



Tommi Alho

Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School

A Case Study of *Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia*
(Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Lit. MS E41)

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN THE RESTORATION GRAMMAR
SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY OF *ORATIONES ET CARMINA ALIAQUE
EXERCITIA* (CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL ARCHIVES, LIT. MS E41)



Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School

**A Case Study of *Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia*
(Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Lit. MS E41)**

Tommi Alho

English Language and Literature
Faculty of Arts, Psychology and Theology
Åbo Akademi University
Åbo, Finland, 2020

Supervised by

Prof Anthony W. Johnson
Faculty of Arts, Psychology and Theology
Åbo Akademi University

Prof Raija Sarasti-Wilenius
Faculty of Humanities
University of Helsinki

Reviewed by

Prof Sarah Knight
School of Arts
Department of English
University of Leicester, UK

Dr Andrew Taylor
School of Arts and Humanities
Faculty of English
University of Cambridge, UK

Opponent

Prof Sarah Knight
School of Arts
Department of English
University of Leicester, UK

ISBN 978-952-12-3913-7 (printed)
ISBN 978-952-12-3914-4 (digital)
Painosalama oy – Turku, Finland 2020

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of a great many people and institutions. First of all, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Professor Anthony W. Johnson and Professor Raija Sarasti-Wilenius for their invaluable guidance and support at every step of this project. I am also grateful to my pre-examiners Professor Sarah Knight and Dr Andrew Taylor for their salutary criticism and valuable comments.

I wish to thank Professor Tuija Virtanen-Ulfhielm and Dr Brita Wårvik for their kind and indispensable help in all practical matters. More broadly, I would like to thank every member of the English department for providing me with a pleasant and supportive research environment.

I am grateful to my co-authors Dr Elizabeth Sandis and Dr Aleksi Mäkilähde for their co-operation and ever so entertaining presence in my life. In addition to Dr Mäkilähde and Professor Johnson, I also wish to thank the other members of the *Orationes* project: Professor Jyri Vaahtera, Dr Paul V. Sullivan, Dr Ilkka Juuso and Mr Tuomo Toljamo.

I wish to express my gratitude to the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies for hosting and financing my research stay in Innsbruck. In particular, I wish to thank Professor Florian Schaffenrath, Professor Martin Korenjak, Dr Isabella Walser-Bürgler and Dr William Barton.

I am grateful to Professor Margareta Steinby and Dr Ville Leppänen for providing me with several tegulo-philological retreats from my everyday research. I also extend my thanks to all the MYK-people, especially Professor Esa Itkonen, Professor Anneli Pajunen, Professor Kari Suomi, Dr Nobufumi Inaba, and Dr Emmi Hynönen. For many inspiring literary, historical and linguistic conversations, I wish to thank especially the following: Professor Roger D. Sell, Professor Angela Bartens, Professor Urpo Nikanne, Dr Brita Wårvik, Dr Jason Finch, Dr Loukia Lindholm, Dr Lena Englund, Dr Timo Korkiakangas, Dr Sonja Dahlgren, Dr Hilla Halla-Aho, Dr Minna Seppänen, Dr Linda Bäckman, Dr Christian Jokinen, Dr Teiko Heinosaari, Mr Adam Borch, Ms Eva Norrman, Mr Marco Pribilla and Mr Reko Tikka.

The King's School Archivist Mr Peter Henderson has kindly replied to my inquiries and guided me in the Cathedral Archives. I further thank my Classics teachers Professor Jyri Vaahtera, Dr Jaana Vaahtera, Dr Martti Nyman and Mr Veli-Matti Rissanen for sparking my interest in Classical languages.

Professor H.W. Donner's Fund, administered by the Åbo Akademi Foundation, provided me with most of the financial support for my project. The first year and a half of the work was funded by the Academy of Finland project *Digital Orationes Database*, while the very final stage was made possible by a grant from the Åbo Akademi University Rector's Fund. I gratefully acknowledge their financial support. I also thank Dr Robert Paul and Dr Jennie Öhman for their help with my Swedish, and Dr Jason Finch for checking some of my English.

Finally, I wish to thank my parents Hannu and Eeva for their wholehearted backing and encouragement. Unfortunately, my mother did not live to see me embark on an academic career. Further, I wish to thank my aunt Kirsti for all her support, and my brother Professor PETERI ALHO for his fraternal guidance in all things academic. Special thanks are also due to my marvelous in-laws.

Needless to say, I could not have finished this work without the loving support of my immediate family. I wish to dedicate this book to Inkeri, Aimo and Astrid. There are no words to express how grateful I am for having you.

Aboae, die Veneris ante sollemnitatem Epiphaniae proximâ, 18 ante diem III Nonas Ianuarias, anno Domini MMXX

Tommi Alho

Table of contents

Acknowledgments	i
List of original publications	v
Author's contribution	v
Svensk sammanfattning	vi-vii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Aims and scope.....	3
2. Early-Modern Educational Context.....	5
2.1 Introduction.....	5
2.2 Grammar schools in seventeenth-century England.....	5
2.3 King's School, Canterbury, in the Restoration period.....	10
3. <i>Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia</i>	16
3.1 Introduction.....	16
3.2 Editorial note.....	19
3.3 <i>In sulphuream Papistarum conspiracyem</i>	20
3.4 <i>In hyemalem scholarium missionem</i>	32
3.5 <i>In Quadragesimalis Victoriae gratiam</i>	41
3.6 <i>In nativitatem et reditium regis Caroli secundi</i>	50
4. Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School: The Case Studies.....	58
4.1 Introduction.....	58
4.2 "Vir bonus, dicendi peritus: Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School" (Article II).....	58
4.3 "Performative grammars: Genre and Allusion in a Restoration Manuscript" (Article I).....	59

4.4 “Grammar War Plays in Early Modern England: From Entertainment to Pedagogy” (Article III).....	60
4.5 “ <i>In sulphuream Papistarum conspiracyem exercitia</i> : Retelling the Gunpowder Plot at the King’s School, Canterbury (1665–84)”..	62
5. Conclusion	64
References.....	67
Original publications.....	73

List of original publications

I Mäkilähde, Aleks, Alho, Tommi & Johnson, Anthony W. (2016). “Performative Grammars: Genre and Allusion in a Restoration Manuscript”, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 117 (2): 315-44.

II Alho, Tommi (2019). “*Vir bonus, dicendi peritus*: Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School”, in T. Alho, J. Finch & R. D. Sell (eds.), *Essays on Literature and Culture for Anthony W. Johnson* (FILLM Studies in Languages and Literature). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 81–101.

III Alho, Tommi, Mäkilähde, Aleks, Sandis, Elizabeth (in review). “Grammar War Plays in Early-Modern England: From Entertainment to Pedagogy”.

IV Alho, Tommi (accepted). “*In sulphuream Papistarum conspirationem exercitia*: Retelling the Gunpowder Plot at the King’s School, Canterbury (1665–84)”, *Arctos – Acta Philologica Fennica*.

Author’s contribution

Articles I and III in this thesis are the result of teamwork. In article I, I had the main responsibility for Section 4, while all authors participated in writing the final manuscript. In article III, I was the principal author and responsible for the majority of data collecting. The writing of the manuscript was shared between the authors.

Svensk sammanfattning

Utgående från manuskriptet *Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia* (Lit. MS E 41, Canterbury Cathedral Archives) har jag i denna avhandling undersökt den klassiska utbildningen vid grammar schools under tiden för den engelska restaurationen. Grammar schools kunde jämföras med trivialskolorna i Sverige-Finland. Manuskriptet innehåller tal, dikter och skådespel som eleverna vid Canterbury King's School framförde under åren 1665–1684 på latin, engelska och grekiska. I skolan firades under året fyra tal- och skådespelsdagar, och i manuskriptet är texterna indelade i motsvarande undergrupper. Den 29 maj firades restaurationen av monarkin och födelsedagen av konung Karl II på vad som kallades Oak Apple Day. Den 5 november firades minnet av den misslyckade krutkonspirationen på vad som kallades Guy Fawkes-dagen. I december ansökte eleverna om jullov av dekanus för Katedralen i Canterbury, och innan fastan inleddes tävlade skolgossarna om vem som var bäst i att lösa gåtor och att framföra tal. Manuskriptet omfattar 68 föreställningar arrangerade i 17 årligen återkommande cykler.

Hittills har forskningen kring den klassiska utbildningen i England under den tidigmoderna tiden fokuserat i huvudsak på sekundära källor, såsom läroböcker, skolundervisningsplaner och manuskript som lärare författat. Det är förmodligen av denna orsak som skolundervisningen under denna tidsperiod har av forskningen framförts som utpräglat konservativ. I min avhandling utmanar jag dock denna uppfattning. Jag analyserar texter som skolgossarna själva skrivit. Manuskriptet *Orationes* utgör den mest omfattande samling av denna typs texter från den tidigmoderna perioden i England. Metodologiskt använder jag mig främst av filologisk texttolkning, mindre av litteraturforskningsmetoder.

Forskningshelheten består av fyra delpublikationer. Publikation I undersöker texterna i *Orationes* ur performativitetssynpunkt, särskilt hur grammatiken framställs. Publikation II betraktar textsamlingens tal och dikter såsom skolexerciser. Jag påvisar hur exerciserna förenar undervisningen i retorik med skolelevernars etiska uppfostran. Publikation III diskuterar en särskild dramatisk genre, de så kallade *bellum grammaticale*-skådespelen. I artikeln inordnar jag föreställningarna vid King's School i en större dramatisk kontext. Publikation IV diskuterar

föreställningarna på Guy Fawkes-dagen mot bakgrund av det litterära och politiska läget under början av 1600-talet.

På basis av avhandlingen kan man göra två centrala observationer. Dels fann jag att drama och performativitet var särskilt viktiga element i skolundervisningen under restaurationen och dels framkom vikten av dialogiskheten i *Orationes*-texterna med den samtida litteraturen och med aktuella samhällsliga händelser.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This study examines classical education in the Restoration grammar schools as manifested in the *Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia* manuscript (Lit. MS E41, Canterbury Cathedral Archives).¹ Running to almost one thousand folio pages, the manuscript contains speeches, verses and plays performed and – for the most part – composed by the students of the King’s School, Canterbury, during the headmastership of George Lovejoy (1665–1684). The texts within the manuscript – written in Latin, English and Greek – are divided into four subgenres according to thematics of the four annual speech days in the school year (occasions on which dramatic productions were encouraged). On Oak Apple Day (29 May), the students fêted the birthday and restoration of Charles II; on Guy Fawkes Day (5 November), they celebrated England’s delivery from the Gunpowder Plot; in December they pleaded with the Dean of Canterbury Cathedral for a Christmas break; and in the week before Lent, the boys engaged in speech and riddle contests. The texts have been arranged in yearly cycles from 1665 to 1684, with seventeen cycles and sixty-eight individual performances in total.

The *Orationes* is a rare collection of extant school composition from early-modern England: most probably, the only surviving specimen that is so extensive. The only similar manuscript witnesses, all preserved in the British Library, that I have been able to come across are a very brief collection of Latin verses composed by Eton schoolboys between 1692 and 1698 (Add MS 78520); another brief Etonian example containing prose and verses declaimed at the election of the scholars between 1734–36 (Kings MS 315); a notebook (c. 1565) of a scholar from the Winchester College comprising dictations by his master

¹ I use the term “classical education” in its broadest sense. This encompasses not only the cultivation of Latin and Greek linguistic skills but also the study of Latin and Greek texts (and their humanist interpretations), ranging from literature to ancient history, rhetoric and philosophy.

(Add MS 4379); and an undated volume (early eighteenth-century?) of school exercises, mainly verses, of uncertain origin (Lansdowne MS 1180). All these manuscripts, however, fall short of the *Orationes* in terms of both their content and scope.

It is perhaps for this reason that previous research – without forgetting to pay due respect to its various merits – has largely focused on secondary material such as textbooks, school syllabi, teachers' manuals and educational treatises. The most important studies addressing grammar school education in early-modern England – and on which this thesis largely builds – are Watson (1908), Baldwin (1944) and Clarke (1959). A recent study by Adams (2015) for the most part sums up the previous research. An excellent historical study of the Restoration grammar schools by Vincent (1969), which however does not pay much attention to the syllabus, has been of greatest help. As for the history of the King's School, the three school histories (Woodruff & Cape 1908; Edwards 1957; Hinde 1990) have been often consulted.

With regard to academic drama, while there seems to have been a constant interest in the university plays (e.g. Boas 1914; Gossett & Berger 1988; Russell 1987; Knight 2002; Norland 2013; Sandis forthcoming) school drama has received only minimal scholarly attention. Accordingly, the only general study on the topic remains that of Vail Motter (1929). A detailed account of dramatic culture in Kent before the Civil War can be found in Gibson (2002: xi–xcvi).

Although it has been briefly discussed in all the school histories (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 125–33, 139–47; Edwards 1957: 101–04; Hinde 1990: 37–39) – and with the exception of Johnson (2007) – the *Orationes* manuscript seems to have received no detailed scholarly attention before the research carried out in the “Digital *Orationes* Database” project between 2010–15 (Academy of Finland, decision no. 140369, PI: Anthony W. Johnson). The aim of the project was to create an open digital edition of the *Orationes* manuscript, of which a trial version is currently accessible online.² In addition to the articles constituting this study, the project and its aftermath have produced several articles on different aspects of the manuscript. Anthony W. Johnson has addressed many literary historical aspects of the manuscript (Johnson 2017), while Aleksis Mäkilähde has discussed language choice and code-switching in the

² Cf. <http://www.ee.oulu.fi/~ijuuso/orationes/browse.php>

Orationes performances in several papers and in his doctoral thesis (Skaffari & Mäkilähde 2014: 269–73; Harjunpää & Mäkilähde 2016: 184–93; Mäkilähde 2018a; Mäkilähde 2018b; Mäkilähde 2019). An edition of five Christmas plays is also underway (Johnson et al. forthcoming).

1.2 Aims and Scope

This study originated as part of the “Digital *Orationes* Database” project. While my original aim was to produce an edition of some of the pre-Lenten contests, the highly repetitive character of these texts redirected me to concentrate on another aspect of the *Orationes* performances. As the manuscript is an exceptional witness to what was actually going on in the schoolroom (vs what was prescribed for the schoolroom), I decided to focus my efforts on the educational practices of the Restoration grammar schools as reflected in the King’s School performances. This has been carried out by way of four case studies, all of them addressing some of the most pivotal aspects of early-modern grammar school education. Articles I and III are the result of co-operation. Article I focuses on the performative aspect of the *Orationes* texts, with a particular emphasis on “performing grammar”, while Article III takes the discussion outside the King’s School premises, presenting a case study on a specific dramatic genre, that is, the grammar war play tradition, linking the King’s School performances to a broader early-modern dramatic context. Article II addresses the *Orationes* speeches and verses as school exercises and shows how they combined rhetorical training with Humanist ethical ideals. Finally, Article IV examines a specific subgenre within the *Orationes*, the Guy Fawkes Day performances, connecting them to earlier literary traditions of the seventeenth century, and to the political landscape of Restoration England.

Methodologically, this thesis makes use of philological text-interpretation, furnished with some perspectives from literary criticism. Moreover, the study of individual passages has been greatly enhanced by the TEI-XML annotated transcriptions produced in the *Orationes* project. As such, the study falls within the field of Neo-Latin, as well as –

to a lesser degree – humanist Greek and early-modern English literary studies.³

I would like to begin my discussion by giving an outline of the early-modern educational context (Ch. 2), addressing, first, the grammar school system in early-modern England (2.2) and, second, the King’s School, Canterbury, in the Restoration period (2.3). In Chapter 3, I shall move on to examine the *Orationes* manuscript, beginning with an outline of the contents and structure of the manuscript (3.2), followed by a brief editorial note (3.3), before discussing the individual subgenres in detail. In Chapter 4, I will summarise the research carried out in the articles and, finally, bring the study to a close with some concluding observations in Chapter 5.

³ “Neo-Latin” is the term commonly used for the Latin literature produced by the Western civilization from around the time of early Renaissance up to the nineteenth century. For a discussion of the term, see e.g. Knight & Tilg 2015: 1–4; Sidwell 2015; for the field, *an sich*, Helander 2001.

2. Early-Modern Educational Context

2.1 Introduction

The main goal of early-modern elementary education was to provide the students with the ability to read, write and speak Latin, and generally, for students on a more advanced level, engage with Greek as well.⁴ Having learned the rudiments of classical languages, the students immersed themselves in the study of the canon of classical literature. This instruction took place in facilities commonly known within post-Reformation culture as “grammar schools”. In this chapter, I will first discuss the grammar schools in seventeenth-century England, or, more specifically their curriculum, and, second, give an outline of the history and practices at the King’s School, Canterbury, in the Restoration period.

2.2 Grammar Schools in Seventeenth-Century England

Grammar schools, as we find them in seventeenth-century England, were the product of humanist educational reforms in the first half of the sixteenth century. Humanism was a scholarly and educational movement, whose proponents believed that the best way to improve people morally, religiously and intellectually was the return to the study and imitation of the classical literature of ancient Greece and Rome (*ad fontes*). The emphasis of this humanist curriculum was on grammar, rhetoric, poetry, ancient history, and moral philosophy, known as *studia humanitatis* (or *humaniora*). In the course of the early sixteenth century, the humanist programme revised the curriculum of the universities, and – through the efforts of early sixteenth-century English humanists and schoolmasters such as John Colet, Thomas Linacre and William Lily – the humanist curriculum was implemented

⁴ Mack 2014: 55–61.

within the grammar schools themselves.⁵ The second half of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century witnessed a rapid expansion in the number of grammar schools with a concomitant increase in the state control of all educational institutions.⁶ After some upheaval amidst the Civil War, and a number of largely futile attempts at general educational reform by the Puritans⁷ during the Interregnum,⁸ the grammar schools remained very much as they had always been, that is, institutions whose main aim was to prepare the sons of gentry and the urban establishment for higher learning at the Universities and Inns of Court.⁹

Before they entered the grammar school at the age of seven or eight,¹⁰ some of the boys were already able to read and write at least to some extent.¹¹ There was no uniform system of primary education in early modern England, but the elementary reading and writing skills were acquired, if at all, at dame's schools (or petty schools) – run by women at their homes for small children of both sexes – or by private tuition.¹²

⁵ For the implementation of humanist ideals into the sixteenth-century universities and grammar schools, see Baldwin 1944: 75–163, vol. 1; Charlton 1965: 89–168; more concisely, Jewell 1998: 22–26.

