



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

A Remedy for Heywood?

Stapleton, M. L. (Michael L.), 1958-

Texas Studies in Literature and Language, Volume 43, Number 1, Spring 2001, pp. 74-92 (Article)

Published by University of Texas Press

DOI: [10.1353/tsl.2001.0005](https://doi.org/10.1353/tsl.2001.0005)



 For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/tsl/summary/v043/43.1stapleton.html>

A Remedy for Heywood?

M. L. Stapleton

In his preface to his mythological pageant play *The Brazen Age* (1613), Thomas Heywood complains bitterly of an act of literary piracy perpetrated against him by one Henry Austin, a shadowy itinerant figure in the netherworld of the Jacobean book trade. To Heywood, Austin is merely

a Pedant about this Towne, who, when all trades fail'd, turn'd *Pedagogue*, & once insinuating with me, borrowed from me certaine Translations of *Ouid*, as his three books *De Arte Amandi*, & two *De Remedio Amoris*, which since, his most brazen face hath most impudently challenged as his own, wherefore I must needs proclaime it as far as *Ham*, where he now keeps schoole, *Hos ego versiculos feci tulit alter honores*, they were things which out of my iuniority and want of iudgement, I committed to the view of some priuate friends, but with no purpose of publishing, or further communicating them. Therefore I wold entreate that *Austin*, for so his name is, to acknowledge his wrong to me in shewing them, & his own impudence, & ignorance in challenging them.¹

The brazen-faced bookseller's answer does not survive, nor does the precise nature of his ignorant challenge to Heywood's authorship, but that he impudently stole the translation of the *Ars amatoria* is beyond doubt. In league with a Dutch publisher named Nicholas Janz Visscher, he printed this rendering of Ovid in Amsterdam unattributed and undated as *PUBLII OVIDII DE ARTE AMANDI, Or, The Art of Loue*, sometimes subtitled *Loues Schoole*, at least six times between the second decade of the seventeenth century and the outbreak of the Puritan Revolution in 1641, the year of Heywood's death. It is the first complete translation of the *Ars* in English and with one exception was the only version of it in our language until a loose paraphrase of Ovid's comic treatise appeared at the end of the century courtesy of the Augustan literary establishment: *Ovid's Art of Love, in Three Books, Translated by Mr. Dryden, Mr. Congreve &c.* (1698).² Heywood (fortunately) did not survive to see the reason for the Dryden-Congreve-Tate version. At the Restoration his poem was co-opted into a

popular pornographic miscellany (again unattributed to him, this time with no publisher named on the title page) that went through multiple editions: 1662 (twice), 1672, 1677, 1682, 1684.³ Austin's gross act of plagiarism became Heywood's *bête noir*; it made him so angry that he attempted to reclaim his poem by including revised excerpts from it in many of his subsequent writings—*An Apology for Actors* (1612), *Gunaikieion* (1624), *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels* (1635), and *Pleasant Dialogues and Drama's* (1637)—strong evidence indeed that the translation is his.⁴

But what became of the “two [books of] *De Remedio Amoris*,” the translation of the contradictory poem that traditionally follows Ovid's three-book *Ars*, one that counsels its readers how to fall out of love? Its disappearance seems strange, as does Heywood's apparent lack of concern as to its fate. He makes no effort at reclamation by including it in his later prose work on classical authors, angels, noble women of antiquity, and the theater, nor does it surface in the play texts he continually produced until his demise. Its wealth of mythological material would have provided excellent exempla for his scholarly arguments, dramatic exchanges, and tableaux. The case becomes even stranger when one considers that Heywood's pride of ownership extended to an obsession with details such as the accurate printing and spelling of his works. He refused to associate further with the printer William Jaggard after he had produced a sloppy edition of *Troia Britannica* and had pirated between two and nine of his Ovidian-style poems and attributed them to Shakespeare in *A Passionate Pilgrim* (1612). He preferred the work of Nicholas Okes, whose ethics and craftsmanship he praises in *An Apology for Actors*, which includes two brief passages from his translation of the *Ars*.⁵ Why would he allow his rendition of the *Remedia* to vanish, unattributed to him? It appears to have been distinctive in at least one way. Unlike the manuscript tradition of Ovid's 814-line poem or any other translation of it in the seventeenth century save one, Heywood's purported lost version is in two parts.

In 1620 a two-part translation of the *Remedia* was published in London under the name of that victim of chicanery at the court of James I, Sir Thomas Overbury, *The First and Second Part of the Remedy of Loue*. Thomas Warton credits this text uncritically to Overbury in his *History of English Poetry* (1774-81); Edward Rimbault does the same in his edition of the courtier's works (1856).⁶ Although the wretched Overbury had a reputation as a wit and poet, nothing that he has been “proven” to have written resembles this translation in any way, nor was he renowned as a classicist. Furthermore, he had any number of works attributed to or associated with him fifteen years after his death, most of them quite spurious (and profitable to publish). This *Remedy* bears a much closer kinship with Heywood's version of the *Ars amatoria*, instead; therefore, I propose that

the translator is indeed Heywood, not Overbury, and present an annotated text and commentary to that effect. The poem's contemporaneity with the Ovidian phase of Heywood's career invites comparison between his translation of the *Ars* and the *Remedy*; the couplet style, turns of phrase, and even diction of both works are quite similar. The translator of the 1620 text certainly knew what he was about; in fact, much of what he excises is simply reverse matter repeated from the *Ars*—as if the author had read Heywood's version and thought it ridiculous to duplicate the same exempla in the *Remedy*, a translation, I think, that appears to have been written to complement *Loues Schoole* as Heywood had obviously intended, in two books, as his *Brazen Age* preface attests. Its printer was Heywood's friend and champion, Nicholas Okes. Although it seems curious that the prolific playwright would allow his dear colleague to publish his juvenile effort as the work of the spectacularly murdered courtier, there would have been sound reasons for such voluntary self-effacement. The poem, disconnected from the *Ars* and thereby amputated from its classical-medieval heritage, could be, in essence, made topical; it could also be divorced from its living translator, who would naturally wish to avoid having anything dangerously topical attributed to him, perhaps preferring to bestow such material on a dead man while he and his publisher profited.

