MARK RILEY, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SACRAMENTO

Poets of Two Hearts

ABSTRACT: Many European writers of the 16th and 17th centuries were bilingual in Latin and their native tongue. Citing examples from England, this essay describes the type of education which these writers enjoyed and discusses some features of the English language ca. 1600 which could have encouraged the continued use of Latin. By quoting selected passages from the English poets Thomas May and John Milton, the essay also illustrates how the poets' education in Latin affected their English compositions.

The Roman poet Ennius, the founder of Latin literature, had, as he put it, "three hearts", since he was fluent in three languages: Oscan, his native tongue, because he was born in a small central Italian town; Greek, in which he was educated; and Latin, the language of the army with which he served in the Second Punic War—not the last person to learn his Latin in the army. The elder Cato took him to Rome in 204 B.C., where he earned a living as a teacher and as a writer. He was on familiar terms with many of the leading men in Rome, among them the elder Scipio. (Aulus Gellius 17)

This paper intends to demonstrate that many writers of the 16th and 17th centuries likewise had more than one heart, i.e., they were bilingual. The writers to be mentioned were educated entirely in Latin and were fluent in that language, but they were also notable writers in their mother tongue, that is English, for the present purposes. As examples I will cite Thomas May and John Milton, both of whom were active in the early and mid 1600's. I could as well cite multi-lingual writers from Spain, Germany, or France, but I find it much easier to deal with the two languages, Latin and English.

First I want to show how and why these writers were bilingual, what education they received to become so. Next will come a short discussion about the state of the English language around 1600 and the qualities of their mother tongue which may have encouraged the continued use of Latin in their lifetime. Finally, specific passages in May's verse and Milton's verse will demonstrate how their Latin and English hearts interacted.

Education

Some of the works of John Milton and Thomas May fall into the category today called Neo-Latin, that is the body of Latin writing from about 1300, roughly the time of Dante and Petrarch, down to our own time. This category includes an immense number of works, especially from the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, ranging from verse to fiction to science. Even as late as 1741 Ludvig Holberg could write a long Latin novel about Nicholas Klimt's underground journey, the ancestor of Jules Verne's *Journey to the Center of the Earth*, and a better novel (Holberg 1741). Certainly from the 15th and 16th centuries there is far more Latin literature extant than the Romans ever thought about writing. So how did the language maintain itself, despite the fact that, by that time, it was no one's mother tongue? The answer is simple; the schools did it.

We know a lot about what we would call elementary and secondary education during the period in question. Quite a few education treatises survive, many with practical day-to-day lesson plans. The Jesuit's *Ratio Studiorum,* a complete description of procedures and methods at Jesuit schools, effective as of 1550, is well known (McGucken 1932:271ff). From the Tudor and Elizabethan period in England, we have perhaps the best known, Ascham's *The Schoolmaster*, but others exist. One worth mentioning was by Brinsley, *A Consolidation for Our Grammar Schools,* written for the schools to be established in Ireland, Wales, and Virginia (1622).[1] The usual English education system was to be imported into the new world. The best modern description of Elizabethan schools is Baldwin's *William Shakespere's Small Latine and Lesse Greek*, an exhaustive treatment (in 2 volumes) of grammar school education in England. Baldwin translates or quotes in English detailed surviving lesson plans and syllabi from Eton, Winchester, St. Paul's, and other schools, giving us an exact knowledge of what happened—or was supposed to happen—in these schools. What did happen?

At about the age of five a child could enter a "petty" school attached to a grammar school. In the petty school he (or she, girls attended these schools) mastered the alphabet and learned to read and write in English. In England and throughout Europe, he would learn by heart the Paternoster, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. At the age of seven or eight the child would

enter the grammar school proper, where he stayed for about seven years. The grammar school's function was clearly defined and understood by everyone: it was to teach Latin. The student memorized grammar, memorized texts, analyzed texts, composed in Latin every day, copied texts into his commonplace book, and so on. No one had any doubt that Latin was the necessary language to learn, the medium of traditional and contemporary scholarship, theology, law, medicine, international relations. In fact, in international relations at the time Latin was the universal language.

