

S K E N È

Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies

7:1 2021

Virtual Theatre

Edited by Sidia Fiorato

SKENÈ Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies

Founded by Guido Avezù, Silvia Bigliuzzi, and Alessandro Serpieri

<i>Executive Editor</i>	Guido Avezù.
<i>General Editors</i>	Guido Avezù, Silvia Bigliuzzi.
<i>Editorial Board</i>	Simona Brunetti, Nicola Pasqualicchio, Susan Payne, Gherardo Ugolini.
<i>Managing Editors</i>	Valentina Adami, Emanuel Stelzer.
<i>Assistant Managing Editor</i>	Roberta Zanoni.
<i>Book Review Editors</i>	Chiara Battisti, Sidia Fiorato.
<i>Staff</i>	Petra Bjelica, Francesco Dall'Olio, Bianca Del Villano, Marco Duranti, Carina Louise Fernandes, Leonardo Mancini, Antonietta Provenza, Savina Stevanato, Angelica Vedelago.
<i>Typesetter</i>	Lorenza Baglieri, Greca Melis, Raul Rossi
<i>Advisory Board</i>	Anna Maria Belardinelli, Anton Bierl, Enoch Brater, Richard Allen Cave, Jean-Christophe Cavallin, Rosy Colombo, Claudia Corti, Marco De Marinis, Tobias Döring, Pavel Drábek, Paul Edmondson, Keir Douglas Elam, Ewan Fernie, Patrick Finglass, Enrico Giaccherini, Mark Griffith, Daniela Guardamagna, Stephen Halliwell, Robert Henke, Pierre Judet de la Combe, Eric Nicholson, Guido Paduano, Franco Perrelli, Didier Plassard, Donna Shalev, Susanne Wofford.

Copyright © 2021 SKENÈ

Published in June 2021

All rights reserved.

ISSN 2421-4353

The Journal is a CC-BY 4.0 publication
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)
SKENÈ Theatre and Drama Studies
<http://skenejournal.skeneproject.it>
info@skeneproject.it

Dir. Resp. (aut. Trib. di Verona): Guido Avezù
P.O. Box 149 c/o Mail Boxes Etc. (MBE150) – Viale Col. Galliano, 51, 37138, Verona (I)

Contents

Virtual Theatre

Edited by Sidia Fiorato

SIDIA FIORATO – <i>Introduction. Intermediality and Virtuality in Performance: A Reflection on Twenty-First Century Mediaturgy</i>	5
SUSAN PAYNE – <i>What Does Virtual Actually/Really Mean?</i>	21
AVRA SIDIROPOULOU – <i>Permission/Seduction/Indulgence: A Theatre Director’s Account of Working With Digital Media</i>	41
SIMONA BRUNETTI – <i>Connections: A Virtual Theatre Experiment in a Medieval Village</i>	61
RINDE ECKERT – <i>The Virtual</i>	83
ANTONIO PIZZO – <i>Performing/Watching Artificial Intelligence on Stage</i>	91

Miscellany

MARCO DURANTI – <i>The First Greek Tragedy Printed in England: Some Textual and Typographical Notes</i>	111
ROBERTA ZANONI – <i>Unmotherly Love: the Medea Model in Mary Sidney’s Antonius</i>	123
GRAZIA D’ARIENZO – <i>Samuel Beckett on Italian Stages. Intermedial Performances Inspired by his Prose and Poems</i>	151
ALISON MIDDLETON – <i>‘Homer’ Tackles Aeschylus: Theatrical Adaptation as Process in Anne Washburn’s Mr Burns and Robert Icke’s Oresteia</i>	169

Special Section

GUIDO AVEZZÙ – <i>Form, Event, Theatre: Carlo Diano, Form and Event. Principles for an Interpretation of the Greek World.</i> Translated by Timothy C. Campbell and Lia Turtas, Introduction by Jacques Lezra. New York: Fordham University Press 2020, pp. 128	195
DELIA GAMBELLI – Guido Paduano, <i>Teatro. Personaggio e condizione umana.</i> Roma: Carocci, 2020, pp. 209	205
ROSSELLA MAZZAGLIA – Jacques Lecoq, <i>The Moving Body (Le Corps Poétique). Teaching Creative Theatre.</i> New York: Methuen Drama, 2020 (third ed.), pp. 232	223
GIOVANNA DI MARTINO – Luis Alfaro, <i>The Greek Trilogy of Luis Alfaro.</i> Edited by Rosa Andújar. London: Methuen Drama series, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020, pp. 304	231

