI, page 473.

17. *The Works* Vol 3, 17 & *Sejanus* B1r.

18. Felix E. Shelling, intro, *Ben Jonson's Plays in Two Volumes* (London: Dent, 1964), xviii.

19. *Sejanus* G4v. & *Jonson's Plays* 357, n. 1.

20. W. D. Briggs, *Sejanus* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1911), lix.

21. 195.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Ibid.*

24. *H&S* Vol. IV, 330.

25. Vol. IV, 473 n. 64.

26. B2r.

27. Vol. XI, 597.

28. Henry de Vocht, ed, *Ben Jonson's Seianus His Fall: Edited From the Quarto of 1605 with Comments on its Text* (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst, 1935), 171.

29. Barish, Jonas ed. *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1965), 7.

30. 205.

31. 181.

32. *Ibid.*

33. 207.

34. W. F. Bolton, *Sejanus his Fall* (London: Benn, 1966), xii.

35. 123.

36. Philip J. Ayres, ed., *Sejanus His Fall: Ben Jonson* (Manchester: UP, 1990, 1999, 2007), 7-9.

37. 8.

38. *Ben Jonson's Sejanus* 122.

39. 122-208.

40. *Rationale*, 35.

41. *Sejanus His Fall* 8.

42. "Fall before this Book" 285.

43. Peter M. Wright "Jonson's Revision of Stage Directions for the 1616 Folio Workes," *Mediaeval and Renaissance drama in England*, 5 (1990): 257-85, 264 *et passim.*

44. ¶1r.

45. "Plays into Print: Shakespeare to his Earliest Readers," *Books and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Jennifer Anderson and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 2002) 23-41, 32-38, *et passim.*

46. ¶1r; STC 14766.

47. A1r; STC 14773.

48. A1r; STC 14781.

49. STC 23081a and 23082.

50. STC 23083.

51. STC 23083.3.

52. "The First Literary Hamlet and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 59.4 (2008): 371-420 & 527-28, *passim.*

53. "Printing and the Multitudinous Presse: The Contentious Texts of Jonson's Masques," *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio*, ed. Jennifer Brady and W.H. Herendeen, (Newark: Delaware U P, 1991) 169-91, 181-81.

54. A1r. *Every Man out of his Humour* was printed three times in 1600: twice for William Holme; once for Nicholas Linge.

55. ¶2r.

56. His next two publications open with his assertion of authorship, and only *His Case is Altered* mentions the players: BEN: IONSON | his | VOLPONE | or | THE FOXE. (1607 for Thomas Thorpe; STC 14783); BEN: IONSON, | HIS | CASE IS ALTERD. | As it hath beene sundry times Acted by the | Children of the Blacke-friers (1609, by Nicholas Okes for Bartholomew Sutton; STC 14757). There are two 1609 editions, one *His Case,* the other *The Case*; it is unclear which was the first published, but *The Case*'s title page makes no mention of Jonson's name: A Pleasant Comedy, | CALLED: | The Case is Alterd. | As it hath beene sundry times acted by the | children of the Black-friers (1609, by Nicholas Oakes for Bartholomew Sutton and William Burrenger; STC 14758).

The Case is Altered presents an interesting bibliographical puzzle: it was first entered into the Register on February 16, 1604, by John Smythick, as *The Case is Altered. How? Aske DALIO and MILLO*; it was next entered on January 26, 1609, by Henry Walleys and Richard Bonion, as *The Case is Altered*; the final entry is on July 20, 1609, by Henry Walley, Richard Bonyon and Bartholomew Sutton, as *The Case is Altered.*

For Jonson's next two quartos, the publisher, printer, or poet shift to the more conventional placement of the author's name without reference to players: ""CATILINE | his | CONSPIRACY. | Written | by | BEN IONSON" (1611 Willaim Stansby [?] for Walter Burre; STC 14759); "THE ALCHEMIST. | Written | by | BEN IONSON" (1612, by Thomas Snodham for Walter Burre; STC 14755). The remaining plays, printed in the various folios, mix poet, play, and players: "EPICOENE, OR THE SILENT WOMAN. A Comoedie. Acted in the yeere 1609. By the Children of her Majesties Revells" (F1; *A Transcript of the Stationers' registers* shows an entry in 1610 for *Epicoene or the silent woman* by BEN: JONSON [200b]; *Biographia Dramatica* mentions a 1609 quarto edition of *Epicoene; or, The silent Woman.* Comedy, by Ben Jonson. Acted by the King's servants [200], and Gifford mentions one of 1612, but none of these are extant); "THE NEW INNE. OR, THE LIGHT HEART. A Comoedy. As it was never acted, but most negligently play'd, by some, the Kings Servants. And more squeamishly beheld and censured by others the Kings Subjects. 1629. Now, at last, set at liberty to the Readers, his Ma[jesties] Servants, and Subjects, to be judg'd" (1631, by Thomas Harper for Thomas Alchorne; STC 14780); "BARTHOLOMEW FAYRE: A Comedie, Acted in the yeare, 1614. By the Lady Elizabeths Servants. And then dedicated to King James, of most Blessed Memorie" (1640, 2nd folio); "THE DIVELL IS AN ASSE: A Comedie acted in his yeare, 1616. By His Majesties Servants" (1640, 2nd folio); "THE STAPLE OF NEWES. A Comedie Acted in the yeare, 1625. By his Majesties Servants" (1640, 2nd folio); "THE MAGNETICK LADY: OR, HUMORS RECONCIL'D. A Comedy composed By Ben: Johnson" (1640, 2nd folio); "A TALE OF A TUB. A Comedy." (1640, 2nd folio); "THE SAD SHEPHERD: OR A TALE OF ROBIN-HOOD" (1641, 2nd folio); "MORTIMER HIS FALL A Tragedie" (1640, 2nd folio).

57. *The tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke by William Shake-speare. As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the cittie of London: as also in the two vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where* (London: Nicholas Ling and John Trundell, 1603); STC 22275.

58. *The tragicall historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. By William Shakespeare* (London: Nicholas Ling, 1604); STC 22276.

59. *Workes* 355/Gg5.

60. STC 13341

61. STC 7565.4

62. Martial, *Epigrams* X.4.9-10.

63. The Elizabethan reader thought of the *Ars Poetica* as distinct from the *Epistles*. Viewed by scholars since the middle ages as one of the, if not the most important Augustan treatise on the poetic arts, the *Ars* is, nevertheless, the *Epistula ad Pisones*. Quintilian gave the title *Ars Poetica* to the epistolary advice on writing Horace penned for the father and son Pisos.

64. This is William Smith's succinct characterization of Horace's *Epistles* (*A Smaller Classical Dictionary* [NY: Harper Bros., 1883] 203).

65. Decimus Junius Juvenal, "The Satires of Juvenal," *Juvenal and Persius*, ed. and trans. G. G. Ramsay (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1961) VII.94.

66. Again these two line are patched together from four lines out of Juvenal VII.

67. Martial *Epigrams* VII.12.4.

68. A1v.

69. *Satiro–Mastix. Or The Vntrussing of the Humorous Poet* (London: Edward White, 1602) A2r; STC 6521.

70. *Ars Poetica* 338.

71. What in 1605 had become Sidney's binary, was born out of Aristotle' observation that historic truth is what did happen; while poetic truth is what might happen, by probability or necessity (*Poetics*, ed. and trans. Stephen Halliwell [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995] 9). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* adds the legendary tales of tragedy which require neither truth nor probability (*Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi* ed. and trans. Harry Caplan [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1981] 1.13). Italian humanists had determined that historic truth was the necessary foundation of tragedy, thus conflating

historical and poetic truth. This notion of truth in poetry should be recalled when considering Scaliger's thoughts on the dramatic laws or unities, as well as the terms of the shift in historiography discussed in Chapter 2.

72. Again I would direct the reader Holger Schott Syme's compelling argument concerning Thorpe's role in Jonson's composition of the Quarto ("Unediting the Margins" *passim*).

73. *The supplication of certaine masse-priests falsely called Catholikes . . . Published with a marginall glosse, for the better vnderstanding of the text . . .* (London: William Aspley, 1604); STC 14429.5.

74. *Al Fooles* (London: Thomas Thorpe, 1605); STC 4963.

75. "Unediting the Margins" *passim*. In partnership with William Aspley and alone Thorpe published many best-selling plays.

76. In his seminal textual study, Henry de Vocht praises the care and skill with which Eld's compositors, print setters, readers, and editors attended to the Quarto *Sejanus* (*Studies on the Texts of Ben Jonson's Poetaster and Seianus* [Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst, 1958] 47-54). In a charmingly cutting phrase, de Vocht illustrates, from a collation of Quarto and Folio variants, that this care is "clearly noticeable by the absence of all minute care in the *Folio*" (*Ibid.* 46).

77. ¶2r-¶2v.

78. A2r.

79. A1v.

80. The 1602 *Poetaster* also has a *Prœludium* (presented by *Livor* or Envy) and an armed *Prologus*, the former a caricature of Marston as the biting satirist ironically stymied by Jonson's application-proof play, the latter set, sword in hand, to defend his erudite playwright against spies and detractors (A2r-A3r).

81. ¶v-¶4r.

82. A3f.

83. A3.r-A3.v.

84. *Hymenaei: or The Solemnities of Masque, and Barriers Magnificently Performed on the Eleventh, and Twelfth Nights, from Christmas; at Court: to the Auspicious Celebrating of the Marriage-vnion, Betweene Robert, Earle of Essex, and the Lady Frances, Second Daughter to the Most Noble Earle of Suffolke* (London: Thomas Thorp,

1606) A3r-A3v; STC 14774.

85. *The Characters of Two Royall Masques the One of Blacknesse, the Other of Beautie. Personated by the Most Magnificent of Queenes Anne Queene of Great Britaine, &C. With Her Honorable Ladyes*, (London: Thomas Thorp, 1608) A3r; STC 14761.

86. *Workes* (1616) 934, Iiii5v.

87. *The Masque of Queenes Celebrated from the House of Fame: by the Most Absolute in All State, and Titles. Anne Queene of Great Britaine, &C. With Her Honourable Ladies*, (London: R. Bonian and H. Wally, 1609) A3r-A3v; STC 14778.

88. ¶2r.

89. *Ibid*.

90. ¶2v.

91. 353/G3r, 219.

92. ¶2r.

93. Such choruses struggle to fit into popular tragedy. Jonson had recently attempted such a chorus in comedy, with *EMO*'s Grex and would later attempt it in history with his *Catiline*. *H&S* offer a list of Renaissance tragedies which include (some with more success than others) the classical chorus: Norton and Sackville's 1562 *Ferrex and Porrex*, Thomas Kyd's 1593 *Cornelia*, Samuel Daniel's 1593 *Cleopatra* and 1604 *Philotas*, and the Earl of Stirling's 1603 *Darius* and 1604 *Croesus* (IX, 591).

94. B3r.

95."Discoveries," *Discoveries 1641 Conversations With William Drummond of Hawthornden 1619*, ed. G. B. Harrison (Edinburgh: UP, 1923) 96.

96. *Workes* (1616) 5/A3r.

97. The complaint about "the Fight ouer *Yorke*, and *Lancasters* long iarres" seems to address one or both of the *Henry IV*'s. For Jonson's complaints to enjoy the full effects of contemporaneity the prologue would have to have been preformed in 1598 and excluded from the 1601 quarto. Finally, if the prologue was written for the First folio, given Shakespeare died April 26/May 3 1616, it seems in bad taste, even for Jonson, to compose a prologue berating his most famous plays.

98. *Ibid*. In this discussion of decorum the prologue echos the *Ars Poetica*. The final line offered here seems a reference to the concept of *Deus ex Machina*. The phrase is from the Greek ἀπὸ μηχανῆς θεὸς, or θεὸς ἐκ μηχανῆς and is not recorded in English usage

until 1697 (OED). The concept does not enter neoclassical criticism until 1660 with the French Aristotelean Pierre Corneille's *Trois Discours sur la Poème Dramatique*. Where Aristotle alludes to the disagreeable contrivance of the *deus ex machina,* he does not mention it explicitly, but merely states that the *Medea* solution should be avoided. Horace explicitly advises against the contrivance and is credited with providing us with the term: *nec deus intersit, nisi dignus uindice nodus/ inciderit:* "Nor let a god enter the scene, unless some hindrance should occur worthy of such a defender" (*Ars Poetica* 191-92).

99. Compare the quarto *EMO*'s induction: *Mit.* No? howe comes it then, that in some one Play wee see so manye Seas, Countries, and Kingdomes, past ouer with such admirable dexteritie? *Cor.* O, that but shewes how well the Authors can trauel in their vocation, and out-run the apprehension of their Auditory (B3v).

100. *Poetics* 8.1-4; compare Horace's *Nec reditum Diomedis ab interitu Meleagri, /nec gemino bellum Troianum orditur ab ouo*: "nor does he begin the return of Diomedes with the death of Meleager, or the Trojan war with the twin eggs"(*Ars Poetica* 146-7).

101. *Poetics* v.4.

102. *Scritti Estetici: De' Romanzi, delle Comedie, e delle Tragedie, ecc* (Bologna: Forni, 1975) II. 10 ff.

103. *Poetica d' Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta* (Basil: Pietro de Sedabonis, 1576) 157, 170.

104. *Ivliis Caesaris Scaligeri, Viri Clarissimi Poetices Libri Septem* (Lyon: Antonius Vincentius, 1561) III.96.

105. Jonson attended closely to the Scaligers – the father and the son. He comments twice on the Scaligers' critical judgments (*Discoveries* 93, 98). In the *Discoveries* Jonson offers an Aristotelean definition of the unity of action: "the *imitation* of one perfect, and intire Action" (101). Again, I acknowledge the danger of conclusions based on the contents of the *Discoveries*; nevertheless, as Jonson's course of self study began in 1600, it is safe to say, and the breadth of scholarship evidenced in the Quarto's margins attests as much, that by 1605 Jonson had already read most of what informed the *Discoveries*'s opinions.

106. H4r.

107. ¶2r.

108. *Ars,* 343.

109. Jonson's claim to be about to publish his translation of Horace's *Ars* is curious, as it would not be published until the 1640 posthumous edition of his *Workes.* Why he did not next publish his Horace as promised is not known. In "An Execration upon Vulcan,"

Jonson alludes to its destruction in the 1623 fire that consumed his study: "All the old Venusine, in poetry / And lighted Stagerite, could spy, / Was there made English" (89-90). Presumably, he then started the *Ars* anew, as critics find the 1640 version much indebted to Heinsius's 1612 *De Satyra Horatiana liber.*

110. ¶2r.

111. *Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind* (Princeton: UP, 1984) 12.

112. ¶2r.

113. *Ibid.*

114. ¶2v.

115. *Poetaster*, "apologeticall Dialogue" 353/G3r, 218.

116. *Studies on the Texts of Ben Jonson's Poetaster and Seianus* 48.

117. OED, sv 9.c.

118. ¶2v.

119. Ayres suggests Holland might be this "Swan"; in 1603 Jonson penned a laudatory poem for Holland's *Pancharis* in which he referred to Holland as a black swan. Cygnus's sonnet and Holland's are in identical form (*Sejanus his fall* 64-65).

120. *H&S* (XI.315, 317) and Ayres (*Sejanus* 66, 69) argue for Thomas Roe and Edmund Bolton.

121. Thomas Roe earned himself two of Jonson's epigrams in which Jonson praises him for his virtue, XCVIII, and his scholarship, XCIX. A T. R. also wrote verses for *Volpone*. The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography styles Roe more a "sparkling conversationalist and raconteur" than a scholar.

122. *H&S* speculate that Ev. B. is a misprint for Ed. B (XI, 317). In his note on Ev. B.'s contribution to the Quarto's prefatory praise, "*To the most understanding Poet*," Ayres informs us that Ev. B. is not an error for Ed. B. (Edmund Bolton), but that, in fact, collation shows that Ed. B. was altered at press to Ev. B., although he finds no Everard B.s to write the poem (*Sejanus ad loc*). I find my curiosity wishing Ayres had offered some detail on how one print state was conclusively dated against another. All this leads me to stay with *H&S*'s speculation. An E. B. also wrote a laudatory poem for *Volpone*.

123. Matthew Gwinne, Nero Tragædia *Noua*. Mattæo Gwinne Med. Doct. *Collegij Diui Joannis Præcursoris* Apud Oxonienses Socio *Collecta* È Tacito, Suetonio, Dione, Seneca (London: Edward Blount, 1603), ¶2v.

124. ¶2v.

125. *Ibid. H&S* suggests that this line refers to Greneway's translation of Tacitus, IX.592. Jonson criticism has taken this suggestion to heart.

126. *The annales of Cornelius Tacitus. The description of Germanie* (London: Bonham and Iohn Norton, 1598) STC 23644. Gifford begins this consensus (3.8.n.5).

127. *Conversations* 24.

128. Richard Dutton agrees with the critical consensus when he argues that Jonson is referring to his translation of Tacitus at Cordus's defense speech ("The Sources"196-97). The margins call into question any such consensus. As will be discussed in Chapter 2, the composite illustrates that Cordus practises parallelography openly.

129. Here "side" means a page of a book or writing (OED sv 9.a.). Facing-page editions were common in the Renaissance. Compare Casaubon's Greek and Latin Strabo: Στραβωνος Γεωγραφικων Βιβλοι ιϚ. *Strabonis Rerum Geographicarum Libri XVII. Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, summóque studio & diligentia etiam veterum codicum,emendauit, ac Commentariis illustrauit. Accessit & Tabula Orbis oius descriptionem complectens. Adiecta est etiam Guilielme Xylandri Augustani Latina versio, cum necessariis Indicibus. Excudebat Eustathius Vignon Atrebat* (Geneva: E. Vignon, 1587); or Estienne's Dio Cassius: Των Διωνος Του Κασσιου Ρωμαικων Ιστοριων βιβλία πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι. *Dionis Cassii Romanarum Historiarum Libri XXV, Ex Guilielmi Xylandri interpretatione. Henr. Steph. De Dionis Hist. Scripserunt alij florentis tempora Roma, Et graue sit quónam tempore passa iugum: Historias alias isti conferto Dionis, Riui, illæ, sed fons ista Dionis erit. Excudebat Henricus Stephanus* (Geneva: Henricus Stephanus, 1592).

130. As well as these debts Ayres argues that "it is clear that Jonson used Greneway from time to time as a check on his own rendering of Tacitus" (*Sejanus* 15-17).

131. B1r.

132. Ayres *Sejanus*, 15.

133. *Ibid.* 14.

134. *C. Cornelii Taciti Opera Qvæ Exstant. Ivstvs Lipsivs postremùm recensuit. Addii Commentarii meliores pleniorésque cum Cvris Secvndvs. Accessit seorsim C. Velleivs Patercvlvs cum eiusdem Lipsii auctoribus Notis* (Antverpiæ: Ioannem Moretum, 1600). When treating the *Annals* in the Quarto, I will first cite from Lipsius's edition and then by book and chapter numbers out of the Loeb edition (Cornelius Tacitus, *Annals*, ed. and trans. Clifford H. Moore [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1925-37]).

135. The margins cite Stuck by the text's title in abbreviation and by nothing but the authors's names for Marcellus, Rhodriginus, Victor, and Zonaras; they cite Seneca by the name of his various works alone, as they do Virgil. The poets and playwrights are cited by the appropriate titles and numbers.

136. This lacuna occurs early 29 to late 31 CE. Beyond Gwinne in his *Nero*, French tragedian Robert Garnier, popular in England and translated by Thomas Kid and Lady Mary Herbert, Countesse of Pembroke, employed Dio Cassius as a necessary supplement to Plutarch (*Porcie*: *Tragedie en Cinq Actes* [Paris: Robert Estienne, 1568]).

137. Earnest Cary's introduction to *Dio's Roman History* provides a helpful, brief discussion of Dio's historical influence (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1954) xvi-vii.

138. M. L. Clarke provides a thorough discussion on the study of classical languages in Renaissance England (*Classical Education in Britain 1500-1900* [Cambridge: UP, 1959] 18-31); Foster Watson suggests "the fact is that, great as was the value set on Greek by scholars, it was a rare accomplishment amongst even university students" (Foster Watson, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice* [Cambridge: UP, 1908] 487). By end of the sixteenth century courtly fashion came to replace classicism at Cambridge: as Gabriel Harvey wrote to Edmund Spenser in 1580, "Petrarch and Boccaccio in every man's mouth, Galateo and Guazza never so happy. . . the French and Italian when so highly regarded of scholars? The Latin and Greek when so lightly" (qtd in J. Simon, *Education and Society in Tudor England* [Cambridge: UP, 1966] 361).

139. B3v.

140. ¶2v.

141. *Ibid. H&S* offer what has become the critical consensus for Chapman (IX. 592 and II.3-5).

142. ¶2v.

143. *The Light in Troy* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1982) 19; see also Greene 42-43.

144. *quisquis es, o modo quem ex aduerso dicere feci,/ non ego cum scribo, si forte quid aptius exit,/ quando haec rara auis est, si quid tamen aptius exit,/ laudari metuam; neque enim mihi cornea fibra est./ sed recti finemque extremumque esse recuso/ 'euge' tuum et 'belle.' nam 'belle' hoc excute totum:/ quid non intus habet?* (Persius, *Satires* I.44-50).

145. *Epistles* II.1.180-81.

146. *The Georgicks of Hesiod, by George Chapman* (London: Miles Partrich, 1618) A4v; STC 13249.

147. *Pancharis the first booke* (London: Clement Knight, 1603) A7v-A10r; STC 13592.

148. The 1607 quarto *Volpone* includes ten laudatory poems: Edmund Bolton's Latin "*Ad Vtramque Academiam*" (¶4v), John Donne's Latin "*Amicissimo & meritissimo* Ben: Ionson" (Ar), Thomas Roe's "To my Friend Mr Ionson. Epigramme," and his "To the Reader. Vpon the worke" (Av), Francis Beaumont's "To my Dear friend, Mr Beniamin Ionson, vpon his *Fox*" (A2r), D. D.'s (Dudly Digges?) "To my good friend. Mr Ionson" (A2v), I.C.'s (John Cooke?) "To the ingenioius Poet" (A2v), George Chapman's "To His Deare Friend, Beniamin Ionson His *Volpone*" (A3r), E. S.'s (Edmund Scory?) "To my worthily-esteemed Mr Ben: Ionson" (A3v), John Fletcher's "To the true Mr in his Art, B. Ionson" (A3v). The 1611 quarto *Catiline* includes three laudatory poems: Francis Beaumont's "To my friend Mr. Ben: Jonson, vpon his *Catiline*"; John Fletcher's "To his worthy friend Mr. Ben. Ionson"; and Nathan Field's "To his worthy beloved friend Mr. BEN IONSON" (A3v-A4r). The 1602 quarto *Alchemist* includes a single poem by George Lacy "To my friend, Mr. Ben: Ionson vpon his *Alchemist* " (A3v). The 1616 folio *Workes* includes nine poems one each by Chapman and Holland taken from *Sejanus*, one each by Bolton, Donne, and Beaumont from the *Volpone* quarto, and Beaumont's from *Catiline*, with the addition of the "*Carmen Protrepticon*" (exhortative poem) by John Seldon and I. C. (John Cooke?), "To Ben. Ionson, on his workes" by Edmund Hayward, and Beaumont's "Vpon the *Silent Woman*" (¶2r-¶5v).

149. *Sejanus* ¶3r.

150. The notion that the marginated manuscript of the Quarto and original dramatic text of *Eastward Hoe* were coetaneous is founded in the assumption that Jonson had prepared a manuscript copy of the Quarto for publication as early as November 2, 1604, when Edward Blunt entered *Sejanus* for his copy to the Stationers, or at least by August 6, 1605, when Thomas Thorpe entered for his copy by Blunt's assignment.

Settling on a firm date of the penning and theatrical premier of *Eastward Hoe* is tricky, due to a lacuna in the theatrical records, the problems of old style dating, and dating that shifts between theatre years and calendar years. *H&S* imply that the first performance would have been in 1604, as it was in the latter part of that year that Jonson voluntarily joined Chapman and Marston in prison for his part in the play's writing (II.31). Others suggest that the play was first performed in 1605, with Jonson and Chapman imprisoned (with or without Marston) later that year, and released by early November. Janet Clare provides an informative discussion on the troubles surrounding *Eastward Hoe* (*Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship* [Manchester UP, 1990] 139-45). Problems of dating aside, less than a month after Thorpe entered for his *Sejanus*, on September 4, 1605, Thorpe and William Aspley entered for their copy of *Eastward Hoe*.

151. Chapman's 1595 Quarto *Ouids Banquet of Sence* employs its dedicatory epistle, "To the Trvlie Learned and my worthy Friende Ma. Mathew Royden," to suggest the necessity of his marginal annotations, to complain of ignorant readers, and to praise learned

readers, and to defend and explain his learnedly artistic style (A2r-A2v). The text then presents five laudatory poems by three authors (A3r-4r). The text itself is carefully marginated, with notes explaining allusions, defining difficult terms, clarifying meaning of difficult passages, and pointing out rhetorical forms (*Ouids Banquet of Sence. A Coronet for his Mistresse Philosophie, and his amorous Zodiacke* [London: R. Smith, 1595]; STC 4985).

152. ¶3r.

153. As far as my research has taken me, no essay-length explication of Chapman's poem has been attempted. In his edition of *Sejanus His Fall*, Ayres treats Chapman's poem with exhaustive annotative footnotes, in which he speculates upon the extratextual relevance of various passages, such as those he attributes to Jonson and Chapman's trouble over *Eastward Hoe* (145 ff). R. P. Corballis, in an intriguing argument for Chapman as *Sejanus*'s second pen, suggests that these same lines refer to the conjectured charges Northumberland brought against *Sejanus*, suggesting that his vested interest in the outcome of these charges reflects Chapman's role in *Sejanus* original composition ("The 'Second Pen' in the Stage Version of 'Sejanus,'" *Modern Philology* 76.3 [1979]: 273-77, *passim*).

154. 5-24, ¶3r. Line numbers are Ayres' from *Sejanus His Fall.*

155. *nos quoque has apes debemus initari et quaecumque ex diversa lectione congessimus. separare (melius enim distincta servantur), deinde adhibita ingenii nostri cura et facultate in umum saporem varia illa libamenta confundere, ut etiam si apparuerit, unde sumptum sit, aliud tamen esse quam unde sumptum est appareat* (L. Annaeus Seneca *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962-71] LXXXIV.5)

156. *Discoveries* 93-94

157. ¶3v, 29-32. *Sus Minervam* (*docet* understood), to suppose to teach Minerva, is proverbial for fools attempting to instruct the learned: this *sententia* was most notably used by Cicero ("Academica," *De natura deorum; Academica*, ed. and trans. H. Rackham [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1951] I.xviii.9; *Epistolae ad Familiares* ed. and trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001] IX.xviii.4).

158. OED, sv II. 8. a.

159. *Sejanus ad loc.*

160. ¶4v, 106–07.

161. 108-26.

162. 108.

163. 127-36.

164. 134-36.

165. "The 'Second Pen' in the Stage Version of 'Sejanus,'" *passim*.

166. ¶2v.

167. A1r-v, 163-78.

168. A1v, 179-83.

169. There is irony in Chapman's claims of Sejanus's low birth and unmerited rise. The historic Sejanus was not of birth and merits lacking in parity with his fortune; Tacitus, the Quarto's Argument, and its margins insist the opposite is true: *Genitus Vulsiniis patre Seio Strabone equite Romano* (*Annals* 74/IV.i-iii). Compare the Argument's opening lines: "*Æ*LIVS Seianus, Sonne to Seius Strabo, a Gentleman of Rome, and borne at *Vulsinium*" (A4r). Whatever Sejanus's historic heights, Jonson raises him higher with the service he will render humanity in the Quarto.

170. A1v, 186.

171. *Ibid.* 193-94; Ayres offers as a translation "George Chapman composed these lines" (*Sejanus ad loc*). Although composed is capable of the nuanced meaning of *commentor*, it loses the verb's sense of careful, studious preparation (*A Latin Dictionary by Lewis and Short* [*L&S*], sv I "*to consider thoroughly, meditate, think over, study, deliberate, weigh, prepare onself*"; and B.2. "Of writings, *to prepare, produce* as a result of study"); cf *compono* or *scribo, ibid. ad loc.*

172. A2r, 1-2.

173. *Ibid.* 13-14.

174. A2r, 1-4.

175. *THE ARGVMENT* opens with a translation of Tacitus 4.1,1-5, A4r; *Sejanus*'s first word, "Haile" is connected by superscript to a note of such marginal flourish that none could doubt the historicity of all that follows: 1.a&b. "SAB. Haile[a] *Caius Silius*": *De* Caio Silio. *vid*. Tacit. Lips. edit. 4⁰. *Anna. lib.* I. *pag.* 11. *lib.* 2. *pag.* 28&33. [b] *De* Titio Sabino. *vid*. Tac. *lib.* 4. *pag.* 79.

176. A2r, 12-14.

177. OED, sv † 5.

178. OED, sv † 2: Clearly manifest, evident, or obvious. *Obs.*

179. A3r. Marston's construction of his title is syntactically awkward.

180. *The vvonder of vvomen or The tragedie of Sophonisba* (London: W. Cotton, 1606) A2r; STC 17488. To name two other instances of this complexity, in 1604, Marston dedicated *The Malcontent* to "*Beniaminoi Ionsonio Poetæ Elegantissimo Gravissimo Amico Svo Candido at Cordato*" (*The malcontent. Augmented by Marston. With the additions played by the Kings Maiesties servants. Written by Ihon Webster* [London: William Aspley, 1604] A1v; STC 17481). For his part, Drummond records that Jonson "had many quarrells with Marston beat him & took his Pistol from him, wrote his Poetaster on him the beginning of ym were that Marston represented him in the stage in his youth given to Venerie" (13).

181. A3r, 1-2.

182. *Poetaster*, "apologeticall Dialogue" Gg3r, 215-18.

183. A3r, 3-4.

184. 5-6.

185. A3r, 13.

186. A3v.

187. *Ibid.* 9-14. Given the text under comment, it is tempting to read Tacitus's statement on application into this description of those readers who manage to find B in A: *utque familiae ipsae iam extinctae sint, reperies qui ob similitudinem morum aliena malefacta sibi obiectari putent. etiam gloria ac virtus infensos habet, ut nimis ex propinquo diversa arguens.* "And while the families themselves ought now be extinct, you will come upon those who would account themselves accused in another's misdeeds, due to some similarity of character. Likewise, glory and virtue have their oppressors; as a lack of resemblance declares them the opposite" (*Annals* 83/IV. xxxiii).

188. A3v.

189. *Workes* (1616) 357/Gg6r.

190. A4r.

191. *Ibid.*

192. *Every Man out of his Humour* A3r.

193. *Sejanus ad loc.*

194. *Censorship and Interpretation* 57.

CHAPTER 2: HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE POLYBIAN TEXT

Men might write safely of others in manner of a tale, but, in manner of a History, safely they could not: because, albeit they should write of men long since dead, and whose posterity is clean worn out; yet some alive, finding themselves foule in those vices, which they see observed, reproved, and condemned in others, their guiltiness maketh them apt to conceive, that, whatsoever the words are, the fnger pointeth only at them.[1]

— John Hayward, *The Lives of Three Norman Kings.*

Much of Jonson's course of reading in Cotton's library traversed the same path as other sixteenth-century historiographers; they learned their art through reading histories and historiographic theory. Where Jonson's course of reading diverged from many of his fellows was in the attention Camden would have given to Polybian historiography. The fruit of Jonson's learning manifests itself in *Sejanus* primarily through its marginalia, as I show in my analysis in Chapter 5. In the present chapter, I discuss the character of the history that Jonson produced in his composite text, arguing that the Quarto *Sejanus* functions as a Polybian history, offering a corrective model to the Florentine practices that had six years earlier inspired the government to ban unauthorized historiography. The margins draw the historic record into the centre, producing from the composite a panoptic view of events. Out of this panoptic view, the broad scope of the historic record combines with the dramatic dialogue to provide the small matter of human causes and circumstances propelling historic events. The Polybian efficacy of the composite contrasts the centre's propensity to attract application, as the Quarto's Polybian "Argument" contrasts its Florentine disclaimer.

Sixteenth-century historiography did not provide a disinterested or holistic record of historic events. Rather, its historiographers selected and presented events in order to

address specific, predetermined ends. By 1605, English historiography had been characterized by selection, adjustment, manipulation, invention, application, and parallelography for the better part of five hundred years. According to Blair Worden sixteenth-century theorists identified four overlapping functions or goals for historiography: to inspire national, regional, civic, or familial identity and pride; to act as a judicial authority, providing precedents for a society organized by lineage and inheritance; to defend reformation; and to assert conventional morality.[2] A fifth goal articulated by theorists but not listed by Worden was to use historical examples to educate political rulers. Throughout the sixteenth century, theorists and historiographers were debating the best way to accomplish the ends of historiography. Before the latter half of the sixteenth century, continental and English writers of histories took their methodologies from Virgilian mytho-foundational historiography and from the high-Mediaeval historiography of Roman Catholic providentialism and determinism. In England these first two influences overlapped and spanned Gildas Sapiens, Nennius, William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Wace, and Layamond. By the 1630s English historiographers were starting to read and copy the politically or morally didactic parallelography of the Florentine historiographic revolution, most famously innovated by Machiavelli in Italy and propounded by Thomas Elyot in England. By the final quarter of the sixteenth century, humanist historiographic theorists of the so-called Polybian movement were calling for a shift away from the providential or politic parallelography that had dominated historiography for the previous five centuries, and toward an

historical scholarship tempered by restrained antiquarianism that produced phenomenistic historiography.

With the *Advancement of Learning* (1605), Frances Bacon joined this call for a new historiography that analyzed the entire record in search of human causation to produce from the smallest matter a true version of historic events, the "whole story" in Bacon's term or "the real truth of things" in Camden's. To Bacon, "discourse upon histories . . . hath a much greater life for practice: when the discourse attendeth vpon the Example, then when the example attendeth vpon the discourse."[3] Bacon was reacting to those historiographers who considered it their social role to isolate an event, extract it from the record, and fashion it to illustrate a predetermined lesson in a preexisting moral or political discourse. Such historiography produced history that could teach only the one lesson the historian wanted to teach. For the historian motivated to educate the reader morally or politically, selection and adjustment become obligatory: "for every drive is tyrannical."[4] Bacon joins the Polybians in calling for an adjustment to the historian's role: the historiographer's new task is to present an event faithfully, in its whole. Such historiography can teach many lessons – the many lessons of history rather than the one lesson predetermined by the historian. Both early Elizabethan plays like *Gorboduc* and later ones like *Richard II* famously display elements of historiography of politic and moral parallelography, which is how they were viewed by both contemporaries and later critics. *Julius Caesar*, the play closest to *Sejanus* in subject matter and dramatic method, and one of its immediate predecessors, has likewise been viewed as a politic and moral parallelography by audiences and critics.[5] While *Julius Caesar* and *Sejanus* both deal

with corruption, betrayal, and usurpation, I argue that their historiographical modes are fundamentally different. That Jonson wrote *Sejanus* in response to *Julius Caesar* has become a critical truism. This is, of course, only a rumour. At Whalley's suggestion that Shakespeare was *Sejanus*'s "second pen," Gifford began this rumour, stating that "Shakespeare derived all his knowledge of Roman story from translation, and this was scarcely sufficiently accurate or extensive to induce our author to solicit his aid."[6] Schelling's introduction to the 1910 Everyman edition of *Ben Jonson's Plays* turns rumour into argument in no uncertain terms: "[Shakespeare] was contented to take all his ancient history from North's translation of Plutarch and dramatized his subject without further inquiry. . . . [Jonson] reprobated this slipshod amateurishness, and wrote his *Sejanus* like a scholar."[7] With Briggs the accusation is gentler and couched in comparison: "[Shakespeare] nowhere attempts to do more than give the essence of the situation as a basis for human action. But merely the essence of a situation for the basis of human action did not suffice Jonson."[8] Following Bacon and the Polybians, the chief of which were none other than Jonson's own mentors William Camden and Robert Cotton, Jonson used the Quarto *Sejanus* to shift dramatic historiography into the phenomenistic mode.

To make this argument, I shall begin with a definition and short discussion of historiography as it was theorized and practised in the sixteenth century. I argue that the Bishops' Ban of 1599 hastened the shift from Florentine to Polybian historiography. The Florentine model of historiography was in many ways a natural progression from the scholastic tradition that preceded it, as the scholastic was a natural progression from the

mytho-foundational tradition it eclipsed. Both scholastic and Florentine historiography are teleological, universalizing, overtly didactic, evaluative, programmatic, and parallelographic. Both serve a preexisting discourse. In each of these areas conventional Christian notions of vice and virtue characterize the scholastic and the Florentine, while the Florentine adds a political dimension. The former served the universal church, the latter a prince.

THE PRACTICE AND HISTORY OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

The following begins from the historical premise that historiography is a mode and not confined to any single genre. A play, a poem, or a comic book can be historiographical, so long as the writer intends to produce a piece of historiography. What is historiography? In modern terms, it is the dispassionate search for the truth of past events through exhaustive investigation of the myriad forms of the historic record. At the end of the sixteenth century, however, English historiography was not primarily historical: it was fiction based in history; it was historical in method not in aim; or it was historical in detail but not in name. Historiography traced religious or political providential design in events, or drew moral and political lessons from events. Furthermore, historiography took many forms. There were fabulous histories, exemplified by Mediaeval historiography and hagiography and, later, by Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. There were the Lives or biographical histories, such as Plutarch's *Lives* and William Roper's *The Life of Syr Thomas More*. There were chronicle and survey histories, such as those of Raphael Holinshed, John Seldon, and John Stow. All such

histories trade in "facts" that have been contorted towards nationalistic praise and moral encouragement. Nor did historiography study only events in the immediate or distant past: in a world that fetishized the scrutiny of ancient texts, a history could treat law, botany, medicine, geography, cosmography, religion, or any number of like fields. Finally, there were competing notions of historiography's function. The Florentine notion of historiography, derived from the universalist historiography of the High Italian Renaissance, drew excerpts or episodes from Greek and Roman histories for their rhetorical/moral/political value, showing little concern for concrete evidence, causation, or even original moral imperatives. Politicians, poets, and playwrights of the Florentine model who employed the historic record to supply *exempla* to their discourses followed the Italian humanist tradition. The other notion was drawn from the historiography of the Northern/Protestant Renaissance, historiography more intent on evidence and causation but for religio-propagandistic reasons. The popularity of historiography in the Renaissance owes much to the capaciousness of the genre.

THE BISHOPS' BAN: AN HISTORIOGRAPHIC CONFLAGRATION

On the first day of June 1599, an event transpired that would catalyze the historiographic shift toward the phenomenistic mode. On that day at Croydon, John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, delivered what would become known as the Bishops' Ban. Taken out of its bibliographic context, the twenty-seven line ban suggests that Whitgift and Bancroft were calling for a ban only on the biting verse satire of the Hall and Marston variety. However, tucked beneath the list

of satires to be immediately seized and the stricture "That noe *Satyres* or *Epigrams* be printed hereafter" are two lines addressing historiography: "That noe Englishe historyes be printed excepte they bee allowed by some of her maiestes privie Counsell."[9] Histories are implicitly included in the order that: "Suche bookes as can be found or are already taken of the Arguments aforesaid or any of the bookes aboue expressed lett them bee presently broughte to the Bishop of LONDON to be burnte."[10] Published histories could now be confiscated and burned. Three days later, the bishops' orders were published in the Stationers' Hall, and the torch was set to a pile of seized books.

While of the seven titles burned none was a history, the threat of burning would have had a profound effect on historiographers. Book burning was not simply a convenient way to dispose of censored materials: it was a public event that often came with the most dire consequences for the offending authors. Renaissance England's most vivid cultural memory of such public displays of censorship came from the reign of Mary I: martyrs William Wolsey and Robert Pygot were burned on a pyre of Protestant books in 1555[11]; in 1556, Protestant cleric John Hullier suffered the same fate on Jesus Green, Cambridge[12]; in 1557, the bodies of Protestant theologians Paul Fagius and Martin Bucer were actually exhumed so that their coffins could be burned with a pyre of books in Cambridge's market square.[13] Following Mary's brief but bloody Catholic counter-reformation, the iconoclastic zeal of Elizabeth's reign saw the mass burning of such textual symbols of Roman worship as breviaries, missals, primers, and psalters.[14] Elizabethan burning of books and authors also targeted heretics: in 1575, two Dutch Anabaptists were burned at Smithfield; in 1580 a proclamation ordered the burning of

books by Henrick Niclaes as well as other writings of the Family of Love.[15] However politically motivated, early-modern book burning had been reserved for religious texts, until the Bishops' Ban of 1599; nevertheless, memories of piles of burning books, often accompanied by their authors, would have been a potent deterrent for many considering publication of anything akin to the "Arguments aforesaid."

The ban's emphasis on satire has received most critical attention, and the consensus has long been that the Bishops' Ban was not intended to control the publication of satire *per se.* Ian Frederick Moulton argues that the Bishops' intention was to shore up public morality by controlling the publication of pornographic literature.[16] John Peters agrees with Moulton's assessment, adding that at least seven of the texts mentioned by the ban were indecent, and that the ban was effective when considered in these terms.[17] Ovidian eroticism has a place in most forms of Renaissance poetry, such as Donne's *Elegies* and Shakespeare's sonnets. Biting verse satire does evince a certain propensity towards libidinous content, as it charges the objects of its satire with libidinous living. The arguments for the ban's moral base fail in the face of the stricture against the publication of unauthorized histories and plays; the latter were also targeted in a brief reference. Histories, as records of the past, necessarily contain accounts of sexual aberrations, but such accounts were the province of Roman histories not English. Jonson confronts the issue of censorship and the Roman histories in the Quarto's margins. Where detailing Tiberius's Caprian obscenities the centre employs self-consciously moral Tacitus, as he avoids explicit reference to the emperor's sexual perversions, and the margins direct the reader to Suetonius for the perverse details (Figure 16). In its 1599

state, English historiography was both too derivative and too intent upon fulfilling the primary goals listed above to delve into the subtleties of human perversion. Yet the Bishops' Ban sought blanket control over the publication of satire, printed drama, and historiography, three of the most popular forms of literature of the day.

Why seek to control the publication of these three? Moulton argues that the Bishops did not differentiate between licentious works and heretical or political works: politic histories have the same potential to "seduce the innocent."[18] Yet, if any subversive work has the potential to seduce, satire need not be libidinous to seduce. The Bishops' Ban was politically and not morally motivated. Richard McCabe argues that satire's troublesome role as an often unfavorable political commentator helped inspire the ban.[19] I would add that historiography and drama share that role. All three provide social commentary often unfavourably directed towards the head of state and her ministers. In the problematic final years of Elizabeth's reign leading up to 1599, histories were both widely available in the theatres and on the print stalls, and they were frequently viewed as critical of the regime. That the Bishops' Ban provided for histories "allowed by some of her maiestes privie Counsell" suggests that the state was well aware of the political power of histories. The state intended to arrogate to itself a well established genre whose first four functions – to inspire identity and pride, to provide juridical models, to naturalize lineage and rank, and to defend reforms – could be deployed in service of the regime. The requirement for Privy Council oversight would prevent histories from offering negative messages about or directed to the political powers.

The ecclesiastical powers did not work independently of the crown and government. The terms of Elizabeth's proclamation against the Family of Love bears scrutiny in reference to the 1599 Bishops' Ban. In 1580 civil and ecclesiastical authorities worked together to control the dissemination of the Family of Love's politically troubling texts. Camden records the event of that proclamation: "For the timely suppressing of these by Law, the Queen, considering that Religion ought to be the chiefest Care of Princes, commanded by Proclamation, that the Civil Magistrate should be assistent to the Ecclesiastical, and that the said Books should be publickly burnt."[20] All bans required the consent of the Privy Council or High Commission. Whitgift was a member of the first, and Bancroft was the head of the second. In banning satire, plays, and unauthorized histories, the bishops were acting as ministers of state.[21] Quite literally, the Government viewed history as its own. The historian who wished to publish his work after 1599 was required to produce flattering parallels.

Within a month of the book-burning, the bishops confirmed their commitment to the two lines banning the unauthorized publication of English histories. The residence of the Bishop of London, Fulham Palace, was the site of the burning of 1500 copies of John Hayward's *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII*. Attorney General Edward Coke had found numerous analogies between Elizabeth and Richard II in Hayward's history. The Crown thought Hayward guilty of treason, because in *Henrie IIII*'s Latin dedication to *Illustrissimo & honoratissimo Roberto Comiti Essexiæ*, Hayward praised Essex as a protector of the people in Henry's image, which seemed to encourage Essex's political ambitions as a second Bolingbroke to match Elizabeth's

Richard II.[22] The potential parallelography of Hayward's history made it an instant popular success. Hayward himself was imprisoned in the Tower from1600 until Elizabeth's death three years later. A popularly successful historiographer had now been prosecuted for parallelography, and historiographers would continue to be prosecuted for parallelography, real or imagined.[23]

The practice of historiography was henceforth fraught with danger. And, despite the brevity of mention in the ban, historiography was more dangerous than satire. Beyond the immediate danger to the author, there was the perceived threat to the state. None of those whose satires were confiscated and burned suffered any punishment. They were allowed to continue writing and publishing. Marston simply made a few necessary generic adjustments and turned to dramatic satire. Hall, whose satires were "staid," republished *Virgidemiarum* in 1602, following his ordination. Davies' *Epigrams* were republished in 1603 and 1611. The biting satirist was a public menace who inspired contempt for his high-born subject. The historiographer's words, however, could justify treason and even regicide. The Crown owned British history and it would control its use. By 1608 the government had also banned outright any plays based on foreign histories but those of antiquity.[24] Why, then, would Jonson, having already been called to account over his satiric comedies, publish a text so insistently historiographic? In direct reference to the Bishops' ban and the sort of parallelography it sought to curtail, Jonson constructed *Sejanus* as a model of efficacious historiography – as the shifting currents of historiographic theory would define efficacy.

LEARNING HISTORIOGRAPHY: THE FONT

Into the seventeenth century, the art of historiography was acquired through reading the whole range of histories from the ancient through the Mediaeval to the contemporary. History became a subject to be studied in 1622, when Camden founded a lectureship in history at Oxford. Before then, students acquired historical knowledge through guided reading of the ancient historians. In sixteenth-century English schools, the study of ancient history was the study of excerpts from the historical record for their rhetorical value as moral or political *exempla*, in the Italian humanist tradition. Educational theorists, such as Elyot, Ascham, and Mulcaster, were following that tradition when they advised reading excerpted histories as sources of moral and rhetorical edification. Mulcaster exemplifies these theorists when he calls for teaching from histories by selecting carefully of men and matters in regard to "virtuous manners and pureness of style."[25] Those Tudor and early Jacobean humanists aspiring to historiography learned the art from extracurricular reading. Until the later part of the century there were few theoretical treatises to inform notions of historiographic efficacy. Jean Bodin's 1566 *Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem* was the most widely read of these early treatises. Although going unmentioned in England before 1580 and untranslated until 1608, Bodin's *Methodus* enjoyed influence among England's more Latinate historiographers. Sidney, Harvey, Nash, and Spenser appear to have employed the *Methodus* before 1600. Thomas Heywood translated Book Four (out of Lois Meigret Lyonnais's French translation) for the prefatory epistle to his 1608 *Sallust*.[26] Bodin attributes the inspiration behind the *Methodus* to the dearth of treatises on historiography:

"while there was a great abundance and supply of histories, yet no one has explained the art and the method of the subject."[27] Despite its claims to redress this dearth, the *Methodus* is more an Aristotelian anatomy than cogent theory of historiography. Blundeville's 1574 *The true order and Method of wryting and reading Hystories* was the first representative treatise on historiography in English. However limited its immediate influence, Blundeville's text contains the seeds of an historiographic change that is still apparent today. As Lewis Einstein offers *The true order and Method* "though almost unknown, was one of the most remarkable of its kind in the sixteenth century, foreshadowing, in its ideas, so much of what is commonly thought the creation of our own times and the modern scientific method."[28] Given the identity of Jonson's tutor and the contents of his own library, one can assume that Jonson's historiographic reading reflected not so much the norm as the full range of possible influences.

The historiographic context for *Sejanus* was the study of primary texts. Historiographic theory was relatively new and was not part of the course of study that most historians followed. The early-modern texts that had the greatest influence upon sixteenth-century English historians issued either out of the impulses of Roman Catholic Scholasticism or out of Protestant and Italian humanism. Like their continental counterparts, historians of the English Renaissance drew much influence from the national historical traditions of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance that marked the beginning of the High Middle Ages. Scholastic historiographers of the twelfth century had laid Augustinian principles upon a mytho-foundational tradition, producing universalized national mytho-histories upon which sixteenth-century English

historiographers in turn built. English Renaissance historiographers both conformed to and reacted to the historiographic principles that guided their predecessors, embracing the nationalizing agenda and adapting the universalizing agenda. The direct influence of this new agenda is felt most strongly in Holinshed, and in those dramatic and prose historians who learned from his *Chronicles*. Raphael Holinshed was one of the English chroniclers who reacted unfavourably to Bodin's historiographic theories, which denied teleological historiography such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's mythic foundation of British history.[29]

From the earliest specimens through to those of the twelfth-century rise of universities and scholastic historiography, British histories were of the mytho-foundational *Brut*/Arthurian tradition, and their historians were clerics guided by church doctrine writing in Latin. Influenced by the Old Testament narratives, by Virgil's *Aeneid*, and by Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, these British foundational histories and their continental analogues – Siegfried in Germany and Carlemagne in France – were written and rewritten to foster national identity and character. From Gildas Sapiens's *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae* (ca. 540), through Nennius's *Historia Brittonum* (ca. 830), William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* (ca. 1125), Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (ca. 1136), Wace's *Geste des Britons* or *Roman de Brut* (ca. 1155), and Layamon's *Brut* (ca. 1190) each successive version of these foundational histories was both derivative and openly indebted to its source. The trope of "mine auctor" at once admitted the single filiation that stood in for scholarly research and allowed for narrative invention under the cloak of an inaccessible source.

This is not to say that these early British historiographers were not diligent historians as well. Although mixing invention with fact liberally, Nennius insists that his history is compounded out of scholarly research, written "partly from traditions of our ancestors, partly from writings and monuments of the ancient inhabitants of Britain, partly from the annals of the Romans, and the chronicles of the sacred fathers . . . and from the histories of the Scots and Saxons, and from our own ancient traditions."[30] William, too, shows great attention to documentation of sources, and, like Nennius's, his historiography employs both written and physical records. Similar impulses guided the earliest historiographers and their scholastic progeny; they all produced teleological universal histories. These universal histories were contrived to emphasize their contemporary society's fallen state through the enumeration of golden-age precedents and the role of providence in national history. By their High Mediaeval manifestations, these British histories had come to be ruled by the Augustinian world view. Speculation on cause had little relevance in a static world in which terrestrial events were judged only by their relationship to eternal salvation.[31] These national histories were figured as battle grounds of good against evil. The scholastic historian became the enumerator of providence who offered moral counsel to his king.

Jonson, like his contemporary historiographers and poets, likely studied these early histories. Into the Renaissance, no secular myth was more important to the English social psyche than that of Arthur and his chivalric knights. Although the story of Brute's arrival from Troy is Britain's foundational myth, Arthur's defeat of the Saxons has been the Britons' foundational myth since the middle ages. Of the early British histories,

William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* had the greatest influence on Renaissance historiographers, who read it as both an authoritative historical source and an important source for the Arthur myth. The progression of the Arthur myth provided the dominant model for comprehending historiography's mytho-Virgilian social functions.[32] Upon Geoffrey's *Historia*, the Tudor monarchy tied itself to political and religious providentialism, through the myth of Arthur and England's Trojan origins. Henry VII seems to have first made this claim out of Geoffrey's addition to the Arthur myth of Merlin's messianic prophecy of the *Aper Cornubiae* (Boar of Cornwall), who would return to deliver England from the Saxons.[33] Tudor claims were through its Welsh ancestor, Owen Tudor, and the connection of Cornwall with Wales.[34] Holinshed cites Nennius in his own oblique defense of England's mythic foundations.[35] Although he never mentions him, Holinshed also made much use of William as a source.[36] As had Holinshed, Polydore Vergil employed the *Gesta* extensively in compiling the years 800-1200, as he did the *Excidio* and Geoffrey. Vergil published an edition of *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*, in 1525. Spenser relied greatly upon William and Geoffrey in composing the *Faerie Queene*, and it was a calculated flattery when, in *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser deftly adjusted the myth to acknowledge the Tudor monarchy's claims to lineal descent from Troy through Arthur. Drummond recalls that Jonson himself thought there was no more effective ground for an "Heroik poem " than Arthur, and it seems likely that Arthur would have figured prominently in Jonson's proposed Heroologia.[37] Intending once to write an epic on Arthur, Milton read extensively in William and Geoffrey.

The Renaissance historian analyzing early British historiography found it manipulating and augmenting historical events for religio-political ends – the historian not history was determining the lessons that were taught. Beginning in the early years of the sixteenth century, the Florentine historic revolution merely blended divine providentialism with political providentialism and exchanged piety for rhetoric, despite its humanist advances.

As I discuss in the Chapter 3, with the twelfth-century development of Catholic universities and the concomitant growth of a wider reading population arose the dangerous possibility of unmediated reading. Scholastic historiographers responded to this danger with attempts to control textual access through the marginated or glossed page. Direct cognitive and causal links exist between the ascendency of historiography and developments in education, reading, and marginalia. From the twelfth through the sixteenth centuries, the progression of historiography mirrors the progression of the universities, of grammar school education, of reading practices, and of the marginated page. The glossed page could convert the pagan into a Christian. More importantly, the glossed page could assure that the lessons of history were moral and prudential. As the Mediaeval world moved towards the Renaissance and more and more texts were written and classical texts were edited, the glossator gave way to the annotator. As marginal intertextuality flourished so did the scholastic metatext. These fruitful margins embodied Scholasticism's emphasis on ratiocinative examination. The intention of annotation is that the reader find confirmation in the metatext. However much scholastic annotation intends to corral the metatext within the margins, the reader's ratiocinative education

would as likely as not assure exploratory reading that scrutinized each source individually; from scrutiny comes confirmation, but anomaly also follows. Classical histories teach that the good do not always prosper and the wicked are rarely punished. The anomalous historic record, itself, would ultimately change the face of historiography.

LEARNING HISTORIOGRAPHY: FLORENCE AND THE ENGLISH POLYBIANS

Historia Magister Vitae[1]

— Cicero, *de Oratore.*

From the twelfth into the sixteenth centuries historiography witnessed substantial theoretical change; yet, until the end of that period, the lessons of history continued to be universal and teleological. Lives and chronicles, such as those of the English national tradition, dominated the historiographic horizon. Historiography had become the record of selective events or moralized biography. Leonard F. Dean suggest that Sallust, Livius, and Maximus were most often read of the classical histories. Their histories are characterized by theatricality and moral embellishment.[38] By the turn of the fifteenth century, chronicle historiography had eclipsed the lives tradition.[39] These histories were modeled on either the earlier vernacular chronicles – both political and non-political records of notable events on a civic or national level – or the classical humanist model of linear narratives on the grand affairs of state – historiography of broad moral or political lessons. Any practical advances in historiography came out of humanist Italy. As the

[1] "History is the teacher of life" (Cicero, *de Oratore*, ed. and trans. E. W. Sutton [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1948] II.9).

margins spread reading outward, Italian humanists were rediscovering more and more classical texts, among these were the histories of Tacitus. Tacitus's sense of moral responsibility, his attention to Roman virtues, his insistent republicanism, and his habit of avoiding some of history's more lurid details render him ideally suited to Florentine historiographic sensibilities. The problem with Tacitus was that his republicanism meant using his histories often raised suspicions of treasonous intent.

Although his *Annals* had been widely available in Latin since 1515, for most of the sixteenth century, Tacitus was generally disregarded. At the height of Ciceronianism, Tacitus's Latin was considered barren and just plain bad; that he held a rather poor opinion of Christians did not help his popularity. By the end of the sixteenth century, with the rise of scientific inquiry, Tacitus's diction came to be considered a model of discourse whose clarity and simplicity were better suited to the efficient dissemination of scientific ideas. The popularity of Tacitus reached its peak between 1600 and 1649, when his *Annals* and *Histories* were published in sixty-seven editions. The growing popularity of Tacitus among scholars was greatly indebted to the Florentine historians as it was to such renowned humanist educators as Justus Lipsius and Marc-Antoine Muret, who both lectured and wrote on Tacitus in the 1580s. In the first half of the seventeenth century Tacitus's works knew greater prominence than they ever had known or ever would know again. With all his ethical indignation, he was read as much as a political theorist as an historian. And he was imitated and quoted by politicos and historians. Yet it must be said that Tacitus did not so much provide the fount for moral political thought as he provided a style and content amicable to its development and expression.[40] In other words, Tacitus

was a convenience of which many, on various points of the political spectrum, availed themselves. Tacitus had become a rallying point for republicans in this age of absolutism.[41] In Norman Miller's account, Florentine historiographers "found in the historical writings of Tacitus maxims to support their views, texts for their dissertations, a mirror for the life of their own times." Tacitus provided themes "of obvious and immediate interest in the political context of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Italy, France and England."[42] In 1599, John Hayward's wholesale use of Tacitus in *Life of Henry IIII,* helped land him in the Tower under suspicion of treason.[43] Lipsius himself, the great editor of Tacitus, and Jonson's undisputed guide in *Sejanus*, in 1572, called the Duke of Alba the *expressa imago* of Tiberius.[44] Lipsius was just one of many. The most notable, or notorious, of these parallelographers for our purposes were those of the Essex circle.[45]

In the early sixteenth century, with Tacitus as its model, the Florentine historical revolution challenged the dominance of chronicles and lives. Reading the canonical texts of this revolution, English historiographers found history reduced to rules served by axioms, in service of rhetoric. By the end of that century Bacon, Camden, and the English Polybian's asserted that efficacious historiography was not teleological – historiography was an end in itself. Polybian historiography presented the "real truth of things" through "the whole story" – or as close to the whole story as the historic record could approximate.

English historians encountered the Florentine historiographic revolution and its most infamous participant, Niccolò Machiavelli, as early as 1530.[46] Then, in response to

the 1532 posthumous publication of *Il Principe*, a papal order of 1559 banned and burned what would be the most influential writings of that revolution, those of Machiavelli. On the grounds of his overly pragmatic views on religious matters, Machiavelli's writings were deemed dangerous for Europe's youth and those who would rule them.[47] Following the ban Machiavelli's works fell under the criticism of the most influential continental humanists. Despite the papal ban and the humanist consensus of Machiavelli's moral short falls, *The Prince* and *Discourses on Livi* continued to travel in manuscript around high-level government circles throughout Europe.[48] In the latter half of the century, English popular interest in his works grew. In 1562 Niclas Ingland published Peter Whitehorne's translation of *The Arte of Warre* (dedicated to Elizabeth); in 1573 and again in 1588, John Wight republished Whitehorne; in 1584 John Wolfe spuriously published two of Machiavelli's works in Italian – *Il Discorsi* (in two editions) and *Il Prencipe* – printed in London, the title pages claimed "in Palermo"; in 1587 Wolfe spuriously published *Historie di Nicolo Macchiavelli* and *Dell'Arte Della Guarra* (twice), again claiming Palermo as the city of publication; in 1595 William Ponsonby published Thomas Bedingfield's first English translation of Machiavelli's *Florentine Wars.* England's taste for things Machiavellian was not reserved for his serious political works: in 1588 Wolfe published the satirical poem *Lasino doro*. Nor was England the only country to embrace and print Machiavelli while under papal ban. The French were particularly fond of him.[49] Machiavelli's English reputation received a further boost in 1587, when Alberico Gentili was appointed Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford. In his 1585 *De Legationibus,* Gentili praised Machiavelli for his learning and prudence.[50]

The burgeoning humanist movement in England found Machiavelli's philosophic pragmatism appealing. Machiavelli placed no value on broad moral lessons; his historiography played a fundamental role in the shift away from universal historiography of the classical humanist chronicles and towards the phenomenistic historiography espoused by late sixteenth-century theorists – that which Jonson practised on the pages of the Quarto *Sejanus*. The Florentine historiographic revolution was only one step in the shift away from universal historiography. Like its Mediaeval English counterpart, historiography of the High Italian Renaissance was the product of Scholasticism and, as such, conceived of the success and failure of nations as being the result of the universal battle between good and evil or good and bad rulers. Rulers for whom histories were written and those about whom favourable histories were written were assumed to be good, God's chosen. The didactic Machiavelli theorized that, to truly serve his prince, the historian must relate events as they really occurred not as they ideally should have occurred. Tacitus had illustrated for the Florentines that divisions among the people – factions, the Senate against the nobles, or the nobles against the plebeians – cause national ruin.[51] Machiavelli's historiography, then, concentrates not on great external events such as wars, but on the civil discords that he felt determined national outcomes. In the *Proemio* to his 1524 *Istorie Fiorentine*, Machiavelli asserts that history is made in the small details, and that no subject is more important to rulers than the political causes and results of such discords:

> For if there be any thing in Histories that delighteth or teacheth, it is that which maketh particuler description. Or if any reading be profitable for men that governe in common-weales, it is that, which sheweth the occations of

> hate and faction: to them that being warned by harme of others may become wise, and continue themselves united.[52]

Machiavelli's conception of a history in full detail falls short in execution of that articulated by the mid-century Italian Polybians and their later English counterparts. It is a twofold shortfall. Machiavelli's hands were tied by his didacticism: his historiography did not offer comprehensive lessons for a broad reading public, but, instead, it offered fixed lessons for a fixed readership. First, Machiavelli reduces the full potential of history's lessons to axioms. Where the historic record does not provide dialogue or detail or, as is often the case, where he does not deign to consult the record, the tyranny of the axiom requires invention. Axioms serve rhetoric, which serves application. Second, Machiavelli takes as the main sources for his *Florentine History* Giovanni Villani's *Cronica,* 1300-1348 – a providential chronicle peopled by allegorical abstractions – and Leonardo Bruni's only slightly less universalized *Historiarum Florentini Populi*, 1439. When Machiavelli set about producing the sort of detail necessary to rendering the axiomatic entertaining he ran into the same deficit that Elizabethan playwrights would later encounter when writing plays based on chronicle histories. Chronicles are by nature scant records of grand events with little attention to terrestrial causes; as such, they provide little in the way of characterization and those hints to motivation complex historiography provides.[53] In order to educate and delight, Machiavelli invented, simplified, and fleshed out his *Florentine History* with dramatic invention. With history's characters, Machiavelli attempted the psychological realism that later theorists would call for as a means for conceiving the human motivations driving historic events.[54] Unfortunately, Machiavelli's psychological realism is more often the product of dramatic invention than of the historic

record. Not a genuine part of the historic record, Machiavelli's inventions cannot inform our understanding of the actual motivations that produce historic events – the small matter of Bacon's intentions.

