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INTRODUCTION

Though it is today almost totally neglected, Marcellus Palingenius' *Zodiacus Vitae* (ZV) was enormously popular in the sixteenth century, especially in Protestant Europe, and continued to be read until well into the last century. Still perhaps one of the best characterizations of the poem appears on the title page of Barnabe Googe's translation of 1576:¹

The *Zodiake of life,* written [sic] by the excellent and Christian Poet, Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus. Wherein are conteined twelue seuerall labours, painting out moste liuely, the whole compasse of the world, the reformation of manners, the miseries of mankinde, the pathway to vertue and vice, the eternitie of the Soule, the course of the Heauens, the mysteries of nature, and divers other circumstances of great learning, and no lesse judgement.

With its simple Latin, earnest moral tone, and numerous proverbs, it introduced many English schoolboys to a host of classical *topoi* with which they would become familiar. As an encyclopedia of traditional wisdom, it should not be overlooked by the student of the history of ideas. The present study will survey what is known about the author, provide a summary of the contents of the poem, re-evaluate Googe's translation, and consider the question of the poem's influence on several writers of the English Renaissance.

¹
Little is known about Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus. Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus (1479-1552), a Ferrarese at the court of Ercole II, mentioned him in De poetis nostrorum temporum (1551) and told of his exhumation and cremation by the Inquisition. 2 It was not till 1725 that Jacobi Faccioli determined that Marcellus Palingenius was an anagram for Pier Angelo Manzolli, an identification that has been accepted since, though no more is known about Manzolli than about Palingenius. "Stellatus" is apparently a reference to the poet's place of birth, Stellata, a small town twenty kilometers northwest of Ferrara, though it could also refer to the title of the poem. The dates of Palingenius', or Manzolli's, birth and death are unknown. Borgiani's conjectures on both, the best available, are based almost entirely on internal evidence from the poem. In the dedication to Ercole II, Duke of Ferrara (1534-1559), Palingenius says that Ercole's physician, Antonio Musa Brasavola, introduced him to Ercole. (Brasavola wrote an herbal [Rome 1536] and was at one time physician to Pope Paul III.) 3 Borgiani assumes from this and the praise of medicine in the ZV (X.361 ff.) that Palingenius was a doctor, and he further speculates that if Palingenius was a friend of Brasavola's they were probably nearly the same age (we know Brasavola's dates, 1500-1555). In addition, Palingenius mentions in XI.846-54 that he was in Rome during the pontificate of Leo X (1513-1521), and Borgiani hypothesizes
that he was studying medicine there, i.e., that he was between sixteen and twenty years old when Leo X was pope. And so a date "c. 1500" is arrived at for his birth.

There are some facts external to the poem for establishing certain limits for the year of Palingenius' death. Gyraldus wrote his account in 1548, so Palingenius must have died before then. A French poet, Nicholas Borboni, wrote an epigram "Ad Palingenium poetam," published in 1538, so Palingenius was presumably living at that time. Borgiani splits the difference between these two dates and thus arrives at "c. 1543," the year usually given for Palingenius' death. All of this is highly speculative.

The first edition of the ZV was printed at Venice without date. Early bibliographers dated it 1531, but, as Borgiani points out, this is certainly too early, since Ercole II (to whom the book is dedicated) did not become duke till October 31, 1534. Therefore the first edition probably appeared in 1535 or even later.4

Several passages in the poem give hints as to the probable dates of its composition. In the dedication and in XII.550 ff. Palingenius mentions the many years he has spent writing the book. In the early part of the poem (III.26, 176, and IV.38) the poet is addressed as "iuvenis" ("youth"). Books VIII and IX end with topical references, VIII with a lament on the sack of Rome (1527) and the French campaign in Italy (1527-28) and IX with a reference to the siege of
Florence by Pope Clement VII and Charles V (1530). Borgiani uses the lapse of time in the composition of these two books to estimate that Palingenius wrote his poem between 1520 and 1534.

Borgiani lists sixty-three Latin editions of the poem. He records, however, only four editions printed in England (there were ten) and omits the last German edition, 1871. The known editions, then, are as follows: Italy 1 (unless some of the others bear false imprints), Switzerland 16, France 19, Holland 7, England 10, Germany 13, Sweden 2. The number of French editions indicates some French independence from Rome. If the poem was especially popular amongst the Huguenots, its popularity does not seem to have been restricted to them, since there were many editions of the ZV printed in France after the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre (1572).

The ZV enjoyed a number of translations. Scévole de Sainte-Marthe published a French verse translation of some passages in 1569 and promised to do the whole poem if these samples pleased his readers; apparently they did not, for no full translation by him is extant. La Monnerie published a complete French prose translation in 1731, and la Riviere published an imitation in French verse in 1619. There have been five German translations, all in verse: Johannes Spreng's (1564), Phillip Machenau's (1743), Franz Schisling's (1785), Joseph Pracht's (1804), and D. M. Hug's (1873).
Kaspar von Barth made a Latin verse imitation (1623), Barnabe Googe did an English verse translation (1560-65), and an anonymous English prose version was published in London in 1896. There still is no complete Italian translation.

The edition used in this study is that edited by C. H. Weise, Leipzig, 1832. The only irregularity in Weise's text is misnumbering of lines 685-1015 in Book XI. In Weise's text these are numbered 785-1115, but references to that section in this study use the correct numbers. All unattributed translations are mine.
In the Dedication to Ercole II, Duke of Ferrara (1534-59), Palingenius introduces the life-is-a-play image ("vitae tragicocomoedia") which he will use repeatedly (Book V.25, VI. 182, 646-725, VIII.121, XII.425). He also anticipates the Church's charge of heresy against him, protesting that if he has said anything unorthodox it is to be attributed to the philosophers and not to him:

Nevertheless, if anything be found in this work which seems to diverge a little from our religion, I believe it is not to be blamed on me. For when I speak of philosophical matters I refer to the opinions of diverse philosophers, especially of the Platonists. If these opinions are false, not I but they are to be blamed, for it is my intention to fall away from our religion in nothing. Therefore in all things I wrote I humbly submit myself to the True Church, and I freely accept its censure, as a true Christian ought.
The first edition contains twelve introductory lines in the prefatory matter which summarize the contents of each book. It is likely that these were written by Palingenius, but they were not reprinted in later editions. Each of these lines will be quoted below, after my outline and before my summary of each book. My subtitles for each book appear in square brackets after the titles. The numbers following each section refer to lines.

Book I, "Aries" [Introduction]

I. Introduction 1-61
   A. To Apollo 1
   B. To the muses 23
   C. To Ercole II 30

II. Contents of poem 62-127

III. Proper writing 128-80

IV. Education 181-219
   A. Bad 181
   B. Good 206

V. Learning vs. virtue 220-79
   A. Learning 220
   B. Virtue 242
   C. Resolution of the two 258

VI. Conclusion—to the muses 279-87
"Scribere quid deceat primus liber explicat apte."
("The first book explains what ought to be written.")

Book I is properly the introduction to the poem. In it the poet speaks in his own voice. He uses two metaphors for the subject matter of his poem, journey by sea and by land (I.62-67). Writing should be "utile, delectans, maiusque ambobus honestum" ("useful, enjoyable, and more than both of these, decent" [I.144]), but in many of his long sermons one is apt to miss the second of these qualities. In the last section of this book Palingenius poses the question, Is it better to be virtuous or learned? After reviewing the dangers of a learned yet evil man he concludes that virtue is superior, but of course it is best to have both virtue and knowledge. Palingenius indicates the fulfillment of this ideal in Book XII, in which he will show how man can become truly wise and happy by communicating with the angels.

In this first book Palingenius uses three metaphors (ascent, road, and light) which he will use repeatedly in the rest of the poem. The book opens with the poet wishing to go to Mount Parnassus and Apollo's temple (12). The path leads up to the citadel of learning (178-80). Wisdom "Tecta Dei scandit" ("scales the temple of God" [231]). The poet will travel the "intentatas . . . vias" ("untried paths" [42-43]); I will "latentes / Naturae tentabo vias" ("explore
the hidden ways of nature" [66-67]). Enveloped in darkness at the beginning of the book, he looks to the east and sees the dawn (4-6). He then invokes Apollo, god of the sun and poetry, to whom he prays "da noscere calles / Ambiguos" ("let me know the confusing paths" [10-11]). Palingenius uses the metaphor of light and darkness for the battle within man between reason and the passions:

Magna voluptatem generat fortuna, voluptas
Stultitiam, et prorsus lumen rationis obumbrat.

Great fortune creates desire, desire creates foolishness and utterly obscures the light of reason.
I.173-74

A topic Palingenius will return to repeatedly is the necessity of reining in the passions. By following the passions we sink to the level of beasts; by following reason we become like gods (231-33). Palingenius says he will rely on reason ("fretus ratione" [66]) and reiterates later the importance of reason to him: "Mihi flectere mentem / Sola solet ratio, ratio dux fida sophorum est" ("Reason alone changes my mind: reason is the faithful guide of the wise" [VIII.136-37]).

These, then, are some of the topics and metaphors Palingenius will use throughout the poem. The light metaphor will be developed most fully in Book XII, where Palingenius elaborates his theory of infinite light beyond the fixed stars.
Book II, "Taurus" [Against Riches, or For Temperance]

I. Introduction 1-26

II. Man 27-71
   A. His glory 27
   B. His depravity 54

III. Riches 72-285
   A. Riches false sumnum bonum 72
   B. The rich man 89
      1. His cares 89
      2. Gluttony 200
      3. Costly clothes 226
   C. Against illicit love 286-93

IV. Learning 294-369
   A. The usefulness of riches 294
   B. Pains of the poor scholar 306
   C. Rewards of learning 332

V. Pleasure 370-430

VI. Noble poverty 431-56

VII. Temperance 457-566

VIII. Conclusion 567-76

"Divitias sumnum esse bonum negat ipse secundus."
("The second book denies that riches are the sumnum bonum.")

In Book II the poet again speaks in his own voice, warning against both avarice and prodigality. The book begins and ends with addresses to the poet's boat, and the
boat metaphor is used in the body of the book itself, where noble poverty protects the boat of life through the shallows (431-36). Palingenius uses the light metaphor, or rather its corollary metaphor, shadows and blindness, repeatedly in Book II (e.g., 59-61 and 457-61), and he exhorts the reader to follow the steep, narrow, thorny path of virtue (334-36). Palingenius' description of the cares of the rich man (126-74) is particularly vivid: he is kicked about like a football; he seethes with hopes and fears like a storm-vext sea; he is bound, like Ixion, to a snaky wheel of cares which gnaw at his heart; he is killed by his servants like a fatted calf, or as the tallest tree in the forest is chopped down.

Book III, "Gemini" [Against Pleasure]

Part 1: Epicurus

I.  Introduction 1-27

II.  Epicurus' philosophy 28-177

A.  Pleasure the _summun bonum_ 38

B.  Hell a fiction of poets and priests 124

C.  _Carpe diem_ 170

III.  Journey to Queen Pleasure's realm 178-360

A.  The path thither 178

B.  The meadow 230

C.  The Queen and her followers 310
IV. The poet's lament on the briefness of life and pleasure 360-71

Part 2: Arete

I. Arete's speech to Epicurus and poet 372-461
   A. Pleasure's evil effects 380
   B. Hercules' example 405

II. Epicurus' flight 462-78

III. Arete's second speech 479-553
   A. Bridling the passions 479
   B. Sadness and Ill-Fame 514
   C. Balance between study and relaxation 529

IV. Poet's inquiry about the Queen's followers 554-64

V. Arete's third speech 564-665
   A. Gluttony 564
   B. Drunkenness 593
   C. Sleep 634

VI. Conclusion 666-701
   A. Thaumantias' and Arete's return to heaven 666
   B. The poet's return the way he came 696

"Tertius attendit quae sit fugienda voluptas."
("The third book tells why pleasure is to be shunned."

Unlike the two preceding books, Book III has a narrative framework, and its didactic lessons are delivered, not by the narrator, but by Arete (Virtue).
The poet begins Book II by exhorting his boat to brave the deep, and at the end of the book he bids his boat to seek port, but in between he makes no attempt to maintain the sailing metaphor. By contrast, in Book III an allegorical journey is maintained throughout. The metaphors used so frequently in the first two books—the road, light and darkness, blindness, and so on—are here employed in an allegory which makes Book III, especially the first half, one of the most interesting books in the poem. The poet, walking on the beach at dawn, meets Epicurus, who takes him to the shade of an oak near a stream and there expounds his philosophy that pleasure is the *sumnum bonum*. The poet is won over by Epicurus' ideas and asks the way ("via" and "iter" [184 and 186]) to pleasure. Epicurus assures him the road ("via" [188]) is short, broad, downhill, and near at hand. They set out, descending by an out-of-the-way path. They pass a rich house in which dwells one of Plutus' retainers, who guards the path. Plutus himself lives in a high citadel ("celsa . . . arce" 201) with three daughters, Luxury, Pride, and Ignorance (204-05). Three maid servants, Capital, Fraud, and Usury, conduct travellers to his citadel. Since the poet has no bribes for them (210), he and Epicurus are forced to take another way, one which is rocky, thorny, and scarcely passable (215-16). This contrasts with I.179-80 and II.332-33, in which the thorny and steep path leads to wisdom's citadel. Here the
difficult way leads down to a valley. It is difficult to obtain pleasure without Capital, Fraud, and Usury, but less difficult than following the uphill path to wisdom.

The poet and Epicurus pass the house of Poverty (217-18) and come to the grove and meadow of Queen Pleasure. The grove is sweet smelling, birds are singing, and the meadow is surrounded by a river just as wide as a stag can leap when chased by hunters (243-45). Trees in the grove and flowers in the meadow are enumerated in long catalogues. A throng of boys, girls, and adults follows Queen Pleasure. On her right are Venus and Cupid, on her left Gluttony and Sleep (mother and son). Two monsters, Sadness and Ill-Fame, follow the crowd, goading and slandering them.

At this point a beautiful but dishevelled maiden, Arete, runs out of the woods on the right and warns the poet and Epicurus of the dangers of following Pleasure. Epicurus flees Arete's company, and she leads the poet to a laurel tree. In response to the poet's questions she enumerates the faults of four of Pleasure's followers, Sadness, Ill-Fame, Gluttony and Sleep. At sunset Thaumantias (the rainbow) descends and takes Arete to heaven before she can speak about the two figures on Pleasure's right, Venus and Cupid, but she promises to send him someone to do so the next day. The poet is left alone to ascend the path by which he came.
In Book III the passage of time is given a prominence it does not have in the preceding books. Book I begins with a description of dawn (I.5-7) but ends with no mention of sunset. Book III, however, begins and ends in a single day, and the passage of time in that day is clearly marked. The poet meets Epicurus at sunrise (III.1-9), and they set out on the path to Pleasure when the day is only one-third spent (191-92). Just before noon they see Pleasure in her meadow (295), and Epicurus says this is the time to eat and drink (302). The poet asks Arete if she can teach him more before night, for the sun is lowering in the west (557-60). After Thaumantias and Arete ascend to heaven, the sun sets (696-97), but Arete has promised to send someone to instruct the poet further the following morning (682-85). There are, in addition, a number of comments on time in Book III, usually with reference to the transience of things. The poet asks Epicurus to instruct him if he, Epicurus, is not busy (27). Epicurus assures him he has plenty of time, for he flees work (28). He tells the poet that belief in the immortality of the soul is foolishness; all things must pass (155-63). Since human life is so brief and uncertain, it is best to enjoy the present (171), and the way to pleasure is short (187). The first section of the book, devoted to Epicurus' arguments for pleasure, is brought to an end with a meditation on the brevity of life and pleasure (361-71). In these lines the poet reflects that the impermanence of
things, which Epicurus used as an argument to enjoy the senses, applies as well to pleasure: scarcely an hour of enjoyment, an hour of quiet, is given us (365), and pleasure itself is brief and mixed. Thus, he concludes, one who devotes himself to pleasure does so in vain. Arete's solution to this dilemma is the golden mean. She says that, indeed, the mind will not remain indefinitely on either serious or pleasurable matters but must alternate between the two (529-32), and she illustrates her point with a simile of an eagle ascending to heaven and returning to earth (533-53).

Both Epicurus and Arete use the images of fountains, light, shadows, blindness, and the path with which we have become familiar in the first two books. Epicurus laments that men are ignorant, lost in mists and shadows ("caligine" and "tenebras," [40 and 46]); he will disclose the fountain of wisdom to the poet (49), and that fountain is pleasure (105). Arete says that drunkenness is a fountain also, but one of numerous illnesses (623). Cupid, one of Pleasure's followers, is blind (317), and her other followers' eyes are oppressed with a dark mist, while clouds involve their heads (347-48). Arete addresses Epicurus and the poet as "caeci" (387); she asks what madness blinded Hercules to play the role of a woman ("furor obcaecavit" [435]). She warns against the hidden snares of pleasure (450) and laments the blind nature of man (509). Gluttons cannot see the light of
truth ("veri . . nitorem") because the fumes of food oppress their minds with a dark mist ("caeca . . caligne"), just as clouds obscure the sun ("Haud secus ac nebulosa sol" [581-85]). Sleep, filling the mind with a mist ("caligine" [643]), is restorative in moderation but dulling in excess.

**Book IV, "Cancer" [On Love]**

I. Introduction 1-58
   A. Invocation of Apollo 1
   B. Apollo's answer 38

II. Pastoral 59-207
   A. The shepherds 59
   B. First shepherd's lament 83
   C. Second shepherd's lament 169
   D. Attack by wolves 196

III. Instruction by Timalphes 208-877
   A. Poet's wandering to spring and plane tree 208
   B. Timalphes' speech 236
      1. Venus 236
         a. Her genealogy 236
         b. Defense of marriage and condemnation of lustful clergy 267
      2. Cupid 316
         a. Loves of gods 316
         b. Fate in love 349
c. Love ordering principle in universe 435

d. Golden Age vs. the present 473

e. Goods of the body, soul, and the will 501

f. Friendship 607

3. Earth's insignificant appearance from heaven 832

IV. Conclusion 878-80

"Te quartus natumque tuum Cytheraea reponit."
("The fourth book speaks about you, Venus, and your birth.")

Most of Book IV (208-end) is a continuation of the preceding book, and like Book III it also has two sections, though they are of unequal lengths. The poet meets two shepherds who ask him to judge whose song is best as they sing of their lovers. The first shepherd sings of his love for another boy, while the second shepherd speaks of his love for a maiden. Contrasting laments, one on a homosexual affair, the other on a heterosexual one, are common in the pastoral tradition. The second shepherd is interrupted when seven wolves (the seven deadly sins?) attack the sheep and the shepherds run off to protect them. The poet wanders off and sits down under a plane tree beside a spring, where Timalphes, Arete's son, descends from heaven and instructs him regarding Venus and Cupid, the two figures on Queen Pleasure's right. A long passage on friendship (607-831) is
a sort of courtier's handbook. Lines 770-831 especially contain the kind of advice of which Polonius in *Hamlet* is so full; this section must have been popular with schoolmasters.

Books III and IV, set as they are in a narrative framework, differ from the first two books. The allegory in Book III, which is nominally continued in Book IV, is not particularly well integrated with the didactic sections of books III and IV. There is nothing to distinguish Arete's voice in III from Timalphes' in IV or from the poet's in books I and II.

The imagery with which we have become familiar appears in Book IV. Apollo is in his high citadel (34); providence is a celestial citadel (428). The way to love is slippery ("prona via . . . lubrica" [361]); friendship is the way to heaven ("via . . . / In caelum" [646-47]). Naiads are stimulated with a blind love ("caeco . . . amore" [94]) for a handsome hunter; lustful monks sin in dark hiding places ("caecis . . . latebris" [293]); Neptune's heart is overshadowed by lust ("pectora caeca" [337]).

**Book V, "Leo" [The Happy Man]**

I. Introduction 1-62

A. To Jupiter 13

B. To the gods 41
C. To the reader 55
D. To the muses 59

II. *Summum bonum:* God 63-208

III. Man's baseness 209-76
   A. Distance from God 209
   B. Nearness to animals 228

IV. The happy man 277-465
   A. A knower of God 277
   B. His qualities 297
   C. His rarity like the phoenix 327
   D. The least unhappy man 346-403
      1. Pains of rulers 351
      2. Glories of liberty 381
   E. Possessions and occupation 404
   F. Servitude 438

V. Marriage 466-752
   A. Disadvantages 466
   B. Advantages 484
   C. A good wife 512
   D. Harlots 528
   E. Choosing a wife 540
   F. Subduing a shrewish wife 568
   G. The lustful clergy 586
   H. Keeping a wife faithful 611
   I. Not loss of liberty 636
"Qui sint foelices enarrat carmine quintus."
("The fifth book speaks of those who are happy.")

Having concluded that riches and pleasure are not the *summum bonum*, the poet asks again, What is? The answer in Book V is that God is the *summum bonum*; the truly blessed man would be he who knows God. But the difference between man and God is as that between a flea and an elephant (221-22); how can such unlike beings possibly be friends? Because knowing God is beyond man's power, Palingenius enumerates the qualities the happy man would have: His body would be agile, handsome, strong, and healthy; his mind wise, brave, prudent, learned, and good. His senses and the gifts of his mind perfected, he would know neither poverty nor malign fate. After a long life he would die a gentle death, and he would have renown during life and after death
(314-26). But even compassing these things is beyond man's reach, so Palingenius considers the qualities or things that a man can attain, i.e., what will make him least unhappy. The picture he paints is again one of moderation, like that in Book II: a man needs enough goods (land, flocks, vineyards, beehives) to keep him from want and dependence; too much is harmful. He needs a good wife, good health, and above all wisdom. Wisdom is that knowledge by which man shakes off all mortal concerns and ascends to the courts of the gods. By it he knows the true and false goods and despises those things--wealth, power, pleasure--which blind and miserable mortals cherish. The wise man shines among them as the sun among the stars and spurns the sway of fortune (875-92).

Among the metaphors Palingenius uses in Book V are the mist of ignorance ("densa errorum caligine" [75], "errorum tenebris" [213]) and spiritual blindness ("caeca voluptas" [193], "caeci reges" [826], "caeci . . . mortales" [885]). He speaks of the easy path to evil (610, 644, 722-23), the path to virtue (717, 740), and compares life to a play ("Nempe videtur / Vita hominum nihil esse aliud, quam fabula quaedam [24-25]). He mentions repeatedly the need for restraining or reining in the passions (694, 704, 749, 827). He apparently views the struggle within man as that described by Socrates in the Phaedrus with the figure of the charioteer (reason) whose chariot is drawn by two horses,
the one noble (man's higher nature), the other willful and base (man's lower nature), which must be reined in and subdued.

Book V has some especially vivid comparisons: man appears as ridiculous to God as an ape or owl in purple robes would to us (26-40; cf. I.162 ff., in which kings are called crowned asses). God is to the world as a carpenter is to a chest (175-77). The difference between man and the animals is like that between skilled carpenters who have tools and skilled carpenters without tools (264-76; man's tools are speech and hands). Man can no more possess God than a shell can contain the ocean (282-85). A free man is to a courtier as a wild bird is to one which feeds on delicacies but lives in a golden cage (394-99).

Book VI, "Virgo" [Appearance and Reality]

I. Introduction 1-49
II. Descent to the underworld 50-74
III. Death's speech 75-114
IV. Description of and meditation on death 115-49
V. Dialogue between Calliope and poet 150-216
VI. Calliope's speech 216-993
A. Nobility 216-518
   1. Not due to money 216
   2. Not due to birth 268
   3. "O tempora! O mores!" 295
4. Difficulties of the truly noble 426-518
   a. From within—passions 436
   b. From without—persecution 470

B. Pains of the scholar 519-59

C. Ambition 560-646
   1. Sapience for gods, prudence for men 560
   2. Fame 592
   3. Ambition 614

D. Life as a play 646-725
   1. Ages of man 669
      a. Infancy 670
      b. Childhood 690
      c. Youth 695
      d. Adulthood 705
      e. Old age 715

E. Iills common to all ages 726-813

F. Death 814-993
   1. Three views 814-878
      a. Eternal sleep 814
      b. Life in Tartarus 836
      c. Ascent to the stars or metempsychosis 848
      d. Calliope's ignorance of the truth 860
   2. This world not to be lamented 879-993
      a. Things only lent us 879
      b. The world an inn 912
In Book VI the poet is again a confused seeker, and the moral instructions are delivered by the muse Calliope. Book VI begins with a denunciation of poetry which uses myths solely to entertain; Palingenius' purpose is serious, and he will not waste his time with such lies. This book has several echoes of Aeneid VI: the poet's muse, Calliope, leads him to the underworld where he is frightened by Death. Calliope then comforts him and tells him that truth is a golden bough hid in a dense wood and that she will lead him to it (168-74). In fact she leads him back up to the light and instructs him in the shade of a laurel near a fountain. The rest of the book is her speech to the poet under that tree.

