The following resources are arranged alphabetically. For additional information about the translation and reception of classical homophilic and homosatiric material, see the print anthology, pp. 143-48.

---

**ANACREON (c. 575-490 BCE)**

For a brief account of Anacreon’s life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, pp. 145-6 and p. 187. For selections from his poetry, see the print anthology, pp. 187-90, and ‘Anacreon’ (*Online Companion*).

**SOURCES AND SELECTED READING:**

**SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF ANACREON AND THE ANACREONTEA BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:**
Stanley, Thomas. *Poems*. London, 1651. [55 poems from the Anacreontea are translated in this volume]

**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF ANACREON AND THE ANACREONTEA:**
CATULLUS (GAIUS VALERIUS CATULLUS, c. 84-54 BCE)

For a brief account of Catullus’ life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, pp. 144-7 and 193. For selections from his poetry, see the print anthology, pp. 194-98, and ‘Catullus’ (Online Companion).

CATULLUS IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND. Catullus was a significant influence on his immediate successors, such as Horace and Martial, but he was only rediscovered in the West at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Although prized for his stylistic elegance and his moral satire, Catullus quickly developed a reputation as a witty, obscene epigrammatist, a writer of light and sensual verse, whose explicit aim was to arouse and titillate the reader (Gaisser, 2009, 166-79). While widely imitated and admired, Catullus’ verse, particularly its putative obscenity, nevertheless became increasingly problematic for his supporters (Gaisser, 2009, 185-90). Fuelled at least partly by Puritan anti-poetic sentiment, and the hardening of religious attitudes, hostility to Catullus was quite overt in England when he arrived there in the sixteenth century, and as a result English Catullan verse is less sensual than its Continental counterpart. The London Latin edition of 1684 prompted more translations, but before 1684 only Richard Lovelace assayed more than one or two: Lucasta: Posthume Poems (1659) contains thirteen. By the middle of the eighteenth century, about half of Catullus’ oeuvre had appeared in English translation (Gaisser, 2009, 194-98). The sparrow poems (Carmina 2 and 3) and the kiss poem (‘To Lesbia: Carmen 5’) were by far the most frequently imitated and translated, while many others, particularly his satiric ones, suffered in comparison with Martial’s and were not frequently translated.

Because Catullus arrived relatively late in England, he lacks frank early modern translations of his more erotically explicit and vituperative poetry. The famously obscene Carmina 16 and 32 were only translated in 1795 and 1707 respectively, but had to wait until the twentieth century for truly direct treatment. Although Lovelace includes translations of a number of Catullus’ poems, the only homoerotic one he attempts is ‘Carmen 49’ (where the speaker begs numerous kisses from Juventius). Apart from his one translation of ‘Carmen 49,’ I have not been able to find any other translations of Catullus’ love poems for Juventius translated before 1707. In fact, Catullus’ homoerotic poetry made its way circuitously into English translation only in this year via a French fictionalization of the poet’s life and loves, Jean de la Chapelle’s Les Amours de Catulle (1680). Like its French original, The Adventures of Catullus (1707) uses a prose narrative of Catullus’ heterosexual relationships, primarily with Lesbia and the fictional Crastinia to explain away the obvious homoerotic content of many of his lyrics. However, in 1713, along with many of Catullus’ heterosexual lyrics, the Adventures’ translations of two poems that Catullus wrote for his young male beloved Juventius (removed from their homosexualizing context) were reprinted at the end of a translation of Petronius’ Satyricon. However, those poems from Adventures that present more explicit sexual desire for a male beloved, and those poems that depict male rivalry over a boy’s sexual favours were not. This division seems in keeping with general early modern attitudes towards sexuality and obscenity in Catullus: while invective that employed references to male-male anal or oral sex (as in ‘Carmen 16’) might eventually be translated towards the end of the eighteenth century through elisions and vagueness, romantic longing for a boy was simply too much for most translators to manage.
**Catullus’ Homoerotic, Homosocial, and Homosatiric Poetry.** With the exception of the translations that appear in the *Adventures of Catullus—Carmina* 15, 21, 29, 48, 57 and 99 (see print anthology, pp. 194-8)—none of the explicitly homoerotic and homosatiric poems listed below were translated into English between 1550 and 1735. *Adventures* does, however, also include one of Catullus’ poems on male friendship, ‘Carmina 50’ and his unusual account of the myth of Attis and Cybele, ‘Carmen 63’ (see Online Companion). However, Latin texts of all of them were available in various printed editions beginning in the early sixteenth century, including the edition published in London in 1684. The ‘?’ below denotes poems that modern critics often interpret as part of Catullus’ cycle for his beautiful young beloved, the youth Juventius, but which do not explicitly name this young man:

a) Carmen 9 (for Veranius) and Carmen 50 (for Licinius): poems celebrating male friends
b) *Carmina* 77 and 91: about the loss of or betrayal by male friends
c) *Carmina* ?15, ?21, 24, 48, 81, 99, ?103: the sequence on Juventius:
   *Carmina* ?15 and ?21: These do not name Juventius, but each expresses the speaker’s fear that his ‘boy’ may be sexually corrupted by a male friend/rival, while the speaker is absent from Rome.
   *Carmina* 24 and 81: These lament Juventius’ poor taste in men, emphasizing Juventius’ lack of fidelity.
Carmen 48 (sometimes numbered 49): A love poem where the speaker desires numerous kisses from Juventius.
Carmen 99: The speaker steals a kiss from Juventius and is subsequently humiliated by the boy.
Carmen ?103: The speaker addresses one Silo, who is sometimes identified as a guardian of Juventius; labelling Silo a “pimp,” the speaker demands repayment of a large sum of money, prompting speculation that he has paid (in vain it would appear) to secure access to Juventius.
d) *Carmina* 16, 28, 29, 57, 74, 80, 88 (self-fellatio), 97: These poems contain descriptions of or references to male-male anal sex, fellatio, etc. that are used as invective, often against Catullus’ sexual, social, and/or political rivals.
e) Carmen 61, lines 119-143: Catullus’ epithalamion (wedding song) includes comments that suggest the wide-spread and casual nature of male same-sex erotic relationships, since the bridegroom is depicted as somewhat reluctantly surrendering his male lover for heterosexual intercourse with his new bride.
f) Carmen 30: The speaker recounts his betrayal by a young male lover, Alfenus.
g) Carmen 56: The speaker recounts how he came upon his girlfriend and her slave boy having sex; the speaker takes the opportunity to penetrate anally his rival.
h) *Carmina* 33 and 112: These poems involve a satire of male homosexual licentiousness and male homosexual prostitution.
i) Carmen 63: A recounting of the myth of Attis and earth mother goddess Cybele; Attis’ self-castration while possessed by an ecstatic frenzy during the worship of the goddess is figured as a sex change, one that separates him from the world of masculine privilege and power that he had previously enjoyed.

**Sources and Suggested Reading:**

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF CATULLUS BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:

John Hanway? Translations of Several Odes, Satires, and Epistles of Horace. With Some Versions Out of Catullus, Martial […] and the Italian Poets. London: W. Burton and Mr. Stokoe, 1730. [none of Catullus’s homoerotic or homosatiric pieces appear in this collection].

SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF CATULLUS:

Duckett, Eleanor Shipley, ed. Catullus in English Poetry. Smith College Classical Studies, No. 6. Northampton, MA, 1925. [an anthology of translations by various authors; none of Catullus’ homoerotic or homosatiric verse appears here]
For a brief biography of Cicero and a discussion of some of the historical and literary contexts of *Laelius*, in particular, see the selections in the *Online Companion*.

