Calvert, I. (2018). Slanted histories, Hesperian fables: material form and royalist prophecy in John Ogilby's The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro. *Seventeenth Century*, 531-555. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2017.1359105

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research
General rights

Slanted histories, Hesperian fables: material form and royalist prophecy in John Ogilby's *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro*

Author Name: Ian Calvert

Author Institution: University of Bristol

Contact Address: Department of English, University of Bristol
                      3/5 Woodland Road
                      Clifton
                      Bristol
                      BS8 1TB

Telephone Number: 07880 344918

Email Address: egicc@bristol.ac.uk

This article considers the status of John Ogilby's Virgil translations as royalist texts. The paratextual material to the 1649 and 1654 editions provides a framework which invites a royalist reading; the translation promotes this by manipulating Virgil's text and contemporary typographic conventions. These factors combine in passages that **depict** the death of kings. The volume follows the Virgilian precedent of foretelling events that had already occurred **by presenting** the passage on the death of Priam **in such a manner** to imply that it anticipated **Charles I's execution**. This allowed Ogilby to grant a sense of inevitability to the prophecies his translation offers regarding events that he hoped lay in the near future. The 1654 edition subtly draws on Caroline-era royalist literary tropes to suggest a permanent revival of the monarchy under Charles II. Ogilby's contributions to Charles II's coronation celebrations draw on the Virgil translations in vindication of such prophecies.

Keywords: John Ogilby; Virgil; translation; royalism; typography; prophecy

The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro, Translated by John Ogilby was the first complete translation of Virgil into English. Published in 1649, reissued in 1650, revised in 1654 and reprinted in 1665, 1666, 1668, 1675 and 1684, it remained the standard rendering of the poet prior to the 1697 publication of Dryden's *Works of Virgil*, a translation which in text and material form owed a substantial amount to its predecessor.[1] Despite this influence, Dryden persistently found fault with Ogilby's version. In the Preface to *Sylvae*, the 1685 miscellany which contained Dryden's first major translations from Virgil,[2] he criticised Ogilby's translations for making, in his view, basic failures of comprehension and for giving a false impression of the originals:

> What *English* Readers unacquainted with *Greek* or *Latin* will believe me or any other Man, when we commend those Authors, and confess we derive all that is pardonable in us from their Fountains, if they take those to be the same Poets, whom our *Ogleby's* have Translated?[3]

Later in the same preface Dryden censured Ogilby for what he perceived to be an overly-literal approach that produced a stilted and cramped rendering of Virgil. **Blending** diffidence and censure**, he** states, with reference to his own Virgil translations, "all that I can promise for my self, is only that I have done [...] better than *Ogleby*".[4] In the *Sylvae* Preface, along with some passages in *Mac Flecknoe*, Dryden portrays Ogilby as one who had achieved the unusual distinction of producing a Virgil translation that was both pedantic and full of blunders.[5]

The majority of Ogilby's subsequent commentators have endorsed Dryden's strictures. Pope included Ogilby in the *Dunciad*, even though he had first accessed the literature of antiquity through Ogilby's translations.[6] In the British Library copy of the 1649 Virgil a piece of marginalia (dated May 1811) reads "In my opinion Ogilbys Translation of Virgil upon the whole is very bad and ought not to be compared with Drydens".[7] More recently, Reuben A. Brower called the translation a "fairly accurate if inept version", and William Frost said that Ogilby is "not in fact a notably more interesting poet than Dryden makes him sound".[8] Frost re-asserted this attitude when he co-edited the volumes in the *Works of John Dryden* that are dedicated to Virgil**, where** Ogilby is called a "poetaster" and the translation "prosaic and literal".[9] Leslie Proudfoot, writing a generation before Brower and Frost, was more generous, but he still regarded Ogilby "ultimately insufficient to his task" and damned him with the faintest of praise: Ogilby, a "pedestrian but conscientious author", had "many failings, few vices" and was "clumsily tender towards his subject".[10] Critics who discuss Ogilby's translation more positively tend to do so by focussing on aspects of the text that were the work of other people, notably the illustrations by Francis Cleyn (and others) that appeared in the 1654 edition.[11] This in itself also reflects the general tendency to focus on the 1654 edition rather than its 1649 predecessor.[12]

This article contends that Ogilby's Virgil has more merit than has often been acknowledged and that the 1649 edition in particular deserves closer attention than it has previously been given. Dryden is right that Ogilby largely attempts to stay close to the Latin original. He is also right when he states that such an approach can impede the flow of the narrative and, at times, make ready comprehension difficult. But Ogilby's concern in his Virgil is primarily a political one. His translation, both in the 1649 and 1654 editions, draws on and responds to the royalist literary culture of the Caroline period in order to promote a royalist interpretation of the civil wars.[13] Ogilby had extensive connections to the Stuarts and their ministers: he was part of Buckingham's circle in the 1610s and 1620s before serving at the Earl of Strafford's court in

Ireland in the following decade. He continued to act on behalf of the royalists throughout the 1640s **and** the Virgil translation can be considered as a continuation of that service. Sometimes Ogilby signals this explicitly **but** he is also capable of doing so through subtler means. Cases of the latter can involve Ogilby translating with the kind of latitude that is more usually associated with the "smoother", "Augustan" classical translations that were produced by Dryden and other poets.[14] Ogilby's perceived mistranslations and errors are usually the result of this strategy rather than a failure of comprehension; they are not so much mistranslations, as creative, deliberate, misreadings.

What needs stressing is that despite these features of the translation Ogilby's Virgil is not a straightforward work of royalist propaganda. **I**n large part this is because royalism itself was not a monolithic entity **but** contained a broad spectrum of attitudes and beliefs.[15] Whilst Ogilby himself remained fairly consistently on its ultra-loyal, absolutist wing, individual lines and passages of his Virgil exist at various points on this spectrum. Depending on which of these are privileged, it is possible to read the translation as a work that acknowledges a defeated political movement that has become accommodated to the new regime, and as a text that suggests the movement is still alive. Nor is the translation a sustained royalist allegory, **but** instead the overt expressions of royalist sentiments (however broadly conceived and defined) occur relatively rarely **and** at strategically key points. Whilst they cast a long shadow over the translation, the Virgilian source text is too nuanced and complex to be entirely constrained by a royalist interpretative framework.

The reading of Ogilby's 1649 Virgil as a politically engaged text that this article offers runs counter to Tanya Caldwell's recent account of the volume. Caldwell suggests that whilst it is part of a 'royalist tradition' of Virgil translations, it is "noticeably devoid of political implications".[16] Such an account is difficult to sustain, not least because any work that was produced in the 1640s was likely to have been informed by the contemporary political situation, and be read, at the time as

now, as a potential commentary on it. The volume's paratextual material in particular capitalises

on this. The argument to the first Eclogue reads:

> *Sad* Melibæus *banished declares*
> *Those miseries attend on civill Wars,*
> *But happy* Tityrus, *the safe defence*
> *People enjoy, under a setled Prince.*[17]

Annabel Patterson has discussed how these lines "inevitably shape a reader's first impressions"

of the poem,[18] but as part of the opening argument to the main body of the volume, they achieve

a programmatic status not just for *Eclogues* 1 but for the translation as a whole. **The connection

the argument makes between public safety and a 'setled Prince'** suggests that Ogilby is

interested in using Virgil as a site of anti-Parliamentarian, pro-Stuart commentary.[19] The

arguments to the majority of the *Eclogues* - especially *Eclogues* 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9 - offer a distinctly

royalist moral **for** the individual poem, a process which often involves Ogilby having to depart

some way from the Latin text.[20]

Ogilby also continues this practice in the arguments to his *Georgics*. The majority of each

argument offers an accurate precis of the poem, but the final couplet again interprets the narrative

in a manner that reminds readers of contemporary events. The argument to *Georgics* I concludes:

"*Clashing of Nobles, Tumults, and of late* / *Popular fury, and great* Cæsars *fate*"; *Georgics* II "*What

safty in the harmless* Countrey *lies :* / *What dangers from rebellious* Cities *rise*"; *Georgics* III "*With

what diseases* Cattell *are annoyd,* / *How rots and murrains have whole* Realms *destroyd*";

'Georgics IV "*What cures against* Diseases *to afford,* / *And how th'whole* Nation *lost, may be

restor'd*".[21] These all are fairly accurate accounts of each poem, but the choice of vocabulary in

each instance points more towards the historical context of the translation rather than the

composition of the Latin originals. The arguments to the books of the *Aeneid* are, by contrast,

more neutral **and** emphasise description over royalist interpretation.[22] Ogilby's *Aeneis* signals its

royalism in other ways, which I will discuss shortly.

Other material **features** of the volume, particularly its typography, play a significant part in signalling its royalism. On a number of occasions successive words or lines are italicised. These lines are (as with the arguments) often combined with freer, less literal moments of translation **and intepretation** to recall contemporary political events. On occasion this involves commenting on the general chaos and violence of civil war in a non-partisan manner, as in the line "*good Daphnis peace did love*" from *Eclogues* 5.[23] This translates "amat bonus otia Daphnis", "good Daphnis loves leisure".[24] Here Ogilby must be consciously choosing to translate "otia" as though it meant "peace" rather than "leisure" or "ease". More usually, though, such lines reflect on the conflict from a distinctly royalist perspective. In Ogilby's translation of *Eclogues* 1 Meliboeus complains how "all with *Sequestrations* are opprest".[25] This is a fairly expansive rendering of Virgil's "undique totis / usque adeo turbatur agris", "since there is such complete chaos everywhere in all the countryside".[26] The choice of vocabulary is likely influenced by the establishment of the Sequestration Committee, which had the licence to confiscate the estates of individuals who had taken up arms in the name of the king.[27] By translating in this manner, Ogilby responds to and amplifies one particular aspect of the original poem, namely the debates around Augustus' land-redistribution programme.[28] Here the combination of italics and contemporary phraseology can read **as** an attempt by Ogilby to find suitably royalist-tinged equivalents for Virgil's own contemporary references. The long-standing tradition of reading *Eclogues* 1 as Virgil's own autobiographically-inspired comment on the political situation could make this (and its companion poem in the volume, *Eclogues* 9) a special case**.** Ogilby's first readers might well have expected him to substitute his own political climate for Virgil's in these particular poems. What is distinctive is that Ogilby applies this tradition to other parts of the translation. In *Georgics* 2, for example, Ogilby translates "ferrea iura / insanumque forum aut populi tabularia", "iron laws, and the mad forum or the records of the people", as "*Mad Parliaments*, *Acts of Commons*, *nor sword-law*".[29] Virgil's "mad forum" has become "*Mad Parliaments*", and in both texts there is the sense

that the institutions need bringing under control by an absolute ruler. Ogilby consequently suggests that, were he living and an Englishman in 1649, Virgil would have supported the royalist cause.