Although by far the most notorious and influential participant in the Florentine revolution, Machiavelli was not the only Florentine whose historiographic innovations would inform later English and Italian theorists. Where Villani's *Cronica* was very much a typical scholastic chronicle, Leonardo Bruni's *Historiarum Florentini Populi*, the originating event in secular historiography, had cast aside religious providentialism to focus on the political and constitutional core of crises – shifting away from the mere presentation of facts towards the analysis of political motives. Yet his history continued to treat large events and external wars. Although he is broadly considered the proto humanist, in name if not in focus, Bruni continued to practise universal historiography's absolutism. At one point his history credits the duke's bloody vengeance not to his moral depravity but to the fact that he was French and, thus, accustomed to a more servile people.[55] Through the writings of the *ars historica*, this emphasis on environmentalism would still be influencing English historiography over a hundred years later in Francesco Patrizzi's *Della Historia Diece Dialoghi* (1560) and, to a greater degree, in Bodin's *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* (1566). Spanning the career of Machiavelli was that of Francesco Guicciardini. Although lesser known than Machiavelli's, Guicciardini's contributions to the Florentine historiographic revolution arguably provided a model more in line with that of later Polybian theorists. Guicciardini's histories were published in English translation, in whole or in epitomes, at least nine

times by 1600. Jonson owned Field's 1599 edition of *The Historie of Guiciardini: Containing the Warres of Italie and Other Partes.* Bacon praises Guicciardini in the most Polybian terms:

> If [a history] mislead by disproportion or dissimilitude of Examples, it teacheth men the force of Circumstances, the errours of comparisons, and all the cautions of application: so that in all these it doth rectifie more effectually than it can peruert. And these medicines it conueyeth into mens minds much more forcibly by the quickness and penetration of Examples: for let a man look into the errors of *Clement* the seuenth, so liuely described by Guicciardini, who serued under him . . . and he will flye apace from being irresolute.[56]

Guicciardini's historiography eschews parallelography, shuns application, and emphasizes circumstance and human causation. Reading through his anomalies and small matter, the reader finds the dangers of irresolution. For Guicciardini, the need to provide moral and political instruction prevented historiography from realizing its true potential, and he abandoned didacticism. In his observations on Machiavelli, Guicciardini criticizes his contemporary's historical simplifications, insistent focus on the particularities, and his use of forced analogies. For Guicciardini, parallels could function efficaciously only if both the analogy and the subject were identical in every detail, a provision that is impossible to fulfill. History was not the record of similitudes but of anomalies. Yet, unlike Machiavelli, Guicciardini still held that the relative virtue of the individual ruler determined the outcome of national events. Guicciardini employed the entire historic record to construct vivid characters out of which an individual's morality gleamed. In this use of the entire record he puts into practice what in Machiavelli is unrealized theory.[57]

Despite the advances of his Florentine contemporaries, Machiavelli's writings were the ones to inform and characterize English dramatic and prose historiography into

the early seventeenth century. His didacticism, forced analogies, simplifications, and dramatic adjustments reverberate though English histories. More important than his *Florentine History* to both his English reputation and his influence over the full spectrum of late sixteenth-century English histories is Machiavelli's *Il Prencipe*. The irreligiously pragmatic advice to Lorenzo d'Medici, in *The Prince*, produced the myth of the villainous Machiavel, the self-willed Janus who smiles center stage then skulks about in corners. I am referring to the dramatic Machiavel, not to manifestations of Machiavellian ideas in Renaissance drama: true Machiavellian features can be found in both heros and villains, from Henry V to Iago. For the English historiographer, the most potent Machiavellian influence was *The Prince*'s reduction of historic exemplars to axioms. In this reduction was made manifest the rhetorical historiography of Italian humanism – without its focus on moral edification. This was the practical application of what English humanists like Thomas Elyot were arguing for in theory. Machiavelli's most inflammatory text practised just the sort of politic parallelography that historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance had openly practised and that Guicciardini condemned three centuries later.

From its opening dedication to Lorenzo d'Medici, *The Prince* confirms itself part of the mirror for princes tradition: "So your Magnificence, take this little gift in the spirit in which I send it; and if you read and consider it diligently, you will discover in it my urgent wish that you reach the eminence that fortune and your other qualities promise you."[58] Implicit in such dedications is a covenant of flattering comparison. Dedicator and dedicatee assume that all those traits represented in *The Prince's* historic examples reflect the potentials of Lorenzo's rule. This is history as the property of the government

employed to educate the government within a mutually acknowledge and expected flattery. The closing line of the dedication affirms that Machiavelli is aware of the various implications of this covenant: "And if, from your lofty peak, Your Magnificence will sometimes glance down to these low-lying regions, you will realize the extent to which, undeservedly, I have to endure the great and unremitting malice of fortune."[59] Machiavelli's is state sponsored parallelography. There is still something very universalizing about his use of history. This is the example attending upon the discourse, the tale wagging the dog.

Despite his claims to having provided full detail, the structure of Machiavelli's discourse places him amongst those Italian historians who employ excerpts out of the historical record for their rhetorical value, history reduced to axioms. What *The Prince* models for readers is that A necessarily and universally equals B. He offers the precept and then the exemplary illustration, followed by a confirmation that the example indeed attends upon the discourse. To provide an illustration, when instructing Lorenzo in "How a prince must act to win honour," Machiavelli presents his rules dictating military loyalties in universal terms: "A prince also wins prestige for being a true friend or a true enemy, that is, for revealing himself without any reservation in favour of one side against another."[60] To illustrate the truth of this claim he chooses out of the historic record the example of the Roman legate's answer to the Achaeans on the question of whether or not to remain neutral at Antiochus's request, as he prepares to drive the Romans out of Greece. The terms of the Roman ambassador's answer validate the historian's universal assertion:[61] "It has been said that you must not interpose in our war; however, nothing is

more contrary to your interests: without favour, without honour, you will be left the prize of the conqueror."[62] The historian concludes the lesson with a final universalizing gesture:

> It is always the case that the one who is not your friend will request your neutrality, and the one who is your friend will request your armed support. . . . But when you boldly declare your support for one side, then if that side conquers, even though the victor is powerful and you are at his mercy, he is under an obligation to you, and he has committed himself to friendly ties with you; and men are never so unprincipled as to deal harshly and ungratefully with you in this instance. Then again, victories are never so overwhelming that the conquered does not have to show some scruples, especially regarding justice. But if on the other hand your ally is defeated, he will shelter you; he will help while he can, and you may become associates whose joint fortunes may change for the better.[63]

The reader cannot help but be struck by Machiavelli's employment of absolute statements. If this one *exemplum* is to possess any value beyond the rhetorical, it must be read as a universally applicable axiom in service of a rule: honour your alliances. When the example attends upon the discourse, historiography fails to acknowledge that *historia magister vitae* can operate only when the historic example and potential application match to the final detail – the minutiae of causation.

Had the lessons of scholastic historiography been insufficient to fix the place of parallelography into the English historiographic psyche, Thomas Elyot's employment of the historic record after the Italian humanist tradition would have abetted. Machiavelli's English contemporary, in his *Book of the Governor*, Elyot is openly derivative of Italian humanist educational and historiographic thought, although he could not have been directly influenced by *The Prince*.[64] One of the most popular and influential books of the sixteenth-century – published no less than ten times between 1531 and 1580 – the *Governor* employs the historic record in ways that would inform generations of English

writers. As I discuss in the next chapter, Elyot's historic *exempla* served as models for the effective rhetorician, as well as moral guides. Elyot argues that, by intercourse with the ancient writers, students might learn of "the beautie of vertue, and the deformitie and lothelynes of vice."[65] He was not alone among English historians in thinking that the historic record should operate as a repository for models of vice and virtue; throughout the sixteenth century, adherence to this same holdover from scholastic universalism was expressed in Polydore Vergil's *Historia Anglicana* (1534), Thomas Wylliam's *Historye of Italy* (1549), the anonymous *The Institution of a Gentleman* (1555), John Stow's *Chronicle* (1580), Sidney's *The Defence of Poetry* (ca. 1583), Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* (1589), Thomas Bedingfield's translation of Machiavelli's *Florentine History* (1595), Geoffrey Fenton's translation of *The Historie of Guicciardini* (1599).[66] Surveying this list of influential texts leaves little question that, at the turn of the seventeenth century, English historians of every genre were simply doing what they were told when producing Florentine histories.

Jonson composed *Sejanus* in a climate of moral and politic homiletic parallelography. It is, therefore, not surprising that so many critics have read *Sejanus* as a commentary on contemporary events – which I contend it is not – and the very model of late-Tudor historiography – which I contend it is but in wholly different terms. As I offered in my introduction, Tricomi applies the term "homiletic" to late-sixteenth-century historiography. For Tricomi, Jonson's adjustments for moral clarity illustrate that "in *Sejanus*, reformist, homiletic history is Jonson's truth."[67] I contend that the terms by which *Sejanus* models Tudor historiography are not found in the "homiletic" practices of

Florentine historiographers but in the Polybian school of historiographic thought. While Tacitus's histories were an important source and model for Jonson's historiography, the pragmatic Polybius was the Quarto's historiographic exemplar. Tacitus's "Machiavellianism" and the moral indignation of his evaluative and didactic historiography were well suited to the Florentine mode and fed the Roman historian's popularity throughout the sixteenth century. The very terms of that popularity evoked a response in the rising popularity of Polybius. Arnaldo Momigliano writes of the rise of the Polybian model:

> one of the reasons why Polybius became so authoritative was that he offered the best alternative to the obsession with Tacitus which was typical of the intellectual climate about 1585, especially in Italy and Spain. In more than one sense, Tacitus had become irresistible. He offered exactly that mixture of Machiavellianism, moralism, epigrammatic acuteness and pathos which the age liked.[68]

Polybius (ca.168-118) was an historian of Rome who, like Dio Cassius, wrote in Greek. First appearing in English translation in 1568,[69] Polybius's histories never enjoyed a popular readership in the Renaissance, but they had a potent influence on such forward thinking English historians as William Camden and Isaac Casaubon – Casaubon was an English historian only during the years he lived and wrote in England under pension from James: from 1610 to his death in 1614. Over the years Jonson owned three editions of Polybius in Justus Lipsius's *Iusti Lipsii de Militia Romana libri quinque, commentarius ad Polybium*.[70] Polybius was a self-reflexive historian, and what remains of *The Histories* contains many statements of what became known as the *normae Polybianae*.[71] The *normae Polybianae* is defined by Polybius's insistence upon eyewitness testimony, disinterested presentation, and historiography that permits investigation into motives and

causes.[72] He describes his historiography as pragmatic (πραγματεια) – in the sense of systematic – and catholic (καθ' ὅλου) – universal in compass not applicability – and apodeictic in its ever returning to cause and effect:

> We can get some idea of a whole from a part, but never knowledge or exact opinion. Special histories therefore contribute very little to the knowledge of the whole and conviction of its truth. It is only indeed by study of the interconnexion of all the particulars, their resemblances and differences, that we are enabled at least to make a general survey, and thus derive both benefit and pleasure from history.[73]

English historians found in Polybius efficacious employment for the anomalies – resemblances and differences – that multiplied out of the historic metatext. They found, too, the terms with which to express their mistrust of histories of parts and historic moralizing, as well as that of the rhetorical nature of epitomes and abridged and episodic (special) histories.[74]

Although Polybius's own histories continue to treat grand events, locating the occasions of invasions and battles in originating political causes, in his articulations of the historiographer's social role are the seeds of late Renaissance's theorists' interest in the psychological motives or human causes:

> What use to the sick is a physician who is ignorant of the causes of certain conditions of the body? And of what use is a statesman who cannot reckon how, why, and whence each event has originated? The former will scarcely be likely to recommend proper treatment for the body, and it will be impossible for the latter without such knowledge to deal properly with circumstances. Nothing, therefore, should be more carefully guarded against and more diligently sought out than the first causes of each event, since matters of the greatest moment often originate from trifles, and it is the initial impulses and conceptions in every matter which are most easily remedied.[75]

These trifles are Bacon's small matter. The first causes of events occur within individual

psyches, not between battling factions. Bacon and the Polybians were beginning to imagine the human psyche as the only universal. Learn to recognize trouble's first fomentation in those around you, and learn to staunch catastrophic events in their infancy. In his discussion of Bacon's historiographic theory Dean argues that "Bacon believed that the chief functions of history are to provide the materials for a realistic treatment of psychology and ethics, and to give instruction by means of example and analysis in practical politics."[76] In his *Annals*, Camden praises Polybius in these very terms:

> I haue not omitted any circumstances, by which, not only the euents of things, but their reasons also and causes may be known; That of POLYBIVS pleaseth me exceedingly. If you take out of History, WHY, HOW, TO WHAT END, and WHAT IS DONE and whether the Actions answer the intents, that that remaines, is rather a mocking than an instruction, and for the present may please but will neuer profit posterity.[77]

The why, how, to what end, and what is done allow the reader to form judgements and learn lessons based upon the events as they really occurred not upon the historian's moral or political bias. This emphasis on pragmatics is where the Florentine and the Polybian meet – both taught expediency. But for those at the rebirth of scientific inquiry, Polybian psychology or ethics determined expediency – not morality or politics. Having been nurtured by Cotton and Camden, Jonson is assumed a Polybian. Even had Cotton and Camden not pressed their historiographic preferences upon their student, Jonson would have been familiar with Polybius through his commentaries attached to Lipsius's *Militia Romana libri quinque*. That Jonson's owned three editions of *Militia Romana libri quinque*, at one time or another, attests at least to his exposure to – if not his interest in – Polybius.

Although the works of Polybius did not really flourish in England until well into

the seventeenth century, printed in six editions between 1633 and 1698, the theories of Polybius came to the popular English historian with the rise of *ars historica*, through Thomas Blundeville's 1574 *The true order and Method of wryting and reading Hystories*. From its title page Blundeville sets his text apart from its Florentine predecessors. As his title argues, *The true order* is not designed to advise the crown nor to discourse with continental humanists; it is "briefly set forth in our vulgar speach, to the great profite and commoditye of all those that delight in Hystories." Targeting both the English court and the ever-broadening Elizabethan reading and writing audience, Blundeville represents Polybian historiographic theory as democratic. Handled exhaustively, history can teach as many different lessons as readers' individual needs require. Blundeville did not treat Polybius directly but introduced Polybian historiographic theory through translations of two of Polybius's most ardent followers, Francesco Patrizzi – in his *Della Historia Diece Dialoghi* (Venice, 1560) – and Giacomo Concio – in his then unpublished *Delle osseruationi, et auuer timenti che hauer si debbono nel legger delle historic*. Patrizzi accounts for the opening thirty-eight pages, Concio for the concluding twenty. Patrizzi supplies the order and method of writing, Concio of reading, although the same Polybian assumptions regarding what constitutes good historiography drive both. Within these two brief articulations lies much of the foundation upon which Bacon would build in the *Advancement of Learning*.

The English historian found in Patrizzi one of the best of the many Italian articulations of what had become of Polybius by the middle of the sixteenth century. I would argue that, inspired by what Bruce Boehrer calls "his nervousness about historical

telos,"[78] Jonson founds his historiography in the Quarto, in part, upon Patrizzi's articulation. This foundation separates *Sejanus* from its dramatic contemporaries. Cause and circumstance form the crux of Partizzi and Concio's historiographic theory. Neither barren and fragmented chronicles nor lives bent on moralizing and comparison can provide adequate cause and circumstance. In his derisive conclusion to *The True Order*, Blundeville paraphrases Concio in the Polybian's disdain for Chronicle histories:

> I can not tell whyther I may deryde, or rather pittie the great follie of those which hauing consumed all theyr lyfe tyme in hystories, doe know nothing in the ende, but the discents, genealoges, and petygrees, of noble men, and when such a King or Emperour raigned, & such lyke stuffe, which knowledge though it be necessarie and meete to be obserued, yet it is not to be cōpared to the knowledge, that is, gotten by such obseruacions as we require, & be of greater importaunce: to the obtayning whereof, I wish all readers of Hystories, to employe theyr chiefest studye, care, & diligence.[79]

Of paramount concern to Patrizzi, Concio, and the English Polybians was that historiography pursue "true" constructions of events: not only must it abstain from lists of men and events, an historic account must be unembellished in its provision of cause and circumstance. Although Patrizzi's Polybian historiography tends to follow the Italian humanist model of rise to fall, it does so without subjugating history beneath the yoke of rhetoric. The Florentine emphasis on rhetorical or dramatic impact and moral erudition allowed for too much manipulation and invention. Polybian historiography neither augments nor diminishes recorded events, nor does it fabricate orations, deeds, or events.[80] As Camden records of his own historiography: "*I haue thrust in no occations, but such as were truly spoken; or those reduced to fewer words: much lesse haue I fained any.*"[81] This Polybian emphasis on cause and circumstance, the whole story, is Jonson's "integrity in the *Story.*" In 1605 "story" and "history" were interchangeable cognates. As

I discuss in my introduction, critics find adjustment and invention in *Sejanus.* When the Quarto's marginalia are considered, *Sejanus* becomes a complete history, an integral whole, unmarred and unviolated by manipulation and invention.

That the historic event upon which Jonson built his *Sejanus* lacks a single sympathetic character not to mention a moral one, that so much of the event is consumed by the inaction of weak Germanicans makes it well suited to Polybian treatment. Polybian historiographers need not only content themselves with great men and events, nor only with ancient or even recent history, nor, indeed, only with good. Polybian historiography presents the human drives behind events. This need to deal with human causes required historiographers to produce complete, integrated histories:

> In hystories things woulde be disposed according to their owne proper nature, and therefore sith in euery action there must be a dooer, or worker, the hystorie must first make mention of hym, and then Shewe the cause that moued him to doe, to what intent and ende, in what place, and with what means and instruments.[82]

Here in Patrizzi's words, for the Polybian, neither vice nor virtue compels historic events. As the Quarto argues, intentionality in both the doer and his instruments compels historic events. Once relative virtue is removed from human cause, studying the motivations, the intent, and ends of historic events becomes studying human psychology:

> Euery deed that man doth, springeth eyther of some outwarde cause, as of force, or fortune, (which properlye ought not to be referred to man:) or else of some inward cause belonging to man: of which causes there be two, that is, reason and appetite. Of reason springeth counsell and election, in affaires of the lyfe, which not being letted, do cause deedes to ensue. Of appetite doe spryng, passions of the mynde, which also doe cause men to attempt enterprises.[83]

The complexity of producing full accounts of events encumbers such psychological investigation. Jonson accomplishes just such complexity in his panoptic historiography, manifesting the "passions of the mynde" that drive humanity to self-ruination.

The lessons history can provide are paramount. Patrizzi advises the historian who is confronted by a paucity of detail in the historic record to focus on environment – the who, what, when, where, and how:

> Agayne, euery deede, be it priuate, or publique must needs be done by some person, for some occasion, in sometyme, and place, with meanes & order, and with instruments, all which circumstaunces are not to be forgotten of the writer, and specially those that haue accompanyed and brought the deede to effect.[84]

For Patrizzi, recourse to environmentalism is neither invention nor speculation, but, rather environmental context is as powerful a determiner of events as political context. A sort of proto sociology or anthropology, this environmentalism is built upon assumptive assessments not historically verifiable facts. As it was first felt in Bruni and was later to resurface within narrower bounds in Bodin, Patrizzi's reliance on environmentalism shows the continued influence of his more inventive Florentine predecessors.[85] Together with his environmentalism, Patrizzi continues to praise the morally edifying value of selected histories: "All those persons whose lyues haue beene such as are to bee followed for their excellencie in vertue, or else to be fledde for their excellencie in vice, are meete to be chronicled."[86] Nonetheless, when Camden and Bacon read Blundeville they did so with experience of the *Histories* and found in Partizzi and Concio articulations upon which to build.

In concert with Patrizzi's *Ten Dialogues*, Blundeville reproduces Concio's *Observations*. A friend of Blundeville and a devotee of Partizzi, Concio was a well-placed Italian expatriate living in England. Blundeville and Concio, together with Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester (Elizabeth's close confidant and something of an historian), Giovanni Castiglione (Elizabeth's tutor in Italian), historian Petruccio Ubaldini (*Vita di Carlo Magno Imperadore,* 1581), and Pietro Bizari (Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge) formed a group of influential professional and amateur historians connected with the inner sanctum of Elizabeth's court. Following excerpts from Patrizzi's *Ten Dialogues* with Concio's unpublished tract, Blundeville was not merely acknowledging a friend's interests. Concio's *Observations* is an uncluttered and augmented articulation of key elements of the *Ten Dialogues*, an articulation that owes as much to Polybius as Patrizzi. Concio's additions render Blundeville's Polybian treatise the mission statement of a group of intellectuals keenly aware of the potentials of historiography.

The True Order and Method is the second time the *Observations* was dedicated to Blundeville's patron, Leicester. Concio had earlier dedicated his *Observations* in manuscript to Leicester. More than any in Blundeville's circle, Leicester's name could lend popular legitimacy to these English Polybians, while his court, privy council, and university connections might broaden their circle and turn English historiography Polybian.

For the modern reader, Blundeville's Concio opens with a statement of the motivations behind historiography that seems to contradict the pragmatics to follow. On

providence and the edifying value of patterns of good and evil – although not vice and virtue – he seems to be regurgitating the scholastic or Florentine model:

> There are but three chiefe and principall [endes and purposes for which histories are written]. First that we may learne thereby to acknowledge the prouidence of God, wherby all things are gouerned and directed. Secondly, that by the examples of the wise, we maye learne wisedome wysely to behaue our selues in all our actions, as well priuate as publique, both in time of peace and warre. Thirdly, that we maye be stirred by example of the good to folowe the good, and by example of the euill to flee the euill.[87]

However, to enter into a discourse on causation, without first confirming God as the *causa prima* of all events, is to put oneself and one's text in the direst position. Only by summarily acknowledging the first cause can the philosopher/historiographer (as Concio viewed Patrizzi) then safely discourse upon history's second causes. Accordingly, Concio qualifies these statements: the historiographer's role is to recount the fullest, often morally ambiguous truth of an event; for if human wisdom is to judge rightly of good and evil it must be able to judge "wyther those things which we desire and seeme to vs good, be good indeed or not; and secondly what the obtayning there of will cost."[88] This notion of cost argues for intentionality, while effectively denying the role of providentialism's vices and virtues in human events. Vile events sometimes lead to good, and good intentions sometimes lead to crime. Concio, the Polybian, teaches expediency not morality, and he trusts his readers to choose whether or not the prize is worth the cost.

Historiographers found fully articulated, in Concio's *Observations*, what historiographers since Machiavelli had been stepping around: the human condition is far too complex a thing to be reduced to axioms or to be spoken to efficaciously by anything resembling a Mediaeval abstraction. Effective historiography cannot be homiletic

historiography. Concio's historiographic observations insist that only integrated real-world examples are able provide insight into the complexities of causation. In Concio's secularity, outcome does not determine the relative good or evil of the event. The cost of attaining the outcome must be weighed in terms of degrees good and evil: "Againe, to way the certaintie of the euills wheron we venter, and the incertayntie of obtayning the good which we seeke, which is made manifest vnto vs by the examples of many which haue long sought, deare bought, and yet obtayned naught."[89] As both Camden and Bacon would later reiterate, events were to be judged on circumstances, reasons, and causes not just outcome. In an increasingly secular world, theorists like Camden and Bacon were attracted to the notion that history not theology should be the arbitrator of right action. Morality was giving way to psychology.

Concio goes on to answer Partizzi's inventive environmentalism. The who, what, when, and where of the doer are redirected to those of motivation, drawn back to details suppled by the record, and broadened to encompass those of the cause and the circumstances of the event itself: "of euery meane we have to consider all the qualities and circumstances that make to the purpose, & from whence eueryone sprange, whither of industie or of chance."[90] Concio's industry and chance, like Patrizzi's reason and appetite, are movements towards the psychological foundation of human causation. In offering causes and circumstances unmediated, Concio and Patrizzi are trusting the individual reader to come to the necessary conclusions – "wyther those things which *we* desire and seeme to vs good, be good indeed or not" – whatever individual necessity might determine those conclusions to be.

Implicit in Concio's "all the qualities and circumstances" is that historians must provide their readers with the fullest possible picture of history. Such full pictures were rarely – if ever – available of every historic event. The Polybian movement's aversion to antiquarianism, digging about moldy archives and searching over ancient monuments and records, meant that few would look past the published histories. But then, as the discourse was meant to attend upon the example, the Polybian historiographer could eschew events that offered little detail and present for consideration histories upon which variety enough had been written. The Polybian insistence upon the fullest picture echos in Bacon's assessment of the relative value of teaching out of exhaustive histories, over selected or excerpted histories:

> *When the Example is the grounde, being set downe in an history at large, it is set downe with al circumstãces: which manye sometimes controul the discourse thereupon made, and sometimes supply it; as a verie patterne for gaine; wheras the Examples alleged for the discourses sake are cited succinctly, and without particularity, and carry a seruile aspecte towards the discourse, which they are broughte in to make good.*[91]

In summary, then, non-Polybian historiography was writing allegory. Scholasticism's Augustinian historiography is pure *Everyman*: the factual event is insignificant in relation to the interpretation. In Machiavellian historiography the factual event and the interpretation are indivisible: the factual event is selected to illustrate the interpretation that follows, and the interpretation determines the sole meaning permitted the factual event. In the ideal Polybian history, the factual event is all there is. Interpretation is not the historiographer's purview; interpretation is the reader's purview. In practice, of course, presenting all the facts is no more possible than ordering their accumulation without some taint of interpretation. Three types of sources offered

themselves up to the historiographer: the first, chronicles and lives, were limited in the detail needed to fulfill the mandates of the Polybian, but they were well suited to those who believed history required an injection of morality to be serviceable; as for the second, memory, the well-placed historiographer could tap personal knowledge of recent events, but the Bishops' Ban and its 1608 corollary illustrate the dangers of recounting recent history; the third, the antiquity of classical or Mediaeval histories, insures plenty of time to accumulate multiple historiographic viewpoints, but, as Jonson and Hayward pointed out, correspondences could always be dug up.

The Polybian movement did not simply arrive on England's shores one day and change the historiographic landscape instantly and forevermore. The historiographic shift inspired by that movement was gradual; indeed, propagandists and apologists continue to employ the Florentine model today. Where Polybian historiography, in Patrizzi and Concio, found an attentive audience amongst England's humanist theorists, many other treatises were declaring the Polybian model dangerous. Polybius and his Renaissance followers were teaching expediency or ethics not morality. Sidney with his English and continental fellows believed moralizing and historiography to be indivisible. If history was not the proper locus for moral erudition, if in fact unembellished history taught that the wicked prevailed while the good suffered, then history could not be trusted to teach. These were the voices of homiletic historiography. Despite the advances wrought by humanist theorists, teaching was still teaching morality. The reaction to Polybian historiography was tantamount to scholastic paranoia. Within five years of Blundeville publishing Partizzi and Concio, two of the *ars historica*'s champions of homiletic historiography were published,

in far more favourable contexts. In 1579, Johannas Wolf published Simon Grynaeus's *De Utilitate legendae historiae* (1539) in his popular collection *Artis historicae penus,* together with Jean Bodin's *Methodus*. That same year Thomas North published Jacque Amyot's *Aux Lecteurs* in his influential translation of the same's *Plutarch* (1572), as "Amiot to the Readers."[92]

Late-sixteenth-century historiography of every form evinces Grynaeus's impact. Elizabethan historiographers commonly printed Grynaeus's treatise on efficacious historiography as prefaces to Livius and Justin. In 1602, Thomas Lodge assured Grynaeus's place in English historiography when including *De Utilitate legendae historiae* as the preface to his *Josephus*, as "To the Courteous Reader: as touching the use and abuse of Historie."[93] The English historiographer finds Grynaeus comparing historiography that presents historic events in their fullest possible detail to a banquet wherein the reader liking everything, but not knowing what to choose, takes nothing.[94] Where Patrizzi and Concio were humanist optimists, assuming that the reader was intelligent, Grynaeus was more the scholastic pessimist, assuming that the foolish or wicked reader could not be trusted to choose rightly. For Grynaeus histories must be embellished and manipulated, as it is the enlightened historian not the morally ambiguous history that edifies. Grynaeus's notion of historiography is the antithetical answer to the anomalous record that inspired the Polybians:

> They imagin that History is the instructor of such as read the Same, whereas it only yeildeth mater of instruction. . . . Now whereas it is the most exact and chiefest intent of Historie to awaken mens idlenes, and arme them against casualties, and the whole bent of example hath no other issue, it falleth out thorow mens securitie . . . that whatsoever is of note, is overslipt with deafe and sleeping iudgment, and things that memorie

should best love, are lost in her.[95]

In his conclusion, assuming his readers are soul-sick and in need of a cure, Grynaeus compares the Polybian historiographer to the neglectful apothecary: lured by the sweet smells, but finding nothing marked, the ignorant readers are as likely to taste of the drugs as the dainties and die.[96] It is not surprising that this pessimistic conclusion should find poor reception with such humanist optimists as Bacon and Camden.

Published in North's *Plutarch*, James Amyot enjoyed a wider English audience than Grynaeus or Blundeville. North's *Plutarch* was a hugely successful text, published no less than eight times by 1603. It is a testament to its popularity that it was renewed in 1595 and again in 1603 with new lives. Between 1595 and 1603, Richard Field printed six editions for various booksellers. Renaissance historians and critics who believed history to be the proper locus of moral erudition, but denied that history should be subjected to wholesale adjustment, found agreement in Amyot. Although Sidney likely took exception to Amyot's claim that history was superior to poetry, there is a great deal of Amyot in Sidney.[97] It is likely that most literary libraries held a copy of North's *Plutarch*: Jonson's did.[98] While, a few years earlier, Concio had argued that historiography must serve pragmatics not morality, as honour actually did not naturally accompany virtue, Amyot holds "that it is good and meete to draw men by all meanes to good doing, and good men aught not to be forbidden to hope for the honor of their vertuous deedes, seeing that honor doth naturally accompanie vertue."[99] Whereas he does not advise filling histories with untruths – in fact he damns the practice – Amyot's concern is that mistakes are often fatal and therefore lessons that draw men to doing good

must be explicit.[100] He is all for omission:

> [the historiographer needs be] a man experienced in the affaires of the world, of good utterance, and good judgement to discerne what is to be sayd, and what to be left unsayd, & what would do more harme to haue it declared, than do good to haue it reproued or condemned: for as much as the chiefe drift ought to be to serue the common weale, and that he is but as a register to set downe the judgements and definitiue sentences of Gods Court.[101]

The ever-expanding historic record is too full of anomaly – vice rewarded and virtue punished. And, as in Grynaeus, in Amyot, humanity is too easily turned from morality and inclined towards variety and novelty. The historiographer's role is to insure that histories exemplify God's justice. Although Amyot himself admits to amending lacunae with conjecture to make the story the richer, he would rather the historian not invent dialogue or deed but, rather, relate that portion fit to tell with such lively eloquence that the past is rendered vivid.[102] Reading *Julius Caesar* beside Plutarch's *Lives* reveals Shakespeare's agreement with Amyot, despite Shakespeare's necessary invention of dialogue. Throughout deploying axiomatic *exempla* with Machiavellian finesse, Amyot offers historic references to the physical healing power of reading historiography and equates that power with the moral healing power he sees as necessary for his fallen readers.[103] Further steering historiography away from Blundeville's democratic Polybian efforts, Amyot declares that histories should be primarily designed for princes' edification, not only to advise them on statecraft and virtue by the remote examples of great and wicked rulers, but, also, to protect them from the dangers of flatterers who hide the less delightful truths.[104]

The weakness of chronicles as historiographic sources lies in their lack of human

detail and character. Amyot's prefatory epistle to *Plutarch* enumerates the weakness of lives as a source of efficacious history:

> [Plutarch has] taken out of the deepest & most hidden secrets of morall and naturall Philosophie, with so sage precepts and frutefull instructions, with so effectuall commendation of vertue, and detestation of vice, with so many goodly allegacions of other authors, with so many fit comparisons, & with so many high inuentions.[105]

Where chronicles cover too many events and omit too much, lives cover too much time and augment too much. One end to which Plutarch writes is to flatter Trajan with comparisons. The very nature of comparative lives is that they search for points of similarity and difference; too often that search ends in invention.

This discussion of Amyot brings us to Plutarch, Shakespeare, and their respective versions of Julius Caesar. Plutarch's character demands some attention, as it informs his own writing and so much popular Renaissance Roman history, including Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. Plutarch (ca. 50-120) was a Greek born into a Roman world. His writing career (ca. 96-120) was in the midst of what is broadly considered to be the glory days of Roman civilization, from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus.[106] There was good government within the Empire and peace throughout most of its world. Plutarch was a dedicated and effective public servant, one generously rewarded by his emperor. Both a biographer and a moralist, Plutarch was a passionate antiquarian and dedicated to the ethos of his Greek ancestry. His enthusiasms for ancient lore and traditional virtue are felt everywhere in the *Lives*.

Dryden wrote of the *Lives* that "all history is only the precepts of moral philosophy reduced into examples."[107] One of the most troubling features of Plutarch for

those who would employ him as a source is the very thing that made him so popular with those, such as Amyot, who saw history as the proper locus for moral edification. Plutarch was not writing history, he was writing biography. As a moralist first and a biographer second, Plutarch was not constrained by the exigencies of historical narration and exposition, and he was, therefore, free to moralize. Plutarch's *Lives* record historic personages in terms of character types. His subjects are near allegorical models of idealized human qualities, who mould events by the inevitable tendencies of those qualities. Plutarch's weakness as a practicable historical source – as well as his popularity as a source for tragedy – is in this emphasis on inevitability. He paints individual portraits not events, epochs, circumstance, causation, or interactions. He writes the whole life, and, therefore, events are briefly sketched. This brevity drew many to Plutarch as an historical source. By the Renaissance, Plutarch's *Lives* was popular history, as the Discovery Channel is to "Roman History 341." Not surprisingly, then, his lack of historical detail bothers the academically minded. Dryden comments on the limitation of this lack of character detail:

> The lineaments, features, and colourings of a single picture may be hit exactly; but in a history piece of many figures, the general design, the ordonnance or disposition of it, the relation of one figure to another, the diversity of the posture, habits, shadowings, and all the other graces conspiring to an uniformity, are of so difficult performance, that neither is the resemblance of particular persons often perfect, nor the beauty of the piece complete; for any considerable errour in the parts renders the whole disagreeable and lame.[108]

It is not that his various sources did not supply Plutarch a complexity of character – complexity itself is inevitable out of such variety – but, rather, that the anomaly inherent in variety seems to slip by without his knowing; he fails to interrogate or attempt to

integrate anomaly, or acknowledge that from anomaly come real individuals. None of his portraits are the complexes of good and bad that make for human characters. There is none of Concio's vile events leading to good and good intentions leading to crime. Plutarch is the public moralist who presents heroic characters in the hope of producing lessons to help his readers in the proper ethical management of their lives.

DRAMATIC HISTORIOGRAPHY: SHAKESPEARE AND PARALLELOGRAPHY

Aut Caesar Aut Nullus

Popular fascination with history was stimulated by the playhouses. With the establishment of permanent playhouses in London, playwrights turned to chronicle histories and lives for new material to feed the growing demand for history plays. The history play reached its zenith in Elizabethan England; about 220 Elizabethan plays took their subjects from British history or historical legend, many of them written in the 1590s.[109] Blair Worden's survey of the STC reveals that two-thirds of the 650 known plays written between 1560 and 1700 were upon historical events.[110] Going to the playhouse or reading play texts was how most English men and women learned their history.[111] Jonson's Fitzdotterl speaks for the majority of Renaissance Londoners when he announces the source of his historical knowledge:

> *Fit.* . . .*Thomas* of *Woodstock,*
> I'm sure, was *Duke,* and he was made away
> At *Calice,* as *Duke Humphery* was at *Bury:*
> And *Richard* the Third, you know what end he came too.
> *Mer.* By m'faith you are cunning i'the *Chronicle,* Sir.
> *Fit.* No, I confess I ha't from the Play books,
> And think they'are more *Authentick.*
> *Ing.* That's sure, Sir.[112]

Whether or not Fitzdottrel has read the plays (as he implies), he is also an avid playgoer. Either way, his history lessons come via the playhouse. The history play had become an industry in itself. Like any industry, dramatic historiography needed resources to feed it. Holinshed's *Chronicles* and such collections as Cinthio's *Hecatomithi* or Plutarch's *Lives* supplied much of those resources.

Even if Plutarch's *Lives* had not been one of the most popular collections of its time, there would be nothing out of the ordinary in it supplying Shakespeare with the details for his 1599 *Julius Caesar*. Of course, as critics have illustrated well, Plutarch is only the main among Shakespeare's sources for *Julius Caesar*, which include Appian, Suetonius, and Dante.[113] Plutarch's is a patently moral text, and for many influential English humanists the historian's primary job was to produce unmuddied morality. Nor would there be anything out of the ordinary in Shakespeare selecting Plutarch's *Julius Caesar* as a politic parallelography upon Elizabeth's reign. The historiographer who hoped to fulfill his didactic role as educator of princes had to write histories, and parallelography was an acknowledged form of didacticism – by 1599 a form more acceptable when flattering than when admonishing. From Livy and Virgil through to Machiavelli, flattery had been a key ingredient of historiography aimed at princes.

Whether as a pragmatic or artistic decision, following 1599, Shakespeare stopped writing English histories, and he did not write another until he collaborated with John Fletcher on the providential *Henry VIII* (1612/13), likely the final play of his career. In fact, according to the First Folio's designations, he did not write another history at all until *Henry VIII*. Heminge and Condell included *The Life and Death of Julius Caesar*,

despite its Aristotle-defying title, under Shakespeare's tragedies, but then it seems they considered the lives of English kings as the only fit subject for histories. The First Folio reserves the designation "Histories" for *King John*, *Richard II* and *III* (these three also entitled *The Life and Death of*), and the *Henries*. After 1600 Shakespeare generally avoided English themes; seven of the twenty-one plays attributed to the post-1600 period were on classical subjects, ten were continental in theme or setting, and only *Macbeth, Lear, Cymbeline* (all out of the Holinshed's *Chronicles* but safely remote), and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* were set upon British soil. Like Jonson, Shakespeare turned to writing classical plays after 1599.

The Bishops' Ban of 1599 invites discussion of the place of both morality and politics in historiography and the roles of adjustment and selection in both moralizing historiography and political parallelography. Plutarch's *Lives* advertised themselves as parallelography – they were the Βίοι Παράλληλοι – and, thanks to Amyot's preface, they advertised themselves as morally and politically didactic. It is no great leap to think that Shakespeare wrote on the troubled reign the Roman emperor Julius Caesar as a piece of didactic parallelography upon the troubled reign of the English queen Elizabeth. As Jonson's margins would strive to avoid, England was ever being figured as Rome. Historiographers and sanctioned propagandists were ever paralleling Elizabeth and her court with classical exemplars and English class divisions with Roman class divisions. The Elizabethan fixation with tyrannicide suggests various possible parallels, including threats from Catholics.[114] Consider "The Murder of Gonzago": the audience was as intent upon finding parallels as the playwright was in presenting them. What they would see in

Julius Caesar was a divided aristocracy threatening revolt.[115] Both Royalists and Parliamentarians repeatedly appropriated Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* for just such politic purposes between the Restoration and the middle of the eighteenth century.[116] Shakespeare had already written a play that could be viewed as advice to or admonition of Elizabeth. Remember the 1601 apocryphal account of Elizabeth exclaiming "I am Richard II. Know ye not that." Elizabeth is supposed to have exclaimed this to William Lambarde, her archivist, while she was reviewing the historical records of Richard II's reign. This account, though popular, remains unsubstantiated. The story continues that Elizabeth complained that *Richard II* had been played in the public streets forty times; presumably this refers to the *Richard II* that Essex's supporters had paid to be performed, which was presumably Shakespeare's.[117] Whether Elizabeth ever exclaimed such or not, whether any single instance of parallelography was intended as such, in a literary milieu so immured by parallelography and application, audience perception was as important as authorial intention. Historiography that accommodates parallelography invites application. It certainly may be assumed that, after Hayward, Elizabeth would have studied any possible parallels.

Anecdotal evidence places *Julius Caesar*'s first performance around September 21, 1599. A Swiss traveler recorded in a journal entry for September 21, 1599 that he had the previous night seen a tragedy of the "first Roman Emperor Caesar."[118] It is tempting to imagine Shakespeare's reaction to the July 1599 burning of Hayward's *Henry IIII* as occasioning both his shift from writing English kings to writing Roman emperors and this the portrait of an imperious, paranoid ruler's demise. More than once the play seems to

skip over time and insinuate itself into Elizabethan England. Consider "*Bru.* Peace, count the Clocke. *Cas*. The Clocke hath stricken three."[119] The government itself had long bridged the chronological and conceptual gap between "Rome is Rome" and "Rome is England." When the Tudor monarchy asserted its lineal descent from Brut, it was asserting its right to rule upon Britian's ancient foundations, which were the same as Rome's. Historians and politicians commonly exploited the mytho-historical connection between ancient Rome and Tudor England. Textually, Rome often was England, and something as innocuous as an anachronism could signal parallelography.[120] The parallel is not stretched: both Julius and Elizabeth were powerful rulers over ever-expanding empires; both were famed for their erudition; both (like Richard) had reached the latter part of their lives without producing an heir; and both took a tyrannical turn at the end. The death of each threatened to precipitate an eruption of national consequences, Julius's a return to republicanism, Elizabeth's civil war or return to Catholicism.

Along with admonition or warning, there is flattery in the potential parallel. Beyond his presence in North's *Plutarch*, Julius Caesar was a well known figure in the Renaissance. His historic and martial writings were read in schools. Such eminent educational theorists as Elyot praise Caesar's historical writings as paragons of rhetoric. Ascham and Sidney quote him. Caesar's conquests and accomplishments are the subject of many Renaissance commentaries, conduct books, histories, and poems.[121] The name Caesar was eternally linked with that of Jesus Christ: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." There are subtle adjustments in the play to lead the viewer to believe that the playwright capitalized on

this connection with Jesus Christ in a cautious and tempered flattery of Elizabeth. Before leaving for the senate house on the Ides of March, Shakespeare's Caesar alone calls for a final draft of wine, a kind of last supper, with his followers – friends and conspirators alike.[122] Shakespeare's Caesar dies of thirty-three wounds – Jesus's age at crucifixion; Plutach's Caesar dies of twenty-three. Compare Plutarch's "he had three and twenty wounds apon his body" and "Cæsars three and thirtie wounds." North's marginal epitome in Plutarch "*Cæsar slaine and had 23. wounds apon him*" reduces the possibility that Shakespeare misread Plutarch.[123] Printed in a 1603 miscellany on the death of Elizabeth, the poem *Sorrowes Joy* suggests that *Julius Caesar* was viewed as Elizabeth:

> They say a comet woonteth to appeare
> When Princes baleful destinie is neare:
> So Julius starre was seene with fiery crest,
> Before his fall to blaze among the rest.[124]

The fiery comet heralding a prince's death was something of a tragic trope, but, nevertheless, there seems a likely resonance in that blazing comet with Shakespeare's addition to Plutarch of Calpurnia's "When Beggers dye, there are no Comets seen/ The Heauens themselues blaze forth the death of Princes."[125] It matters little what of Elizabeth the author of his elegy did or did not see in Shakespeare's portrait of Julius, or whether Shakespeare intended the same; the object of this discussion is not to accuse Shakespeare of parallelography in *Julius Caesar,* but to suggest how his first Roman historic tragedy is of that historiographic mode that produces extra- or a-historical portraits, portraits that function as illustrative examples fitted to a preexisting moral or political discourse. The potential for application is a pitfall of this mode of historiography. With the Quarto's historiographic shift, Jonson is confronting this potential. However broad the Florentine

historiographer's intentions might be, the mode determines the reception. In the case of moral or politic historiography, parallelography and application are both theoretically intended. *Julius Caesar*'s Elizabethan audience would see parallels. Whether that apparent parallelography is seen as cautioning Elizabeth against the dangers lurking in her cabinet or admonishing her for exposing her nation to danger by leaving it without a direct heir would depend upon the viewer's politics.

In terms of *Julius Caesar* and early-modern moral discourse, the preceding discussion on Plutarch's idealized biographic sketches will serve as an introduction. Writing Caesar, Shakespeare was writing a character as familiar to his audience as any Richard or Henry. Yet, the events surrounding Caesar's death involved more players than Caesar, and those events are certainly more complex than they seem as viewed through the perspective of Plutarch's ideologically distilled Caesar. As Dryden comments:

> If the action or counsel were managed by colleagues, some part of it must be either lame or wanting, except it be supplied by the excursion of the writer. Herein likewise, must be less of variety for the same reason; because the fortunes and actions of one man are related, not those of many. Thus the actions and achievements of Sylla, Lucullus, and Pompey, are all of them but the successive parts of the Mithridatick war; of which we could have no perfect image, if the same hand had not given us the whole, though at several views, in their particular lives.[126]

Fortunately, for those like Dryden who see Plutarch's myopia as a limitation to his efficacy, Plutarch provided Shakespeare with events from the perspectives of Antony, Brutus, and Caesar. As much as *Richard II* is Henry's story so *Julius Caesar* is Brutus's. The fall of the virtuous Brutus is the more morally educative, than that of the tyrant Caesar. In Nietzsche's assessment, Shakespeare "believed in Brutus and didn't cast a speck of suspicion on his type of virtue! To him he devoted his best tragedy . . . to him

and to the most dreadful epitome of lofty morality. Independence of the soul." Nietzsche speculates that Shakespeare produced so lofty a Caesar in order to heighten his portrait of Brutus's psychological struggle, and that Brutus's melancholy, like Hamlet's, was Shakespeare's own.[127] However true Nietzsche's estimation might be, Shakespeare's portrait of Brutus, like that of his Caesar, finds its moral struggle in the moralist Plutarch's own fetishized portrait.

As Gifford and Schelling suggest, Shakespeare went no further than Plutarch for the moral clarity that Grynaeus and Amyot would demand of his edifying historiography. Shakespeare's Caesar is Plutarch's.[128] Caesar is never likeable; he is too frightened, even if it is fear itself he fears; he is too vain, too easily convinced that the people and the senate will mock him as an uxorious coward, if he allows Calpurnia's dreams to keep him from the senate, even on the Ides of March. Shakespeare's Brutus is uncomfortable being Plutarch's. The moralist Plutarch creates in Brutus a tragic model of traditional morality, the virtuous Roman *Vir*. Class defined Roman virtue, and a great part of that virtue was defined as civic. Brutus frames his life by the rules of virtue and the study of philosophy; he is a man of gentle and constant wit, "rightly made and framed vnto vertue."[129] Brutus is a portrait of constancy, a very Roman ideal with no place in Roman society and less in English society. Plutarch brings his portrait almost immediately into the civil war, providing little of the background he does for Julius's youth. Brutus's valiant and virtuous actions in what follows define his character. At the outset Plutarch illustrates the pragmatism of the Roman civic ideal: Brutus joins Pompey's party even though Pompey had killed his father:[130] "But *Brutus* preferring the respect of his countrie and common

wealth before priuate affection, and perswading himselfe that *Pompey* had iuster cause to enter into armes than *Cæsar*: he then tooke parte with *Pompey*."[131] In the dual emphasis the *Lives* places on Brutus' virtuous and careful mind and the high regard and great honours with which Caesar invests him, Plutarch insists that Brutus's will – his private affections – is always led by reason.[132] Brutus's fate pictures the danger of being the only virtuous man in a world of politic villains.

In Plutarch, the source of Brutus's strength, his constancy, is also his weakness. Cassius's followers capitalize on his blind virtue, when they beleaguer the stalwart Brutus, trying to shift him from Caesar's side, saying that Caesar was trying to weaken his constant mind.[133] When the conspiracy is set in motion, Cassius wants to kill Antony also, but virtuous Brutus will not allow more blood to be spilled.[134] As this most famous history shows, Brutus would have been well advised to remove Antony. Constant Brutus's civic virtue never falters. Once the war is raging and Antony's armies begin carrying out the proscriptions, Brutus and Cassius head for Italy to save their countrymen. Plutarch sets Brutus's virtues in vivid contrast with Cassius's choler and grasping.[135] Even when his evil spirit promises to see him at his defeat at Philippi, constant Brutus is unfazed: "Brutus, beeing no otherwise afrayd, replyed againe vnto it: well, then I shall see thee agayne."[136] Guiltless, fixed Brutus confirms his *Romanitas,* choosing death before defeat, leaving "a perpetuall fame for [his] corage and manhoode."[137]

As a Florentine historiographer, Shakespeare seems to be making a moral point about the cost of regicide in *Julius Caesar*. That cost is determined not by some constant of the human condition, but by the particular cultural context of late sixteenth-century

England. The dictates of his historiographic mode require that Shakespeare make a-historical moral or political adjustments to Plutarch's Brutus in order to better serve his audience. Critics suggest both Plutarch's "Brutus" and Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* treat tyrannical rule and the virtuous action of civic nobility. In the face of tyranny, then, civic virtue must, paradoxically, eventuate in regicide. And that same virtue must, by that paradox, end in noble suicide. How would such Roman virtue play out in London? Not well. In Rome, tyrants were regularly deposed. In London, Divine Right generally saved them. Shakespeare's reliance on Plutarch's *Lives* assured that any adjustments he makes to his Brutus must take place either inside the character circumscribed by Plutarch or outside of the historic record. Had Shakespeare constructed his *Julius Caesar* as Jonson had his *Sejanus*, he would have found the matter for his conflicted Brutus within the anomalistic historic record. The historic record contains a variety of less morally fixed Bruti: Tacitus, himself a republican, records a political Brutus fighting to save the republic; Dio Cassius, so pro-Augustus, records Octavius serving the public good by dispatching a plotting, factious Brutus; Suetonius, a great admirer of Julius Caesar, paints Brutus's part in almost bathetic terms: instead of *et tu Brute*? it is καὶ σὺ τέκνον? "And you my child?"[138] One can imagine Jonson, as Gifford had, being irked by Shakespeare shirking all the opportunities the historic record offered for a more nuanced Brutus.

Shakespeare subtly adjusts Plutarch to produce the Brutus *Julius Caesar*'s cultural context requires. He opens his portrait of Brutus with his civic virtue. In the *Lives* Shakespeare found Brutus's "respect of his countrie and common wealth before priuate affection" and adjusts it for his English *Vir*'s civic virtue:

> If it be ought toward the general good,
> Set Honor in one eye, and Death i'th other,
> And I will looke on both indifferently:
> . . . as I love
> The name of honour more than I fear death.[139]

The adjustment is that will (private passions) is now defined as honour. Clarifying the moral lesson to come, Shakespeare's Brutus emphasizes the conflict in his civil virtue, divided as it is between Rome and Caesar's Rome – "*Brutus* had rather be a Villager,/ Then to repute himselfe a son of Rome/ Vnder these hard Conditions."[140] For the Englished Brutus the conflict is turned inward.

Founded in Plutarch's allegorised portrait, Shakespeare's Brutus is the microcosm of a virtuous nobility – constancy is civic man's virtue. When the nobles turn to insurrection, chaos ensues within the microcosmic psyche. Brutus is still the ideal man, but the ideal struggles to be English on the Roman model. Shakespeare's tragedy begins when the constant man questions his constancy. He can never step too far from Plutarch's Brutus; yet, *Julius Caesar* breaths into this Brutus a beleaguered psyche that is a near allegory on the dangers of regicide rather than a call for regicide. In the social ethos of Elizabethan England, honour dictates that the ideal nobleman's fixed end is devotion to his monarch first, God second, and family third. This Brutus's tragic error is the very thing that defines Plutarch's Brutus: reason's rule over the will. In *Julius Caesar*'s allegory, when reason overcomes will (honour), allegorical madness ensues. Turned by reason, Brutus falls into a sort of dream world from which he never returns:

> Since *Cassius* first did whet me against *Caesar*,
> I haue not slept. . . . all the interim is
> Like a Phantasma, or a hideous Dreame,
> The *Genius*, and the mortall Instruments,

> Are then in councell; and the state of man,
> Like a little Kingdome, suffers then,
> The nature of an Insurrection.[141]

He apostrophises the conspiracy as a nightmarish daemon: "O Conspiracie, / Sham'st thou to shew thy dang'rous Brow by night,/ When euills are most free?"[142] Neither this constant Brutus nor the virtue he embodies are psychologically equipped for the moral consequences of insurrection. At Philippi, Brutus does not meet his evil spirit, but his own guilt manifested as Caesar's ghost. Torn by that guilt, Brutus starts in fear; but, then, calmed by curiosity, his transcribed words insist upon association with Plutarch's unfazed Brutus. As the ghost vanishes, Brutus is, again, very much afraid: "Boy, *Lucius*, *Varrus*, *Claudio*, Sirs: Awake./ *Claudio*. . . Did'st thou see any thing?"[143] Ultimately, this torn dreaming Brutus accounts all to his guilt: "O *Iulius Cæsar*, thou art mighty yet,/ Thy spirit walkes abroad, and turnes our Swords/ In our owne proper Entrailes."[144] Tormented by his conscience, Brutus knows that his act of regicide not Antony's army brought death and defeat to his men.

While Plutarch's Brutus is the noble Roman of fixed civil virtues, Shakespeare adjusts his to fit Christian London's elite. The *Lives* records the execution of a tyrant: the senators butchered Caesar "as a wilde beaste taken of hunters."[145] If *Julius Caesar* is to show the cost of regicide, pragmatic fixity would not serve. The conflicted Brutus is compelled to ameliorate the act with a touch of Renaissance piety, not diverging from but inverting Plutarch: "Let's carue him, as a Dish fit for the Gods,/ Not hew him as a Carkasse fit for hounds."[146] This Brutus does not cease to honour Caesar: he will present him as a sacrifice to Rome, a purgation "Necessary, and not Enuious."[147]

Be it Roman or English, sensibility dictates that suicide follow regicide. Brutus's suicide was inevitable. Plutarch's Brutus, musing on suicide, is confident that the virtuous regicide will awake in Elysian Fields: "For I gaue vp my life for my contry in the Ides of Marche, for the which I shall liue in another more glorious worlde."[148] In Shakespeare's political allegory, Brutus's act is an insuperable assault on his morality, and this Brutus anticipates no posthumous reward: "But this same day must/ End that worke the Ides of March begun."[149] If he and Cassius are to meet again it will be in life. From Brutus's discussion of suicide to the act itself, Shakespeare returns to Plutarch; here the resonance between the two texts reaches its fullest.[150] The king is dead; the regicides are routed; and all that is left is history to pursue its course toward a mutually satisfying end. Shakespeare's civic and spiritual morality were Elizabethan and Plutarch's Roman. The historic events Plutarch treats hold unlimited potential to teach, but, restricted by his own morality and the nature of his biography, Plutarch was constitutionally ill-suited to offering those events with Polybian integrity. Beginning from the premise Brutus "was rightly made and framed vnto Vertue," *The Life of Marcus Brutus* and the death of Caesar were necessarily an illustration of that premise; nevertheless, whatever his political intentions, with careful manipulation and invention, Shakespeare could at least render Brutus's Roman morality English, even if he threatened to turn Rome England.

DRAMATIC HISTORIOGRAPHY: MOTIVE AND CIRCUMSTANCE IN SEJANUS

If [a history] mislead by disproportion or dissimilitude of Examples, it teacheth men the force of Circumstances, the errours of comparisons, and all the cautions of application: so that in all these it doth rectifie more effectually than it can peruert.[151]

— Francis Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*.

Although there are shadowings of various historiographic resources in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Plutarch's moralizing biography is its ruling voice and historiographic model, rendering Brutus an allegorical abstraction. Questioning the value of such historiography, Jonson offered an alternative – the Polybian *Sejanus*. Among those without a comprehensive grasp of Roman history, *Sejanus*'s centered or dramatic text is a version of a popular historic moment fairly unmuddied by human detail, and, as such, it enjoys reasonable success: political impotence and tyrannical overreaching lead to dire consequences. And there is plenty of room in the centre for application. Jonson composed the Quarto *Sejanus* to thrust comprehension upon the reader, his margins insisting upon Jonson's "integrity in the *Story*." Implicating something approaching the entire historic record – historians, philosophers, poets, and scholars – into the events of the centred text and embracing historic anomaly, Jonson creates a vastly expanded, realized context that strives to exhaust both motive and circumstance. Thus realized, the Polybian composite allows both matter and pause; whereby the reader raised on application might reject the impulse to contemporize Sejanus's sociopathic overreaching or the Germanicans' inept republicanism, and instead comprehend the psychological causes and motivations behind the events surrounding Sejanus's rise and fall. In its emphasis on psychological realism the Quarto does not provide explicit models of goodness or virtuous action, but, rather, the Quarto provides a complex, phenomenistic portrait of necessary and expedient actions. Manifesting for the reader the self-delusion that motivates so much of the action and inaction in *Sejanus*, the Quarto illustrates that only holistic, pragmatic historiography

can offer truly universally applicable lessons. The Quarto *Sejanus*'s composite text is Jonson's answer to five centuries of historiographic manipulation and invention.

The method of proceeding here will be to discuss, through specific intersections of margins and centre, how the Quarto shows itself Polybian. In the incipient moment of reading, at each marginal note the information provided must be judged on the terms of its unique intersection with the dramatic text. In Slights's terms, the marginal resource, the centre, the momentary intersection, and the whole are "conflated in the act of deciphering the printed text."[152] In this accumulation the whole is controlled not by any one historic version but by the Polybian synergy of all the sources and centre. In considering the operations of margins, it is a mistake to think of the various and often conflicting historic accounts as representing disparate versions of history. Whatever the bias of each individual narrativization of the historic moment, in the textual moment of the composite, all the sources operate in combination. Whether citing single or multiple sources at any given dramatic moment, Jonson is constructing a single semantic field. However disparate in its versions, the historic record becomes involved and implicated with itself and the centred text. Each excerpt becomes part of the synergy that constitutes the composite's *Story*. The synergy is of marginal excerpt(s) and correlating dramatic dialogue, not of each history in its entirety interfused with *Sejanus*.

The composite *Sejanus* perfects history, not by expunging human complexity, but by sorting through and harmonizing all those messy human details that had been thought to threaten an event's moral educative value. In his Polybian fidelity to the historic record, Jonson insists that *Sejanus* will not be read as a mytho-tragic fable, peopled by

quasi-allegorical abstractions: *non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas, Harpyasque, Inuenies: Hominem pagina nostra sapit.* Indeed, the composite's unique "value" lies precisely in Jonson's stipulation that this story was ever to retain an explicit connection with the complex picture of humanity from which it was constructed. Every messy detail of historic character is abidingly present in the margins, and ever flowing through the centre. Much of what Jonson accomplishes by means of intertextual characterization becomes a study of motivations. History tells us what these characters did and did not do. The composite entreats the reader to question why these dramatic characters, constructed out of the historic record, do not ultimately behave as that record suggests they ought. *Sejanus*'s dialogue is public dialogue. Each deviation the dramatic dialogue makes from the historic record is merely the public manifestation of a character's unwillingness to face up to the reality made manifest upon the composite page. *Sejanus*'s characters do, after all, inhabit their own historical context.

The intersections for consideration are those treating the characters Arruntius and Silius, those noble Germanicans so antagonistic to the corruption of Tiberian Rome. As they are manifested in the dramatic centre, the Germanicans exemplify the unmuddied world of morally or politically edifying historiography. Their Juvenalian rants describe a world populated by extravagant caricatures, paradigmatic ideals easily distinguishable as good or evil; whereas, from the margins, the historic record ever insists that Tiberian Rome enjoyed the usual muddying complexity of human action. To begin with Arruntius: despite Jonson's precise marginal documentation, critics have found much to comment upon in his adjustments to Arruntius. As the opening survey in my introduction

illustrates, critics peg such alterations to political and moral exigencies. Exemplifying these critical commentaries, Dutton argues that Jonson's morally edifying history had to "concentrate on the essential aspects of a character, at the expense of confusing and contradictory details."[153] Critics anticipate that homiletic historiography will simplify or alter sources when creating their edifying portraits unmuddied by anomaly. For some critics, Arruntius is the play's conscience, Jonson's commentator, the voice of Tacitus's or Jonson's morality. That Arruntius should be, in effect, the voice of both Tacitian moral indignation and Juvenalian vituperation is, perhaps, not surprising. Kirk Freudenburg suggests that Tacitus and Juvenal were both part of a political and writerly milieu, during the reigns of Nerva, Tragan, and Hadrian, a milieu in which it was no longer possible to avoid – and was now safe to begin – writing scathingly of those deemed responsible for Rome's fallen state. For Freudenburg this indignation is no mere literary hallmark of an age; rather it is "an urgent cultural obsession that keeps writers of that age nailed to the past, researching famous deaths, writing about them, and finding ever new, grander ways to tell the same dead-men's tales."[154] It might be argued following Freudenburg, that in affiliating his centre so closely with Juvenal and Tacitus, Jonson obliquely implicates himself in the social/political projects of such authors, and in doing so adds James's name to the list of good emperors with Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian. Samuel Coleridge calls Arruntius Jonson's advocate for hereditary succession.[155] Yet, I would argue that with the margins considered, Jonson's construction of Arruntius becomes Polybian: Arruntius is produced out of the historic record; his character is not altered; his historic details are not adjusted. Through Tacitus and Dio, the Polybian Quarto offers the cause and

circumstance driving Arruntius; Arruntius is neither a moral voice nor a political advocate; something far more human motivates Arruntius.

When Arruntius enters the scene at Act 1, the superscript key insists upon an historic introduction before he speaks (Figure 2):

> SAB. But these our times
> Are not the same *Arruntius*, [e] ARR. Times? The Men,
> The men are not the same: 'Tis we are base,
> Poore, and degenerate from the exalted streine
> Of our great Fathers. Where is now the soule
> Of God-like *Cato*? He, that durst be good,
> When *Cæsar* durst be euill; and had power,
> As not to liue his slaue, to die his Master.
> Or where the constant *Brutus?* [156]

[e] *De* Lu. Aruntio *isto, vid.* Tac.*Ann. lib.*1.*pag.*6. & *lib.* 3. *pag.*60.& Dio.*Rom. Hist.lib.*58.

Dio Cassius and Tacitus paint an incongruent picture. Tacitus records, in a glowing blazon, that, not only was Arruntius once considered an audacious (*ausurum*) candidate for succession, Tiberius had plotted against him on that account:

> [Arruntius] was rich, energetic, distinguished in many arts, with which his public reputation accorded, and Tiberius suspected him. For Augustus, in his last conversations, when he was considering who might take possession of the place of emperor – those who would suffice but might refuse, those insufficient and willing, and those both able and desirous – he spoke of Manius Lepidus as able but haughty, Asinius Gallus as keen yet inapt, Lucius Arruntius as not undeserving and, if cause should be given, audacious. . . . all but Lepidus were soon encompassed by various charges of Tiberius's devising.[157]

Dio confutes Tacitus: faced by a second tyrant, Caligula, Arruntius chose slavish death, over the noble action for which he praises Brutus:

> Lucius Arruntius, eminent in age and character, decided upon death for himself, although Tiberius was languishing, and there was no hope that he would come out of his sickness: yet, as he had observed the wickedness of Gaius, he preferred that he might, before he had trial of it, yield up his life; he said that he would not be able in his old age to bear a master the likes of him.[158]

With this contradictory portrait the Quarto's Arruntius can claim no ignorance of succession, nor, indeed, of the fact that Tiberius threatens his life, nor can he claim audacity: he has ample cause to act, whether out of civic virtue or self-defence. Now defined by the historic record, when Arruntius speaks, the passionate lament that Tiberian Rome lacks a regicide Brutus becomes the bombast of one sometime of that audacious stripe. If selfless defiance of tyranny is a Roman virtue, Arruntius's inaction is doubly detestable. There is no civic virtue in his inaction but only a self-deluded hope for self-preservation. In Sejanus's estimation Arruntius is one who "only talks," and in cultivating that estimation Arruntius hopes to survive. This complex Arruntius is neither an illustration in service of an axiom nor a political or moral *exemplum*. However detestable, the historic Arruntius is a complex character bent on survival, and a lesson to all on the political and ethical consequences of a nobility crippled by self-delusion.

For critics, *Sejanus*'s Silius is a vociferous opponent of tyranny and corruption. Silius is most often the object of critical application. Tricomi suggests that Silius is "utterly without recourse" in his suicide, and in the act "teaches the feckless Senate to mock Tiberius's tyranny."[159] Slights' assessment agrees with Tricomi's, calling Silius "the noblest of Jonson's Romans."[160] In the noble Silius, Jonson is thought to have paralleled Essex or Essex' rival, Raleigh. Patterson provides a convincing argument for Silius as Essex.[161] Ayres argues that Silius is Northampton.[162] Critics anticipate this sort of Silius, Silius as he exists in the centred text alone. The Silius critics see is not the product of invention but of omission – an idealized Silius after Amyot's fashion. However noble the Silius of the dramatic text, through the margins, Silius becomes the

most detestable of the weak-willed Germanicans. Silius's caustic defense against charges of treason becomes the closing bluster to years of ceaseless and vain ranting. Silius's Juvenalian ranting becomes his unique brand of self-delusion. Silius's ranting masks the inaction of a sometime hero turned pompous fool, the necessary inaction of one who is himself culpable in the corruption he would feign to stand against.