CICERO IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND. Cicero occupied an honoured and indeed an almost unrivalled place both in England’s humanist revival of classical literature and in the educational curriculum that was so influenced by it. A young man’s grammar school education had at its heart ‘the learning of true piety and the Latin tongue’ (Jones 157), and the learning of Latin often proceeded through the imitation of classical writers, whereby the student learned not just to read and translate classical writers but to compose in Latin in a variety of styles and genres. The rhetorical and stylistic models that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century students were offered included the works of many classical writers, but none were more emphasized or more often imitated than those of Cicero. Although Cicero took up a central role in the more advanced stages of a young man’s education in Latin grammar, composition, and literature, his works were also important in the beginning stages of this education. Roger Ascham’s *The Schoolmaster* (1570), for example, has a memorable passage describing the pedagogy of the good teacher, one who attracts a student to learning through making knowledge and texts attractive and accessible, and through a gentle combination of praise and correction:

> […] Let the master read unto him the *Epistles* of Cicero, gathered together and chosen out by Sturmius for the capacity of children. First, let him teach the child, cheerfully and plainly, the cause and matter of the letter; then, let him construe it into English so oft as the child may easily carry away the understanding of it; lastly, parse it over perfectly. This done thus, let the child by and by both construe and parse it over again, so that it may appear that the child doubteth in nothing that his master taught him before. After this, the child must take a paper book and, sitting in some place where no man shall prompt him, by himself, let him translate into English his former lesson. Then showing it to his master, let the master take from him his Latin book and pausing an hour at the least, then let the child translate his own English into Latin again, in another paper book. When the child brings it, turned into Latin, the master must compare it with Tully’s book and lay them both together, and where the child does well, either in choosing or true placing of Tully’s words, let the master praise him and say, “Here you do well.” For I assure you, there is no such whetstone to sharpen a good wit and encourage a will to learning as is praise.

But if the child miss, either in forgetting a word or in changing a good with a worse, or misordering the sentence, I would not have the master either frown or chide with him, if the child have done his diligence and used no truantship therein. For I know by good experience that a child shall take more profit of two faults gently warned of than of four things rightly hit. For then the master shall have good occasion to say unto him, “N. [i.e., insert the name of the student here] Tully would have used such a word, not this; Tully would have placed this word here, not there; would have used this case, this number, this person, this degree, this gender; he would have used this mood, this tense, this simple, rather than this compound; this adverb here, not there; he would have ended the sentence with this verb, not with that noun or participle, etc.”

Independent Latin composition, particularly of the period’s most formal compositions—the
letter, the theme, and the oration—were based on the imitation of the style of Cicero and others, as well as a thorough study of classical rhetoric; this focus characterized the higher stages of grammar school education. Ascham declares Cicero the perfect model for prose imitation in each of these genres of formal composition, and many of his humanist educational contemporaries agreed with him, such as John Brinsley. Cicero’s familiar letters, his various treatises (such as *De Senectute*, *De Officiis*, and *De Amicitia*), as well as orations (particularly those against Catiline) were all works with which an advanced student would become familiar in the process of learning to compose his own letters, essays, and orations. As Jones notes, “To masters and pupils, Cicero was a sourcebook of rhetorical precepts, a guarantor of correct Latin usage, a repository of elegant phrases, *sententiae*, and *exempla*, a font of good moral matter, and a model supreme for all types of formal composition” (190).

This focus on Cicero in the humanist revival and the humanist revolution in education also affected the print market, since the printing of Cicero in Latin to meet the demand for school texts increased the number of Latin editions of Cicero produced in England over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; as well, students took what they had learned in their rigorous training both in grammar school and university and proceeded to translate Cicero’s most popular works for the larger non-Latin literate reading public. Cicero’s popularity also led to numerous bibliographical and grammatical aids being produced to help students read and imitate his works and those of other classical writers. Cicero also received the dubious honour of starring in Robert Greene’s enormously popular romance *Ciceronis Amor: Tullies Love* (1589; rept. eight times by 1639), wherein Greene informs us that he intends “to pen down the loves of Cicero, which Plutarch, and Cornelius Nepos, forgot in their writings.” Fulke Greville also wrote a play based on Cicero’s life, *The Tragedy of That Famous Roman Orator Marcus Tullius Cicero* (1651).

**MAJOR ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF CICERO BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735.** It would be difficult to list all the translations of Cicero’s works that appeared during this period, beginning with one of the earliest printed books in England, Caxton’s 1481 translation of *De Senectute* and *De Amicitia*. However, the most frequently translated of Cicero’s works were *De Officiis* (On Duties), which appeared in English twenty-five times between 1534 and 1735; *De Senectute* (On Old Age), which appeared ten times between 1535 and 1727; *Laelius: De Amicitia* (Laelius: On Friendship) translations of which were printed seven times between 1530 and 1727; and *Tusculan Disputations*, which appeared four times between 1561 and 1715. Other works, such as Cicero’s epistles and orations received less than a handful of translations in this period, although no record of translation can begin to suggest Cicero’s influence: the Latin editions of his texts were far more numerous than their English translations, although before 1521, only two of Cicero’s works in Latin made it into print: the *Pro Milone* and the *Philippica* (Jones 191). However, as Jones notes, during the later sixteenth century, some 57 Latin editions, with an additional ten Latin-English editions, were printed in England (131). The seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries saw an exponential rise in the number of printings of Latin editions of Cicero’s works.

**SOURCES AND SUGGESTED READING:**

Ascham, Roger. *The scholomaster, or [a] plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to understand, write, and speake, the Latin tonge [...]*. London: John Daye, 1570.


SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF CICERO'S LÆLIUS: DE AMICITIA [ON FRIENDSHIP] BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:

Worcester, John Tiptoft, earl of. Here begynneth the prohemye upon the reducyng, both out of latyn as of frensshe in to our englyssh tongue, of the polytyque book named Tullius de senectute … Westminster: Printed by William Caxton, 1481 [It is followed by a translation of ‘Laelius: De Amicitia’: Here followeth the said Tullius de Amicicia translated in to our maternall Englishh tongue by the noble famous Erle, the Erle of wurcestre …]. Westminster: William Caxton, 1481.

—. Tullius de amicicia, in Englysh. Here after ensueth a goodly treatys of amyte or frendshyp compiled in Latyn by the most eloquente Romayne Marcus Tullius Cicero and lately translatyed in to Englyshe. London: W. Rastell, 1530(?). [a reprint of Caxton’s 1481 edition].


Newton, Thomas, trans. Four severall treatises of M. Tullius Cicero conteyninge his most learned and eloquente discourses of frendshippe; old age; paradoxes; and Scipio his dreame. All turned out of Latin into English by Thomas Newton. London: [Printed] by Thomas Marshe, 1577.


SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF CICERO’S TUSCOLAN DISPUTATIONS BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:

Dolman, John. Those fewe questions, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputed in his manor of Tusculanum, written afterwarde by him, in as manye booke, to his frende, and familiar Brutus, in the Latin toungue. And nowe, oute of the same translated, & englished, by John Dolman, studente and fellowe of the Inner Temple. London: Thomas Marshe, 1561.

Wase, Christopher. The five days debate at Cicero’s house in Tusculum between master and sophister. London: Printed for Abel Swalle, 1683. [Printed for Thomas Simons, 1683]

Selected Translations of Cicero’s ‘Second Oration against Catiline’ between 1550 and 1735:

Wase, Christopher. *Cicero against Catiline, in IV invective orations containing the whole manner of discovering that notorious conspiracy*. Done into English by Christopher Wase. London: printed by T.N. for Samuel Lowndes, 1671.


Selected Modern Translations of Cicero:


HOMER (fl. 8th c. BCE)

For a brief biography of Homer and selections from the Iliad, see the print anthology, pp. 148-52.

HOMER IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND. Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey were revered by the ancient Greeks and Romans, viewed as repositories of wisdom and examples of poetic excellence; they were imitated by numerous writers, including Virgil and Lucretius, and were first translated into Latin by Livius Andronicus (284-204 BCE). Rescued initially by Byzantine scholars, Homer’s epics survive in an unusually large number of manuscripts, which made their way to Europe in the late-fourteenth century. Although these Greek manuscripts first appeared in print in Florence (1488), the Iliad and the Odyssey only became widely accessible when they were translated from Greek into Latin near the end of the century by Petrarch’s tutor Leonzio Pilato. This highly unsuccessful translation was soon replaced others in the fifteenth century: two Latin prose translations and one Latin verse translation, the latter by the Italian humanist Angelo Poliziano (1454-94). However, it was only in the sixteenth century that printings of Homer began to increase dramatically, with 246 editions appearing between 1501 and 1600 (Young 97), with the Aldine Press (Venice) producing important Latin editions in 1504, 1517, and 1524; a London Latin edition appeared in 1591. Interestingly, although one might assume that Homer had an exalted reputation in early modern England, he was actually much less influential than his Latin counterpart, Virgil. When George Chapman (1559/60-1634), Homer’s most important early translator, said of the Iliad that “of all books extant in all kinds, Homer is the first and best,” his statements have the force of a corrective, challenging what he perceived as the neglect of Homer and his relegation to secondary status compared with Virgil.

