

STEPHEN CLUCAS

Banquets of the Senses: Elizabethan Ovidianism and its Discontents

1. Paganism and the flesh

In his book *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism*, Leonard Barkan has argued that in the early decades of the sixteenth century, a “New Ovidianism,” or “Ovidian Renaissance” in the visual arts and literature arose, in which “the spirit of paganism and metamorphosis is resurrected from the dead and at the same time alive as though there had been no interval of dormancy.”¹ This revival, which Barkan associates (as far as the visual arts are concerned) with the mythological paintings of Correggio and Titian of the 1520s and 1540s, was characterised by the aesthetic “freeing of pagan materials from cosmological, allegorical and philosophical constraints,”² and by a painterly celebration of “sensuous loveliness” and a “lush delight in the flesh.” This “new pagan language,”³ Barkan argues, “evokes the senses more than the intellect,”⁴ and is a “revival of the tradition that links paganism and the flesh.” This “fleshly tradition” is defined in opposition to what Barkan sees as the “cold design” of mediaeval allegorisation and rigid philosophical programmes. The new tradition favours “flowing sensuality” rather than the “religious hieroglyph frozen in the past,”⁵ and “celebrates the beauties of nature and art, of music and dance, of the corporeal and the

irrational.”⁶ In this new art, the representation of the pagan gods “become[s] an occasion for feasting... the senses.”⁷ Barkan calls this “*Ovide imagisé*,” as opposed to the *Ovide moralisé* of the middle ages; it is the “Renaissance answer to the moralization of metamorphosis,” an art “celebrating images for the sake of their own beauty... freed from the orthodoxies of interpretation.”⁸

In Barkan’s account, Titian’s various versions of *Danae*, painted between 1545 and 1554, are presented as paradigmatic images of the new paganism, “emblem[s] of sensuous beauty in the specifically antique manner,”⁹ each version presenting the viewer with “a feast of naked and complaisant feminine beauty” which is “almost pornographic in its appeal.”¹⁰ Barkan dates the beginning of his Ovidian Renaissance to c.1520, and as a movement which developed among painters with different backgrounds, working in different localities, Titian in Venice, and Correggio in Parma,¹¹ Barkan sees the survival of pagan mythology in the Renaissance as “a history of competitive relations between the visual and the verbal,” and in his study he shifts seamlessly between examples drawn from the visual arts and literature.¹² The character of “Renaissance metamorphism” did not reside in specific “verbal and visual genres,” he argues, but rather in its “metamorphic aesthetics,” which he sees as operating both in art and in literature.¹³ Barkan’s decisive figures in the realm of literary Ovidianism are Petrarch, Ronsard, Spenser and Shakespeare. These literary figures—according to Barkan—celebrate sensuous beauty and use mythic metamorphoses to figure mutable desire in ways which are comparable to the paintings of Titian or Correggio. In Barkan’s summary of Ronsard’s achievement, however, I find a significant moment of vacillation that calls attention to what is unthought or suppressed in Barkan’s account:

Metamorphosis creates a permanence of sex, dream and the golden imaginary world of myth. Other Renaissance poets may elide the terms less completely and may subject eros to sterner judgement than does Ronsard, but the associations among

passion, paganism, and transformation continue to reflect a Petrarchan heritage not entirely in keeping with Petrarch himself.¹⁴

In sidestepping or downplaying the “sterner judgement” of sixteenth-century readers and writers concerning the eroticised pagan mythologies of a “metamorphic aesthetic” Barkan neglects, I would argue, a key determinant and shaper of that aesthetic. The pagan dreamworld that Barkan so vividly evokes was not an untroubled one. If, as Barkan maintains, metamorphosis became “an explicitly psychological condition”¹⁵ for the Renaissance artist, then we need to attend to the zones of ambivalence—even abjection—within this condition, where the vacillations of sin and grace, shame and desire, the sensuous and the spiritual, could create distorted and internally conflicting shapes.

In this paper I will be focussing on the northward migration of the literary side of Barkan’s “Ovidian Renaissance.” Was this “new pagan language” transplanted successfully into northern Renaissance literary cultures? By focusing on “Ovidianism” in the English Renaissance, I hope to show that the “Ovidian Renaissance” was rendered problematic in late sixteenth-century English literary culture by the renewed vigour of Protestant iconoclastic thinking and lay pietistic devotion after the Marian persecutions. In these conditions the internalised “sterner judgements” of a range of Protestant subjectivities shaped, checked and deflected the writing and reading of amorous, Ovidian poetry from within.

2. Stephen Batman: *New Arrival of the three Gracis* (1580) and *The Golden Booke of Leaden Goddes* (1577)

The introduction of continental Renaissance influences into late sixteenth-century English literary culture was skewed and transformed both by a heightened suspicion of

images, and also by the intense scrutiny of the psychological processes of sin and repentance inaugurated by Calvin's codification of the *ordo salvationis*. A vivid sense of the difficulties attending the Protestant reception of what Barkan calls the "new Pagan language" can be gained by contrasting Botticelli's well-known visualisation of the graces in *La Primavera*, with the following evocation of the grace Aglaia, from Stephen Batman's *New Arrival of the three Gracis into Anglia*:

From Ioue the iust I *Aglaia*, am, a grace of liuely hew which being placed in mortal wight, such sight may not me vew, As carnall man, by shewes of loue, in armes them imbrace, no such am I, of substance sure, but aye a liuely grace. Not seene, nor felt, so pure am I, I let you vnderstand, a thousand bodies I possesse, in euery soyle and land.¹⁶

While Botticelli gives sensuous physical form to his Classical graces (albeit, as Barkan observes, these forms "require the viewer to look beyond the veil" of flesh toward immaterial "essences"), Batman's "Christianised" graces are disembodied abstractions,¹⁷ denied their corporeality in the name of an immaterial divinity which transcends the "carnal" and the "mortal." While this curious book condemns the pagans for worshipping "gods of dyvers sortes,"¹⁸ it makes free use of Classical imagery, adapting Ovid's account of the metamorphosis of Ulysses's companions in book 14 of the *Metamorphoses*, for example, to represent recusant Catholics living in England, types of those "greedy grasshops... that Egipt did possesse."¹⁹ While it is true that Batman is able to recuperate the ancients to some extent, praising their depictions of "vice subvertid and ouerthrown,"²⁰ and approving their belief in "one principall God"²¹ it is clear that he was compelled to overcome an immense internal resistance to Pagan antiquity in order to appropriate its aesthetic materials.