That said, moments where Ogilby draws explicitly on issues and vocabulary with such immediate contemporary resonance are relatively rare**,** are confined to italicised lines**, and not** every example of an italicised line shape**s** interpretation in this manner. Often they seem to indicate the presence of a *sententia* worth copying down into a commonplace book or a particularly significant example of moral guidance.[30] In his translation of *Georgics* 1 the instruction "*But first the gods adore*" stands out all the more clearly because of its use of italics.[31] Similarly, italics help to increase the impact of "*Dire thirst of gold*, *what dost not thou constrain / In mortall breasts!*"; doing so draws out the moral both Ogilby and Virgil hope the reader will draw from the Polydorus episode at the beginning of *Aeneid* 3 where these lines appear.[32] Such occasions are also usually close renderings of the original Latin. Whilst italicised lines that function as *sententiae* occur more frequently than those which can be read purely as expressions of royalism, many **of** these *sententiae* could still be interpreted as containing information that is conducive to a royalist interpretation, if the reader was predisposed to read the volume in this manner. The more overtly royalist arguments from earlier in the text help to steer the reader in this direction. **The moral of, for example,** Dido's "*I know t'help others*, *taught by my own want*", can be applied universally, but would have a special resonance for sequestered or exiled royalists.[33]

The nature of seventeenth-century book production means it is possible that **the decision to** italicize certain lines to enhance the royalist aspects of the translation **was made by the** volume's printers or publisher **rather than Ogilby himself**. The title page of the 1649 Virgil lists the printers as "T. R." and "E. M."**, whom** the edition's entry in the ESTC identifies as Thomas Ratcliffe and Edward Mottershead. The ESTC also shows that these men collaborated on several

publications in the 1640s and 1650s, none of which have obvious (or even indirect) associations with royalism. Even if they were not committed royalists themselves, they at least seem to have been prepared to present the text in a manner that allows a reading sympathetic to royalism. The volume's publisher, John Crooke, was, however, like Ogilby, a committed royalist. Ogilby had most likely made Crooke's acquaintance in Ireland.[34] Both men were active in the small literary circle centred around Strafford in the 1630s, although Crooke only established himself as a bookseller in his own right in the following decade **and** Ogilby's Virgil is, in fact, the first volume published under Crooke's name.[35] Ogilby's Virgil of 1649 involved an extended network of known and potential royalist sympathisers, which also extended to the engraver of the frontispiece portrait of Virgil**. This** was produced by William Marshal, who is best known for creating the icon of Charles I as martyr for the frontispiece of *Eikon Basilike*.

Examining the editions of Virgil that would have been available to Ogilby **suggests** that he was the person primarily responsible for italicising certain lines. There are marked similarities between the formatting of the text and Thomas Farnaby's Latin Virgil. This is the only other seventeenth-century edition of Virgil which prints individual lines in a different type **from** the main body of the text. Farnaby's Virgil, like other Virgil editions published before 1650, prints the Latin in italics.[36] Unlike these other editions, on occasion Farnaby prints phrases or lines in Roman type, consequently drawing attention to them in a manner similar to Ogilby's use of italics.[37] A crucial difference between the Farnaby and Ogilby Virgils is that the lines in Farnaby's edition that are printed in Roman type exclusively offer moral guidance for the reader, **so** none of them could be said to point to specific contemporary events in Farnaby's own lifetime from a royalist (or any other) perspective. **As** just under half of Farnaby's romanised lines are italicized in Ogilby's translation there is a sizeable degree of overlap between the respective **emphasized** passages in Farnaby and Ogilby. It is also generally the case that Ogilby translates a line that is italicised in the Farnaby edition relatively closely. It seems more likely, therefore, that the Ogilby volume is

manipulating a practice established by Farnaby in order to incorporate lines that express royalist sentiment in the guise of universalising moral *sententiae*; partisan opinions are being presented as objective verities.

Besides the parallels in typographic practice there are other factors **which increase the likelihood that** Ogilby used the Farnaby Virgil as the primary source-text for his translation. It was the most recently printed edition **(**first published in 1634, it was reissued in 1642**), and, a**s an edition intended for use in schools, it contained a greater amount of annotation than other printed Virgils: Farnaby's entry in Pierre Bayle's *Historical and Critical Dictionary* states "His Notes upon most of the ancient *Latin* Poets have done Youth a great deal of Service; being short, and full of Erudition, and principally calculated for the Understanding of the Text".[38] Ogilby's own familiarity with Latin prior to translating Virgil has been the subject of **a** debate **that** turns on how to interpret a reference by Aubrey that states Ogilby was, as a boy, "bred to his grammar".[39] It is known, however, that he immersed himself in the study of Latin when he left Ireland for England. Whether or not Ogilby was refreshing his knowledge of the language, or learning it for the first time, he would have found Farnaby's edition an appealing choice. It is possible that Ogilby consulted his friend James Shirley for guidance on producing his translation**, and** during the 1640s Shirley had been forced to abandon writing for the stage (which he first pursued in London before moving to Ireland to work for Ogilby's theatrical company) and had resumed his previous career as a schoolmaster.[40] As a result Shirley would have been especially familiar with Farnaby's edition. In addition to Farnaby's high reputation as an editor of classical texts, by the 1640s he had also demonstrated his ideological, as well as scholarly credentials: he had been imprisoned following his involvement in a royalist uprising in Kent.[41]

The volume appears in the Stationer**s'** Register's entry for 10 October 1648, **but** given the scope of the endeavour, Ogilby must have begun work on it several years previously. [42] Ogilby's

own comments on its composition also suggest that he wanted readers to think of it as a product of the early 1640s, written against the backdrop of the civil wars' first stages. In the dedication Ogilby states that it was "bred in phlegmatick Regions, and among people returning to their ancient barbarity".[43] Both Kristi Eastin and Alan Ereira posit that this is a reference to Ireland;[44] Ereira has established that Ogilby was in the country from c.1633 until 1647, and suggests that Ogilby began translating Virgil following the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland in 1641.[45] Despite this desire to place some temporal and spatial distance between composition and publication, italicised lines in the *Aeneid* (or least its later books) usually suggest events and sentiments from the conflict's latter stages, when the royalists had been militarily defeated and Charles was under house arrest. In *Aeneid* 9 Ogilby has Nisus tell Euryalus that "*The Peers and People would recall the Prince*".[46] This translates "Aenean acciri omnes, populusque patresque, / exposcunt", "everybody, the people and the fathers, demand Aeneas".[47] "Prince" could act as a synonym for "Aeneas", but it also seems chosen to recall the exiled Prince Charles, who by early 1649 was already being called Charles II by his supporters. "Peers" is a somewhat free rendering of "patres", "fathers", and seems designed to remind readers of the House of Lords. Ogilby could **nonetheless** justify this application by the fact that the council of Trojan elders in this book of the *Aeneid* is itself designed to remind Virgil's first readers of the Roman Senate. **L**ike so much of the poem, this episode provides an aetiology for institutions in Virgil's Rome.[48] This is related to the attempt to find contemporary equivalents for specifically Roman institutions like the forum or events from Roman history discernible elsewhere in Ogilby's translation. Such moments do not**, however,** wholly supersede Ogilby's references to earlier aspects of the conflict **since** there are points, particularly in the *Georgics*, where the translation seems to have been overtaken by events between its composition and publication. His reference to "*covenanting Brethren*" is an example of this.[49] The line comes in the account of the Giants' war against Olympus, and "*covenanting*" translates Virgil's "coniuratos", "those who have sworn an oath".[50] This makes more sense as a reference to the Scottish Covenant of 1643 who aligned themselves with Parliament, rather than

the 1648 Covenanters who realigned with the royalists. This would better explain the comparison with the Giants, who are leading a rebellion against the King of the Gods.

