

Hao Tianhu* 

The Readers of 17th-Century English Manuscript Commonplace Book *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*¹

Abstract: *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden* is a 17th-century manuscript commonplace book known primarily for its Shakespearean connections. The readers of *Hesperides* generally combine reading and thinking, or reading and writing. Though few, *Hesperides* is not without its “fit audience.” In addition to the few modern scholars who have examined the manuscripts, the actual known readers of *Hesperides* include Humphrey Moseley the 17th-century publisher, James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps in the Victorian period, and a late-18th-century anonymous reader. The last of this group copies Shakespearean and dramatic extracts into the commonplace book and is identified through internal evidence based on paleography. The intended readers of *Hesperides*, including the Courtier, would make use of it as a linguistic aid, to learn how to speak and write well from literary models. They take the commonplace book as a reference library.

Keywords: William Shakespeare, *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*, commonplace book, readers, Humphrey Moseley, James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps, manuscript study

John Evans compiled the manuscript commonplace book *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden* in the 1650s and 1660s (Hao, 2009: 384). For modern scholars such as Gunnar Sorelius and Peter Beal, *Hesperides* is primarily a Shakespearean commonplace book. This essay focuses on the (potential) readers of *Hesperides*. First it is helpful to examine the compiler's attitudes toward reading and writing, which are reflected in his extracts under “Readeing” and “Writeing.” Evans often talks metaphorically of writing:

* Zhejiang University, China.

¹ The Chinese version of this article has been published in the author's monograph “*Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*.” *The Study of an Early Modern English Commonplace Book*. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014: 134-152. The present essay in *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* is a revised version. Supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities and the National Humanities and Social Sciences Foundation, China (authorization: 19ZDA298).

Never were words more slowly married together. A
 Most blessed paper, w^{ch} shalt kiss y^t hand, to w^{ch} all blessednes in nature is
 a servant. A.
 Not hauing opportunity personally to kiss her hands: he sent this letter as his
 paper deputy to doe it for him. CA
 —As when Joves braine
 With Pallas swell'd, not to bring forth was paine. CP^s
 But like to Durers pencill, w^{ch} first knew
 The lawes of faces, & then faces drew
 The [sic] know'st y^e air, y^e colour, & y^e place
 The Symetry, w^{ch} giues y^e poem grace.
 Parts are so fitted unto parts as do
 Shew thou hadst wit & mathematicks too. CP^s (Evans 887)

Writing is compared to marriage, kissing, Pallas's birth, and Durer's drawing.
 The images associated with writing include bays (honor), muse (inspiration), and
 brass and marble (immortality).

Bee his owne lines his bayes. HW
 My greene muse, w^{ch} hath scarce yet displai'd her vernall blossomes. CA
 O for a muse of fire, y^t would ascend the brightest heaven of invention. H5
 —This booke
 When brass & marble fade, shall make thee looke
 ffresh to all ages. [L. Digges, front matter, Shakespeare's First Folio] (Evans
 887)

As for the famous Chinese novelist Cao Xueqin, who writes an elegy on the
 miserable fate of maidens in feudal times with tears and blood in *The Story of
 the Stone*, tears and blood can become ink for Western writers.

What though y^e muses springs are almost dry?
 Each h^t may finde a fountaine in his eye
 Wherein to dip its quill, & 'tis most fit
 To mourn, since death hath ov^rmastred wit. CP^s
 His passions can not be written of mee without flouds of teares (w^{ch} would wet
 the paper, & obliterate y^e relation) nor reade of you without <teares> grieffe. CA
 Write till your inke be dry, & with yo^t teares moist it againe: & frame some
 feeling line y^t may discouer such integrity— 2 G of V.
 Ile write, but in my bloud y^t he may see
 These lines come from my wounds but not from me. B^dA (Evans 887)

It is paramount for Evans that the heart guides and governs writing and reading.

If I should not teach my pen which is guided by my hart, to affirme. CA (887)
 Gently reade

This mourning in inke in w^{ch} my h^t doth bleed.
Let thy h^t take acquaintance of this stone. StT (Evans 628)

Reading should be combined with meditation. As Confucius says, “To learn without thinking is labor lost; to think without learning is perilous.”