The nature of this resistance is more apparent in Batman's mythographic treatise, *The Golden Booke of the Leaden Goddes*. Presented to Henry Carew, Lord Hunsdon, in 1577

as a “token of good will & obedience,” the *Golden Booke* is a “small treatise of the putatiue & imagined Gods of the Gentiles” and the “vayne imaginations of heathen Pagans.”²² The “fruitfull documentes” of this “instruction,” written for “Godlye purposes,” consist of bald iconographical descriptions of the images of the Classical Gods, followed by cursory and unsophisticated euhemeristic, aetiological and (more frequently) moralising interpretations. It is quite clear from Batman’s preface that the perfunctory nature of his interest in the “Tables” and “Pictures” of the pagan gods is a function of his overall perspective. In these interpretations he says,

we Christians, now lyuing in the cleare light of the Gospel, may euidently see, with what erroneous trumperies, Antiquitie hath bene nozzeled: in what foggy mystes, they haue long wandered: in what filthy puddles they haue been myered: vnder what masking vysors of clouted religions, they haue bene bewytched; what traditions they haue of theyr owne phantastical braynes to themselues forged: & finallye into what Apostacye, Atheisme, Blasphemy, Idolatrye, and Heresie, they haue plunged their Soules & affianced their beleuees.²³

Batman’s account moves almost seamlessly from the “many Demi Gods and Goddesses,” to the “Gods of the Romishe Church,”²⁴ where “such a number of preposterous Gods are to be found: so saincted and made by the mayster *Demon*.”²⁵ Batman invents a god, “Vorax” to represent what he considers to be Catholic “supersticion,” and draws a direct parallel between the images of the Classical gods and idolatrous Catholic images: “as the former Pagans set up Images of theyr fathers to be honoured: so likewise hath ye pestilent Church of superstition mayntayned Idolls, ye very ceremonies of the heathen pagans.”²⁶ Roman Catholicism, he says, is an “apish Religion,” and a “yoke of counterfayted carnality.” In this comparison Batman condemns both the Catholic idol and the heathen image as “carnal;” there is no doubt that English Protestant propagandistic attacks on Catholic idolatry coloured their attitudes towards all kinds of pictorial and literary representations.

Puritan opposition to “counterfayted carnality” led to some vehement attacks on Classicising literature. In his *Certayn Chapters taken out of the Prouerbes of Salomon* of 1550, John Hall defended his verse translations of the Bible, which, he argued, “as moche deserued to be commended, as he, what soeuer he was that made ye court of Venus or other bokes of lecherous Ballades, the whyche haue bene a great occasion to prouoke men to the desyre of synne.”²⁷ Hall felt strongly enough about *The Court of Venus*—which was an influential Tudor anthology of tales and amorous verse, including several love lyrics by Sir Thomas Wyatt—to produce a series of moral *parodiae* entitled *The Court of Vertue*, which Christianised Wyatt’s amorous sentiments, and attacked the “lascivious” verse of amorists.²⁸ The puritan Edward Dering also attacked the “sorcerie” of “baudie songes” in a book of godly instruction for Christian families. “Yea,” he said, “some haue bin so impouident as new borne Moabites, which wallow in their own vomit & haue not bine ashamed to entitle their books the court of Venus, the Castle of Loue, & many such other as shameles as these.”²⁹ The existence of such fierce resistance to amorous poetry, and continental Classicising traditions, ensured that the “Ovidian Renaissance” was absorbed into English literary culture in a fitful and spasmodic fashion.

3. “Shakespeare’s Ovid:” Arthur Golding’s Preface to *Ouid’s Metamorphoses* (1567)

The difficulties caused by these religious criticisms of secular and classical literature can be seen clearly in the apologetics of Arthur Golding, the author of what has become known as “Shakespeare’s Ovid,” the English verse translation of the *Metamorphoses* published in 1567. Golding’s dedicatory verse epistle addressed to the Protestant activist Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, presents an elaborate account of the work’s virtues,

and seeks to advise its readers on the correct way to interpret the poem.³⁰ His first priority is to present the metamorphoses as an encyclopaedic digest of ancient wisdom, a trope which had become a commonplace in Italian and French mythographic literature and humanist commentaries.³¹ “Whatsoever hath bene writ of auncient tyme in greke,” Golding says,

By sundry men dispersedly, and in the latin eeke,
Of this same dark Philosophie of turned shapes, the same
Hath Ovid into one whole masse in this booke brought in frame.³²

Golding’s preface is a deeply equivocal text, and one which draws attention to its own anxieties about the uses (or *misuses*) to which Ovid’s text can be put. He exhorts his readers to use the text wisely (i.e. allegorically) and in a fascinating passage, figures the text as a potential predator, waiting to prey upon the unwary reader:

The readers therefore earnestly admonisht are too bee
Too seeke a further meaning than the letter giues too see [...]
And if they happening for to meete with any wanton woords
Or matter lewd, according as the person doth avoord
In whom the evill is describde, doo feele their myndes therby
Provokte too vyce and wantonnesse, (as nature commonly

Is prone to evill) let them thus imagin in their mynd.
Behold, by sent of reason and by perfect sight I fynd
A Panther heere, whose peinted cote with yellow spots like gold

And pleasant smell allure myne eyes and senses too behold.
But well I know his face is grim and feerce, which he dooth hyde,
He may devour mee vnbewares.³³

This astounding passage vividly attests to the profound ambivalence that the pious Elizabethan reader might feel in the presence of a pagan text: a mixture of fascination, desire and fear—a fear which could only be assuaged by mobilising an array of moralising interpretations. Ovid’s fables are not designed “Too further or allure too vyce,” Golding insists,

[...] but rather this is ment,
 That men beholding what they see when vice doth reigne in stead
 Of vertue, should not let their lewd affections have the head[.]³⁴

These initial anxieties attending the “Englishing” of Ovid’s “very pleasaunt and delectable” work, even among those with humanist leanings, set the tone for the literary engagements of the later Elizabethan period. The unequivocal celebration of physical beauty and sensual pleasure which Barkan saw as the hallmark of this new Ovidianism, in both literature and painting, was filtered through English Protestant sensibilities in various ways: transvaluation, painful detachment, involuntary fascination, and ironic displacements and distortions of various kinds.

