

“Pearls of Eloquence”: *Hesperides*, or the Muses’ Garden as a Herald of Canon Formation*

Tianhu Hao
Peking University

Abstract

The two extant versions of the manuscript commonplace book *Hesperides, or the Muses’ Garden* were compiled by John Evans in the 1650s and 1660s under the commission of Humphrey Moseley, arguably the most important literary publisher in seventeenth-century England. Evans cites from 356 titles, nearly 100 of which are those published or possibly published by Moseley. Evans’s extensive extracts from 177 plays, including Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and the most notable Moseley title, the 1647 folio of Beaumont and Fletcher, establish drama as a genre of the page rather than the stage in a period when the theater was enforced to be closed. Romances and poems, two other genres promoted by Moseley, are also gathered in *Hesperides*. The three literary genres—plays, romances, poems—account for a majority of the 356 titles; Evans’s exclusion of sermons and his heavy literary inclination mark *Hesperides* as a herald in the history of canon formation. Evans makes

Tianhu Hao holds a Ph.D. in English (Columbia University) and is currently Associate Professor in the Department of English at Peking University (Beijing 100871, China; email: haotianhu@pku.edu.cn). In charge of three ministry- or national-level research projects, he is mainly interested in Renaissance English literature, Anglo-American love poetry, bibliography, manuscript study, scholarly editing, book history, and the production of cross-cultural knowledge between China and Anglo-America. A recent Erasmus Mundus scholar (2013), he has taught in New York, Beijing, and Thessaloniki. In addition to over a dozen Chinese essays, his English articles have appeared in *The Library*, *Milton Quarterly*, *Spenser Studies*, and *Tamkang Review*. He has also published a number of translations, including Martin Bernal’s *Black Athena* (vol. 1) and David Kastan’s *Shakespeare and the Book* (both as first translator). He is completing a monograph on *Hesperides, or the Muses’ Garden*, a seventeenth-century manuscript commonplace book.

* Supported by the Humanities and Social Sciences Research Fund of the Ministry of Education, People’s Republic of China. Authorization: 08JC752001. This article is a revised version of Chapter 5 of my unpublished dissertation, and I am indebted to Professor David Scott Kastan for his exemplary mentorship. Sincere thanks also go to the three anonymous readers, whose comments and suggestions I find constructive and helpful.

(Received: 28 August 2012; Accepted: 27 March 2013)

an anthologization and hence, a canonization, of English literature by commonplacing it. The publisher and the compiler work together for the foundation of an early modern canon of English literature. The Evans-Moseley canon is text-centered, reading-oriented, socially functional and politically loaded. The medium of manuscript and the genre of the commonplace book function as an indispensable stage not to be neglected in the process of literary reception and canon formation.

Keywords: *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*, commonplace book, canon formation, drama, John Evans, Humphrey Moseley

The two extant versions of the manuscript commonplace book *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden* (Folger MS V.b.93 and its related manuscripts at Folger and in Stratford-on-Avon) were compiled by John Evans around the 1650s and 1660s under the commission of Humphrey Moseley (Hao, "Manuscript History"), arguably the most important literary publisher in seventeenth-century England. Many discussions of English literary canon formation often pinpoint its inception at the middle of the eighteenth century.¹ Paulina Kewes dates the formation of a dramatic canon in the later seventeenth century (*Authorship and Appropriation* 180), and Trevor Ross discusses "a prestigious author-centered royalist canon" established by Humphrey Moseley (134). David Scott Kastan contends for the role of the book trade in canon formation and claims that "English literature was invented early in the winter of 1645" ("Humphrey Moseley" 105)² when Humphrey Moseley published Edmund Waller's *Poems*. I would argue that under the commission of Moseley, John Evans established a text-centered, reading-oriented, socially functional, politically loaded, all-inclusive canon—primarily a dramatic one—in *Hesperides* around the middle of the seventeenth century. Displaying literature in commonplace forms and reading literature in a commonplace manner, *Hesperides* stands as a herald in the history of canon formation. While foregrounding the indispensability of the medium of manuscript in literary reception and canon formation, I shall also emphasize the inseparability of print and manuscript. The essay falls into three parts. I shall discuss in Part I the rise of the play, in Part II the rise of the romance, and in Part III the central place of literature and the politics of the canon.

What is "canon"? The ancient Greek word *kanōn* originally means "any straight rod or bar" (Gorak 9) and later, a list, or a catalogue of authors (Ross 23). A canon as rule, as implied in the property of straightness, defines a standard of excellence and authenticity. "In an early Christian context, 'canon' refers both to a set of ecclesiastical practices and to a list of inspired texts" (Gorak 29). The Catholic Church regularly canonizes people, i.e. admits them to the list

¹ For example, Kramnick argues that the English canon received its definite shape during the mid-eighteenth century. Shakespeare's canonical status was not achieved until the mid-eighteenth century (Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book* 30). According to Wellek, who devotes a whole chapter to Thomas Warton in his *Rise of English Literary History* (chapter VI), the first history of English literature "in form" was Warton's three-volume *History of English Poetry* (viii), published a little later than the mid-eighteenth century (1774-81).

² This dramatic claim might seem less sensational if we remember that in the late seventeenth century critics, including Francis Atterbury (1690), Thomas Rymer (1693), Joseph Addison (1694), Sir Thomas Pope Blount (1694), and John Dryden (1700), generally agreed that Waller represented the perfection of English poetry; indeed, one of them went to such an extreme as to identify the poet as the "parent of English verse." See Wellek 20, 35, 36, 40.

of saints. The early Church authorities distinguished between “authentic” Scripture and apocrypha; thus the concept of “canon” as a body of writings arose in connection with the Bible. Trevor Ross suggests usefully that we consider literary canons “as lists as much as standards of excellence” (23). In the discussion of canons we should combine the idea of rule with the idea of listing. The publisher’s catalogues listing all the plays available for sale (Greg III: 1320-56), such as Rogers and Ley’s Catalogue (505 titles), Archer’s Catalogue (622 titles), and Kirkman’s Catalogues (1661, 685 titles; 1671, 806 titles), do not represent critical efforts of constructing dramatic canons. Such a list, with its inclusiveness and comprehensiveness, may constitute a specialized, uncritical enumerative bibliography, but certainly not a canon, which is characterized with exclusiveness and serves as the yardstick of excellence. Therefore not Catalogue A or Catalogue H,³ but *Hesperides* the whole book including the catalogue, constructs an early modern canon, for Evans’s list and extracts are selective, and selectiveness suggests a standard of excellence.

Evans cites from no less than 356 titles,⁴ nearly 100 of which are those published or possibly published by Moseley. Nearly 90% (87/97)⁵ of the Moseley titles are “literary,” which can be divided into three categories: plays (49), romances (11), and poems (28).