The translation of Homer into English has a surprisingly long history, given that knowledge of Greek was extremely limited in England until the first half of the sixteenth century. Earlier English redactions of narratives and figures from Homer’s epics do not rely directly on the Iliad or the Odyssey, but on the prose ‘histories’ of the Trojan War in particular of Dictys and Dares, often via this material’s use in Continental writers like Boccaccio. By the mid-sixteenth century Greek was being taught in the universities, but it was still a language known by relatively few educated men in contrast to Latin. Even by the beginning of the seventeenth century expertise in Greek was relatively uncommon in England among educated gentlemen, and thus Arthur Hall (1539-1605), MP and a client of the powerful Cecil family, was the first to attempt an actual English translation of Homer’s works, with his 1581 version of the first ten books of the Iliad; however, he worked from a French version (by Hugues Salel; 1st edition, 1555), rather than from the Greek or one of its available Latin translations. Hall’s DNB biographer says that the translation is quite free, and in places inaccurate. George Chapman followed with his highly lauded and still-read translation of the Iliad (1598; rev. and completed, 1611) and the Odyssey (1616); Chapman worked from Jean de Sponde’s dual language edition (Greek-Latin) published in 1583, but seems to have relied largely on the Latin not the Greek version. Chapman’s translations have sometimes been criticized for adding to his originals—sometimes phrases, sometimes entire lines—but they have also been praised for capturing some essential Homeric qualities: vigour of style, plain and indeed idiomatic language, and rapid pacing (Young 105-106). The printer and cartographer John Ogilby (1600-1676) and the famous political philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) each produced translations of Homer’s epics, both of which were much praised at the time. Ogilby’s Homer His Iliads Translated (1660) was followed by his
translation of the *Odyssey* (1665); both were handsome volumes, with engraved illustrations and thorough scholarly notes. Hobbes’ *Odyssey* (1674) and *Iliads* (1676) were both characterized by a direct, unornamented style, as well as significant compression, and a complete absence of scholarly annotation (Hobbes comments that as he could not add anything to Ogilby’s scholarly commentary, he thought it best to leave out such commentary altogether). This quality of brevity, however, at least according to Alexander Pope, involved the excision of the original’s “particulars and circumstances” resulting in a translation which had an undeserved reputation for accuracy: “He sometimes omits whole similes and sentences, and is now and then guilty of mistakes.” Neither Ogilby nor Hobbes was celebrated for the poetic qualities of their translations. Dryden published selections from the *Iliad* (1700) and Pope produced in 1715-1720 perhaps the most influential English version of this epic, following it with a translation of the *Odyssey* (1725-1726). Like Chapman, Pope saw the *Iliad* and Homer’s works in general as allegories, commenting that Achilles’ flaws helped convey the poem’s ethical focus on the necessity to “avoid anger, since it is ever pernicious in the event [i.e., outcome, end].”

The relationship between Achilles and Patroclus and the nature of their love have always been matters of controversy. Clearly, Homer emphasizes the “exceptional love between Achilles and Patroclus,” and makes it clear that it is partly “a physical intimacy Achilles is missing and longing for” after the death of Patroclus (Davison 298). Moreover, Davison continues, the sexually and emotionally intimate nature of this warrior pairing is reinforced through the obvious parallels between Achilles and Patroclus’ relationship and that of husband and wife: Achilles mourns Patroclus, cradling the dead man’s head in his arms, a gesture duplicated when Andromache cradles the head of her dead husband, Hector. Later classical writers, such as Aeschylus in his tragedy *Myrmidons*, Plato in *Symposium*, and Aeschines in his oration against Timarchus, all clearly acknowledge the passionate and erotic nature of the classical heroes’ relationship. Moreover, the assumption that Achilles and Patroclus were lovers and not simply committed friends can be found in early modern texts as well (Davidson 255-84).

Homer’s early modern English translators clearly found the intimacy between Achilles and Patroclus both attractive and troubling, particularly in the way it was evinced in Achilles’ overwhelming grief for Patroclus’ death. Although we need to bear in mind that Chapman, Ogilby, Hobbes, and Pope would have been working from dual Greek-Latin editions, examining a particularly vexed passage in the *Iliad* helps reveal some of the linguistic ‘veiling’ that early modern translators often engaged in to manage, downplay or purge the homoerotic / homosexual character of the heroes’ relationship. In the poem, Achilles arranges for funerary games and a funerary pyre to mourn the death of his dear friend and comrade Patroclus. After the completion of these rituals, however, Achilles continues to mourn deeply and passionately, and refuses to allow Hector, the Trojan warrior who has earlier killed Patroclus on the battlefield, proper burial. Frustrated with Achilles’ grief and his refusal to return, and indeed his active degradation of, Hector’s body, the gods send Achilles’ mother, the goddess Thetis, to speak with her son, and deliver Jove’s command that Hector be given back to his father, King Priam of Troy. Thetis, seeing Achilles’ emotionally distraught state, tries to advise and console her son. Davison says that a literal translation of Thetis’ remarks at this point would be as follows: “My child, how much longer are you going to eat your heart out in grief and agony, forgetful both of food and bed. It is good to have loving [sexual] intercourse even with a woman” (258). Although the Greek is clear and unequivocal, critics, commentators, and translators have sought ways of avoiding what Thetis is saying: that Achilles’ grief contingent on the loss of Patroclus has led him to isolate himself from loving intimacy and sexual relations, and that he should not so isolate himself, and that even the ‘second-best’ sexual intimacy with a female partner is a good
thing. Early modern translators vary in their willingness to suggest that Achilles’ relationship with Patroclus is the intimate, sexual, and erotic equivalent of a heterosexual relationship. To his credit, Chapman implies that Achilles’ love for Patroclus is precisely this: the equivalent of the erotic love of a man for a woman:

His reverend mother then
Came near, took kindly his fair hand, and asked him: “Dear son, when
Will sorrow leave thee? How long time wilt thou thus eat thy heart,
Fed with no other food, nor rest? ’Twere good thou wouldst divert
Thy friend’s love to some lady; cheer thy spirits with such kind parts
As she can quit thy grace withal.

(24.134-139)

However, later translations attempt to obscure the clarity of Thetis’ utterance by eliminating the implied comparison between Achilles’ love for and sexual intimacy with Patroclus and a man’s love for and sexual intimacy with a beloved woman. Ogilby presents this passage thus:

then the sad mother by her weeping son,
Sate down, and him bemoaning thus begun:
How long thy spirits wilt thou pining waste
Of sweet repose regardless and repast?
Since thy sad fate and woeful day draws near,
Let thee some female’s kind embraces cheer.

(pp. 503-04, 1669 edition).

In contrast, Hobbes has Thetis plead:

Be comforted, and for your health provide;
And take delight in women’s company,
For here you know you are not long to stay

(pp. 368-69).

Pope even more decorously transforms Thetis’ comments into a general ‘carpe diem’ utterance, eliminating both Patroclus’ body and those of the nameless women:

How long, unhappy! shall thy sorrows flow
And thy heart waste with life-consuming woe?
Mindless of food, or love whose pleasing reign
Soothes weary life, and softens human pain.
O snatch the moments yet within thy pow’r,
Not long to live, indulge the am’rous hour!” (24.163-168).
In Pope, moreover, the implication is that Achilles’ grief for Patroclus can be assuaged by love, as though the grief Achilles feels is not indeed fuelled by the most passionate love expressed anywhere in Homer’s works.

Interestingly, other moments in the Iliad that convey Achilles’ profound grief and love do not cause early modern translators as much (if indeed any) anxiety. Earlier in the poem, when the grief-stricken Achilles retires to lie on the seashore, he falls into a troubled sleep and has a vision of the dead Patroclus, who reproaches him for not having given him his due funeral rites. Achilles, promising to do everything he has been asked, tries to embrace his friend.