4. Marlowe’s *Elegies*, n.d., c. 1595–8.

By the late 1590s, the Ovidian Renaissance was making headway, although few amorists, Petrarchan, Catullan, or Ovidian, could match the unashamed eroticism of Christopher Marlowe’s translation of Ovid’s *Amores*, which unapologetically reproduced the sensuality of the original poems, without the protective carapace of moralisations or euphemism:

Then came Corinna in a long loose gowne,
 Her white neck hid with tresses hanging downe:
 Resembling fayre Semiramis going to bed
 Or Lays of a thousand woers sped.
 I snatcht her gowne, being thin, the harme was small,
 Yet striu’d she to be couered there withall.
 And striuing thus as one that would be cast,
 Betray’d her selfe, and yelded at the last.
 Starke naked as she stood before mine eye,
 Not one wen in her body could I spie.
 What armes and shoulders did I touch and see,
 How apt her breasts were to be prest by me?
 How smooth a belly vnder her wast saw I?
 How large a legge, and what a lustie thigh?
 To leaue the rest, all lik’d me passing well,

I cling'd her naked body, downe she fell,
 Iudge you the rest: being tirde she bad me kisse,
Ioue send me more such after-noones as this.³⁵

Marlowe's example did not open the floodgates: it was small wonder, given the frankness of these translations, that the several imprints of this work all bore the dubious imprint of Middleburgh, and that the volume was one of those appointed to be burned by the ecclesiastical authorities after the Bishop's Ban in 1599.³⁶ Other poets of the 1590s who wished to write in an amorous vein were more circumspect about their narratorial positioning, and strategies of ironic distancing were more characteristic of late Elizabethan poets in a variety of amorous genres.

5. Thomas Lodge: *Rosalynde. Euphues golden legacie* (1590)

Thomas Lodge's 1590 pastoral romance, *Rosalynde*, for example, dedicated to Stephen Batman's patron, Lord Hunsdon, gives full ironic vent to the suspicions surrounding the moral probity of the Ovidian and Petrarchan genres and their continental sources:

the sonnettoes, canzones, madrigals, rounds and roundelays, that these pensive patients pour out when their eyes are more full of wantonness, than their hearts of passions. Then, as the fishers put the sweetest bait to the fairest fish, so these Ovidians, holding *amo* in their tongues, when their thoughts come at haphazard, write that they were rapt in an endless labyrinth of sorrow, when walking in the large lease of liberty, they have only their humours in their inkpot. If they find women so fond, that they will with such painted lures come to their lust, then they triumph till they be full-gorged with pleasures; and then fly they away like ramage kites, to their own content, leaving the tame fool, their mistress, full of fancy, yet without even a feather.³⁷

In his preface "To the Gentleman Readers" Lodge is careful to distance himself from such charges. "Look not here to find any sprigs of Pallas' bay tree," he disingenuously begs his readers "nor to hear the humour of any amorous laureate, nor the pleasing vein of any eloquent orator... they be matters above my capacity." "Here you may perhaps

find some leaves of Venus' myrtle, but hewn down by a soldier with his curtal-axe, not bought with the allurements of a filed tongue." With *Rosalynde* purportedly written whilst he was at sea, Lodge plays up his seamanship, and affects a bluff nautical persona: "To be brief, gentlemen, room for a soldier and a sailor, that gives you the fruits of his labours that he wrote in the ocean, when every line was wet with a surge, and every humorous passion counterchecked with a storm."³⁸ The evocation of the *vita activa* here acts as an assurance of the temperance or moderation of the piece: his work does not present unrestrained passions, they have been "counterchecked" by his industrious preoccupations.

The ironic framing of Lodge's "fidelity test" narrative, in which Rosalynde tests the mettle of Rosader's amorous exclamations, and a continual insistence on the vaporous, evanescent and self-deluding nature of amorous love, qualifies the sensuality which the narrative indulges, containing it within the censorious bounds of a Christian morality. Thus when Rosalynde is "passionate alone," her conscience counsels her against her attraction to Rosader:

Seest thou not how Venus seeks to wrap thee in her labyrinth, wherein is pleasure at the entrance, but within, sorrowes, cares and discontent? She is a siren, stop thine ears at her melody; she is a basilisk, shut thy eyes and gaze not lest thou perish. Thou art now placed in the country content, where are heavenly thoughts and mean desires: in those lawns where thy flocks feed Diana haunts: be as her nymphs chaste, and enemy to love, for there is no greater honour to a maid, than to account of fancy as a mortal foe to their sex. Daphne, that bonny wench, was not turned into a bay tree, as the poets feign: but for her chastity was immortal, resembling the laurel tree that is ever green. Follow thou her steps, Rosalynde [...]³⁹

When Rosalynde attacks the Italianate flattering "Ovidian," she warns Rosader of the dangers of being led by the sensual appetites:

If you be such a one, then I pray God, when you think your fortunes at the highest, and your desires to be most excellent, then that you may with Ixion embrace Juno in a cloud, and have nothing but a marble mistress to release your martyrdom.

Although Rosader insists on the sincerity of his canzon, which “was written in no such humour,”⁴⁰ he represents his amorous longings to himself in similar terms: “as Ixion had Juno, who, thinking to possess a goddess, only embraced a cloud: in these imaginary fruitions of fancy I resemble the birds that fed themselves with Zeuxis’s painted grapes,”⁴¹ and Rosalynd pities Rosader “that thou shouldst hunt after a cloud.”⁴² Thus while it indulges Ovidian and Petrarchan amorous themes, it consigns them to the realm of “imaginary fruitions” and cloudy delusions.⁴³

6. John Marston: *Pigmalion’s Image* (1598)

As Thomas Lodge distanced himself from the amorous Italianate tradition of “sonnettoes and canzones,” by constructing a “counterchecking” virile prefatory persona, John Marston’s Ovidian poem *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion’s Image* is placed in interpretative parentheses by paratextual design. The poem cannot be interpreted in isolation, but loses its meaning if read without reference to its prefaces and coda, and is continuous with the “Certaine Satyres” which follow it.⁴⁴ Marston unsettles the reader from the start, by ironically dedicating his collection of poems “To the Worlds Mightie Monarch, Good Opinion... whom fleshly Epicures call vertues essence.”⁴⁵ This strategem which seems both to endorse and to criticise the moral hypocrisy of the “fleshly” is closely followed by the “Argument” of the poem, which sets out the subject matter with a prurient specificity of detail:

