

R. W. MASLEN

Lodge's *Glaucus and Scilla* and the Conditions of Catholic Authorship in Elizabethan England

Thomas Lodge's poem *Glaucus and Scilla or Scillaes Metamorphosis* (1589) transformed the landscape of English poetry. On its publication, Elizabethan imaginative literature became a space dominated by metamorphoses: impossible mutations which mimicked the destabilising and collapse of moral certainties, customs and laws in contemporary culture by linking them to the most drastic of changes in the human body and mind. Lodge's poem declared the old ways of reading—which treated the Ovidian text as a treasure-house of immutable truths, capable of being unlocked through the application of certain intellectual keys or interpretative techniques—to be utterly redundant, rendered obsolete by the willingness of his contemporaries to redraw their intellectual, political and religious maps at the drop of a hat in the interests of self-advancement and sensory gratification. It is hardly surprising, then, to learn that the writer of the poem was a Catholic convert, whose career as an author was checked at the outset by a draconian act of censorship.¹ Lodge's estrangement from the English establishment, marked both by his distancing of himself from the national religion and by the prohibition of his first printed work by the national censors, found a voice in his account of Scilla's alienation from

human form; and this account in its turn gave a new poetic voice to the various forms of discontent being harboured in the breasts of educated young Elizabethans.

The claims I have just made for *Glaucus and Scilla* are, of course, exaggerated. For one thing, sophisticated “metamorphic” verse was already being written in English by the time Lodge wrote his poem. For another, the process of decoding Ovid’s verse was a good deal less rigid than I have suggested. But it has long been accepted that Lodge gave the Ovidian metamorphosis a vigorous new twist, helping to inaugurate a fashion for erotic verse narratives which lasted well into the following century, and which generated some of the finest Elizabethan poems: Shakespeare’s *Venus and Adonis* (1593), Marlowe’s *Hero and Leander* (1598), and Marston’s *Pygmalion’s Image* (1598).² In this essay I shall return to the old question of why Lodge’s poem and the fashion it inaugurated should have appealed so strongly to such a formidable array of talented writers. I shall argue that the poem does indeed play games with its Elizabethan readers’ preconceptions about the proper way to read a poem—above all with the familiar dictum that a poem should be as instructive as it is delightful. I shall also argue something more: that *Glaucus and Scilla* helped to consolidate the link between erotic narrative poetry and satire which had begun to be forged before Lodge started to write, and that it concerns itself (among other things) with what Annabel Patterson calls the conditions of authorship—questions of authorial liberty and constraint in Elizabethan England.³ These conditions were of urgent interest to every English poet, and Lodge’s poem proved beyond doubt that Ovidian erotic satire could address them with unrivalled subtlety and wit.

My reading of *Glaucus and Scilla* depends on a careful examination of its context, both in the body of Lodge’s work and in Elizabethan literary debates. The path I shall trace towards the poem may therefore seem indirect. But I hope that the new perspectives it offers on this neglected poet, and on the extraordinary dynamism of the literary scene

in England at the turn of the 1590s, will finally make the wandering steps of the journey seem worthwhile.

1. Lodge's *Defence of Poetry* and the uses of satire

The first of Lodge's surviving works is an energetic *Defence of Poetry* (c.1579), which contains some vital clues to his agenda as a poet, and above all to the thinking behind his long-term interest in satire. Lodge wrote the *Defence* in response to the most famous anti-theatrical tract of its time, Stephen Gosson's *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579), and its publication was forbidden at once by the Elizabethan censors.⁴ We don't know the real title of Lodge's essay, since both surviving copies lack a title page, as a result, one presumes, of the censorship to which it was subjected. And we don't know why it was censored. Lodge simply tells us that it was refused permission to be printed "by reason of the slendernes of the subject (because it was in defence of plaies and play makers)" (*Works* 1. 6).⁵ It seems reasonable to presume that his text fell victim to a vigorous campaign to control the theatre on the part of the city authorities.⁶ Still, the *Defence* achieved some limited circulation despite its suppression, and Gosson managed to get hold of a copy, albeit nearly a year after it was written. He answered it in the most rigorous of his anti-theatrical polemics, *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* (1582), which contains both a clever refutation of the *Defence* and a nasty slur on Lodge's personal reputation. Lodge responded to the slur in *An Alarum against Usurers* (1584) with some *ad hominem* vitriol of his own flung at Gosson; but he never again directly answered Gosson's attacks on poetry and drama.⁷

Never directly; but from one point of view, nearly every piece of imaginative writing he published had something to contribute to the debate. In *Playes Confuted*, for instance, Gosson delivered a devastating blow to Lodge's credentials as a scholar by showing that a quotation Lodge had ascribed to Cicero—"that a Play is the *Schoolmistresse of life; the lookinge glasse of manners; and the image of trueth*"—cannot

be found among Cicero's writings.⁸ Gosson went on to conclude that "a plaie, can bee no *looking glasse of behaviour*" and that "the rebuking of manners is as fit for the Stage, as the picture of Chastitie for the stues."⁹ Lodge's response was to write with Robert Greene a spectacular urban morality play called *A Looking Glasse, for London and Englande* (published 1598). In it the biblical prophet Hosea delivers a succession of tirades against the sins of the city of Nineveh—standing in for London—every bit as stern as the catalogue of theatrical abuses listed by Gosson. Here, then, was living proof that a play could serve as a "looking glasse of behaviour." In the same way, the only play Lodge wrote by himself might almost have been written to affirm that the theatre could supply the "image of trueth." *The Wounds of Civill War* (published 1594) is an account of the historical struggle between the Roman generals Marius and Sulla, and once again it obliquely mirrors current events in England: it has been interpreted as a response to "renewed anxieties over regal succession, Catholic plotting in the 1580s, dissension over the fate of Mary Stuart, and lower-class restiveness."¹⁰

Lodge's two plays, in fact, like most of his prose fiction and verse, corroborate his contention in the *Defence* that the ideal poetry is a form of satire, delivering scathing social commentary and blunt advice to the ruling classes in any given historical period. Lodge develops this view of poetry's function in the last section of his *Defence*; but it is implicit throughout. The essay opens with the usual list of classical authorities who have lent their endorsement to poetry. It then goes on to elaborate the familiar notion—common to apologists from Boccaccio to Bacon—that poetry teaches by way of allegory; and like both Boccaccio and Bacon he takes as his examples of allegorical figures the gods of the pagan pantheon:

in the person of Saturne our decaying yeares are signified; in the picture of angry Juno our affections are dissiphered; in the person of Minerva is our understanding signified, both in respect of warre as policie... So that, what so [the poets] wrot, it was to this purpose, in the way of pleasure to draw men to wisdom: for, seing the world in those daies was unperfect, yt was necessary that they like good

Phisitions should so frame their potions that they might be appliable to the quesie stomaks of their werish patients.¹¹

So far so predictable. But Lodge's poets are more concerned, as Gosson is, to stress the dangers of corruption than the attractiveness of virtue. (Indeed, the metaphor that closes the passage anticipates Lodge's eventual move from literature to medicine, from lancing moral sores through his writing to lancing physical sores as a physician). Later in the *Defence* Lodge argues that he and Gosson are on the same side, and that Gosson has wasted his energies in attacking imaginary theatrical abuses, when they would have been better spent in assailing the genuine forms of wickedness that infest the capital:

If therefore you will deale in things of wisdom, correct the abuse, honor the science, renewe your schoole; crye out over Hierusalem wyth the prophet the woe that he pronounced ... cry out against unsaciabie desyre in rich men; tel the house of Jacob theyr iniquities; lament with the Apostle the want of laborers in the Lords vineyards; cry out on those dume doggs that will not barke; wyll the mightye that they over mayster not the poore; and put downe the beggers prowde heart by thy perswasions.¹²

The passage neatly summarizes the plot of *A Looking Glasse, for London*, whose prophetic chorus Hosea moves from scene to scene delivering invectives against all the metropolitan misdemeanours Lodge has here listed.

Then, towards the end of the *Defence*, Lodge announces that this is just the sort of daring social intervention every responsible poet or playwright should engage in. They should make themselves latter-day Hoseas, crying out against the sins of the mighty and the proud. The history of the theatre, according to the *Defence*, is one of bold assaults on civic corruption; from the staging of "the lives of the Satyers" in ancient Greece, designed "so that they might wiselye, under the abuse of that name, discover the follies of many theyr folish fellow citesens," to the Greek comedies described by Horace: "For, sayth he, ther was no abuse but these men reprehended it."¹³ And Lodge recommends that

modern poets take up where the ancient satirists and comedians left off. He longs for the emergence of a new Lucilius¹⁴—the inventor of Roman satire, whose works (now lost) influenced Horace, Persius and Juvenal. Lodge yearns, that is, for a commentator capable of distinguishing good from evil in the complex environment of late sixteenth-century England.

Later in the *Defence* Lodge conflates comedy and satire with an ease that suggests he sees little difference between them: “if we had some Satericall Poetes nowe a dayes to penn our commedies, that might be admitted of zeale to discypher the abuses of the worlde in the person of notorious offenders, I knowe we should wisely ryd our assemblyes of many of your brotherhood.”¹⁵ At the same time he sees the satirist as particularly vulnerable in corrupt societies, pointing out that “as these sharpe corrections were disanulde in Rome when they grewe to more licenciousnes, so I fear me if we shold practise it in our dayes the same intertainente would followe.” The sentence is deliberately ambiguous; it could mean that satirical comedy was banned in Rome when *either* the stage *or* the city became excessively licentious. But the gist of his argument is clear: that opposition to satire, on the page or on the stage, is the sign of a decadent state. Gosson’s unease with plays stems not from genuine religious “zeale” but from his unwitting complicity with the decadence he claims to condemn.