Jonson's gradual assembly of Silius's character out of the historic record is itself a feat of Polybian systematic historiographic construction. The reader comes first upon Silius as he separates himself from the flattering, informing, defrauding, and lying that corrupts Tiberian Rome. He aligns himself with the past glories of his now dead heroic ideal: Germanicus. In the opening note, the historic record affirms the nobility and heroic deeds of Silius in tandem with those of Germanicus (Figure 14).

> SAB. Haile[a] *Caius Silius.* SIL.[b] T*itius Sabinus*, Hayle.
> Yo'are rarely met in Court! SAB. Therefore, well met.
> SIL. 'Tis true: Indeed, this Place is not our Sphære.
> SAB. No *Silius*, we are no good Inginers;
> We want the fine Artes, and their thriuing vse
> Should make vs grac'd, or fauor'd of the Times:
> We haue no shift of Faces, no cleft Tongues,
> No soft, and glutinous bodies, that can stick,
> Like Snailes, on painted walls.[163]

> *De* Caio Silio.*vid.* Tacit.Lips. edit.4°. *Anna.lib.*I. *pag.*11.*lib.* 2. *pag.*28.

This is Tacitus's Silius, ca. 14-16 CE, seven years prior to *Sejanus*'s conflation of 23-30:

> Two armies were on the bank of the Rhine; the upper army was commanded by lieutenant-general Gaius Silius. . .. those whom Silius was controlling were, with uncertain hearts, observing the fortunes of others' sedition: while the soldiers of the lower army had fallen into a frenzy.[164]

> Silius and Anteius and Caecina were trusted with the construction of the fleet.[165]

> But, while the ships were driven into shore, [Germanicus] ordered his second lieutenant, Silius, to make an attack into Chattan territories with a lightly armed force.[166]

> [Germanicus] ordered Gaius Silius to go against the Chatti with thirty thousand foot and three thousand horse.[167]

These excerpts render Silius in all his past patriotic virtues, introducing him through the crucial role his loyal ranks played in quelling the mutiny of the German legions, and his own success in every office Germanicus placed upon him in the German wars. In this initial portrait, set beside Silius's plain-spoken opening lines, Jonson creates expectation that the accomplishments of the historic Silius will determine the actions of *Sejanus*'s Silius.

Then, in Act 2, as Sejanus sets Tiberius on to making an example of the heroic Silius, Jonson dashes expectation:

> SEI. first, *Caius Siliu*;
> He is the most of marke, and most of danger:
> In power, and reputation equall strong,
> Having [c] commanded an imperiall armie
> Seauen yeares togither, vanquish'd *Sacrouir*
> In *Germanie*, and thence obtain'd to weare
> The ornaments triumphal. His steepe fall,
> By how much it doth giue the weightier crack,
> Will send more wounding terror to the rest.[168]

[c] Tac.*lib. Ann.*3. *pag.*63. & *lib.*4. *pag.*79

The margins provide two excerpts from Tacitus that complicate and defame Silius, at the very moment the centre suggests he will die an innocent and noble pawn. The first details the heroic egotism of Silius, ca.21 CE, cheering his troops to action; this is the sometime man of action's dangerous egotism:

> However the presumption of hope might eliminate the causes of exhortation, nevertheless, on the other side Silius, exclaimed that it was shameful that those very soldiers who had been victorious against the

> Germans should be led against the Gauls as an enemy. 'Of late one cohort dashed the Turoni rebellion, one company of cavalry the Treviri, a small troop of these very soldiers the Sequani.'[169]

Jonson closely translates six lines from the second excerpt, confirming the historic Silius's egotism his Silius's too. Silius's egoism is the hectoring of a public fool, boasting in corrupt, spy-filled Rome that Tiberius owes the imperium to his able command:

> [Sejanus] attacked Gaius Silius and Titus Sabinus. The friendship of Germanicus was fatal to both; and that Silius, commander of a great army for seven years, winning part of the triumphs in Germany, and the victor in the wars with Sacrovir, the mighty ruin of his fall would have spread greater terror amongst others. Almost all believed that his offence was swelled by his immoderate use of wine, and his intemperate vaunts that his soldiers had remained in their obedience, when all of the other troops were prone to fall into rebellion; and, had his legions also desired revolution, Tiberius's rule would not have endured.[170]

The Silius of this new Polybian history is not the once heroic Silius, nor is he the vociferous but noble Germanican in the centred text. This is Jonson the careful historiographer producing the true Silius ca. 24 CE. Jonson confirms that Silius's open contempt for tyranny are the empty rants of self-delusion. Silius of the composite text now conceals inaction behind blustering exhortation and intemperate vaunts. Although posing no threat, this Germanican annoyance will serve nicely as an effortless and necessary example to his fellows. Yet once the heroic Silius has entered the composite through the margins, he cannot be so easily removed. The abiding memory of the sometime hero, the noble warrior who might and ought correct Rome's corruption, now only furthers the composite's defamation of the blustering self-delusional fool. Yet even here, the margins do not offer all they hold in store for Silius.

Between his opening portrait and trial scene, the margins construct a Silius who shows an almost prescient understandings of Tiberian Rome's lubricious workings. Ever agreeing with those multiple voices echoing through the margins from the historic record, Silius's Juvenalian rants clearly have their source in a sure and reasoned knowledge of the circumstances and potentials of his tenuous position. With the clarity of Silius's perception made patent, the margins render the vaunts that spell his doom a monumental effort of self-delusion.

As Act 3 opens, Silius's treason trial draws near. Sejanus coaches Varro on the details of the prosecution's trumped up charges. But even as doom is prepared for Silius of the dramatic centre, the still innocent if somewhat boastful war hero, the margins introduce Silius's own criminal past:

> SEI. No. It was debated
> By *Cæsar*, and concluded as most fit,
> To take him vnprepar'd. AFE. And prosecute
> All [a] vnder name of Treason. VAR. I conceiue.
> SAB. *Drusus* being dead, *Cæsar* will not be here.[171]

> [a] Tac.*ibid. Sed cuncta questione maiestatis exercita.*

Taken verbatim out of Tacitus, the note insists upon immediate access to the pertinent lines: "It was not in doubt that they were entwined in the crimes of polling the province, but the entire question was one of treason; and Silius anticipated the imminent sentencing by a voluntary end."[172] This revelation of Silius's real crimes set beside *Sejanus*'s false charges lards irony upon the great folly in this "good-dull-noble Looker on"[173] believing his innocence and ignorance would save him. Though not directly guilty in the coming charade's indictment of treason, Silius is, nonetheless, implicated in Rome's corruption,

and his guilt is implicit in the blatant self-delusion and willful inaction that leads him into this trap.

Finally, as Silius stands before his accuser, the margins turn the historic record's accusatory glare directly upon Silius the noble Roman who claims to be innocent of any wrong doing:

> Against the Maiestie of *Rome*, and *Cæsar*,
> I do pronounce thee here a guilty cause
> First, [c] of beginning, and occasioning,
> Next, drawing out the warre in [d] *Gallia*,
> For which thous late triumph'st; dissembling long
> That *Sacrouir* to be an enemy,
> Onely to make thy Entertainment more,
> Whilst thou, and thy wife *Sosia* poll'd the *Provinces;*
> Wherein, with sordide-base desire of gaine,
> Thou hast discredited thy *Actions* worth
> And bene a Traitor to the state.[174]

> [c] Tac.*lib*.4. *pag*.79 *Conscientiâ belli,* Sacrouir *diu dissimulatus, victoria per auaritiam fœdata,&* *vxor* Sosia *argueban-*

The margins have already offered this excerpt and the political motivation behind Silius's prosecution:

> Thus with great earnest, as if it were that this were argued with Silius before the law, as if Varro were a consul or that this were a commonwealth, the Fathers were convened. With [Silius] either silent in this matter, or, if he were undertaking a defence, not hiding by whose wrath he was pursued, the charges were laid: Sacrovir had been a long dissembled accomplice in the war, and the victory was tarnished by greed and a wife as coconspirator. There was no doubt that they were entwined in the crimes of polling the province, but the entire question was one of treason; and Silius anticipated the imminent sentencing by a voluntary end.[175]

Yet, at the moment of Silius's trial, interjecting this note excerpted verbatim from Tacitus beside dramatic lines translated from Tacitus, the composite insists that the record be revisited, the scope of reading be expand, and the connotations be considered – that the reader, as Bryant suggests, "look before and after what he finds there."[176] Thus, the

margins compound the criminality of Silius's disregard for the bold Germanican ideal. Silius's abandonment of his *noblesse oblige* goes far beyond his own willful inaction in the face of tyrannical corruption, to encompass corruption itself. In the composite, the crime of willful inaction is tainted with Silius's hypocrisy and his arrogance in denying his own crimes. Silius is certainly not, as he would have it, "too honest for the Times," and his "*Treasure*, *Iewels*, *Land* or *Howses*" are not merely gaped for but ill-gotten.[177] The historic record now turns all of Silius's complaints against himself. The knowledge of his own crimes provides Silius his singular comprehension of the corruption in Tiberian Rome. Silius's choice of suicide can no longer be read as a noble hero's final show of *Romanitas*, but, rather, it is now an ignoble cop-out of the highest order.

In Silius, the composite text systematically creates a very real portrait of ethical degeneration. Through the margins, the reader learns of Silius's past heroics, the criminal egoism into which his heroics had degraded, and the fatal consequences of the self-delusion that degradation precipitated: the why, how, and to what ends of Silius's inaction. *Sejanus*'s ineffectual Silius is neither virtuous nor vicious. Silius can no more be read as a paradigmatic everyman than he can an Essex or Raleigh – not only does A neither necessarily nor universally equal B, but there is too much small matter for A to be read as B. Silius is a complex human character, driven to destructive impotence by complex human motives. While for Elizabethan literary historians, simplified abstractions edified most effectively, emerging theories of historiography taught Jonson that history's necessary lessons could not be delivered effectively without all the complexity of the historic record. In their humanist ideal, playwrights and historians stage human events

from which we might learn in safety the common errors of humanity. In thus bringing both the expectation and potential of Silius's noble action to so abrupt an end, Jonson renders a model of Polybian historiography's efficacy, warning each reader against the hollow promises of self-delusion. Who amongst us cannot see something of so real a Silius or Arruntius in ourselves.

TERENTIUS: THE QUARTO'S POLYBIAN HISTORIOGRAPHER

Whether Jonson wrote *Sejanus* in direct response to the historiography in *Julius Caesar* or to the manner of historiography that Shakespeare's histories have come to epitomise, it is pure Jonson that his response would not merely be a corrective model but would also include a corrective model. The intersections of margins and centre produce the composite's Polybian historiographer as pointed contrast to the centre's parallelling Cordus. Terentius is both a model of reasoned action ideally suited to survival in Rome or London and the Polybian ideal. The composite reveals throughout the final two acts that Terentius speaks facts alone. In assuming his Polybian role, Terentius defies the categorization that defines *Sejanus*'s factional world. Terentius's history is non-teleological, non-evaluative: there is in his reporting no judgement, no authorized version of cause or motivation. Evaluation of cause and motivation is the purview of his audience on and off the stage. There is no universalizing, no politicizing, no subversion in his historiographic gaze.

In the Polybian efficacy of Terentius's historiography, the composite insists that the reader compare its historiographer to the centre's historiographer, Cremutius Cordus,

so famously one who "paralells / The times, the gouernments."[178] The composite first introduces Cordus through the fullness of the historical record on the opening page of the play text[179] and repeats that introduction with more or less detail throughout the first three acts. Where the historic record is divided on whether his troubles with Sejanus or his histories brought about Cordus's demise, none suggest that he was not a parallelographer. With Cordus's historical introduction in its second and fullest iteration sixty-four lines before his first speech, the reader is fully aware of Cordus's historiographic practices and political affiliations:"[b] *De Cremutio Cordo vid.* Tacit. *Annal. lib.* 4. *pag.* 83. 84. Seneca *cōsol. ad Marciam.* Dio *lib.* 57. *pag.*710. Suet. Aug. *ca.* 35. Tib. *cap.* 61. Cal. *cap.* 16."[180] However much critics and Cordus would claim he does not parallel; when he first speaks he does just that, and his parallels are subversive:

> I thought once,
> Considering their Formes, Age, Manner of deathes,
> The nearnesse of the places, where they fell,
> T'haue paralell'd him with great *Alexander*:
> For both were of best feature; of high race,
> Year'd but to thirty, and, in forreyne lands,
> By their owne people, alike made away.[181]

Cordus plays Plutarch, writing the *Parallel Lives* of Germanicus and Alexander. Such historiography is the antithesis of Terentius's *normae Polybianae*. Not only does Cordus parallel the times and governments, he does so in the company of an antigovernment faction that does the same. Arruntius openly sets his satiric gaze subversively, condemning Tiberian Rome with parallels (Figure 2):

[e] ARR. Times? the Men,
The Men are not the same: 'Tis we are base,
Poor, and degenerate from th'exalted streine
Of our great Fathers. Where is now the soule
Of God-like *Cato?* He, that durst be good,
When *Cæsar* durst be euil; and had power,
As not to liue his Slave, to die his Master.
Or where the constant *Brutus?* that (being proofe
Against all Charm of benefits) did strike
So braue a blow into the monsters heart
That fought vnkindly) to captiue his countrie?
O they are fled the Light. Those mighty spirites
Lye rak'd up, with their ashes in their vrnes,
And not a sparke of their eternal Fire
Glowes in a present bosome:
. . .
Tis true, that *Cordus* say's,
'Braue Cassius *was the last of all that race.*[182]

[c] *Leg* Suet. Aug. *ca.35.* [d] *Vid.de factiō.* Tac. Ann.*lib.2. pag.39.& lib.4 pa.79* [e] *De* Lu. Aruntio *isto, vid.* Tac. *Ann. lib..pag.6.. & lib.3. pag.60.&* Dion *Rom. Hist.lib.58.*

When he calls for another "God-like *Cato*" or "constant *Brutus,*" Arruntius is comparing Tiberius's imperium to that of Julius Caesar and calling for regicide against a universalized vice – "into the monsters heart." Arruntius confirms Cremutius Cordus the spokesperson for this faction of impotent parallelographers. And all the while, the historic record filling the margin insists that Germanican historiography is subversive parallelography.

In Tacitus and Dio, Terentius receives no mention until the bloody aftermath of Sejanus's fall, and then only in reference to his defence. The Quarto's Terentius is first seen in company with Sejanus, at 1.176, and not heard from until 4.478. Yet the only portrait the margins provide for Terentius comes at 1.265. "Your Fortune's made vnto you now, *Eudemus*: [a] *Leg.* Terētij *defensionem.* Tac. *Annal. li.* 6. *pag.* 102."[183] at this moment in the centred text, Satrius is drawing Eudemus into Sejanus's plot against Drusus. The margins insist that we read Terentius's defence (*Leg.* Terētij *defensionem*) in

Tacitus. Yet, there, Tacitus makes no mention of Eudemus's role in or rewards from the murder of Drusus and only brief mention of Satrius and a little of Sejanus's influence: "anyone intimate with Sejanus, was, for that alone, effectively a friend to Caesar . . . we venerated Satrius and Pomponius; and it was taken as sublime to be known by his freemen and doormen."[184] This little adds nothing to the exhaustive marginal treatment of Sejanus at I.175. Terentius is a character of whom the centre has yet to offer anything, but some manner of association with Sejanus. The margin instructs us to read, *Leg*, Terentius's defence, not to consult it (*cons*), nor to look at it (*vid*); but, then, not having met Terentius, there is little upon which to deliberate. So we read it and store it away. Terentius presents his defence a year after Sejanus's trial and execution. In his defence Terentius relates a brief point by point history of the facts surrounding Sejanus's rise and fall, from "the colleague of his father, commanding the praetorian cohorts, soon discharging civil and military functions together" to "treason toward the state and plots of murder against the emperor."[185] In Tacitus's estimation, the plain honesty of Terentius's defence distinguishes him from both Germanicans and opportunists.[186] Terentius admits to his former friendship with Sejanus as an historic fact,[187] although he was not one who participated in Sejanus's crimes.[188] He offers no speculation, no rumour. In contrast with Germanican historiography, for the non-evaluative historian there is no speculation upon cause, no inside story behind Sejanus's rise, no adjustment or embellishment. Tiberius is Caesar; all power rests with Caesar; Sejanus rose to power; Caesar granted that power. The historic record and, therefore, the composite bear out that estimation. Tacitus's Sejanus is the conniving master villain who skillfully manipulates Tiberius in an

unfaltering rush for the height of Roman power. But ever surfacing beside Tacitus's master villain is Suetonius's Sejanus, puppet to the Machiavellian Tiberius. In Dio, Tiberius sets Sejanus in power as his "support and assistance." Critics diverge in their assessments of this relationship. Maus sees Sejanus as the tool or instrument of the satire, as the creative servant, another Mosca or Face, duping his patron Tiberius.[189] Barton sees the relationship more in terms of the puppet/puppet master, with Tiberius as the puppet master.[190] Terentius places responsibility for Sejanus and all his atrocities firmly in Tiberius's lap. Tiberius made Sejanus a partner in his consulate (*tui consulatus*) and Tiberius allowed Sejanus to administer his offices (*tua officia*). In this pileup of possessives Terentius makes manifest that it was not merely Sejanus's plans for ascendency that brought so much grief to Rome; Sejanus's power and honour were granted him by Tiberius (*ex te*).[191] One line before Terentius first steps upon the stage, in their deftest feat of Polybian panoptics, the margins insist that what will become Terentius's version of history is the unvarnished truth: "ᵉ *De* Seiano. *vid.* Tacit. *Annal. l.* 1. *pag.* 9. *l.* 4. *princip et per tot*. Suet. Tib. Dion. *lib.* 57 & 58. Plin. et Senec."[192] This note represents the most monumental task set by Jonson's margins. The task, once all the entries are traced, requires the reading/translation of well over 5,000 words. Of course, tracing the entries is made significantly easier by the exhaustive appendices of scholarly humanist texts. This labor is rewarded when most of these excerpts are called upon again and again as the Quarto proceeds. Out of these 5,000 words, Jonson's margins construct a Sejanus in the full detail offered by the historic record. In the centre, Sejanus is self-serving. In the composite Sejanus serves Tiberius. Tiberius not Sejanus would have made

Eudemus's fortune once his bothersome son were dead. Before he even speaks, Terentius lifts Sejanus's veil and confirms him infected by self-delusion.

In placing Terentius's defence at *Sejanus*'s beginning, the Quarto is spoiling its ending. But it assures that its lesson will be at hand as events unfold. Those lessons are on a manner of living as well as a manner of writing history. The success of Terentius's defence – he is set free, and his accusers are put to death[193] – suggests that his mode of living and his mode of historiography please those who rule. Terentius is not merely a corrective model of the efficacious historiographer; he is the corrective model of survival in a state ruled by tyrants and stalled by impotence and grasping. Neither "the good-dull-noble Lookers on,"[194] the impotent idealists who vainly waste their words and lives on politic parallelography and Juvenalian rants, nor the shifting, incontinent opportunists survive. Survival in Tiberian Rome is reserved for the disinterested witness of events who can remain aloof from factions, study from without, live within, and both see and report upon the world as it is. Terentius is the model of efficacious action. As Sejanus's associate, Terentius's choices are not, by association, virtuous – the virtuous Roman would have killed the tyrants – yet he neither flatters nor commits crimes for Sejanus. His choices are pragmatic: he befriended Sejanus because Tiberius befriended Sejanus. "For surely it is [Terentius's] to cherish all whom [Tiberius] honours."[195] In Terentius's Rome, being Sejanus's friend is better than being his appliance, his enemy, his flatterer, or his fool. In the terms of the composite text, this ability to survive renders Terentius a character to watch.

It is Terentius, the pragmatist, with whom Jonson closes the play, to whom he gives the concluding *sententia*: "For whom the Morning saw so great, and high, / Thus low, and little, 'fore the 'Even doth lye."[196] Compare Terentius's lines with *Thyestes*' third Choral Ode: "whom the coming day sees proud, the fleeing days sees lying low."[197] Although never cited, *Thyestes* plays an foundational role in the tragedy that Jonson constructs out of *Sejanus*'s final act. This role is first felt at 5.5-6 – "But this, and gripe my wishes. ᶜ Great, and high, / The world knowes onely two, that's *Rome* and I" – then confirmed at 5.7-9 – with the debt of "my Roof receiues not; 'tis aire I tread:/ And, at each step, I feele my aduanced head/ Knock out a starre in Heau'n!" to Seneca's "I walk equal to the stars, and I advance above everything,/ Knocking the high heavens with my lofty head."[198] Jonson then concludes the act and play with the third choral ode.[199] In giving this ode to Terentius, the Quarto lends its Polybian witness a nonparallel insight into the workings of the world. Employing a complex diachronic itinerary, Terentius invokes *Thyestes*' third choral ode's response to the peace promised by the seeming rapprochement of Atreus and Thyestes. As this unique Chorus is sure that the contagion plaguing the *domus Pelopiae* will find no end in this reconciliation, so Terentius the Polybian historian knows that the events he reports defy historic *telos*: the very species of self-delusion that characterised Sejanus's reign of terror will assure that another will rise to take his place. The historic record filling the Quarto's final pages bears him out. Only those who choose to learn from the motives and circumstances of these events can avoid their repetition, and only those who follow Terentius's pragmatic model can survive in such a world.

When he first speaks, Terentius takes up the role of the Polybian historian, a witness of events not a participant in them.[200] Contradictory letters regarding Sejanus's position have been arriving from Tiberius. The "*Heliotrope*" opportunists debate upon those letters' meaning, wishing they knew whom Tiberius "loues or hates" so that they "might follow, without feare, or doubt."[201] They are unwilling to see guile in contradiction. While it seems that they have not seen the actual letters,[202] this does not excuse these satellites who drift about the halls of Roman power from embracing self-delusion. In a stroke of composite-textual irony, Arruntius nicely sums up the opportunists' motivation: "How easily,/ Do wretched men beleeue what they would haue!"[203] This summation contains all the tragedy and satire in *Sejanus*. The opportunists greet Terentius, stepping into this scene, as one whom they assume to be well informed: "Here comes *Terentius*. He can giue vs more."[204] And then they confer with him in conspiratorial whispers. Terentius, befitting his role as the Polybian historiographer, bears the very letters with him. In the centred text, Laco asks Terentius for confirmation of the rumoured news he had just brought to Minutius and Pomponius. Terentius does not address rumour but provides the historic detail. When Dio's historic account is set beside Terentius's report, the margins testify to the historicity of his account:

[a] Dio.*Hist. Rom.lib.58 pag,718.*

LAC But is that true, it'tis [a] prohibited
To sacrifice vnto him? TER. Some such thing
Cæsar makes scruple of, but forbids it not;
No more then to himselfe: sayes, he could wish
It were forborne to all.[205]

Moreover he decreed that no human was to be sacrificed to (as matters stood, it was customary to make sacrifices to Sejanus) and that nothing further be voted to his own honour (inasmuch as much had been voted to bedeck Sejanus). This prohibition existed before this. Now it was renewed

> against Sejanus: for Tiberius would not assent to that for another that he would not permit to himself.[206]

Terentius reports the detail of Tiberius's letter. He offers no speculation on motivation behind these contradictory letters. Terentius's unwillingness to speculate sits in contrast to the astute speculation Lepidus offers Arruntius.[207] Terentius is merely reporting from the evidence at hand. The composite increases the sense of the opportunists' self-delusion. While the opportunists miss the craft of letters they now hold in their hands, Lepidus is able to extrapolate the truth from reports and rumour. With the next note Jonson confirms that Terentius reports, and Laco formulates upon, the full evidence presented in Dio.

The final two notes on this page treat Sejanus's reaction to Caligula's popularity in Rome, not his escape to Capreae, as the superscript suggests it would. Suetonius would have supplied this expectation, although in Suetonius there is no Macro in this "escape"; Caligula was *accitus Capreas a Tiberio*, "summoned to Capreae by Tiberius."[208] Terentius's response to Pomponius's query, reflecting Dio's record, attests to his closeness to Sejanus's counsels:

> POM. Takes he well [c] th'escape
> [c] Dio. *pag.* 717. Of young *Caligula,* with *Macro*? TER. Faith,
> At the first ayre, it somewhat mated him.
> (LEP. Obserue you? ARR. Nothing. Riddles. Till I see
> *Seianus* stroocke, no sound thereof strikes me.)
> [d] Dio. *ibid.* POM. I like it not. I muse h'would not attempt
> Somewhat [d] against him in the *Consulship,*
> Seeing the people'ginne to fauour him.
> TER. He doth repent it, now.[209]

Terentrius is reporting things as witnessed by a disinterested observer, not as by a fawning zealot. In fact, as Dio records, what zeal he did show in his friendship with

Sejanus was out of a sense of duty to Tiberius.[210] There is a discontinuity between the emotion Dio records and the tone in Terentius's report. Compare the treatment of this moment the margins offer out of Dio: "And previously thinking that the people too favoured his side, once he understood their zeal for Gaius, it distressed him; he was seized by regret that he had not attempted somewhat in the consulship."[211] This discontinuity suggests Terentius is not relating Sejanus's words or thoughts, but simply reporting what slipped out of Sejanus's otherwise guarded countenance. Part of the *normae Polybianae* is being present when things happen. As the composite affirms, Terentius is decidedly not one of Sejanus's opportunistic minions, despite the company he keeps.

When Terentius next appears, in Act 5, Sejanus himself confirms Terentius the Quarto's historiographic corrective, the disinterested and pragmatic witness of events. Terentius continues to fulfil his part as the faithful reporter of events, now to Sejanus. Terentius, Satrius, and Natta bring news of the various portents that are foretelling Sejanus's fall. When Terentius delivers the first portent, seven notes attest to the historic accuracy of these omens. Yet at this key point in the building tragedy, the confluence of the historic record and dramatic dialogue also divulges that Sejanus's witty indifference is but the nervous bluster of a disturbed mind. When the pragmatic Terentius is momentarily overcome by Sejanus's feigned aplomb, Sejanus's anxiety comes to the surface in a show of unguarded surprise, that this neutral reporter of facts would speculate upon cause: "What! and you too, *Terentius*?"[212]

Out of these historically realized portraits of Arruntius and Silius together with those of each of their fellows, founded upon the same Polybian impulses that eventuated in the composite's historiographic realism, Jonson employed his margins to emphasize the small matter behind historic events. In doing so he creates psychological realism out of the historic record. Out of these same margins Jonson invokes Terentius as his ideal historiographer. Receiving so little treatment in the historic record, Terentius is perhaps the perfect location for Jonson to situate his one adjustment to the historic record. These may seem to be lofty claims for marginal annotation. From our current textual perspective, marginalia, footnotes, and commentaries have moved to the periphery of meaning and too far into the paratext to accomplish so much. Chapter 3 strives to recreate the Quarto's bibliographical and reading context so that the modern reader might view its margins as the early-modern reader did.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. This excerpt is from the dedicatory epistle to Prince Charles (*The Liues of the III. Normans, Kings of England William the First. William the Second. Henrie the First* [London: R. Barker, 1613] A2r-2v; STC 13000).

2. Worden offers this list of historiographic goals in his helpful article treating the shared labours of Renaissance historians and poets ("Historians and Poets," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1-2 [2005]: 71-93).

3. *The two bookes of Sr. Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and aduancement of learning, diuine and humane To the King* (London: Henrie Tomes, 1605) Book II, 92; STC 1164.

4. I have commandeered Nietzsche's comment on philosophy to clarify my point on historiography: "I accordingly do not believe a 'drive to knowledge' to be the father of philosophy, but that another drive has, here as elsewhere, only employed knowledge (and false knowledge) as a tool" (Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil,* ed. Robert Baldrick, Betty Radice, and C. A. Jones [Baltimore: Penguin, 1973] 19).

5. Wayne A. Rebhorn provides a cogent summary of this argument in the case of Shakespeare's contemporary readers and, in doing so, of critics since ("The Crisis of the

Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*" *Renaissance Quarterly*, 43.1 [1990]: 75-111, 80 *et passim*).

6. *The Works of Ben Jonson* III. 8. n.5.

7. xviii.

8. *Sejanus by Ben Jonson* xlviii.

9. *A Transcript of The Stationers' Registers*, III. 677.

10. *Ibid,* III. 678.

11. John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments of John Foxe* 8 Vols., ed. G. Townsend and S. R. Cattley (London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837) 7.405; see also D. Cressy, "Book Burning in Tudor and Stuart England," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 36 (2005): 364.

12. Foxe Vol. 8, 379.

13. Arthur Golding, *A briefe treatise concerning the burnynge of Bucer and Phagius, at Cambrydge, in the tyme of Quene Mary with theyr restitution in the time of our moste gracious souerayne lady that nowe is . . . Translated into Englyshe by Arthur Goldyng* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1562) H1r; STC 3966; see also Cressy 363.

14. A. Walsham, "'Domme Preachers'? Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print," *Past & Present*, 168 (2000): 88.

15. Edward Cardwell ed., *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England* 2 Vols., Oxford: UP, 1844) 1.454; see also P. Hughes and J. Larkin eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations. Volume II. The Later Tudors (1553–1587)* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1969) 474–75.

16. *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* (NY: Cambridge UP, 2000) 104 *et passim*

17. *Satire and Complaint in Early English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) 149-50.

18. *Before Pornography* 104.

19. "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 188-93.

20. William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth* (London: Benjamin Fisher, 1630) 2.109-110; STC 4500.

21. Richard McCabe argues for the bishops' roles as ministers of state ("Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599" 188-93).

22. "*Cuius nomen si Henrici nostri fronte radiaret, ipse et laetior et tutior in vulgus prodiret*" (*The first part of the life and raigne of King Henrie the IIII.* [London: John Woolfe, 1599] A2r; STC 12995). For further helpful discussion on Elizabeth's reaction to this dedication see R. P. Adams, "Despotism, Censorship, and Mirrors of Power Politics in Late Elizabethan Times," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 10 (1979): 5-16, 9–12; and Cressy 366.

23. F. Smith Fussner provides a helpful and detailed discussion of censorship and historical publication (*The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and*

Thought [NY: Columbia UP 1962] 37-44).

24. I owe this detail to A. R. Braunmuller's useful discussion of censorship and historical drama ("King John and Historiography," *ELH*, 55-2 [1988]: 309-332, 311).

25. Richard Mulcaster, *Positions on the training up of Children*, ed. Richard L. DeMolen (NY: Teachers College Press, 1971) 248.

26. Leonard F. Dean presents a detailed discussion of the *Methodus*'s English reception ("'Bodin's 'Methodus' in England before 1625," *Studies in Philology* 39.2 [1942]: 160-66).

27. *The Method and Comprehension of History by Jean Bodin* Trans Beatrice Reynolds (NY: Octagon, 1966) 14.

28. *The Italian Renaissance in England* (NY: Columbia UP, 1905) 309-10.

29. (*The firste [laste] volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande . . .* [London: John Hunne, 1577] 4/a2v, I.2, 20.2; STC 13568b).

30. Nennius "The History of The Britons; by Nennius," *The Works of Gildas and Nennius*, ed. and trans. J. A. Giles (London: James Bohn, 1841), second collation i-xliv & 1-43, II.3.

31. John L. Brown provides a brief discussion of the impact of Augustine's *Ciuitas Dei* and its theocentric world view on the conception of historiography in the Middle Ages (*The Methodus ad Historiarum Cognitionem of Jean Bodin: A Critical Study*. [DC: Catholic UP, 1939] 51-52.

32. Eugene Mason provides an informative discussion of the politics and personalities of Monmouth, Wace, and Layamon in the Arthurian tradition (*Arthurian Chronicles: Roman de Brut by Wace*, ed. Eugene Mason [Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Electronic Press, 2007] 14-15).

33. *Geoffrey of Monmouth: The History of the Kings of Britain*, ed. Michael D. Reeve, trans. Neil Wright (Woodbridge UK: Boydell & Brewer, 2007) 145, VII. III. J. P. D.

34. Cooper provides a lengthy discussion of Tudor claims to this myth (*Propaganda and the Tudor State* [Oxford: Clarendon, 2003] 107-09).

35. *Chronicles* 10[7]/A[a]4r, I.3, 10.1.

36. Annabel Patterson suggests one such debt in the anecdote of William Rufus and the three shilling hose (*Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* [Chicago: UP, 1994] 44).

37. "Conversations" 8.

38. Leonard F. Dean *Tudor Theories of Historiography* (Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1947), 176.

39. Mark Philips provides a helpful discussion of the transition from lives to Chronicles ("Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and the Tradition of Vernacular Historiography in Florence" *The American Historical Review* 84.1 [1979]: 86-104, 86-88).

40. Miller, "Style and Content in Tacitus" 113-14; see also Butler, "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources" 152.

41. Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation* 53.

42. "Style and Content in Tacitus," 113.

43. Schellhase, *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought*, 158.

44. Burke provides insight into this and other contemporary examples of political applications of Tacitus ("Tacitism" 160-2).

45. Tricomi, *Anticourt Drama* 73-4.

46. George B. Parkes offers this date as the *ante quo non* for the revival of English interest in Italian. Parkes provides a very informative discussion of the early influence of Machiavelli and Italian humanism on such English humanists as Thomas Cromwell, Thomas Wyatt, and Thomas Elyot ("The Genesis of Tudor Interest in Italian," *PMLA* 77.5 [1962]: 529-35, 530-34. Much of what follows is tangentially indebted to Parkes.

47. Sydney Angelo, *Machiavelli – The First Century* (Oxford: UP, 2009) 354.

48. Cyndia Susan Clegg mentions Machiavelli's circulation in manuscript in discussing the influences of *The Prince* on John Stubbs's *Gaping Gulf* (*Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* [Cambridge: UP, 1997] 10-31.

49. Angelo, *Machiavelli* 183.

50. Peter E. Bondanella offers this detail (*The Prince and The Discourses on Livi. By Nicolo Machiavelli* [Oxford: UP, 2005] xix).

51. Gisela Bock offers a helpful discussion of Machiavelli's thoughts on civil discord "Civil Discord in Machiavelli's *Istorie Fiorentine*," *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, ed. Gisela Bock, Quentin Skinner, and Maurizio Viroli [Cambridge: UP, 1990] 181-201).

52. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Florentine historie. Written in the Italian tongue, by Nicholo Macchiavelli, citizen and secretarie of Florence,* trans. *T.B.* (London: William Ponsonby, 1595) A3r; STC 17162.

53. F. Smith Fussner suggests that Chronicles such as Holinshed's were the locus of praise, moral encouragement, and warnings against vicious behavior, not of cause and the complex motivations upon which character is built (*Tudor History* 261-65).

54. In this assessment of Machiavelli's attempts at psychological realism, I am indebted to Mark Philips ("Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and the Tradition of Vernacular Historiography" 94-95). Much of what follows is indebted to this article and, if not in detail, in spirit to his "Barefoot Boy Makes Good: A Study of Machiavelli's Historiography" *Speculum* 59-3 (1984): 85-605.

55. I borrow this anecdote from Mark Philips' discussion of the morphology of Florentine historiography in "Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and the Tradition of Vernacular Historiography" 92.

56. *Advancement of Learning* 9/C3v, II.4.

57. Again I am here indebted to Mark Philips, "Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and the Tradition of Vernacular Historiography" 95-98.

58. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. George Bull (NY: Penguin, 1999), 2. The first English translation of *The Prince* was published after the scope of this research, in Daniel Pakeman's 1640 edition.

59. *Ibid.*

60. *Ibid.* 72.

61. The exemplar is from Livy XXXV. 48-49. The Latin quotation is adjusted out of Livy's *nam quod optimum esse dicunt, non interponi uos bello, nihil immo tam alienum rebus uestris est: quippe sine gratia, sine dignitate praemium uictoris eritis.*

62. *Quod autem isti dicunt non interponendi vos bello, nihil magis alienum rebus vestris est: sine gratia, sine dignitate, praemium victoris eritis* (*The Prince* 73).

63. *The Prince* 72.

64. Parkes 531. Elyot's only acknowledged debt is to Erasmus's *Institutio Principis Christiani* (*The Book Named the Governor* fol 42r/F2r).

62. *Ibid.* fol 247r/V5r.

66. This list is indebted to D. T. Starnes' influential discussion of universal historiography in the Renaissance ("Purpose in the Writing of History," *Modern Philology* 20.30 [1923]: 281-300, 293).

67. *Anticourt Drama* 77. I offer a more thorough discussion of the critical assessments of Jonson's historiography in my introduction. For two concise treatments of the most common terms of Jonson's supposed parallelography, I would point the interested reader to Richard Dutton's *Mastering the Revels* 10ff & 171; and Annabel Patterson's "'*Roman-cast Similitude,*'381-86.

68. Arnaldo Momigliano, *Storia e Letteratura Raccolta di Studi e Testi 149: Sesto Contributo Alla Storia Degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico* Vol 1. (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1980) 119.

69. *The hystories of the most famous and worthy cronographer Polybius discoursing of the warres betwixt the Romanes Carthaginenses, a riche and goodly worke, conteining holsome counsels wonderfull deuises against the incombrances of fickle fortune,* trans. C. W. (London: Thomas Hacket, 1568); STC 20097.

70. McPherson *ad loc.*

71. I borrow this term from the title of Ubertto Foglietta's influential discussion of Polybius (*De ratione scribendæ historiæ. De similitudine normae Polybianae* [Frankfurt: Joannes Jurist, 1579]).

72. J. H. M. Salmon provides a brief but informative discussion of the influence of Polybius and the *normae Polybianae* in late sixteenth-century England, "Precept, example, and truth: Degory Wheare and the *ars historica*" *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Donald R. Kelly and David Harris Sacks, (Cambridge: UP,

1997) 11-36, 13-15.

73. Polybius, *The Histories* Vol.I, trans. W. R. Paton. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1922- 1927) 13, I.4.

74. Peter Burke compiles a very helpful discussion of Polybius's relative popularity and its terms, as well as charts detailing his and other classical historians' publication history ("A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450-1700," *Source, History and Theory* 5.2 [1966] 135-152).

75. Polybius II.7.

76. Leonard F. Dean, "Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-Writing" *ELH* 8.3 (1941): 161-183, 172.

77. "From the Author to the Reader," *Annales the true and royall history of the famous empresse Elizabeth Queene of England France and Ireland &c. True faith's defendresse of diuine renowne and happy memory. Wherein all such memorable things as happened during hir blessed raigne ... are exactly described,* trans. Abraham Darcie (London: Benjamin Fisher, 1625) no signature; STC 4497.

78. "The War on History in Jonson's *Sejanus*" 209-11.

79. Thomas Blundeville, *The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories According to the Precepts of Francisco Patricio, and Accontio Tridentino, Two Italian Writers, No Lesse Plainly than Briefly, Set Forth in Our Vulgar Speach, to the Great Profite and Commoditye of All Those That Delight in Hystories* (London: William Seres, 1574) H4r-v.

80. E4v.

81. "From the Author to the Reader," *Annales* no signature.

82. Bundeville F1r.

83. *Ibid.* B1r.

84. *Ibid.* A4v-B1r.

85. Hugh G. Dick's introduction to Blundeville provides a brief and helpful discussion of Patrizzi's historiographic theories, as drawn from many of his works ("Thomas Blundeville's '*The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories,*'" ed. Hugh G. Dick. *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 3.2 [1940]: 149-70, 149-51).

86. Blundeville C2r.

87. *Ibid.* F2v-3r.

88. *Ibid.* F4r-v.

89. *Ibid.* G1r.

90. *Ibid.* G2v-G3r.

91. *The two bookes of Sr. Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and aduancement of learning, diuine and humane To the King* II. 92-93.

92. *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, . . . and out of French into Englishe, by Thomas North* (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1579) *4r; STC 20065.

93. *The famous and memorable vvorkes of Iosephus, a man of much honour and learning among the Iewes. Faithfully translated out of the Latin, and French, by Tho. Lodge Doctor in Physicke* (London: G. Bishop, S. Waterson, P. Short, and Thomas Adams, 1602) ¶ 3r-3v; STC 14809.

94. *Ibid.* ¶ 3r.

95. *Ibid.* ¶3v.

96. *Ibid.* ¶5r.

97. Much has been written on this relationship. I would refer the interested reader to Marguerite Hearsey's excellent foundational discussion ("Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* and Alyot's *Preface* in North's *Plutarch*: A Relationship," *Studies in Philology* 30.4 [1933]: 535-550, *passim.*

98. McPherson *ad loc.*

99. North *4r.

100. *Ibid.* *5r.

101. *Ibid.*

102. *Ibid.* *4v and *5v.

103. *Ibid.*

104. *Ibid.* *5v-6r.

105. *Ibid.* *7r. Vautroullier's pagination is temporarily interrupted here with the imposition of this unsigned sheet.

106. These details and much of what follows are indebted to M. W. MacCallum's chapter on Plutarch in his seminal and endlessly helpful discussion of Shakespeare's Roman plays (*Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Their Background* [London: MacMillan, 1910] 95-119.

107. John Dryden "The Life of Plutarch," *Critical and miscellaneous prose works, now first collected: with notes and illustration; an account of the life and writings of the author, grounded on original and authentick documents; and a collection of his letters, the greater part of which has never before been published,* ed. Edmond Malone (London: T. Cadell Jr. and W. Davies, 1800) 404.

108. *Ibid.*

109 F. Smith Fussner suggests this figure (*Tudor History and the Historians* [NY: Basic, 1970] 33).

110. "Historians and Poets," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1-2 (2005): 82-83.

111 Smith Fussner provides a helpful discussion of this point in his chapter on the expansion of historiography in Tudor England (*Tudor History* 227-28).

112. *Devil is an Ass*, II.iv.8-15.

113. T. J. B. Spencer's introduction to *Shakespeare's Plutarch* discusses various of these debts (*Shakespeare's Plutarch*, ed. T .J. B. Spencer [Baltimore: Penguin, 1964] 7-19).

114. Robert S. Miola provides an informative discussion of the treat of tyrannicide in *Julius Caesar* ("*Julius Caesar* and the Tyrannicide Debate" *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.2 [1985]: 271-289, *passim*).

115. Wayne A. Rebhorn discusses various potential points of parallelography in *Julius Ceasar* ("The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*" 83ff).

116. Michael Dobson offers a comprehensive survey of *Julius Caesar*'s use by Royalists and Parliamentarians of various stripes ("Accents Yet Unknown: Canonization and the Claiming of *Julius Caesar*," *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth,* ed. Jean I. Maiden [NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991] 11-28).

117. James R. Siemon, "'Word Itself Against the Word': Close Reading After Voloshinov," *Shakespeare Reread: The Texts in New Contexts*, ed. Russ McDonald, (NY: Cornell UP, 1994) 226-258, 239.

118. William and Barbara Rosen eds. *Julius Caesar* (NY: Penguin, 1987) xxi.

119. II.i.192. Spelling and orthography reflect the First Folio edition (*Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies Published According to the True Originall Copies* [London: W. Iaggard, Ed. Blount, I. Smithweeke, and W. Aspley, 1623]; STC 22273). All line numbers are those of the Signet Classic edition (*Julius Caesar,* ed. William and Barbara Rosen [Toronto: Penguin, 1987]).

120. See Wayne A. Rebhorn's "The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*" for an exhaustive discussion of the place of Rome in the Elizabethan social psyche.

121. Clifford Ronan provides a very helpful discussion of the first Roman emperor's place in the Renaissance imagination ("Caesar On and Off the Renaissance Stage," *Julius Caesar: New Critical Essays*, ed. Horst Zander [NY: Routledge, 2005] 71-89).

122. *Caesar* II.ii.126.

123. 794/XXX1v, F, in Plutarch and V.i.53, in Shakespeare.

124. I am indebted to MacCallum for this echo (*Shakespeare's Roman Plays* 168).

125. *Julius Caesar* II.ii.30-31.

126. "The Life of Plutarch" 402-03.

127. *The Gay Science,* ed. Bernard Williams, [Cambridge: UP, 2001] cap. 98.

128. What follows does not intend to treat the number of direct borrowings from nor the scope of Shakespeare's historiographic debt to Plutarch. This work has been done often and well. The interested reader might turn to T. J. B. Spencer's exhaustively collated text

(*Shakespeare's Plutarch*).

129. *Plutarch*, "Brutus" 1055.

130. In fact it was rumored that Caesar was Brutus's father: "Some say [Julius Caesar stayed Brutus's execution after Pharsalia] for *Seruiliaes* sake, *Brutus* mother. For when he was a young man, he had bene acquainted with *Seruilia*, who was extreamelie in loue with him. And bicause *Brutus* was borne in that time when their loue was hottest, he perswaded him selfe that he begat him" (1057/VVVV1r).

131. 1056/TTTT6v.

132. 1057/VVVV1r.

133. 1058/VVVV1v.

134. 1063/VVVV4r.

135. 1068/VVVV6v.

136. 1072/XXXX2v.

137. 1080/XXXX6v.

138. *Julius Caesar* 82.2.

139. I.ii.85-9.

140. I.ii.172-4.

141. II.i.61-69.

142. II.i.77-99.

143. IV.iii.278-96.

144. V.iii.94-96.

145. "Caesar" 794/XXX1v, F.

146. *Julius Caesar* II.1.173-74.

147. II.i.178-79.

148. "Brutus" 1074/XXXX3v.

149. *Julius Caesar* V.i.112-13.

150. Spencer's collated text manifests this increased indebtedness: *ad loc.*

151. C2v.

152. Slights, *Managing* 69.

153. "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*" 184-86; for further discussion on Jonson's adjustments see also Dutton, *Ben Jonson: To the First Folio* 57-59; Barish, *Ben Jonson: Sejanus* 8-9; Martin Butler, "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources," *Re-presenting Ben Jonson: text, history, performance,* ed. Martin Butler (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999) 165; Douglas Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic tradition* (Cambridge: UP, 1979), 140-42; and Miles, *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* 72.

154. Kirk Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses From Lucilius to Juvenal* (Cambridge: UP, 2001), 212-17.

155. *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets,* ed. T. Ashe [London: George Bell and Sons, 1883] 413-14.

156. B2r, 1.875-93.

157. *[Arruntius]divitem, promptum, artibus egregiis et pari fama publice, suspectabat. Quippe Augustus supremis sermonibus, cum tractaret quinam adipisci principem locum suffecturi abnuerent, aut inpares vellent, vel idem possent cuperentque, M. Lepidum dixerat capacem, sed aspernantem, Gallum Asinium avidum et minorem, L. Arruntium non indignum et, si casus daretur, ausurum. . . . omnesque praeter Lepidum variis mox criminibus struente Tiberio circumventi sunt* (6/I.xiii).

158. *L. Arruntius ætate & moribus grauis, mortem sibi consciuit, quanquam iam ægrotante Tiberio, ita vt spes nulla morbo leuatum iri esset: tamen quia Caii malitiam norat, maluit antequam eũ experiretur, vita concedere, non posse se in senectute sua dominũ, eumque talem, ferre dicens* (732.C-D/LVIII.xxvii.4).

159. *Anticourt Drama* 76-77.

160. *Managing Readers* 549.

161. "Roman-cast Similitude," 385-86.

162. *Sejanus* 17-19.

163. B1r, 1.1-9.

164. *Duo apud ripam Rheni exercitus erant: cui nomen superiori sub C. Silio legato. . . quibus Silius moderabatur, mente ambigua fortunam seditionis alienae speculabantur: inferioris exercitus miles in rabiem prolapsus est* (11/I..xxxi).

165. *Silius et Anteius et Caecina fabricandae classi proponuntur* (28/II.vi).

166. *Sed Caesar, dum naves adiguntur, Silium legatum cum expedita manu inruptionem in Chattos facere iubet.*(28-29/II.vii).

167. *C. Silio cum triginta peditum, tribus equitum milibus ire in Chattos imperat* (33/II.xxvi).

168. D4v, 2.285-93.

169. *Silius, etsi praesumpta spes hortandi causas exemerat, clamitabat tamen pudendum ipsis quod Germaniarum victores adversum Gallos tamquam in hostem ducerentur. "una nuper cohors rebellem Turonum, una ala Trevirum, paucae huius ipsius exercitus turmae profligavere Sequanos* (Tacitus 63/III.xlvi).

170. *C. Silium et Titium Sabinum adgreditur. Amicitia Germanici perniciosa utrique; Silio et quod ingentis exercitus septem per annos moderator partisque apud Germaniam triumphalibus Sacroviriani belli victor, quanto maiore mole procideret, plus formidinis in alios dispergebatur. Credebant plerique auctam offensionem ipsius intemperantia, immodice iactantis suum militem in obsequio duravisse cum alii ad seditiones*

prolaberentur; neque mansurum Tiberio imperium si iis quoque legionibus cupido novandi fuisset (*Ibid.* xviii).

171. E4r, 3.9-13.

172. *nec dubie repetundarum criminibus haerebant, sed cuncta quaestione maiestatis exercita, et Silius imminentem damnationem voluntario fine praevertit* (79/IV.xix).

173. *Sejanus* III.16.

174. F2r/3.182.

175. *Igitur multa adseveratione, quasi aut legibus cum Silio ageretur aut Varro consul aut illud res publica esset, coguntur patres. Silente reo, vel si defensionem coeptaret, non occultante cuius ira premeretur, conscientia belli Sacrovir diu dissimulatus, victoria per avaritiam foedata et uxor socia arguebantur. Nec dubie repetundarum criminibus haerebant, sed cuncta quaestione maiestatis exercita, et Silius imminentem damnationem voluntario fine praevertit* (79/IV.xix).

176. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable" 272.

177. *Sejanus* F2r/3.169-71.

178. E1r, 1.310-11.

179. "SIL. [g] *Satrius Secundus*, and [h] *Pinnarius Natta*,": [g] De Satrio Secundo, & [h] Pinnario Natta. *Leg* Tacit. *Annal. lib.* 4. *pag.* 83. *Et de* Satrio. *cons.* Seneca. *Cōsol ad Marciam* (B1r, 1.22).

180. B2r, 1.73.

181. B2v, 136-42.

182. B2r, 1.85-109.

183. D4v.

184. *Illius propinqui et adfines honoribus augebantur; ut quisque Seiano intimus ita ad Caesaris amicitiam validus . . . Satrium atque Pomponium venerabamur; libertis quoque ac ianitoribus eius notescere pro magnifico accipiebatur* (102-103/VI.viii).

185. *Videram collegam patris regendis praetoriis cohortibus, mox urbis et militiae munis simul obeuntem.. . . Insidiae in rem publicam, consilia caedis adversum imperatorem* (Tacitus 103/VI.viii).

186. *Nam ea tempestate qua Seiani amicitiam ceteri falso exuerant ausus est eques Romanus M. Terentius, ob id reus, amplecti* (*Ibid.*).

187. *Fortunae quidem meae fortasse minus expediat adgnoscere crimen quam abnuere: sed utcumque casura res est, fatebor et fuisse me Seiano amicum* (*Ibid.*).

188. *cunctos qui novissimi consilii expertes fuimus meo unius discrimine defendam* (*Ibid.*).

189. Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind*, 7. See also Burton, 105; and Pebworth and Summers, 115.

190. Anne Burton, *Ben Jonson Dramatist* 104-5. See also Pebworth and Summers, *Ben Jonson Revised* 16; Jongsook Lee, *Ben Jonson's Poesis* 19; and Arthur F. Marotti, "The Self-Reflexive Art of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*" 209.

191. *Non enim Seianum Vulsiniensem set Claudiae et Iuliae domus partem, quas adfinitate occupaverat, tuum, Caesar, generum, tui consulatus socium, tua officia in re publica capessentem colebamus. non est nostrum aestimare quem supra ceteros et quibus de causis extollas: tibi summum rerum iudicium di dedere, nobis obsequii gloria relicta est* (*Ibid.* 103/VI.viii).

192. B3r, 1.175.

193. Dio 726.C/LVIII.19.5.

194. E4r, 3.16.

195. Dio records Terentius's defense in these terms (Dio 726.B-C/LVIII.19.3-4).

196. N2r, 5.912-13.

197. *quem dies vidit veniens superbum, hunc dies vidit fugiens iacentem* (L. Annaeus Seneca, *Thyestes*, ed. R. J. Tarrant [Atlanta: Scholars, 1998] 614-5).

198. *Aequalis astris gradior et cunctos super/ altum superbo vertice attingens polum* (*Thyestes,* 885-86).

199. Brock MacLeod discusses the *Thyestes* in *Sejanus*'s concluding line ("An Unacknowledged Debt to Seneca in the Quarto *Sejanus,*" *Notes and Queries* 50.4 [2003] 427).

200. I4v, 4.478.

201. I3v, 4.424-45.

202. "But there are Letters come (they say) eu'n now" (I4r, 4.436).

203. I4v, 4.492.

204. I4.r, 4.445.

205. I4v, 4.485-89.

206. *edixisset etiam ne cui homini sacrificaretur, (atqui Seiano res sacra fieri solebat) néue in suum honorem quiquā decerneretur (quippe multa Seiano decernebantur) quod iam antè interdictum, tum propter Seianum repetebatur: neque enim id concessurus alteri erat Tiberius quod sibi ipsi nō permisisset* (718.A/LVIII.8.4).

207. I4r-v, 4.446-72.

208. Tranquillus Suetonius *Suetonius* 2 Vols, ed. and trans. J. D. Rolfe (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1951) *Gaius Caligula* X.1.

209. I4v-K1r 4.501-08.

210. *vt ostenderit maximo se eum studio coluisse, quem ipse Tiberius in tanto habuerit honore* (Dio 726.B/LVIII.19.3).

211. *& prius opinatus populum quoque suis rebus fauere, postquā tum sensit eos Caii studiosos, ægrè tulit, pœnitentiáque correptus est, quòd non in consulatu aliquid conatus esset* (Dio 717.E/LVIII.8.3).

212. K1v, 5.48.

CHAPTER 3: MARGINALIA AND THE BELEAGUERED TEXT, AN OVERVIEW

As for example, when thou treatest of liberty and thraldom, thou mayest cite that non bene pro toto libertas venditur auro: *& presently quote* Horace, *or whosoever said it on the margent!*[1]

— Miguel de Cervantes, Thomas Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote.*

Following upon the treatment in Chapter 2 of the Quarto's historiography and the key function the margins play in that historiography, the primary work of the next three chapters is to show that Jonson's ideal reader was meant to read the Quarto's margins and access their sources. The purpose of these chapters is twofold. The first argument is that, while the Renaissance author or editor could choose from a broad range of marginating functions with which to provide the reader with instruction or information, the Renaissance reader had little choice but to read and consider all parts of the marginated page, to attend to the margins and to what the marginator intends. The second argument is that, composed at the very ebb of the vogue for margination, the Quarto reimagines margination in the same way that it reimagines historiography. This twofold purpose allows for a discussion of the dynamics of a Renaissance marginated text – how the centre and margins interact.

In this chapter, I begin with a brief account of Renaissance marginalia's history from its nascence in Roman law, through its crescence in Mediaeval Scholasticism, to its recession in the late Renaissance. The marginated page, ca. 1605, knew the lows of the Mediaeval model's programmatics and the heights of humanist optimism's potential. Scholarly pretense had also found its way into the margins. Integral to this discussion is

marginalia's reception, how Renaissance educators taught readers to conceive of and consume these texts.

In Chapter 4, I offer an anatomization of Renaissance marginalia: what are their forms and functions, and what about those forms and functions caused readers to mistrust the marginated page. I examine two contemporary texts: Matthew Gwinne's 1603 quarto *Nero* and John Harington's 1591 folio translation of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*. Jonson seems to have been intimately familiar with Harington's *Orlando*. In the *Conversations*, Drummond is silent on Jonson's reaction to the notes but recalls Jonson commenting "that Iohn Haringtones Ariosto, under all translations was the worst."[2] Given the academic environment in which he had been composing, Jonson likely knew Gwinne's *Nero*. A prolific neo-Latinist, lecturer, and physician *cum* playwright, Matthew Gwinne published a striking parallel in his *Nero*. Gwinne's is a Roman play, heavily and patently indebted to the very historians to which *Sejanus* is so indebted. *Nero* is printed in a marginated quarto, although its margination is sparse in comparison to that of *Sejanus*, rarely exhibiting more than four or five single-line citations per page and rarely citing page or chapter, with the exception of those notes referencing Tacitus. Finally, Gwinne's play was written entirely in Latin and never performed. Despite these differences, it is tempting to speculate upon the potential influence of Gwinne's quarto upon Jonson's. Had Jonson not come across *Nero* as a matter of course, Blount, *Nero*'s publisher, would likely have brought it to Jonson's attention when the playwright and his original publisher first entered into discussion over *Sejanus*. These extensively marginated texts anticipate many of the Quarto's marginal maneuvers. Gwinne's *Nero* is a Latin Roman tragedy

assembled from the historic record. Gwinne's notes are appropriate to an academic historic drama; they are concerned mainly with amplifying annotation – citing sources. Harington's marginalia employ a fuller range of marginating functions; the most interesting notes are those which co-opt Ariosto's original satiric intentions. *Nero* and *Orlando* exhibit both the ideal and the abuses of late-Renaissance marginalia. In Chapter 5, I argue that Jonson's Polybian Quarto addresses both, whether or not it intends them. In doing so, I present a taxonomy of the Quarto's marginal functions together with concrete examples from the interplay of margins and centred text. The Quarto's marginalia assert their inexpendability. The centred text alone cannot contain Jonson's innovation in a genre usually circumscribed by the fear that readers will search for application.

ANNOTATION: THE ROMAN FOUNT

Marginal annotation boasts the most solemn origins. Yet, as early as 1528, a critic could consider marginalia in terms of a patching with fetid plasters and reeking poultices: *foedis emplastris olidisque malagmatis margini adsarcinatis horridus.* E. J. Kenney, from whom I took this quotation, suggests that printer Eucharis Cervicornus's criticism was aesthetic not scholarly.[3] In his 1523 *Livy*, Cervicornus offers this comment in reaction to Josse Bade's extensive use of asterisks to signal the textual corruptions discussed in the notes to his 1516 *Livy*. Ostensibly a helpful guide to reading, Bade's curatives were deemed worse than the errors they hoped to redress. I agree that Cervicornus' terms insist that the asterisks' physical (visual) presence on the text page inspires this complaint. I would, however, argue that these terms are too much like those of many complaints

leveled at the marginated page to have been chosen on purely aesthetic grounds: a wound of some sort inevitably festers beneath each plaster and poultice. Readers had begun to judge the marginated page in general by its abusers – primarily those abusers who attempted to control the reading process but also those who were inspired by the market to dress their texts with marginalia. Cervicornus's is far from an isolated opinion.

Although the suspect annotation inhabiting the margins of Renaissance texts grew out of the manuscript commentaries and annotations of twelfth-century Scholasticism, marginal notation finds its origins in Hellenistic commentaries by way of ancient Rome. Although they seem to have played only a tangential role in the constitution of the Mediaeval or Renaissance marginated page, freestanding commentaries predated the Roman models by at least 300 years.[4] Glosses, annotations, citations, and commentaries in their Mediaeval or Renaissance forms do not appear in the margins of ancient texts, but Rome's grammarians, rhetoricians, emperors, jurists, and historians provide the seeds of marginalia's composite parts and terms. Holding Varro and Quintilian as their grammatical and scholarly models, Mediaeval scholastic commentators, and the Renaissance scholiasts whom they engendered, included glosses within their margins.[5] Quintilian calls obsolete or foreign words requiring explanation *Glossa*/γλῶσσα or *glossema*/γλῶσσημα; thus, Quintilian's *glossemata* and Varro's *glossae* are collections of such words and their explanations.[6] In his discussion of the *glossographi* who composed the texts of Naevius's comedies, Varro suggests the practice of providing interlinear glosses upon the text page: *in Demetrio "persibus" a perite: itaque sub hoc glossema "callide" subscribunt* (In the *Demetrius* "very skillfully," from skillfully; and

beneath this rare word they write "cleverly").[7] Quintilian affirms the necessity of such glosses in learning to read: *Circa glossemata etiam, id est voces minus usitatas, non ultima eius professionis diligentia est* (Concerning the glossemata, that is words not in common use, the teacher must employ extraordinary diligence).[8] With the paucity of textual relics, there is no way to say conclusively whether ancient writers weighted their margins with these glosses.[9] Having said this, ancient grammarians expressed the need for such glosses to be at hand as aids to textual understanding – whether in a separate text or on the page itself.

The ancient origin of annotation/*annotatio* has intriguing implications for Mediaeval margins. In post-Augustan Rome, *annotatio* was the writing down of an observation or comment; the *annotator* was one who observes and comments. The originating act of scholastic annotation was in the sense of *annotatio* as the note or rescript by which a Roman Emperor would amend or assign laws upon senatorial edicts.[10] These imperial autographs in purple ink were decrees, often arbitrary ones, that neither sought nor required senatorial ratification.[11] Annotation was associated with absolute imperative in disregard of general interpretation or approval. As a Mediaeval king's authority could be proxied by his portrait, the purple *annotatio* itself came to represent the unembodied imperial power to dictate. Roman sources also provide for the impulse to furnish intra-textual annotations. Ancient historiographers included statements regarding sources in their histories. In his *Annals*, Tacitus ties the selection of evidence to historiographic integrity and the historian's social role:

By no means have I undertaken to enumerate senatorial declarations

> except those distinguished by honesty or notable in their infamy; which I believe is the special function of history, lest virtuous deeds should be kept silent by vicious words and deeds; and let history be a terror to posterity and infamy.[12]

Citing sources by chapter and page number, fourth- and fifth-century legal texts present another potential source of medieval procedures for citing methods of research and inter-textual discussions of evidence.[13]

ANNOTATION: SCHOLASTIC PROGRAMMATICS

Over the centuries in which Mediaeval Scholasticism was developing marginalia, the practices of reading, text production, and education were inseparable. The potentials of utility and danger inherent in reading were the combined force that set the unified trajectory of all three practices. Roman Catholic determinism decided the terms of that trajectory. With the twelfth- and thirteenth-century emergence of degree granting universities, under the aegis of the Catholic Church, reading experienced a shift from monastic to scholastic practices. Reading in the monastic culture was individual or at least intimate: spiritual or philosophical meaning was drawn from an unmediated text through contemplative consumption and excogitation. As a process productive of meaning, meditative thinking was communing with the Bible's spiritual marrow. Constituent of the twelfth-century shift in education and reading was a shift in the processes of thinking: early Mediaeval monasticism's intimate conversational process gave way to the ratiocinative examination of scholastic *lectio*. *Lectio* is reading aloud, or lecturing, perusing and gathering, or selecting.[14] Thinking became a process of reasoned

collection and assembly. Readers no longer conceived of the Bible itself as an autonomous authority. They consulted academic and theological texts as potential references. A scholastic metatext tailored to the purposes of Catholic determinism supplanted individual textual authority.[15]

With these shifts in reading and thinking came the new potential of social consequences. Monastic reading had been confined to a coterie of cloistered individuals reading to themselves for themselves. However subversive the suppositions born out of meditative reading might have been, those suppositions held little potential to impact the *status quo*. Such reading necessitated no extra-textual authority. With the advent of universities, reading/thinking became public. Whereas harmonious suppositions could serve God's commonwealth, subversive suppositions could – and would – ignite a conflagration. To borrow an apt figure from Anthony Grafton, "some annotators see the scriptures as a bomb that may go off if roughly handled by ordinary people, others as a bulwark to theological and social order."[16] As a result of these potentials, the text itself changed: the very *mise-en-page* shifted to make room for all the apparatus necessary to academic reading. Reading before or by a wider audience required the control of acknowledged authorities who could help to define answers as well as questions. The unmediated Bible came under the sway of extra-textual authorities. Representative of Scholasticism's secular arm, classical texts were edited under the same principle. Nigel Wilson suggests that this editorial relationship goes both ways: "the new arrangement of the commentaries on classical texts is in some way related to the standard form of commentary on the Bible. The history of exegesis of scripture has some analogy to the

history of classical scholarship."[17] With an eye turned to finding the proto-Christian in the pagan author, margins were filled with ancient and modern commentaries.[18]

In the twelfth century, carefully determined extra- or inter-textual meaning was put in place to control reading's byproducts. Marginal annotation began to surround the centred text, as scholastic annotators or writers of glosses began externally defining and refining textual meaning. The most notorious examples of these scholastic glosses are the thirteenth-century *Glossa Ordinaria*, encircling, subduing, and encroaching upon the Bible's text. These twelfth-century scholastic texts were not the first to provide sources in the margins, but they were the first to organize the various aspects of glosses, commentary, sources, and authority into a formal system.[19] *Glossa ordinaria* is a term well chosen to describe its function: what constitutes a *glossa* is defined by *ordinaria* – "of or belonging to order, orderly; according to the usual order, usual, customary, regular, ordinary" – or, more ominously, as the substantive *ordinarius* – "an overseer who keeps order."[20] The *Glossa Ordinaria* is a weighty collection of patristic and scholastic commentaries that endeavors to mediate meaning. These glosses, inter- and intra-textual references, and centuries-old commentaries crowd the text into a few inches at the centre of the page. The volume of these authorities virtually drowned out the voice of God.[21] In 1526, Henry VIII (then a Catholic) declared Protestant glosses heretical, illustrating the degree to which the forces of convention conceived of these marginal glosses and commentaries as the locus of prescribed interpretation:

> [Luther is accused of instigating] one or two leude persons, borne in this our realme, for the translatyng of the Newe testament in to Englysshe, as well with many corruptions of that holy text, as certayne prefaces, and

> other pestylent gloses in the margentes, for the aduauncement and settyng forthe of his abhomynable heresyes, entendynge to abuse the gode myndes and deuotion, that you oure derely beloued people beare, towards the holy scrypture, and to enfect you with the deedly corruption and contagious odour of his pestylent errours… [Therefore, it is determined that] the sayde corrupte and vntrue translatyons be brenned, with further sharpe correction and punysshment against the kepars and redars of the same.[22]

Here, as in Cervicornus's comment upon Bade's Livy, the language of disease and pestilence is telling. That punishment was to fall upon both the keepers and readers attests to the gloss's power to dictate meaning.