The translation consequently possesses the multiple temporality critics have found in the contemporary publications by two other royalists: Fanshawe's *Il Pastor Fido* and Herrick's *Hesperides*.[51] Where Fanshawe's volume suggests a more calculated strategy of layered temporal perspectives, Herrick's responses to various stages of civil conflict are more haphazard: accounts of decay and decline, for example, occur before and after lines, such as "*this age best pleaseth me*", which are concerned with the 1630s.[52] *Hesperides* also gives another precedent for the practice of italicisation. It is worth noting that, although Herrick and Ogilby are not known to have met or read each other's work, they moved in similar circles from the 1620s onwards and had several mutual acquaintances, including James Shirley.[53] Their respective works have an additional connection: the Crooke brothers initially owned the copyright for *Hesperides* before selling it to its eventual publishers, John Williams and Francis Eglefield.[54] Italicised lines feature heavily in Herrick's volume, many of which function as *sententiae*. These are particularly prevalent in the second, concluding, line of an epigram: "*The morrowes life too late is, Live to-day*"; "*Griefe, if't be great, 'tis short; if long, 'tis light*".[55] Other italicised lines emphasise their contemporary resonance. Ones such as "*No Kingdomes got by Rapine long endure*", express loyalty to the royalists and hostility to their antagonists.[56] Others serve to criticise and advise Charles I: "*Kings ought to sheare, not skin their sheepe*"; "'Twas *Cesars* saying: *Kings no lesse Conquerors are / By their wise Counsell, then they be by Warre*"; "*No man so well a Kingdome Rules, as He, / Who hath himselfe obaid the Soveraignty*".[57] There are distinct parallels with how Ogilby's Virgil and *Hesperides* exploit a potential overlap between italicisation for moral guidance, and italicisation for the expression of royalist sentiment. Phrases such as "*It is the End that crownes us, not the Fight*" can seem fairly innocuous and generalizing, but would have an especially consoling effect for any readers who shared Herrick's royalism.[58]

The publication of *Hesperides* in 1648 meant that the collection does not respond directly to Charles I's execution. It does, however, contain poems which seem to anticipate this event, or at least explore the possibility of Charles's deposition and death.[59] H-998, one of several epigrams in the volume printed entirely in italics, reads: "*Kings must not use the Axe for each offence:* / *Princes cure some faults by their patience.*" The presence of 'Kings' and 'Axe' in the same line makes it difficult to read the poem without thinking of Charles's execution**. T**his event also gives a political charge to **italicised** lines in less overtly politically-oriented poems in *Hesperides*, such as "*A sullen day will cleere againe*", or "*All things decay with Time*".[60] Something similar informs the parts of Ogilby's Virgil that are directly concerned with the death of kings. The 1649 publication date of the volume, combined with Ogilby's apparent desire to present it as the work of the early 1640s, makes it difficult to establish with certainty as to whether they anticipate or reflect on Charles I's execution. Three passages in particular are of interest in this context, all of which involve italicisation and a non-literal interpretation of the Latin text. The first of these occurs in the argument to the fifth *Eclogue*:

> *Since* Kings *as* common Fathers *cherish all,*
> Subjects *like* children *should lament their fall* ;
> *But learned men of grief should have more sense,*
> *When violent death seizes a* gracious Prince.[61]

In and of itself this is not the most accurate summary, as it does not acknowledge the primary status of *Eclogues* 5 as an elegy for the poet Daphnis. The use of "should" in the second and third lines suggests that Ogilby could have intended the argument to act primarily as a warning or a doom-laden prophecy. If the first argument was written in the early stages of the conflict, it acquired a new, potentially subversive, resonance by the time of publication, which may have necessitated its removal. Whatever its initial intention, on its publication the argument appears to have evoked Charles I's execution too strongly. In the 1650 reprint, which, unlike the 1649 edition,

contains an official licence in the form of an imprimatur,[62] this was the only argument that was rewritten:

> *Poor Swains mourn* Cæsars *losse, husbandmen may*
> *At Princes Obsequies their sorrow pay* ;
> *And it concerns them, when the death of Kings*
> *Oft murrains*, *rots*, *and mighty famine brings.*[63]

This argument draws on the traditional reading of the poem that Daphnis represents Julius Caesar. This provides a reading that was still royalist, but was also more explicitly historical. Any contemporary resonance is restricted more to mourning a departed monarch, rather than castigating a populace for not showing obedience to a sovereign.

Ogilby returns to this account of the relationship between a monarch and his subjects in his translation of *Georgics* 4. It occurs in a passage which discusses the social harmony that bees lose when they are not ruled by a king:

> *Whil'st their King lives*, *they all agree in one*,
> *But dead*, *the publick faith is overthrown.*
> *They make the Commonwealth a spoyle*, *and rend*
> *Their waxen Realms*, *his life did all defend.*[64]

Whereas the monarch in Virgil is "amisso", "lost", in Ogilby he is dead. "Amissus" can be used to mean "dead" as well as "lost", but "lost" is the more frequent usage. Ogilby adds his own royalist sympathies by calling the honeycombs "waxen realms", and adding the reference to how the king "his life did all defend" these realms, which has no equivalent in the Latin. The more immediate reference in the Latin is also to the usurpation of one monarch by another rather than the death of the hive's king.

As with the argument to *Eclogues* 5 and certain poems in *Hesperides*, the emphasis could be on a warning that had come to pass by the time of publication, rather than as a reflection on the execution itself, **and** presenting **these lines** as a warning or premonition also suited Ogilby's

wider strategy of **implying that** the work **was** a product of the early 1640s. There is also the fact that the Stationers' Register entry should give a *terminus ante quem* of late 1648 for the translation's composition. There were, however, often significant gaps between **registering** and **publishing a book**: Nicholas McDowell has identified how Lovelace's *Lucasta* was registered in February 1648, but was not published until May 1649 at the earliest.[65] Ogilby's translation of the *Iliad* was entered on 18 April 1656, but was not published until 1660.[66] Jason McElligott has discussed how "Authors and stationers could, and did, present carefully selected portions of potentially problematic texts for pre-publication review; they could, and did, rewrite texts or insert new material into them after a licence was granted".[67] It **consequently** remains possible that lines were adapted or marked for italicization at a late stage in its composition, or even as the manuscript was being prepared for publication. It is now impossible to establish for certain that Ogilby's Virgil is an example of this practice, **as the manuscript has not survived and, more significantly, because I have not been able to ascertain precisely when in 1649 it appeared**.[68] These lines could have been composed prior to Charles's execution **since** the possibility of this event was being anticipated by the time the translation was registered for publication.[69] Nonetheless, it appears to be **a** likely explanation for the contemporary resonance of the italicised lines, especially those which, as in the case of the lines from *Georgics* IV, have no equivalent typographic status in Farnaby.

The possibility of late or stop-press amendments to incorporate references to very recent events informs the third italicised passage that is concerned with the death of kings. This occurs in *Aeneid* 2, during Aeneas' account of Priam's death at the hands of Pyrrhus:

> as soon as this he said,
> Through his sons blood, he dragging him convai'd
> Trembling to th'altars : then his haire he wreathes
> In his left hand, his right his sword unsheathes,
> Which to the hilts he buries in his side.
> So finish'd *Priams* fates, and thus he dide,
> Seeing *Ilium* burn, whose proud Commands did sway

So many potent Realms in *Asia.*
Now on the strand his sacred bodie lies
Headlesse without a name or obsequies.[70]

As with the passage from *Georgics* 4, there is no precedent in Farnaby's Virgil for the use of italics in the concluding couplet, and it is very difficult to read the lines without thinking of the execution of Charles I.[71] **There is also the possibility that, as with "*Kings must not use the Axe*" in H-998, the lines, however they were initially intended, achieved a new melancholic and commemorative resonance after 1649, at least for royalist readers. Whilst** th**e** potential parallel between the headless Priam and the beheaded Charles I **(and the implication that Charles's execution has the potential to be as cataclysmic for Charles's country as Priam's death was for Troy)** would have been apparent enough even without the interpretative aid of italicisation, Ogilby adds **certain** detail**s to make the connection between Charles and Priam all the more explicit. It is Ogilby, and not Virgil, who states** that Priam's body is "sacred". This seems highly indebted to the notion of divinely-sanctioned monarchy that was such a feature of Stuart myth-making.[72] It also overrides the concept of the King's two bodies to present the body as sacred in death as well as in life**, which also** suggests affinities with the Anglican notion of King Charles as a martyr. **This status is one that Ogilby could have foreseen and anticipated, but he makes other alterations to provide details which are more likely to represent a *post-hoc* response than any specific prescience on his part**. Ogilby's use of "strand" is a fairly close rendition of Virgil's "litore", "on the shore", but he may have chosen this particular term to remind readers of the Strand, the thoroughfare in London which intersected with Whitehall, the site of Charles's execution. Another of Ogilby's additions, or at least inferences, is how the body lies without "obsequies". Whilst this could certainly apply to Priam's body the more immediate reference appears to be to Charles I, **since** none of the funerary rites from the Book of Common Prayer were spoken when Charles was interred at Windsor Castle.[73] Ogilby was not eyewitness to this event, but the details of the funeral, including the lack of spoken rites, were reported in a

number of newsbooks soon after. Ogilby may even had heard of this from an eyewitness before it appeared in print. He dedicated the translation to William Seymour, Marquis of Hertford, who acted as one of the four pallbearers at Charles**'s** funeral.[74]

As **with** *Eclogues* 1 and 9, Ogilby could claim Virgilian precedent in using the death of Priam to point to recent events. Recalling Charles's death at this moment acts as a further contemporary updating of the political context to the original text. Several seventeenth-century editions of Virgil, including Farnaby's, acknowledge how Virgil used the death of Priam to remind readers of the death of Pompey the Great.[75] After his defeat at Pharsalus Pompey fled to Egypt, where he was beheaded (on the orders of the Pharaoh, Ptolemy XIII) the moment that he stepped ashore. This could suggest that Ogilby's readers who were aware of this precedent would have expected him to manipulate the original text in this way **and so,** to a certain degree, these examples stand apart from the other incidents of italicised lines. A collapsing of past and present also helps to account for an inconsistency in Virgil's narrative. The passage makes it clear that Pyrrhus kills Priam by a sword-thrust to the body before Priam's ancestral altar in the Trojan citadel. Yet the concluding couplet indicates that Pyrrhus (or somebody else) has severed Priam's head from the body, and moved the corpse from the altar at the heart of the palace to the shoreline outside of the city walls. The shift helps make the final two lines serve as a narrative flash-forward. The lines grant an added pathos by emphasising how the king of Troy has been cast out of his city as though he were a polluting agent.[76] Ogilby's reference to Charles in the death of Priam draws on the pathos that is already present in the original to augment its elegaic status.

The passage on the death of Priam has affinities with another publication of 1649 that mourns Charles's death. *Lachrymae Musarum* is a collection of elegies that were officially published as a response to the death of Henry Hastings in June 1649.[77] In the collection Hastings's death is sometimes, as in the contributions by "J. B." and John Denham, compared

with Charles's own**, but** in the majority of poems Hastings acts as a substitute for Charles. The collection also encourages this application through the manipulation of material form. The title page stresses Hastings's own royal ancestry: he is "Onely Sonn of the Right Honourable Ferdinando Earl of Huntingdon Heir-Generall of the high born Prince George Duke of Clarence, Brother to King Edward the fourth". The first elegy is headed by an emblem containing a rose, a thistle, a fleur-de-lys, and a harp, the traditional symbols for the kingdoms Charles claimed as his domains (England, Scotland, France, and Ireland). The connection is made even more explicit by the presence of a crown above each emblem. The volume's emphasis is very much on mourning, of lamenting the past rather than looking to the future.