Who readeth much, & never meditates
Is like a greedy eater of much food,
Who so surcloyes his stomack wth his cates
That commonly they do him little good. Q of P (Evans 628)

Evans himself unites reading with thinking, as we can see from the alterations he makes of his texts. He not only takes a lot of food, but also digests it. If there is good reading, then there is bad reading too, which is equated with murder and violence.

Philoxenus, passing by, & hearing some Masons, missensing his lines, with their ignorant sawing of them, falls to breaking their bricks amaine: They aske y^e cause, & he replies, They spoile his worke, & he theirs. R^s (Evans 628; Felltham, sig. P4)

It was a speech becoming an able poet of our owne, when a lord read his verses crookedly, & he besought his lordship, not to murder him in his owne lines. He y^t speakes false Latine breakes Priscians head, but he that repeates a verse ill, puts Homer out of joint. R^s (Evans 628; Felltham, sig. P4)

The misreading here refers to the performance of reading aloud. What are the purposes of reading? Owen Felltham (1602?-1668) answers with classical commonplaces: delight and instruction.

Some men reade Authors, as our Gentlemen use fflowers, onely for delight and smell: to please their fancy, & refine their tongues. Others, like y^e Bee extract only the honey, y^e wholesome precepts, and this alone they beare away, leaving y^e rest, as little worth of small value. R^s (Evans 628; Felltham, sigs. Aa1^v-Aa2)

The familiar metaphor of the bee pops up again. Felltham emphasizes moral instruction, though he cares for both. The opposition between instruction and delight, or *res* and *verba*, or matter and expression, or in Felltham’s own words, “conceit” and “words” (Felltham, sig. P3), is dialectical. The best reading and writing unify both. As Felltham describes, “A good *stile*, with *wholesome matter*, is a *faire Woman* with a *vertuous soule*” (sig. Aa2). Finally, reading and writing are inseparable.

Such as accustome themselues & are familiar wth y^e best Authors. Shall ever & anon, find somewhat of them in themselues: and in y^e expression of their minds

even when they feele it not, be able to utter somthing like theirs, w^{ch} hath an Authority aboue their owne. Dis. (628)

Here Ben Jonson (1572-1637) argues that for a man to write well, he must read the best authors. Where suitable, he can quote books as a higher authority. The process of reading and writing is a process of self-discovery. Evans's citation, "His worth commandeth my pen to waite on him" (887), implies that the authors he quotes are worthy ones, if not the "best Authors."

The readers of *Hesperides* generally combine reading and thinking, or reading and writing. Though few, *Hesperides* is not without its "fit audience" (Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 7.31). In addition to the few modern scholars who have looked at the manuscripts,² the actual known readers of *Hesperides* include Humphrey Moseley the publisher, James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps (1820-1889) in the Victorian period, and a late-eighteenth-century anonymous reader. The last of this group is identified through internal evidence based on paleography, for he/she writes in the manuscript. The late-eighteenth-century hand in *Hesperides* foregrounds the central place of the play in the Evans-Moseley canon, for the four extracts it adds are all dramatic:

Oh twas a sight that might have bleached joys rosy cheek for ever, and strewed the snows of age upon youths auburn ringlets—Cas Spec (Evans 17, "Afraid")
Never trifle with the feelings of a woman nor act so unmanly a part as to become a Persecutor, when Nature meant you should be a Protector.
—Shipwreck (Evans 23, "Advise")

It is not always that the eye that pities is accompanied by the hand that bestows, some there are who can smile without friendship and weep without charity.
— (Evans 40, "Appearance")

Ethereal loveliness informs her frame
And beams in living glory from her eyes
Yet oer these charms sublime meek modesty
Draws a transparent veil of wandering Grace
As fleecy Clouds flit oer the noonday Sun— (Evans 63, "Beauty")

The first extract is from Matthew Gregory Lewis's *The Castle Spectre* (1798), the second from Samuel James Arnold's *The Shipwreck* (1797), the third from Richard Cumberland's *The Wheel of Fortune* (1795), and the fourth from Sophia Lee's *Almeyda, Queen of Granada* (1796). All the four plays were performed at the Theatre-Royal, Drury Lane. We might imagine a London theater-lover who frequented the Theatre-Royal, Drury Lane toward the end of the eighteenth

² These scholars are Gunnar Sorelius, Peter Beal, and me. Heidi Brayman Hackel cites Sorelius's research on *Hesperides* (151), and she might have been a reader of *Hesperides*.