⁶ Green 2009: 57–58; Jewell 1998: 26–33; Stone 1964.

⁷ The meaning and use of the term “Puritan” remain the subject of lively scholarly debate falling beyond the scope of this thesis. In what follows, I use the term “Puritan” as a synonym for Calvinist Nonconformists. For the debate, see e.g. Lake 2008; for a recent study on defining Puritanism in Restoration England, Winship 2011.

⁸ Most especially, the seemingly modern idea – advocated by such visionaries as John Knox and Comenius and abhorred by many of their learned contemporaries – to offer free education to all children regardless of their social background (Jewell 1998: 33–36; Vincent 1969: 9–16).

⁹ Green 2009: 75–78. This is not to say, however, that the lower social strata – apart perhaps from the very poorest labouring classes – would have been excluded from grammar school education (Stone 1964: 44–45).

¹⁰ Vincent 1969: 58.

¹¹ Clearly, not all of them were able to read and write before entering the grammar school. This is confirmed, for example, by the 1665 “Rules and Orders” of the King’s School (cf. below pp. 13–15), which state: “13. That the boys be not suffered to leave y^e schoole any part of y^e forenoon or afternoon for going elsewhere to learn to write or cipher: but that such of them as have not learned to write or cipher before their coming to this schoole, take their time for it after 11 in the forenoon and in the afternoon, or other wise as the master and Usher shall appoint” (Edwards 1957: 212).

¹² Lawson & Silver 1973: 110–15; Vincent 1969: 71–75.

The syllabus of the seventeenth-century grammar schools – with particular emphasis on the curriculum of the Restoration period King’s School – is discussed in detail in Article II.¹³ In what follows, I will offer a brief summary of the curriculum with some additional remarks.

The grammar school curriculum was devoted almost exclusively to studying Latin and Greek authors, and divided into “forms” according to ability and age of the students with little variation between schools.¹⁴ At the King’s School by 1682, the syllabus was divided into three forms, the usher teaching the rudiments in one form and the master the rest in two upper forms, both further divided into two classes. At the Merchant Taylors’ School, for example, the curriculum consisted of six forms, preceded by a rudimentary “*Infinita classis*, or the Pettite form.”¹⁵ As for the authors to be read – usually prescribed in the school statutes – there was very little variation between schools, and, notwithstanding the addition of some ancient and early-modern authors into the syllabus, the core of the curriculum seems to have remained very much the same since the sixteenth century.¹⁶

The first years were dedicated to Latin accidence and to learning how to read, write and speak Latin.¹⁷ The rules of Latin accidence were first memorised in English. Such works as John Brinsley’s *The posing of the Parts* (1612) were used for this purpose. Written in the question-answer format, Brinsley’s textbook corresponds to the two-part structure of William Lily’s (c. 1468–1522) Latin primer, of which the first

¹³ Article II: esp. 82–93.

¹⁴ Hebrew was introduced into the curriculum of some schools in the sixteenth century but with apparently little success (Clarke 1959: 34–35). Minimal, if any, attention was paid to such subjects as modern languages and mathematics (Vincent 1969: 96–101). The little that was learned of modern history and geography were derived from such works as William Camden’s *Britannia* (1586), a historical and topographical survey of Great Britain and Ireland. The work is mentioned in one of the Christmas plays (f. 149r).

¹⁵ *The Schools-Probation* 1661: sig. D3r ff.

¹⁶ The authors to be studied are recorded in the 1682 “Orders” (for the full list, cf. pp. 10–11 below; Article II: 83) and the following discussion takes its cue from there. Originally, the King’s School curriculum, modelled after Eton and Winchester, was in six forms. The curriculum is recorded in the 1541 Cathedral Statutes, when the school was refounded, and differs little from the 1682 syllabus (cf. Baldwin 1944: 164–69, vol. 1; Leach, 1911: 452–69; Woodruff & Cape 1908: 47–56).

¹⁷ After the Restoration, the practice of conversing in Latin outside the schoolroom was dying out, and regulations prescribing compulsory speaking in Latin are found at some schools of the Restoration period (Vincent 1969: 76).

part, *A Shorte introduction of grammar*, was in English and the second part, *Brevissima institutio*, in Latin. In one form or the other, Lily's grammar remained the authorised Latin grammar used in schools up until to the nineteenth century.¹⁸ Learning the catechism by heart was also part of the boys' daily round.

When the students had learned the rudiments of Latin grammar, they moved on to the elementary reading exercises. These included, among others, collections of brief moral sayings, like the *Disticha Catonis* and Leonhard Cullmann's *Sententiae pueriles*, followed by such more advanced dialogues as Erasmus's *Colloquia*. Aesop's *Fables* were also standard reading material in the lower forms.

Next, the students proceeded to study the canon of classical literature.¹⁹ Typically, the first classical works examined were Terence's comedies and Ovid's *Tristia*, followed by such works as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Cicero's *De officiis*. Erasmus's *Adagia*, a collection of Greek and Latin proverbs, *De copia*, a rhetorical textbook, and *De conscribendis epistolis*, a guide to letter-writing, were also commonly introduced at this level. To these should be added the reading of the New Testament in Latin.

Greek was universally begun only after a good grounding in Latin: at the King's School in the upper class of the master's first form, at Merchant Taylors' in the fourth form.²⁰ Similarly to Latin, the study of Greek was begun by learning the grammar – William Camden's *Institutio Graecae* was the standard textbook for this purpose – followed by simple dialogues, like *Familiarum colloquiorum libellus Graece et Latine* by Johannes Posselius the Elder. As the first reading material, came Isocrates's speeches, followed by Homer and Hesiod, and supplemented by the so-called "minor poets", including Hesiod, Callimachus, Theognis and Theocritus, usually read from Ralph Winterton's *Poetae minores Graeci* (1636). The Greek New Testament was also read. As for the Latin authors, Virgil and Horace were also typically reserved for the middle or higher forms. To the above-mentioned authors may be added, at some schools, such ancient poets as Martial and Juvenal; the historians

¹⁸ Gwosdek 2013: 1–14.

¹⁹ For how such a canon came into existence in the course of the sixteenth century, see Dolven 2007, esp. Chapter I.

²⁰ *The Schools-Probation 1661*: sig. D4r.

Sallust, Quintus Curtius, Florus and Xenophon; tragedies by Seneca, Sophocles and Euripides; Lucian of Samosata's dialogues; and Greek epigrams. Among the early-modern works we find, inter alia, such supplementary texts as Jean Tixier's (Lat. "Ravisius Textor") collection of model letters (*Epistolae*), Johannes Sturm's edition of Cicero's letters, and Susenbrotus's rhetorical manual, *Epitome troporum ac schematum*.²¹

While the above-discussed syllabus certainly formed the basis of all grammar school education in seventeenth-century England, to it should be added the Neo-Latin as well as – although to a lesser degree – humanist Greek literature produced in early-modern Europe. As will be evident in Chapter 3 and the articles, the reading of (near)-contemporary Latin and Greek authors was a commonplace at the King's School, and, in all probability, elsewhere as well. At the King's School these included, among others, collections of eulogical verse produced at the universities, riddle collections, brief epic, and even Neo-Latin works by such major contemporary English poets as Abraham Cowley, whose monumental *Plantarum libri sex* (1662) was apparently put to good use in the schoolroom. On the Greek side, we find at least James Duport's *Δαβίδης ἔμμετρος* (1666), a translation of the psalms into Homeric hexameter, printed with a royal recommendation that it should be used at grammar schools.

Regardless of the author – classical or contemporary – in practice, the daily round of seventeenth-century grammar school boys constituted of endless memorising, construing, parsing and translating the above-discussed texts. In addition to this, were the composition exercises, where the boys were required to imitate and vary the authors they had studied. Letter-writing, theme-writing and versification were the most common composition exercises employed to this end.

All early-modern composition relied heavily on rhetoric, and the culmination of the composition exercises was the delivery of an oration. To this end, the pre-eminent exercise was the theme, a kind of written essay on a moral or political topic. The most common textbook for theme-writing was Aphthonius's *Progymnasmata*, read in a Latin translation, which provided a set of fourteen exercises, from the elementary fable, maxim and anecdote to the proposal of a law. In essence, rhetoric

²¹ Cf. e.g. the lists of authors for Merchant Taylors' (*The Schools-Probation* 1661: sig. D4r ff.) and St Paul's schools (Clark 1948: 110–13); cf. also Green 2009: 40–52.

formed the pinnacle and goal of all grammar school education. The underlying idea, derived originally from Cicero and largely absorbed by the Renaissance humanists through a version of Quintilian, was actually simple. In order to be a good and active citizen and to benefit the society (*vir civilis* or *bonus*), man needed two qualities above all: eloquence (*eloquentia*) and reason (*ratio*). Eloquence was necessary for convincing one's audience, and reason for finding out the truth, or rather telling right from wrong in its grammar school version. These were essential qualities for young men who were preparing to take their places in the society as ecclesiastics, university men, lawyers or civil servants.²²

While moral conduct was emphasised in very much all the reading materials, five skills or canons were required in order to deliver an effective oration: invention (*inventio*), arrangement (*dispositio*), diction (*elocutio*), memory (*memoria*), and delivery (*pronuntiatio*).²³ Even if the first four canons could be learned from textbooks, delivery, which dealt with how something was said (voice, gesture) rather than what was said, had to be learned in practice. Public speeches and acting were the common means employed to this end at every early-modern grammar school.²⁴ Before I move on to address the speeches and plays performed at the King's School and recorded in the *Orationes* manuscript, a brief account of the school as we find it in the Restoration period will be in order.

2.3 King's School, Canterbury, in the Restoration Period

At the Restoration in 1660, the King's School found itself in neglect.²⁵ Both the Cathedral and the school had suffered great damage at the hands of political and religious radicals during the Interregnum.²⁶ One of the first tasks of the newly elected Dean and Chapter, apart from the

²² Article II: esp. 82–83, 95, 101. For the origins of the ideal in the Renaissance humanist thought, cf. Van der Poel 2015: 124 and the references therein.

²³ See Article II: 88–89 for a brief outline of the five canons.

²⁴ For the place the public orations and play-acting held at early-modern grammar schools, see Enterline 2012: 33–61; Article I: 320–26; Article III.

²⁵ For the history of the school from its refoundation in 1541 up until the Restoration, see e.g. Edwards 1957: 68–100.

²⁶ Gregory 1995: 211–14

overhaul of the damaged buildings, was to elect a body of men who would stand for the restored regime.²⁷ With regard to the school, the Dean and Chapter were quick to expel the Puritan headmaster Henry Montague together with all his scholars, all of whom had been elected without any lawfull authority.²⁸ The headmastership fell on John Paris, who held the reins of the school for only five years before leaving it to George Lovejoy in 1665.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a dearth of information in regard to Lovejoy's life and career. The following outline, however, can be drawn largely from the Oxford matriculation register and Lovejoy's epitaph in the church of St Peter-in-Thonet.²⁹ He was born in Wickham, Bucks, the son of George Lovejoy, and matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1631 at the age of eighteen. Lovejoy received his MA in 1640 and was appointed rector of Threxton, Norfolk, in the same year. Lovejoy was a fellow at Merton College from 1634 but, having served as a chaplain in the army of Charles I during the Civil War, he was suspended from his fellowship in 1647 by the Puritans.³⁰ Apparently, Lovejoy ended up as a schoolmaster by default: although a successful one. For before he was appointed to Canterbury, Lovejoy had already served as headmaster of the Free School in Islington (Dame Alice Owen's School) from 1654 to 1665.³¹ Lovejoy retired in 1684 and died the following year, survived by his wife Elizabeth (d. 1695).³²

Retiring in his early seventies, Lovejoy may well have been exhausted and taken some short cuts or other liberties in his management of the school. Certainly that is the tenor of a number of the statutes issued towards the end of Lovejoy's career.³³ At the 1682 St Catharine's

²⁷ An Act of Parliament in 1649 had abolished all deans and chapters (Gregory 1995: 205). For the consequences of sequestration and confiscation by Parliament at Canterbury, cf. Collinson 1995: 200–03.

²⁸ Edwards 1957: 99; Hinde 1990: 35; Woodruff & Cape 1908: 122–23;

²⁹ Foster 1891: 940 s.v. "Lovejoy, George". Lovejoy's epitaph is reproduced in Woodruff & Cape 1908: 138. Cf. also Article I: 316.

³⁰ Brodrick 1885: 90; cf. Johnson 2017: 377 n. 53.

³¹ Two letters of credence from the headmasters of St Paul's and Merchant Taylors' schools, Samuel Cromliholme and John Goad, respectively, survive in the Cathedral Archives ("Testimonials for Staff"). The letters emphasise Lovejoy's orthodoxy, loyalty and his experience in teaching.

³² Woodruff & Cape 1908: 138.

³³ Cf. Edwards 1957: 101; Woodruff & Cape 1908: 133–34.

audit (Chapter), the Dean and Chapter saw it necessary to issue ten orders “for the better regulating of the schoole”:

1. Nothing to be required of any schollar for entrance.
2. Noe private schollar who is not of the schoole to be taught in either of the houses of the Master or Usher.
3. No exactions [sc. exactions] for teaching save five shillings a quarter for King Schollars, and ten for Commoners.
4. Nothing at breaking up save only at Christmas for candles and then not exceeding ten shillings a boy[.] Nor noe other impositions [or] whatsoever without the leave of the Deane and Chapter.
5. The Usher to teach the Accidence, Lillyes Grammer, Cato, puerilis, Corderius, Esops fables, Erasmus colloquies
6. The Master to teach in his second form the lower classis Ouid de Tristibus <,> Terence, Latine Testament, Erasmus, Tullys Offices, The Upper Classis Ouids Metamorphosis, Tullys Orations, Quintus Curtius, Greeke Grammer, Posselius colloquies. Here to make Latine Theams and verses
7. The lower Classis of the upper form Virgill, Horace, Isocratis, Greeke Testament. In the upper Homer, Hesiod, Minores poetæ, Florus etc. Here to make Declamations, verses Greeke and Latine ex tempore
8. None to be admitted a Schollar into the schoole without the knowledge and examination of the Master to be placed accordingly.
9. None to be removed from the Usher to the Masters forms but by the Deane and prebends or in the absence of the Deane by the Vice-dean and prebends after their quarterly examinations or by the Deane and Chapter after their General examination at st Katherines.
10. Noe plaies to be acted in the Schoole unless first seene and allowed by the Deane, or in his absence by the Vice Deane, or in the absence of them both by the Senior Prebend present.³⁴

The school was examined in 1684 by the Dean and Chapter, and, having “found it sensibly declining by reason of the Head-Master’s age”,

³⁴ Cf. “Orders”.

Lovejoy was asked to retire.³⁵ He was succeeded by his usher for three years, Richard Johnson (1684–89).³⁶

The same year Lovejoy was appointed headmaster, the Dean and Chapter³⁷ issued a set of twenty-four rules and orders for governing the King's School, which offer interesting information with regard to school life.³⁸ The school day began at seven in the morning and ended at five, with a two-hour break between eleven and one [1.].³⁹ This means six days a week. As the boys typically entered the grammar school when they were seven or eight and continued there until the age of sixteen or seventeen, the amount of classical education they received must have been quite remarkable.⁴⁰ The day started and ended with a prayer at the school premises [2.] but on holidays and Sundays, the boys attended the church service and the evening prayer at the Cathedral [19.]. They were required to provide themselves with the *Books of Common Prayer* and to join the Dean and prebends in the psalms and responsorials in the stalls [20]. After the evening prayer on Sunday, both the King's Scholars and Commoners were to return to the school for catechesis [22.].

The school was divided between the King's Scholars, i.e. the boys enjoying a scholarship, and the Commoners (or Oppidans), i.e. the fee-paying boys. Archbishop Laud's revision of the Cathedral Statutes in 1637 provides explicit rules and procedures for the election of King's Scholars.⁴¹ The election was to take place after the St Catharine's Day audit on 25 November. Having examined the school, the Dean, or in his absence the Vice-Dean, together with the Canons and the headmaster were to elect those students who they found to be the most worthy to

³⁵ In a letter addressed to the Archbishop Sancroft, quoted by Woodruff & Cape 1908: 147. I have been unable to consult the original, preserved in the Bodleian (Tanner MSS).

³⁶ Johnson was preceded as usher by John Culling, a BA from Clare College, Cambridge, from 1661. For a list of headmasters and ushers, see e.g. Edwards 1957: 201–05.

³⁷ The first Dean during Lovejoy's headmastership was Thomas Turner, who was appointed in 1643 and, having survived the Interregnum, held the deanery until 1672. Turner was followed by John Tillotson (1672–89), the future Archbishop of Canterbury.

³⁸ *Rules & and Orders for governing the Freeschoole at Canterbury agreed upon by the Dean & Chapter there Aprill. 13 1665*. Recorded in the Bodleian Library MS Gough Kent 3, these rules are transcribed in Edwards 1957: 211–14.

³⁹ The references to the orders are by the numbering in Edwards 1957: 211–14.

⁴⁰ Cf. Vincent 1969: 58–59.

⁴¹ Laud 1858: 528–30; cf. Edwards 1957: 95.

be promoted to King's Scholars.⁴² The number of the King's Scholars was to be fifty.⁴³

Moreover, "monitors" were to be nominated from among the ranks of the students. Their duty was to oversee the other boys and, in the case of misconduct, inform them to the school authorities. Negligent monitors were to be publicly castigated as an example to the others.⁴⁴ The Dean, resident prebends and the headmaster conducted an examination of the whole school once a year after the St Catharine's audit in order to select the students to be promoted to the higher forms.⁴⁵ Minor examinations were carried out every trimester.⁴⁶ In all likelihood, this also involved the inspection of their notebooks, which the orders required the boys to acquire and provide with "a date to every exercise whereby their proficiency may be tried"[16.].

The rest of the orders consists largely of different regulations concerning the boys' outfit or behaviour, such as "[t]hat they be not suffered to swear, curse, bann, or use any lewd, or prophain language; or to play at any game for money; or to throw at Cocks; or to make Mintyard, the Greencourt, the Church, Churchyard, or Cloyster their sporting place." [7.]⁴⁷ Further instruction is provided for the appropriate hours to play, that is, on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons in the main, [8.] and for the "use of the house or place of easement" [11. -12.].

One more passage, however, requires our attention: "That the ancient Custome of Victors, as (from the honour, and priviledge of it), a

⁴² [...] *eos solum quos (conscientia teste) maxime idoneos judicaverint* (Laud 1858: 529).