Pigmalion whose chaste mind all the beauties in Cyprus could not ensnare, yet at the length hauing carued in Iuorie an excellent proportion of a beauteous woman, was so deeplie enamored on his owne workmanship, that he would oftentimes lay the Image in bedde with him, and fondlie vse such petitions and dalliance, as if it had been a breathing creature.⁴⁶

This is quickly followed by a dedicatory sonnet “To his Mistres,” in which he declares his intention: “My wanton Muse lasciviously to sing / Of sportiue loue, of louely dall-ing.” The purported aim of the poem (repeated in the pendant poem, “in prayse of his precedent Poem”) is to secure his fictional mistress’s sexual consent:

as thou read’st (Faire) take compassion,
Force me not to enuie my Pigmalion.
Then when thy kindnes grants me such sweet blisse,
I’le gladly write thy metamorphosis.⁴⁷

Marsilio Ficino, in his commentary on Plato’s *Symposium*, had argued that the beauty of the body was a “shadowy and evanescent image” (*umbratilem et fluxam imaginem*),⁴⁸ and Pigmalion, (although he has a “loue-hating mind”) is forced by the god of Love to “loue the shade, whose substance he did hate,” but his love of the shadowy image is not of the chaste Ficinian variety,⁴⁹ but rather a sensual fascination:

And naked as it stood before his eyes,
Imperious Loue declares his Deitie.
O what alluring beauties he descries
In each part of her faire imagery! (4)

Dwelling narcissistically over his own shadowy creation, his eyes drink in every part of her body:

Vntill his eye discended so farre downe
That it discried Loues pauillion:
Where Cupid doth enioy his onely crowne,
And Venus hath her chiefest mantion:
There would he winke, & winking looke againe,
Both eies and thoughts would gladly there remaine. (9)

While he feasts his senses on the statue a “wondrous metamorphosis” transforms the statue into a “liuing creature.”(28) Having set the scene for the sexual consummation of

Pigmalion and his animated workmanship, however, Marston brings the narrative to a detumescent close. Suddenly he directly addresses his reader, upbraiding them for their “wanton itching ears,” which were “expecting for to heare / The amorous description of that action / Which *Venus* seekes.”(33) But while seeming to chasten the lascivious readers, Marston actually continues to titillate them, exhorting them to indulge in sexual fantasy to complete his tale: “Let him conceit but what himselfe would doe” in Pigmalion’s place (34), Marston counsels, and in the following stanza the breathless interruptions of syntax seem to supply obliquely the sense of Pigmalion and his mistress “doing that, which is not fit reporting.”(35) In closing, Marston seems to be exercising a modest restraint, or aesthetic self-censorship (38):

Who knows not what ensues? O pardon me
 Yee gaping eares that swallow vp my lines
 Expect no more. Peace idle Poesie,
 Be not obsceane though wanton in thy rimes.
 And chaster thoughts, pardon if I doe trip,
 Or if some loose lines from my pen doe slip.

But this disingenuous apology, which seems to strive to appease both the wanton and the chaste reader of his verse is retro-actively conditioned by the poem which immediately follows it, “The Authour in prayse of his precedent Poem,” which acts as both an epilogue for *Pigmalions Image* and as a prologue for *Certaine Satyres*, encouraging us to read the collection as a continuous and unified composition. The poem opens with an address to two dissolute companions, Rufus and Luxurio, which undermines and overturns our perceptions of the narratorial strategies of *Pigmalions Image*, which are revealed to be part of a deliberate and ironic act of ventriloquism:

Now *Rufus*, by *Glebrons* fearefull mace
 Hath not my Muse deseru’d a worthy place?
 Come come *Luxurio*, crowne my head with Bayes,
 Which like a Paphian, wantonly displayes

The Salamian titillations,
 Which tickle vp our leud Priapians.
 Is not my pen compleate? are not my lines
 Right in the swaggering humor of these times?⁵⁰

What we have, of course, is simply a transition between two modes of ventriloquism, two artificially constructed personae, but the local effect of this confession places the Ovidian “dalliances” of the mock epyllion at a safe ironic distance. His main objective, he now declares, had been to flatter his mistress; his poetry “like odd hands / Of voluntaries, and mercenarians,” has ulterior motivation. He boasts of the superficiality of his verses, which are “Glittering in dawbed lac’d accoutrements, / And pleasing sutes of loues habiliments. / Yet puffie as Dutch hose... within.”⁵¹ But his seemingly self-flagellatory attack on his own literary achievement is revealed to be another strategy, designed to pre-empt and confound his would-be critics, but also facilitating the transition between “Paphian” and “Satyrical” registers:

Now by the whyps of *Epigrammatists*,
 Ile not be lasht for my dissembling shifts.
 And therefore I vse Popelings discipline,
 Lay ope my faults to *Mastigophoros* eyne :
 Censure my selfe, fore others me deride
 And scoffe at mee, as if I had deni’d
 Or thought my Poem good, when that I see
 My lines are froth, my stanzaes saplesse be.
 Thus hauing rail’d against my selfe a while,
 Ile snarle at those, which doe the world beguile
 With masked showes. Yet changing *Proteans* list,
 And tremble at a barking Satyrist.⁵²

The “barking Satyrist” persona of *Certaine Satyres* is even harder on his wanton “Protean” readers, than the hypocritical chiding amorist of *Pigmalion’s Image*, and while he metamorphoses from one linguistic register to the next, aping Puritan moral outrage and the “swaggering humour” of the city gallant by turns, “changing” his “hew like a Camelion,” he attacks the mutations and dissimulations of his hypocritical

contemporaries, the “vizarded-bifronted-*Ianian* rout.”⁵³ In the gallery of Marston’s targets, which include puritans, machiavellians, whoremongers and male prostitutes, we find a bevy of amorists of various colours: Castilio, a hard-wooing sonneteer,

[...] that can purpose it in dainty rimes,
Can set his face, and with his eye can speake,
And dally with his Mistres dangling feake,
And wish that he were it, to kisse her eye
And flare about her beauties deitie.⁵⁴

or the ineffectual, brainsick, Petrarchan “inamorato *Lucian*,” who trades in the “sweet-smelling pinck Epitheton,” sighing in his bed:

His chamber hang’d about with Elegies,
With sad complaints of his loues miseries:
His windowes strow’d with sonnets.⁵⁵

or the unscrupulous Elegist Muto, who pays “*Roscio* the Tragedian” to pen poems to “put betwixt his Mistris paps,” claiming them as his own work,⁵⁶ or the unnamed author who (not unlike George Chapman) produces verse which is “darknes palpable,” an “Anatomie of Poesie” which Marston claims is composed of gobbets of mythography and “Booke[s] of Epithetes” full of “dark Enigmaes, and strange ridling sence.”⁵⁷ But while he snaps and bites at his literary competitors, Marston’s “Satyrist” (in the fourth satire, “*Reactio*”) also defends literature against the incursions of those puritan critics who, like “fierce enraged Boare... foame at sacred Sonnets,” and denounce poetry as “defild with superstition” and “Popish showes,”⁵⁸ and xenophobically rail against “all Translators that doe striue to bring / That stranger language to our vulgar tongue.”⁵⁹ Thus while on one level Marston seems to echo the complaints of Protestant cultural critics like Batman, or Dering, or Gosson, in his attacks on “riot, and lewd luxury,”⁶⁰ and the dubious morality of amorous poetry, on the other he rejects such censures as “outward

sober, inlye impudent.”⁶¹ Ultimately, however, the “Camelion” nature of Marston’s persona confounds attempts at pronouncing on authorial intention with its proliferating perspectives and targets of abuse.⁶² The disingenuous lascivious indulgence of *Pigmaliions Image* is debunked and overturned in *Certaine Satyres*, tickling “leud Priapians” before taxing “lewd, immodest beastliness” and vexing the “guilty.”⁶³

7. George Chapman: *Ouids Banquet of Sence* (1595)

If the narratorial position in Marston’s *Pigmalion’s Image* volume is ultimately illocated by the metamorphic succession of ironic masks (or unmaskings), a different but related set of problems confronts the reader of George Chapman’s *Ouids Banquet of Sence*.⁶⁴ This poem, which depicts Ovid as an Actaeon-like figure who, chancing upon his beloved Julia/Corinna while she bathes in a curiously wrought fountain (ironically dedicated to Niobe)⁶⁵ “venters to see her in the pride of her nakednesse,”⁶⁶ while it is ostensibly a parable illustrating what Ficino called the “abuse of love” (*amoris abusem*)⁶⁷ in which the mind “descends from sight to touch,” rather than “ascending from sight to the mind”⁶⁸ —a progressive “feasting” of the senses (beginning with hearing, proceeding through smell and sight to a chaste kiss, and the final desire to touch his mistress’s flesh) the poem is caught in a curious paradox. While it seems to be advancing an argument against the lures of the senses, and the perversion of reason by the will, the poem presents the “Banquet of Sence” announced by its title, and its relation to amorous Ovidianism is problematic. In his two dedicatory sonnets, John Davis praises Chapman as a reincarnation of the Augustan poet, inspired by Venus:

The gentle *Ouids* easie supple Muse,
Which vnto thee (sweet *Chapman*) she hath doone:
Shee makes (in thee) the spirit of Ouid moue,
And calls thee second Maister of her loue.⁶⁹

Ovid's "waking soule in *Chapman liues*," Davis says, "Which showes so well the passions of his soule." "And yet," he suggests, Chapman transcends his forebear:

this Muse more cause of wonder giues,
And doth more Prophet-like loues art enroule :
For Ouids soule now growne more old and wise,
Poures foorth it selfe in deeper mysteries.⁷⁰

If Chapman is *Ovidius redivivus*, he is certainly not presented as the wanton amorist of the *Amores*, but rather as the philosophical, encyclopaedic Ovid of Golding and the Italian mythographers, an Ovid who is "misticall and deepe," author of "sacred vierre."⁷¹ This theme is echoed in the other dedicatory sonnets by Richard Stapleton and Thomas Williams. Williams suggests that the "Issue of Semele that will imbrace / With fleshly arms," will not understand Chapman's verse, their "vnhalloved eyes" cannot "pierce" his meanings, whereas the superior readers, the "high spirits," will approve Chapman's "bright Saturnian muse," and be able to withstand its "dazeling beames," and approve its attacks on "basenes."⁷² Stapleton praises Chapman's Apolline muse, and his "Sweet philosophick strains," and, significantly (given the association of wanton amorists with the Italian and French traditions), praises his poems for being "vnstainde with forraine graces."⁷³ Chapman himself, in his dedicatory epistle to his friend Matthew Roydon, declares that it is only readers whose "wits endeuour heauen-high thoughts of Nature," that will be able to "sound the philosophicall conceits" of his poem. "Empty and dark spirits, wil complaine of palpable night," Chapman says, "but those that beforehand haue a radiant, and light-bearing intellect, will say that they can passe through Corynnes Garden without the helpe of a lantern."⁷⁴

But if these preambles lead us to anticipate what Barkan calls the "frozen, and the emblematic," the "cold design" of intellectual allegory,⁷⁵ these expectations are

only partly fulfilled by the “curious frame” of Chapman’s poem, which he compares, with more than a little justification, to “The Painters Art.”⁷⁶ In his epistle to Roydon, he compares the “high, and harty invention” of his “strange Poems” to the mimetic vigour of the painter. “It serues not a skilfull painters turne,” he argues,

to draw the figure of a face onely to make knowne who it represents; but hee must lymn, giue luster, shaddow, and heightening; which though ignorants will esteeme spic’d, and too curious, yet such as haue the iudiciall perspectiue, will see it hath motion, spirit and life.⁷⁷

His poetry, too, strives for effects of “luster, shaddow and lightening,” and in its visual invention at times draws close to the “flowing sensuality” of Barkan’s “New Ovidianism:”

In a loose robe of Tynsell fourth she came,
Nothing but it betwixt her nakednes
And enuious light. The downward-burning flame,
Of her rich hayre did threaten new accesse,
 Of ventrous *Phaeton* to scorch the fields:
And thus to bathing came our Poets Goddesse,
 Her handmaides bearing all things pleasure yeelds
To such a seruice; Odors most delighted,
And purest linnen which her lookes had whited.