Another publication of 1649, Christopher Wase's translation of Sophocles' *Electra*, is worth comparing with how Ogilby's Virgil and *Lachyrmae Musarum* mark Charles's death. One dedicatory poem refers to Wase's "*choice and seasonable translation*", and another calls the translation "an ingenious choice […] Representing Allegorically these Times".[78] Wase certainly draws attention to the fact that in the play the children of King Agamemnon avenge their father's murder. As Lois Potter has discussed, Wase helps to secure the allegorical status by italicising certain lines, as when Orestes is addressed as "*Avenger of thy Royall Fathers head*".[79] In a more extensive use of italics Wase lingers over the means of Clytemnestra's murder of Agamemnon in order to recall another more recent beheading. The Chorus states:

> Nor will *Greeces* nat'rall Father
> Ever be forgetfull, neither
> Th'ancient *Poll-ax Rasor-edg'd*
> *With steel wing on both sides fledg'd*,
> Which with *opprobrious* stroke,
> Off *its Sovereigne took*.[80]

Wase might have felt able to signal the parallels between his translation and the death of Charles I more explicitly than Ogilby because his *Electra* appeared anonymously, although he is identified as the author in Thomason's copy. Its allegory can be signalled more overtly thanks to its status

as a post-regicide response rather than a work that was adapted in response to this event.[81] The title page also claims that it was printed at The Hague, and so it escaped the licensing authorities. At the time of Charles I's execution Prince Charles was resident at The Hague with his sister, Princess Mary**, who** was the first person in England to hold the title that Electra is called in the Dramatis Personae, "Princesse Royall".[82] Wase dedicated the volume to another daughter of Charles still resident in England, Princess Elizabeth. The translation consequently acts as a call to arms by Charles's heirs. Wase commemorates Charles's death in a manner which is noticeably more vengeful than melancholic.

Placing Ogilby's rendering of Priam's death alongside other moments in the translation which discuss the death of kings, as well as works by other writers which mark Charles's death via a proxy, strengthens the **possibility** that **the text and typography of its** concluding couplet was altered **whilst the volume was in press** in order to make it read like a flash-forward or prophesy. There are additional precedents for this Fanshawe as well as in Herrick **as,** in both their collections, any potentially prophetic elements of poetry that w**ere** written prior to the 1640s are emphasised and privileged on publication. Whilst Herrick and Fanshawe "anticipate" defeat in armed conflict, Ogilby's Virgil goes one step further to "anticipate" Charles execution. It was in Ogilby's interest to claim that the translation was completed at an earlier date than it really was. This could help the volume avoid censure by the licenser, but, equally significantly, doing so allowed Ogilby to claim a Virgilian precedent for this practice. Virgil had sought to re-establish the links between poetry and prophecy by referring to himself not as *poeta* ("a poet"), but as *vates* ("a seer"). From at least late antiquity (and possibly earlier) Virgil's reputation was such that his poetry was deemed to contain all human knowledge and so could be used to discern the outcome of future events. This approach to Virgil derives largely from how it was felt he 'Christs *birth* […] *by happie error sings*' in his prophecy of an imminent new Golden Age in *Eclogues* 4,[83] but Virgil's own use of prophecy in the *Aeneid* acts as a more immediate precedent for Ogilby. In that poem

Virgil's characters **prophesy** events that lie in the future in terms of the poem's narrative, but which had already come to pass by the time of the poem's composition.[84] Prophesying events that had already happened allowed Virgil and his later imitators to add a greater sense of destiny to those events.

Emphasising the prophetic qualities of the source-text allowed Ogilby, in certain italicised lines, to respond to the sense of fated inevitability that often informs Virgil's poetry. In *Georgics* 1 he claims "*All things by destiny / So hasten to grow worse and backward goes*";[85] in *Georgics* 3 "*The best dayes first from mortall wretches flye, / Disease, sad age, labour, and death supply*".[86] Such lines could help Ogilby console himself and his fellow royalists that there was nothing more they could have done in order to support their cause. Again, emphasising lines such as these can help avoid the licenser's censure **since** they are both fairly close translations of the original and are italicised in Farnaby. Other examples could even be interpreted as accepting defeat, as in the exhortations "*Live, and preserve yourselves for better chance*" and "*What God and hard chance bids, we must obey*".[87] Again, these examples had been romanised in Farnaby's Virgil, and they do not add any new details or information in the manner of other italicised lines and passages.

At the same time, though, both Virgil and Ogilby use the same technique when it came to anticipating matters that really were beyond the present. Virgil **interrogates the** long-term prospects of the Augustan settlement (and the power of his own poetry to outlast that settlement)**, but** Ogilby was concerned more with the possibility of royalist revival after 1649. The volume emphasizes, again through italicised lines, aspects of Virgil which stress the cyclical nature of time and the virtue of patience. In *Aeneid* 11, Ogilby's Turnus tells his beleaguered forces:

> *The various work of time and many days,*
> *Often affairs from worse to better raise,*
> *Fortune reviewing those she hath cast down,*
> *Sporting restores again unto their crown.*[88]

The Latin this passage translates is fairly complex and in need of paraphrasing in order to make it readily intelligible in English.[89] Ogilby's choice of "their crown" at this point in the translation is surely a deliberate one, just as it had been earlier in the volume when Ogilby was translating an account of a tree catching fire:

>   which first
> Under the sappie rinde is closely nurst:
> Then by degrees to the high branches flies
> And spreading sends loud fragor to the skies:
> A victor straight from bough to bough aspires;
> *And the Crown seis'd, involveth all with fires*.
> To Heaven black clouds and pitchy mists are sent,
> And dismall vapours scale the firmament.[90]

 Here the use of 'Crown' has some justification from the original – the fire 'alta cacumina regnat', 'reigns as a victor among the high treetops' – but is clearly gesturing towards a different type of crown. But where these lines from the *Georgics* remain fatalistic and offer an apocalyptic vision of the loss of monarchical authority, by the time of its publication in 1649 Turnus' speech had come (thanks to the various work of time) to indicate a potential revival of the monarchy under Prince Charles / Charles II. Other italicised lines elsewhere in the volume, such as "*Labour returns in circle to the Swaine*, / *And years revolve in their own steps again*" and "*Such change workes length of time*", offer the same sentiment.[91] These offer a different sort of consolation to Ogilby's fellow royalists **from** ones which meditate on the fated hopelessness of their cause and an acceptance of defeat. Ogilby's Virgil consequently signals a more nuanced royalism than other volumes published in the same **year** which commemorate Charles's execution. Unlike *Lachrymae Musarum*, it is not backwards-looking and melancholic; unlike Wase's *Electra*, it is not anticipatory and wrathful. The translation contains hope, as well as despair and rage.

For some critics, Ogilby did not sustain this hope into the Interregnum and the revised translation of Virgil he published in 1654. Colin Burrow has suggested that the revised edition "rarely takes a royalist peek over the parapet" **and** the passage on Priam's death can act as a

case study that would affirm such an approach.[92] The final couplet **was, as with all the lines that appear in italics in the 1649 edition,** no longer italicised but **instead** printed in the standard Roman type**.[93]** The **1654** edition is a noticeably more lavish, high-status production than its predecessor. It is replete with annotations, and Ogilby glosses the passage with an annotation on how Virgil's Priam points at the death of Pompey.[94] This ensures that the main political figure recalled at this moment is Pompey instead of Charles I. Rather than suggest a more muted royalism, or even a form of accommodation with the Republican regime, however, these alterations are more likely the result of Ogilby's desire to produce a more scholarly edition. Other critics, including Annabel Patterson, assert that the 1654 edition is an overtly royalist work.[95] Patterson's argument can be projected back to the 1649 edition, as some of the examples she provides in fact first appear in that volume. Nonetheless, other changes for the 1654 edition do demonstrate a continued desire to express royalist sentiment. The pointedly contemporary argument for *Eclogues* 5 from the 1649 Virgil that was removed in the 1650 reprint for a more historicized version was restored in the 1654 edition.[96] At points Ogilby even adds vocabulary which makes very clear references to events of the 1640s, especially in his repeated reference to the Solemn League and Covenant.[97] Such references usually occur at moments when individuals are being mendacious or breaking a treaty, and so perhaps indicate Ogilby's sentiments towards the shifting allegiances of Scottish Covenanters more systematically than he was able to do in the 1649 edition.

As in the 1649 Virgil, the 1654 edition manipulates the circumstances of publication and the volume's material form in order to signal its continued support for the royalist cause. **When** Ogilby compared his Virgil editions in the dedication to his 1670 atlas *Africa* he took particular pride in the fact that between 1649 and 1654 his Virgil had swelled "from a *Mean Octavo*", to "a *Royal Folio*".[98] The latter term ostensibly denotes a particular size of folio, but it also has clear implications regarding Ogilby's political sympathies. The 1654 edition was published by Thomas

Warren, who had previously printed other works associated with the royalists, including several editions of *Eikon Basilike*. The translation retains its original dedication to Hertford, but to finance such an ornate volume Ogilby sought further, more direct, patronage. The translation was published by subscription, and all the subscribers had supported the monarchy during the 1640s: the individuals concerned had, amongst other things, commanded forces in the army, allowed their estates to become royalist garrisons, served on royal councils, and acted as tutors to Charles's children.[99] The edition came with a series of illustrated plates. Subscribers were assigned one each, to which was added a name and, where relevant, a title and coat of arms. This practice was later recycled (as were the plates themselves) by Tonson and Dryden for the first, five-guinea, subscribers to the 1697 *Works of Virgil*.[100] As with the 1697 Virgil, attempts were made to find an appropriate subscriber for the illustrations (or at least some of them). As a result, threaded throughout the volume are the names of prominent royalists, some of whom had already been executed by the time of its publication. In addition, readers are steered towards a royalist interpretation of the *Aeneid* as the plates depicting Aeneas show him with a distinctly Cavalier beard and moustache.