Ogilby has Achilles say to Patroclus’ ghost:

[...] but stay a little space
To make grief pleasant by our sweet embrace.’
His arms (this said) he lovingly extends;
But straight the murmuring shade like smoke descends” (476).

Hobbes has:

‘Come nearer to me that embrace we may
A little while, and one another moan.’
This said, his arms he spreads; and then away
Patroclus sunk . . . (344).

In fact, Pope of all these translators captures best the physical and emotional nature of Achilles’ yearning:

‘O more than brother! Think each office paid,
Whate’er can rest a discontented shade;
But grant one last embrace, unhappy boy!
Afford at least that melancholy joy.’
He said, and with his longing arms essayed
In vain to grasp the visionary shade;
Like a thin smoke he sees the spirit fly.

(24.110-115)

**Sources and Suggested Reading:**

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF THE ILIAD BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:
Ogilby, John, trans. Homer His Iliads Translated, Adorned with Sculpture, and Illustrated with Annotations. London: Thomas Roycroft, 1660.
Dryden, John, trans. ‘The Iliad’ in Fables Ancient and Modern. London: Jacob Tonson, 1700.

MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF THE ILLIAD:
HORACE (QUINTUS HORATIUS FLACcus, 65-8 BCE)

For a brief biography of Horace and other selections from his verse, see the print anthology, pp. 191-3, and the Online Companion.

HORACE IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND. Horace is by far the most often translated and imitated of classical poets in the early modern period. The first Latin edition of his works appeared in 1470 (Italy), followed by others in 1492 (Germany), 1501 and 1561 (France). His influence on Renaissance Continental writers from Petrarch to Tasso to Ronsard is well-documented (McGann 305-307). Moreover, his treatise on writing, the Ars Poetica, was a standard handbook for the poet throughout the period. Generally early modern writers in England were attracted by the same Horatian themes that inspired their Continental counterparts: the virtues of retirement and a simple life; the celebration of friendship; and the moral seriousness of his satires and many of his odes. Horace’s most enduring reputation, however, was as a moral poet, although his verse early inspired some unease. Thomas Drant’s Medicinable Morall (1566) pairs a translation of the first two books of Horace’s ‘Satires’ with that of the Old Testament prophet Jeremiah’s ‘Lamentations.’ Of the two writers, however, only Horace (in Drant’s opinion) requires amelioration, addition, and emendation, as Drant compares what he has done to Horace’s ‘Satires’ with what the Israelites did with “captive women that were handsome and beautiful”; “I have shaved off his hair, and pared of[f] his nails; (that is) I have wiped away all his vanity and superfinity [not in OED: perhaps, excessive refinement?] of matter” (4). Drant’s unease notwithstanding, Horace was widely viewed as an accomplished poetic stylist as well as a moral instructor. In his ‘Discourse on Satire,’ Dryden notes that Horace’s strengths as a satirist, in comparison with Juvenal’s, are the greater “generality” of the moral instruction he offers, as well as the greater reliance on “familiar examples” than severe “precepts” (xxxvi, xxxvii). Horace’s reputation as a poet par excellence is perhaps best indicated by the reaction to Thomas Creech’s translation, damned by contemporary critics for not having captured Horace’s tone, style, and general poetic glory.

There were five major translations of Horace’s works (complete or nearly complete) in the seventeenth century: Henry Rider (1638), J[ohn] S[mith] (1649), Barten Holyday (1652; but many of the translations of Horace are actually by Thomas Hawkins [1625], see below), the anonymous All Horace His Lyrics (1653), and Thomas Creech (1684). In addition, there were four translations of selection from Horace’s works: John Ashmore (1621), Thomas Hawkins (1625), Richard Fanshawe (1652), and John Harington (1684), as well as a collection of translations from Horace’s works by various writers edited and sponsored by Alexander Brome (1666). The early eighteenth century saw the anonymous Odes of Horace (1712-13; rept., 1719), Henry Coxwell (1718), and John Wilmot, earl of Rochester et. al (1730). Hawkins rejects Horace’s “wanton and looser poems” to focus on his “moral and serious odes,” an attitude generally typical of those partial translations of Horace that include his Odes and Epodes. Even Henry Rider, who remains so faithful to Horace’s originals, deletes Epodes 8 and 12 for their putative obscenity. Given this attitude, the two most important and influential of Horace’s homoerotic odes (4.1 and 4.10) appear surprisingly often throughout these volumes, and in a way that usually does not obscure the gender of the male beloved. Nevertheless, they are missing from Holyday, Ashmore, and Harington. Harington, however, often assures the reader that the many poems he deletes from his collection, including 4.1 and 4.10, were “on good grounds omitted,” clearly on account of content that Harington deems obscene. In a few cases, the male beloved in these and other
poems is given a sex change; Manning, for example, transforms the beloved boy Ligurinus into the female beloved Lisetta (Rochester et. al. [1730], pp. 137-38)); other translators leave Ligurinus’ sex discreetly ambiguous. Alexander Pope’s version of 4.1 leaves the beloved boy unnamed and ungendered, addressed simply as “too dear” and “cruel.” However, 4.1 and 4.10 appear (with varying degrees of erotic longing expressed) in most of the other volumes listed above, except for Brome (1666) which contains only 4.1. For some comments on early modern translations of Odes 1.4, 1.32, 2.5, 3.20, and an appendix containing various translations of the last twelves lines of 4.1, see the selections in the Online Companion.

**Sources and Suggested Reading:**


**Select English Translations of Horace Between 1550 and 1735:**


Anonymous, trans. *All Horace His Lyrics, Or, His Four Books of Odes and His Book of Epodes Englished*. London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1653 [some of the poems here are identical to those credited to Richard Fanshawe in Alexander Brome’s work: see Brome, above]


[Oldisworth, William, trans.?] *The Odes of Horace in Latin and English*. London: Printed for Bernard Lintott, 1712-1713; rept. in 2 vols, 1714. [the odes are identical to those that appear in the larger volume printed in 1719, below]


Rochester, John Wilmot, earl of, et al., trans. [along with the earl of Roscommon, Abraham Cowley, Thomas Otway, William Congreve, Matthew Prior, Arthur Mainwaring, John Dryden, John Milton and many others]. *The Odes and Satires of Horace, That Have Been Done into English by the Most Eminent Hands ... With his Art of Poetry. To this edition are added several odes never before published*. Dublin: Printed by Samuel Fuller, 1730.


*The Odes and Satires of Horace, that have been done into English by the most eminent hands*. Dublin: Printed by Samuel Fuller, 1730.


**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF HORACE:**


For a brief account of Juvenal’s life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, pp. 144-6 and p. 248; for three versions of ‘Satire 2,’ see the Online Companion; for selections from ‘Satire 6,’ see the print anthology, pp. 249-51.

**Juvenal in Early Modern England.** By turns angry, vituperative, ironic, morally outraged, and energetically obscene, Juvenal’s *Satires* offered early modern writers a sanctioned precedent for their attacks on the vices of their own times, and thus *Satires* became a favourite group of poems for imitation and adaptation, inspiring the satires of John Donne, John Marston, and Joseph Hall. Sir Robert Stapylton (1607/9?–1669) translated Juvenal’s complete satires in 1647, and his heroic couplets generally maintain quite well the sense of the original. In his notes, he suggests that at mid-century translators viewed the putative obscenity of Juvenal’s work as more than justified by his moral utility: he was the scourge of vice, reformer of manners, exposor of the secrets of men, and encourager of virtue. Like Dryden, Stapylton maintains that Juvenal’s immodest language was dictated by the times in which he lived, but unlike Dryden, Stapylton decides to “purge him thoroughly [...] of [his] malignant humour,” acknowledging, however, that this decision makes him an “interpreter” and “more than a translator” (1644, A3’). Barten Holyday (1593-1661) tends to sacrifice the poetry to the accuracy in his 1673 translation; his literal approach often requires the extensive notes he offers for the sense to be clear. In contrast, Dryden called his 1693 collaborative translation of *Satires* a work “betwixt a paraphrase and an imitation” (Dryden, ‘To the Right Honourable Charles,’ n.p.), remaining very close to the original yet escaping the trap of over-literallness. He makes Juvenal “speak that kind of English which he would have spoken had he lived in England and written to this age” (liii). According to Dryden, Holyday’s translation fails because he is too obsessed with speaking to a scholarly audience, and thus he renders Juvenal’s meaning “almost line for line.” For Dryden, neither Holyday nor Stapylton “have imitated Juvenal in the poetical part of him” (liii).