I. The *Remedia* Tradition

Ovid wrote the *Remedia Amoris*, by all accounts a minor work, to accompany his much more substantial and notorious *Ars amatoria*; one could even argue that it represents a fourth book of his comic love treatise. Classical scholars note the interpenetration of the two poems, some suggesting that Ovid even revised sections of *Ars* 3 so that the *Remedia* would complement it better.⁷ E. J. Kenney lists over two dozen manuscripts in common in his sigla for the two poems.⁸ The medieval scribes to whom we owe preservation of this ancient author respected Ovid's apparent intentions and, with this manuscript tradition, bequeathed the concept of complementarity to ensuing ages. With the advent of printing, Aldus Manutius created the most authoritative Renaissance edition of the Ovidian corpus (1516–17) and set the two poems together. In 1583 Thomas Vautrollier was granted an exclusive license to publish Ovid in England and simply reprinted this Aldine edition; therefore, to any reader, scholar, or translator in Elizabethan and Jacobean England such as Marlowe, Overbury, or Heywood, it *was* the Latin Ovid; its title states that the *Remedia* is in two books, in contrast to the manuscript tradition.⁹

An extensive literature exists on the medieval reception of Ovid and on the transmission and interpretation of his ideas, so only a brief discussion of the matter is necessary here. Moderns discover with some

amazement that their predecessors deployed the erotic works for astonishingly diverse purposes: the teaching of Latin grammar in cathedral schools; fodder for troubadours who wished to make *cansos* in their Provençal dialects; the stuff of medical texts for the prehistoric treatment of psychological and physiological ailments that love was assumed to cause. This last use is the most common to which medievals put the *Remedia* as well as the *Ars*, and it helped foment the idea of Ovid as medical authority, somewhat famously in Andreas Capellanus's twelfth-century *De amore*, a text said to have been commissioned by Eleanor of Aquitaine and consulted by the romancer Chrétien de Troyes.¹⁰ At the same time, moderns are also surprised to discover that their medieval predecessors were quite capable of understanding the comic and fallacious nature of the *Ars* and *Remedia*; if it is foolish to write a contradictory rulebook for love, it is even more foolish to write a retraction that subtly subverts its own advice. The Middle Ages greatly appreciated Ovid's protean nature.¹¹

This appreciation extends to early modern England; most of the corpus was translated in several versions between 1500 and 1650.¹² There were four English translations of the *Remedia* in Heywood's lifetime: an F. L.'s *Ovidius Naso His Remedie of Loue* (1600), John Carpenter's *Ovid's Remedy of Love* (1636), the dramatist Francis Beaumont's *The Remedie of Love* (1640), and the version with Overbury's name on the title page (1620). The first three texts approach Ovid's poem in differing ways, but each rendition appears independently of the *Ars*, with Beaumont's buried in his posthumous *Poems* of 1640; F. L. fragments his *Remedie* into 107 sestets (rhyming ababcc) and one quatrain (rhyming abab), whereas Carpenter (an accomplished classicist) and Beaumont prefer the pentameter couplet form.¹³ F. L. and Beaumont present the *Remedia* as a continuous poem, the former transmuting approximately the first 400 lines of the source text, the latter in its 585 lines excising virtually all the mythological-historical references and the franker sexual passages. (The similarity of these excisions with those of the *Remedy* suggests that Beaumont borrowed from it.) The 1620 text, also in pentameter couplets, is bifurcated into two parts, as its title states; Carpenter seems to have consulted it and to have divided Ovid's poem in this manner, following the Aldine edition.¹⁴ Yet the 1620 text is unusual because unlike most other English versions of classical verse, it does not increase the number of lines therein by expansive translation; its two sections of 189 and 184 lines represent a somewhat draconian reduction of Ovid's poem, truncating the master's matter (and, one must admit, digressions) by 441 lines. Furthermore, although the *Remedy* was, like its fellows, an independent publication, it was often bound with Heywood's translation of the *Ars amatoria* and was even included in the Restoration miscellany, intended to follow the *Ars* and to serve as commentary on it in the traditional fashion.¹⁵

II. Overbury and the Fatal Clyster

To what uses could the *Remedy* be put in Jacobean England? How could such a poem possibly be topical? Overbury's troubled life and controversial death posit some answers. Although several detailed accounts of his career exist, it would be useful at this point to summarize this information for those who are unfamiliar with his story and to explain how he could have written the *Remedy* or why it would have been natural to attribute it to him. He was born in Gloucester, Warwickshire, in 1581, the son of a judge. He took a degree at Queen's College, Oxford, and studied at the Middle Temple. The ambitious twenty-year-old surfaced in Edinburgh in 1601, probably to curry favor with the monarch-to-be. He soon became an agent of Robert Cecil, later James's chief minister and Earl of Salisbury, the brilliant son of Elizabeth's indispensable courtier William Cecil, Lord Burleigh. In Edinburgh he made a fateful acquaintance with a Scottish boy of twelve, Robert Carr, also near James for similar reasons. Carr impressed James with his beauty and intelligence, allegedly attracting his attention six years later at a tournament in 1607 where he broke his leg and the monarch ministered to him, beginning a friendship that would last for nearly a decade.¹⁶ Overbury, no fool, began to ingratiate himself with the new eighteen-year-old favorite of the King and, with his industry on behalf of Cecil, James, and Carr, earned himself a knighthood in 1608. James made Carr Viscount Rochester in 1611 and Earl of Somerset in 1613.¹⁷ Overbury became the secretary of Carr's estates, tirelessly helping his young master satisfy his mania for collecting paintings and sculpture, going so far at one point to alert the agent at Brussels, William Turnbull, to keep an eye out for any "estate art" that surfaced on the market there.¹⁸

Overbury was indefatigably careerist and recognized as such. Jonson's epigram on him concludes, with prophetic sarcasm: "Nor may' any feare, / to loose of their degree, / Who'in such ambition can but follow thee."¹⁹ He was now a man of some influence, aiding not only Carr but both Cecil and James with various matters. From most accounts, he considered his power over the young Earl of Somerset to have been absolute, and, given the ensuing degree of proximity to the King, believed that he had succeeded in making himself indispensable to the court and therefore invulnerable to the daggers that were always out for a man such as himself.²⁰ One does not need to recall the woeful tales of hubristic courtiers such as Gaveston, Wolsey, Cromwell, Essex, Strafford, and Clarendon to understand immediately how fatal a miscalculation Overbury's trust in princes proved to be.

His downfall began innocuously enough; one could even note the irony that he encouraged the relationship that undid him because of his eventual (and very foolish) opposition to its exfoliation. Carr had proven

to be the court's most eligible bachelor and began a love affair with Lady Frances Howard, a scion of one of the most powerful families in England, with what appears to be the full complicity of this family, including her great-uncle, the Earl of Northampton. Frances was unhappily married to the young Earl of Essex, son of Elizabeth's disfavored courtier. Overbury, gauging with absolute precision the influence of the Howards with both James and Carr, served as pander to his master and the seductive Frances, allegedly playing amanuensis for Carr by writing poems and love letters on his behalf to his mistress that he folded into hearts for extra romantic effect.²¹ Eventually the affair became scandalous, an embarrassment to all who had abetted it, with the possible exception of the pander himself.