Several passages in this book suggest Plato's Myth of the Cave in Republic VII. The mob follows shadows and night, i.e., money and things of this world; their eyes are too weak to behold the sun, i.e., truth (222-32). The fool is like an owl, for he cannot abide the light of day (552-55; cf. the owl's cries on the path to the underworld [57]).
The world is a den of thieves and a cave of evils (941-42, 968-69). There are five references in this book to bridling the passions (306, 455, 581, 695, 703), an image which again reminds the reader of the Phaedrus (see Book V).

Metaphors used in Book VI include the road (to the underworld [50, 51], to virtue [314, 574], to the gods [448], or to wisdom's high temple [542]); ascent (to virtue [310, 618], to Minerva [540-43], to the heavens [401-02]; in the last example the metaphor is used in a negative sense for one motivated by ambition); blindness (131, 189, 306, 613, 700); light/darkness (166, 179, 192, 196, 222-32, 421-22, 432, 559, 600, 754, 757-58).

**Book VII, "Libra" [Macrocosm and Microcosm]**

I. Invocation of the muse 1-15

II. Macrocosm 16-535

A. One God 16
B. God incorporeal 107
C. Bodies of angels 158
D. Hierarchy of four elements; creation of the earth 198
E. Deception of the senses 239
F. Proof of angels' existence 295
G. Mortal angels 423
H. Immortal angels 442
I. Nature of the earth 497
III. Microcosm 535-1051
   A. Causes of motion and growth 555
   B. Causes of passions 690
   C. The senses 742
   D. Immortality of the soul 855

IV. Conclusion 1052-79
   A. Summary of Section II 1052
   B. Invocation of muse and bridge to Book VIII 1060

"De dis deque anima loquitur bene septimus ipse."
("The seventh book speaks of the gods and the soul.")

In Book VII the poet once again speaks the moral message himself. This book is almost evenly divided between considerations of the nature of celestial nervous systems (God's and the angels') and man's. Palingenius devotes considerable space (295-422) to a proof of the angels' existence. Believing in the angels and communicating with them, among the most important concepts in the second half of the poem, is the *summum bonum* as Palingenius will finally define it in Book XII. There is a running contrast throughout Book VII between the light of heaven (wisdom) and the darkness (ignorance) of earth (see, for instance, 6-7 and 507-08). In 338-40 and 497-512 Palingenius touches briefly on an argument which he will develop at length in Book VIII, that earth is hell.
Striking metaphors and similes are the following: the wise follow the sun of reason while the mob follows the moon of opinion (292-94); man exposed to the mysteries of God is like an owl in the sun (516-17); God is to the angels as the sun is to the stars (476). The mind is to the senses as the archetypal world is to the physical universe (474-75), as the sun is to the stars (851), as a center is to its radii (873-74), as the ocean is to the rivers (874-75), or as the sun is to the clouds (953).


Book VIII, "Scorpius" [Fate]

I. Introduction 1-29
   A. Invocation of muse 1
   B. Chance 6
   C. Fortune 17
   D. Fate 22

II. Chain of cause and effect 30-122
   A. Assertion of its existence 30
   B. Proof of its existence 57

III. Chance 123-221
   A. Believed in by many 123
B. God not defiled by knowledge of base things 154

C. Only apparent 172

D. Order in all things 192

IV. Fortune 222-87

A. Her nature 222

B. Same as Dis or Pluto (god of this world) 236

C. Good and bad spirits 255

V. Fate 288-369

A. Source of wealth and position 288

B. Cause of the time and manner of death 330

C. Determiner of mental qualities 353

VI. Free will 369-520

A. Same as reason 369

B. Possessed by few 445

VII. Fate, God's law, ruler of all things 521-51

VIII. Inequality of men's lots 552-698

A. Just desserts? 559

B. God's unknowable will? 583

C. God guilty for permitting evil? 639

IX. Sarcotheus (the Devil) and God 699-821

A. Sarcotheus' qualities 699

B. God 760-802

1. Indirect cause of evil 760

2. Man too base to offend Him 771
C. Sarcotheus' punishment of men for their sins 803

X. Prosperity of wicked, suffering of virtuous 822-995

A. Goods of body and goods of soul 822
B. Evil men 870-914
   1. Lawyer 870
   2. Rich man 884
   3. Poor man 905
C. Good man 915-95
   1. Healthy in soul even if body sick 915
   2. Afflictions 942-79
      a. For hypocrisy 942
      b. For purification 956
D. Relativity of good and bad fortune 980-95

XI. Conclusion "O temporal" 996-1026

"Indicat octavus sit quanta potentia fati."
("The eighth book indicates the power of fate.")

In Book VIII the poet again speaks in propria persona. The duality of Palingenius' universe--the opposition of the celestial and the terrestrial--implicit from the beginning, was touched on directly in Book VII, is developed more fully in VIII, and will receive much more attention in IX. In Book VIII Palingenius makes it clear that the earth is, in effect, a hell, for the god of this world is Dis or Pluto,
vulgarly called Fortune (236–54). Later he names this god Sarcotheus ("God of Flesh") and makes it clear that he is the Devil (700–03). Palingenius touches on communication with good and bad spirits (255–87) and promises that he will give more details on this in XII.

To resolve the problem of suffering by the virtuous and the enjoyment of prosperity by the evil, Palingenius defines the good once more: The mob prizes only the goods of the body, whereas the wise esteem the goods of the soul. This argument leads Palingenius to the relativity of good and evil fortune: The knowledge of a corrupt lawyer is not a good, for he uses it to oppress. Similarly, riches in the hands of a sensualist are not a good, for they allow him to indulge his passions. On the other hand, apparent evils which befall the virtuous man may be purifying him as bitter medicines do the sick and thus may not be evils at all (956–95).

Palingenius attacks Aristotle for espousing the doctrine of chance (129), and he ends the book with a lament on the sack of Rome and the French campaign in Italy (these events occurred in 1527 and 1527–28 respectively).

Some recurrent metaphors are the road (64, 342, 401, 434, 446), light/darkness (67–68, 133, 301, 419, 503, 611, 657, 670–71, 675, 730, 763–64, 808), blindness (6, 102, 232, 671), and ascent (517–19).
Book IX, "Sagittarius" [Types of Demons and Men]

I. Introduction 1-118
   A. Mt. Parnassus 1
   B. Mt. Theorea 10-83
      1. Ascent 10
      2. Heavenly voice 29
      3. Prayer to God 36
      4. Divine response 79
      5. Ascent to the moon 84

II. Timalphes' instruction 119-989
   A. Myth of Menarchus 119
   B. Judgment of souls 148
   C. Causes of the soul's pursuit of evil 200-502
      1. The body 200
      2. Evil spirits 291-502
         a. Typhurgus, King of Pride, in east 337
         b. Aplestus, King of Greed, in west 368
         c. Philocreus, King of Incontinence, in north 396
         d. Miastor, King of Envy, in south 418
         e. Sarcotheus (Lucifer), King of demon kings 460
   D. Man 503-727
      1. Races 503
      2. Types 517-641
         a. Thumb—gods incarnate 524
b. Index finger—just men 536

c. Middle finger—sharpsters 546

d. Ring finger—fools (the mob) 579

e. Little finger—madmen 632

f. Reformation of types C and D 642-727

a. Wisdom—pursuit of good and shunning of evil 642-727

(1) Wisdom (fruit of life) vs. knowledge (flower of life) 686

(2) Against modern education 709

E. Moral requirements 728-989

1. Praying to God 728

2. Praying to angels 749

3. Believing in angels 759

4. Following the golden rule 771

5. Pursuing virtue from youth 779

6. Avoiding avarice 843

7. Avoiding pride 895

8. Avoiding wrath 954

9. Summary 978

III. Conclusion 990-1017

A. Mercury's message to Timalphes 990

B. Mercury's return to earth with the poet 1006

"Daemonas atque hominum mores dat noscere nonus."

("The ninth book gives the characters of demons and men.")
Book IX is another of the allegorical books; the didactic message is given by Timalphes, Arete's son, who discoursed on love in Book IV. The metaphors which Palingenius has used so often, the ascent of the mountain of virtue or wisdom, the clouds of ignorance, and so on, are given allegorical significance here.

Book IX begins at sunrise, as did books I and III. The poet is on Mount Parnassus, where he was at the end of the preceding book, but he abruptly shifts to the sea (10), where he is sailing his boat. (Cf. the beginning and end of Book II. The boat metaphor is not, however, used at the end of Book IX.) Some god, the poet does not know who, dispels the darkness, and he sees the cliffs of Mount Theorea before him. The path leading up it is like the other mountain paths in earlier books, narrow, thorny, and rocky, but it becomes easier as the poet approaches the summit. Once on top he is told by a celestial voice to kneel and pray. He does so and his prayer is heard; the heavenly voice allows him to stay on the mountain. This prayer (36-78) is one of the most frequently anthologized sections of the poem.

In fact, the poet does not stay on the mountain, but, borne by a subtle breeze, ascends to the moon, where Timalphes instructs him. In Palingenius' cosmology, the area below the moon is evil, the realm of Sarcotheus, while the heavens, beyond the moon, are good. In Book IX, then, the poet goes to the border of these two realms and is given
a close look at the normally hidden workings of Sarcotheus' realm.

The first half of Book IX (through 502) has a fairly lively allegory. The comparison of the types of men to the five fingers lends some interest to the following section (517-637), but the second half of the book is a fairly tedious rehearsal of ethical do's and don't's. One is rather surprised to be reminded at the end of the book that Timalphes has been speaking, for there is nothing to distinguish him from the didactic speakers in the preceding books.

In addition to the allegorical form Palingenius has given to the metaphor of ascent in this book, the metaphors of light and darkness are also used allegorically. As has been pointed out above, clouds, shadows, and blindness are Palingenius' metaphors for ignorance. In Book IX the allegory of the evil spirits is developed largely by means of these metaphors. Storm clouds are produced by evil spirits (293-97), the Archangel Michael wrapped Lucifer in clouds (482), and lightning is sent against Lucifer (488). Lucifer, the source of evil as the sun is the source of light (465), was once the light-bearer, but he now loves darkness, and smoky flames come from his ears, eyes, nose, and mouth (470-71). Typhurgus and his followers are black (345), as are Miastor's followers (423). Miastor's followers blind men with the poison of envy (453). The soul
in the human body is like a flame in a vase (227) or the sun obscured by clouds (228).

In Book IX Timalphes again touches on a theme so common to the second half of the poem when he tells the poet he must pray to God and the angels and believe in the angels' existence (728-70).

Condemnation of lustful monks is cleverly used at the end of Book IX to bring the poet back to earth. Mercury brings a summons to Timalphes from Jupiter to attend a general court of all the gods. The accused will be the monks of a monastery outside Rimini who have been following the evil example of their prior. The gods will consider whether these monks, pigs good for nothing but eating, sleeping and fornicating, should be deprived of their riches and testicles. Having delivered his message, Mercury brings the poet back to earth on his way to the underworld to deliver Jupiter's message to Pluto.

Book X, "Capricornus" [The Wise Man]

I. Introduction 1-63
   A. Mercury's description of the underworld 1
   B. Pluto's complaint 28
   C. Mercury's farewell and the poet's invocation of the muse 58

II. The wise man 64-453
   A. Horoscope 64
   B. Education 76-146
      1. Mind 76
      2. Body 125
   C. Wealth 147-79
      1. Worldly 147
      2. True 154
   D. Philosopher's stone 180-238
      1. Its value 180
      2. Philosopher's prayer for it 189
      3. Apollo's answer 210
      4. Its owner 227
   E. Celibacy 239
   F. War 263-335
      1. Evils 263
      2. Goods 300-35
         a. Redistribution of wealth 300
         b. Elimination of drones 313
         c. Defense of self or country 329
There are a number of speakers in Book X: Mercury (who recounts his journey to Hades and relates Pluto's speech), the poet, Apollo, the wise hermit, and Sarracilus and Remisses, two evil spirits. The beginning of Book X is a continuation of Book IX, at the end of which Mercury was going down to Hades to summon Pluto to the trial of the
monks. At the opening of Book X Mercury has just returned from Hades, explains to the poet what he saw there, and retells Pluto's complaint. In this book, however, Mercury says Jupiter's message is that Pluto is to lose Antichrist. Pluto responds with his own message to Jupiter: he needs more room; the underworld is overflowing with monks, priests, and popes. Couldn't a few Christians go to heaven? This episode is unconnected, however, with the rest of the book; and after Mercury departs, Palingenius begins the book proper with an invocation of the muse.

The next section (64-453) is a consideration of the qualities the wise man ought to have, delivered in the poet's own voice except for Apollo's brief response to the prayer for the philosopher's stone (210-26). The wise man should be born under auspicious stars, have a proper education and sufficient wealth (the philosopher's stone gives the wise man to whom it is granted the resources to travel where he will). He should be celibate, fight only in defense of self or country, and practice medicine if he must earn a living (and presumably does not have the philosopher's stone to support himself!).

In the next section (454-766) the poet meets a wise hermit living on Mount Soractis (site of the shrine to St. Silvester) who delivers a long speech on the wise man. The hermit finishes at sundown and the poet sets out on the road to Rome. On the way he meets three men (Sarracilus,
Sathiel, and Jana; later a fourth, Remisses, joins them) who turn out to be spirits or minor gods in human form. Their dwelling is near the moon, and their spokesman, Sarracilus, laughs at the notion that any man is wise. They leave the poet in a profound depression. (This episode together with a translation will be found in the appendix.)

Recurrent metaphors are the road (208, 419), darkness (104-05, 190, 221, 316, 713-15, 717, 747, 757, 849), blindness (230, 269, 402, 408, 651, 850), and ascent/descent (252, 421-23, 671).

Book XI, "Aquarius" [Cosmology]

N.B. Lines 685-1015 in Weise's text are misnumbered 785-1115. The correct numbers are used here.

I. Invocation of muse 1-15

II. Zones of earth and heavens 16-66

III. Nine celestial spheres 67-93

IV. Signs of the zodiac 93-132
   A. Relationship of planets to each sign 93
   B. The signs and their qualities 102

V. Constellations 133-162
   A. Twenty in Northern Hemisphere 133
   B. Twelve in Southern Hemisphere 151

VI. Stars 162-227
   A. Number in each constellation 162
   B. Number in each sign of zodiac 190
VII. Rising and setting of zodiacal signs 228-319

VIII. Invocation of Urania 320-31

IX. Composition of heavens 332-454
   A. Matter and form two primal elements 332
   B. Heaven harder than adamant 344
   C. Music of spheres 372
   D. Heavens round (most perfect form) 408
   E. Stars 418-78
      1. Not just denser portion of their sphere 418
      2. Rulers of all things on earth 428
      3. Of different sizes 435
      4. Cause of their twinkling 455

X. Revolution of spheres 479-583
   A. Fixity of earth 479
   B. Cause of their motion 504-83
      1. Not angels 504
      2. Their own nature 538

XI. Angels 584-667
    A. Proof of their existence 584
    B. Nature of their bodies 624

XII. Cause of dark spots on the moon 668-85

XIII. Creation 686-773
    A. From eternal matter 692
    B. From nothing 697
    C. Beginningless and endless 700
D. Arguments for C 702
E. Religious objection to C 740
F. Refutation of A 746
G. Refutation of C 752
H. Proof of B 764

XIV. Elements 774-1014
A. Fire and air (meteors) 774
B. Air 794-866
   1. Three regions 794
   2. Winds (storms) 802
   3. Causes of winds 828
      a. Magicians 828
      b. Spirits 834
      c. Stars and planets 842
C. Water 867-911
   1. Circulation 867
   2. Saltiness of oceans 889
D. Earth 912-1014
   1. Center 912
   2. Seasons 925
   3. Men in all zones 945
   4. Spirits the cause of earthquakes and volcanoes 989

XV. Conclusion 1015

"Naturam undecimus totam partesque requirit."
("The eleventh book tells of all of nature and its parts.")
In the first 319 lines of Book XI Palingenius does not argue (for once!); he simply describes the heavens. But after a second invocation of the muse (320-31), this time specifically Urania, he becomes argumentative once again, disproving the music of the spheres, proving the existence of angels, and so on. Some of his proofs are rather curious. For instance, he says there is no music of the spheres because no one ever heard it (403-07), yet he argues later that the angels' ability to pass through marble walls is as real as salamanders' living in fire:

Quis, nisi vidisset pisces habitare sub undis, 
Sub limo ranas, salamandras vivere in igne, 
Aëre chameleonta, et pasci rore cicadas, 
Crederet? At vera haec tamen et mira esse fatemur.

Who, unless he had seen it, would believe that fish live in water, frogs in mud, salamanders in fire, chameleons in air, and that locusts feed on dew? Yet these marvels are true.

(XI.641-44)

Palingenius uses a variety of arguments to prove the doctrine of plenitude, that all parts of God's creation are inhabited. In a long passage (584-623) he compares the heavens to a huge palace and earth to a stable; would the creator, he asks, of such a wonderful structure allow only the most sordid building to be inhabited? Surely not; surely only empty minds can think such a thing. Spirits are one cause of storms (835), and spirits cause earthquakes and volcanoes (1007-10). In addition, men inhabit all the parts
of the earth (945-88). He ends the book with a summary of this doctrine of plenitude:

Nempe locus nullus frustra est: habitatur ubique, Sub terris, supra terras, inque ære et igni, In caelo et supra caelum, est ubi regia summi Induperatoris, mundum qui possidet omnem.

No place is in vain; all is inhabited: under earth, on earth, in the air and fire, in heaven and above heaven, where is the palace of the supreme emperor who possesses the entire universe.

(XI.1011-14)

The images with which we have become familiar, light, darkness, clouds, shadows, are not used metaphorically in this book. For instance, when Palingenius mentions clouds (787, 802, 814, 820, 858) he is simply talking about the weather.

Book XII, "Pisces" [The Transcendent and Communication with Angels]

I. Invocation of God 1-19

II. Nature of the transcendent 20-194

A. Its reality 20

B. Pure, infinite light—form without matter 71

C. Air not the source of light 108

D. Degrees of reflection of pure light 136-57

1. The sun 136

2. The gods and stars 150

E. Theory of ideas 158

III. Hierarchies of angels and spirits 195-232
IV. Fools' disbelief in afterlife 233-72

V. Exhortation to good men 273-328

VI. Angels 329-539
   A. Communication with them 329-539
      1. Hindrances 329
      2. Requirements 378-481
         a. Cleanliness of body and soul 378
         b. Love for divine things 410
         c. Repeated prayers 454
   B. Their reality 482-522
      1. Disbelief of the mob 482
      2. Testimony of prophets, fathers, and Church 499
   C. Joys of heaven 523

VII. Conclusion 540-84
   A. To God 540
   B. To his book 560

"Ultimus in mundi archetypo divisque quiescit."
("The last book ends with the archetype of the universe and the gods.")

Having dealt at length with the composition and structure of the universe in Book XI, in Book XII Palingenius expands his earlier conceptions. Whereas in XI matter and form are the two primal elements from which the other elements are created (see XI.332-43), in XII he considers the
transcendent, a realm of pure light, light which owes its origin not to any body (materia) but to forma only. In the first eleven books, Palingenius' universe has two levels, the translunar (celestial and pure) and the sublunar (the impure). In XII his universe is threefold: beyond the celestial region is the supracelestial, which is infinite and shines with a wonderful, pure light (80-83). All parts of this threefold cosmos, in accordance with Palingenius' doctrine of plenitude, are inhabited by sentient beings who reflect the pure, transcendental light to varying degrees and hence experience different degrees of beatitude. This doctrine is foreshadowed in Book VII, in which Palingenius talks about mortal and immortal angels (VII.423-96). The immortal angels would live in the supracelestial region with God, the mortal angels in the translunar region.

Book XII is divided roughly in half; after Palingenius has dealt with the transcendent, he defines for the last time the sumnum bonum for man: to walk and talk with angels in this life and after death. His program for communicating with them is threefold: one must be pure in body and soul, one must love the angels and heavenly things, and one must pray repeatedly (378-481).

Like the preceding book, XII has no attacks on the clergy, though Palingenius does revile the ignorant mob because it cannot understand his ideas. Book XII ends with a conclusion to the whole ZV. This conclusion has two
parts: the first is addressed to God, the second to Palingenius' book. In the latter he foresees that it will be attacked and reviled. In his address to God he summarizes the themes with which he has dealt repeatedly: life's dreams and illusions, its onerous work, its bitterness, the author's sins committed due to ignorance ("mentis caligine caeca"—favorite phrase), and his hope of repose in heaven.

Recurrent metaphors are the road (162, 374, 376, 402, 444), light/darkness (231-34, 260-61, 384-85, 400, 431-32, 558), clouds (275), and blindness (234, 263, 452, 558).
CHAPTER 2
ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

Organization

Palingenius' organization is loose, and he frequently runs off on long digressions. Book I is an introduction; II proves that the *summum bonum* is not wealth; III proves that the *summum bonum* is not pleasure; IV is a treatise on love and friendship; V deals with the physical requirements for a happy life; VI is a meditation on nobility and death; VII considers the natures of God, the angels, and man's soul; VIII takes up the problem of fate; IX deals with the nature of evil; X lists the qualities of the wise man; XI deals with cosmology; and XII treats of the transcendent and how to communicate with the angels. Palingenius returns to certain subjects repeatedly, and if one does not take into account all of his treatments of a topic one is liable to come away with a false impression of his beliefs. For instance, in IV.267-315 Timalphes speaks on proper and improper love, defending marriage and attacking lustful priests and monks. Rosemond Tuve suggests that in this passage we see Palingenius rejecting sacerdotal celibacy: "Like Alanus, like Jean de Meun, he openly ridicules the
celibacy of clerics; especially like Jean's is a defense of love, marriage, fertility, as 'sacred natures hest.' And in V.466-752 Palingenius again enumerates the advantages of marriage. But in X.239-62 he defends celibacy as being most compatible with the spiritual life. Has he contradicted himself? No. In Book IV he attacks not the celibacy of clerics but their lack of celibacy. In Book V his argument for marriage centers on the advantages of disposing of one's property at death. In Book X he says that a wife and children hinder the wise man from contemplating things divine. In the last passage Palingenius stresses that the kind of single life he has in mind is not the promiscuous one for which he has criticized the monks throughout the poem: "Sit castus, purusque et mente et corpore" ("let him be chaste and pure in body and mind" [X.249]). In fact this purity is essential to Palingenius' program for communicating with the angels (X.255-58). He goes on to say that celibacy is not possible without aid from God: "Nemo tamen virgo esse potest, nisi cui Deus adsit, / Auxiliumque ferat" ("Therefore, no one can have purity unless God grants it to him and gives him His aid" [X.259-60]). Palingenius' views on celibacy, then, are just as consistent as his attitude toward doctors, for he violently attacks incompetent doctors (V.798-837) but says that medicine is the best profession if one must work for a living (X.336-65).
The lack of organization seems greater than it is if we see Palingenius from a modern viewpoint as a writer with two distinct purposes, one to establish moral precepts and the other to explore the hidden mysteries of nature. Benedetto Croce's remarks on the \( Z V \) provide historical perspective in this regard. Croce says Renaissance philosophy differs from modern philosophy in that its starting point is not the cosmos but spirit and conscience.\(^2\) Palingenius is not an abstract scientist, exploring the structure of the universe and the mysteries of nature for their own sakes. The poem is unified not by the order in which Palingenius treats his subjects, but by his vision of the structure of the universe and man's moral nature. Failure to recognize this Renaissance unity has led to complaints about the \( Z V \) such as Thomas Warton's in the eighteenth century:\(^3\)

From the title of this work . . . the reader at least expects some astronomical allusions. But it has not the most distant connection with the stars: except that the poet is once transported to the moon, not to measure her diameter, but for a moral purpose; and that he once takes occasion, in his general survey of the world, and in reference to his title, to introduce a philosophical explanation of the zodiacal system.

Even a recent critic like Luzius Keller sees Palingenius' interest in ethics and cosmology as two separate pursuits:\(^4\)

Voilà les deux préoccupations principales de Palingène. La cosmologie, c'est-à-dire la recherche des secrets de la Nature qu'avaient entreprise autrefois Orphée, Hésiode ou Lucrèce; et deuxièmement les moeurs, c'est-à-dire une théorie de la morale. . . . Bien que Palingène parle toujours et partout de tout, il faut noter
cependant que les livres 2 à 10 sont consacrés avant tout à la recherche du Souverain Bien et que la cosmologie s'articule le plus clairement dans les deux derniers livres. Mais cette séparation n'est pas nette. La valeur de la poésie palingénienne consiste justement dans le fait que la morale s'y imprime en images cosmiques et que la cosmologie y est toujours chargée de signification morale.