As the third of these inseparable practices, education at the primary level experienced a shift corollary with that from meditative reading to scholastic *lectio*. Teaching the ratiocinative examination defining *lectio* was, in broad terms, the first step toward humanist investigation. Late-Mediaeval teachers attempted to replicate in the schoolroom what they had experienced in the universities. The goal of primary teaching matched that of the universities and their texts: to assure that the Roman church retained control over the production of textual meaning in the face of a broadening reading public. As the annotator impressed scholastic will upon the margins of the page, the teacher impressed that will upon the students. One late-Mediaeval teacher sums up his labours thus:

> Lykwise as birdes gether mete in ther moughtes and part it among the young whan the be lityn oons and not able to helpe them selfe, and after the be waxed bige or rype go a-for them and techee them to cum owt of ther nystes a lityl. . . so good techeres gather smalle rules and latyns and part with them a-mong the yong scolars. . . . And a lityl expound vnto them all the best authores.[23]

In this avian analogy, students are imagined as newborn chicks without the ability to

consume and safely digest their food. The only way of proceeding that protects the student from choking on too much knowledge is for the teacher to predigest and regurgitate information. These "smalle rules and latyns" were gathered from carefully selected and glossed classical and contemporary moralistic and proverbial texts and employed to impart Catholic wisdom and morality. Once fostered on this pabulum and with the teacher's examples of conventional virtue in mind, the stripling students can be trusted to venture out.

Teaching in the late-Mediaeval schoolroom was through lecturing and learning by rote. With the cost of production still prohibitive, the text itself rarely made it into the students' hands. While the margins carefully controlled textual interpretation, the teacher's careful and conspicuous selection dictated textual utility. By these means scholastic teachers controlled access to an expanding body of texts and prescribed how they would be read. The student came to conceive of the text not as unified whole, but as a part of an edifying metatext and as a repository for moral *sententiae*. In the end, Scholasticism's programmatic controls failed to maintain the necessary limits upon access to the metatext. Failing to keep in rein the potentials of the *lectio*'s reasoned scrutiny, Scholasticism would ultimately implode.

ANNOTATION: HUMANIST COMPREHENSION

The rise of reasoned scrutiny that eventuated in scholastic (Roman) determinism and the obfuscating glosses of the *Glossa Ordinaria* and its secular counterparts, which, in turn, resulted in Protestant humanism's hostility towards those glosses. William Tyndale's

1536 *Expositions on Matthew* attacks the scholastic gloss in its preface "Vnto the Reader":

> Here hast thou Deare Reader an Exposicion vnto the.v.vi. and. vii. Chapters of Mathewe. Wherin Christe our spirituall Isaac diggeth agayne the welles of Abraham, which welles the scrybes and phareses, those wyched and spiteful philistines, hade stopped and fylled vp with the erthe of theyr false exposityons, He openeth the kyngdome of heuen which they had shut vp that other men shulde not enter, as they themselues hade no luste to go in. He restoreth the keye of knowledge which they hade taken awaye and broken the wardes with wresting the text contrary to his due and naturall course, with theyr false gloses. He pluckethe awaye from the face of Moyses, the vayle which the scribes and phareses hade spred theron, that no man myght perceaue the bryghtnes of hys countenaunce. He wedeth out the thornes and busshes of theyr pharesaicall gloses, wherewith they hade stopped vp the narowe way and stryt gate, that fewe coude fynde them.[24]

This prefatory epistle asserts that Tyndale's text was to lift the veil of scholastic obfuscation from the scriptures. Echoing the Bible throughout, the epistle's damnation of the *Glossa Ordinaria* figures scholastic marginators not merely as textual impediments to God's word, but as types of the Anti-Christ: they are mud stopping up Abraham's wells (2 Kings 3.19), doors closing the kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 23.13), thieves of the key of knowledge (Luke 11.52), those who place the veil upon Moses's bright countenance (2 Cor. 3.7), thorns that block the strait gate and narrow way (Matt. 7.14). A kind of bibliographic irony threatens Tyndale's text. Despite the Protestant indignation so tangible in Tyndale's attack on scholastic glossators, the *Expositions on Matthew* is marginated with epitomes. Tyndale announces his text's freedom from Roman control; however, he capitalizes on the same mechanism of control. While early Protestant humanists, such as Tyndale, were the primary antagonists of the textual mechanisms of

scholastic control, the broader humanist movement was eager to appropriate the margins. As the reading public grew so did the need to mediate access to the text. Throughout the sixteenth century, the margins would lose little of their power to dictate.

For humanism the practices of reading, text production, and education remained inseparable. The potential utility and danger inherent in reading remained the combined force that determined the unified trajectory of all three. The sixteenth century saw the expansion of secular universities and a concomitant growth of private, state, and civic opportunities for a secular educated class. Scholasticism's Catholic determinism gave way to humanist comprehension. As the notion of textual utility expanded to encompass a broad spectrum of life skills, the notion of what constituted the useful text expanded to comprehend all manner of classical, scholarly, and instructional works.[25] The metatext expanded, and inter-textuality threatened limitless avenues for thought. Humanist margins often attempted to evoke a comprehensive metatext, but too often comprehension was merely an illusion created by the humanist marginator's own version of programmatic control. Once concerned with circumscribing morality, edification and its margins now fostered civil, cultivated citizens.

In humanist England, reading and the thinking it produced were still expected to have practical applications, and reading and thinking were rife with the potential of dangerous suppositions.[26] Stability in the commonwealth demanded that reading remain a process closely guided by an incontestable authority. However, the prohibitive costs of text production continued to keep the marginated text out of reach of most readers. In the grammar schools, teachers remained the vanguard of authority: more often than not the

teacher still held the only copy of the text; therefore, the teacher ensured the text's mediated consumption. The model of reading humanist educators learned and espoused was Erasmus's four-part system. Each passage was read four times: for grammar, rhetoric, inter-textuality, and philosophical purport. This reading process replicated and thus anticipated the marginated text; it taught the student to conceive of reading as a process of searching out noteworthy ideas to fix in the memory. Whether found in the marginated text – with the aid of citations, quotations, epitomes, *maniculae* (☞), or other such deictic markers – or mediated through the teacher, these noteworthy ideas were preselected on grounds of social utility. Thomas Elyot's *The Governor* provides a contemporary rational for the collection and employment of noteworthy ideas as well as an example of deictic preselection:

> Of which to oratours [Demosthenes and Tulli] may be attayned nat onely eloquence excellent and perfecte but also preceptes of wisdome and gentyll maners: with most cōmodious examples of all noble vertues and pollicie. . . . The vtility that a noble man shall haue by redyng these oratours is that whan he shall happe to reason in counsaile or shall speake in a great audience or to strange ambassadours of great princes he shall nat be constrayned to speake wordes sodayne and disordered but shal bestowe them aptly and in their places. Wherefore the moste noble emperour Octauius is highly cōmended for that he neuer spake in the Senate or to the people of Rome but in an oration prepared and purposely made.[27]
>
> *Octauius*

For Elyot, it is paramount that texts be selected in terms of their social utility. Demosthenes and Cicero should be utilized as models of eloquence and as founts of sententious thoughts and phrases; but their primary utility was that their modeled eloquence would serve the state. In a marginating gesture suited to Eylot's Florentine leanings, the epitome, *Octauius,* marks this passage as note-worthy. Such marginal

epitomes are, ostensibly, aids to efficient study; yet over these two and a half pages, primarily discussing Demosthenes and Cicero with a reference to the tyrant Nicocles, only the exemplar of Octavius earns a marginal mark. The lessons of the page are to be learned, but the example of Octavius's prudence has been preselected to be fixed in the memory for future employment.

For students, fixing ideas in the memory was accomplished by way of the commonplace book or Erasmian notebook. The historiographer feeds the notebook, and, in turn, the notebook feeds the historiographer. The connections between Florentine historiography and the Renaissance reading practices are nowhere more clear than in the Erasmian reading system and its notebooks. Constantly shifting students away from the centre of the page to the margins was essential to prescriptive reading. Reading was taught not as a process of fluid excogitation out of textual continuity. Reading was to be a halting, fragmented process, and the primary products of that process were to be received opinions and the *sententiae* to authorize those opinions. Autographic commonplaces became the storehouses for pre-approved convictions. From these storehouses students were to select and construct the themes upon which they would be graded. Students were graded not on originality but on the finesse of their conventionality.[28] These exogenic products of reading served to add authority to opinions selected and nurtured by the very readings from which those commonplaces were derived. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, a call for the widest possible reading furthered textual fragmentation. The obstacle to wide reading was the cost of textual production. The solutions to this obstacle helped educators and their texts control reading and readers' suppositions: two of these

solutions were anthologies – carefully selected excerpts bound in one manageable text – and printed commonplaces, such as Erasmus's *Apophthegems*. In the publication of anthologies, texts, no longer even coherent, cogent works, were in danger of losing the last vestiges of their exegetical autonomy.[29] The compiler, like the marginator, was the guardian of prescribed opinion.

Humanist control of textual consumption extended beyond the classroom and print marginalia to private reading. In this heyday of the instructional manual, prominent humanists produced extra-institutional treatises on effective reading. Effective reading necessarily included the margins. Jean Bodin's *Methodus Ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem* was among the most broadly read of these manuals. The *Methodus* instructs readers that effective reading employs active scrutiny of the whole page, pen in hand; such scrutiny eventuates in exhaustive manuscript margination detailing the text's utility and a notebook full of evaluated quotations.[30] Students' or readers' books provide the material evidence for the success of such manuals. As the long confirmed residence of the reader's guide to textual utility, the margins were the natural place to record the fruits of private reading. Manuscript margination was not restricted to scholarly tracts, but, rather, is found in texts across the generic spectrum, from herbals to romances. Autographic annotation in non-scholarly texts suggests that the lessons learned in school continued to dictate not only the reading process but also what readers conceived of as textual utility.[31] Although in their number and nature Jonson's collected books are not representative of the average reader's library, the nature and number of his manuscript marginalia likely are. All but 61 of the 207 books David McPherson lists contain some manner of

margination, many of which exhibit additional margination by subsequent hands.[32] The majority of Jonson's marginalia are simple glosses or corrections of errata; many are graphic marks such as flowers or *maniculae*. Jonson most often annotates with inter-textual references and thoughts inspired by what he has read. Perhaps surprisingly, only three of Jonson's books exhibit any sort of judgment or opinion in their margins, and only one shows any sort of critical comments on style.[33] McPherson sums up Jonson's annotative style as that of a "scholar of strong but sporadic interests."[34] The number and nature of manuscript margination recorded in the bibliographical descriptions libraries attach to early-modern texts argues that private reading focused no less on culling over the page for textual utility. Whatever the text, readers employed the margins to fill their intellectual larder with authorized and authorizing *eloquentia, sapientia*, and *prudentia*.

Coming with the innovations in print technology, a wealth of classical texts were recovered; secular scholars began to marginate them anew, now with an eye not only to how texts might serve the commonwealth or conform to the dominant ideology but also to their intrinsic artistic value. From this point into the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the margins were gradually drained of commentary, the space to be filled with annotations explicating obscure allusions, epitomes of the argument, glosses, *maniculae* pointing to *sententiae*, and inter-textual citations and references. Even with all this, the page was a much roomier place in the commentary's absence. The centered text expanded to fill much of the absent space.

Edification and reading were indivisible concepts, an indivisibility from which side notes were inseparable. Ultimately, the proliferation of annotated texts in the

Renaissance suggests that they were what education had conditioned readers to expect. Of the 225 items Slights reviews from the 382 listed in the STC's chronological list for 1605, 60 percent contain some printed margination.[35] It is very intriguing that such a high percentage of texts should be marginated at the very moment when the vogue of the marginated text began its decline. Perhaps in 1605, as now, for the elite, general use heralded impending decline. Based on his reading of earlier models of instruction through glossed editions of classics and other edifying texts, Slights contends that the margins, as agents of programmatic edification, were intended to assure the reading was fragmented.[36] This moving the reader constantly outside of the centre of the text reflects Renaissance teaching practices. The page's margins operate as the teacher, highlighting what utility the text has to offer; by fragmentation the reader is "managed from the margins."[37] Even the editors of the 1611 Bible could not conceive of so important a text wholly devoid of marginalia, despite concerns that the authorized English Bible might take on the visual sins of its Roman progenitors. The Church of England editors defended the expository and deictic marginalia: "Some puraduenture would haue no varietie of sences to be set in the margine, lest the authoritie of Scriptures for deciding of contrauersies by that shew of vncertaintie, should somewhat be shaken."[38] Beside this statement sits an insistent marginal epitome: "Reason mouing vs to set diuersitie of sences in the margin, where there is great probability for each."[39] Throughout Protestant Europe the individual was theoretically able to enjoy an unmediated relationship with God and His Word, but the programmatic margins prevailed.

Despite humanism's lofty goal to liberate learning from the strictures of Roman

Catholic determinism, in the margins and in the classroom, Scholasticism's programmatics were replaced by a no less programmatic civic agenda. In the face of the broad range of texts comprising that 60 percent that Slights finds were marginated, I would be doing many texts an injustice to suggest that all margination was part of a programmatic agenda. Indeed, in Shelton's 1612 translated edition of *Don Quixote*, the marginalia is mainly content to provide the sort of glosses necessary to comprehending a foreign text. Shelton's main goal is to increase accessibility to subtler points of Cervantes' satire, although, as I discuss below, it is hard to discern the difference between programmatic intervention and helpful direction.

Education was secularized and expanded to fill the need for good statesmen and counselors through the study of classical histories, philosophies, and moralities. Thomas Elyot, in his *Gouernour*, outlines the making of these statesmen and counselors. Employing a horticultural analogy, Elyot describes teaching as a process strikingly similar to that of the late-Mediaeval teacher with his avian analogy:

> He will first serche throughout his gardeyne where he can finde the most melowe and fertile erth: and therin wil he put the sede of the herbe to growe and be norisshed: and in most diligent wise attende that no weede be suffred to growe or aproche nyghe unto it: and to the entent it may thrive the faster, as soone as the fourme of an herbe ones appereth, he will set a vessell of water by hit, in suche wyse that it may continually distille on the rote swete droppes; and as it sprygeth in stalke, under sette it with some thyng that it breake nat, and alway kepe it cleane from weedes.[40]

Like the student as chick, the student as seed is incapable of playing an active role in the learning process. As that teacher must feed his chick grubs preselected and predigested, this teacher must carefully select the proper soil and weed around his sprouting herb, lest

its growth be inhibited by something noxious. These two analogies attest to the fact that for the sixteenth-century humanist the unmediated text still possessed inherent dangers: the teacher's role remained to protect the student from dangerous textual influences.

The system and purpose of teaching/reading changed little; only the end product changed. Half a century later, in 1581, Richard Mulcaster echoes Elyot's call for education to serve the ends of piety, civility, and learning, texts to be culled over for "virtuous manners and pureness of style."[41] There was a surge of edifying texts that sought to turn once good citizens of the universal church into good citizens of the national commonwealth. Clear from Mulcaster's call is that Renaissance education was beginning to add political conservatism to religious conservatism.[42] Despite claims to liberate the text and learning from scholastic obfuscation and determinism, the focus of the text and education in the Renaissance remained controlling what was read and how it was read. Like all conspiratorial theories, mine leaves out complicating facts. Editors and authors controlled access to meaning through the margins of such scholarly texts as classics, histories, political tracts, and spiritual or theological works, but not all marginated texts were bound for the classroom.

ANNOTATION: UBIQUITY, THE MARKET, AND DECLINE

The overuse of marginalia by obfuscating Scholasticism prior to the sixteenth century meant that the marginated page never managed subsequently to throw off the taint of scholastic determinism; nevertheless, those scholarly texts that intentionally served conservative humanism's socio-political ends, at least, had the courage of their

convictions. Had academic texts been the only locus of annotative abuses, the marginated page might not have fallen from favour. The glut of gratuitous margination likely tipped the scales against the maculate page. I would not suggest that all non-academic texts display their apparatus merely as a pretense; yet, as is the nature of such criticism, the only comments we have concerning the apparatus of non-academic texts are negative. For some, every annotated page came to be viewed with suspicion: marginalia were the henchmen of programmatic control; they stood unbidden before the text, directing reception, even when they were pseudo-scholarly smoke and mirror work to buttress the text's flagging claims of scholarly value.[43] Dekker exemplifies this suspicion, in the preface to *The Magnificent Entertainment.* He reacts to the annotations filling Jonson's own *Royall and Magnificent Entertainement*:[44]

> To make a false florish here with the borrowed weapons of all the old Masters of the noble Science of Poesie, and to keepe a tyrannicall coyle, in Anatomizing *Genius*, from head to foote, (onely to shew how nimbly we can carue vp the whole messe of the Poets) were to play the Executioner, and to lay our Cities houshold God on the rack, to make him confesse, how many paire of Latin sheets, we haue shaken & cut into shreds to make him a garment. Such feates of Actiuitie are stale, and common among Schollers, (before whome it is protested we come not now (in a Pageant) to Play a Maisters prize) For *Nunce ego ventosae Plebis suffragia venor*.[1]

For Dekker, Jonson's marginalia are an academic pretense, not compiled to aid the reader but to flaunt the author's erudition. As much as Dekker makes it clear that he considers scholarly margination an antiquated practice, he allows that it has its place before an appropriate readership. The very existence of this complaint argues that pretentious

---

[1] The Latin reads "at present I hunt the applause of the fickle rabble" (Horace *Epistles* 1.19.37).

margins still demanded attention.

The omnipresence of marginated texts and the attention they demand of their readers is reflected in popular cultural forms. As the great registrar of the time, Shakespeare provides this reflection. In the *Rape of Lucrece* he hints at the dangers inherent in the glosses of the scholastic tradition:

> But she, that never coped with stranger eyes,
> Could pick no meaning from their parling looks,
> Nor read the subtle-shining secrecies
> Writ in the glassy margents of such books.[45]

Couching Lucrece's entrapment in a metaphor of marginalia attests to the ubiquity and cultural currency of obfuscating marginalia. Beside Lucrece's face – modesty's red shielded by virtue's white, lilies and roses upon an open field – Tarquin's drift is "hiding" within grave pages (pleats).[46] His eyes cry his lust, but to the unlearned this text is obscure. Tarquin is scholastic manipulation hiding between authoritative covers. Although his meaning is unavailable to the reader, his authority demands trust. And the "margents of such books," the Latin and Greek glosses promising to elucidate, aid the manipulation by rendering those obscurities impenetrable. In *Romeo and Juliet* the text is neither authoritative nor scholarly, but a mere pretense. Lady Capulet offers a metaphor in praise of Paris's beauty which suggests more than her passion for courtly Romances:

> Read o'er the volume of young Paris' face,
> And find delight writ there with beauty's pen;
> Examine every married lineament,
> And see how one another lends content
> And what obscured in this fair volume lies
> Find written in the margent of his eyes.[47]

What mysteries are here are not intrinsic to the text but purposefully set within it:

Shakespeare writes the passive adjectival "obscured" not "obscure." Lady Capulet discloses her reliance upon the margins of those texts to explicate intentional obscurities. In Boyet's doggerel anatomy of Navarre's love for the princess, the reader imagines him no great reader of scholarly texts. The margins Boyet refers to are those which cite for citation's sake: "His face's own margent did quote such amazes/ That all eyes saw his eyes enchanted with gazes."[48] His eyes were so glazed with wonder that any seeing his eyes saw wonderment. The margins hardly need cite what the centre makes plain. Finally, in what is surely Shakespeare's most bibliophilic play, when Hamlet mockingly misses Osric's grandiloquent use of "carriages" to refer to a sword's hangers, the prince's preceding play upon the courtier's "golden words" confirms that Osric is the text that would employ "liberal-conceited" terms to inflate its claims to scholarly value. Amidst this repartee, is Horatio's slanted aside to Hamlet: "I knew you must be edified by the margent ere you had done."[49] The burlesque in Horatio's interjection is palpable: Hamlet needs to refer to Osric's verbal gloss no more than he would need to refer to the margins of the pseudo-scholarly page. Whether Shakespeare posits marginalia as necessary, in secrecies or obscured words, or wholly gratuitous in Boyet's quotations or Osric's "carriages," he confirms that the margins are present, persistent, and demanding.

It is problematic to suggest that the cultural presence of these notes illustrates that Renaissance readers conceived of them as integral to meaning. Lucrece, Lady Capulet, Boyet, and Osric are no less readers than Hamlet. The margins are no less integral to Hamlet's conception of the text than they are to those of the others. At best relegated to footnotes but often banished to endnotes, modern annotation does not demand the

immediate scrutiny of early-modern marginalia. The Renaissance reader raised on marginated texts would have no conception of textual negotiations operating inside or outside of the text, no notion of supplementary textuality. Slights insists "that the properly managed Renaissance reader was encouraged to view such 'supplementary' notes as fully integrated parts of what he or she was reading. Text and supplement, textuality and contextualization were virtually inseparable in this model of reading."[50] In his seminal work on the subject, "The Marginal Gloss," Lawrence Lipking offers the analogy that in its perfection the marginal note is to the text as the New Testament is to the Old: "absolutely parallel, reflective, mutually reinforcing."[51] Through the processes of excogitation, margins and text become one. Indeed, a helpful way to comprehend the difference between early-modern and modern conceptions of annotation's supplementarity is in terms of its modern cultural presence. Although there is still a relationship between the modern footnote and the text it occupies, the footnote is a supplement to meaning not a constituent part of meaning. Consider the modern metaphorical use of the term. In the preface to his *A Footnote to History*, Robert Louis Stevenson effectively defines the word's popular use: "An affair which might be deemed worthy of a note of a few lines in any general history has been here expanded to the size of a volume or large pamphlet."[52]

For its early-seventeenth-century antagonists, the marginated page had become something to be mocked or ignored as an all-too-inevitable maculation of an otherwise white border. First published in 1605, *Don Quixote*'s "Authors Preface to the Reader" addresses all forms of textual dressing, from prefatory poems to end matter, with a

lengthy emphasis on the gratuitous margination that had inspired apathy towards the marginated page:

> [I lamented to my friend] *For how can I chuse (quoth I) but bee much confounded at that which the old legislator (the vulgar) will sai, when it sees that after the end of so many yeeres (as are spent since I first slept in the bosome of obliuon) I come out loaden with gray haires and bring with me a booke as dry as a kexe, . . . altogether empty both of learning & eloquence: without quotation on the margents, or annotation in the end of the book, wherewith I see other books are still adorned be they neuer so idle, fabulous, and prophane: so full of sentences of* Aristotle *and* Plato *and the other crew of the Philosophers, as admires the Reader, & makes then beleeue that these Authors are very learned and eloquent. . . . all which things must bee wanting in my booke, for neither haue I any thing to cite on the margent, or note in the end, and much lesse doe I know what Authors I follow, to put them at the beginning as the custome is, by the letters of the A.B.C. beginning with* Aristotle, *and ending in* Xenophone, *or in* Zoylus *or* Zeuxis. *Although the one was a Railer, and the other a Painter. So likewise shall my book want sonnets at the beginning.*[53]

Serving an increasingly textual world, the satire in *Don Quixote* is, above all else, directed at the dangerous potentials of reading. While the objects of that satire are chivalric romances and those who so readily and so heartily invest in them, the satire itself epitomizes anecdotal urbanity and its true scope is all but universal. What, on the face of it, motivates this prefatory lament is Cervantes' hesitation to publish his "history of so noble a Knight" without scholarly apparatus. The vulgar reader determines the necessity of scholarly apparatus. The presence of apparatus defines textual value, even when those texts are of no intrinsic scholarly value. The lament's opening points explain why 60 percent of English texts published in 1605 were marginated. *Don Quixote* is not empty of learning and eloquence. Cervantes, like Jonson, spent much time composing in seclusion. As the Quarto *Sejanus*'s laudatory poems bear witness, the claim to diligence

alone would distinguish *Don Quixote* as a literary achievement to learned readers.

The response of Cervantes' interlocutor is as interesting, for this study, as the lament itself. In Cervantes' estimation his "friend" is circumspect and agreeably intelligent, a "very discret and pleasantly witted man":

> [And my friend hearing this said] *as touching Citations in the margent, and authors out of whom thou mayst collect sentences and sayings, to insert in thy history, there is nothing else to be done, but to bobbe into it some latine sentences, that thou knowst already by rote, or mayst get easily with little labour: . . . After all this, to shew that thou art learned in humaine letters and a Cosmographer, take some occation to make mention of the riuer Tigus, and thou shall presently find thy self stored with another notable notation. . . . Now let us come to the citation of Authors, which other Bookes haue, and thine wanteth, the remedie hereof is very easie, for thou needest doe nought else but seeke out a Booke that doth quote them all from the Letter A, untill Z. as thou saidst thy self but euen now, and thou shalt set that very same Alphabet to thine own Booke. For although the little necessitie that thou hadst to vse their assistance in thy work, will presently conuinct thee of falshod, it maks no matter, and perhaps there may not a few be found so simple as to belieue that thou hast holpe thy self in the Narration of thy most simple and sincere Historie, with all their authorities. And though that large Catalogue of Authors doe serue to none other purpose; yet will it at least giue some authoritie to the Booke as the first blush: and the rather, because none will bee so mad as to stand to examine whether thou dost follow them or no, seeing they can gaine nothing by the matter.*[54]

Detailing many suggestions of pseudo-scholarly debt and how they might easily be inserted into the text, the interlocutor's response is three times longer than the author's inspiring lament. In so rich and poignant a social satire as *Don Quixote*, this dialogue is a satiric indictment of current textual practices. The number and variety of these suggestions testify that the agreeably-intelligent early-seventeenth-century reader was familiar to the point of contempt with the many means of rendering an unscholarly text scholarly. Perhaps, as the number and variety of marginated texts suggest, it is true that

for the vulgar book buyer authorization was key, and the mere presence of apparatus was authorization enough. It is witness to the value of marginalia that Shelton marginates his translation of *Don Quixote* with glosses and reminders of preceding action. These notes are not purely auxiliary. Some notes serve the satire. The note glossing the name of Don Quixote's horse, Rozinante, admits Cervantes' potential for satiric burlesque while not losing the exoticism provided by Spanish names: "*A horse of labour or carriage in Spanish is called a* Rozin, *and the word* Ante *signifies* Before: *so that* Rozinante *is a horse that sometime was of carriage.*"[55] Both the scholarly detail Cervantes' interlocutor suggests for spurious annotation and the effort Shelton himself puts into his margins attest to the reality that marginalia were still read. Even if Jonson was correct when writing that "none but the Learned would take the paynes to conferre them," as far as the sources to which they point.[56] As Shelton's glosses to *Don Quixote* show, for the astute reader the margins still have a role to play in textual negotiations.

ANNOTATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Slights provides the terms by which I will proceed. Slights anatomizes marginalia from a broad spectrum of Renaissance annotated texts, and he identifies fifteen pervasive functions:

> Amplification: Adding detail peripheral to the text such as analogies, examples, exceptions to generalizations, and so on.
> Annotation: Providing references, particularly to Scripture but also classical and contemporary works as well as to particular historical or political events.
> Appropriation: Co-opting a text for purposes likely not anticipated by its author.

Correction: Objecting to some point made by the author; also anticipating erroneous interpretations.
Emphasis: Calling attention to important items; reproducing sententia and other memorable phrases from the text in the margins, possibly for easy transportation into other texts such as commonplace books.
Evaluation: Formulating judgments on soundness of argument and aptness of expression.
Exhortation: Encouraging the reader to take to heart the author's message.
Explication: Clarifying meaning; providing literal senses for metaphors and other figures; spelling out implications.
Justification: Defending the author against detractors.
Organization: Dividing texts into parts and outlining their organizational plan.
Parody: Mocking the tone or substance of the text.
Preemption: Filling marginal space so as to prevent insertion of unauthorized, handwritten text.
Rhetorical gloss: Identifying figures of speech and other artful uses of language and argumentation.
Simplification: Generating rubrics and summaries.
Translation: Offering English versions of foreign phrases or paraphrases of obscure English expressions.[57]

These functions roughly constitute the Renaissance marginator's starting point. From this store of functions the marginator could construct margins that anticipated the appropriate reception. Each of these functions, but for preemption, could be employed to draw readers into the text's discursive community or to draw them away from the text toward the marginator's program. Slights admits that his is an incomplete taxonomy, and as I progress through the following chapters, I will augment his list with additional functions. As expected, there is much crossover at play in the margins of Renaissance texts, and functions often combine in productive ways. Take this marginal excerpt from *Don Quixote*: "**The Porton of Cordoua is a certain fountaine wherein stands a Pegasus: and to that fountaine resort a number of cunny-catching fellows, as Duke* Humfrey *at* Paules." The reference to "*Duke* Humfrey *at* Paules" is to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester's walk

in the old St Paul's Church. The name comes from a tomb popularly assigned to Humphrey but actually housing John of Gaunt. At the time of Shelton's translation, Duke Humphrey's walk was adjacent to a popular promenade where the fashionable would take their afternoon stroll; it notoriously provided an opportunity to mingle for those who preyed upon the rich.[58] In the centre text Don Quixote requests that an innkeeper, whom he fancied to be a constable, knight him, in order that he might wander the country performing deeds and rescuing maidens. This note confirms that the innkeeper is not so subtly couching his knightly adventures of picking pockets, swindling, and whoring in punning place names, double entendre, and inside knowledge. The ostensible function of this note is to provide part annotation part rhetorical gloss for "*Porto or Cowlt of Cordoua," to which it is attached by an asterisk; the satiric function is to provide explication that extends further than the Porto. Spelling out the mocking or satiric implications of this reference to the fountain of Cordova, it confirms the mocking intentions of the innkeeper's other place names: "the compasse of Siuill (manure piles), Quicke-siluer-house of Granada, the wharfe of S. *Lucor*."[59] What the note ultimately accomplishes is to appropriate the satire: by naming names and places Shelton co-opts Cervantes' satire to embrace those knights, flooding London, more intent on venery than chivalric adventure.

With Eucharis Cervicornus's indictment of Bade's maculate *Livy*, I offered that referring to marginal marks as plasters, poultices, veils, and vain paintings suggests that they are covering something up.[60] Diseases, whether venereal or pestilent, were far too prevalent in the sixteenth century to suggest that such complaints were grounded in

aesthetic concerns, that opponents of the glossed page could never get beneath its surface. These scholarly marks on the margins were covering something up. What they were covering up was the implication that a text that claims the authority of its own knowledge could not be wholly autonomous. Scholasticism had opened the door to the idea of extra-textual authority; once such a door is open it is difficult to close. The potential to add, to clarify, or to emphasize is boundless once a superscript character renders a line conditional. This potential keeps the reader coming back to see what the margins have to offer.

Why did such a wide range of Renaissance authors chose to annotate their texts? That they did so in order to produce pages that reflected the received notion of a text or that met market demands are only partial answers. Overt physical display played a sizable role in the marginating impulse.[61] Marginal annotation renders the vernacular text classical in appearance; its form alone argues that the text belongs in the continental humanist tradition. Yet *mise-en-page* is not the only aspect of the marginated page that includes the text and thus the author in this tradition; the contents of the notes – the lists of ancient and contemporary authorities – create an analogy by which the author and his text are drawn into the realm of authorization.[62] By this gesture the author, the text, and the readers are intentionally defined. Defining the reader might be better termed selecting the reader. By producing a "scholarly" text, whatever the genre, the author tacitly addresses only those readers accustomed to and amicable to such texts – those who are, or would like to be considered, scholarly readers. In arguing that "none but the Learned would take the paynes to conferre" its margins, the Quarto identified itself as a text suited

to learned tastes. In effect it hoped to assure that the "Learned would take the paynes to conferre them." In this gesture the marginated text invites the reader to join in the performance of authorization: these margins speak not to every reader but to the reader able to listen. And the model for such a reader is, of course, the marginator, be he a scholar or a courtier.[63]

Attracting learned readers, efficacious margins create a discourse productive of textual meaning. Such margins address uncertainties or complexities considered unnecessary for the average reader but that the author or marginator would wish to bring to the attention of the learned.[64] And by this the author creates yet another scholarly community, now that of the readers and writer of the text. Thus the margins become a discursive context that can be likened to the schoolroom, wherein the author, the margins, and the reader enter into a conversation over the potentialities of textual meaning. While the abuses of margination threatened to silence the marginal note, in their ideal, marginalia would draw the text and its discursive community into the broader humanist dialogue. Again reading and historiography collide. This sort of dialogue was precisely what Bacon and the Polybians intended when they called for historiography in which "the discourse attendeth vpon the Example."[65] This, I would argue, was precisely Jonson's intention for the Polybian Quarto. Nevertheless, however much the marginated text might determine an ideal readership, the weighty page neither assures nor anticipates an exclusive audience. Margins thick with scholarly glosses, citations, and Latin illuminations could not help but cause the uninitiated to shy away, which might limit the conversation. The resulting presence of this peripheral readership renders the margins, at

best, ineffective or, at worst, something quite inimical to the author or annotator's intentions.

The indifference that had begun to calcify the margins was not endemic. And the growing pessimism inspired by the tumultuous events of the seventeenth century would soon call into question humanism's faith in the ability of the great muddle of ancient writers and humanist theorists to teach the lessons needed to move humanity safely forward. In John Milton's 1645 *Colasterion*, marginal notation ceases to cover the disease and becomes the disease itself:

> Provided he be sure not to come with those old and stale suppositions, unless hee can take away cleerly what that discours hath argu'd against them, by one who will expect other arguments to bee perswaded the good health of a sound answer, then the gout and dropsy of so big margent, litter'd and overlaid with crude and huddl'd quotations.[66]

For Milton, texts were meant to make their arguments autonomously. He calls for the ambiguities of antiquarianism – the ancient masses of history and learning – and their vestiges upon the margins of the page to be replaced by amateurism's plain, unmediated text. To give Michel *de* Certeau the final word: "the blank page. . . is a place where the ambiguities of the world have been exorcized."[67] Not surprisingly, Milton's 1667 *Paradise Lost* contains no print marginalia. Not surprisingly, of the two copies EEBO displays of Milton's 1667 *Paradise Lost* one is filled with manuscript margination.[68]

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. Thomas Shelton, *The history of the valorous and vvittie knight-errant, Don-Quixote of the Mancha Translated out of the Spanish* (London: Edward Blount and William Barret, 1612) A1r-v: STC 4915. The Latin reads "Liberty is not sold profitably for all the gold in

the world." To the point, the quotation is not out of Horace but *Aesop's Fables* 54: *De Cane et Lupo*; just down Cervantes's page the interlocutor quotes Ovid and cites Cato: ironically, to the point, Giuseppe Passi employed this same quotation out of Aesop and cites Horace (*Dello Stato Maritale*: *Trattato di Giuseppe Passi Ravennate nell'Academia de' Signori Informi di Ravenna L'Ardito* (Venice: Iacomo Antonio Somascho, 1602) 12). One can but hope that Cervantes is mocking the Italian antifeminist.

2. "Conversations" 4.

3. *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Los Angeles: California UP, 1974) 155.

4. Nigel Wilson provides a very helpful summary of the foundational influence of Hellenistic commentaries upon scholastic texts ("Scholiasts and Commentators,"*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies,* 47 [2007]: 39-70).

5. Having said this, as Nigel Wilson shows the first substantial commentaries were the second-century BC Hellenistic scholar Aristarchus in his work on Herodotus. Homer had also received such commentary (41). Wilson admits, however, that the evidence is scant, and that direct influence is small, as the Hellenistic commentaries were transmitted to Mediaeval scholasticism through Roman commentaries of the late empire (45-49).

6. *L&S ad loc.*

7. M. Terentus Varro, *De Lingua Latina* Vol. II, ed. and trans. Roland G. Kent (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958) VII.vi.107.

8. M. Fabius Quintilianus, *Institvtio Oratoria*, ed. and trans. H. E. Butler (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1963) 1.8.15.

9. Wilson suggest that Hellenistic commentators provided intra textual markings as aids to understanding. "The obvious case is Homer, where the obelus and other signs soon came to have established meanings and are found in a number of papyri" (44-45).

10. *L&S ad loc.*

11. Stephen Nichols discusses the potential influence of these authoritative decrees on Mediaeval theologians: "Medieval annotation did not forget its cultural roots in the late Roman empire" ("On the Sociology of Medieval Manuscript Annotation," *Annotation and Its Texts,* ed. Stephen A. Barney [Oxford: UP, 1991] 43-77, 46-47).

12. *Exequi sententias haud institui nisi insignis per honestum aut notabili dedecore, quod praecipuum munus annalium reor ne virtutes sileantur utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit* (*Annals* 69/III.lxv).

13. Anthony Grafton offers a helpful discussion on the debt of Mediaeval annotator to Roman jurisprudence (*The Footnote: A Curious History* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997] 30).

14. *L&S ad loc*.

15. This is a necessary oversimplification of a complex process. M. B. Parkes provides a lengthy and very helpful discussion of this shift from *meditatio* to *lectio,* as well as that shift's consequences upon the academic page."The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book," *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London: Hambledon, 1991) 35-69.

16. *The Footnote* 32.

17. 47.

18. Anthony Grafton discusses scholastic christianizing commentaries in the margins of Ovid, Seneca, and Virgil in reference to their Renaissance reception ("Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on Some Commentaries," *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.4 [1985]: 615-649, esp 619, 627, & 637). A parallel to this practice is found in the representation of mythical figures set in contemporary scenes and dress that characterize the illustrations of Mediaeval collections. Brigitte Buettner offers an interesting discussion of this practice ("Profane Illuminations, Secular Illusions: Manuscripts in Late Medieval Courtly Society," *The Art Bulletin* 74.1 [Mar., 1992] 75-90).

19. Examples of ninth-century marginated texts can be found in New Palaeographical Society, *Facsimilies of Ancient MSS etc*, 1st ser. (London: Oxford UP, 1903-12) pl. 120 and pl. 236.

20. *L&S ad loc*.

21. Evelyn Tribble offers a helpful appraisal of these pages: "Bristling with annotations, abbreviations, obscure references, a jumble of authorities past and present, this page represented all the abuses of Scholasticism" ("Like a Looking-Glas in the Frame: From the Marginal Note to the Footnote," *The Margins of the Text*, ed. D. C. Greetham [Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1997] 229-44, 230).

22. qtd in Alfred W. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible,* (Folkestone: Dawsons, 1974) 117-18.

23. qtd in Nicholas Orme *Education and Society in Medieval and Renaissance England.* (London: Hambledon, 1989) 128. I owe much of this discussion of Mediaeval education to Orme's very informative study.

24. *An exposycyon vpon the v.vi.vii. chapters of Mathewe: which thre chapters are the keye and the dore of the scrypture, and the restoring agayne of Moses lawe corrupt by ye scrybes and pharyses. And the exposycyon is the restorynge agayne of Chrystes lawe corrupte by the Papystes. Item before the boke, thou hast a prologe very necessary, conteynynge the whole sum of the couenaunt made betwene God and vs, vpon whiche we be baptysed to kepe it. And after thou haste a table that ledeth the by the notes in the margentes, vnto al that is intreated of in the booke* (London: R. Redman, 1536) A2 r/fol. ii: STC 24441.3.

25. I am here thinking of the broad range of texts recommended in works such as Thomas Elyot's *The Governor* (*The Boke Named the Gouernour Deuised by Thomas Elyot knight* [London: Thomas Berthelet, 1531]; STC 7637).

26. In his helpful discussion of the pragmatics determining teaching and reading practices in Renaissance England, Eugene R. Kintgen suggests that the fear was that "reading the wrong sorts of texts could lead to the wrong sorts of actions"(*Reading in Tudor England* [Pittsburgh: UP, 1996] 15).

27. *The Boke Named the Gouernour* fol.36v-37r/E4v-E5r.

28. In his treatment of grammar schools and humanist reading practices, Kintgen discusses the role of these notebooks in student evaluation, referring to commonplaces as "repositories of matter for themes" (*Reading in Tudor England* 36).

29. Rebecca Bushnell provides a helpful discussion of the dictatorial role of anthologies and printed commonplaces in humanist education.(*A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* [Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996] 129).

30. Bodin instructs his readers on the use of notebooks in the conclusion to "The order of Reading"; he instructs on manuscript margination in his conclusion to "Arrangement of Material" (*The Method and Comprehension of History by Jean Bodin,* trans. Beatrice Reynolds [NY: Octagon, 1966] 27 and 49).

31. In her helpful discussion of margination and the reading process, Heidi Brayman Hackel suggests that manuscript margination can "provide intimate glimpses into the practices and habits of reading" ("The 'Great Variety' of Readers and Early Modern Reading Practices," in *A Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. David Scott Kastan [Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999] 149).

32. "Ben Jonson's Library" 9.

33. *Ibid.* 10-18.

34. *Ibid.* 17.

35. Slights's work on Renaissance margination will become increasingly important was this chapter proceeds. He provides detailed discussion of the wide variety of marginated texts published in 1605 (*Managing Readers* 160ff).

36. *Ibid.* 62.

37. *Ibid.* 26.

38. *The Holy Bible conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: newly translated out of the originall tongues: & with the former translations diligently compared and reuised, by his Maiesties speciall co[m]mandement. Appointed to be read in churches* (London: Robert Barker, 1611) B2r; STC 2216.

39. *Ibid.*

40. *The Boke Named the Gouernour* fol.13v/B5v.

41. Richard Mulcaster, *Positions on the Training up of Children*, ed. Richard L. DeMolen (NY: Teachers College Press, 1971) ix & 248.

42. Rebecca Bushnell provides a compelling argument for humanism's political conservatism in its use of secular history/literature to bolster/justify the current order of society (*A Culture of Teaching*14).

43. Evelyn Tribble provides a forceful discussion of scholastic glosses and the pretense of margination ("Like a Looking-Glas in the Frame" 231).

44. *The magnificent entertainment giuen to King Iames, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, vpon the day of his Maiesties tryumphant passage . . .* (London: Thomas Man Jr., 1604) A4v; STC 6510.

45. 99-102. All line references for Shakespeare are from *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt *et al* (NY: Norton,1997).

46. *Ibid.* 59-93.

47. I.ii. 83-88.

48. *Love's Labour's Lost*, II.i.245-46.

49. V.ii.114.1-14.2; Beatrice Graves provides a compelling argument that "edified by the margent" is a nod to the introduction of the marginated Geneva Bible: "seeing some translations reade after one sort, and some after another, whereas all may serue to good purpose & edification, we haue in the margent noted that diuersitie of speach or reading which may also seeme agreeable" ("Shakespeare's Sonnets and the Genevan Marginalia," *Essays in Criticism* 54.2 [Oxford: UP, 2007] 124-25). For other articles treating the

potential influence of the Geneva Bible upon Shakespeare's texts see Thomas Carter, *Shakespeare and Holy Scripture: With the Version He Used* (NY: AMS, 1970) 15; R. A. L. Burnet, "Shakespeare and the First Seven Chapters of the Genevan Job," *Notes & Queries*, 29[227]/2 (1982), 127-8; R. A. L. Burnet, "Shakespeare and the Marginalia of the Geneva Bible," *Notes & Queries*, 26[224]/2 (1979), 113-14; R. A. L. Burnet, "Two Further Echoes of the Genevan Margin in Shakespeare and Milton," *Notes & Queries*, 28[226]/2 (1981), 129; R. A. L. Burnet "Some Echoes of the Genevan Bible in Shakespeare and Milton," *Notes & Queries* 27[225]/2 (1980), 179-81; Roger Stritmatter, "By Providence Divine: Shakespeare's Awareness of Some Genevan Marginal Notes of I Samuel," *Notes & Queries*, 47 [245]/1 (2000), 97-100; Peter R. Moore, "A Biblical Echo in Romeo and Juliet," *Notes & Queries*, 50 [249] (2004), 278-9.

50. *Managing Readers* 13.

51. "The Marginal Gloss," *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 609-55, 622.

52. *A Footnote to History: Eight Years of Trouble in Samoa* (Honolulu: Hawaii UP, 1996).

53. *Don Quixote* ¶4r-4v.

54. *Ibid.* A1r-A2v.

55. B3V.

56. *Sejanus* ¶2v.

57. *Managing Readers* 25-6.

58. 16/B8v.

59. *Ibid.*

60. The reference to marginal texts as vain paintings comes from William Wilkinson: *now when* HN *can iustiffie his callyng to have been such as* S.Paules *was, then he shall proue some what, in the meane tyme our skill is not so meane as whensoeuer he vseth to alledge Scripture for the phrase that by and by it must materially be vnderstood as he will haue vs take it, or else all is marred. In the same sort he abuseth a place taken out of* S.Paul *to the* Corinthians Cap.3.vers [15]. *But these his vayne payntyngs of his margent, shall hereafter make his cause more unto them. Whiche will diligently labour to take him haltyng in the alledgyng of the Scriptures* (*Confutation.of certain articles deliuered vnto the Familye of Loue* . . . [London: John Daye, 1579] 48/D4r; STC 25665).

61. D. C. Greetham offers a very helpful discussion on the subject of margination as pretense or display ("Editorial and Critical Theory: From Modernism to Postmodernism,"

Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities, ed. George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams. [Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1993] 121); on this point see also Evelyn Tribble *Margins and Marginality* 88.

62. Lawrence Lipking states (in relation to footnotes but the point is by intention equally applicable here) that "[notes] stand for a scholarly community, assembled by the author specially so that he can join in"("The Marginal Gloss" 639).

63. Ralph Hanna III argues that the annotator "is in fact creating himself as reader – and thus creating the reader of his work" ("Annotation as Social Practice," *Annotation and Its Texts*, ed. Stephen A. Barney [Oxford: UP, 1991] 178-84, 181). This point will be ratified at the discussions of Gwinne's and Harington's marginalia.

64. As with much of what I have to say about the reader and the marginated page Gérard Genette has much to say on this point (*Paratexts*, trans Jane E. Lewin [Cambridge: UP, 1997] 326).

65. *The two bookes of Sr. Francis Bacon. Of the proficience and aduancement of learning* II, 92.

66. *Colasterion: a Reply to a Nameles Ansvver Against the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce. Wherein the Trivial Author of That Answer is Discover'd, the Licencer Conferr'd With, and the Opinion Which They Traduce Defended. / by the Former Author, J. M.*, (London: S.N., 1645) 2; Wing M2099.

67. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: UP, 1984) 134.

68. *Paradise Lost a Poem Written in Ten Books* (London: Peter Parker, Robert Boulter, and Matthias Walker 1667); Wing M2136.

CHAPTER 4: ANNOTATIVE USES AND ABUSES IN NERO AND ORLANDO

The Quarto's year is 1605, in which year 60 percent of texts published in England were marginated, the same year that Cervantes predicts the beginning of the end for the marginated page. This chapter turns to two contemporary marginated literary texts, Gwinne's Latin *Nero* and Harington's translation of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* – in part, because they are exemplary and, in part, because Jonson knew *Orlando* and likely knew *Nero*. These two texts represent the practice of margination at the time that Jonson composed the Quarto *Sejanus*. Both *Nero* and *Orlando* make bibliographical claims to scholarly status. I will discuss the forms, functions, potentials, and abuses of marginalia through these two texts. Both Gwinne's *Nero* and Harington's *Orlando* exhibit scholarly pretense in their margins. Having said this, *Nero*'s margins also exhibit a scholarly commitment to the learned reader. The fact that *Nero* in many ways anticipates *Sejanus*'s marginating functions and historiographic affiliations fuels speculation that it was known to Jonson. *Nero* turns to the historic record to produce realized scenes and characters and to hint at the subtle motivations driving those characters. *Orlando*'s audience is different than *Nero*'s, and Harington's agenda is different than Gwinne's. If Gwinne is part scholarly Polybian, Harington is all popular Florentine, and his annotations practise all the Florentine historiographer's flattering parallelography and politic moralizing. This is not to say that some of Harington's annotative maneuvers do not find their way into the Quarto. The control Harington's marginal notation exerts over his readers would have provided a promising model for Jonson.

THE FUNCTIONS OF NERO'S MARGINALIA

Gwinne published his *Nero* early in the year that *Sejanus* was first performed, and it is tempting to imagine Jonson reading and exacting powerful inspiration from Gwinne's historio-tragic bibliographic example. Unlike Jonson's *Sejanus* or Shelton's *Don Quixote*, Matthew Gwinne's *Nero* needs do little to define its ideal reader as academic – it is wholly in Latin. Nonetheless, like Jonson and Shelton, Gwinne saw the commercial advantage in claiming *Nero*'s scholarly value. The most potent claim to the scholarly value of Gwinne's *Nero* is to be found on its title page:

> NERO TRAGÆDIA *NOVA* | MATTHÆO GWINNE Med. Doct. | *Collegij Divi Ioannis Praæcursoris* | apud Oxonienses Socio | *collecta* | è Tacito, Suetonio, Dione, Seneca | *Tam fœlix utinam, quàm pectore candidus essem.* Ouid.

This title page provides Gwinne's full credentials: he is a medical doctor and a fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. Confirming *Nero*'s classical authority, the text is assembled (*collecta*), like Jonson's, out of four authoritative sources: Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and Seneca. The epigram out of Ovid's *Epsitulae ex Ponto*, attests to Gwinne's scholarly *exercitatio*: "Would I were as fortunate as I am pure of heart."[1] Out of context, this epigram provides an erudite pun on Gwinne's name – Gwinne and *candidus* are cognates – and the trope of the penurious poet. Drawing in the *ex Ponto*, the margins accomplish a feat of diachronic itinerary:

> But a wicked interpretation inflames people's anger against me,
> Accuses my poetry of a new crime.
> Would I were as fortunate as I am pure of heart!
> No one yet exists that has been wounded by my words.
> Not only that, if I were now blacker than Illyrian tar,
> No loyal crowd would be criticized by me.[2]

Ovid provides the author an opening disproof of application. Like Jonson's, Gwinne's text is intent on defying application, insisting that it is assembled out of the historic record: not only is *Nero* authentic, but the words are not even the author's.

Nero's prefatory pages are designed to assert its scholarly authority. The dedication continues the work begun by the title page: "Prudentiâ, honore, æquitate clarissimi *Domini* THOMÆ EGERTONI *Magni Sigilli Angliæ Custodis in*signissimi Illustrissimo Hæredi filio *Ioanni Egertono, et Generosissimo Genero Fran*cisco Leigh, Musarum optimis fautoribus, cultoribus D.D."[3] Gwinne dedicates his work to three illustrious men: Thomas Egerton, John Egerton, and Francis Leigh. Following beneath are six quarto pages of Latin dedicatory epistle, filled with italicized *sententiae* drawn from a broad range of classical, Mediaeval, and humanist texts – all marginally cited.[4] Accomplishing ends similar to the Quarto's epistle and laudatory poems, *Nero*'s epistle comprises a defense of dramatic poetry and the theatre, a discussion of Gwinne's style, his treatment of the unities, and a rational for *Nero* having never been performed at Oxford: it was neither of a suitable ground, nor written to that end, and it was deemed implausible to stage such an ungainly work. Following the epistle is a short laudatory verse, "Iustum Lipsium ad hoc *Nerone*," in twelve iambics from the pen of John Sandsbury, Oxford scholar, Latin poet, and clergyman.[5] Sandsbury's poem addresses Lipsius, editor of both Tacitus and Seneca, confirming *Nero* to be of scholarly value adequate to the eminent Flemish humanist's reading. The verse's drift is that *Nero* serves to fill the vacancy that the pseudo-Senecan *Octavia*, in Lipsius's published opinion, fails

to fill. Sandsbury goes so far as to suggest that Gwinne's work will lend glory to Seneca. In Sandsbury's poem Gwinne comes to equal Seneca. In closing, Sandsbury claims for Gwinne preeminence above leading neo-Latin tragedians of his time – William Gager, George Buchanan, and Theodore Beza.

Certifying Gwinne's claim that the play is too unwieldy for the stage, *Nero*'s *Actorum Nomina* boasts eighty-four characters, including the Furies and five Senecan ghosts – one per act.[6] Beyond rendering the play unplayable, this massive cast attests to *Nero*'s insistence upon historic accuracy: present is virtually every figure to whom the historic record assigns a role in Nero's rise to the imperium and ultimate suicide.

Gwinne and Jonson shared much as writers of tragic histories, and, as is true of the Quarto *Sejanus*, consideration of Gwinne's marginalia must develop out of what the text records of the impulses prompting his functional choices. *Nero*'s play text fills 140 marginated pages, more than twice as many as the Renaissance's average executable play. The marginalia are entirely original, authorial, and, to one degree or another, integral to textual meaning. Gérard Genette suggests that the original authorial note is not paratextual: "the original authorial note, at least when connected to a text that is itself discursive and with which it has a relation of continuity and formal homogeneity, belongs more to the text, which the note extends, ramifies, and modulates rather than comments on."[7] From what is known of Renaissance reception of marginated texts, it seems likely that the distinction of allographical or original authorial marginalia would have little impact on conceptions of supplementarity and the potential of accessing the margins. *Nero*'s title page shows Gwinne cognizant of the potentials of application, and Gwinne is

intent upon giving credit where credit is due: "Am I qualified to write tragedy? Let Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio, and Seneca speak for me; for they say almost everything themselves."[8] By Gwinne's own admission, *Nero* was written to be exhaustive not to be acted. It is too long and too complex. Just to fill the roster of players would require every actor in London: "I do not say that it is not apt, nor that it was, perchance, not written to that end: though one might intimate both these things by the multitude of actors and the unequal length of the acts."[9] He writes for a learned audience, and in spite of the unlearned: "This aught to find praise amongst the learned equal to that dispraise it finds amongst the unlearned."[10] From Nemesis's induction, Gwinne, like Jonson, seems intent upon reuniting Sidney's separated poets and historians. Gwinne is the poet/historian delivering edification with truth:"But Xiphilinus is not silent on this stage, nor is Tacitus tacit, or is Tranquillus tranquil, you will think the historians to be made poets."[11] Letting the historians speak for him, Gwinne denies his own authorial role. In this gesture he asserts that he is a historiographer more of the non-politic, non-evaluative Polybian stamp. These, then, are the motivations behind *Nero* and its marginalia.

However similar the motivations suggested in its prefatory matter, Gwinne's text does not exploit the full potential of marginalia, and, thus, it lacks the composite complexity of the Quarto. Unlike Jonson's, Gwinne's marginalia signal the centre's historicity rather than draw the historic record into the centre. *Nero*'s notes are not imperative; they do not include injunctions to see (*vid*), or consider (*cons*), or read (*leg*). *Nero*'s margins merely present the citations, often so incompletely that to trace them is difficult. Nor does Gwinne's text employ superscripts to help draw attention at will to the

margins. Tying the margins to the centre with superscript numbers, letters, or symbols offers the author some control over when the reader addresses a note. Proximal notes suggest semantic equivalence between their contents and whatever portion of the text they parallel, where the keyed note's purport is assured primacy.[12] *Nero* often gives the impression that the citation's importance, its power to authorize, is in its presence on the page. *Nero* seems to lack the faith the Quarto shows in the margins' capacity to operate with the potency they then struggled to maintain.

The majority of the margination that accompanies the play text deals with the business of stagecraft – entrances, exits, speech directions (asides and deictics), acts, scenes, and persons in the scene. Although never meant to be acted, *Nero* exhibits more stage direction than a play printed following a successful run in the theatre. Early-modern playwrights included many of the necessary clues to stage action in the dialogue itself, only writing basic instruction, such as entrances and exits, in the margins. Perhaps, as a closet drama, *Nero* suffers from an invisibility complex: as it can never be seen, it is more intent upon being fully visualizable. A post-theatrical publication enjoys the advantage that a large portion of its readership would have a memory of the action.[13] In terms of Slights' functions, those of *Nero*'s notes that provide extra-dramatic or historical information function as Annotation and Amplification, referring readers to historic sources for the lines to which they are proximally attached.

In seven exemplary pages, Gwinne's system of margination shows itself to be overcompensating for its limitations as a closet drama; in others it seems to be caught between a scholarly commitment to acknowledging sources and the scholarly pretense

currently infecting margination; and, yet, in still others, Gwinne's marginalia performs feats of annotation that could well have inspired the Quarto's marginalia. Although Slights does not include stage directions in his list of functions, as they are generally ruled by convention, *Nero*'s stage directions defy convention, functioning as something close to Slights' Justification – self-consciously insisting that *Nero* is a play, however unplayable it might be. *Nero*'s most numerously marginated pair of pages, P2v and P3r contain thirteen elaborate stage directions, at the expense of transparency (Figures 4 & 5). While the overdetermined page is not unique in Gwinne's text, overdetermination of such stagecraft certainly is. The notes read: "She is carried out by Flavius and Asper, they soon return"; "Rufus returns with Epaphroditus and Natalus"; "Nymphidius Sabinus to Piso"; "standing next to Lateranus and Epaphroditus"; "Scevinus is brought back in"; "Poppaea is called back"; "Granius to Seneca"; "to them three Tribunes with Epaphroditus"; "Granius returns"; "Flavius and Asper return"; "secretly turning to Rufus"; "Granius to Seneca"; and "the soldier, Cassius, grabs and binds Rufus."[14] In many of these directions Gwinne seems merely to alter convention: *Granius ad Senecam* (Granius to Seneca) would conventionally be rendered "exit" – were it necessary to know whither, the playwright would supply an aside by Granius, "I'll away to Seneca." Where Gwinne provides an aside, he again alters convention: instead of "aside to Rufus" he writes *diuertit ad Rufũ secretò* (secretly turning to Rufus). As these pages show, Gwinne's text, with its unplayable overpopulation of characters, requires more than the accustomed share of coming and goings, and too many asides could become cumbersome; nevertheless, if whither a character exits is important then the dramatic dialogue must contain that

information. Other stage directions self-consciously rupture the illusion that *Nero* is a dramatic text. *Poppaā euocat* (Poppaea is called back) could never appear on the printed page of a post-theatrical text. In a dramatic text a note cannot record what is spoken: that is the dialogue's job. Yet such notes appear in *Nero*'s margins with regularity, and render his dramatic text markedly nontheatrical. However bristling with stage directions, the margins fail to reference the centred text's patent debt to Tacitus. As Sutton illustrates in her notes, these two pages are pieced together from Tacitus *Annals* XV.xlix-lxvii.[15]

Nero's marginalia lack the Quarto's annotative precision, suggesting that, in some instances, the marginalia's presence on the page served other purposes than to allow the reader access to the sources. The opening pages of Act 5 Scene 7, Q2v and Q3r treat Lucan, distraught over betraying his mother, preparing to commit suicide (Figures 6 &7). The margins repeatedly cite the source of this lament in Books 3-9 (primarily Book 4) of Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*: *Lucan.l.1.466., l.4.579., 613., 620., l.3.39 l.8.629., 629., l.9.210., 403., 388., 892., 817., l.3 637.* Not only do these notes often mis-cite or fail to cite, the entire section is a pastiche of *Bellum Ciuile* IV.476ff, fleshed out with details from I, III, and IX.[16] This is not to say that Gwinne's margins are inept; quite the contrary is true. Readers who start at IV.579 might miss the completeness of Gwinne's debt to Lucan, but those interested could follow epitomes. Gwinne might not be concerned about granting access to Lucan; nevertheless, his marginal reiterations represent *Nero*'s historic accuracy in its attention to Lucan's words. Not offering exacting citations, *Nero*'s margins exclude the reader from the full potential of the derivative text's discursive community. These margins seem more a pretense than Slights' Annotation. In Gwinne's defense,

Renaissance margination is not a scientific method laid out in detailed manuals but a complex of functions resulting from centuries of practical application.

Nero's annotation seems a symptom of the malaise overtaking the marginated page. Having said this, *Nero*'s margins have the potential to provide much insight into the level of scholarly investigation they anticipated. At A3v and A4r, before the play's action begins, Nemesis presents a prologue introducing the chorus of Furies (Figures 8 & 9). Opening with a Fury is a Senecan convention, setting dramatic mood not historic foundation; therefore, its accompanying marginalia should function as nnotation at least. The induction's initial note would seem to offer Amplification, Annotation, and Explication.

Debita sceleribus flagra, Iustitiæ manus,	Arist. demond.
Distribuo Nemesis; siquis insequitur scelus,	Nat.Com.myth.
Insector Adrasteia, nec quisquam effugit.	l.9.c.19.l.3.c.10.

(I, Nemesis, the hand of justice,
Allot due scourges to crimes; if any crime comes after,
I, Adrasteia, will pursue, nor will any escape).[17]

This note treats the initial thirty lines of *Nero*'s prologue and, in effect, renders the next two notes redundant. The margin refers to a classical and a humanist source for discussion of Nemesis's alias – Adrasteia. In this first note Gwinne's commitment to his reader is again in question. He provides no cap, line, or page number for *de Mundo*, which is not by Aristotle. *De Mundo* was written by the second-century pseudo-Aristotelian Apuleius of Madauros, and was generally known to be a spurious attribution

since the middle ages; nevertheless, *De Mundo* was popular cosmography into the Renaissance. In *de Mundo*, Apuleius treats together Nemesis, Adrasteia, and the Fates. For Conti's *Mythologiae* the margins offer two exacting choices – book 9 cap. 19 and book 3 cap. 10. In IX.xix, *Nemesis*, Conti quotes Antimachus and Diodorus to confirm that Nemesis was otherwise called Adrasteia.[18] The eight pages comprising III.x, *Eumenidibus*, treats the Furies as a group, as individuals, their roles as judges, and their homes and haunts.[19] Where a reader might not be aware that *De Mundo* is not by Aristotle, nor that Adrasteia is Nemesis's alter ego, the list of canonical texts quoted in Conti witnesses that no reader capable of Gwinne's Latin text could claim ignorance of the Eumenides. Neither Apuleius nor Conti are likely to be at hand to any but those reading in an academic library. Is this note mere window dressing? Is naming Aristotle authorization enough to keep any reader happy, and are Natale Conti's book and page numbers just for erudite show? Were this the only note in which Gwinne misused the margins, the answer might not be such a resounding yes.