MARCO DURANTI*

The First Greek Tragedy Printed in England: Some Textual and Typographical Notes

Abstract

This article focuses on the first Greek edition of a work of classical antiquity printed in England, namely Euripides' *Troades*, published by John Day in 1575. This is not a new edition of Euripides' text, but it reproduces the text established in the editions derived from the Aldine one, without any of Willem Canter's 1571 changes. Basing their discussion on a textual and contextual analysis, these notes focus on the book's typographical peculiarities, suggesting that Day's Greek types may have been used later by Dawson. The article also attempts to identify Day's printing purposes and the possible readership of this entirely unusual printing venture.

KEYWORDS: Greek theatrical literature; reception of Greek literature; early modern English culture; reception of Euripides

In the history of the reception of Greek literature in England, the year 1575 is worth remembering. In that year the printer John Day¹ published the Greek text of Euripides' *Troades* (USTC 508002). Beforehand, the publication of Greek texts in the original language was rare, in fact it counted a single book, a work of Christian homiletic literature: John Chrysostom's orations, edited by John Cheke and printed by Reyner Wolfe² in 1543 (USTC 503443).³ Indeed, Day's edition holds a twofold record, as it is both the first English publication of a masterpiece of Greek profane literature and the first single edition of that specific tragedy of Euripides in Europe. Whilst in 1503

¹ <https://data.cerl.org/thesaurus/cni00031601> (Accessed 27 April 2021).

² <https://data.cerl.org/thesaurus/cni00041111> (Accessed 27 April 2021).

³ If we include devotional texts in our survey, we must add that in 1573 the printer Reyner Wolfe published a *Catechism* in Latin and Greek (KATHXΙΣΜΟΣ, ἡ πρώτη παιδευσις τῆς Χριστιανῶν εὐσεβείας, τῆ τε Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῆ Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτῳ ἐκδοθεῖσα = *Catechismus, sive prima institutio, disciplinaque pietatis Christianae, Graecae & Latine explicata*; USTC 507704). It goes without saying that, given the low survival rate of catechisms, there might have been other editions now lost.

* University of Verona - marco.duranti@univr.it

Troades had been first published with Euripides' other seventeen tragedies by Aldo Manuzio (USTC 828498),⁴ and hence in the following editions of the entire Euripidean corpus throughout Europe, it had not yet been published autonomously, unlike other Euripidean plays.⁵

The uniqueness of this book within the English printing environment, which, as different from elsewhere in Europe, had not yet had to deal with the printing and publishing of Greek, prompts specific analysis. Firstly, it should be understood why the printer decided to publish this tragedy, which raises questions on the context of the publication and its relation to the European and English reception of Euripides. Secondly, we should examine the textual and typographical characteristics of this edition and situate it within the context of other continental editions as well as in relation to current printing practices in England. Finally, one crucial question regards the aims of the printer and the readership he had in mind. As we shall see, this was very probably not a book for scholars, but for learners of the Greek language. I shall argue that this hypothesis allows us to locate Day's *Troades* within the broader context of the apprenticeship of the Greek language and culture in late sixteenth-century England.

The following analysis is meant to offer a first sample of a broader research on the printing and reception of original Greek texts in England. Such a study involves a focus on the cultural context, the purposes of the printers, as well as the formal characteristics of the printed texts. In other words, it will consider the necessarily interconnectedness of the following aspects of early modern printing practices: the reasons behind the printer's selection of the text, his purposes, the Greek types he employed, the editing and textual decisions, and finally his own relation to other English and continental printers. By pointing out the interaction between these various factors, such an analysis will hopefully be able to contribute to the recent debate on the degree of knowledge and scholarship of Greek in early modern England (cf. e.g. Lazarus 2015, Demetriou and Pollard 2017, Pollard 2017).

The frontispiece of the edition under consideration advertises the play as follows: "ΕΥΡΙΠΙΙ-ΔΟΥ ΤΡΩΩ-ΑΛΕΣ. | EVRIPIDIS | Troades. | ¶LONDINI | Apud Ioannem Dayum | 1575. | Cum gratia & priuilegio". The book has 24 leaves, with signatures A-F⁴, and contains: A1v: Argument (*hypothesis*) and list of characters (as in the other editions of Euripides' tragedies), A2r – F3v:

⁴ The 1503 Aldine edition is the *princeps* of most Euripides' tragedies, except *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Electra*: the former four plays had already been published in Florence in 1495 by Lorenzo d'Alopa, whereas *Electra* would be published in Rome in 1545 by Antonio Blado.