Plays (49): Beaumont and Fletcher: 1+35 (the 1647 folio and the works therein);
348, 353

William Cartwright: 187, 243, 277, 292

Sir John Suckling: 10, 36, 132

James Shirley: 320

John Milton: 216

Henry Glapthorne: 282

Pierre Corneille (trans. Joseph Rutter): 34

Romances (11): 33, 74, 6, 163, 245, 68, 58, 7, 20, 21, 23

Poems (28): Francis Quarles: 11, 14, 94, 120, 146, 164, 258, 298, 299

Robert Heath: 56, 91, 92, 247, 294

Translations: 245, 90, 55, 331

James Shirley: 238, 293

William Davenant: 82, 228

Richard Crashaw: 77, 291

³ For transcriptions of Catalogue A (Folger MS V.b.93) and Catalogue H (Folger MS V.a.75), see Hao, “Manuscript History,” 385-402.

⁴ Catalogue A actually lists 351 titles; Catalogue H lists 302 titles, 4 of which are absent from Catalogue A. In addition, J. P. Perrin’s *Albingenses* (trans. Samson Lennard, STC 19769, London, 1624) is extracted but included in neither catalogue. Therefore *Hesperides* cites no less than 356 titles.

⁵ The other 10% are non-fictional prose works: 5, 9, 16, 17, 112, 118, 119, 270, 296, Dodona’s Grove. The numbers are from Catalogue A, Folger MS V.b.93.

Sir John Suckling: 295

John Milton: 215

James Howell: 330

William Cartwright: 50⁶

Plays, poems, and romances are generic distinctions employed by Moseley in his publisher's catalogues. The following categories appear in a Moseley catalogue: Poems lately Printed; Plaies lately Printed; New and excellent Romances (Reed 117). I classify the Moseley titles according to a contemporary standard rather than a modern criterion. Adrian Marino writes, "The Renaissance and Humanism continue to set up literary hierarchies according to the principles devised in the Middle Ages. . . . The essential value-criterion—the sacred on top, the profane at the bottom—is not changed" (133). William London puts "Divinity Books" first and "Romances, Poems and Playes" last in his catalogue, certifying Marino's claim, whereas Moseley's catalogues usually open with "Various Histories, with curious Discourses in Humane Learning" and sometimes end with "several Sermons" (Greg III: 1170-81). Visible in Moseley is a process of what Adrian Marino calls the "laicization of literature" or "humanization of literature" (149; "literature" in the broad sense of writings in general). While marketability is apparently London's motive for inclusion of the most vendible literary genres, Moseley's interest in literature is "clearly driven by concerns beyond market logic" (Kastan, "Humphrey Moseley" 115). Moseley consciously promotes literary genres, especially plays. Over half of the Moseley titles are plays; first and foremost the Evans-Moseley canon is a dramatic one.

The Rise of the Play

In volume one of Giles Jacob's *Poetical Register*, a two-volume biographical collection published in 1719-20, "a miniature portrait of Shakespeare is ringed by smaller ones of Jonson, Fletcher, Wycherley, Dryden, Otway, and Beaumont, as representing a canon of English drama" (Terry 5). In this early-eighteenth-century dramatic canon the triumvirate—Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher—occupies a prominent place. The idea of the dramatic triumvirate was already a commonplace in the seventeenth century. John Denham, John Dryden, Edward Phillips, William Winstanley, Sir Thomas Pope Blount, and Earl of Rochester all refer to the three dramatists as the "happy Triumvirat" (Hao,

⁶ The list is based on Appendix V of Hao, "Commonplace Reading and Writing" 203. "Oronta, the Cyprian Virgin" (No. 245), a translated romance in verse, counts twice.

“Commonplace Reading and Writing” 133-34). Statistics show that half of the titles extracted in *Hesperides* are plays,⁷ which is the most salient feature of the commonplace book. The 177 play titles cited by Evans include 45 by Ben Jonson, 36 by Shakespeare, and 41 by Beaumont and Fletcher. The triumvirate accounts for nearly 70% of the play titles (122/177). Kewes says that the supremacy of the triumvirate of wit is a “cliché” among scholars (*Authorship and Appropriation* 181), but knowledge of the supremacy of the triumvirate in the manuscript medium is refreshing. According to Gunnar Sorelius, with whom I agree, Evans extracts from Shakespeare’s first folio (301). The Beaumont and Fletcher titles are mostly excerpted from the 1647 folio. The Ben Jonson collection has three volumes:

1616 folio or vol. 1 of *Works* (1640): 95, 96, 60, 259, 300, 116, 97/311, 15, 61; 62, 133, 147, 166, 194, 195, 220, 221, 222, 248, 262, 275; 99, 260; 98, 122, 261.

Vol. 2 of *Works* (1640): 81.

Vol. 3 of *Works* (1641): 301, 323, 227; 64, 65, 123, 149, 197, 223, 224, 225, 226, 240, 241, 263, 264, 322, 334; 174, 196; 148, 333, 63, 100, 101, 102; 80, 103.⁸

Vol. 3 of Ben Jonson’s *Works* also has a Moseley connection: on November 20, 1658 Thomas Walkley transferred the right of “A booke called Ben Johnsons Workes ye 3d volume” to Humphrey Moseley, but neither published the work (Reed 122; Wright 79n). Other books in Catalogue A entered by Moseley but not issued by him are: George Chapman, *Byron’s Conspiracy*, 30; *Byron’s Tragedy*, 31; *Bussy D’Amboys*, 32; Beaumont and Fletcher, *Cupid’s Revenge*, 75; *Monsieur Thomas*, 217 (Reed 119-24). Thus the Moseley-related titles are increased from 97 to 130, more than one third of the total (130/356), which is a significant proportion indeed.

The triumvirate playwrights were all published in the folio format. The folio “was an impressive book . . . most obviously distinguished by its size . . . usually about fourteen inches high and nine inches wide (their actual size, of course, is not prescribed but a function of the fact that ‘folio’ technically refers to a book made up of gatherings of sheets each folded once along the longer side to make two leaves or four pages; hence a folio page would normally be larger than anything other than the unfolded broadsheet, though, as sheets themselves came in various sizes, this would not necessarily be the case)” (Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book* 50-51). The folio was economically more costly than the cheaper quarto or octavo, and it was often reserved “for consequential publications in

⁷ As a contrast, about half of the titles listed in London’s *Catalogue* are “Divinity Books.”

⁸ For bibliographic information of Jonson’s collections, see Greg III: 1070-82, and Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation*, Appendix B.

subjects like theology or law" (Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book* 51). In literature the "impressive" folio usually signifies a high canonical status, as witnessed by the folios of Jonson (1616), Shakespeare (1623), and Beaumont and Fletcher (1647). As Gary Taylor remarks,

Of the pre-Restoration dramatists, only Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Jonson were honored by folio collections of their plays in the late seventeenth century. Such editions testify to the cultural prestige of those dramatists; but that cultural prestige itself resulted in part from the publication of collected editions of their work in the first half of the century (31-32).

The abuse of the prestigious folio format would cause remorseless ridicule, as in the case of "aristocratic pretenders" like Sir John Suckling (Kewes, "Humphrey Moseley's Serial Publication" 12). Another pretender is Sir William Killigrew, whose *Fovr New Playes* (Oxford, 1666) is cited by John Evans.