⁴³ As for the number of Commoners, there is no certain information. Woodruff & Cape (1908: 136) speculate that the number may have been around the same as that of King's Scholars. This may not be far removed from the truth as schools in larger towns seem to have taught around 100–150 students at a time (Green 2009: 60). Records of King's Scholars from 1540 to the mid-nineteenth century are preserved in the Cathedral Archives. A list of all known students between 1660–1749 has been compiled by the school archivist Peter Henderson, and it can be accessed on the King's School website (see Henderson n.d.).

⁴⁴ *Si quis monitorum deliquerit, aut in officio negligenter sese gesserit, aperte in aliorum exemplum vapulet* (Laud 1858: 530).

⁴⁵ Cf. the 1682 "Orders", p. 12 above.

⁴⁶ Laud 1858: 530.

⁴⁷ The frase "to throw at Cocks" refers to a popular bloodsport in early-modern England where the players threw heavy sticks at a live cock or hen until it died. It was typically practiced at Shrovetide.

great incentive to emulation in learning shall be revived, and restored” [10.]. “The ancient Custom of Victors” refers to the yearly pre-Lenten performances, recorded in the *Orationes* for the tenure of Lovejoy’s headmastership. The custom seems to have been an ancient one at the King’s School but had fallen into oblivion at some point, probably during the Interregnum, before being revived by the Dean and Chapter for the pre-Lenten period of 1666. Of course, plays had been performed and orations delivered at the King’s School long before the Restoration but, unfortunately, none of these seem to survive.⁴⁸ In addition to the endless grammar lessons, the four annual speech days formed an important part of the yearly round of the King’s School boys. I will now move on to address these performances as they have been preserved in the *Orationes* manuscript.

⁴⁸ Payments for the expenses related to the staging of plays are recorded in the Treasurer’s Accounts as early as 1562–63, although the tradition must go back to the Middle Ages (Woodruff & Cape 1908: 79–80).

3. *Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia*

3.1 Introduction

Preserved as Lit. MS E41 in the Canterbury Cathedral archives, the title-page of the manuscript reads as *Orationes, et Carmina, / aliaque / Exercitia, / Quae composita fuerunt / In Nativitatem, et reditum regis Caroli secundi. / In sulphuream Papistarum conspirationem. / In hyemalem Scholarium missionem. / In Quadragesimalis Victoriae gratiam. / et publice habita / Coram Decano, & Canonicis, aliisque Auditoribus / a / Scholasticis in regia Schola / Cantuariæ. / Georgio Lovejoy A M. archididascolo*. This, translated, is: "Speeches, poems and other exercises, which were composed for the birthday and restoration of King Charles II, for the sulphurous conspiracy of the Papists, for the winter release of the scholars, for the sake of the Lenten victory, and which were publicly held before the Dean and Canons, and other auditors, by the scholars of the King's School, Canterbury, during the headmastership of George Lovejoy, MA."

The volume consists of speeches, poems, dialogues and plays composed in Latin, English and Greek by the students of the King's School during the headmastership of George Lovejoy (1665–1684).⁴⁹ In addition, it also records the staging of several plays by various authors on these days. In this chapter, I shall first give a brief description of the manuscript, followed by an outline of its contents and structure. And, third, I will attempt a succinct account of the performances recorded for each day.

Bearing the words PUBL[ICA] EXERCITIA. LOVEIOII. SCHOLARIUM embossed in gold on the spine of its leather cover, the manuscript comprises 484 folio leaves (23.5 x 36.5 cm) plus blanks. It has been continuously paginated with the folio numbers appearing in every upper right recto corner of each folio. All the pages have an ample double margin in red ink. Apart from occasional scribal corrections in secretary hand, the manuscript has been written in even italics, easily legible to

⁴⁹ The case that the texts within the manuscript, for the most part at least, were indeed composed by the students themselves has already been convincingly argued by Mäkilähde (2019: esp. 43, 173) and will not be reiterated here.

the modern eye. The scribe has taken great care in copying and arranging the texts, so that the manuscript rather resembles a printed book of the period. The identity of the scribe remains entirely speculative. One may of course be tempted to include among the possible candidates such persons as Lovejoy himself, the usher, or even one of the students.

The performances run from f. 1r to f. 477r. These are followed by a list of names of the “Victors” in the pre-Lenten performances, titled as *Nomina Scholasticorum qui Georgio Lovejoy archididascalo Regiae Scholae fuerunt Victores* (ff. 478r–79r). Last, there are eight very brief speeches given by the students before visiting dignitaries and the examiners of the School (ff. 480v–84r).⁵⁰ Between ff. 435v–436r is an illustration of Lady Grammatica, accompanied by her daughters Orthography, Etymology, Syntax and Prosody. Inserted between ff. 421vr–22r are two loose folio sheets, clearly of different paper. Written in distinct hands, both of them contain two brief elegiacs modelled on the Gospel reading and the Collect for Ash Wednesday and Easter Sunday.⁵¹

The texts within the manuscript have been arranged in annual cycles, according to the four yearly festivities in the school year: Guy Fawkes Day (5 November), Christmas, Lent and Oak Apple Day (29 May). Beginning with the 1665 Guy Fawkes Day performance, the compiler of the manuscript has tried to maintain the cycles in ascending chronological order throughout the manuscript. Many of the dates can indeed be confirmed by internal evidence and relevant records in the

⁵⁰ These are *Oratio coram domino Middleton habita anno Domini 1666; Oratio in adventum reverendi patris D[omi]ni Gunning episcopi Elyensis composita, sed illo non veniente fuit indicta; Oratio coram Johanne Tillotson DD ecclesiae Christi Cantuarensis decano 12° calendarum Aprilis anno Dom[ini] 1672 a Samuele Gibson habita; Oratio coram scholae examinatoribus ab Edouardo Missenden habita 14° calendarum Decembris an[no] Dom[ini] 1674; Oratio coram scholae examinatoribus a Leopoldo Finch habita 24° Novembris an[no] Dom[ini] 1676; Oratio coram illis a Guilielmo Brome habita; Oratio a Guilielmo Sprat habita coram D[omi]no Guilielmo Lloyd Petriburgi episcopo cathedralem Cantuariensem ecclesiam visitante 26° die Aprilis an[no] Dom[ini] 1682; Oratio coram Scholae examinatoribus a Carolo Hardress habita 13° Nov[em]bris an[no] Dom[ini] 1682.*

⁵¹ Recorded for Ash Wednesday and signed by “Carolus Whitus” are *Sanctum Evangelium in diem cinerum secundum Matthaeum Cap[itulum] 6 a versu 16 ad 22* (32 lines) and *Collecta eiusdem diei sive Oratio* (6 lines). In the second sheet for Easter Sunday, signed by “Johannes Tournayus”, we have *Evangelium resurrectionis Secundum Johannem Cap[itulum] 20. a versu [pri]mo ad [undeci]mum* (32 lines) and *Collecta eiusdem diei sive Oratio* (6 lines).

Cathedral Treasurer's accounts.⁵² Accordingly, for the first Guy Fawkes Day performance an initial date of 1665 is given in the margin. That the first recorded performance indeed took place in 1665 is confirmed by a mention of the Great Plague in the prologue (f. 1r). Further, the next Guy Fawkes performance can be definitely dated to 1666, for this time the speaker alludes to the Great Fire of London (f. 31r). Further, the correct date for many of the pre-Lenten performances can be confirmed by comparing the names of the students appearing in them with the list of "Victors" at the end of the volume.⁵³

Unfortunately, the chronology of the performances is rendered somewhat more complicated by the fact that the compiler has omitted two entire years from the record. Although Lovejoy acted as the headmaster from 1665 to 1684 and the list of Victors of the pre-Lenten disputations gives the names for all these years, there are only seventeen cycles in the whole manuscript. Based on the evidence discussed above, it seems likely that the missing years are 1671 and 1681.⁵⁴ To further complicate matters, the compiler has misplaced the 1674 and 1675 Gunpowder performances into the cycles beginning in 1678 and 1679, respectively.⁵⁵ Notwithstanding these difficulties, one can safely assume

⁵² An entry in the Treasurer's accounts for 16 February 1672 (f. 39r) records a payment to headmaster Lovejoy for "preparing a scene for acting the comedy *Senile Odium*" before Ash Wednesday. Similarly, an entry for 2 September 1673 (f. 40v) records a reward paid to "the Schollers for acting *Valetudinarius* twice" before the previous Ash Wednesday.

⁵³ The New Year is taken to start on 1 January (New Style). In the Old Style the calendar year began on the Lady Day (25 March), which always fell between Ash Wednesday and the Oak Apple Day (25 May). Accordingly, the first pre-Lenten performance, recorded for the year 1665, is taken to have been performed in 1666 (New Style).

⁵⁴ The gap between 1670 and 1672 is confirmed by the list of Victors and the 1682 entry in the Treasurer's accounts. The date for the second gap is somewhat more difficult to establish. However, the names of the Victors for 1682 and the two plays performed on Christmas 1680, make the year 1681 a likely option.

⁵⁵ These dates are confirmed by the speakers who state explicitly how many years ago the event under discussion took place; cf. f. 337r: [...] *quod post sexaginta novem annos jam peractos, novam hodierni sceleris memoriam refricamus*; and f. 364v: [...] *septuaginta ab hinc annis, sic hoc anno abortionem fecit*. On the other hand, similar statements confirm the correct dates for the 1667 (f. 49v) and 1668 (f. 74v) Oak Apple Day performances while a reference to the 1683 Rye House Plot (f. 470r), an alleged conspiracy to assassinate Charles II together with the Duke of York, confirms the date of the 1684 Oak Apple Day performance.

that the performances are recorded in rough chronological order. With the obvious exception of the dates that can definitely be shown to be wrong, I shall – for the sake of convenience and for the reason that the exact dating of individual performances is not pertinent to the present discussion – refer to the performances by the years (and folios) for which they have been recorded in the manuscript.⁵⁶

As the title-page informs us, the performances took place before the Dean and canons of the Cathedral. In addition to these authorities, there were – at least on some occasions – other guests present as well.⁵⁷ In regard to the place of performance, the internal evidence points towards the schoolroom.⁵⁸

3.2 Editorial note

In the Latin transcriptions, I have largely preserved the original spelling, which conforms to the contemporary conventions but in some respects deviates from present-day practice.⁵⁹ The most noteworthy feature is the use of a single ligature for the diphthongs *ae* and *oe* (rendered in the transcription as *ae* and *oe* according to the classical standard). Hypercorrect spellings, where long-*e* has been replaced with a ligature denoting a diphthong, are not uncommon (e.g. *fælix*, transcribed with *ae*). Other features include writing *ci* for *ti* when followed by a vowel (e.g. *ocium*); hypercorrect spelling of *y* for *i* (e.g. *hyems*, *lachryma*); spelling *j* for *i* in the beginning of a word (e.g. *janua*), between two vowels (e.g. *cujus*), and after *i* (e.g. *officij*, *auspicijs*); as well as the aspiration

⁵⁶ A full account of the issue will be offered in Johnson et al. forthcoming.

⁵⁷ For example, in a Christmas oration recorded for 1678 (f. 346r), the speaker addresses some former alumni and members of both universities. Besides, as Johnson (2017, 381–82) suggests, some parents and local dignitaries may have also attended these occasions.

⁵⁸ For example, the speaker in the 1679 Christmas oration tells the audience that they have embarked the school as some vessel (*Vos, Auditores, in hanc Scholam, seu naviculam quandam conscendistis*, f. 375v). Similarly, in the Oak Apple Day oration recorded for 1676, it is made clear that the Dean and canons had attended church services before coming to the school ([...] *nunc in Schola, prout nuper fecistis in Templo, plurimi faciat, Mecaenates reverendi*, f. 265r).

⁵⁹ Cf. Minkova 2014.

of *c* and *t* (e.g. *lachryma*, *nothus*). Ligatures, which in the manuscript are employed very sparingly (mainly for the diphthongs and *-que*), have been expanded.

In Neo-Latin, diacritics were used to distinguish between homographs.⁶⁰ The grave accent is typically used to mark adverbs (e.g. *verò*, *longè*), while the circumflex is often found over long vowels to mark ablative singular endings (e.g. *gratiâ*) and fourth declension genitive singulars (e.g. *senatûs*). In addition, the circumflex marks contracted verb forms (e.g. *spectâsse*). The acute is used very infrequently, usually to mark words compounded with an enclitic (e.g. *méne*, *gentéque*). Following the usual practice, I have omitted diacritics from my transcriptions. The original punctuation, however, has been retained.

Unlike the Latin passages within the *Orationes*, the Greek in the manuscript abounds with ligatures in accordance with the contemporary practice.⁶¹ I have silently expanded the ligatures for the sake of better legibility. However, I have retained the original diacritics, which in places deviate from the classical standard, betraying perhaps a certain insecurity in terms of accentuation.

3.3 *In sulphuream Papistarum conspirationem*

Celebrating the failure of the Gunpowder Plot,⁶² the typical structure of a Guy Fawkes Day performance is a Latin prologue, followed by Latin orations, verses in Latin and Greek, a dialogue or two in both Latin and English, and an epilogue.

The first recorded performance from 1665 (ff. 1r–3r) is rather brief, consisting of only a few orations, a hexameter poem and an epilogue. The same holds for 1676 (ff. 271v–78v) and 1682 (ff. 423v–32r) while for the 1677 (ff. 310v–18r) performance the dialogue was replaced by a declamation. In terms of content, the speeches and verses remain very much the same from year to year. As a representative example, I quote the 1677 prologue in full:

⁶⁰ Cf. Steenbakkens 1994.

⁶¹ For the use of ligatures in early-modern Greek, see Ingram 1966.

⁶² For the Gunpowder Plot in general and for its literary aftermath in particular, see the recent study by James 2017.

Salvete millies, Auditores reverendi, quos hodie tam laetos huc confluisse cernimus, fremat quanquam, frendeatque Jesuitarum malignitas. Tam horrendum, tamque atrox erat hodierni facinoris periculum quod evasimus; ut etiam ipse, quanquam infans, non solum eloquendi, sed loquendi admodum imperitus, silere nequeam. Quantum hodie nefas moliti sint perfidiosi istiusmodi carnifices, quamque miraculosa salus nobis contigerit, vobis elegantius enarrabunt mei Condiscipuli, qui mox pace vestra suggestum ascendant oratorium. Quorum gratia supplex oro in horam ut benevoli se deatis; ut cognoscendo pernoscatis prodigiosum hodierni facinoris et principium, et exitium.

(f. 311v)

A thousand greetings, reverend auditors, whom we see happily gathered here today, although the malignity of the Jesuits roars and gnashes its teeth. Although I am only a child, inexperienced in both eloquence and speaking, the peril of today's offence, which we have escaped, was so dreadful and savage that even I cannot remain silent. My fellow students, who shall soon mount the oratorical pulpit with your permission, will tell you more elegantly about how great a wickedness such treacherous murderers set in motion and how a miraculous salvation was granted to us. For their sake, I humbly beg you to sit benevolently for an hour so that you may thoroughly learn the prodigious beginning and end of today's crime.

In addition to the conventional greetings, the prologues focus on bemoaning the wickedness of the Gunpowder Plot, usually personifying the conspiracy with the Jesuits.⁶³ The same applies to the orations:

Ecce nimirum hoc ipso die, Auditores venerandi, execranda barbarorum turba sub specie scilicet religionis non solum in Regis, sed etiam totius regni, simul et Ecclesiae perniciem nequissime conjurabat. Cujus coeptis si fortuna faeliciter aspirasset, irrevocabile fatum nobis incubuerat inopinato, funditusque pereundi. Summa nimirum regni autoritas duram serviisset sub Papa servitum: Judices, et magistratus ficto Christi vicario fasces suos ignominiose submis-

⁶³ I discuss the 1677 performance and the following examples in detail in Article IV.

sent: et cives Anglicani, nisi veram, et catholicam abjurassent veritatem, ad metalla, vel molam, vel ignem damnati essent ad Papae arbitrium.

(f. 311v)

Truly, on this very day, Venerable auditors, a detestable mob of barbarians on the pretext of religion most worthlessly plotted not only the destruction of the King but also of the whole realm together with the Church. If fortune had favoured their undertakings, the irrevocable fate of perdition would have fallen unexpectedly and totally upon us. Truly, the highest authority of the kingdom would have served a difficult servitude under the Pope: judges and the magistracy would have shamefully lowered their fasces to the false Vicar of Christ. And the English people, had they not renounced the true and catholic truth, would have been condemned to the mines, millstone or fire at the Pope's bidding.

As a rule, the orations prepare the ground for the hexameter verses that are to follow by taking up a mythologising narrative pattern, which introduces Pluto (or Satan) as the originator of the Plot:⁶⁴

Hujus rei gratia cum Plutone Furiisque consilium cepit. A quo responsum erat nullam aliam Angliae subjugandae rationem iniri posse, quam more talparum cuniculos agendo, et aedibus Parliamentariis fasces, et ferramenta supponendo; quibus igne sulphureo sursum elevatis, tota concilii domus membratim discerperetur. Unde Rex, Principes, Episcopi, Proceres, quasi tot sanguinei cometae, huc et illuc in aere volverentur.

(ff. 311v–12r)

For this cause [that is to bring down the Church and the Commonwealth], he [Fawkes] took counsel with Pluto and the Furies. The advice was that no other method could be devised in order to subjugate England than to make underground passages in the way of moles and to set faggots and iron tools under the Houses of Parliament, which, having been lifted up from below by sulphureous fire, would

⁶⁴ Similarly in ff. 2v, 103v, 191r, 220v and passim. For this narrative pattern, cf. Article IV: 3–4 and the references therein.

have torn to pieces the entire House of Parliament member by member. Whence the king, princes, bishops and nobles would have rolled here and there in the air as though a great number of bloody comets.