Then, to Overbury's horror, the Howards betrayed him. They petitioned the King for an annulment for Frances from Essex on somewhat specious grounds so that the adulterous couple could solemnize what they had already consummated on numerous furtive occasions.²² Sir Thomas was certainly not opposed to marriage; he was simply opposed to Carr's marriage to this woman. The power and influence that he had so successfully helped the Howards attain as the family of Carr's mistress would overwhelm his own if Frances were elevated to spouse. He would no longer be indispensable to Carr and thereby to Cecil and James. This was too much. He reacted in predictable fashion; the triumvirate on which he had founded his position rebuffed him; he was imprisoned 21 April 1613 on the trumped-up charge of refusing an ambassadorship to Russia that he knew was meant to get him out of the way; and, because he knew too much, was slowly poisoned over the next five months, the coup de grâce an enema of bichloride of mercury on 14 September after weeks of subtler poisons administered in his meat and drink during his residency in the Tower, memorably recalled in Richard Niccols's dramatic monologue *Sir Thomas Overburies Vision* (1616): "The venome seazing on me vulture-like, / With torment tore my entrayles."²³ Soon after, the King granted Frances her annulment and married her to Carr with much fanfare, including epithalamia and masques by Donne, Jonson, and Chapman.²⁴ Yet rumors of malfeasance spread, and in 1615 Frances, Carr, and several others were indicted, tried, and found guilty for the murder, all but the happy couple suffering death sentences, James wishing to disassociate himself as completely as possible from the sordid business of which he was inextricably a part and appointing no less than Sir Edmund Coke and Sir Francis Bacon to convict or rusticate all involved.²⁵ His edict on the matter is quite stern: "we cannot satisfy our own conscience if any course should be left unattempted whereby the foulness of so heinous a fact may be laid open to the view of the world."²⁶

Overbury was not much liked during his brief lifetime, Jonson's "So where thou liv'st, thou mak'st life understood" deftly and wryly

commenting on his notorious officiousness and sententiousness.²⁷ He seems to have been possessed of an acerbic and obsessive personality, the result, perhaps, of what we would now call severe depression, even keeping a silver wedge in his arm to keep a vein open for bleeding, a favored remedy for treating the spleen and the melancholy to which it was alleged to contribute.²⁸ He is said to have been heterosexual, even enlisting Jonson to present a copy of his homiletic and misogynistic poem *The Wife* to the Countess of Rutland, Sir Philip Sidney's daughter, in a flawed attempt to woo her that she angrily rebuffed.²⁹ But the attachment to Carr raises other questions; the young man, no matter his eventual sexual preference, could not have long enjoyed a friend of this kind to whom he was so indebted, as the surviving evidence implies. Coke's private judgment was that "his mind was great, but it moved in not any good order . . . And the greatest fault I ever heard of him was, that he made his friend his idol." Carr himself asserted, "I think he had never a friend in his life that he would not sometimes fall out with and give offense unto." And Frances's great-uncle Northampton, perhaps implying more than he meant to imply, said, upon the courtier's death: "God is gracious in cutting off ill instruments," having already characterized him to his acquaintances as "the Scab."³⁰

III. Ventriloquism

How enormous the contrast, then, when one compares these disparaging remarks about this Scab with the tenor of the commendatory verses appended to the posthumous editions of *The Wife* and the prose *Characters*. Sir Thomas "was made / A sacrifice to Malice and darke shade," a winner of "More Honor in his Sufferance," his death "Succeeded by his Vertues endles Breath."³¹ The anonymous commendators, it should be noted, nowhere describe Overbury's personality or attempt to create correctives for its reputation. They actually use the occasion of his death to write bitter criticism of the court and, by covert implication, the King himself. The homiletic *Wife* and some of the *Characters* about women are by legend implicit messages to Carr about Frances. As David Lindley has usefully argued, cultures possess archetypal narratives and personality types into which they compartmentalize people, no matter how uncomfortable the fit, and Jacobean were no different, delineating Frances, Carr, and Overbury as wicked woman, duped yet complicit husband, and officious and betrayed friend, respectively.³² Lindley's thesis can be applied especially to the attribution controversy regarding Overbury's output. It was natural, given the publicity surrounding the murder and its intimate details, for the book trade to profit from the matter by creating ligatures between lines such as "For wandring Lust; I know tis infinite . . . The guilt is euerlasting"³³ and the Carr-Frances trysting.

Connections between the *Remedy* and the infernal triad are also easy to make for even more obvious reasons. Why would this translation not comment somewhat directly and obviously on the same matter, since Overbury was so opposed to his friend's attempts at attaining connubial bliss with such a wicked woman? By affixing Sir Thomas's name to the title page, Okes could ensure that he could be made to comment on these events, and with more authenticity than Niccols's fanciful and spectacular version of his ghost crying under the public stage. There was no reason not to expect a healthy profit as well. *The Wife*, along with the increasing number of anonymous commendatory poems and the *Characters*, reached an astonishing sixteen editions between 1616 and 1638; Okes and Heywood obviously expected to wive it wealthily.³⁴

The *Remedy* constitutes a clever bit of ventriloquism in which Ovid is made to speak for Overbury, who in turn counsels Carr to fall out of love. Sir Thomas thought of himself as the young man's mentor, much in the same way that "The old Tree nurseth the adopted bough" (*Rem.* 1.104). "Il'e ease you now which taught to loue before, / The same hand which did wound shall heale the sore" (16–17) would seem to comment directly on the older man's initial facilitation of the Carr-Frances relationship as well as his later attempt to subvert it. What began as a fairly shallow sexual alliance, "a skarre, / Becomes a wound while we the cure deferre" (43–44). Carr understandably grew annoyed with his mentor's "friendly counsel," since it was "vrged out of date," and thus managed to "fret the sore and cause the hearers hate" (61–62). The implacable and desperate Overbury persists and reasserts his authority: "my rules are hard, I do confesse it, / I needs must hurt the wound because I dresse it" (125–26). The greed of Frances and her family needs to be considered: "Thinke how much she hath cost thee many times" (146). Her voracious sexual appetite extends to some fairly rough trade: "the same night that she thee denies, / . . . with some seruimgman she lies" (149–50). Carr's own wealth and influence would make her quite unnecessary: "Let him which will a wife with nothing take / Thinke from preferment she will keep him back" (2.69–70). She is, after all, female, "And woman is least part of what we see" (1.183). The mentor, definitely not a woman and therefore the person to trust, reminds his charge that when Frances inevitably disappoints, "Then shalt thou finde how much a friend is worth, / Into whose brest thou maist thy grieffe poure forth" (2.83–84). She is to be avoided, and her *billets-doux* destroyed: "All letters written from thy Mistresse burne" (135).

The title and the subject matter could also be read ironically in terms of Overbury and his poisonous medicinal fate. The ghostly form admonishes his living charge, "I must some meates forbid the sicke" (2.175); "Vse not on sweete and iuicy meates to feede" (177). Wine is worse, something

that "heates our bloud and it on rage doth set" and "drownes our minde" (182–83). The murder of this ill instrument, this Scab, constituted a remedy for him indeed, in the form of the fatal clyster, preceded by poisoned wine and sweetmeats. And Carr, failing to heed his dear friend's advice, sitting in the docket on trial for his life, with Coke and Bacon demolishing his character as well as Frances's, proved to be the emblem of this poignant line: "Let him alone summe vp his Mistresse crimes" (1.145). Okes must have been delighted at his good fortune.