‘Satire 6’ has always been a popular yet controversial work, both for its sexual explicitness and its virulent misogyny. Identifying it as the “wittiest” yet most “unjust” of Juvenal’s satires, since it imputes to all women the vices of a few, Dryden justifies his translation partly on the grounds that Juvenal “will bring but few over to his opinion” and that he could not persuade any of his collaborators to undertake it. Dryden further describes the vices Juvenal identifies in the women of his age as alien to Englishwomen. Situating female sexual voraciousness and tribadism in the ancient past perhaps frees Dryden to be fairly explicit in his translation of the work’s female same-sex orgy, a scene unique in classical literature. However, Stapylton expresses the same view, noting that Englishwomen are so chaste that “we are absolutely freed of the vanities and vices of the Romans” (A4r), yet neither he nor Holyday makes clear that tribadic sex takes place in the poem before the women call in the men at the end of the same-sex pleasuring. As Donoghue concludes, although Dryden deletes details from the original he is more explicit about the nature of the orgy here than any other writer before the twentieth century (*Passions* 212-214). In fact, as the cancelled lines in “Satire 6” indicate (see the print anthology, pp. 249-51), Dryden was initially willing to risk an even more direct treatment of female same-sex sexual intercourse than what finally appeared in print. In contrast, ‘Satire 2’ with its frequent references to various male same-sex sexual acts tends to receive relatively straightforward treatment in the major translations I have consulted; the major difficulties that early modern translators faced in ‘Satire 2’ seem related to this work’s abundant contemporary references and allusions.
**Sources and Suggested Reading:**

**Selected English Translations of Juvenal Between 1550 and 1735:**
Stapylton, Sir Robert, trans. and ed. _Juvenal’s sixteen satyrs, or, A survey of the manners and actions of mankind with arguments, marginal notes, and annotations clearing the obscure places out of the history, laws, and ceremonies of the Romans_. London: Humphrey Mosely, 1647.
John Dryden, ed., trans., and comp. _The satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis translated into English verse by Mr. Dryden and several other eminent hands. Together with the satires of Aulus Persius Flaccus_. London: Jacob Tonson, 1693.

**Selected Modern Translations of Juvenal:**
For a brief account of Lucian’s life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, pp. 145-6 and p. 256. For selections from his verse, see the print anthology, pp. 256-68, and ‘Lucian of Samosata’ (Online Companion).

**LUCIAN IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD.** The early modern period saw Lucian variously as a more than usually entertaining moral writer, a master of rhetoric and style, an interpreter of classical philosophy, and an unsparing satirist of the follies of paganism (Robinson 84). Gradually, he also became known as a sceptic, and some less charitable scholars depicted him as a sneering atheist, contemptuous of all religion and revealed truth (Robinson 97-98). Lucian’s use of the dialogue, a popular genre in early modern writing, and his satiric edge ensured his continued popularity, and his dialogues were frequently imitated [e.g., Thomas Brown (1711)]. There were translations of Lucian’s selected works beginning in 1530, including those of Jasper Mayne and Francis Hickes (1634), Thomas Heywood (1637), and Charles Cotton (1675), but his complete works had to wait until Ferrand Spence (1684) and John Dryden (1711). In the eighteenth-century, Lucian was transformed into a proponent of reason and social justice, with an Enlightenment hatred of extremes of all kinds (Robinson 66-67).

Lucian’s homoerotic pieces—particularly those contained in ‘Dialogues of the Courtesans’ and the ‘Dialogue of Jupiter and Ganymede’—have a sporadic printing and translation history. ‘Courtesans’ and ‘Jupiter’ are missing from Erasmus’ edition of Lucian’s selected dialogues, the most frequently reprinted Latin edition in England. Unlike Lucian’s other dialogues, ‘Courtesans’ did not receive a published English translation before Spence (1684), and here many of the details of tribadic sex and desire in ‘Dialogue 5’ are deleted or deemphasized, with Spence focusing on Megilla’s masculinity rather than on her dual-gendered nature. In contrast, Dryden’s collaborator Thomas Brown forthrightly depicts the same-sex relationship between Leaena and Megilla, and while Dryden despised Spence’s Lucian “as a gross affront to the memory of Lucian,” the “filthiness” he condemns it for is that of language and style rather than content. In fact, Dryden’s prefatory ‘Life of Lucian’ speculates straightforwardly that the recurring representations of male same-sex intercourse reflect Lucian’s approval of and “secret inclinations to it” (29-30), pointing particularly to the homosexual content of the now-acknowledged pseudo-Lucian ‘Dialogue of Loves’ [Erotes] (for selections, see the print anthology, pp. 260-66).

**SOURCES AND SUGGESTED READING:**

**SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF LUCIAN BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:**


**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF LUCIAN:**


MARTIAL (MARCUS VALERIUS MARTIALIS, c. 40-104 CE)

For a brief account of Martial’s life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, pp. 144-7 and p. 238. For selections from his poetry, and analyses of some of its homoerotic contexts, see the print anthology, pp. 239-48, and ‘Martial’ (Online Companion).

MARTIAL IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND. Martial is one of those poets whose influence on early modern writers’ representations of male homoerotic love and sexual activity can scarcely be overestimated. Those who could read Latin encountered some of the most explicit of ancient satires of male-male sexual practices, as well as some of the most tender love poems for young men and boys. Martial, however, did not fare well at the hands of his early modern translators, since the poet’s epigrams dealing with the homoerotic and the ‘homosexual’ were almost always deleted or expurgated. R[obert?] Fletcher (1656) actually goes much further than many of Martial’s eighteenth-century translators by venturing into the homoerotic territory of tribadism (1.91), the love of masters for their young male slaves [boys] (6.34, 9.26, 11.7), the varieties of sexual intercourse between masters and their young male slaves [boys] (11.23, 11.43, 11.57, 12.99), the love of men for youths [boys] (8.46, 77), and male homosexual prostitution (6.30). In fact, Fletcher’s work, although published and legally issued, was apparently seized at the press and ordered burnt wherever found, “being stuff tending to the corruption of manners” (CSPD 9.325). Thomas May’s Selected Epigrams of Martial has more qualms about male-male sex and fewer qualms about male same-sex love, translating Epigram 3.64, one of Martial’s poems for a beloved slave boy, Dindymus. Sir John Heath’s manuscript translations (MS Egerton 2982 and MS Additional 27343) contain many of those epigrams which even Fletcher thought were inappropriate to appear in print.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MS EGERTON 2982 AND MS ADDITIONAL 27343: In their invaluable collection Martial in English, J.P. Sullivan and A.J. Boyle state that the translations of Martial’s epigrams in MS Egerton 2982 and MS Additional 27343 (part of the British Library manuscript collections) are by various hands, and that the former is the older of the two, dating to the sixteenth century, while the latter is more a more recent seventeenth-century production. Neither of these statements is entirely true. The author of the Martial translations in Egerton 2982 is actually Sir John Heath, and these translations are in the author’s own hand; moreover, the British Library Manuscripts Catalogue also states that MS Additional 27343 is an earlier draft of these poems, and is also in Heath’s own hand. In the print anthology, I have incorporated into the footnotes those significant changes that Heath made from the earlier draft of his poems in MS Additional 27343 to the (relatively) final version of them in MS Egerton 2982. Generally, in the selections contained in the print anthology, I have not noted changes in punctuation, but only in phrasing and wording. However, although MS Egerton 2982 is a much ‘cleaner’ copy than the earlier MS Additional 27343, it contains many revisions, deletions, and additions, and even includes entire poems that are not in MS Additional 27343. However, as the Catalogue notes, MS Egerton 2982 is itself not simply still a work in progress but one that is ‘imperfect’: there are clearly sections missing, and thus (sadly) some poems cannot be traced through their revision process.
**Versions of Martial’s Epigrams.** In the print anthology, I have included representatives of all of Martial’s epigrams concerning same-sex love and desire that were translated between 1550 and 1735. In the Online Companion, I include additional versions of some of these epigrams, and others that could not be included in the print anthology on account of limitations of space. However, a reader who consults a modern translation of Martial will find many other epigrams that deal with male and female homosexual relationships and acts. However, my investigations suggest that these epigrams were not translated between 1550 and 1735.