Perhaps needless to say, teaching the boys to read, write, and speak this inflected language took much time and effort. Pupils were in school for eight to ten hours, six days per week, usually starting at 6:00 or 7:00 a.m. Here is the schedule for Eton in 1560: at 6:00 pupils were taught about parts of speech and forms of verbs. At 7:00 they were quizzed orally on the previous hour's work. At 8:00 they were assigned a passage to be translated or to be re-written or versified, depending on the grade they were in. At 9:00 they wrote a prose composition on a set theme or else studied Latin authors, Terence or Caesar in the lower grades, Cicero, Ovid, or Vergil in the upper. From these authors they had to excerpt proverbs, phrases, moral maxims, fables, and so on. Prayers at 10:00 were followed by lunch. From 12:00 to 2:00 the boys were examined on what they had read. At 4:00 they translated prepared passages from other authors and repeated their memorized precepts. At 6:00 they translated from English into Latin. At 8:00 they went to bed. On the weekends they studied religious texts (Baldwin 1944 I:353-362).

In the first three years, the student memorized one of the Latin grammars in common use. Exercises included translating into Latin words or phrases set by the teacher. Students were expected, or required, to speak only Latin in the school. To help attain a good speaking knowledge, phrase books were published, one of which was Udall's *The Flowers of Latin Speaking* (1533). One (perhaps typical) example from this book: "My master hath beat me" 'Praeceptor a me sumpsit poenas'. By the end of the third year the pupil had read Aesop and the Distichs of Cato. He could diagram sentences, recognize all the grammatical forms, vary and rephrase sentences, and recognize the Latin poetic meters. Readings came from the Bible and from dialogues of Erasmus and Vives.

In the fourth year students read the comedies of Terence, partly for their utility in developing verbal fluency in Latin. They also read Ovid and Vergil. Every day a pupil memorized a few verses of whatever author was being studied, parsed every word, listed all the rhetorical figures (syllepsis, metonymy, synecdoche, and so on). Then the student would translate the passage into English, and finally, with his English translation in front of him, retranslate the passage back into Latin. His version could then be compared with the original.

In the fifth, sixth, and seventh years the readings became more difficult. Using anthologies, students compiled their own commonplace books of apt quotations. They read Vergil, especially the *Eclogues* and *Georgics,* which perhaps accounts for the popularity of pastoral as a genre in Neo-Latin. They also read Horace, Lucan, Martial, and Seneca (Baldwin 1944 I:366-371). In all classes they continued composing in Latin in the style of the author being studied, in the better schools using the "double translation" method just mentioned: translating from Latin into English then back into Latin. They also wrote letters using Cicero as a model and gave orations and performed plays, all in Latin. Hundreds of academic dramas survive from the 16th to the 18th centuries. These plays were produced for the parents and local dignitaries to show that the students were actually learning something, the something being Latin. These productions of course continued into the university years, for the few who attended university. During Queen Elizabeth's visits to Oxford or Cambridge several Latin plays were produced for her entertainment.

After their third or fourth year students could start Greek, reading primarily the New Testament and perhaps Lucian or Demosthenes. But Greek was never drilled as thoroughly as Latin (Baldwin 1944 II:617ff).

I have shared perhaps too much detail about Tudor education (or Stuart; little changed until the late 1600's). But I just want to emphasize the point that the language training provided by the grammar schools far exceeded any university graduate program in existence today. Any reasonably diligent grammar school pupil had far better speaking and writing skills in Latin than virtually any modern Latin professor, for example, after a lifetime of study. In addition I must emphasize that what I have described was the totality of elementary and secondary education. Any science, history, or philosophy

which students might learn in grammar school came from the Latin texts, and most of what they learned subsequently at university also came from Latin texts. Hence the constant references to Roman history and politics. There are far more references to Caesar and Pompey in English literature of the period than to individual English kings, far more references to the noble Cato than to the noble Sir Thomas More. Moreover there were no alternative schools for those who wanted a different type of formal schooling—which of course would have been a minority of the population. One investigator has found that before the Reformation there was a grammar school for every 5600 persons in England. By contrast official figures give one such school for every 24,000 persons in 1864 (Thompson 1958:4). Certainly one could argue about what constituted a school, how big they were, and the like. But the figures do show that grammar schools, i.e., Latin schools, were not rare in Tudor and Stuart times. In short, education meant training in Latin.