This practice developed an interpretative technique that Ogilby had deployed in his 1651 verse paraphrase of Aesop. Like the 1654 Virgil, Ogilby's Aesop is a politicised rendering of its source material **which** steers opinion as much through image as it does through text.[101] The Fable "Of the Fox and the Lion" in the fourth book of the collection is prefaced by an illustration in which the lion wears a crown and coronation robes whilst holding an orb and sceptre.[102] Lions in the collection are frequently equated with Charles I, and are, in addition, invariably described as being old, worn-out, overthrown, or killed. The *Aesop* had first been published in 1651, also by Warren. In many respects the volume, for both translator and publisher, acted as a dry run for a Virgil that is complete with "ornament of Sculpture and Annotations" which Ogilby promised 1649, **but** it also looked back to the Virgil edition of that year.[103] The morals that conclude each fable are set off

from the main narrative and placed in italics. **Whilst this** was common in editions of Aesop and other fabular texts **it** also suggests the influence of the 1649 Virgil. On occasion the text of several lines within the morals themselves are even taken directly from the 1649 Virgil itself. The moral to "Of the Forester, skinner, and Bear" begins "*Fortune assists the bold*, *the valiant Man / Oft Conquerour proves, because he thinks he can*".[104] This draws on two lines from the *Aeneid*: the first of which is "audentis ['audentes' in early modern editions] Fortuna iuvat", "Fortune helps the daring"; Ogilby's translation of this (one of the lines italicised in the 1649 edition) is "Fortune assists the bold", and so presumably served as the source for the fable's moral.[105] The second line draws on "possunt, quia posse videntur", "they can do it, because they think they can".[106] This was not italicised in either the 1649 Virgil or Farnaby's edition, but it had become something of a commonplace by the seventeenth-century.

The textual and material resemblance between the morals of Ogilby's *Aesop* and the 1649 Virgil extends to the fact that the moral often extrapolates and glosses its fable in a manner which stresses contemporary application and a royalist perspective. As the account of the Lion/Charles I indicates, however, that perspective had shifted by the 1650s.[107] Unlike other works that mark Charles's death via a proxy, there is significantly less emphasis on the pathos of his overthrow and death. In the twelfth fable of the first book, "The Frogs desiring a King", the loss of the first king, King Log, precipitates anarchy, then tyranny.[108] As Mark Loveridge discusses, the equation between Charles I and King Log is hardly complimentary.[109] Despite the frogs' experiences under the tyrant Stork / Cromwell, Ogilby draws the moral:

> *No government can th' unsetled vulgar please,*
> *Whom change delight's think quiet a disease,*
> *Now Anarchie and Armies they maintain,*
> *And wearied, are for King and Lords again.*[110]

The moral looks beyond the narrative of the fable (where the frogs are still suffering under the Stork) to a new regime similar to that of King Log. Ogilby's *Aesop* moves away from mourning the

past and begins to look to the future, albeit a future that restores the pre-1642 *status quo* of monarchy and the House of Lords.[111]

Ogilby's Virgil of 1654 draws on tropes from the royalist literary culture of the Caroline period in order to act as a reminder of what once had been, and what, Ogilby intimates, will be again. Despite the setbacks to the royalist cause after Charles's execution, Ogilby actually increased his sense of hope for the 1654 Virgil by providing further prophecies of a Stuart restoration. This aspect of the translation helps affirm Ereira's account of the 1654 volume (drawn from his analysis of the subscription-list) as "the membership card of an elite and dangerous club", that is, ultra-loyal royalists.[112] The translation could still, however, speak to interests beyond those of this small group. These references are more veiled than **those** to sequestrations or mad Parliaments and they are not signalled by a special use of italics**, so** they are thus unlikely to be picked up by a casual reader. One of the most potent examples of this comes in a minor, but telling, change Ogilby makes in *Aeneid* 2, in a passage where Aeneas tells Dido how he was guided away from Troy with his fellow-survivors by the Morning Star, the planet sacred to his mother Venus. Virgil is, according to Servius, referring to the myth that Venus kept the day star in the sky as a guide for the duration of Aeneas' voyage from the ruins of Troy to Italy.[113] It also acts as one of several assertions that Aeneas makes regarding his departure from Troy on account of divine instruction and his fated destiny as the heir to Troy and the founder of the Roman people. The lines in Virgil's text read:

> iamque iugis summae surgebat Lucifer Idae
> ducebatque diem, Danaique obsessa tenebant
> limina portarum, nec spes opis ulla dabatur.
> cessi et sublato montis ['montem' in early modern editions] genitore petivi.[114]

"And now the morning star rose from the summit of [Mount] Ida and brought in the day, and the Greeks held the besieged thresholds of the gates, nor was there any hope of support for us. I conceded defeat and, with my father on my shoulders, made for the mountain."

Ogilby's reworked the 1649 version of these lines for the 1654 edition:

When the day starre from high-brow'd *Ida* rise Ushering the morn, our gates the enemies Kept with strong guards : no hope left, I retire And take the hills, bearing my aged sire.	When *Hesperus* from high-brow'd Ida rose , Ushering the Day, our Gates beset with Foes , Nor hope of succour, I the Mountain take , Bearing my aged Father on my back.[115]

Ogilby's 1649 edition translates "Lucifer" as "the day starre" **whereas** the 1654 translation refers to "*Hesperus*". Arvid Løsnes calls this "an obvious error", since Hesperus is the evening star.[116] Whilst the conclusion to *Aeneid* II is clearly intended to be the beginning of a new day rather than the end of an old one the shift could be fairly inconsequential. Both the morning and evening star, after all, are the same planet, which one of Ogilby's marginal glosses earlier in the volume had already observed.[117]

More significantly, Løsnes passes over how the equivalent passage in the 1649 Virgil does refer to the day star; Ogilby's use of '*Hesperus*' in the 1654 edition must, therefore, have been deliberate. At all other points when Virgil uses either "Lucifer" or "Hesperus", Ogilby renders the term accordingly **since** this is the only exception in either edition.[118] Within the context of the poem "Hesperus" for "Lucifer" allows Ogilby to offers a more optimistic note by anticipating the Trojans' final destination. The ghost of Aeneas' wife Creusa informs him that his future home lies in "terram Hesperiam", "the Hesperian land".[119] This is translated by Ogilby as "*Hesperia*".[120] Virgil established the connection between Hesperia and Italy earlier in the *Aeneid*:

> est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,
> terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glaebae;
> Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores
> Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem.
> Hic ['huc' in early modern editions] cursus fuit …[121]

"there is a place, the Greeks call it Hesperia, an ancient land, powerful in war and rich in soil, colonised by the Oenotrians; now the story is that their descendants call the land Italy after the name of their leader. This was where our journey lay …"

The reference to Hesperus thus acts both as a sign to Aeneas that his mother will help guide his journey, and also act as a reminder of that journey's end-point. This allows a moment of reassurance for the Trojans even when things seem at their most desperate.

The particular associations of Hesperus in royalist poetry allow Ogilby to transfer this note of optimism from the Trojans to his fellow royalists. In the Caroline period, royalists had associated Hesperus with the future Charles II. Hesperus was visible at the moment of Charles's birth in 1630, and Charles is presented as a Hesperus in a number of royalist panegyrics of the period. This connection is particularly associated with *Hesperides*, which Herrick dedicated to Prince Charles.[122] Fanshawe uses it in the poem "Presented to his Highness in the West, Ann. Dom, 1646".[123] This poem was first published in his collection *Il Pastor Fido* **and,** like *Hesperides*, this volume was dedicated to Prince Charles.[124] The Hesperus trope also appears in poems by Henry Wotton and John Cleveland as well as providing an additional resonance to Orestes' claim in Wase's *Electra* that he will "*rise*, / Like a *bright star* upon my enemies", although the reference is present in the original Greek.[125]

By referring to Hesperus at the conclusion of *Aeneid* II, then, Ogilby suggests that by the 1650s royalist hopes now lay with Charles I's eldest son and heir. The passage talks of the loss of hope, and yet Ogilby was still prepared to anticipate a Stuart restoration. Even after Cromwell's installation as Lord Protector, Ogilby, unlike many fellow Virgilian royalists, remained optimistic that Charles would act as a Hesperus to the royalists. He would lead and guide them in their exile until they were able to return to their ancestral home. Rather than seeing the use of "Hesperus" as an error, it is more helpful and accurate to see it as a creatively deliberate alteration on Ogilby's part, and as a royalist cultural shibboleth that hopefully signals the ultimate future triumph of their cause.

The associations between Charles and Hesperus may have informed his decision to enter London for the first time as Charles II on 29 May, 1660. As this was his birthday it was also the anniversary of Hesperus' daytime appearance in the sky. Paul Hammond has observed **that**

Dryden's reference to "That Star that at your Birth shone out so bright" in *Astraea Redux*, his poem on Charles's accession, was one of many examples of the trope re-establishing itself in royalist panegyric.[126] But what Dryden and other poets did in 1660, Ogilby had done in the previous decade in the depths of what Earl Miner called the "Cavalier winter".[127] There is a strong sense of vindication and declaration of long-standing loyalty in Ogilby's dedication of his next substantial translation, the *Iliad*, to Charles II. In the dedication Ogilby offers a prayer for Charles's safety which seems more inspired by his translation of Virgil than of Homer:

> *May that great God who sent a Star to wait on your Nativity (seen at Noon to the Astonishment of the Beholders, and though long since vanished, yet still remembred and look'd upon as an Omen of your future happiness) be the constant Light and Conduct of all your Actions.*[128]

The Homer of 1660 seeks to ratify not only Caroline-era panegyrics, but also Ogilby's own prophecy in his 1654 Virgil, when the "halcyon days" of the 1630s had long since vanished, and when royalist hopes seemed at their nadir.