The second note on this page, again, combines the functions of Amplification, Annotation, and Justification.

Quin si sit illis arbiter rerum Chorus,
Iudex, vel index, qui malis abstet, bonis Hor.art.poet.
Faueat, utrisque sua tribuat, oret deos .191.
Fortuna miseris redeat, à tumidis eat,
Quin nos facinorum vindices, æquae arbitræ?

(And if a Chorus shall be arbiter of these thing,
As judge or juror, who would keep the wicked at bay,

And support the good, and allot to each their own, entreat the gods
That Fortuna should return to the wretched, and abandon the prideful,
Who but us, avengers of crimes, arbiters of justice?).[20]

These lines ask rhetorically: if there is to be a chorus, who better than we avenging Furies? Here Gwinne offers full access to the cited source. The *Ars* is a text more likely to be at hand than any other *Nero*'s margins cite. The line cited reads "Nor let a god enter the scene, unless some hindrance should occur worthy of such a defender."[21] It seems the margins are assuring the reader that the play will present such an occasion. If the learned playwright is defending his text against the charge of abusing *deus ex machina* – a charge such as Jonson might lay – offering one's knowledge of literary theory to assert the right to deviate from the popular norm is an effective maneuver, one Jonson himself employs in the Quarto. If this note is simply to inform the reader of the Furies' ultimate success in punishing Nero, it seems a superfluous gesture. The historic record's treatment of Nero's fate would be known to any who could read enough Latin to get though this play. And what is the hindrance requiring the god's presence? Nero's crimes? His pride? In either scenario this note seems as much a pretense as genuine Amplification, Annotation, or Justification.

The play's third note, offers Amplification, Annotation, and Explication, but also accomplishes more.

Agenda quin prædicimus, quoniam Deae? Orph, hymn.
Interpretamur acta, Iustitiae asseclæ? Eumenid.

(As we are gods, do we not foretell what is to be done?
As we are servants of justice, do we not interpret what has been done?).[22]

In the centre, Gwinne's Nemesis describes what a Fury does, their prescience and right to mete out justice. The margins had just cited Conti's description of the Eumenides/furies. Now, seemingly overzealous for authorization, the margins cite *Orphic Hymn to the Eumenides,* which describes the same. But here Amplification is not redundant: the *Orphic Hymn* amplifies the centre's dramatic impact by providing a nightmarish description of these dark queens with their life-destroying eyes and snaky tresses.[23] Sutton suggests that "Orph, hymn" refers to the *Orphic Hymn to the Eumenides* and that the citation "Eumenid." in fact, refers to Aeschylus's play *Eumenides* for its Chorus of horrific Eumenides. As the *Orphic Hymn* supplies horror enough, and there is no marginal reference to Aeschylus to any degree of abbreviation, I feel that Sutton's attribution is an unnecessary supposition. And, as Conti quotes Aristotle in his treatment of Nemesis, he also quotes the *Orphic hymn* when treating the Eumenides. A productive study could be made of the role of *Mythologiae Siue Explicationis Fabularum libri X* in *Nero*. With this citation, Gwinne, as Jonson would two years later, uses his sources to add dramatic impact to the written word.

In another marginating gesture that would find its way into the Quarto, at the bottom of this first page, Gwinne provides objectionable details unsuited to an academic drama, details so explicit that, if included in the centre, might have stalled *Nero* at the censors. In the final note on the first page, the margins draw Juvenal into the centre.

En Messalinæ quam procax amor, an furor!
Quæ quam impudica, et impudens, satyræ canunt, Iuu-Sat.6.
Lassata, nec dum satura, quòd fuerit viris. 130.
Prodiga pudoris, hactenus tandem pudens?

(How impudent was Messalina's love, or madness!
Satires style her unchaste and shameless,
How men would be exhausted while she was unsated.
Prodigal of her shame, who was hitherto false modest).[24]

The centred text informs that satires sing of Messalina's insatiability, but Juvenal supplies the lurid details. Like Horace, Juvenal is likely to appear in many personal libraries. Where the note cites a single line confirming her insatiability with a close translation – *et lassata uiris nec dum satiata recessit* (and men were exhausted while she withdrew unsated) – marginal epitomes in Juvenal would point to the anecdote's beginning. As the margins had employed the *Orphic Hymn* to create an image of a Fury, here they produce a vivid tableau of Messalina's sexual crimes. Placing this scene in the margins keeps the text safe from the censor's pen. Juvenal VI.115-132 treats Messalina's nightly visits to a brothel, where she takes on all comers: "Welcoming, she received all comers, and demanded payment: and lying prostate, she devoured every stroke without interruption."[25] Juvenal's satire paints an image of the emperor's wife standing among the filthy blankets, naked but for the adornments of her nocturnal trade: "She entered the brothel steaming with ancient blankets. She took to her empty cell; then she stood naked, her nipples exposed for sale, adorned with gold, feigning Lyisca's title."[26] Thus referenced, Juvenal's Messalina remains present when, in *Nero*, Messalina's ghost enters and claims her innocence – "You ordered me, innocent, to be killed."[27] The margins confirm the first of five ghostly visitors capable of deception if not self-deception. In this gesture the margins demand the reader pay close attention to the other four.

Promising Annotation and Amplification, *Nero*'s first marginal reference to

Tacitus lacks precision; but, here, the lack of precision suggests the sort of attention Gwinne expects his readers to give to *Nero*'s historiographic sources.

> *Remedia Silius unica periclis putat* Tacit. Annal.
> *Pericla: scelera cum patent, audax iuvet* l.11.f.
> *Furor: innocentes tuta consilia expetant.*
>
> (Silius supposed the only remedy for his peril
> Was through peril: when wickedness is manifest,
> Let audacious madness serve, let the innocent wish for safe plans).[28]

This marginal citation might be expected to offer the source of Messalina's line, in Tactus's "when even Silius argued for breaking off dissimilation, whether through fatal frenzy or because of some imminent danger, thinking danger itself the best remedy."[29] But this note does not direct; as in so many of Gwinne's marginal references to the histories, it merely points in the right direction. Gwinne's note deigns to supply only the book; the centre excerpts Messalina's lines from *Annals* cap. xxvi, and xxvi is only one of thirty-eight chapters comprising Book XI, and Book XI is all about Messalina's crimes and her demise. Even if the reader employs a marginal epitome to find the right chapter, the reader would as likely start at the top of that cap. and read the whole moment Messalina's ghost is relating:

> Messalina now loathing the very ease of her adulteries, was rushing toward novel lusts, when even Silius argued for breaking off dissimilation, whether through fatal frenzy or because of some imminent danger, thinking danger itself the best remedy. They had come to such a state that they could not wait for the emperor's old age. Harmless plans were for the innocent. With crimes made manifest, help aims for audacity.[30]

Chapter xxvi confirms Juvenal's opinion of Messalina's venereal mismanagement. Reading through, or briefly scrutinizing Book XI's epitomes, it soon becomes evident that

what follows is adapted from Book XI, chapters xiv to xxxi. Even in setting the dramatic mood, Gwinne employs his margins to situate his tragedy in what Italian humanists had long determined to be the only proper foundation for tragedy – historic truth. By providing such a broad treatment of Messalina's crimes, Gwinne allows his reader full access to *Nero*'s discursive community.

Where Gwinne offers Annotation and Amplification from his primary historiographic sources, he denies that his marginalia are a mere pretense. From *Nero*'s title page through its prefatory epistle, Gwinne is adamant that the Roman historians are active participants – Dio speaks through Xiphilinus, Tacitus speaks for himself, and Suetonius is busy in these pages. Gwinne expects much more of his readers attention to these three at least. That attention is generously rewarded. Exhibiting twelve marginal citations, over forty-four lines, the margins of the opening page of Act 2 Scene 3 are among *Nero*'s fullest. The marginal references are explicit – citing book and cap – and each note performs Slights' Annotation and Amplification (Figure 10). This is *Nero*'s most Jonsonian page. The intersections of margins and centre increase the humour, if such a word can be used of Nero's mockery, and even provide correction and parody of their author's own text. The first eight of these notes are so tightly packed that they might well be construed as a single note addressing eight lines or, if the four references to Tacitus *ibid* are considered, forty-three lines. Nero is not self-apostrophizing. The Nero speaking is still Domitius and the Nero he speaks of was, as Caesar, Claudius.:

Nero. Postquam inter homines desiit diuus Nero	*Suet.c.33.N*
Mórari, avitis Claudijs clarus Nero,	*Tacit.A".13.449.*
Suis triumphis clarus, illorum inclytus	*Suet.c.17.C*

Græcæ et Latinæ scriptor historiæ Nero — *Suet.c.41.et.42.C*
Patriæ pater, curator annonæ Nero — *Suet.c.18.C*
Sub quo regente triste nil, tuta omnia, — *Tacit.ib.*
Prouidus (id acta vita sub Caio docet) — *Suet.c.38.C*
Sapiens (id ipsum nomen imperij probat) — *Senec. in αποχ*
Cæsar, Tiberius, Drusus, Augustus, Nero;
Pietatis ergò Claudium in cælos, patres — *Dion.l.60.in fine*
Vnco trahamus, Diuus ubi fungos edat,
Cibos Deorum: funus Augustum apparo.
Nunc quia Deorum gratià, voto meo, — *Tacit.ib.*
Virtute matris, militum assensu omnium,
Filius, et hæres Claudij, imperium gero,
Authoritatem postulo vestram, Patres,
Summam, auspicatam, liberam, unanimem, gravem.
Vnam esse Lunam, luceant stellæ licet,
Solum esse Solem, Luna licet orbem impleat,
Vnum esse superis, inferis, medijs Iouem,
Vnum esse Romæ, monstra nisi gignat, caput,
Pax, ordo, lex, vis, vsus, vtilitas iubent
Ille vnus ecce Iupiter, pastor, pater.
Adsum, iuuando Iupiter, amando pater
Et alendo pastor adsum,vt Augusti pia — *Xilophi, in.ini. Ner.*
Subinde referam regna, licet impar feram.
Augustus, ecce denuò Augustus, redit.
Nec mihi iuuentus ciuicis armis furit — *Tacit. ib.*
Imbuta, nec sunt, quas alam, lites domi.
Nulla odia, nullae iniuriae, nulla ultio.

(*Nero*: Since divine Nero has ceased to stay amongst men; Nero, illustrious for his Claudian ancestry, illustrious for his own triumphs, renown because of them; Nero, author of Greek and Latin histories, Father of his Country; Nero, the supervisor of the grain supply in whose reign nothing was sorrowful, everything safe; prudent (as was shown by his career under Caius), wise (proved by the very name of empire); Tiberius Drusus Augustus Nero Caesar; thus Senators, let us haul him up into the heavens by the hook of piety, where he may eat the divine mushrooms, food of the gods. I will prepare him an Augustan funeral. And now, by the grace of the gods, by my will, my mother's virtue, with the entire army approving, I govern the imperium as Claudius's son and heir, I require your sanction, senators, supreme, favorable, free, unanimous, and weighty Peace, order, law, authority, practice and utility demand that there is one moon, although the stars may shine, a single sun, although the moon might fill the world, one Jove in heaven, the underworld, and earth, and one head

> of Rome, lest it should bred monsters. There is one Jupiter, one shepherd, one father. I attend to you as Jupiter for aiding, a father for loving, and I attend to you a shepherd for nourishing, so that I might immediately restore the pious rule of Augustus. Although I shall bear it unequally. Behold an Augustus once more, Augustus returns. My youth does not rage with civil wars, nor are there domestic disputes that I maintain. I have no hatreds, no injuries, no vendettas).[31]

Gwinne's margins first refer to Suetonius's version of the event:

> He commenced parricide and murder with Claudius; even though he was not the actor in this, he at least was privy to it. Nor did he lie on that point, as afterwards he was accustomed to praise mushrooms as "the food of the gods," as the Greek proverb has it, upon which food Claudius received the poison. Certainly, upon Claudius's death he attacked him hostilely with every kind of insult, in act and word, charging him now with stupidity and now with cruelty; for he joked that Claudius had ceased to play the fool [*mōrari*] among mortals, drawing out the first syllable of the word, and he regarded as void many of his decrees and commands as the work of a fool and a madman. In the end, he neglected to fence his tomb except with a humble, thin wall.[32]

Gwinne draws attention to this excerpt from Suetonius for a number of reasons. Even the most learned among his readers would likely have missed the pun on "Mórari." The pun is in drawing out the first syllable in moror/morari (remain/stay) to render it mōror/mōrari, to be a fool. Only those who follow his marginal lead would know that Gwinne's Nero is Suetonius's mocking Nero, not Tacitus's earnest Nero. The confusion caused by all the Neros in Gwinne's version now seems deliberate, as the living Nero becomes self-aggrandizing and self-apostrophizing.

Recourse to Tacitus illustrates that, paradoxically, Gwinne's primary debt, in this excerpt, is owed to the *Annal*s:

> On the day of the funeral, the prince began Claudius's eulogy, while he enumerated the antiquity of his family, his consulships and triumphs of his ancestors, he himself and the others in audience were in earnest. Likewise,

> they heard with rapt hearts the commemoration of his generous methods, and that during his reign nothing sorrowful had befallen the republic from outsiders. After when Nero turned to his prudence and wisdom, no one could control their laughter, although the speech, which was composed by Seneca, displayed much polish."[33]

Tacitus supplies Gwinne with the solemn, earnest Nero; Tacitus's is the pro-Nero account of Nero's funeral eulogy to Claudius.

But Gwinne is not finished. Now the margins correct themselves, placing Suetonius's Nero upon Tacitus's:

> All in all he undertook only one campaign and that a small one. When the triumphal regalia was decreed him by the senate, thinking the distinction a trifle to the imperial dignity and wishing the glory of a proper triumph, [Claudius] elected Britain as the best place from which gain it; it had not been attempted by any since the Deified Julius, and it was then in rebellion because deserters had not been returned. During the voyage from Ostia he was almost sunk twice in violent northwesters, neighboring Liguria and next to the Stoechades islands. Therefore he made the journey all the way from Massilia to Gesoriacum by foot, crossed from there, and, without any battle or bloodshed, within a few days received the surrender of a part of the island; within six months he returned to Rome, and celebrated a triumph with great pomp.[34]

This excerpt adds new nuances to Nero's eulogy. Again Suetonius turns on their head the notions formed out of Gwinne's lines, refuting Tacitus's seeming depiction of an earnest Nero. Claudius's triumphs were nonexistent: he was a weak buffoon; and everyone of any standing new it. The margins are not done with Nero and Claudius at this solemn occasion; now they cite Suetonius *Claudius* XLI and XLII:

> He attempted to write history in his youth with the encouragement of Titus Livius and the aid of Sulpicius Flavius. But when he gave his first reading before a full house, he recited it with difficulty, since he repeatedly froze. For, at the beginning of the reading, benches broken by a fat man exhorted a laugh, and even with the uproar quieted, [Claudius] could not keep from recalling the incident and renewing his guffaws. Even while emperor,

> [Claudius] wrote much and regularly gave recitals through a professional reader. He began his history after the death of the dictator Caesar, but he skipped over to later times and began anew at the end of the civil war, when he understood that he was at liberty to give neither frank nor true account of the earlier times, since he was often chastised by his mother and his grandmother. He left two books of the earlier history, but forty-one of the later.[35]

> In the end he wrote Greek histories, twenty books on the Etruscans, eight on the Carthaginians.[36]

The latter part of XLI deals primarily with Claudius's non-historical writings: an autobiography and a defense of Cicero against Asinius Gallus. He also invented and wrote a theory on three new letters, and mandated their use when he became emperor. *Claudius* XLIII deals with his love of and proficiency in Greek. But what does this excerpt do for our impression of Claudius? The margins invite empathy for the youth stumbling over his recital with nervous laughter, and they invite the reader to envy Claudius his teachers. He is to be admired as a scholar. Claudius is no more the complete fool than Nero is earnest. This excerpt also provides insight into historiography at a time rife with spies and application, something Gwinne was keenly aware of in his own time.

Turning to Suetonius *Claudius* XVIII, the margins again offer edification:

> He always acted with the most anxious care for the city and the rations of grain. When the Aemiliana burned out of control he remained in the Diribitorium for two nights, and when a crowd of soldiers and his own slaves were insufficient to help, through the magistrates, he called the commons from every neighborhood, and placing bags full of money before them, he exhorted them to help, paying each man, then and there, a fit reward for his labours. Then when there was a scarcity of grain because of continuous droughts, he was once detained in the middle of the Forum by a mob and so harassed with abuse and at the same time pelted with pieces of bread, that he was barely able to pass to the palace by a back door; there

> was nothing he would not try to bring provisions to Rome, even in the winter.[37]

With this note Claudius becomes the vigilant and concerned ruler, albeit one who commands little respect of his people. Gwinne manifests within these few lines and their marginal resources that a single source does not provide the whole truth. The complexity of human events requires a complete picture. But still he is not done. The text turns to back to Tacitus, *Annals* Book XIII cap iii, and the earnest Nero. Tacitus reconfirms that life at Rome under Nero was without foreign attack.

Then this cramped margin refers to Suetonius and *Claudius* XXXVIII, to detail Nero's prudence under Gaius, Caligula, Caesar, and correction turns into parody:

> He did not even keep silent about his own stupidity, but he testified in certain brief orations that he had purposefully simulated stupidity under Gaius, because otherwise he could not have escaped and arrived to undertake his present station. Still he persuaded no one, and within a short time a book was published, the title of which was 'The Elevation of Fools' and its argument, that no one feigned stupidity.[38]

Suetonius confirms the sarcasm that signals Nero's shift to ridiculing Claudius's prudence; yet Suetonius himself has just marginally provided examples of his prudence in making preparations to assure corn provisions. The margins take up the production of meaning from the centre and mock the mocker.

When the margins cite *Senec. in* αποχ, Seneca's *Apokolokyntosis*, and Dio Cassius, while in the centre Nero turns to Claudius's wisdom, together they bring out the irony, which otherwise may not be apparent in Nero's encomium. Seneca's Menippean *Apokolokyntosis Diui Claudii* was often published together with Erasmus's *Stultitiae Laus* and was, thus, widely read. Its title is a play on the very apotheosis of a Roman

emperor for which Nero is, here, mockingly calling. As part of a complex of functions, the margins confirm that Claudius was a complex character whom Nero's glib estimation does not serve. Seneca's name commands too much respect to be ignored, and his text has too much to say about the stupidity of Claudius to be ignored. Beneath Seneca, Dio Cassius records Nero's call for the apotheosis of Claudius. Dio corroborates both the events as they are transpiring. He records that Claudius was drawn to heaven on hooks, as executed prisoners were dragged to the Forum and then from the Forum to the river with hooks. This same excerpt mentions Seneca's *Apokolokyntosis* and Nero's comment on the mushrooms of the gods.[39]

The margin's next *Tacit. ibid,* positioned opposite Nero's address to the senate concerning his right to the imperium, is a compositional error: Tacitus's treatment of this announcement appears in Book XIII cap. iv: "As for the rest, with his imitation of sadness done, he entered the Senate, and having first cited the authority of the senators and the consent of the army, he recounted his counsels and examples with which to guide him in ruling the empire exceptionally."[40] Other than confirming that which needs little confirmation – Nero's feigning sorrow – this note is purely an annotation, providing the source of these lines.

The page's penultimate note presents a bit of a mystery: is Gwinne citing Xiphilinus? Why does Gwinne cite Xiphilinus? Is the note, *Xiliphi.in.ini Ner*, a compositor's error for *Xiphilini.ibi Ner*, or a failed correction for *Xiphilini Ner* – the Nero of Xiphilinus? Xiphilinus is the scholar who produced the epitome of the Dio Cassius Gwinne employs. But why cite him and not Dio? Sutton suggests that the note references

Dio LXI.iii.1, but then states that, there, Dio makes no comment on Nero's present speech.[41] Dio LXI.iii refers to the speech that Seneca wrote for Nero to deliver to the army at his ascension to the imperium. The margins offer that Seneca wrote the eulogy with which Nero opens this scene. Within these marginal references to Seneca at Nero's succession, Gwinne produces tragic irony for those witnessing Seneca's words and counsels raising to the imperium the boy Nero, who would, eleven years later, force him into suicide. The page's final marginal note is another *Tacit. ibid*, which is here an *ibid* for 13.4: "His youth, he said, was not drenched in civil wars or domestic discord, and he brought with him no hatreds, no injuries, no lust of vengeance."[42] This final quotation again confirms that Gwinne is following the historic record. He provides historic truth as the foundation for his tragedy, not truth as provided from a single popularly accessible source, such as North's translation of *Plutarch's Parallel Lives*, Astemio's two *Hecatomythia*, or Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*, but historic truth provided by three of the most respected contributors to the historic record. Had Jonson read Gwinne's *Nero* while composing the Quarto, it would have provided a potent model of both the does and the don'ts of marginal annotation.

THE FUNCTIONS OF ORLANDO FURIOSO'S MARGINALIA

Harington's *Orlando* is different from Gwinne's *Nero* and the Quarto *Sejanus,* and it has different expectations. The English *Orlando* practises parallelography in its margins. *Nero* and the Quarto *Sejanus* eschew parallelography in their margins. Despite his inconsistent margination, Gwinne was more like Jonson than Harington, more the

Polybian historiographer than the programmatic marginator. Programmatic margination in Harington's *Orlando* shows him more the Florentine historiographer, flattering his queen and edifying his noble readers. Openly parallelographic and composed for a specific courtly audience, these margins address *Orlando*'s readers with an intimacy, greater than that accomplished by *Nero* or *Sejanus*. This chapter opened with a promise to illustrate the forms, functions, potentials, and abuses of marginalia. *Nero*'s marginalia often seem a mere pretense – intended to provide little more than visual authorization. Nevertheless, in the final reckoning, fruitfulness overshadows pretense, and Gwinne's primary agenda is a scholarly one. Gwinne's notes serve better to illustrate marginalia's forms, functions, and potentials, than its abuses. But Gwinne's is an historic tragedy written in Latin with little hope of influencing a broad spectrum of educated readers. The genesis of Harington's *Orlando* ensured that it would serve a socio-political agenda – it was written to serve its queen. Harington had translated some indecent passages out of Ariosto to read at court. Elizabeth, his godmother, found offence in them and banished him from court until he translated the entire epic. Only flattering service to queen and court could trump offending them.

What Harington produced is an eminently accessible, insistently scholarly, broadly marginated, elaborately annotated folio that demands association with the continental humanist tradition. Harington's *Orlando* comprises 404 generously marginated pages, spans forty-six cantos, each of which Harington concludes with a Morall, Historie, Allegorie, and Allusion. Opening the work is a table of contents, or "A Note of the Matters Contained in this Whole Volvme," which provides no page

numbers.[43] Following this are a single-page dedicatory epistle "To the Most Excellent, Vertvovs, and Noble Princesse, Elizabeth by the Grace of God Qveene of England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith"[44]; a thirteen-page "A Preface, or Rather a Briefe Apologie of Poetrie, and of the Author and translator of this Poem,"which is marginated with running epitomes[45]; and, finally, a one-page "An Advertisement to the Reader Before He Reade This Poeme, of Some Things to Be Observed, as well in the substance of this worke, as in the setting foorth thereof, with the vse of the Pictures, table, and annotations to the same annexed," which is also marginated with epitomes.[46] Consuming the page preceding each canto or "Booke," an elegantly-wrought and detailed copper engraving depicts key points of the forthcoming action. At the head of each canto is a verse Argument in *octava rima*, providing comic play on the stanzaic form of Italian epic poetry. Each of *Orlando*'s forty-six cantos is heavily marginated. Concluding each canto, in the form of a lengthy annotation or annotations, are all or some of the Moral, Historie, Allegorie, and Allusion, sometimes marked as such, sometimes not. Concluding his translation of Ariosto are nine full folio pages of "for those that haue read the former poem"[47]; nine full pages of "The Life of Ariosto Briefly and Compendiovsly Gathered Ovt of Svndrie Italian writers by Iohn Harington"[48]; eight pages of "An Exact and Necessaries Table in Order of Alphabet, Where in Yov May Readilie Finde the Names of the principall persons treated in this worke, with the chiefe matters that concern them"[49]; and, in a single page, "The Principal Tales in Orlando Fvrioso That May Be Read by Themselves" followed by "Faults escaped in the Printing, the first is the fault, the second the correction."[50]

Ariosto's presence in the text is ubiquitous, even though, when turning to his English *Orlando*, Harington took as his source text the most sumptuous edition of the poem ever published, the elegantly-marginated 1584 Venetian edition of Francesco de Frenceschi, borrowing much of *Orlando*'s aesthetic detail from de Frenceschi, and, indeed, borrowing some of his annotations verbatim.[51] Harington leaves Ariosto the centre and commandeers the margins. Harington's "he" in the annotations diminishes the proprietorship established by Ariosto's "I" in the centre. Ariosto represents himself as the active narrator, relating his history in the first person, as if delivering each canto before a courtly audience like that assembled in Castiglione's *Courtier*: "Where I did leaue *Orlando*, since a wile./ I meane that Ile, that Lippadusa hight.[52]" As Ariosto accounts Turpin his author, Harington takes over the "I" and renders Ariosto his author: "I will observe one thing in which mine Author is thought to keepe an excellent decorum. For, making Discord and Fraud of the feminine gender, he still makes Silence of the masculine."[53]

Harington's *Orlando* is open in its programmatic approach to annotation. Through his annotation, Harington appropriates Ariosto's litany of Italian aristocratic, military, literary, and courtly achievements, rendering them England's achievements. Praise of the house of Este becomes praise of the houses of Tudor, Sidney, and Harington – amongst others.[54] This *Orlando* was to become the English courtier's manual of courtesy, England's *The Courtier*.[55] Ariosto's *Orlando* is less history and more ironic and timely social satire. Unfortunately for Harington's efforts, he ceaselessly reads and annotates Ariosto's ironic satire as part humorous history, part allegorical morality. He reads for

truth as one is meant to read histories. Where Harington fails to find truth in the history, as he all too often fails to do, he finds fiction; fiction must be contorted to find its allegorical value – its truth. Harington's historiography follows the Florentine model. It universalizes, attempting to yield allegorical truth from Ariosto's mytho-historic satire, and it appropriates Ariosto's epic to glorify England and its queen. *Orlando* is historic parallelography of the very sort that the Polybians hoped to supplant with phenomenistic historiography. *Ars gratia Artis*, so much part of the fun in Ariosto, only enters the conversation in Harington's rhetorical glosses. The cost of misreading Ariosto's *Orlando* is missing out on the depth of Ariosto's social satire. The cost of misreading Harington's *Orlando* is missing the English values its annotator would impose upon Ariosto's text. To turn dangerously toward authorial intent, in the former misreading the cost is born by the reader, in the later, by the reader and the author. Harington's margins guard against misreading. Directing and redirecting the reading process, they guarantee that Harington's *Orlando* enjoys an appropriate reception – before its courtly audience and Elizabeth.

In his search for "truth," the programmatic agenda Harington carries out in his marginalia and annotations does not stop with Englishing the text. Harington's marginalia and annotations chastise, allegorize, moralize, and historicize Ariosto's text. Harington plays, in turns, the comic, the straight man, the moralist, and the historian. Harington's control of Ariosto's text goes beyond the content of his marginal notes to the presence of the notes themselves. Where the concluding Summarie and Table provide assistance to comprehension, the marginalia ostensibly aim at edifying the reader. Harington states in the epistle to the reader that he takes precautionary steps, lest any moral harm should

befall the reader from his poetry: "I haue in the marginall notes quoted the apt similitudes, and pithie sentences, or adages, with the best description, and the excellent imitations, and the places and authors from whence they are taken."[56] Here margination signals evaluation. Even single words dotted throughout the text – *sentence*, *simile*, *proverb* – are never neutral. The very application of the term "apt" to these notes betrays an evaluative judgement: "This is what I deem important to note." Slights is very helpful on this point: "The more likely goal [of the annotator] is to legislate meaning by excluding some possibilities while highlighting others in the white space surrounding the text."[57] Such annotative control operates in all varieties of margination and annotation. The appearance of rubrics, running epitomes, or *maniculae* (☞) directs readers toward the appropriate reading. At the level of the single glossed word, each decision of the glossator determines the text's reception. The very claims to simplify reading through marginal annotations of literary or historic allusions are an effort at augmentation that results from this process of selection and are a means of controlling access to unmediated speculation. Harington's marginal notes insist that, while Ariosto speaks, something else must be said. Even if we should read only Ariosto's centered text and allow the marginalia to sit silently in the periphery, as Lawrence Lipking offers, "we are always aware of a companion who knows the answers."[58]

In terms of Renaissance annotation, the end goal of allographic annotation was to manipulate someone else's text to conform to the annotator's agenda. By its over-determination of textual meaning, by its sheer physical dominance, and by its very foreignness, allographic annotation is intrusive, an aggressive act. Ralph Hanna suggests

that annotation does not merely determine the ideal reader, but, rather, it is in effect determining the ideal reading: "forms of annotation speak what is not: they exist deliberately to obscure the aggressive act of controlling audience consumption of the text."[59] It must be said that the annotator's agenda was often not to coopt meaning but to improve access to the centre text. As an expedient to textual utility, marginal or annotative control is only as benign as the agenda that inspires it.

Harington's cooption and evaluation of Ariosto also operates at the conclusion of each "Booke," wherein under the guise of explication he manufactures the canto's "Morall, Historie, Allegorie, and Allusion." In these allographic commentaries Harington's programmatic agenda is most present. Each of these explications is the result of a process of evaluative selection and appropriation aimed at making Ariosto's text historically, socially, or morally edifying for English readers. Harington's *Orlando* has no iniquitous agenda, except to vex those foolish enough to see themselves in its satire; nevertheless, annotation such as Harington's circumscribes the parameters of the conversation between the text and reader. However accustomed readers are to having parameters set by morally or socially edifying annotation, such circumscriptive notes deny readers participation in a conversation that aims to be productive of meaning.

The English *Orlando* provides the bibliographer with a feast of annotation. Three pages show the broad range of Harington's annotative functions. The first two pages are selected as exemplary of those notes Harington attached to his translation of Ariosto's verse; the third page contains one of Harington's explicative commentaries, wherein his agenda is most explicit. The first note for discussion is proximally attached to a

description of Logistilla's castle, stanza (or staffe) 50 in the Tenth Booke (Figure 11). This note asserts the English *Orlando*'s scholarly substance with Horace's Latin, although he adjusts that Latin to his purposes. As with most of Harington's marginalia, this note combines Annotation, Amplification, and Appropriation:

These walls are built of stones of so great price,
All other vnto these come far behind;
In these men see the vertue and the vice,
That cleaueth to the inward soul and mind,
Who looks in such a glasse, may grow so wise,
As neither flattring praises shall him bind
With tickling words, nor vndeserued blame,
With forged faults shall work him anie shame.[60]

Horace. Falsus honor iuuat & mendax infamia terret. Quem? nisi mendosum & mendacem?

This note does very little to serve the verse or the satire it would augment. It is far from necessary that Horace was the author "from whence" it was taken. Nevertheless, this marginal excerpt could simply be Harington pointing out a pithy sentence. As Horace says: "Whom but those prone to error and deceit does false honor please and notorious lies terrify?"[61] Addressing flattering praises and undeserved blame, the note's content is not ill-fitted to the lines to which it is attached. Yet they hardly address Ariosto's poetic point in this stanza. Harington's commentary "Allegorie" of this description insists that Logistilla's castle is to be read as virtue: "*the ornament there of, the herbs of the garden, all these figure the true magnificence, glorie, comfort, and vtility of vertue.*"[62] I would contend that it seems clear from Ariosto's lines, and their context, that the castle depicts the mirror of satire, wherein we see our faults and repair them. Why are these lines those to which Harington points with this note? What is the lesson? Only fools and liars are

duped by flattery and false accusation. The concern, however hackneyed, is reasonable enough: courtiers' wealth and power make them targets for the flattering advances of the wicked. The cure is a bit insulting though: if average courtiers' lack of virtue retards them from ignoring flattery and lies, then they must be shamed into ignoring it by this marginal equivalence.

Through access to Horace, the margins accomplish their full programmatic effect. In its Horatian context, the marginated excerpt introduces Horace's definition of a good man:

> Whom but those prone to error and deceit
> does false honor please and the notorious lie terrify? Who then is the good man?
> "He who serves the senate's decrees, the statutes and laws;
> upon whose judgement are decided many important disputes;
> upon whose guarantee private property is preserved
> and upon whose testimony lawsuits are supported."[63]

As a Roman, Horace describes a good man as a nobleman. In his instruction to the English courtier, such statements provide Harington potent authorization for Renaissance notions of *noblesse oblige*.

Quoting from the source of the final two lines of stanza 51, the next note provides Annotation and Amplification, however imprecise:

	From hence doth come the euerlasting light,
	That may with *Phebus* beames so cleare compare,
	That when the Sunne is downe there is no night,
	With those that of these jewels stored are,
	These gemmes do teach vs to discerne aright:
	These gems are wrought with workmāship so rare,
Ouid. Materiam	That hard it were to make true estimation,
superabat opus	Which is more worth the substance or the fashion.[64]

This excerpt – "The workmanship surpasses the substance" – comes from Ovid's

description of the doors enclosing the Palace of the Sun.[65] Not only does the marginal quotation clearly supply Ariosto's lines, the entire description of these walls built of stones of everlasting light echos the preceding lines in Ovid: "The regal Palace of the Sun sat atop lofty pillars lit with bright gold and rubies that blazed like burning fire."[66] In this case there is little question that Ovid supplies Ariosto with much for this stanza. This note, then, although lacking any source information, is a more accurate citation than the preceding.

Attached to the stanza wherein Rogero, mounted on his hippogryph, was setting out to circumnavigate the earth, the third marginal note is one most familiar to the academic reader: it is a deictic emphasizing a *sententia* of the sort worthy to be recorded in the reader's commonplace book. But it also appropriates Ariosto's verse to Harington's agenda.

> And though the thing were much to vndertake,
> Yet hope of praisse makes men no trauell shunne, *Sentence.*
> To say another day, this we haue donne.[67]

This *Sentence* both announces a pithy piece of *sententia* and exhorts the courtly reader to attend to an important lesson for England's noble youth. Harington reasserts this exhortation in the canto's Moral: "*Finally in Rogeros trauell about the world, we may see how commendable it is for a yoūg Gentleman to trauell abrode into forraine nations.*"[68]

The fourth and fifth notes on this page address Stanza 60. The fourth advertises itself as a *Sentence*. The fifth appropriates Ariosto's own marginal note from this line and then performs a unique variation on his practice for quoting classical sources.

> Yet hauing now of trauell felt the sweet, *Sentence*

(Sweet vnto those to knowledge that aspire),
When Germanie and Hungrie he had past,
He meanes to visit * England at the last.[69]

**Ariosto cals vs vltima Ingleterra, the vttermost countrey. So in time past the old Roman's wrate, Et penitus toto diuisos orbe Britannos.*

Evidently this excerpt is sententious for the same reason as the last. The asterisk connecting the second note to the centre marks one of the important differences between Gwinne and Harington's *modus scribendi in margine*: the sporadic use of superscript letters and symbols keying the marginal notation to the centred text. A marginating ploy of which Jonson would make near constant use, this system ensures that the note is addressed before the verse is finished. Where Gwinne and Harington's proximal notes suggest semantic equivalence, primacy is given to the keyed note's contents. Evelyn Tribble discusses the system through the most Englishing of Harington's notes, that at Book 1 Stanza 3, where a superscript "c" renders Cardinal Hippolyte Elizabeth.[70] Attached to "Vouchsafe (O Prince [c] of most renowmed race/ The ornament and hope of this our time) is Harington's note "*c This is by the author intended to Cardinal Hippolito, but by the translator to a Prince far more worthie.*"[71] Harington's use of English, at 10.60, to introduce the Latin further ensures the note's primacy. The note itself – "And even as far as the Britons, sundered from the whole world"[72] – is taken out of Virgil's first *Eclogue*, wherein Tityrus attempts to convince Meliboeus to resign himself to a life drifting in exile. There is great authorizing virtue in citing Virgil. Not naming him might cost the marginator a valuable connection. Between the insistent asterisk and the failure

to name the source, Harington's choice to alter his marginal quotation practice is curious. The note's Virgilian source loosely confirms the substance of the verse and the two preceding notes. More importantly, Harington's note ties England visually to Virgil, as English historians had been wont to do since Gildas Sapiens' *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*. At the moment that England is drawn into Ariosto's epic, its own epic past is remembered. In these Englishing notes, Harington addresses his audience directly with the familiar "us" or "we." In doing so, he lends his Englishing gestures a conspiratorial tone, turning readers into confederates, drawing them into the act of appropriation.

The final note on this page further appropriates Ariosto's verse to emphasize England's heroic past. The stanza itself is the start of one of the many epic lists that choke Ariosto's text, this one a list of the British dukes and earls marshaled to aid France against the pagan hordes:

> See you the standerd that so great doth show,
> That ioynes the Leopard and the flour de luce?
> That is the chiefe, the rest do come below,
> And reu'rence this according to our vse,
> Duke *Leonell* Lord Generall doth it ow,
> A famous man in time of warre and truce,
> And nephew deare vnto the king my master,
> Who gaue him the Dukedome of Lancaster.[73]

> *Ariosto doth but roue at these noble mens names, and if any of vs should write of the noble men of that time, we should not do the like.*

The note runs beside the centre, consciously competing with its length. Harington is openly hostile to the manner by which Ariosto lets his bolt so randomly. Again the use of familiar collective pronouns draws the co-conspiratorial readers into the process of annotation. Now, evoking the impulse to marginal transactions, he invites his readers to vent their shared vexation at the Italian by recounting in the margins their own list of

English heroes. Harington's note calls to his readers to abet his annotative manipulation by filling their minds with English glory. The annotative aggression shifts outward to intrude upon the reader.

The Eighteenth Booke provides the second page for discussion (Figure 12). The first three notes on the page offer a subtle evaluation of Ariosto's organization, revealing Harington's frustration with his source's episodic style, ever shifting from story to story with only the promise of return to reassure the frustrated reader. This frustration is hardly unique to this page, and notes expressing this frustration punctuate *Orlando*'s episodic shifts. Harington offers a species of Slights' Simplification to help the reader who shares his frustration. The frustration that inspires the first note in turn frustrates the centred text's attempt to create cliff-hanging tension:

> *He returneth to them in the xix. booke. 34st.*
>
> Now while this noble crew with tempest tost,
> Went in the sea as winde and weather draue,
> Looking each minute to be drownd and lost,
> The Christians with a fresh assault and graue,
> Set on the Pagans sorely to their cost.[74]

This frustration inspired Harington in the opening epistle to write: "where diuers stories in this work, seeme in many places abruptly broken off, I haue set instruction in the margent, where to find the continuance of euery such storie"[75] – although he does advise his reader to approach the text as it is until the second reading. This frustration inspired the paginated list under "The Principal Tales in Orlando Fvrioso That May Be Read by Themselves," with which Harington closes the text.

The second note, attached proximally to the next stanza, is simply a single-word running epitome or deictic announcing the return of Renaldo:

Renaldo. *Renaldo* him had noted from the rest,
Proud of the slaughter of so many foes.[76]

This deictic is strangely positioned: it is not, as might be expected, at the point adjacent to where the story returns to the knight's adventures, at the previous stanza's "The Christians with a fresh assault and graue." The marginal *Renaldo* sits right beside *Renaldo* in the verse; in fact, as the initial line of each staffe juts into the margins and the centred text italicizes proper names, the two *Renaldo*s appear to be mirror images of one another, boldly heralding his return. Harington's disdain for Ariosto's constant abandonment of his heroes is evident in this marginal celebration of Renaldo's return.

The third note on this page is a marginal epitome announcing Dardanello's death, not nine lines above where the centre announces he will be slain, nor at the point in the final line of the following stanza where Renaldo's spear slays Dardanello, but at the point where Dardanello accepts Renaldo's martial challenge:

Dardanello Know this (quoth he) that these my cullors I,
Slaine Will brauely here defend, or brauely die.[77]

On one page, Harington objects to Ariosto ever suspending the action and defies any kind of suspense with this emphatic spoiler.

Citing Virgil, the next note sits adjacent to the joust scene in the following stanza and offers Annotation and Amplification that provide a very important lesson for a noble youth who might find himself defending his flag in battle:

With that he spurr'd his horse (as this he spake)
And with great force *Renaldo* did assaile,
Virg. 1. AEn. But loe the staffe vpon his armor brake,
Infelix puer at- So as his blow but little did auaile,
que impar con- But straight *Renaldos* speare away did make,

gressus Achilli. Piercing the double folds of plate and maile,
And went so deepe into the tender skin,
Out went the life there where the staffe went in.

The reference – "unhappy boy, unequally joined with Achilles" – is to the *Aeneid* Book 1 where, felled by Achilles' spear, Troilus is dragged dying in his chariot:

> In another part of the field, fleeing Troilus, weapons lost,
> unhappy boy, unequally joined with Achilles,
> borne by his crazed horses, and on his back he clings to the chariot
> vainly clutching the reins, his hair and shoulders drag on the ground,
> his dragging spear head writes his sorrow in the dust.[78]

Where they often fail to do so, by including the book number, here, the margins insist that readers trace the quotation, although it is likely every school boy would have known the first book of the *Aeneid*. As it does little to describe the scene to which it is attached, Harington selected this excerpt for dramatic tone rather than detail. It incites pity for the beautiful and noble Dardanello's unripe death, turning the pagan into Chaucer's chivalric hero. And the Latin in the margins is authorizing and eminently accessible to even the average student. Reading Harington's use of *Orlando*'s margins to elicit the desired emotions in his readers, likely provided a powerful inspiration for Jonson own margins.

The following stanza eulogizes Dardanello's death, and Harington performs the most pedestrian of his marginating functions – stating that a simile is a *simile*. Then he does something more original and annotates the simile, drawing Homer into the centre, increasing Dardanello's heroism:

Looke how a purple flowre doth fade and drie, *Simile.*
That painefull plawman cutteth vp with sheare, *Homer hath*
Or as the Poppeys head aside do lie, *of a Poppy*
When it the bodie cannot longer beare,
So did the noble Dardanello die,

> And with his death fild all his men with feare.
> As waters run abrode that beake their bay, *Simile.*
> So fled his soldiers breaking their array.[79]

In Book VIII of the *Iliad*, Teucer aims his arrows at Hector and, missing, kills his brother Gorgythion. Homer's *Iliad* had, the previous year, become widely accessible in Chapman's successful translations. Homer offers this somber simile: "And as a Crimson poppy flower, surcharged with his seed / And vernall humor, falling thick, declines his heauie brow: / So, of one side, his helmets weight, his fainting head did bow."[80] Homer's Gorgythion is another beautiful prince cut down in the flower of youth. At the other end of that stanza as the pagan armies flee disheartened by the loss of Dardanello, Harington informs his reader that this is again a simile. Whether Ariosto invented this simile, as so cowardly a retreat does not deserve a classical allusion, or whether Harington's Italian source advertised one that Harington chose not to include, with the stark juxtaposition of *Simile. Homer hath of Poppies* and *Simile*, Harington's margin separates the hero from the cowards.

Attached to the bottom of the next stanza another pedestrian note points out another *sententia*:

> Charles by the forhead meanes to take Occasion, *Sentence.*
> And follows them full close with all his host, *Fronte capillat,*
> And comming to their tents so brauely venterd, *est post tergum*
> That he with them themselues almost had entred *occasio calua.*

The content of the note, taken out of Dionysius Cato's *Disticha*, is eminently suited to the line it addresses:"Occasion wears a forelock, in the back she is bald." But to what end? That Occasion wears a forelock is a trope so hackneyed as to be common knowledge.

And this common knowledge springs from Cato's *Distichs*. The *Disticha* is a collection of morals and proverbs that first found popularity as a Mediaeval school book for learning Latin and appropriate morality. Taken up by Erasmus, the *Distichs* remained a popular school text through the Renaissance and beyond. Operating as a repository of *sententiae*, in much the same way as a student's Erasmian notebook or a printed commonplace, this is just the sort of text that the courtly reader was likely to have at hand. The note itself is an understandable misquotation, likely the product of Harington relying on memorial transcription. The actual lines are: *Rem, tibi quam noscis aptam, dimittere noli. Fronte capillata, est post Occasio calua.*[81] One seventeenth-century edition offers this translation as the most correct of the nine variations presented: "Slight not the offered thing, that fits thy minde; Time, hath a locke, Before; is Bald behind."[82] With this note Harington can as likely rely on the readers' memory as their willingness to access his marginal resources. Whatever authorization might be gained from quoting Cato or Erasmus, this note seems little more than a pretense, an excuse to dress the margins with more accessible Latin. In this Harington constructs his margins to ends very different than Jonson's: where in the composition of Jonson's *Latine* marginalia "it was presupposd, none but the Learned would take the paynes to conferre them," Harington purposefully fills his margins with the satisfyingly familiar.

Attached to the stanza introducing two more beautiful pagan youths upon whom Ariosto sets his adoring gaze, the page's penultimate note is part pedestrian deictic or running epitome – *Cloridano, Medore* – and part emphasis that something notable is coming. Humble Cloridano and Medore nobly venture through the Christian camp to the

battlefield where they recover Dardanello's body for burial. On their way through the camp, they slaughter dozens of the sleeping enemy. Although, when chased by Scots cavalry, Cloridano leaves his side, wounded Medore carries on with the body. Angelica finds him and eventually marries him (Booke XXX) and makes him King of India. Not finding its way into the Eighteenth Booke's Argument nor any Booke's concluding Moral, Historie, Allegorie, or Allusion, yet so filled with noble courage and reward, the episodic tale this stanza begins is one to which Harington feels he must marginally insists his noble readers attend. This notion that nobility came of deeds not birth earned much humanist discussion.

The final note on this page, attached to Ariosto's description of Medore, is that to which the previous emphatic deictic points, although it points to a pretense:

> *Medore* was but young, and now began,
> To enter to, of youth the pleasant greene,
> Faire skind, black eyd, and yellow curled heare,
> Hanging in louely locks by either eare.[83]

*Statius descri-
beth the beautie
of Achilleides in
such sort.
Dulcis adhuc vi
su niueo notat
ignis in ore.
Purpureus ful
uoque nitet coma
gratior auro.*

Although Ariosto's description seems much more of an ideal European than a north African, Harington's translation removes much of the sense of adoration when removing Ariosto's potentially heretical suggestion that Medore was so beautiful he might have been an angel or a seraphim. The note accompanying this description contains Statius's description of Achilles' beauty: "Yet sweet to the sight: shimmering passion burns in his

snow-white countenance, and his locks shine more pleasing than tawny gold."[84]

Harington is likely misremembering the genitive, "Achilleidos" which appears on the title page of the book – *Of the Achilleid the first book.*[85] Or, perhaps Harington took this out of a commonplace and read the excerpt's title reference as its subject. Although fitting and a likely inspiration for Ariosto's lines, this marginal annotation does little more than dress the page with Statius's name.

Evidence of Harington's programmatic appropriation of Ariosto for the edification of his courtly reader is all but ubiquitous in the English *Orlando*'s marginalia, but nowhere is Harington's appropriation more manifest than in the Moral, Historie, Allegorie, and Allusion concluding each book. The most blatantly Englishing Moral is found in the commentary concluding the Twentith Booke (Figure 13). This is a troubling commentary. On the surface of the page, it seems that somewhere between the composing stick and the chase the marginal labels shifted down the page. What by all accounts ought to be the Moral is labeled a *Simile*; what ought to be the Historie is labeled the Moral; what ought to be the Allegories is labeled the Historie, and the Allusion misses labeling entirely. Given the story of the English *Orlando*'s nativity, this must surely be the most politically important of Harington's commentaries. Any claims the page might make to faulty composition must be feigned. The problem with this seeming compositorial slip is that Harington played a substantial role in the production of this book. In the prefatory Advertisement, Harington claims to have hired and directed the artists who cut the illustrations into brass, although he does not admit to having them copy the prints from his source text. Throughout the epistle's description of the text, Harington insists that he

made all: "I haue in the marginal notes, quoted," "I haue noted," "I haue set directions," "I haue made a table." He confirms his compositorial role when addressing the annotations and commentary; he states that "if any other notes happen to come after, it is but for want of rome in the margent."[86] A manuscript copy of the first edition and letters between Harington and Richard Field, that edition's publisher, further attest to Harington's direct involvement in Orlando's *mise-en-page*. In that letter, Harington insists that his Allegory, the Apology, and all the prose but the Table use the same font as Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesy* – which Field also published.[87] A year after Orlando's publication, the Privy Council rebuked Harington for having twice hired an apprentice printer and engraver out from under his master.[88] Two final pieces of evidence for this seeming misalignment being intentional exist within *Orlando's* textual apparatus. At Book XX, Stanza 14 beside "*Phalanto* sonne of *Clytemnesta* Queene," a note reads "*Looke in the Historie of this booke.*"[89] Even with the deictics shifted up, it would be the Moral not the Historie that treats Phalanto. According to Harington's own marginal notes, then, the Moral and the Historie must switch places. Finally, in his "Faults escaped in the Printing," Harington makes no mention of a compositorial error with the Twentith Booke's concluding commentaries. This would not be so remarkable, were it not that in that same appendix Harington notes "p.160.st.94.in the marg.wants Simile."[90] On page 160 staffe 94 sits directly above Book XX's Moral and Historie. The evidence certainly points to Harington intending this commentary to serve as the Moral first the Historie second:

In the beginning of this booke he reciteth the name of foure

> *women famous, two for warre, two for learning, and indeede there haue bene many more, excellent in either kind: as* Thomeris *that killed* Cyrus, Zenobea, Hipsicratea *wife to* Mythridates, Debora *the Hebrew, whom the scripture commendeth;* Valesca *queene of* Moral. *Boemia,* Thenca *queene of Slauonia,* Amalasunta *queene of the Gothes: All these are famous for their wise gouerment. And for learning diuers women haue greatly excelled; as* Eriana, Aspasia, Cleobulyna, Theana, Leontio, Manto, Hicostrata, Carmenta, *the* Sibils, Sulpicia, *But for a perfite patterne of excellency in both kinds, both in governing the common welth most wisely, peacably and prosperously, and skill in all kinds of learning, and Languages, Greeke, Latine, French, Italian and Spanish, I may say it truely, and without flatterie, that our gracious soueraigne is to be preferred before any of them, yea before all of them, and therefore may iustly be called the iewel, or rather the wonder of her sex.*[91]

Harington represents this commentary as a Moral. Harington's morals customarily explicate or add the stanzas' philosophical, ethical, or theological purports. In the Advertisement, Harington announces the motivation behind his Morals: "that we may applie it to our owne maners, and disposition, to the amendment of the same." How then is Book XX's Moral a moral in any but the loosest sense? The argument could be made that the moral courtly readers are to take away from the English *Orlando* is that England is greater and her nobility are better than their Italian counterparts, and Elizabeth is the quintessential Briton. Following this thread, Harington accomplishes much moralizing in Booke XX, so replete with heroic women – Angelica heals Medore; Marfisa challenges the law of the Amazons, discomfits Pinabell, and puts Zerbino in his place. Indeed *Orlando* is ruled by the heroic deeds of women – to the mockery and shame of a host of noblemen and princely knights. In effect, concluding that this chapter, with its deeds of worthy women, serves as a Moral for Elizabeth, renders Elizabeth the most worthy of

them all. This is likely the point – to flatter Elizabeth with parallels.

Of course the page might, in fact, be honest, and this commentary is the Booke's Historie. Harington tells his reader in the Advertisement that the Histories are presented "both that the true ground of the poeme may appeare (for learned men hold, that the perfect poeme must ground of a truth) as also to explain some things, that are lightly touched upon by him, as examples of all times, either of old or of late."[92] The text's historical matter serves as a parallelography of Elizabeth. Beyond the Moral/Historie's relationship with the text from which it issues, there is politics in the content of the commentary itself. In his opening maneuver, Harington sends the readers back to the opening stanza, in order to draw a narrative line between Elizabeth and the two mytho-historical heroines and two Greek poetesses, a line drawing them to her for comparison and her to them in a mythologizing gesture. In the commentary's second maneuver, the note places Elizabeth at the head of a list of nineteen worthies whose histories span two thousand years, which is a flattery that presumes her place in that history.

However harmlessly, Harington's marginalia exhibit many of the sins of programmatic margination. In places it contravenes the original author's intentions, in others it coopts those intentions for its own uses, in still others it circumscribes the original text in such a way as to deny the original the right to lead the textual discourse. There is parallelography in the margins and commentaries that would turn Ariosto's mock epic into a model of Florentine historiography. Even though many marginal notes are indeed mere window dressing, providing little more than recognizable Latin to flatter the courtly readers with pretensions to learning, much of Harington's marginalia is

productive, turning Ariosto's mock epic to the service of Queen Elizabeth and her court. Whereas both *Nero* and *Orlando* broadly anticipate the Quarto's margination, the Quarto's margins fulfil the potentials of marginalia to a greater degree than either *Nero*'s or *Orlando*'s.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. Publius Ovidius Naso, "Epsitulae ex Ponto," *Tristia; Ex Ponto*, ed. and trans. Leslie Wheeler (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988) IV.xiv.43. Etymologically *felix* is from φύω – fruitful, fertile productive – but it translates quite broadly as fruitful, happy, lucky, successful, prosperous (*L&S ad loc*).

2. *At malus interpres populi mihi concitat iram / inque nouum crimen carmina nostra uocat. / Tam felix utinam quam pectore candidus essem! /Extat adhuc nemo saucius ore meo. /Adde quod, Illyrica si iam pice nigrior essem, /non mordenda mihi turba fidelis erat* (*Ex Ponto* 41-46).

3. ¶2r.

4. ¶2r-4v.

5. A1r

6. A1v-2v.

7. *Paratexts* 328.

8. *Num ergo tragice sufficio? Pro me loquantur Tacitus, Suetonius, Dion Seneca*: *nam et loquuntur ipsi fere omnia* (¶2v).

9. *Non dico, quod non apta; forte nec scripta in hunc finem: etsi utrumque innuat et personarum multitudo et longitudo inaequalis actuum* (¶4r).

10. *apud doctos habere debet gratiam, quanto minorem apud indoctos habet.* (¶4v). This is marginally cited *Plin.l.2.epist.19.f* (Pliny the Younger, *Letters and Panegyrics of Pliny*, ed. and trans. Betty Radice [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1969] II.19.8).

11. *Sed nec in scena silet / Xiphilinus istâ, nec tacet Tacitus; nec est / Tranquillus hic Tranquillus: historicos putes / Fieri poetas* (A4r).

12. Evelyn Tribble argues that the marginating ploy of employing superscript figures follows that of the Geneva bible (*Margins and Marginalia* 94-95).

13. I refer here to Kastan's suggestion that the market for published plays was primarily among theatergoers ("Plays into Print" 32-38).

14. *effertur à Flauio et Aspero mox redeuntibus*; *redit Rufus et Epaphroditus cum Natali; Nymphidius Sabinus ad Pisonem; Stat. Proximus ad Laterā et Epaphrod.*; *reducitur Sceuinus; Poppaā euocat*; *Granius ad Senecā; ad ilios Tribuni tres cum Epaphro.; Redit Ganius; Redeunt Flau. Et Asp.; diuertit ad Rufū secretò; Granius ad Senecam; Cassius miles Rufū vincit rapit.*

15. *ad loc;* I owe much of this discussion of Gwinne's marginal notes to Dana F. Sutton's electronic version of *Nero*; http://thelatinlibrary.com/gwinne.html.Sutton has produced an electronic version of the original Latin and of an English translation; she has also transcribed the marginal notes (many of which were indecipherable in EEBO) and traced them in detail regrettably restricted by the limitations of her page. My debt to Sutton's notes is ubiquitous in what follows. I, therefore, cite her here with a protracted *ad loc*. I footnote where my investigations disagree with Sutton.

16. Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, *Bellum Civile*, ed. J. D. Duff (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997). See also Sutton *ad loc*.

17. A3v, 5-7.

18. *Natalis Comitis Mythologiae Siue Explicationis Fabularum libri X* (Venice: Andeas Wechel, 1581) 668.22.

19. *Ibid.* 142-49.

20. A3v, 18-22.

21. *nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus / inciderit* (*Ars* 191-92).

22. A3v, 23-24.

23. Martin Litchfield West, *The Orphic Poems* (New York: Oxford UP, 1983) LXIX.

24. A3v, 27-30.

25. *excepit blanda intrantis atque aera poposcit. / continueque iacens cunctorum absorbuit ictus* (Juvenal VI, 125-26).

26. *intrauit calidum ueteri centone lupanar / et cellam uacuam atque suam; tunc nuda papillis / prostitit auratis titulum mentita Lyciscae* (*Ibid.*, 121-23).

27. *innocens, perimi iubes* (B1r).

28. A4r, 35-37.

29. *cum abrumpi dissimulationem etiam Silius, sive fatali vaecordia an imminentium periculorum remedium ipsa pericula ratus, urgebat* (*Annals* XI.xxvi). Certainly Sutton considers that this is Gwinne's intention, as she offers her reader only this line.

30. *Iam Messalina facilitate adulteriorum in fastidium versa ad incognitas libidines profluebat, cum abrumpi dissimulationem etiam Silius, sive fatali vaecordia an imminentium periculorum remedium ipsa pericula ratus, urgebat: quippe non eo ventum ut senectam principis opperirentur. insontibus innoxia consilia, flagitiis manifestis subsidium ab audacia petendum* (*Annals* XI.xxvi).

31. D2v.

32. *Parricidia et caedes a Claudio exorsus est; cuius necis etsi non auctor, at conscius fuit, neque dissimulanter, ut qui boletos, in quo cibi genere venenum is acceperat, quasi deorum cibum posthac proverbio Graeco conlaudare sit solitus. Certe omnibus rerum verborumque contumeliis mortuum insectatus est, modo stultitiae modo saevitiae arguens; nam et morari eum desisse inter homines producta prima syllaba iocabatur multaque decreta et constituta, ut insipientis atque deliri, pro irritis habuit; denique bustum eius consaepiri nisi humili levique maceria neglexit* (*Nero* XXXIII).

33. *Die funeris laudationem eius princeps exorsus est, dum antiquitatem generis, consulatus ac triumphos maiorem enumerabat, intentus ipse et ceteri; liberalium quoque artium commemoratio et nihil regente eo triste rei publicae ab externis accidisse pronis animis audita: postquam ad providentiam sapientiamque flexit, nemo risui temperare, quamquam oratio a Seneca composita multum cultus praeferret* (*Annals* XIII.iii).

34. *Expeditionem unam omnino suscepit eamque modicam. Cum decretis sibi a senatu ornamentis triumphalibus leviorem maiestati principali titulum arbitraretur velletque iusti triumphi decus, unde adquireret Britanniam potissimum elegit, neque temptatam ulli post Divum Iulium et tunc tumultuantem ob non redditos transfugas. Huc cum ab Ostia navigaret, vehementi circio bis paene demersus est, prope Liguriam iuxtaque Stoechadas insulas. Quare a Massilia Gesoriacum usque pedestri itinere confecto inde transmisit ac sine ullo proelio aut sanguine intra paucissimos dies parte insulae in deditionem recepta, sexto quam profectus erat mense Romam rediit triumphavitque maximo apparatu* (*Claudius* XVII).

35. *Historiam in adulescentia hortante T. Livio, Sulpicio vero Flavo etiam adiuvante, scribere adgressus est. Et cum primum frequenti auditorio commisisset, aegre perlegit refrigeratus saepe a semet ipso. Nam cum initio recitationis defractis compluribus subselliis obesitate cuiusdam risus exortus esset, ne sedato quidem tumulto temperare potuit, quin ex intervallo subinde facti reminisceretur cachinnosque revocaret. In*

principatu quoque et scripsit plurimum et assidue recitavit per lectorem. Initium autem sumpsit historiae post caedem Caesaris dictatoris, sed transiit ad inferiora tempora coepitque a pace civili, cum sentiret neque libere neque vere sibi de superioribus tradendi potestatem relictam, correptus saepe et a matre et ab avia. Prioris materiae duo volumina, posterioris unum et quadraginta reliquit (*Claudius* XLI).

36. *Denique et Graecas scripsit historias, Tyrrhenicon viginti, Carchedoniacon octo* (*Claudius* XLII).

37. *Urbis annonaeque curam sollicitissime semper egit. Cum Aemiliana pertinacius arderent, in diribitorio duabus noctibus mansit ac deficiente militum ac familiarum turba auxilio plebem per magistratus ex omnibus vicis convocavit ac positis ante se cum pecunia fiscis ad subveniendum hortatus est, repraesentans pro opera dignam cuique mercedem. Artiore autem annona ob assiduas sterilitates detentus quondam medio Foro a turba conviciisque et simul fragminibus panis ita infestatus, ut aegre nec nisi postico evadere in Palatinus valuerit, nihil non excogitavit ad invehendos etiam tempore hiberno commeatus* (*Claudius* XVIII).

38. *Ac ne stultitiam quidem suam reticuit simulatamque a se ex industria sub Gaio, quod aliter evasurus perventurusque ad susceptam stationem non fuerit, quibusdam oratiunculis testatus est; nec tamen persuasit, cum intra breve tempus liber editus sit, cui index erat μωρῶν ἐπαναστασις, argumentum autem stultitiam neminem fingere* (*Claudius* XXXVIII). The record is unclear whether this refers to the *Ludus de morte diui Claudii*, which Dio names *Apokolokyntosis Diui Claudii* (*The Gourdification of [the Divine] Claudius*) and attributes to Seneca.

39. Dio LX.xxxv.

40. *Ceterum peractis tristitiae imitamentis curiam ingressus et de auctoritate patrum et consensu militum praefatus, consilia sibi et exempla capessendi egregie imperii memoravit* (*Annals* XIII.IV).

41. *Ad loc* in Sutton's Latin transcription.

42. *neque iuventam armis civilibus aut domesticis discordiis imbutam; nulla odia, nullas iniurias nec cupidinem ultionis adferre* (*Annals* XIII.iv).

43. *Orlando Fvrioso in English Heroical Verse, by Iohn Haringtõ* (London: Richard Field, 1591) ¶1v; STC 746.

44. ¶2r.

45. ¶2v-¶8v.

46. A1r.

47. 405-14/ Mm2r-Mm6v.

48. 414-23/Mm6v-Nn5r.

49. Nn5v-Oo3r; the remainder of the end matter is unnumbered.

50. Oo3v.

51. D. H. Craig discusses Harington's debt to Italian annotators in his very helpful discussion of Harington's *Orlando* (*Sir John Harington* [Boston: Twayne, 1985] 55).

52. 169 [369]/XLIII.142-43, Ii.ii.r.

53. XIV *Allegorie*, 111/K3r.

54. Evelyn Tribble has much of note to say on Harington's coopting of Ariosto's courtly praise to serve his Englishing ends (*Margins and Marginality* 87-100).

55. Slights offers a brief but enlightening discussion of the correlation between Harington and Castiglione *(Managing* 172).

56. A1r.

57. *Managing* 158.

58. Lipking 615. Michel de Certeau also makes this point when suggesting that "linked to a received text which refers to a hidden meaning within the figure (allegory, blazon, emblem, etc), [the marginator's] symbol implies the necessity for an *authorized commentary* by whomever is 'wise' or profound enough to detect this meaning" (*The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley [NY: Columbia UP, 1988] 74).

59. "Annotation as Social Practice" 181.

60. 77/G4r.

61. The note reads excerpted from Horace *Epistles* I.xvi:(77/G4r).

62. 80/G5v.