The State of English in 1600

Why was there such an emphasis on Latin? The reasons are not hard to discern. First, English was known only to its native speakers, perhaps 4-5 million people in 1600—that is even if we could define "English language" as one entity at that time. (Even now accents and dialect differences can make understanding difficult, as Americans who watch the film *Trainspotting* or the "Little Britain" TV show from the BBC can attest. The situation in 1600 would have been far worse.) Latin was certainly the only way for a writer to gain an audience outside his native land. For example, much of Milton's work for the Commonwealth consisted of Latin defenses and diplomatic letters addressed to a European audience. Writing such addresses in English would have been a waste of time. The same was true in most of Europe at the time. Many writers state that they are writing in Latin to ensure the propagation of their work: Latin was an eternal language exempt from the mutations of time and capable of immortalizing the writer's efforts (Bizer 1995:70). Works in Latin had at least the possibility of becoming a *monumentum aere perennius.*

A second reason why men wrote in Latin is perhaps not so obvious. At the time, Latin was a more developed language than was English, with an ability to express concepts and ideas that the Elizabethan language lacked.

Complaints about the insufficiency of English were not rare: the language was rude and barbarous, and it did not have the technical vocabulary required in specialized areas of language use, like theology or medicine. John David Rhys, the author of the first grammar of Welsh, *Cambrobrytannicae cymraecaeve linguae institutiones* (London 1592) wrote it in Latin both for an international audience and because it was easier to explain Welsh in Latin than in English (Binns 1990:297).

You may say: "What about Shakespeare? How could his language be surpassed?" But an inspection of the OED, for example, shows how much of our modern English is post-Elizabethan and how recent many words in current use are—and I am not referring to present-day slang and jargon. Let me cite an example. In 1594 a Latin book was published in London, *Tractatus de globis et eorum usu.* (Sumptibus Gulielmi Sandersoni ciuis Londinensis, conscriptus à Roberto Hues. It was reprinted several times.) In this book the expression "Globi superficiem" appears. In 1639 this book was translated into English as *A Learned Treatise of Globes* (Hues 1639). The phrase in question was translated as "the superficies of the globe", with the Latin term simply used in the English translation. ("Superficies" had been introduced into English as a geometrical term early in the 16th century.) The English word "surface" did not come into the language until 1611, and even so must have been rare, since it was not used in the 1639 translation (Binns 1990:297-8). This is just one example of a handicap under which English (and other languages) suffered relative to Latin. Here are some other words which were introduced into English during the period 1600-1649: premium, equilibrium, specimen, formula, impetus. In the last half of the 17th century, antenna, stimulus, complex were introduced. Of course the large number of Latinate words in English shows that not every "superficies" was replaced by a "surface". We have "deity" and "Godhead", "latitude" and "breadth", and many other such pairs (Nevalainen 1999:367).

In short, Latin had a ready-made vocabulary at hand, it had a long series of authoritative texts concerning history, theology, philosophy, politics, and other topics of international interest, and it gave its speakers access to the outside world. Who would not have chosen Latin? (A present-day analogy might be India, where English is the language of advancement.) Of course as the vernacular languages developed the vocabulary to discuss almost anything, these languages began to replace Latin. This happened first in Italy,

then in France during the 16th century, in Germany and England during the 17th century, and finally in Scandinavia, where the last long original work of fiction in Latin, Holberg's *Iter Subterraneum*, previously mentioned, was published in 1741. In the sciences, publication in Latin continued for a much longer period. The last major scientific work in Latin was probably by Hans Christian Oersted, who made the identification of electricity and magnetism in a pamphlet written in Latin in 1820 (Oersted 1820). Mathematical work in Latin continued into the 20th century, replaced now by English. Latin titles for works in the vernacular continue, however, to designate a serious content. Examples include Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* and Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica.*

The Poets

What were the effects of this intensive training in Latin on native English poetry? To begin I want to cite a spectacular example of a poet writing equally well in two languages. This is Thomas May, who translated the poems in John Barclay's *Argenis,* a best selling novel first published (in Latin) in 1621 and translated into English first in 1625 and next in 1629; May's verse translations were used in both English versions (Barclay 2004 I:31) More important, May composed a continuation of Lucan's *Bellum Civile.* Thomas May (1595-1650), practically unknown today, was from a respectable country family, attended university, and was an acolyte of Ben Jonson. He wrote several plays which survive, both comedies and tragedies, very much in Jonson's style. May was also active as a translator, and ended his life as a pamphleteer for the English Commonwealth government (Chester *passim*).