In contemporary England as in ancient Rome, the lack of good satirical drama is attributable not to the corruption of the players but to the repressive nature of the regime under which they work. In Greece and Rome, Lodge explains, playwrights resorted to satirical comedy in order to avoid reprisals for conveying unwelcome truths to the ruling classes: “Menander dare not offend the Senate openly, yet wants he not a parasite to touch them prively. Terence ... dare not openly tell the Rich of their covetousnesse and severity towards their children, but he can controle them under the person of Durus Demeas.”¹⁶ In Elizabethan London, by contrast, playwrights are too cowed to produce even “privy” comic attacks on corruption:

surely we want not a Roscius, nether ar ther great scarcity of Terence's profession, but yet our men dare not nowe a dayes presume so much, as the old Poets might, and therfore they apply ther writing to the peoples vain; wheras, if in the beginning they had ruled, we should now adaies have found smal spectacles of folly.¹⁷

In other words, it is the Gossonian enemies of the theatre themselves who are responsible for its sorry moral condition under Elizabeth I.

2. *An Alarum against Usurers: satire in action*

Lodge's next publication after the *Defence*, *An Alarum against Usurers*, reads like a more or less systematic effort to put the precepts of the *Defence* into practice.¹⁸ Its relevance to the dispute with Gosson is suggested by its dedication. Like Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse* and his *Apologie of the Schoole of Abuse* (1579), it is dedicated to the man who later came to be known as the pre-eminent Elizabethan apologist for poetry: Philip Sidney. But where Spenser claimed that Gosson was "scorned" for dedicating the *Schoole of Abuse* to Sidney,¹⁹ Lodge's dedication of the *Alarum* exudes a sense of confidence in its reception by its dedicatee, placing the text under Sidney's "undoubted protection" and hoping for the "continuaunce" of his favour in future.²⁰ Perhaps Lodge's confidence arose from his knowledge of Sidney's literary interests: the second part of the *Alarum* consists of a short romance reminiscent of the *Old Arcadia* (c. 1580). The first part, on the other hand—the part that gives the pamphlet its title—follows Lodge's advice to Gosson in the *Defence* by attacking what Lodge takes to be a genuine abuse in London, as opposed to the imagined abuses Gosson detected in the theatre. The abuse is the practice among usurers of lending money on ruinous terms to spendthrift young gentlemen. The pamphlet proposes a number of legal sanctions to put an end to this abuse, and ends by pronouncing a severe judgement on moneylenders modelled on the thunderous compositions of the Old Testament prophets. As we have seen, Lodge's *Defence* defines satire as "sharpe correction," and it is possible that he considered this first part of the

Alarum as his first serious exercise in satire, a preliminary bid to establish himself as the new English Lucilius.

The prose narrative that follows shows, by contrast, how mistaken Gosson is in directing his scorn against amorous fictions, whether in poetry, prose or drama. The young couple Forbonius and Prisceria—whose ancestry alludes to the impeccably ancient credentials of romance, being descended from the hero and heroine of Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*—make no bones about the sexual nature of their mutual attraction. At one point, indeed, Forbonius woos Prisceria by means of a long erotic poem, which is both Lodge’s first imitation of Ovid and one of the first imitations of the scandalous *Amores* in the English language.²¹ But the couple remains as impenitent about their desire as Sidney’s Pyrocles; and by the end of the narrative they have succeeded in converting the older generation to their point of view with a facility which is unparalleled in the canon of Elizabethan romance. The heroine’s father, who is fiercely opposed to the match, catches the hero in the act of courtship, imprisons him, then undergoes a sudden change of heart: “weyghing with my selfe that it is vaine to alter that which is prefixed by destynye... I yeelde thee thy love to injoye in chast wedlocke, and whereas thou lookedst I should bee thy tormentour, loe I am nowe contented to be thy unlooked for Father.”²² Prosecution of “chast” love and its fictions, Lodge implies, is a waste of time, a manifestation of a diseased imagination which needs reformation more urgently than the harmless desires it seeks to extirpate.

Better targets for attack are set up in the poem that forms the last part of the pamphlet. This is a post-medieval complaint, closely reminiscent of the most influential satire of the previous decade, George Gascoigne’s *The Steele Glas* (1576). The form of the two poems is different—Lodge’s is written in rhyme royal, like some of the satires of Skelton and the complaints in the *Mirror for Magistrates*, while Gascoigne’s is in blank verse—but their subject and tone are more or less identical. So too are the circumstances of their composition. The volumes in which the poems appear open with strenuous

protests against the writer's treatment at the hands of his enemies. Gascoigne's dedication alludes to the public reaction to his two collections of poems, the *Flowres* (1573) and the *Posies* (1575), which eventually led to the censorship of the *Posies*: "I am derided, suspected, accused, and condemned: yea more than that, I am rygorously rejected when I proffer amendes for my harme;"²³ while Lodge's contains a self-defence against "that reproch, which, about two yeares since, an injurious caviller [i.e. Gosson] objected against me."²⁴ Gascoigne's *Steele Glas* goes on to allegorise the reception and censorship of the *Posies* at some length. It is narrated by an allegorical figure, Satyra, who complains of having suffered the same fate as Ovid's Philomela: Satyra was ravished by a corrupt nobleman, Vain Delight, then had her tongue cut out to prevent her reporting his crimes. Nevertheless, she continues to sing "with the stumps of my reprov'd tong"²⁵ in hope of reforming English society by telling the truth in spite of censure. Gascoigne seems to be suggesting that those who accused his collection of licentiousness were reading their own sexual obsessions ("vain delight" or delight in vanity) into his innocent productions. He seems, too, to imply that he is first and foremost a satirist, and that those who regard him as an erotic writer who "ment a common spoyle / Of loving dames, whose eares wold heare my words / Or trust the tales devised by my pen"²⁶ are radically misrepresenting his texts. This is perhaps what led Lodge to imitate Gascoigne's poem, as another writer whose innocent text, the *Defence*, had been punitively silenced. Lodge may also have been attracted by Gascoigne's association of *The Steele Glas* with the "famous old satyricall Poete" Lucilius.²⁷ Nobody knew exactly what Lucilius' lost satires were like, but Gascoigne's poem explicitly sets itself up as a model for aspiring future Lucilians by allying itself with the poet who had provided a model for Horace and Juvenal.

The title of Lodge's poem, *Truths Complaint over England*, makes the same claim to authenticity that Gascoigne made in his satire, when he contrasted the old-fashioned "steel glass" of the title, which "shewde al things, even as they were in deede," with the flattering and expensive crystal glass preferred by most contemporary Englishmen, which

“shewes the thing, much better than it is.”²⁸ At the centre of *Truths Complaint* is an allegorical figure reminiscent of Gascoigne’s Satyra, Truth, who instructs the melancholy poet to set down her words with the aid of the tragic Muse Melpomene. Truth is concerned, like Satyra, to expose one by one the misdemeanours of the court, the nobility, the commons and the legal system, together with the religious hypocrisy that infects English society. The abuses Truth exposes in each of these estates are for the most part those delineated by Gascoigne’s satire: the self-indulgence of the aristocracy and their excessive fondness for flattering “showes”; the promotion of faint-hearted soldiers instead of courageous ones; the corruption of the law by greed, and of the church by “wily worldlings.” The form of Lodge’s poem—the complaint was a distinct and well-established form at the time—seems at first sight to set it apart from Gascoigne’s; but *The Steele Glas* was published alongside a stanzaic poem, *The Complaynt of Phylomene*, whose opening situation closely resembles that of *Truths Complaint*, and whose retelling of the story of Philomene connects it with the blank verse satire that precedes it. Lodge’s imitation of Gascoigne’s composite volume is a faithful one, and knowledgeable Elizabethan readers could have been expected to recognize the source of its inspiration.

Having said this, certain details in the poem are distinctively Lodge’s own. Whereas Satyra had included the tendency to be “Romainlike” among the vices of the church,²⁹ Truth’s poem ends with a thinly-veiled allusion to English Catholics (“those would mend the misse,” that is, those who would restore the Mass,³⁰ as guardians of the faith. And unlike Satyra, Truth’s dismay is such that she departs from the island, like the one true Catholic church, at the end of the poem.