In the early modern period plays are constantly condemned on religious and moral grounds. For Stephen Gosson, plays being "consecrated to idolatrie, they are not of God[;] if they proceede not from God, they are the doctrine and inventions of the devill" (1582; qtd. in Barish 89). In *Histrion-mastix* (London, 1633), William Prynne uses a syllogism to prove that plays are un-Christian.⁹ He deplores the fact of "there being above forty thousand Play-books printed within these two yeares" and complains that plays are "now more vendible than the choycest Sermons" (sig. *3r-v), Shakespeare's plays being printed on "farre better paper than most Octavo or Quarto *Bibles*" (sig. **6^v). In his "gargantuan encyclopedia of antitheatrical lore which scourges every form of theater in the most ferocious terms" (Barish 83), Prynne attacks the reading and writing of plays as well: "And may wee then read or write these sinnes and vices which we ought not to name? or study or peruse such wanton Playes and Pamphlets, which can administer nought but gracelesnesse, lust, prophanesse to the Readers?" (sig. 6B3^v) More generally, the Puritans reject theaters and theatricalism for their changeability and hypocrisy.¹⁰ Ben Jonson demonstrates a high-brow uneasiness with the impermanence of plays and masques, which are largely popular entertainment forms in early modern England.¹¹ He commits his plays to the 1616 folio, a more lasting medium than the fragile stage, making the printed script a higher authority than

⁹ "Those Playes which are usually accompanied with amorous Pastoralls, lascivious ribaldrous Songs and Ditties, *must needs be unlawfull, yea abominable unto Christians*. But Stage-playes are usually accompanied with such Pastorals, Songs, and Ditties as these. Therefore they must needs be unlawfull, yea abominable unto Christians" (sig. 2L3^v).

¹⁰ See Barish, chapters 4 and 5.

¹¹ Many scholars hold this opinion. For example, David Kastan resembles the role of the drama in early modern England to that of the movie in today's society (*Shakespeare and the Book* 21).

the live performance; thus “the play moves formally into the domain of literature” (Barish 138-39). Jonson takes an initiative to elevate the play to the status and prestige of what we now call “literature.”

Moseley published play books in a variety of formats: folio, quarto, octavo. Size matters in the sense that different formats signify a different canonical status in the literary hierarchy, with the folio being the highest. Moseley’s publication of plays contributes consciously to the establishment of a canon of English drama. In the 1650s he published the octavo play collections by five dramatists¹² and their single plays in octavo or quarto.¹³ As Paulina Kewes eloquently and plausibly maintains, “Moseley’s octavo play collections of the 1650s supplemented the canonical hierarchy of literary reputation and esteem which had been mapped out by the three folios of 1616, 1623 and 1647. . . . Furthermore, Moseley’s collections effect authorization of the playwrights they feature and initiate the establishment of their individual canons” (“Humphrey Moseley’s Serial Publication” 10); “The long-term significance of Moseley’s collected editions of pre-Civil War drama consists in their canon-making potential” (*Authorship and Appropriation* 184).¹⁴ Note the word “potential.” Started by Jonson, the process of canonization continued with the expansion of the market around the middle of the century, but was not fulfilled until later in the century when critical commentary on drama was developed, in Kewes’s opinion (*Authorship and Appropriation* 10). Among the dramatists Jonson, Shakespeare, and Beaumont and Fletcher are first-rate, while Moseley’s octavo authors are second-rate, as Gerard Langbaine, a late-seventeenth-century drama critic held.¹⁵ The distinction in this hierarchy is signaled by the different sizes of their play books. In a time when the theater was closed Moseley’s publications replaced the function of the theater and strengthened drama as a literary genre by promoting the reading of plays. Significantly, Langbaine’s “primary concern was with plays as printed artifacts” (Kewes, *Authorship and Appropriation* 212). Both on the market and in critical commentary in the late seventeenth century, drama arose as a native

¹² James Shirley, *Six New Playes*, 1653; Richard Brome, *Five New Playes*, 1653; Philip Massinger, *Three New Playes*, 1655; Lodowick Carlell, *Two New Playes*, 1657; Thomas Middleton, *Two New Playes*, 1657.

¹³ In accordance with the “principle of matching format” (Kewes, “Humphrey Moseley’s Serial Publication” 7), Moseley issued *The Wild Goose Chase* (1652) in folio so that the reader could bind it with the 1647 folio.

¹⁴ Andrew Nash argues that the collected edition is one of the main determinants of the English canon. For instance, the First Folio helped establish Shakespeare as the central figure in the canon of English literature (3).

¹⁵ See Langbaine’s *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (Oxford, 1691). Discussed in Kewes’s “Humphrey Moseley’s Serial Publication,” 10, 20 and *Authorship and Appropriation*, 207-18.

literary genre. Moseley's publications in the middle of the century prepared materials for dramatic commonplacing as well as for later critical commentary.

From 1642 to 1660 the London theater was closed owing to the Puritan revolution. During, or rather, due to, the closure of the theater the stage gave place to the page. As James Howell remarks, ". . . since we cannot have Thee trod o' th' stage, / Wee will applaud Thee in this silent Page" (qtd. in Wright 82). Plays were no longer seen, but read. Former theater-goers had to go to the bookshop for the enjoyment of drama. These historical circumstances create the play as a literary genre or a genre of print instead of a theatrical genre or a genre of performance. As Louis B. Wright comments, "The focusing of attention upon the reading of plays, a natural result of the prohibition of acting, tended to increase the prestige of drama as *literature*" (107-08). Or as David Scott Kastan remarks, the closing of the theaters "arguably even ensured the successful transformation of drama into a literary form . . . and plays became literature precisely as they left the stage and found their way into print" ("Performances and Playbooks" 176, 180). Evans reads plays via the time-honored tool of the commonplace book. John Marston refers to a commonplace book of plays in his *The Scourge of Villanie* at the end of the sixteenth century (1598): "Now I haue him, that . . . H'ath made a common-place booke out of playes, / And speakes in print" (sig. H4). But dramatic commonplace books do not appear until John Cotgrave (*The English Treasury of Wit and Language*, London, printed for Humphrey Moseley, 1655) and John Evans, around the middle of the seventeenth century. It must be stressed that in addition to the closure of the theater, the commonplace book plays a considerable role in the birth of the play as a literary genre.¹⁶

In what ways is literature represented in Cotgrave and in Evans? A comparison of the two anthologists under the same commonplace subject "Youth" is instructive. Cotgrave cites seven passages to illustrate the topic (310-11), whose respective sources I identify as: Ben Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor*, Sir John Suckling's *Brennoralt*, Barnabe Barnes's *The Devils Charter*, Sir William Davenant's *The Wits*, Thomas Middleton's *A Mad World, My Masters*, Shackerley Marmion's *A Fine Companion*, Thomas Heywood's *The English Traveler*. In Evans we read:

Youth

Do you see how y^e spring is full of flowers, decking it selfe wth them, & not aspiring to y^e fruits of Autumn. A.

A touch of y^r stampe, maketh an impression on y^r waxen age. HW.