Complying with the well-established tradition of brief Anglo-Latin Gunpowder epic, the infernal origins of the conspiracy are then related in detail in the poems.⁶⁵ These are all rather succinct, the longest containing little more than one hundred lines, and abound with classical references, mainly to Virgil, Claudian and Ovid. Apart from these classical sources, some *Orationes* Gunpowder poems quote directly from near-contemporary works falling within, or bordering on, the Gunpowder epic tradition. For example, the 1678 (sc. 1674) poem (ff. 338r–39v) first reproduces three lines (f. 339r, 9–11) from the anonymous *In homines nefarios* (1605), a lengthy hexameter poem on the Plot set in hell, with right below it (ll. 16–18) three lines from William Forbes's *Apophoreta Papae*, printed in his *Poemata miscellanea* (1642), which celebrate the Dutch victory over the Spanish fleet at the Battle of the Downs (1639) during the Eighty Years' War.⁶⁶ To give another example, the 1682 poem (ff. 426–27r), borrows seven lines (f. 427r, ll. 15–21) with minor modifications from *Oxoniensis Academiae Funebre* (1603), a collection of commemorative verses from Oxford marking the death of queen Elizabeth.⁶⁷

Returning to the 1677 performance, after the opening lines modelled on Ovid,⁶⁸ the poem begins somewhat *in medias res*, presenting an infernal council, in which Pluto summons the Jesuits to carry out his wicked design:

Sat nimis est dictum Prosis. Quid carmina possunt
Iam nunc tentemus. Linguis, animisque favete.
Vestra etenim venia, quanquam sum viribus impar,
Incipiam. Daemon furiis accensus, et ira,
Consilium ipsius quod tot labentibus annis
Frustratum bello, fatis fuit atque repulsum,

⁶⁵ Cf. Article IV: 3–5, 12–18.

⁶⁶ Cf. Anonymous 1606: 7, ll. 19–21; Forbes 1642: sig. Er, ll. 14–16.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Oxoniensis Academiae Funebre* 1603: 19, ll. 17–23.

⁶⁸ Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 1. 71–72: *prospera lux oritur: linguis animisque favete / nunc dicenda bona sunt bona verba die.*

Nos elemento alio statuit tentare, petensque
 Ut posset melius tacita nos perdere fraude
 Igniferos fratres subito sibi jussit adesse
 Spirantes ignem Jesuitas. Ocijus omnes
 Imperio laeti parent, ac jussa facessunt.
 Praesentes sua quos recte commenta docebat.
 Quorum unus scelere ante alios immanior omnes
 Textor atque dolis, Garnettus, nomine, torvo
 Plutoni incurvans sese, genua atque volutans,
 Sic fatur. Placeat si sic, dignissime Princeps,
 Omnia perficiam ipse tibi haec promptissimus actor.
 Et Pluto ridens tum talia voce profatur.
 I fortunato nunquam non alite<r>, Fili,
 Nil metuens adero tecum auxiliator in igne.

(ff. 312v, ll. 1–20)

Enough has been said in prose. We shall now try what verses can do. Keep silence and attend! Although I am unequal in strength, by your leave, I shall begin. Demon ablaze with fury and rage that his plan was rendered vain by war and foiled by the faiths, as so many years were passing by, decided to try us with another element; and attacking with a hidden deceit to better destroy us, he immediately ordered the fire-bearing brothers, fire-breathing Jesuits to be present. At once they all happily obeyed his commands and carried out his orders. He duly taught his devices to those present. One of them, monstrous in crime above all others, weaver of deceits, called Garnett, bowed down to fierce Pluto, and with bended knee spoke thus: "If it pleases you, most worthy ruler, I myself shall readily be at your disposal in carrying out all this." And Pluto, smiling, spoke such words: "Go with good fortune, my son, certainly not otherwise, fearing nothing, I shall be your helper in fire."

The most heinous among their ranks is, predictably, Garnett, the English Jesuit superior executed for his alleged complicity in the Plot. Garnett calls Guy Fawkes and Robert Catesby – who is conveniently compared to Sinon, his Virgilian counterpart in treason – to his aid:

Garnettus tunc surrexit cito coepit opusque
Susceptum, sibi in auxilium Fauxumque vocavit:
Et simul astabat Catesbeius utrique paratus
Seu versare dolos, seu certae occumbere morti.⁶⁹
Incipit hinc facinus saevum, plenumque cruoris.

(f. 313r, ll. 21–25)

Then Garnett rose up and quickly began the work received, calling Fawkes to his help; and Catesby stood up at once, ready for either event, either to engage in deceit or to meet certain death. Hence began the cruel deed filled with bloodshed.

Invective rhetorical questions addressed to Fawkes and vivid descriptions of the terrible consequence of the conspiracy, had it succeeded, take up the rest of the poem:

Siccine, Guido ferox, audes tu spernere sacrae
Vincula naturae, et divinae vincula legis?
[...]
Rex heu! Jacobus nulli pietate secundus,
Regina, atque omnes Britonum veneranda propago
Infaelix rapida flammaram strage perisset
Funditus, igniferoque volasset ad aethera curru:
Sic tamen ut rueret lapsu graviore sub Orcum.⁷⁰

(f. 313r, ll. 34–35, 40–43)

Do you truly dare, savage Guido, to sever the bonds of sacred nature and divine law?

[...]

Alas, King James, second to none in piety, the Queen, and all, the venerable race of Britons would have miserably perished entirely in a rapid slaughter of flames, flown to heaven in a fiery chariot: only to tumble down to the Underworld with a heavier fall.

The poem concludes with a few lines of warning to those who intend to harm Charles II:

⁶⁹ Cf. *Aen.* 2. 61–62: *utrique paratus. Seu versare dolos, seu certae occumbere morti.*

⁷⁰ Cf. *Claud. Ruf.* 1. 22–23: *tolluntur in altum, ut lapsu graviore ruant.*

O sic sic pereat Regi quicunque malignus
Pronus et ad Stygias, et praeceps transeat undas
Qui tibi non bene vult, tibi nostro, Carole, regi
Talem habeat finem, vel finibus exulet hisce,
Finibus hisce tuis nullo rediturus in aevo.

(f. 313v, ll. 79–83)

Thus, let anyone inclined to harm the King perish and pass headlong to the Stygian waters. Whoever does not wish you well, our King Charles, let him have such an end or let him be banished from these borders, from these borders of yours, never to return.

On four occasions, Greek verses accompany the Latin poems.⁷¹ Cast in hexameter lines, all the Greek poems are modelled after James Duport's *Δαβίδης ἔμμετρος* (1666), a rendering of the psalms into Homeric Greek with an accompanying Latin prose translation. Accordingly, the Greek Gunpowder poems within the *Orationes* are psalms, in which the students celebrate the divine salvation of England from the catholic conspiracy.⁷² The 1677 poem consists of fifty somewhat detached lines, of which the first fourteen lines read as follows:

Κλείετε νῦν ἱερὸν Βρετανοὶ κράτος Ἀθανάτοιο.
Αὐτὸν ἀρίζηλη Βρετανοὶ νῦν κλείετε φωνῆ,
Καὶ ἀνὰ λαὸν ἅπαντ' ἀγγέλλετε οἷά τ' ἔρεξεν
Οὗτός τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐφθειρε νοήματα φαυλῶν:
Ἡμέας οὐδ' αὐτοῖσιν ἄθυρμα τε, <χ>άρμα τ' ἔθηκεν.
Ἡμῖν μασιδίως φάυλοι λίνον ἐξεπέτασαν.
Ὡς λύκος εἰς ἀρνούς, ἵρηξτε περισσεραν ἄρπαξ,
Ἡμᾶς ἐνήδρεοσαν, φᾶντες, Τίς δέρεκεται ἡμᾶς.
Πάντα δ' ἰδὼν Θεοῦ ὀφθαλμὸς, καὶ πάντα νοήσας
Τοῦς κακὰ ῥέσοντας φθινυθεὶ, δολερῶς τε νοουντας.
Λωβητοὶ δ' εἰσιν, καὶ ἐλεγχέες, οἱ μὴν ὄλεθρον
Ῥάψαν ἀεικελίως, μέμασάν δ' ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἐλέσθαι·
Ἐσχίσθησαν ὁμοῦ μετὰ τε στρεφθεσαν ὀπίσσω
Αὐτως, ἀκλειῶς, οἱ μὴν κακὰ μηχανάωσαν.

(f. 313v–14r, ll. 1–14)

⁷¹ In 1675 (ff. 348v–49v), 1676 (274v–75v), 1677 (313v–14v) and 1683 (457v–58r).

⁷² Cf. Article IV: 18–21.

Praise now, Britons, the divine might of the Immortal. Glorify him now, Britons, with a clear voice, and declare among the people all the Lord has done. He destroyed the designs of paltry enemies: he made us no plaything nor a delight for them. The wicked have recklessly spread a net for us. As the wolf for a sheep and the rapacious hawk for a dove, they lay in wait for us, saying: "Who sees us?" The all-seeing and all-knowing eye of God lays waste the evildoers, deceivers of treacheries. They are disgraceful and despicable, they shamefully contrive his destruction, eager to tear out his soul: let those who ignominiously plotted his hurt be divided altogether and turned back in vain.

The last four lines (11–14) constitute, almost exactly, a quotation from Duport's rendering of Psalm 35.⁷³ However, for the most part, the first person pronouns (μοι in the original) have been conveniently changed to the third person (μὴν) in order to enable the passage to refer to King James. Psalm 35 is one of the proper psalms prescribed for the Guy Fawkes Day in the revised version of the *Book of Common Prayer*, issued in 1662, and the boys would have recited it at the prayer service earlier in the day. The 1677 performance continues with a school declamation – the only one recorded in the manuscript – followed by a brief epilogue.⁷⁴

Of the Gunpowder dialogues, seventeen in total, nine are in Latin and seven in English. Five performances contain two dialogues, the first always in Latin and the second in English.⁷⁵ Somewhat departing from the dialogues in terms of length and structure is an English play in five acts recorded for 1681 (ff. 390v–412v).⁷⁶ The dialogues bring onto the stage stock characters involved in the plot, ranging from the stereotypical Jesuit to the plotters themselves.

As an example of what is going on in these plays, I shall briefly address the dialogues recorded for the year 1667 (ff. 54v–61v). Set in the

⁷³ Cf. Article IV: 6, 20.

⁷⁴ For the 1677 declamation, cf. Article I: 97–98; Article IV: 21–27.

⁷⁵ That is 1667 (ff. 54v–61v), 1671 (ff. 134r–43r), 1672 (ff. 159v–70r), 1674 (ff. 219r–28r) and 1678 (sc. 1674, ff. 337 44v).

⁷⁶ The play has twenty-two characters, some assistants plus a chorus. It relates very much the whole story, from Robert Catesby's confession to Henry Garnett to the Montague letter and capture of the plotters.

underworld, the dramatis personae of the Latin play are *Garnettus*, *Catesbeius*, *Fauxius* and *Nemesis*. The play opens with a reference to the oration the conspirators have just heard:

G[arnettus]. Auditis, Socij, quantum in Nos virus eructant haeretici. Irrumpamus in medium; nam tuti hoc possumus. Licet enim non visibiles, nec audibiles, non tamen sumus mortui, quicquid somniant Protestantes fanatici. Vivimus adhuc in exitium gentis Britannicae. Ego Garnettus, ut tu bene nosti, Catesbeie, sum Plutoni a consilijs secretioribus, qui papam, et Jesuitas intimos habet.

(f. 56v)

Garnett: Hear, my Fellows, how much venom the heretics vomit upon us. Let's rush forth, as we can do it safely. For though we are not visible nor audible, we are not dead, whatever the Protestant fanatics may dream. Still we live for the destruction of the British race. I, Garnett, am Pluto's secret counselor, as you well know, Catesby, intimate with the Pope and the Jesuits.

Garnett goes on ranting, proleptically praising the Jesuits for the Great Fire of London, and swears that they will burn down the city after it has been rebuilt. Next, Catesby, the "Infernal Archgravedigger" (*Archifossor infernalis*, f. 57r) cuts in and begins to wonder where their friend Fawkes is. Enter Fawkes, bringing sad news from their masters:

F[auxius] Tacete, Fratres, Professa perdunt odia vindicatae locum.⁷⁷ Nam neque dominus noster Pluto, neque deus noster Papa locum adhuc dabit Incendiarijs. Dicunt nunc etiam Jesuitae moderatiores Nos nimis esse ignivomos.

(f. 57r)

Fawkes: Be quiet, brothers, "hatred professed loses its place of revenge." For neither our lord Pluto, nor our god the Pope, will yet give place to the incendiaries. Now even the more moderate Jesuits are saying that we are too ignivomous.

Next, *Nemesis*, who has come to take Garnett before the heavenly tribunal, enters and begins a lengthy verse dialogue with the Jesuit (ff. 57r–

⁷⁷ Cf. Sen. *Med.* 154.

58r). For the most part – and one may be tempted to find some irony in this – the exchange has been adapted from two Jesuit tragedies, *Nabuchodonosor* (1620) and *Theodoricus* (1620), by the French Jesuit scholar Nicolas Caussin (1583–1651).⁷⁸ Appropriately, both tragedies focus on God’s revenge on the insolent.⁷⁹ The character of Nemesis is adopted from *Theodoricus*, where – together with divine justice (*Iustitia Divina*) – she serves the same function as in the King’s School dialogue. The exchange opens with an adaptation of the passage in *Theodoricus*, where the king addresses Boethius and Symmachus in abusive language:

Scelerosa capita, juris exitium sacri,
Regumque pestes, ore sacrilege diem
Foedere non vos pudeat? [...]⁸⁰

(f. 57r)

Abominable men, ruin of the sacred law and plagues of kings, are you not ashamed to disgrace this day with your sacrilegious mouths?

Several pleas by Garnett and curses on both sides follow, for example:

G[arnettus] Per Christiani nomen! **N[emesis]** Hoc non est tuum.

G[arnettus] Per chrisma sanctum! Polluisti, perfide.

G[arnettus] At per beatos Angelos! **N[emesis]** Hostes tuos.

G[arnettus] Miserere, Diva. **N[emesis]** Fata misereri vetant.⁸¹

(f. 58v)

⁷⁸ Both plays were first published in 1620, together with three other tragedies (*Solyma*, *Felicitas*, *Hermenigildus*), under the title *Tragoediae Sacrae*. References are to the 1699 edition.

⁷⁹ Nebuchadnezzar is accused for his excesses and Theodoric the Great for having executed Boethius and Symmachus. For a discussion on *Nabuchodonosor* and *Theodoricus*, see Chevalier 2013: 428, 433–34, 439–40.

⁸⁰ Cf. Caussin 1699: 234. “Scelerosa capita” appears again in the beginning of the next incantation by *Nemesis* (f. 57r, final line): *Scelerosa capita, busta Tartarae domus* (“Abominable men, funeral pyres of the infernal house”). This time the quotation is from *Nabuchodonosor* (Caussin 1699: 118).

⁸¹ Cf. Caussin 1699: 277.

Garnett: For the Christian name! **Nemesis:** That is not yours.
Garnett: For the holy chrism! **Nemesis:** You have desecrated it.
Garnett: But for the blessed angels! **Nemesis:** Your enemies.
Garnett: Have mercy on me, Goddess. **Nemesis:** The fates forbid that we have mercy.

The dialogue concludes with a final plea by Garnett, which Nemesis rejects:

G[arnettus] Unum precabor; quando me ad flammam jubes
Abire, quando me hospitem Fornax manet:
Eviscerati pectoris vermem eripe
Qui tunc lenta devorans pectus coquit.
N[emesis] Aletur igne Tartari vermis tuus.
Flammam petisti alijs, perire igne expedit.
G[arnettus] O vermis! O flamma! O tenebrarum domus!
Aeternitas! Aeternitas! Aeternitas!⁸²

(f. 58r)

Garnett: One thing I ask. When you order me to go into the flames, when Fornax awaits me as her guest, tear out the worm, who with slowly consuming decay cooks my breast, from my eviscerated chest.

Nemesis: The fires of hell shall nourish your worm.

Garnett: Oh worm! Oh flame! Oh home of shadows!
Eternity! Eternity! Eternity!

The whole dialogue is put to rest with a brief verse epilogue, summing up the wicked deeds and the well-deserved fate of the plotters (ff. 58r–58v).

In opposition to the infernal scene above, the English dialogue (ff. 58v–61v) is a brief debate between the three theological virtues – *Faith*, *Hope* and *Charity* – accompanied by *Philadelphia* (“lover of brothers”) and *Philalethes* (“lover of truth”). The dialogue consists of little more than *Faith* and *Hope* questioning their sister, *Charity*, about her catholic beliefs. *Faith* begins:

⁸² Cf. Caussin 1699: 280.

F[ai]th Sister Charity, though you would not vouchsafe us your presence at the worship of this day: yet wee thank you for your patience at this meeting. For I doubt not you being well skilled in the Romish Office, and Liturgye well understand the contents of this nights Solemnity. It being an annual commemoration of our Kingdom, and Churches happy, miraculous, and mighty deliverance from Popish treachery. By which our then gracious sovereign King James of blessed memory, the Queen, the Prince, and all the royal Branches, with the Nobility, Clergy, and all the Commons of this realm, were appointed as sheep to the slaughter in a most barbarous, and savage manner, beyond all examples of former ages.

(f. 58v)

Hope accompanies her sister:

H[ope] And therefore wee hope, Sister, you will ventur your soul no longer in that Church, where deposing and murdering of Princes is counted religion: blowing up of Parliament with powder a holy sacrifice: and violating of words, promises, and oaths absolved, and esteemed meritorious. [...]

(f. 58v–59r)

Charity defends her faith by laying the blame of the treason on the Puritans:

[...] Which treason, to speak truth, the Puritan in a Roman garbb [Garnett] first insinuated; then gave heart and hopes to these fond, deluded Spirits. And in the neck of time disclosed their own plot to the eternal utter defamation of the Catholick cause.

(f. 59r)

The debate goes on until *Philaethes* enters and is able to convince her mother of her false beliefs (f. 60v–61r), who, “shall no more sollicite [Philadelphia’s] tender years to unite [her] with that Church whose acts have been so horrid that after ages shall toyl out themselves in thinking for the like, but never dare to do it (f. 61r).” Finally, *Philadephia* steps on the stage, and, in the spirit of brotherly love, welcomes *Charity* back to the communion of the established Church:

Philad[elphia] Sister Charity, You are welcome once again to the communion of the Church of England: a church founded on that rock against which Hell, or Devills shall never be able to prevail: a Church orthodox, and sound for her principles, obedient to Gods commands, though not to the Popes: pious in her devotion without Superstition, or fanatic rebellion. [...]

(f. 61v)

The dialogue ends with *Philadelphia* thanking god for having saved her from the Jesuits and for bringing her back to the Church of England:

Philal[ethes] I hope this night hath saved me from the crafty solicitations of deceiving Jesuites: and that now I shall live at peace in that Church where I have had my first birth, and confirmation. Thanks be to God for this nights happy Solemnity.