Forbonius and Prisceria and *Truths Complaint over England* are the first of the many imaginative treatments of tyranny that span Lodge’s literary career. These extend from the tyrannies of Marius and Sulla in *The Woundes of Civill War* to that of Rasni king of Nineveh in *A Looking Glasse, for London and England*; from the “cruell Queen” who drowns Elstred and Sabrina in *The Complaint of Elstred* (1593) to the despots who

set Lodge's romances in motion: King Torismond of France, who forces Rosalind into exile in *Rosalynde. Euphues Golden Legacie* (1590); Robert the Devil, second Duke of Normandy in the romance of that name (1591); and the Emperor Arsidachus of Peru, who dies after executing an insane welter of murders at the end of *A Margarite of America* (1596). *Truths Complaint* is also—in its extensive use of marine metaphors—the first of a succession of Lodge's works that proclaim his close affinity with the sea. These range from *Rosalynde*, which he describes as “the fruits of his labors that he wrought in the *Ocean*,” to the poetry collection *Phyllis* (1593), composed “Amidst this watrie world, where now I saile,” from *A Margarite of America*, which he wrote on board ship “in those straits christned by Magelan,”³¹ to the scenes involving Jonah in the *Looking Glasse*, which contain a detailed account of the reluctant prophet's forced conversion at sea from fugitive to divine messenger. In Lodge's literary works, then, the “teares lyke Ocean billowes”³² of unhappy exiles (and nearly all his works contain exiles) transmute themselves into quasi-satirical laments or meditations on the abuse of power, exactly as they do in *Truths Complaint over England*. And in recent years the peculiarly Catholic sensibility that informs these laments and meditations has been productively explored by scholars.³³

I would like to suggest that *Glaucus and Scilla* is another of Lodge's efforts to establish himself as the English Lucilius. It is a sophisticated experiment in a new form of satire, which fuses apparently disparate elements from his earlier collection, *An Alarum against Usurers*—the love story and the complaint—as well as anticipating his imitations of Horatian satire in *A Fig for Momus* (1595) (the book that started the vogue for satire in the late 1590s, just as *Glaucus and Scilla* started the vogue for erotic narrative poetry at the beginning of the decade). It is a particularly subtle piece of social comment, the target of whose “sharpe correction” is not at once obvious. Indeed, this may be one of the things that made the new form so popular in the following decade—that it had a vibrant life of its own above and beyond the issues that occasioned it, and that it could therefore be

given a range of topical or imaginative applications. But I believe its first readers would have seen at once that the poem occupied a satiric *milieu*, albeit of an unfamiliar variety. And its success in creating a new verbal weapon for mischievous wits to wield against the Elizabethan authorities is amply demonstrated by the outpouring of more openly satirical epyllia that followed its publication.

3. Reading *Glaucus and Scilla*

The plot of Lodge's *Glaucus and Scilla* is simple enough. A wandering poet meets the distraught sea-god Glaucus, who tells him of his frustrated desire for the sea-nymph Scilla. Glaucus's mother intercedes with Venus on his behalf and persuades her to erase the smart of unrequited love from her son's breast. Scilla is then punished for her disdain by being smitten with hopeless yearning for the now indifferent Glaucus; and the poem ends with her transformation into a monster, a kind of animate rock.

The handling of the plot, on the other hand, is highly complex. The simple story is extended into a minor epic nearly eight hundred lines long, full of orations, elaborate rhetorical figures, and mythological references, all directed to a common end: that of playfully manipulating the reader's emotions, senses and intellect. Most commentaries on the poem have tended to address themselves almost exclusively to the techniques by which the poem manipulates its readers, without paying much attention to the possible *motives* for the abrupt emotional shifts to which those readers are subjected. My contention here is that the poem has another function besides that of witty titillation: that it purveys a particularly uneasy kind of wisdom, a wisdom fundamentally at odds with conventional contemporary moralising. In Lodge's terms quoted earlier from the *Defence*, it conceals certain deeply distasteful medicinal "potions" which it aims to render "applicable" to the "quesie stomaks" of its readers. In this section, I hope to trace some of the clues it affords as to its hidden medicinal function.

For an Elizabethan reader, the first clues to the poem's underlying motives may have lain in the scene with which it opens, where the narrator encounters a deeply afflicted mourner, who proceeds to tell his story. Lodge used the same opening scene in several other poems, and in nearly every case it was in the service of complaint. As John Peter pointed out long ago, the complaint mode has close affinities with satire, taking advantage of the licence traditionally accorded to mourners to speak out against forms of injustice and oppression.³⁴ It seems fitting, then, that two of Lodge's complaint poems should have been read by recent commentators as trenchant critiques of Elizabethan society from a Catholic perspective. One of these poems (written in six-line stanzas, like *Glaucus and Scilla*), *The Discontented Satyr*, appeared alongside *Glaucus* in the volume *Scillaes Metamorphosis*, and Andrew Hadfield has described it as an "attack on the vagaries of life in over-centralized Elizabethan England."³⁵ The other is *Truths Complaint over England*, which, as Alison Shell notes, "uses the myth of the Golden age as a foil for present ills," and whose "Catholic sympathies are ... overt at the end."³⁶ A third poem that shares both its stanza form and elegiac opening with *Glaucus and Scilla* is a historical verse narrative called *The Complaint of Elstred*, which Lodge appended to his sonnet-sequence *Phyllis* (1593), on the model of Samuel Daniel's celebrated verse narrative *The Complaint of Rosamund* (1592). Lodge's text tells the story of a woman who suffers at the hands of the English monarchy, first forced into sexual slavery by the King of England, then drowned in the river Severn, along with her innocent daughter Sabrina, by a vengeful English Queen. Milton used the story in *Comus* as part of his ongoing project to mythologise the resistance to tyranny in history, and as I've suggested, Lodge's treatment of it fits neatly into the gallery of portraits of tyranny and its effects which he was assembling throughout his literary career. Elstred tells her tale as part of what she calls the "Annals of mishap," an alternative history of England written by the victims of the powerful, and a volume "Wherein woe-tempted men may reade their fortune: / Since all are subject to the selfe like trap."³⁷ One suspects that Elizabethan

Catholics in particular might have been inclined to read their own fortunes in the story of Elstred's persecution and death.

In each of these complaints Lodge lays unusual stress on the parallels between the situation of the male narrator and that of the complainant, parallels which predispose him to sympathise with the complainant's predicament. The narrator of *Truths Complaint* indicates that he was singled out to write down Truth's words because he shared her distress, tormented as he was by "melancholy grieffe, / Which in my heart at that time had the cheefe."³⁸ The narrator of *The Discontented Satyre* encounters the woodland creature of the title when "My watchfull griefes perplext my minde so sore,"³⁹ while the *Complaint of Elstred* finds its narrator "lamenting" in a suitably miserable setting. *Glaucus and Scilla*, too, opens with a mournful narrator "Walking alone (all onely full of grieffe),"⁴⁰ and gives this grief as the reason why the still more grief-stricken Glaucus chooses to unburden his heart to him. The unusual thing about the poem, though, is that the narrator shifts his sympathies in the course of the narrative from the male complainant Glaucus to Scilla, the nymph who is punished for his sake. It is the tension produced by his efforts to reconcile these two incompatible acts of sympathy that makes the poem so intriguing.

Like *The Complaint of Elstred*, Lodge's *Glaucus and Scilla* is set in England; but unlike *Elstred* it does not take ancient Britain or British history as its subject. Instead it relocates the classical gods and goddesses in Northwest Europe, transplanting them geographically as well as linguistically to Lodge's native soil. This was nothing new: by the late 1580s, the English were well used to tracing links between pagan mythology and the political past and present of their own nation. I have already discussed Gascoigne's transference of the Philomene myth from ancient Greece to modern England in *The Steele Glas* (1576). Exactly ten years later, William Warner reminded the English, in the first instalment of his Ovidian epic *Albions England* (1586), that their rulers were descended in a direct line from the lascivious monarchs who had been deified by the Greeks and

Romans.⁴¹ During the intervening decade John Lyly had begun to entertain the royal court with an Ovidian drama full of gods, nymphs, and metamorphoses, which anatomised the emotional and political climate under Elizabeth I with startling incisiveness.⁴² In each of these cases the importation of the classical gods to England constituted a decidedly backhanded compliment to the author's nation. The presence of Philomene in England presupposed the presence there of her royal rapist, the tyrant Tereus, while Warner's association of the uproarious exploits of Jupiter and his relatives with the English monarchy was at times little short of scandalous. But it was Lyly's comedies in particular, and the peculiar atmosphere they diffuse of cool eroticism combined with the threat of incipient violence, that contributed most to the imaginative landscape of Lodge's poem.

The play of Lyly's that comes closest to *Glaucus* is *Gallathea*, which was entered in the Stationer's Register in 1585, although the first surviving quarto dates from 1592. Here as in *The Steele Glas* and *Albions England* the pagan gods have moved to England; but the relationship between them and their English subjects is very far from amicable. The sea-god Neptune—traditional ally of the seafaring islanders—has conceived a seemingly implacable rage against them for their iconoclastic demolition of his temples, and this leads him first to drown the land, then to demand the annual sacrifice of “the fairest and chastest virgine in all the Countrey” to a monster of his called Agar (1.1.42-43).⁴³ Cupid, too, exploits less powerful beings for his own cruel amusement as he wanders through the English forests disguised as one of Diana's followers. He plots to “use some tyranny in these woodes” (2.2.9-10), and mischievously causes two girls disguised as boys to fall in love with one another, while each is adored in her turn by Diana's nymphs, who are sworn to chastity. And Diana, the moon-goddess closely associated with Elizabeth I, tyrannises both over her nymphs (who must abjure desire for her sake) and over Cupid (whom she seizes and tortures for his temerity in wreaking havoc among her entourage). In this comedy, then, the gods are locked into a cycle of

competing forms of tyranny, whose most extreme manifestations are the sacrifice of virgins—effectively a form of sexual violence, as Michael Pincombe has argued⁴⁴—and the forcible suppression of sexual desire. Lyly seems to be drawing attention to one of the strangest paradoxes of Elizabethan culture both in and beyond the royal court, which is that elements of this culture are dedicated to the erasure of desire, while other equally powerful elements dedicate themselves to unleashing it in all its lawless fury. The play ends with the two elements embodied by Diana and Venus being uneasily and temporarily reconciled through the intervention of Neptune; but the prospects for a lasting peace do not look good.

