

Reading by Pieces:
Heliodorus, Sir Philip Sidney, and the Model of Romance

Abstract: In *The Model of Poesy*, William Scott asserts that Sir Philip Sidney ‘did imitate’ Heliodorus’s *Aethiopika* in ‘the general gate of conveyance’ when he wrote *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*. Sidney’s engagement with Heliodorus’s fourth-century prose fiction has long been recognised, especially in relation to the revised and composite versions of the *Arcadia* that appeared in print during the 1590s. Nevertheless, the close relationship between Heliodorus and Sidney’s text has rarely been viewed in the broader context of the *Aethiopika*’s sixteenth-century reception and has never been taken seriously as an instance of literary imitation. This essay returns to Renaissance debates over the propriety of prose epic to explore the background to Sidney’s *Defence of Poesy* and *Arcadia*, and examines neglected sources on the *Aethiopika* which shed new light on how Heliodorus was reconciled with existing systems of poetics. The discussion explores how Sidney’s education in European Protestant circles taught him to think about literary imitation in ways that made him especially receptive to other sixteenth-century approaches to the *Aethiopika*, and proposes that he saw *imitatio* and *mimēsis* as closely connected. In addition, it considers how Scott used Heliodorus’s text as a critical tool with which to read the *Arcadia*, and suggests that Martin Crusius may have exerted a subtle yet significant influence on the *Model*. Finally, in showing how the *Arcadia* adapts the narrative form of Heliodorus’s text, the essay assesses the intricacy of Sidney’s imitative technique.

I

Yet sometime tell I lesse, and often more,
Then read is in Greek Prose of *Heliodore*:
That Poetrie may shorten Oratorie,
And with a Muses vaine improve the Storie.¹

So writes William Lisle in the proem to his 1631 versification and translation of Heliodorus’s *Aethiopika*. Lisle’s lines throw into focus much of what follows, even as they assert taxonomic distinctions between ‘Poetrie’ and prose (‘Oratorie’) which the *Aethiopika* had proved so useful in helping earlier authors to explode. Translating prose into verse, Lisle judges himself to ‘improve’ upon his model by accommodating its style to his ‘Muses vaine’, while also reworking the text through edits and embellishments, thus situating his work at the uneasy intersection between translation, imitation, and original poetic endeavour. In more subtle ways, his lines also suggest the spatial terms on which the dilatory circumlocutions of Heliodorus’s prose were liable to be judged – in this case, ‘shorten[ed]’ – both visually, as lines of printed text on the page, and as narrative discourse.

Like Abraham Fraunce's 1591 versification of the *Aethiopika*'s opening scene, which he included in *The Countess of Pembroke's Yvychurch*, Lisle's Heliodorus was published during an English vogue for the text that had gathered pace following the death of Sir Philip Sidney and the publication of his works during the 1590s.² In a manner not unlike Thomas Churchyard (who produced, in 1595, a set of 'notes' from *The Defence of Poesy* rendered into rhymed quatrains),³ these works exhibit meagre interest in the theoretical purposes to which Sidney had put the *Aethiopika*, both in the *Defence* and in *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*. Yet Heliodorus was a key point of reference for Sidney, and central to his conception of epic poetry as 'heroicall' matter narrated either in verse or prose: for 'it is not ryming and versing that maketh a poet', he writes, but 'that faining notable images of vertues, vices, or what els'.⁴ The position taken by Sidney has long been recognised as a contribution to sixteenth-century debates, both in humanist commentaries and in vernacular works of poetics, over Aristotle's use of the words 'λόγοις ψιλοῖς' in his definition of 'ἐποποιία' in the *Poetics*.⁵ Thus, Francesco Robortello claims that 'epic poetry uses language either in prose [*soluto*], or bound in verse', while Pietro Vettori, refusing to take Aristotle's words to refer to prose, identifies poetry exclusively with verse.⁶ Returning to these primary sources, however, Sidney's decision to cite the *Aethiopika* (alongside Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*) as an 'absolute heroicall Poeme' (C2v) comes into focus as a more radical turn than previous criticism has acknowledged – for Heliodorus was not adduced by the commentators as a writer of prose epic during Sidney's lifetime, and when he was eventually cited (by Francesco Patrizi in 1587) he was in fact used to disclaim the inclusive definition of epic that had been advanced by others.⁷

Taking these remarks in the *Defence* as its starting point, this essay reconsiders Sidney's relationship towards Heliodorus and argues that the *Arcadia*, in its revised form, ought reasonably to be viewed as an imitation of the *Aethiopika*. After all, it was with printed

versions of this revised text – as opposed to the ‘old’, original *Arcadia* (probably completed c. 1580) – that most of Sidney’s readers during the 1590s and subsequent decades were familiar, and about which they formed their views regarding the work. In his 1599 treatise *The Model of Poesy*, William Scott makes clear to his reader the terms on which he believes the *Arcadia*’s debt to Heliodorus should be viewed, with a shrewd gesture to its structural arrangement: ‘I think it plain’, he writes, ‘that Sir Philip Sidney in the general gate of conveyance did imitate him’.⁸ Yet Sidney’s modern critics have largely been reticent to characterise the same relationship in such direct terms. John Hoskyns’s frequently-quoted remark that Heliodorus provided part of the ‘webb’ of Sidney’s ‘storie’ is echoed by Lee Samuel Wolff’s delightful (if vague) description of the *Aethiopika* as ‘the loom’ on which the ‘old’ *Arcadia* was re-woven,⁹ while elsewhere it is variously described as a ‘pattern’,¹⁰ ‘source’,¹¹ or ‘model’¹² by which Sidney was ‘influenced’¹³ or from which he ‘borrowed’.¹⁴ Victor Skretkowicz calls the *Aethiopika* an ‘influence on structure and ethos’, yet even this account stops short of identifying the revised *Arcadia* as an imitation, and ultimately limits its discussion to parallel episodes in the two works.¹⁵

It is not difficult to see how this position came about. Histories of classical reception tend to be shaped, at least in part, by existing conceptions of the classical canon – and, despite more than thirty years of renewed attention to Greek prose fiction, it remains the case that Heliodorus is only now coming of age. There remains much work to be done: the *Aethiopika* is absent from the Oxford Classical Texts series, and there is still no Loeb. Nevertheless, owing to vital work by Tim Whitmarsh, Nicholas Lowe, and others, the *Aethiopika* can once more be viewed (as it was during the Renaissance) as a major classical text, replete with stylistic idiosyncrasies and narrative complexity.¹⁶ I propose, therefore, to take seriously Scott’s claim for Sidney as an imitator of Heliodorus. He was not alone in his view. Gervase Markham, observing that Sidney drew ‘honie’ from the *Aethiopika*, deploys an apian

metaphor central to classical theories of imitation,¹⁷ while in 1640, André Mareschal – who adapted the *Arcadia* for the French stage – asserts the affinity between the texts and their authors when he refers to Sidney’s *chef-d’oeuvre* as ‘l’Helyodore d’Angleterre’.¹⁸

Writing fifty years ago, A. C. Hamilton stands apart from most modern scholars when he calls the *Arcadia* a ‘close imitation’ of Heliodorus.¹⁹ It is the purpose of this essay to consider the processes involved in closely imitating this author, and how the *Aethiopika*’s narrative techniques and formal properties manifest themselves in the revised *Arcadia*. Through his education at home and abroad, Sidney learned to think about imitation not only as a term by which to render Aristotle’s word ‘μίμησις’ into English (as in the *Defence*’s definition of poetry as ‘an Art of *Imitation*’ [C1v]), but also as a set of methods for analysing and reproducing the forms and structures that undergird classical texts.²⁰ The *Defence*’s reputation as a work of Aristotelian poetics, concerned primarily with ‘the representing, counterfeiting, or figuring forth’ (C1v) of an idealised external reality, has meant that Sidney’s attitude towards the imitation of past authors has been largely overlooked in studies of Renaissance *imitatio*.²¹ I claim, however, that Sidney’s complex ideas regarding imitation made him particularly receptive to sixteenth-century traditions which read the *Aethiopika* with an eye to its structural and formal characteristics, and that his literary theory shared with those readings a rich store of spatial and architectural metaphors. In practice, Sidney’s imitation of Heliodorus’s text goes further than his adoption of its prose form and well beyond its use as a ‘source’ for particular scenes, as previous criticism has argued, and manifests itself rather in the revised *Arcadia*’s overarching structure, and the scenes which connect its component parts – ultimately, in ways that are neatly encapsulated by Scott’s word ‘general’.

II

Sidney’s ideas about imitation were drawn from diverse places and synthesised with the learning he derived from adjacent disciplines. Besides his putative inclination to focus on

Aristotelian *mimēsis* and the ethical emulation of heroes, the principal reason why Sidney's attitudes towards *imitatio* (as the literary imitation of previous authors) have been neglected is perhaps because, in his surviving writings, his views sometimes appear blandly conventional: complaints in the *Defence* about 'Nizolian paper bookes' of 'figures and phrases' (I3v) and warnings against 'Ciceronianisme the cheafe abuse of Oxford' in a letter to his brother, Robert, amount to generalised attacks that reveal little about the character of Sidney's own thought.²² Looking beyond these remarks, however, it is possible to reconstruct a set of attitudes that combined gleanings from his continental education among the followers of Philipp Melanchthon with what he learned in England from John Dee and Gabriel Harvey.