century; he/she recognized the importance of *Hesperides* as a commonplace collection of plays and added dramatic extracts to it. He/she enjoyed theatrical performances and the reading of plays; in particular, he/she enjoyed reading *Hesperides* as a commonplace anthology of plays and continued the anthologizing, bringing it up-to-date. With his/her acts of reading and extracting, this late-eighteenth-century anthologist—presumably an owner of the manuscript of *Hesperides*—reminds us emphatically of the nature of *Hesperides* as a dramatic anthology. More important, the anthologist extracts in the fourth excerpt a tragedy by a woman playwright, thus expanding the canon into a new domain, for Evans does not cite a work by a woman writer.³ Evans's successor rectifies his one-sided masculine leaning.

A second hand that adds to *Hesperides* emphasizes Shakespeare's central status in the canon.

To morrow & to morrow & to morrow
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
 To y^e last Syllable of recorded time
 And all o^f yesterdays have lighted fools
 The way to dusty death. Shakesp: Macb: (Evans 184, "Death")
 Out, out, brief candle
 Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player,
 That struts & frets his hour upon y^e stage
 And then is heard no more. It is a tale
 Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury
 Signifying nothing. Shakesp: Macbeth. (Evans 460, "Life")
 But reckning Time whose million accidents
 Creep in twixt vows, & change decrees of kings,
 Tan sacred beauty, blunt y^e sharpst intents,
 Divert strong minds to th' course of altring things.
 Shakespears Poems. p. 176. (Evans 775, "Time")

Following the page number in the last extract, I identify the source book as *The Poetical Works of Shakspeare. With the Life of the Author. Cooke's Edition. Embellished with Superb Engravings* (London, 1797). So this hand is also from the late eighteenth century at the earliest. One is tempted to think that it is the same hand as the above one, which is paleographically possible, i.e. the Shakespearean quotations are in the italic of the same hand. Life, death, and time—arguably, these are three most important universal subjects. No doubt, the

³ But see Hao, 2014: 172-173. Female dramatists before 1666 include Elizabeth Cary, Jane Lumley, Mary Sidney Herbert, Katherine Philips, and Margaret Cavendish. See Wilcox (ed.), 267-290. Early modern women poets include Mary Sidney Herbert, Anne Bradstreet, Aemilia Lanyer, Katherine Philips, and Margaret Cavendish. See Wilcox (ed.), 190-208.

additions are significant ones. This anthologist quotes from two genres: drama and poetry. Shakespeare occupies a central position in the seventeenth-century literary canon. In the Victorian age, James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps's act of cutting a version of *Hesperides* into pieces for the Shakespearean extracts also sets off the central place of the Bard. Admittedly, this is a historical hindsight; with Evans himself, the Shakespearean center is only latent and incipient.⁴ By the end of the eighteenth century, Shakespeare emerged triumphantly as the national hero of English literature, as can be attested by the above entries by the anonymous reader.

If the anonymous reader is an amateur one, *Hesperides* has several scholarly readers, who base their scholarly writings on their research of the commonplace book. Among them, the Victorian Shakespearean scholar James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps occupies a special place. Halliwell-Phillipps was born Halliwell, who adopted the additional surname Phillipps in 1872, following the death of his father-in-law, Sir Thomas Phillipps. This is "an ironic tag, after a lifetime at bitter variance" (Freeman and Freeman). Halliwell-Phillipps is most widely known by that name, so I use it throughout my thesis. Samuel Schoenbaum, Shakespeare's modern biographer, provides an account of Halliwell-Phillipps's life as a Shakespearean scholar (282-308), and Marvin Spevack has produced a book-length biography of Halliwell-Phillipps as a Shakespearean scholar and bookman (2001). Unfortunately, however, neither deals specifically with Halliwell-Phillipps's relationship with the manuscript of *Hesperides* or with Halliwell-Phillipps as an editor of Shakespeare.