In *Gallathea* tyranny manifests itself, as it often does in Lyly's plays, in the silencing of oppositional voices. At the beginning of the play, when the girl Gallathea seeks to know more about the fate of the virgins sacrificed to Neptune, her father replies that "it is not permitted to knowe, and encurreth danger to conjecture" (1.1.55-56). When Diana captures Cupid she tells him "I will bridle thy tongue and thy power" (3.4.89); and when Venus finally confronts the goddess of chastity she describes her as the ultimate kill-joy, a kind of female Gosson who throttles the freedom of the young to speak of love: "This is shee that hateth sweete delights, envieth loving desires, masketh wanton eyes, stoppeth amorous eares, bridleth youthfull mouthes, and under a name, or a worde constancie, entertaineth all kinde of crueltie" (5.3.29-32). Diana, in fact, sets herself against precisely the sort of amorous goings-on that are the life and soul of Lyly's comedy, and she admits as much in reply: the "untamed affections" of the goddess of love, she claims, "have bred more brawles in heaven, then is fitte to repeate in earth" (5.3.40-41). Diana's point of view, if taken seriously, would make the play she is in impossible, since *Gallathea* depends on "repeating" a number of the "brawles" encouraged by Venus. Indeed, Diana is antagonistic to dramatic dialogue itself. "I say there is nothing more vaine, then to dispute with *Venus*," she begins, and later adds cattily: "It is knowne *Venus*, that your tongue is as unrulie as your thoughts ... *Diana*

cannot chatter, *Venus* cannot chuse” (5.3.39-56). Lyly’s comedy therefore has no choice but to side with the libertarian and verbally effusive *Venus* against her censorious, tongue-tying rival, and it closes with a witty critique of the courtly *Diana*, Elizabeth I herself, who demanded strict sexual self-control from her courtiers and ladies-in-waiting. “Yeelde Ladies,” *Gallathea* recommends in the epilogue, “yeeld to love Ladies, which lurketh under your eye-lids whilst you sleepe, and plaieth with your hart strings whilst you wake: whose sweetnes never breedeth satietie, labour wearinesse, nor greefe bitterness” (5-8). Not for the last time Lyly is comparing his work to an amorous daydream, where the boundaries that separate sleep from waking, nocturnal desire from daytime action, have been briefly relaxed in defiance of the Elizabethan moralists.

Gallathea ends, then, by mounting what is in effect a spirited defence of drama in general, and of the comic genre in particular. Perhaps this is why it caught the eye of the dramatist Lodge, who had been stung by the censorship of his own defence of drama. *Glaucus and Scilla* deposits its pagan gods, as the play does, on the banks of an English river—in the poem it is the Isis, in the play the Humber. Its chief complainant is one of Neptune’s sons, the sea-god Glaucus; and it ends, like *Gallathea*, with the intervention of the goddess *Venus*. In Lodge’s poem, however, *Venus*’ intervention is not unproblematically benevolent. She steps in not to disseminate love more widely, as Lyly’s *Venus* does—who changes the sex of one of the heroines to enable her to marry the girl she loves—but to exact a terrible vengeance on the nymph who has failed to yield to Glaucus’ blandishments; and the grief of *Scilla* with which the poem ends is decidedly tainted with “bitternesse.” Lodge is as interested as Lyly in the relationship between tyranny and desire, but he is a good deal less optimistic about the possibility of finding a happy resolution to the problems generated by their convergence. Perhaps his pessimism stemmed from his position as a Catholic, debarred from entering the courtly world of sexual politics that was being so productively explored by the author of *Euphues*. Was it the poet’s exile from the charmed circle of the court that plunged him into gloom before

the beginning of his narrative? If so, his gloom could only have been compounded by his own evident skill in entering the Ovidian imaginative territory that was currently dominating court culture.

It seems likely, then, that Lodge's decision to imitate Ovid would have helped to associate his poem with the very highest echelon of Elizabethan society. But the decision may also have been prompted by the marked aversion of his enemy, Stephen Gosson, for the Roman poet. Ovid's scandalous stories about the erotic exploits of the gods supplied Gosson time and again with instances of poetic irresponsibility. His observations (in the *Ars amatoria*) about the function of the theatre as a pick-up point for unattached youngsters prompted Gosson to denounce the Elizabethan playhouse as a neo-Roman "Market of Bawdrie."⁴⁵ And for Gosson, the erotic education furnished by the *Ars amatoria* makes Ovid the ultimate "Amarous Scholemaister,"⁴⁶ whose poetic schoolhouse has lured generations of his scholars into a life of reckless sexual self-indulgence.

Lodge responds to Gosson's anti-Ovidian utterances on several occasions in his *Defence of Poetry*. At one point he suggests that Gosson's objections to Ovid show, quite simply, that "he can beare no bourde"⁴⁷—he can't take a joke. At another, Lodge acknowledges that "Ovids abuses" constitute "the greatest bob [i.e. the most telling blow against poetry] I can gather out of your booke;"⁴⁸ but he adds that the appropriate response to the mild misdemeanours committed by Ovid was not to exile the poet, as Augustus did, but to reform him.⁴⁹ Finally, Ovid supplies Lodge with the last quotation in his *Defence of Poetry*, an allusion to the benefits of peace,⁵⁰ as opposed to the perpetual war against England's enemies which Gosson urges on his readers at the end of *The Schoole of Abuse*. By taking its theme from the *Metamorphoses*, *Glaucus and Scilla* proclaims its status as Lodge's last word in his verbal running battle with the anti-Ovidian Gosson—published exactly ten years after the battle began.

As if in homage to Ovid's exile from Augustan Rome, the poem contains at least two acts of banishment: first when Scilla tells Glaucus "Packe hence, thou fondling, to the westerne Seas,"⁵¹ and next when Scilla flees from Glaucus' presence at the end of the poem. Ironically, however, the love-sick sea-god is banished not to live among the barbarous Geats but to take up residence in England, thus confirming Gosson's fear that Mediterranean sensuality had begun to contaminate English culture, while Scilla's exile is her punishment for adopting a stance Gosson would thoroughly have approved of. Lodge's mimicry of the trendiest and most up-to-date poetic mode available to him shows just how far Gosson's resistance to sensual poetry and drama has been overtaken by the advancing tide of fashion. In this poem the very landscape of England is lascivious, reaching out to molest the naked bodies of lovers who recline on it, passionately responding to the passions they utter. The classics may have taken up residence in Elizabeth's kingdom, but in the process they have transformed it into the eroticised landscape of early modern Italy.

As I have already suggested, Lodge seems decidedly ambivalent about this triumph of the pagan gods over his native country. His careful cultivation of ambivalence can best be seen in the changes he made to the story of Glaucus as Ovid told it. In the *Metamorphoses* Glaucus was an ordinary fisherman, transformed into a sea-god when he consumed a potent herb.⁵² In Lodge's poem, by contrast, his pedigree is impeccably divine. The goddess Thetis is his mother, and it is Glaucus, rather than Scilla as in Ovid, who is surrounded at all times by a throng of affectionate nymphs, and who has his clothes tailored, his hair dressed, and herbal remedies applied to him when he is sick, by his hordes of female admirers. Lodge similarly converts Scilla from a mortal girl to an immortal sea-nymph, and surrounds her with besotted Tritons. Lodge's Glaucus and Scilla, then, are members of the oceanic aristocracy; but Glaucus clearly has an immensely superior social position, as the royal offspring of Neptune and the "Queen of

Sea.” And Glaucus’ courtly provenance has a direct bearing on the most significant change Lodge makes to the *Metamorphoses*: his removal of Circe from the story.

Circe was, of course, the enchantress who transformed Ulysses’ companions into swine in the *Odyssey*. In Elizabethan England a “Circean transformation” described the process of succumbing to sensual self-indulgence to which young travellers were thought to be peculiarly susceptible, by reason of their exposure to foreign customs and values. The humanist Roger Ascham, for instance, compares the effects on young gentlemen of travel in Italy to the “inchantementes of *Circes*,” transforming them into the likeness of beasts and alienating them forever from their English Protestant heritage.⁵³ And he goes on to suggest that Italian literature can cast as potent a Circean spell over its readers as any Italian sojourn. Gosson agrees wholeheartedly with Ascham, who is in many respects his mentor. He describes modern English poetry as “the Cuppes of *Circes*, that turne reasonable Creatures into brute Beastes,”⁵⁴ since Elizabethan poets have imported foreign values into England by their imitation of foreign poetic and dramatic forms. (Circe’s foreignness is as important to him as her magic, since the Elizabethans never forgot that Ulysses encountered her *on his travels*.) The removal of Circe from a tale in which she had once played a prominent role was therefore a highly significant gesture on the part of an Elizabethan poet—especially one who had been involved in defending poetry against allegations such as Gosson’s.