63. *Falsus honor iuuat et mendax infamia terret /quem nisi mendosum et mendacem?/ Vir bonus est quis?/ "Qui consulta patrum, qui leges iuraque seruat,/ quo multae magnaeque secantur iudice lites,/ quo res sponsore et quo causae teste tenentur"* (*Epistles* I.xvi 39-45). I have adjusted the Loeb's reading of *mendacem* as *medicandum* to reflect Harington's use of a version based upon the codex Ambrosianus or Mellicensis.

64. 77/G4r.

65. Publius Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphoses*, ed. and trans. Frank Justus Miller (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977) 2.1.4.

66. *Regia Solis erat sublimibus alta columnis, / clara micante auro flammasque imitante pyropo* (*Ibid.* 2.1.2).

67. 77/G4r, 58.

68. 80/G5v.

69. 77/G4r, 60.

70. *Margins and Marginalia* 94-95.

71. 1/A2r.

72. Publius Vergilius Maro, "Eclogues," *Virgil*, ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978-86) 1.66.

73. 77/G4r, 63.

74. 142/M6v, 67.

75. A1r.

76. 142/M6v, 68.

77. *Ibid.* 69.

78. *Parte alia fugiens amissis Troilus armis, /infelix puer atque impar congressus Achilli,/ fertur equis, curruque haeret resupinus inani,/ lora tenens tamen; huic cervixque comaeque trahuntur/ per terram, et versa pulvis inscribitur hasta.*("Aeneid," *Virgil,* ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978-86] 1 .474-78).

79. 142/M6v, 71.

80. Chapman's *Iliad* (*Homer prince of poets: translated according to the Greeke, in twelue bookes of his Iliads, by Geo: Chapman* [London: Samuel Macham, 1609] 126/R3.r: STC 13633).

81. *Catonis disticha de moribus cum scholiis des. Erasmi Roterodami. Adiecta sunt, dicta graeca sapientum, interprete Erasmo Roterodamo. Eadem per Ausonium, cum Erasmi doctissima enarratione. Mimi publicani ex cuiusdem Erasmi restitutione, cúmque scholijs eiusdem. Christiani hominis institutum, ab eodem Erasmo docta carmine conscriptum. Isocratis ad Demonicum oratio paraenetica, longè ad iuventutis mores rirè formandos vtilissima. Omnia summa cura, diligentu[m]que execusa* (London: Robert Robinson,

1592) 22/B3v.II.xxvi: STC 4848; here the title alone attests to both the distichs' and Erasmus's place in Renaissance education.

82. *Cato variegatus or Catoes morall distichs: translated and paraphras'd, with variations of expressing, in English verse. By Sr. Richard Baker Knight* (London: Anne Bowler, 1636) 52-53: STC 4863.

83. 142/M6v, 76.

84. Publius Papinius Statius, *Achilleid*, ed. and trans. J. H. Mozley (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1928) 1.161-62.

85. I owe this observation to Cedric Littlewood, of the University of Victoria Department of Greek and Roman Studies.

86. A1r.

87. This detail is quoted in Robert McNutly, *Ludovico Ariosto's Orlando Furioso* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) xlvii.

88. I draw this anecdote from Craig (*Sir John Harington* 12).

89. 154/N6v.

90. Unsigned.

91. 160/O3r.

92. A1r.

CHAPTER 5: THE FUNCTIONS OF SEJANUS'S MARGINALIA[1]

Of the dozens of Renaissance marginated texts I have perused in this research none accomplishes what the Quarto *Sejanus* does in exhausting the potentials of margination. The record supplies the Quarto *Sejanus* no bibliographical or generic cognates ideally suited to this discussion. The preceding chapter provides two examples of contemporary marginated texts to act as foils for the Quarto's marginalia. Gwinne's *Nero* and Harington's *Orlando* are suited to function as foils not merely because they are marginated texts, but because they are creative works, and they are openly indebted to their sources. Both historiographic and dramatic, *Nero* is the closest in mode and genre. *Nero* was, however, too scholarly to expect a popular audience. Nevertheless, republished in 1638 and again in 1639, *Nero* seems to have achieved reasonable success. Ariosto's *Orlando* is pure popular fiction, and it was published, excerpted, and translated throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While it may seem incongruous to discuss the translation and annotation of a foreign work of epic poetry as the creative output of its translator/annotator, the degree to which Harington co-opts Ariosto's text to his purposes renders *Orlando* his own. As this chapter and the previous show, these two texts taken together provide as close a practicable foil for Jonson's marginal functions as we can ask. Unfortunately, in the face of Jonson's near exhaustion of the potentials of margination, much of what this chapter discusses can only be related to the discussion in the previous chapter by repeating that Jonson did this, where Gwinne and Harington did not. *Nero* and *Orlando*, then, must perform as the bibliographical context in which *Sejanus*'s margins flourish.

Slights lists the functions of Jonson's notes in the Quarto: "annotation, amplification, correcting errors of interpretation, justification of his own political stance, and explication."[2] I would argue that the Quarto's marginal functions are broader still. Operating as equal partners in textual meaning, the margins are active. They are literally *Sejanus*'s imaginative, historical, and even physical context. They render Tiberian Rome Roman, setting the centre's scenes within exquisite detail and movement. By their mere presence, the marginal notes remind the reader that there is a "truth" of the historic event of Sejanus's rise and fall beyond the capacity of the centre to describe. The vast majority of those notes offer sources, and those sources rarely offer confirmation but, instead, ramification. The sources compiled in the Quarto's margins manifest that the "truth" behind an historic event must be sought in the convergences and interstices of the anomalistic record. *Sejanus*'s historic event transpired within this living context driven by motive and circumstance. The history within the margins reveals the "truth" that *Sejanus*'s characters cannot acknowledge. The margins parallel, inform, and complicate what the characters or their actions say of the events as they unfold. Jonson's margins offer a companion who knows the answers, however burlesquing, deceptive, and judgmental that companion might sometimes be.

The print area of the Quarto's ninety-one pages of dramatic dialogue is divided between the centred and marginal text. On average, the centred text occupies 9.1 and the margins 1.4 cm. Only ten pages deviate from this pattern. In four the marginal notes pass under the centred text to fill the entire print area: one line at the bottom of B3r, two lines at the bottom of D3v and D4v, and eight lines at the bottom of K3v. On K4r three lines of

annotation extend from the margins at the top of the page, as do five lines in the middle of that page (the latter two pages contain the lengthy marginal description and citation of Sejanus's sacrifice to Fortuna). On M1v through M2v, an italic rendering of Tiberius's letter to the senate markedly encroaches upon the margins, the centred text space widening to 9.4 cm. Only E4v and G1r are void of any marginal notation whatsoever. Forty-five pages have at least 50 percent of their marginal space filled, and eighteen are above 80 percent filled.

Meaning in the composite Quarto is constructed in each intersection of margin and centre. Insisting upon the received version of events, the historic record creates for the centre a metatextual context. I use "insisting" literally: the margins direct reading with imperatives. They insist the reader consult or consider carefully (*Cons./Consulta*), read (*Leg./ Lege*), witness (*Test/Testa*), or see (*Vid./Vide*). Jonson's choice of imperative dictates how the reader is to approach the sources. When a character acknowledges the historic record in the centred text (speaks from it, refers to it, or alludes to it), the character is admitting an awareness of the received versions of events. Yet when a character veers from the historic record, in words or actions, that character does not negate the record's existence. The margins insist that historic moment transpires as the record dictates, whatever the characters might do. The margins construct the context in which the events of the centred text play out, the stage, as it were, upon which *Sejanus* is played. Tiberius, the Germanicans, and Sejanus, as well as the opportunists and pragmatists who surround them, are necessarily aware of their historic context, whether or not they can acknowledge such awareness. When Silius and the Germanicans echo the

historic record they are showing an understanding of their context that belies the seeming innocence with which they fall into Sejanus's traps.

Sejanus, like many of its contemporaries, plays upon genre. *Sejanus* is, by turns, a history and a tragedy. As my introductory survey outlines, critics view the tragedy in *Sejanus* as inept and the historiography as following the Florentine model of flattery or caution through adjustments and parallels. In my reading of the Quarto as a composite, there is no adjustment; the historiography becomes a panoptic treatise on human cause and circumstance – the small matter of historic events. The synergy of margins and dramatic dialogue highlights each generic turn, realizes the scene, produces the psychological realism of Polybian historiography, and qualifies the tragedy. Each genre of the Quarto's marginal resources has the potential to create context. A chaotic street-scene from Juvenal or the wonderful detail of a sacrifice from Rosinus creates a conceptual *scena*, infusing and occupying the dramatic context of the centred text. The introduction of Martial or Plautus undermines the dramatic context with burlesques of the Germanicans or Sejanus. Creating the historic context, Tacitus, Dio, and Suetonius turn Sejanus's bold vaunts into a comic Alazon's tragic attempt at self-flattering self-delusion.

Tendering 306 notes, many of which cite multiple sources and perform multiple functions, Jonson's *modus scribendi in margine* fits comfortably into Slights's generalized functions, as set out in Chapter 3. For the purposes of this discussion, I augment and reconfigure those functions slightly and redistribute them among seven broad functions of my own, many of which are further divisible, and all of which have the potential to operate in combination: there are notes that 1) inform characterization, 2)

complicate or work against meaning as purported in the centred text, 3) mock or burlesque the tenor of the centre text, 4) assert *Sejanus*'s Roman context, 5) conflate and situate time and events, 6) perform and inform spatially, and 7) offer events outside of the historic scope of the centre. Jonson's notes are entirely authorial and therefore neither peripheral nor paratextual. What follows is an illustrative anatomy of the Quarto's marginal functions. The range of the Quarto marginalia's functions and the relative complexity of their textual interactions to those of *Nero* or *Orlando* do not permit the same sample page analyses. I will discuss each of these functions, in turn, with concrete examples from the Quarto's margins.

Notes that inform characterization lay the foundation for the Quarto's Polybian historiography. Such notes cite the Roman historians and Seneca's *ad Marciam*. Of those texts discussed in these concluding chapters, this function is unique to the Quarto. These notes create expectations and suggest motivation. Employing marginal resources to, in effect, manipulate the readers' expectations is a master stroke wherein the historian, the bibliographer, and the poet come together on the page. In the margins, Jonson presents history out of sequence, creating psychologically realized portraits. He increases the impact of the historic events by subtly drawing on the historic record itself. In these intersections of history and dramatic text, Jonson shows himself the Polybian, drawing small matter out of the historic record to produce phenomenistic historiography. Whether a character will become a model of folly or of reasoned action is determined by the degrees of correlation between the marginal portrait and the character represented in the centred text. Some of these marginal portraits create expectations that will be

disappointed by the version in the centred text. Some create expectations that will complicate or be complicated by the version in the centred text, while others create expectations that will be fulfilled by the version in the centred text. Still other portraits reveal motivation.

The composite's initial note, at 1.1, creates expectations of Silius that will soon be disappointed (Figure 14).[3] This marginal function compounds Amplification – adding detail and examples – Annotation – those details and examples are referenced out of the historic record – and Correction – those details and examples assure that the centre prompts no erroneous interpretation. Out of Tacitus, the margins introduce the historic Silius of ca. 14-16 CE – seven years prior to *Sejanus*'s conflation of the events of 23-30 – and the key role he played in Germanicus's German successes. For this historic Silius, Germanicus's deeds and noble virtues are as real as his own.

> Two armies were on the bank of the Rhine; the upper army was commanded by lieutenant-general Gaius Silius, the lower by Aulus Caecina. Over-all command was in the power of Germanicus, then attending to the taking of the Gaulish census. But those whom Silius was controlling were, with uncertain hearts, observing the fortunes of others' sedition: while the soldiers of the lower army had fallen into a frenzy.[4]
>
> Silius and Anteius Caecina were trusted with the construction of the fleet. A thousand ships were thought sufficient and quickly built.[5]
>
> But [Germanicus], while the ships were driven into shore, ordered his second lieutenant, Silius, to make an attack into Chattan territories with a lightly armed force.[6]
>
> But rumours of the fleet's loss excited the Germans to hopes of war, yet they also excited [Germanicus] to repressing those hopes. He ordered Gaius Silius to go against the Chatti with thirty thousand foot and three thousand horse.[7]

This is the noble Silius of critical conception, the Silius who could be Essex or Ralegh, the Silius whom Tricomi suggests "teaches the feckless Senate to mock Tiberius's tyranny."[8] This Silius is decidedly not the angry, impotent, and intemperate braggart whom the composite portrays throughout. Nor is this the vainglorious, grasping Silius, as the margins will characterize him at his trial scene. Ayres suggests that Jonson adds impatience, scorn, ill-temper, and drunkenness to Tacitus's boastful Silius – all characteristic of "Ralegh's unrestrained individualism," and that the tone with which Jonson's Silius defends himself has "much in common with Ralegh's conducting of his own defense."[9] Although this project argues against Jonson practising any parallelography in *Sejanus*, when the centre alone is considered, Ayres argument is convincing. With the composite considered, as I believe it should be, using the texts that it demands, Ayres evidence does not hold. From the margins the historic record provides Silius all of these bad qualities and more: his troubles with Varro's father, his boasting about Tiberius's debt to his loyal legions, and his stealing from the provinces are species of impatience, scorn, and ill-temper. Aryes employed the Loeb translation of the *Annals*. Tacitus' Latin calls into question Ayres' suggestion that Silius's drinking is unique to Jonson's portrayal. Tacitus writes:

> Almost all believed that his offence was swelled by his immoderate use of wine (*ipsius intemperantia*), and his intemperate vaunts (*immodice iactantis*) that his soldiers had remained in their obedience, when all of the other troops were prone to fall into rebellion; nor would rule have lasted for Tiberius, had but there also been the desire for revolution in his legions.[10]

The Loeb translates *intemparantia* as "indiscretion," an interpretation that *L&S* allows for Tacitus in *intemperantia linguae*.[11] *Intemperantia* can mean immoderation in anything

including drink. Suetonius uses *intemperantia* in reference to Tiberius first thinking that Drusus had died of disease as a result of his debauched lifestyle: *morbo et intemperantia perisse existimaret*.[12] One early-modern Latin dictionary defines *intemperantia* as: "when a body can not rule, and gouerne, nor refrayne his appetites, and affections, lacke of temperance."[13] This was a usage of intemperance common in Jonson's time. The likelihood is that Jonson would have read Tacitus's line as "Almost all believed that his offence was swelled by his immoderate use of wine." A likelihood made greater by Jonson translating "intemperate vaunts" in the following line out of Tacitus's *immodice iactantis*. It also seems possible that in translating Tacitus, Jonson reversed *Intemperantia* and *immodica*.

The margins and centre combine to produce a complex portrait of Silius in conflict with that depicted in the centre alone. Out of this portrait, the margins quickly begin to produce a sketch of the Germanican pyche, widening the gap between what these "good-dull-noble lookers on" represent themselves to be and know and what the historic record insists that they were and knew. Out of this ever-widening gap manifests Germanican self-delusion. In *Sejanus*'s Tiberian Rome, self-delusion is the most popular means of survival. The Germanicans delude themselves that Tiberius is knowable in his patent duplicity; that Sejanus, not the emperor, is the evil, and that curtailing him is Tiberius's obligation not theirs; and they delude themselves that their own guise of harmlessness is protection enough against tyranny's machinations. In this Polybian portrait the composite offers a psychological study out of which readers learn of society's propensity for self-delusion.

When the dialogue first introduces the character of Drusus Sr. the margins complicate or work against meaning as given in the centred text (Figure 15). Here the margins insist the reader judge the soundness of Germanican hopes for Drusus, adding Evaluation to the compound. The Germanicans hold Drusus, Tiberius's son, as the best hope for a return to Rome's former glory. The margins introduce the historical Drusus over the course of the first nine lines of B2v, through four notes citing Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio.[14] At each intersection of marginal note and Germanican assessment, the historic record either complicates or, more often, undercuts the dramatic dialogue's portrait of Drusus. At note "a," in the first excerpt from Tacitus, Drusus is sent by Tiberius to quiet the German mutiny. Yet in Tacitus, the presence of Drusus's protector, Sejanus, as the real threat glowering at the mutineers from over the princes's shoulder, undercuts Germanican hopes of Drusus's heroic potential: "Aelius Sejanus commander of the praetorian guard . . . was there as a protector of the youth and, for the rest, as a vivid reminder of perils or rewards."[15] At this same note, in Suetonius, is Tiberius's disdain for Drusus's "loose and negligent life," which eventuates in Tiberius's lack of interest at Drusus's death:

> He loved neither his natural son Drusus nor his adopted son Germanicus with any fatherly affection, enraged by the former's vices. Indeed Drusus lived a loose and negligent life. And thus, when he died [Tiberius] was not as affected as one might expect, but almost at once after the funeral he returned to his accustomed business with a lengthier public mourning forbidden.[16]

The excerpt from Dio treats of Tiberius's harshness towards criminals, including his son, Drusus, "a most infamous man, and of the most extreme ferocity."[17] In the concluding

note to this marginal portrait, at 113,Tacitus debunks Silius's assessment of Drusus's affection for Germanicus's sons: "For Drusus, however difficult it might be for power and friendship to dwell in the same place, was held as being equitable or at least not adverse to the youths."[18] Tacitus's picture of the politic, dissembling Tiberius convincing the senate that his dear son, recently murdered to his advantage, performed the duties of a loving father to Germanicus's sons adds to this portrait of a detached uncle. The margins create an historically grounded portrait of Drusus by drawing together Suetonius's voluptuous Drusus and Dio's infamous and ferocious Drusus with Tacitus's detached uncle/guardian and ineffectual leader. Once read, the historic record's portrait of Drusus and the terms of Germanican expectations conflate, and their incongruity is confirmed. The margins have altered the effect of the scene. The new conflated scene mocks the Germanicans' hopes as delusional.

Terentius's marginal portrait creates expectations the composite ultimately fulfills. Such notes compound Amplification and Annotation. Terentius's marginal portrait includes Emphasis. The margins introduce Terentius at 1.265, long before anything is known of him. He is first seen but not heard in company with Sejanus, at 1.176, but he neither speaks nor plays a role in the action until Act 4. This portrait employs Tacitus to present Terentius's 32 CE defense against charges of conspiring with Sejanus.[19] Tacitus's Terentius insists that he is not one who participates in Sejanus's crimes but one who simply follows his emperor's lead:

> I take up no man as my example: all who, like me, did not share in the final end of [Sejanus's] schemes, I shall defend at my own risk only. For we attended upon not Sejanus of Vulsinii, but a scion of the Claudian and

> Julian houses, which he occupied by his alliances, your son-in-law Caesar, the partner of your consulate, he who administered your offices in the affairs of state. It is not our place to weigh whom you raise above another or by what causes: the gods have given you the place of judgment over the highest matters; to us is left the glory of obedience. Furthermore we see that which is held before our eyes, who has power and honour from you, who has the most power of helping or harming, no man would have denied that that was Sejanus.[20]

Terentius's carefully reasoned defence creates the expectation that *Sejanus*'s Terentius will be history's pragmatist. As Chapter 2 treats the case of Terentius in detail, I will only provide a sketch here. This marginal gesture offers Terentius greater complexity than the rest of Sejanus's clients. In its location, this note applies a subtle emphasis to Terentius's introduction. The anticipation created by this portrait of an unknown subject seems calculated to inspire the reader to follow Terentius. And, as the composite progresses, exposing every other character's species of human error, this portrait of Terentius's singular pragmatic clarity gains emphasis. When he next appears and first speaks, at 4.479, Terentius takes up the role of the Polybian historian whose non-teleological, non-evaluative reporting the margins set in contrast with Cordus's parallelography. And the reader's expectation of Terentius's role is fulfilled when the historic Terentius, the pragmatist, closes the play and has the last word. The composite, thus, offers Terentius as both the Polybian historiographer to a Florentine centre and the model of reasoned action in a world of impotent self-delusion.

Finally among those notes that inform characterization, there are those whose primary function is to construct something of the historic motivations behind characters' actions. These constitute the voice of the Polybian Jonson, and correspond to or

compound all of Slights' functions, but for Preemption and Translation. The example of Minutius serves this point. The basis of Minutius's motivation, and that of his fellow opportunists, is marginally attached to the stage directions announcing his arrival in Act 4: "LACO. ᶜ POMPONIVS. MINVTIVS. &C.": ᶜ *De* Pomponio, & Minutio. *vid*. Tac. *Ann. lib*. 6."[21] Yet to appear or even be mentioned, Minutius is known to the reader only by the company he keeps, of whom Laco alone has played any part in the action. Arruntius has just pronounced Laco one of Rome's "Horse-leaches," a spy for Sejanus.[22] The margins argue that the alacrity with which Minutius and his fellows will shift alliances at Sejanus's fall is a necessary virtue in Tiberian Rome: "Afterwards Servaeus and Minucius Thermus were indicted [for being leaders in the crimes of Sejanus] . . . when they were found guilty Servaeus and Minucius went over to the informers."[23] This excerpt resurfaces in the margins with each coming shift of *Sejanus*'s opportunists.[24] With each resurfacing, the margins impose meaning upon the centre: as these clients fawn over Sejanus or fret over Tiberius's letters, the margins insist these are more than mere toadies – they are as much nimble survivors as incontinent caitiffs.

Notes that complicate or work against the meaning of the centred text insist upon *Sejanus*'s historical context. Gwinne's marginal introduction of the historical Messalina before her ghost enters and claims her innocence functions in this way. Each point of variance between the marginal constructions and the centre's dialogic representations deepens the human complexity that marks the Quarto's historiographic novelty. Such notes perform what Slights terms the "deconstructive mode of noting," announcing that the centred text requires allo-textual interpretation.[25] Such notes employ Amplification,

Annotation, Correction, and Justification. Notes of this function are also the province of the historians and the *ad Marciam* and work in several ways. Some distort the meaning of the dramatic dialogue, by constructing a marginal context at variance with that suggested by the centre. A second kind of note offers facts in direct contravention of the dialogue to which they are attached. A third kind complicates meaning by offering multiple or alternative sources.

Notes that distort meaning create a metatextual backdrop before which the events or the dialogue of the centre are played. When a scene ill-suited to its backdrop is played out, the terms of the discrepancy between dramatic text and marginal context enrich the composite's historiography. Making explicit the gaps between what the mind knows and what the psyche can admit, such notes realize the causes and circumstances that the Quarto's Polybian historiography presents. The most striking examples of this subdivision are in Act 4, where notes treat Arruntius's rant against Tiberius's crimes on Caprea (Figure 16 & 17).[26] The synergy of margins and centre demonstrates that Arruntius attempts to mitigate Tiberius's venal crimes and, thus, his own culpability in not arresting them. With Tacitean moral reserve, the initial note "b" confirms Arruntius's assessment of the reasons for Tiberius retiring to Caprea – "to acquire in secret a place for enacting his savagery and lust" – and Terentius's assessment of his countenance – "his face ulcerous and checkered with many medications."[27] Yet, however foul the crimes Arruntius sets out in the centred text, those crimes Jonson enumerates in the margins are worse. What is clear in the placement of the second note "c" is that Jonson intends his marginal reader to confront the brutality in Suetonius before reading Arruntius's pallid

version:

> Upon withdrawing to Caprea, in truth, he contrived a drawing-room, a seat for his secret desires, into which from every quarter were brought crowds of young girls and full-grown youths, and authors of unnatural intercourse, whom he called analists, who joined before him in triple unions, defiling each other in turn.[28]

Positioning the flourish and metaphor of Arruntius's version after the explicit violence in Suetonius increases the impact of this contrast. At the third note "d," the margins render Arruntius further suspect in his insight into the details of Tiberius's taste for fortune telling:

> He intimated a knowledge of the Chaldean arts, the understanding of which he had from his leisure on Rhodes, and tutelage of Thrasullus.[29]
>
> For many, by casting their nativities, he searched their character and fortune, and if he should have conceived that anyone might have desired to achieve greatness, or aspire to the imperium, he would have them put to death forthwith.[30]
>
> But that death prevented him, not a few more would have died, and they say that Thrasyllus, in his consultations, had compelled him to defer such out of hope for a longer life.[31]

Between the notes attached to 388/89 and 391/92 the extent of Tiberius's island debauchery becomes grotesque:

> Through trickery, men charged with large draughts of wine, of a sudden, their privates bound fast, he would torture at once by the distention of penis and urine.[32]
>
> The sturdier infants, not yet removed from their mothers' breast, he would put to his groin as if it were a pap.[33]

Such perversity is set out in the margins in contrast to the limits that Arruntius's self-delusion is willing to admit. The historic backdrop represents what Arruntius knows to be

the truth and thus the motivation behind his self-preserving self-delusion.

As Arruntius's mitigation wanes to conclusion, the historic record insists that Tiberius's choice of victims would have assured that his crimes were not secret, at least not among Rome's nobility. Compare Arruntius's "He hath his Boyes, and beauteous Girles tâne vp, / Out of our *noblest Houses*, the best form'd, / Best nurtur'd, and most modest[34]" with Tacitus's "in regal style, he polluted a noble child with his violations."[35] Echoing those of Tacitus, Arruntius's words suggest, perhaps, that he shares the moral historian's repugnance toward detailed enumeration; yet, in the margins, Suetonius confirms the public nature of Tiberius's crimes: "and from that time the people openly called this island by the common name, for its abuses, Old Goat's land."[36] *Sejanus*'s synergy of margins and centred text insists on the sexual violence suggested in Tacitus and confirmed in Suetonius. Thus the margins work against the meaning purported in the centred text to reveal that Arruntius's relation of events on Caprea is self-preserving self-delusion. The Polybian text reveals the psychology behind the cause; the effect is that Tiberius's Caprean perversity does not inspire regicide. Beneath Arruntius's railing is a cautious treatment of the events on Caprea that cannot be considered mere Jonsonian self-censoring.

Jonson illustrates his disdain for such censorship in his own manuscript margination. Commenting on a translation of Martial I.xxxii, treating oral sexual intercourse, Jonson writes "*fellator, siue cunnilingus* vid. lib III. epi. xvii" beside "I do not love you, Sabidius; and I can't say why." The cross-reference suggests that Jonson thinks Martial is implying that Sabidius is a "quim-licker" (McPherson's term). On

Epigram VI.vi where the translation reads "There are three actors in Comedy, but your Paula, Lupercus, loves four. Paula loves a 'walker-on' as well." Jonson writes "*mutam personam/ sci cuneling*," the suggestion being that "walker on" is mute and mute because of his sexual activity. Elsewhere Jonson comments upon a Jesuit edition of Martial: *non ille Jesuitara castratus, euiratus, et prorsus sine Martiali Martialis* "not that of the Jesuits, castrated, unmanned, and utterly Martial without Martial."[37] David McPherson suggests that this Jesuit edition is the *Chorus poetarum* (Lyons, 1616), which omits every obscene or questionable line in all Latin poetry. Jonson supplies all the censored material in the margins of his copy of *Chorus poetarum*, in what McPherson characterizes as "a work of infinite patience."[38]

Jonson employs those notes that offer facts in direct contravention of the line to which they are attached to illustrate both the self-delusion of characters and the ability of those with mastery over language to manipulate others. The case of Macro provides a clear example of this marginal function. In Act 4, Macro begins his seduction of Caligula under the guise of a warning against Sejanus's plots. His rhetorical prowess is vivid, not in his command of the language of law, as Varro, or rumour, as Afer, but in his calculated omissions. The margins reveal that Macro suppresses the historical truth of Tiberius's involvement in the crimes against Germanicus's family, attributing all to "bold *Seianus*'s Plots" (Figure 18).[39] From the margins at note "a," Tacitus exposes Tiberius's role in the demise of Germanicus's family: "Then, as if [Tiberius and Sejanus] were freed from the bridle, they broke out, and a letter was sent against Agrippina and Nero, which the people believed had been delivered long since and kept back by Augustus."[40] At "b," Dio

confirms that "Tiberius, seizing upon the opportunity, attacked Asinius Gallus."[41] Dio offers no question of Tiberius's culpability in Gallus's demise: "This, indeed, was extreme misery, which Tiberius afflicted on many others."[42] Yet, in the centred text, Macro, intent upon laying all upon Sejanus, suggests that the only connection between the feast and Gallus's sentencing was a coincidence of date: *"Gallus,* / Feasted today by *Cæsar,* since committed." Then, Macro's advice is confirmed a complex treachery at "c." While Macro suppresses Tiberius's role in the centre, Tacitus and Suetonius agree that Tiberius accused Agrippina:

> Indeed [Tiberius's] rashness of suspicion and trust remained, which Sejanus was wont to minister to, even in the city.[43]
>
> At last, falsely accusing her of wishing to fly now to the statue of Augustus now to the army, [Tiberius] consigned her to Pandataria.[44]

Through the historic record, the composite text makes manifest that Macro is manipulating the facts, in order to portray himself as sympathetic to Rome's besieged nobility. Yet the record also makes manifest that Caligula, Agrippina's son and a member of the Germanican faction, deludes himself into trusting such patent manipulations. When Macro advises Caligula to seek shelter with Tiberius, he is wittingly sending Caligula to an enemy for safe keeping, and Caligula willingly goes.

Notes that offer multiple or alternative sources complicate the centre in ways that the synergy cannot, for the most part, resolve. Through this function the composite realizes the history, making palpable the anxiety driving *Sejanus*'s various forms of self-delusion. This function is at play in that scene that receives most critical commentary: Cordus's trial scene. By the time Cordus has been found guilty of parallelography none

can hope to make a definitive statement on the cause of his indictment, let alone on his guilt. The historic record offers two versions of the cause behind Cordus's indictment – that of Tacitus and Suetonius and that of Dio Cassius and Seneca. The margins present these versions at various points throughout the first three acts in such a variety of combinations as to manifest a source of Germanican anxiety and to illustrate the danger of forming opinions upon a single historical account. Cordus's trial is marginally referenced four times. The first is on the opening page, where the margins introduce Satrius and Natta through their role in Cordus's trial. This mention offers a balance of Tacitus's and Seneca's versions.[45] Tacitus records how "Cordus was summoned before the court on the novel and hitherto-unheard-of crime" of writing histories.[46] Tacitus's is *Sejanus*'s surface version, with Cordus as the victim of application. Beneath this surface lies Seneca's quite different record:

> Sejanus gave your father to his client, Satrius Secundo, as a prize. He was angry because once or twice your father had spoken too freely, unable to keep silent that Sejanus could not merely be set upon our necks, but indeed that he could climb upon them.[47]

There is no mention of Tacitus's hitherto-unheard-of crime. Further complicating the Tacitan surface version, at the end of that act, the margins insist that Cordus gives voice to Seneca's version: "Cor. [c] Great *Pompei's* Theatre was never ruin'd: [c] *Vid*. Sen. *cons. ad.* Marc. *cap* 22."[48] Compare in Seneca, "Cordus exclaimed, 'now indeed the theatre is ruined. What! Would it not crack, to place Sejanus upon the ashes of Gnaenus Pompeius!'"[49] The second and most comprehensive marginal treatment of Cordus's indictment is upon Cordus's first appearance in the text (Figure 2).[50] The margins offer

four sources from which to form an estimation of Cordus's trial, adding Dio Cassius and Suetonius to Tacitus and Seneca. Dio agrees with Seneca's version but includes Tacitus's as a pretext:

> Cremutius Cordus was forced to take his life with his own hand as he had offended Sejanus. Now, he was one burdened by age, and one who led life most honestly, so much so that there was nothing to bring against this man, by way of a charge, so that the cause was his history.[51]

With the scales thus weighted against the surface version, the margins bring in Suetonius to somewhat restore the balance with his cursory treatment: "an historian was charged, because he had said that Brutus and Cassius were the last of the Romans."[52] At these first two marginal treatments of Cordus's trial, the balance of multiple and alternative versions allows for no final judgement of cause.

The other two marginal treatments of the charge against Cordus further complicate the issue of cause. The third is at the moment when Sejanus suggests to Tiberius that Cordus should be done away with for his histories paralleling the times and the governments.[53] Here Jonson upsets the balance; omitting Suetonius, he overwhelms Tacitus with Dio and Seneca's version. At this line this omission seems to render Sejanus the liar and proclaims Tiberius the dupe who facilitates his brutal ego. This omission turns the composite towards the dark satire of the master and clever slave that so many critics see in *Sejanus*.[54] Ultimately, this variety of marginal representation complicates the critical assessment. Neither Tacitus nor Suetonius, nor for that matter Sejanus, denies that Cordus had angered Sejanus. But then no one but Cordus himself denies that Cordus was a parallelographer. The composite reveals a complexity in the causes of Cordus's

indictment that reflects the unknowability of Tiberian Rome and Tiberius himself. Perhaps most interesting is the final of these notes, at the lead up to Cordus's trial.[55] Here the margins cite only Tacitus and Dio. The note itself is set thirty-five lines apart from the speech it cites. This is the speech in which Jonson famously translates fifty-four lines of Tacitus – "In his Sejanus he hath translated a whole oration of Tacitus"[56] – inspiring critics to speculate, with Dutton, that Tacitus's version of historic events is *Sejanus*'s version.[57] Present in the margins throughout these scenes, the historic record insists that Cordus's is neither the only nor the longest oration that Jonson translates verbatim out of Tacitus. Cordus's defense translates Tacitus for a total of fifty-four lines (3.406-60). Sejanus's request for Livia's hand and Tiberius's response translates Tacitus for seventy-three lines, almost 50 percent longer (3.503-76).

Cordus's trial scene is considered by many critics to be the crux of *Sejanus*, the historian beleaguered by the powers of censorship and an oppressive government wary of application and unflattering parallels. Yet haunting Tacitus's version, the version in the centred text, are Dio's marginal words: "Cremutius Cordus was forced to take his life with his own hand as he had offended Sejanus. . . . there was nothing to bring against this man, by way of a charge, so that the cause was his history."[58] Dio's is a version best suited to the devious Sejanus depicted in the centre. At the moment of Cordus's trial, the margins allow the reader no sure grasp of cause, yet the centre insists that application is at the indictment's source. Nevertheless, in Seneca certainly, the composite argues that contemporaries to the event could enjoy no such conviction of their knowledge. Perhaps it is that the Polybian text suggests there were really two causes: insulting Sejanus was

the impetus, writing parallels the crime.

Notes that mock or burlesque the tenor of the centre are some of Jonson's most creative uses of the Quarto's metatext, representing human characters and the small matter of efficacious historiography. This, again, is a marginating function Jonson might very well have gained from his reading of Gwinne and Harington. These notes turn the margins upon the centre, exposing and deriding the bluster that hides crippling fear. Such notes make recourse to the full spectrum of *Sejanus*'s marginal sources. Some of these notes burlesque the tenor of the dramatic dialogue; others present the Jonsonian trope of the power of productive language to prevail over non-productive language.

Those notes that mock the tenor of the centred text employ the Roman poets, satirists, elegists, epigrammatists, and playwrights to produce burlesques that mock from the margins. In Act 5, Sejanus concludes an anxiety-inspired invective against the devout with a begrudging admission that he would tender offerings only to Fortuna, and only parsimonious offerings at that:

> I know not that one Deity, but *Fortune*;
> To whom I throw vp, in begging smoake
> One [e] grane of Incense: or whose eare I'ld buy
> With thus much oyle. Her I indeed ador;
> And keepe[f] her gratefull Image in my house,
> Some times belonging to a *Roman King*.[59]

> [e] *Grani Turis.* Plaut. Pænu. *Act.* I. *Scen.*I. *Et* Ovid. *lib.*4.*Fast.*
> [f] Dio. *Hist. Rom. lib.* 58. *pag.*

Jonson could have employed any of his encyclopedic resources for a discussion of *Grani Turis*. Instead, the margins conflate comedy and history. Turning to Plautus's *Poenulus,* they burlesque the arrogant inconstancy with which Sejanus treats his tutelary deity:

"LYCUS Let all the gods render him wretched, should, after this day, a panderer even immolate a single sacrificial beast to Venus/ or should one sacrifice a single grain of incense."[60] The margins insist upon this reference to Plautus, now, three pages before Sejanus will sacrifice to Fortuna. Thinking to gain the advantage of Venus's proximity, *Poenulus*'s Lycus has a house beside her temple. Lycus then mocks her and loses his eighteen minae. At note "f," Dio provides verification that Sejanus owned a statue of Fortuna: "And seeking favorable omens, he saw the statue of Fortuna (that was said to have sometime belonged to Tullus, a Roman king; this he himself considered most welcome in his house) turn away from him."[61] Comic Venus proving inimical to Lycus echoes throughout, when grateful Fortuna averts her glance as a portent of Sejanus's fall. However fitting the comparison in kind, it is hardly fitting in tenor. In the centred text, Jonson situates this mocking reference between the morning's ominous portents and the portentous announcement of Macro's arrival at the house of Regulus. The marginal context of this note is the historical confirmation of those omens and the erudition authorizing Sejanus's call for sacrifice to be prepared.[62] As the Flamen prepares the sacrifice to Fortuna, the margins bring Lycus back into the centre through a quotation in Nonius Marcellus and through Plautus himself: "Between *SACRFICARE* and *LITARE* the difference is this: *sacrificare* is to seek favour; *litare* is to propitiate, and to accomplish a sacred vow . . . [this is found in] Plautus in *Poenulus*: 'If, by Hercules, this deed is ever done, then let Jupiter make it that I should ever seek and never attain his favour.'"[63] Through this disjunction between marginal source and dramatic dialogue – burlesquing arrogant pretense in the mighty with parallels in the lowly – the margins mock the self-

serving hypocrisy of Sejanus's religious inconstancy. The introduction of burlesque levels Sejanus's anxiety-inspired arrogance with the frightened self-delusion of the Germanicans. The margins give the composite psychological depth, realizing its historiography. In such notes lies the astounding potential of marginalia.

The margins of Silius's trial scene, in Act 3, are filled with vivid examples of those notes through which the composite shows the power of productive language to prevail over non-productive language. Out of Jonson's plays and epigrams emerge what I would term Jonson's law of rhetorical supremacy – that is portraits of efficacious and inefficacious use of language. For Jonson, in language use, as in all things, true learning is the measure of efficacy. Forthright, reasoned simplicity upon a firm foundation of learning wins the day against show – whether that show is mannerist play, in the vacuous vapors of Quarlous and Knock-Hum; pseudo intellectual railing, in Justice Overdoe's Ciceronian complexity; or those "Fooles or Ierking *Pedants*" whom *Poetaster*'s Virgil attacks as "*Buffonary* wits," who speak "beggerly, and barren trash"[64]; or that empty vituperation the *Epigrammes* deride in those who "hurl ink, and wit,/ As mad-men stones."[65] If anywhere in the Quarto, here Jonson reveals an agenda that is not necessarily Polybian, although it is an agenda not necessarily inimical to the Polybian model. The interactions of margins and centre show success and failure to be the result of reason and folly not of virtue and vice.

Although the margins illustrate that Silius deserves indictment for other crimes, they also illustrate that he is not guilty of the crimes for which he is indicted. Silius's trial is a pretence to rid Tiberius of a brace of troublesome Germanicans. Yet, ultimately, the

margins illustrate, too, that Silius's rhetorical impotence made Varro's job eminently easier. The margins begin the juxtaposition of productive and non-productive language when they illustrate that Varro speaks from a foundation in Roman law:

[a]*Vid. accusandi formulam apud* Brissō. *lib. 5. de For.*

> VAR. [a]If I not proue it *Cæsar*, but iniustly
> Haue call'd him into tryall; here I bind
> My selfe to suffer, what I claime 'gainst him;
> And yeeld to haue what I have spoke, confirm'd
> By iudgment of the Court, and all good Men.[66]

The note reads, "see the formula for accusation in Brisson." Brisson records the formula in almost identical terms:

> If I shall have molested you unjustly, and I shall thence have appeared the victor, I bind myself to the same penalty that I moved to punish you, and elect to be damned by your portion, and submit to it, and by my own hand I sustain the entire matter with constancy, and I yield myself to be confirmed by the judgment of good men.[67]

With this close translation the margins illustrate Varro's rhetorical adherence to the precepts of Roman jurisprudence. Even for those who cannot access Brisson, the citation itself makes authoritative statement enough to accomplish something. Patently taking the language of this scene out of the realm of poetic invention into that of judicial procedure, the composite makes manifest the productivity of language wielded by the learned. Varro's adept application of this fixed formula renders questions of truth or prevarication moot. This use of productive language, next to Arruntius's quibbling interjections, leaves little question of who will and, by Jonson's law of rhetorical supremacy, who should prevail in the proceedings of this trial and this text.

The impression of the condemned ranting against the powers of productive language is confirmed when Silius offers his German campaign in defence:

> When *Phœbus* sooner hath forsooke the day
> Then I the field? Against the blew-ey'd *Gaules*?
> And crisped *Germanes*? when our *Roman* Eagles
> Haue fann'd the fire, with their labouring winges,
> And no blow dealt, that left not death behind it:
> When I haue charg'd, alone, into the troopes
> Of [b] curl'd Sicambrians, routed them, and came
> Not off, with backward ensigns of a slaue,
> But forward markes, wounds on my brest, and face,
> Were meant to thee O *Cæsar*, and thy *Rome*?
> And haue I this return? did I, for this,
> Perform so noble, and so braue defeate?[68]

[b] *Populi* Germ. *hodie* Geldri *in* Belgica *sunt inter* Mosam & Rhenum: *quos celebrat* Mart. *Spect.* 3. *Crinibus in nodum tortis venêre Sicambri.*

The margins do not authorize Silius's claim with the historic record; they cite and quote Martial in reference instead. The note reads: "A peoples of Germany once of Gallia Belgica, they are between the Mosal and the Rhine: which Martial mentions in *Liber de Spectaculatis* 3. The Sygambri have come with their hair twisted in a knot."[69] Referencing Martial is unnecessary; the Sygambri appear in Tacitus's and Suetonius's sober descriptions of Silius's German campaign.[70] But then the margins have established throughout that there is plenty of historical authorization for Silius's vaunts. The margins do not merely cite Martial; they quote him, and, by quoting him, they insist upon his relevance. The flourish of Silius's "curl'd," within this thicket of rhetorical questions, admits the pithy satirist's name for its virtue to burlesque the empty complexity of Silius's florid vaunts. Lepidus will soon illustrate that Roman law is well equipped with precedents for defence. As the margins make manifest, offering the wholly immaterial tidbit concerning German hairstyles authorized by a satirical epigrammatist, Silius's rant

bears no authority adequate to a defence in the face of such learned masters of language as Varro.

Each genre of the Quarto's marginal resources finds its way into the fourth function: notes that assert Sejanus's Roman context. These notes seem in direct response to both the practices of parallelography and application, as well as that of marginal co-option such as Harington practises. With such notes there is always the potential for functional overlap. Some of these notes educate the reader upon some point of Roman life; some realize the scene and accomplish a fully realized conceptual stage-craft, creating for the reader extraordinary a fully dressed stage of the mind; others insist, at some key point in the events of the centred text, that Rome is not London; and still others illustrate Jonson's "truth of Argument."

In those notes that educate the reader upon some point of Roman life, the margins make recourse to a wide range of authorities both classical and Renaissance encyclopedic to create conceptual pictures. The most expansive examples of this marginal function are the stage directions detailing the rituals of sacrifice, in Act 4, while the Flamen invokes Fortuna. The third of these notes provides an example.[71] The note offers that "this ritual is called the libation," and instructs the reader to read (*lege*) Johannes Rosinus, Barnabé Brisson, Joannes Guilielmus Stuck, and Giglio Gregorio Giraldi. With Rosinus the scant detail provided in the centred text explodes into a fully realized sacrifice with all the pomp, colour, sights, and sounds of Roman sacrificial rites. There is space for one excerpt from Rosinus's brightly detailed treatment:

Hairs were plucked with the hand from between the horns of the sacrificial

> animal, just as [the sacrificer] threw the first offerings into the fire, and turning towards the east he drew a knife at an angle from the victim's brow to its tail, at last he orders the priests to slit the animal's throat that it might be shown and dedicated to the gods: now they would immolate both the sacrificer and his assistant, who are called by many the conveyer of the victim and the victim; of the rest, some drew out the streaming blood by applying small vessels, some sliced the flesh into strips, and wash it clean, and some kindled the fire.[72]

Brisson provides authorization through applications of "libation" from Xiphilinus's Dio, Tacitus, and Demosthenes.[73] In Stuck the margins add, at length, the processes of, history of, and authorities on libation.[74] Giraldi's confirmation of Jonson's usage fills out the authorization: "To make an offering of libation is to sacrifice and solicit according to sacred rite: this we easily comprehend from the authorities."[75] The margins educate, authorize that education, and offer up a fantastically dressed stage of the mind upon which the dramatic dialogue might play.

Notes that function to realize the scene also make use of the full range of Jonson's marginal resources. Such notes make the most of superscript keys to conflate source and centre in the moment of reading. These notes function primarily to accomplish a fully-realized conceptual stage-craft. Although Jonson's educational and Romanizing notes demonstrate this function, notes of the second subdivision seem primarily intended to provide what no Renaissance stage – excepting those of court masques – would: a fully decked scene. In the centred text, the senators approach the Temple of Apollo for the reading of Tiberius's letter. The notes attached to Arruntius's commentary turn that approach into the harried navigation of Rome's busy streets. Beside Arruntius's "Get thee *Liburnian Porters*, thou grosse Foole" is a note and gloss: "*Ex* Liburnia*, magnæ, &*

proceræ staturæ mittebantur, qui erant Rom. *Lecticarij. Test.* Iuuen. *Sat.* 3. *vers.* 240. — *turbâ cedente vehetur Diues, & ingenti curret super ora Liburno.*"[76] The marginal gloss reads, "of large and tall stature they were sent from Liburnia; in Rome they were sedan-bearers." Although the note itself provides the necessary gloss, it insists that the reader witnesses (*Test.*) Juvenal and provides a guiding line: *turbâ cedente vehetur Diues, & ingenti curret super ora Liburno*. By first referencing and then insisting upon the relevance of Juvenal, the margins draw sound and colour from the metatext, transferring from the satirist's page to the composite the vivid portrait of a congested early morning Roman street:

> The crossing of wagons in the narrow, winding streets, and the jeers of cattle herders brought to a standstill would steal the sleep from a Drusus or sea-calf . . . with the crowd yielding, the rich man is carried and he runs above the earth in a huge Liburnian car . . . The surge of people in front blocks us, hurrying along, and the great crowd that follows in a column presses us from behind; one jabs me with an elbow, another with a hard litter-pole, and this one strikes me in the head with a beam, and that one with a wine cask. My legs are thick with mud, soon I am trampled from every direction by huge feet, and a soldier sticks his spiked boots into my toe.[77]

The composite page provides a mental *scena* dressed with all the bustle that does not fit upon the page or the renaissance stage.

At key points in the events of the centred text, the third subdivision of those notes asserts that Rome is Rome not London. Such notes seem primarily to provide a bulwark against application. And again such notes make recourse to the full range of Jonson's marginal resources. In Act 1, Tiberius tells the senate that he defers all matters to their authority:

And it is fit, a good, and honest Prince,
Whom [a] they, out of their bounty, have instructed
With so dilate, and absolute a power,
Should owe the office of it, to their seruice.[78]

[a] *Vid.*Suet Tib.*ca*.29 *et* Dio.*hist. Rom.lib*. 57.*pa*.696.

Compare this with Suetonius's treatment of this moment: "whom you have instructed with so dilate and absolute a power."[79] Illustrating that Tiberius speaks the very words attributed to him by Suetonius, the margins fix the events of this scene in historical verity. This is Rome ca. 29, not London; this is the historical Tiberius not some current despot. Application is always possible, but with such marginal contextualizing application can never be conclusive.

The final subdivision of notes that assert *Sejanus*'s Roman context are those that illustrate Jonson's "truth of Argument"; these notes are the historians' province. They inform the reader extraordinary that what happens in the centred text, although lacking in detail, agrees precisely with the historic record. Where the physician Eudemus informs Livia that Sejanus "hath put away his Wife,"[80] written in the margins is "*Ex quâ tres libros genuerat, ne pellici suspectaretur.* Tac. *Ann. lib*. 4. *pag*. 74." The note reads, "out of whom he had born three children, lest he should be suspected by his mistress." The marginal quotation is the latter half of Tacitus's: "Sejanus put away from his home his wife, Apicata, out of whom he had born three children, lest he should be suspected by his mistress."[81] The direct debt of "put away his wife" to Tacitus's *Pellit . . . uxorem* suggests that the margins offer this excerpt as the continuation of Eudemus's line. Adding a bit of motivation that does not really require iteration, the margins assert that the centred text follows the letter of history, as the conspiracy against the elder Drusus is in

its infancy. Notes such as these confirm the events of Jonson's *Story* true to the historic record. Whereas all of the composite's historic notes insist that *Sejanus* adheres to the letter of history, moments in the synergy when centre and margins agree serve to heighten the impact of those many moments when they do not agree.

Notes that conflate and situate time/events deny the historian and reader the capacity to produce evaluative statements out of the anomalistic historic record . The primary events depicted in *Sejanus* are a conflation of nine years (23-31 CE); yet, through characters' words and actions, the margins draw in points of history that take the action back as far as 20 CE, three years before the brutal change in Tiberius that Tacitus attributes to Sejanus, and forward to 32, and the fates of those who survive Sejanus. In Act 1, the centre's Tiberius seems the puppet of Tacitus's reckoning. Yet the centre depicts the emperor as genuinely gracious, thanking the Senators for their benevolence and their granting requests. All the while, Germanican interjections argue all this to be a Machiavellian deceit. Attached to Tiberius's "Their choise of *Antium*, there to place the guift," a note cites Tacitus book 3, page 71.[82] This line and this note, with the marginal *ibid*'s at 509 and 511, situate the events of this scene ca. 22. This excerpt lists the benefices of Tiberius, the fairminded, pious emperor of ca. 22. Tiberius is being gracious; he is the modest Tiberius of contemporary opinion, or the flatterer, or the politic ruler, but, in 22, he is not yet the tyrant or the puppet. In the democratic flourish, from which these excerpts are taken, Tiberius is "prudent and reasonable" (*prudens moderandi*), and Tiberius shows his piety, however "rare with Tiberius" (*rarior apud Tiberium*), towards the Julian line and the requests of a religious sister.[83] If not conclusively, Tiberius is here

firmly the Tiberius of ca. 22. Do these lines, and their marginal explications, contain the suggestion that the Germanicans are already able to see Tiberius as the deceptive, manipulating tyrant, in contravention of the historical consensus? The centred text suggests, as the Germanicans' quips suggest, that this is another instance of Tiberian duplicity. Yet the margins allow no such comfortable assessment. By manifestly manipulating the progression of history, the margins complicate the composite, intimating that the Tiberius of Act 1 might be Tacitus's prudent, reasonable, and beguiled Tiberius. Neither Germanicans nor readers can comfortably say what this Tiberius is, the puppet or the puppeteer, and that is the marginator's point. The Polybian Quarto demands that the reader assess cause and circumstance only through the whole story.

Notes that perform or inform spatially are among the Quarto's marginating innovations and are some of the most complex. Such notes make recourse to a variety of Jonson's classical sources, and are comprised of two distinct kinds. Some of these obliquely point to something noteworthy upon the source-text page, something pertinent to textual meaning but not necessarily pertinent to the dramatic/historic moment at hand; and others confer some meaning, auxiliary or primary, upon their physical location on *Sejanus*'s page. Notes of the first kind operate upon the assumption that the margins' humanist reader would read not only that excerpt that the note would ostensibly address. The many places within this synergy where an excerpt's context informs *Sejanus*'s historiographic intentions argues that Jonson did not anticipate narrowly directed reading when compiling the Quarto.

The second instance of this first kind of note offers an historiographer's statement

on application. This note occurs on the first page of Jonson's text, at 1.22 (Figure 14). In the centred text Silius and Sabinus are ranting upon all that characterizes the fallen state of Tiberian Rome, when Satrius Secundus and Pinnarius Natta, a pair who exemplify that fall, appear. Jonson's marginal note directs the reader to read (*Leg*) about Natta in Tacitus and to consider (*cons*) Satrius in Seneca. The excerpt from Tacitus prematurely treats the part Natta and Satrius will play in Cordus's indictment and demise:

> In the consulate of Cornelius Cossus and Asinius Agrippa, Cremutius Cordus was summoned before the court on a novel and hitherto-unheard-of crime: that histories had been written; and praising Marcus Brutus, he had said that Cassius was the last of the Romans. Satrius Secundus and Pinarius Natta, clients of Sejanus, were accusing him.[84]

This point will be made numerous times in the margins – the next time is a mere 51 lines later. Directly preceding the point where this excerpt appears, Tacitus comments on historiography and misapplication – a comment of obvious relevance to Jonson and *Sejanus*:

> Again, the detractor rarely attacks the writers of ancient histories, nor does it matter if you happily extol the Carthaginian or Roman battle lines. But the descendants remain of many who suffered penalty or disgrace under the reign of Tiberius. And while the families themselves ought now be extinct, you will come upon those who would account themselves accused in another's misdeeds, due to some similarity of character. Likewise, glory and virtue have their oppressors; as a lack of resemblance declares them the opposite. But I return to what I have begun.[85]

This sounds like the sort of charge that haunted Jonson throughout his early career – the sort of charges against which Jonson rigged some of the Quarto's margins. Indeed, this sounds very much like the sort of charges on which the centre would soon insist that Cordus was arraigned. This complaint of the disinterested historiographer accompanying

this first reference to Tacitus's version of Cordus's prosecution cannot help but inform how the reader experiences the events of the composite *Sejanus*.

Those notes that confer meaning upon the physical location on *Sejanus*'s page are perhaps Jonson's most subtle. This function is akin to Harington's "mis-composition" between the Moral and the Historie of the Twentith Booke. These notes serve to mark a place on the Quarto's page. Some bookend a passage of note, such as those containing Apicata's Medea-ing on the Quarto's final pages. A "Dio. *ibid.*," referring to "Dion. *lib. 58. pag. 720*," attached by superscript "d" to 5.859, is the first in a pair of bookends; the second is "Dio. *Hist. Rom. lib. 58. pag. 720*,"proximally attached to 5.875 (Figures 19 & 20).[86] This pair of bookends mark and contain an alteration and expansion of Jonson's historic source:

> Apicata, Sejanus's wife, was not condemned. Having heard of her children's death, and witnessed their bodies upon the Stairs, she withdrew and composed a letter, wherein was contained the manner by which Drusus was killed, and an accusation against Liuilla, his wife, because of whom her husband had angrily abandoned her. With the letter sent to Tiberius, she deprived herself of life.[87]

The second note concludes the expansion of Dio's dispassionate retelling of Apicata's last moments begun by the first. Thus the margins make patent the Quarto's final deviation from its sources: recourse to Dio shows that *Sejanus*'s Apicata is a vibrant recreation of the composed Apicata of the historic record. Apicata's language, in the Quarto, although not derived from Seneca's *Medea,* is unmistakably Senecan in its caustic tone. There is Seneca in the Nuntius's report, but it is *Thyestes*, again, rather than *Medea*: "make old/ Deformed *Chaos* rise again t'ore-whelme,/ Them, vs, and the

world."[88] Compare the Nuntius's words with *Thyestes*'s: "And let deformed Chaos again overwhelm gods and men."[89] In this open addition to Apicata's character, heightened by the striking incongruity of marginal resource and centre, Apicata becomes a raving Medea in her sanguine frenzy for revenge. Further, by offering the historic record for consideration, the composite makes patent that, unlike the historic Apicata, the composite's raving Apicata/Medea is left alive to work her vengeance. And by offering the historic record for consideration, the composite makes patent that, unlike its Florentine relations, the composite makes patent it adjustments – that adjustment is a large part of the point.

Other notes of this function illustrate Jonson's deft tactical manoeuvring. In Act 5 Terentius announces the appearance of a portentous meteor (Figure 21):

> But now, [e] a fiery Meteor, in the forme
> Of a great ball, was seene to roule along
> The troubed ayre, where yet it hangs, vnperfect,
> The'amazing wonder of the Multitude.
> SEI. No more. That *Macro's* come, is more then all.
> TER. Is Macro come? POM. I saw him. TER. Where? with whom?
> POM. With Regulus. SEI. *Terentius*, – TER. My Lord?[90]

[e] *Vid*.Sen. *Nat.Quæst. lib*.1.cap.1

The marginal instruction is to see (*Vid*) Seneca, who provides this dramatic occasion as an example of such phenomena: "We saw another [meteor] at the time when the final decision was made concerning Sejanus."[91] So far there is nothing exceptional about this note. But what to make of Jonson's opposing this note to Sejanus's line instead of Terentius's? This is Jonson the subtle Polybian. As Seneca suggests, this is the time "when the final decision was made concerning Sejanus." Were this note placed

appropriately on the page, with "Meteor" instead of "Macro," the suggestion would remain that the gods had now determined the impious Sejanus's doom. But placed next to Sejanus's frightened reaction to Macro's arrival at Rome and Terentius and Pomponius's Hitchcockean repetition of the fact, the synergy of margins and dramatic dialogue suggests something far more interesting. Gary H. Hamilton suggests that in placing the announcement to Sejanus of Macro's return directly after the scene in which Fortuna averts her gaze, Jonson "clearly suggests that Macro is to be the instrument which carries out Fortune's wishes."[92] While Hamilton's observation that Macro not Fortuna spells Sejanus's demise is clearly true, I would argue that the margins insist upon it as much as the sequence of appearances. Whatever part the gods – or virtue and vice – might play in human affairs, with his all too human motives, Macro is the true harbinger of Sejanus's doom, his arrival more ominous than all portents, and the composite's anxiety ridden Sejanus knows as much.

The final function of *Sejanus*'s marginalia discussed here is the closest the Quarto's marginalia come to being gratuitous – those notes that offer events outside of the historic scope of the centre – but in the most positive sense of "gratuitous." With Sejanus dragged away in chains, the margins direct the reader to "*Vid*. Dion. *Hist. Rom. Lib.* 58. *pag.* 720. 721. 722. 723."[93] Of these four pages, only 720 treats the events of the day. In citing 721 and 722 the composite records the quality of self-willed amnesia that characterizes society:

> As customarily is the case, all that which had happened [the people] conferred upon Sejanus, now dead, and they imputed nothing, or very little, to Tiberius, saying that most of those deeds were done in ignorance

> or unwillingly. This was the state of private thoughts. Publicly, however, they voted that, since they had been freed of a cruel master, no one would mourn Sejanus, that a statue of liberty would be placed in the forum, and a festival day would be celebrated by all the magistrates and priests (something never before done): the day on which he paid his penalty with death would be commemorated with annual races and hunts to be provided for by the four colleges of priests and the priests of Augustus, which was indeed not previously the custom: thus to he whom they had advanced to his destruction by immoderate and novel honours, they had established new observances unknown to the gods. To be sure it was evident enough that it was principally their folly that furnished the cause of Sejanus's fall: and thus in an edict they prohibited, forthwith, that anyone should, in the future, be dressed with too many honours or swear oaths to anybody other than the emperor. And yet while they decreed these things by some divine council, nevertheless it was not long after that they came to fawn upon Macro and Laco, bestowing upon them rewards and honours; the latter they made ex-quaestor the former praetor.[94]

In these two pages, Dio shows humanity's propensity for self-delusion. Including these pages, the margins also show the importance of an accurate and exhaustive historic record from which to learn from the mistakes of the past. As for the people of Rome? They learned nothing from their own experience. Sejanus's death gained them little more than a holiday. With Sejanus dead, Tiberius was *de facto* innocent of all crime, and those left of Rome's nobility were relieved of their responsibility to end their emperor's tyranny, so they suffered on. As soon as the opportunity presented itself with Marco and Laco, the people happily grazed their way back in to the fold. Including these pages, the Polybian margins insist that this propensity to political self-delusion is not limited to the people of ancient Rome. Dio show us that humanity is not marching steadily toward some higher conclusion. History is not teleological. History repeats itself, not in the big details, in the small details. There are glitches in the human psyche which dictate that the mistakes of the past will be the mistakes of the future. Only by studying the role human psychology

plays in historic events can humanity hope to halt history's repetition.

In 723, the margins articulate the appropriate fates of Sejanus's minions. By this stage in the composite the reader has learned enough of what motivates those minions to appreciate this gratuitous inclusion.

A great deal of the discussion of marginalia over the last three chapters revolves around issues of access. The unified genesis of the marginated page, education, and individual reading assured that, in 1605, the learned reader would both read and consider marginal annotation. Margins and centre were part of a single semiotic field. Yet, in 1605, the margins, like the centre, were subject to textual misappropriation – by readers and marginators. Politic readers bent on application scanned texts for parallels, while politic writers and marginators bent on parallelography filled the centre and margins with allusive damnation and flattery. At this same apex of the marginated page, marginators could market any text as scholarly by loading the margins with citation. Readers and editors in every genre complained of pretentious or programmatic marginalia. Gwinne's *Nero* and Harington's *Orlando* practice pretentious annotation. Yet Gwinne's margins also provide a Polybian access to the broad historic discourse surrounding the events of Nero's fall, while much of Harington's annotation of Ariosto is textual appropriation by a artful annotator bent on flattering parallelography. In this milieu of readerly mistrust of the margins, the Quarto's innovative marginalia strove to reward readerly access by reasserting the value of margination.

The Quarto's margins try to ensure the reading towards which Jonson composed *Sejanus*. Notions of appropriate use are central to the Quarto's historiographic

innovations. As the margins manipulated the text to assure that its lessons conformed to those of the annotator, so the Elizabethan historiographer manipulated the historic record to ensure that its lessons conformed to a preexisting moral or political discourse. As an historiographer, Jonson's agenda was Polybian: to produce a panoptic text that told the whole story of an historic episode. Only from such a disinterested text could the reader learn history's broader lessons, those of the cause and circumstance driving human events.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. In the following discussion of *Sejanus*'s marginalia, I have use the lineation provided by *H&S* Appendix XI: "Jonson's Historical Notes in the Quarto."

2. *Managing* 32.

3. "*De* Caio Silio. *vid*. Tacit. Lips. edit. 4^{0}. *Anna*. *lib*. I. *pag*. 11. *lib*. 2. *pag*. 28&33 [b]" (B1r).

4. *Duo apud ripam Rheni exercitus erant: cui nomen superiori sub C. Silio legato, inferiorem A. Caecina curabat. Regimen summae rei penes Germanicum, agendo Galliarum censui tum intentum. Sed quibus Silius moderabatur, mente ambigua fortunam seditionis alienae speculabantur: inferioris exercitus miles in rabiem prolapsus est* (*Annals* 11/I..xxxi).

5. *Silius et Anteius et Caecina fabricandae classi proponuntur. Mille naves sufficere visae properataeque* (*Ibid.*, 28-29/II.vii).

6. *Sed Caesar, dum naves adiguntur, Silium legatum cum expedita manu inruptionem in Chattos facere iubet* (*Ibid.*, 28/II.vi).

7. *Sed fama classis amissae ut Germanos ad spem belli, ita Caesarem ad coercendum erexit. C. Silio cum triginta peditum, tribus equitum milibus ire in Chattos imperat* (*Ibid.*, 33/II.xxvi).

8. 76-7.

9. "Jonson, Northampton, and the 'Treason' in *Sejanus*," 360, *et passim.*

10. *Credebant plerique auctam offensionem ipsius intemperantia, immodice iactantis suum militem in obsequio duravisse cum alii ad seditiones prolaberentur; neque mansurum Tiberio imperium si iis quoque legionibus cupido novandi fuisset* (*Annals*, IV.xviii).

11. *Ad loc.*

12. *Tiberius,* LXII.

13. John Veron, *A Dictionary in Latin and English* (London: John Harison, 1575) *ad loc.*

14. B2v, 1.105-13.

15. *prætorij præfctus Ælius Seianusv . . . rector iuueni, & ceteris perculorum præmiorúmque ostentator* (*Annals* 9/I.xxiv-v).