IV. Linkages

The translator of the *Remedy* preserves Ovid's dichotomous thesis throughout the text: "*Nec noua praeteritum Musa retexit opus*" (RA 12); "I meane not to blot out what I haue taught" (*Rem.* 1.7). Indeed, it can be argued that the *Remedia* does not unravel the old work of the *Ars amatoria*, but simply underscores the inevitability of love, even as Ovid revisits some of the same topoi and attempts to demonstrate that rhetoric can transform the most ambrosial of aphrodisiacs into alum. Although he recommends that the same *vitia* (bodily flaws) that whet the appetite in the *Ars* (2.641–62) should be used to quell it in the *Remedia* (315–56), the latter remains an unnatural activity in contrast to the former, and as Shakespeare reminds us in the last line of his sonnets, water cools not love. In many instances, the *Remedy* follows its source in repeating the delusive unraveling of the *Remedia*; however, in several other cases, the 1620 text simply excises such passages, especially those of a mythological bent. Most of these cuts are quite judicious; they tend to resemble, in reverse, the same material that Heywood not only translates but embellishes in *Loues Schoole*. It is as if he saw perfectly well that full translation of the smaller poem would have been quite redundant if it were to be joined to the larger. So Rimbault's description of the *Remedy* as paraphrase is quite inaccurate; the author's surgical excisions amount to what I call complementary omission. Although the commentary delineates this phenomenon in greater detail, a few examples of it seem appropriate here. Ovid refers to the disastrous Roman defeat at the battle of Allium in the *Remedia* (220); the *Remedy* translator omits this reference, but Heywood describes it in *Loues Schoole* (1.511–13). Similarly, Ovid expounds on the sorrows of Phyllis (RA 589–609) and Laodamia (721–24) in excruciating detail; this unhappy matter disappears in the *Remedy*, perhaps because Heywood had already written quite enough about it in *Loues Schoole* (2.469–70; 3.51–52; 3.653–54; 2.472; 3.25). The *Remedy* omits the catalogue of love poets that Ovid mentions (RA 759–65); Heywood had already listed them (*LS* 3.495–506). Most memorably, the *Remedy* does not reproduce the counter-aphrodisiac advice in its source text (RA 249–62), perhaps because it is

simply the reverse of the precepts about raising desire in *Loues Schoole* (3.972–1005). Heywood saw no purpose in plowing the same furrow twice.

At the same time, Heywood's stylistic hallmarks in *Loues Schoole* appear with surprising frequency in the *Remedy*. *Loues Schoole* features the loose couplet form with some enjambment; the poetic sentences tend to be long and employ colons to join related distichs. He uses sententiae as well as a large number of rhetorical questions (twenty-three) for epigrammatic effect. The much shorter *Remedy* also features periodic sentences as well as a great number of aphorisms, some highlighted with quotation marks; the translator also uses rhetorical questions (eight). Heywood the playwright expands on or even interpolates theatrical material into his translation of the *Ars amatoria* (e.g., 1.69–86); the *Remedy* contains similar additions and variations on the same matter (2.147–48). Yet some of the most convincing evidence for Heywood's authorship of the later text lies in the similarity of distinctive and even idiosyncratic rhetorical formulations, poetic devices, and diction. It is, for example, hard not to notice that Heywood sometimes widens the meaning of an abstract noun so that the entity constitutes a personification, as if he were writing allegory, especially with "delay": "delay consumes and dyes" (*LS* 1.458); "delay hath might" (3.891). The *Remedy* translator does precisely the same thing: "Delay addes strength and faster hold imparts" (1.31; see also 1.32; 1.52). There are, however, much broader corresponding patterns.

Heywood, like most poets, demonstrates a fondness for ending his lines with the same words from habit or expediency, perhaps for rhyming purposes. Furthermore, when such words are rare in *Loues Schoole*, and equally unusual in the *Remedy*, this strongly suggests that the same author translated both poems. Heywood does not often use the verb "abide," yet makes a rhyme with it on this one occasion: "But where thy Mistris sits, do thou abide" (*LS* 1.135); the *Remedy* translator employs the same device twice: "If thou be once abroad, there long abide" (1.135; see 2.110). Heywood rarely chooses "esteeme" as a verb, but when he does, he ends a line with it (*LS* 2.326; 2.379); this word appears in the *Remedy* only once, and in identical fashion (1.143). Other parallels of similarly rare verb rhyming usage include "agree" (*LS* 2.746; 3.525; 3.858; *Rem.* 2.144); "call" (*LS* 1.56; 1.115; 3.538; *Rem.* 2.9; 2.14); "conceale" (*LS* 2.521; 2.742; 3.117; *Rem.* 2.141); and "confesse" (*LS* 2.704; *Rem.* 1.125; 1.159). Both translations also deploy other identical words at the ends of lines more frequently. Heywood often finds the adverb "again" helpful for this reason (*LS* 1.155; 1.769; 1.827; 2.144; 2.372; 2.412; 2.572; 3.680), as does the *Remedy* translator (2.51; 2.93; 2.112). One finds a similar idiosyncratic pattern with the verbs "appeare" (*LS* 1.492; 2.544; 3.200; 3.287; *Rem.* 2.40); "get" (*LS* 1.137; 3.294; 3.497; 3.605; *Rem.* 2.89; 2.168); and "proue" (*LS*

1.165; 2.335; 3.745; 3.879; *Rem.* 2.46; 2.57; 2.126; 2.148; 2.161). These four verbs are unique in both translations and also happen to end lines: "asswage" (*LS* 2.602; *Rem.* 1.49); "redeeme" (*LS* 1.938; *Rem.* 1.144); "repay" (*LS* 2.511; *Rem.* 1.154); and "sowne" (*LS* 1.624; *Rem.* 1.11). These three line-ending verbs appear somewhat more frequently: "remoue" (*LS* 1.433; *Rem.* 1.37; 1.87); "refuse" (*LS* 1.998; 3.258; 3.276; *Rem.* 2.87); and "impart" (*LS* 1.550; 3.61; *Rem.* 1.31; 2.61). Participles and adverbs also cap lines in both texts: "growne" (*LS* 1.807; 2.489; 2.878; 3.589; *Rem.* 2.6) and "gone" (*LS* 1.383; 1.689; 2.475; 3.1; 3.51; 3.767; *Rem.* 1.121). Heywood seems to have enjoyed sonority: "And hide the sacred youth till feare be gone" (*LS* 3.767); "But how much more it grieues thee to be gone" (*Rem.* 1.121).