His most lasting work was his translation and continuation of the Roman poet Lucan. In the first century A.D., Lucan wrote a long epic about the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, the *Bellum Civile.* (To summarize the plot, after conquering Gaul, in 49 B.C. Caesar wanted to return to Rome to resume his political career. He was refused and marched on the city. He defeated Pompey at Pharsalus in Greece and became sole dictator in the city. He was assassinated on the Ides of March, 44 B.C.) Lucan managed to versify the first years of the war, 49 to 47 B.C., before he fell out of favor with the Emperor Nero and was forced to commit suicide by opening his veins in the bath. His work was clearly unfinished. Lucan, along with

Seneca (his uncle), was very popular in Elizabethan times. To capitalize on this popularity in 1627, May published a verse translation of the *Bellum Civile*, and in 1630 he published his own English-language contribution, called *A Continuation of the Subject of Lucan's Historical Poem till the Death of Julius Caesar* (i.e., 44 B.C.). Ten years later, in 1640, he published a Latin continuation, *Supplementum Lucani Libri VII*. The English is usually called the "Continuation", the Latin the "Supplementum". The Supplementum enjoyed long popularity and was included in editions of Lucan down into the 19th century. The Continuation was reprinted twice in the 17th century, but not thereafter.

Which came first, the Continuation or the Supplementum? For years there was doubt. The Continuation was published first, but that fact would not necessarily be decisive. May's Latin could have remained on his desk unpublished. But in 1949 R. T. Bruère did a study showing that Lucan wrote the English first, then his Latin text. He also pointed out that the Latin Supplementum is not a translation of the English Continuation, but a revised and improved version, recounting the same facts about the war between Caesar and Pompey, but with different emphases and varying descriptions. May also composed his Latin very much in the style of Lucan. He was able to write two different poems on the same subject in two different languages. Let me illustrate his talent by citing one passage from each poem. In Book I of both the Comparison and the Supplementum, May recounts Caesar's defeat of Ptolemy, the King of Egypt, who had just had Pompey killed to win Caesar's favor. May derived his historical facts from the surviving ancient witnesses. (After the defeat at Pharsalus, Pompey fled to Egypt to recoup his fortunes, since he had been friends with Ptolemy, the king of Egypt. But Ptolemy had Pompey killed on the beach where he landed, and then had Pompey's head and signet ring presented to Caesar when he landed in pursuit of Pompey.) At the end of Book I, May addresses the dead Ptolemy in a long apostrophe and says:

> Happier might'st thou have died, before thy reign
> (Though short it were) had left that lasting stain
> Of Pompey's death upon thy name, and shew'd
> To future times thy foul ingratitude...   (May 1567:18)

and a few lines later, May says that Ptolemy wanted to win Caesar's favor:

> In whose behalf thou didst that heinous crime,
> Who chooses rather to revenge, than owe
> To thee so base a ruin of his foe.

In the corresponding passage of the Supplement, also an apostrophe, May says:

> Te nunc occisi, rex ingratissime, Magni
> Manibus inferias Caesar, quem demeruisse
> Crimine sperasti, mittit, generique perempti
> Ne possit debere nefas, ulciscitur ipse
> Inque tua titulum pietatis caede requirit. (May 2005:100)

> Caesar sends you, most ungrateful king, as a death offering
> to the spirits of Pompey. You had hoped to deserve well of Caesar
> by this crime,
> but lest he feel obligated by the criminal murder of his son-in-law,
> Caesar himself avenges him, and seeks the title of "pious" by your
> death.