¹⁶ Admittedly, judging from the evidence available, Shakespeare's presence in manuscript circulation was rather limited in the Renaissance period. For a brief summary of manuscript commonplace books that contain extracts from Shakespeare's plays, prominently *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*, see Marotti and Estill, esp. 65-70.

Nature cressant do's not grow alone in bulke: but as his temple waxes, y^e inward
service of y^e mind & soule growes wide withall. H.

Now sanguin. Age

VE 2

VÆ 212 (Evans 890)

[Now sanguine Venus doth begin

To draw her sanguine colours in. Francis Quarles, *Hieroglyphicks* (QH)

When first my downy chin the razor shav'd. Virgil's *Ecloques* (VE 2)

One trusting youth, best traversed his ground,

Th'other in strength and size advantage found. Virgil's *Æneis* (VÆ 212)]¹⁷

Several things stand out from the comparison. First, Cotgrave excerpts exclusively from verse drama, while Evans extracts from various genres: poetry (Virgil and Francis Quarles), drama (*Hamlet*), and prose works (*Arcadia* and *The Holy War*). Second, Cotgrave does not specify the source of his passage, while Evans does. Third, both Cotgrave and Evans alter the quotation in certain ways. Disregarding the spellings, the former changes two words plus the lineation of the Suckling passage. In the latter, the poetic lines of *Hamlet* are cited in the form of prose. Fourth, both employ figurative language to describe youth. This fact emphasizes the literariness of the canon. In the former, “youth restrain'd” is like “an eager Dog” (simile; Jonson); in the latter, youth is the “spring full of flowers,” unlike age, or the “fruits of Autumn” (metaphors). Fifth, Cotgrave and Evans quote different authors under the same topic; they are complementary to each other. Now we understand why Moseley commissioned two books of similar forms and subjects: individual fancies dictate the selection of each commonplace book, and the two compilations' range of coverage differs and the actual extracts supplement each other.

The Rise of the Romance

Evans constructs a canon of much wider coverage than Cotgrave, for in his canon, romances and poems stand together with plays. By “the rise of the romance,”¹⁸ I mean the popularity of the genre on the book market around the middle of the seventeenth century, especially the French heroic romances translated into English. I shall discuss the romance as an imported feminine genre,

¹⁷ From the page numbers we may infer, with the aid of EEBO, that Evans used the 1650 edition of Virgil translated by John Ogilby (Wing V609).

¹⁸ “The Rise of Romance” is the title of a book by Eugène Vinaver, which explores the rise of the genre in the medieval times prior to the advent of print.

its rise from the object of denigration to the status of literature, and the commonplacing and canonization of the romance.

According to Salzman's classification (355-78), there are four kinds of romances in those extracted by Evans:

1. Sidneian romance: Sir Philip Sidney, *Arcadia*; Giovanni Francesco Biondi, *The Banished Virgin*; Richard Beling, *Sixth Book to the Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*, 1628 ed. of *Arcadia*; Francis Quarles, *Argalus and Parthenia*.¹⁹
2. Political/Allegorical romance: Robert Baron, *Erotopageion, or the Cyprian Academy*; James Howell, *Dodona's Grove*.
3. French heroic romance: Gauthier de Coste de la Calprenède, *Cassandra and Cleopatra*; Madeleine de Scudéry, *Artamenes or The Grand Cyrus*.
4. The novella: Miguel de Cervantes, *Exemplary Novels*, trans. James Mabbe: "A Storie of Two Damsells," "The Ladie Cornelia," "The Liberrall Lover," "The Force of Blood," "The Spanish Ladie," "The Jealous Husband"; *Choice Novels and Amorous Tales. Aurora, Ismenia, and the Prince, with Oronta the Cyprian Virgin*, trans. Thomas Stanley.

Of the twenty romances published or advertised by Moseley,²⁰ ten are French heroic romances, and five are continental romances (adventure romances or pastoral romances). All of the twenty are translations, defining the genre as an imported one, usually from French.²¹ Moseley is a publisher that promoted particularly French heroic romances. Of the fifteen French heroic romances published in seventeenth-century England (Salzman 360-61), ten or two-thirds are associated with Humphrey Moseley. The first book that Moseley published after being admitted to the livery of the Stationers' Company, October 28, 1633, is a romance, Biondi's *The Banished Virgin* (1635), and the last book that Moseley published in his lifetime is also a romance, the second folio edition of *Cassandra* (1661).²² From first to last Moseley promoted the genre of romance with all his efforts.

Dedicated frequently to ladies and created largely for women, the romance might be viewed as a feminine genre. Famous examples of dedication are "The

¹⁹ Biondi attempted to translate Sidney's *Arcadia* for Prince Thomas of Savoy, but he did not know the language well, "so as not translating but rather paraphrasing it, I made him speake what he never meant." Finally he wrote *The Banished Virgin* and besought the Prince to accept it "in discharge of the *Arcadia*" ("The Authors Epistle Dedicatory"). Quarles's poem *Argalus and Parthenia* is based on the *Arcadia*.

²⁰ For the list, see "Other Excellent Romances Printed for Humphrey Mosley at the Princes Arms in St. Pauls Church-yard," on the last page of *Cassandra* in folio (La Calprenède). Among the titles advertised (but not published) by Moseley, John Pyper published *The History of Astrea*, and Thomas Walkley published *Ariana*, *The History of Polesander*, and *The Romant of Romants*.

²¹ This should not blind us to the large amount of original fiction in the century. Of the 450 new titles published in England during the century, 213 were translations. Of the 213 translations, 164 were from French, only 22 from Spanish and 13 from Italian (Salzman 114).

²² See Reed 104, 114.

Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia” and “The Countesse of Montgomeries Urania.” Romances are regularly dedicated by the author, the translator, or the publisher to ladies. Both *Ariana* and *Clelia* are presented “To the Ladies,” and *The Cyprian Academy* addresses “Bright ornaments of the British nation,” or the “Ladies and Gentlewoemen [sic] of England.” Women are supposed to be the primary audience of romances. The commendatory verses prove this point well.

Me thinks I see the world thy booke admire;
And Ladies dandling it with much desire
To see that hand;

William Beversham, “On his beloved friend the Authour”

Each gallant here may have his fill²³

Each Lady please her eye
Such are thy streames of eloquence

Such is thy poesie.

Robert Brounrigg, “To his much respected and learned friend Master
Robert Baron on his Booke”

(Baron, *The Cyprian Academy*, sigs. A4, a1)

Moreover, the romance must be read in quietness and seclusion: “Take her each of you apart into some retired place, and then giving her attention and silence. . . . She cannot love noise, or assemblies, since repose and solitude gave birth to her” (Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, *Ariana*, sig. A2^v). The use of feminine pronouns to refer to the feminine genre is appropriate enough. Although most romances are written by men, romance fiction by women does occur. In England, Margaret Tyler translated out of Spanish *The Mirror of Knighthood* (London, 1578); Lady Mary Wroth famously wrote and published *Urania* (London, 1621).²⁴

In English translations *Artamenes*, *Ibrahim*, and *Clelia* are known to be by “Monsieur de Scudéry, Governor of Nostre-Dame [sic] de la Garde,”²⁵ which is misleading. These three romances were actually written by Madeleine de Scudéry, who was the ghost-writer of her elder brother Georges. The two “collaborated” in the writing of *Artamenes*. But “[t]heir literary partnership was very one-sided. Madeleine did the actual writing and Georges would then ‘correct’ it by changing the color of this one’s hair and that one’s eyes” (Backer 189). Then the book

²³ Men are also the audience of romances.