In the *Metamorphoses*, Glaucus requests Circe to use her art to make Scilla love him. Unfortunately, the enchantress falls in love with Glaucus herself, and uses her enchantments to convert Scilla into a monster rather than a lover. But in Lodge’s version it is Glaucus’ mother, the sea-nymph Thetis, who seeks a remedy for her son’s unrequited affection, and it is to her fellow monarch Venus that she turns for help. Venus responds by instructing her own son Cupid to erase “fancy” from the sea-god’s heart, then makes Scilla fall in love with the fancy-free immortal. In Lodge’s version of the story, then, the nymph’s transformation into a monster is engineered not by a single vindictive

enchantress but by a conspiracy of goddesses; not by a foreigner but by Glaucus' powerful extended family; not by the personification of poetic abuse but by the closed ranks of the classical pantheon, whose link with the Elizabethan ruling classes had been repeatedly affirmed in contemporary poetry and court drama. Here Circean metamorphoses are not the exclusive province of a small coterie of irresponsible poets writing under foreign influence, as they were for Gosson. Instead they are a legitimate weapon of the ruling elite, part of the arsenal by which they protect their ascendancy. And to write about such metamorphoses, Lodge implies, is to write about the relationship between poetry and power in Elizabethan England.

4. *Glaucus and Scilla* as tragicomic satire

At stake in the narrative Lodge unfolds is a question of genre. Is Scilla's metamorphosis a comic or a tragic one? The question is implicit in the title page of the volume where the poem first appeared. Lodge (or his printer) offers us "Scillaes Metamorphosis: Enterlaced with the unfortunate love of Glaucus. Whereunto is annexed the delectable discourse of the discontented Satyre: with sundrie other most absolute Poems and Sonnets.

Contayning the detestable tyrannie of Disdaine, and Comicall triumph of Constancie: Verie fit for young Courtiers to peruse, and coy Dames to remember."⁵⁵ Whoever wrote that title page chose their terms with care. The problems of who might most aptly be described as a tyrant, or as the personification of Disdain or of Constancy, are those we are left puzzling over when we have finished reading *Glaucus and Scilla*; and although the other "most absolute Poems and Sonnets" mentioned on the title-page invite us to continue puzzling over the same issues, none is as deeply involved in them as this is. In *Glaucus and Scilla*, as in nearly all his literary works, Lodge concerns himself with competing versions of history: with how the fluctuating fortunes of the key players in any given historical event will determine the manner in which that event is recorded for posterity. (This concern is highlighted by the poem's full title in the body of the book:

here it is “The most pithie and pleasant *Historie* of Glaucus and Silla”).⁵⁶ In *The Wounds of Civill War*, for instance, the term “tyrant” is switched with dizzying rapidity from Marius to Sulla and back again, until by the end it has become little more than a rhetorical weapon wielded by rival factions against one another. The key term on the title-page of *Scillaes Metamorphosis*, however, is not “tyrannie” but “Comicall.” For whom, and at what point, do Scilla’s metamorphosis and the unfortunate love of Glaucus become comic? Is the term more constant than the term “Constancie,” which seems as difficult to apply to the poem’s hero as to its heroine (or indeed to anyone else in Lodge’s volume)? The poem begins and ends with elaborate expressions of sorrow, and it is these more than any other element which urge the reader to think hard before deciding precisely what about the text makes it “Verie fit for young Courtiers to peruse, and coy Dames to remember.”

As I have said before, the opening finds the solitary narrator wandering along the banks of the Thames “all onely full of grieffe;”⁵⁷ and commentators have tended to assume that the grief in question is love-induced, like that of the sonneteer in *Phyllis*. But although this seems quite plausible (a few sonnets about Phyllis are included at the end of *Scillaes Metamorphosis*) Lodge is careful to imply that the narrator’s grief is also symptomatic of a more general malaise. The princely narrators in the *Mirror for Magistrates* are invariably melancholic because of the vagaries of fickle fortune, and when Lodge’s narrator meets Glaucus in the second stanza the sea-god offers him consolation as appropriate for an unhappy magistrate or a disaffected recusant as for a jilted lover. “Thy bookes,” he says, “have schoold thee from this fond repent, / And thou canst talke by prooffe of wavering pelfe: / Unto the world such is inconstancie, / As sapp to tree, as apple to the eye.”⁵⁸ Glaucus goes on to summarize the Pythagorean doctrine of mutability which is most fully developed in Book XV of the *Metamorphoses*: “Take moist from Sea,” he declares, “take colour from his kinde, / Before the world devoid of change thou finde.”⁵⁹ But where Pythagoras’ doctrine is finally optimistic—any change

for the worse is finally redressed by a change for the better, no living creature ever dies— Glaucus’ vision of change is a depressing one, following a downward trajectory “From high to lowe, from better to the bad.”⁶⁰ As if in confirmation of this tragic vision, the English landscape in the poem, though sensuous, is impregnated with melancholy: earth, sea and air share the misery of the text’s successive mourners. Brief flashes of delight, as when the “weedes and sallowes” sing to celebrate the approach of the sea-nymphs near the beginning,⁶¹ swiftly give way to returning sadness, as nightingales and other “pencie birds” melodiously sympathize with the mood of the gods and goddesses gathered on the banks of the Isis.⁶² It is easy enough to see how such pervasive sorrow would have chimed in with the thoughts of the solitary wandering Catholic of the poem’s opening.

But Glaucus, it seems, is not content with enjoining the narrator to resign himself to the mournful fact that change for the worse is endemic in nature. Instead the sea-god urges him to stop weeping on his own account and to dedicate his lamentations to the service of Glaucus: “Then mourne no more, but moane my haples state.”⁶³ The poet is being enlisted, in fact, as an elegist for the divine royal family. This is the first of several moments in the poem when Glaucus insists that his own point of view be the dominant one, and where he demands that the narrator commit himself to acting as his secretary and official historian. In this mythical alternative England, Glaucus assumes that there is a clear hierarchy of worthwhile objects of sympathy: the griefs of a prince are more considerable, more worthy of protracted contemplation than those of a mere subject, and deserve articulation as a subject’s griefs do not. And at this point the poet seems wholly in accord with Glaucus’ point of view: “I ... Comparing his mishaps and moane with mine, / Gan smile for joy and drie his drooping eyne.”⁶⁴ The scene is set for the unfolding of the sea-god’s complaint, with a sycophantic poet poised to write it down verbatim.

Next moment, however, the scene is interrupted by the arrival of a bevy of sea-nymphs, all of whom seem well acquainted with love melancholy of the kind experienced by Glaucus, but who are less inclined to take it seriously. On arrival they arrange

themselves “on the grassie grounde” to exchange their own beguiling tales of love.⁶⁵ One nymph sings a love-complaint, but so well that Love himself is “forced... to love her;”⁶⁶ another pricks herself on a thorn while listening to a nightingale, which prompts two more to crack a few puns about the pricks women yearn for and get hurt by.⁶⁷ And the conclusion reached by these “jollie Dames” concerning love and the world’s mutability is cheerful. Where Glaucus told the poet (anticipating Spenser) that the world is declining “from better to the bad,” the nymphs concur with the more balanced view of Ovid’s Pythagoras: “That while some smile; some sigh through change of time; / Some smart, some sport amidst their youthlie prime.”⁶⁸ For the sea-god’s tragic view of existence they substitute a comic one, where smiles and sighs, pain and pleasure are equally mixed. The clash of genres is implicit in the contrast between Glaucus’ solitude, attended only by a convenient amanuensis, and the sea-nymphs’ lively sociability. For a moment one is tempted to assume that the distinction between these two perspectives, the comic and the tragic, is simply one of personal preference.

Glaucus, however, is quick to insist that his own perspective should prevail over that of the nymphs. The English landscape responds to the nymphs’ arrival with erotic excitement: “The watrie world to touch their teates doo tremble,” while “The flowres themselves... woed [them] with so much glee, / As if they said, sweet Nymph come gather mee.”⁶⁹ But Glaucus hastens to reduce this landscape once again to drab conformity with his depressive state by means of a string of pathetic fallacies (“The flouds doo faile their course to see our crosse”), and a collection of allusions to unfortunate lovers (Venus and Adonis, Angelica and Roland, Aurora and Cephalus), among which his own “tragicke storie”⁷⁰ deserves pride of place. In comparison with these tragedies, he claims, the sea-nymphs’ misfortunes in love are trivial: “tender Nymphes, to you belongs no teene.”⁷¹ This minor epic belongs to Glaucus, and he stakes his claim to it with all the self-confidence of a spoiled princeling.

Remembering *Gallathea*, one might even think there was a touch of tyranny about Glaucus' conviction of his own pre-eminence. The sea-god's account of his grief culminates in a prediction that the sky will weep so abundantly in sympathy with him that Deucalion's flood will come again, "And shippes shall safely saile whereas before / The ploughman watcht the reaping of his corne."⁷² The passage might have reminded Lodge's readers of the awesome power of the sea which Scilla is defying. In the first book of the *Metamorphoses* Deucalion's flood was unleashed by Neptune, Glaucus' father; and the same flood was invoked at the beginning of Lyly's *Gallathea* as a reminder of the destructive force of Neptune's wrath: "then might you see shippes sayle where sheepe fedde, ankers cast where ploughes goe, fishermen throw theyr nets, where husbandmen sowe theyr Corne" (1.1.28-30). These associations make Glaucus' complaints about his powerlessness ring hollow. Sea-gods in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* were hardly inclined to accept the passive resignation of the Petrarchan lover, and Neptune in particular was a serial rapist. At the centre of Lodge's poem, then, is a tension between Glaucus' Petrarchan rhetoric, which induces him helplessly to "plaine my Scillaes pride and want of pittie,"⁷³ and his Ovidian provenance, which allows him a free hand to take what he desires by force. At this stage he is content to play the role of Petrarch, or of one of Ovid's feebler lovers such as Narcissus: he invents fine Ovidian paradoxes ("A mortall wound is my immortall being")⁷⁴ and allows the women present to administer medicines to him unavailingly. But his genetic heritage and his arrogant self-obsession guarantee that he will not be content to remain in this role forever.