**Sources and Suggested Reading:**

**Selected Translations of Martial between 1550 and 1735:**

**Selected Modern Translations of Martial:**
For a brief account of Ovid’s life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, p. 147 and p. 204. For selections from the *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*, see the print anthology, pp. 205-24.

**OVID IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND.** Ovid is arguably the classical poet with the most profound and wide-ranging influence on Western literature and art. His works’ reception, particularly the reception of the *Metamorphoses*, in some ways mirrors that of Virgil’s, since Ovid’s epic mythological poem was also subject to Christian allegorizing early in its post-classical history. More than any other classical work, the *Metamorphoses*, both in its Latin editions and vernacular translations, was hedged around by moralizing commentary and allegorical explication. Caxton concludes each of his prose paraphrases of tales in *Metamorphoses* with a discussion of its moral significance. Although Ovid’s most famous early modern translators (Arthur Golding and George Sandys) also offer commentaries on Ovid’s tales, they rarely incorporate such commentary directly within the poem itself, preferring to use prefaces, marginal comments, and appendices for this material. The anti-poetic sentiments of English Puritans fuelled this representation of Ovid as a moral teacher, and in his preface Golding defends himself against charges that translating Ovid simply spreads immorality and obscenity. However, the Renaissance also produced humanist readings of his works, particularly *Metamorphoses*, that emphasized the poem’s language and rhetoric, as well as the poet’s original historical and cultural contexts. At the same time, *Metamorphoses* existed in a number of guises for non-scholarly readers between 1520 and 1735: as Latin reader and textbook, as ancient classic, and salacious fiction.

Like Sappho, Ovid had a biographical ‘after-life’ in Western literature and art, but unlike Sappho it was not bound up with same-sex relationships and desires. There is no tradition that Ovid himself had an erotic preference for boys, as was the case with Virgil, and his *Amores* is almost entirely concerned with heterosexual relationships. The erotic nature of his work, and in particular his ironic ‘handbook’ on heterosexual affairs, the *Ars Amatoria*, ensures that Ovid appears in early modern writing as an advocate of sensuality, heterosexual love, and the material world generally. He appears in this guise in George Chapman’s poem *Ovid’s Banquet of Sense* (1595) and Ben Jonson’s drama *Poetaster* (1602).

**SOURCES AND SUGGESTED READING:**

**SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF OVID’S *METAMORPHOSES* BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:**
Brinsley, John, the elder, trans. *Ovid’s Metamorphosis Translated Grammatically*. London: Humphrey Lownes, 1618. [rept. 1650]
*Ovid’s Metamorphosis, Containing the First Five Books*. Translated by several hands. London: W. Rogers, 1697.

**SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF OVID’S *HEROIDES* BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:**
Dryden, John, ed., comp., and trans., *Ovid’s Epistles, Translated by Several Hands*. Edited by John Dryden. Translated by John Dryden and Others. London: Jacob Tonson, 1680 [rept. sometimes with additions, 1681, 1683, 1688, 1693, 1701, 1705, 1712, 1716, 1720, 1725, 1727, 1729]

**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF OVID’S *METAMORPHOSES*:**
*The Ovid Collection*. University of Virginia. Director: Daniel Kinney. ‘The Metamorphoses’
(freely available electronic versions of translations by Golding and Sandys, as well as Samuel Garth, et al. [1717], Brookes More [1922] and Anthony S. Kline [2000]

**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF OVID’S *HEROIDES*:**

Little is known about Petronius, and even his exact identity remains uncertain. He is sometimes identified as Titus Petronius, politician and the so-called ‘arbiter of elegance’ at Nero’s court. He held several important offices during his career, including proconsul of Bithynia and later consul. He committed suicide in 66 CE.

**PETRONIUS’ SATYRICON.** Given its sexual content, it is surprising that so much of Petronius’ satiric novel *Satyricon* (1st c. CE) survived through Christian antiquity and into the Middle Ages. The work was apparently very popular throughout late antiquity and there is evidence that its readers were both pagan and Christian, with authors as varied as Servius and Macrobius as well as St Jerome and Boethius citing it in their own works. These citations suggest not only the novel’s popularity, diverse audiences, and wide circulation, but also (sadly) the serious truncation the work has suffered over the centuries: many of these writers’ references to *Satyricon* come from portions of the work that have vanished, and modern critics speculate that the work may have originally been as long as 400,000 words (Walsh xxxv-xxxvi). After the seventh century the novel disappears from active and popular circulation, taking up a dusty existence in various French monastic libraries, and the history of its reception and translation becomes linked to the discovery of manuscript versions of various portions of the work across Europe. John of Salisbury (late 1110s-1180) apparently had sections of various manuscript versions copied for him, at least one of which included the novel’s most famous section ‘The Cena Trimalchionis’ or ‘The Dinner at Trimalchio’s’; Poggio Bracciolini discovered versions in England (1420) and Cologne (1423). The latter seems to have been the only surviving manuscript of ‘The Dinner at Trimalchio’s’ at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and for some unknown reason it soon vanished again for more than 200 years. Most European versions of *Satyricon* relied on Bracciolini’s English manuscript find, and it led finally to printed editions in c. 1482, 1489 and 1520. Soon, other fragments were discovered and were added to the burgeoning printed editions, with the first edition to include these newly discovered fragments appearing in 1575 (sans ‘The Dinner at Trimalchio’s’). The late sixteenth century, with all this publishing activity, saw a rise in Petronius’ reputation and importance in France and Spain, with some modern critics portraying him as a formative influence on the Spanish novel, particularly in its picaresque mode. When in 1663 the manuscript of the *Satyricon* containing ‘The Dinner at Trimalchio’s’ was finally rediscovered in Trogir, Dalmatia, it assumed as complete a form as this fragmentary work has ever achieved since it was first written and circulated; it was published in this form in 1669 (Walsh xxxv-xxxvi).

In its various Latin editions, the *Satyricon* was clearly known to major English writers, such as Robert Burton, Ben Jonson and George Chapman, but Petronius’ reputation tended to rise and fall with alarming rapidity in England. After the Restoration in 1660, Petronius found himself the darling of the elites on account of his perceived connection with Epicureanism. However, this brief period of approval soon ended after the death of Charles II, when those writers like Pope, Addison, and Steele who still appreciated Petronius’ ‘virtues’ as a writer became fewer and fewer, as fiction became increasingly tied (at least publicly) to the promotion of civic and personal virtue. Generally, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century critics and writers found the *Satyricon* morally and aesthetically objectionable, although some writers, notably Thomas Love Peacock, praised Petronius’ satiric powers and acknowledged his influence. Gradually, into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, writers as different as Oscar Wilde and T.S. Eliot rediscovered Petronius, and promoted his...
As this brief reception history obviously suggests, the *Satyricon*’s sexual and satiric content has meant that it has not usually fared well at the hands of English translators, commentators, and critics. Although the *Satyricon*’s most recent translations are relatively explicit in their treatment of the work’s sexual content, as recently as 1913 the Loeb standard edition, with its parallel Latin and English texts, refused to translate lengthy passages that its translator M. Heselstine found disturbingly ‘perverted’ and obscene; Loeb commissioned E. Warmington to revise Heseltine’s translation, and it was published in 1960 with the sexual content finally translated. Even though late twentieth-century translators, such as Sullivan (1965), Walsh (1996), and Banham and Kinney (1996) still face the problem of the work’s multiple shifts in style, tone, mode, and diction, the sexual content no longer seems to pose particular issues. William Burnaby’s ground-breaking 1694 translation took advantage of the 1663 Trogir manuscript discovery, but it also relied on another manuscript supposedly discovered in Belgrade in 1688 (published, 1693), but soon after proven conclusively not to be Petronius’ work or that of any other classical writer. However, for all its inaccuracies and recourse to these spurious fragments, Burnaby’s remained the standard translation throughout the eighteenth century. Burnaby’s translation was revised in 1708, and at this point some of the work’s sexual content was elided and modified; its original version, however, is surprisingly straightforward in dealing with the work’s heterosexual and same-sex erotic desires and sexual acts, particularly when compared with those of the early twentieth century.