²⁴ For a useful discussion of women readers of romances and the romance as a feminine genre, see Hackett 4-19.

²⁵ The publisher, the translator and the compiler (John Evans) all thought so, though they were sometimes uncertain of the authorial identity of romances, as they speculated on the authorship of *Cleopatra*: “be our Author a Monk, Cavalier, or Doctor, for what *he* is, we know not (since *he* hath not been pleased to fix *his* name to any of *his* Books) . . .” (La Calprenède, *Cleopatra*, sig. A3^v, my italics). The extraordinary thing is that they automatically supposed the unknown author to be a male.

was published under the name of Georges de Scudéry, who assumed the post of governor of Notre Dame de la Garde, a tiny fortress on the southern coast of France near Marseilles, from 1644-50. Mme. de Rambouillet had found the job for him out of kindness to his sister Madeleine (Backer 188). *Artamenes* was exceptionally popular and earned the brother and sister a decent living. It even won Georges a chair in the Academy (Backer 189). Although Dorothy Backer finds Scudéry to be "such a poor artist" in *Artamenes* and *Clelia* "a worse book" than *Artamenes*, she still considers the writer "one of the most popular authors of all time" (Backer 191, 199). With *Clelia* going through many editions and translated into English, Italian, German, even Arabic, by 1659 Madeleine de Scudéry had acquired an international reputation (Backer 201). Ironically, at least in English translations, the fame rested with her brother Georges. The feminine romances were disguised as masculine works or the products of a man because a woman could not freely write them at the time.

It is characteristic of a translator to be modest about his own work. As a contrast, the friends of the translator express through metaphors like clothing that the translation surpasses the original. There are many examples of this.²⁶ The translation is even "worthy of the bays" (La Calprenède, Hymen's Preludia, preliminaries). Since the bays are usually an honor reserved for original works, the translation is elevated to the status of original composition.²⁷ The translated romances become part and parcel of English literature. It is symptomatic of the original status of translations that Moseley regularly groups poems and translations together (often also with plays) in his publisher's catalogues (Greg III: 1170-80). The transformation of "*French* attire" into "*English* habit" registers a literary transplant, which enriches native English literature and contributes to an English canon. Interestingly, only the translator sees the romance naked during the transformation.

²⁶ . . . you so bravely in this your translation
 Have *Cleopatra* cloath'd in such attire
 As even the *French-man* may himself admire
 To see her *English* habit to surpass
 The *mode* in which in *French* before she was.

John Crosbie, "To my worthy friend Mr. John Coles"

When *Cleopatra* in her *French* attire
 I first beheld, ne're did I more admire
 A forreign beauty, but I now professe
 She's yet more lovely in thy *English* dresse;

Antho. Prissoe, "To his most ingenious Friend Mr. John Coles"

(La Calprenède, Hymen's Preludia, preliminaries)

²⁷ See also William Beversham's praise of Robert Baron and his *The Cyprian Academy*: "*Momus* shall wear the Ivy; Thou the Bays" and Henry Bold's: "Thou highly dost deserve it, and the bays / Should crown thy browes to thine immortal prayse" and John Gleané's: ". . . in worths plentuous cropps, of infant bays / I gleane an handfull to adorne thy prayse" etc (Baron, sigs. A4, a3, a4).

Both Sidney and Robert Baron refer to their work of romance as the child of their brain. Sidney prefers a restricted manuscript circulation of his work, whose chief safety “shalbe the not walking abroad” (sig. A4). An aristocratic mind susceptible to the “stigma of print” (Saunders), Sidney denies the medium of print and authorship (“this child, which I am loath to father”: sigs. A3r-v). In contrast, Baron boldly claims his authorship in his dedications, and the book was printed as soon as it was composed. As William Beversham says in his commendatory verse, “Noe sooner in our Inne, but out in Print!” In over half a century’s lapse of time we see the stigma of print—if any—overcome and the book market triumphant. The rise of the romance benefits from this historic change. Moseley published the English translation of *Artamenes* almost concurrently with the French original. The market prospered, “so prosper’d” (Reed 96, 95). To enhance the demand and promote the sale, Moseley emphasizes time and again that he intends no second impression. Further, Moseley advertised *Artamenes* as “a noble usefull Work” “written with so much Wit and noble Passion” (Reed 95, 93-94). The commercial bookman’s serious gesture towards “noble” literature contrasts sharply with the attitude of the noble-born Sidney, who calls the *Arcadia* “this idle worke of mine,” “being but a trifle, and that triflinglie handled” (sigs. A3, A3^v). While Sidney’s position may be read as a modesty *topos*,²⁸ it is an undeniable fact that the romance is a genre long denigrated by Renaissance humanists for its supposed immorality. In England from Roger Ascham to Margaret Cavendish the romance was consistently condemned as “bawdie,” “foolish,” and “unprofitable” (Hackett 42, 184). Yet, in my opinion, the climate for the evaluation of romances did change around the middle of the seventeenth century mainly as a result of the market force. Moseley analyzes *Artamenes* in literary terms: “the Plots are deeper, the Turns and Changes much more frequent, the Disputes and Arguments farr stronger, than in other Compositions” (Reed 95). He also defends the epic technique *in medias res*: “some may possibly quarrel with the Beginning, as too Sudden and Abrupt, rushing on Sinope as all on fire without any Introduction. But such may know, our Author professedly did it on purpose, for the subsequent Story clears it up to be so” (Reed 95). In Moseley’s characteristic commercialized literary-critical discourse *Artamenes* emerges distinctively as a work of literature, no longer immoral or foolish. Around the middle of the seventeenth century, as Annabel Patterson observes, “romance itself came to be redefined as serious” (160).

The prestige of Sidney’s *Arcadia* also lends itself to the elevation of the romance to a literary status. The *Arcadia* was regarded as a serious work by Sidney’s

²⁸ Sidney calls his *An Apologie for Poetrie*, a forensic defense and a serious work, “this incke-wasting toy of mine” (Smith 1: 206).

contemporaries and later times. In the seventeenth century, as Patterson comments, "the *Arcadia* flourished to the point that it almost became its own genre" (171), i.e. Sidneian romance. Francis Meres assessed the *Arcadia* in 1598 in *Palladis Tamia* as Sidney's "immortal poem . . . in Prose"²⁹ and Sidney as "our rarest Poet" (Smith 2: 315-16). Sir William Alexander said in 1634(?) that the *Arcadia* is "the most excellent Work that, in my Judgement, hath been written in any Language that I understand, affording many exquisite Types of Perfection for both the sexes" (qtd. in Salzman 111). As early as 1588, before it reached print, the *Arcadia* was extracted along with classical writers such as Homer and Virgil in *The Arcadian Rhetorike*. The compiler, Abraham Fraunce, must have drawn from a manuscript copy of the *Arcadia*. The juxtaposition of Sidney with Homer and Virgil has an effect of canonizing the *Arcadia* as a high literary work. The long-standing prestige enjoyed by the *Arcadia* renders assistance to the Evans-Moseley project of canonizing the romance in *Hesperides*.