Central to Sidney's thought is the term 'model', which he employs in the *Defence* to refer to an architectural plan – 'the house wel in modell' (D1v) – containing the proportions and measurements governing a given structure, and near the end of the revised *Arcadia* to qualify his similes for the combat between Anaxius and Pyrocles (disguised as Zelmane):

The Irish greyhound against the English mastiff, the swordfish against the whale, the rhinoceros against the elephant might be models, and but models, of this combat.²³

A model, for Sidney, therefore suggests a miniaturised or proportionate version of an object reduced to its outline, which is nevertheless capable of admitting a degree of difference from its original – as well as, the passage suggests, from other models – while remaining commensurate with it. Thinking about literary texts as models provides Sidney with a means of imitating the form and structure of the *Aethiopika* without reproducing the exact particulars of its plot and its characters in the *Arcadia* – just as the greyhound and the mastiff, or the swordfish and the whale, might 'be models' of the same combat, and indeed of each other.

Sidney's spatial metaphors, however, have deep roots. For John Dee, who was acquainted with Sidney during the 1570s and whose 'Mathematicall Preface' to Billingsley's

translation of Euclid supplies the first recorded use of the term ‘model’ in English, an architectural plan was useful precisely for setting out in ‘lineaments’ the ‘whole forme and figure’ of a building, ‘all materiall stuff being secluded’. Having been sketched in miniature, relationships and proportions between an object’s component parts are able to be easily apprehended in ‘the mynde and imagination’.²⁴ For similar reasons, Cicero and Quintilian had turned repeatedly to architectural metaphors when speaking of the arrangement, or *dispositio*, of a whole oration – what Dee might have called its ‘whole forme and figure’. In *De Oratore*, for example, Crassus compares ‘omnibus [...] partibus orationis’ [‘all the divisions of a speech’] to the parts of a building that combine beauty with usefulness – according to the ‘ratio’, or calculation, made by an architect – to support a peaked structure (‘fastigium’) at the roof.²⁵ Quintilian, perhaps drawing upon analogies such as that in Demetrius’s *On Style*, likens the arrangement of words in a sentence to the interlocking of blocks in ‘constructions made of unhewn stones’ [‘structura saxorum rudium’],²⁶ and – in a ‘Similie’ noted by Dee in his own copy of the *Institutio Oratoria* – compares the processes of *dispositio* to manual labour. Just, he writes,

as it is not enough in erecting a building simply to collect the stone and the timber and the other building materials, unless the hands of craftsmen are put to work to dispose and assemble them, so also in speaking, however rich the material, it will be nothing but a random accumulation unless disposition organizes it, links it all up, and binds it together.

[ut opera extruentibus satis non est saxa atque materiam et cetera aedificanti utilia congerere nisi disponendis eis conlocandisque artificium manus adhibeatur, sic in dicendo quamlibet abundans rerum copia cumulum tantum habeat atque congestum nisi illas eadem dispositio in ordinem digestas atque inter se commissas devinixerit.]²⁷

Just as words in well-formed sentences link together like stones in a wall, so it is the case that, at the level of its overall structure, the parts of a speech are set ‘in ordinem’ like building materials at the hands of an *artifex*. As well as proposing its utility elsewhere in the *Institutio* as a mnemotechnic device, therefore, Quintilian follows Cicero’s Crassus in asserting the

figure of the building as an indispensable analogy for inculcating students in the principles of unity, wholeness, and proportion that govern the structure of a complete literary work.²⁸

This store of architectural and structural imagery was seized upon, during the sixteenth century, by a school of writers and teachers who would exert a significant influence upon the young Sidney whilst he travelled throughout Europe during the 1570s. As Robert Stillman has shown, Sidney's continental education was overseen by men who had been students of Melanchthon, and who continued to promote and build upon the rhetorical, philosophical, and theological programme he had taught at Wittenberg until his death in 1560.²⁹ Letters in Hubert Languet's Latin correspondence with Sidney record pupil and teacher exchanging exercises in Ciceronian epistolography and imitation, as well as Languet's recommendation that Sidney 'train' his written style by translating Cicero into another language and then back into Latin – the practice known as 'double translation'.³⁰ But Sidney's education went far beyond what his letters record. The two volumes of Cicero's *epistolae* recommended by Languet in this letter were likely those edited by Johannes Sturm, who developed the pedagogical technique of 'double translation' and who likely received Sidney at his Academy when he arrived in Strasbourg.³¹ Sturm, like Languet, was a follower of Melanchthon, and his pedagogical works share the interest of his own teacher in the structural metaphors used by Cicero and Quintilian. It may well have been here that Sidney first began to think about texts as models.

Melanchthon's *Elementa Rhetorices* – the main textbook for his students in rhetoric – cites directly, in a passage about the structural characteristics of a speech, Crassus's lines about the beauty and utility of rational and unified structures. 'A speech', he writes, 'will be more clear if the sentences hang together fittingly, and if its divisions and arguments are not left incomplete [*Fit enim oratio magis dilucida, si apte cohaereant sententiae, si non relinquuntur imperfecta membra, aut argumenta*']'.³² Like Crassus, Melanchthon finds

instances of such order ‘in nature’ [‘in natura’], ‘in works of art’ [‘in artium operibus’], ‘and above all in buildings’ [‘maximeque in aedificiis’], where ‘the apt proportion of parts’ [‘apta partium proportio’] can be viewed most clearly.³³ Cicero’s architectural simile is elevated by Melanchthon as the greatest analogy for the structure of writing, and serves as an emblem for his key idea of *cohaerentia* (or ‘coherence’), witnessed here by the verb *cohaerere*. Viewing a speech in outline as an architect might figure a building becomes a vital part of how the *Elementa* teaches its reader to imitate ‘the whole form of an oration’ [‘totam orationis formam’].³⁴

Sidney’s work bears evidence of the *Elementa*’s direct influence, but even if this passage had not stood out to him, he would have been able to encounter a similar turn in the *Nobilitas Litterata* of Sturm, which was translated in 1570 as *A Ritche Storehouse*.³⁵ Taking his spur from Antonius’s remark on the ‘groundwork’ [‘fundamenta’] and ‘completed structure’ [‘exaedificatio’] of written histories, Sturm digresses on how all writing may be ‘drawne out and framed as buildings are’.³⁶ As he explains, buildings are sketched in model

that the foundation may appeare, the rooffe may shewe forth, the entraunces may be seene, the Chambers may be severed [...] and other partes may cunningly be set before our eyes, so that the whole building may be vewed.³⁷

It was Dee who wrote in his copy of Quintilian of ‘an affinity between geometry and rhetoric’ [‘Geometriae cum Rhetorica cognatio’], but he appears not to have been the only one of Sidney’s teachers who might readily have offered such a sentiment.³⁸ In Melanchthon and Sturm, spatial and architectural metaphors emerge as being fundamental to what Colin Burrow has described as their shared theory of ‘formal imitation’, which emphasised ‘the underlying rhetorical and structural principles of a text’ and ‘was designed to enable students to produce new variants on those underlying patterns’.³⁹ This shift in imitation theory from focusing on aspects such as word choice and key phrases to consideration of a text’s *dispositio* (including the order of its arguments and the effects of their arrangement) would

exert considerable influence in England, as Burrow demonstrates, through the writings of Roger Ascham and Gabriel Harvey – another writer who made Sidney’s acquaintance during the 1570s and who, on occasion, may have served him as a tutor. Harvey’s own brand of Ramist rhetorical theory – outlined in the two Latin orations printed in 1577, *Ciceronianus* and *Rhetor* – bears some suggestively Sturmian echoes, not least in his reference to the chambers (‘cellulas’, or little rooms) of the arguments in Cicero’s orations and his stipulation that exemplary texts ought to be ‘modelled, as the Greeks say’ [‘ἐσχηματισμένη, ut Graeci vocant’] in the works of their imitators.⁴⁰

Harvey’s innovation in adding to Melanchthon and Sturm, however, lies less in his absorption of their architectural metaphors into the technical terms of his vocabulary than in his strengthened pedagogical emphasis on analysis as a tool for mapping the *σχῆμα* (the shape or outline) of a text for its imitator to build upon. The practice of analysing a text for its structural underpinnings did not begin with Ramism – as Kees Meerhoff shows, it was fundamental to Melanchthon’s own thought – but Harvey did respond to its reinvigorated vogue by including, in the *Rhetor*, a *prosōpopoeia* which sees a figure named ‘Exercitatio’ describe his methods of analysis and command his listeners to ‘unravel’ [‘retexite’] the works they read, ‘as Penelope once did her web’ [‘ut suam olim Penelope telam’].⁴¹ It is a method that can be applied to writers as diverse as Xenophon, Homer, Sophocles, and Lucian, as well as Cicero, in order to reveal ‘the sinews’ [‘nervos’] in the figures of thought [‘figuram ... in sententiis’], and the ‘conformationem’, ‘contextum’, and ‘constructionem’ of their whole discourse [‘totius orationis’].⁴² Rather than backing the ideas of Melanchthon and Sturm into a Ciceronian corner, Harvey directs the application of their methods towards other authors in diverse genres.