Then she cast off her robe, and stood vpright,
As lightning breakes out of a laboring cloude;
Or as the Morning heauen casts off the Night,
Or as that heauen cast off it selfe, and showde
 Heuens vpper light [...]
 Or as when *Uenus* striu’d for soueraine sway
Of charmfull beautie, in yong Troyes desire,
So stood *Corynna* vanishing her tire.⁷⁸

The parallels between Chapman’s staging of Corinna’s beauty and sensuous, painterly depictions of Diana at her bath are manifest, and it is difficult to read Chapman’s poem without thinking of Barkan’s characterisation of the visual space of these Ovidian paintings: “the arrangement of the body in the dramatic scene within the space of the canvas and in relation to the viewer’s space defines classical beauty as sensual, visual

and voyeuristic.”⁷⁹ In counterpoint to the sensuousness of Chapman’s description, however, there are neoplatonising details, which sit in uneasy equilibrium with its emphasis on nakedness, pleasure and delight. Thus while the “downward burning flame” of Corinna’s hair alludes both to the myth of Phaeton’s disobedience and to the iconography of Eros and Anteros, establishing Corinna both as a figure of chastity and of destruction, and while her nakedness is compared to “Heavens vpper light,” there is a compensating counter-movement towards the venereal and the bodily keeping these neoplatonic gestures in check.

This *coincidentia oppositorum*, the sensuous vying with the neoplatonic, is a deliberate part of the poem’s paradoxical design, but also represents, I feel, a genuine inability to synthesise these contradictory and co-existent impulses. Thus while the first part of the poem presents arguments for the spirituality of the auditory and olfactory faculties,⁸⁰ and uses the Ovid persona to express the idea of the senses as a spur to “immortal ardour,” “whose species through my sence / My spirits to theyr highest function reares... Marries my soule, and makes it selfe her dowre,” the representation of Corinna in the act of producing these neoplatonic songs, “led forth by furious trance,”⁸¹ is an erotic evocation of visual and tactile fantasy:

And thus she sung, all naked as she sat,
Laying the happy Lute upon her thigh,
Not thinking any neere to wonder at
The blisse of her sweet brests divinitie.⁸²

The subject of Corinna’s song, ironically, is that loving “proves, prophanenes, holy,” and Barkan, who notes similar ambiguities in the paintings of Titian and Correggio, sees “the sanctifying of sensual beauty”⁸³ as an essential part of the “dialectic” of the pagan image, the “tension between pleasure (visual or erotic) and [intellectual] meaning,”⁸⁴ but if it is a dialectic, it is closer to Hegel’s “bad infinite” (*das schlecht-Unendliche*), where opposing

terms are endlessly “entangled in unreconciled, unresolved absolute contradiction,” than to a sublation or resolution of tensions.⁸⁵ Chapman’s poem is permeated with sensuous imagery which supports the intellectual design (in demonstrating the power of the senses to thwart reason, and the progressive mutation of spirituality into carnality) but also undermines it by creating an undertow of unmediated eroticism. Thus Corinna, lying on a “soft enflowred banck,” is surrounded by flowers which “cling about this Natures naked Jem / To taste her sweetes, as Bees doe swarme on them,” and while the quasi-heraldic “abstracted field” signifies both lust (“Cupids crimson shielde” and “Venus navill”) and chastity (“Diana’s arrow” and “Solemne Violets, hanging head as shamed”), the “sensual leakage” of the passage predominates over the intellectual subtext.⁸⁶ The poet is not unaware of these internal tensions, and posits them in the form of a paradox.

Of sensual beauties he says

Theyr sweetnes poisons with such blest infection,
And leaves the onely lookers on them swooning,
These forms so decks, and colour makes so shine,
That Gods for them would cease to be divine.⁸⁷

The paradoxes of sweet poison and blest infection are structured by the psychology of sin, which conditions the reception of the pagan image in Christendom in varying degrees. Reformers like Calvin knew the appeal of vice and sin. “Though we are purged by his sanctification,” Calvin wrote:

we are still beset by many vices and much weakness, so long as we are enclosed in the prison of the body. Thus it is, that placed at a great distance from perfection, we must always be endeavouring to make some progress, and daily struggling with the evil by which we are entangled [...] we must be intently vigilant, so as not to be taken unawares in the snares of our flesh.⁸⁸

These “depraved desires which are always enticing us” are incident to the “corruption of nature” after the fall, the body, the senses, and the mind together naturally conspire

against salvation.⁸⁹ Chapman's Ovid is "taken unawares in the snares of the flesh." The spiritual pleasures of the "tender clouds" of Corinna's "Odors" are displaced, "vanisht in his visual fires," and his sexual appetites are whetted: "So vulture love on his encreasing liver, / [...] egerly did feede." Although his conscience counsels him against succumbing to sight ("Thou would'st be prickt with other sences stings, / To tast, and feele, and yet not there be staide"),⁹⁰ he uses sophistic neoplatonic arguments to endorse his desires:

Shee is a sweet Elisium for the sence
And Nature dooth not sensuall gifts infuse
But that with sence, shee still intends their vse.

The sence is giuen vs to excite the minde,
And that can never be by sense exited,
But first the sence must her contentment finde,

We therefore must procure the sence delighted,
That so the soule may vse her facultie.⁹¹

Corinna, in reproving Ovid, posits the conventional corrective to such arguments, that "Thought Sights childe / Begetteth sinne."⁹² "Well you show how weake in soule you are," Corinna chides, "That let rude sence subdue your reasons skill."⁹³ Ovid himself concedes that in coaxing Corinna to grant a kiss, and then to allow him to touch her breasts, he is "disputing still / For Sence, gainst Reason, with a sencelesse will."⁹⁴ But while Ovid's sophistic arguments are revealed as such, there is a paradoxical pleasure and delight generated by these arguments (like those of Marlowe's "bold, sharpe sophister," Leander)⁹⁵ which is attributable to more than simple rhetorical versatility, and the inexplicable capitulations of Corinna (unconvincingly glossed as "civill favours"),⁹⁶ stage the carnal aberration which the poem ostensibly decries, as Ovid touches her breast, supposedly "To use with pietie that sacred place, / And through his Feelings organ to disperse / Worth to his spirits." Ovid's ironic paean on "*Cupids Alps*," which celebrates touch as "King of Sences,"⁹⁷ and figures the antique world as a land which

“flow’d with Milke and Honny,” where “Pleasure her selfe lyes big with issue panting,” gives a “keener edge” to “Ovids longings.” Although Chapman breaks off at this point to exclaim, in Calvinist fashion, against “rude frailetie:”

O nature how doost thou defame in this
 Our human honors? yoking men with beasts
 And noblest mindes with slaves?

and attacks “beauties blisse” as “Surfet on flesh” rather than “feasts” for the “quick spirit,”⁹⁸ in effect it has repeated the form of Marston’s *Pigmalion*, “tickling” before it “censures,” interrupting the amorous flow once it has sufficiently fed the appetites.