The qualification added in the last two sentences needs to be stressed. In fact, Palingenius does not have two separate interests, one in scientific knowledge, the "secrets de la Nature," the other in man's moral nature. Keller's study is valuable as a contribution to the study of the history of cosmology, but placing the emphasis on the poem's cosmology, which he says is of the most interest to the modern student, distorts Palingenius' intention. Palingenius is not a pure scientist, interested in the diameter of the moon or the structure of the heavens for their own sakes. The microcosm is a reflection of the macrocosm; the two cannot be dissociated. The organization of the heavens is important because it corresponds to the organization of man's soul. Hence, Palingenius' universe is consistently dualistic: the region above the moon is pure, that below the moon impure (an important modification in Book XII of this twofold concept will be dealt with below). Similarly, Palingenius' vision of human nature is dualistic, like Socrates' myth in the Phaedrus of the noble horse and the ignoble horse which pull the chariot of life. (Palingenius uses the image of rein in or curbing the
passions frequently.) It is true, as Keller says, that most of Book XI is devoted to a description of the universe and Book XII to a consideration of a supracelestial realm of pure light. But Palingenius is interested in the constellations of the zodiac only insofar as they affect man, and after discussing the supracelestial region Palingenius considers what man can do to contact the beings which inhabit that region. As Foster Watson puts it,\(^5\)

Palingenius, however, was no vulgar alchemist or astrologer. He is characterized by a keen desire to arrive at a right spiritual application of all physical theories. . . . In other words, he emphasizes the unity of all knowledge, physical and spiritual.

This emphasis on the ethical implications of cosmological knowledge is the burden of the second half of the poem and especially of Book XII, in which Palingenius says that a man who possesses all virtues is a mortal god or an immortal man:

\[
\text{Haec sunt virtutes, pietas, prudentia, necnon Iustitia, et cunctis potior sapientia rebus. Haec bona quisquis habet, deus est mortalis, et idem Immortalis homo, felix post fata futurus.}
\]

These are the virtues: piety, prudence, justice and above all wisdom. Whoever has these is a mortal god and an immortal man and will be blessed after death. (XII.256-59)

The name of the poem and those of the individual books lead the reader to expect that the contents of the work will be organized according to the qualities of each zodiacal
sign. But most critics, beginning with Julius Caesar Scaliger, have seen little or no correlation between the zodiac and the contents of the poem:


Nevertheless, the choice of title is not satisfactory. Since he proclaims a zodiac of the life of man, he ought to draw out his arguments about our life either from the analogy of the signs or from their powers. He argues, however, in Aries about the Good. But if he began thus, because Aries is thought to be the beginning of the signs (though the Good is the final end of man, for Beatitude is the fruit of the Good, as we said elsewhere), I would have put the infancy of man here and his early training; in Taurus childhood, in Gemini adolescence, in Cancer the beginning of youth, in Leo what you may call the condition of youth, or its maturity or strength; in Virgo the state of life called manhood, in Libra his policy for the acquisition of riches or power, in Scorpio disturbances of the mind, in Sagittarius achievements and skills, in Capricorn the beginning of old age, in Aquarius senility, in Piscis the end of life. So in infancy the senses, in adolescence disturbances, in youth the passions (wrath, hate, love, war), in the time of maturity virtues, in
old age judgment, attacks on vices, in senility peevishness. I would do thus or something similar to these. If these do not fit the zodiac, the books should not be named after the zodiac.

Most of Palingenius' critics have echoed Scaliger's judgment. An exception, however, is Walter Old, who maintains that the contents of the books are directly related to the qualities of their zodiacal signs. Testing this assertion would require careful study of sixteenth-century astrology. But if Old is correct, Scaliger was quite ignorant about astrology. For instance, Old says that Gemini, the third house, governs the period of life between four and fourteen, while Cancer, the fourth house, rules the period from birth to age four. In addition, Taurus, the second house, is the sign of earthly wealth, and Palingenius appropriately devotes his second book to a proof that riches are not the summum bonum. The third house, Gemini, is the house of the mind, of logical, practical thought. Its nature is also dual, as its name suggests; under its influence one often alternates between the frivolous and the serious. Book III has this duality: the first half is dominated by Epicurus, the second half by Arete. The connection between Palingenius' thought and contemporary astrology needs to be re-examined instead of being dismissed out of hand as Scaliger and his followers have done.

There are some resemblances between the structure of the ZV and the Aeneid: in Book VI the poet descends to the
underworld, and Book VII begins a **maior ordo** (*Aeneid* VII.44). Incidentally, Old reaches a similar conclusion by pursuing the astrological relationship:

In this section [Book VII] Palingenius rises to a higher key, and having fully dealt with material conditions of life, he now lifts the gamut of his argument by a complete octave. Under Aries he considered the unit of human life, and now under the opposite sign he treats of Deity as the single source of all life.

The distinction between the two halves of the *Aeneid* is familiar, and my examination of the contents of the *ZV* reveals a significant difference between the two halves of the poem. In the first six books Palingenius is concerned primarily with man in relationship to men. In the second half of the poem he is concerned with man in relationship to the cosmos, specifically to the spirits, good and evil, which fill the universe. In this half he argues for the immortality of the soul (VII.855-1051; X.556-655, 797-804) and the existence of angels (VII.295-422, IX.749-70, XI.584-623), describes the activities of good and bad spirits (VIII.255-87, 699-821; IX.291-502; XI.834-41, 989-1014), and ends with instructions on how to communicate with the angels (XII.329-539).

The twofold scheme proposed here, then, is not intended to support the old fallacy that Palingenius has two interests, one in ethics, the other in science. Really the concerns of the two halves of the poem are simply two aspects of the same question: What should man be doing here
on earth? In order to answer this question, I wish to argue that Palingenius is first and last a teacher; writing should be "utile, delectans, maiusque ambobus honestum" ("useful, enjoyable, and, more than both of these, decent"[I.144]). These are the qualities of the good:

Semper habere bonum desiderat ipsa voluntas,  
Et vitare malum, solisque movetur ab istis;  
Haec duo sunt igitur causae et fundamina amoris.  
Omnia sed bona sunt triplici discrimine secta.  
Quaedam iucunda, et quaedam dicuntur honesta:  
Utiliumque aliud genus et natura bonorum est.

The will itself desires always to have the good and to avoid evil and is moved by these alone. These two are the causes and foundations of love. But all goods are divided into three categories: some are termed pleasant, others decent; and the category of the useful is also a type of good things.

(IV.521-26)

Palingenius is interested in teaching only goodness and decency; he condemns contemporary education (I.181-219, IX.709-27) because boys are taught "obscoena . . . Carmina" ("filthy poems" [I.183-84]) and "fabellas turpes" ("base stories" [IX.710]). The masters who lead youth astray with such pernicious education are "corruptores, non cultores puerorum" ("corrupters, not teachers, of youth" [IX.724]). His poem is filled with references to classical myths, yet the introduction to Book VI attacks myths as the "inflatas nugas" ("airy trifles" [VI.8]) of the poets. But as in his attacks on lustful clergy and quack doctors, Palingenius is not against all myths but only those which do not instruct. He does not care, therefore, whether he is
considered a poet or not; he will follow truth only, and the
truth will make men as the gods:

Ergo seu vulgus me iudicet esse poetam,
Seu neget, haud ideo mendacia vana sequemur, 
Sed verum: quoniam verum est perfectio mentis. 
Quod quicunque magis novit, magis est similis diis, 
Atque magis felix.

Therefore whether the mob thinks me a poet or denies it, 
I will not follow vain lies but truth, since truth is 
the perfection of the mind. For whoever knows more is 
more like the gods and will be happier. 
(VI.42-6)

Controlling Imagery

In order to see how Palingenius binds the two halves of 
the poem together, we can follow three clusters of metaphors 
which he introduces in Book I and continues to use 
throughout the poem: the road; ascent or descent; and light 
or darkness, shadows, clouds, blindness. These metaphors 
carry the burden of Palingenius' moral message and 
illuminate his cosmology.

The road is used to represent man's activity in this 
world, his pursuit of spiritual or material ends. Light, 
the light of God or light of reason, reveals the spiritual 
path:

Phoebe pater, vatumque decus, da noscere calles 
Ambiguos: avidumque reple ambrosia Aganippe: 
Lux tua monstrat iter, per quod penetraria templi 
Ingrediar veneranda tui, et me subtrahe vulgo.

Father Apollo, glory of poets, reveal the confusing 
paths; fill your follower with Aganippe's ambrosia; let 
your light reveal the path by which I may enter the
sacred recesses of your temple, and preserve me from the mob.

(I.10-13)

The spiritual journey leads upward to Mount Parnassus (I.1-2), Mount Theorea (IX.10-83), Mount Soractis (X.454 ff.), or simply to the citadel of learning:

Gaudia sectatur dives, dulcemque quietem:
Dumosos odit calles, clivosque viarum
Difficiles, per quas doctrinae scandimus arcem.

The rich man follows pleasure and soft ease; he hates the thorny paths and the difficult grades of the roads by which we climb to the citadel of wisdom.

(I.178-80)

This "doctrina" (learning or wisdom) is a divine thing, attained only through long and arduous toil:

Tecta Dei scandit, naturae arcana recludit:
Qua sine nemo potest perfectus dicier. Haec nos
Dissimiles pecudum reddit, similesque deorum.

It scales the temple of God and reveals the mysteries of nature; without it no man can be called perfect. This is what distinguishes us from the beasts and makes us like the gods.

(I.231-33)

The last idea is a leitmotiv, to which Palingenius returns repeatedly, for he sees two basic types of men, those who pursue spiritual matters and those who follow their passions and are thus like the animals. (This is the burden of the hermit's speech in Book X, especially lines 656-704.)

Darkness, clouds, shadows, or blindness are associated with those who follow their lower nature:
Ut caecus nescit scrobibus divertere ab imis,
Impinguntque pedem tenebrosa nocte vagantes,
Quum silet inferno recubans Proserpina lecto:
Sic mens quae caeca est, sine lumine doctrinarum,
In quodcunque nefas facili descendere lapsu
Non dubitat, nisi sit poenae compressa timore.

As the blind man does not know how to avoid the deep ditches, and as wanderers in the dark night hurt their feet, when Proserpina is silent, resting on her infernal couch, so the mind which is blind, without the light of learning, does not hesitate to descend, with an easy fall, to any sin, unless it is constrained by fear of punishment.

(I.267-72)

Blindness or darkness is the sin of ignorance—Palingenius addresses "caecis mortalia plena tenebris / Pectora" ("mortal breasts filled with blind shadows" [II.59-60]) and suggests that we men "aspiciamus / Interius, procul excussis a mente tenebris" ("look within, having thrown off shadows far from the mind" [VIII.66-67]). He is determined to explore "latentes / Naturae . . . vias" ("the hidden paths of nature" [I.66-67]), though he may not be successful:

Talia multa Deus tenebris involvit opacis,
Constituitque suos fines mortalibus, ultra
Quos frustra humanum ingenium sensusque laborat.

God wrapt so many things in shadows and gave to mortals their boundaries, beyond which the human mind and senses labor to go in vain.

(VIII.611-13)

On earth physical goods are esteemed, while "honor . . . /
Conditur illa intus, caecis abstrusa latebris" ("honor is hidden within, closed in dark shadows [VIII.101-02]). This imagery of shadows and darkness reaches its culmination in
books VIII and IX. In Book VIII Palingenius tries to
determine the cause of evil and reasons that God is one and
simple, the first mover of the chain of cause and effect,
while the ultimate effect in that chain, being furthest from
God, must be most diverse:

Ergo quum Deus et simplex sit semper et idem,
Ultima causarum, quae distat maxime ab illo,
Et minime simplex erit, et diversa, suosque
Effectus semper varios pro viribus edet.

Therefore, since God is always simple and the same, the
last cause, which is most distant from Him, will be
least simple, diverse, and always, due to its nature,
will produce the most varying effects.
(VIII.592-95)

That last effect, or being, errs because of his distance
from the light, i.e., from God. That demon rejoices in
darkness, and just as shadows determine the extent of light,
and all things determine the extent of their contraries, so
the chain of cause and effect begins in good and ends in
evil and misery (VIII.668-79). The being at the bottom of
the chain rules the earth. Men call him Fortune or Pluto,
but a more fitting name is Sarcotheus ("Lord of Flesh"
[VIII.701-02]). He is the fountain of all evil just as God
is the fountain of all good:

Hei mihi, quam vere dixit ter maximus Hermes:
Congeries mundus cunctorum est iste malorum.
Nimirum quoniam daemon, qui praesidet c
Terrarum, malus est, saevaque tyrannid c et,
Ac, veluti fons est cunctorum prima bon,
Causa, ita cunctorum fons est postrema malorum.
Alas, how truly spoke Hermes Trismegistus when he said the world is a mass of all evils. Indeed, because that demon, who rules the world, is evil and rejoices in cruel tyranny, and, just as the first cause is a source of all good things, so the last is a source of all evils.

(VIII.687-92)

God is the indirect cause of evil, just as the sun creates darkness by descending below the horizon, or as fire creates cold when it is removed to a distance, though properly speaking the sun is not dark, nor fire cold:

Quare pessime agunt, qui verbis turpibus audent Irritare Deum summum, qui causa bonorum Cunctorum est, a quo per se propriique mali nil Esse potest unquam, nisi contingenter: uti sol Producit tenebras, quoties descendit ad imos Antipodas, frigusque absente creatur ab igni: Non tamen obscurus sol est, neque frigidus ignis.

Therefore they do wrong who dare with base arguments annoy the high God, the cause of all good things, from Whom properly nothing evil in itself can ever come unless contingently. Just so the sun produces shadows as often as it descends to the antipodes, and cold is produced by the absence of fire. Nevertheless, the sun is not dark nor is fire cold.

(VIII.760-66)

In Book IX Timalphes instructs the poet further on the cause of evil and gives more details on the kingdom of darkness, i.e., on Sarcotheus and his subordinate princes. Timalphes takes the poet to a tower (they are on the moon) from which they can see the whole world and explains that the soul is from God, hence pure in itself (IX.217-21). There are two causes of its sinning. The first is the body, the soul's prison, which obscures the soul's brilliance as a
pot hides a flame hidden in it or as clouds dim the sun (IX.224-28). Therefore the soul's first sin is ignorance of the good and true, which leads to false judgment, which issues in foolishness and evil. The result of foolishness is lust; that of evil, wrath (IX.254-69). The second cause of sin is evil spirits which reside in the air, hiding in clouds (again the clouds of ignorance):

Namque ubi densantur nubes, pluviaeque creantur,
Et venti horrisono concursu fulgura gignunt,
Illic pravorum sedes est daemoniorum,
Quorum opera fiunt pestes, insanaque bella,
Et tempestaties, terra pelagoque furentes.

For where clouds are thick, and rain falls, and the winds breed lightning with a horrid crash, there is the seat of evil demons, of whose works are plagues, mad wars, and fierce tempests on land and sea. (IX.293-97)

Few, however, believe in these demons since they cannot see them, so Timalphes tells the poet to pray to Iris to clear away the clouds so he can see the demons. He does so and the clouds dissolve. Timalphes then applies an herb to his eyes and says "iam mundi arcana videbis" ("now you will see the secrets of the world" [IX.329]). In this passage, then, Palingenius links very clearly the outer darkness of the demons (their distance from the light of God) and the inner blindness, or ignorance, of the poet.

Typhurgus ("Worker of Smoke" or "Worker of Pride") is king in the east. He and his followers are black and they drag men down to a smoky lake in hell. Aplestus
"Insatiable") is king in the west and drags men down to a stinging lake in hell. Philocreus ("Flesh Lover") is king in the north. He brings innumerable evils to blind mortals, putting hidden, Stygian poison in their food and dragging them down to the black depths of the muddy lake of hell:

O quantum noxae caecis mortalibus affert!
Namque hamis, quos ipse vides, dulcem inserit escam,
Infectam tamen occulto Stygioque veneno;
Hisque capi iubet insulsos, stagnique lutosi
In vada nigra trahi captos, et gurgite mergi.

O how much evil he brings to blind mortals! For he baits the hooks, which you see, with sweet food infused with the dark poison of hell. With these hooks he orders that fools be captured, dragged to the black depths of the muddy lake, and drowned in the flood. (IX.405-09)

Miastor ("Wretch Stained with Crime"), king of envy in the south, has "Lividaque ora, atri dentes, spumosaque labra" ("a dark mouth, black teeth and foaming lips" [IX.447]):

Quo instigante sui mortalia corda ministri
Tartareis implet spumis: tunc improba pestis
Diffundens sese, totos contaminat artus:
Praesertimque oculos angit, ne prospera ferre
Alterius possint, intabescantque videndo.

At his instigation his followers fill mortals’ hearts with the foam of hell. Thence the horrible plague, spreading out, contaminates all the limbs. Especially it chokes the eyes, so that they cannot bear the good fortune of another but pine away at the sight. (IX.450-54)

Above these four archdemons, in the middle of the air, is their king, Sarcotheus, from whom each kind of evil shines forth, as rays emanate from the body of the sun
For he wished to be equal to God, desiring the honor of an equal seat. Then he deserved banishment, and Michael, having been ordered, set certain boundaries for him within the clouds. But remembering often his previous glory and former honors and deluded by a vain hope, he instigates war with the gods and tries to break into heaven: hence comes thunder and fearful lightning, and horrifying fires light up the black cloud; beasts
are frightened and the hearts of men tremble. But he
rages in vain and his futile effort vexes him, and he
cannot enter the heavenly dwellings. He who was the
first bearer of the light and used to be called Lucifer
is now a lover of night and delights in wandering
through the night, leading ghosts and spectres with him.
Sometimes he also comes out by day and seeks to join
armed forces of wastrels and strew the fields with dead
bodies, or he prepares cruel fates for sailors and
overwhelms unhappy ships with waves, or he attempts some
other great crime. For then he works in the light, but
silently, and he sends his servants to certain places in
secret. They prick the hearts of evil men and fill them
with madness and daring, and they quietly inspire the
mind, speaking voicelessly.

(IX.479-502)

The two kinds of spirits, the evil ones who are lovers of
darkness and the gods or angels who enjoy the light, thus
correspond to the two kinds of men described in Book VI,
those who follow darkness and those who are drawn to the
light:

Fugiunt animalia quaedam,
Oderuntque diem, tenebris ac nocte vagantur:
Sic homines multi lumen cognoscere veri
Nec possunt, nec amant.

Some animals flee and hate the day, wandering in shadows
and night. So many men can neither recognize the light
of truth nor love it.

(VI.222-25)

From this it is clear that Palingenius sees no separation
between the macrocosm and the microcosm: men and spirits
are closely allied, joining themselves with one side or the
other of the cosmic struggle.

After seeing the devils, Palingenius asks Timalphes to
show him men, and he sees the different races, negroes at
the equator, whites near the poles, and in between those of intermediate hues. But Timalphes tells him that the criteria of light and dark (good and evil) are to be applied, not literally to the color of people's skins, but figuratively to their souls and actions:


While I wondered at such things foolishly, my guide asked, "Why do you trouble yourself about trifles? Why do you look at the meaningless colors of human flesh? It will be better to weigh their characters and the various habits of their minds and the qualities of their deeds. From these you will know, and you will see when I show you, what is the life of men, and how much chaos rules in it.

(IX.518-23)

The contrast between light and darkness is plain enough in this book. Though Sarcotheus is once compared to the sun as the source of all ills, he and his followers are consistently associated with clouds and darkness.

The light imagery reaches its culmination in Book XII. In the first eleven books of the poem, Palingenius' universe is divided into two spheres, celestial or transluunar (the pure) and sublunar (the impure). In Book XII he adds to this scheme a supracelestial realm which is filled with a wonderful, infinite light, the light of God (XII.80-83). This light is invisible to our bodily eyes and is the source of the sun's light. In accordance with Palingenius'
doctrine of plenitude (XI.945-88 and 1011-14), the supracelestial realm is inhabited just as are all the other levels of creation. The gods are numberless, and just as the stars shine with different degrees of brightness, so the gods reflect this transcendent light to varying degrees, proceeding downwards to the lowest god of them all, Sarcotheus. Palingenius prepares for this doctrine of supracelestial and celestial gods in VII.423-96, where he talks about mortal and immortal gods. He wonders why he wants to show blind men the light ("caecis cupiens ostendere lucem" [XII.234]), for they believe neither in hell ("tenebris / Aeternis—eternal darkness" [XII.231-32]) nor the immortality of the soul but pursue gold only. The greatest honor on earth is to walk and talk with the gods:

O quam sublime hoc, et quam mirabile donum est,
Quo nihil in terris homini contingere maius
Posse puto: at pauci tanto dignantur honore.

O how sublime, how wonderful, is this gift! It seems to me nothing better can come to man on earth, but few are worthy of such honor.

(XII.332-34)

But while speaking with demons is easy because they are near at hand, communication with the gods is difficult:

Nam cum daemonibus multi fortasse loquuntur:
Quos facile alliciunt precibus, sacrisque peractis,
Cum procul a terris non sint, et in aere vivant,
Atque hominum coetus videant adeantque frequenter;
Imo ultro apparent multis, ultroque ministrant:
Et iuvenum magno interdum capiuntur amore.
Dii vero ætheræi terras odere, hominumque
Res dedignantur cognoscere, et impia facta
Ipsorum detestantur, renuuntque videre:
Quippe quibus bene compertum est quam stulta et iniqua
Sit natura hominum, quam fallax, perfida, et audax,
Contemptrix, spretrix, blasphematrixque deorum.
Quare compellare ipsos, et cernere coram,
Difficilis nium labor est, et gratia rara.

Now perhaps many speak with demons: they are easily attracted by prayers and rituals, since they are not far from earth and live in the air, and they see and come to the gatherings of men frequently. Indeed, they appear to many and aid them, and sometimes they are taken with love of youths. On the other hand the gods of heaven hate earth, disdain knowing the business of men, detest their evil ways, and refuse to see them. Obviously they have understood well how foolish and wicked is human nature, how deceitful, faithless and presumptuous is the scorner, despiser and blasphemer of the gods. Therefore to address them, to see them openly, is a very difficult task, and success infrequent.

(XII.335-48)

In order to see the gods one must be pure in body and mind, be filled with divine love, and pray incessantly (XII.378-481). Though many may scoff at such a possibility, the lives of the prophets and the desert fathers attest to it, as does Holy Church (XII.499-517):

Non sunt nugaæ igitur, sed consentanea vero,
Posse hominem affari divos coram, atque videre:
Quod reor esse bonum summum, finemque bonorum
Cunctorum quaecunque homini contingere possunt,
Donec praesentis vitae frena turbida sulcat.
Cum vero elapsus mortali carcere abibit
Spíritus, abducens secum haec tria, quae sibi semper
Sunt propria, mentem, sensum, motum, aetheris oras
Exultans petet, et felix perfecte erit illic:
Quippe habitans cum diis, Deus efficietur et ipse.

Therefore, this is no trifle but agrees with truth, this ability of man's to talk openly with the gods and see them. This I believe the summum bonum and the end of all the goods which man can attain while he plows the raging seas of the present life. When, however, the spirit will depart from this mortal prison, taking with it these three which always belong to it, mind, sense,
and motion, it will seek the heavens, exulting, and there it will be perfectly blessed. Indeed, living there with the gods, it will itself be made a god. (XII.518-27)

The metaphor of ascent also finds its culmination in Book XII, for the supracelestial realm is the highest realm, the farthest from the earth, though it is also inside man, for man can glimpse it, or at least its inhabitants, while he lives here on earth.

**Palingenius' Heresies**

The first Index of prohibited books on which the **ZV** appeared was that of Louvain (1558). Although the Index of Pope Paul IV for Rome, Florence, and Milan (1559) did not list the **ZV** by title, Palingenius was entered by name among heretics of the first class. His book may have suffered by association: Nikolaus Brylinger printed it at Basel in 1552 and 1557, and Brylinger's books were condemned *en bloc* in the Pauline Index of 1559. But Palingenius' bones had been exhumed and burnt before 1548. One of the few extant documents of the Tridentine commission for reforming the Index (still in manuscript at the Biblioteca Estense at Modena) records the commission's recommendation that a number of works be rehabilitated, among them the **ZV**. But the recommendation was not taken, at least for the **ZV**, for it was on the Index of 1564 and on nearly all succeeding
indices until that of Pope Leo XIII (1900), from which all pre-1600 titles were eliminated.\(^1\)

Borgiani asks why it was not on any of the nearly twenty indices or catalogues of prohibited books of various countries which came out between 1534 and 1558.\(^2\) The reason must in some way be connected with the changing religious climate. The Counter-Reformation began to gather momentum in Italy with the foundation of the Society of Jesus in 1540 and the establishment of a new inquisition at Rome in 1542 and at Naples in 1546. But Pope Paul III (1534-49) dealt rather gently with heretics, especially in comparison with his successors Paul IV (1555-59) and Pius V (1566-72): during Paul III's reign no one was put to death in Italy for heresy.\(^3\) Paul III himself believed in astrology and made Luca Gaurico, a famous astrologer, a bishop.\(^4\)

We do not know for certain which passages of the \textit{ZV} the Church considered heretical. There are several doctrines which the Church may have objected to. Palingenius evidently believed that the world was not created, i.e., that it is eternal. He goes to great length to prove this point (XI.702-39) and then rejects it less than wholeheartedly:

\begin{quote}
Quare si humanae rationi credere par est, 
Aeternus certe mundus dicetur, et omni 
Principio prorsus, prorsus quoque fine carere: 
At si aliter quondam dixit Deus, et sua Mosi 
Facta revelavit, debemus credere Mosi:
\end{quote}
Succumbat ratio fidei, et captiva quiescat.
Namque Deus nunquam fallit, nec fallitur ipse,
Si modo dignatur quicquam mortalibus unquam
Dicere, si quicquam apparens arcana recludit.