This is a more cynical view of Caesar's motivation than we see in the Continuation. Moreover this last line ends the apostrophe with a typical Lucan *sententia*, a pointed and paradoxical statement: "He is seeking a reputation for pietas by massacring Ptolemy". Clearly one poem is not a direct translation of the other, but rather a different development of the same material illustrating the point I have made in this paper, that many Renaissance poets were bilingual, able to work equally well in two languages.

As a final example, let's examine what may be the best example of similar poems by the same poet in two different languages, John Milton's "Lycidas" and his "Epitaphium Damonis". The first was written in 1637 as a memorial to Edward King, who had been drowned at sea. The second was written in 1640 as a memorial to Milton's friend Charles Diodati, who had died while Milton was in Italy. This is not a case where the Latin poem influenced the English, since "Lycidas" was written first; it is simply that Milton's literary skills were governed by his Latin training and that both poems arise out of the same poetic tradition. Both poems are pastoral laments with classical predecessors like Theocritus' laments for Daphnis and for Hylas. The pastoral genre had certainly been naturalized in English by Spenser and

Sidney. But the close similarities between Milton's two poems are not due solely to their common genre, but to Milton's thoroughgoing immersion in Latin literature.

What are some of these similarities? In the "Epithaphium", the poet begs the nymphs of Himera (i.e., of Sicily, the home of pastoral poetry) to tell him what were the words and complaints of Thyrsis, a bereaved shepherd/poet, as he mourned the death of Damon. Thyrsis' lamentations begin at line 18 and continue through the rest of the poem. When Thyrsis begins his lament, he wonders what deities he should invoke when mourning Damon. He mentions Mercury, the rustic gods Pales, Faunus, and Pan, among others. He also mentions his shepherd friends, who keep trying to cheer him up, but in vain.

In the English "Lycidas", the unnamed mourner/narrator is also a shepherd, an "uncouth swain", as we read at the end of the poem (186). As in the Latin poem, the narrator initially invokes the Sicilian muse to cast flowers in memory of Lycidas. (*Paradise Lost* also begins with an invocation to the Heavenly Muse.) The narrator calls on many divinities of ancient mythology: Jove, Faunus, satyrs, Phoebus Apollo, Neptune, Aeolus, plus various personified fountains and streams. This invocation of pagan divinities might be grating, especially when we also find in the list the pilot of the Galilean lake, clearly St. Peter, who bears "two massy keys of metals twain" (110). St. Peter then makes a speech critical of evil shepherds who do not feed their sheep: "The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed" (125). This passage is an attack on the corrupt clergy of England, as the argument to the poem makes clear. Immediately after St. Peter comes Alpheus, the river god, and the Sicilian muse again, in a blending of pagan and Christian references, so characteristic of Milton. In the English poem we may feel that the Christian reference is natural, the pagan an intrusion, but in fact the pastoral genre allows both. Even the Latin poem combines pagan and Christian: Damon enjoys the *caeli iura,* the citizenship of heaven; he *colit aethera*, inhabits the ether; the *caelicolae*, the heaven-dwellers, know Damon's true name—all this is conventional Roman terminology. But at the end of the poem Milton mixes the Bacchic thyrsus and Zion's Mount in the unique phrase "Sionaeo bacchantur thyrso", "they revel with Zion's thyrsus", which sums up the implicit Christian picture of heaven developed in the last 25 lines of the po-

em—never mind that the thyrsus is the staff which the pagan worshippers of Bacchus carry.

These common traits—shepherds and rustic divinities—can be considered part of the pastoral genre and one could say that even a poet who knew only English could write something that sounds pastoral. Other traits show more clearly the Latin language influence on "Lycidas".

Two distinguishing characteristics of most Latin poetry of all periods are *amplificatio* (amplifying) and *copia* ("copy" in Elizabethan English). The first is an elaboration of a thought or statement to increase its rhetorical effect, sometimes by digressions, repetitions, or reformulations. An example: in "Epitaphium" 125ff Thyrsis mentions that, while in Italy, he had met Tuscan poets. This reminded him of Damon, who was Tuscan by lineage. These two statements are then amplified: Thyrsis tells how he lay under poplar trees by the banks of the Arno in Florence and listened to Menalcas and Lycidas (the two Tuscan poets) competing in verse—this is the meeting. He then goes on to relate what he imagined Damon was then doing: "Now Damon is singing, now he is snaring rabbits, now he is weaving baskets"; soon we will meet and he will tell me of many things, and so on (142-4). This amplifies how he was reminded of Damon.