Heywood also tends to begin lines with the same words for transitional or metrical purposes. He uses "Although" only twice in *Loues Schoole*, once at the beginning of a line (3.17); one finds the conjunction twice in the *Remedy*, both times at the inception of a line (1.47; 2.35). It comprises a ready-made iamb, as does "Because," more frequently employed in both translations (*LS* 1.295; 1.539; 2.200; 2.202; *Rem.* 2.12; 2.16; 2.82; 2.111). When in need of some metrical variation, Heywood sometimes relies on the imperative form of the verb "Frequent" as a trochee (*LS* 1.131; 2.461; 3.559; 3.602), a habit he carried over into the *Remedy* (2.147). Heywood in fact habitually begins lines with imperatives. "Thinke," depending on how one scans, may well form the stressed syllable of a two-word trochee in both poems several times (*LS* 2.180; 2.339; *Rem.* 1.146; 1.147; 2.70; 2.106), as well as the unstressed syllable in an iamb: "Thinke not that newes, but that thy eye-sight fail'd thee" (*LS* 2.677); "Thinke not by witchcraft to fright loue away" (*Rem.* 1.139). The imperative "Let" surfaces a remarkable number of times to begin lines in *Loues Schoole* (thirty-four) and the *Remedy* (ten), in many instances taking the same pronoun as object: "Let her" (*LS* 2.279; 2.433; 2.439; *Rem.* 1.145); "Let him" (*LS* 1.940; 2.655; 3.666; *Rem.* 1.145; 2.65; 2.68; 2.69; 2.73). Both poems also favor the construction "Let not" (eight times in both translations), "Let not thy" (four), and even "Let not thy Mistris" (*LS* 2.988; *Rem.* 2.36). For that matter, the conjunction "Nor," employed seventy-three times in both poems, begins lines on sixty-seven of those occasions, for example, "Nor let my words amongst the windes depart" (*LS* 1.475); "Nor let loues fire by smoake of sighes appeare" (*Rem.* 2.40). As with imperatives, Heywood continually begins lines with such conjunctions. "Though" and "Lest" fulfill this function in *Loues Schoole* (thirteen, five) and in the *Remedy* (five, one), respectively. Another favored conjunctive line-starter is "If thou" (*LS* 1.139; 1.476; 1.626; 1.781; 1.782; 1.922; 3.395; 3.777; *Rem.* 1.135; 2.54). "This" begins forty lines in both translations, most commonly as a demonstrative pronoun (twenty times in *Loues Schoole*, six in the *Remedy*), less frequently as a demonstrative adjective (thirteen times in *Loues*

Schoole, once in the *Remedy*). A peculiarly Heywoodian line-starter is the adjective “Great,” used most often as part of an honorific epithet: for Caesar (*LS* 1.174), Jove (3.552), and Romulus (1.85; 1.128). The *Remedy* translator does not follow this pattern exactly, but indeed begins a line with this word as a simple adjective: “Great Riuers being peece-meale oft diuided” (2.25); Heywood does the same: “Great and rich gifts I do not bid thee send her” (*LS* 2.349); “Great furtherance to many in their loues” (1.166). Another shared tendency is to begin lines with “Had” (i.e., “If [substantive] had”): “Had *Cressa* kept her from *Thiestes* bed” (*LS* 1.393; see also 3.593; 3.632); “Had wicked *Scylla* this my counsell read” (*Rem.* 1.25).

A recent trend in attribution study has been to attempt to identify diction that is peculiar to a given author, particularly words that are rare or constructions that are unusual.³⁵ In Heywood’s case, there are a number of words that surface only once in *Loues Schoole*, but that are at the same time no means uncommon to early modern English. Many of these same words appear only once in the *Remedy*, as well; this infrequent usage points to a correspondence that does not seem accidental. Most of these are nouns: “Country” (*LS* 2.311; *Rem.* 1.89); “custome” (*LS* 2.460; *Rem.* 1.133); “deformitie” (*LS* 1.282; *Rem.* 2.14); “drops” (i.e., “tears,” *LS* 1.122; *Rem.* 1.56); “fulnesse” (*LS* 2.994; *Rem.* 2.178); “Gamester” (*LS* 1.573; *Rem.* 2.115); “repulse” (*LS* 1.425; *Rem.* 2.50); “roote” (*LS* 3.932; *Rem.* 1.46); “something” (*LS* 3.214; *Rem.* 2.8); and “triumph” (*LS* 3.564; *Rem.* 1.82). As for one-to-one correspondences with verbs, there are “frequented” (*LS* 1.363; *Rem.* 2.85); “spoke” (*LS* 1.375; *Rem.* 1.57); “teacheth” (*LS* 2.224; *Rem.* 2.60); and “terme” (*LS* 1.884; *Rem.* 2.28), which Heywood also spells “tearme” twice in *Loues Schoole* (2.853; 2.881). The following adjectives appear once in both poems: “greedy” (*LS* 3.898; *Rem.* 1.150); “hardest” (*LS* 2.698; *Rem.* 1.133); “second” (*LS* 3.621; *Rem.* 2.33); and “written” (*LS* 3.312; *Rem.* 2.135). These adverbs show themselves as metrical line-fillers once in the two translations: “forthwith” (*LS* 2.748; *Rem.* 2.112) and “perchance” (*LS* 3.511; *Rem.* 2.9); the idiom “out of date” surfaces once in both poems as well (*LS* 3.899; *Rem.* 1.61). Words that are somewhat more common yet still unusual in both translations are “coy” (*LS* 1.420; 1.870; *Rem.* 1.170); “Hare” (*LS* 2.669; 3.803; *Rem.* 1.107); “chamber” (*LS* 3.739; 3.785; 3.804; *Rem.* 1.178; 2.49); “cheape” (*LS* 1.534; 1.556; 2.427; 3.258; *Rem.* 1.144); “boxe/s” (*LS* 3.315; 3.338; *Rem.* 1.188); “bred” (*LS* 1.541; 3.289; *Rem.* 2.166); “breed” (*LS* 1.493; 1.956; 1.926; 1.976; 3.212; *Rem.* 2.41); and “trifle” (*LS* 2.690; *Rem.* 2.9; 2.133–34). One might also notice that these two reflexive compounds appear once in both poems, one a substantive and another adjectival: “selfe-loue” (*LS* 1.804; *Rem.* 2.62) and “selfe-same” (*LS* 2.481; *Rem.* 2.23).