Thus, when Sidney writes the *Defence* in 1580, we find him utilising these reading practices against a specific text: Sackville and Norton’s 1561 Senecan tragedy, *Gorboduc*.

Sackville and Norton's play is Senecan insofar as it imitates important components of Seneca's plays, both structural (such as their use of *nuntius* figures and the chorus) and stylistic (including figures such as bloodied hands). In particular, it recasts the conflict between Eteocles and Polynices in Seneca's *Phoenissae* as the pseudohistorical feud between the sons of the British king, Gorboduc. Yet, as Sidney argues, it disregards the unity of place to which Seneca adhered and which his *nuntius* figure is designed to supplement with reported accounts of offstage action. It is with this structural error, rather than one of *elocutio*, that he charges the play. Being 'faultie both in time and place', *Gorboduc* is deemed 'verie defectious in the circumstaunces', despite 'clyming to the height of Seneca his style' (H4r). Lorna Hutson has analysed these remarks in view of the rhetorical circumstances (the *loci argumentorum* of time, place, occasion, person, and so on) to propose that Sidney connected *Gorboduc*'s loose adherence to the unities with a collapse of dramatic verisimilitude, and its failure to present a probable pattern of events to its audience.⁴³ At the same time, however, it is clear that Sidney views the play's mimetic failure as being preceded and occasioned by a failure of *imitatio*: 'it might not remaine', he writes, 'as an exact modell of all Tragidies' (H4r). It is an ambiguous remark that faces both forwards and backwards, in ways that are connected: on the one hand, following Sidney's analysis, *Gorboduc* can no longer be viewed as an 'exact' imitation of Seneca; on the other, it supplies a faulty copy of Seneca's structural ratios and proportions, which ought not to stand as a new example of Senecan tragic form to would-be English tragedians. This censure has significant implications. In this section of the *Defence*, it appears that *mimēsis* – or, at least, verisimilitude – stands or falls on whether an author succeeds in imitating the representational techniques of a prior model. To Sidney, the best way of imitating reality may in fact be faithfully to imitate an exemplary, verisimilar text.

Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* furnishes an illuminating context for this position. Like Sidney, Scaliger thinks about the relationship between *mimēsis* and *imitatio* less as a binary than as an area of considerable overlap – after all, the Latin terminology of humanist poetics, which used the same word for both concepts, encouraged productively ambiguous theorising.⁴⁴ Proposing a theory that will be ‘sharper’ [‘acutius’] than Aristotle’s, Scaliger directs his poet to represent persons, objects, and places by imitating analogous depictions in Virgil.⁴⁵ For instance, the true forms of persons ‘are discovered in the depths of nature’ [‘in Naturae sinu investiganda’], but, in order to represent them in writing, it is necessary to utilise literary forms (or *exempla*) from Virgil: ‘from whose divine poem we will determine the various kinds of person’ [‘e cuius divino Poemate statuemus varia genera personarum’].⁴⁶ Whether Scaliger’s poet seeks to represent buildings, battles, voyages, or what else, the *Aeneid* serves as guide: ‘All these things which you might imitate, you have in the second nature that is Virgil’ [‘Haec omnia quae imiteris, habes apud alteram naturam, id est Virgilium’].⁴⁷

Diverse explanations for Scaliger’s conflation of *mimēsis* with *imitatio* have been posited, ranging from Virgil-worship to his theory of idealist representation.⁴⁸ But what these accounts disregard is the fact that by identifying the processes of *mimēsis* with those of *imitatio*, Scaliger brings Aristotle’s concept more securely within the compass of art. As the author of an *ars* who repeatedly emphasises technical ability and practical skill, Scaliger makes *mimēsis* achievable for the poet via the methods of *imitatio* – methods in which, owing to the character of sixteenth-century humanist education, they were already likely to have been well-trained. Scaliger’s Virgil is like Sidney’s ‘*Dedalus*’, the master-craftsman of ‘Art, Imitation, and Exercise’ whom the *Defence* appoints as guide to even ‘the highest flying wit’ (H3r). He constitutes (as Seneca ought to have done for Sackville and Norton) a model of what *mimēsis* should look like in a literary work, and provides the necessary rules for the

production of verisimilitude. Yet the *Aeneid* was not the structure on which Sidney built when he wrote his own ‘heroicall Poeme’, and it is to the revised *Arcadia*’s own exemplary model which this essay will now turn.

III

Sidney’s remarks on Heliodorus in the *Defence* are brief, given its importance for the *Arcadia*’s composition, although its description as a ‘sugred invention of that picture of love in *Theagenes & Chariclea*’ (C2v) delicately suggests a well-framed and unified structure. There is strong evidence, however, that Ramist methods not unlike Harvey’s were applied to the *Aethiopika* by Sidney’s followers in the wake of his death. Fraunce, for example, compares its intricate structure, or ‘intangled circumduction’ (whereby it begins *in mediis rebus* and reveals earlier parts of its plot by analepsis) to ‘the inversion of the premises’ in a syllogism.⁴⁹ William Alexander, whose criticism explicitly seeks to separate ‘Language’ (‘the Apparel of Poesy’) from a work’s ‘general Contexture’ in order to recover its ‘Sinewes’, echoes the *Rhetor*’s use of the terms ‘contextum’ and ‘nervos’ before comparing the *Aethiopika*’s ‘methodicall Intricateness’ to a narrative edifice: ‘a Labyrinth of Labours’.⁵⁰

Readings such as these took their literary and intellectual cue from what their authors believed to best approximate Sidney’s thought, and emerged during a period in which readers sought to supplement the revised *Arcadia* – an incomplete work, ending mid-sentence in its 1590 printing – by reference to its sources.⁵¹ Foremost amongst such readers is William Scott, who cites Heliodorus on no fewer than six separate occasions in his *Model* and quotes the *Aethiopika*’s heroine as a voice of literary-theoretical wisdom that bolsters Sidneian ideas of circumstantial verisimilitude.⁵² Scott’s readings, however, were drawn from texts that were available to Sidney during his lifetime, and which, in one instance, drew upon the same theories in Melanchthon and Sturm that shaped his continental education during the 1570s. Taking Scott as a guide to the *Arcadia* and its author’s thought, it is possible to reconstruct

the critical architecture that surrounded Heliodorus in the sixteenth century and to set Sidney's work in new light.

The *Aethiopika* was rediscovered in the library of Matthias Corvinus during the sack of Buda in 1526, before making its way to Basel to be printed by Vincentius Opsopoeus.⁵³ Its first translation was made from the Greek by Jacques Amyot in 1547, whose French rendering was followed by the Latin of Stanislaus Warschewiczki in 1552 (to which Melancthon supplied a dedication) and the English versions of Thomas Underdowne in 1569 and 1577. Owing to its idiosyncratic character – combining prose form with an epic structure and amorous subject matter – the *Aethiopika* could look like a remarkably different work to different kinds of readers. Warschewiczki and Underdowne view Heliodorus as a 'iucundam historiam' and as a 'passing fine, and wittie historie', respectively, and imply that the political lessons of his fiction may be read in preparation for the study of history proper (Underdowne's description of Hydaspes as 'the patterne of a good prince' evokes the language of princely education in the *ars historica*).⁵⁴ They do not, however, have recourse to poetic theory.

In France, a different tradition was inaugurated by Amyot's translation and the 'Proësme' with which it was printed. Both Terence Cave and Alban Forcione have stressed the importance of Amyot's preface in the history of narrative theory, but their accounts obscure the complex mosaic of Strabo and Horace which informs his knotty exposition.⁵⁵ Denoting Heliodorus's text a 'fabuleuse histoire' (a label which becomes muddled when Amyot cites Strabo's definition of 'ἱστορία' as historical truth), the 'Proësme' figures the *Aethiopika* as a masterpiece both of Horatian verisimilitude and of narrative form, beginning in the middle of its story 'comme sont les Poëtes Heroïques'.⁵⁶ Combined with the *Aethiopika*'s 'disposition [...] singuliere', Heliodorus's care for the probabilistic coherence of

his narrative's events produces suspense, as his reader becomes intimately engaged in working out the connections between its parts in the process of the plot's unfolding.⁵⁷

Thus emerges a thread in the history of Heliodorus's reception which will be developed later in the century by his humanist critics. Scaliger's interest in the *Aethiopika* focuses too upon *dispositio*, but the work sits uneasily in his treatise. Poetry, for Scaliger, is inseparable from verse form and thus, like Amyot, he studiously avoids calling the work a poem, even as he recommends it to be 'read most carefully' ['*accuratissime legendum*'] by the would-be epic poet as one of the finest *exemplaria* for epic structure.⁵⁸ Its 'method of arrangement' ['*rationem disponendi*'] provides the reader with a calculation, a measure, or a formula – in other words, a *ratio* – by which to supplement their study of Virgil's own epic arrangement:

The whole work is divided into books, in imitation of nature: it makes divisions of these parts, which it brings together as the structure of a whole body. No man achieved this better than Virgil, and so you may conclude the matter with certainty: that those books themselves appear to have sought for limits.