(f. 61v)

3.4 *In hyemalem Scholarium missionem*

Before Christmas, the students pleaded with the Dean of the Cathedral for a short holiday. Framed by this, the relevant texts centre on school life and frequently draw on the classical authors who formed the boys' daily round. Many of the recorded texts consist of two parts: a set of Latin speeches plus a dialogue or a play in English or Latin. This is not always the case, however, and the performance may, for example, sometimes consist only of speeches as in 1679 (ff. 374v–78v) or of a single play (e.g. *The Cheats* by John Wilson, recorded for 1669).⁸³

The first performance, recorded for the year 1665, offers a representative example of the genre with regard to the ideas expressed. The performance opens with a brief prologue of which I quote only the first (somewhat lengthy) sentence:

Bonis, uti spes est, auspicijs, sub vestro benevolorum patrocinio,
Decane colendissime, necnon Doctores undiquaque reverendi, hu-
millimus Orator prodeo pro captivis hisce grammaticalibus, quos

⁸³ For a discussion of the Christmas plays, cf. Johnson et al. forthcoming.

Priscianus noster, assiduus puerorum Ἐργοδιώκτης per totum hoc tempus strictius incarceravit.

(f. 4r)

With good auspices, as I hope, most worshipful Dean and in all respects reverend Doctors, under the protection of your benevolences, I proceed, a humble Orator, for these captives of grammar, whom our Priscian, the incessant taskmaster of the boys, has incarcerated with such constraints for all this time.

The passage introduces a recurring theme in the Christmas performances: the boys are captives of grammar, incarcerated by the grammarian Priscian (or the headmaster), their incessant taskmaster, from under whose yoke they ask the Dean to deliver them.⁸⁴ The same theme appears again in 1670 (ff. 144r–49v), when the whole play focuses on captivity, and in 1673 (ff. 197r–201v), 1677 (ff. 319r–27v) and 1678 (ff. 345v–56v). Indeed, Plautus's *Captivi* was staged as a Christmas entertainment in 1675 with a new prologue and an epilogue (ff. 254v–55r).⁸⁵

The performance continues with a set of brief orations on the eight parts of speech (*Nomen*, *Pronomen*, *Verbum*, *Participium*, *Adverbium*, *Conjunctio*, *Praepositio* and *Interjectio*). The first is *Nomen*:

Vulgo clamitant Priscianum, scilicet grammaticum, quotidie a pueris vapulare. At certo certius est, a Priscianis hujus seculi mirum in modum pueros vapulare. Quod abunde testatur vel unicum Illius instrumentum, scilicet Substantivum, vel Adjectivum. Nomen sane mihi semper, proh dolor! malum omen. Nam imprimis, Propria quae maribus adeo sunt innumerabilia ut ea repetendo, vires nostrae prorsus emasculatae deficient. Ad nutum enim Praeceptoris evocandi sunt de mortuis Ajax, Diomedes, Hercules, Achilles, Agamemnon, Protesilaus, Idomeneus, Menelaus, Ulysses, Telamon, Hector, Sarpedon, Memnon, Troilus, Aeneas, Menetas, Iason, Priamus, Briareus.

(f. 4v)

⁸⁴ The biblical word Ἐργοδιώκτης (“taskmaster”) as a euphemism for the headmaster is also attested in ff. 93r, 255r and 377r.

⁸⁵ Cf. Article I: 337–38; Mäkilähde 2018b: 462, 466–68.

They commonly proclaim that Priscian, namely the grammarian, is beaten up by the boys every day. But it is as sure as can be that the Priscians of this century, marvelously enough, beat up the boys. His only instrument, namely the noun or the adjective, bears ample witness to this. Alas, what a bad omen the noun always is to me! For in the first place, the number of proper nouns [denoting] males is so immense that by repeating them our vigours fade away completely emasculated. At the headmaster's command, we have to summon from among the dead Ajax, Diomedes, Hercules, Achilles, Agamemnon, Protesilaus, Idomeneus, Menelaus, Ulysses, Telamon, Hector, Sarpedon, Memnon, Troilus, Aeneas, Menetas, Iason, Priamus, Briareus.

The passage opens with the common metaphor for breaking the rules of grammar ("to beat up Priscian"), which is immediately turned upside down: it is grammar (or the headmaster) who constantly beats up the boys.⁸⁶ Reference is then made to the section of Lily's grammar concerning the gender of nouns (*Regulae generales Propriorum*), commonly referred to by the first three words of its opening line (*Propria quae maribus tribuuntur, mascula dicas* "You shall call the proper nouns denoting males masculine"). The endless repetition of these nouns emasculates their vigour, the boy claims, and goes on to offer a list of masculine Greek personal names they would have certainly had to memorise and decline during their grammar lessons.⁸⁷

The Latin orations are followed by a set of English speeches of a rather comical nature on different professional options.⁸⁸ The *Brewer*, for example, asks the audience:

⁸⁶ Similarly, e.g., in a dialogue between two schoolfellows: *Ah! but Priscian, Priscian (whose head wee haue often broken, and I am ashamed to tell this company how oft he hath broken me, I am sure I know where to my grief) he denies us this just relief* (f. 93r). For assaulting Priscian as a metaphor for a grammatical mistake, cf. also Article III: 3.

⁸⁷ See Lily 1672: 12–21; cf. also Article I: 339. Similar references to the *Propria quae maribus* are found, e.g., in 1667 (f. 62v), 1668 (f. 93v) and 1671 (f. 144v).

⁸⁸ These are: *The Divine, The Lawyer, The Physician, The Chirurgion, The Merchant, The Astrologer, The Poet, The Landlord, The Woollen-Draper, The Grosser, The Comfitmaker, The Taylour, The Ship-carpenter, The Bookbinder, The Joyner, The Hatmaker, The Watchmaker, The Working-goldsmith, The Saltar, The Brewer, and The Usurer.*

Are you not a thirsty, Gentlemen, after so long a discourse of your Votes, & Options? I am a Brewer able to wett your whistles, and fill your dry pipes, not with sophisticated Wine, which will intoxicate: but with a homebred, generous, English liquour, Beer & Ale, great Br<i>taine's water of Life.

[...] Have not many Brewers from a narrow Fortune brewed themselves into Aldermen; and Knights, and that to without Pride, or Rebellion? I have heard of venerable Plat; who, by the blessing of God upon this Mystery, hath founded a Schoole, and Almes-house for the good of Posterity.⁸⁹

If I might have the wishes of my heart
I would embrace, 'bove all, the Brewers art.

(f. 15r)

The theme of brewery was taken up again the next year (ff. 37r–47r) when – following a Latin verse dialogue between the four seasons (*Ver, Aestas, Autumnus, Hyems*) – the boys staged an anonymous dialogue entitled *Wine, Beer, Ale / Together by the Eares*, presenting a humorous debate between personified beverages.⁹⁰

For the year 1667 (ff. 62v–72r), the manuscript records two orations preceded by a brief prologue. The first oration (entitled *In Laudem Ocij*) praises the benefits of leisure while the second (*In Laudem Studij*) argues the opposite, underlining the importance of study. The orations are followed by an anonymous play, *The Conquest of Metals*, presenting a dispute between metals.

As the students were pleading with the Dean for a Christmas break, their right for *otium* (“leisure”) as opposed to *stadium* (“study”) is another recurrent theme in the Christmas performances. In 1677, for example, the dialogue – entitled *Colloquium Inter Monitorem, et 4r Discipulos de Rhetorica* (“A colloquium between the monitor and four students

⁸⁹ Richard Plat (d. 1600), a wealthy brewer who bequeathed a substantial part of his property for the foundation of an almshouse and a free school in Aldenham, Hertfordshire.

⁹⁰ The speakers are: *Wine – a Gentleman, Sugar – His Page, Beer – a Citizen, Nutmeg – His Prentice, Ale – a Countrey Man, Tost – One of his rural Servants, and Water – a Parson*. For the authorship and different editions of this play, see Hanford (1915: 5–20).

on rhetoric”) – is preceded by four brief orations arguing for the students right to be granted a period of leisure.⁹¹ One of the students opens his oration by greeting the audience with the following plead:

Incredibile dictu est, Mecaenates reverendi, quibus gaudiis reficimur: quod tandem aliquando haec exoptata dies intervenit. Nam post tot, tantosque ingenii labores respirandi tempus (uti spero) nobis concedetur.

(f. 198v)

It is incredible, reverend Mecaenates, that the joys be spoken of with which we refresh ourselves as this greatly desired day finally interposes itself. For after so many labours of the mind, a moment to breathe, or so I hope, will be granted to us.

And further below:

Hinc bene notum est illud dictum Ingenia moderato lusu recreantur. Postquam Alexander totum mundum sub jugo misisset, et de hostibus victis triumphum duxisset, modum laboribus imposuit, et victoriis anchoram jecit.

(f. 199v)

Well-known is the saying: “Minds are refreshed by moderate play.” After Alexander had subjugated the whole world and triumphed over defeated enemies, he placed a limit on work and cast anchor on his victories.

The oration concludes with two poems, the first in hexameter and the second, of only four lines, in elegiac distichs:

O si post studium foret Intermissio nobis!
Grata quidem nostrae quam foret illa Scholae!
Tandem, cum nostras foverunt ocia vires,
Laetus ad assuetum quisque redibit opus.

(f. 199v)

⁹¹ Cf. Article II: 92–95.

Oh if we had an intermission from our studies, how welcome would that be for our School! Finally, when leisure has fostered our vigour, everyone will gladly return to his usual work.

The 1668 performance (ff. 87r–94r) presents us with a contention between *natura*, *ars* and *exercitatio*, the triad which forms the basis of eloquence (or of any education),⁹² followed by the Moderator’s response plus a brief dialogue in English between four school fellows about the hardships they must endure during their schooldays. The next year (f. 115r) saw the performance of John Wilson’s comedy, *The Cheats* (1662), of which only the title page is recorded. Similarly, the manuscript records the performances of an anonymous play, *Amor in Labyrintho*, for 1674 (f. 229v), Plautus’s *Captivi* mentioned above for 1675, and *The Female Prelate* (1680) by Elkanah Settle and the *Spanish Fryar* (1681) by John Dryden both for 1681 (f. 413v). Copied in its entirety in the manuscript is James Shirley’s morality play, *A Contention for Honour and Riches* (1633), recorded for the year 1678.⁹³

The 1672 performance (ff. 171r–83v) consists of a prologue and a brief oration, followed by a Latin dialogue between the monitor and four students. The dialogue opens with the Moderator asking the students to tell him what they have been reading during the school year.⁹⁴ The list is quite remarkable:

Dis[cipulus] 1. Ne voluntati tuae repugnare videamur, Monitor observande; libros quos volvere, atque revolvere saepe solemus, tibi dicam. Imprimis vero quatuor orationes Marci Tullii Ciceronis in Catilinam summa cum diligentia etiam, atque etiam percurrimus.

Dis[cipulus] 2. Et post tot sudores, et nocturnas lucubrationes, tametsi periculosissimae habentur, post tot, tantaque verbera, quae nobis certe miserrimis quotidie inferuntur, ingratiis sane nostris, insignem Lucii Flori historiam de bello Romano, magno cum labore perlegimus.

Dis[cipulus] 3. Et tres Isocratis orationes. Unam scilicet ad Demonicum, et duas ad Nicoclem; necnon Plutarchi libellum illis adjunctum de puerorum institutione legendo percurrimus.

⁹² On this triad as the basis of eloquence, cf. Calboli Montefusco 1996; also Article II: 95.

⁹³ For the King’s School performance of Shirley’s play, see Johnson 2017.

⁹⁴ Cf. Article II: 96 n. 52.

Mon[itor] Quosnam vero legistis Poetas?

Dis[cipulus] 4. In Homero evolvendo, atque ediscendo bonas horas collocavimus.

Dis[cipulus] 5. Et Horatii odas, Epodas, Satyras, Epistolas, librum denique de Arte Poetica pro modulo nostro diligenter investigavimus.

(ff. 172r–72v)

Student 1: We do not want to resist your will, esteemed Monitor; I shall tell you the books we are frequently accustomed to read and reread. In the first place, we have run through again and again Marcus Tullius Cicero’s four orations against Catiline with great diligence.

Student 2: And after so many toils and nocturnal studies, notwithstanding that they are considered very dangerous, and after so many whippings inflicted upon miserable us every day, truly against our will, we have read through the distinguished history of the Roman war by Lucius Florus with great labour.

Student 3: And we have run through three orations by Isocrates, that is, one against Demonicus and two against Nicocles, not to mention Plutarch’s booklet on the education of boys.⁹⁵

Monitor: Which poets have you read?

Student 4: We have spent our time reading Homer and learning it by heart.

Student 5: And we have investigated Horace’s odes, epodes, satires, epistles, and finally his book on the Art of Poetry to the best of our ability.

Next, the students go on to recite the entire *Ars Poetica* by Horace in turns with the monitor questioning them every now and then:

Dis[cipulus] 5.

Sumite materiam vestris qui scribitis aequam
viribus, et versate diu quid ferre recusent,
Quid valeant humeri. Cui lecta potenter erit res;
Nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo.
Ordinis hæc virtus erit, et venus (aut ego fallor)

⁹⁵ Reference is here made to the Pseudo-Plutarchian *De liberis educandis* (“The education of children”) which was often printed together with Isocrates’s orations; cf. e.g. Isocrates 1638.

Ut jam nunc dicat, jam nunc debentia dici
Pleraque differat, et praesens in tempus omittat.
Hoc amet, hoc spernat promissi carminis author.⁹⁶

Mon[itor] Quid sibi vult Poeta his carminibus?

Dis[cipulus] 5. Ex his carminibus talis regula colligitur. Quia invita, ut aiunt, Minerva, id est repugnante ingenio nihil faeliciter attemptemus; acrius, et attentius considerandae sunt nobis vires. [...] (f. 173v)

Student 5:

Take a subject, ye writers, equal to your strength; and ponder long what your shoulders refuse, and what they are able to bear. Whoever shall choose a theme within his range, neither speech will fail him, nor clearness of order. Of order, this, if I mistake not, will be the excellence and charm that the author of the long-promised poem shall say at the moment what at that moment should be said, reserving and omitting much for the present, loving this point and scorning that.⁹⁷

Monitor: What does the Poet mean by these verses?

Student 5: The following rule is drawn from these verses. Minerva being unwilling, as they say, that is, when the intellect resists we reach nothing with good results: we are eagerly and diligently to examine our vigor.

The performance concludes with a brief dialogue between two school-fellows (ff. 182r–83v), mostly in English, drawing on the “long ribble, bibble, babble *De arte Poetica*” (f. 182r) they had just heard, followed by a Latin epilogue of a few lines.

In 1676 (ff. 279r–94r) the students performed a play – dense with switching between English and Latin – that has as its main plot an attempt by grammar school students to arrange a play together with two rustics.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Hor. *Ars* 38–45.

⁹⁷ Trans. by Fairclough 1926: 453–55.

⁹⁸ For a detailed discussion of code-switching in this play, see Harjunpää & Mäkilähde 2016: 185–93; Mäkilähde 2019: 265–69.

The following year (ff. 319r–27v), the boys gave four Latin orations on parts of grammar (orthography, etymology, syntax and prosody), preceded by an English dialogue between three scholars plus a brief verse prologue. The orations are followed by a verse exchange between four students and an epilogue in rhymed Latin lines. Very similar to this is the 1682 performance (ff. 433r–38r) beginning with an untitled prologue and orations, which customarily argue for students’ right for their well-deserved leisure. These are followed by verses delivered by parts of grammar and *Grammatica* herself. Some of the verses are reproduced as captions in the illustration depicting *Lady Grammatica* together with her companions *Orthographia*, *Etymologia*, *Syntaxis* and *Prosodia* (between ff. 435v–36r).⁹⁹ As an example, I quote a few lines from the hexameter verses delivered by *Prosodia*:

Tytere tu patulae¹⁰⁰ – teres est, est sermoque tersus.
Pātŭlǎě tŭ Tytĕrĕ, limatas perforat aures.
Dic mihi, Musa, virum¹⁰¹ – recto pede currit, et aequo
Dĭc mŭsǎ mĭhĭ vĭrŭm, pede plus quam claudicat uno.
Est modus in rebus¹⁰² – Placet haec sententia doctis.
Ĕst rĕbŭs ĩn mŏdŭs – proh! Quantum displicet illis!
Qui mihi discipulus – noster bene Lillius inquit
Qŭi dĭscĭpŭlŭs mĭhĭ, – nisi bardus, nemo sonabit.

(f. 437v)

“Tytere tu patulae” – is polished and correct diction.
“Pātŭlǎě tŭ Tytĕrĕ” – pierces refined ears.
“Dic mihi, Musa, virum” – the foot runs straight and fairly
“Dĭc mŭsǎ mĭhĭ vĭrŭm” – limps more than one foot.
“Est modus in rebus” – This sentiment pleases the learned.
“Ĕst rĕbŭs ĩn mŏdŭs” – oh how much they hate this!
“Qui mihi discipulus” – said our good Lily
“Qŭi dĭscĭpŭlŭs mĭhĭ” – no one but a fool will sing.

The passage takes its fun from quoting the classical commonplaces first in their correct word order and then in the wrong order with the false

⁹⁹ The illustration is reproduced in Article I: 323, plate 2.

¹⁰⁰ Ver. *Ecl.* 1. 1.

¹⁰¹ Hor. *Ars* 141.

¹⁰² Hor. *S.* 1. 1. 106.

quantities being marked above the syllables. *Qui mihi discipulus* are the opening words of William Lily's *Carmen de moribus*, a poem on manners, appended to the end of his *Introduction*.¹⁰³

For 1678 (ff. 374v–78v) the manuscript records a brief performance, consisting of Latin orations, a few lines of elegiac couplets in Greek, and a lengthy Latin hexameter poem. The texts present us with the usual pleas to the Dean and poetical descriptions of winter. Finally, in 1683 (ff. 463v–468r), there are five brief humorous orations in Latin on the five senses (*Olfactus, Gustus, Tactus, Auditus* and *Visus*), preceded by a short prologue.

3.5 *In Quadragesimalis Victoriae gratiam*

Before Lent, the students confronted each other in “grammatical battles.” The manuscript records nine such “battles”, or rhetorical contests, written entirely in Latin apart from occasional quotations in Greek, and eight performances of plays by various authors.¹⁰⁴ No contests are recorded for those years when a pre-Lent play was staged but the list of Victors, recording the names for each year from 1666 to 1684, confirms that they must have also taken place. The plays, of which only the title pages survive, are: *The Example* (1637) by James Shirley (f. 48r), *Bellum Grammaticale* (1581) by Leonard Hutten (f. 73r),¹⁰⁵ *Priscianus Vapulans* (1580) by Nicodemus Frischlin (f. 96r), *Senile Odium* (1631) by Peter Hausted (f. 150v), *Valetudinarium* (1638) by William Johnson (f. 184v), *Senile Odium* in English translation (f. 328v), *Fraus Honestas* (1619) by Edmund Stubbe (f. 357v), and *The Valetudinary*, an English translation of *Valetudinarium* (f. 469r). *Valetudinarium*, *Senile Odium* and *Fraus Honestas* are all early seventeenth-century university comedies from Cambridge, while *Bellum Grammaticale* and *Priscianus Vapulans* fall within a well-established tradition of performing “grammar war” plays at early-

¹⁰³ See Gwosdek 2013: 81–82, 204–9.