How the *Halliwell* version of *Hesperides* came into Halliwell-Phillipps's possession we do not know. As Sorelius has pointed out, as early as 1843 Halliwell-Phillipps mentions a few extracts from Shakespeare's plays which John Payne Collier had found in "an early manuscript common-place book" and thought of some importance (Sorelius 295; Halliwell, 1843: 22-23), but we are unsure whether this is *Hesperides* or not. If it is, then Halliwell-Phillipps must have acquired the commonplace book from Mr. Collier. Then he cut the manuscript into pieces with scissors for the Shakespearean extracts. These extracts he mounted into his scrapbooks, which are now held respectively in the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Shakespeare Birthplace Library. In his 1859 publication *A brief hand-list of books, manuscripts, &c., illustrative of the life and writings of Shakespeare; collected between the years 1842 and 1859*, Halliwell-Phillipps mentions the three Folger manuscripts: no 133 (V.a.75), no 173 (V.a.79), and no 313 (V.a.80). Thus we know for certain that *Halliwell*

⁴ In his *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668) John Dryden describes Shakespeare as "the Homer, or father of our dramatic poets" (50). Dryden writes about the time when Evans has completed the compilation of *Hesperides* (1666).

somehow came into Halliwell-Phillipps's possession between 1842 and 1859. And Halliwell-Phillipps did not know the existence of *V.b.93*.

Why did Halliwell-Phillipps cut manuscripts and books into pieces? Schoenbaum thinks that the behavior "reflects a deep-seated aberration of character" (286). J. A. B. Somerset gives evidence that "other researchers [in the period also] indulged in the practice" (14). Spevack defends Halliwell-Phillipps's conduct: "The charge [of vandalism] is modern and myopic since it was not an unusual procedure in its time and none of Halliwell's friends and colleagues (who received gifts of single leaves) or enemies for that matter seemed to have objected. Besides, it is difficult to believe that Halliwell's passion for books was so unruly as to cause him to destroy anything but relatively worthless or defective copies" (2001, 590). Nonetheless, the once intact *Halliwell* version of *Hesperides* was not "relatively worthless or defective." In addition, Giles E. Dawson, former curator of manuscripts at the Folger Shakespeare Library, was able to identify an otherwise-perfect volume, the first edition of Raleigh's *History of the World*, from which a leaf is pasted in a Halliwell-Phillipps scrapbook (Schoenbaum 303n). And Peter W.M. Blayney's work proves that Halliwell-Phillipps cut over thirty-six hundred scraps from over eight hundred books (some of them very rare) printed before 1701, many of which were not defective before Halliwell-Phillipps's scissor-work (Alan Somerset 225). Without the modern technologies of scanning and photocopying available, and when the art of photography was inchoate and costly, Halliwell-Phillipps perhaps had to cut and scrap for his research work.

Halliwell-Phillipps cut *Hesperides* into pieces to help edit his folio edition of Shakespeare (1853-1865).⁵ He consistently recognizes the value of early manuscripts of Shakespeare for philological reasons: "It is reasonable to suppose that persons contemporary, or nearly so, with our great poet, were more likely to alter advisedly than modern editors, because they probably had a better knowledge of his language and allusions, if they were not so competent to judge of his excellencies."⁶ Early manuscript extracts can, claims Halliwell-Phillipps

⁵ In 1876 Halliwell-Phillipps produced his facsimile edition of the First Folio. Spevack notes in his *Classified Bibliography*, which is "really a chronological rather than a classified listing" (Alan Somerset 225), that the edition is "A reduced facsimile of the earlier one made by Staunton in 1866" (132). The information is inexact; according to Charlton Hinman, the Halliwell-Phillipps facsimile is based upon the No. 33 First Folio in the Folger collection, "and upon it alone, throughout the Comedies and from the beginning of the Histories through part of *1 Henry IV*. But from about the middle of *1 Henry IV*, throughout the rest of the Histories and all of the Tragedies, the facsimile is based exclusively upon the Staunton reproduction of 1866" (396).

⁶ Halliwell, 1843: 5-6. The same sentence appears in Halliwell, 1852: 74-75 with the ending word "excellences."

quoting Collier, “now and then throw light upon difficult and doubtful expressions” (1843, 23). But Halliwell-Phillipps is sensible enough to add that he does not claim for the manuscript “any additional value” (1843, 23). He uses a facsimile of the cut pieces of *Hesperides* in this way in his folio edition of Shakespeare: “curious, and worthy of notice,” but “generally of no real authority.”⁷ He usually calls the manuscript readings “unauthorized alterations,” “unauthorised and useless,” or even “corrupted.”⁸ The facsimile illustrates early modern adaptations of Shakespeare, but is no real textual authority. Unlike Edwin Wolf II, who advocates the textual importance of manuscript commonplace books, Halliwell-Phillipps tends to de-emphasize the textual importance of commonplace-book variants. And he does not recognize the significance of those variants for early modern reading practice.