16. *Filiorum neque naturalem Drusum neque adoptivum Germanicum patria caritate dilexit, alterius vitiis infensus. Nam Drusus fluxioris remissiorisque vitae erat. Itaque ne mortuo quidem perinde adfectus est, sed tantum non statim a funere ad negotiorum consuetudinem rediit iustitio longiore inhibito* (*Tiberius* LII.1).

17. *Cæterum Tiberius quum seuerum se iis quibus aliquod crimen obiiceretur, præberet, Drusum quoque filium suum hominē impurissimum, & extremæ sæuitiæ,* (Dio, 699.D-700.A/LVII.13.1).

18. *Nam Drusus, quamquam arduum sit eodem loci potentiam et concordiam esse, aequus adulescentibus aut certe non adversus habebatur* (*Annals* 75/IV.iv).

19. "SAT. [a]Your Fortune's made vnto you now, *Eudemus,* [a] *Leg.* Terētij *defensionem,* Tac. *Annal. li.* 6. *pag.* 102" (B4v, 1.265).

20. *Nec quemquam exemplo adsumo: cunctos qui novissimi consilii expertes fuimus meo unius discrimine defendam. Non enim Seianum Vulsiniensem set Claudiae et Iuliae domus partem, quas adfinitate occupaverat, tuum, Caesar, generum, tui consulatus socium, tua officia in re publica capessentem colebamus. non est nostrum aestimare quem supra ceteros et quibus de causis extollas: tibi summum rerum iudicium di dedere, nobis obsequii gloria relicta est. Spectamus porro quae coram habentur, cui ex te opes honores, quis plurima iuvandi nocendive potentia, quae Seiano fuisse nemo negaverit* (*Annals*102-03/VI.viii).

21. I3v, 4.410.

22. I2v, 4.356.

23. *Servaeus posthac et Minucius Thermus inducti, . . . Minucius et Servaeus damnati indicibus accessere*: (*Ibid* 102/VI.vii).

24. 5.210/11 s.d. and 5.454.

25. *Managing* 157.

26. I3r-3v, 4.73-401.

27. *saevitiam ac libidinem cum factis promeret, locis occultantem.. . . ulcerosa facies ac plerumque medicaminibus interstincta* (*Annals* 91/IV.lvii).

28. *Secessu uero Caprensi etiam sellaria excogitauit, sedem arcanarum libidinum, in quam undique conquisiti puellarum et exoletorum greges monstrosique concubitus repertores, quos spintrias appellabat, triplici serie conexi, in uicem incestarent coram ipso* (*Tiberius* XLIII).

29. *significans, scientia Chaldaeorum artis, cuius apiscendae otium apud Rhodum, magistrum Thrasullum habuit.* (Tacitus, *Annals* 106/VI.xx).

30. *Multos etiam indagato eorum natiuitatis die ac hora, indéque mores & fortunam eorum scrutatus, si quid adesse excellens, aut quod imperium sperare iuberet, deprehenderetur, protinus interficiebat.* (Dio 706/LVII.19.3).

31. *Quod nisi eum et mors praeuenisset et Thrasyllus consulto, ut aiunt, differre quaedam spe longioris uitae compulisset, plures aliquanto necaturus.* (Suetonius, *Tiberius* LXII).

32. *ut larga meri potione per fallaciam oneratos, repente ueretris deligatis, fidicularum simul urinaeque tormento distenderet* (*Ibid.* LXII).

33. *atque etiam quasi infantes firmiores, necdum tamen lacte depulsos, inguini ceu papillae admoueret, pronior sane ad id genus libidinis et natura et aetate* (*Ibid.* XLIV).

34. 395-97.

35. *more regio pubem ingenuam stupris pollueret* (Tacitus, *Annals* 100/VI.i).

36. *palam iam et uulgo nomine insulae abutentes "Caprineum" dictitabant* (*Tiberius* XLIII).

37. *H&S*, I.2 17.

38. "Jonson's Library and Marginalia" 11-12.

39. I1r-1v, 4.233-51.

40. *tunc velut frenis exoluti proruperunt missaeque in Agrippinam ac Neronem litterae quas pridem adlatas et cohibitas ab Augusta credidit vulgus* (*Annals* 97-98/V.iii).

41. *Cæterùm G. Asiniū Tiberius propter ductam ab eo vxorem suam, ac libertatem dicendi de imperio vsurpatam, capto tempore adortus est* (713.B/LVIII.3.1).

42. *Hæc verò erat extrema miseria, qua alios quoque permultos Tiberius afflixit* (713.E/LVIII.3.6).

43. *Manebat quippe suspicionum et credendi temeritas, quam Seianus augere etiam in urbe suetus acrius turbabat, non iam occultis adversum Agrippinam et Neronem insidiis* (*Annals* 94/IV.lxvii).

44. *Nouissime calumniatus modo ad statuam Augusti modo ad exercitus confugere uelle, Pandatariam relegauit* (*Tiberius* LII.2).

45. "SIL. [g] *Satrius Secundus*, and [h] *Pinnarius Natta*: [g] De Satrio Secundo, & [h] Pinnario Natta. *Leg* Tacit. *Annal. lib.* 4. *pag.* 83. *Et de* Satrio. *cons*. Seneca. *Cōsol ad Marciam"* (B1r, 1.22). See Chapter 5, Figure 14.

46. *Cremutius Cordus postulatur, novo ac tunc primum audito crimine, quod editis annalibus* (83/IV.xxxiv).

47. *Propone illud acerbissimum tibi tempus, quod Seianus patrem tuum clienti suo Satrio Secundo congiarium dedit. Irascebatur illi ob unum aut alterum liberius dictum, quod tacitus ferre non potuerat Seianum in cervices nostras ne imponi quidem, sed escandere.* (Lucius Annaeus Seneca, "Consolatio ad Marciam," in *Seneca Moral Essays*, 3 Vols. [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958] XXII.4).

48. C4v, 1.542.

49. C4v. *exclamavit Cordus tunc vere theatrum perire. Quid ergo? non rumperetur supra cineres Cn. Pompei constitui Seianum* (*Ibid.* XXII.4-7).

50. "Now [b] good *Cremutius Cordus*. COR. Haile to your Lordship: [b] *De Cremutio Cordo vid.* Tacit. *Annal. lib.* 4. *pag.* 83. 84. Seneca *cōsol. ad Marciam*. Dio *lib.* 57. *pag.*710. Suet. Aug. *ca.* 35. Tib. *cap.* 61. Cal. *cap.* 16" (B2r, 1.73).

51. *Cremutius Cordus manus sibi ipsi inferre propter offensum Seianū coactus fuit. Adeo nihil in eo viro iam ingrauescentis ætatis, vitæque honestissimè actæ, crimini obuium fuit, vt historiæ causa* (710.C/LVII.24.2).

52. *obiectum et historico, quod Brutum Cassiumque ultimos Romanorum dixisset*: (*Tiberius* LXI.3).

53. "Thither in time. Then is there one [a] *Cremutius*: [a] *Vid*. Tac. *Ann*. 4. *pag* 83. Dio. *Hist. Rom. lib*. 57. *pag*. 710. *et* Sen. *cons. ad Mar. cap*. I. *et fusius cap* 22" (E1r, 2.303).

54. Again, on the master/clever slave relationship see Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind* (Princeton: UP, 1984) 7; Burton, 105; and Pebworth and Summers, 115.

55. "Noble *Cordus*,/ I wish thee good: Be as thy writings, free: Tac. *Ann. lib*. 4. *pag*. 83. 84. Dio. *Hist. Rom. lib*. 57. *pag*. 710" (F4v, 3.371).

56. *Conversations* 24.

57. "The Sources" 196-97.

58. 710.C/LVII.24.2.

59. K2r, 5.81-86.

60. LYCVS *Di illum infelicent omnes, qui post hunc diem/ leno ullam Veneri umquam immolarit hostiam/ quive ullum turis granum sacruficaverit* (Titus Maccius Plautus, "Poenulus," *Plautus*, ed. and trans. Paul Nixon [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1916-38] II.i.449-51).

61. *& ipse litans viderat simulacrum Fortunæ (quod Tulli quondam Romanorum regis fuisse ferebatur, ipse domi suæ gratissimum habebat) sese auertere.*(Dio 717.A-B/LVIII.7.2).

62. "Altar, placeth his Censer thereon, into which they [d] put se-": [d] *Hoc reddere erat, & litare, id est propitiare, & votum impetrare: secundum* Nonium Marcellum. *Litare etiam* Mac. *lib*. 3. *cap*. 5. *explicat, sacrificio facto placare numen. In quo sens. leg. apud* Plaut. Suet. Senec. *&c*" (K4r, ca.182/3 s.d.).

63. *Inter SACRIFICARE et LITARE hoc interest: sacrificare est veniã petere; litare est propitiare & votum inpetrare . . . Plaut. Pœnulo: Si hercle istuc vnquam factum est, tum me Iupiter Faciat, vt semper sacrificem, neque vnquam litem.* (Nonius Marcellus, *Nonivs Marcellvs De Proprietate Sermones, et Fvlgentivs Placiades de Prisco Sermone. Ex vetustissimis codicibus longè emendatiores, & duobus indicibus locupletiores. . . .* [Paris: Ægidium Beys, 1583] 206.a)

64. M1v, 5.3.365-67.

65. "Epigrammes," *Complete Poems,* II.5-6.

66. F2v, 3.192-96.

67. *Igitur, ego ille adversvm te in rationibvs pvblicis adsisto. Si te inivste interpellavero, et victvs exinde apparvero, eadem poena qvam in te vindicare pvlsavi, me constringo, atqve conscribo partibus tvis esse damnandvm, atqve svbitvrvm, et pro rei totivs firmatate manv propria firmo, et bonorvm virorvm ivdicio roborandvm trado* (Barnabé Brisson, *Barnabæ Brissonii Regii Consistorii Consiliarii Amplissimiqve Senatvs Parisiensis Præsidis, De Formvlis et Sollemnievs populi Romani Verbis, Libri VIII* [Frankfurt: Johannes Wechel & Peter Fischer, 1592] V.469).

68. F3r, 3.255-65.

69. M. Valerius Martial, "Liber de Spectaculis," *Select Epigrams of Martial* 2 Vols. ed. R. T. Bridge and E. D. C. Lake (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906-08) 3.9.

70. Tacitus, *Annals* II.xxvi; Suetonius, *Augustus* xxi.

71. "While they sound againe, the *Flamen* [b] takes of the Honey, with his fingers, and tasts: [b] *Vocabatur hic Ritus Libatio. lege*. Rosin. *Ant. lib*. 3. Bar Brissō *de form. lib*. 1. Stuchium *de Sacrif. Et* Lil. Synt. 17" (K4r, ca.182/3 s.d.).

72. *quo facto setas inter cornua victimæ manu euulsa tanquam prima libamina proijciebat in ignem, conuersusque ad ortum, obliquum cultrum à fronte victimæ ad caudam ducebat tandem victimam Dijs exhibitam & dedicatam iubebat iugulare ministros: qui quòd mactarent eas cultrarij & victimarij, à nonnullis Popæ & Agones vocabantur: reliqui partim admotis vasculis emanantem cruorem excpiebant, partim victimam excoriabant, & abluebant, partim ignem accendebant* (Johannes Rosinus, *Romanarum Antiquitatum libri decem Exvariis Scriptoribus Summa fide singularique diligentia collecti À Ioanne Rosino Bartholomæi F. Isennacensi Thuringo. Cum Inidicibuv locupletissimis* [Basel: Hæredus Petrus Perna, 1583] III.213.

73. *Barnabæ Brissonii* I.33.

74. Johann Wilhelm Stuck, *Sacrorum, Sacrificiorumque Gentilium Brevis et Accurata Descriptio Universae Superstitionis Ethicae Ritus Cerimoniasque Complectens: Ad Sacros et Profanos Scriptores Probé Intelligendos Explicandosque Peraccommodata . . .* (Zurich: Johannes Walpinius, 1598) 99.a, 130.b, 133.b, 134.a.

75. *Libare uerò est ritè sacrificare, & impetrare: id quod ex auctoribus facilè colligimus.* (Giglio Gregorio Giraldi, *De Dies Gentium varia & multiplex Historia . . .* [Basel: Johannes Oporminus, 1548] XVII, 724.B).

76. L4r, 5.458.

77. *plurimus hic aeger moritur uigilando (sed ipsum/ languorem peperit cibus inperfectus et haerens/ ardenti stomacho); nam quae meritoria somnum/ admittunt? magnis opibus dormitur in urbe./ inde caput morbi. raedarum transitus arto/ uicorum in*

flexu et stantis conuicia mandrae/ eripient somnum Druso uitulisque marinis . . . turba cedente vehetur Diues, et ingenti curret super ora Liburno. . . . nobis properantibus obstat/ unda prior, magno populus premit agmine lumbos/ qui sequitur; ferit hic cubito, ferit assere duro/ alter, at hic tignum capiti incutit, ille metretam./ pinguia crura luto, planta mox undique magna/ calcor, et in digito clauus mihi militis haeret (III.236-48).

78. *Sejanus* C2v-r, 1.441-42.

79. *quem uos tanta et tam libera potestate instruxistis* (*Tiberius* XXIX).

80. D2r, 2.85.

81. *pellit domo Seianus uxorem Apicatam, ex qua tres liberos genuerat, ne pellici suspectaretur* (*Annals* 74/IV.iii).

82. C3v, 1.508.

83. *Annals* 70/III.lxix.

84. *Cosso Asinio Agrippa consulibus Cremutius Cordus postulatur, novo ac tunc primum audito crimine, quod editis annalibus laudatoque M. Bruto C. Cassium Romanorum ultimum dixisset. Accusabant Satrius Secundus et Pinarius Natta, Seiani clientes* (*Ibid.* 83/IV xxxiv).

85. *Tum quod antiquis scriptoribus rarus obtrectator, neque refert cuiusquam Punicas Romanasne acies laetius extuleris: at multorum, qui Tiberio regente poenam vel infamias subiere. utque familiae ipsae iam extinctae sint, reperies qui ob similitudinem morum aliena malefacta sibi obiectari putent. etiam gloria ac virtus infensos habet, ut nimis ex propinquo diversa arguens. sed ad inceptum redeo* (*Ibid.* 83/IV.xxxiii).

86. N1v-2r.

87. *Verùm Apicata vxor Seiani dānata nō fuit. Hæc liberorū morte suorum audita, eorúmque in scalis corpora intuita, digressa inde libellū cōposuit, in quo cōtinebatur quomodo Drus⁹ esset interfect⁹, accusatioque Liuillę vxoris eius, propter quæ vir ipsi infēsus nūtiū remiserat: eo ad Tiberiū libello misso, vita seipsā priuauit* (720.D/LVIII.11.6).

88. *Sejanus*, 868-70.

89. *interumque deos/ hominesque premat deforme chaos* (831-32).

90. K4v, 5.218.

91. *uidimus eo tempore, quo de Seiano actum est* (Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Naturales Quaestiones* 2 Vols., ed. and trans. Thomas H. Corcoran, [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP,

1971-1972] I.1.3).

92.Gary H. Hamilton, "Irony and Fortune in *Sejanus*," *Studies in Englsih Literature, 150-1900* 11.2 (1971): 265-81, 271.

93. M4r, V.737.

94. *Quippe, vt adsolet fieri, ea quæ acciderãt, in Seianum iã sublatum cõferebant, nihil, aut perpauca, Tiberio imputabant, pleraque aut ignaro eo, aut inuito acta dicentes. Hi priuatorũ erant effectus. Publicè autẽ decreuerunt, vt quoniã domino exonerati essent, nemo Seianũ lugeret, vt libertatis effigies in foro poneretur, festus dies ab omnibus magistratibus & põtificibus (quod nũquã antè factum) celebraretur: dies quo in pœnas morte dedisset, annuis circensibus ludis & venationibus per quatuor collegia põtificum & Augusti sacerdotes orandus indiceretur, ne hoc quidem prius vsitatum: ita quem immodicis ac nouis honoribus ad perniciem prouexerant, in eũ diis quoque nouos cultus statuerunt. Equidem satis ipsis liquebat, istos Seiano præsertim furoris sui causam præbuisse: itaque edicto prohibuerũt exemplo ne quis nimiis honoribus in posterũ afficeretur, neque per quenquam alium quàm per imperatorem iuramenta fierent, quæ etsi diuino quodam consilio tum decreuerunt, tamen haud ita multo pòst Macronem & Laconem adulati sunt, pecuniam eis, & honores, huic quæstorios, illi prætorios, tribuentes* (Dio 721.C-722.A/LVIII.12.3-7).

CONCLUSION: BEYOND THE POLYBIAN TEXT.

He rather prayes, you will be pleas'd to see
. . .
persons such as Comedie *would chuse,*
When she would shew an Image of the times,
And sport with human follies, not with crimes.
Except, we make 'hem such by louing still
Our popular errors, when we know th'are ill.
I meane such errors, as you'll all confesse
By laughing at them, they deserue no lesse:
Which when you heartily doe, there's hope left, then,
You, that haue grac'd monsters, may like men.

— Ben Jonson *Every Man in His Humor* (1616 Folio).

When *The Defence of Poesie* was published in 1595, there was still conceptual currency in Sidney's 1589 discussion of the unified social role of the poet, the historian, and the philosopher. Although each had his strength, all three were to write in service of moral or social edification. In practice, however, personal politics had eclipsed instruction in poetry and historiography. However much Jonson disagreed with Sidney's definition of the poet's purview as what should happen and the historian's as what did happen, the Quarto *Sejanus* implicitly agrees that the *raison d'etre* of both was to assist the general reader in safely navigating life. This commitment must have pressed upon Jonson's shoulders as he sat month after month in Cotton's library bent over a table obscured by stacks of open books. Turning page after page, text after text, he laboured to make theory concrete in his manuscript margins.

With the work done, in the dog days of 1605, Jonson likely hired a boatman at Westminster Stairs to row him to Paul's Wharf. Balancing an awkward bundle of papers, he would have stepped from the boat to the wharf and walked the quarter mile up Paul's

Chain to the centre of London's book trade, in Paul's Churchyard. In the Spring of the previous year, Jonson had made this same journey with a smaller but no less awkward bundle. On that occasion he carried his *Entertainment* to George Eld's print shop to meet with Eld and Edward Blount about its publication. That collaboration must have served as a test flight. Would Eld and Blount produce his heavily marginated *Entertainment* to his exacting specifications? Would the public then approve and buy it? Eld and Blount accomplished their task admirably. The collaboration in Eld's shop rendered *B. Ion: His Part of the Royall and Magnificent Entertainment* a scholarly testament to Jonson's erudition. The public approved, prompting Thomas Dekker and architect Stephen Harrison to publish their own descriptions. Beside Jonson's *Entertainment*, Dekker's *The Magnificent Entertainment* and Harrison's *The Arches of Triumph* are mere records of the event.

Given Jonson's prior experience of working with Blount and Eld, it is not surprising that he contracted with Blount to publish *Sejanus*. On November 2, 1604, Blount presented *Sejanus* to the Stationers' Company and was granted the right to publish. However, probably fearing government reprisals, Blount dropped *Sejanus* before it could go to press. Although there were numerous publishers and printers within the churchyard a successful playwright might approach for publication, Jonson was likely determined to have Eld print the Quarto. Most printers worked with more than one bookseller, which meant that Jonson did not have to contract with Blount in order to have Eld print *Sejanus*. It is easy to imagine Jonson complaining angrily to Blount, and Blount agreeing to assign *Sejanus* to his friend and colleague, Thomas Thorpe, who had just

worked with Eld on Marston's *Al Fooles*. Thorpe would have been happy to add another popular playwright to his roster, and happy to allow that playwright a compositorial role in the printing. In the subsequent weeks, Eld worked with Jonson to produce what must surely be Renaissance England's most-commented-upon dramatic quarto.

As I suggest in my own prefatory material, this project occurred to me not through any acquaintance with the critical discourse surrounding *Sejanus*, but through reading *Sejanus* in a modern edition – while Tacitus was on my mind. To the reader intimate with Tacitus, Tacitus is everywhere in *Sejanus*. Playwrights were expected to borrow heavily from their sources, and in 1605 Tacitus was popular. There was market value in the familiar. Nevertheless, I questioned why the same playwright who first called a man plagiary would so patently plagiarize his sources. Finding the Quarto and its citation filled margins only broadened my question. Why would he openly translate so much of the historic record verbatim? Why would he cite so exhaustively, while his peers were simply taking what they would, from where they would. Why would he make no move without citing a classical or humanist authority? Why would he go to such lengths to assure that his Rome was Roman in every detail, that his history was historical in every detail? Why do so when playwrights were finding such success making free with the historic record? Why do all this when historiography was such a dangerous vocation? And why on earth would he want to congest the reading of a play – surely meant to be an entertaining diversion – with the demands of a scholarly tract? The question ceased to be so much "what is *Sejanus* about?" as it was "what is the Quarto about?" Before I could answer any of these questions I needed all the facts – the facts being all the marginal resources. I took

a plane to Washington DC; I took a train to Philadelphia; I sent emails around the world; and finally I had collected every page to which those 306 marginal notes refer. With that collection amassed before me I was finally able to read the Quarto *Sejanus* as Jonson had composed it. I read every note and referred to every source, that I might grant each its due share of meaning. In doing so, I was able to answer some of those whys.

While I am only supposing that Jonson insisted that Eld take charge of printing the Quarto *Sejanus*, there can be little question that Jonson insisted that the Quarto *Sejanus* appear exactly as it does. The long, syncretic labour that preceded the Quarto's composition is present in every aspect of its final form. This study illustrates that the Quarto *Sejanus* as a material object and the dramatic text printed therein participate equally in the construction of textual meaning. This equal participation has both immediate and far-reaching consequences. The immediate consequence for the Quarto itself is that by exploiting the full potential of Renaissance textual negotiations an unplayable but otherwise unexceptional play can locate itself at the centre of the shifting current in historiography.

The months of *Sejanus*'s composition passed within a particular historiographic, literary, and bibliographical context. At *Sejanus*'s historical moment the psychology of human motivation was gaining ascendency over universalist and politic programmatics. The small matter of cause and circumstance was taking the place of universal notions of vice and virtue in historiography. The Florentine model was giving way to the Polybian model of historiography. Although Polybian historiography had gained favour amongst theorists, Florentine historiography still ruled the stage. At this same moment, the

scholarly page itself began to experience the first tremors of its own shift. Marginalia as an integral part of textual meaning was damned by association with marginalia as a marketing ploy, and critics were beginning to call for an unmediated text to replace the marginated page. The Quarto *Sejanus* manifests this shift from programmatics to psychological exploration – from its title page to its marginalia – and it is a testament to Jonson's belief in the potential of the marginated page. Reading *Sejanus* without access to all the details of its original material form means one misses the fullness of its meaning. One also misses Jonson's response to contemporary historiographic, literary, and bibliographic trends. My analysis has shown the advantages of reading the Quarto with all its material innovations in place – *Sejanus* ceases to be an untenable play and becomes, instead, a richly nuanced and insistently scholarly portrayal of the humanity behind historic events. The means by which the Quarto discharges its responsibility to assist the general reader in safely navigating life situates it at the forefront of historiographic theory. The critical conversation about *Sejanus* would proceed in different directions were the margins to become an integral part of the text under discussion.

If fullness of meaning is the literary critic's end goal, then we ought to be reading historic texts as they were originally presented. The preceding analysis has read not only the contents of the prefatory matter and margins as they were presented, but also the page, itself, as composed. In my reading, font size, typeface, setting, and justification are meaningful. With EEBO and other electronic resources, one can view reproductions of many Renaissance texts. But availability of the images is not all that is required for full apprehension of the material text. This sort of reading asks us to read like the first readers

of the texts. The questions we would need to ask of modern readers are different from those asked of early modern readers. Conceptual, linguistic, and textual barriers would need crossing. As discussed in Chapter 3, Renaissance authors and editors could make assumptions of their readers that their modern counterparts cannot. The Renaissance reader assumed that typesetting and textual apparatus played an equal part in the construction of meaning. Although not governed by a strict set of rules, such things were subject to conventions. A modern text displaying such apparatuses would need to ask its reader to suspend deeply ingrained expectations before approaching a marginal note or prefatory poem in such an unconventional way.

Such a suspension of expectation or casting off of convention would likely be the easiest hurdle to surmount. Reading the historic page requires reading more than the page itself. Like the Quarto *Sejanus*, many Mediaeval and Renaissance texts include commentary, quotation, and citation that are intrinsic to the page. For the modern reader, accepting the exegetical equality of print conventions and apparatuses is much easier than acquiring the knowledge base that the historical text could assume for its first readers. The Renaissance author and editor constructed texts for readers trained up within a system of education produced by the humanist discourse that it was meant to foster. The educated elite shared a knowledge base from their common training. For the most part the public school or university student in London read the same texts – and read them in the same way – as his fellows in Paris or Padua. That reader could come upon a piece of Virgil or Horace in the margins and know its context and judge its diachronic itinerary or potential to parallel without having to hunt down and read the text. In the case of many

classical texts, even if the excerpt did not bring its context immediately to mind, a brief hunt through the exhaustive apparatus would supply direction, and the text itself would likely be familiar enough that broader reading would not be necessary. The learned Renaissance reader from any European country would be able to read the many humanist source texts that were only available in Latin. Even well-educated modern readers do not share such a universal knowledge base. Few possess the linguistic skills to access all the sources.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the Renaissance author and editor could assume that many learned reader had access to large personal libraries, most of which boasted texts ranging from Aristotle to Zonaras. Even among the most broadly learned, today's personal libraries would hold few of the texts found in their early-modern predecessors – then only the popular classical sources. As my own research illustrates, reading that replicates early-modern conditions would have to take place in a library with massive historical holdings such as The Library of Congress, the Folger Shakespeare Library, or the Huntington Library. Even an internet connection cannot yet supply all those texts that the well stocked Renaissance library would contain. Were the world wide web to supply all, as it soon surely will, language would present a barrier. The majority of humanist texts known to Renaissance readers have yet to be translated into English.

How then might a modern edition of an early modern text provide for all that the modern reader requires to replicate early modern reading conditions? Electronic editions have the potential to provide cultural memory in the form of links and data bases. Having compiled all of the text pages to which the Quarto's margins point, I can imagine a

hypertext edition that displays the original pages with links to source texts buried beneath each note. Such links would connect the centre with the marginal resources in such a way as to allow greater access to meaning. Source pages could be translated and broader contexts supplied. Even such minutia as font and typeface conventions could be discussed in buried links. The Quarto *Sejanus* is just one of many complex texts that have the potential to reveal much about the motivations behind their composition. Certainly Jonson's marginated masques would benefit from such an edition. Such an edition might reveal why Chapman chose to marginate his *Ouids Banquet of Sense* but not his Homer. An exhaustive electronic edition of Gwinne's *Nero* might show much about the impulses behind the publication of closet drama; while one of Harington's *Orlando* might grant access to the fullness of his flattery. The Renaissance text carries its context within it. The reader need only look close enough to see.

Appendix 1: Figures.

THE ARGVMENT.

ÆLIVS *Seianus*, Sonne to *Seius Strabo*, a Gentleman of *Rome*, and borne at *Vulsinium*, after his long seruice in Court, first, vnder *Augustus*; afterward, *Tiberius*: grew into that fauour with the Latter, and wonne him by those Artes, as there wanted nothing but the Name to make him a Copartner of the *Empire*. Which greatnes of his, *Drusus* the Emperours sonne not brooking, after many smothered dislikes, it one day breaking out; the *Prince* strooke him publiquely on the Face. To reuenge which disgrace, (*Liuia*, the wife of *Drusus*, being before corrupted by him to her dishonor, & the discouery of her husbands Councells) *Seianus* practiseth with, together with her *Physitian*, calld *Eudemus*, & one *Lygdus* an *Eunuch*, to poison *Drusus*. This their inhumane Act hauing successefull, and vnsuspected passage, it emboldeneth *Seianus* to farther, and more insolent Proiects, euen the ambition of the *Empire*: where finding the Lets he must encounter to be many, and hard, in respect of the issue of *Germanicus* (who were next in hope) he deuiseth to make *Tiberius* selfe, his meanes; and instill's into his eares many doubts, and suspicions both against the *Princes*, and their mother *Agrippina*: which *Cæsar* iealously hearkning to, as couetously consenteth to their Ruine, and their Friends. In this time, the better to mature and strengthen his *Designe*, hee labours to marry *Liuia*, and worketh (withall his Ingine) to remoue *Tiberius* from the knowledge of publique Businesse, with allurements of a quiet and seperated Life; the latter of which *Tiberius*, (out of a pronenesse to Lust and a desire to hide those vnnatural Pleasures which he could not so publiquely practise) embraceth: the former inkindleth his Feares, & there giues him first cause of doubt, or suspect toward *Seianus*. Against whom, he raiseth (in priuate) a new Instrument, one *Sertorius Macro*, and by him vnderworketh, discouers the others Coũsells, his Meanes, his Ends, sounds the Affectiõs of the *Senators*, diuides, distracts them: at last, when *Seianus* least looketh, and is most Secure; (with pretext of doing him an vn-wonted honour in the *Senat*) he trayns him from his Guardes; with one Letter, & in one Day, hath him suspected, accus'd, condemned, and torne in peices, by the rage of the *People*.

This do we aduance as a marke of Terror to all *Traytors*, & *Treasons*; to shewe how iust the *Heauens* are in powring and thundring downe a weighty vengeance on their vnnatural intents, euen to the worst *Princes*: Much more to those, for guard of whose Piety and Vertue, the *Angels* are in continuall watch, and *God* himselfe miraculously working.

The

Figure 1, *Sejanus* A4r.

SEIANVS.

Our [a] loookes are call'd to queſtion, and our wordes,
How innocent ſo euer, are made Crimes;
We ſhall not ſhortly dare to tell our dreames,
Or thinke but 'twill be Treaſon. SAB. "Tirannes Artes
"Are to giue Flatterers grace, Accuſers power,
"That thoſe may ſeeme to kill whom they deuoure.
Now [b] good Cremutius Cordus. COR. Haile to your Lordſhip.
NAT. Who's that ſalutes your Coſin? LAT. 'Tis one Cordus,
A Gentleman of Rome; one, that has writ
Annal's of late, they ſay, and very well.
NAT. Annal's? of what times? LAT. I thinke of Pompei's,
And Caius Ceſars; and [c] ſo downe to theſe,
NAT. How ſtands h'affected to the preſent ſtate?
Is he or [d] Druſian? or Germanican?
Or ours? or neutrall? LAT. I know him not ſo far.
NAT. Thoſe Times are ſomewhat queaſie to be toucht.
Haue you or ſeene, or heard part of his worke?
LAT. Not I, he meanes they ſhall be publike ſhortly.
NAT. O. Cordus do you call him? LA. I. SAB. But theſe our times
Are not the ſame Arruntius.[e] ARR. Times? the Men,
The Men are not the ſame: 'Tis wee are baſe,
Poore, and degenerate from th'exalted ſtreine
Of our great Fathers. Where is now the ſoule
Of God-like Cato? He, that durſt be good,
When Ceſar durſt be euill; and had power,
As not to liue his ſlaue, to die his Maſter.
Or where the conſtant Brutus, that (being proofe
Againſt all charme of benefits) did ſtrike
So braue a blowe into the monſters heart
That ſought vnkindly) to captiue his countrie?
O they are fled the light. Thoſe mighty ſpirits
Lye rak'd vp, with their aſhes, in their vrnes,
And not a ſparke of their eternall fire
Glowes in a preſent boſome: All's but blaze,
Flaſhes, and ſmoake, wherewith we labour ſo,
Ther's nothing Romane in vs; nothing good,
Gallant, or great: 'Tis true, that Cordus ſay's,
Braue Caſſius was the laſt of all that race.

[a] Vid. Tac. Ann. 1. pag. 4. & lib. 3. pa. 61. Suet. Tib. cap. 61 Senec. de Benef. lib. 3. cap. 26.
[b] De Cremutio Cordo vid. Tacit. Annal. lib. 4. pag. 83. 84. Senec. conſol. ad Marciam. Dio. lib. 57. pag. 710. Suet. Aug. ca. 35. Tib. cap. 61. Cal cap. 16.
[c] Leg. Suet. Aug. ca. 35.
[d] Vid. de factio. Tac. Ann. lib. 2. pag. 39. & lib. 4. pa. 79.
[e] De Lu. Aruntio iſto, vid. Tac. Ann. lib. 1. pag. 6. & lib. 3. pag. 60. & Dion. Rom. Hiſt. lib. 58.

 SAB.

Figure 2, *Sejanus* B2r

SEIANVS.

Auoid these fumes, these superstitious Lights,
And all these coos'ning *Ceremonies*; You.
Your pure, and spiced conscience. I, the Slaue,
And Mocke of Fooles, (Scorne on my worthy head,)
That haue bene [a] titled, and ador'd a God,
Yea, [b] sacrific'd vnto, my selfe, in *Rome*,
No lesse then *Ioue*: and I be brought, to doe
A peeuish Giglot rites? Perhaps, the thought,
And shame of that made *Fortune* turne her face,
Knowing her selfe the lesser Deity,
And but my Seruant: bashfull Queene, if so,
Seianus thanks thy modesty. Who's that?

[a] Tac. *Ann.* lib. 4 pa. 96.
[b] Dio. lib. 58 pag. 716 717.

POMPONIVS. [c] MINVTIVS. &c.

[c] Dio Minutio. vid. Tac. *Ann.* lib. 6.

POM. His Fortune suffers, till he heares my newes:
I haue wayted here too long. *Macro*, my Lord—
SEI. Speake lower, & withdraw. TER. Are these things true?
MIN. Thousands are gazing at it, in the streetes.
SEI. What's that? TER. *Minutius* tells vs here, my Lord,
That, a new Head being set vpon your Statue.
A [d] Rope is since found wreath'd about it; And,
But now, [e] a fiery Meteor, in the forme
Of a great ball, was seene to roule along
The troubled ayre, where yet it hangs, vnperfect,
The amazing wonder of the Multitude.
SEI. No more. That *Macro's* come, is more then all.
TER. Is *Macro* come? POM. I saw him. TER. Where? with whom?
POM. With *Regulus*. SEI. *Terentius*,— TER. My Lord?
SEI. [f] Send for the *Tribunes*, we will straight haue vp
More of the Souldiers, for our guard. *Minutius*,
Wee pray you goe for *Cotta*, *Latiaris*,
Trio the *Consull*, or what *Senatours*
You know are sure, and ours. You, my good Natta,
For *Laco*, *Prouost* of the watch. Now, *Satrius*,
The Time of proofe comes on. Arme all our seruants,
And without tumult. You *Pomponius*,
Hold some good Correspondence, with the *Consul*,

Attempt

[d] Dio. Hist. Rom. lib. 58. pag. 717.
[e] Vid. Sen. Nat. Quest. lib. 1 cap. 1.
[f] Dio. pag. 718.

Figure 3, *Sejanus* K4v.

NERO.

Si perstitissent,fraude perijsset Nero. *efferuntur à Flauio et Aspero mox redeuntibus.*
Ne. Sic illa libertina : quid tandem viri?
*Epaph.*Natalis,ignes vt videt,& vncos truces, *redit Rufus et Epaphroditus cum Natali.*
Non fert : fateri malit : at soli tibi.
An.Na. Ignosce Cæsar; fateor,(ô ne sit malo
Primum fateri)particeps semper fui
Pisoni ad eius omne secretum : fauor
Multorum in illum simul & adiunxit meum.
Illi voluimus imperia,cædem tibi.
Primus,sedentem qui palàm in Circo premat,
Lateranus : et qui feriat, is primus fuit
Sceuinus: alij vt cæpta sequerentur,fides.
Ne. Cæsaris is amor est?ea Senatorum fides?
Sabine,duce te,tyro Pisonem premat,
Premat inopinum,cui fauet miles vetus. *Nymphidius Sabinus ad Pisonem.*
Statio tribuno tam trucidetur citò
Lateranus,vt nec liberos tangat priùs. *Stat. Proximus ad Lateranū et Epaphrod.*
Sed quis meorum ex classe Pisoni fauet?
Ant.Nat. Missus ego ab illo,qui salutarem domi
Senecam, & amico colloquia peterem viro.
Colloquia neutri Seneca respondit fore
Commoda; saluti at illius niti suam. *reducitur Sceuinus.*
Ti. Nonne admonueram quàm Seneca fidus,bonus?
Ne. Poppæa; an audis? Seneca quoque nomen dedit. *Poppæā euocat.*
Pop. Credamne? merito tam bene,reponit male
Tam bonus? hoc vrge. *Nr.* Ad ista, quæ audisti Grani,
Responsa,dicta,Seneca quid dicat,refer. *Granius ad Senecā.*
Sceuinus at nunc conscium num se negat?
Fl.Sceui. Negare nunc non proderit : quid non patet?
Non nego. *Ner.* Sed alij conscij qui sint, refer.
Fl.Sceui. Lucanus. *Ne.* Ille, an æmulus laudis meæ?
Quos iactitabat ille, quia versus premo.
Fl.Sceui. Et Quinctianus. *Ne.* Corpore infamis suo,
Versu meo famosus vlcisci studet.
Fl Sce. Senecio. *Ner.* Amicus odia concepit meus;
Credo, quia solus non erat,summus comes. *ad illos Tribuni tres cum Epaphro.*
Illi Tribuni,tres tribus,primo inferant

Minae

Figure 4, *Nero* P2v.

NERO.

Si perstitissent, fraude perijsset Nero. *effertur à Flauio et Aspero mox redeuntibus.*
Ne. Sic illa libertina: quid tandem viri?
Epaph. Natalis, ignes vt videt, & vncos truces, *redit Rufus et Epaphroditus cum Natali.*
Non fert: fateri malit: at soli tibi.
An. Na. Ignosce Cæsar; fateor, (ô ne sit malo
Primum fateri) particeps semper fui
Pisoni ad eius omne secretum: fauor
Multorum in illum simul & adiunxit meum.
Illi voluimus imperia, cædem tibi.
Primus, sedentem qui palàm in Circo premat,
Lateranus: et qui feriat, is primus fuit
Sceuinus: alij vt cœpta sequerentur, fides.
Ne. Cæsaris is amor est? ea Senatorum fides?
Sabine, duce te, tyro Pisonem premat,
Premat inopinum, cui fauet miles vetus. *Nymphidius Sabinus ad Pisonem.*
Statio tribuno tam trucidetur citò
Lateranus, vt nec liberos tangat priùs. *Stat. Proximus ad Lateranū et Epaphrod.*
Sed quis meorum ex classe Pisoni fauet?
Ant. Nat. Missus ego ab illo, qui salutarem domi
Senecam, & amico colloquia peterem viro.
Colloquia neutri Seneca respondit fore
Commoda; saluti at illius niti suam. *reducitur Sceuinus.*
Tig. Nonne admonueram quàm Seneca fidus, bonus?
Ne. Poppæa; an audis? Seneca quoque nomen dedit. *Poppæā euocat.*
Pop. Credamne? merito tam bene, reponit male
Tam bonus? hoc vrge. *Ne.* Ad ista, quæ audisti Grani,
Responsa, dicta, Seneca quid dicat, refer. *Granius ad Senecā.*
Sceuinus at nunc conscium num se negat?
Fl. Sceui. Negare nunc non proderit: quid non patet?
Non nego. *Ner.* Sed alij conscij qui sint, refer.
Fl. Sceui. Lucanus. *Ne.* Ille, an æmulus laudis meæ?
Quos iactitabat ille, quia versus premo.
Fl. Sceui. Et Quinctianus. *Ne.* Corpore infamis suo,
Versu meo famosus vlsciscí studet.
Fl Sce. Senecio. *Ner.* Amicus odia concepit meus;
Credo, quia solus non erat, summus comes. *ad illos Tribuni tres cum Epaphro.*
Illi Tribuni, tres tribus, primo inferant

Minas

Figure 5, *Nero* P3r.

NERO.

Age nunc venenum prome prouisum mihi:
Quo cecidit olim Socrates, illo cadam:
Aut velut imago viua virtutis Cato: *Sen.tranq.vit.c.14.*
Aut qualis tuo Canius nost. o optimus. *Cicuta poculum profert med.*
Totũ hauriendũ!nempe, quia iustus modus. *ebibit Seneca.*
Inambulandum posteà! hinc aderit salus: *Eras.Socr.apoph.74.75.*
Hinc gallus Æsculapio sacrum cadat.
Migratio sit fausta, sit fœlix mihi.
Quæ nescienti est indita, hanc animam precor,
Natura repete; reddo tibi, gratus, libens. *Sen.ib.c.11.*
Frustrà precamur: corpus occlusum, pori
Obstructi, & artus frigidi impediunt iter.
Quid adhuc agendũ est? *P.* Ah. *Sen.* Quid est? perijt mea *Paulina intus*
Paulina? *Clem.* Nondum perijt: at cecidit suo
Defecta sensu; proximè à letho iacet.
Sen. Paulina venio: balneum ò præsens petam;
Quo liberanti sanguinem libem Ioui *balneo infertur.*
Gran.Silu. At quia Neroni haud iussa Paulina est mori,
Nec proprium odium Cæsaris in illam fuit,
Crudelitatis ne inuidia glíscat nimis,
Famuli cruorem premite, prohibete exitum:
Seu nolit illa, seu velit, viuat tamen;
Et ferat amoris pallida exangues notas.
Virtutis vno perijt in Seneca satis. *Exeunt milites.*

ACT. 5. SCE. 7. 2. 6.
Lucanus incisis venis.

Lucanus. Lucane, nunc te collige solutus metu.
Vnum illud, illud vnicum (ò superi precor)
Abolete, matrem prodidi (ò facinus) meam.
Tantum in viris cupido viuendi potest.
Spem fecit, & fefellit impuram impius.
At vita cum te deficit (vita heu breuis)
Tui memineris, memineris saltem tua.
Reditura vita: huic parcere ignauum puta. *Lucan.l.1.466.*
Vulteius an te, tuue Vulteium doces?

Vita

Figure 6, *Nero* Q2v.

NERO.

Vita breuis nulli superest, qui tempus in illa l.4.579.
Quærendæ sibi mortis habet: virtute merendũ est, 613.
Cæsar vt amissis inter tot millia paucis
Hoc damnum cladémque vocet: dent fata recessum
Emittantque licet, vitare instantia nolim.
Victurosque Dei celant, vt viuere durent 620.
Fœlix esse mori.
Pompeius an te, tuue Pompeium doces?
Aut nihil est sensus animis à morte relictum, l.3.39
Aut mors ipsa nihil.
Ignorant populi, si non in morte probâris l.8.629.
An scieris aduersa pati: ne cede pudori.
Sum tamen ò superi, fœlix, nullique potestas 629.
Hoc auferre Deo: mutantur prospera vitâ:
Non sum morte miser.
Denique Catonem tu doces, an te Cato?
Scire mori sors prima viris, sed proxima cogi. l.9.210.
Lætius est quoties magno sibi constat honestum. 403.
Ii mihi sunt comites quos ipsa pericula ducent, 388.
Qui me teste pati vel quæ tristissima pulchrum
Romanumque putent.
Mihi nempe scriptis à Styge ereptus Cato.
Aduolat, atqui ingens meritum maiusque salute 892.
Contulit in lethum vires, puduitque gementem
Illo teste mori.
Scilicet, vt illi Tullus, ita cæsus cado;
Sanguis erant lachrimæ: quacunque foramina nouit 817.
Humor, ab his largus manat cruor: omnia plenis
Membra fluunt venis, totum est pro vulnere corpus.
Brutiue potius videor vt Lycidas mori:
Scinditur auulsus: nec, sicut vulnere, sanguis l.3 637.
Emicuit lentus, ruptis cadit vndique venis,
Discursusque animæ diuersa in membra meantis

Q 3 *Inter-*

Figure 7, *Nero* Q3r.

Nemesis.

EMissus atro Dite quid spondet Chorus?
Cædem, vltionem, lachrymas, cladem, nefas.
E filiabus quatuor Noctis nigræ,
Nocturna scelera, infesta quæ prodat dies.
Debita sceleribus flagra, Iustitiæ manus, Arist. de mund.
Distribuo Nemesis; si quis insequitur scelus, Nat. Com. myth.
Insector Adrastea, nec quisquàm effugit. l.9.c.19.l.3.c.10.
Indesinenter vrget Alecto minax
Libidinosos ambitus : odium grauat
Megæra : cædem cæde Tisiphone aggerat,
Mulctatq;. Erinnes furere lymphatos agunt.
Theatra digna prorsus inferno Choro.
Quod si Tragœdis materia primùm malis
Patheticis turbata, lachrymosa, horrida,
Quæratur; vllum terra sustinuit, tulit
Natura, vidit Phœbus, historia edidit,
Vel par NERONI, vel parallelum malum?
Quin si sit illis arbiter rerum Chorus,
Iudex, vel index, qui malis absiet, bonis Hor.art.poet
Faueat, vtrisque sua tribuat, oret Deos, .191.
Fortuna miseris redeat, à tumidis eat;
Quin nos facinorum vindices, æqua arbitræ?
Agenda quin prædicimus, quoniam Deæ? Orph.hymn.
Interpretamur acta, Iustitiæ assecle? Eumenid.
Acta, vel agenda, linquimus inultum nihil?
Nunc, vnde veniant, scelera, quæ venient, loquar.
En Messalinæ quàm procax amor, an furor!
Quæ quàm impudica, et impudens, Satyræ canunt;
Lassata, nec dum satura, quòd fuerit viris. Iuu.Sat.6.
Prodiga pudoris, hactenus tandem pudens; 130.

Ardere

Figure 8, *Nero* A3v.

Ardere Silium, nisi virum ducat, pudet.
Ardet, nec audet : audet, ô facinus, viro
Viuente, propè vidente, sibi mæchum virum
Inducere : furit Bacchadum infælix modo.
Remedia Silius vnica periclis putat
Pericla : scelera cum patent, audax iuuet Tacit. Annal.
Furor : innocentes tuta consilia expetant. l.11.f.
Incautus, iræ properus Augustus citò
Premendus illis : coniuges isti imperent.
Ausa, acta tanta, Claudij horrescit domus.
Flagrante Pallas gratiâ, haud animo satis.
Acer, potens, Callistus ; at cautus magis.
Narcissus vrget ; nec mora, accusat : rogat,
Suumne nôrit ipse dissidium ; tenet
Vrbem maritus, inquit. Hinc stultus Senex,
Vxoriusque, mox fremit, sed mox tremit ;
Tremensq; rogitat, an sit imperij potens?
Priuatus an sit Silius? hinc atrox ruit
Procella veniens Hostiâ : occursum cupit
Accincta mater liberis : sed non viro
Audita, vel neglecta, vel minimè placens.
Rediuiua ne sit gratia, superbam premit
Adulteram libertus. Hinc scelerum seges,
Quæ mox agenda. Sed nec in scena silet
Xiphilinus istâ ; nec tacet Tacitus ; nec est
Tranquillus hic Tranquillus : historicos putes
Fieri poetas. Iste locus at quid valet?
Quid grex pusillus, comicus tragicis? sed est
Voluisse in istis alquid. Aut ista æquiùs
Accipite, vel vos Nemesis, vrgebit pari.

ACT.

Figure 9, *Nero* A4r.

NERO.

Ille imperabit? sic Agrippina imperat?
Volumne feret impune? sic uetus Nero?
Cum hos Gygantes dum struunt, in se struunt.
Sed in Senatum Cæsar è castris redit.

ACT. 2. SCE. 3.

Nero è castris in Curiam. Senatores. L. Antistius Consul. Burrhus praefect Praetorian. Seneca.

Nero. Postquàm inter homines desijt diuus Nero	*Suet.c.33.N.*
Morari, auitis Claudijs clarus Nero,	*Tacit.An.13.449.*
Suis triumphis clarus, illorum inclytus,	*Suet.c.17.C.*
Græcæ et Latinæ scriptor historiæ Nero,	*Suet.c.11.et 42.C.*
Patriæ pater, curator annonæ Nero,	*Suet.c.18.C.*
Sub quo regente triste nil, tuta omnia,	*Tacit.ib.*
Prouidus (id acta vita sub Caio docet)	*Suet.c.38.C.*
Sapiens (id ipsum nomen imperij probat)	*Senec.in* [illegible]
Cæsar, Tiberius, Drusus, Augustus, Nero;	
Pietatis ergò, Claudium in cælos patres	*Dion l.60.in fine.*
Vnco trahamus, Diuus vbi fungos edat,	
Cibos Deorum: funus Augustum apparo.	
Nunc quia Deorum gratiâ voto meo,	*Tacit.ib.*
Virtute matris, militum assensu omnium,	
Filius, et hæres Claudij, imperium gero,	
Authoritatem postulo vestram, Patres,	
Summam, auspicatam, liberam, vnanimem, grauem.	
Vnam esse Lunam, luceant stellæ licet,	
Solum esse Solem, Luna licet orbem impleat,	
Vnum esse superis, inferis, medijs Iouem,	
Vnum esse Romæ monstra nisi gignat, caput,	
Pax, ordo, lex, vis, vsus, vtilitas iubent.	
Ille vnus ecce Iupiter, pastor, pater,	
Adsum, iuuando Iupiter, amando pater,	
Et alendo pastor adsum, vt Augusti pia	*Xiphil.in im.Ner.*
Subinde referam regna, licet impar feram.	
Augustus, ecce denuò Augustus, redit.	
Nec mihi iuuentus ciuicis armis furit	*Tacit.ib.*
Imbuta, nec sunt, quas alam, lites domi.	
Nulla odia, nullæ iniuriæ, nulla vltio.	

Vestra

Figure 10, *Nero* D2v.

50

Thesewalls are built of stones of so great price,
All other vnto these come far behind;
In these men see the vertue and the vice,
That cleaueth to the inward soule and mind,
Who looks in such a glasse, may grow so wise,
As neither flatting praises shall him blind
With tickling words, nor vndeserued blame,
With forged faults shall worke him anie shame.

Horace. Falsus honor iuuat & mendax infamia terret, Quem? nisi mendosum & mendacem.

51

From hence doth come the euerlasting light,
That may with *Phebus* beames so cleare compare,
That when the Sunne is downe there is no night,
With those that of these iewels stored are,
These gemmes do teach vs to discerne aright:
These gems are wrought with workmāship so rare,
That hard it were to make true estimation,
Which is more worth the substance or the fashion

Ouid. Materiem superabat opus.

52

On arches raisd of porphirie passing hie,
So hie, that to ascend them seemd a paine,
Were gardens faire and pleasant to the eye,
Few found so faire below vpon a plaine;
Sweet smelling trees in order standing by,
With fountaines watring them in steed of raine,
Which do the same so naturally nourish,
As all the yeare both flours and frutes do flourish.

53

No weeds or fruitlesse trees are in this place,
But herbs whose vertues are of highest price,
As soueraigne sage,and thrift and herbe of grace,
And time,which well bestowed maketh wise,
And lowly patience, proud thoughts to abase,
And harts ease,that can neuer grow with vice.
These are the herbs that in this garden grew,
Whose vertues do their beauties still renew.

54

The Ladie of the castell greatly ioyed,
To see the safe ariuall of this knight,
And all her care and trauell she employed,
That honor might be done him in her sight,
Astolfo (in his passage lesse annoyed)
Doth take in his acquaintance great delight,
And all the other his good fauor sought,
That by *Melissa* to them selues were brought.

55

Now hauing all them selues some dayes reposed,
In *Logestillas* house, and taken rest,
And finding all them selues right well disposed,
To make returne againe into the West.
The good *Melissa* for them all proposed,
Vnto the mightie Ladie this request,
That by her leaue without incurring blame,
They might return thē all from whence they came

56

To whom Dame *Logestilla* thus replide,
That after they a day or two had stayd,
She would for them most carefully prouide,
For all their iourney furniture and ayd,
And first she taught *Rogero* how to ride,
The flying horse (of whom he was affrayd)
To make him pase,or passe a full careere,
As readily as other horses here.

57

When all was readie now for him to part,
Rogero bids this worthie dame farewell,
Whom all his life time after from his hart,
He highly honored and loued well.
First I will shew how well he playd his part,
Then of the English Duke I meane to tell,
How in more time, and with far greater paine,
He did returne to *Charles* his court againe.

58

Rogero mounted on the winged steed,
Which he had learnd obedient now to make,
Deeming it were a braue and noble deed,
About the world his voyage home to take.
Forthwith beginneth Eastward to proceede,
And though the thing were much to vndertake,
Yet hope of praise makes men no trauell shunne,
To say another day,this we haue donne.

Sentence.

59

And leauing first the Indian riuer *Tane*,
He guides his iourney to the great Catay,
From thence he passeth vnto Mangiana,
And came within the sight of huge Quinsay;
On the right hand he leaueth Sericana,
And turning from the Scythians away,
Where Asia from Europa first doth draw,
Pomerie, Russia, and Prutin he saw.

60

His horse that hath the vse of wings and feete,
Holpe him with greater hast home to retire,
And thoe with speed to turne he thought it meet,
Because his *Bradamant* did so desire,
Yet hauing now of trauell felt the sweet,
(Sweet vnto those to knowledge that aspire)
When Germanie and Hungrie he had past,
He meanes to visit * England at the last.

Sentence.
** Ariosto cals vs vltima Inghilterra, the uttermost countrey. So in times past the old Romans wrate, Et penitus toto diuisos orbe Britannos.*

61

Where in a medow on a morning faire,
Fast by the Tems at London he did light,
Delighted with the water and the aire,
And that faire citie standing in his sight,
When straight he saw that souldiers did repaire,
To muster there: and asking of a knight,
That in the medow he had met by chaunce,
He vnderstood that they were bound for Fraunce.

62

These be the succours(thus the knight him told)
Renaldo sude for at his comming hither,
With Irish men and Scots of courage bold,
To ioyne in harts and hands and purse together:
The musters tane, and each mans name enrold,
Their only stay is but for wynd and wether,
But as they passe I meane to you to shew them,
Their names and arms that you may better know (them,

63

See you the standerd that so great doth show,
That ioynes the Leopard and the flour de luce?
That is the chiefe, the rest do come below,
And reu'rence this according to our vse,
Duke *Leonell* Lord generall doth it ow,
A famous man in time of warre and truce,
And nephew deare vnto the king my master,
Who gaue to him the Dukedome of Lancaster.

Ariosto doth but touch these noble mens names, and if any of us should write of the noble men of that time, we should not do the like.

Figure 11, *Orlando* 77/G4r.

64

The weather ſtill was temperat and cleare,
A pleaſant gale their ſwelling ſailes did fill,
No ſigne of ſtorme, or tempeſt did appeare,
To ſuch as in the weather had beſt skill:
But loe the weather oft doth chaung her cheare,
Eu'n as a woman oft doth chaunge her will,
For ſodainly they had ſuch ſtormes of wether,
As if that heau'n & earth would come together.

65

The aire doth on the ſodaine grow obſcure,
Lightned ſomtime with lightnings dreadfull light
And ſaue their houreglaſſe kept thē reckning ſure
Twas hard for to diſcerne the day from night:
The deſprat marriners do all endure,
As men inur'd to the waters ſpight,
The heau'ns aboue, the waues beneath do rore,
Yet are not they diſmaid one whit therefore.

66

One with a whiſtle hang'd about his necke,
Shewes by the ſound which cord muſt be vndone,
And ſtraight the ſhipboy readie at a becke,
Vnto the toppes with nimble ſleight doth runne,
The other marriners vpon the decke,
Or at the ſteere the comming waues do ſhunne,
And then by turnes they pumpe the water out,
By paine and care preuenting eu'rie doubt.

67

He returnes to them in the xix. booke. 34 ſt.

Now while this noble crew with tempeſt toſt,
Went in the ſea as winde and weather draue,
Looking each minute to be drownd and loſt,
The Chriſtians with a freſh aſſault and braue,
Set on the Pagans ſorely to their coſt:
Who now began the worſer ſide to haue,
But chiefly then their courage gan to quaile,
When noble *Dardanellos* life did faile.

68

Renaldo.

Renaldo him had noted from the reſt,
Proud of the ſlaughter of ſo many foes,
And to himſelfe he ſaid tis ſurely beſt,
To crop this weed, before it higher growes,
Therewith he ſets his fatall ſpeare in reſt,
And cries to *Dardanello* as he goes,
Alas poore boy, much woe to thee they bred,
That left to thee that ſhield of white and red.

69

Ile trie if you defend thoſe cullors well,
(He ſaith) which if with me you cannot do,
Againſt *Orlando* fierce, I can you tell,
For to defend them will be great adoe:
Thus ſaid *Renald* and noble *Dardanell*,
In valiant wiſe thus aunſwerd thereunto,
Know this (quoth he) that theſe my cullors I,
Will brauely here defend, or brauely die.

Dardanello ſlaine.

70

With that he ſpurr'd his horſe (as this he ſpake)
And with great force *Renaldo* did aſſaile,
But loe the ſtaffe vpon his armor brake,
So as his blow but little did auaile,
But ſtraight *Renaldos* ſpeare a way did make,
Piercing the double folds of plate and maile,
And went ſo deepe into the tender skin,
Out went the life there where the ſtaffe went in.

Virg. 1. AEn. Infelix puer atque impar congreſſus Achilli.

71

Looke how a purple flowre doth fade and drie,
That painefull plowman cutteth vp with ſheare,
Or as the Poppeys heads aſide do lie,
When it the bodie cannot longer beare;
So did the noble *Dardanello* die,
And with his death fild all his men with feare.
As waters runne abrode that breake their bay,
So fled his ſouldiers breaking their array.

Simile. Homer hath of a Poppy.

Simile.

72

They flie vnto their tents with full perſwaſion,
That of the field the maſterie was loſt,
Wherefore to fortifie againſt inuaſion,
They ſpare no time, no trauell, nor no coſt;
Charles by the forhead meanes to take Occaſion,
And follows them full cloſe with all his hoſt,
And comming to their tents ſo brauely ventred,
That he with them themſelues almoſt had enterd

Sentence. Fronte capillata eſt poſt haec occaſio calua.

73

Had not his valient attempt bene ſtaid,
By ouer haſtie comming of the night,
So that of force as then it was delaid,
And either ſide was driu'n to leaue the fight
But with this difference the Turkes diſmaid,
And newly gatherd from their fearefull flight,
The Chriſtians on the tother ſide purſewing,
And day by day their hope and powre renewing.

74

The number of the Turks that day were ſlaine,
Was more then fourescore thouſand (as they ſay)
Their blood did fat the ground of all that plaine,
Making the ſoile more fertile to this day:
Among the dead ſome men halfe dead remaine,
Left there for thieues and robbers as a pray,
Within the Pagan campe great mone they make,
Some for their frends, ſome for their kinsfolks ſake

75

Two youthes there were among ſo many more,
Whoſe friendſhip faſt & firme, whoſe faithful harts
Deſerueth to be plaſt the reſt before,
And to be praiſed for their good deſearts,
Their names were *Cloridano* and *Medoro*,
Both borne farre hence, about the Eſter parts,
Their parents poore, and not of our beliefe,
Yet for true loue they may be praiſed chiefe.

Cloridan, Medoro.

76

The Elder of the two hight *Cloridan*,
An hunter wilde in all his life had beene,
Actiue of limbs, and eke an hardie man,
As in a thouſand men might well be ſeene:
Medoro was but young, and now began,
To enter to, of youth the pleaſant greene,
Faire skind, black eyd, and yellow curled heare,
Hanging in louely locks by either eare.

Statius deſcribeth the beautie of Archemorus such ſort. [illegible]

77

Theſe two among the reſt kept watch that night,
And while the time in ſundrie ſpeech they ſpent,
Medoro oftentime moſt ſadly ſight,
His maſters death did cauſe him to lament,
Oh (ſaid *Medoro*) what a wofull ſpight?
What cruell ſcourge to me hath fortune ſent?
That *Dardanell Almontes* worthy ſonne,
So ſodainly ſhould vnto death be done.

Behold

Figure 12, *Orlando* 142/M6v.

92

And now that by his words she plainely found,
That this was *Zerbin*, and that he beleeued
Faire *Isabella* was in tempest dround,
With which conceit she saw he sore was greeued,
She that did know her to be safe and sound,
Yet meaning not his griefe should be releeued:
She telleth onely that that would diseafe him,
And doth conceale that which she thought would (please him.

93

You sir (quoth she) that me so greatly scorne,
If you but knew what tydings I could tell,
Of her whom you lament as dead and lorne,
You would both speake me faire and vse me well:
But first I will with horses wild be torne,
And suffer all the paines of earth and hell,
Rather then I will condiscend to show it,
Or then by me you euer come to know it.

94

Looke how a gentle grewnd, that doth assaile
And flies vpon a straunger at the furst,
Will on the sodaine faune and wag his taile,
If so of bread one profer him a crust:
So *Zerbin* that before on her did raile,
And bitterly vnto her face he curst,
Now he entreates her, and doth pray and flatter,
To giue him farther notice of the matter.

95

At last with long entreatie she replies,
And saith, faire *Isabella* is not ded,
But so she liues, that sure she death enuies,
And neuer hope to haue her maidenhed,
For I haue seene (quoth she) with these mine eyes
How twentie lawlesse men her captiue led,
And eu'rie one might haue her at their pleasure,
Hauing both libertie and lust, and leasure.

96

Ah wicked hagge, thou know'st it is a lie,
And yet behold how thou canst paint it out,
Thou know'st that none of them with her did lie,
Thou know'st *Orlando* thence did fetch her out:
And made the malefactors all to die,
That of her daunger now there was no doubt:
But now alas this lying storie bred,
A thousand iealousies in *Zerbinos* hed.

97

He askt her where and when his loue she saw,
He speakes her oftentimes both foule and faire,
But not a word more could he from her draw,
Neither by threatning words, nor yet by prayre:
He feeles a corzie cold his heart to gnaw,
His little hope was turnd to great dispaire:
And thus this old ilfauord spitefull caller,
Gaue good *Zerbino* such a choking faller.

Callet is a [illegible]

98

What patience thus prouoked could haue borne,
At such a womans hands so vile a spite?
And saue he was vnto her seruice sworne,
No doubt he would haue done her then her right
Thus she of mallice full, and he of scorne,
Went on their way, vntill they met a knight:
But what became hereof if you will know,
The booke ensuing shall the sequel show.

In the tale of Phalanto, *and his compauie, women may note the notable inconstancie of young mens dishonest loues, how sweet and pleasant so euer they be at the first. In* Pynabello *and his wife that scorned* Gabrinas *old age and deformitie, we may obserue the foule sin and the iust punishment of pride and contempt of others. In the good* Zerbino, *that for his promise sake suffers himselfe to be so notoriously abused of a spitefull malicious old wretch, we may marke a notable example of a man true and faithfull of his word.*

Simile.

In the beginning of this booke he reciteth the names of foure women famous, two for warre, two for learning, and in deede there haue bene many more, excellent in either kind: as Thomeris *that killed* Cyrus, Zenobea, Hipsicratea *wife to* Mythridates, Debora *the Hebrew, whom the scripture commendeth;* Valesca *queene of Boemia,* Thenca *queene of Slauonia,* Amalasunta *queene of the Gothes: All these are famous for their wise gouernment. And for learning diuers women haue greatly excelled; as* Eciana, Alpasia, Cleobulyna, Theana, Leontio, Manto, Hicostrata, Carmenta, *the* Sibils, Sulpicia. *But for a perfite patterne of excellency in both kinds, both in gouerning the common wealth most wisely, peaceably and prosperously, and skill in all kind of learning, and languages, Greeke, Latine, French, Italian and Spanish, I may say it truely, and without flatterie, that our gracious souraigne is to be preferred before any of them, yea before all of them, and therefore may iustly be called the iewell, or rather the wonder of all her sex.*

Moral.

Historie.

All the Allegoricall matter of this booke is onely in Astolfos *horne, of which I haue spoken before this.*

This tale of the Greeks comming home from Troy, and finding so many bastards, alludeth to a like hap that fel vnto the Spartans when they made warre on the Messenians; from whence one in deed named Falanto *or* Phalanto *with other bastards called Parthenians went to the Oracle to know what they should do, and were directed by the said Oracle to go to Tarentum: Their answere they receiued of the Oracle was this,*

Statireum, & pingue solum, tibi trado Tarenti
Incolere, & late sedem per Iapygas ædes.