Another of the poem's tensions manifests itself soon afterwards, when Glaucus begins, at the sea-nymphs' invitation, to unfold the story of his unfortunate love for Scilla. From its opening the poem has paid lip service to the medieval tradition of *Ovide moralisé*, which read the *Metamorphoses* as an encyclopaedic instruction manual, teaching lessons in moral and natural philosophy to readers of all ages by way of its allegorical stories of the pagan gods.⁷⁵ Elizabethan schoolmasters continued to teach their

pupils to read the *Metamorphoses* as a fount of moral instruction, undeterred by its eroticism. As we have seen, Glaucus first enters the poem speaking like a schoolmaster as he rebukes the poet for his grief (“Thy bookes have schoold thee from this fond repent”); but he fails to take his own advice, plunging at once into self-indulgent wallowing in his misery. Later, one of the sea-nymphs brings him Moly, the herb whose properties protected the traveller Ulysses from the enchantments of Circe:⁷⁶ but the herb is powerless to rescue him from his “fancies fond”, leaving him (by implication) as bestial as Ulysses’ companions, whom Circe turned into pigs. Glaucus’ narration of his love for Scilla finally confirms his awareness that he has abandoned the moral stance he adopted at the beginning, and that he is less capable of controlling his physical instincts than a beast. At this point Lodge seems to be going out of his way to confirm Gosson’s ill opinion both of Ovid and of Lodge himself, adding fuel to the fire of disapproval in which his *Defence* had been consumed. The difference is, this time his anti-Gossonian text has all the hallmarks of a royal entertainment; and Lodge reminds us of this by placing his most outrageously erotic passage in the mouth of a member of the royal family—albeit a fictional one. Glaucus, who began by posing as the poem’s moral spokesman, ends by lending his weight and the protection of his status to the poet’s right to cater for the pleasure rather than the profit of his readers.

The sea-god’s story opens with an extended allusion to a piece of the “unnatural natural history” so beloved of the mid-Elizabethan poets, concerning geese who fill their beaks with stones to keep themselves silent when flying close to the haunts of their natural enemies, the eagles.⁷⁷ The story comes from Plutarch’s essay *De garrulitate* (“Of intemperate speech or garrulity”),⁷⁸ and is designed to show the importance of bridling one’s tongue to prevent oneself getting into trouble. Glaucus uses it to castigate himself for his own relative lack of “sense,” his failure “By due foresight misfortune to prevent,” as the geese do, and for letting his “too judiciall eyes” take precedence over his reason.⁷⁹ It sounds here as though Glaucus is once again in schoolmaster mode, moralising on his

own misfortunes. But the moral lesson is soon swept away by the long and sensuous *blazon*⁸⁰ with which he illustrates the operation of those “too judicall eyes.” The blazon recalls the long erotic poem in the middle of *Forbonius and Prisceria*, which modelled itself not on the *Metamorphoses* but on Ovid’s scandalous *Amores*. It follows the usual rhetorical pattern of itemising Scilla’s features one by one, working downwards from the top of her head; but unlike the conventional *blazon* it stops not at the feet but at the genitals, “Whose lovely Nectar dooth all sweetes surmount.”⁸¹ Here Glaucus ends his description because “Lovers must thinke, and Poets must report them;”⁸² but he could hardly have been more explicit about the aspect of Scilla that has disastrously caused his “fancie” to overthrow his reason.

From this point on, Glaucus abandons all pretence at paying lip service to moral instruction. He ceases to bemoan his own loss of the good sense possessed by the stone-carrying geese, and turns instead to vilifying Scilla for refusing to gratify his lust: “For where I thought my fancie should be feasted... When first I woode, the wanton straight was flying.”⁸³ And in doing so, the sea-god exposes once and for all the double standards by which he lives. On the one hand, he is horrified by his own enslavement to “fancies fond deceit,” denouncing love “which wit and reason blinds.”⁸⁴ On the other, he accuses Scilla, who is free from “fancie” (“fancie from this bosome late is fled,”⁸⁵ she tells him) of being scornful, wanton, false—the personification of disdain—simply for repulsing his advances. In one breath he calls Scilla blameless: “May none be blande but heaven for all these doings;” in the next he loads her with blame for his predicament (her “falsehoode wrought my smart”).⁸⁶ Glaucus has finally lost his capacity for seeing the affair from any angle but his own. And the admiring train that surrounds him—consisting of nymphs and the poet—seem to share this incapacity, the former pouring forth literal streams of tears (“of their teares there grew a pretie brooke”), the latter weeping in sympathy as the sea-god dozes on his bosom.⁸⁷ When in the next stanza the poet requests his Muse to lend him “feeling words” with which to bring his tragic story to a conclusion

(“Delays in tragicke tales procure offences”),⁸⁸ the reader must assume that the tragedy he means is that of Glaucus.

But at this point the poem undergoes an abrupt change of mood—thus manifesting in its own form the innate changefulness Glaucus (and Ovid) identified in nature. The train of Glaucus’ admirers is suddenly swollen by the arrival of more deities. First comes his mother Thetis, Queen of the Sea, who fruitlessly enjoins him once again to forget Scilla and live “by reasons levell still,”⁸⁹ as befits his royal status. Then after a ritual incantation Venus arrives with Cupid, who instantly agree to Thetis’ request that they “Assist poor *Glaucus* late by love undone.”⁹⁰ Cupid shoots Glaucus with the arrow of disdain, and the sea-god rises at once from his melancholic prostration, “Revivde, relievd, and free from Fancies cup.”⁹¹ Tragic laments turn to comic festivities—as the poet puts it, “Within my heart a sodein joy did move”⁹²—and the company of immortal women once again flocks around the recovered prince, extending hearty congratulations on his constancy as a lover (“*Venus* praised him for his faithfull love”)⁹³ at the very moment when he gives love up.

If the narrative had ended here, we might leave with a sense that Glaucus’ dilemma had been neatly (if somewhat oddly) resolved, all parties satisfied. But of course it does not. The Queen of the Sea and the Queen of Love cannot rest easy without taking revenge on the nymph “that so contemneth love, / As no attempts her lawles heart may move.”⁹⁴ Thetis demands “rightfull justice” on her, and Cupid strikes her with “such a shaft as causd her endles smart.”⁹⁵ This is neither a necessary development nor a satisfactory one. Scilla has only been “lawles” in the sense that she has refused to let herself be overruled by the sea-god’s demands—she has effectively resisted rape, like the girls in *Gallathea* who disguise themselves as boys to escape being sacrificed to Neptune’s monster—and “rightfull justice” has only been served in that the two queens have slaked their thirst for revenge. Cupid’s action produces a situation quite as unjust as the one he was supposed to be rectifying: Scilla now hopelessly loves a sea-god who has

taken on her former role as the personification of “disdaine.”⁹⁶ The poet comments on this neat swapping of roles in a punning stanza that once again mimics the complex web of paradoxes woven by Ovid:

Oh kisse no more kind Nimph, he likes no kindnes,
 Love sleepes in him, to flame within thy brest;
 Cleer’d are his eies, where thine are clad with blindnes;
 Free’d be his thoughts, where thine must taste unrest:
 Yet nill she leave, for never love will leave her,
 But fruiteles hopes and fatall happes deceave her.⁹⁷

The puns remind us that in the unequal world of the pagan gods, translated in this poem to the shores of England, it is inevitable that one person will start loving when another leaves off, that kindness will meet only its opposite, that the “clearing” of one set of eyes will involve the “cladding” (obscuring) of another, that hopes will be countered by “fatall happes.” And for women such as Scilla there is no redress. They cannot turn to more powerful gods or queens for assistance, as the princely Glaucus could. As a subject, Scilla is condemned to perpetual torment more irrevocably than the sea-god ever was.

Elizabethan readers would not, I think, have been blind to the satirical significance of this act of divine injustice. I’ve already pointed out that the episode represents Lodge’s most significant departure from his source in the *Metamorphoses*, replacing the agency of Circe in Scilla’s transformation with an unholy alliance between Thetis, Venus and Cupid. In fact, his account of the punishment meted out to Scilla recalls one of John Lyly’s most popular comedies, *Sapho and Phao*, which elaborately compliments Elizabeth I.⁹⁸ In it the chaste poet-queen of Sicily, Sapho, falls in love with the beautiful ferryman Phao, then manifests her power over desire itself by seizing control of the little love-god Cupid and taking over Venus’ function as the goddess of love (“You are not worthy to be the Ladye of love,” she tells her, “that yeelde so often to the impressions of love” 5.2.58-60). Hereafter, she declares, the dispensation of desire

will be a royal prerogative: “Every rude asse shall not say he is in love” (5.2.94-5). Venus has earlier stocked Cupid’s quiver with a variety of arrows intended for sundry purposes, including one “which striketh a deepe disdain of that which we most desire” (5.1.8-9). Lodge’s Cupid similarly carries a quiver “well stored / With sundrie shaftes,”⁹⁹ which he dedicates exclusively to the service of queens; and the shaft he uses to quench Glaucus’ desire for Scilla is “the arrowe of disdaine.”¹⁰⁰ In Lodge’s England, the implicit claim of Lyly’s Queen Sapho to be capable of dispensing affections with rationality and temperance is undermined by the willingness of both queens in the poem to exploit Cupid’s arsenal for a personal vendetta. His characters are as helplessly subject to metamorphosis as the inhabitants of the Ovidian universe, but their changes are governed by the mood-swings of volatile monarchs, and only royalty has the power to determine when all changes come to an end.