[Divides autem universum librum in libellos, naturae imitatione: quae partium partes facit, quibus confiat totius corporis constitutio. Verum quod nemo praeter divinum Maronem servavit, ita certas conicias in materias: ut libri ipsi illos sibi terminos quaesisse videantur.]⁵⁹

Rather than proffering the *Aethiopika* as a model for imitation, Scaliger views it as a reference text through which the structural divisions of the *Aeneid* can be brought sharply into focus. Unpicking its structure by pieces ('*librum in libellos*', '*partium partes*') before emphasising their arrangement into a cohesive pattern ('*constitutio*'), the passage turns on the figure of an epic work's 'terminos' – the spatial boundaries or outlines of its books, akin to those that might separate plots of land or delimit a settlement's borders.⁶⁰ Resembling a kind of Sidneian 'groundplat' (G1v) for epic composition, Scaliger's Heliodorus becomes a prose model of Virgil's poem that borrows its shape and structure without manifesting itself as epic poetry in the truest sense.

Scott cites this very passage when he claims that Sidney ‘did imitate’ the *Aethiopika* ‘in the general gate of conveyance’, writing that Scaliger ‘worthily commends’ its ‘orderly order’ for ‘a well-contrived invention as a pattern’. He borrows from Heliodorus his ‘delightful easy intricateness and entangling his particular narrations one with another, that makes them as it were several acts, each one having a kind of completeness in itself’.⁶¹ Suffused with the same terms of particularity and completeness as Scaliger’s passage (and mirroring, in the phrase ‘orderly order’, the distinctive repetitions of its critical language), Scott’s reference to Heliodorus’s ‘gate of conveyance’ appears loosely to translate the important idea of his *ratio disponendi*. ‘Conveyance’, in this period, readily served as an equivalent term for describing *dispositio* in English (as in Ralph Robinson’s praise of the ‘fine conveiaunce, or disposition of *the* matter’ in More’s *Utopia*), while ‘gate’ is used elsewhere in the *Model* to refer to an individual’s method or manner, and thus could serve Scott as a rendering of *ratio*.⁶² This passage in Scaliger – who is cited by name on four occasions in the *Defence* (F3v, H1r, H2r, K1v) – was clearly thought to be key to a reading of how Sidney imitated the *Aethiopika*, and it is tempting to read Scott’s reference to it as an effort to elucidate a critical source that Sidney, in his mind, must have read.

Yet it does not tell the full story of how Scott understood the relationship between Heliodorus and Sidney. For it is probable that the *Model* was also informed by the work of the German Hellenist and Tübingen professor Martin Crusius, who prepared an introductory treatment (‘Iudicium’) of the *Aethiopika* that appeared before its 1596 printing in Hieronymus Commelinus’s Latin-Greek edition, as well as in 1584 as part of an *Epitome* that Crusius compiled to introduce Heliodorus to his students.⁶³ As surviving booklists and library inventories show, both these texts were available in England not long after their respective publication dates, and so it is far from impossible that even Sidney – who, between 1584 and his death, was likely still revising the *Arcadia* – might have encountered Crusius’s

account of Heliodorus.⁶⁴ After all, he was closely attuned to the shifting terrain of continental poetic theory, and shared intellectual circles with Crusius which had a significant point of overlap in the person of Sturm, at whose Strasbourg school Crusius had been first a student and then a teacher.⁶⁵ Having been instilled with a similar Melanchthonian education to Sidney by some of the same men, Crusius's account of Heliodorus offers a window onto one way in which Sidney may have read the *Aethiopika*, and an analysis which may have been sympathetic towards his own thought, even if he never encountered it in print.

For Scott, its appeal is clear. Like Sidney, Crusius is a rare sixteenth-century writer who, despite its composition in prose ('soluta oratione'), explicitly identifies the *Aethiopika* as a poem – a form which he defines on account of feigning ('fictione') rather than verse ('metro').⁶⁶ But Crusius also makes use of what he learned from his teachers to figure the *Aethiopika*'s narrative design as a model or architectural structure, in terms that recall Melanchthon and Sturm's use of Crassus's speech. Constructing his work out of 'membra', which are brought together and made into a single body ('συσσωματοποιηθέντα') by the 'author's art' ['arte Auctoris'], Heliodorus's text concludes with the appearance of a marvellous Daedalian edifice:

proceeding in order from the seventh book to the end, again fetching herein characters and things from earlier, he finally concludes, everything being linked and fitted together like the gable of a great and complex building, united in many places by beams.
[a septimo ad extremum ordine pergens, ibi rursus e superioribus personas & res accersens, ad postremum omnia, inter se connexa & apta (ceu magnifici & multiplicis ædificii fastigium, trabibus multifariam compactum) concludit.]⁶⁷

The apt connections of the work's parts intersect and combine with impressive effect, in ways that Crusius's analogy helps to make visible. Comparing the *Aethiopika*'s narrative climax to the same kind of peaked structure, or *fastigium*, that Cicero had made central to Crassus's speech, Crusius indirectly cites for his students a passage that Melanchthon's *Elementa* would have made familiar to them. Scaliger's account of Heliodorus had been useful for

identifying what was distinctive in the *Aethiopika*, but obscure in explaining the precise mechanics of how its structures might be replicated. Resorting to ambiguous ideas such as the ‘imitation of nature’ [‘naturae imitatione’] and appearing to make the books of both the *Aeneid* and the *Aethiopika* responsible for determining their own *terminos*, his reading has limited practical applicability. By contrast, Crusius brings Heliodorus’s structure within the scope of Melanchthonian rhetoric’s formal concerns.

There is, however, an additional layer of subtlety to his approach. In the *Elementa*, Melanchthon had emphasised the importance of *dispositio* in making a speech ‘more clear’ [‘magis dilucida’] to its readers or listeners. Like Amyot, however, Crusius is less interested in clarity *per se* than in the skill with which clarity can be made suddenly to emerge out of suspenseful uncertainty in a recognition scene, when the various relationships between a work’s narrative parts are thrown into stark relief. Once again, Crusius relates this aspect of the text to Roman rhetorical practices. Quintilian’s recommendation that the orator consider purposefully hinting at some of their later material out of order – that they might ‘sow some seeds of the proofs’ [‘semina quaedam probationum spargere’] in their opening *narratio*, in order to generate anticipation for their full exposition later on – is invoked by Crusius’s account of the *Aethiopika*’s early books, throughout which Heliodorus can be found ‘scattering in the meantime the seeds of new matters besides, which will flourish in due course’ [‘interim novarum etiam rerum semina, quae suo tempore excrescent, spargens’].⁶⁸ When Scott describes ‘how much more welcome’ the *Aethiopika*’s ‘final issue’ is for having been ‘hid and held aloof from the longing mind’, he attests to the psychological effects produced in the reader by precisely such techniques.⁶⁹

Crusius’s signal contribution to the history of Heliodorus’s reception, though, is his use of a quotation from Charikleia’s speech at the end of Book IX, reworked from its original Greek into a critical pronouncement regarding the arrangement of the work in which she is a

character. Charikleia delivers her speech to Theagenes upon their arrival in Ethiopia, at a point in the narrative where it is still too soon for her to reveal her identity to her parents, who are unaware that she is their lost daughter. Extracted from its narrative context, Crusius's rewritten version of her words reads as follows:

After convoluted beginnings have been tangled together, the whole narrative complication and discovery scene are resolved beautifully and brought about through greater things. Thus, I quote from Book 9. [οὕτως ἄρα πολυπλόκων ἀρχῶν καταβληθεισῶν ἢ σόμπασα συμπλοκή τε καὶ ἀνεύρεσις, διὰ μακροτέρων ἀνακαλύπτεται κάλλιστά τε συμπεραίνεται: ut sic ex 9 libro dicam.]⁷⁰

Modern classicists have followed in Crusius's wake by describing this moment as a wry turn on the part of Heliodorus (one notes it playfully as evidence that Charikleia 'seems to have studied' Aristotle's *Poetics*).⁷¹ His expert knowledge of Greek having alerted him to the passage's value as a manifesto for the work's poetics contained within itself, Crusius overgoes Scaliger by setting it as an example for how the *Aethiopika* really might, in practice, determine the rules and boundaries for its own arrangement.