Therefore if it is appropriate to believe human reason, the world will certainly be said to be eternal, and to be without beginning or end. But if God once said otherwise and revealed his works to Moses, we ought to believe Moses. Let reason submit to faith and be quiet, a captive. For God never deceives nor is deceived, if ever He deigns to reveal anything to mortals, if anything evident discloses secret things.

(XI.737-45)

Palingenius' enthusiasm for this doctrine of an eternal universe is a bit surprising since it is Aristotelian (a doctrine which the Church of course always rejected), and Palingenius' universe in other respects is consistently Platonic or Neo-Platonic. Palingenius is nothing, however, if not eclectic. He is not unduly interested in the source of ideas as long as they appear reasonable to him.

Another doctrine the Church may have objected to is reincarnation (V.662, VI.848-59, IX.148-63, XI.197-99), but Palingenius mentions it only briefly each time.

The Church may also have objected to Palingenius' explanation of the origin of evil, developed in books VIII and IX. As we saw, Palingenius maintains that there are two sources of evil: the soul's ignorance of good (caused by the body) and the influence of Satan and his evil spirits. Borgiani says this is not Christian because Palingenius says nothing about original sin or the sin of the individual.
But to say that calling Satan the source of evil is not Christian seems quibbling. Was Satan or free will the cause of the Fall? Were not both necessary?

The primary charge against Palingenius must have been that he was a magician, according to Borgiani. He admits, however, that Palingenius gives no incantations or formulae for summoning spirits as do, for example, Cornelius Agrippa and Petri de Abano, and he further admits that Palingenius' instructions in Book XII for communication with the gods are compatible with Christian mysticism. Roellenbleck shares Borgiani's conclusion that Palingenius was a magician, but stops short of the assertion that that must have been the principal charge of heresy against him. In any case, I do not believe that the poem indicates that Palingenius was a magician.

To prove that Palingenius was a magician, Roellenbleck examines in detail two passages: the encounter with the spirits on the way to Rome at the end of Book X and the instructions for communicating with the angels in Book XII. Because of the importance of these passages, it will be useful to look at them in detail. The passage from Book X, along with a translation, will be found in the appendix.

Regarding the encounter with the spirits, Roellenbleck makes an interesting observation:

Diese Icherzählung scheint ein persönliches Erlebnis wiederzugeben, und ihre Pointe is offensichtlich die,
The first is a good point; this narrative does have the immediacy of an actual experience of the author's, unlike the obviously allegorical episodes in books III and IV. But the conclusion that Roellenbleck draws from this passage, "That man can have true knowledge only if he binds himself to the spirit world through magic [my translation]," is not as evident. This may be the point the spirits wish to make, but even that is questionable. To determine how the poet views the spirits, we must first examine what sort of spirits they are.

The poet meets them at a full moon, a traditional time for contact with the unseen. Their spokesman, Sarracilus, belittles the wise hermit whom Palingenius has just left. The hermit, if not especially electrifying in his sermon, is a persona in the mold of Arete, Timalphes, Calliope, i.e., he is one of the speakers who delivers the didactic message. We have, therefore, no reason to believe Sarracilus when he says no man is wise.

Sarracilus' second speech is more problematic. He argues that man's ability to control spirits is a proof of the immortality of man's soul, a point that Palingenius argues for extensively elsewhere. In this Sarracilus shows himself cleverly deceitful, for not all that he says is lies. He gains the poet's trust by giving another proof for
one of Palingenius' favorite doctrines. Sarracilus' references to "a certain youth from Narnia who resides at the palace of Cardinal Orsini," "a certain German," and "a bearded little monk" are so specific that Palingenius must have had particular people in mind, but their identities remain unknown. Sarracilus' last remark, that he and the other spirits will drag certain Roman princes down to Hell that night, is a clear indication that these are evil spirits. And Remisses, the spirit just returned from Rome, gives further clues that they are evil, for he says that the sins of the Romans mark them as belonging to the party of the spirits.

Even the devil can cite scripture for his purpose, and just as Sarracilus gave another proof for a doctrine dear to Palingenius, Remisses expresses Palingenius' sentiments when he says that Pope Clement's response to Martin Luther is contrary to the teachings of the Fathers and the precepts of Christ. This is quite transparently Palingenius' own view. Book X opened (X.28-57) with Pluto's complaint about the glut of popes and monks in hell, and the numerous criticisms of monks and priests throughout the ZV leave no doubt that Remisses is expressing Palingenius' opinion here. By putting the speech in the mouth of a demon, Palingenius may have hoped to avoid condemnation for it. At any rate, Remisses' speech shows Pope Clement and the cardinals on the side of the demons; for from the wars Clement is preparing,
the demons will be able to bear many souls down to hell. Among those souls no doubt will be those of the "proceres" ("princes" [811]) that Sarracilus says the spirits hope to drag to hell that night; of course, these could be princes of the Church as well as lay princes.

After the spirits depart, the poet continues on his way in a profound depression, reflecting on the foolishness and misery of all men. In XII.335-48 Palingenius says communication with evil spirits is easy while communication with good spirits is difficult. Though he does not explicitly say so, the four spirits in Book X are definitely not beneficent. The poet's depression at the end of this book is in keeping with his depression or melancholy in all the other books (III, IV, VI, IX) in which the poet is a seeker and a deity or personification delivers the didactic message. But there is no indication in this episode that Palingenius is advocating that one should "bind oneself to the spirit world by magic," or that he considers the Narnian youth or the German magician examples to be emulated.

The censure of Pope Clement may have political overtones as well: Palingenius may have been taking the side of Alfonso I (Duke of Ferrara, 1505-34) against Clement. At the beginning of Book X, Mercury bears a message to Pluto from Jove. Jove's instructions are that Pluto should release Antichrist, perhaps a reference to Pope Clement. The conflict between Ferrara and the Papal States began when
Pope Julius II seized Modena and Reggio. Alfonso availed himself of Pope Clement's weakness following the sack of Rome to retake them in 1527, for which Clement excommunicated Alfonso the following year. In 1530, Charles V awarded Modena and Reggio to Ferrara despite Clement's objections. Book X was probably written in 1530 or 1531, when the dispute between Ferrara and the Pope was still unresolved, so Palingenius may be simply anti-Clement rather than pro-Luther.

Roellenbleck thinks XII.329-539 evidence that Palingenius was a magician because he urges communication with the gods rather than with God. But while Palingenius' program of purity, love of the divine and continual prayer is compatible with magic or Neo-Platonism (as the Renaissance understood them), it is equally compatible with orthodox Christian mysticism. Palingenius says expressly that the beings of the supracelestial light know God, and the goal of the program of observances he expounds is to know those beings both in this life and hereafter.

Is Palingenius urging his reader to communicate with pagan gods or spirits? The question is legitimate, for he uses "dii," "superi," "coelicoles" and so on, which were applied to the gods of the pagan Romans. But this is really a matter of Neo-Latin usage. For instance, in Book IX, Timalphes tells the story of the fall of Lucifer and his
fight with Michael, and he refers to "supremoque Iovi" (IX.477). There can be no doubt that this "Supreme Jove" is the Christian God; Palingenius is simply following the established custom of Renaissance Latinists. Later in the same book Timalphes tells Palingenius that he must believe in and pray to the higher beings (IX.749-70). He begins by calling these beings "cives caeli, angelicasque cohortes, / Et summi regis famulos, sanctosque ministros, / Divinae maiestatis iussa efficientes" ("citizens of heaven, angelical companies, servants of the high king, sacred ministers, carrying out the commands of the divine majesty") and ends by calling them "deos," "dii," "deorum" ("gods"). Is Palingenius therefore promoting black magic or urging his reader to become a medium? The concept of a cosmos of unseen spirits may be a tenet of magic, but it is also good Catholic doctrine. If one assumes \textit{a priori} that Palingenius was a magician, then these passages can be used to support that view, but there is really nothing un-Christian about them.

Borgiani asks the obvious question: If Palingenius was so plainly an occultist (as Borgiani maintains), how can one explain his popularity in Protestant countries, for Protestants persecuted practitioners of the occult sciences as bitterly as did Catholics? His answer is surprising: "Evidentemente, agli occhi dei lettori protestanti deve essere sfuggito quello che non potè sfuggire agli occhi
degli inquisitori cattolici." If only the English schoolmasters who gave Palingenius to schoolboys, if only Googe, for whom Palingenius was an "excellent and Christian Poet," had known what ideas they were disseminating! Borgiani's argument is quite implausible.

Borgiani says that the encounter with the spirits does not indicate that Palingenius was a Lutheran, for it was probably written in 1530 before Lutheranism was completely defined and established in its independence from Rome. That this passage does not prove that Palingenius was a Lutheran is perfectly true, but it does show him as a sympathizer at this early stage.

Because Palingenius' dedication of the poem to Ercole II gives him some link to the court of Ferrara, and because he criticized abuses in the Church, it has been supposed that he was a member of the circle of Calvinists round Ercole II's wife, Renée of France. A daughter of Louis XII of France, Renée was married to Ercole in Paris in 1528. Ercole wrote later that she was a faithful, practicing Catholic when he married her. In Ferrara, however, she gradually became more and more openly Protestant, appointing the poet Clement Marot, a well known reformer, her private secretary and harboring various followers of Calvin. (Calvin himself visited Ferrara in 1536 under the pseudonym Carlo d'Espeville.) In 1540 she stopped taking the Catholic sacraments, though Pope Paul III, on a visit to
Ferrara in 1543, granted her a brief exempting her from all ecclesiastical jurisdiction save that of the Holy Office in Rome and the pope himself. In 1545 Pope Paul ordered the magistrates of Ferrara to investigate heretics in the city, causing one of Renée's circle, the poetess Olimpia Morata, to flee. After Paul's death in 1549 restrictions on Renée grew tighter, and in 1554 events came to a crisis when Ercole took her children away from her and imprisoned her on charges of heresy (she recanted within a few days and was freed). But while Renée was a Protestant and there were a number of Protestants in Ferrara, there is no external evidence for Palingenius' having known her.

Whether Palingenius was actually a Protestant is difficult to determine. He criticized the Church, but that was nothing new for an Italian poet. He was called a Lutheran later (e.g., a Spanish index of 1667 describes him as "poeta Luteranus"), but the term was often loosely applied to anyone who objected to abuses in the Church. Rosemond Tuve feels he remained Catholic; Googe and his contemporaries felt he was indeed a Protestant, while Borgiani and Roellenbleck maintain he was not Christian at all but an occultist. Very likely the ZV would not have been condemned had Palingenius written in the time of Dante or Petrarch. Although his criticisms of the Church were similar to the earlier poets', the Church's threatened position made it much less tolerant of such criticism. We
need seek no further for the cause of the charge of heresy than Palingenius' statements on pope and clergy.

Sources

Palingenius was steeped in the classics, and therefore ideas and phrases borrowed from them appear throughout his book. He was especially fond of Plato. An image for the soul which Socrates uses in the Phaedrus (the charioteer who is drawn by two horses, one white and noble, the other dark and vicious) underlies many passages in the poem (e.g., V.694, 704, 749, 827; VI.306, 455, 581, 695, 703). The contrast throughout the poem between those who like darkness and those who are drawn to the light suggests the Myth of the Cave in Republic VII. In Book VI Palingenius says specifically that the world can rightly be called a cavern of thieves ("Ut merito possit mundus spelunca latronum / Dicier" [VI.941-42]) and a cave of evils ("hanc scelerum caveam" [VI.968]). Other Platonic concepts Palingenius embraces are the following: the body is the prison of the soul (used repeatedly, e.g., VII.153), sight is the noblest of the senses (VII.749-801), and the stars are of different sizes and revolve (XI.435-78).

Perhaps Palingenius' greatest debt to Plato is his use of the theory of ideas. In XI.616 he says that earthly things are merely shadows of their heavenly counterparts, and in XII.478 he uses the term "mundum archetypum." In
VII.449-96 he talks at length about the archetypal world, and in XII.158-94 he gives a fairly long explication of the theory of ideas, citing Plato by name in line 189.

Palingenius also cites Aristotle as an authority. He sends his readers to the books of Aristotle and Plato, "duo sunt haec magni lumina mundi" ("these are the two lights of the great world" [IV.553]), and refers to "doctus Aristoteles" (XII.72) for proof that there cannot be an infinite body. But he does not hesitate to disagree with the Stagyrite's teaching on chance and to attack learned authorities in general:

Quicquid Aristoteles, vel quivis dicat, eorum
Dicta nihil moror, a vero quam forte recedunt.
Saepe graves, magnosque viros, famaque verendos
Errare et labi contingit; plurima secum
Ingenia in tenebras consuerunt nominis alti
Auctores, ubi connivent, deducere easdem:
Tantum exerapla valent, adeo est imitabilis error.
Nemo putet sibi me addictum. Mihi flectere mentem
Sola solet ratio, ratio dux fida sophorum est:
Hanc scrutator amet veri, inprimisque sequatur.

Whatever Aristotle or anyone else says, I care nothing for their pronouncements, since they often miss the truth. It often happens that serious and great men, worthy of fame, err and fall; authors of great renown are wont to draw many minds with them into darkness when they nod. To the extent that models prevail, so far may error be imitated. Let no one think me his slave. Reason alone rules my mind, reason the faithful guide of the wise: let the seeker of truth love her and follow her first.

(VIII.129-38)

This independent attitude toward authority is characteristic of Palingenius. For instance, unlike many Renaissance poets, Palingenius denies that the spheres are guided by
sirens or muses (XI.504-83), or that they make music as they turn (XI.372-407). In this he silently contradicts Plato (Republic X.617). Giuseppe Saitta considers this independence the most important feature of the ZV and sees Palingenius’ battle against various authorities as the struggle of the Renaissance down the long road to freedom, freedom from popes, tyrants, philosophers and others.

Vergil’s influence on the ZV is evident. Ludwig’s suggestion of the structural indebtedness of ZV VI to Aeneid VI has already been mentioned. In IX.511 Palingenius says the negroes at the equator are “nuda, aut simae corio male tecta capellae” (”naked or ill-covered with the hide of the snub-nosed nanny goat”). This may be indebted to Vergil’s Eclogue X.7: “tenera attendent simae virgulta capellae.” The following lines from Vergil’s Georgics closely connect with several passages in Book I of the ZV:

\[
\text{temptanda via est, qua me quoque possim} \\
\text{Tollere humo victorque virum volitare per ora.} \\
\text{Primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit,} \\
\text{Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas.}
\]

I must essay a path whereby I, too, may rise from earth and fly victorious on the lips of men. I first, if life but remain, will return to my country, bringing the Muses with me in triumph from the Aonian peak.

\begin{quote}
(Georgics III.8-11)
\end{quote}

trans. Fairclough

Palingenius asks Apollo to raise him from earth, using “Tollere humo” to begin a line, just as Vergil does: “Sis igitur mihi, quaeo, faves Latoe, tuumque / Tollere humo,
nisi fata vetent, dignare clientem" ("May you be then, I pray, helpful to me, Apollo, and deign to raise your disciple from the earth, unless the fates forbid" [I.21-22]). He then makes a similar address to Ercole:

Adsis, et placido vultu dignare poetam
Adspicere, insolitas intentatasque volentem
Ire vias, vatum quas non ulla orbita signat
Hactenus, et timido optatum largire favorem.

Draw near and deign to look favorably on your poet who wishes to follow unaccustomed and untried paths which until now have been marked by no poets, and lavish your hoped for favor on me who am timid.

(I.41-44)

The "intentatas . . . vias" again echoes Vergil, and Palingenius uses the image a few lines further on ("latentes / Naturae tentabo vias atque abdita pandam" I.66-67). Gustave Reynier suggests that these passages are influenced by Lucretius, but no passage in Lucretius using any form of "via" or "temptare" is so close to the above lines from the _ZV_ as the passage quoted from _Georgics_ III. The metaphor of seeking out truth in dark, hidden places Palingenius may have found in Lucretius:

Namque canes ut montivagae persaepe ferai
Naribus inveniunt intectas fronde quietes,
Cum semel institerunt vestigia certa viai,
Sic alid ex alio per te tute ipse videre
Talibus in rebus poteris caecasque latebras
Insinuare omnis et verum protrahere inde.

For as dogs often find by scent shrouded under leafage the lair of a wild beast that ranges the mountains, when once they are set on sure traces of the track, so for yourself you will be able in such themes as this to see
one thing after another, to win your way to all the
secret places and draw out the truth thence.
(D.R.N.I.404-09)
trans. Bailey

There are other aspects of the ZV which show Lucretius'
influence. Palingenius could have found the blindness
metaphor of which he is so fond (e.g., XII.558) in the above
passage and in Lucretius' address to the mob:

O miseris hominum mentis, o pectora caeca!
Qualibus in tenebris vitae quantisque periclis
Degitur hoc aevi quodcumquest!

Ah! miserable minds of men, blind hearts! in what
darkness of life, in what great dangers ye spend this
little span of years!

(D.R.N. II.14-16)
trans. Bailey

This metaphor Palingenius may also have encountered in
Catullus 64.207 ("caeca mentem caligine").

Reynier also points out parallels between Palingenius'
meditation on death (VI.903 ff.) and D.R.N. III.944 ff., and
between Epicurus' speech (ZV II.52 ff., 125 ff.) and D.R.N.
III.842 ff. In fact, Reynier suggests that Palingenius
cannot decide which of the two poets, Vergil or Lucretius,
should be his model: "Quem praecipue poetam ad imitandum
elegerit Palingenius, ambiguum est. Nunc Vergilio sese
addit. . . . Nunc Lucretium in exemplum assumit."42 ("Which
poet chiefly Palingenius chose especially to imitate is not
clear. Now he follows Vergil. . . . Now he takes Lucretius
for his example"). Borgiani denies out of hand Lucretius'
influence on Palingenius and suggests that scarcely one hundred lines in the ZV are clearly derived from other writers. But his position, especially regarding Lucretius, is difficult to accept for reasons which will be pointed out when considering Palingenius' style. The lightning which makes the guilty man tremble, fearing the wrath of the gods (ZV I.97-104) may well be indebted to the famous passage in D.R.N. V.1218-25. Adele Nosei details a number of parallels between Palingenius and Lucretius, mostly drawn from ZV III, VI, and VII. She quotes a poem "Ad Lectorem" by Thomas Scauranus, prefixed to the first edition of the ZV, which specifically compares Palingenius with Lucretius.

Ausonios inter vates Lucretius unus
Scrutator veri sedulus ipse fuit,
Abdita naturae cupiens irrumpere clausta
Et superos acie mentis adire deos:
Saepe tamen recto deflectit tramite et errat
Deceptus dictis, o Epicure, tuis.
At nunc Marcellus meliori numine ductus
Vera magis, nec non utiliora canit,
De dis deque anima ostendit quid credere sit fas,
Dum sequitur nostrae religionis iter.

Lucretius alone among the Roman poets was a diligent follower of truth, desiring to break the hidden barricades of nature and to approach the high gods by the keenness of his mind. But often, nevertheless, he turns aside from the right path and errs, deceived by your doctrines, O Epicurus. But now Marcellus, led by a better spirit, sings true things and, besides, more useful things. Of the gods and the soul he shows what ought to be believed, while he follows the path of our religion.
Nosei objects to Palingenius' use of phrases or comparisons from Lucretius to prove points very different from those for which Lucretius used them. But this seems to me precisely Palingenius' intent if, as Scauranus suggested, he set out to correct Lucretius.

Palingenius quotes Ovid's *Amores* I.xv.39 verbatim in the dedication to Ercole ("Pascitur in vivis livor; post fata quiescit"), and his description of the poppies lining the banks of silent Lethe (VI.52-55) may be indebted to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* XI.602-07. One of Palingenius' favorite stylistic devices is the catalogue. Perhaps his most outstanding are those of the trees and flowers in the Garden of Pleasure (III.252-76), for which Ovid's *Metamorphoses* X.90-105 may have been the model. Palingenius makes catalogues not only of nouns, but of verbs and adjectives as well, though none of the other catalogues approaches the length of the list of forty-two trees. For instance, Book IX has eight catalogues: lines 46-7, eleven nouns; 298, five nouns; 411, six nouns; 700-02, nine nouns; 730-31, six adjectives; 736, five imperative verbs; 740-41, five verbs; 846-48, eleven nouns. Keller suggests that in his fondness for catalogues Palingenius anticipates his successors, the baroque poets.

Sometimes several classical authors may have served Palingenius as sources for one passage. Book II is divided into two nearly equal parts, the first devoted to Epicurus'
argument for pleasure and the second to Arete's refutation. Epicurus delivers his views under an oak, and Arete hers under a laurel. There are two **loci classici** which may have been behind his selection of these particular trees: Vergil's *Eclogue* VII.1 and Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae* II.109. The latter seems especially appropriate: "Ilex plena favis, venturi praescia laurus" ("The oak is full of honey, the laurel of knowledge of the future"). The settings of the two contrasting speeches also suggest Plato's *Phaedrus*.

Other classical sources to which Palingenius may be indebted are Statius' *Thebaid* IX.415 ff. and XII.809 for the boat metaphor with which *ZV* II opens and closes, and Seneca's *Ad Marciam de Consolatione* XXI.1 for the comparison of life to a sojourn at an inn (*ZV* VI.912-19). A classical scholar may discern other borrowings or analogues.

**Style**

The *ZV* has many satirical passages, but the poem as a whole is more didactic than satirical. The satiric passages always reinforce Palingenius' moral message for an upright life. Scaliger thought satire was the hallmark of the poem: "Palingenii poema totum Satyra est: sed sobria, non insana, non foeda" ("Palingenius' poem is a satire throughout, sober, not excessive nor disgusting.")
Palingenius uses a number of personae or narrative voices. The situation is not as simple as Tuve suggests when she remarks that the ZV "is set in a 'vision' framework, with various guiding spirits to explain and to instruct the author," for only four books (III, IV, VI, IX) have extended allegories in which personifications speak. Tuve's remark does, however, raise a significant point. The didactic message throughout the poem is consistent, and there are a number of speakers of that message. In books I, II, V, VII, VIII, XI, and XII the expounder of that message is the poet, i.e., the unnamed persona who is the subject of the first person verbs. In books III, IV, VI, IX, however, the didactic message is delivered by Arete, Timalphes, Calliope and Timalphes respectively. (Book X is a special case with its variety of speakers: Mercury, Pluto, the poet, Apollo, the hermit, Sarracilus, and Remisses.) There is nothing to distinguish Arete, Timalphes, Calliope or the hermit from each other or from the poet in books I, II, V, VII, VIII, XI, and XII. That is, when the poet gives the moral message he is as self-assured as are these other speakers. But in those books in which the poet does not deliver the didactic message he appears as a confused, usually depressed, seeker. And while Palingenius may begin a book with dramatic allegory, e.g., Book III with its journey to the Garden of Pleasure or Book VI with the descent to the underworld, the dialogue form breaks down and
is abandoned in the last parts of those books, as Arete or Calliope hammer away at their edifying lessons. Borgiani distinguishes between the poetic and philosophic portions of the poem: in the poetic portions Palingenius writes emotionally, and in the others from his head. While this formulation is too rigid, it is true that the two kinds of writing, the poetic (or allegorical or dramatic) and the moral, are not always adequately linked.

The allegorical machinery itself is handled with varying degrees of consistency and vividness. For instance, in Book IX the poet goes to the moon and sees a huge crowd of people. Timalphes tells him they are paying their respects to one Menarchus and relates Menarchus' history. Palingenius apparently invented this myth, for it is not classical, but its purpose is not clear. Timalphes then takes the poet to the Citadel of Judgment, where souls are judged by three sons of Jove and Doxa—Telescopus, Dorophonus, and Philorthus—but these figures remain vague abstractions. The poet next asks why men pursue evil, and Timalphes tells him that they do so because of the nature of the body or because of evil spirits. As to the first, the body is a prison and obscures the soul. This leads to "veri atque boni ignorantia"; "ignorantia" leads to "iudicium falsum," "iudicium falsum" to "Stultitia" and "Scelus." We are told that these last two are great kings with hosts of followers, but again the abstractions are not described
These "kings" drag men down to one of the three lakes of hell: the muddy for the lustful, the stinging for the avaricious, or the smoky for the proud (IX.275 ff.). Such are the tendencies to evil for which the body is responsible; there are in addition hosts of demons, which the mob does not believe in because it cannot see them, but which are nonetheless real.