So as they taking heart vpon this, went from Sparta, and as some thinke built the cittie of Tarentum.

Allegorie.
Allusion.

The end of the notes vpon the xx. booke.

Figure 13, *Orlando* 160/03v.

SEIANVS.

ACTVS PRIMVS.

SABINVS. SILIVS. NATTA. LATIARIS. CORDVS.
SATRIVS. ARRVNTIVS. EVDEMVS.
HATERIVS. &c.

NAT. W
Gent

SAB. HAile [a] *Caius Silius*. SIL. [b] *Titius Sabinus*, Hayle.
Yo'are rarely met in Court! SAB. Therfore, well met.
SIL. 'Tis true: Indeed, this Place is not our Sphære.
SAB. No *Silius*, we are no good Inginers;
We want the fine Artes, and their thriuing vse
Should make vs grac'd, or fauor'd of the Times:
We haue no shift of Faces, no cleft Tongues,
No soft, and glutinous bodies, that can stick,
Like Snailes, on painted walls; or, on our brests,
Creepe vp, to fall, from that proud height, to which
We did by [c] slauerie, not by seruice, clime.
We are no guilty men, and then no Great;
We haue nor place in Court, Office in state,
That we [d] can say, we owe vnto our Crimes;
We burne with no [e] black secrets, which can make
Vs deare to the pale Authors; or liue fear'd
Of their still waking iealosies, to raise
Our selues a Fortune, by subuerting theirs.
We stand not in the lines, that do aduance
To that so courted point. SIL. But yonder leane
A paire that doe. (SAB. Good Cossen [f] *Latiaris*.)
SIL. [g] *Satrius Secundus*, and [h] *Pinnarius Natta*,
The great *Seianus* Clients; There be two,
Know more, then honest Councells: whose close brests
Were they rip'd vp to light, it would be found
A poore, and idle sinne, to which their Trunkes
Had not bene made fit Organs: These can lie,
Flatter, and sweare, forsweare, depraue, [i] informe,
Smile, and betray; make guilty men; then beg

[a] *De Caio* Silio, *vid.* Tacit. Lips. edit. 4°. *Anna. lib.* 1. *pag.* 11. *lib.* 2. *pag.* 28. & 33.
[b] *De* Titio Sabino. *vid* Tac. *lib.* 4. *pag.* 79.
[c] Tac. *Annal. lib* 1. *pag.* 2.
[d] Iuuenal. *Sat.* 1. *ver.* 75.
[e] *Et Sat.* 3. *ver.* 49. &c.
[f] *De* Latiari, *cos.* Tac. *Annal. lib.* 4 *pag.* 94 & Dion. Step. *edit. fol. lib.* 58. *pag.* 711.
[g] *De* Satrio Secundo, & [h] Pinnario Natta. *Leg* Tacit. *Annal. lib.* 4. *pag.* 83. *Et de* Satrio. *cons.* Senec. *cō-sol. ad Marciam.*
[i] *Vid.* Sen. *de Benef. lib.* 3 *cap.* 26.

B The

Figure 14, *Sejanus* B1r.

SEIANVS.

SAB. Stād by, Lord [a] *Drusus*. HAT. Th'Emp'rours son, giue place.
SIL. I like the Prince well. ARR. [b] A riotous youth,
There's little hope of him. SAB. That fault his Age
Will, as it growes, correct. Me thinkes, hee beares
Himselfe, each day, more noblie then other:
And winnes no lesse on mens affections
Then doth his Father loose. Beleeue me' I loue him;
And chiefely [c] for opposing to *Seianus*.
SIL. And I [d] for gracing his yong kinsman so,
The [e] sonnes of Prince [f] *Germanicus*; It shewes
A gallant clearnesse in him, a streight minde,
That enuies not, in them, their Fathers name.
ARR. His Name was, while he liu'd, aboue all envie;
And beeing dead, without it. O that man!
If there were seedes of the old vertue left,
They liu'd in him. SIL. He had the fruicts, *Arruntius*,
More then the seedes: [g] *Sabinus*, and my selfe
Had meanes to know'him, within; and can report him:
We were his followers, (he would call vs Friends.)
He was a Man most like to vertue'; In all,
And euery action, nearer to the Gods,
Then Men, in nature; Of a body'as fayre
As was his mind; and no lesse reuerend
In face, then fame: [h] He could so vse his state,
Temp'ring his greatnesse, with his grauitie,
As it auoided all selfe-love in him,
And spight in others. What his Funeralls lack'd
In Images, and Pompe, they had supplied
With honourable sorrow, Souldiers sadnesse,
A kind of silent mourning, such, as Men
(Who knowe no teares, but from their Captiues,) vse
To shew in so great Losses. COR. I thought once,
Considering their Formes, Age, Manner of deathes,
The neernesse of the places, where they fell,
T'haue paralell'd him with great *Alexander*:
For both were of best feature, of high race,
Year'd but to thirty, and, in forrayne lands,
By their owne people, alike made away,

SAB.

[a] Lege de Dru o. Tac. Anna. lib. 1 pag. 9. Suet. Tib. cap. 52. Dio. Rom. hist. lib. 57. pag. 699.
[c] Tacit. Ann. lib. 3. pag. 62.
[d] vid. Tac. Ann. lib. 4. pag. 74.
[e] Ann. lib. 4 pag. 75. 76.
[e] Nero. Drusus. Caius, qui in castris genitus, et Caligula nominatus.
Tac. an. l. 1.
[f] De Germanico. cons. Tac. Anna. lib. 2. pag. 14. et Dion Hist. Rom. l. 57. p. 694.
[g] vid. Tac. Ann. lib. 4. pag. 79.
[h] Tac. An. l. 2. pag. 47 et Dion. Hist. Rom. lib. 57 pag. 705.

Figure 15, *Sejanus* B2v.

Now you are ſpi'd, be gone. LEP. I feare, you wrong him.
He has the voice to be an honeſt *Romane*.
ARR. And truſted to this office? *Lepidus*,
I'ld ſooner truſt *Greeke-Sinon*, then a Man
Our *State* emploies. Hee's gone: and being gone,
I dare tell you (whome I dare better truſt)
That our [a] Night-ey'd *Tiberius* doth not ſee
His *Miniſters* driftes; Or, if he doe, H'is not
So errant ſubtill, as we Fooles doe take him:
To breed a Mungrill vp, in his owne Houſe,
With his owne Blood, and (if the good *Gods* pleaſe)
At his owne Throate, traine him, to take a leape.
I do not beg it, *Heau'n*: but, if the *Fates*
Graunt it theſe eyes, they muſt not winke. LEP. They muſt
Not ſee it, *Lucius*. ARR. Who ſhould let 'hem? LEP. Zeale,
And Duty; with the thought, *He is our Prince*.
ARR. He is our Monſter: forfeited to vice
So far, as no rack'd vertue can redeeme him.
His loathed perſon [b] fouler then all crimes:
An *Emp'rour*, onely in his luſts. Retir'd
(From all reguard of his owne fame, or *Rome's*)
Into an [c] obſcure Iland; where he liues
(Acting his Tragedies with a Comick face)
Amidſt his rout of *Chaldee's*: [d] ſpending howres,
Daies, weekes, and monthes in the vnkind abuſe
Of graue *Aſtrologie*, to the bane of men,
Calling the *Scope* of mens Natiuities,
And hauing found ought worthy in their *Fortune*,
Kill, or precipitate them in the Sea,
And boaſt, he can mock *Fate*. Nay, muſe not: theſe
Are far from endes of euill, ſcarſe degrees.
He hath his Slaughter-houſe, at *Capreæ*;
Where he doth ſtudy Murder, as an *Art*:
And they are deareſt in his grace, that can
Deuiſe the deepeſt tortures. Thether, too,
He hath his Boyes, and beauteous Girles tâne vp
Out of our *nobleſt Houſes*, the beſt form'd,
Beſt nurtur'd, and moſt modeſt: what's their Good

[a] Tiberius *in tenebris* *videret*. *teſtibus* Dion. *Hiſt. Rom. lib.* 57 *pag.* 691. *Et* Plini. Nat. *Hiſt. lib* 11. *cap.* 37.

[b] *Conf.* Tac. *Ann. lib.* 4. *pag.* 91.

[c] *Vid.* Suet. Tib. *de ſeceſſu Caprenſi.* *cap.* 43. Dio. *pag.* 715. Iuue. Sat. 10.

[d] Tac. *lib.* *Annal.* 6. *pag.* 106. Dio. *Rom. Hiſt. lib.* 57. *pag* 706. Suet. Tib. *cap.* 62. Suet. *ibid.* Suet. Tib. *cap.* 44.

Figure 16, *Sejanus* I3r.

[a] Tacit. Ann. lib. 6. pag. 100. Suet. Tib. cap. 43.	Serues to prouoke his Bad. [a] Some are allur'd Some threatned; Others, (by their friends detain'd) Are rauish'd hence, like Captiues, and, in sight Of their most grieued Parents, dealt away Vnto his *Spintries*, *Sellaries*, and Slaues, Masters of strange, and new-commented lusts, For which wise *Nature* hath not left a Name. To this (what most strikes vs, and bleeding *Rome*,)
[b] Leg. Dio. Rom. Hist. lib. 58. pag. 714.	He is, with all his craft, become [b] the Ward To his owne Vassall, a stale *Catamite*: Whome hee (vpon our low, and suffering neckes) Hath rays'd, from excrement, to side the *Gods*, And haue his proper Sacrifice in *Rome*: Which *Ioue* beholds, and yet will sooner riue A senslesse Oke with thunder, then his Trunck.
[c] De Pomponio, & Minutio. vid. Tac. Ann. lib. 6.	LACO. [c] POMPONIVS. MINVTIVS. &c.
[d] Dio Rom. Hist. lib. 58. pag. 716.	LAC. These [d] Letters make men doubtfull what t'expect, Whether his comming, or his death. POM. Troth, both: And which comes soonest, thanke the *Gods* for. (ARR. List, Their talke is *Cæsar*, I would heare all voyces.) MAR. One day, hee's well; and will returne to *Rome*:
Dio ibid.	The next day, sick; and knowes not when to hope it. LAC. True, and to day, one of *Seianus* Friends Honor'd by speciall writ; and on the morrow Another punish'd— POM. By more speciall writ.
Dio. ibid.	MIN. This man receiues his praises of *Seianus*, A second but slight mention; A third none: A fourth rebukes. And thus he leaues the *Senate* Diuided and suspended, all vncertaine. LAC. These forked tricks, I vnderstand 'hem not. Would he would tell vs whome he loues, or hates, That we might follow, without feare, or doubt. (ARR. Good *Heliotrope*! Is this your honest man? Let him be yours so still. He is my Knaue.) POM. I cannot tell, *Seianus* stil goes on,
[e] Leg. Tac. Ann. lib. 4. pag. 96.	And mounts we see: [e] New *Statues* are aduanc'd, Fresh leaues of *Titles*, large *Inscriptions* read,

His

Figure 17, *Sejanus* I3v.

SEIANVS.

Proiects the courſe, that ſerues him to condemne,
Keepes in opinion of a Friend to all,
And all driues on to ruine. LAT. *Cæſar* ſleepes,
And nods at this? SAB. Would he might euer ſleepe,
Bogg'd in his filthy Luſts. OPS. Treaſon to *Cæſar*.
RVF. Lay hands vpon the Traytor, *Latiaris*,
Or take the name thy ſelfe. LAT. I am for *Cæſar*.
SAB. Am I then catch'd? RVF. How thinke you ſir? you are.
SAB. Spies of this head! ſo white! ſo full of yeares!
Well, my moſt reuerend Monſters, you may liue
To ſee your ſelues thus ſnar'd. OPS. Away with him.
LAT. Hale him away. RVF. To be a Spie for Traytors,
Is honorable vigilance. SAB. You doe well,
My moſt officious Inſtruments of *State*;
Men of all vſes: Drag me hence, away.
The Yeare is well begunne, and I fall fit,
To be an Offring to *Seianus*. Goe.
OPS. Couer him with his garments, hide his Face.
SAB. It ſhall not neede. Forbeare your rude aſſault,
"The fault's not ſhamefull Villany makes a fault.

Tac. *Ann.* *lib.*4.*pag.* 94.95.

MACRO. CALIGVLA.

MAC. Sir, but obſerue how thick your Dangers meete
In his cleare drifts. Your [a] Mother and your Brothers
Now cited to the *Senate*. Their Friend [b] *Gallus*
Feaſted to day by *Cæſar*, ſince committed.
Sabinus here we met, hurried to Fetters.
The *Senators* all ſtrooke with feare, and ſilence.
Saue thoſe, whoſe hopes depend not on good meanes,
But force their priuate prey, from publique ſpoile.
And you muſt know, if here you ſtay, your State
Is ſure to be the ſubiect of his hate,
As now the obiect. CAL. What would you aduiſe me?
MAC. To goe for *Capreæ* preſently: and there
Giue vp your ſelfe, entirely, to your Vncle.
Tell *Cæſar*, (ſince your Mother is [c] accuſd
To flie for ſuccours to *Auguſtus* Statue,
And to the *Army*, with your Brethren,) You

[a] Tac.*lib.*5 *pag.*98.
[b] Aſinium Gall. *eodem die & conuiuam* Tiberij *fuiſſe, et eo ſubornante damnatum, narrat*. Dio. *lib.*58. *pag.* 713.
[c] *vid.* Tac. *lib eod pag.* 94. Suet. Tib. *cap.* 53.

I Haue

Figure 18, *Sejanus* I1r.

SEIANVS.

NVNTIVS,&c.

ARR. More of *Seianus*? NVN. Yes. LEP. What can be added?
We know him dead. NVN. Then there begin your pitty,
There is inough behin'd, to melt eu'n *Rome*,
And *Cæsar* into teares:(though neuer Slaue
Could yet so highly 'offend, but Tyranny
In torturing him would make him worth lamenting.)
A sonne, and daughter to the dead *Seianus*,
(Of whom [a] there is not now so much remaining
As would giue fastning to the Hang-mans hooke)
Haue they drawne forth for farder sacrifice;
Whose tendernesse of knowledge, vnripe yeares,
And childish silly Innocence was such,
As scarse would lend them feeling of their danger:
The [b] Girle so simple, as she often askt,
Where they would lead her? for what cause they drag'd her?
Cry'd, *She would doe no more. That she could take*
Warning with beating. And because our Lawes
Admit no virgin [c] immature to dye,
The wittely, and strangly-cruell *Macro*
Deliuer'd her to be deflowr'd, and spoil'd,
By the rude lust of the licentious Hang-man,
Then, to be strangled with her harmelesse brother.
LEP. ô Act, most worthy Hell, and lasting night,
To hide it from the world! NVN. Their bodies throwne
Into the *Gemonies*, (I know not how
Or by what accident return'd) the Mother,
Th'expulsed [d] *Apicata*, finds them there;
Whom when she saw lie spread on the [e] *Degrees*,
After a world of Furie on her selfe,
Tearing her haire, defacing of her face,
Beating her brests, and wombe, kneeling amaz'd,
Crying to heauen, then to them; at last,
Her drowned voyce gate vp aboue her woes:
And with such black, and bitter execrations,
(As might affright the *Gods*, and force the *Sunne*

Runne

[a] *Vid Senec. lib. de Tranq. Ani. cap. xi.* [b] *Tac. Ann. lib. 5 pa. 99. & Dion. lib. 58. pag. 710.* [c] *Lex enim non tam virginitatis ignarum tantumque voluit quam aetatis*. Lips. Comment. Tac. [d] Dio. ibid. [e] *Scalæ Gemoniæ in quæ erant protracta damnatorum Corpora.*

Figure 19, *Sejanus* N1v.

SEIANVS.

Runne backward to the Eaſt,nay, make the old
Deformed *Chaos* riſe againe t'ore-whelme
Them,vs, and all the world) ſhe fills the ayre ;
Vpbraids the *Heauens* with their partiall doomes,
Defies their tyrannous powers,and demaunds
What ſhe,and thoſe poore Innocents haue tranſgreſs'd,
That they muſt ſuffer ſuch a ſhare in vengeance,
Whilſt *Liuia*,*Lygdus*,and *Eudemus* liue,
Who, (as ſhe ſay's,and firmely vowes, to proue it
To *Cæſar*,and the *Senate*) poyſon'd *Druſus* !

Dio. *Hiſt.* *Rom. lib.* 58.*pag.* 710.

LEP.Confederats with her husband? NVN.I. LEP.Strange Act!
ARR.And ſtrangly opend : what ſay's now my Monſter,
The Multitude ? They reele now ? do they not ?
NVN. Their Gall is gone,and now they 'gin to weepe
The miſchiefe they haue done. ARR.I thanke 'hem,Rogues!
NVN. Part are ſo ſtupide, or ſo flexible,
As they beleeue him innocent ; All grieue :
And ſome,whoſe hands yet reeke with his warme blood,
And gripe the part which they did teare of him,
Wiſh him collected,and created new.
LEP. How *Fortune* plies her ſports,when ſhe begins
To practiſe 'hem ! purſues,continues,addes!
Confounds,with varying her empaſſion'd moodes !
ARR. Doſt thou hope *Fortune* to redeeme thy crimes ,
To make amends,for thy ill placed fauours
With theſe ſtrange puniſhments ? Forbeare,you Things,
That ſtand vpon the Pinnacles of *State*,
To boaſt your ſlippery height ; when you do fall,
You paſh your ſelues in peices, nẽre to riſe,
And he that lends you pitty,is not wiſe.
TIB. Let this example mooue th'inſolent man,
Not to grow proud,and careleſſe of the Gods :
"It is an odious wiſdome, to blaſpheme,
"Much more to ſlighten,or deny their powers.
For whom the Morning ſaw ſo great, and high,
Thus low, and little,'fore the 'Euen doth lye.

FINIS.

Figure 20, *Sejanus* N2r.

SEIANVS.

Auoid these fumes,these superstitious Lights;
And all these coos'ning *Ceremonies*; You.
Your pure,and spiced conscience. I,the Slaue,
And Mocke of Fooles,(Scorne on my worthy head,)
That haue bene [a] titled,and ador'd a God,
Yea, [b] sacrific'd vnto, my selfe, in *Rome*,
No lesse then *Ioue*: and I be brought, to doe
A peeuish Giglot rites? Perhaps, the thought,
And shame of that made *Fortune* turne her face,
Knowing her selfe the lesser Deity,
And but my Seruant: bashfull Queene,if so,
Seianus thanks thy modesty. Who's that?

[a] Tac.*Ann.* lib.4.pa.96.
[b] Dio. lib. 58.pag.716 717.

POMPONIVS. [c]MINVTIVS. &c.

[c] De Minutio. vid. Tac. *Ann.* l.b.6.

POM.His Fortune suffers, till he heares my newes:
I'haue wayted here too long. *Macro*,my Lord—
SEI. Speake lower,& withdraw. TER. Are these things true?
MIN. Thousands are gazing at it,in the streetes.
SEI. What's that? TER. *Minutius* tells vs here, my Lord,
That, a new Head being set vpon your Statue.
A [d] Rope is since found wreath'd about it; And,
But now, [e] a fiery Meteor,in the forme
Of a great ball, was seene to roule along
The troubled ayre,where yet it hangs, vnperfect,
The'amazing wonder of the Multitude.
SEI. No more. That *Macro's* come,is more then all.
TER. Is *Macro* come? POM.I saw him. TER. Where?with whom?
POM.With *Regulus*. SEI.*Terentius*,--TER.My Lord?
SEI. [f] Send for the *Tribunes*, we will straight haue vp
More of the Souldiers,for our guard. *Minutius*,
Wee pray you goe for *Cotta*,*Latiaris*,
Trio the *Consull*, or what *Senatours*
You know are sure,and ours. You,my good Natta,
For *Laco*,*Prouost* of the watch. Now,*Satrius*,
The Time of proofe comes on.Arme all our seruants,
And without tumult. You *Pomponius*,
Hold some good Correspondence,with the *Consul*,

Attempt

[d] Dio.*Hist.* Rom.lib.58. pag.717.
[e] Vid. Sen. Nat.*Quest.* lib.1.cap.1.
[f] Dio. pag. 718.

Figure 21, *Sejanus* K4v.

Appendix 2: Conjectured Bibliography of *Sejanus*'s Marginal Resources

Aristotle. Aristotelis Stagiritæ Politica, ab Iacobo Lodoico Strebæo à Græco conuersa. Paris: Ioannes Roigny, 1549.

Brisson, Barnabé. Barnabæ Brissonii Regii Consistorii Consiliarii Amplissimiqve Senatvs Parisiensis Præsidis, De Formvlis et Sollemnievs populi Romani Verbis, Libri VIII. Francfurt: Ioannes Wecheles & Petrus Fischer, 1592.

Budaeum/Bude, Guillaume. De Asse et Partibus Eius, Libri Quinque, Gulielmi Budaei Parisiēsi: Regis Franciæ, Nunper Recogniti & Ampliores Fecti, À Furtoque Uindicati; Eiusdem De Asse & Partibus Eius, Breuiarum. Cologne: Ioannis Soteris, 1528.

Budaeum/Bude, Guillaume. Omnia Opera Gvlielme Bvdaei . . .. Basil: Nicolaus Episcopius Jr., 1557.

Cassius, Dion. Των Διωνος Του Κασσιου Ρωμαικων Ιστοριων βιβλία πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι. Dionis Cassii Romanarum Historiarum Libri XXV, Ex Guilielmi Xylandri interpretatione. Henr. Steph. De Dionis Hist. Scripserunt alij florentis tempora Roma, Et graue sit quónam tempore passa iugum: Historias alias isti conferto Dionis, Riui, illæ, sed fons ista Dionis erit. Excudebat Henricus Stephanus. Geneva: Henri Estienne, 1591.

Giraldi, Giglio Gregorio. De Dies Gentium varia & multiplex Historia, in qua simul de eorum imaginib. & cognominib. agiturm vbi plurima etiã hactenus multis ignota explicantur, & pleraque clarius tractantur. Ad D. Herculem Estens. II. Ferrariens Ducem IV. Lilio Gregorio Gyraldo Ferrariensi Auctore. Syntagmatum decem &

septem huius Operis, ac rerum quæ singulis tractantur seriem, proxima post Præfationem pagella indicabit. Accessit quoque omnium quæ toto Opere continentur, nominum ac rerum locuples Index. Basil: Ioannis Annes Oporminus, 1548.

Lipsius, Justus. Iusti Lipsii Satyra Menippæa. Somnium. Lusus in nostri æui Criticos. Edita iterùm, & correcta. Antwerp: Christophorus Plantinus, 1585.

Macrobius, Theodosius. Avr Theodosii Macrobii V. Cl. & inlistris Opera. Ioh. Isacivs Pontanvs recensuit: & Satvrnaliorvm libros MS. ope auxit, ordinauit, & Castigationes siue Notas adiecit. . . accedunt I. Mevri breuiores Notæ. Leiden: Franciscus Raphelengius, 1597.

Marcellus, Nonius. Nonivs Marcellvs De Proprietate Sermones, et Fvlgentivs Placiades de Prisco Sermone. Ex vetustissimis codicibus longè emendatiores, & duobus indicibus locupletiores. In eosdem libros virorum doctissimorum Notæ, & variatum lectionum libellus. Paris: Aegidius Beys, 1583.

Panvinio, Onofrio. Onvphrii Panvinii. Veronensis Avgvstiniani Reipublicae. Romanae Commentariorvm Libri Tres. Paris: Egidius & Nicolaus Gillios, 1588.

Paterculus, Velleius. C. Velleivs Patercvlvs cvm Animadversionibvs I. Lipsii. Leiden: Franciscus Raphelengius, 1591.

Politianus, Angelus. Angeli Politiani Epistularvm Lib. XII Miscellaneoruvm Centvria I. Antwerp: Philippus Nutius, 1567.

Politianus, Angelus. Angeli Politiani Opera, Quea Quidem Extite. Re Hactenus, Omnia, Longè Emendatius quàm. Usque antehac expressa: quibus accessit Historia de

Coniutatione Pactiana in familiam Medicam, elegantissimè conscripta: quorum omnium ordinem post Politiani elogia inuenies: addito una Indice memorabilium copiosissimo. Basil: Nicolaus Episcopius Jr., 1553.

Rhodiginus, Ludovicus Caelius. Ludovici Cælij Rhodigini Lectorum Antiquarum Libri Triginta: Recogniti Ad Auctore, Atque Ita Locupletati, Vt Tertia plus Parte Auctiores Sint Redditi: Ob Omnifariam Abstrusarum & Reconditiorum Tam Rerum Quà Vocum Explicatione . . Meritò Cornvcopiæ Seu Thesavrvs Vtrivsqve Lingvæ Appellandi. Frankfurt: Andreas Wechel Claudius Marnius, & Ioannis Aubrius, 1599.

Rosinus, Johannes. Romanarum Antiquitatum libri decem Exvariis Scriptoribus Summa fide singularíque diligentia collecti À Ioanne Rosino Bartholomæi F. Isennacensi Thuringo. Cum Inidicibuv locupletissimis. Basil: Petres Perna, 1583.

Seneca, M. Annaeus. *M. Annaei Senecae, Rhetoris. Controversiar. Suasoriarum. Lib. X Liber I. Multis locis emendati & annotationibus illustrati cum indice amplissimo*. Paris: Aegidius Beys, 1587.

Strabo. Στραβωνος Γεωγραφικων Βιβλοι ιϚ. Strabonis Rerum Geographicarum Libri XVII. Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, summóque studio & diligentia etiam veterum codicum,emendauit, ac Commentariis illustrauit. Accessit & Tabula Orbis oius descriptionem complectens. Adiecta est etiam Guilielme Xylandri Augustani Latina versio, cum necessariis Indicibus. Excudebat Eustathius Vignon Atrebat. Geneva: E. Vignon, 1587.

Stuck, Johann Wilhelm/Joannes Guilielmus. Sacrorum, Sacrifificiorumque

———. Gentilium Brevis et Accurata Descriptio Universae Superstitionis Ethicae Ritus Cerimoniasque Complectens: Ad Sacros et Profanos Scriptores Probé Intelligendos Explicandosque Peraccommodata. . .. Zurich: Iohannis Vvolphivs, 1598.

Suidas. Suidae Historica, Caeteráque omnia que ulla ex parte ad cognitionem rerum spectant: Opus iucunda rerum uarietate, & multiplici eruditione refertum opera ac studio Hier. Wolfii annis abhinc XVII, in Latinum sermonum conuersa: nunc uer & emendata, & aucta. Basil: Eusebius Episcopus, 1581.

Tacitus, C. Cornelius. C. Cornelii Taciti Opera Qvæ Exstant. Ivstvs Lipsivs postremùm recensuit. Addii Commentarii meliores pleniorésque cum Cvris Secvndvs. Accessit seorsim [?] C. Velleivs Patercvlvs cum eiusdem Lipsii auctoribus Notis. Antwerp: Ioannis Moretus, 1600.

Turnebus. Adrianus. Adriani Tvrnebi Regii philosophiæ græcæ Professoris Adversariorvm, Tomus primus duodecim libros continens. Cum Indice copiosissimo. Paris: Gabrieles Buonius, 1564.

Victor, Sextus Aurelius. "Epitome de Caesaribus, de Vita et Moribus Inperatorum Romanorum Excerpta ex Libris Sexti Aurelii Victoris," Sexti Aurelii Victoris Historia Romana,cum Notis Integris. . .. Amsterdam/Utrecht: Janssonia-Waesbergius/Jacobums à Poolsus, 1733.

Virgil, Maro, Publius. P. Virgilii Maronis Opera Omnia innumeris pene locis ad veterum Petri Bembe Cardinalis et Andreæ Navgerii exemplarium fidem, postrema hac editione castigata. Cum XI. Commentarijs, Seruio præsertim ac Domato, ad suam

integritatem restitutis. Venice: Ivntas, 1552.

Virgil, Maro, Publius. Pvb Vergilii Maronis Opera, quæ quidem exstant, omnia. Basil: Sebatianvs Henri, 1613.

Zonaras, Ioannis. Ioannis Zonarae Monachi, qui olim Byzantij Magnus Drungarius excubiarū seu Biglæ, & protosecratarius fuit, compendium Historiarum, in tres Tomos distinctum. Basil: Ioannis Oporinus, 1557.

WORKS CITED

Adams, Robert P. "Despotism, Censorship, and Mirrors of Power Politics in Late Elizabethan Times." Sixteenth Century Journal 10 (1979): 5-16.

Amyot, Jacque "Amiot to the Readers." The Famous and Memorable Vvorkes of Iosephus, a Man of Much Honour and Learning among the Iewes. Trans Thomas Lodge. London: G. Bishop, S. Waterson, P. Short, and Thomas Adams, 1602.

Angelo, Sydney. Machiavelli – The First Century. Oxford: UP, 2009.

Arber, Edward, ed. A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; A.D. 1554-1640 Vol. III, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1967.

Aristotle. Poetics. Ed. and Trans. Stephen Halliwell. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995.

Ayres, Philip J. "Jonson, Northampton, and the 'Treason' in *Sejanus*." Modern Philology (May 1983): 357-363.

— "The Nature of Jonson's Roman History." English Literary Renaissance 16.1 (1986 winter): 166-181.

—, ed. Preface. Sejanus His Fall: Ben Jonson. Manchester: UP, 1990.

Bacon, Francis. Opera Francisci Baronis De Verulamio Vice-comitis Sancti Albani, Tomus Primus: Qui Continet De Dignitate & Augmentis Scientiarum Libros Ix. Ad Regem Suum. London: John Haviland, 1623.

—. The Two Bookes of Sr. Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Aduancement of Learning, Diuine and Humane to the King. London: Henrie Tomes, 1605.

—. The Two Bookes of Sr. Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Aduancement of

______ Learning, Diuine and Humane to the King. London: William Washington, 1629.

Baker, Richard, trans. Cato Variegatus or Catoes Morall Distichs: Translated and Paraphras'd, with Varations of Expressing, in English Verse. London: Anne Bowler, 1636.

Barish, Jonas ed. Preface. Ben Jonson: *Sejanus*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1965.

Barton, Anne. Ben Jonson, Dramatist. Cambridge: UP, 1984.

Bland, Mark. "Ben Jonson and the Legacies of the Past." The Huntington Library Quarterly 67.3 (2004): 371-400.

Blundeville, Thomas. The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories According to the Precepts of Francisco Patricio, and Accontio Tridentino, Two Italian Writers, No Lesse Plainly than Briefly, Set Forth in Our Vulgar Speach, to the Great Profite and Commoditye of All Those That Delight in Hystories. London: William Seres, 1574.

—. "Thomas Blundeville's '*The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories,*'" ed. Hugh G. Dick. The Huntington Library Quarterly 3.2 (1940): 149-70.

Bock, Gisela. "Civil Discord in Machiavelli's *Istorie Fiorentine*." Machiavelli and republicanism. Ed Gisela Bock, Quentin Skinner, and Maurizio Viroli. Cambridge: UP, 1990. 181-201.

Bodin, Jean. The Method and Comprehension of History by Jean Bodin. Trans. Beatrice Reynolds. NY: Octagon, 1966.

Boehrer, Bruce. "The War on History in Jonson's *Sejanus*," Studia Neophilologica 66.1

(1993): 209-11.

Bolton, W. F. ed. Sejanus his Fall. London: Benn, 1966.

Bondanella, Peter E. ed. The Prince and The Discourses on Livi. By Nicolo Machiavelli. Oxford: UP, 2005.

Boughner, Daniel. "Jonson's Use of Lipsius in *Sejanus,*" MLN 73 (April 1958): 247-255.

—. "Juvenal, Horace and *Sejanus*," MLN 75. 7 (November 1960): 545-550.

—. The Devil's Disciple: Ben Jonson's Debt to Machiavelli. NY: Philosophical Library, 1968.

Briggs, W. D. ed. Sejanus. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1911.

Bryan, Lynn, and Robert C. Evans. "Ben Jonson, Neostoicism and the *Monita* of Justus Lipsius." The Ben Jonson Journal: Literary Contexts in the Age of Elizabeth, James and Charles 1 (1994): 105-23.

Bryant, Joseph Allen Jr. "'Catiline' and the Nature of Jonson's Tragic Fable." PMLA 69 (Mar.-June 1954): 265-277.

—. "The Significance of Ben Jonson's First Requirement for Tragedy: 'Truth of Argument.'" Studies in Philology 49 (1952): 195-213.

Braunmuller, A. R. "King John and Historiography." ELH 55-2 (19880: 309-332.

Brisson, Barnabé. Barnabæ Brissonii Regii Consistorii Consiliarii Amplissimiqve Senatvs Parisiensis Præsidis, De Formvlis et Sollemnievs populi Romani Verbis, Libri VIII. Frankfurt: Johannes Wechel & Peter Fischer, 1592.

Brown, John L. ed. The Methodus ad Historiarum Cognitionem of Jean Bodin: A Critical

______ Study. DC: Catholic UP, 1939.

Buettner, Brigitte. "Profane Illuminations, Secular Illusions: Manuscripts in Late Medieval Courtly Society." The Art Bulletin 74.1 (Mar., 1992): 75-90.

Burke, Peter. "A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450-1700." Source. History and Theory 5.2 (1966): 135-152.

Bushnell, Rebecca. A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.

Butler, Martin. "Politics in *Catiline*: Jonson and his Sources." Re-presenting Ben Jonson: text, history, performance. Ed. Martin Butler. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999. 152-173.

Cain, Tom, ed. Poetaster. Manchester: UP, 1995.

Camden, William. The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth. London: Benjamin Fisher, 1630.

—. Annales the True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth Queene of England France and Ireland &C. True Faith's Defendresse of Diuine Renowne and Happy Memory. Wherein All Such Memorable Things as Happened During Hir Blessed Raigne . . . Are Exactly Described. Trans. Abraham Darcie. London: Benjamin Fisher, 1625.

Cardwell, Edward, ed. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. 2 Vols. Oxford: UP, 1844.

Cary, Lucius. "An Eclogue on the Death of Ben Jonson." Ionsonus virbius: or, The memorie of Ben: Iohnson revived by the friends of the Muses. Ed. Brian Duppa

London: Henry Seile, 1638. 4/A4v.

Cassius, Dion. Των Διωνος Του Κασσιου Ρωμαικων Ιστοριων βιβλία πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι. *Dionis Cassii Romanarum Historiarum Libri XXV, Ex Guilielmi Xylandri interpretatione. Henr. Steph. De Dionis Hist. Scripserunt alij florentis tempora Roma, Et graue sit quónam tempore passa iugum: Historias alias isti conferto Dionis, Riui, illæ, sed fons ista Dionis erit. Excudebat Henricus Stephanus.* Geneva: Henri Estienne, 1591.

—. Dio's Roman History. 9 Vols. Ed. and Trans. Earnest Cary. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1955.

Castelvetro, Lodovico. Poetica d' Aristotele Vularizzata et Sposta. Basil: Pietro de Sedabonis, 1576.

Certeau Michel de. The Practice of Everyday Life. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: UP, 1984.

—. The Writing of History. Trans. Tom Conley. NY: Columbia UP, 1988.

Cervantes, Miguel de. The history of the valorous and vvittie knight-errant, Don-Quixote of the Mancha Translated out of the Spanish. Trans. Thomas Shelton. London: Edward Blount and William Barret, 1612.

Chapman, George. Al Fooles. London: Thomas Thorpe, 1605.

—, ed. and trans. The Georgicks of Hesiod. London: Miles Partrich, 1618.

—, ed. and trans. Homer prince of poets: translated according to the Greeke, in twelue bookes of his Iliads. London: Samuel Macham, 1609.

—. Ouids Banquet of Sence. A Coronet for his Mistresse Philosophie, and his Amorous

_____ Zodiacke. London: R. Smith, 1595.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. "Academica." De natura deorum; Academica. Ed. and Trans. H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1951.

—. de Oratore. Ed. and Trans. E. W. Sutton. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1948.

—. Epistolae ad Familiares. Ed. and Trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001.

Cintio, Giraldi. Scritti Estetici: De' Romanzi, delle Comedie, e delle Tragedie, ecc. (photo-facsimile) Bologna: Forni, 1975.

Clarke, M. L. Classical Education in Britain 1500-1900. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1959.

Clare, Janet. Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship. Manchester UP, 1990.

Clegg, Cyndia Susan. Press Censorship in Elizabethan England. Cambridge: UP, 1997.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets. Ed. T. Ashe. London: George Bell and Sons, 1883.

Conti, Natale. Natalis Comitis Mythologiae Siue Explicationis Fabularum libri X. Venice: Andreas Wechel, 1581.

Cooper, J. P. D. Propaganda and the Tudor State. Oxford: Clarendon, 2003.

Corballis, R. P. "The 'Second Pen' in the Stage Version of 'Sejanus,'" Modern Philology 76.3 (1979): 273-77.

Coronato, Rocco. Jonson Versus Bakhtin: Carnival and the Grotesque. NY: Rodpoi, 2003.

Craig, D. H. Sir John Harington. Boston: Twayne, 1985.

Cressy, David. "Book Burning in Tudor and Stuart England." Sixteenth Century Journal. 36.2 (2005): 35-74.

Dean, Leonard F. "'Bodin's 'Methodus' in England before 1625." Studies in Philology 39.2 (1942): 160-66.

—. "Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-Writing." ELH 8.3 (1941): 161-183.

—. Tudor Theories of Historiography. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1947.

De Luna, B. N. Jonson's Romish Plot: A study of Catiline and its Historical Context. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Dekker, Thomas. The magnificent entertainment giuen to King Iames, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, vpon the day of his Maiesties tryumphant passage (from the Tower) through his honourable citie (and chamber) of London, being the 15. of March. 1603. As well by the English as by the strangers: vvith the speeches and songes, deliuered in the seuerall pageants. London: Thomas Man Jr., 1604.

—. Satiro–Mastix. Or The Vntrussing of the Humorous Poet. London: Edward White, 1602.

Dick, Hugh G., ed. "Thomas Blundeville's '*The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories.*'" The Huntington Library Quarterly 3.2 (1940): 149-70.

Dobson, Michael. "Accents Yet Unknown: Canonization and the Claiming of *Julius Caesar*." The Appropriation of Shakespeare Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth. Ed. Jean I. Maiden. NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991. 11-28.

Drant, Thomas ed. and trans. Horace His Arte of Poetrie, Pistles, and Satyrs. London: Thomas Marsh, 1567.

Drummond, William. "Notes of Conversations with Ben Jonson." Discoveries 1641 ______ Conversations With William Drummond of Hawthornden 1619. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Edinburgh: UP, 1923.

Dryden, John. "The Life of Plutarch." Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works, Now First Collected: with Notes and Illustration; an Account of the Life and Writings of the Author, Grounded on Original and Authentick Documents; and a Collection of His Letters, the Greater Part of Which Has Never Before Been Published. Ed. Edmond Malone. London: T. Cadell Jr. and W. Davies, 1800.

Duffy, Ellen M. T. "Ben Jonson's Debt to Renaissance Scholarship in 'Sejanus' and 'Catiline'," MLR 42 (1970): 24-30.

Duncan, Douglas. Ben Jonson and the Lucianic tradition. Cambridge: UP, 1979.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "Just a Jiglot," Times Literary Supplement. 5 Aug. 2005: 18.

Dutton, Richard. Ben Jonson: To the First Folio. Cambridge: UP, 1983.

— Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama. Iowa City: Iowa UP, 1991.

—. "The Sources, Text and Readers of *Sejanus*: Jonson's 'integrity in the Story," Studies in Philology 75.2 (1978): 181-198.

Einstein, Lewis. The Italian Renaissance in England. NY: Columbia UP, 1905.

Elyot, Thomas. The Boke Named the Gouernour Deuised by Thomas Elyot knight. London: Thomas Berthelet, 1531.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Catonis disticha de moribus cum scholiis des. Erasmi Roterodami. Adiecta sunt, dictagraeca sapientum, interprete Erasmo Roterodamo. Eadem per Ausonium, cum Erasmi doctissima enarratione. Mimi publiani ex ciusdem Erasmi restitutione, cúmque scholijs eiusdem.Christiani hominis institutum, ab eodem Erasmo docta carmine conscriptum. Isocratis ad Demonicum oratio paraenetica, longè ad iuventutis mores rirè formandos vtilissima.Omnia summa cura, diligentu[m]que execusa. London: Robert Robinson, 1592.

Evans, Robert C. "*Sejanus*: Ethics and Politics in the Early Reign of James." Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender Politics and the Jonsonian Canon. Ed. Julie Sanders. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Foxe, John. Actes and Monuments of John Foxe. 8 Vols. Ed. G. Townsend and S. R. Cattley. London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837.

Foglietta, Ubertto. De ratione scribendæ historiæ. De similitudine normae Polybianae. Frankfurt: Joannes Jurist, 1579.

Freudenburg, Kirk. Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses From Lucilius to Juvenal. Cambridge: UP, 2001.

Garnier, Robert. Porcie: Tragedie en Cinq Actes. Paris: Robert Estienne, 1568.

Genette, Gérard. Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: UP, 1997.

Gifford, William, ed, The Works of Ben Jonson, in Nine Volumes: With a Biographical Memoir by William Gifford. London: G. and W. Nicol; F. C. and J. Rivington; Cadell and Davies; Longman and Co.; Lackington and Co.; R. H. Evans; J.

Murray J J. Mawman; J. Cuthell J J. Black; Baldwin and Co.; Rodwell and Martin; and R. Saunders, 1816.

Gildas Sapiens "De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae." The Works of Gildas and Nennius. Ed. and Trans. J. A. Giles. London: James Bohn, 1841.

Giraldi, Giglio Gregorio. De Dies Gentium varia & multiplex Historia, in qua simul de eorum imaginib. & cognominib. agiturm vbi plurima etiã hactenus multis ignota explicantur, & pleraque clarius tractantur. Ad D. Herculem Estens. II. Ferrariens Ducem IV. Lilio Gregorio Gyraldo Ferrariensi Auctore. Syntagmatum decem & septem huius Operis.... Basel: Johannes Oporminus, 1548.

Golding, Arthur, trans. A Briefe Treatise Concerning the Burnynge of Bucer and Phagius, at Cambrydge, in the Tyme of Quene Mary with Theyr Restitution in the Time of Our Moste Gracious Souerayne Lady... London: Thomas Marshe, 1562.

Grafton, Anthony. "Discitur ut agatur: How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy." Annotation and Its Texts, edited by Stephen A. Barney. Oxford: UP, 1991. 108-129.

—. "Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on Some Commentaries," Renaissance Quarterly 38.4 (1985): 615-649.

—. The Footnote: A Curious History. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997.

Graves, Beatrice. "Shalespeare's Sonnets and the Genevan Marginalia." Essays in Criticism 54.2 Oxford: UP, 2007.

Greene, Thomas. The Light in Troy. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.

Greetham, D. C. "Editorial and Critical Theory: From Modernism to Postmodernism."

Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities. Ed. George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1993.

Greg, W. W. "The Rationale of Copy-Text," Studies in Bibliography 3 (1950-1951): 19-37.

Greneway, Richard. The annales of Cornelius Tacitus. The description of Germanie. London: Bonham and Iohn Norton, 1598.

Gwinne, Matthew. "Nero Tragædia Noua. London: Edward Blount, 1603.

Hackel, Heidi Brayman. "The 'Great Variety' of Readers and Early Modern Reading Practices." A Companion to Shakespeare. Ed. David Scott Kastan. Malden MA: Blackwell, 1999. 139-57.

Hamilton, Gary H. "Irony and Fortune in *Sejanus*," Studies in English Literature, 150-1900. 11.2 (1971): 265-81.

Hanna, Ralph. "Annotation as Social Practice." Annotation and Its Texts. Ed. Stephen A. Barney. Oxford: UP, 1991.

Harington, Thomas. Orlando Fvrioso in English Heroical Verse, by Iohn Harington. London: Richard Field, 1591.

Hayward, John. The first part of the life and raigne of King Henrie the IIII. London: John Woolfe, 1599.

—. The Liues of the III. Normans, Kings of England William the First. William the Second. Henrie the First. . . London: R. Barker, 1613.

Hearsey, Marguerite. "Sidney's *Defence of Poesy* and Alyot's *Preface* in North's *Plutarch*: A Relationship," Studies in Philology. 30.4 [1933]: 535-550.

Herford, C. H. and Percy and Evelyn Simpson eds. Ben Jonson: Works. 11 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925-63.

Holinshed, Raphael. The firste [laste] volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande . . . London: John Hunne, 1577.

Holy Bible conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: newly translated out of the originall tongues: & with the former translations diligently compared and reuised, by his Maiesties speciall co[m]mandement. Appointed to be read in churches. London: Robert Barker, 1611.

Holland, Hugh. Pancharis the first booke. London: Clement Knight, 1603.

Horace, Q. Flaccus. "*Ars poetica*." Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica. Ed. and Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.

—. "Epistles." Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica. Ed. and Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.

Jonson, Ben. "A Tale of a Tub." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

—. "Bartholomew Fayre." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

—. Ben Ionson, his Case is Alterd. London: Bartholomew Sutton, 1609.

—. Ben Jonson The Complete Poems. Ed. George Parfitt. Baltimore MD: Penguin Education, 1975.

—. Ben: Ionson his Volpone or The foxe. London: Thomas Thorppe, 1607.

—. Catiline his Conspiracy. London: Walter Burre, 1611.

—. "Discoveries," in Discoveries 1641 Conversations With William Drummond of

Hawthornden 1619. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Edinburgh: UP, 1923.

—. "Epicoene, or the Silent Woman." The Workes of Beniamin Jonson. London: William Stansby and Richard Meighen, 1616.

—. Every Man in His Humor. London: Walter Burre, 1601.

—. Haddington Masque. The Workes of Beniamin Jonson. London: William Stansby and Richard Meighen, 1616.

—. Hymenaei: or the Solemnities of Masque, and Barriers Magnificently Performed on the Eleventh, and Twelfth Nights, from Christmas; at Court: to the Auspicious Celebrating of the Marriage-vnion, Betweene Robert, Earle of Essex, and the Lady Frances, Second Daughter to the Most Noble Earle of Suffolke. London: Thomas Thorp, 1606.

—. "Mortimer His Fall." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

—. Poetaster or the Arraignment. London: M. Lownes, 1602.

—. "Poetaster." The Workes of Ben Ionson. London: William Stansby and Richard Meighen, 1616, 171-354/Z4r-Gg3v.

—. Seianus His Fall. London: Thomas Thorpe, 1605.

—. Seianus His Fall. (photo-facsimile) NY: Da Capo Press Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1970.

—. "Seianus His Fall. A Tragœdie." The Workes of Beniamin Jonson. London: William Stansby and Richard Meighen, 1616.

—. The Alchemist. Written by Ben. Ionson. London: Walter Burre, 1612.

—. The Characters of Two Royall Masques the One of Blacknesse, the Other of Beautie.

______ Personated by the Most Magnificent of Queenes Anne Queene of Great Britaine, &C. With Her Honorable Ladyes. London: Thomas Thorp, 1608.

—. The Comical Satyre of Every Man Out of His Humour. London: William Holme, 1600.

—. The Divell Is an Asse. London : S.N., 1641.

—. "The Divell Is an Asse." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

—. The Fountaine of Selfe-Love or Cynthias Revels. London: Matthew Lownes, 1602.

—. "The Magnetick Lady." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

—. The Masque of Queenes Celebrated from the House of Fame: by the Most Absolute in All State, and Titles. Anne Queene of Great Britaine, &C. With Her Honourable Ladies. London: R. Bonian and H. Wally, 1609.

—. The New Inne. Or, the Light Heart. London: Thomas Alchorne, 1631.

—. 'The Sad Shepherd: or a Tale of Robin-hood." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

—. "The Staple of Newes." The Workes of Ben Jonson. London: Ben Jonson, 1640.

Jowett, John. "'Fall before this Booke': The 1605 Quarto of *Sejanus*." Text 4. Ed. D. C. Greetham and W. Speed Hill. NY: AMS Press, 1988.

Juvenal, Decimus Junius. "The Satires of Juvenal." Juvenal and Persius. Ed. and Trans. G. G. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1961.

Kastan, David Scott. "Plays into Print: Shakespeare to his Earliest Readers." Books and Readers in Early Modern England. Ed. Jennifer Anderson and Elizabeth Sauer. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 2002. 23-41.

Kenney, E. J. The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book. Los Angeles: California UP, 1974.

Kintgen, Eugene R. Reading in Tudor England. Pittsburgh: UP, 1996.

Lee, Jongsook. Ben Jonson's Poesis: A literary Dialectic of Ideal and History. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1989.

Lipking, Lawrence. "The Marginal Gloss." Critical Inquiry 4. (1977): 609-55.

Livy, Titus. Livy. 14 Vols. Ed. and Trans. O. B. Foster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1919-59.

Loewenstein, Joseph. Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship. Cambridge: UP, 2002.

—. "Printing and the Multitudinous Presse: The Contentious Texts of Jonson's Masques." Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio. Ed. Jennifer Brady and W.H. Herendeen. Newark: Delaware U P, 1991, 169-91.

Lucanus, Marcus Annaeus. Bellum Civile. Ed. J. D. Duff. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997.

MacCallum, M. W. Shakespeare's Roman Plays and Their Background. London: MacMillan, 1910. 95-119.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Florentine historie. Written in the Italian Tongue, by Nicholo Macchiavelli, Citizen and Secretarie of Florence. Trans. T. B. London: William Ponsonby, 1595.

—. The Prince. Trans. George Bull. NY: Penguin, 1999.

MacLeod, Brock. "An Unacknowledged Debt to Seneca in the Quarto *Sejanus*." Notes and Queries 50.4 (2003): 427.

Malmesbury, William of. Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi Gesta Regum Anglorum Atque Historia Novella. Ad Fidem Codicum Manuscriptorum Recensuit Thomas Duffus Hardy. Vol. II London: Sumptibüs Societatis, 1840.

Marcellus, Nonius. Nonivs Marcellvs De Proprietate Sermones, et Fvlgentivs Placiades De Prisco Sermone. Ex Vetustissimis Codicibus Longè Emendatiores, & Duobus Indicibus Locupletiores.. . . Paris: Aegidius Beys, 1583.

Marotti, Arthur F. "The Self-Reflexive Art of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*." Texas Studies in Literature and Language 12 (1970): 197-220.

Marston, John. The Malcontent. Augmented by Marston. With the Additions Played by the Kings Maiesties Servants. Written by Iohn Webster. London: William Aspley, 1604.

—. The Wonder of Women or The Tragedie of Sophonisba. London: W. Cotton, 1606.

Martial, M. Valerius. Epigrams. Ed. and Trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993.

—. "Liber de Spectaculis." Select Epigrams of Martial. 2 Vols. Eds. R. T. Bridge and E. D. C. Lake. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906-08.

Mason, Eugene, ed. Arthurian Chronicles: Roman de Brut by Wace. Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Electronic Press, 2007.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind. Princeton: UP, 1984.

McCabe, Richard. "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599." The Yearbook of English Studies. 11 (1981): 188-93.

McFarland, Thomas. "Who Was Benjamin Whichcote? or, The Myth of Annotation." Annotation and Its Texts, edited by Stephen A. Barney. Oxford: UP, 1991. 152-77.

McNutly, Robert. Ludovico Ariosto's Orlando Furioso. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

McPherson, David. "Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: An Annotated Catalogue." Studies in Philology 71.5 (1974): 1+3-106.

Miles, Rosalind. Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art. NY: Routledge, 1990.

Miller, Norman P. "Style and Content in Tacitus," Tacitus. Ed. T. A. Dorey. London: Routledge, 1969. 99-116.

Milton, John. Colasterion: a Reply to a Nameles Ansvver Against the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce. Wherein the Trivial Author of That Answer is Discover'd, the Licencer Conferr'd With, and the Opinion Which They Traduce Defended. London: S.N., 1645.

—. Paradise Lost a Poem Written in Ten Books. London: Peter Parker, Robert Boulter, and Matthias Walker, 1667); Wing M2136.

Miola, Robert S. "Julius Caesar and the Tyrannicide Debate." Renaissance Quarterly 38.2 (1985): 271-289.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. Storia e Letteratura Raccolta di Studi e Testi 149: Sesto Contributo Alla Storia Degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico Vol 1. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1980.

Monmouth, Geoffrey of. Geoffrey of Monmouth: The History of the Kings of Britain. Ed. Michael D. Reeve, Trans. Neil Wright. Woodbridge UK: Boydell & Brewer,

2007.

Moulton, Ian Frederick. Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England. NY: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Mulcaster, Richard. Positions on the Training up of Children. Edited by Richard L. DeMolen. NY: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Nennius. "The History of The Britons; by Nennius." The Works of Gildas and Nennius. Ed. and Trans. J. A. Giles. London: James Bohn, 1841.

New Palaeographical Society, Facsimilies of Ancient MSS etc. Ser. 1. London: Oxford UP, 1903-12.

Nichols, Stephen. "On the Sociology of Medieval Manuscript Annotation." Annotation and Its Texts. Ed. Stephen A. Barney. Oxford: UP, 1991. 43-73.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. Beyond Good and Evil. Ed. Robert Baldrick, Betty Radice, and C. A. Jones. Baltimore: Penguin, 1973.

—. The Gay Science. Ed. Bernard Williams. Cambridge: UP, 2001.

Orme, Nicholas. Education and Society in Medieval and Renaissance England. London: Hambledon, 1989.

Ovidius, Publius Naso. "Epsitulae ex Ponto." Tristia; Ex Ponto. Ed. and Trans. Leslie Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988.

—. "Metamorphoses." Ed. and Trans. Frank Justus Miller. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977.

Parkes, George B. "The Genesis of Tudor Interest in Italian." PMLA 77.5 (1962): 529-35.

Parkes, M. B. "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book." Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts. Ed. M. B. Parkes. London: Hambledon, 1991. 35-70.

Passi, Giuseppe. Dello Stato Maritale: Trattato di Giuseppe Passi Ravennate nell'Academia de' Signori Informi di Ravenna L'Ardito. Venice: Iacomo Antonio Somascho, 1602.

Patterson, Annabel. Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

—. Reading Holinshed's Chronicles. Chicago: UP, 1994.

—. "'*Roman-cast Similitude*': Ben Jonson and the English Use of Roman History." Rome and the Renaissance: The City and the Myth, edited by P. A. Ramsey. NY: MRTS, 1982.

Pebworth, Ted-Larry and Claude J. Summers. Ben Jonson Revised. NY: Twayne, 1999.

Persius, Aulus Flaccus, "The Satires of Persius." Juvenal and Persius. Ed. and Trans. G. G. Ramsay. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1961.

Peters, John. Satire and Complaint in Early English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.

Peterson, Richard S. Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.

Philips, Mark. "Barefoot Boy Makes Good: A Study of Machiavelli's Historiography." Speculum 59-3 (1984): 85-605.

—. "Machiavelli, Guiccardini, and the Tradition of Vernacular Historiography in Florence." The American Historical Review 84.1 (1979): 86-104.

Plautus, T. Maccius. Plautus. 5 Vols. Ed. and Trans. Paul Nixon. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1916-38.

Pliny the Younger. Letters and Panegyrics of Pliny. Ed. and Trans. Betty Radice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1969.

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. Trans. Thomas North. London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1579.

Pollard, Alfred W. Records of the English Bible. Folkestone: Dawsons, 1974.

Polybius. The Hystories of the Most Famous and Worthy Cronographer Polybius Discoursing of the Warres Betwixt the Romanes Carthaginenses, a Riche and Goodly Worke, Conteining Holsome Counsels Wonderfull Deuises Against the Incombrances of Fickle Fortune. Trans. C. W. London: Thomas Hacket, 1568.

—. The Histories. 6Vols. Trans. W. R. Paton. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1922-1927.

Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie Contriued into Three Bookes: the First of Poets and Poesie, the Second of Proportion, the Third of Ornament. London: Richard Field, 1589.

Quintilian, M. Fabius. Institvtio Oratoria. Ed. and Trans. H. E. Butler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1963.

Rebhorn, Wayne A. "The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar.*" Renaissance Quarterly. 43.1 (1990): 75-111.

Ribeiro, Alvero. "Sir John Roe: Ben Jonson's Friend." The Review of English Studies New Series, 24.94 (1973): 153-164.

Ronan, Clifford. "Caesar On and Off the Renaissance Stage." Julius Caesar: New Critical Essays. Ed. Horst Zander. NY: Routledge, 2005. 71-89.

Rosinus, Johannes. Romanarum Antiquitatum libri decem Exvariis Scriptoribus Summa fide singularíque diligentia collecti À Ioanne Rosino Bartholomæi F. Isennacensi Thuringo. Cum Inidicibuv locupletissimis. Basel: Hæredus Petrus Perna, 1583.

Salmon, J. H. M. "Precept, Example, and Truth: Degory Wheare and the *Ars Historica.*" The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain. Ed. Donald R. Kelly and David Harris Sacks. Cambridge: UP, 1997. 11-36.

Sanders, Julie. Ben Jonson's Theatrical Republics. London: MacMillan, 1998.

Scaliger, Julius Caesar. Ivliis Caesaris Scaligeri, Viri Clarissimi Poetices Libri Septem: ad Syium filium. Lyon: Vicentium, 1561.

Schott Syme, Holger. "Unediting the Margins: Jonson, Marston and the Theatrical Page." English Literary Renaissance. 33.1 (2008): 142-71.

Siemon, James R. "'Word Itself Against the Word': Close Reading After Voloshinov," Shakespeare Reread: The Texts in New Contexts. Ed Russ McDonald, New York: Cornell UP, 1994. 226-258.

Seneca, L. Annaeus. Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales. Ed. and Trans. Richard M. Gummere. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962-71.

—. "Consolatio ad Marciam." Seneca Moral Essays. 3 Vols. Ed. and Trans. John W. Basore. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958.

—. "de beneficiis." Seneca Moral Essays. 3 Vols. Ed. and Trans. John W. Basore. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958.

—. Naturales Quaestiones. 2 Vols. Ed. and Trans. Thomas H. Corcoran. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977-1972.

—. *Thyestes*. Ed., Trans. and Intro. R. J. Tarrant. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.

Shakespeare, William. "Love's Labours Lost." The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt *et al.* NY: Norton, 1997. 733-802.

—. Julius Caesar. Ed. William and Barbara Rosen. Toronto: Penguin, 1987.

—. "Julius Caesar." Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies Published According to the True Originall Copies. London: W. Jaggard, Ed. Blount, I. Smithweeke, and W. Aspley, 1623. 109-30.

—. "Romeo and Juliet." The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt *et al.* NY: Norton, 1997. 865-941.

—. "The Rape of Lucrece." The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt *et al.* NY: Norton, 1997. 635-82.

—. "The Tragical History of Hamlet Prince of Denmark." The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt *et al.* NY: Norton, 1997. 1659-1759.

—. The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke by William Shakespeare. As it

Hath Beene Diuerse Times Acted by His Highnesse Seruants in the Cittie of London: as Also in the Two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and Else-where. London: Nicholas Ling and John Trundell, 1603.

—. The tragicall historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. By William Shakespeare. London: Nicholas Ling, 1604.

Shelling, Felix E., intro. Ben Jonson's Plays in Two Volumes. (London: Dent, 1964)

Shelton, Thomas, ed, and trans. The history of the valorous and vvittie knight-errant, Don-Quixote of the Mancha Translated out of the Spanish. London: Edward Blount and William Barret, 1612.

Sidney, Philip. The Defence of Poesie. London: William Ponsonby, 1595

Simon, J. Education and Society in Tudor England. Cambridge: UP, 1966.

Slights, William W. E. "Back to the Future Littorally Annotating the Historic Page." The Future of the Page. Ed. Peter Stoicheff and Andrew Taylor. Toronto: UP, 2004. 71-90.

—. Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy. Toronto: UP, 1994.

—. Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Books. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 2004.

Smith Fussner, F. The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought. NY: Columbia UP, 1962.

—. Tudor History and the Historians. NY: Basic, 1970.

Spencer, T .J. B., ed. Shakespeare's Plutarch. Baltimore: Penguin, 1964.

Starnes, D. T. "Purpose in the Writing of History." Modern Philology 20.3 (1923): 281-

300.

Statius, P. Papinius. Achilleid. Ed. and Trans. J. H. Mozley. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1928.

—. Statius. 2 Vols. Ed. and Trans. J. H. Mozley. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1928.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. A Footnote to History: Eight Years of Trouble in Samoa. Honolulu: Hawaii UP, 1996.

Stuck, Johann Wilhelm. Sacrorum, Sacrifificiorumque Gentilium Brevis et Accurata Descriptio Universae Superstitionis Ethicae Ritus Cerimoniasque Complectens: Ad Sacros et Profanos Scriptores Probé Intelligendos Explicandosque Peraccommodata. . . . Zurich: Johannes Walpinius, 1598.

Suetonius, Tranquillus. Suetonius. 2 Vols. Ed. and Trans. J. D. Rolfe. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1951.

Sutcliffe, Matthew. The supplication of certaine masse-priests falsely called Catholikes . . . Published with a marginall glosse, for the better vnderstanding of the text . . . London: William Aspley, 1604.

Sutton Dana F. Matthew Gwinne's *Nero* (1603). May 25, 2010 <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/Nero>

Tacitus, C. Cornelius. C. Cornelii Taciti Opera Qvæ Exstant. Ivstvs Lipsivs postremùm recensuit. Addii Commentarii meliores pleniorésque cum Cvris Secvndvs. Accessit seorsim C. Velleivs Patercvlvs cum eiusdem Lipsii auctoribus Notis. Antwerp: Ioannis Moretus, 1600.

—. The Annals. Ed. and Trans. Clifford H Moore [Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1925-

37.

Tribble, Evelyn. Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England. Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1993.

—. "Like a Looking-Glas in the Frame: From the Marginal Note to the Footnote." The Margins of the Text. Ed. D. C. Greetham. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1997. 229-44.

Tricomi, Albert H. Anticourt Drama in England 1603-1642. Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1989.

Tyndale, William. An Exposycyon Vpon the V.vi.vii. Chapters of Mathewe: Which Thre Chapters Are the Keye and the Dore of the Scrypture, and the Restoring Agayne of Moses Lawe Corrupt by Ye Scrybes and Pharyses. And the Exposycyon Is the Restorynge Agayne of Chrystes Lawe Corrupte by the Papystes. . . . London: R. Redman, 1536.

Varro, M. Terentus. De Lingua Latina. Vol. II. Ed. and Trans. Roland G. Kent. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958.

Vawter, Marvin L. "The Seeds of Virtue: Political Imperatives in Jonson's *Sejanus.*" Studies in the Literary Imagination 6.1 (April, 1973): 41-60.

Vergilius, Publius Maro. "Eclogues." Virgil. Ed. and Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978-86.

—. "Aeneid." Virgil. Ed. and Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978-86.

Vocht, Henri de. Ben Jonson's Sejanus His Fall: Edited From the Quarto of 1605 with

Comments on its Text. Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst, 1935.

—. Studies on the Texts of Ben Jonson's Poetaster and Seianus. Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst, 1958.

Walsham, A. "'Domme Preachers'? Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print." Past & Present 168 (2000): 72-123.

Watson, Foster. The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1908.

West, Martin Litchfield. The Orphic Poems. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.

Whalley, Peter, ed. The Dramatic Works of Ben Jonson: Printed from the Text, and With the Notes of Peter Whalley. 7 Vols. London: John Stockdale, 1811.

Wilkinson, William. Confutation.of certain articles deliuered vnto the Familye of Loue . . . London: John Daye, 1579.

Wilson, Nigel. "Scholiasts and Commentators." Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 47 (2007): 39-70.

Worden, Blair. "Historians and Poets." Huntington Library Quarterly. 68.1-2 (2005): 71-93.

Wright, Peter M. "Jonson's Revision of Stage Directions for the 1616 Folio *Workes*." Mediaeval and Renaissance drama in England. 5 (1990): 257-85.