Ogilby's commitment to royalism during the Interregnum and his ability to read Virgil in a sophisticated manner helped him secure the commission for organising Charles II's triumphal procession that formed part of his coronation ceremony in 1661.[129] Ogilby was involved in the design of the triumphal arches which lined Charles's route from the Tower of London to Westminster Abbey. These arches are adorned with a number of allegorical icons and phrases, many of which have been analysed by Paula Backscheider.[130] What Backscheider does not discuss is the frequent use of Virgilian mottos on these arches and their connections with Ogilby's Virgils of 1649 and 1654. The first Virgilian motto on the first arch is "IN SOLIDO RURSUS FORTUNA LOCAVIT".[131] Ogilby provides the necessary context in his printed account of the procession. There he notes the line is:

> Alluding to that of *Virgil*,
>
> > *Multa dies variusque labor, mutabilis ævi*
> > *Rettulit in melius, multos alterna revisens*
> > *Lusit, & in solido rursus Fortuna locavit.*

Thus rendred,

> "The various Works of Time, and many Dayes,
> "Often Affairs from worse to better raise,
> "Fortune reviewing those she tumbled down,
> "Sporting restores again unto the Crown.[132]

Ogilby cites his own translation of Virgil here. They are lines which his 1649 edition placed in italics, **although the translation itself comes** from the revised Virgil of 1654 **since** the **final line in the** 1649 rendering reads "*Sporting restores again unto their Crown*".[133] **Several of** the other Virgilian mottos on the coronation arches, **including "REGE INCOLUMI MENS OMNIBUS UNA EST", "AUSI IMMANE NEFAS AUSOQUE POTITI" and "DISCITE JUSTITIAM MONITI", are also taken from lines that are italicised in Ogilby's 1649 Virgil.[134]** Charles's process not only heralded the return of the monarchy, it also demonstrated how Ogilby's prophecies of a Stuart restoration had actually come to pass. Even though it was more a triumph of hope rather than experience, Ogilby did become a Virgilian *vates*. His Virgil allowed him to outdo his Latin predecessor and shape public events to vindicate the prophecies that he had included in the various editions of that volume.

Word count (excluding title page, abstract, keywords, and bibliography): 12 055.

Notes

[1] For which see Proudfoot, *Dryden's Aeneid*, 14-93 (analysis confined to *Aeneid* 4), 126-37 (briefer, more general remarks); Løsnes, "*Arms and the Man*", 137-41 (analysis confined to *Aeneid* 2); Dryden, *Works*, 6, 863; 865; 889-1127.
[2] *Sylvae* contains translated extracts from *Aeneid* 5, 8, 9, and 10. Dryden's translations of *Eclogues* 1 and 9 had appeared in the *Miscellany Poems* of 1684.
[3] Dryden, *Works*, 3, 4. Dryden is referring to Ogilby's translations of the *Iliad* (1660) and *Odyssey* (1665) as well as of Virgil.
[4] Dryden, *Works*, 3, 8.
[5] See *Mac Flecknoe*, ll. 102, 174.
[6] *The Dunciad* (1728), 1.248. For Pope's childhood reading of Ogilby, see Mack, *Alexander Pope*, 44-7 (which draws on Spence, nos. 29-30).
[7] **BL Shelfmark: General Reference Collection 833.d.26.**
[8] Brower, "Verbal Translation of Myth", 283; Frost, "Translating Virgil", 274-5.
[9] Dryden, *Works*, 6, 860; 848.

[10] Proudfoot, *Dryden's Aeneid*, 126; 137.

[11] Eastin, "Dramatic Performance", focuses on the effect of the Latin inscriptions (keyed to specific parts of the text) that are present in the illustrations. Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, 169-86, combines discussion of the images with some comments on the translation's literary qualities.

[12] In addition to the works already cited, see Burrow, "Virgil in English Translation", 25-7.

[13] See Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, for an account of this literary culture.

[14] For the connections between this form of "freer" translation and royalist politics, see Potter, *Secret Rites*, 52-3.

[15] For a summary and examples of further criticism, see Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 2-3.

[16] Caldwell, "Translation", 601.

[17] Ogilby (1649), 1. The edition lacks line references, so quotations are by page number; pagination is continuous for the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, but restarts at *Aeneid* 1 and 7. References to editions are by year rather than title.

[18] Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, 171.

[19] For the tradition of politicised translations and imitations of the *Eclogues* prior to Ogilby, see Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, 133-69.

[20] Ogilby (1649), 5; 17; 21; 25; 34.

[21] Ibid., 41; 57; 75; 95.

[22] Ibid., 1; 25; 51; 74; 97; 125 (*Aeneid* 1-6 pagination); 1; 27; 50; 77; 108; 138 (*Aeneid* 7-12 pagination).

[23] Ibid., 19.

[24] Virgil, *Eclogues*, 5.61. For ease of reference, Virgil is quoted from the most recent Loeb edition, but has been checked against the editions of Virgil that were published in the British Isles before 1649. In addition to those discussed elsewhere in the article, these were: *Vergiliana poesis* (1515); *Opera P. Virgilii Maronis* (1570, reprinted 1572, 1576, 1580, 1583, 1584, 1597, 1602, 1613, and 1632); three separate volumes called *Pub. Virgilii Maronis Poemata*, (1593; 1612; 1629); *Pub. Vergilii Maronis opera* (1616, reprinted 1622). Discrepancies between these editions and the Loeb text are acknowledged. All glossing translations from Latin are mine unless otherwise indicated. Ogilby may also have had access to the major European editions of Virgil that were imported into Britain during this period: these were the editions by Germanus (1570-5), Pontanus (1599), Taubmann (1618), Heinsius (1636), and Schrevelius (1646). For the use of European editions of the classics in the British Isles during the early modern period, see Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance*, 29-30.

[25] Ogilby (1649), 2.

[26] Virgil, *Eclogues*, 1.11-12.

[27] For further analysis, see Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, 171.

[28] For details, see Virgil / Williams, *Eclogues and Georgics*, 89.

[29] *Georgics*, 2.501-2; Ogilby (1649), 73. Patterson also draws attention to these lines in her brief comments on the *Georgics*: see *Pastoral and Ideology*, 179-80.

[30] For editions of Virgil as a case study of early modern reading practices in this manner, see Kallendorf, *Protean Virgil*, 88-95.

[31] Ogilby (1649), 51; translating Virgil, *Georgics*, 1.338, "in primis venerare deos": "above all else, admire the gods."

[32] Ibid., 53; translating Virgil, *Aeneid*, 3.56-7: "quid non mortalia pectora cogis, / auri sacra fames!": "oh accursed hunger of gold, what will you not compel mortal hearts to do!"

[33] Ibid., 20, translating Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.630: "non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco": "not ignorant of evils, I learn to support the wretched."

[34] Van Eerde, *John Ogilby*, 80; Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 91.

[35] Information about Crooke's career in both Ireland and England is given in Goldie, "Andrew Crooke (*c.*1605-1674)" (Andrew Crooke was John Crooke's brother and a more established bookseller).

[36] Ogilby's own 1658 Latin edition of Virgil, which prints the text exclusively in Roman type, signals the beginning of a shift away from this tradition.

[37] Farnaby had previously used this method in his 1615 edition of Juvenal; he did so again in his 1636 edition of the *Metamorphoses*.

[38] Bayle, *Critical Dictionary*, 2, 1286.

[39] Van Eerde, *John Ogilby*, 16 cites this passage and suggests it refers to a knowledge of Latin as well as English; Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 6 argues that this refers to privileging an English diction over a Scottish one.

[40] See Clark, "James Shirley (*bap.* 1596, *d.* 1666)", and Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 90.

[41] This draws on McDermott, "Thomas Farnaby (1574/5-1647)", and Paleit, 'Farnaby, Thomas', 334-6.

[42] Eyre, *Company of Stationers*, 1, 303.

[43] Ogilby (1649), sig. A3r.

[44] Eastin, "Dramatic Performance", 298; Ereria, *Nine Lives*, 89.

[45] Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 76-9.

[46] Ogilby (1649), 56.

[47] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 9.192-3.

[48] Virgil / Hardie, *Aeneid IX*, 110.

[49] Ogilby (1649), 50.

[50] Virgil, *Georgics*, 1.280.

[51] For Fanshawe, see Healey and Sawday, "Warre is all the world about", 4-5; 15; Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 107-8; for Herrick, see Maus, "Why Read Herrick?", 28-32; Herrick, *Complete Poetry*, 1, 414-15.

[52] H-927, l.2.

[53] Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 52, notes how Herrick and Ogilby served on Buckingham's 1628 Île de Ré expedition. McDowell, 'Black Riband Club', 106-26, discusses Herrick's links to an association of royalists of that name, of which Shirley was a member.

[54] See Herrick, *Complete Poetry*, 1, 403.

[55] H-655, l.2; H-810, l.2.

[56] H-1023, l.2.

[57] H-780, l.2; H-825, ll.1-2; H-1074, ll.1-2.

[58] H-309, l.2.

[59] Parry, "Troubled Arcadia", 38-41, and Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 108 identify a similar dynamic in Fanshawe's collection of the same year.

[60] H-725, l.8; H-69, l.1. Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 45 cites these lines, but does not draw attention to their use of italics.

[61] Ogilby (1649), 17. For further analysis, see Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, pp. 175-7.

[62] Ogilby (1650), sig. A2v.

[63] Ibid., 14.

[64] Ogilby (1649), 102, translating Virgil, *Georgics*, 4.212-14, "rege incolumi mens omnibus una est; / amisso rupere fidem, constructaque mella / diripuere ipsae et crates solvere favorum": "with the king safe all are of the same mind; with the king lost faith is destroyed, and they themselves break up the honey works and the structure of the honeycomb."

[65] McDowell, "Black Riband Club", 121.

[66] Eyre, *Company of Stationers*, 2, 51; Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 133 posits a March publication date.

[67] McElligott, "The Book Trade", 143.

[68] **The year still officially began in 25 March rather than January, so the presence of 1649 on the title-page could suggest publication after that date. However, as Herrick, *Complete Poetry*, 1, 413 notes, printers regularly dated publications from October to December with the subsequent year date, so a 1648 publication for Ogilby's Virgil cannot be discounted.**

[69] See Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, 266-7.