When the romance is extracted in the commonplace book, a sea change happens. For instance, "O wth w^t a gracefull dexterity! A." (Evans 9) Originally in the *Arcadia* the sentence describes Dorus dancing a Matachine dance in armor. In the commonplace book both Dorus and the Matachine dance disappear. The sentence is lifted out of its context, or decontextualized, to reside under the commonplace head "Active." One result of decontextualization may be timeless, immortal literature, while another is that the sentence becomes a description of action and activeness applicable to many contexts. The organic body of the romance is anatomized into fragmented limbs, scattered under the commonplace heads, to be recycled in a new context. The commonplace heads, which contain the specificity of topics and subjects, direct the usage and application of the pieces. Having gone through the process of commonplacing, the extracts are hardly recognizable and achieve their function only in potential new uses. What are the effects of commonplacing on the project of canonization? Commonplacing transforms the literary text into rhetorical bits and pieces, and in the process, the romance loses much of what it is, the plot, for example. Commonplacing chooses to view literature as units of words and reduces literature to language. This linguistic and rhetorical reduction considerably annuls generic characteristics. Literality replaces and displaces literariness; yet at the same time, much literariness is retained in literality. In the final analysis the rise of the romance in *Hesperides* is not without ambiguity. The early modern canon of the romance—and those of the play and the poem—is a canon commonplaced and rhetoricized.

²⁹ Meres's position is similar to Sidney's, who argues in his *Apologie for Poetrie* that "there haue beene many most excellent Poets neuer versified" (Smith 1: 160).

The Place of Literature and the Politics of the Canon

In a commendatory poem to *The Banished Virgin*, we read:

I meane in *Learning*, whereof the best kinde
Is *Poetry*, 'cause that doth move the mind
To *Vertue* more, yea and doth teach it too
More winningly than any else can doe.

.....
These two [Philosophy and History] ore-throwne, all other *Arts* must downe
And homage doe to'th' *Poets* Lawrell Crowne. (Biondi, sigs. a1^v, a2)

Three points stand out in the verse. First, compared with philosophy and history, poetry—its modern equivalent is literature—is the best kind of learning.³⁰ Second, poetry teaches. Third, poetry teaches better than philosophy or history. These points are admittedly Sidneian.³¹ Thus the verse contains some of the basic points I shall make in this section: literature occupies the center of learning in the Evans-Moseley canon; the canon is an all-inclusive one; the canon has a social function.

On the first page of *Hesperides* (Folger MS V.a.75) a seventeenth-century hand refers to the commonplace book as a “new Parnassus” (Sorelius 298n).³² The note locates *Hesperides* in the tradition of *England's Parnassus*, compiled by Robert Allot, 1600, and allows a comparison of the two. Both *England's Parnassus* and *The English Treasury of Wit and Language* are printed commonplace books, and *Hesperides* is a commonplace book intended for print. If *England's Parnassus* establishes a poetic canon³³ and *The English Treasury of Wit and Language* a dramatic canon, then *Hesperides* establishes an all-inclusive canon of various kinds of learning, primarily a dramatic one. Allot collects his passages from the works of over fifty Tudor poets ranging from Sir Thomas Wyatt to Ben Jonson; of his 2,350 quotations a predominant portion are from non-dramatic poems, and only seven or eight per cent are taken from plays (Bentley 187). The five poets that are cited most frequently are:

³⁰ “Learning” here means “a branch of learning; a science” (*OED*, 2d). See Bacon’s concept of “learning” in his *Advancement of Learning*, discussed in Wellek 12-13.

³¹ See Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, in Smith 1: 148-207, esp. 164-72.

³² John Cotgrave’s *Wits Interpreter* (London, 1655) is also entitled “The English Parnassus.” Other books entitled “Parnassus” include: Josua Poole’s *The English Parnassus* (London, 1657), Abraham Wright’s *Parnassus Biceps* (London, 1656), and Richard Walden’s *Parnassus Aboriens* (London, 1664).

³³ Ann Moss comments that *England's Parnassus* “replace[s] the ancient canon of authors and rewrite[s] commonplaces in the language of a new canon of modern poets” (210).

Edmund Spenser	387
Michael Drayton	226
William Warner	171
Thomas Lodge	144
Samuel Daniel	141 (Crawford xliii)

All these five names are absent from *Hesperides*. The five original poets that have the largest number of works extracted in *Hesperides* are (translations are disregarded):

Francis Quarles	11
Ben Jonson	9
Joshua Sylvester	8
Robert Heath	5
John Quarles	4 (Hao, "Commonplace Reading and Writing" 200-02)

Of these five names only Sylvester and Jonson appear in *England's Parnassus*, 123 and 14 quotations respectively. The coverage of the two books is complementary: *England's Parnassus* covers poets in the sixteenth century, and *Hesperides* seventeenth-century poets. *England's Parnassus* includes a lot of bad poetry (Crawford ix), while *Hesperides* overlooks "major" seventeenth-century poets like John Donne and George Herbert. *Hesperides* cites Christopher Harvey's imitation of Herbert, *The Synagogue, or the Shadow of the Temple*, but ignores Herbert's *The Temple*. Among Moseley's English Poets series (Lindenbaum, "Milton's Contract" 451; "Humphrey Moseley" 180), Milton, Shirley, Suckling and Cartwright are present, but Waller and Carew are absent. In his poetic selections Evans shows a lack of taste to some extent.

According to Moseley's advertisement of the book, *Hesperides* contains not only literature, but also philosophy, history, cosmography, etc. It is "stored with the choicest Flowers of Language and Learning" (qtd. in Hao, "Manuscript History" 382-83). Language comes before learning. To interpret in geometric terms of concentric circles: literature sits at the center of learning; drama lies at the center of literature; the triumvirate is the center of drama; finally, Shakespeare is the center of the triumvirate. Two late-eighteenth-century hands that add contemporary and Shakespearean extracts to *Hesperides* strengthen the manuscript's status as a dramatic collection, with Shakespeare presiding at the very center, and the Victorian scholar James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps's act of cutting a version of *Hesperides* into pieces to secure the Shakespearean extracts also sets off the central place of the Bard (Hao, "Commonplace Reading and Writing" 117-19). Shakespeare is the center of centers. These concentric circles describe the Evans-Moseley canon very well. As far as we know, the Shakespearean association of *Hesperides* also sparks some interest in the manuscript and

draws a few readers over the centuries, whose number is growing conspicuously in recent decades.³⁴ Though remaining unpublished, *Hesperides*, along with its genre, does deserve more scholarly attention.