Scott was the first writer in England to draw upon this passage to analogous purposes. He cites almost exactly the same moment in Charikleia's speech, and provides an English rendering as a statement of circumstantial coherence as outlined in the *Defence*:

These rules are broken by not observing the circumstances of time and place and persons likewise: long speeches in great exigents; short conveyances and shuffling up of matters of great consequence, contrary to Chariclea's excellent conceit when Theagenes would have had her (according to the nature of desire) suddenly acknowledge her self and state more quickly that they might enjoy their long-desired mutual joy — 'No, sweetest sir,' saith she, 'matters of great consequence must be brought about with much preparation and wrought out through many circumstances.' Our tragedies (nowadays) huddle up matter enough for whole *Iliads* in one hour.⁷²

Alluding quietly to Sidney's discussion of *Gorboduc* as another such tragedy of ill-organised matter, Scott uses Charikleia's lines as a critical 'conceit' which can be rendered into the emergent terms of English poetics as established by the *Defence*. For Scott is neither quoting

from Underdowne's edition (which renders Charikleia's lines in demotic terms: 'my deare, great businesse must be done with great circumspection') nor translating from Commelinus's dry Latin version: 'Magna negocia magnis indigent apparatibus' ['Great affairs require great preparation'].⁷³ Rather, he seems to be attempting to capture a sense of Heliodorus's self-consciously metacritical Greek – not only by mimicking the sentence structure of the original text as it appears in the 1596 edition, but, more significantly, by having Charikleia speak the language of the surrounding discussion in the *Model* and of Sidneian poetics at large. The 'rules' of Scott's treatise – in this case, the measures by which a work is to be kept in good proportion – are evidenced in an ancient text, which is made to take on the distinctive terminology of those very precepts in its new English translation. His version of Charikleia becomes the emblem for what he calls 'agreeableness', which is 'the correspondency' of a text 'so as it be still proportionable in itself', and her circumspection in regard of both her chastity and her decision to reveal her identity figures as a model of 'constancy' (Scaliger's 'prudencia'). Indeed, her physical appearance – as imagined in the *ekphrasis* of the *Aethiopika*'s opening scene – stands as a counterpoint to the 'hermaphrodite or mongrel', or Horatian chimera with 'a fair woman's face on a horse's neck with wings upon her back', which analogises bad poetry.⁷⁴ Scott's treatment of Heliodorus accommodates Sidney's source not only to its imitation in the *Arcadia*, but to the literary theories of the *Defence*, to the point that his *Aethiopika* resembles a product of them. Scaliger and Crusius helped Scott to express what Sidney had appeared to grasp during his lifetime: that the *Aethiopika* was a text which lent itself to being imitated as a form, a structure, and a 'picture of love' – and that it provided its own commentary as to how its frame might be constructed.

IV

To read the revised *Arcadia* for the kinds of unity described above may appear counterintuitive. In the *Model*, Scott uses the *Aethiopika* to read Sidney's text for qualities of

absolute order and unfailing coherence which, in its unfinished and imperfect condition, it does not have. Rather like the hypothetical Sidney upon whom Scott draws to resolve an apparent error of circumstantial coherence near the end of the five-book composite *Arcadia* printed in 1593 ('Sir Philip Sidney would not have so erred'), Heliodorus serves to help model an *Arcadia* that might have been, had its author lived to complete it.⁷⁵ Arranging this composite text by combining the revised versions of the first three books with an ending adapted from the 'old' *Arcadia* was a process that was likened, by Hugh Sanford, to 'repairing' and 'mending' the parts of 'a ruinous house' as to approximate Sidney's intended design – though Sanford also confessed that it would never 'exactly and in every lineament represent' its author's original plan.⁷⁶ This was the version of the *Arcadia* which was reprinted in 1598 along with the *Defence* and with *Astrophil and Stella*, and it is the text which Scott read and which he uses in the *Model*. Yet his attitude towards it differs markedly from Sanford's. Like Sidney's editor, Scott views the revised *Arcadia* in its composite form as an inexact approximation of its author's intentions – yet by reading the text with Heliodorus in mind, he is able to conceive of the *Arcadia* in various sections of his treatise as though it really were an ideal and exemplary work in relation to its model. Unlike Sidney's closest family members and friends, Scott did not have access to the 'old' *Arcadia* and thus would not have been aware that the work he had read was shaped by a process of comprehensive revision. Nevertheless, his keen grasp of the *Defence* and minute attention to Sidney's sources, both classical and critical, make him an indispensable guide to the revised *Arcadia* as a work of *imitatio*. Having recovered Sidney's theoretical attitudes towards literary models, it will now be possible to consider the practical methods by which he imitated Heliodorus 'in the general gate of conveyance' when he chose to revise the form and structure of the 'old' *Arcadia*.

The reworked opening of the text, which sees Musidorus rescued from a shipwreck by the lovestruck shepherds Strephon and Claius, has long been the focus of critical attention to how Sidney made use of the *Aethiopika*. The vivid *ekphrases* through which he represents his shipwreck imitate those used by Heliodorus to mimic the experience of witnessing a scene of disaster. Seen through the eyes of Egyptian bandits, the grounded ship and debris-strewn beach that open the *Aethiopika* become the focus of immense uncertainty (for both the bandits and Heliodorus's readers), and lead them to 'conjecture' its cause without success: 'For they when they had given these thinges the lookinge on a good while from the hill, coulde not understande what that sight meante'.⁷⁷ Functioning as a direct analogue for the reading experience, the bandits' inquiry turns upon the assumption that the scene's various fragments of evidence, and the various narrative strands which they represent, might be united to reconstruct a coherent set of prior circumstances. Indeed, Underdowne's word 'conjecture' translates – via its rendering as 'coniectura' in the Latin translations – Heliodorus's term 'συμβάλλειν', which means 'to deduce' or 'to infer', but also speaks etymologically to the act of throwing together or uniting (συμ-βάλλειν) disparate parts and fragments.⁷⁸ Leaving the reader 'suspended in unhappy ignorance' ['ignoratione tristi suspensum'], as Crusius writes, the questions posed by this scene are left deliberately unresolved until the end of the fifth book – at which point, we eventually discover the circumstances of the shipwreck, involving a storm off the coast and a contest between pirates.⁷⁹

When Sidney opens the revised *Arcadia* with a Laconian shipwreck, he absorbs entirely the narrative strategies which Heliodorus had interwoven with his *ekphrasis*. For the material similarities between the two scenes are, in fact, relatively superficial. Whereas Theagenes and Charikleia are discovered on dry land, Musidorus and Pyrocles are found at sea. While Heliodorus's heroes remain together as they are transported to Thyamis's hideout,

Sidney's are separated when Pyrocles is abducted by pirates. Rather than basing the details of his scene on that of Heliodorus, however, Sidney instead chooses to imitate the *Aethiopika* in ways described by Scott as 'general' – that is, by refashioning the gestures towards readerly ignorance and obscured knowledge which characterise its descriptive technique, and even heightening them by separating his characters and further fragmenting his narrative into separate parts. Once he has been pulled ashore by Strephon and Claius, Musidorus sails out in a fisherman's boat in search of his friend, while Sidney describes the wreck as witnessed by the men with attention to the information that they glean and their emotional responses. Passing the mouth of the haven, they 'discern, as it were, a stain on the water's colour'; moving closer, Musidorus points to plumes of smoke as 'the beginning of his ruin' and 'a small relic of a great fire'; when eventually, coming 'so near as their eyes were full masters of their object', they witness 'a sight full of piteous strangeness', death 'having used more than one dart to that destruction' (*NA* 7). Long ago, Wolff attributed such descriptions to Sidney's interest in 'pathetic optics' and related them to Heliodorus, proposing that almost nothing, in either author, is described without some reference to the experience of its viewer.⁸⁰ They contribute to the production of *enargeia*, associated with *ekphrasis* by Erasmus for its capacity to reproduce imaginatively the experience of a first-hand observer, 'so that at length it draws the reader or hearer outside himself as in the theatre'.⁸¹ It is impossible, however, to isolate the effect of such techniques in this opening scene from the larger, structural ways in which Sidney's text imitates the *Aethiopika*. As is the case with Heliodorus, Sidney does not allow the uncertainty and suspense that are generated by this scene to be resolved until much later in the *Arcadia*. The most significant way in which Sidney imitates his model is in figuring not only a version of the shipwreck, but its formal purpose as a narrative hinge upon which the rest of the work pivots.

Like Heliodorus, Sidney constructs much of his work from analepsis – moments, described by his 1590 editors as ‘intermitted historiology’ (*NA* 229n23, 156n31), in which his characters recount different parts of their respective backstories that will gradually slot together to form a complete account of prior events. Sidney revels in the use of such episodes to unfold matter that appears purely digressive and detached from the main plot. Yet, as is the case in the *Aethiopika*, narratives which resemble digressions can suddenly reveal themselves as being integral to the work’s structure. By the middle of Book II, the reader has learned much from Musidorus about his past adventures with Pyrocles, but the cause of their shipwreck remains obscure. Having been discovered by Philoclea at the edge of a secluded bank, Pyrocles (hitherto known in Arcadia as Zelmane) drops his disguise and proves his identity with letters from his father, Euarchus. Believed to have been killed, he reveals himself as ‘the same Pyrocles who you heard was betrayed in a ship, which being burned, Pyrocles was drowned’ (*NA* 231). The nearest analogue for this moment is the end of Kalisiris’s tale in Book V, when the circumstances of the shipwreck are finally revealed. It is an episode highlighted for its structural importance in Underdowne’s 1577 edition by a sidenote, which emphasises the ‘orderly’ interlocking of his account with what Book I had narrated previously, and echoes Harvey’s words on *ordo* (or, precisely, ‘ordinis structuram’ – the order’s structure) in literary works, which were printed the same year.⁸² The language used by Sidney’s characters makes plain that the significance of his scene is comparable with that in his model.