In contrast to kings Stultitia and Scelus, the poet describes the four kings of evil spirits which he sees next with a multitude of vivid, precise details. The description of Typhurgus is so detailed that one is tempted to believe Palingenius worked from a picture or from an emblem book: Typhurgus is black and has horns, wide nose, white teeth, bat's wings, duck's feet, and lion's tail. (Roellenbleck objects to so much detail here, saying that it throws this passage out of balance with the rest of the book.)

Typhurgus drags men down to the smoky lake, Aplestus drags them to the stinging lake, and Philocreus drags them to the muddy lake. Since there are only three lakes in hell, there is no lake for the fourth king, Miastor, to take men to, and the relationship between these four kings and the two kings introduced earlier, Stultitia and Scelus, which were supposed to arise from the nature of the body, is not spelled out. The allegory is thus not very well worked out.

Scaliger praises Palingenius' "dictio pura" ("pure diction"). It is true that his vocabulary is mostly
classical, though he is not a strict Ciceronian (e.g., he uses "ens" and "Satan"). Palingenius' arguments are often repetitive and tedious, and he could have edited the poem without loss, as Scaliger observed: "multa millia versuum auferri posse ex hisce libris" ("many thousands of verses could be deleted from these books"). Croce praises Palingenius' "limpido e fluidissimo latino" and admires the figures and allegory, "Ma la piu gran parte e meramente didascalica . . . prosa in verso."

Borgiani says that Palingenius' syntax is Italian rather than Latin and notes that he has a number of spondaic lines and lines ending in a monosyllable. He uses archaic forms, especially -ai for the genitive singular of second declension nouns and -ier for the present passive infinitive, and many Greek words. Contrary to Borgiani's denial of Lucretius' influence on the ZV, Palingenius undoubtedly learned the use of spondees, terminal monosyllables, and archaic forms from Lucretius. Palingenius regularly uses Greek nouns for his most important personifications (e.g., Sarcotheus, Arete, Timalphes), though he gives minor figures Latin names (e.g., Stultitia). In using Greek for personifications he conforms to the usage of a number of Italian poets, including Ariosto. To indicate Palingenius' departure from "classico latine," Borgiani lists some of the Greek common nouns in the ZV: "callipareus," "doxa," "lampsiris," "aelurus,"
"cerdo," "dipsas," "philautia," "sophia." Only the first three, however, were not used by classical Latin writers. In the light of this, Scaliger's judgment of "dictio pura" still seems valid.

Palingenius is not much given to humor; Borgiani sees humor in three passages:

Non puer huic Bacchus pater est, ut Graecia fingit:
(Non etenim, si sic, abstemius ullus amaret).

Bacchus is not the father of this boy [Cupid] as Greece pretends; if he were, no teetotaler would ever love.
(IV.349-50)

sed claudere oportet
Iam librum; sat cauda meo prolixa Leoni est.

But the book should end now; my Leo's tail is long enough.
(V.911-12)

... bruchiphagusque
Iudaeus credit, praeputia nostra perosus:
Quae Deus haud faceret, si non facienda putaret.

The locust-eating Jew believes [sc. that the soul is immortal], filled with hatred for our foreskins, which God would not have made if He had not thought they should be made.
(VII.906-08)

But only the second of these seems even mildly humorous.
There is, however, one passage in which Palingenius pokes fun at himself. In Book VI Calliope has just begun to warm to her subject when she promises a discourse on riches (207-09). The poet interrupts her and says that Minerva told him all about riches some time ago, so could she please skip that topic? For that matter, he adds, Arete and Timalphes
spoke copiously on pleasure, so maybe she would not speak on that either; anything else would be fine. Calliope resumes (line 216) with a speech on nobility as if nothing had happened.

Palingenius does like various types of word play. Several outstanding examples are the following:

Insani fugiunt mundum, immundumque sequuntur.
Madmen flee purity and follow impurity. (IV.291)

Namque a turbando nomen sibi turba recepit.
For from its turbulence the mob takes its name. (IV.745)

Si tibi sit pellex, tibi erit non tuta supellex.
If you take a whore, your mattress will not be safe. (V.537)

Quot bellua morsu
Exanimat? mulusve malus, vel non equus aequus,
Dum furit atque ferit ferratis calcibus?
How many beasts kill with a bite? Does the evil mule or the friendly horse when it rages and strikes with its ironshod feet?

(VI.785-87)

Dum moror, et miror latos laetosque sagaci
Mente locos . . .
While I wait, I also wonder with a wise mind at the wide and blessed spaces . . .

(IX.27-28)

The most attractive quality of the poem for Elizabethan schoolmasters must have been Palingenius' ability to write pithy sententiae:
At times diffuse, he offered alternative expressions, yet he rarely dismisses any topic under discussion without a concise epigrammatic line, dear to an age which delighted in adages and proverbs.

Some examples of his sententiae are the following:

Index est animi sermo.
Speech is the measure of the mind.
(I.194)

Esto bonus saltem, si non potes esse peritus.
Let him be good if he cannot be clever.
(II.365)

Verbaque foemineae vires sunt, facta virorum.
Words are the strength of women, deeds of men.
(IV.804)

Vera etenim virtus fortunae cedere nescit.
True virtue does not know how to yield to fortune.
(X.162)

Arma amens amat.
The madman loves arms.
(X.280)

Egregius medicus mendicus non erit unquam.
The outstanding doctor will never be a beggar.
(X.354)

Felix in terris sapiens, et in aethere felix.
The wise man is blessed on earth and will be blessed in heaven.
(X.401)

Sed qui sero sapit, frustra sapit.
He who learns late learns in vain.
(X.447)
Non annosa uno quercus deciditur ictu,
Non stilla una cavat marmor, neque protinus uno est
Condita Roma die.

The aged oak is not felled with a single blow nor marble
worn with a single drop of water, nor was Rome built in
a single day.

(XII.459-61)

Palingenius cannot, of course, be credited with having
discovered these thoughts but only with expressing them
felicitously. For instance, there were numerous forms of
the last proverb in Medieval Latin, e.g., "Roma die una non
tota edificata." His ability to write pithy *sententiae*
fits his didactic purpose admirably. Palingenius is
important not because he was an original thinker but because
he was a transmitter of metaphysical and moral thoughts
from a variety of sources to an age eager for such
digests. He was, first and last, didactic.
Barnabe Googe (1540-1594) translated the ZV into English verse, the first three books appearing in 1560, the first six in 1561, and all twelve in 1565. A revised edition with extensive marginal glosses came out in 1576, and this was reprinted in 1588. Rosemond Tuve prepared a facsimile reprint of the 1576 edition with introduction (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1947, reprinted 1975). Googe also published a volume of original verse and made several other translations.

The question of the quality of Googe's translation requires reconsideration. His contemporaries praised his work, though only in general terms. (Their remarks will be presented in Chapter 4.) In The History of English Poetry (1774-81) Thomas Warton wrote:

Googe seems chiefly to have excelled in rendering the descriptive and flowery passages of this moral Zodiac. . . . It must be confessed, that there is a perspicuity and a freedom in Googe's versification. But this meter of Sternhold and Hopkins impoverished three parts of the poetry of queen Elisabeth's reign.
To illustrate Googe's better work Warton quoted part of the description of spring (opening of Book III) and the description of the first demon king (Book IX). The latter passage will be examined below.

C. S. Lewis does not think much of the ZV nor of Googe's translation: "The original, a diffuse and tedious satirical-moral diatribe in hexameters, lost little in Googe's fourteeners. Perhaps it gained." Rosemond Tuve is sympathetic toward Googe and a bit defensive of him in her introduction to the facsimile reprint. She admits that his marginal glosses show "a certain youthful pedantry" and that he used "a metre which many have vilified"; she praises his "energy of mind" and "indefatigability" for finishing such a long project.

But if one is willing to match Googe's own indefatigability, by careful rather than unsympathetic reading, one comes through to the end of the twelve books of the Zodiake with considerable respect for its translator.

Tuve's assessment of Googe's translation contains the following points among others:

His translation is spare; minute compressions of phrase will mount gradually to a saving of a hundred lines in a book. He does not force the opinions of his original by sly choices in the coloring of phrases. He wrenches syntax, he uses rhyme-fillers (though in this he is no egregious sinner). . . . The trenchant irony which is the most powerful instrument used by Palingenius was not the natural tone of his translator. Googe's qualities are not those of subtlety, nice discrimination, or mature mastery of covered or modulated tones. . . . Except perhaps in the very earliest part of the book, he
takes care not to miss opportunities for particularity, and slight differences from his original frequently take that direction.

Brooke Peirce accepts without comment Tuve’s judgments. Sheidley praises “Googe’s faithful translation” as his “most significant accomplishment” and suggests that Googe did not intend his work to be a schoolboy’s trot, as did, for instance, Abraham Fleming (a friend of Googe’s), in whose 1589 translation of Vergil’s Bucolics and Georgics the English lines are unrhymed, printed side by side with the Latin, and all words not corresponding with the Latin are bracketed. Fleming said his work was “for the releefe of weake Grammatists, not . . . [for] courtly Humanists.” Googe, presumably, did write for the humanists, i.e., he aimed at producing a literary translation.

Sheidley repeats Tuve’s judgment regarding Googe’s adding “concretion and particularity” to Palingenius, though he adduces only two illustrative examples, and asserts that Googe is least successful in rendering Palingenius’s logical disputations and practical counsel, which often tend toward repetition and banality. When the matter is satiric invective or vigorous action, however, Googe’s fourteeners come to life with urgent, thumping rhythms or sneering tones of disdain.

In other words Sheidley sees Googe failing where Palingenius failed and succeeding where Palingenius succeeded. Unlike Tuve, Sheidley considers Googe a competent satirist.
None of these critics has adequately illustrated these assertions. (Tuve's examination of Googe's poetical practice in the *Zodiake*, the most thorough, is inadequate.) Therefore we should compare closely some passages in Googe's translation with the Latin in order to get a clear understanding of Googe's habits. Tuve's and Sheidley's assessments, I shall show, are misleading. Tuve may have had in mind generalizations about Elizabethan translators such as those of F. O. Matthiessen:

His diction [that of the Elizabethan translator in general] was racy and vivid, thronged with proverbial phrases, the slang of the streets, bold compounds, robust Saxon epithets, and metaphors drawn from English ports and countryside. . . . [He enjoyed] fullness of expression, the free use of doublets and alliteration, the building up of parallel constructions for the sake of rhythm. . . . Whenever possible he substituted a concrete image for an abstraction, a verb that carried the picture of an action for a general statement. . . . [Elizabethan] translations in verse . . . are, as a whole, distinctly inferior to those in prose.

Tuve's comments on the comparative lengths of the Latin and English versions imply that Googe has improved on the Latin, that he is more economical than his original. It is true that Googe's translation has 9103 lines versus 9937 in the Latin, a shortening of nearly 9%. There is, however, another explanation for Googe's reduction. J. P. Postgate did a number of translations from Latin verse into English verse:

In ordinary circumstances the carrying capacity of the English ten-syllabled verse is nearly the same as that
of the Latin hexameter. This is known to all who have turned English heroics into Latin. . . . An allowance of one-sixth should certainly give the translator of the hexameter as much room as he needs.

The "carrying capacity" of the Latin hexameter, then, would easily account for the overall "compression" of 9% into English fourteeners: the fourteen-syllabled English line simply contains more information than the Latin hexameter. The two books which Googe shortened the most are VII (13.6%) and XI (11.6%). Examination of two very different passages from these books, an argument for the existence of angels in VII and an exposition of the rising and setting of the signs of the zodiac in XI, should allow us to make a fair judgment regarding Googe's poetic practices. In addition, examination of the description of the demon king in IX (which Warton considered some of Googe's best poetry) should give us a balanced idea of Googe's range as a poet.

Passage 1 is 29 lines in the ZV and 23 1/2 lines in Googe:

Quid demum ratio dictat? viventia multa (295)
Esse quidem, nostros fugiant quae tenuia sensus.
Nam nisi fecisset meliora et nobiliora,
Quam mortale genus, fabricator maximus ille,
Nempe videretur non magno dignus honore,
Nempe imperfectum imperium atque ignobile haberet.(300)
Infra etenim naturam hominis, pecudesque feraeque
Existunt, viles omnes ac mente carentes,
Et miserae, et ventri tantum somnoque vacantes.
Quod si nullum animal melius natura creasset,
Quidnam aliud foret hic mundus, quam turpe ferarum(305)
Ac pecudum stabulum, spinisque fimoque refertum?
Quidnam aliud foret ipse Deus, quam pastor herusque
Multorumque gregum, multorumque armentorum?
Atqui hominem fecit: nimirum maxima laus haec;
Nimirum satis hoc. Ohe, fieri melius nil
Debuit aut potuit? iamiam perfectior orbis
Esse nequit? fuit haec Iovis infinita potestas?
Sed videamus, utrum sit fas, hoc credere. Non est,
Non est hoc, inquam, fas credere, nec ratio vult.
Nam quid homo est? animal certe stultum atque
malignum,
Praeque aliis miserum, si se cognoscat ad unguem.
Quis non sponte malus? Vitiorum lubrica et ampla
Est via, qua properant omnes, ul troque feruntur;
Nec prohibere val ent monitor, lex, poena, metusve:
Contra virtutis salebrosa, angusta, nimisque
Ardua, qua pauci tendunt, iidemque coacti.
Quis sapit? an mulier? numquid puer? aut cerdonum
Tota cohors? Eheu stultorum maxima turba est.
(VII. 295-323)

But what doth Reason byd me write, that many creatures framed
Aliue there are that we can not by senses understand:
For if that God should not haue made, wyth hye and glorious hand,
More noble creatures than the state of fading mortall kinde:
He had not then deserued such prayse, as is to him assignde,
Unperfect eke had bene his reigne: for underneth the kinde
Of Man, the wilde and sauage Beastes consist of brutish minde,
To sleepe and foode, addicted all. And if he had not framed
No better things than here we see, the worlde might well be named,
A folde of filthy feeding flocks, with thornes and donge set out.
What should we then this God account, a mighty heardman stoute?
But he created man besides, now sure a goodly thing:
Was this his best? is this the power of that Almighty king?
But let vs trye if thys be true, if we may credite giue:
It is not good nor reason will, that we shall this beleue.
For what is Man? a foolish beast, a creature full of spight,
And wretched farre aboue the rest if we shall judge vpright.
Who is not of his nature nought? the way to vice is wide,
Wherin the feete of mortal men continually doth slyde:
No Warning, Lawe, no Payne, nor Feare can cause them for to stay.
Againe, the path of vertue is a straight and painfull way,
Wherin but fewe doe vse to walke, and them you must constraine.
Who is wyse? the woman? or the childe? or all the Common traine?
The most (alas) are foolish doltes.

(Googe p. 114)

In the following notes, the formulae "4:3 1/2" and so on mean four lines of Latin are represented by 3 1/2 lines in English. The periods are numbered according to the Latin, and Googe's significant changes are given after the corresponding Latin word or phrase.

295-96 1st period 1:1 "viventia"--"framed / Aliue" (redundant), "tenuia" (not trans.)

297-300 2nd period 4:3 1/2 "fabricator maximus ille"--
"God" (loss of epithet), "wyth hye and glorious hand" (addition), "meliora et nobiliora"--"More noble" (single noun for doublet), "imperfectum . . . atque ignobile"--"Unperfect" (single adj. for doublet)

301-03 3rd period 3:2 "viles omnes ac mente carentes, /
Et miseræ"--"of brutish minde" (change of meaning)

304-06 4th period 3:2 1/2 "natura"--"he" (changed subj.), "animal melius"--"better things"
(less particular), "ferarum" (omitted for allit.), rhetorical question--statement

307-08 5th period  2:1 "herusque / Multorumque gregum, multorumque armentorum" (omitted--less redundant?)

309-10 6th period  1 l/2:1 "nimirum maxima laus haec; / Nimirum satis hoc"--"now sure a goodly thing" (compression)

310-11 7th period  1:l/2 "Ohe, fieri melius nil / Debuit aut potuit?"--"Was this his best?"
    (Elimination of distinction of "debuit" and "potuit")

311-12 8th period  1:0 "iamiam perfectior orbis / Esse nequit?" (omitted)

312 9th period  1/2:1/2 "fuit haec Iovis infinita potestas?"--"is this the power of that Almighty king?" (pagan "Iovis" omitted)

313-14 10th & 11th periods  2:2 "Non est, / Non est hoc"
    (Latin repetitive but G. does not improve)

315-16 12th & 13th periods  2:2 "animal"--"beast, a creature" (2 nouns for 1)

317 14th period  1/2:1/2

317-21 15th period  4 l/2:4 1/2 "omnes"--"feete of mortal men" (more particular?), "lubrica,"
    "properant," and "feruntur"--"slyde" (1 word for 3--less detail)
Googe does reduce his material here somewhat, but departures from his original in the above passage are nearly always simply omissions rather than contractions. In some cases it can be argued that he has eliminated redundancy by translating only one of a pair of words, e.g., l. 297. But in other cases he eliminates helpful distinctions, making arguments less rather than more "particular" as Tuve claims. In ll. 310-11 he has "Was this his best?" where Palingenius is more dramatic, more anguished: "Oh, couldn't He or wouldn't He make anything better?" Googe's rendering of the description of the road to vice (317-18) does not have the force of the Latin because he translates two verbs and an adjective with the one verb "slyde." The Latin is more particular, its sense closer to the following: "Slippery and broad is the way of evil, by which all hasten and are borne away." There are a couple of passages here which show Googe's fondness for alliteration, sometimes at the expense of intelligibility: "A folde of filthy feeding flocks" is not bad, but the meaning of "Who is not of his nature nought?" will likely escape the reader who does not have the Latin before him ("Quis non sponte malus?"). In both cases Googe had to change the meaning slightly, but that in the latter is more serious: in the Latin man is bad
by his own will, whereas in Googe man sins because of his nature. Admittedly man's sinful nature may give him a perverse will, but Googe's phrase does not indicate man's free will as Palingenius' does.

Passage 2, another example of Googe's shortening, is 29 lines in the ZV and 18 in Googe.

Occasus nunc signorum dicamus et ortus:
Signorum est ortus triplex, occasus eorum
Est etiam triplex. Namque ortus cosmi cus atque (230)
Occasus fertur, quum tempore matutino
Sole oriente, aliquod signum quoque surgit Eoa De regione simul, vel quum mane occidit undis. Dicitur at chronicus, quotas surgitve caditve
Signum aliquod, quum primum alto se surgite (235)
condens

Iam patitur stellas alias splendescere Titan.
Heliacus vero est ortus, quum sole propinquho
Iam pridem occultum signum, postquam ille recessit, Ingrediens aliu, posse incipit orbe videri.
Occasus contra Heliacus tunc dicitur esse, (240)
Quando aliquod signum, per quod tunc ingreditur Sol, Obtenebrat splendore suo, prohibetque videri.
Nunc quo quaeque modo exoriantur signa, cadantque, Versibus expediam: tribuant modo carmina nobis Pegasides, vatemque suum non spernat Apollo. (245)
Quando Aries oritur, consurgit pars quoque laeva Andromedae, Perseique caput, media tenus alvo.
Opposita tunc parte poli pars occidit Arae: Averso Taurus per caelum corpore fertur:
Ipso ascendente, ascendit totus quoque Perseus: (250)
Heniochi consurgit item pars maxima, necnon Pristis cauda, etiam penitus tunc occidit Ara.
Ipse autem Arctophylax tunc primum absconditur undis, Cum Geminis totus Cetus, partesque priores Eridani surgunt, cunque his armatus Orion. (255)
Anguittenens utrumque pedem tunc aequore mergit.

The rising and the setting of the Signes let vs display. Three sortes of wayes the starres do rise, three sortes they fall away, That rising called Cosmi ke is, the setting termde likewise, When early in the Easte the signe, with Sunne is knowne to rise:
But when soeuer any signe doth rise, or downeward fall,  
And Sunne in setting, lets them shine, this terme we  
Cronicall:  
And Heliake is the rising namde, when as the Sunne full  
nere  
The signe lies hid, and passing thence, forthwith doth  
bright appere:  
The Heliake setting that we cal when as in any signe  
The Sunne doth walke, and with his light permit it not  
to shine.  
But now the rising of the Signes, and how they downe  
descend  
I will declare, if Muses ayde and Phoebus be my frend.  
When Ram doth rise then mounteth up left part of  
Andromead  
Unto the halfe, ioyned therwith Sir Perseus flaming  
head:  
Then backward commes the Bull aloft, who while he vpward  
hyes,  
All Perseus springs, and greatest part of Carter then  
doth rise,  
And Thurlpoles tayle, and fading quite the Altar downe  
dothe fall:  
Then hydes himself in flashing floudes, the Berward  
first of all.  

(Googe p. 209)

228 1st period 1:1
229-30 2nd " 1 1/2:1
230-33 3rd " 3 1/2:2 "vel quum mane occidit undis"  
(omitted)
234-36 4th period 3:2
237-39 5th " 3:2
240-42 6th " 3:2
243-45 7th " 3:2
246-47 8th " 2:2
248-52 9th " 5:3 (1. 248 omitted entirely)
Except for omitting 1 1/2 lines and adding an alliterating adjective, here Googe stays very close to the Latin, conveying all the technical information in Palingenius' description. These passages make it clear that Googe's fourteen-syllabled line simply carries more information than Palingenius' hexameters, and this, rather than any greater terseness, accounts for the number of lines Googe “saves” in his translation.

Passage 3, a test case for the quality of Googe's poetry, is 22 lines in the ZV and 18 1/2 lines in Googe. This was one of the two passages Warton singled out as among Googe's best:

Pandite nunc vestros fontes, vestra antra, sorores, Quae iuga lauriferi Parnassi excelsa tenetis, Et mihi (namque opus est) date centum in carmina linguas, Ut possim æreos reges populosque referre, Ludificatores hominum, scelerumque magistros, Qui assidue vexant mortalía cuncta, suisque Artibus humanas tradunt in tartara mentes. Hic, ubi puniceo coniux Tithonia curru Oceano emergit primum, primumque nitescit, Nocturnas abigens rubicunda luce tenebras, Ingentem vidi regem, ingentique sedentem In solio, crines flammani stemmate cinctum. Pectus et os illi turgens, oculique micantes, Alta supercilía, erectus, similisque minanti Vultus erat, latae nares, duo cornua lata, Ipse niger totus: quando nigra corpora pravis Daemonibus natura dedit, turpesque figuras.
Dens tamen albus erat, sannae albae utrinque patentes,
Alae humeris magnae, quales vespertilionum,
Membranis contextae amplis, pes amplus uterque,
Sed qualem fluvialis anas, qualemve sonorus (350)
Anser habere solet: referebat cauda leonem.
(IX.330-51)

Now open wide your springs, and plaine your caues abrode displaye,
You Sisters of Parnassus hill, beset about with baye,
And vnto me (for neede it is) a hundred tongues in verse
Sende out, that I these Aierie Kings, and people may rehearse,
Deceiuers great of men, and guides of vice, which all that liue [5]
Did stil molest: and by their craft mans soule to hell do giue.
Here first whereas in chariot red Aurora fayre doth ryse,
And bright from out the Ocean seas, appeares to mortal eyes,
And chaseth hence the hellish night, with blushing beauty fayre,
A mighty King I might discerne, plaste hie in lofty chaire, [10]
His haire with fierie garland deckt, puft vp in fiendishe wise,
With browes full broade, and threatning loke, and fierie flaming eyes.
Two monstrous hornes and large he had, and nostrils wide in sight,
Al black himself, for bodies black to euerie euell spright
And uggly shape, hath nature dealt, yet white his teeth did showe, [15]
And white his grenning tuskes stode out, large wings on him did grove
Framde like the wings of Flindermice, his feete of largest sise,
In fashion as the wilde Duck beares, or Goose that creaking cries,
His taile such one as Lions haue.
(Googe p. 165)

In the first six lines Googe is very literal. Beginning in line [7] he is a bit freer, not translating the epithet for the dawn as "Tithonian spouse" but simply as "Aurora" with the added adjective "fayre." Googe regularly eliminates
epithets. "Chariot red" is a perfectly literal translation, although "red" does not carry the connotations of "royal purple" present in "puniceus." "Ocean seas" is another of Googe's redundant doublets; his addition, "to mortal eyes," in the same line may be a more concrete detail, but it could also be dismissed as a conventional tag employed as line filler. "Bright . . . appeares" in [8] is a colorless rendering of "nitescit" ("begins to glisten"). There is no reason (other than metrical) for "hellish night" in line [9] instead of a more literal "nocturnal shadows," a point to which Googe himself was sensitive, for he added this marginal gloss: "Hellish because it is darke." "Blushing beauty fayre" is a nice touch for "rubicunda luce," though Googe had already used "fayre" for Aurora earlier in the sentence. If neither Palingenius nor Googe has produced a poetic description of Aurora equal to, say, Tennyson's in "Tithonus," Googe has diluted whatever poetry the Latin did contain.