The Evans-Moseley canon has social functions. With its variety of eloquent expressions, *Hesperides* helps cultivate eloquence, a desirable objective in rhetorical culture. As Philomusus, the compiler of *The Academy of Complements* (1640) holds, “There is no question but eloquence is a principall part in a well qualified man” (“The Avthors Preface to the Reader”). Indeed, a modern scholar, Hanna H. Gray, claims the “pursuit of eloquence” to be “*the* identifying characteristic of Renaissance humanism” (498, my italic). In its educational function *Hesperides* resembles a complement-school, as staged in James Shirley’s play *The Schoole of Complement* (1631), for pupils who wish “to suck the hony of [its] eloquence” (sig. E4). Like the Books of Complements such as *Pearls of Eloquence* (Elder), which is also entitled “The School of Complements. Choice and fair Flowers, selected out of the Garden of Eloquence, to adorn our Language with variety of Expressions upon severall occasions” (27),³⁵ *Hesperides* exercises the function of a complement-school and provides an opportunity for upward social mobility “to a higher Classe.”³⁶ In addition to a didactic social function, *Hesperides* definitely has an element of pleasure in it, especially in the Erasmian idea of *copia*. There is, as it were, a verbal feast provided in the commonplace extracts. The extensive copiousness is meant to delight as well as to teach. Here the Horatian³⁷ and Sidneian formulation of the purposes of literature comes in.

The most popular Book of Complements, *The Academy of Complements* published by Humphrey Moseley, catered to the taste of middle-class readers (Marotti 266; Wilcher). It went through at least thirteen editions in the seventeenth century since its first publication in 1639.³⁸ Its immense popularity disseminates the linguistic nationalism—compiled “for the honour of our Language”

³⁴ See Hao, “Commonplace Reading and Writing” 114-27. We may add to the list of readers Arthur Marotti and Laura Estill.

³⁵ *Pearls of Eloquence* is modeled closely upon *The Academy of Complements*, which is also entitled “Pearles of Eloquence.” Please compare their frontispieces and title-pages, which are strikingly similar. Sections of the former are lifted directly from the latter. Please compare pp. 27-32 of *Pearls of Eloquence* with pp. 41-49 of *The Academy of Complements* (1640).

³⁶ Shirley, op. cit., sig. F3^v. The word “class” in the sense of social class was a new phenomenon in the seventeenth century. The *OED* records 1656 quotations as the earliest uses of the word in that sense and in the sense of “A division of the scholars or students of an institution, receiving the same instruction or ranked together as of the same standing.” Shirley here supplies an earlier instance of the use of the word as academic class and possibly social class.

³⁷ See Horace, *Art of Poetry*, in Adams and Searle 79-85, esp. 83 (ll. 333-47 in the original).

³⁸ For the different editions of *The Academy of Complements*, see Smyth, Appendix. But Smyth misspells the compiler’s name as “Philomuses” and misses the first edition (1639).

(Philomusus, "To the Reader")—far and wide. Both in the *Academy* and *Hesperides* Moseley demonstrates a conscious effort to promote vernacular literature. In the early modern period the notions of language and literature were closely related and virtually inseparable.

Evans and Moseley's promotion of English literature is politically loaded. The early modern canon which Evans and Moseley construct is a masculine one. The only woman writer in the canon, Madeleine de Scudéry, is translated by a man and presented as a male, "that famous wit of France, Monsieur de Scudéry." The feminine genre of the romance is masculinized. This fact foregrounds the masculine nature of the Evans-Moseley canon. From his extracts under the head "Woman" (Evans 879), nevertheless, it seems improper to conclude that Evans is misogynistic or anti-feminist. As a compiler his attitude is generally neutral and disinterested, gathering extracts ranging from the hostile to the laudatory. He recognizes the importance of the fair sex and the complexity of the woman question. The Evans-Moseley canon is also royalist, for it includes three staunch royalist works published during the Civil War: "Palingenesia," Martin Lluelyn's *Men-Miracles*, and James Howell's "The Vote, or a Poeme Royall." The last, presented to his majesty for a new year's gift, was published by Humphrey Moseley. The other two of Moseley's publications, the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher folio and Cartwright's *Comedies, Tragi-comedies, with Other Poems* of 1651, embody the royalist aesthetic as well. Both the publisher and the voluminous commendatory verse writers—the 1647 folio has over forty pages of commendatory poems (thirty-four verses), and the Cartwright collection over a hundred (fifty-two verses)—are retrospective and nostalgic. By looking back at the past "Wits" the volumes celebrate royalist aesthetics, filling the psychological need of the elite reader.³⁹ Evans's extracts under "Kings" and "Rebells" (Evans 436, 630) also demonstrate his royalist and anti-rebellion tendency.

The three literary genres—plays, romances, poems—account for a majority of the 356 titles; Evans's exclusion of sermons and his heavy literary inclination mark *Hesperides* as a herald in the history of canon formation. Evans makes an anthologization and hence, a canonization, of English literature by commonplacing it. The publisher and the compiler work together for the foundation of an early modern literary canon. In my view, the medium of manuscript and the genre of the commonplace book function as an indispensable stage in the process of literary reception and canon formation. Without a fair examination

³⁹ As Kastan observes, "For Royalists in the vertiginous world of the Civil War and following . . . 'Wits' became a code word for those of not only talent and taste but also shared Royalist sympathies" ("Humphrey Moseley" 122).

of the important role of the manuscript commonplace book in the formation of English literary canon, the evaluation of the process of canon formation would be not only incomplete, but also logically lame. As I have argued elsewhere, the commonplace book is instrumental in the invention of critical reading and the modern critical reader (Hao, "Commonplace Reading and Writing" 100-14). Critical reading necessarily involves the use of the pen/pencil/quill and the medium of manuscript, as it is still often the case today. Modern readers underline the words they are reading and write marginal comments on them, while an early modern reader might draw a pointing hand or an asterisk at the place worthy of notice (Hao, "An Early Modern Male Reader"). An author might make corrections of the text in the margin when reading a printed book; a familiar example is Milton's autograph correction of *Lycidas*. In so far as it amounts to a logical necessity that critical reading entails the medium of manuscript, and because critical reading is a logical step in the formation of a literary canon, canon formation and the medium of manuscript are inseparable from each other. *The English Treasury of Wit and Language* does not assign the sources of the quoted passages, yet the British Museum copy contains manuscript ascriptions. The media of manuscript and print work together to form an English dramatic canon. As I have demonstrated above, Evans and Moseley construct an early modern literary canon in the manuscript *Hesperides*, which is text-centered, reading-oriented, socially functional and politically loaded. Earle Havens rightly remarks, "The literary commonplace book . . . contributed significantly to the invention and consolidation of 'national' vernacular literatures during the Renaissance" (34). Studies of the manuscript commonplace book, which will enrich our knowledge of early modern canon formation and early modern literary culture, must be performed in greater depth and on a larger scale. In accordance with David Kastan's sensible opinion that English literature does not have "a single history and a single point of origin; it has many histories" ("Humphrey Moseley" 124), this essay serves as an attempt to add a chapter to a history of the invention of English literature.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard, and Leroy Searle, eds. *Critical Theory since Plato*. 3rd ed. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth, 2005. Print.
- Backer, Dorothy Anne Liot. *Precious Women*. New York: Basic, 1974. Print.
- Barish, Jonas. *The Antitheatrical Prejudice*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1981. Print.
- Baron, Robert. *Erotopaignion or the Cyprian Academy*. London, 1648. Wing B890. Print.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. "John Cotgrave's *English Treasury of Wit and Language* and the Eliza-