Like the passage from Charikleia’s speech quoted in Scott’s *Model*, Pyrocles’s address to Philoclea underlines that to reveal his true identity ‘doth require both many ceremonies in the beginning, and many circumstances in the uttering’ (*NA* 230). Sidney’s scenario demands that Pyrocles supplement the hard proofs of his father’s letters by delivering a plausible and circumstantially coherent explanation for how he survived the

shipwreck and came into Arcadia in Amazonian guise – a narrative, in other words, that will serve as a proof of his identity to Philoclea. The parallel with Charikleia’s speech is close, even if the precise circumstances of each episode differ from each other markedly, for both concern the preparations required to reveal one’s true identity. More strikingly than this, however, Sidney has Pyrocles speak in the language of rhetorical theory, much like Heliodorus’s heroine, as well as, specifically, make use of the key critical terminology of the *Defence*. Such a gesture, in a text which has made plain its debt to the *Aethiopika* from its opening pages, serves to signal for the reader the structural importance of the scene, as one in which important strands of the *Arcadia*’s narrative are about to be woven together. After all, rumour has run wild by this point in Book II regarding the circumstances of the shipwreck, owing, not least, to the erroneous account given to Basilius by the Iberian prince Plangus. Much else, however, was given a fair account by his story. The aid given by the princes to the Queen of Erona, for example, is already known to Philoclea by this point, and it will be necessary for Pyrocles’s story to complete her partial knowledge by supplying the requisite materials in a manner that fits neatly with the facts already established. Much as the circumstances of Charikleia’s parenthood – so crucial to the *Aethiopika*’s dénouement – are sown like proofs throughout the text’s first half, so in the *Arcadia* has the groundwork of Pyrocles’s narration been laid already by the tales of Musidorus and Plangus. Philoclea reveals as much, in terms that bear theoretical resonances no less strong than those of Pyrocles, when she explains that his fame has ‘rather showed itself by pieces than delivered any full form of it’ (NA 233). Evoking the ideas of part and whole that run throughout Heliodorus’s reception in the sixteenth century, Sidney has Philoclea let on rather more about the structure of the *Arcadia* than she could be expected to understand. Whereas the text has hitherto proceeded piecemeal, now will its parts be incorporated into a ‘full form’ – akin to Melanchthon’s *tota orationis forma* – that will itself become a part of a larger whole, which

will proceed to detail not only the princes' conflict with Cecropia but also, in the composite text of 1593, their trials in Arcadia. For Philoclea, to 'deliver' (Lat. *de-* + *liberare*, 'to set free') this 'form' is to release the suspense and uncertainty that has built up regarding the circumstances of the shipwreck, which we discover have involved a plot against the princes' lives orchestrated by Plexirtus, the bastard son of the Paphlagonian king, who enlisted the ship's captain and crew to murder Pyrocles and Musidorus.⁸³ Her choice of this word thus subtly implies the very ways in which information has been carefully withheld from the reader that Sidney learned to imitate when he read the *Aethiopika*. With so many of the characters involved in Plexirtus's plot and its circumstances having already been introduced in the course of other tales, Pyrocles's narrative fits into an apt place in the *Arcadia*'s structure for both its characters and its readers. Sidney's method of imitating Heliodorus's narrative structure allows him and his characters to unfold a series of interconnected tales and backstories, which demand of the reader a constant effort to resolve disparate parts into a coherent whole.

This is far from the only moment in which Sidney allows earlier matter to sprout, having been planted seed-like in earlier sections of the work. Nevertheless, it may well provide the best illustration of how Sidney's revised *Arcadia* imitates the *Aethiopika* in a way that the 'old' *Arcadia* does not. Sidney, we can be sure, was familiar with Heliodorus when he wrote the original version of the *Arcadia*, and would have had access by this point to the majority of contemporary critical sources on its structure and narrative design – though not, of course, the reading contained in Crusius's 1584 *Epitome*. This much is witnessed not only by the near-contemporary references to the *Aethiopika* in the *Defence*, but also by the direct use that Heliodorus is put to in the 'old' *Arcadia* itself. For in this version of the *Arcadia*, it is worth noting that Heliodorus already exerts a strong influence as a source for episodes such as the trial scene in Book V and even the tale of Amasis, as told by Histor during the Second

Eclogues, which follows closely that of Demaenete and Cnemon in the *Aethiopika*.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the work in its original form cannot be described in the same terms as the revised *Arcadia* that was known to readers such as Scott – that is, as an imitation of Heliodorus’s text at the deepest levels of form and structure. Many of the incidents of which Sidney makes so much in the revised *Arcadia* are reported, albeit briefly, in the ‘old’ – the ‘terrible tempest’ (*OA* 11) which leads to the princes’ shipwreck, for example, is described near the work’s beginning along with their ‘valiant acts’ undertaken in ‘lesser Asia, Syria, and Egypt’ (*OA* 11), prior to their arrival in Arcadia. And yet extended passages of analepsis are almost completely absent from the ‘old’ *Arcadia* as a whole, which begins with Basilius’s retirement and the arrival of the princes, and which rarely elaborates upon their previous adventures in significant detail. What is revealed regarding the princes’ prior activities is generally consigned to the Eclogues, which serve as bridging sections between the ‘old’ *Arcadia*’s books; by contrast, the revised *Arcadia* interweaves long passages of analepsis amidst the events which take place in the course of its books, and asserts their significance for the reader’s understanding of the work’s Arcadian plotline. It is possible, when considering the ‘old’ *Arcadia*, to draw a relatively firm distinction between the work’s main plot and the backstories of its characters. Such a distinction cannot be made so easily in the case of the revised *Arcadia* – nor, indeed, in that of the *Aethiopika*.

The difference between the ‘old’ and revised forms of the *Arcadia*, however, extends well beyond the scope given by each text for passages of analepsis. Events which occur without explanation in the ‘old’ *Arcadia*, such as the attack of the ‘monstrous lion’ and ‘she-bear of little less fierceness’ (*OA* 46) at the end of Book I, provide Sidney with opportunities to create new and subtle connections between earlier and later sections of his text. When this episode is reworked, Sidney includes a sinister set of details which comprehensively reframe our response to an attack which had, originally, come about ‘by chance’ (*OA* 46). Following

the attack, a manservant appears on behalf of Cecropia ‘to excuse the mischance of her beasts ranging in that dangerous sort, being happened by the folly of the keeper’ (NA 117) – but this is a detail which, in practice, functions more to arouse readerly suspicions about Cecropia and her activities than to explain the true reason for the beasts’ assault. Such suspicions will turn out to be well-founded – for as we later discover in Book III, the lion and bear which menaced the Arcadians had been deliberately trained to hunt ‘in the place of their pastorals’ by Cecropia as one of her ‘sharp-sighted inventions’ (NA 319), intended to terrorise Basilius and his family. Sidney revises his text with care and patience, turning events that had previously been attributed to chance into opportunities to unfold new plotlines over time, which only emerge fully into view once ‘all the circumstances’ (NA 45) – to use a phrase from Book I – can be made known to the reader. John Winkler once observed that the plotting of the *Aethiopika* is remarkable insofar as it ‘utterly eschews irrelevance’ – and it is a remark that might well be applied (as Sidney’s transformation of this episode demonstrates) to the complexity of the revised *Arcadia*, in which Heliodorus serves as the author’s fundamental model for narrative arrangement.⁸⁵

There are many other ways in which the revised *Arcadia* imitates the *Aethiopika* in terms of its structure and methods of plotting. As we have seen, characters speak constantly in the self-conscious language of literary terminology – some do so even as they refuse to ‘use many circumstances’ (NA 62) to tell their stories; and others still have tales ‘by pieces [...] delivered unto’ (NA 306) their ears from the mouths of various speakers. In every case where a different interlocking part of the same story is told, Scott’s vital notion of ‘agreeableness’ in both Heliodorus and Sidney serves as a useful guide. Functioning as one of Scott’s synonyms for decorum in the *Model*, ‘agreeableness’ governs how characters address others and what they reveal both to one another and to the reader. If, as Roger Ascham had suggested in *The Scholemaster*, decorum could not simply be designated a

question of style, or ‘proprietie of wordes’, but needed also to concern the ‘handlyng of matter’ in a way that is ‘fytte’ – both in terms of *dispositio*, and its suitability for a given listener or audience – then Scott’s sense of ‘agreeableness’ functions as its expanded, poetic equivalent.⁸⁶ It involves, as we have seen, the proportioning of parts to wholes and their arrangement in the correct places, but it also demands that their ‘symmetry or conformity’ be directed towards and proportioned, ultimately, to the reader.⁸⁷ Sidney, like Charikleia, is circumspect with regard to what he reveals and when, and, like Heliodorus, is meticulous in tailoring his text’s structure in respect of what is known (and unknown) to both his characters and his readers.