**Sources and Further Reading:**


**Translations of Petronius between 1550 and 1735:**


**Selected Modern Translations of Petronius:**

PLUTARCH (C. 50-120 CE)

For a brief biography of Plutarch and selections from ‘Dialogue on Love,’ see the print anthology, pp. 251-55; for selections from some of his other works, see ‘Plutarch’ (Online Companion).

PLUTARCH IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD. Plutarch was perhaps the most widely read classical historian in the early modern period, and a large part of his appeal lies in the relatively easy way in which much of his work could be assimilated to a Christian and humanist milieu. Plutarch’s most enduring work was and is Lives (more properly called the Parallel Lives), a collection of paired biographies of great Greek and Roman men; the moralizing and exemplary approach of Plutarch’s Lives resonated with the early modern tendency to see history as providing noble examples to emulate and vicious ones to eschew, thus making Lives enormously popular and influential. Unlike Lives, Plutarch’s Moralia is a huge, diffuse work—the standard Loeb edition runs to fourteen volumes—essentially comprising everything else that Plutarch wrote, largely essays on a wide variety of subjects from marriage to education to religion. In contrast to Lives, it has had a very uneven reception history. Montaigne, Francis Bacon, and Jeremy Taylor were all influenced by Plutarch’s essay form, and humanist educational theory owes a great deal to his essay ‘On the Education of Children.’ In terms of the homoerotic customs of various ancient societies, Plutarch is a mine of information, reporting on the same-sex relationships and desires of Roman and Greek leaders (in Lives), comparing male same-sex and heterosexual love in ‘Dialogue on Love’ (the Amatorius or Eroticus), and discussing the relationship between pedagogy and pederasty in ‘On the Education of Children.’ He is our chief source of information about the Sacred Band, an elite military force comprised of 150 pairs of same-sex lovers (see ‘The Life of Pelopidas,’ Online Companion and ‘Dialogue on Love,’ print anthology, pp. 251-55), and he at least mentions the existence of female same-sex pairing in the austere warrior society of ancient Sparta. More than three-quarters of the twenty-three Greeks in Lives have male lovers or are depicted as sympathetic to homoerotic male bonding as a civic and martial institution.

In the ‘Dialogue on Love,’ Plutarch’s son, Autobulus, recounts events that took place before his birth, when his mother and father attended the religious celebration of the Erotidia (in Thespiae). The couple and a group of friends withdrew from the hectic festival to a country retreat near Mt. Helicon. Approached by two men, Anthemion and Pisias, Plutarch is asked for advice about the beautiful youth Bacchon, Anthemion’s kinsman and Pisias’ beloved. Bacchon has asked his two friends for advice about a proposal of marriage he has received from the beautiful and wealthy widow, Ismenodora. Anthemion favours the marriage, while Pisias opposes it, but the two agree to abide by Plutarch’s arbitration. Plutarch’s friend Daphnaeus takes up Anthemion’s side, and Protagenes Pisias’. The heart of the dialogue concerns the debate between heterosexual, marital love and pederastic love, with Daphnaeus opening the case for former against Protagenes’ championing of the latter. Pisias then supports Protagenes with an attack on heterosexual love generally, before Plutarch enters the fray on Daphnaeus’ side, and most of the rest of the dialogue concerns his brief for the superiority of heterosexual-marital love over pederastic relationships.

SOURCES AND SUGGESTED READING:
SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF PLUTARCH BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:

Lives
North, Thomas, trans. *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*. London: Thomas Vautrollier for John Wright, 1579 (Richard Field for Bonham Norton, 1595; revised with additional lives by various authors: Richard Field for G. Bishop, 1603)

Amatoria Narrationes

‘Of Love’ [Moralia]

SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF PLUTARCH:

Lives

‘Of Love’ (Moralia)
Sappho (fl. 630 BCE)

For a biography of Sappho, selections from her poetry, and a brief account of her reception into the eighteenth century, see the print anthology, pp. 153-55, 165-67. For selections concerning Sappho’s after-life in the early modern period, see ‘Sappho’ and ‘Ovid’ (Online Companion).

Sources and Suggested Reading:
**SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF SAPPHO BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:**

**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF SAPPHO:**
THEOCRITUS (early 3rd c. BCE)

For a brief biography of Theocritus and selections from his poetry, see the selections in the Online Companion.

THEOCRITUS IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND. Credited as the founder of the pastoral or bucolic idyll, Theocritus’ corpus contains five poems about homoerotic desire, ranging from the exuberance of fulfilled erotic love between men (‘Idyll 12’) to the anguish of unrequited or lost love (Idylls 13, 23, 29, and 30). Although both early modern and standard modern editions of Theocritus include all 30 poems, critics have agreed on only 22 as being indisputably by Theocritus. Of his homoerotic verse, however only ‘Idyll 23’ is generally thought not to be Theocritus’ work.

SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF THEOCRITUS BETWEEN 1550 AND 1735:
E.D. (Edward Dyer?). Six Idyllia, that is, Six Small or Pretty Poems, or Eclogues, Chosen out of the Right Famous Sicilian Poet Theocritus, and Translated into English Verse. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1588. [the earliest print translations of Idyll 8, 11, 16, 18, 21 and 31].

SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF THEOCRITUS:
For a brief account of Virgil’s life, reception, and reputation in early modern England, see the print anthology, pp. 147-8 and pp. 198-201. For selections from *Eclogues (Bucolics)*, see the print anthology, pp. 201-204, and ‘Virgil’ (Online Companion); for selections from the *Aeneid*, see ‘Virgil’ (Online Companion).

**Virgil in Early Modern England.** Often called ‘the Roman Homer,’ Virgil was lionized soon after his death, and in Christian antiquity he was one of the first classical poets to be reinterpreted for Christian audiences and sensibilities: his ‘Eclogue 4,’ and its reference to the child of a virgin mother who would usher in a new golden age, was believed to contain a prophecy of Jesus’ birth. Though many scholars remained sceptical about this tradition, it was popularly and widely believed throughout the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance. In the Middle Ages and Renaissance, Virgil’s works were also made part of the Christian tradition through allegorizing them, producing for readers a Virgil who was Christian in all but name, and whose great tragedy was that he died before he could witness the birth of the messiah that he himself had prophesied. Virgil’s literary career, especially in his movement from the pastoral poems of his youth to the epic poem of his maturity, became a professional model for ambitious Renaissance poets, such as Edmund Spenser and John Milton.

‘Eclogue 2’ was translated many times in early modern England, and the earliest translation may be Abraham Fleming’s in 1575 (another, completely different translation by him was published in 1589). Fleming’s *The Bucolics of Publius Virgilius Maro* contains a dedicatory epistle to Master Peter Osborne, which sets out a highly pragmatic purpose for his work, as a necessary and helpful accompaniment to students learning Latin (“beginners in grammatical exercises”) as well as to their teachers, many of whom lack the deep knowledge of Latin needed to give adequate instruction (those “many ignorant and unskilful instructors of youth in the Latin tongue, who sometimes read that to their hearers which they themselves understand not, and teach their scholars that which they themselves had need to learn” [A2v]). Dismissing the many fantastical and ungrounded interpretations such teachers place upon Virgil, Fleming states that he is interested in “a plain interpretation and a literal explication” as that which “maketh a ready and speedy passage to understanding and knowledge, whereof I have had a principal care in this translation, leaving nothing unsifted which might appertain to the uttermost exposition of these Bucolics, that weaklings in poetry might rather be supported than suppressed, quickened than dulled [...] furthered than hindered” (A3r). To accomplish this end, he includes marginal annotations identifying people, places, and things, and would have included further notes discussing “obscure and dark phrases of speech” but the printer to spare cost ignored them; he promises to include them when he republishes the *Bucolics* along with a projected translation of Virgil’s *Georgics*. This dedicatory epistle, however, contains little direct indication that Fleming seeks to offer a traditionally allegorical interpretation of the *Eclogues*, nor does the general preface (“To the Indifferent [i.e., neutral] Reader”). His introduction to ‘Eclogue 2’ makes no excuse for, nor does it allegorize the love of the older shepherd Corydon for the boy Alexis; in fact, it baldly reports the traditional identification of Virgil with the lovelorn Corydon and Alexis with Virgil’s beloved slave, Alexander.