I would suggest, in conclusion, that the “Ovidian Renaissance” in England, unlike its Italian counterpart as Barkan has characterised it, is not a “freeing of pagan materials” from moral and intellectual constraints, a “fleshly tradition” which is “more in tune with pagan materials,” but rather a transvaluation in which the “pagan image” inhabits the contradictory space within the psychological structure of Christian sin, where the fascination of desire is acknowledged at the very moment its repression is posited as a necessity. Despite their differences, puritan critics such as Stephen Batman and John Hall, and sophisticated literary artists such as John Marston and George Chapman, all acknowledge the “blest infection” of the flesh, for which the Gods—or the Godly—“would cease to be divine.”

Notes

An earlier version of this paper was presented at a symposium “Die Renaissance in Italien: und ihre Europäische rezeption,” held at the National Gallery, London, on 28 October 1998.

¹ Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (Newhaven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), Chapter 5: “Metamorphosis, Paganism, and the Renaissance Imagination,” 171-242: 172-73.

² Ibid., 173.

³ Ibid., 181.

⁴ Ibid., 183.

⁵ Ibid., 179. Cf. 182, where he praises Titian’s “new vision of the pagan world, completely freed from the remote, the frozen and the emblematic.”

⁶ Ibid., 182.

⁷ Ibid., 185.

⁸ Ibid., 188.

⁹ Ibid., 190.

¹⁰ Ibid., 193.

¹¹ Ibid., 175-77.

¹² Ibid., 247.

¹³ Ibid., 242.

¹⁴ Ibid., 221.

¹⁵ Ibid., 206.

¹⁶ Stephen Batman, *The New Arrival of the three Gracis, into Anglia. lamenting the abusus of this present Age* (London: T. East, n.d., c.1580), sig. [Biiij] verso.

¹⁷ Ibid.: “In these three principall vertues, are contayned the liberalitie of a Christian, thankfulness, plentifulnes, & liberalitie.”

¹⁸ Ibid., sig. Dii verso.

¹⁹ Ibid., sig. Ci verso: “If they do not so relent, as christian lawes require / With Pluto be infernall hel sure paid shalbe their hyre: / Vlisses he hath sayled so long, in vaine delight and lust, / that all his men transformid are, to beastly shapes vniust. / Some to wolves, which do devoure, and some to Vipers kind, / [...] Like foxes some other bee, which through craft and goyle, / By vsery in watching steps, their brother seekes to spoyle.’ Cf. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, XIV, 248-307.

²⁰ Ibid., sig. Cii recto.

²¹ Ibid., sig. Dii recto.

²² Stephen Batman, *The Golden Booke of the Leaden Goddes. Wherein is described the vayne imaginations of heathen Pagans, and counterfaict Christians: wyth a description of their seueral Tables, what ech of their Pictures signified* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1577), title page and dedicatory epistle, “To the Right Honorable Lord, Henry Cary [...] Baron of Hunsdon [etc.],” sig. *2 recto.

²³ *Ibid.*, sig. *2 verso.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 22 verso.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 29 verso. Batman directs his reader to works of anti-Catholic propaganda, such as Thomas Becon’s *The Reliques of Rome* (London, 1563) for more detailed discussions of “the superstitious Gods and Saints of Romaine factions.”

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 34 verso. Batman provides a genealogy of error, which runs from the oracles (“ye Thondringe clamour of Deuylls”), through the Ancient Roman worship “of Saturn in Italy, of Iupiter in Candie, of Iuno in Samus” to “MACHOMET in Mecha, PAPA in Rome.” (34 recto-verso). Cf. *New Arrival*, sig. Dii verso, where he suggests that the Roman deities of late antiquity were the intermediates between the Classical gods of antiquity and the “ydolatry” of contemporary Catholicism.

²⁷ John Hall, *Certayn Chapters taken out of the Prouerbes of Salomon [...] & certayne Psalmes of dauid, translated into English metre* (London: Thomas Raynold, 1550), “Preface to the Reader.”

²⁸ John Hall, *The Courte of Vertu contayning many holy or spretuall songes sonnettes psalmes ballettes short sentences as well of holy scriptures as others* (London, 1565). The Stationer’s Register also records a work by Thomas Brice, *The Courte of Venus moralized* (London, 1567), but there are no surviving copies of this work. On this and other contemporary responses to the *Court of Venus* see Russell A. Fraser, ed., *The Court of Venus* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1955), 56-73.

²⁹ Edward Dering, *A Briefe and Necessarie Catechisme Or instruction* (London, 1572), “To the Christian Reader.”

³⁰ Arthur Golding, *The XV. Bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, entytuled Metamorphosis, translated oute of Latin into English meeter, by Arthur Golding Gentleman, A worke very pleasaunt and delectable* (London: Willyam Seres, 1567), ed. W. H. D. Rouse, *Shakespeare’s Ovid, being Arthur Golding’s Translation of the Metamorphoses* (London: De La Mare Press, 1904), “To the Ryght Honourable and his Singular good Lord, Robert Erle of Leycester; Baron of Denbygh, Knyght of the most Noble Order of the Garter, &c. Arthur Golding Gent. wisheth continuance of health, with prosperous estate and felicitie. The Epistle,” 1-13.

³¹ See Don Cameron Allen, *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), Chapter 7, “Undermeanings in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*,” 163-200, and Ann Moss, *Ovid in Renaissance France: A Survey of the Latin editions of Ovid and Commentaries printed in France before 1600*, Warburg Institute Surveys, VIII (London: Warburg Institute, 1982), 28-36, 44-53.

³² Golding, “The Epistle,” 1 (ll. 5-8). Cf. also Golding’s dedicatory epistle to his translation of the first four books, *The Fyrst Fovver Bookes of P. Ouidius Nasos worke, intituled Metamorphosis* (London: Willyam Seres, 1564), sig. [*I] verso, in which he commends the work as “purporting outwardly moste pleasant tales & delectable histories, and fraughted inwardlye with most piththie instructions & wholsome examples, and conteynyng bothe wayes moste exquisite connynge and deepe knowledge.”

³³ Golding, “Epistle,” 11-12 (ll. 541-2, 547-557).

³⁴ Golding, “Epistle,” 12 (ll. 561-564).