⁵ The list of Euripides' tragedies individually edited in Greek before 1575 in the entire Europe includes *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia in Aulis* (1520), *Orestes* (1536), *Andromacha* (1537), *Medea* (1539), *Electra* (1545, *princeps*), *Hecuba* (1545), *Alcestis* (1570).

Euripides' *Trojan Women*.⁶ As regards the format, it is not specified in the USTC or ESTC entries. However, the reproduction in EEBO shows it to be 14 cm. in height and so plausibly it is in -8°. The only extant copy belonged to the library of Thomas Grenville, a British politician and bibliophile, and is now preserved in the British Library (General Reference Collection G.8570), to which it was donated in 1848. We do not know where and how Grenville acquired the book: the catalogue of his library records that it was in his possession in 1842, when the catalogue itself was printed; however, it does not provide any information on the book's provenance (Payne and Foss 1842, 237). Nor does the copy in the British library have signs of use or marginalia which can help us reconstruct its ownership.⁷

Considering that the frontispiece does not tell us much about the printer's intent, and that no other paratext clarifies it any further, the first question that needs to be answered is why Euripides' *Troades* was chosen for publication. Our knowledge of the cultural environment of early modern England allows us to conjecture a specific interest in this tragedy.⁸ The way was paved by the growing fortune of Seneca's tragedies since the 1550s, when "there was intense interest in the author, especially at the universities and early English law schools, the Inns of Court, where students and fellows translated most of the dramas and performed a series of Senecan and neo-Senecan plays" (Winston 2006, 30). The Roman dramatist's tragedies dealt with the nature of kingship, with its virtues and vices, as well as its dangers (37). Moreover, they warned against the constant threat of abuse of power and tyranny. Interestingly enough, the first Senecan tragedy translated in England by the hand of Jasper Heywood in 1559 is *Troades*, a reworking of Euripides' own play bearing the same title. Apparently, Seneca's *Troades* was also staged twice at Trinity College in Cambridge, in 1551-1552 and 1560-1561 (Boas 1914, 18, 387; APGRD 3663 and 3666).

Euripides' *Troades* is connected not only with Seneca's version of that story, but also with *Hecuba*, traditionally by far the most popular tragedy of Euripides: it was the first of the Byzantine triad (alongside *Orestes* and *Phoenissae*), as well as the first Euripidean tragedy of which a Latin translation was attempted (by Leontius Pilatus, fourteenth century, and Francesco Filelfo, fifteenth century).⁹ Furthermore, Erasmus also chose to translate

⁶ In fact, the edition uses Greek numerals (e.g. α', β').

⁷ Due to current travel restrictions, I could only inspect the digitised copy available in EEBO, which neither reproduces the binding nor provides information about it.

⁸ I am thankful to an anonymous reviewer for observing that, given the low rate of survival of early modern printed texts, it is possible that Day published also other tragedies of Euripides; therefore, it might be possible that he had a general interest in Euripides' tragedies and not specifically in *Troades*. However, this remains conjectural.

⁹ Of course *Hecuba* was also the most popular choice for early translations in Ital-

this tragedy in 1506 (USTC 143156) because of its position in the Byzantine school curriculum (Wilson 1973: 87). *Hecuba* was praised for its depiction of maternal grief, and the intensity of the queen's lament for the the sacrifice of her daughter, Polyxena. To early modern readers, Hecuba's grief evoked that of another mourning mother, the Virgin Mary (Pollard 2017, 8-13). Besides, as Pollard has further remarked, this tragedy impressed the readers also for the quality of its dramatic action pivoting on Hecuba's successful revenge plan against her enemy Polymestor for the killing of her son Polydorus (ibid.). Now, the character of Hecuba is also central in *Troades*, where she is prominent among the captives who must suffer the violence of the Greek conquerors. The queen never leaves the stage until the end, so she may be considered the connecting element within a play which is otherwise characterized by an "episodic character" whereby "the connections among the episodes are not easy to see" (Poe 2020, 255).