However, Fleming’s 1589 translation of the *Eclogues* is a much more conflicted performance. On the one hand, Fleming offers a far more conventional representation of these poems, placing them firmly in the allegorizing tradition that was so much a part of the interpretation of Virgil’s works from the Middle Ages on. Unlike his first attempt, a
resolutely neutral, grammatically oriented and historically sensitive treatment of Virgil’s Eclogues, Fleming’s 1589 translation suggests that his ‘literal’ exposition of Virgil’s texts, one that focused on historical, linguistic, and cultural explication, may have provoked some criticism. His 1589 translation offers a conventional, allegorical reading of Virgil’s texts, and the homoeroticism of ‘Eclogue 2’ in particular, with the dedicatory epistle, addressing John, archbishop of Canterbury. Fleming states there that the Eclogues are essentially encomiastic, praising Julius Caesar and his successor Augustus, as well as Asinius Pollio, a Roman nobleman who first encouraged Virgil to write these poems. Says Fleming, The matter or drift of the poet is mere allegorical, and carrieth another meaning than the literal interpretation seemeth to afford; as in the main argument following, and likewise the particular before every eclogue orderly placed manifestly appeareth. I beseech your Grace to bestow but the looking hereupon and to esteem it as it is, even a pearl in a shell, divine wit in a homely style, shepherds and clowns representing great personages, and matters of weight wrapped up in country talk.

However, Fleming’s 1589 translation does seem to fulfill his earlier promise to include those explanatory notes that his first printer deleted. More significantly, perhaps, in the argument preceding Eclogue 2 Fleming also maintains the traditional identification of Alexis with Virgil’s beloved slave Alexander, and Corydon with Virgil himself, significantly abbreviated though this identification is.

Fleming was followed by Fraunce (1591), Latham (1628), Biddle (1634), Dryden (1697), Creech (1684), Tate (1684), and Trapp (1731). The allegorizing strain helped translators deal with what is a locus classicus for homoerotic desire in the period, one that seems to have become increasingly controversial towards the end of the seventeenth century. In an often-reprinted preface, the famed Italian humanist Juan Luis Vives asserts that in Eclogues “many [...] matters are [...] manifestly and merely allegorical and dark,” which his annotations will explain, allowing the reader “to mount higher than the simple sense of the very bare letter.” Vives later asserts that the love of Corydon for Alexis is an allegory of Virgil’s platonic love for Cornelius Gallus—poet and one of Augustus’ most favoured statesmen—and his desire for this nobleman’s patronage. Allegorizing transforms the homoerotic desire of Corydon into the more acceptable register of patronage plea, and this allegorizing occurs as well in Fraunce, Latham, and Biddle. While such allegorizing treatment is typical of the way many classical writers were accommodated to a Christian milieu, in Virgil’s case it also provided a means of dealing with the homoerotic elements in Virgil’s life. Aelius Donatus (fl. 350 CE) in his influential and widely-known ‘Life of Virgil’ notes the poet’s erotic preference for boys, his love for his two young male slaves Alexander and Cebes, his education of them, and his shadowing of himself and Alexander as (respectively) the lovesick shepherd Corydon and the scornful boy Alexander in ‘Eclogue 2’ (9).

Virgil’s Aeneid is also important for the representation of homoerotic male love in a martial context, and commentary has tended to focus on those exemplary warriors and friends, Nisus and Euryalus. Their deeply affective relationship is modelled to a certain extent on that of Achilles and Patroclus (see the essay on Homer, above, pp. 9-13), but also more generally on the Greek ideal of heroic love, like that found in Plutarch’s description of the Sacred Band (see ‘The Life of Pelopidas, Online Companion; and ‘Of Love,’ print anthology, pp. 252-55). Like the relationship between the inexperienced youth, relatively new to the world of war, and the older warrior, mature and seasoned in battle depicted in these and
other classical texts, the *Aeneas*’ relationship between the beautiful, courageous Euryalus and the protective Nisus places male-male love in the context of martial bonding and mentorship.

**Sources and Suggested Reading:**


**Selected Translations of Virgil’s Eclogues Between 1550 and 1735:**


**Selected Modern Translations of Virgil’s Eclogues:**


**Selected English Translations of Virgil’s Aeneid Between 1550 and 1735:**


Bynneman, 1583.

**SELECTED MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF VIRGIL’S AENEID:**
For a brief biography of Xenophon, see the selections in the Online Companion.

**Xenophon in Early Modern England.** Xenophon was best known in the ancient world as a philosopher, but also as a military leader and historian. His ancient readers also saw him as an excellent stylist, whose Greek was pure, simple and graceful; he was a formative influence on the 1st c. CE Greek orator and philosopher Chrysostom and the 2nd c. CE Greek historian Arrian. The history of Xenophon’s early translation into English, however, is a brief one in comparison with that of Virgil or Cicero; as the list below suggests, only the *Cyropaedia* saw more than one translation before 1735, although Xenophon’s other major works (it should be noted) were also translated by the seventeenth century: the *Oeconomicus* and the *Anabasis*.

Given this unimpressive history of translation, Xenophon’s importance to early modern English humanism and politics may come as a surprise to modern readers. Xenophon was a highly respected writer, and was best known for his *Cyropaedeia* (‘The Education of Cyrus’), a work that presents the ideal education and rule of Cyrus, king of Persia (Cyrus I, the Great [560/59-530 BCE]), a work that Renaissance readers and critics placed firmly in their ‘mirror for princes’ genre, wherein rulers were offered images of virtuous governance, both of the self and the nation. That *Cyropaedeia* was by far Xenophon’s most popular work in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must be due (at least in part) to the popularity of this genre, and its Continental as well as home-grown examples, especially Erasmus’ *Education of a Christian Prince* (1516), Baldessare Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier* (trans. into English by Sir Thomas Hoby in 1561) and Thomas Elyot’s *The Book of the Governor* (1531). Edmund Spenser’s 1589/90 ‘Letter to Ralegh’ (prefacing the *Faerie Queene*) praises in particular *Cyropaedeia*’s moral utility:

> For this cause is Xenophon preferred before Plato, for that the one in the exquisite depth of his judgement formed a commonwealth such as it should be, but the other in the person of Cyrus and the Persians fashioned a government such as might best be: so much more profitabler and gracious is doctrine by ensample than by rule.

In his *Defence of Poesy* (1595), Sir Philip Sidney echoed and extended Spenser’s praise of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedeia*. For Sidney, Xenophon’s portrait of Cyrus, the ideal king, shows how the poet—of which he counted Xenophon one—was able to outdo all other types of writers in their ability to move the reader to virtue. In short, Xenophon did not simply “make a Cyrus, which had been but a particular excellency as Nature might have done, but [did] bestow a Cyrus upon the world to make many Cyramids, if they will learn aright why and how that maker made him.” In addition to *Cyropaedia*’s importance in the debate over the moral utility of imaginative literature, it was also “deployed as a critique of existing authority rather than, as one might expect, its bulwark” (Grogan 63).

Xenophon’s *Hiero*, however, was never adopted enthusiastically into the genre of the ‘mirror for princes,’ even though the work does contain many elements that a Renaissance reader would find familiar, in addition to its dialogue form, an enormously popular mode in the period. The anonymity of the authorship of Hiero’s sole early modern translation suggests that the frank discussion of male same-sex erotic and sexual relationships posed particular problems, even though the translator draws the reader’s attention to the parallels between the
emperor Hiero’s problematic relationship with the beautiful youth Dailochus, and James I’s relationship with his favourites, particularly George Villiers, duke of Buckingham.

**Sources and Recommended Reading:**

**Selected Translations of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia, Hiero, and Memorabilia* between 1550 and 1735:**

**Cyropaedia**

**Hiero**
Xenophon. *Hiero: Or, the Condition of a Tyrant.* London: Printed for Bernard Lintoff, 1713 [with another edition in the same year; rept., Glasgow, 1750; and rept., Bath, 1795]. An anonymous translation, and the only English translation between 1550 and 1735.

**Memorabilia**

**Selected Modern Translations of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia, Hiero, and Memorabilia*:**

**Cyropaedia**

**Hiero**

**Memorabilia**