Further, Halliwell-Phillipps points out that later writers alter the text of Shakespeare “to suit their own fancy.” Sometimes they alter “capriciously and absurdly.”⁹ Halliwell-Phillipps correctly notes that personal fancy and caprice often becomes the deciding factor in early modern textual variations.

Fancy also occupies a place in Humphrey Moseley’s reading of *Hesperides*. As we have discussed (Hao, 2014: 41-43), he entered the book into the Stationers’ Register in August 1655, and *Hesperides* appears in his publisher’s catalogues twice, in 1656 and 1660 respectively. The three are presented in similar terms; the last reads:

Hesperides, or the Muses’ Garden, stored with the choicest Flowers of Language and Learning, wherein grave and serious minds may tasthe [sic] Fruits of Philosophy, History and Cosmography with the sweets of Poetry, and the ceremonious Courtier, the passionate Amourist with his admired Lady, may gather Rarities suitable to their fancies, by *John Evans*, Gent. (Qtd. in Hao, 2014: 43)

Moseley properly regards *Hesperides*—the title is given by him—as a commonplace book (“being upon twelve hundred heads alphabetically digested”), a genre familiar to a man who has published *The English Treasury of Wit and Language* (May, 1655).¹⁰ As a commercial publisher and commissioner of the project, he stipulates the ideal readers of the book: “grave and serious minds,” and “the

⁷ *Works*, vol. 1, p. 395, n. 111.

⁸ “Unauthorized alterations:” *Works*, vol. 2, facing p. 177; vol. 3, facing p. 51, facing p. 133; vol. 4, facing p. 184; vol. 5, facing p. 308. “Unauthorised and useless:” vol. 2, p. 177, n. 10. “Corrupted:” vol. 7, facing p. 128.

⁹ *Works*, vol. 1, p. 395, n. 111; vol. 3, p. 133, n. 30.

¹⁰ For the publication date of *The English Treasury of Wit and Language* (no later than May 1st 1655), see Reed 111.

ceremonious Courtier, the passionate Amourist with his admired Lady.” The bipartite readership constitutes a neat contrast:

grave and serious minds	the ceremonious Courtier, the passionate Amourist with his admired Lady
Learning	Language
Philosophy, History and Cosmography	Poetry
tast[e]	gather
Fruits	Rarities suitable to their fancies

The dominating metaphor of the book’s title is the garden, and the two kinds of readers are both implied to be bees. Moseley’s literary reading captures his understanding of the content and the reading method of the commonplace book. The acts of “tasting” and “gathering” are suitable to *Hesperides*, for they point to the characteristic segmental reading which is particular to the genre (Hao, 2019). Since Learning and Language appeal to different faculties of human beings, we may extend the contrasts with an addition of reason vs. emotion. Moseley advertises a wide audience for his planned publication. Nearly every reader, serious or light, male or female, would be interested in this book. Appealingly, Moseley promises that the reader’s taste and fancy will be satisfied. We have a feel of the fashion language current on the mid-seventeenth-century book market. The advertisements show Moseley’s commercial acuity and compositional style.

Significantly, the intended readers of *Hesperides* include the “Courtier” (capitalized C). We immediately think of Baldassare Castiglione (1478-1529)’s *The Book of the Courtier*, “one of the most influential texts in Renaissance European culture” (Richards 43). Castiglione influenced early modern English culture mainly through Sir Thomas Hoby (1530-1566)’s translation (London, 1561).¹¹ The influence of this translation continued into the seventeenth century.¹² As Jennifer Richards observes, Hoby’s edition casts the *Courtier* as a manual of conduct by including marginal glosses for use as an index and appended summaries of the chief qualities desirable in the male and female courtiers (63), both of which are absent from modern editions such as the one translated by Charles Singleton. Although Castiglione’s original text is not prescriptive, the printing history of the English translation makes it a prescriptive text. In “A breef rehersall of the chiefe conditions and qualities in

¹¹ I am aware of seventeenth-century English parallels to Castiglione such as Richard Brathwaite’s *The English Gentleman and the English Gentlewoman* (London, 1641). Evans cites this book. See Appendix I, 106, 107, 178, 324 in Hao 2009 or 2014.