[70] Ogilby (1649), 42, translating Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2.550-8, "hoc ['haec' in early modern editions] dicens altaria ad ipsa trementem / traxit et in multo lapsantem sanguine nati, / implicuitque comam laeva, dextraque coruscum / extulit ac lateri capulo tenus abdidit ensem. / haec finis Priami fatorum; hic exitus illum / sorte tulit, Troiam incensam et prolapsa videntem / Pergama, tot quondam populis terrisque superbum / regnatorem Asiae. iacet ingens litore truncus, / avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus": "saying this he dragged him trembling to the altar and slipping in a great amount of his son's blood, he wrapped his hair in his left hand, and, in his right, drew his glittering sword and buried it in his side up to the hilt. This was the end of Priam's fates; this was the death fated to him, seeing Troy burning and the citadel Pergama collapsed, he who had been the proud ruler of so many of the peoples and lands of Asia. A great body lies on the shore, the head torn from the shoulders and a body without a name."

[71] In this Ogilby anticipates the identification between Priam and Charles I that concludes *The Destruction of Troy*, the partial translation of *Aeneid* II by John Denham that was published in 1656, **a line which Dryden famously incorporated wholesale into his own later translation, and acknowledged having done so in a footnote. Paul Hammond, *Traces of Classical Rome*, 239-40, convincingly links this overt borrowing to Dryden's approach to translation in general.**

[72] For the emphasis on sacredness as an indicator of ultra-loyal royalism, see Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 4.

[73] For details, see Potter, *Secret Rites*, 168-9.

[74] This draws on Smith, "William Seymour, first marquess of Hertford and second duke of Somerset (1587-1660)".

[75] Virgil / Farnaby, *Opera*, 139.

[76] For how Virgil uses Priam elsewhere in *Aeneid* 2 for the purposes of writing a "subjective" epic of pathos, see Conte, *Poetry of Pathos*, 28-9.

[77] This paragraph draws on information in Potter, *Secret Rites*, 192; McWilliams, "Lamentations Writ", 273-89; McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, 209-12.

[78] Wase, *Electra* [n.p]. For the allegorical nature of the translation, see Kerrigan, "Revenge Tragedy Revisited", 231.

[79] Potter, *Secret Rites*, 53; Wase, *Electra*, 2. As with Ogilby's 1649 Virgil, the volume does not include line numbers; quotations are cited by page number.

[80] Wase, *Electra*, 19.

[81] Thomason's copy of the translation is dated "Aprill 5".

[82] Wase, *Electra*, sig. Av.

[83] Ogilby (1649), 14.

[84] The most celebrated examples of this in the *Aeneid* are Jupiter's prophecy to Venus at 1.257-96, the Parade of Roman Heroes at 6.756-853, and the ecphrasis of Aeneas' Shield at 8.626-731.

[85] Ogilby (1649), 47, translating Virgil, *Georgics*, 1.199-200, "sic omnia fatis / in peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri: "thus do all things by the fates rush towards a worse mode and are carried back to their former state."

[86] Ibid., 77, translating Virgil, *Georgics,* 3.66-8, "optima quaeque dies miseris mortalibus aevi / prima fugit: subeunt morbi tristisque senectus / et labor, et durae rapit inclementia mortis": "the best days of life flee first from wretched mortals: illnesses and hard work and a sad old age comes, and the unhappiness of harsh death seizes us."

[87] Ibid., 8, translating Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.207, "durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis": "endure, and preserve yourselves for more favourable things"; Ogilby (1649), 160, translating Virgil, *Aeneid*, 12.677, "quo deus et quo dura vocat Fortuna sequamur": "we must follow what god and harsh Fate calls."

[88] Ibid., 122.

[89] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 11.425-7, "multa dies variique [printed as 'variusque' in early modern editions] labor mutabilis aevi / rettulit in melius, multos alterna revisens / lusit et in solido rursus Fortuna locavit": "the passing of the days and the changing labour of shifting time changes things for the better, changeable Fortune sets people down and places them on solid ground again."

[90] Ogilby (1649), 67, translating Virgil, *Georgics*, 2.303-9, "nam saepe incautis pastoribus excidit ignis, / qui furtim pingui primum sub cortice tectus / robora comprendit, frondesque elapsus in altas / ingentem caelo sonitum dedit; inde secutus ['sequutus' in early modern editions] / per ramos victor perque alta cacumina regnat, / et totum involvit flammis nemus et ruit atram / ad caelum picea crassus caligine nubem", "for often a fire falls from heedless shepherds, which, hiding secretly in the rich bark, grasps onto the trunk, makes its way up to the high leaves and gives a great sound to the sky; then, secure ['following on'], reigns as a victor among the branches and high treetops, and wraps up the whole grove in flames and a black cloud rushes to the heavens thick with pitchy blackness."

[91] Ogilby (1649), 70, translating Virgil, *Georgics*, 2.401-2, "redit agricolis labor actus in orbem / atque in se sua per vestigia volvitur annus": "work, driven in a circle, returns to farmers, and the year revolves upon itself again, retracing its own footsteps"; Ogilby (1649), 64, translating Virgil, *Aeneid*, 3.415, "tantum aevi longinqua valet mutare vetustas", "so great change length of time can affect."

[92] Burrow, "Virgil in English Translation", 27.

[93] **Whilst the 1665 reprint of the 1649 edition reinstated the italicised lines, the subsequent publications of the translation were of the 1654 edition, so the lines appeared in Roman type after this.**

[94] Ogilby (1654), 219.

[95] Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, 171-9.

[96] There are a few word changes to five of the arguments that head the 1654 *Aeneid* translation: see Ogilby (1654), 165; 231; 291; 431; 465. They are all of a very minor kind, and neither assist or impede in creating a potentially royalist interpretative framework.

[97] Ibid., 203; 388; 402; 471; 518.

[98] Ogilby, *Africa*, sig. Cr.

[99] Here, and in the remainder of the paragraph, I am indebted to Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 121-4.

[100] Unlike Ogilby, Dryden and Tonson sought subscribers from across the political divide: see Barnard, "Patrons of *Works of Virgil*".

[101] Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, 8, discusses the connections between Aesop and politics in this period.

[102] Ogilby, *Aesop*, 51.

[103] Ogilby (1649), sig. A4v.

[104] Ogilby, *Aesop*, 31.

[105] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 10.284; Ogilby (1649), 86.

[106] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 5.231. Other lines that draw on the 1649 translation include Ogilby, *Aesop* 15; 58; 62; 63 (Book 1); 29 (Book 2); 7; 31; 48; 52 (Book 3).

[107] For the complex nature of that perspective, see Loveridge, *Augustan Fable*, 102-27.

[108] Ogilby, *Aesop*, 35-6.

[109] Loveridge, *Augustan Fable*, 122-3.

[110] Ogilby, *Aesop*, 36.

[111] For the connections between fable and political prophecy, see Loveridge, *Augustan Fable*, 97-9.

[112] Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 124.

[113] See Virgil / Williams, *Aeneid*, 1, 265.

[114] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2.801-4.

[115] Ogilby (1649), 50; Ogilby (1654), 228.

[116] Løsnes, *"Arms and the Man"*, 328.

[117] Ogilby (1654), 42.

[118] For other uses of Lucifer, see Virgil, *Eclogues*, 8.17 (Ogilby (1649), 30, (1654), 42); Virgil, *Georgics*, 3.324 (Ogilby (1649), 85, (1654), 128); Virgil, *Aeneid*, 8.589 (Ogilby (1649), 45, (1654), 228). For Virgil's use of Hesperus, see *Eclogues*, 8.30 (Ogilby (1649), 30, (1654), 42); *Eclogues*, 10.77 (Ogilby (1649), 39, (1654), 58).

[119] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2.781.

[120] Ogilby (1649), 49; (1654), 227.

[121] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.530-4. 1.530-3 is repeated at 3.163-6 to serve as a further reminder.

[122] See Herrick, *Complete Poetry*, 1, lxxii-lxxiv; Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 5; 51-7.

[123] ll.13-14, *Poems of Fanshawe*, 1, 143-6 (144).

[124] For Fanshawe's poetry on Prince Charles, and Charles's status as the imagined reader of the *Pastor Fido* volume, see Parry, "Troubled Arcadia", 38-55. For Fanshawe's translations from Virgil that hope for a Stuart Restoration under Prince Charles, see Power, "*Aeneid*, Age of Milton", 189, and Pugh, *Politics of Intertextuality*, 164-73.

[125] See Wotton, *Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*, 519-20; Cleveland, *Clievelandi Vindiciae*, 74; Wase, *Electra*, 4.

[126] *Astraea Redux* l.288; see Dryden, *Poems* 1, 52.

[127] Miner, *Cavalier Mode*, 64.

[128] Ogilby, *Iliad*, sig. av.

[129] Discussed in Backscheider, *Spectacular Politics*, 5-18; van Eerde, *John Ogilby*, 48-56; Ereira, *Nine Lives*, 140-53.

[130] See Backscheider, *Spectacular Politics*, 14-15; 21-2.

[131] Ogilby, *The Entertainment*, 3.

[132] Ibid.

[133] Ogilby (1650), 530; Ogilby (1649), 122.

[134] **Ogilby, *The Entertainment*, 23; 3; 7. The first quotes from the passage in *Georgics* IV concerning the death of a king bee discussed earlier. The second adapts Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.624, "ausi omnes immane nefas ausoque potiti": "all dared shameful crimes, and did what they dared". The third quotes Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.620: "forewarned, learn justice". These last two both occur in a passage which depicts the sufferings of the rebellious, and Ogilby applies them to the Stuarts' antagonists. Ogilby's italicised renderings of these lines – "*All dar'd strange crimes* [altered to "bold Crimes" in the 1654 edition (Ogilby (1654), 354)]*, and thriv'd in what they dar'd*" and "*Admonish'd, justice learn*", both occur at Ogilby (1649), 144.**

Bibliography

Barnard, John. "Dryden, Tonson, and the Patrons of *The Works of Virgil*." In *John Dryden: Tercentenary Essays*, edited by Paul Hammond and David Hopkins, 174-239. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Backscheider, Paula R. *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England*. London: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Bayle, Pierre, *An historical and critical dictionary. By Monsieur Bayle. Translated into English, with many additions and corrections, made by the author himself, that are not in the French editions*, 4 vols. London, 1710.