In line [10] the use of "might" after "mighty" is rather unfortunate. "Mighty" could have been repeated modifying "chaire" as "ingens" modifies both "regem" and "solio" in the Latin, but at any rate "hie in lofty chaire" is no more vivid than the Latin, which could be rendered "I saw a monstrous king seated on a monstrous throne." "Puft vp in fiendishe wise" in [11] is less specific than the Latin, which tells us his chest and mouth were puffed up. In line
Googe introduces another of his pairs of redundant alliterating adjectives, "fierie flaming," and omits "erectus." In line 13 Googe again has two adjectives ("monstrous" and "large") for one in the Latin, and again he ignores Palingenius' intentional repetition of words ("primum, primumque" [338], "Igentem . . . ingentique" [340], "latae . . . lata" [344]). "In sight" at the end of 13 is line filler. The meaning of the next two lines [14 and 15] is not as clear as it could be because Googe has partially followed the Latin word order: "for nature gave black bodies and base figures to depraved spirits" renders the idea more readily in English; separating "turpesque figuras" from "nigra corpora" does not cause the hesitation in Latin, with its free word order, that the corresponding separation causes in English. "Grenning tuskes" in [16] may be an improvement on the Latin, which says merely that "white grimaces were evident on either side." The next phrase, "large wings on him did growe," is less exact than the original, which specifies that they come from the shoulders. "Framde" ([17]) is less colorful than "Membranis contextae amplis" (349).

A characteristic of Googe's translation which Passage 3 makes clear is his use of a pair of synonyms for a single Latin word or phrase to fill out a line. Other examples, all from Book V, are indicative of his practice throughout the poem: 1. 4 "with sceptred hand and mace" for
"Sceptrigera . . . manu"; 1. 229 "they that cowles do weare and hoods" for "collegia tecta cucullis"; 1. 333 "The Grecian of a foolish head, and of a franticke brayne" for "Graeculus insani capitis"; 1. 656 "last and finall ende" for "ultima meta"; 1. 879 "Doth scale and clime" for "scandit"; 1. 881 "ascending always vp" for "in altum." In such instances the result is expansion rather than terseness. Though Tuve feels he was "no egregious sinner" with these rhyme or line fillers, one wonders what she would have considered "egregious."

Passage 3 has some awkward syntax, though nothing as difficult as many of Googe's lines, in which the meaning can often be difficult to tease out unless the reader has the Latin before him. In the following example one has to read Googe more than once to see that "represent" is a verb whose subject is "glasse":

Mutatosque gemes vultus, deformiaque ora,
Ipsum te quoties speculo referente videbis.
(IV.155-56)

Vaine hope, (Alas) of this thy face, then shalt thou
sore lament
Thy chaunged cheekes, and face so foule, thy selfe when represent
Thou shalt thy glasse perceiue.
(Googe p. 44)

In the next example one can read the English several times before realizing that "terme" is a verb dependent on "we":
Ergo quicquid erit, tribuat quod talia nobis, 
Utile dicetur. 

(IV.554-55)

Whatsoever then it be
Such like to us that gives, that terme may profitable
we.

(Goose p. 53)

In the following example it is impossible to tell if "best" modifies "seede" or "grounde," though in the Latin there is no possibility of mistake:

semina quamvis
Optima, si terrae fuerint mandata sinistris
Sideribus . . .

(VI.364-66)

If seede amyd the grounde
Though best be cast, and therto starres agreeing not be founde . . .

(Goose p. 92)

If, then, Passage 3 is a fair sample of Goose at his best, as Warton said, one is more inclined to accept Soellner's judgment that Goose's translation was "unattractive" rather than Tuve's plea for "considerable respect" for the translator. ¹⁴

Googe has some tendency to bowdlerize. In Book II Palingenius is giving advice similar to St. Paul's in I Corinthians 7.9 ("better to marry than to burn"): 

Si te delectant formosae membra puellae,
I, pete coniugium: vel non meretricula deerit.
Quid mavis demens cupere et sperare negata,
Pellere cum possis facili medicamine morbum?

(II.290-93)
If the pleasaunt portrature of maydes doe thee delight,
Go take a wife, thou nedest not lack a Dormouse for the night.
What, hadst thou rather foole to wysh, and hope for things denayde,
When as with easier medcine, thou maist haue thy griefe alayde?

(Googe p. 16)

If the limbs of a beautiful girl please you, go seek a wife; otherwise you will take a whore. Why, madman, do you hope and wish for forbidden things when you can cure the malady with a suitable medicine?

Palingenius suggests two alternatives for the passionate man: a wife or a whore. This contrast is carried through in the two final lines, in which "negata" (Googe's "things denayde") corresponds with "meretricula," "facili medicamine" refers to "coniugium," and "morbum" is the passion of the first line. In Googe's translation "Dormouse" is in apposition with "wife." In eliminating the antithesis in the second line, Googe eliminates the interlocking relationship of the four Latin lines outlined above, though of course the meaning of Googe's third and fourth lines is clear enough. If this passage is considered in isolation, one could argue that Palingenius is telling his reader to find relief with either wife or whore. But Palingenius' condemnation of lechery and praise of marriage and celibacy elsewhere make it unlikely that he intended here to indicate that the choice of wife or whore is a matter of indifference.
Another instance of bowdlerization is Googe's translation of IV.295-6 ("Nemo quidem caste consuevit vivere, salvis / Inguinibus"), from which he simply omits "salvis / Inguinibus"—"as long as their sexual organs are healthy." But the clearest case of bowdlerization is the following:

Hinc uxor pulchrum et generosum saepe maritum
Odit, et immundi penem calonis adorat,
Aut aliquem externum, quem vix bene noverit, ardet.
(IV.369-71)

By this the wife disdaines
Hir husbande faire of gentle bloud, and greater joy sustaines
A lither lousy loute to haue, or vnaquainted wight.
(Goose p. 49)

Hence the wife often hates her handsome and generous husband and adores the penis of a filthy slave or burns for some stranger whom she scarcely knows.

There are five other passages where Googe has bowdlerized his text. In some places, however, Googe, who is never totally consistent, does not shrink from being explicit, e.g., "Whorehunters vile, and Sodomites" (p.75) for "moechi, puerorum corruptores" (V.594), and though he leaves out some details of VI.945-52, he adds these sidenotes:

Googe shows some knowledge of Greek in the one emendation he offers. Among the three offspring of Jove and Doxa is Dorophonus (IX.159). Googe emends the name to Dorophorus and gives this justification in a sidenote:
"Dorophorus (as I take it, and not Dorophonus, as the Latine text hath it) that is: rewarding, or recompensing according to desart" (p. 160). Since Dorophonus means "Gift Killer," Googe's emendation is apt. Weise, editor of the 1832 edition used here, did not adopt this reading, nor do any of Palingenius' commentators mention it.

Googe's handling of references to the Deity must be attributed his desire not to propagate paganism. This has two aspects. As was pointed out in Chapter 2, Palingenius follows the practice of Renaissance Latinists by referring to the Christian God as "Deus" as well as "Juppiter" and "Tonans." Googe usually translates these simply as "God." More important is his handling of the many references to the angels or saints. Googe shows a marked tendency to translate "dii" as "God," i.e., to change the reference from angels or saints to the one God. But he does not always do so; e.g., in VI.45 he translates "diis" as "saintes," and in VI.560 he translates "dii" as "aungels." More typical is his translation "O God" for "pro superi" (VI.442) and "prayer is to God alone" for "propriumque deorum" (VI.551). While he usually changes references to deities from plural to singular, I find no instance in which he does the opposite, e.g., translating "gods" or "saints" for "Deus." Of course, oaths are a special case; the English equivalent of an imprecation like "pro superi" is "O God," as Googe renders it. That this was standard Elizabethan
practice is shown by Cooper's *Thesaurus* (London 1565). Under "deus" Cooper gives the following examples among many others: "Iuvantibus diis--Cicero--With gods helpe," and "Dii faciant--Cicero--God graunte: woulde to God."\(^{15}\)

In those cases, however, where Palingenius is not simply emphasizing a point with an oath but is talking about the existence of or means of communicating with angels or gods, it makes a difference if his words are translated in the singular or plural. One of the most important passages in the \_ZV\_ is the last definition of the *sumnum bonum* (the invocation of and communication with angels) in XII.329-535 (pp. 235-40 in Googe). Palingenius uses a number of words to refer to the angels ("dii," "superi," "numina," "caelicolae") and two ("daemones" and "manes") to refer to demons. In these 207 lines there are about seventy-six nouns, pronouns and verbs in the Latin which refer to the Deity or to angels. All but four of these are in the plural, and not even all the singular instances refer to the one Christian God. The four singular nouns and Googe's translation are as follows: 479 "cunctarumque patrem rerum"--"Prince of all the worlde"; 502 "quis Deus"--"some God"; 514 "divino numine"--"inspirde with holy sprite"; 527 "Deus efficietur et ipse"--"a God shall it created be."

Only the first of these four, "patrem," refers to the one Christian God. The other seventy-two references noted above are in the plural; Palingenius is not talking about
conversing with the one God, unless one infers that communication with the angels is a prerequisite to that. Googe often translates these as singular, and his practice can be summarized as follows (the formula "pl/pl" means plurals in Palingenius are retained by Googe, "pl/s" means he has changed a plural to singular): 330-50 pl/pl, 354-62 pl/s, 363/64 pl/pl, 367-73 pl/s, 374-77 pl/pl, 379-85 pl/s, 385 pl/p1, 391-98 pl/s, 408-18 pl/pl, 421 pl/s, 428 s/s, 440-55 pl/pl, 458 s/pl, 467-75 pl/pl, 478 s/s, 479 s/s, 483 pl/p1, 502 s/s, 506 pl/p1, 514 s/s, 516 pl/p1, 519 pl/s + pl, 527 pl/p1, s/s, 528-35 pl/p1. Some of these are special cases: 458 "divina luce" Googe renders "Gods," changing the metaphor; 478 "mundum archetypum" Googe translates "the maker great of skies," substituting a Christian concept for the Platonic one. Googe's handling of 519 is instructive of his attitude toward Palingenius' whole argument, for he translates "Posse hominem affari divos coram, atque videre" as "That men may come to speake with God, and them in presence see." Googe's idea seems to be that communication with God will bring communication with the lesser gods, or angels, which exist between man and God.

Out of these seventy-six cases, then, Googe has changed twenty-six to the singular. In addition he has added sidenotes which are not in the Latin text. All of these are singular. For instance, "daemonibus" (335) he translates "diuels" in the text, but his sidenote reads "the deuill is
soone intreated" (p 235). Similarly, all of the seven other sidenotes on this passage are in the singular, "God careth not . . . "; "God regardeth not . . . " and so on. One might argue that Googe is careless, as he appears to be in at least one instance:

Nec tales audire volunt, nisi se prius ipsi Mundarint, multis lacrymis peccata lavantes, Abstulerintque atras maculas candore reducto, Et veniam precibusque piis animique dolore Quaesierint, iterum virtutis calle reperto, Et veterem exuerint pellem, ceu tempore verno Antiquas solet exuvias deponere serpens. (XII.398-404)

Nor will he once their prayers heare, except they cleanse before, And washe away their sinnes with teares, and white for black restore: Requiring pardon for their faults, with voice of mourning minde, Obtaining once againe the pathes, of vertue for to finde, And casting of his canckred skinne. As in the pleasant spring, The Serpent vseth all his skinne, of olde away to fling. (Googe p. 237)

In the clause beginning "nisi se prius" (398) Palingenius uses four verbs to refer to sinful men who repent ("mundarint," "abstulerint," "quaesierint," "exuerint") and then compares them with a snake casting its slough (beginning "ceu" 403). Googe translates the first three of these verbs with plural pronouns and verbs; however, "veterem exuerint pellem" becomes "casting of his canckred skinne." The fact that "pellem" is singular, as is "serpens" to which these sinners are compared in the next
clause, undoubtedly caused Googe's anticipatory singular, and no especial significance can be attached to this particular switch.

In XII.329-535, then, Googe has often, though not consistently, blunted the Catholic impact of the poem by eliminating many of the exhortations to pray to the saints (or angels, depending on how one wishes to translate "dii," "caelicolae," and so forth) and recommending, in good Protestant fashion, that one pray to God Himself.

Googe's Protestant attitude towards Palingenius' theology and respect for pagan philosophers is revealed in other ways as well, especially in his sidenotes. In Book VI Palingenius says that we should not grieve at the thought of death and separation from loved ones because the soul is eternal and we will all be reunited after death:

Praecedam? at parvo post tempore nostra sequentur, Quum volet ipse Deus, vestigia, meque revisent; Si modo sunt aliquid manes, ut credere par est, Ut Christi praecepta docent, multique sophorum. (VI.899-902)

I go before, and what for this they all shall after goe When God appointed hath their time, and mee agayne shall see: If soules be ought as wee beleue as CHRIST declares they bee. (Googe p. 105)

Googe has eliminated "multique sophorum" ("many wise men") entirely, a reference to pagan philosophers whose teaching Palingenius has placed on a par with Christ's. (That Googe
understood "multique sophorum" to refer to pagan philosophers will be demonstrated below.)

In Book VII Palingenius, again discussing the immortality of the soul, cites his authorities:

Sic Plato, sic Samius voluit, sic sensit et ille Divinus vere Plotinus, sicque poetae Non pauci cecinere.

(VII.530-32)

So Plato, so Pythagoras, and so Plotinus thought, And so haue many Poets erst, in pleasaunt verses wrought.

(Goose p. 119)

Goose uses "Pythagoras" rather than "Samian" and omits Plotinus' epithet ("divinus").

In the two passages above, Goose's omissions are minor and mean little by themselves. When linked with other passages, however, his attitude towards pagan philosophy becomes clear. Book VI begins with a speech by Mors which terrifies the poet. Calliope then leads him out of hell and instructs him on various topics, ending with a discourse on death (814-933). She presents three theories about the afterlife: 1) Death is oblivion, eternal sleep. 2) The dead live in the underworld, in Elysium or Tartarus according to their desserts. 3) The good ascend to the stars, while the evil are reborn as beasts until they expiate their sins, after which they too ascend to the stars. Calliope goes on to say that she does not know which of these is correct; for that the poet will have to consult
her sister, Sophia. Later Calliope affirms that the soul is immortal and that we will be reunited with our loved ones "as the doctrines of Christ and many wise men teach" (VI.902), a view which is compatible with alternatives 2 and 3 as well as with a more narrowly Christian concept of heaven. Googe, however, wants the reader to be in no doubt that these are not proper alternatives, for in the margin next to alternative 2 he has added this sidenote: "The description of Hell according to the opinion of dreaming Dolts" (p. 104). Next to alternative 3 is this note: "The fond opinion of Pythagoras which savoureth of the musty leuen of Purgatory." Here Googe not only dismisses the concept of reincarnation but takes the opportunity to condemn Catholic doctrine, surely not Palingenius' intent here. Finally, Googe adds a note identifying Calliope's sister Sophia ("Wisdom") as "The holy Scripture."

Googe reveals his anti-Catholic position in other sidenotes. Book VIII.698 ("Si cupidus vendit caelum et Phlegethonta sacerdos") he renders "If Heauen and purging place Sir Iohn doth sell with greedy guile" and adds this note: "Sir Iohn selleth Heauen Hell and Purgatory for money" (p. 148). In both his translation and note he has introduced purgatory to make the passage apply only to the Catholic Church. In IX.749-58 Timalphes exhorts the poet to pray to the angels ("cives caeli, angelicasque cohortes / . . . sanctosque ministros"), for they can help one, they
can drive away danger, they can intercede for one with God. Googe leaves none of this out but adds a note: "This doctrine would be read, but not followed: for it is derogatorie to gods glory and maiestie" (p. 175). This helps explain his discomfort, discussed above, with the invocation of angels in Book XII.

The beginning of Book X is a stinging satire on the Church, spoken by Pluto, who complains that hell is overflowing with Christians, including priests and popes. Googe shows his relish in this attack with this sidenote: "A pleasant discourse touching the popishe clergie" (p. 183). But in other sidenotes Googe shows himself uncomfortable with Palingenius' point of view. For instance, regarding the allusion to Minerva in V.105, Googe makes this comment: "The Goddesse supposed of wysdome" (p. 64). And in X.280-81 Palingenius says "Arma amens amat; arma cupit, quicunque laborem / Odit iners et inops" ("To tosse the blades mad men do loue, and he desires to fight, / That poore and lazy laboures hates"). Googe adds this note: "He speakes not here of good Souldiers for where is more nobilitie then in the valiant souldiers brest: but of theues, Ruffians, and distresors" (p. 189). In his "Epistle dedicatorie" to the 1565 edition, Googe indicates his firm belief that Palingenius was a Protestant, but the changes examined above show that Palingenius needed help from Googe to be the thoroughgoing Protestant Googe wanted to present to England:
I could not (when I had long debated the matter with my selfe) finde out a Poet more meete for the teaching of a Christian life (an estate in these oure dayes most miserably decayed) than this no lesse learned than famous Italion: Marcellus Pallingenius, a man of such excellent learning and Godly life, that neither the vnquietnesse of his time (Italie in those dayes raging wyth most cruell and bloudy warres) ne yet the furious tyranny of the Antichristian Prelate (vnder whose ambicious and Tirannicall gouernaunce he continually liued) coulde once amase the Muse, or hinder the zealous and vertuous spirit of so Christian a Souldiour. I haue many times much mused wyth my selfe, howe (liuing in so daungerous a place) he durst take vpon him so boldly to controll the corrupte and vnchristian liues of the whole Colledge of contemptuous Cardinalles, the vngracious overseings of bloudthyrsty Bishops, the Panchplying practises of pelting Priours, the manifold madnesse of mischeuous Monkes, wyth the filthy fraternitie of flattering Friers.

In sum, contrary to Tuve's claim, Googe is no more "spare" than Palingenius. If he has omitted some redundancies he has compensated by introducing many of his own. He does not consistently eliminate or alter things he is uncomfortable with (e.g., sexual references and praying to the angels), though he often employs sidenotes to warn his reader about doctrines in the text he considers unsound. His distorted word order sometimes makes passages incomprehensible, and if he sometimes uses a concrete image for an abstraction in the original he as frequently does the reverse. Googe does show some tendency to introduce Elizabethan proverbs (he is so fond of the saw about flatterers who say "the crowe is white, or the swanne blacke" that he uses it three times in his translation), but he is not particularly good at the difficult task of adequately translating Palingenius' pithy
sententiae, one of the features of the poem which must have made it so popular. Of the items Matthiessen enumerates as being characteristic of Elizabethan translators, the most conspicuous in Googe is "the free use of doublets and alliteration."

Googe's was not an inspired translation, and it was not nearly as popular as the Latin version, to judge by the number of editions of each. The printing history of his translation during the Renaissance may be compared with that of the Latin version: three complete editions (1565, 1576, 1588) versus ten (1569, 1572, 1574, 1575, 1579, 1592, 1599, 1602, 1616, 1639). When one considers additionally the great number of Latin editions printed on the Continent, many of which must have found their way into England, it seems likely that an educated Englishman of the sixteenth or seventeenth century knew the ZV in Latin rather than in English.
CHAPTER 4

THE ZODIACUS VITAE IN ENGLAND

A full investigation of Palingenius' influence on English literature exceeds the scope of this study. I shall restrict myself to some general observations on the popularity of the work and the difficulty of evaluating its influence and then assess the possibilities for its influence on four eminent Renaissance poets, Spenser, Shakespeare, Sir John Davies, and Milton.

General Remarks

The popularity of Palingenius' poem in England is amply indicated by the number of editions (ten) published in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Though the first Latin edition printed in England (1569) postdates Googe's translation, copies of the numerous Latin editions from the Continent must have found their way to England before that date.¹ (Most Latin schoolbooks were imported from the Continent before the 1570's.)²

That the ZV was a schoolbook on the Continent is indicated by H. Pantaleon's poem, prefixed to the Basle edition of 1574, in which he addressed teachers
("moderatores"), saying that the purpose of the poem is "that beardless boys may first learn pious teachings, and that afterwards they may further read the sweet writings of the poets." T. W. Baldwin has assembled abundant evidence that the book was used in English grammar schools. Gabriel Harvey included it in a long list of textbooks, and it is named in the statutes of five grammar schools: St. Saviour's, Southwark (1562); St. Bee's, Cumberland (1583); Durham (1593); Aldenham (1600); and Camberwell (1615).

The models for sixteenth-century English grammar schools were St. Paul's and Winchester (the Winchester system was adopted with slight modifications at Eton and Westminster). Of the five schools known to have required or recommended Palingenius, St. Saviour's statutes were modelled on St. Paul's with influence from Winchester, Durham followed the Eton-Westminster system of the 1560's, and Aldenham followed Westminster. Palingenius was usually taught with Baptista Mantuan in the third form. Mantuan was also prescribed in the statutes of many schools. According to Baldwin, Elizabethan references to Mantuan are numerous, showing that he must have been used almost universally, even if the curricula do frequently omit to mention him. Gabriel Harvey in 1581 includes Mantuan as a regular grammar school author. Half a dozen English-printed editions of Mantuan are known between 1569 and 1600, as well as a couple of editions of G. Turberville's English translation. Clearly Mantuan was in great demand.
Several points in the above passage are relevant to our study of Palingenius. Harvey's list is the same one which included Palingenius. During the period Baldwin mentions, there were more editions of Palingenius printed in England than there were of Mantuan (eight of the ZV between 1569 and 1602 as well as five of Googe's translation). Another important fact for us is that Mantuan was taught more widely than the rather scanty curricula which have come down to us would indicate. This silence led Donald Clark, evidently none too fond of the Christian Latin poets, to believe that Dean Colet (who reorganized the curriculum of St. Paul's at the beginning of the sixteenth century) praised those poets merely to placate his opponents; Clark doubts that they were ever read at St. Paul's (Milton's school). However, Harris Fletcher, however, has shown that one of Milton's Latin poems is a paraphrase of one of Mantuan's; Milton surely composed it at his grammar school. Although none of the four English authors who will be examined in this chapter went to any of the five schools which explicitly required or recommended Palingenius, the uniformity of the curricula of the grammar schools is prima facie evidence that they were exposed to Palingenius. (Spenser went to Merchant Taylors', Shakespeare to King's New School in Stratford-upon-Avon, Sir John Davies to Winchester, and Milton to St. Paul's.)

The fact that Palingenius was not an original thinker should not prejudice us against the ZV but allow us to see
its charm for Renaissance schoolmasters. Mantuan and Palingenius were taught in the lower forms, along with Terence. The Christian poets would help ground the boys in Christian morality and counteract any deleterious effects the pagan poets might have. Palingenius would have greatly expanded the boys' fund of topoi and memorable exempla for use in their translations and paraphrases. Through the pedagogical methods of memorizing, translating into English verse and prose and back into Latin, sixteenth-century schoolboys would have become very intimate with Palingenius.

Merchant Taylors' was not only Spenser's school but also most likely that of Thomas Jenkins, master of King's New School in Stratford-upon-Avon when Shakespeare was in attendance. The statutes of Merchant Taylors' were in harmony with Palingenius' insistence that a master was to have his pupils read no off-color stories; the master of Merchant Taylors' was to be "learned, in good & cleane Latine l[ite]rature . . . [and] to teach the children of the same, not only good l[ite]rature but also good manners."11

That the ZV was popular beyond the grammar schools can be seen from the fact that several sixteenth-century English writers mentioned it or Googe's translation. Roger Ascham praised Googe's translation, although he did not approve of "that barbarous and rude Ryming."12 William Webbe, in A Discourse of English Poetrie (1586), after praising the best Greek and antique Latin poets, continued as follows: "Onely
I will adde two of later times, yet not inferiour to the most of them aforesayde, Pallingenius and Bap. Mantuanus. Webbe called Googe "a painefull furtherer of learning" for both his own poetry and his translation of Palingenius. Meres, in Palladis Tamia (1598), listed Palingenius among the modern writers of Latin poetry who "have obtained renown and good place among the ancient Latin poets" and also praised Googe's translation. Gabriel Harvey made an intriguing connection in his marginalia:

M. Digges hath the whole Aquarius [Book XI] of Palingenius bie hart: & takes mutch delight to repeate it often. M. Spenser conceiues the like pleasure in the fourth day of the first Weeke of Bartas. Which he esteemes as the proper profession of Urania.

Thomas Digges, one of the most eminent astronomers and mathematicians in England, published in 1576 a description and defense of Copernicus' De Revolutionibus. Digges may have known Shakespeare in London, and since Digges was a friend of Harvey's, it is likely that he knew Spenser as well. On the verso of the page which contains the remarks quoted above Harvey noted as follows:

Excellent Doctor Gesner made as singular account of the most learned Zodiacus of Palingenius Stellatus, as owre worthie Mr Thomas Digges. Who esteemes him aboue all moderne poets, for a pregnant introduction into Astronomie, & both philosophies. With a fine touch of the philosophers stone itself. the quintessence of nature, & art sublimed.
And Harvey approved of Gooe's translation:

Few translate excellently, or sufficiently well; yet meethinke neither exquisite Virgil is wronged bie Doctor Phaer . . . nor learned Palingenius bie the gentlemen that bestowed an Inglish Liuerie vpon them.