However, this lack of unity was arguably one of the reasons for the preference given to *Hecuba* over *Troades* in early modern reception, especially since Aristotle in his *Poetics* (1451b33-35; Aristotle 1987, 41) criticized the episodic plot, arguing that a tragedy should consist in a chain of probable or necessary events. Furthermore, although the character of Hecuba dominates *Troades* too, in her homonymous tragedy she is a more impressive character thanks both to the intensity of her grief for her daughter, and to her ability to progressively acquire an active role, especially at the end of the tragedy.

What has been said so far suggests why *Troades* was published rather late in a separate edition, and also why it could nonetheless elicit interest on the part of publishers. If we now turn to a textual analysis of this edition, we notice that Day's *Troades* is based on the canonical text established in the Aldine edition of 1503 and then regularly reproduced until the Stiblinus edition of 1562 (Euripides 1562; USTC 654877). The English edition does not introduce any changes or variants, it only shows some peculiarities in punctuation: while in some cases they might be errors, in others they seem to have an emphatic purpose, as in the use of two commas at C.δ'ρ., l. 8 (629), separating two interjections: αἰ, αἶ, μάλ' αὖθις, ὥς κακῶς διόλλυσσαι. Day's edition reflects the previous ones also in the use of commonplace marks highlighting moralistic *sententiae* (*gnomai*).

It is plain that Day does not follow Canter's more recent edition (Euripides 1571; USTC 411593). At the end of 41 (A.β'v., l. 14), Day prints πάροιθεν like Aldus, Herwagen (lastly 1551; USTC 654575), and Stiblinus, which is the form that could be read in manuscript P (Palatinus 287); Canter, instead,

ian. The first translation was made by Giovan Battista Gelli and printed around 1519 (Renouard 1825: 408) by Giunta. Poet Ludovico Dolce also published an Italian rewrite of the play in 1543 with Giolito (then reprinted in 1549, 1560, and 1566).

chooses *παρθένον*, the reading of manuscript V (Vaticanus 909). Another example is provided at 232-4 (B.α'v., 11-13), which Day prints by omitting several words, as in the Aldine and the following editions until Stiblinus':

ἔξανύων.
δοῦλαι γὰρ δὴ
χθονὸς ἤδη.

Here too he clearly follows the previous editions, whereas Canter restores the text, which is supplemented by the hand 'q' in the Harley MS. 5743 (Q):¹⁰

στείχει ταχύπουν ἶχνος ἔξανύων.
τί φέρει; τί λέγει; δοῦλαι γὰρ δὴ
Δωρίδος ἐσμέν χθονὸς ἤδη.

Day not only ignores Canter's textual novelties, but also, and more significantly, does not reproduce Canter's colometry, the innovation for which the Dutch scholar's edition is now best known and even then perceived as the most salient feature of Canter's edition.¹¹ Whilst Canter distinguishes the metres (for instance, he writes *ἀνάπαιστοι* before the chorus intervenes at 98) and indicates the antistrophic structure, as well as the number of the metrical units (*cola*), this information cannot be found in Day. Thus, we can surmise that either Canter's edition was not available to him, or he regarded the colometry as not relevant for his editorial purposes.

In fact, it seems unlikely that the 'new' Euripides by Willem Canter was not available or, worse, unknown to the Days, father and son: in 1575, John Day's son, Richard, had recently returned from Cambridge, where he had become a fellow of King's College, and the *PLRE.Folger* Catalogue records the presence of no less than six books compatible with Canter's edition between 1577 and 1589 (although it is not possible to identify the specific edition). Moreover, in the inventories of the University of Cambridge for the 1535-1590 years, inspected by Lisa Jardine (1975, 16), Euripides appears among the most frequently cited authors. On the other hand, one must consider the possibility that this recent product of continental scholarship that followed the contributions of Adrien Turnèbe in the early 1550s, culminating in his edition of Sophocles in 1553, could be reproached – especially by John – for too much indulgence in worthless technicalities. This critical attitude, which seems to be linked to a certain Calvinist extremism, also inspires Théodore de Bèze, Calvin's successor, in the "Aux Lecteurs" letter prefacing his tragedy

¹⁰ For the text of the *Troades*, see Euripides 1981.

¹¹ On the title page of his Euripides of 1597 (USTC 654566), Marcus Aemilius Portus felt bound to point out that it presented the structure ("carminum ratio") assigned to the lyrical parts by Canter.