Both translations employ some of the same metrical-syntactic idiosyncrasies that strongly suggest that Heywood is the author of both

poems. One of his most reliable metrical line-fillers is the modal auxiliary “doth.” Although this form of “do” was becoming obsolete in the seventeenth century, it is frequently utilized in *Loues Schoole*, unstressed or stressed as the occasion demands: “A clyming waue the shore doth ouerflow” (2.188); “A white soft hew my iudgement doth disproue” (1.933). Heywood’s most common practice is to stress “doth” before an iambic (and thus dissyllabic) verb, and to use it as an unstressed syllable before a stressed monosyllabic verb at the end of a line. The auxiliary is more commonly unstressed (sixty-three times) than stressed (twenty-nine times). The same tendency occurs in the *Remedy*; “doth” is used with proportionate frequency in a translation that is nearly ten times shorter than *Loues Schoole*, unstressed (twenty times) more often than stressed (seven times), in nearly exact ratio to the rates in Heywood’s rendering of Ovid. In an even more uncanny type of parallel, Heywood shows a tendency to employ the substantive “griefe” as a stressed syllable in the fourth foot of his pentameter line, for example, “A Louer must endure much griefe besides” (LS 2.668); “But what ensude oh God, much griefe it cost me” (2.235; see also 1.123; 2.319; 2.673; 3.26; 3.226). The *Remedy* also demonstrates this tendency: “Into whose brest thou maist thy griefe poure forth” (2.84; see also 1.57). This translation employs this noun in the epicenter of the line as well, the third foot: “Nor as a signe of griefe their weeping take” (2.119), as does Heywood (LS 2.530; 3.818). Metrical exigency also dictates common deployment of the adverb “abroad,” perhaps because of its naturally iambic quantity: “Thou art abroad whilst in thy house doth stay” (LS 2.480; see also 1.49; 1.135; 1.632; 2.307; 2.491; 2.674; 2.843; 3.196; 3.249; 3.714). It appears once in the *Remedy*, used in a similar way: “If thou be once abroad, there long abide” (1.135). One can discern the same habit with the adjective “furious,” always dissyllabic and trochaic, somewhat redundantly applied to nouns that do not appear to require this modifier: “rage” (LS Proem 21); “anger” (1.457); “fire” (3.746); and “heate” (*Rem.* 1.51).

The two translations share some of the same rhetoric for classical allusions and English translations of Latin words and concepts. Following Ovid, Heywood deploys the patronymic “Atrides” for the brothers Menelaus and Agamemnon, “the two *Atrides*” (LS 3.17; see also 1.405), as does the *Remedy* translator: “Atrides could lye dull by Helens side” (2.171). Heywood, fascinated with Roman history and careful to preserve its arcana, faithfully includes every reference to those fabled enemies of the fatherland who seemed both cowardly and skilled because they could shoot arrows backward on horseback in the direction of their pursuers: “And from mens sight like the swift *Parthian* fly” (LS 3.925; see also 1.217; 1.225; 1.228; 2.241; 3.372); the *Remedy* preserves this fidelity to history: “The *Parthian* by flight doth ouercome” (1.124; see also 1.81). Ovid’s

usual self-deprecating term for his nuggets of advice is *praecepta*, which Heywood, more often than not the faithful translator in tone as well as diction, renders as “precepts”: “Receiue my precepts whilst my wits are quicke” (LS 3.80; see also 2.218; 2.663; 3.387); the *Remedy*, with Ovidian-Heywoodian humility, does the same: “Some may perchance these precepts trifles call” (2.9). And Heywood takes special care to preserve, through diction, the concept of the *Ars* as medical treatise, as does the Heywoodian maker of the *Remedy*: advice to the lovelorn is “Physicke” (LS 2.1007; 3.378; *Rem.* 1.21; 154; 1.59; 2.71); its purveyor titles himself “Physition” (LS 1.439; *Rem.* 2.71; 2.176).

Other kinds of diction peculiar to *Loues Schoole* appear in the *Remedy*. Heywood uses the adjective “doubtfull” not only in the sense of “uncertain,” but also with the meaning “dangerous,” “risky”: “Doubtfull to be disturb’d amidst thy pleasure” (LS 2.1001; compare 3.857). This seems to have been carried over into the *Remedy*, also: “vnto the doubtfull warres go range” (1.79; see also 1.120; 2.21). Another distinctive and twofold adjectival meaning concerns “fat” (i.e., swollen or pregnant as well as fleshy): “Such whose fat hands are itchie in the ioynt” (LS 3.413; see also 1.562); “Hath she fat fingers?” (*Rem.* 1.173; see also 1.166). Heywood is also not above using adjectives as parts of epithets that border on the cliché, such as “golden haire” (LS 1.690; 3.104; *Rem.* 1.26) and “siluer Brookes” (LS 1.484; *Rem.* 1.97). He uses “frame” as a verb in much the same way that contemporary Americans transform the substantive “picture”: “Your greatest cunning is with art to frame” (LS 3.543; see also 3.658; 3.911). This idiosyncrasy also appears in the *Remedy*: “like Pigmalion we an image frame” (2.79; see also 2.169).

Loues Schoole and the *Remedy* favor some of the same idiom. Heywood consistently employs the expression “the same” to end lines, probably for its iambic and rhyming effects: “Who oft deceiu’d are thought to vse the same” (LS 3.647; see also 1.61; 1.178; 1.335; 1.412; 1.583); this also occurs in the *Remedy*: “And fall in loue deuoutly with the same” (2.80; see also 2.36; 2.138). Similarly, the two-word “at length,” also happily iambic for poets attempting to keep their meter consistently at the pentameter level, consistently fleshes out lines for Heywood, “Age with a soft pace steales on you at length” (LS 2.899; see also 1.389; 1.611; 1.718; 2.256; 2.595; 2.899; 3.397), and the *Remedy* translator: “Yet I at length (for many times I said it)” (1.160; see also 1.50; 2.26). As for “fleshing out,” the same sorts of proverbial doublets appear in both translations: “thou her foote or well shapt leg maist see” (LS 1.158); “I blam’d her leg and foote when I stood by her” (*Rem.* 1.158); “Onely pursue to reape what thou hast sowne” (LS 1.624; see also 2.428); “if he reape scorne where he loue hath sowne” (*Rem.* 1.11). And, as for idioms of the pleasures of the flesh, both translations share some of the same sexual lingo at length: the adjective “dull”

(i.e., unresponsive): “Vnhappy Maide to whom that place is dull” (LS 3.938; Proem 2); “*Atrides* could lye dull by *Helens* side” (Rem. 2.171). For the genitals themselves, the consistent term is “parts”: “[her] hidden parts haue not a fault or spot” (LS 3.920; see also 2.629; 2.808; 2.958); “the good parts thou in thy Mistresse know’st” (Rem. 1.164).