¹⁰⁴ Although we refer to the pre-Lenten performances as “disputations” in Article I, I prefer here to term them simply as “contests”, which I find better describes the nature of these occasions.

¹⁰⁵ Most likely staged at the King’s School in 1668 and mistakenly attributed in the manuscript to John Spencer, the editor of the 1635 edition of Hutten’s play.

modern English schools and universities. As will become obvious below, it is from this tradition, and from Hutten's play in particular, that the King's School pre-Lenten contests – at least during Lovejoy's headmastership – draw their inspiration.¹⁰⁶

The plays, as their title pages inform us, were staged right before Ash Wednesday: the Latin plays only once, that is, on "Thursday next before Ash Wednesday" (*Die Jovis ante diem Cinerum proxima*), and the English plays always twice, that is, "on Thursday & Monday next before Ash-Wednesday". As for the contests, the exact day of performance remains uncertain. It is clear, however, that they took place just before Ash Wednesday, perhaps on Thursday or Monday as well.

The prologue to the 1682 performance states that various privileges were granted to the Victors of these contests. The speaker, who appears to have been the headmaster himself, lays out these privileges in detail:

Vos omnes, prout, aequum est, Iuvenes scholastici, primum salvere jubeo. Deinde notum sit vobis quod duos nunc quaero qui inter vos digniores, et doctissimi jure merito habeantur. Illi nimirum perinde ac hujus gymnasii Victores fuerint, floridam hanc meritissime reportabunt laureolam. Praemium profecto minime contemnendum, sed prae omnibus maxime cupiendum. Quippe quod non solummodo honorem, verum etiam varia secum privilegia affert obtinentibus victoriam. Suntne qui libris aliquando domi cupiunt incumbere? vel desiderio tanguntur amicorum, eosque revisere peroptant? Quotiescunque libeat, haec opportuno quidem tempore iis facere triumphantibus licebit. Si quenquam forte e condiscipulis unice, perinde ac semetipsos ament, illumque vapulare nollent: per totum hoc Quadragesimale tempus quemcunque volent, modo carmina composuerint, a crudeliore praeceptoris virga intactum servabunt. Maxime tamen cavendum est, ne haec potestas cuiquam sit tutela, et incitamentum ignaviae. Estne aliquis puerorum qui hisce Victoribus fuit benignissimus, cui grati animi testimonium exhibere hi Victores optaverint? Iam nunc opportunitatem id etiam efficiendi habebunt. Nam omni pomeridiano tempore liceat illis ludendi veniam quatuor concedere; die scilicet Lunae, necnon Mercurii, et Veneris. Suntne ambitiosi ut condiscipulorum vigorem ingenii faeliciter

¹⁰⁶ For Hutten's dramatisation and the *bellum grammaticale* tradition in general, see Article III: esp. 4–7 and 13–15; Article I: 328–29.

refocillent moderato lusu? Si carmina dederint archidadascolo, quotiescunque dis Martis, et Jovis recurrent, ipsi pomeridiano tempore toti puerorum gregi a studiis missionem facillime impetrabunt. Ac ne forte horum aliquis aegrotaret, aut Scholae non interesset; erunt hisce Subvictores duo, quibus eandem (prioribus absentibus) in omni re potestatem exercere liceat. Haec sunt praemia, haec lauri nostri privilegia. Sed enim nemo vestrum est qui ignorat quod in omnibus locis, potissimum vero Scholis, quam maxima valet Exemplum. Hinc illis ita semper evigilandum est qui hanc mereri coronam ambiunt, ut eorum nunquam desiderentur exercitia. Sed in studendo, et semetipsos bene gerendo, optimum aliis exemplum semper praebeant. Sin aliter fecerint, pro honore dedecus, pro laureola virgam justissime merebuntur. Jam dicite, Iuvenes, mihi inquam dicite, quibus hoc gloriae trophaeum meritissime tribuatur.

(ff. 415v–16r)

First, as is fair, I must greet you all, young students. Then, let it be known to you that I shall now find two among your ranks who are rightly regarded as worthy and most learned. These two, as Victors of this school, shall deservedly carry this blooming laurel branch. Truly, it is a prize not to be in the least disregarded but to be very much desired beyond all others, inasmuch as it is not only an honour but brings with itself various privileges to those who have gained victory. Are there those who sometimes wish to lean upon books at home or those who long for their friends and desire to revisit them? These will be permitted to the winners at an opportune moment as often as they wish. If there is anyone among their fellow students, whom they love as themselves and whom they do not want to be flogged, they may keep whomsoever they wish intact from the master's unmerciful cane by composing verses through the whole season of Lent. But great care ought to be taken that this right does not become a safeguard and an inducement to idleness for anyone. Is there any boy who has been very kind to these Victors, to whom these Victors wish to show their gratefulness? Now they will have the change to do so. For every afternoon they are permitted to bestow on four of their friends a leave to play; that is, on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Are they eager to refresh the vigour of their fellow students' minds in moderate play? Having delivered verses to the headmaster, they shall return on every Tuesday and Thursday, and will easily procure a dismissal from studies in the same afternoon for the whole flock of boys. And if perchance anyone of these falls ill or is absent

from school, there shall be two “Sub-Victors”, who, in the absence of the former, are permitted to exercise the same power in all things. These are the rewards and privileges of our laurel. But certainly none of you is unaware of the great importance of example in all places, especially in schools. Hence, those who strive to obtain this wreath are always to be vigilant that their exercises are never asked after, but that they excel in their studies and provide the best example for others. If they act otherwise, they will justly earn disgrace instead of honour and the cane instead of the laurel branch. Tell me now, young men, I say, tell me to whom this trophy of glory shall be granted.¹⁰⁷

That is, there were always two Victors, both of whose names appear in the list of Victors at the end of the volume. The Victors were granted leave from school on occasions; by composing verses during Lent, they were able to spare their fellow students from castigation by the headmaster; they could procure a dismissal from studies for the whole school twice a week; and they were able to acquire an afternoon leave from school to four of their friends thrice a week. Moreover, two “Sub-Victors” were appointed, who, in the absence of Victors, were to exercise the same privileges.

With only minor variations, all the contests have been structured in the same way, each consisting of a prologue, a set of initial speeches, a set of riddling dialogues in verse, and an epilogue. Apart from the atypical specimen discussed above, the prologues always focus on stating the nature of the forthcoming battle as, for example, in 1666:

Quos hic videtis utrinque Duo sunt exercitus, Regiorum alter, alter Oppidanorum. Ἀσπονδος, ut loquuntur, utrinque πόλεμος: ἀναίματος tamen, id est sine sanguinis effusione, quanquam ut vere fatear, non absque sudore. Bellum scilicet excitatur tantum grammaticale.

(f. 17v)

You see here on both sides two armies, the one of Oppidans and the other of King’s Scholars. It is *an implacable battle*, as they say, on both sides, but *one without bloodshed*, though, to be honest, not one without sweat. To be sure, a war only on grammar is called forth.

¹⁰⁷ The passage has also been translated by Woodruff & Cape (1908: 130–31) with somewhat greater liberty.

Similarly, in 1676:

Scitote proelium esse Grammaticale; in quo verbis, et minis tantum pugnatur. Non est ergo quod cadaverum struem, vel tela circumvolantia, vel bellum civile inter Scholae nostrae parietes vereamini.
(f. 256r)

Know that the battle is a grammatical one, fought only with words and menaces. Therefore, there is no reason for you to be afraid of a pile of cadavers, flying spears, or a civil war inside the walls of our School.

The prologues are brief – a few dozen lines each – and move quickly on to the initial speeches delivered by the individual contestants. The battles took place between a select number of Oppidans and King’s Scholars, divided into two “armies” (*exercitus*) and led by their respective “Dukes” (*Duces*), a setting clearly adapted from the “grammar war” tradition.¹⁰⁸ The number of boys attending seems to have varied from six to ten.¹⁰⁹ The first to deliver their speeches were always the Dukes, followed thereafter by each of their fellow soldiers (*Commilitones*).

Typically entitled *Exhortationes ad pugnam* (“Exhortations to battle”), the speeches are thoroughly invective in character, making use of warlike language and consisting mainly of ad hominem attacks directed against one’s opponent. There is, however, also a clearly humorous overtone to the speeches – appropriate, of course, for the pre-Lenten season – with the King’s School boys showing a particular liking for joking about each others’ last names. Accordingly, in 1666, a contestant named Warner is confronted by an opponent who ludically brings attention to the fact that his name begins with “War”: *Nam Warnerus incipit cum illo, quod anglice dicunt Warr* (“For ‘Warner’ begins with that which in English they call ‘War’”). Warner is then told that

Orthographia certe, Warnere, nomen tuum odio habet, hoc praesertim nomine, quod atramentum in sanguinem vertis, et calamos usurpas sanguineos: a quibus Lilius noster prorsus abhorruit, cum Mercurij mandato tumultuantem pacaverit Grammaticae provinciam.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Article III: 3–8.

¹⁰⁹ Six at least in 1666 and 1670, eight in 1673, 1674, 1676, 1677, and ten in 1683.

(fol. 20v)

Orthography, Warner, certainly hates your name, especially because with this name you turn ink into blood and use bloody pens, from which our Lily entirely shrunk back when he pacified the tumultuous province of Grammar by Mercury's order.

The reference to Lily pacifying the province of grammar by Mercury's order is from Hutten's *Bellum Grammaticale*.¹¹⁰ Similarly, in 1683, the contestant addressed his opponent in a rhetorical question, quoting Hutten's play almost verbatim:

Quis es tu qui audes lacesere? cujus avus, atavus, abavus, proavus, tritavus, majores omnes humi repserunt, ut vermes solent.¹¹¹

(f. 443r)

Who are you who dares provoke [me]? Whose grandfather, great-grandfather, great-great-grandfather, great-great-great-grandfather, great-great-great-great-grandfather and all ancestors crawled on the ground in the manner of worms.

Of course, the original passage in Hutten is modelled after Plautus,¹¹² another source, together with Terence, from which the boys drew inspiration for their invectives. Such characters as the young country yokel, *Strabax*, from Plautus's *Truculentus* or the boastful soldier, *Thraso*, from Terence's *Eunuchus* were constantly put to good use in the speeches. Accordingly, one of the contestants in 1674 begins his speech by announcing that

Tu vero, Strabax stolidissime, memento potius ovium, boum, et asinorum, qui tot verberibus tibi constiterunt apud matrem, quam Victoriae.¹¹³

(f. 231v)

¹¹⁰ Act V, Scenes I and II (Bolte 1908: 138–41, ll. 1320–1439).

¹¹¹ Act I, Scene II (Bolte 1908: 110, ll. 88–89); cf. Article II: 99; Article III: 5–6, 14.

¹¹² Pl. *Per.* 57.

¹¹³ Cf. Article I: 331.

You surely, most uncultivated Strabax, should take thought for your sheep, cows and asses, which earned you so many floggings at your mother's, rather than for the Victory.

Likewise in 1683:

Verba bene notum est, Thraso insulsissime, non sunt facta. Inceptum est proelium, et (quicquid tu aliter obgannias) de victoria non dubitemus. Nihil habent isti regii, pene dixeram Semipagani, de quo glorientur, Commilitones, excepta, tantum impudentia.

(f. 442v)

It is well known, you stupid Thraso, that words are not deeds. The battle has begun and – whatever you may snarl to the contrary – we have no doubts about victory. Those regals [the King's Scholars] – I almost said semi-pagans – have nothing to boast about, my fellow soldiers, except merely their shamelessness.

Finally, the students addressed (or attacked) each other in versed riddles. Preceding each riddle contest are a few lines in hexameter or elegiacs. While these are most likely original compositions, the riddles themselves are usually adapted from riddle collections or schoolbooks and often assume an even more schoolboy-like overtone than above. Thus, in 1677, the boys deemed it appropriate to set the following riddle:

K[itche]ll Dic mihi quod flumen soleat conscendere montes
E[vers] Heu pudet ! Urinam sed reor esse tuam. ¹¹⁴

(f. 302v)

Kitchell: Tell me what stream tends to go up the mountains.

Evers: Oh what shame but I think it is your urine.

Another feature is the punning on the peculiarities of Latin grammar:

¹¹⁴ Cf. Article II: 100. The riddle is also recorded in 1670 (f. 123v). It can be found, for example, in *Carminum Proverbialium* (1654: 4), a collection of proverbs and riddles compiled in 1576 by Hermann Germberg but printed anonymously at least eleven times in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England.

[Foche] Discrimen quodnam est inter Leporem, atque Leporem?
W[akefield] In sylvis Lepores, in verbis quaere Lepores. Prudens ornavit non tua verba lepos.

(f. 262r)

Foche: What's the difference between a hare [Leporem] and wit [Leporem]?

Wakefield: Seek hares [Lepores] in the woods and wit [Lepores] in words! Versified wit has not embellished your words.

The word-play is on the Latin accusative singulars *leporem* and *lepōrem* from *lepus* (hare) and *lepōs* (wit, charm), respectively. The point is that these nouns, apart from their nominative singulars, do not differ from each other in writing but only in pronunciation with *lepōs* having a long *o*-vowel (as opposed to a short one in *lepus*) in its oblique cases.¹¹⁵

With only one exception,¹¹⁶ the battles come to an end with a brief epilogue, often both in verse and prose but sometimes only in verse. I quote the 1666 epilogue:

Sistite: certatum satis est. Nunc jurgia, & iras
Mittite. Nequicquam rixari fortibus aequum est
Militibus, quos hasta decet, quos laurea. Linguis
Utatur muliebre Genus.

Cum Archididascalus illa, quae composuistis, Themata & Carmina audiverit, aequissimus inter vos erit Iudex, atque huic postea certamini finem merito imponet. Interea temporis, Auditores, ex animo precamur, ut in longum vivatis, et optime valeatis.

(f. 25r)

Halt! Enough of fighting. Now set aside quarrels and wrath. Soldiers of equal strength quarrel in vain for who deserves the cane, who the laurel branch. May the female sex use their tongues.

When the headmaster has heard the themes and verses you have composed, he will fairly judge you and rightly put an end to this

¹¹⁵ The passage seems to draw on a list of words of similar pronunciation or meaning in Hugh Robinson's *Scholae Wintoniensis phrases Latinae* (1654: 417–27, 423).

¹¹⁶ The epilogue is omitted in 1681 (f. 384v).

battle. Meanwhile, listeners, we heartily wish that you may live long and fare most well.

The passage makes it clear that the Victors were not decided on the grounds of the recorded contests. Rather, it was only after the contest that the boys were required to deliver themes and verses to the headmaster, who then decided the winners.¹¹⁷ This is further confirmed by the 1683 epilogue where it is stated that

Archididascalus mox themata quaedam vobis dictabit, quae cum composueritis una cum carminibus in eadem; vos invicem illa ad amussim examinabit, et deinde praeceptoris censura finem huic certamini vere acquissimum imponet.

(f. 421v)

The headmaster will soon dictate to you certain themes, and when you have composed them together with a poem for each, he will examine them with precision one after the other, and thereafter the headmaster's judgment will truly give the most just end to these battles.

Moreover, it is obvious that we are here concerned with prearranged contests. If one considers, for example, the exchange between Kitchell and Everts, and Foche and Wakefield above (or any of the pre-Lenten riddles for that matter), it is self-evident that the riddles and the answers to them must have been agreed – and perhaps rehearsed – with the contestants in advance. In this way, the recorded contests served as a kind of public prelude to the “actual” contests, which simply took the form of the standard grammar school exercise of composing themes and verses.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ For the composition of school themes and verses, cf. Article II. Edwards (1957: 103) – apparently quoting Woodruff & Cape (1908: 130) – claims that “laurel wreaths were presented to the two boys judged Victors by the vote of their schoolfellows.” However, there is nothing in the manuscript to indicate that the Victors would have been decided by the vote of their fellow students.

¹¹⁸ Another possibility is that the recorded contests served as public “epilogues” to the actual contests. That is, the other way around: the students who had won the actual contest of composing themes and verses during Lent then celebrated their victory in a

3.6 *In nativitatem et reditum regis Caroli secundi*

Celebrating the restoration of the monarchy and the birthday of King Charles II, the typical structure for the Oak Apple Day performances is a prologue, a set of speeches, a dramatic dialogue (in Latin or English), and an epilogue. Only one play by a professional dramatist seems to have been staged at the King's School on the Oak Apple Day. Recorded for 1682 (f. 422v) is *The Royalist* (1682) by Thomas D'Urfey, a cuckold farce with Loyalist sympathies set during the Interregnum.¹¹⁹

The first performance (ff. 26r–30r), recorded for the year 1666 consists of only a prose prologue and a brief dialogue between a Parliamentarian and a Royalist, that is, *Misomonarchus* (“King-hater”) and *Philomonarchus* (“King-lover”). Their exchange is representative of the sentiments expressed at the King's School on Oak Apple Day:

P[hilomonarchus] Opportune temet mihi offers hodie solennitatis, Misomonarche. Quid tristis es, et vultu tam torvo? Quis die tam festivo animum tuum exagitat dolor.

M[isomonarchus] Nihil mihi unquam quod scio ita vexavit, et vulneravit animum, quam illa, quae hodierno die perstrepat, popularis exultim triumphans jubilatio. Non enim recuperato tantum Principe gaudent, sed omnes Sanctos gravissimis onerant, lacerantque convitijs. Vocant enim Nos homicidas, regicidas, perduelles, perjuros, sacrilegos, professionis christianae carcinomata, religionis portenta, lupos sanguisugas, bellorum faces, factionum atque haeresium cini-flores natos cum ad Ecclesiae tum ad sacrae Majestatis exitium.

(f. 29r)

King-lover: How opportunely you present yourself to me on today's solemnity, King-hater. Why are you sad with such a grim look on your face? What pain torments your soul on such a festive day?