Abraham sacrificant (first published in 1550 in Geneva by Conrad Badius), faithfully translated into English by Arthur Golding in 1575 (*A Tragedie of Abrahams Sacrifice*, printed in London in 1577 by Thomas Vautrouillier). This is the part of the text that concerns us, in the two languages:

Mesme i'ay fact un cantique hors le Chorus, et n'ay usé de strophes, antistrophes, epirrhemes, parecbases, ni autre tels mots, qui ne seruent che d'es-pouuanter les simples gens, puis que l'usage de telles choses est aboli, et n'est de soy tant recommandable qu'on se doieue tormenter à le remettre sus.

Verily I haue made a songe without a chorus, nother haue I vsed the termes of *Strophies*, *Antistrophies*, *Epirrhemes*, *Parecbases*, and other such wordes, which serue to no purpose but to amase simple folke, seeing the vse of such thinges is worne away, & they be not so commendable of them selues, that a man should trouble him selfe to bringe them vp again. (8-9)

If Day shares this calvinist perspective, Kirsty Milne's suggestion that "sponsoring domestically produced Greek texts was a gesture of Protestant nationalism, a bid to disseminate classical and Biblical originals without the mediation of Catholic scholars and printers" (2007, 683) may appear relevant to the publication of *Troades*.

But before raising other questions about Day's own reasons for publications, it may be worth considering the typographical features of this text. Day's edition has no connection with the 1543 edition of two homilies of John Chrysostom made by Reyner Wolfe, the first printed edition of a long Greek text. Whereas Wolfe employed a type originally cast by Hieronymus Froben (Proctor 1905, 109), Day's font appears to be modelled on the pica type designed by the French printed Robert Estienne and first used in the latter's 1546 edition of the New Testament (see Proctor 1905, 102; Armstrong 1986, 52; Vervliet 2008, 392-3). One noticeable characteristic of Day's edition is the use of the triangular alpha only in the conjunction $\gamma\alpha\rho$ ($\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$). This shape of the alpha is found in all three types of Estienne. The same $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ appears in the first book printed with these types – precisely with the Royal Great Primer type (see Proctor 1905, 96; Vervliet 2008, 394): Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica* (1544, 440). It is also registered as one of the possible ways of printing $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ in the *Alphabetum Graecum* of Guillaume Morel¹² (1560, 16), who printed on behalf of Adrièn Turnèbe, Estienne's successor as royal printer. It is peculiar that in the *Troades* edition the triangular alpha is limited to this usage, and surely Day had a single sort for the entire word $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$.

Day's text as a whole, if compared to the continental editions of Greek texts, deploys a fairly limited number of abbreviations. In particular, it does not show any abbreviations common in Estienne: for instance, ⵉ for $\kappa\alpha\iota$

¹² <https://data.cerl.org/thesaurus/cni00099395> (Accessed 27 April 2021).

(the alternative abbreviation Ϛ is found only once in the text of the tragedy, at C.δ', l. 30 [683]); ϛ for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, Ϝ for $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$, ϝ for $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$, Ϟ for $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$, ϟ for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. If we compare *Troades* with the Catechism published by Day in the same year 1575 and again in 1578, with the title *Christianismou stoicheiosis* (Elements of Christianity) (USTC 508070, 508626), we notice a larger use of abbreviations in the latter work: Ϛ for $\kappa\alpha\iota$, which is employed almost systematically, ϝ for $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$, ϟ for $\tau\omicron\upsilon$. The probable reason for this difference is that the Catechism is written in prose: the text extends to the entire line and therefore a more compact way of printing is needed. Indeed, in *Troades* the abbreviation ϟ , as well as two Ϛ of the total of three, are found only in the initial *hypothesis*, which is in prose. This observation suggests the need for a wider-reaching survey of early-modern printed texts in order to assess the different printing standards between prose and poetry.¹³

One interesting question is whether Day's Greek types were further used by following printers. When Day died in July 1584, he left his estate to his wife, and it seems that his son Richard did not inherit his materials, which "were perhaps dispersed" (McKerrow 1913, 169). Thus it can be inferred that at least the Greek part of that material was handed down to Thomas Dawson,¹⁴ who in 1586 printed the only Greek text of his career, Demosthenes' oration *Against Midias*. The shape of the types is the same as Day's own types and, most interestingly, we find the peculiar printing of $\gamma\alpha\lambda$. As in Day's *Troades*, in Dawson's too the triangular alpha is not used otherwise.