The question of whether Palingenius influenced English writers is difficult to answer. By contrast, the influence of one English dramatist on another is often much simpler to trace. For instance, in the following passage Shakespeare quite clearly borrowed from Marlowe:

Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships,  
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?  
(Dr. Faustus V.i.107-08)

Why, she is a pearl  
Whose price hath launched above a thousand ships.  
(Tro. II.ii.82-3)

In this case the languages, meter, subject and many of the words are the same. But when Shakespeare translated and adapted a passage from Palingenius he had to become much freer. Even if he was recalling the English version, Gooe's fourteeners would necessitate changes.

The other difficulty stems from Palingenius' commonplace subject matter, e.g., comparisons of the passions to a horse which needs to be reined in or to a storm at sea, of sleep with death, topoi on the vileness of the human body, the vanity of human wishes, the influence of the stars, and so on. The ZV is a compendium of commonplaces. In determining
influence, then, we will look not merely for a vague restatement of one of Palingenius' classical commonplaces, but rather for earmarks of unusual imagery, and, if possible, two images used together. This last criterion enabled Hankins to come up with his most convincing parallels.  

Sometimes two verbal reminiscences from the same source will reinforce each other as indications of Shakespeare's borrowing. Even more convincing are those instances in which two images closely associated in the original are likewise closely associated in Shakespeare's text, indicating that he recalled the sense of the whole passage. This test is particularly useful when the images are common to a number of possible sources, for it enables us to fix upon some one as the most probable immediate source.

One of the values of this study of sources is to remind us of the high value the Renaissance placed on imitatio. Renaissance writers used a traditional body of figures to deal with traditional topics. In examining possible borrowings by English writers from Palingenius, I will seek to determine the degree of probability in each case.

**Spenser**

Spenser very likely met Googe in Ireland, a fact which increases the likelihood that Spenser was acquainted with the ZV.  Spenser and Palingenius share philosophical arguments, images, metaphors, and rhetorical devices. In some cases we can see only general resemblances, in others close similarities in subject matter and details. Josephine
Bennett cites the \textit{ZV} as one of the possible sources for the Garden of Adonis (\textit{FQ} III.vi), for Spenser would have found in the \textit{ZV} treatment of such questions as the location of the Platonic forms, a threefold universe, two paradises, the doctrine that form and matter precede material life, and so on. But she traces these ideas in a number of writers, including Plato, Aristotle,Macrobius,Boethius,Aquinas, and Ficino as well as Palingenius, emphasizing the coherence of the tradition within which Spenser worked. She advances no parallels suggestive of direct borrowing from Palingenius.\textsuperscript{23}

Tuve says that the commonplaces which Palingenius and Spenser share "are common ideas which could hardly have been new to Spenser when he read Googe, but would have been emphasized in his mind by that reading, and whose wording would have called up many others." Among those she cites are envy chewing a toad, covetousness never sated with men's blood, the use of a boat to introduce cantos, the ill-omened owls on the way to the underworld, eulogies of friendship, and so on.\textsuperscript{24} One could extend this list almost indefinitely, e.g., the eagle's ability to look at the sun, the legend of the phoenix, the ascent of the mountain of knowledge. The last metaphor appears repeatedly in the \textit{ZV}, e.g., in V.711-25, when the poet talks about the Mount of Virtue, or IX.1-26, when he climbs Mount Theorea. Spenser uses the metaphor in \textit{FQ} I.x.53-57, in which Contemplation
takes Redcross knight to the top of a mountain from which he sees the New Jerusalem and the "little path, that was both steepe and long" (FQ I.x.55) which leads to it. But this image is so commonplace that it affords no proof of influence.

Sheidley suggests a source for the catalogue of trees in FQ I.i.8-9 in Palingenius' catalogue in ZV III.250-65. But the locus classicus for this is Ovid (see above, p. 86), so again the ZV is a work which would have reinforced Spenser's other reading. If Spenser was familiar with this catalogue in the ZV, there are interesting differences between his catalogue and Palingenius'. Spenser's is much shorter, mentioning only twenty trees compared to Palingenius' forty-four. Palingenius attaches descriptive epithets to very few of his trees, for the most part just listing them, whereas Spenser particularizes with an adjective or phrase each one of his trees, e.g., "the sayling Pine, the Cedar proud and tall." Spenser's catalogue is thus better on two counts: it stops before the reader gets bored, and each tree is briefly characterized.

Two passages in the ZV may be behind the stripping of Duessa in FQ I.viii.46-48. One is the description of the rich man, who appears beautiful from the front, yet ugly from the back (ZV II.140-43). The other is Arete's description of Queen Pleasure (ZV III.384-94). Spenser may have been imitating the unmasking of the enchantress Alcina.
in *Orlando Furioso* (VII.71-73). Since the first edition of *OF* precedes the *ZV* by some eighteen or twenty years, and since Ariosto wrote his poem at Ferrara, it may well be that Palingenius was also following Ariosto here. Spenser could have relied on either or both Ariosto and Palingenius. I rather think he remembered both.

Tuve suggests that Spenser's description of the Garden of Proserpine in *FQ* II.vii.51 ff., for which Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae* II.287 ff. is usually given as a source, has echoes of Palingenius' descent to the underworld at the beginning of Book VI. The resemblances again are those of general tone only, and Palingenius' manifest borrowing in Book VI from *Aeneid* VI makes Vergil as likely a source for Spenser's Garden of Proserpine as Palingenius. Tuve also suggests that the Garden of Pleasure in *ZV* III could have influenced the descriptions of the House of Pride in *FQ* I.iv and the Bower of Bliss in *FQ* II.xii. There are so many analogues to these passages of the *Faerie Queene* that one might despair of adding the *ZV* to the list. For instance, the City of Alcina in *Orlando Furioso* VI.59 and Chaucer's House of Fame in *Book of Fame* 1130 ff. are usually credited with being the sources for the House of Pride. But there is good evidence that Palingenius influenced Spenser here: John L. Lowes thought that Spenser was alone in assigning the parentage of Pride to Pluto and Proserpina (*FQ* I.iv.11). But Palingenius gives Pride the same parentage.
In ZV III.202-04 we are told that Pluto was Pride's father, and the union of Pluto and Proserpine was so well known that Palingenius did not have to explicitly say that Proserpine was her mother. So here we have good reason for suspecting that the ZV was one of Spenser's sources for the House of Pride.

There are other details of the House of Pride which suggest Palingenius' influence. In ZV III Epicurus leads the poet to the garden of Queen Pleasure. They go through lonely places past a lavish palace. The poet asks Epicurus whose it is and is told it belongs to Pluto, who dwells therein with his three daughters, Filthy Luxury, Pride with the Swelling Cheeks, and Dull Ignorance with the Bold Face (ZV III.191-205). Tuve points out certain resemblances between Pluto's palace and the House of Pride (FQ I.iv.4-5). She uses, however, Googe's translation. Closer parallels emerge if one uses the Latin version. Palingenius describes the palace as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
moles oblata palati
Eximia est; scitorque ducem: Sublimis, et auro
Tam preciosa domus, quo possessore tenetur?
Plutus, ait... .
Ipse autem celsa residi, quam cernis, in arce.
(III.195-201)
\end{verbatim}

Beholde appeares a sumptuous house, and strayt I aske my guide
What owner kepeth that precious gemm, and princely palace wide?
Plutus (quod he)... .
But he himselfe doth hold his hall, amid yon towry clift.

(Goose p. 28)
There is the outstanding pile of a palace; and I ask my
guide, "That wonderful dwelling, so rich with gold,
who owns it?"
"Pluto," he says... "He resides in the high
citadel which you see."

(M.B.)

A stately Pallace built of squared bricke,
Which cunningly was without morter laid,
Whose wals were high, but nothing strong, nor thick,
And golden foile all ouer them displaid,
That purest skye with brightnesse they dismaid:
High lifted vp were many loftie towres,
And goodly galleries farre ouer laid,
Full of faire windowes, and delightfull bowres;
And on the top a Diall told the timely howres.

It was a goodly heape for to behould,
And spake the praises of the workmans wit;
But full great pittie, that so faire a mould
Did on so weake foundation euer sit:
For on a sandie hill, that still did flit,
And fall away, it mounted was full hie,
That euery breath of heauen shaked it:
And all the hinder parts, that few could spie,
Were ruinous and old, but painted cunningly.

(FQ I.iv.4-5)

Plutus' palace is much more sparely drawn than the House of
Pride. Spenser's epithets for the House, "stately Pallace"
and "goodly heape," are close translations of the "moles
oblata palati / Eximia est," "heape" being an especially
felicitous rendering of "moles." Googe translates less
colorfully: "a sumptuous house." "Wals were high... /
And golden foile all ouer them displaid" corresponds with
"Sublimis, et auro / Tam preciosa domus." Palingenius
describes the palace from the outside, just as Spenser does,
so "auro / Tam preciosa domus" must mean Plutus' palace has
gold leaf on the outside, as does the House of Pride.
Spenser could not have gotten these details from Googe. It appears he had the Latin ZV in the back of his mind.

The golden walls could have come from Ariosto, who says the walls of the City of Alcina were all of gold (Orlando Furioso VI.59). Several other details suggest Chaucer's House of Fame. For example, the House of Fame's foundation of ice, in which are chiselled the names of the famous, partially melted away on the south but intact on the north, may have suggested the sandy foundation of the House of Pride with its "hinder parts" which "Were ruinous and old, but painted cunningly," though it is more likely Spenser was thinking of the man who built his house on sand (Matthew 7.26-27). The construction of the House of Pride, its bricks laid without mortar, its "loftie towres," "faire windowes, and delightfull bowres" all have close parallels in Chaucer's description of the House of Fame (1181-92). The allegorical tradition in which Spenser was working is so rich that it is difficult to pin down one source for the House of Pride. But although the House of Pride is a composite, it very likely owes more to Palingenius than it does to Ariosto. Spenser is known to have read Ariosto, and critics tend to stop there without giving Palingenius his due. In this case the resemblance between Spenser and Ariosto is slighter than that between Spenser and Palingenius.
Of course, the contrast in what Palingenius and Spenser do with their materials is great: Spenser describes the House of Pride in eighteen lines, while Palingenius devotes only a few phrases to Pluto's palace. Spenser introduces a Biblical allusion with the detail of the shifting sand on which the House is built. This touch reminds readers that they are reading allegory, but Spenser describes an edifice one can readily picture, while Pluto's palace remains vague. Similarly, Palingenius merely names the personified daughters of Pluto, whereas Spenser's Pride is vividly drawn. If, then, Spenser read and remembered this passage in Palingenius, the evidence that he did so is greater when one refers to the Latin text rather than Googe's. More work needs to be done on Spenser and Palingenius, but what has been done points very strongly to Spenser's familiarity with the ZV.

Shakespeare

The case for Palingenius' influence on Shakespeare stands on somewhat more solid ground, and more work has been done on this subject. T. W. Baldwin, in his exhaustive study of Elizabethan grammar schools, establishes that Shakespeare most likely read the ZV at King's New School in Stratford-upon-Avon.

Baldwin compares at length Jaques' speech on the Seven Ages of Man (AYLI II.vii.138-65) with ZV VI.646-725.
Baldwin says that Palingenius' immediate source for the life-is-a-play image was probably Vives' *Satellitium* (1524). The image goes back ultimately to Democritus. Palingenius' concept of the various stages in man's life is dependent on Ovid and St. Chrysostom as well as Vives. (Ovid enumerates seven stages in man's life, St. Chrysostom six, and Palingenius five.) Other Renaissance authorities for the ages of man with which Shakespeare may have been familiar are Susenbrotus, Pelegromius, Mirabellus, and Proclus. Samuel Chew has made an admirable survey of these sources and of a host of others, especially in the visual arts, and almost contemptuously dismisses the idea that one of them influenced Shakespeare. Hankins adds other literary uses of the life-is-a-play and ages-of-man metaphors, but comes down in favor of Palingenius. Hankins observes that in all the uses of these metaphors, in only three are the two metaphors combined: in the *ZV*, an old print (now apparently lost), and *The Legend of Orpheus and Eurydice* (1597). (To these may be added a fourth, a poem formerly attributed to Sir Walter Ralegh, quoted in part by Chew.) When Hankins' criterion of two images used together is added to the many other similarities which Baldwin and Hankins have noted between Palingenius' passage and Jaques' speech, the probability that Palingenius influenced Shakespeare here becomes great.
Some of the most convincing of Hankins' parallels should be mentioned. Macbeth's "all our yesterdays have lighted fools / The way to dusty death. Out. out, brief candle!" (V.v.22-23) is close to this from Googe's translation (p. 68): "O candle set before the windes, O subject dust to graue" ("O mortale lutum, ventisque obiecta lucerna" [ZV V.284]). The occurrence of two words in the same line ("candle" and "dust") suggests influence, and Shakespeare's using them in the same order as they appear in the Latin, which Googe reversed, argues for his acquaintance with the Latin text. (Hankins believes Shakespeare was familiar with both the Latin and English versions of the poem, possibly using Googe as a trot in school.)

Hankins ingeniously traces the "fat weed," mentioned by the Ghost of Hamlet's father, to Googe's "poppy fat" (p. 39), itself a loose translation of "papavere pavit" (ZV III.638). If correct, this would mean that Shakespeare read Googe. Hankins' examination of Hamlet's "To be, or not to be" speech (III.i.56-88) in relation to a passage in the ZV is also attractive. If Hamlet's "When we have shuffled off this mortal coil" refers to a man escaping from prison, then the relationship to the ZV is close, because of the presence of the same two images in the two passages:

Non sunt nugae igitur, sed consentanea vero,  
Posse hominem affari divos coram, atque videre:  
Quod reor esse bonum summum, finemque bonorum  
Cunctorum quaecunque homini contingere possunt,  
Donec praesentis vitae freta turbida sulcat.
Cum vero elapsus mortali carcere abibit
Spiritus . . .

(XII.518-24)

Therefore it is no fable fonde, but doth with truth agree,
That men may come to speake with God, and them in presence see:
Which I suppose the chifest good and finall ende to bee,
Of all good things that vnto man, may any waies arise,
While as of this his present life, the troublous seas he tries,
And when escape from mortall chaine, the soule hath passage straight . . .

(Googe p. 240)

Hamlet's "sea of troubles" corresponds with "troublous seas" ("freta turbida"); and the shuffling "off this mortal coil," which Hankins takes to be an image of escape from prison, corresponds to "escapte from mortal chaine" ("elapsus mortali carcere abibit / Spiritus"). Googe's "chaine" is a loose translation of Palingenius' "carcere" ("prison"), but since "coil" could refer to a coil of rope or cable, as Hankins says, the image may well be one of a prisoner's escaping from prison. If Shakespeare took the image from the ZV (whether Latin or English), he altered it slightly in the process.

Another of Hankins' parallels which is quite attractive is between Macbeth's speech in I.vii and a passage in ZV VI.42 Macbeth speaks as follows:

I have no spur
To prick the sides of my intent, but only
Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself
And falls on th'other.

(Macbeth, I.vii.25-28)
In Book VI of the *ZV* Calliope (not Nature as Hankins says on p. 140) warns the poet against ambition but then adds that it can be of help in getting the lazy to act at all:

Curent mortales, quae sunt mortalia: omittant,
Quae superum: ne, si contendant altius aequo
Scandere, praecipitent potius, moveantque
    cachinnum . . .
Nimirum ambitio multos ad fortia, tanquam
Calcar agit, multosque trahit virtutis ad arcem.
Torpentes urgens stimuli compellit, ut armis
Grande aliquid faciant. . .
Ipsa tamen vitium est.

(VI.587-89, 617-22)

Let mortall men such things regarde as mortall men behoues
Let them not search beyond their powre, least if they clyme to hy,
They hedlong fall, and prove themselues a laughing stocke thereby. . . .
Ambition many doth enforce, and drive to Glories gaine
Much like a spurre, and many brings to toppes of Vertue hye
With prickes, prouoking sluggish folk by force of sworde to try
Some worthy thing. . . .
Yet is Ambition sure a vice.

(Googe pp. 97-98)

Hankins reads the "but" in line 26 of Macbeth's speech in the sense of "except." If this is correct, then we have the same metaphor, ambition equals a spur, in both works. 43

Another of Hankins' parallels which is quite compelling is Sonnet 146 and two passages in the *ZV*: 44

Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth,
[Control] these rebel powers that thee array!
Why dost thou pine within and suffer dearth,
Painting thy outward walls so costly gay?
Why so large cost, having so short a lease,
Dost thou upon thy fading mansion spend?
Shall worms, inheritors of this excess,
Eat up thy charge? Is this thy body's end?
Then, soul, live thou upon thy servant's loss,
And let that pine to aggravate thy store;
Buy terms divine in selling hours of dross;
Within be fed, without be rich no more.
So shalt thou feed on Death that feeds on men,
And Death once dead, there's no more dying then.
(Sonnet 146)

The first passage in the Z_V that Hankins cites in reference to this sonnet is the one on ambition, quoted in part above. Calliope lists things which deceive: copper covered with silver, iron covered with gold, rotten nuts in sound shells, wolves in lambs' skins, and ends with the following:

Nonne aulaeis cariosa teguntur
Ligna, vel antiquus paries, rimisque pudendus?
(VI.606-07)

Doe not the gorgeous Hangings hyde the dusty mouldred Wall,
Where gaping Riftes vnsemely syt and Wormes consuming crall?
(Googe p. 98)

The second passage Hankins quotes is from Book I, in which the poet inveighs against wealthy men:

Hos tu iurares magnum superare Platona
Ingenio, et sanctis non cedere moribus illi,
Quem solum cecinit Phoebi cortina beatum.
Nil tamen intus habet species haec tanta: sed ipsos Nomine non vano ventosos dixeris utres.
(I.168-72)

Those men, a man would almost swear, that Plato they excell,
Or Socrates, who (Phoebus judge) of wisdome bare the bell,
And yet these Princely painted walles do nought within contayne,
A blather full implete with winde they may be termed playne.  
(Googe p. 5)

Hankins says that Shakespeare must have been remembering both of these passages when writing Sonnet 146. Shakespeare's purpose for using the image of the painted walls is closer to Palingenius' in the second passage, which stresses the vanity of riches, than the first passage, in which it is part of a sermon against hypocrisy. The principle of two images used together (worms in a wall) would lead us to link the first passage from the ZV with the sonnet. The second passage from the ZV suggests Shakespeare's acquaintance with Googe, for "walles" in the second passage is Googe's translation for "species" ("appearance" or "likeness").

The following example demonstrates the difficulty of determining which version of the ZV Shakespeare may have read:\[45\]

Heu mihi quam iustas de nobis numina poenas Sumunt! Nam sceleris quid non committimus! aut quid Iustitiae est usquam? quis amor cultusque deorum?  
(VIII.1017-19)

Alas how iustly now doth God plague vs in sundry case? What mischief do we not commit? what iustice is in place?  
(Googe p. 156)

The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices Make instruments to plague us.  
(King Lear V.iii.172-73)
If Edgar in *King Lear* is closer to the Latin in speaking of "gods" rather than "God," he is closer to Googe when he says "plague us." Further, in the Latin "just" is an adjective modifying "penalties" ("iustas . . . poenas"), in Googe "iustly" is an adverb, and in Shakespeare "just" is an adjective modifying "gods." No wonder Hankins and the others who have worked on these parallels have said that Shakespeare was subconsciously recalling these details from his past reading, not working with Palingenius or Googe open before him.

Another example shows the danger of reading too much into the presumed changes Shakespeare made in the material he borrowed from Palingenius. Hankins says the following speech by Isabella in *Measure for Measure* is dependent on two passages in Palingenius:46

> But man, proud man,  
> Dressed in a little brief authority,  
> Most ignorant of what he's most assured,  
> His glassy essence, like an angry ape,  
> Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven  
> As makes the angels weep; who, with our spleens,  
> Would all themselves laugh mortal.  
>  
> *(MM, II.ii.118-24)*

The relevant passages in the *ZV* are the following:

> Utque movet nobis imitatrix simia risum,  
> Sic nos caelicolis, quoties cervice superba  
> Ventosi gradimur, quoties titubante cerebro  
> Divitias nimium, nimium affectamus honores,  
> Spiramusque acres piperosis naribus auras,  
> Grandia iactanties, et grandia multa minantes.  
> *(V.26-31)*
And as the Ape that counterfets, to vs doth laughter moue:
So we likewise doe cause and moue the Saintes to laugh aboue.
As oft as stately steps we tredde with looke of proude disdaine.

(Googe p. 51 [62])

Simia caelicolum, risusque iocusque deorum est
Tunc homo, quum temere ingenio confidit, et audet
Abdita naturae scrutari, arcanaque divum,
Cum re vera eius crassa imbecillaque sit mens.
Si posita ante pedes nescit, quo iure videbit,
Quae Deus et natura sinu occuluere profundo?
Omnia se tamen arbitratur noscere ad unguem,
Garrulus, infelix, caecus, temerarius, amens,
Usque adeo sibi palpatur, seseque licetur.

(VI.182-90)

An Ape (quoth shee) and iesting stock is man to God in skye,
As oft as he doth trust his wit to much, presuming hye,
Dare searche the things of nature hid his secrets for to speake,
Whenas in very deede his minde is dull and all to weake,
If he be ignorant of things that lye before his feete,
How thinkst thou those things shall he see, which God and nature sweete
Within their bosoms close haue hyd? yet al at fingers ends
This hasty, blinde, vnhappy foole, perswades himselfe he kends.

(Googe p. 87)

Hankins argues for Shakespeare's indebtedness to Palingenius as follows:

The fact that he "plays . . . before high heaven" comes from the comparison of the ape that "counterfets" for our amusement to human beings whose actions amuse the "Saintes" of the heavenly audience. The laughter of the saints, who have been human beings on earth, as distinct from the angels, who were always dwellers of heaven, has suggested Shakespeare's image of the angels who weep but would laugh if they had human spleens.
Charles Garrigus relates the same two passages in the ZV to Isabella's speech and adds a third:

Praestringunt oculos: ita diis risumque iocumque
Stultitiis nugisque suis per saecula praebent.
(VI.651-52)

So moue they goddes aboue to laugh wyth toyes and trifles vayne,
Which here in Pageants fond they passe while they doe life retayne.
(Googe p. 99)

As Garrigus adds, "Because of parallels two, three, and four [other Shakespearean passages], which prove Shakspere knew the use of 'gods' in the figure, the substitution of 'angels' for 'gods' does not weaken the parallel."
(Garrigus thinks Shakespeare knew the ZV in Latin, not in Googe's translation.)

Now let us sort out these "gods," "angels," and "saints" by looking at the Latin. In the first passage (Googe p. [62]), the word Googe translates "Saintes" is "caelicolis." In the second passage, Googe's "God" does duty for two words, "caelicolum" and "deorum." In the third passage, Googe's "Goddes" stands for "diis." All four of these Latin words are plural. A difficulty confronting Googe or any translator of Renaissance Latin was how to handle the humanists' use of pagan vocabulary for Christian concepts. The Latin text refers to "heaven-dwellers" ("caelicolis" and "caelicolum") and "gods" ("deorum" and "diis"). Hankins' point regarding Shakespeare's contrast of
angelic and human natures is valid when Isabella's speech is considered by itself. But if Shakespeare read both the English and Latin versions of the ZV, as Hankins suggests, then it becomes much more difficult to speak of Shakespeare's "altering" the ZV for his own purposes, for "angels" is as good a translation of "caelicolis" as Googe's "Saints."

Garrigus provides additional parallels from Palingenius for many of the Shakespearean passages which Hankins uses (as in the above example relating to Isabella's speech). He asserts that there are no passages from the second half of the ZV which correspond to anything in Shakespeare, speculating that only the first half of the ZV was taught in King's New School. But Hankins has provided more than enough examples from the second half of the book to indicate that Shakespeare had read it in its entirety if he read it at all. And the evidence points to his having done so.

Sir John Davies

Sir John Davies' _Nosce Teipsum_ (London 1599) has many similarities with the ZV. For instance, Davies repeatedly refers to the eye of reason (e.g., pp. 113, 117) and compares reason to the sun (p. 115). The metaphor of light for reason is one of Palingenius' favorites (e.g., VII.292-94 in which Palingenius refers to the sun of reason). In order to prove "That the soule is more then a
perfection or reflection of the sense" (NT p. 129), Davies argues that as a person ages he grows wiser even though the senses decay and grow less reliable (NT p. 131).

Palingenius makes a similar point in ZV VII.910 ff. Both poets speak of the chain of cause and effect which binds heaven and earth:

that Adamantine chaine,
Whose golden linkes effects and causes bee,
And which to Gods owne chaire doth fixt remaine.