King-hater: Nothing I know of has ever harassed and wounded my soul as that leapingly triumphing popular jubilation, which today makes so much noise. For they do not only rejoice over the restoration of the Prince but burden and slander all the Saints [i.e. the Puritans] with harshest insults. For they call us murderers, regicides,

public performance recorded for the pre-Lenten period at the end of the year. Cf. the discussion in Mäkilähde 2019: 46.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Canfield 1996: 115–20.

public enemies, perjurers, sacrilegists, tumours of Christian profession, monsters of religion, blood-sucking wolves, torches of war, hair-curlers of factions and heresies, born for the destruction of Church and the sacred Majesty.

For the next year (ff. 49r–53v), the manuscript records only speeches and poems both in Latin and Greek. There are only two lengthier Greek hexameter poems recorded for the Oak Apple performances (the second is from 1678, ff. 330v–31r).¹²⁰ Both are again psalms adapted from Duport’s Δαβίδης ἔμμετρος. I quote the opening lines of the 1667 poem:

Χερσὶν συμπλαταγήσαθ’ ὁμοῦ τάνυ φῦλα Βρετάννων
Φωνῇ ἀγαλλόμενοι τε Θεῶ ἀλαλάξατε λαοί.
Ἀθάνατος γὰρ ἄναξ ὑπατος, δεινός τε φαείνων
Ἐχθροὺς πᾶμπαν ὀλέσσειν ὑφ’ ἡμῖν ἴφι δαμάσσας
Ἐχθροὺς τε στυφελίξεν ὑφ’ ἡμετέροισι πόδεσσι.¹²¹

(f. 50v)

Clap your hands together, all the tribes of Britain: praise the Lord with your voice, rejoicing people. For the Immortal, the Most High Lord is fearful and shining. He shall destroy our enemies altogether, putting them under our yoke by his might; he shall strike our enemies down under our feet.

This goes on for another twenty-nine lines with little if any variation in terms of content. As for the Oak Apple Day speeches, they typically lament the execution of Charles I, as well as the hardships encountered by his son, Charles II, and bemoan Cromwell’s unspeakable betrayal of

¹²⁰ Plus a prose passage in Greek (ff. 186v–87v), ca. one folio-page in length, which does not depart from the Latin speeches in terms of content.

¹²¹ Cf. Duport 1666: Ps. 47, p. 127, v. 1: Χερσὶν συμπλαταγήσαθ’ ὁμοῦ πάντ’ ἔθνεα φωτῶν· / Φωνῇ ἀγαλλόμενοι τε Θεῶ ἀλαλάξατε λαοί. / Ἀθάνατος γὰρ Ἄναξ ὑπατος, δεινός τε τέτυκται; and v.3: Λαοὺς πᾶμπαν ὀλέσσειν ὑφ’ ἡμῖν ἴφι δαμάσσας / Ἐνθεά τε στυφελίξεν ὑφ’ ἡμετέροισι πόδεσσι. Appropriately, Psalm 47 is one of the enthronement psalms, known in English as “O clap your hands” by its first line in the Authorized Version.

the King and the Church. Cicero's Catiline orations were of course the most natural classical reference point for Restoration schoolboys:

Rex noster illustrissimus ille Carolus, Auditores reverendi, non citius natus erat, quin pro nefas! Patre privatus, paterno Solio dejectus, et in exilium denique missus ab Isto, scilicet Cromwellio, qui se Populi protectorem, sed false, gloriatus est. Nam revera omnium, quos Terra tulit, fuit hominum perditissimus. Homo dixi? immo Daemon potius: omnibus enim hominibus erat magis nefarius; immo ipsam etiam Megaeram scelere anteibat. Neque enim nox tenebris, neque Sol opertus nefarios proditionis suae coetus obscurare potuit. Fuit, fuit, inquam, talis quem nec pudor a turpitudine, nec metus a periculo, nec ratio a furore revocaret. Dum ille infaelicioris hujusce imperij fraena tyrannice tenebat, Deus immortalis! Ubinam gentium fuimus? quali regione viximus? quam Ecclesiam, atque Rempub[licam] habuimus?

(f. 51v)

Our most illustrious King Charles, reverend Auditors, no sooner than he was born was deprived – oh horror! – of his father, ejected from his ancestral throne, and sent thereafter into exile by that man, namely Cromwell, who glorified himself, but falsely, as the Protector of the People. For in fact, of all those men the earth ever bore, he was the most wicked. Did I say man? No, rather a demon for he was more nefarious than any other man; no indeed he even surpassed Megaera herself in his villainy. For neither the night in its shadows nor the hidden sun can conceal the nefarious assemblies of his treason. He was not, I say, he was not a man who would withdraw from disgrace by a sense of shame, from danger by fear, or from madness by reason. While he was tyrannically holding the reins of this unfortunate realm – O immortal God! – where on earth were we? What kind of country did we live in? What Church and Commonwealth did we have?

The speech borrows from Cicero's first Catiline oration, describing Cromwell with the same words Cicero put to good use when he was

accusing Catiline in the Senate for attempting to overthrow the Roman Republic (*Neque enim nox tenebris, neque Sol opertus ...*).¹²²

With only a few exceptions, the rest of the performances follow the typical structure, consisting of a brief prologue plus an oration (or a few), followed by a dramatic dialogue (or two) and an epilogue. In addition to the Latin dialogue discussed above, there are twelve dialogues in total, only one of them entirely in Latin, two in Latin and English, and nine in English.¹²³ In terms of content, both the Latin and English dialogues differ little from the 1666 specimen discussed earlier. For example, the 1679 performance presents a dialogue (ff. 361v–63r) between two Conformists (*Oldway* and *Rightrule*) and a Quaker (*Newlight*). The whole exchange focuses on *Oldway* and *Rightrule* educating their Non-Conformist neighbour:

Ol[dway] What think you now, Neighbour, of this days solemnity?

New[light] Alack! alack! my spirit truely even boyles within mee to hear upon this which men call the Kings holiday, soe many carnall exclamations, carnal praises, carnal prayers not only from men, but even children, superstitiously chang'd into prattling Oratours. And I think yee are all wood: that is to say in old English mad.

[...]

New[light] Hah! But, Friend what good either negative, as I may soe say, or positive have you gotten by this which you call a glorious Restauration? Is not trading far worse then it was in the days of Oliver?

Ri[ghtrule] Shall I tell you the truth. **New[light]** Yea, verily.

Ri[ghtrule] There were as many complaints then as now. Know also besides that your factious Brethren gape after a Change, aiming daily at nothing but the Church, and Kingdom's ruine; and fright most men from trading by whining out in secret places to their followers great fears of persecutions. Hence they will not trade, hoping by soe doing to starve the people into a forc'd rebellion, having swallowed

¹²² Cf. Article II: 96–97; Cic. *Catil.* 1. 6: *si neque nox tenebris obscurare coetus nefarios nec privata domus parietibus continere voces coniurationis tuae potest*; 1. 23–24: *Neque enim is es, Catilina, ut te aut pudor a turpitudine aut metus a periculo aut ratio a furore revocarit.*

¹²³ Latin dialogues are recorded for the years 1669 (ff. 97r–102r); Latin plus English for 1668 (ff. 74r–79r) and 1671 (ff. 125r–33r); English for 1671, 1673 (ff. 186r–90r), 1674 (ff. 211v–18r), 1675 (ff. 239v–46v), 1676 (ff. 265r–70v), 1677 (ff. 305v–10v), 1678 (ff. 329v–36r), 1679 (ff. 358v–63v) and 1684 (ff. 470r–79r).

up in former times the revenues of Church and Kingdom. Which keeping in their coffers they without doubt in a holy zeal, have stockt up in a holy bank, to help a new holy rebellion when time shall serve.
(f. 362r)

And so forth. Departing from the typical structure of an Oak Apple Day performance is a set of speeches recorded for the year 1672 (ff. 152r–58v) and entitled *Arborum triumphus in reditum Caroli secundi* (“Triumph of trees for the restoration of Charles II”). Consisting of eleven orations by different trees (the laurel, the elm, the cedar, the birch, the cherry, the box, the cypress, the apple, the wine, the fig and the oak), the speeches take their inspiration from Abraham Cowley’s *Plantarum libri sex*, of which Book VI is devoted to an assembly of trees.¹²⁴ The King’s School orations associate the virtues of different trees with Charles II. For example, in the first triumph (*Lauri triumphus*), Charles is depicted as Apollo, Phoebus:

Quis Musarum filius qui Laurum meruit non ex animo hodie triumphabit, cum noster jam regnat Apollo? Quippe Phoebus gratissimum est suum munus, Laurus scilicet.
(f. 152r)

Which son of the Muses, who deserves the laurel, shall not triumph today from his heart, now that our Apollo reigns. For his tribute, the laurel, is most pleasing to Phoebus.

The speech concludes with Alcaic strophes:

Gaudete, Cives; psallite, psallite:
Curasque tristes, atque acerbos
Pellite pectoribus dolores.
Sumpsit sacrato debita vertici
Post tot moras tandem diademata
Ille optimusque, maximusque

¹²⁴ In Book VI, the Dryad of the Oak summons a meeting of trees in the Forest of Dean. The major part of the poem is dedicated to the Dryad’s speech, in which she relates the events of the Civil War, focusing on Charles hiding in the Royal Oak. For an online edition of *Plantarum*, cf. Sutton 2007; for a detailed discussion of the work, Spearing 2017.

Carolus, ille beans Britannos.
Iam nunc querelas ponite lugubres.
Iam nunc repostum promite caecubum.
Haec, haec dies, haec est choreis
Haec rutilus decoranda flammis.

(f. 152v)

Rejoice, citizens, applaud, applaud: banish sad worries and bitter sorrows from your hearts. After so many delays, he has at last assumed the destined diadem on his sacred head, he who is best and greatest, Charles, who blesses the Britons. Now put aside mournful complaints, now bring forth the stored Caecuban wine. This, this day, this is for dancing, this day is to be decorated with shining torches.

The poem quotes Janus Secundus's first Ode on the coronation of Charles V (1530) – itself an imitation of Horace's Roman Odes – in which the poet glorifies the emperor (or here Charles II) as the second Augustus.¹²⁵ In order to render the poem more topical, the King's School boy has replaced the fifth line in Secundus's original ode (*Gaudete quotquot terra tenet bonos* "Rejoice as much as the earth bears good things") with a reference to Charles II (*Carolus, ille beans Britannos* "Charles, who blesses the Britons").¹²⁶

Predictably, the Royal Oak delivers the last triumph (*Querci triumphus*):

Ego regalis illa Quercus, arborum facile princeps, nemorum decus,
& robur, unum inter omnes arbores Regis adventu triumphantes locum instar omnium jure vendico.

(f. 157v)

I am the Royal Oak, truly the prince of trees, the glory and might of groves. I justly claim an equal place among all the trees triumphing at the coming of the King.

Again, the speech is brought to an end with a few lines of verse:

¹²⁵ Janus Secundus (1511–1536) was a prolific Dutch Neo-Latin poet, most famous for his *Basia* (1541).

¹²⁶ Price 2005: 65.

Non igitur Dryades nostrates pectore vano
Nec sine consulto coluerunt Numine Quercum.
Non illam Albionis iam tum celebravit honore
Stulta superstitio, venturive inscia secli
Angliaci ingentes puto praevidisse triumphos
Roboris, imperiumque maris quod maximus olim
Carolides vasta victor ditione teneret.

(f. 158r–58v)

Our British Dryads did not frequent the Oak with vain hearts or without divine counsel. It was not the foolish superstition of Albion long ago nor the ignorance of the future age that held the Oak in great esteem: I think the Englishmen foresaw the mighty triumphs of the Oak, and the empire of the sea that one day the son of Charles shall keep under his vast rule.

These lines are quoted verbatim from the Book VI of Cowley's *Plantarum libri sex*, from a passage where the poet praises the Oak for providing Britain with timber to build a fleet.¹²⁷

The last recorded performance in the whole manuscript took place on the Oak Apple Day in 1684 (ff. 470r–79r). This includes, after a Latin prologue, a brief comic play in English, the plot of which presents three Royalists – first disguised as Fanatics and then as Papists – testing the allegiance of their Presbyterian friend to the King and the Church. The performance is put to rest with a Latin epilogue, the last lines of which, appropriately enough, offer a fond farewell to the retiring headmaster:

Deum etiam opt[imum] max[imum] humillime petimus, ut jucundissima, faelicissimaque semper vita charissimus ille nobis Archididascalus in recessu abunde perfruatur. Et, ut perantiquas, laudandas, saluberrimasque hujusce gymnasii consuetudines diu, diutissime servent, et observari faciant (idque ingratiis repugnantium novitiorum) vivant, vivant Decanus, omnesque ecclesiae cathedralis, et metropolitanae Christi Cantuariensis Canonici! Gloria Deo in excelsis.

(f. 477r)

¹²⁷ Sutton 2007: VI, ll. 526–32.

We humbly beg the best and greatest God that our most beloved Headmaster may always fully enjoy a most agreeable and happy life during his retirement. And that they may forever preserve and ensure the observation of the ancient, laudable and most salubrious customs of this school (and this against the will of resisting novices). Long live the Dean, all the ecclesiastics and the Canons of the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of Christ at Canterbury! Glory to God in the highest.

Soon after this performance Lovejoy retired to the parish of St. Peter in the Isle of Thanet, where he died in 1685.¹²⁸ We do not know for sure who commissioned the compilation of the manuscript, but it is highly likely that Lovejoy himself was behind the initiative: creating in the process a lasting testimony to his achievements as the headmaster of the King's School, Canterbury.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Woodruff & Cape 1908: 137.

¹²⁹ Cf. Mäkilähde 2019: 43.

4. Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School: The Case Studies

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I would like to address four central aspects of grammar school education, summing up the discussion in the four intertwined articles. The focus in Articles I, II and IV is on the King's School while Article III leads the discussion out of Canterbury to its broader early-modern (dramatic) contexts. For the purposes of the present study, my opening article (actually Article II), foregrounds the other studies, setting the speeches and verses recorded within the *Orationes* in their grammar school context. Articles I and II address two pivotal aspects of early-modern education, namely, performance and drama, or rather, the "performance of grammar". The final study (Article IV) discusses the Gunpowder performances against their educational and societal background.

4.2 "*Vir bonus, dicendi peritus*: Classical Education in the Restoration Grammar School" (Article II)

Previous research on the early-modern grammar school curriculum in England has almost exclusively focused on what was prescribed for the schoolroom rather than what was actually done within it. For this reason, previous scholars' attempts to describe the grammar school curriculum have mostly drawn on secondary sources, leaving the surviving grammar school composition aside (to some extent understandably so, as the latter has not survived in abundance). The *Orationes* manuscript, by contrast, supplies a testimony to real schoolroom practice.

In this article, I first discuss seventeenth-century school syllabi, textbooks, and educational treatises in regard to the curriculum at the King's School; second, I move on to examine some examples of school

orations within the *Orationes* in relation to the secondary sources mentioned above; and, third, I show how they are connected to ethical training, an essential part of early-modern grammar school education.

The study of classical languages at Restoration period (and earlier) grammar schools involved several types of written exercises, beginning with letter-writing and later proceeding to verse composition and themes. The “theme”, a kind of written essay on a predefined (usually ethical) topic, followed a division into predefined headings (or topics of invention). The main purpose of writing themes was to furnish the students with the skills required for composing orations. In Article II, I attempt to show how the King’s School orations conform to the theme structure, focusing on their status as elaborated school-themes, bordering on the diction of a full-scale oration. Further, by arguing for the students right for leisure (before Christmas), debating matters of public importance (on Guy Fawkes and Oak Apple days) and by throwing invectives at each other (before Lent) the King’s School boys received a thorough training in the three genres of rhetoric (demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial).

Moreover, in the Guy Fawkes Day, Oak Apple Day and Christmas performances in particular, the King’s School orations reflect the educational goal of early-modern grammar schools in combining rhetorical training with moral conduct. Combining eloquence (*elocutio*) with reason (*ratio*), the boys were brought up according to the Humanist ideal of *vir bonus* (or *civilis*), and trained to take their places in the society as good and active citizens.

4.3 “Performative grammars: Genre and allusion in a Restoration manuscript” (Article I)

This article discusses another pivotal aspect of early-modern grammar school education, that is, the “performance of grammar”. Focusing on the King’s School pre-Lenten and Christmas performances, the article argues that the “performance of grammar”, with its roots in the Roman educational system, had a central part in the Humanist pedagogical ideals put to use in early-modern grammar schools.

The paper traces the origins of the tradition of “performing grammar” from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages up to the Restoration period, where it was retained in the form of composition exercises and drama with their constant allusions to and quotations from classical authors, schoolbooks and grammar lessons. With the word “grammar” (in its early-modern educational context) referring to the whole content of the school syllabus, its performativity, or the idea of “children learning as they play”, became an essential part of the work of many early-modern educational writers. These include, for example, James Shirley, a schoolmaster and dramatist, whose plays were staged at the King’s School.

Within the King’s School pre-Lenten contests, this tradition took the shape of “grammatical battles”, where students engaged with each other by wielding their verses and riddles as metaphorical swords, while in the Christmas performances it emerged through allusions to the boys’ grammar lessons and textbooks which had caused them so much suffering during the school year. The themes of captivity and torture, where the parts of speech act as instruments of torment, were also noted as a recurring allusional strategy in the Christmas plays.

With regard to school life, the performances – with their constant employment of classical quotations and allusions – offered the King’s School students an occasion to demonstrate their learning before the Dean and Chapter. Further, the allusions to classical authors and standard textbooks helped to unite the students and the audience as a shared community of learned men.

4.4 “Grammar war plays in early modern England: from entertainment to pedagogy” (Article III)

Closely connected with the previous study, Article III sets out to explore a specific genre within the early-modern academic drama, that is, the grammar war plays. Originating in Andrea Guarna’s humorous prose allegory, *Grammaticale bellum* (1511), different incarnations of the work enjoyed wide popularity throughout early-modern Europe, being subsequently translated into a number of vernacular languages, and adapted onto the stage, as well as giving birth to several imitations.

The grammar war plays (*bella grammaticalia*) are allegorical works in which parts of speech or rhetorical devices face each other in battle. In England, Guarna's allegory was first translated into the vernacular by William Hayward in 1569, before being adapted onto the Oxford stage by Leonard Hutten in 1581. Hutten's version then found its way to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammar schools, with recorded performances at the King's School and Tonbridge School in 1668 and 1718 respectively. The year 1669 saw the staging of *Priscianus Vapulans* at the King's School, a university comedy from Tübingen, which takes its cue from a subplot in Guarna. The King's School pre-Lenten performances clearly take their inspiration from the grammar war tradition, in particular from the Hutten's adaptation.