Other formal aspects of this book may help us to reconstruct which readers Day had in mind. This edition has neither a prefatory epistle, nor an apparatus of comments, a life of the author or any introduction to the tragedy, except for the alexandrine *hypothesis*. Moreover, it does not specify the name of any scholar as editor. This sets Day's book apart from the learned editions of Euripides' works published on the continent: to cite but one example, Stiblinus' edition (1562) has three prefatory letters (to the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I, to the reader, to the printer Johannes Oporinus), as well as a short poem on Euripides' tragedies, written in Latin in elegiac couplets by Stiblinus himself. Furthermore, each tragedy is followed by Stiblinus' *praefatio* and *annotationes*, and at the end a few notes by Johannes Brodaeus (Jean Brodeau, about 1500-1573) can also be found.

A different category of publications has more in common with Day's

¹³ It may also be argued that these abbreviations were being cast while *Troades* was being printed, and thus started being tested only towards the end of the printing. This hypothesis may also account for the presence of the abbreviations in the first sheet or printing forme, as this was frequently the last to be printed. I am grateful to a reviewer for this suggestion.

¹⁴ <https://data.cerl.org/thesaurus/cnio0020474> (accessed 27 April 2021).

Troades: those printed for educational purposes. Some examples can be found in continental Europe. In 1567, the Strasbourg printer Josia Rihel published *Euripidis Hecuba et Iphigenia in Aulide* (USTC 654882), a choice clearly oriented by the very successful pair of translations made by Erasmus, which, as Day's *Troades*, displays only the two *hypotheses* and the *dramatis personae*; no editor is specified. In this case, its educational aim is spelled out in the same title page where we read *pro Schola Argentinensi*, that is, for the Gymnasium of Strasbourg, which was founded in 1538 by Jacob Sturm and soon became a model for the religiously oriented humanist school. One copy, now in the Halle University Library, has interleaved empty pages to allow both teachers and students to take notes. Although we must remember that the addition of extra blank leaves was not specifically designed by the printer, but rather made by the bookbinder upon request of the owner of the book, this addition confirms that the book was used for didactic purposes. Likewise, an *Alcestis in usum scholarum seorsim excusa* (USTC 654568) was issued in 1570 by Theodosius Rihel (one of Josia's brothers), again in Strasbourg, with neither apparatus nor the name of the editor: it has just the *hypothesis*, the *dramatis personae* and the text.

The same low survival rate of Day's *Troades*, of which only one copy is left, confirms that the book was probably destined for teaching purposes. As Andrew Pettegree points out, the early modern books that survive best are the largest and most expensive ones, which "were primarily intended for reference rather than consecutive reading" (Bruni and Pettegree 2016, 3). On the contrary, the most read books "served their purpose, were read for the information they contained, and then discarded", without making their way into libraries (2). Therefore, and paradoxically, the more a book was used, the less it survived. Thus, whereas Day's edition of *Troades* was almost lost, the 23 entries of Euripides' works in the *PLRE.Folger*, dating between 1552 and 1652, most probably refer to the precious editions which were meant to be conserved in libraries. Indeed, they all belonged to scholars. Among them, we find two exemplars of *Hecuba* (*PLRE* 70.30 and 148.83) and two copies of the *scholia* (*PLRE* 67.68, 1585), probably the Venetian edition of 1534 (USTC 810067). In three cases, the catalogue records the title "Rhesus" (*PLRE* 143.43, 121.19, 67.122). However, since the tragedy *Rhesus* was not published autonomously, the title is to be interpreted as referring to the second volume of one of the following editions: Aldus', Herwagen's (either 1537 or 1544; USTC 654573, 654574), or Collinus' Latin translation (Basle 1541, USTC 654885). The second volume of all these editions opens indeed with *Rhesus* (and has *Troades* in second position). It is interesting to notice that the *PLRE* records not less than six books which may have contained *Troades* between 1552 and 1575, all mentioned as Euripides' tragedies and in one case as *Rhesus* (in 1558; *PLRE* 67.122). This demonstrates that the tragedy was available in Eng-

land well before Day's edition and suggests that the printer meant to provide a different product: not a complete edition of Euripides for scholars, but a small format book with a single tragedy for Greek learners.