Likewise in "Lycidas" we find *amplificatio*. The narrator asks: "Where were ye nymphs when the remorseless deep/ Clos'd o're the head of your lov'd Lycidas?" (50-1). He amplifies this by answering the question. He says that they were not in the hills with the Druids, nor on the top of Mona, nor at the river Dee, and even if they had been, not even the Muse herself could have saved Lycidas. Then another *amplificatio:* the Muse was not even able to save her favorite Orpheus, whose "goary visage down the stream was sent". Much less could she have saved Lycidas. This is *amplificatio:* statement, followed by development or elaboration. It is in effect a delaying mechanism that inhibits narrative progression for the sake of description and thematic development. The long 17th century novels in Latin and the vernacular offer countless examples of *amplificatio.*

The other, perhaps more noticeable feature of Latin poetry is *copia,* the ability and willingness to say the same thing in many ways. Exercises in rephrasing statements, lines of verse, and the like were a universal part of schoolwork and are a valuable exercise when learning a foreign language.

Erasmus' book *De Copia* lists about 150 ways of saying "I enjoyed your letter very much". Milton's Latin verse exhibits many examples of *copia:* Who will console Thyrsis in the summer 1) when the sun is high, 2) when Pan sleeps in the shade, 3) when the nymphs hide under the water, 4) when shepherds can't be found, 5) when the farmer snores under the hedge (50ff)? Later in the poem the narrator meditates on the nature of companionship among animals and men (94ff). In the meadows the calves sport together; jackals come in crowds to feed; wild donkeys pair off; on the shore the seals come in herds; even the sparrow has a companion. But if that companion is shot down or captured by a falcon, the sparrow quickly finds another mate. "But human beings are different; we can hardly find one mate among thousands" (108). A little later in the poem the narrator imagines how, on his return, he and Damon will study medicinal flowers: hellebore, the lowly crocus, the hyacinth, and marsh plants (150ff).

"Lycidas" also shows many examples of *copia*. Flowers are always a favorite for elaboration. Nature should cast down all her flowers in mourning:

> And purple all the ground with vernal flowers.
> Bring the rathe primrose that forsaken dies,
> The tufted crow-toe, and pale gessamine,
> The white pink, and the pansy freaked with jet,
> The glowing violet,
> The musk-rose, and the well-attired woodbine,
> With cowslips wan that hang the pensive head,
> And every flower that sad embroidery wears;
> Bid amaranthus all his beauty shed,
> And daffadillies fill their cups with tears, (142ff).

(This is also an example in English of the poetry of names, so prominent in ancient poets, particularly Ovid. An early and most prominent instance is Homer's catalog of ships.)

Another example: The loss of Lycidas is to the narrator as "killing as the canker to the rose, / Or taint-worm to the weanling herds that graze, / Or frost to flowers…" (45ff).

I hope to have cited enough evidence to show that Milton's long study of Latin governed the way he composed his English verse. Certainly his in-

dulgence in *copia* can make his verse difficult, not to say vexing, to modern English students. I have confined my comments here to poetry, but as anyone who has looked into Milton's English prose works can testify, most of his English sounds like a literal translation from the Latin, with its long sentences and its elaborate subordination. For this reason most students find it difficult to read.

In summary, "Lycidas" is not a direct copy of the "Epitaphium", but rather an example which illustrates the point mentioned above, that many of these Renaissance poets were bilingual, able to work equally well in the two languages. The example from Thomas May illustrated the same point. This talent for two languages should be kept in mind by any critic discussing, for example, Campion, Herbert, or Crashaw in English, besides Milton and May. Elsewhere in Europe the situation was similar. In Germany Luther gave his "Table-talks" in German and Latin. Johann Ludwig Prasch (1637-1690), whose Latin novella, *Psyche Cretica,* is a masterpiece of Christian fantasy literature, in addition to being a Baroque Latin poet, was also an important figure in the development of German literature (Dachs 1957). In France Du Bellay called the French language his wife and Latin his mistress:

> Gallica Musa mihi est, fateor, quod nupta marito.
>> Pro domina colitur Musa Latina mihi.
> Sic igitur (dices) praefertur adultera nuptae?
>> Illa quidem bella est, sed magis ista placet. (*Epigrammata;* Bizer 1995:82)

> The French Muse is to me, I confess, what a wife is to a husband.
> The Latin Muse is cherished by me as a mistress.
> "You will say: Is the paramour therefore preferred to the wife?"
> The former is indeed beautiful, but the other pleases more.