For Lodge’s Scilla, change ends when she finds herself locked in a hopeless obsession for a disdainful prince; and the cessation of her hopes for further change is signalled by the fact that her former lover undergoes metaphorical petrification long before she does. Glaucus sits “starke as stone”¹⁰¹ beneath the desperate nymph’s attempts to woo him; her pleas for mercy are answered only by the mockery of the echoing rocks. When at the end of the poem the nymph herself becomes a rock (“hir locks / Are chang’d with wonder into hideous sands, / And hard as flint become her snow-white hands”),¹⁰² this merely literalizes the effects on the unfortunate nymph of the closure of all channels of communication by Glaucus. And this in turn gives the metamorphosis a very different function from that of Ovid’s Scilla, who was transformed by Circe from motives of jealousy, leaving the infatuated sea-god inconsolable. The indifference of Lodge’s Glaucus anticipates the rock-like incapacity for pity of Queen Gwendolen in *The Complaint of Elstred* as she oversees Elstred’s drowning, “A ruthles rocke, deaf-eared.”¹⁰³ The cessation of change marks the beginning of tyranny; and tyranny consists above all, in Elizabethan representations of it, in an imperviousness to the appeals of

suffering subjects. Indeed, Scilla's suffering stems chiefly from her gradual loss of the ability to appeal, as her pleading is reduced to inarticulate yells; first by the mocking repetition of them by Echo, then by her own transformation into the eye of a cacophonous tempest ("The waters howle with fatall tunes about her ... The winds and waves with puffes and billowes skout her").¹⁰⁴

The difference between Scilla's position at the end of the poem and Glaucus' at the beginning could hardly be more pronounced. Glaucus was entertained by the melodies of nymphs, where Scilla is shunned by "Nimphes, Sea-gods, Syrens when they list to smile,"¹⁰⁵ and surrounded by din instead of music. Glaucus was exiled to a fertile and populous Western island, England, where Scilla finds herself banished to the desolate coast of Sicily. Glaucus was repeatedly urged to speak—by nymphs, by his mother, by the poet—as a remedy for his suffering, while nobody but the poet is genuinely interested in Scilla's complaints. And Glaucus *did* speak, with eloquence and at considerable length, from the moment when he met the poet at the beginning to the moment when he accompanied him "hand in hand" on a dolphin ride to visit Scilla's final destination.¹⁰⁶ For all his asseverations about the futility of speech ("Heart, tongue, thought, pen nil serve me to repent me;" "But short discourse beseemes my bad successe"),¹⁰⁷ Glaucus' domination of the poem's rhetoric has its desired effect, winning over first the poet, then the nymphs and finally Cupid to his faction. By the end, Glaucus and his relatives, friends and subjects—even the Tritons who once admired Scilla—are united in cheerful celebration of his recovery. And Scilla has been effectively silenced. Her voice has been practically written out of this account of her transformation. We could be forgiven for having forgotten what Glaucus told us earlier, that "Scilla in wit surpasseth grave Sibilla," and that "Scilla hath words, but words well storde with grutching."¹⁰⁸ The "tyrannie of disdaine," as the title-page of Lodge's volume puts it—in this case, the disdain of the powerful—has expunged her from history.

The one *articulate* voice of dissent in this cheerful conclusion is that of the poet. At the point when the protagonists' fortunes reverse themselves and Scilla is afflicted with hopeless love, the poet transfers his sympathies from Glaucus to Scilla. As Glaucus moves into comic mode the poet follows Scilla's descent into the tragic; her wretchedness, he says, "did hartely agreeve me,"¹⁰⁹ he longs to see her attain "the end whereto disdain [i.e. Scilla] aspired," and her misery rapidly extends itself from the narrator ("Rue me that writes, for why her ruth deserves it")¹¹⁰ to the reader ("Wofull that read what wofull shee approved").¹¹¹ Glaucus notices that the poet remains "pencie" amidst the general rejoicing,¹¹² and characteristically intervenes to ensure that he will participate in the closing celebrations—will become a team player, as it were. He helps him onto a dolphin so that he can join in the new spectator sport of following Scilla to laugh at her. And he advises him to articulate his grief in public, as Glaucus has done, since "secret want can finde but small befriending."¹¹³ Of course, Scilla's want—her desire for Glaucus—is hardly a secret, and she has found "but small befriending" by uttering it. It would seem that there are right and wrong ways of publicising one's discontent with the state of things; the time, place and manner in which one does so are all-important, as Glaucus' parable of the geese should have taught us. And the poet, at least, seems to have learned something from the parable; for the end of the poem is a masterpiece of ambiguity, a skilful exercise in the articulation of discontent (a favourite word of Lodge's) under the guise of consent to the demands of an overbearing authority.

Despite Glaucus' best efforts, the poet continues to set himself apart from the comic conclusion until the final stanza. As the sea-god throws a feast in Neptune's palace and squirts out fountains for the refreshment of his allies, the poet sits aside to "write this storie / With many a sigh and heart full sad and sorie."¹¹⁴ When the party is over, Glaucus turns his attention to him once more, supplying him with a dolphin taxi home and eliciting promises from him to write henceforth only what the sea-god permits him to write. "[B]y oath he bound me," the poet tells us, "To write no more, of that whence

shame dooth grow: / Or tie my pen to Pennie-knaves delight, / But live with fame, and so for fame to wright.”¹¹⁵ For the second time in the poem it looks as though Glaucus is recommending the abandonment of an unhealthy fascination with sex in favour of more elevated interests. But the lines could just as easily be read as an injunction to stop writing texts designed to appeal to a popular readership (“Pennie-knaves” are those who pay pennies for printed matter) and to write instead for the rich and famous. The poet is being told to stop writing texts like those Lodge had earlier penned in defence of the popular theatre, or of romantic love, or of the Truth that has been exiled from his country, and to write instead in defence of the values held dear by the court. And this second reading seems to be supported by the “Envoy” with which the poem ends. Glaucus himself instructs the poet to append the Envoy (it contains only what “he wild me tell you”), and its moral is a long way from the humanist commendation of sense over sensuality. It states simply

That Nymphs must yeeld, when faithfull lovers straiie not,
Least through contempt, almightie love compell you
With Scilla in the rockes to make your biding
A cursed plague, for womens proud back-sliding.

In Lodge’s mythological England, love may be enforced by compulsion if you have power to direct the actions of the little god. The Envoy reads like a cynical pastiche of the epilogue of Lyly’s *Gallathea*, which besought the ladies in the audience to “yeeld” willingly to love because his playful presence is never far from their sleeping or waking minds. Lodge’s epilogue, by contrast, is governed by verbs of constraint (“he wild me,” “nimphs must yeeld,” “Least... love compell you”), which convert Lyly’s appeal for a blissful surrender to desire into a succinct acknowledgement of the ability of the powerful to punish those who will not surrender. The threat of rape hung over *Gallathea* but was finally dispelled in the play’s comic ending. In Lodge’s poem, on the other hand, the

threat of a “cursed plague” for those who spurn the demands of their superiors takes centre stage in the final stanza, leaving an unpleasant taste in the mouths of those who might have expected a more genial comic conclusion.

The Envoy hardly reflects well on the pagan court that has set itself up on England’s shores in the course of the poem. It articulates a philosophy quite the reverse of a “moral,” a philosophy that does nothing to cure the poet of the depression from which he was suffering at the beginning of the poem. “At last he left me, where at first he found me,”¹¹⁶ Lodge explains: leaves him, that is, in a kind of internal exile within England, a condition many Catholics must have felt themselves to share. His only consolation is that he has found, in the narrative he has been allowed to tell, an accurate representation of his own alienation: an alienation imposed on him for his refusal to conform to the unreasonable demands of his superiors, and for his superiors’ refusal to accept his own protestations of loyalty. Scilla may have been rendered voiceless; her efforts to lament her condition may have been “mocked” by the very “Ecchoes in the rockes / Of Sicilie,”¹¹⁷ as Venus’ grief would later be mocked by Echo in Shakespeare’s Ovidian epyllion; but the poet has given her misery full voice in his astonishing allegorical representation of her descent into emotional breakdown. The celebrated stanzas¹¹⁸ in which he describes a swarm of allegorical furies rising from “Ditis den” to torment her, in obedience to the pettily vindictive commands of the classical gods, suggest that the poet identifies with her fate more fully than ever he did with that of Glaucus. In Glaucus’ case we merely heard the sea-god’s account of his own sufferings. In Scilla’s, her emotions themselves are brought to life and paraded in a dazzling Spenserian procession before our mind’s eye, from the fire-breathing Fury with “hands and armes ibath’d in blood” to Wan-hope sitting on his broken anchor “Wringing his armes as robbed of his witts.”¹¹⁹ In these stanzas the tongueless woman has been made to speak, the powerless subject placed at the story’s centre, and the vengeance of the powerful rendered in deeply unflattering colours. Disaffected Englishmen of all faiths

and parties may have felt as they read that Lodge had here found a vital new way to critique the ruling elite of Elizabethan England without succumbing a second time to the enforced silence of censorship.