The idea that Day's *Troades* may be an educational book finds further support in the coeval publication of Greek texts in England, which can be divided in two main groups, both related to education: grammars and catechisms. Day himself printed a *Christianismou stoicheiosis*, as we have seen. A Catechism was also printed by Reyner Wolfe in 1573 (USTC 507704). As regards Greek grammars, Henry Bynneman printed one edited by Edward Grant (USTC 508014) in the same 1575 when also *Troades* was printed, and then issued another grammar in 1581, a reprint of the grammar written by Petrus Ramus (USTC 509373). To this category we can also ascribe a manual of rhetorical figures printed by Henry Wykes in 1572 (USTC 516739). Day's *Troades* stands out from these other educational books insofar as it is a work of a Greek classical author: we can guess that Day aimed at providing a new product in a country where not a single Greek play, nor other Greek literary works, had yet been published in the original language.

We do not find in England any other classical text printed in Greek until the 1580s, when the Eliot Court's Press¹⁵ published Isocrates' oration *Ad Demonicum* (1585; USTC 510315) and Thomas Dawson published Demosthenes' *Against Midias* (1586; USTC 510495), the latter using Day's types. Indeed, both texts share the characteristics of *Troades*, likewise suggesting a didactic use: lack of the editor's name and of paratexts. Moreover, each book contains only a single work, not the entire corpus of the selected author: a single oration – or, in Day's case, a single tragedy – was more useful for educational purposes, as well as economically accessible than a ponderous *opera omnia*. The survival rate is low: *Ad Demonicum* is preserved in one copy like *Troades*, *Against Midias* in four copies.

As regards *Troades* and then *Against Midias*, the educational purpose may also account for the use of the relatively simple, unembellished Greek types we have described, unless this feature is due to the lack of a larger variety of types.

These publications invite a revision of the long held idea that “the Elizabethan age is almost a blank in the history of Greek learning in England” (Bywater 1919, 13). In fact, as Micha Lazarus has demonstrated, in the second half of the sixteenth century Greek flourished both in universities – to the degree that “Greek was a matter of ordinary instruction for undergraduates” (2015, 451) – and in grammar schools (453-6), in whose curricula Isocrates and Demosthenes were included (454).

If Day's *Troades* was dedicated to the learning of Greek, it is likely that

¹⁵ <https://data.cerl.org/thesaurus/cncooo23863> (accessed 27 April 2021).

it was used in universities. We know from the statute of St. John's College in Oxford that Euripides was included in the list of authors whose works were daily read at 9 a.m. (SCO III [part 12], 49–50). As regards Cambridge, in the inventories of the university a work of Euripides – the exact title is not specified in the lists – appears among the most frequent titles also in non-specialist lists (Jardine 1975, 16). Thus, we can conclude that Euripides was probably a prescribed reading for the preliminary arts course and that the reading of a text like Day's *Troades* is not inconceivable in either university. On the other hand, Day's connection with Cambridge is arguable, as his son Richard, as we have seen, was appointed Fellow of King's College in 1574, one year before the publication of *Troades* (McKitterick 1992, 79); his father John also donated manuscripts and printed books to the College, although *Troades* is not recorded among them (see Munby 1948). If this is the case, John Day may have been informed about the didactic needs of the university and may have decided to make more editions of Euripides available.

Conjectural as these considerations may be, they nevertheless underline the importance of a multifaceted analysis of Greek texts in order to determine the degree of knowledge and penetration of Greek literature in sixteenth-century England. A further step in this direction will be to explore more extensively the cultural relevance of printing and reading these ancient works in those years. As Kirsty Milne puts it, "In this case of convergence between the history of the book and the history of ideas, the material object demands reappraisal of the intellectual milieu, and the Greek title-page stands in defiance of received wisdom" (2007, 683).