O, could we see, how cause from cause doth spring!
How mutually they linckt and folded are!
(NT p. 144)

Quod si causarum non esset nexus et ordo
Perpetuus, si alia ex alia non pendeat, (ac si
A summo iunctis nodis duratur Olympos
Longa catena, usque ad nigri regna infima Ditis,)
Quod dictu absurdum est, plura uno prima dabuntur
Principia, et causae primae multae invenientur.
(VIII.47-52)

For if of causes were no knot, nor order still to raine,
If thone of thother should not hang, (as if from heauens hye
A Chayne to deepest part of Hell should hang and lincked lye,
Which is to vile to be rehearst) beginnings more then one
Shall seeme to be: and causes first must many spring theron.
(Goose p. 133)

This chain metaphor goes back to Homer and has been used by countless writers for many purposes. But most writers who use it do not explicitly say that it is a chain of cause and effect as Davies and Palingenius do, though that is often implied (e.g., in Macrobius' use, which is closest to Palingenius': "Invenietur pressius intuenti a summo Deo
usque ad ultimam rerum faecem, una mutius se vinculis religans et nusquam interrupta catena." Somnium Scipionis I.xiv). This fact may indicate that Davies was influenced by Palingenius, although Davies' adjective "golden" points to Homer or some other writer as well. Davies' "Adamantine" suggests Spenser's Hymne of Love (1. 89), in which the "Adamantine chaines" do not bind causes and effects but the four elements.

Palingenius and Davies use sun and cloud imagery for similar purposes. In the following passage Palingenius is speaking of one's enhanced ability to meditate at night, when darkness envelops the world and sensory stimuli are reduced:

Nempe animum turbant sensus: populantur eundem Affectus, redduntque hebetem, involvuntque tenebris; Non secus ac nitidum praetexunt nubila solem. Ergo si propriis residens penetralibus, intra Ipse suas latebras, fugiens a sensibus, atque Corporeis crucibus, melius sapit: esse profecta Quum poterit liber, moribunda a carne solutus, Cuncta animus meliore modo cognoscet, et ipsi Haerebit vero magis ac perfectius absque Corpore, et aeternum vivens durabit in aevum. (VII.951-60)

For senses do the minde disturb, affections it destroyes, Amasing it with dulnesse great, and blindnes it anoyes: None otherwise than cloudes do hide the Sunne that clearly shines. If therfore, when it doth remaine within his owne confines, And flying farre from senses all, and cares that body brings, It wyser be, then shall it know, and understand all thinges,
In better sort, when it is free, and from the flesh doth flye,
More perfect of it selfe it is, and liues continuallye.
(Googe p. 129)

So though the clouds eclips the Suns faire light,
Yet from his face they do not take one beame;
So haue our eyes their perfect power of sight,
Euen when they looke into a troubled streame.

Then these defects in Senses organes bee,
Not in the Soule, or in her working might;
She cannot loose her perfect power to see,
Though mists, & clouds, do choke her window light.
(NT pp. 182-83)

Here Davies uses the cloud metaphor not for the senses themselves but for the defects in the senses as one grows old or mad (the senses are the windows in Davies). In the following stanza, though, Davies makes the body itself the obstructing cloud, as did Palingenius:

And thou my Soule, which turnst thy Curious eye,
To view the beames of thine owne forme divine,
Know, that thou canst know nothing perfectly,
While thou art Clouded with this flesh of mine.
(NT p. 193)

Both the NT and ZV are didactic, philosophical poems. If Davies used ideas and images which he could have gotten from a number of sources besides Palingenius, the ZV did provide a model for handling such ideas poetically.

Milton

There are several passages in Milton's poems which may be indebted to the ZV. Palingenius ends Book VII (1060-79) with an address to his muse: He will rest under a laurel or
myrtle tree during the dog days to recoup his strength. If fortune will smile on him, driving away poverty and his cares, "Totus ero tecum, tuaque intra limina semper / Versabor" ("All wholly will I live with thee [my muse], and alwaies with thee dwell" [Googe p. 132]). The endings of "L'Allegro" (151-52) and "Il Penseroso" (175-76) are similar: "These delights, if thou canst give, / Mirth with thee, I mean to live" ("These pleasures Melancholy give, / And I with thee will choose to live").

At the end of the ZV Palingenius addresses his book as follows:

Iudiciura vulgi insulsum, imbcellaque mens est:
Stulta placent stultis: obsonia quisque palato
Digna suo quaeit: non omnibus una voluptas:
Sed docti atque boni, quae sunt pia, vera et honesta,
Auscul sus legunt, discuntque libenter.
Hic cibus illorum est, haec consolatio mentis.
(XII.573-78)

The iudgment of the common sorte is grosse, and eke their minde
Is wondrous weake, and foolishe things delights the foolishe kinde:
All men the meate do most desire that them doth best delight.
Eache pleasure is not acceptable to euery kinde of sprite.
But good and learned men the things of good and godly sense
Gieue eare vnto, and reade and marke the same with diligence.
This is the foode that them doth feede, and comfort of their minde.

(Googe p. 241)
This suggests "fit audience find, though few" (Paradise Lost VII.31), in which Milton expresses in half a line what Palingenius has taken many lines to say.

The Attendant Spirit's opening and closing speeches in Comus also recall a passage in the ZV. In Book VII Palingenius is arguing for the existence of angels:

May we beleue the seas and earth alone replenishte bee, Which are compared to the skyes as nothing in degree? And if the mighty compast sphære, in minde thou well doest way, Thou shalt perceiue the smallest Starre, more great: as Wisemen say. Shall then so small and vile a place, so many fishe conteigne Such store of men, of beasts and foules, and theother voide remaine? Shall skyes and ayre their dwellers lacke? he dotes that thinketh so, And seemes to haue a slender wit, for there are thousandes mo, That better state and lyfe enioye, and farre more blessed bee. Moreouer if wee will confesse th'ufnayned veritie, This Earth is place for man and beast: beyonde the clowdes, the ayre,
And sacred skye, where peace doth reigne, and daye is alwayes fayre,
The Angels haue their dwellings there.
(Googe pp. 115-16)

The Attendant Spirit comes from "Before the starry threshold of Joves Court . . . / In Regions milde of calm and serene Ayr" (ll. 1 and 4) which he contrasts with

the smoak and stirr of this dim spot,
Which men call Earth, and with low-thoughted care
Confin'd, and pester'd in this pin-fold here,
Strive to keep up a frail, and Feaverish being
Unmindfull of the crown that Vertue gives
After this mortal change, to her true Servants
Amongst the enthron'd gods on Sainted seats.
(Comus 11. 5-11)

Milton uses classical (pagan) terminology here, referring in l. 11 to "gods," just as Palingenius does ("divum" VII.385).
(The question of the category of spirits to which the Attendant Spirit belongs need not concern us here.)
The pinfold corresponds with VII.375, which enumerates all the forms of terrestrial life. Palingenius returns to the theme of the vileness of earth in XII.305, in which the earth is "mundi stabulum" ("Stable sure / Of all the world" [p. 234]). Following the passage quoted above, Palingenius says this about those who do not believe in angels:
"Delirat, crassa mentis caligine pressus, / Nec minus, ac pecudes, terrena in faece sepultus" ("He dotes deceived by ignorance, and foolishnesse of minde, / And semes all drounde in earthly drosse, as beastes of basest kinde"
[VII.393-94 and p. 116]). The Attendant Spirit has
similar thoughts regarding earth, in 11. 5-7, quoted above, and when he speaks of "the rank vapours of this Sin-worn mould" (17).

Palingenius then speaks about "fortunatae . . . / Insulae in Oceano, loca cunctis plena bonis et / Deliciis" ("happy Ilandes founde / In Ocean seas they say there bee, where all things good abounde" [VII.395-97 and p. 116]) and compares these islands with the stars: "Omnis stella autem censebitur insula?" (401) to which he responds with an emphatic "yes!" In fourteen lines which Milton cancelled between 1. 4 and the present 1. 5, the Attendant Spirit speaks of the Garden of the Hesperides on that "blisfull Isle / [in] the jealous ocean," closely associating the fortunate isles with the heavens, though he does not call the stars islands as does Palingenius. Milton deleted this reference to the Hesperides from the beginning of the poem and inserted it in the epilogue, spoken by the Attendant Spirit:

To the Ocean now I fly,
And those happy climes that ly
Where day never shuts his eye,
Up in the broad fields of the sky.

(Comus 11. 976-79)

This suggests ZV VII.383-85 (quoted above); 1. 978 corresponds with "Pax ubi perpetua nitidi lux clara diei / Assidue regnant" ("where peace doth reigne, and daye is alwayes fayre"). "Domus . . . divum" in 1. 385 may explain
the "mansion" in 1. 2 of the Attendant Spirit's opening speech ("Before the starry threshold of Jove's Court / My mansion is"). This "mansion" has exercised the commentators considerably, and it could be Milton was thinking of "domus" in the ZV. Googe's translation ("dwellings") is accurate, but it is not as likely to have suggested "mansion" as the Latin word. Here the ZV helps clarify an otherwise obscure point. More work needs to be done on Milton and Palingenius; from what has been done it appears very likely that Milton read and remembered the ZV.

Conclusion

There is a large body of evidence that these four authors were acquainted with the ZV. There is more evidence in Shakespeare's case than the others simply because more work has been done on him. What has been done on Spenser also strongly suggests influence, and, given the large body of Spenser's work, only the surface has been scratched in his case. Palingenius has been overlooked as a source for Milton; pursuing the similarities between the two poets would undoubtedly yield a large number of analogous and imitated passages. The similarities between Palingenius and Sir John Davies rest on the most general grounds.

A full investigation would have to take into account other writers, especially minor ones, who are often more imitative than the best authors. Rosemond Tuve suggests
several English writers with whose work the ZV ought to be compared. For instance, George Wither's and Ben Jonson's personifications of Arete should be compared with Palingenius'. A full investigation would, in addition, consider other Neo-Latin poets as well. But even this brief survey indicates the influence of the Italian heretic on English letters.

The ZV was an important book in the making of the English literary Renaissance. Its influence in England was not restricted to suggesting a few passages or images to writers. It had an important role in the grammar schools in helping teach the boys good morals. A handbook of Christian humanist philosophy that was acceptable to Protestants in particular, it is full of the moral, metaphysical, and religious commonplaces of which the schoolmasters approved. If the ZV is repetitive and digressive, it also contains much that is memorable—vivid exempla and pithy sententiae. These would have remained with the schoolboys long after the tedious homilies had faded from their minds. The ZV contains an abundance of information on the knowledge of man's self and on the universe, on microcosm and macrocosm, the soul and the emotions, the love of men and God, the immortality of the soul and the structure of the universe. Here were the verba necessary for acquiring res, the understanding of "things" that gave man a hold on life and
nature. We must not underestimate the importance of the ZV in the making of the English Renaissance and the propagation of Christian humanism.
APPENDIX
ENCOUNTER WITH THE SPIRITS X.767-854

Haec dum vir sanctus loqueretur, finierat sol
Paene diem lasso iam curru, et iuxta aderat nox,
Paulatim inficiens atro velamine mundum.
Discedo, et Romam versus vestigia duco. (770)
Dumque iter inceptum perago, iam Cynthia pleno
Orbe micans, claram reddebat lumine noctem.
Ibam igitur solus, meditans audita: sed ecce
Tres comites haesere mihi, quos forte repertos
Affatus blande, quo vellent ire rogavi. (775)
Romam, dixere. Interea me conspicit unus;
Nomine me appellans: unde is nunc? inquit. Ab illo,
Respondi, sapiente, manet qui in vertice summo
Rupis Apollineae. Subrisit protinus ille,
Atque ait: O demens, reperiri qui sapientem (780)
Posse putas quenquam in terris. Sapere ille videtur,
Qui minus est aliis stultus, licet insipiens sit.
Convenit haud dubie solis sapientia divis:
Quorum de numero sumus hic tres. Namque ego dicor
Sarracilus, verum hic Sathiel, hic Iana vocatur. (785)
Quamvis humanam videamur habere figuram,
Dii sumus, et lunae contermina regna tenemus.
Namque illic habitat divum ingens turba minorum,
Est quibus imperium telluris et aequoris alti.
Talibus auditis stupui, coepique timere:
Me tamen audacem ostendens, rectoque timore,
Cur Romam peterent, quaesivi. Tunc ait ille:
Est socius nobis illic, quid dicitur Ammon;
Hunc sibi servitio adstrictum, magicaque coactum
Arte tenet iuvenis quidam, cui Narnia tellus
Est patria, Ursinique colit qui praesulis aulam.
O quanta est hominum generi concessa potestas!
Coguntur divi. Vobis hinc scire licebit
Divinas animas vestras, et morte carere.
Nam si nil vestri superesset, si moreretur
Vestra anima, ut corpus moritur, quid iuris haberet
In superos tam vile animal, tam frivola imago?
Si foret in vobis nil sanctum, quomodo divi
Tanti hominem facere, aut homini succumbere possent?
Ipse etiam quandoque fui servire coactus
Germano cuidam, cristalli in corpore clausus:
Sed me barbatus tandem fraterculus illis
Exemit vinculis, et fracto carcere fugi.
Romam igitur petimus, cupientes solvere duro
Servitio socium, si qua est via: deinde ut ad Orcum
Romanos quosdam proceres hac nocte trahamus.
Haec dicente illo, flavit levis aura repente.
Tunc Sathiel ait: O socii, iam noster ab urbe
Remisses remeat: praecedens indicat aura.
Non vanus fuit hic sermo: namque ilicet illic
Egregius iuvenis Remisses astitit; omnes
Advenisse illum gaudent, laetique salutant,
Atque rogant, quidnam Romana ageretur in urbe.
Cuncti luxuriae, atque gulae, furtisque dolisque
Certatim incumbunt, nosterque est sexus uterque,
Respondit: sed nunc summus parat arma sacerdos
Clemens, Martinum cupiens abolere Lutherum,
Atque ideo Hispanas retinet nutritque cohortes:
Non disceptando, aut subtilibus argumentis
Vincere, sed ferro mavult sua iura tueri:
Concilium valeat, valeant commenta Lutheri,
Pontifices nunc bella iuvant, sunt caetera nugae:
Nec praecepta patrum, nec Christi dogmata curant.
Iactant se dominos rerum, et sibi cuncta licere.
Cui vis est, ius non metuit, ius obruitur vi.
Sed nos hinc socii lucrum speramus, et inter
Tot caedes, multorum animas ad Averna feremus.
Sic ait: et mox, inter se nonnulla locuti,
Decedunt, et me solum tristemque relinquunt.
Namque ubi Sarracilus nullum dixit reperiri
In terris sapientem, extemplo pectora tristis
Invasit cura, et coepi sic volvere mecum:
Ergo nequicquam petitur sapientia nobis?
Laudatur frustra, frustra speratur, et ipsis
Caelicolis tantum conceditur? Ergo necesse est
Hac misera in vita mortales desipere omnes?
Ridiculosque esse, et spectacula tradere divis?
O humanum genus infelix, o effraena parentum
Luxuria, et natos gignendi infanda libido!
Quid tandem facitis? stultos miserosque creatis.
Mas puer est natus: laeti celebrate choreas,
Fundite vina, epulas festivis addite mensis:
Sed mox ille puer fiet stultusque miserque,
Aut cito pallentes moriens migrabit ad umbras.
O mens caeca hominum, et venturae nescia sortis!
Mortales miseri laetantur saepe dolendis.

Haec igitur mecum meditabar, tristitiaque
Plenus paulatim hospitium requiemque petebam:
Namque oculos iam somnus iners et crura gravabat.

While the holy man was speaking these things, the sun almost
ended the day with his tired chariot, and night approached,
darkening the world little by little with a black veil. I
left and turned my steps toward Rome. And while I
kept to the road begun, the full moon shone and rendered the
night clear with light. I went alone, thinking about the
things I had heard, when behold! three companions joined
me, whom, having met by chance, I addressed
courteously and asked where they wanted to go.
"To Rome," they said.

Meanwhile one was looking at me and, calling me by name, asked, "Whence do you come?"

"From that wise man," I said, "who dwells at the summit of the Apollonean mountain [Mount Soractis]."

At that he smiled somewhat and said, "O mad man (780) who think you can find anyone wise on earth! He seems wise, let him be never so dull, who is only less foolish than the others. Without doubt wisdom befits the gods alone, of whose number we are three. I am called Sarracilus, (785) he Sathiel, and he Jana. Although we appear to have human form, we are gods and live in a region near the moon. For there dwells a large number of minor gods, to whom is given power over land and the deep sea."

I was astounded at hearing such things and began (790) to be afraid, but showing myself bold and with fear under control, asked why they were going to Rome. He responded as follows:

"A companion of ours is there, named Ammon, who is held in forced service, compelled by the magic art of a (795) certain youth from Narnia who resides at the palace of Cardinal Orsini. O how much power is granted to the race of men! They rule the gods! From this you can know that your souls are immortal; they do not die. For if nothing (800) of you remained, if your souls died as your body dies, what right over gods would so insignificant an animal, so paltry
a form have? If there were nothing divine in you, how would
gods make so much of man, or would they be able to give way
to man? I myself was once forced to serve a certain (805)
German, locked in a crystal ball, but a bearded little monk
took me out from those bonds, and, the prison shattered, I
escaped. Therefore we go to Rome, desiring to free a (810)
companion from harsh servitude, if there is any way; and so
that we might drag certain Roman princes down to hell this
night."

Having spoken these things, a sudden wind blew up. Then
Sathiel spoke: "O companions, now Remisses returns from the
city; this breeze indicates his approach."

This speech was not in vain, for immediately the (815)
excellent youth Remisses stood there. All of them were
pleased by his arrival, saluted him happily, and asked the
news from Rome.

"All concentrate in competition on riches, gluttony,
thief and fraud; both sexes are ours," he answered. (820)
"But now Pope Clement prepares arms, desiring to destroy
Martin Luther, and for this retains and feeds Spanish
troops. Not by debate or subtile arguments does he wish to
conquer, but with steel he prefers to protect his (825)
rights. Though the council be strong, though the remarks of
Luther be valid, the cardinals now prepare for war, and
other matters are trifles; they care for neither the
precepts of the Fathers nor the teachings of Christ. They
boast that they are masters of all things, and permit themselves everything. He who has power does not fear the law, for the law is overwhelmed by power. But let us, colleagues, hope for spoil from this, and amidst so much slaughter we will bear the souls of many down to hell."

He spoke, and soon, speaking some among themselves, they depart, leaving me alone and downcast. For as soon as Sarracilus said no wise man is to be found on earth, sadness invaded my breast, and I began to think to myself: "Therefore in vain we seek wisdom? In vain it is praised, in vain it is desired, and it is only granted to the gods? Therefore it is necessary that all men be fools in this miserable life? To be ridiculous and provide a spectacle to the gods? O unhappy race of man, O unbridled dissipation of parents, the base desire of engendering offspring! Why do you do it? You create fools and wretches. A boy is born: happy, you hold a dance, pour wine, bring food to festive tables. But soon that boy will become foolish and wretched, or dying quickly he will go to the pale shades. O blind mind of men, ignorant of the fate to come! Miserable mortals often rejoice in things they will have to grieve for."

Thinking these things to myself, full of sadness, I slowly sought an inn and rest, for dull sleep made heavy my eyes and feet.
NOTES

Introduction


2 I follow closely Giuseppe Borgiani, *Marcello Palingenio Stellato e il suo poema, lo "Zodiacus Vitae"* (Citta del Castello: Lapj, 1912). Borgiani's is still the most comprehensive study of Palingenius and the ZV.


4 For a discussion of the dating of the first edition, see Borgiani, pp. 97-108.

5 Borgiani, pp. 211-15.


6 This edition is very scarce; the National Union Catalogue locates only one copy.
Chapter 1

1 Since I have not been able to examine the first edition, I have taken these lines from Borgianii, pp. 111-12, who also provides a critical exposition of the poem. In English the longest summary of the contents of the ZV is Foster Watson, The "Zodiacus Vitae" of Marcellus Palingenus Stellatus (London: Wellby, 1908). Watson's summaries of each book, however, are very uneven. For example, he devotes five pages to Book IX and only one short paragraph to Book VIII. William Sheidley, Barnabe Googe (Boston: Twayne, 1981), Luzius Keller, Palingene, Ronsard, Du Bartas (Bern: Francke, 1974), and Walther Ludwig, "Julius Caesar Scaligers Kanon neulateinischer Dichter," Antike und Abendland 25 (1979), 20-40 also provide short summaries of the contents. No one has provided outlines and summaries of the imagery as I have.

Chapter 2


4 Keller, p. 20.
5 Watson, p. 7.
8 Ludwig, p. 25.
9 Old, p. 89.
10 Borgiani, pp. 70-71.
12 Borgiani, p. 67.
13 Rotondo, p. 1429.
14 Borgiani, p. 71.
15 Borgiani, p. 71 note.
17 Thorndike, V, 259.
19 See Borgiani, pp. 80-81.
21 Borgiani, p. 57.
22 Roellenbleck, p. 192.
23 See Borgiani, p. 42 note.
24 Benedetto Varchi, Storia fiorentina, in Opere
(Trieste: Sezione letterario-artistica del Lloyd austriaco, 1858), I, 25.
25 Varchi, pp. 89-90, 106.
27 Roellenbleck, pp. 193-94.
28 Borgiani, p. 90.
29 Borgiani, p. 74.
31 Chiappini, p. 255 note.
32 Chiappini, p. 255.
33 Borgiani, p. 69 note.
34 Chiappini, p. 260.
35 Borgiani, p. 71 note.
36 Tuve, Introd., p. xiii; Borgiani, pp. 82-90; and Roellenbleck, pp. 190-91.


43 Borgiani, p. 205 note.

44 I take this portion of Scauranus' poem from Adele Nosei, "Marcello Palingenio Stellato e Lucrezio," Studi italiani di filologia classica NS 5 (1925), p. 111. Who Thomas Scauranus was I do not know; he is not in Mario Cosenza, Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800 (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1962), 6 vols.

45 Nosei, p. 122.


47 Suggested by Ludwig, p. 26 note.

48 Keller, p. 29.
49 Quoted in Ludwig, p. 26 note. The translation is mine.

50 Hankins, p. 216 note.

51 Scaliger, p. 306.

52 Tuve, Introd., p. ix.

53 Borgiani, p. 169.

54 Roellenbleck, pp. 197-98.

55 Scaliger, p. 306.

56 Scaliger, p. 307.

57 Croce, pp. 55, 58.

58 Borgiani, p. 204 note.

59 On these points in Lucretius see Cyril Bailey, Prolegomena, in D.R.N. pp. 75-77.

60 The Oxford Latin Dictionary has entries for the last five except philautia, which nevertheless was used by Cicero (see Liddell and Scott).

61 Borgiani, p. 203 note.

62 Watson, p. 8.


64 See Borgiani, "Pier Angelo Manzoli," Enciclopedia italiana (Rome: Istituto Giovanni Treccani, 1929-37), who says the only original concept in the ZV is the theory of infinite light in Book XII.
Chapter 3

1 The best account of his life and work is Sheidley's recent study.

2 Warton, IV, 282, 284-85.


8 Sheidley, p. 46.


10 Borgiani, *Enciclopedia italiana*, counts 9939 lines in the Latin poem; Weise's edition, used here, has 9937.


12 All quotations from Googe are taken from Tuve's facsimile reprint.


16 This list looks suspiciously short, but the only Latin editions printed in England are those listed in the *Short-Title Catalogue 1475-1640*. Neither Donald Wing, *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700* (New York: The Index Society, 1945) nor NUC nor the *British Museum Catalogue* lists any editions after 1639. Perhaps the revision of Wing or the *Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue* will uncover later printings.

Chapter 4

1 Johnson, p. 145.


3 Quoted in Watson, p. 73.

4 Baldwin, I, 387, 413, 424, 433 and Watson, p. 5.

5 Baldwin, I, 385, 413, 424.

6 Baldwin, I, 644.


10 Baldwin, I, 418, 477.


12 Quoted in Watson, p. 81.

13 Quoted in Baldwin, I, 645.

14 Quoted in Watson, p. 82.

15 Quoted in Watson, p. 82.


17 Johnson, p. 161.


19 Harvey, p. 231.

21 Hankins, p. 9.


26 Sheidley, p. 128 note 29.

27 See Spenser, *Variorum*.


32 I have used Googe's translations in this chapter since the four authors could have read it as well as the Latin. I have translated myself only where I wanted to make a special point about Googe's rendering.


34 Baldwin, I, 657-63.


37 Hankins, p. 21.

38 Chew, p. 175.

39 Hankins, pp. 42 and 15.

40 Hankins, p. 120.

41 Hankins, p. 133-35.


44 Hankins, p. 210-12. The emendation in line 2 is Hankins', as is the punctuation.

45 Hankins, p. 263.

46 Hankins, p. 144.

47 Hankins, p. 144.


49 Garrigus, pp. 8-10.


52 Quoted in Eirionnach, 2.3 (1857), p. 83.


55 The cancelled lines are taken from Woodhouse, Pt. 3, 856.

56 See Woodhouse, Pt. 3, 854. The editors deny that the reference is to John 14.2 ["In my Father's house are many mansions"].
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