- bethan Drama." *Studies in Philology* 40 (1943): 186-203. Print.
- Biondi, Giovanni Francesco. *The Banished Virgin*. London, 1635. STC 3074. Print.
- Cotgrave, John. *The English Treasury of Wit and Language*. London, 1655. Wing C6368. Print.
- Crawford, Charles, ed. *England's Parnassus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913. Print.
- Desmarests de Saint-Sorlin, Jean. *Ariana*. London, 1636, 1641. STC 6779/ Wing D1194. Print.
- Elder, William. *Pearls of Eloquence*. London, 1656. Wing E325AB. Print.
- Evans, John. *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*. Folger MS V.b.93. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. Manuscript.
- Fraunce, Abraham. *The Arcadian Rhetorike*. London, 1588. STC 11338. Print.
- Gorak, Jan. *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a Literary Idea*. London: Athlone, 1991. Print.
- Gray, Hanna H. "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963): 497-514. Print.
- Greg, W. W. *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*. 4 vols. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1939-59. Print.
- Hackett, Helen. *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- Hao, Tianhu. "Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden: Commonplace Reading and Writing in Early Modern England." Diss. Columbia U, 2006. Print.
- _____. "An Early Modern Male Reader of *The Faerie Queene*." *Spenser Studies* 23 (2008): 257-60. Print.
- _____. "Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden and its Manuscript History." *The Library*, 7th ser., 10.4 (2009): 372-404. Print.
- Havens, Earle. *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2001. Print.
- Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare and the Book*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- _____. "Performances and Playbooks: The Closing of the Theatres and the Politics of Drama." *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*. Ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 167-84. Print.
- _____. "Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature." *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*. Ed. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2007. 105-24. Print.
- Kewes, Paulina. "'Give me the sociable pocket-books. . .': Humphrey Moseley's Serial Publication of Octavo Play Collections." *Publishing History* 38 (1995): 5-21. Print.
- _____. *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998. Print.
- Kramnick, Jonathan Brody. *Making the English Canon: Print-Capitalism and the Cultural Past, 1700-1770*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.
- La Calprenède, Gaultier de Coste, seigneur de. *Cleopatra*. London, 1652. Wing L110A. Print.
- _____. *Hymen's Preludia*. London, 1658. Wing L117. Print.
- _____. *Cassandra*. London, 1661. Wing L107. Print.
- Langbaine, Gerard. *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*. Oxford, 1691. Wing L373. Print.

- Lindenbaum, Peter. "Milton's Contract." *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 10 (1992): 439-54. Print.
- _____. "Humphrey Moseley." *British Literary Book Trade, 1475-1700. DLB*, vol. 170. Ed. James K. Bracken and Joel Silver. Detroit: Gale Research, 1996. 177-83. Print.
- London, William. *A Catalogue of the Most Vendible Books in England*. London, 1657. Wing L2849. Print.
- Marino, Adrian. *The Biography of "The Idea of Literature" from Antiquity to the Baroque*. Trans. Virgil Stanciu and Charles M. Carlton. Albany: State U of New York P, 1996. Print.
- Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995. Print.
- Marotti, Arthur F., and Laura Estill. "Manuscript Circulation." *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. 53-70. Print.
- Marston, John. *The Scourge of Villanie*. London, 1598. STC 17485. Print.
- Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. Print.
- Nash, Andrew, ed. *The Culture of Collected Editions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.
- The Oxford English Dictionary (OED)*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. CD-ROM.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984. Print.
- Philomusus. *The Academy of Complements*. London, 1640. STC 19883.5. Print.
- Prynne, William. *Histrio-mastix*. London, 1633. STC 20464. Print.
- Reed, John Curtis. "Humphrey Moseley, Publisher." *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers* 2.3 (1929): 59-142. Print.
- Ross, Trevor. *The Making of the English Literary Canon from the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1998. Print.
- Salzman, Paul. *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985. Print.
- Saunders, J. W. "The Stigma of Print." *Essays in Criticism* 1.2 (1951): 139-64. Print.
- Scudéry, Madeleine de. *Artamenes or The Grand Cyrus*. London, 1653-55. Wing S2144, S2162. Print.
- Shirley, James. *The Schoole of Complement*. London, 1631. STC 22456. Print.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. *Arcadia*. London, 1590. STC 22539. Print.
- Smith, G. Gregory, ed. *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. 2 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1904. Print.
- Smyth, Adam. *"Profit and Delight": Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2004. Print.
- Sorelius, Gunnar. "An Unknown Shakespearian Commonplace Book." *The Library* 5th ser. 28 (1973): 294-308. Print.
- Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History, from the Restoration to the Present*. New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989. Print.
- Terry, Richard. *Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past 1660-1781*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.
- Vinaver, Eugène. *The Rise of Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971. Print.

- Virgil. *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro*. Trans. John Ogilby. London, 1650. Wing V609. Print.
- Wellek, René. *The Rise of English Literary History*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Print.
- Wilcher, Robert. "Moseley, Humphrey." *Oxford DNB*. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.
- Wright, Louis B. "The Reading of Plays during the Puritan Revolution." *Huntington Library Bulletin* 6 (1934): 73-108. Print.

「語詞的珍珠」：作為經典建構先聲的 《繆斯的花園》

摘要

現存兩個版本的手稿札記書《赫斯珀裡得斯，或繆斯的花園》是由十七世紀英國最重要的文學作品出版商漢弗萊·莫斯利委託，於一六五〇和六〇年代由約翰·埃文斯編纂而成的。埃文斯援引的三百五十六部（篇）作品中，有近一〇〇部（篇）是（或可能）由莫斯利出版的。埃文斯廣泛徵引了一百七十七部劇作，包括莎士比亞、本·瓊生以及博蒙特與弗萊徹所著的一六四七年對開本（此書是莫斯利最引人注目的出版物）。在劇院被迫關閉的情況下，《繆斯的花園》將戲劇確立為一種文學體裁，而非舞臺表演體裁。埃文斯還摘引了莫斯利提倡的另外兩種體裁：傳奇和詩歌。三種文學體裁，戲劇、傳奇和詩歌，佔據了該札記書引用的三百五十六部（篇）作品的大多數，埃文斯之完全排斥佈道文和強烈的文學傾向使得《繆斯的花園》成為英國文學經典建構史上的先聲。埃文斯以札記的方式將英國文學選集化，進而經典化。出版商和編纂者共同建立了一個英國文學的早期現代經典。埃文斯—莫斯利經典以文本為中心、以閱讀為導向、具有社會功能且政治性很強。手稿媒介和札記書體裁成為文學接受和經典建構過程中不可或缺、不可忽視的階段。

關鍵字：《赫斯珀裡得斯，或繆斯的花園》，札記書，經典建構，戲劇，約翰·埃文斯，漢弗萊·莫斯利