Works Cited

- Aristotle. 1987. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Translation and Commentary. Edited by Stephen Halliwell. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth. 1986. *Robert Estienne, Royal Printer: An Historical Study of the Elder Stephanus* (revised ed.). Sutton Courtenay: Sutton Courtenay Press.
- Bèze, Théodore de. 1577. *A Tragedie of Abrahams Sacrifice (Abraham sacrificant, 1550)*. London: Thomas Vautrouillier.
- Boas, Frederick. 1914. *University Drama in the Tudor Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bruni, Flavia, and Andrew Pettegree, eds. 2016. *Lost Books. Reconstructing the Print World of Pre-Industrial Europe*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bywater, Ingram. 1919. *Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Demetriou, Tania and Tanya Pollard. 2017. "Homer and Greek Tragedy in Early Modern England's Theatres: An Introduction". *Classical Receptions Journal* 9 (1): 1–35.
- Euripides. 1981. *Euripidis fabulae*, ed. James Diggle, vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- 1597. *Euripidis tragoediae XIX*. [...] Latinam interpretationem M. Aemilius Portus [...] correxit et expolivit [...]. Carminum ratio ex Gul. Cantero diligenter observata, additis eiusdem in totum euripidem notis. Heidelberg: typis Hieronymi Commelini.
 - 1575. *Euripidis Troades*. Londini: apud Ioannem Dayum.
 - 1571. Εὐριπίδου τραγωδία ἸΘ', *Euripidis tragoediae XIX*. Antwerpiae: ex officina Christophori Plantini.
 - 1562. *Euripides poeta tragicorum princeps, in Latinum sermonem conversus, adiecto e regionè textu Graeco: cum annotationibus et praefationibus in omnes eius tragoedias: autore Gasparo Stiblino*. Basileae: per Johannem Oporinum.
 - 1551. Εὐριπίδου τραγωδία ὀκτωκάϊδεκα . . . , *Euripidis tragoediae octodecim*. Basileae: per Iohannem Hervagium.
 - 1506. *Euripidis tragici poete nobilissimi Hecuba et Iphigenia latinae factae Erasmo Roterodamo interprete* (trans. Desiderius Erasmus).[Paris]: ex officina Josse Bade.
 - 1503. Εὐριπίδου τραγωδία ἑπτακάϊδεκα . . . , *Euripidis Tragoediae septendecim . . . Venetiis*: apud Aldum.
- Jardine, Lisa. 1975. "Humanism and the Sixteenth Century Cambridge Arts Course". *History of Education* 4 (1): 16-31.
- Lazarus, Micha. 2015. "Greek Literacy in Sixteenth-Century England". *Renaissance Studies* 20 (3): 433-58.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. 1913. *Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England and Scotland 1485-1640*. London: Chiswick Press.
- McKitterick, David. 1992. *A History of Cambridge University Press*, vol. 1, *Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge, 1534-1698*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milne, Kirsty. 2007. "The Forgotten Greek Books of Elizabethan England". *Literature Compass* 4 (3): 677-87.
- Moore Smith, George Charles. 1909. "Plays Performed in Cambridge Colleges Before 1585". In *Fasciculus Joanni Willis Clark Dicatus, 265-73*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munby, Alan Noel Latimer. 1948. "The Gifts of the Elizabethan Printers to the Library of King's College, Cambridge". *The Library* 5 (2): 224-32.
- Payne, John Thomas, and Henry Foss. 1842. *Bibliotheca Grenvilliana; or Bibliographical Notices of Rare and Curious Books, Forming Part of the Library of the Right Hon. Thomas Grenville*, vol. 1. London: William Nicol.
- PLRE.Folger, *Private Libraries in Renaissance England*, <https://plre.folger.edu/books.php> (accessed 27 April 2021).
- Poe, Joe P. 2020. "Trojan Women". In *Brill's Companion to Euripides*, volume 1, edited by Andreas Markantonatos, 255-77. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Pollard, Tanya. 2017. *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Proctor, Robert. 1905. *Bibliographical Essays*. London: Chiswick Press.
- Renouard, Antoine-Augustin. 1825. *Annales de l'imprimerie des Alde, ou histoire des trois Manuce et de leurs éditions*, 2nd edition, vol. 3. Paris: Antoine-Augustin Renouard.
- SCO. 1853. *Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford: with Royal Patents of Foundation*, In-

- junctions of Visitors, and Catalogues of Documents Relating to the University, Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. 3. Oxford: Parker and London: Longman, Brown, Greens, and Logmans.
- Vervliet, Hendrik D. L. 2008. *The Palaeotypography of the French Renaissance. Selected Papers on Sixteenth-Century Typefaces*, vol. 1. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Wilson, Nigel G. 1973. "Erasmus as a Translator of Euripides. Supplementary Notes". *Antike und Abendland*, 18: 87-8.
- Winston, Jessica. 2006. "Seneca in Early Elizabethan England". *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (1): 29-59.