³⁵ Christopher Marlowe, *All Ouids Elegies: 3 Bookes. By C. M. Epigrams by I.D.* (?Middleburgh: n.d., but c. 1595-8), “*Elegia 5. Corinnae Concubitus*,” ll. 9-26.

³⁶ Sandra Clark, ed., *Amorous Rites: Elizabethan Erotic Verse* (London: J.M. Dent, 1994), xxviii.

³⁷ Thomas Lodge, *Rosalynde. Euphues golden legacie: found after his death in his Cell at Silexedra. Bequeathed to Philautus Sonnes nursed vp with their father in England. Fetcht from the Canaries, by T. L. Gent.* (London, 1590), ed. W. W. Gregg, *Lodge’s “Rosalynde” being the original of Shakespeare’s “As You Like It”* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1907), 80.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, “To the Gentleman Readers,” xxix.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 84.

⁴³ On Ixion as a figure of “cloudy delusion” in Petrarchan verse see Stephen Clucas, “Giordano Bruno’s *Degli eroici furori* and Fulke Greville’s *Caelica*,” *Renaissance Studies* 4.2 (1990), 201-227: 216-217.

⁴⁴ John Marston, *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion’s Image. And Certaine Satyres* (London: Edmond Matts, 1598).

⁴⁵ Marston, *Pigmaliions Image*, sig. A3 recto.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, “Argument,” sig. A4 recto.

-
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., “To his Mistres,” sig. [A5] recto.
- ⁴⁸ Marsilio Ficino, *Commentarium [...] in Convivium Platonis*, Oration II, cap. 7, trans. Sears Jayne (University of Missouri Press, 1944), Oration I, Cap. IV, 42, 132. [Page references for this work are for the Latin text and English translation respectively.]
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., Oration I, Cap. IV, 41, 131. “proper, pure and divine passions” (*decoris, honestis, divinis affectibus*).
- ⁵⁰ Marston, *Pigmaliions Image*, “The Authour in prayse of his precedent Poem,” 23.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 24.
- ⁵² Ibid., 25-6.
- ⁵³ Marston, *Certaine Satyres*, sig. C3 recto.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., sig. C4 recto.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., sig. D8 verso.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., sig. D2 recto.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., sig. D recto-verso. There is a possible allusion in “darknes palpable” to the preface of Chapman’s *Ouids Banquet of Sence* (1595), see n.50 below.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., sig. E4 recto-verso.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., sig. E3 verso.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., sig. D8 recto.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., sig. E4 verso.
- ⁶² On the problematic nature of Marston’s use of multiple personae and his “chameleon muse” see Cliff Forshaw, “‘All protean forms in venery’: The Textual and Apparitional Body in John Marston’s Verse Satires,” in Darryll Grantley and Nina Taunton, eds., *The Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000), 169-185, and idem, *The Chameleon Muse: Satirical Personae in the Formal Verse Satires of Marston, Guilpin and Others* (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1998).
- ⁶³ Marston, *Certaine Satyres*, sigs. E3 recto, D6 verso.
- ⁶⁴ George Chapman, *Ouids Banquet of Sence. A Coronet for his Mistresse Philosophie, and his amorous Zodiacke. With a translation of a latine coppie, written by a Fryer, Anno Dom. 1400* (London: I.R. for Richard Smith, 1595).

⁶⁵ Ironic, because in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Niobe is punished for her insistence on divinity which is accessible to the senses. See *Metamorphoses*, VI, 146-312, esp. 170-1: "What madness this, to prefer gods whom you have only heard of to those whom you have seen?" ("*quis furor auditos*", inquit, "*praeponere visis caelestes?*"). She dishonours the "dread divinity" (*numina divae*, VI, 315); Latona, the mother of Apollo and Diana, and her children are slain in revenge. Chapman's poem reinstates the priority of hearing (*auditus*) over sight (*visus*).

⁶⁶ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, "The Argument," sig. B recto.

⁶⁷ Ficino, *Commentarium*, Oration II, cap. VII, 49, 143.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, Oration VI, cap. VIII, 86, 193: "The love of the contemplative man ascends from sight into the mind; that of the voluptuous man descends from sight into touch." (*contemplativi hominis amor ab aspectu ascendit in mentem. Voluptuosi ab aspectu descendit in tactum.*) Ficino believed that the desire for touch was the "wantonness and derangement of a servile man" (*petulantiae [...] et servilis hominis peturbatio.*), Oration II, cap. IX, 52, 147.

⁶⁹ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, sig. [A4] recto.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, "I[ohn] D[auis] of the Middle Temple," sig. [A3] verso.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, sig. [A3] verso.

⁷² *Ibid.*, "Tho[mas] Williams of the inner Temple," sig. A3 recto.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, "To the Trvlie Learned, and my worthy Friende, Ma. Mathew Royden," sig. A2 verso.

⁷⁵ Barkan, 178, 182.

⁷⁶ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, sig. [E4] recto.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. A2 recto-verso.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. B2 recto.

⁷⁹ Barkan, 190. The scopophilic aggression of the viewer/reader is signalled in Chapman's imagery as an act of penetrative aggression: "he charg'd the Arbor with his eye, / Which pierst it through."

⁸⁰ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, sig. C2 recto: "sweet sounds and Odors, are the heauens, on earth / Where vertues live."

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, sig. B3 recto-verso.

⁸² *Ibid.*, sig. B2 verso.

⁸³ Barkan, 192.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 194-5.

⁸⁵ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Science of Logic*, trans. A. V. Miller (London: Allen & Unwin, 1969), 138-43.

⁸⁶ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, sig. B2 recto-verso.

⁸⁷ Ibid., sig. D recto.

⁸⁸ Jean Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge, 2 vols (Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1845, repr. 1970), III, iii, 520.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 524-5.

⁹⁰ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, sig. C2 verso.

⁹¹ Ibid., sig. D recto.

⁹² Ibid., sig. D3 recto.

⁹³ Ibid., sig. D4 verso.

⁹⁴ Ibid., sig. E2 recto.

⁹⁵ Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander* (1598), First Sestiad, ll. 197-330.

⁹⁶ Chapman, *Ouids Banquet*, sig. E verso: “Nicenes in civill favours, folly is.” Cf. her concession to the honourable kiss: “honor is not brusde / With such a tender pressure as a kisse” (sig. E verso), which was a commonplace of the “civil neoplatonism” of the cinquecento *Trattato d’amore*.

⁹⁷ Ibid., sig. E2 verso.

⁹⁸ Ibid., sig. E3 verso.