Sidney’s absorption of Heliodorus’s techniques is so complete as to cast the revised *Arcadia* as an imitation of the *Aethiopika* – not simply in its incidents or in the details of individual episodes, but at the deepest level of form and order. If its unfinishedness makes Sidney’s final intentions unknowable, then the text’s assimilation of Heliodorus in its structure and connecting episodes leaves it no less recognisable as an incomplete imitation based on its Greek model. This ancient prose poem – despite its most slippery of generic forms – functions in Sidney’s hands like a precise set of ratios and measures, which correspond to the *Defence*’s rules of circumstantial coherence and provide him with the outline by which to plot the *Arcadia*. Reconsidering Sidney’s Heliodorus helps to redraw the boundaries between works of poetics and classical texts in the Renaissance – it demonstrates how classical works could be made to provide their own critical exegeses and shows the capacity of English writers to draw upon their example. It figures criticism as a site of innovation, and it casts revision as an activity in which critical work resides. The precise reason behind why Sidney chose to recast the ‘old’ *Arcadia* as an imitation of the *Aethiopika* might have to remain obscure: it may be that this ‘heroicall Poeme [...] in prose’ (C2v) was one which supplied him with a suitable structure for narrating that ‘work for a higher style

than mine' (*OA* 11), towards which he had gestured in the 'old' *Arcadia*; or it may be that the experience of writing the *Defence*, with its heavy use of Aristotle and its celebration of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, made him more conscious of the value of Greek literature and its models than he had been previously. Nevertheless, we can be certain that the revised *Arcadia* was viewed by Scott as a treasury of theoretical wisdom, and that the features which enabled it to be read as such are the same ones that make its methods of imitation visible to modern eyes.⁸⁸ When Ben Jonson explored the 'magnitude and compass of any fable' by analogy with buildings in *Discoveries*, he drew not only upon what he had read in Daniel Heinsius, but also tapped into a rich tradition of critical thought regarding structural unity that went back to Sidney's experiments and beyond. Indeed, it is tempting to imagine that, having been tasked by King James with translating the *Argenis* (John Barclay's attempt at imitating Heliodorus in Latin), he might have encountered Crusius's version of the comparison while making preparatory investigations into Barclay's sources.⁸⁹ This essay has sketched an episode in the history of that tradition, and seeks to sharpen our sense of Sidney's place in it. In doing so, it adds to our increasing understanding of Sidney's philhellene literary inclinations, and our subtle sense of his theories and methods of *mimēsis* and *imitatio*.

¹ William Lisle, *The Faire Ethiopian* (London, 1631), B1v.

² See Steve Mentz, *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2006), 47–72; Victor Skretkowitz, *European Erotic Romance* (Manchester, 2010), 111–166.

³ Thomas Churchyard, *A musicall consort* (London, 1595), E4r.

⁴ Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesy* (London, 1595), C2v. Hereafter cited parenthetically.

⁵ Aristotle, *Poetics*, ed. and trans. Stephen Halliwell (Cambridge, MA, 1995), 1447a27–1447b9. The word 'ἑποποιία' is absent from modern editions, but was included in the text as it appeared in the Renaissance. The best overview of these matters is Micha Lazarus, "'Anonymous to This Day": Aristotle and the Question of Verse', in *"In Other Words": Translating Philosophy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, eds. David Lines and Anna L. Puliafito, *Rivista di storia della filosofia* 74.2 (2019), 267–85.

⁶ 'epopoeiam uti sermone, aut soluto; aut metris incluso', Francesco Robortello, *Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes* (Florence, 1548), 14. Cf. Pietro Vettori, *Commentarii, in primum librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetarum* (Florence, 1560), 11–13. Unless otherwise attributed, all translations are mine.

⁷ Francesco Patrizi, *Della Poetica* (Ferrara, 1586), 112–113.

⁸ William Scott, *The Model of Poesy*, ed. Gavin Alexander (Cambridge, 2013), 37. As Alexander suggests in his 'Introduction' (lii), Scott probably read the *Arcadia* in its 1593 edition, although he must have been aware of the condition in which it had appeared in 1590 – not least from the remarks contained in the 1593 prefatory

material. Textual matters and the question of revision are discussed further in the final section of this essay; see also n.23.

⁹ John Hoskyns, *Directions for Speech and Style* in Louise Brown Osborn, *The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns* (New Haven, CT, 1937), 155; Samuel Lee Wolff, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York, NY, 1912), 352.

¹⁰ Kenneth Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Cambridge, MA, 1935), 110.

¹¹ ‘Introduction’ in Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, ed. Jean Robertson (Oxford, 1973), xxiii. Further references to this edition, which represents the version of the *Arcadia* completed in manuscript around 1580, will be given parenthetically as *OA*.

¹² Joan Rees, *Sir Philip Sidney and Arcadia* (London, 1991), 91. Cf. Thomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA, 1983), 200.

¹³ Carol F. Heffernan, ‘Heliodorus’s *Æthiopica* and Sidney’s *Arcadia*: A Reconsideration’, *English Language Notes* 42.1 (2004), 12–20 (13).

¹⁴ Christine S. Lee, ‘Two Roads to Arcadia: Romance and the Narrative of Experience’, *Sidney Journal* 31.2 (2013), 77–105 (82).

¹⁵ Victor Skretkowicz, ‘Sidney and Amyot: Heliodorus in the Structure and Ethos of the *New Arcadia*’, *RES* 27.1 (1976), 170–174 (170).

¹⁶ See Tim Whitmarsh, *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Cambridge, 2011); Nicholas J. Lowe, *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge, 2000); Marília P. Futre Pinheiro and Stephen J. Harrison, eds., *Fictional Traces: Receptions of the Ancient Novel* (Eelde, 2011); Edmund Cueva, Stephen J. Harrison et al., eds., *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel*, 2 vols (Groningen, 2018); B. P. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton, NJ, 1991).

¹⁷ Gervase Markham, *The English Arcadia* (London, 1607), A2v. The *locus classicus* for the figure of the imitative bee is Seneca’s 84th Epistle; see Kathy Eden, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy* (Chicago, IL, 2012), 41–42.

¹⁸ André Mareschal, *La cour bergère, ou L’Arcadie de Messire Philippes Sidney* (Paris, 1640), a2v. See Albert Osborn, *Philip Sidney en France* (Paris, 1932), 145–150.

¹⁹ A. C. Hamilton, ‘Sidney’s *Arcadia* as Prose Fiction: Its Relation to Its Sources’, *English Literary Renaissance* 2.1 (1972), 39–60 (42).

²⁰ For the relationship between *imitatio* and μίμησις, see Richard McKeon, ‘Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity’, *Modern Philology* 34 (1936), 1–35.

²¹ The *Defence* is cited three times in Thomas Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven CT, 1982), 21, 49, 270; once, in G. W. Pigman, ‘Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.1 (1980), 1–32 (8); and three times in Colin Burrow, *Imitating Authors: Plato to Futurity* (Oxford, 2019), 192, 227, 313.

²² ‘Sidney to Robert Sidney, Leicester House, 18 October 1580’, in *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Roger Kuin, 2 vols (Oxford, 2012), 2. 1009.

²³ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia (The New Arcadia)*, ed. Victor Skretkowicz (Oxford, 1987), 464. Hereafter cited parenthetically as *NA*. This edition is based on the text printed in 1590, which ends mid-sentence in the middle of Book III; I generally refer to this text as the ‘revised’ *Arcadia*, and to the 1593 text (which combines the ‘revised’ version of books I–III with an ending from an edited form of the ‘old’ *Arcadia*) as the ‘composite’ *Arcadia*. For further uses of the term ‘model’ in Sidney and others, see Gavin Alexander, ‘Introduction’, in *The Model of Poesy*, lii–lxx; Kathryn Murphy, ‘Greville’s Scantlings: Architecture, Measure, and the Defence of Modular Poesy’, in *Fulke Greville and the Culture of the English Renaissance*, eds. Russ Leo, Katrin Röder, Freya Sierhuis (Oxford, 2018), 48–62.

²⁴ John Dee, ‘Mathematical Preface’, in Euclid, *The Elements of Geometrie*, trans. Henry Billingsley (London, 1570), d4r. Dee’s use of ‘model’ is the first occurrence recorded in the *OED*, as well as the earliest instance that appears in the database of *EEBO-TCP*. For Dee’s relationship with the Sidney circle, see Peter French, *John Dee: The World of the Elizabethan Magus* (London, 1972), 126–159.

²⁵ Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. H. Rackham and E. W. Sutton (Cambridge, MA, 1942), III.180–181.

²⁶ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge, MA, 2001), 9.4.27. Cf. Demetrius, *On Style*, trans. Doreen C. Innes and W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, MA, 1995), 13.

²⁷ *Institutio Oratoria*, 7.Prooemium.1–2. For Dee’s annotation, see *Institutio Oratoria* (Lyon, 1540), Royal College of Physicians Library (shelfmark 10106 D1/20-b-3), u2r.

²⁸ For Quintilian’s mnemonics, see Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London, 1992), 18–19.

²⁹ Robert Stillman, *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism* (Aldershot, 2008).

³⁰ ‘Hubert Languet to Sidney, Vienna, 1 January 1574’, in *Correspondence*, 1. 77. For ‘double translation’ among Melancthon’s followers, see William E. Miller, ‘Double Translation in English Humanistic Education’, *Studies in the Renaissance* 10 (1960), 163–174.