As a concluding quotation I must mention Wordsworth's comment on Lycidas. He states that in Milton's time "an importance and a sanctity were at that period attached to classical literature that extended, as is obvious in Milton's Lycidas, for example, both to its spirit and form in a degree that can never be revived" (Wordsworth 1817). For Wordsworth Lycidas was the product of a vanished era, one differing from his own in education, language, and taste.

NOTE

1. All the 16th and 17th century works cited in this paper and published in England, including May's *Continuation* and *Supplementum*, are available on microfilm in the Early English Books series from Bell and Howell.

REFERENCES

Aulus Gellius. 1968. *Noctes Atticae.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baldwin, William. 1944. *William Shakespere's Small Latine and Lesse Greek.* Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Barclay, John. 2004. *Argenis.* Eds. Mark Riley and Dorothy Huber. Assen: van Gorcum.

Binns, J. W. 1990. *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England.* Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Bizer, Marc. 1995. *La Poésie au Miroir: Imitation et Conscience de soi dans la Poésie Latine de la Pléiade.* Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur.

Bruère, R. T. 1949. "The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May's Supplementum Lucani." *Classical Philology* 44,3:145-163.

Chester, Allan Griffith. 1932. "Thomas May: Man of Letters 1595-1650." Thesis. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Dachs K. 1957. "Leben und Dichtung des Johann Ludwig Prasch (1637-1690)." In: *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins Oberpfalz und Regensburg XCVIII* 5-200.

Darbyshire, Helen. *The Poetical Works of John Milton.* London: Oxford Univ. Press 1958.

Holberg, L. 1741. *Nicholai Klimii Iter Subterraneum.* Copenhagen and Leipzig 1741. (on-line at at http://www2.kb.dk/elib/lit//dan/holberg/klim/)

Hues, Robert. 1639. *A learned treatise of globes, both coelestial and Terrestriall.* London: Stephens and Meredith. In Early English Books 1475-1640.

May, Thomas. 1567. *A Continuation of the Subiect of Lucans Historicall Poem, till the Death of Iulius Caesar.* English Books microfilm. London: William Shears.

——. 2005. Modern edition of the Supplementum in Backhaus, Birger. *Das Supplementum Lucani von Thomas May: Einleitung, Edition, Über-setzung, Kommentar.* Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

McGucken, William. 1932. *The Jesuits and Education.* New York: Bruce.

Nevalainen, T. "Lexis and Semantics." In: Ed. Roger Lass. *The Cambridge History of the English Language III: 1476-1776.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 332-458.

Oersted, Hans Christian. 1820. *Experimenta Circa Effectum Conflictus Electrici in Acum Magneticum.* Copenhagen 1820. In: Ed. Kirstine Meyer. *H. C. Oersted, Scientific Papers II.* Copenhagen: Hoest and Soen, 1920.

Prasch, Johann Ludwig/Praschius, Iohannes Ludovicus. *Jo. Ludovici Praschii Psyche Cretica.* Ratisbonae: Typis Jo. Georgii Hofmanni 1685. (on line at http://www.uky.edu/AS/Classics/retiarius/Psyche_Cretica.html)

Thompson, Craig R. 1958. *Schools in Tudor England.* Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library.

Wordsworth, William. *Preface* to the "Ode to Lycoris, May 1817". In: Ed. Paul Sheats. *The Poetical Works of Wordsworth.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin (1982), 558

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Mark Riley is Professor Emeritus of Classics at California State University Sacramento. He has edited several Neo-Latin texts on-line and has published (with Dorothy Huber) an edition with text and translation of John Barclay's *Argenis* (Paris 1621), the best selling Neo-Latin novel.