The poet's sympathy with a voiceless, cruelly tormented woman aligns him with George Gascoigne's poet in *The Steele Glas*, whose identification with Philomela paradoxically enables him to voice his opposition to the sort of tyranny that had censored his work. As Gascoigne's satirist puts it:

And thus (my Lord) I live a weary life,
 Not as I seemd, a man sometimes of might,
 But womanlike, whose teares must venge hir harms.
 And yet, even as the mighty gods did daine
 For *Philomele*, that thoughe hir tong were cutte,
 Yet should she sing a pleasant note sometimes:
 So have they deignd, by their devine decrees,
 That with the stumps of my reproved tong,
 I may sometimes, *Reprovers* deedes reprove,
 And sing a verse, to make them se themselves.¹²⁰

Glaucus and Scilla takes its place alongside Gascoigne's *Steele Glas* as an item in what *The Complaint of Elstred* calls the "Annals of mishap." We might also call this body of writing the "Literature of Discontent:" a series of poetic texts devoted to the goddess Discontent, who presides over the poem that follows *Glaucus and Scilla* in the volume *Scillaes Metamorphosis*, "The Discontented Satyre." The goddess Discontent is invoked by the Satyr of the poem's title explicitly as an alternative to the moon-goddess Cynthia, Elizabeth's alter-ego. So, too, the poetry of Discontent labours to articulate "Truth" as Catholics saw it, not as the followers of the earthly Cynthia would have it. Truth was exiled from England, like the Catholic Church, at the end of Lodge's poem *Truths Complaint over England*. But she left behind certain available techniques for alluding to her, for use by her few remaining English adherents. One of these techniques is that of

Ovidian satire; the kind of oblique social commentary bequeathed to the world by the most prominent poetic exile of the reign of Augustus.

Notes

¹ The date of Lodge's conversion to Catholicism is not known, but Alison Shell, among others, assumes that it was "secret and prolonged." See *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 77. For a summary of the evidence concerning his early conversion, see George Alan Clugston's edition of Lodge and Greene's *A Looking Glasse for London and England* (New York: Garland, 1980), introduction.

² For a discussion of Shakespeare's debt to Lodge, see John Roe, "Ovid 'renascent' in *Venus and Adonis* and *Hero and Leander*," in A. B. Taylor, ed., *Shakespeare's Ovid* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 31-46.

³ The reference is to Patterson's celebrated book, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press, 1984). I have begun to explore the link between Ovidian poetry and satire in two previous essays: "Myths exploited: the metamorphoses of Ovid in early Elizabethan England," in Taylor 15-30; and "*Venus and Adonis* and the Death of Orpheus," in *The Glasgow Review* 1 (1993), 67-78. The latter may be traced by hyperlink through the website of the Department of English Literature, University of Glasgow.

⁴ I have found no satisfactory account of the censorship of Lodge's text apart from Lodge's own in *An Alarum against Usurers*, quoted below.

⁵ *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge*, 4 vols. (Glasgow: Hunterian Club, 1883), 1. 6. Unless otherwise indicated in the notes, references to Lodge's works are taken from this edition. References allude first to the number of the volume in which the work appears, followed by the page number of individual works (in this edition each work is paginated separately).

⁶ For a recent account of censorship practices in Elizabethan London, see Richard Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2000), especially chapters 1, 2 and 4.

⁷ For an account of the controversy between Lodge and Gosson, see Arthur F. Kinney, *Markets of Bawdrie: The Dramatic Criticism of Stephen Gosson* (Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1974), introduction. All references to Gosson's works are to this edition.

⁸ Kinney, 159. In fact it was attributed to Cicero by Donatus at the beginning of his essay on comedy, which was attached to many sixteenth-century editions of the works of Terence. See O. B. Hardison *et al.*, eds., *Medieval Literary Criticism: Translations and Interpretations* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1974), 41, 45.

⁹ Kinney, 167.

¹⁰ David Bevington, *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 234.

¹¹ G. Gregory Smith, ed., *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1904), 1.66. All references are to this edition.

¹² *Ibid.*, 1.77-78.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 1.80-81.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.81.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.82.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1.83.

¹⁸ The fullest account of *An Alarum against Usurers* is that of Arthur F. Kinney, in *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 368-72.

¹⁹ See Smith, 1.89.

²⁰ Lodge, 1.3.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1.70-76.

²² *Ibid.*, 1.83.

-
- ²³ John W. Cunliffe, ed., *The Complete Works of George Gascoigne*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 2.135. All references are to this edition.
- ²⁴ Lodge, 1.5.
- ²⁵ Gascoigne, 2.146.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.144.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.148.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.147-48.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.168.
- ³⁰ Lodge, 1.40.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 1.7, 2.8, 3.3.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 1.37.
- ³³ See e.g. Alison Shell on *Truths Complaint over England* (Shell, 178-80); and Andrew Hadfield on *Rosalynde*, in *Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 187-92.
- ³⁴ See John Peter, *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956); also John Kerrigan, *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and "Female Complaint:" A Critical Anthology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), introduction.
- ³⁵ Hadfield, 188.
- ³⁶ Shell, 179.
- ³⁷ Lodge, 2.83.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.37.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.31.
- ⁴⁰ Elizabeth Story Donno, ed., *Elizabethan Minor Epics* (New York: Columbia University Press and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), 21, stanza 1. All references to *Glaucus and Scilla* and *Scillaes Metamorphosis* are taken from this edition, giving the number of the stanza from which quotations are taken.

⁴¹ See my brief account of Warner's poem in "Myths exploited: the metamorphoses of Ovid in early Elizabethan England," Taylor, 27-8.

⁴² See Michael Pincombe, *The Plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

⁴³ See R. Warwick Bond, ed., *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), 2.433. All references to Lyly's works are taken from this edition.

⁴⁴ See Pincombe, *The Plays of John Lyly*, 126: "It is here that the tragical theme of rape receives its fullest and most lurid treatment;" and Ch.6, 129-45.

⁴⁵ For Gosson's reference to the *Ars amatoria* see Kinney, 86. For the phrase that gives Kinney's book its title, see 92.

⁴⁶ Kinney, 86.

⁴⁷ Smith, 1.64.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.75.

⁴⁹ "I like not of an angrye Augustus which wyll banishe Ovid for envy. I love a wise Senator, which in wisdom wyll correct him, and with advise burne his follyes," 1.76.

⁵⁰ Smith omits this quotation in his edition: see Lodge, 1.47.

⁵¹ Donno, 63.

⁵² For the full story see Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, XIII, 730-7, 898-968, and XIV, 1-74.

⁵³ Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (1570), in W. A. Wright, ed., *Roger Ascham: English Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 225. For Ascham's views on Italian literature and travel, see my *Elizabethan Fictions: Espionage, Counter-Espionage and the Duplicity of Fiction in Early Elizabethan Prose Narratives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), introduction and Ch. 1.

⁵⁴ Kinney, 77.

⁵⁵ See Lodge, 1.1.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.7.

⁵⁷ Donno, 1.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., 9.

⁶² Ibid., 19.

⁶³ Ibid., 7.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 8.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 11.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 13.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 15.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 16.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 10, 17.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 19, 20.

⁷¹ Ibid., 28.

⁷² Ibid., 29.

⁷³ Donno, 30.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 32.

⁷⁵ On available early modern readings of the *Metamorphoses* see Sarah Annes Browne, “Arachne’s Web: Intertextual Mythography and the Renaissance Actaeon,” in Neil Rhodes and Jonathan Sawday, eds., *The Renaissance Computer: Knowledge Technology in the Age of Print* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 120-34; and my essay “Myths exploited.”

⁷⁶ Ibid., 34.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 39-43.

⁷⁸ *De garrulitate*, 510A.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 39, 48.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 48-53.

⁸¹ Ibid., 53.

⁸² Ibid., 54.

⁸³ Ibid., 55.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 70, 64.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 63.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 58, 60.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 71, 72.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 73.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 76.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 81-83.

⁹¹ Ibid., 91. “Fancies cup” is presumably a reference to what Gosson calls “the Cuppes of *Circes*” (77), containing the mixture of wine and potent herbs by which she administers her enchantments. See *Odyssey*, X, 233-243.

⁹² Ibid., 94.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 97.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 99.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 102, 107.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 103.

⁹⁸ On the popularity of *Sapho and Phao* see Pincombe, 18.

⁹⁹ Donno, 88.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 102.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid., 103.

¹⁰³ Lodge, 2.79.

¹⁰⁴ Donno, 124.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 125.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 113.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 58, 62.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 31.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 106.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 109.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 110.

¹¹² Ibid., 113.

¹¹³ Ibid., 114.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 128.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 130.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 116.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 120-24.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 120-22.

¹²⁰ Gascoigne, 2.146.