Again, Heywood’s poetical syntax tends to be idiosyncratic, even to the structure of a given line and the word placement therein. On an extraordinary number of occasions, he begins a line with a conjunction when the substantive “love” is the subject, for example, “And by my art is Loue himselfe conducted” (LS Proem 24); “And with no straining discourse loue beseech” (1.593; see also 1.444; 1.593; 1.743; 1.879; 2.147; 2.761; 2.921; 2.947; 3.723); this Heywoodian fingerprint also appears in the *Remedy*: “And through that wound loue slyly creepeth in” (1.76); “And fall in loue deuoutly with the same” (2.80; see also 1.154; 2.62). The rhetorical flourish “And now” to begin a line is common to both poems: (LS 1.241; 1.637; 1.705; Rem. 1.6); Heywood also favors “not” in lines that he begins with “And” to create a similar type of effect (twelve times), for example, “And will she not as yet an answer write” (LS 1.613)—yet another syntactic field mark that shows itself (four times) in the *Remedy*: “And wilt not thou do this thy minde to mend?” (1.129). Both poems tend to affix the negative to the beginning of a line after an imperative: “Do not” (LS 3.123; 2.844; Rem. 2.49); “But trust not thou” (LS 2.149; Rem. 2.117); “Let not” (five times in *Loues Schoole*, three times in the *Remedy*); and “Thinke not” (LS 2.677; Rem. 1.139). The expression “out of” occurs once in both poems, and both times at the beginning of a line (LS 3.170; Rem. 1.59).

One of Heywood’s most characteristic verbs is “to take” (forty-five times), sometimes in the indicative: “our loues take part” (LS 3.725); sometimes in the imperative: “*Ai*ax, *Tec*nessa take” (3.706); he daubs the beginning of a line with it for metrical purposes: “Take me thy guide, and safely I will leade thee” (2.78); he uses it as a rhyming word to cap a couplet: “But good aduise they leaue, fond counsell take” (3.633); he seems also to be fond of it in the third foot to help him make a caesura: “And in the morning take away the slime” (3.297). These are precisely the patterns that the *Remedy* demonstrates with the same verb, employed less frequently, of course (nine times), but frequently enough when considered in proportion to the number of lines overall. “Take” is a caesura-maker: “One loue doth take the others force away” (Rem. 2.22); essential to the chime of a couplet: “And thereby loues impression apt to take” (2.156; see also 2.69; 2.77; 2.119); a line-starter for metrical purposes: “Take heed, when thou dost first to like begin” (1.27; see also 2.39). With the proper heed having been taken, and with like willing to like, it appears that Heywood is the author of both translations.³⁶

In creating this edition, I have sought to produce a text that is faithful to the conventions of its time with regard to most accidentals. The exception is punctuation, silently emended for maximum readability but nonetheless consistent with seventeenth-century practice. The *apparatus criticus* records the very few emendations I felt compelled to make; the commentary glosses some difficult words and constructions, but is devoted primarily to the differences between the *Remedy* and the *Remedia*, providing when necessary alternate readings from Beaumont, Carpenter, and F. L. These four translations contribute in some way to helping one understand how early moderns read Ovid and appropriated him for their own uses. Above all, I have desired to restore a poem to Heywood that is rightfully his.

Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, Texas

NOTES

1. See *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*, 6 vols., ed. John Pearson (London, 1874; reprint New York: Russell and Russell, 1964), 3:167. Austin gets a brief mention in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 vols., ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (London: Oxford University Press, 1917), 1:734–35. All references to *Loues Schoole*, including book and line-numbers, are taken from my edition of the poem, *Thomas Heywood's "Art of Love": The First Complete English Translation of Ovid's "Ars amatoria"* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). The book and line-numbers for the *Remedy* are those of the present edition.

2. The other translation of the *Ars: The Three Books of Publius Ovidius Naso, De Arte Amandi*, trans. Francis Wolferston (London: Joseph Cranford, 1661).

3. See Donald Wing, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries 1641–1700*, 3 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945–51), 2: 648–53.

4. See Arthur Melville Clark, "Thomas Heywood's *Art of Love* Lost and Found," *The Library*, 4th ser. 3 (1923): 210–22.

5. "I must necessarily insert a manifest iniury done me in that worke [*Troia Britannica*, 1609], by taking the two Epistles of *Paris to Helen*, and *Helen to Paris*, and printing them in a lesse volume, vnder the name of another [i.e., Shakespeare], which may put the world in opinion I might steale them from him; and hee to doe himselfe right, hath since published them in his owne name: but as I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage, vnder whom he hath publisht them, so the Author I know much offended with M. *Iaggard* (that altogether vnknowne to him) presumed to make so bold with his name." See *An Apology for Actors* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612), G4r–G4v.

6. For Wharton, see *The History of English Poetry*, 4 vols. (London: J. Dodsley, 1774), 3:419, note e. In attribution, he follows Cibber's *The Lives of the Poets*,

5 vols., (London: R. Griffiths, 1753), 1:119. Rimbault's edition of Overbury: *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Sir Thomas Overbury, Knt.* (London: John Russell Smith, 1856); the *Remedy* occupies pages 201–19, including a reproduction of the title page. He comments only briefly on the translation (xxii), providing no explanatory notes or critical apparatus.

7. Charles Murgia is the leading proponent of this theory, and analyzes in great detail the interconnectedness of the two poems; he also makes a strong case for Ovid's revision of *Ars* 2 to fit with the *Remedia*, comparing *Ars* 2.657–62 with *Remedia* 315–40. See "The Influence of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* on *Ars amatoria* 3 and *Amores* 3," *Classical Philology* 81 (1986): 203–20, especially 203 and 206.

8. Kenney is arguably the foremost textual authority on Ovid's erotic poetry. For his lists of sigla, see *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores Medicamina Faciei Femineae Ars amatoria Remedia Amoris*, 2nd ed., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 119–20; 223–24. See also his "The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*," *Classical Quarterly* 12 (1962): 1–31.

9. That is, *Publii Ouidii Nasonis Heroidam epistolae, Amorum libri iii, De arte amandi libri iii, De remedio amoris lib. ii, Omnia ex acuratiss*, ed. Andrea Naugerius (Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1516–17; reprint London: T. Vautrollerius, 1583). The two-book *Remedia* occupies pages 269–91 and is divided into sections of 396 and 418 lines each; the bifurcation occurs after line 396, "Quantum Virgilio nobile debet opus." However, because this edition is not easily accessible, my Latin text of the *Remedia* follows that of J. H. Mozley and G. P. Goold, trans., "The Art of Love" and *Other Poems*, 2nd. ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969). Kenney's critical apparatus to the poem notes that some manuscripts begin and end the poem with formulations such as "The first book of the *Remedia*," but do not divide the poem in half.

10. The standard translation of Andreas, with an invaluable introduction, is John Jay Parry, *The Art of Courtly Love* (New York: Norton, 1969).

11. For an excellent overview of the medieval and Renaissance reception of Ovid, see W. S. Anderson, ed., *Ovid: The Classical Heritage* (New York: Garland, 1995).

12. See A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475–1640*, 3 vols., 2nd. ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1974–91), 2:201–3.

13. For examples of these translators' versification, see the commentary, *passim*. Beaumont probably made his translation in the second decade of the seventeenth century; he knew Jonson and wrote verse epistles to him; Jonson also translated classical authors such as Horace and others.