Brome, Richard, ed. *Lachrymae musarum The tears of the muses : exprest in elegies written by divers persons of nobility and worth upon the death of the most hopefull, Henry Lord Hastings; collected and set forth by R.B.* London, 1649.

Brower, Reuben A. "Visual and Verbal Translation of Myth: Neptune in Vergil, Rubens, and Dryden." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam, 270-89. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Burrow, Colin. "Virgil in English Translation." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 21-37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Caldwell, Tanya. "Translation." In *The Oxford Handbook of British Poetry, 1660-1800*, edited by Jack Lynch, 596-614. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Clark, Ira. "Shirley, James (*bap.* 1596, *d.* 1666)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, May 2015 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25427, accessed 11 June 2017].

Cleveland, John. *Clievelandi Vindiciae, or, Clieveland's genuine poems, orations, epistles, &c. purged from the many false and spurious ones which had usurped his name, and from innumerable errours and corruptions in the true copies : to which are added many never printed before, with an account of the author's life.* London, 1677.

Conte, G. B. *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*, ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Dryden, John. *The Works of John Dryden*, eds H.T. Swedenberg Jr, *et al*, 20 vols. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1956-2000.

Dryden, John. *The Poems of John Dryden*, eds Paul Hammond and David Hopkins, 5 vols. London: Longman, 1995-2005.

Eastin, Kristi. "*The Aeneas* of Vergil: A Dramatic Performance Presented in the Original Latin by John Ogilby." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam, 290-310. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Ereira, Alan. *The Nine Lives of John Ogilby*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co, 2016.

Eyre, G. E. B., ed. *A transcript of the registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640-1708 AD*, 3 vols. London: Privately Printed for the Roxburgh Club, 1913-14.

Fanshawe, Sir Richard. *The Poems and Translations of Sir Richard Fanshawe*, ed. Peter Davidson, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997-9.

Frost, William. "Translating Virgil, Douglas to Dryden: Some General Considerations." In *Poetic Traditions of the English Renaissance*, edited by Maynard Mack and George deForest Lord, 271-86. London: Yale University Press, 1982.

Goldie, Mark. "Crooke, Andrew (*c.*1605–1674)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/67206, accessed 19 April 2017]

Hammond, Paul. *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Healey, Thomas, and Jonathan Sawday, eds. *Literature and the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 'Introduction: "Warre is all the world about", 1-17.

Herrick, Robert. *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick*, eds Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2013.

Juvenal. *Pvblii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseōn libri xv. Ad fidem editionum optimarum & codicum manuscriptorum examinati, animadversi, necnon notis illustrati. Operâ & studio Thomæ Farnabii*. London, 1615.

Kallendorf, Craig. *The Protean Virgil: Material Form and the Reception of the Classics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Kerrigan, John. "Revenge Tragedy Revisited, 1649-1683." Chap. 11 in *On Shakespeare and Early Modern Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Løsnes, Arvid. *"Arms and the Man I sing": A Preface to Dryden's Aeneis*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011.

Loveridge, Mark. *A History of Augustan Fable*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Mack, Maynard, *Alexander Pope: A Life.* London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Maus, Katherine Eisaman. "Why Read Herrick?" In *'Lords of Wine and Oile': Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*, edited by Ruth Connolly and Tom Cain, 25-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

McDermott, James. "Farnaby, Thomas (1574/5-1647)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9173, accessed 26 April 2017].

McDowell, Nicholas, "Herrick and the Order of the Black Riband: Literary Community in Civil-War London and the Publication of *Hesperides* (1648)." In In *'Lords of Wine and Oile': Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*, edited by Ruth Connolly and Tom Cain, 106-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

McDowell, Nicholas, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

McElligott, Jason. "The Book Trade, Licensing, and Censorship." In *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers, 135-49. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

McWilliams, John. "A Storm of Lamentations Writ: *Lachrymae Musarum* and Royalist Culture after the Civil War." *Year in English Studies*, no. 33 (2003): 273-89.

Miner, Earl. *The Cavalier Mode from Jonson to Cotton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Ogilby, John. *Africa being an accurate description of the regions of AEgypt, Barbary, Lybia, and Billedulgerid, the land of Negroes, Guinee, AEthiopia and the Abyssines : with all the adjacent islands, either in the Mediterranean, Atlantick, Southern or Oriental Sea, belonging thereunto : with the several denominations fo their coasts, harbors, creeks, rivers, lakes, cities, towns, castles, and villages, their customs, modes and manners, languages, religions and inexhaustible treasure : with their governments and policy, variety of trade and barter : and also of their wonderful plants, beasts, birds and serpents : collected and translated from most authentick authors and augmented with later observations : illustrated with notes and adorn'd with peculiar maps and proper sculptures by John Ogilby, Esq*. London, 1670.

Ogilby, John. *Homer his Iliads translated, adorn'd with sculpture, and illustrated with annotations by John Ogilby.* London, 1660.

Ogilby, John. *The relation of His Majestie's entertainment passing through the city of London, to his coronation: with a description of the triumphal arches, and solemnity; by John Ogilby*. London, 1661.

Ogilby, John. *The fables of AEsop paraphras'd in verse, and adorn'd with sculpture, by John Ogilby*. London, 1651.

Ogilby, John. *The works of Publius Virgilius Maro translated by John Ogilby*. London, 1649.

Ogilby, John. *The works of Publius Virgilius Maro translated by John Ogilby*. London, 1650.

Ogilby, John. *The works of Publius Virgilius Maro translated, adorn'd with sculpture, and illustrated with annotations by John Ogilby.* London, 1654.

Ovid, *Pvblii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseōn libri xv. Ad fidem editionum optimarum & codicum manuscriptorum examinati, animadversi, necnon notis illustrati. Operâ & studio Thomæ Farnabii.* London, 1636.

Paleit, Edward. "Farnaby, Thomas". In *The Encyclopedia of English Renaissance Literature*, edited by Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr *et al*. 3 vols, 1, 334-6. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Parry, Graham. "A troubled Arcadia." In *Literature and the English Civil War*, edited by Thomas Healey and Jonathan Sawday, 38-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Patterson, Annabel. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Pope, Alexander. *The Dunciad: In Four Books*, ed. Valerie Rumbold, rev edn. London: Pearson Longman, 2009.

Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Power, Henry. "The *Aeneid* in the Age of Milton." In *A Companion to the Aeneid and its Tradition*, edited by Michael C.J. Putnam and Joseph Farrell, 186-202. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Proudfoot, Leslie. *Dryden's Aeneid and its Seventeenth-Century Predecessors*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960.

Pugh, Syrithe. *Herrick, Fanshawe and the Politics of Intertextuality: Classical Literature and Seventeenth-Century Royalism*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Smith, David L. "Seymour, William, first marquess of Hertford and second duke of Somerset (1587–1660)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25182, accessed 18 April 2017].

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. London: Yale University Press, 1994.

Virgil. *Aeneid*, ed. R. Deryck Williams, rev edn. 2 vols. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2005.

Virgil. *Aeneid, Book IX*, ed. Philip Hardie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Virgil. *The Eclogues and Georgics*, ed. R. Deryck Williams, rev edn. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.

Virgil. *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid*, ed. H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. G. P. Goold, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Virgil. *Opera P. Virgilii Maronis. Opera P. Virgilii Maronis. Pauli Manutii annotations brevissimae in margine adscriptae. Homeri loca magis insignia, quae Virgilius imitatus est. Georgii Fabricii chemnicensis observationes Virgilianae lectionis*. Cambridge, 1632.

Virgil. *Pub. Vergilii Maronis opera scholiis doctissimis marginalibus illustrate, cum verborum & rerum indice*. London, 1616.

Virgil. *Publ. Virgilii Maronis poemata, cum optimis, quae nunc exstant, & fide dignissimis ex[e]mplaribus collata, & correcta. Quibus brevissimae ex iisdem [sic] exemplaribus excerptae annotationes i[n m]argine adscriptae sunt. Rerum & verborum me[m]orabilium a[mp]lissimus index*. Aberdeen, 1629.

Virgil. *Publii Virgilii Maronis opera Bucolica, Georgica, AEneis, notis admarginalibus illustrata à Thoma Farnabio.* London, 1634.

Virgil. *Publii Virgilii Maronis Opera per Johannem Ogilvium edita et sculpturis AEneis adornata.* London, 1658.

Virgil. *Publii Virgill Maronis poemata. Novis scholiis illustrate, quæ Henr. Steph. partim doni*

nata, partim è virorum doctissimorum libris excerpta dedit. Cæterea quæ hæc secunda edition exhibit, pagina tertia recensentur. London, 1593.

Virgil. *Publii Virgilii Maronis poemata, cum optimis, quae nunc exstant, & fide dignissimis exemplaribus collata, & correcta. Quibus brevissimae ex iisdem exemplaribus excerptae annotationes in margine adscriptae sunt. Rerum & verborum memorabilium amplissimus index*. Edinburgh, 1612.

Virgil. *Vergiliana poesis que latinitatis norma est et propulsatis elimatis [sic] omnibus mendis felici gaudet exordio*. London, 1515.

Wase, Christopher. *Electra of Sophocles presented to Her Highnesse the Lady Elizabeth; with an epilogue, shewing the parallell in two poems, the return, and the restauration. By C.W.* London, 1649.

Wilcher, Robert. *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Wilson-Okamura, David Scott. *Virgil in the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Wotton, Sir Henry. *Reliquiae Wottonianae or, a collection of lives, letters, poems; with characters of sundry personages: and other incomparable pieces of language and art. By the curious pensil of the ever memorable Sr Henry Wotton Kt, late, provost of Eton Colledg*. London, 1651.