Several imitations followed. These include the *Heteroclitanomalomonia* (1613), in all probability the earliest surviving example of an original grammar war play in English; *Basileia seu Bellum Grammaticale Tragico-comoedia*, staged at the Cranbrook School before Christmas in 1666; and a school play from Middlesex, simply titled as the *School-play* (1663). At the Stamford School, Kent, the grammar war tradition was "rhetoricated": the headmaster, William Turner, publishing in 1718 a set of grammar war speeches in Latin. And finally, the headmaster of the Ashby-de-la-Zouch School, Leicestershire, published two plays taking their inspiration from the grammar war tradition under the title *Words Made Visible* (or *Minerva's Triumph*) in 1679.

As for the popularity of the grammar war phenomenon within English educational institutions, the article argues for two main factors. First, these plays had the dual aim, often pronounced in title pages and introductions, to both educate and entertain at the same time. Second, the war-like scenario of these plays fell on fertile ground in early-modern England (or Europe), echoing with the thoroughly adversarial character of contemporary rhetoric. In this way, the tradition also served the practical goal of preparing the students for their future careers, involving debates at the Universities or Inns of Court. This antagonistic character of early-modern rhetoric is clearly visible throughout the King's School performances but in particular in the pre-Lenten contests.

4.5 “*In sulphuream Papistarum conspirationem exercitia: Retelling the Gunpowder Plot at the King’s School, Canterbury (1665–84)*” (Article IV)

The final article discusses a specific subgenre within the *Orationes*, that is, the Guy Fawkes Day performances. Focusing on the Latin and Greek speeches and verses recorded for the day, I chiefly examine one representative example of the genre – the textual tradition surrounding speeches and verses being rather repetitive in character – as recorded in the year 1677. Here, these texts are discussed in their social and literary historical context. The dialogues, many of which are in English, fall beyond the scope of this article.

The speeches and verses recorded for the Guy Fawkes Day draw on a well-established tradition of Gunpowder Plot literature. Employing a mythologising narrative pattern, the Latin hexameter verses (and the orations) take their impetus from the tradition of brief Anglo-Latin Gunpowder epic, besides quoting several appropriate classical authors (e.g. Virgil and Claudian) and near-contemporary verse collections. Typically, the speeches and verses emphasise the demonic origins of the conspiracy, recounting vividly the terrible consequences that would have ensued had the Plot succeeded, followed by a providential account of the salvation of the British nation, and the due punishment suffered by the Plotters.

The Greek Gunpowder verses accompanying some of the orations are, in essence, psalms – quoted chiefly from James Duport’s $\Delta\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$: itself a translation of the psalms into Homeric hexameter – celebrating the deliverance of a Protestant nation from the perennial Catholic threat.

In 1677, the verses were followed by a school declamation presenting a debate between two students, with a third taking the part of moderator. The question posed is, which of the two, the Fanatics (i.e. Non-conformists) or the Plotters, were the worst. The declamation is put to end with the moderator summarising the declamation and declaring that both factions must be equally evil. The conclusion encapsulates many of the ideals expressed on both the Guy Fawkes and Oak Apple

Days: both occasions were celebrated as deliverances of the Stuart dynasty, while, accordingly, the King's School performances commonly equated the Plotters with the Protestant Fanatics.

Again, the speeches and verses – not to mention the declamation, a standard oratorical exercise in early-modern grammar schools – are elaborated school exercises. As such, the article shows how the Gunpowder performances provide us with a prime example of ways in which a contemporary literary tradition could be imported into the Restoration schoolroom and used to promote current political and religious establishment.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to discuss classical education at the King's School of the Restoration period as it manifests itself in the *Orationes* manuscript. I have attempted to bring together some of the most essential – and, in my opinion, the most interesting – aspects of early-modern grammar school education: drama, rhetoric, classical reception, and ethical training. To this end, four case studies have been carried out. The opening study in the present volume (Article II) addresses *Orationes* texts as grammar school compositions, laying particular importance on the schoolroom oration as a way of linking together rhetorical and ethical training. The following study (Article I) has as its focus the performative aspect of grammar school education. The third study connects the *Orationes* performances to their broader educational and dramatic context, while my final study (Article IV) discusses a specific subgenre, the Guy Fawkes Day performances, with a focus on their (literary) historical background.

The following conclusions can be drawn from these studies. First, the texts of Latin and Greek verses and orations recorded within the *Orationes* are elaborated school exercises, composed, at least for the most part, by the students themselves. These exercises were intimately connected with one of the fundamental tasks of the early-modern grammar school education, that is, to provide the students with ethical training in order to mould them into exemplary citizens (*viri civiles*). In the Restoration context, this meant allegiance to the newly restored monarchy and compliance with the teachings of the established church. This is most evident in the Guy Fawkes and Oak Apple Day performances.

While to a certain extent, King's School practices conform to the impression that can – and has been – drawn from the school syllabi, textbooks, educational treatises etc., there seems to be, however, something more to the story. For, strange as it may seem to some observers, the grammar schools actually interacted with the surrounding society. This may sound like a platitude, but the impression one easily gets from many classical studies on the topic is somewhat the opposite: they often depict grammar schools as nothing more than static institutions of

grammar with little if any response – and an incapability to adapt – to the needs of the contemporary society.¹³⁰

The *Orationes*, that is to say, hint at the opposite to the prevailing stereotypes on the subject. While studying the core of classical literature – a necessity for every young man aiming for any higher studies – most certainly kept the students busy for most of the day, the *Orationes* texts, indeed, engage in dialogue – or often rather in a propagandistic polylogue – with the literary and social trends of the contemporary society. The Neo-Latin literary works employed in the King’s School performances range from Nicolas Caussin’s Jesuit tragedies to Gunpowder verse and Neo-Latin writings of such eminent English poets as Abraham Cowley. Moreover, current events are constantly referred to in the performances. On the other hand, this should not surprise us in the slightest, given the fact that in the early-modern world Latin, and – although to a much lesser extent – Greek as well, was the language of all learned communication, constantly used to all sorts of contemporary purposes, from legal disputations to composing poetry.

There is, however, a caveat. While it is certain that public speechdays and play-acting were a commonplace at least in most grammar schools of the Restoration period, the *Orationes* is – as far as I can tell – the only collection of its kind that survives from early-modern England. On the other hand, unless further evidence proves otherwise, there is no reason to assume that the performances that took place at the King’s School – a typical cathedral school of its day – would have differed in any significant way from those put forward in other grammar schools of the period. More research must certainly be carried out in the archives.

Further, the *Orationes* bears evidence to the fundamental role drama and public performance played within the early-modern grammar schools. Apart from their dual aim, to teach and entertain, they served the purpose of training the rhetorical talent of the students, furnishing them with eloquence and courage, necessary qualities for any public career. Indeed, with regard to the time devoted to play-acting, the reality may not have been always too far removed from the words spoken by the “Censure” in Ben Jonson’s *The Staple of News*:

¹³⁰ Cf. e.g. Watson 1908; Clarke 1959; Vincent 1969.

They make all their scholars playboys! Is't not a fine sight, to see all our children made interluders? Do we pay our money for this? We send them to learn their grammar and their Terence, and they learn their play-books?

The Staple of News (1626) III INT. 36–38

References

Primary sources

Manuscripts

Exercitia Etonae habita in solenni Scholarium Electione, quum interesse dignaretur, qua est erga literatos omnes voluntate, Wilhelmus, maximae spei Princeps, Cumberlandiaë Dux. BL King MS 315

“Evelyn Papers, Vol. CCCLIII.” Notebook headed by Sir John Evelyn, “Verses made by Eton school boys, whilst I was there from 1692 to 1698”. BL Add MS 78520
Orationes et carmina aliaque exercitia = Canterbury Cathedral Archives, CCA-DCc/ Lit. MS/E/41.

“Orders” = *Orders made at St Katherines Audit 1682* = CCA-DCc-KINGS/1/6

“School Exercises, Vol. 1.” BL Lansdowne MS 1180

“Testimonials for staff” = Canterbury Cathedral Archives, CCA-DCc-KINGS/3/1

“Treasurer’s Accounts” = Canterbury Cathedral Archives, CCA-DCc/MA/183

“Winchester School Exercises” = BL Add MS 4379

Printed Sources

Anonymous 1605. *In homines nefarios qui scelere ausuque immani, parliamenti iam-primem habendi domum, pulvere bombardico evertere, sunt machinati, scilicet Quinto Novembris, 1605.* Cambridge. STC (2nd ed) / 7737

Anonymous [Hermann Germberg] 1654. *Carminum proverbialium totius humanae vitae statum breviter delineantium, nec non utilem de moribus doctrinam jucundè proponentium, loci communes in gratiam juventutis selecti.* London. Wing / I11

Caussin, Nicolas 1699. *Tragoediae, longe praestantissimae, cum Actione oratoria Hermenigildus dicta.* Nüremberg (?).

Duport, James 1666. *ΔΑΒΙΔΗΣ ἙΜΜΕΤΡΟΣ, sive Metaphrasis Libri Psalmorum Graeci Versibus Contexta.* Cambridge. Wing / B2723

Forbes, William 1642. *Poemata Miscellanea Gulielmi Forbesii Scotii,* London.

Isocrates 1638. *Isocratis orationes tres 1. Ad Domicum. 2. Ad Nicoclem. 3. Nicoclis. Item Plutarchi Chaeronensis de liberis educandis libellus.* Cambridge. STC (2nd ed.) / 14274

Laud, William 1858. *The works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud, D. D., sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury,* vol. V part II. Oxford: John Henry Parker.

Leach, A. (ed.) 1911. *Educational Charters and Documents 598–1909.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lily, William 1672. *Brevissima institutio, seu Ratio grammatices cognoscendae ad omnium puerorum utilitatem praescripta.* Oxford. Wing / L2258

- Oxonienſis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratiſſimam ſereniſſimae et beatiſſimae Elizabethae, nuper Angliae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Reginae.* Oxford, 1603. STC (2nd ed.) / 19018
- Robinson, Hugh 1654. *Scholae Wintonienſis phraſes Latinae. The Latin Phraſes of Wincheſter School.* London. Wing (2nd ed.) / R1681A
- The Schools-Probation: or, Rules and Orders for certain Set-Exerciſes to bee performed by the Scholars on Probation-Daies. Made and approved by learned men, for the uſe of Merchant Tailor's School in London.* London, 1661. Wing / S887A

Secondary Sources

- Adams, M. 2015. *Teaching Classics in English Schools, 1500-1840.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Baldwin, T. W. 1944. *William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Boas, F. S. 1914. *University Drama in the Tudor Age.* New York: Benjamin Blom.
- Bolte J. 1908. *Andrea Guarnas Bellum grammaticale und seine Nachahmungen.* Berlin: A. Hofmann & Comp.
- Brodrick, G. C. 1885. *Memorials of Merton College with Biographical Notices of the Wardens and Fellows.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Calboli Montefusco, L. 1996. "Quintilian and the Function of the Oratorical *exercitatio*", *Latomus* 55 (3): 615–25.
- Canfield, J. D. 1996. "Tupping Your Rival's Women: Cit-Cuckolding as Class Warfare in Restoration Comedy", in K. M. Quinsey (ed.), *Broken Boundaries: Women and Feminism in Restoration Drama.* Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.
- Charlton, K. 1965. *Education in Renaissance England*, Studies in Social History. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Chevalier, J.-F. 2013. "Jesuit Neo-Latin Tragedy in France", in J. Bloemendal & H. B. Norland (eds.), *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe.* Leiden – Boston: Brill, 415–69.
- Clark, D. L. 1948. *John Milton at St. Paul's School. A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education.* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clarke, M. L. 1959. *Classical Education in Britain 1500–1900.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collinson, P. 1995 "The Protestant Cathedral", in P. Collinson, N. Ramsay & M. Sparks (eds.), *A History of Canterbury Cathedral.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 155–203.
- Dolven, J. 2007. *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Edwards, D. L. 1957. *A History of the King's School Canterbury.* London: Faber & Faber.
- Enterline, L. 2012. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fairclough, H. R. 1925. *Horace: Satires, Epistles, the Art of Poetry*, trans. by H. R. Fairclough (Loeb Classical Library 194). Harvard: Harvard University Press.

- Foster, J. 1891. *Alumni Oxonienses. The members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714: Their Parentage, Birthplace, and Year of Birth, with a Record of Their Degrees*. Early series – vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibson J. M. (ed.), *Records of Early English Drama. Kent: Diocese of Canterbury, vol. 1*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gossett, S. & Berger, T. L. (eds.) 1988. *Jacobean Academic Plays*. Oxford: Malone Society.
- Green, I. 2009. *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Gregory, J. 1995. "Canterbury and the *Ancien Régime*: The Dean and Chapter, 1660–1828", in P. Collinson, N. Ramsay & M. Sparks (eds.), *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 204–55.
- Gwosdek, H. (ed.) 2013. *Lily's Grammar of Latin in English: An Introduction of the Eyght Partes of Speche, and the Construction of the Same*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hanford, J. H. 1915. "Wine, Beer, Ale and Tobacco: A Seventeenth Century Interlude", ed. with introduction and notes by J. H. Hanford, *Studies in Philology* 12 (1): 3–56.
- Harjunpää, K. & Mäkilähde, A. 2016. "Reiteration: At the Intersection of Code-Switching and Translation", *Multilingua* 35 (2): 163–201.
- Helander, H. 2001. "SO Debate – Neo-Latin Studies: Significance and Prospects", *Symbolae Osloenses* 76: 5–102.
- Henderson, P. *King's School, Canterbury, Register Index 1660-1749*. https://www.kings-school.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/KSC_register_index_1660-1749.pdf
- Hinde, T. 1990. *Imps of Promise: A History of the King's School, Canterbury*. London: James & James.
- Ingram, H. W. 1966. "The Ligatures of Early Printed Greek", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7 (4): 371–96.
- James, A. 2017. *Poets, Players, and Preachers: Remembering the Gunpowder Plot in Seventeenth-Century England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jewell, H. 1998. *Education in Early Modern England*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Johnson, A. W. 2007. "Ben Jonson and the Jonsonian Afterglow: Imagemes, Avatars, and Literary Reception", *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 6 (2): 145–72.
- Johnson, A. W. 2017. "Contingencies of Time and Place: A Contention for Honour and Riches, James Shirley, and the School Community", in R. D. Sell, A. W. Johnson & H. Wilcox (eds.), *Community-Making in Early Stuart Theatres. Stage and Audience*. London – New York: Routledge, 377–88.
- Johnson, A. W., Sullivan, P. V. & Vaahtera, J. (eds.) forthcoming. *Five Restoration Plays from the King's School, Canterbury*.
- Knight, S. 2002. *From "Pedantius" to "Ignoramus": University Drama at Oxford and Cambridge, 1580-1625*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale University.
- Knight, S. & Tilg, S. (eds.) 2015. *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Knight, S. & Tilg, S. 2015. "Introduction", in S. Knight & S. Tilg (eds.) 2015, 1–10.
- Lake, P. 2008. "The Historiography of Puritanism", in J. Coffey and P. C. H. Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 346–71.

- Lawson, J. & Silver, H. 1973. *A Social History of Education in England*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Mack, P. 2002. *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mack, P. 2014. "Neo-Latin and Renaissance Schools", in P. Ford, J. Bloemendal & C. Fantazzi (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World: Macroaedia*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 55–61.
- Minkova, M. 2014. "Orthography of Neo-Latin", in P. Ford, J. Bloemendal & C. Fantazzi (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World: Microaedia*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 1122–23.
- Mäkilähde, A. 2018a. "Approaching the functions of historical code-switching: The case of solidarity", in P. Pahta, J. Skaffari & L. Wright (eds.), *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond*. Boston – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 299–318.
- Mäkilähde, A. 2018b. "Some Reasons to Study Quotations, References and Allusions in Neo-Latin School Drama: Examples from the King's School, Canterbury", in A. Steiner-Weber et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Vindoboenensis*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 459–69.
- Mäkilähde, A. 2019. *The Philological-Pragmatic Approach: A Study on Language Choice and Code-Switching in Early Modern English School Performances*. Dissertation. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, ser. B – tom. 499. Turku.
- Norland, H. B. 2013. "Neo-Latin Drama in Britain", in J. Bloemendal & H. B. Norland (eds.), *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 471–544.
- Price, D. 2005. "Negotiating Poetry at Court: Charles V and Janus Secundus", in S. Heyes-Healy (ed.), *Medieval Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Jeremy Duquesnay Adams*. The New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 55–75.
- Russell, D. L. (ed.) 1987. *Stuart Academic Drama: An Edition of Three University Plays*. The Renaissance Imagination 34. New York & London: Garland.
- Sandis, E. forthcoming. *Growing Up Dramatically: University Men and Their Plays in Early Modern England*.
- Sidwell, K. 2015. "Classical Latin – Medieval latin – Neo-Latin", in S. Knight & S. Tilg (eds.) 2015, 13–26.
- Skaffari, J. & Mäkilähde, A. 2014. "Code-switching in historical materials: Research at the limits of contact linguistics", in N. Robert (ed.), *Questioning Language Contact: Limits of Contact, Contact at its Limits*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 252–79.
- Spearing, C. 2017. *Abraham Cowley's Plantarum Libri Sex: A Cavalier Poet and the Classical Canon*, Doctoral Dissertation, retrieved from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>
- Steenbakkens, P. 1994. "Accent-Marks in Neo-Latin", in R. Schnut et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neolatini Hafniensis*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, vol. 120. Tempe, AZ, 925–34.
- Stone, L. 1964. "The Educational Revolution in England 1560–1640", *Past & Present* 28: 41–80.
- Sutton, D. F. 2007. *Abraham Cowley, De Plantis Libri VI (1668)*. A hypertext critical edition by Dana F. Sutton, revised March 11 2007. <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/plants/>

- Vail Motter, T. H. 1929. *The School Drama in England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Van der Poel, M. "Oratory", in S. Knight & S. Tilg (eds.) 2015, 119–34.
- Vincent, W. A. L. 1969. *The Grammar Schools: Their Continuing Tradition 1660–1714*. London: John Murray.
- Watson, F. 1908. *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winship, M. P. 2011. "Defining Puritanism in Restoration England: Richard Baxter and Others Respond to *A Friendly Debate*", *The Historical Journal* 54 (3): 689–715.
- Woodruff, C. E. & Cape, H. J. 1908. *Schola Regia Cantuariensis: A History of Canterbury School. Commonly Called the King's School*. London: Mitchell Hughes & Clarke.