- ³¹ Andre Koszul, ‘Les Sidneys et Strasbourg’, *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* 17.2 (1938), 37–44. For Cicero’s epistles ‘chosen out by *Sturmius*’, see Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (London, 1570), C1v.
- ³² Philipp Melanchthon, *Elementa Rhetorices*, in *Principal Writings on Rhetoric*, eds. William P. Weaver, Stefan Strohm, and Volkhard Wels (Berlin, 2017), 371.
- ³³ *Elementa*, 371.
- ³⁴ *Elementa*, 373. For *cohaerentia* in Melanchthon, see Michael Hetherington, ‘“The Coherence of the Text” in Sixteenth-Century England: Reading Law and Literature with Abraham Fraunce’, *Studies in Philology* 115.4 (2018), 641–678 (651–645); for ‘form’ (*forma*) in Renaissance poetics and criticism, see also Hetherington, ‘Places of Form in Early Modern Poetics: Art, Mind, and Voice’, in *The Places of Early Modern Criticism*, eds. Gavin Alexander, Emma Gilby, and Alexander Marr (Oxford, 2021), 112–124.
- ³⁵ On the *Elementa*’s influence on Sidney, see Stillman, *Philip Sidney*, 57.
- ³⁶ Johannes Sturm, *A Ritche Storehouse or Treasure for Nobilitye and Gentlemen*, trans. Thomas Brown (London, 1570), D8v; *De Oratore*, II.63.
- ³⁷ *A Ritche Storehouse*, D8v.
- ³⁸ *Institutio Oratoria* (Lyon, 1540), Royal College of Physicians Library (shelfmark 10106 D1/20-b-3), d5r.
- ³⁹ Burrow, *Imitating Authors*, 221.
- ⁴⁰ Gabriel Harvey, *Ciceronianus*, trans. Clarence A. Wilson and Harold S. Forbes (Lincoln, NE, 1945), 86; Gabriel Harvey, *Rhetor* (London, 1577), M3r. See Virginia F. Stern, *Gabriel Harvey: A Study of his Life, Marginalia, and Library* (Oxford, 1979), 28–31. For Sidney and Harvey, see Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, ‘“Studied for Action”’: How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy’, *Past and Present* 129 (1990), 30–78 (37).
- ⁴¹ *Rhetor*, M2v; Kees Meerhoff, ‘Imitation: analyse et création textuelles’, in *Renaissance-Poetik*, ed. Heinrich Plett (Berlin, 1994), 114–132.
- ⁴² *Rhetor*, M2v.
- ⁴³ Lorna Hutson, *Circumstantial Shakespeare* (Oxford, 2015), 22–29.
- ⁴⁴ Rendall, Steven, et al. *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*, eds. Barbara Cassin et al. (Princeton, NJ, 2014), s.v. ‘mimēsis’.
- ⁴⁵ Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem* (Lyon, 1561), 80a1.
- ⁴⁶ *Poetice*, 83c1.
- ⁴⁷ *Poetice*, 86b1.
- ⁴⁸ Bernard Weinberg, ‘Scaliger versus Aristotle on Poetics’, *Modern Philology* 39.4 (1942), 337–360; Luc Deitz, ‘“Aristoteles imperator noster...”?: J. C. Scaliger and Aristotle on Poetic Theory’, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 2.1 (1995), 54–67.
- ⁴⁹ Abraham Fraunce, *The Lawiers Logike* (London, 1588), 116r.
- ⁵⁰ William Alexander, *Anacrisis*, in *The Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, ed. Thomas Ruddiman (Edinburgh, 1711), 159.
- ⁵¹ Gavin Alexander, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 2006), 263–283.
- ⁵² See *Model*, 19, 36, 37, 39, 43, 71.
- ⁵³ This account is repeated in early editions. See Heliodorus, *Αἰθιοπικῆς ἱστορίας*, ed. Opsopoeus (Basel, 1534), a2v; *L’Histoire Aethiopique*, trans. Amyot (Paris, 1547), A3v–A4r.
- ⁵⁴ *Aethiopicæ Historiæ*, trans. Warschewiczki (Basel, 1552), a3v; *An Aethiopian Historie*, trans. Underdowne (London, 1577), ¶2v, ¶3r. See Skretcowicz, *Erotic Romance*, 115; Robert H. F. Carver, ‘Knowing Heliodorus: The Reception of the *Aethiopica* in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England’, in *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel*, I 231–263.
- ⁵⁵ Terence Cave, *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (Oxford, 1988); Alban Forcione, *Cervantes, Aristotle, and the Persiles* (Princeton, NJ, 1970).
- ⁵⁶ *L’Histoire Aethiopique*, A3r. Cf. Strabo, *Geography*, trans. Horace Leonard Jones (Cambridge, MA, 1917), I.2.17.
- ⁵⁷ *L’Histoire Aethiopique*, A3r.
- ⁵⁸ *Poetice*, 144d1. Cf. 5a2.
- ⁵⁹ *Poetice*, 144d1–144a2.
- ⁶⁰ Cf. Pliny, ‘terminis agrorum’ (*Natural History*, 18.2.8), and Tacitus, ‘terminos urbis’ (*Annals*, 12.23) in Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879), s.v. *terminus*.
- ⁶¹ *Model*, 37.
- ⁶² Thomas More, *Utopia*, trans. Robinson (London, 1551), ✕4r. See *Model*, 51; *OED*, ‘gate’, n.², 9a.
- ⁶³ See Martin Crusius, *Aethiopicæ Heliodori historiae Epitome* (Frankfurt, 1584); Heliodorus, *Aethiopicorum libri x*, ed. Commelinus (Heidelberg, 1596). See also Asaph Ben-Tov, *Lutheran Humanists and Greek Antiquity: Melanchthonian Scholarship between Universal History and Pedagogy* (Leiden, 2009), 179–183. The 1584 version is longer, but I quote passages common to both texts.
- ⁶⁴ E. S. Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1986), 2. 413–414; Thomas James, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae publicae* (Oxford, 1605), 338.

- ⁶⁵ Anthony Grafton, ‘Martin Crusius reads his Homer’, *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 64.1 (2002), 66, 68, 84. Sidney’s education in such circles may have made him familiar with an earlier iteration of Crusius’s remarks on the *Aethiopika*’s structure, particularly its *ordo artificialis*, which appeared in his *scholia* on Melanchthon’s *Elementorum Rhetorices Libri Duo* (Basel, 1574), 249–250.
- ⁶⁶ *Epitome*, A3r. To my knowledge, the only other sixteenth-century instance of the *Aethiopika* being called a poem in print is a marginal note to Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* (Paris, 1562), 386.
- ⁶⁷ *Epitome*, A3r, A4r.
- ⁶⁸ *Institutio Oratoria*, 4.2.54; *Epitome*, A4r.
- ⁶⁹ *Model*, 37.
- ⁷⁰ *Epitome*, A4r.
- ⁷¹ Arthur Heiserman, *The Novel Before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West* (Chicago, IL, 1977), 197.
- ⁷² *Model*, 36.
- ⁷³ *Aethiopian Historie*, 130v; *Aethiopicorum libri x*, 448. The Greek text, printed opposite this Latin translation in 1596, reads as follows: ‘Ὡ γλυκύτατε, ἔφη, τὰ μεγάλα τῶν πραγμάτων μεγάλων δεῖται κατασκευῶν’ [‘O my love, she said, great matters require great preparation and circumstances’].
- ⁷⁴ *Model*, 35; cf. ‘mongrell Tragicomédie’ (*Defence*, 11v). See Micha Lazarus, ‘Poetry and Horseplay in Sidney’s *Defence of Poesy*’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 79 (2016), 149–182. For more on ideas of proportion, see Gavin Alexander, ‘Sidney, Scott, and the Proportions of Poetics’, *Sidney Journal* 33.1 (2015), 7–28.
- ⁷⁵ *Model*, 36.
- ⁷⁶ ‘To the Reader’, in Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (London, 1593), ¶4r, ¶4v.
- ⁷⁷ *Aethiopian Historie*, 1v.
- ⁷⁸ *Aethiopicorum libri x*, 2; Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1940), s.v. συμ-βάλλω.
- ⁷⁹ *Epitome*, A4r.
- ⁸⁰ Wolff, 177; cf. Shadi Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton, NJ, 1989), 119.
- ⁸¹ Erasmus, *On the Copia of Words and Ideas*, trans. Donald King and David Rix (Milwaukee, WI, 2012), 47.
- ⁸² *Aethiopian Historie*, 78r; *Ciceronianus*, 86.
- ⁸³ *OED*, ‘deliver’, v.¹, 14b.
- ⁸⁴ There has been interesting work on the question of whether the ‘old’ *Arcadia* has a distinct model for its narrative arrangement; see Clark Chalifour, ‘Sir Philip Sidney’s *Old Arcadia* as Terentian Comedy’, *Studies in English Literature* 16.1 (1976), 51–63.
- ⁸⁵ John Winkler, ‘The Mendacity of Kalisiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros’ *Aithiopika*’, *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982), 93–154 (101).
- ⁸⁶ *Scholemaster*, R1v. See Kathy Eden, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and its Humanist Reception* (New Haven, CT, 1997), 26–27.
- ⁸⁷ *Model*, 35.
- ⁸⁸ For literary practice as site of criticism, see the ‘Introduction’ to *The Places of Early Modern Criticism*, 1–21. Gavin Alexander has also argued that the revised *Arcadia* is engaged in adapting and focusing the arguments of the *Defence*; see ‘Loving and Reading in Sidney’, *Studies in Philology* 114.1 (2017), 39–66.
- ⁸⁹ Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, ed. Lorna Hutson, in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, 7 vols (Cambridge, 2012), 7. 591; ‘Introduction’, in John Barclay, *Argenis*, ed. and trans. Mark Riley and Dorothy Pritchard Huber, 2 vols (Tempe, AZ, 2004), 1. 30–31.