14. At the same time, in spite of Carpenter's decision to follow 1620, he seems to have restored much of the excised material and to have realigned some of the passages in the *Remedy* to their rightful Ovidian places, especially the sections at the place of bifurcation. He expands to 1008 lines and a sixteen-line preface, in keeping with seventeenth-century practice. See commentary 2.1–2f. Yet Carpenter also lifts the detail of the unbending father from *Remedy* 2.69 that is not in the *Remedia* (p. 26). The idea of "remedies for love" seems to have been popular during this time period: Michael Drayton's 1619 edition of his sonnet sequence *Idea* contains the marginal gloss, "His Remedy for Love."

15. For example: a volume entitled *Various Poems* in the British Library (shelfmark b. 39. a. 37.) contains several of the seventeenth-century English translations of Ovid, including *Loues Schoole* and the *Remedy*.

16. The depth of feeling can be gauged by the King's letter to Carr in 1615, the year of trial: "worst of all and worse than any other thing that can be imagined, ye have in many of your mad fits done what you can [to?] persuade me that ye mean not so much to hold me by love hereafter as by awe, and that ye have me so far in your reverence as that I dare not offend you or resist your appetites. I leave out of this reckoning your long creeping back and withdrawing yourself from lying in my chamber, notwithstanding my many hundred times earnest soliciting you to the contrary, accounting that but as a point of unkindness." See G. P. V. Akrigg, ed., *The Letters of King James VI and I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 337.

17. This material from Overbury has been condensed from the following sources: E. Parry, *The Overbury Mystery* (London: Fisher Unwin, 1925); William McElwee, *The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London: Faber & Faber, 1952); Miriam Allen de Ford, *The Overbury Affair: The Trial That Rocked the Court of King James I* (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1960); Beatrice White, *Cast of Ravens: The Strange Case of Sir Thomas Overbury* (London: J. Murray, 1965); Edward Le Comte, *The Notorious Lady Esse* (London: Robert Hale, 1969); Otto J. Scott, *James I* (New York: Mason-Charter, 1976).

18. See A. R. Braunmuller, "Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, as Collector and Patron," in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 230–50.

19. "To Sir Thomas Overbury," lines 11–12. See William B. Hunter, ed., *The Complete Poetry of Ben Jonson* (New York: Norton, 1963), 52.

20. De Ford describes Overbury as Carr's "quondam friend and presumptuous disciplinarian" (*Overbury Affair*, 25).

21. See Scott, *James I*, 313.

22. The more distasteful and humiliating aspects of the divorce proceedings, including the revelations of Essex's alleged impotence and Frances's semi-public gynecological examination, are recounted in David Lindley, *The Trials of Frances Howard: Fact and Fiction at the Court of King James* (London: Routledge, 1993).

23. See Richard Niccols, *Sir Thomas Overburies Vision* [1616], ed. James Maidment (London, 1873; reprint London: Johnson Reprint Company, 1966), 12. The poisons allegedly used before the fatal clyster were aqua fortis (nitric acid), black and white arsenic, red mercury, powder of diamonds (ground glass), rosalgar / realgar (arsenic monosulphide), cantharides, "great spiders," lapis costitus (caustic potash). See de Ford, *Overbury Affair*, 36.

24. For recent scholarship on these poems and their relationship to this matter, see David Lindley, "Embarrassing Ben: The Masques for Frances Howard," *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 343–59; William A. McClung and Rodney Simard, "Donne's Somerset Epithalmion and the Erotics of Criticism," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50 (1987): 95–106; and Patricia Pinka, "Donne, *Idios*, and the Somerset Epithalamion," *Studies in Philology* 90 (1993): 58–73.

25. For an account of the minor players in the poisoning, see Lindley, *Trials*, 30–39.

26. See Akrigg, ed., *The Letters of King James VI and I*, 346.

27. "To Sir Thomas Overbury," line 3. John Aubrey reports: "it was a great question who was the proudest, Sir Walter [Raleigh] or Sir Thomas Overbury, but the difference that was, was judged on Sir Thomas's side." See *Aubrey's Brief Lives*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957), 254.

28. De Ford, *Overbury Affair*, 40.

29. The most offensive part of *The Wife*: "the lines my Lady Keepd in remembrance he comes to near, who comes to be denied" (i.e., "He comes too neere, that comes to be denide"; see James E. Savage, ed., *The "Conceited Newes" of Sir Thomas Overbury and His Friends: A Facsimile Reproduction of the Ninth Impression of 1616 of "Sir Thomas Overbury His Wife"* [Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1968], 48). For a brief account of this strange story, see *Ben Jonson*, 11 vols., ed. C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925–52), 1:138. The unfortunate line bears a striking resemblance to a line from the *Remedy* marked out as sententia, "'Who asketh faintly teacheth to deny'" (2.60).

30. These quotations are taken from de Ford, *Overbury Affair*, 63, 119; G. P. V. Akrigg, *Jacobean Pageant, Or The Court of King James I* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 203; and Scott, *James I*, 313, respectively.

31. See Savage, ed., "Conceited Newes," 6, 8.

32. "The murder of Overbury could be represented as a warning of the dangers of the court, the illusion of the pursuit of place and the untrustworthiness of the great. At the same time the fact of its discovery revealed the everlasting justice of God, and, most potently of all, it could be held up as an example of the dangers of lust and the menace of womankind. It is precisely because the narrative could be made so tidy, so rounded, and be simultaneously accommodated into so many satisfying narrative frames that it has retained its appeal down to the present day." See Lindley, *Trials*, 191. For some other contemporary theoretical readings of the matter, see Lorie Jerrell Leininger, "Exploding the Myth of the Lustful Murderer: A Reinterpretation of Frances Howard's Role in the Death of Sir Thomas Overbury," *Topic* 36 (1982): 38–53; Anne M. Haselkorn, "Sin and the Politics of Penitence: Three Jacobean Adulteresses," in *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon*, ed. Anne Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990); and Donald Foster, "'Against the Perjured Falsehood of Your Tongues': Frances Howard on the Course of Love," *English Literary History* 61 (1994): 72–103.

33. See Savage, ed., "Conceited Newes," 48.

34. See Pollard and Redgrave, *STC 1475–1640*, 2:200. The text reaches a seventeenth edition in 1664. See Wing, *STC 1641–1700*, 2:513.

35. Most notably, of course, see Donald Foster, "Elegy by W. S.": *A Study in Attribution* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989) and "A Funeral Elegy: W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s 'Best-Speaking Witnesses,'" *PMLA* 111 (1996): 1080–1105.

36. The present study would have been impossible without the assistance of William Ingram, University of Michigan, who prepared a concordance of *Loues Schoole* and the *Remedy*, and whose gracious assistance and enthusiastic support I hereby gratefully acknowledge.