¹² After the first edition three editions of this book were published in the early modern period: 1577, 1588, 1603.

a Courtier” (sigs. Yy4-Zz2^v), we find many do’s and don’t’s concerning a courtier’s speech:

Not to be womanish in his sayinges or doinges.
 Not to be ouerseene in speaking wordes otherwhile that may offende where he ment it not.
 Not to be a babbler, brauler or chatter, nor lauish of his tunge.
 No lyer.
 To be well spoken and faire languaged.
 To be wise and well seene in discourses vpon states.
 To speake and write the language that is most in vre emonge the commune people, without inuenting new woordes, inckhorn tearmes or straunge phrases, and such as be growen out of vse by long time.
 Not to be ill tunded, especiallie against his betters.
 To speake alwaies of matters likely, least he be counted a lyer in reporting of wonders & straunge miracles.
 To delite and refresh the hearers mindes in being pleasant, feat conceited, and a meerie talker, applyed to time and place.
 To consyder well what it is that he doeth or speaketh, where, in presence of whom, what time, why, his age, his profession, the ende, and the meanes.
 His conuersation with women to be alwayes gentle, sober, meeke, lowlie, modest, seruiceable, comelie, merie, not bitinge or sclaudering with iestes, nippes, frumpes, or railinges, the honesty of any.

The same with “Of the chief conditions and qualityes in a waytyng gentylvvoman” (sigs. Zz3-Zz4^v):

To haue a sweetenesse in language and a good vttrance to entertein all kinde of men with communication worth the hearing, honest, applyed to time and place and to the degree and disposition of the person whiche is her principall profession.
 Not to speake woordes of dishonestye and baudrye to showe her self pleasant, free and a good felowe.
 To be heedefull in her talke that she offend not where she ment it not.
 To beeware of praysinge her self vndiscreatlye, and of beeing to tedious and noysome in her talke.
 Not to mingle with graue and sad matters, meerie iestes and laughinge matters: nor with mirth, matters of grauitie.
 To shape him that is ouersaucie wyth her, or that hath small respecte in hys talke, suche an answere, that he maye well vnderstande she is offended wyth hym.
 To vse a somewhat more famylyar conuersation wyth men well growen in yeeres, then with yonge men.

If we use one word to catch the essence of all these rules, it is decorum. Decorum in speech is achieved through exercise; the presumption of a conduct manual is that the advocated virtue can be learned. In terms of exercise, speaking cannot be separated from writing:

wrytyng is nothings elles, but a maner of speache ... Therefore it is certain, whatsoeuer is allowed in writing, is also allowed in speaking: and that speache is moste beautifull that is like vnto beautifull writinges. (sigs. E4^v-F1)

Knowledge ensures the success of speaking and writing well:

That therefore which is y^e principal mater & necessary for a Courtyer to speak & write wel, I beleue is knowledge. (sig. F3^v)

Therefore a courtier must be learned. He learns how to speak and write through imitation.

Let him much exercise hym selfe in poets, and no lesse in Oratours and Historiographers, and also in writinge bothe rime and prose, and especiallye in this our vulgar tunge. For beside the contentation that he shall receiue thereby himselfe, he shall by this meanes neuer want pleasaunt interteinments with women which ordinarylye loue such matters. (sig. H4)

The courtier takes upon learning to please women.

His loue towarde women, not to be sensuall or fleshlie, but honest and godlye, and more ruled with reason, then appetyte: and to loue better the beawtye of the minde, then of the bodie. (sig. Zz2^v)

Platonic love is preferred (cf. “his admired Lady”). Woman is the cause of poetry (sig. Ii1^v).

Just as “[s]ixteenth-century English readers were interested in the *Courtier* as a conversational treatise” (Richards 46), the intended readers of *Hesperides* would make use of it as a linguistic aid, to learn how to speak and write well from literary models. They take *Hesperides* as a reference library.¹³ Edward Vaughan suggests in *Ten Introductions* (London, 1594) that the reader keep multiple commonplace books of the Bible, “and then you shall be able readily and roundly, to speake artificially and diuinely of all things necessarie to saluation” (sig. K5). As Dutch humanist Rudolph Agricola (1443/44-1485)

¹³ For a discussion of the Renaissance trope of the library, see Sherman 62-63. Cf. David Parker: “If the commonplace book is indeed a private library *in parvo*, then the texts within are analogous to the books in the library” (164).

advises, the commonplace book “gathers together whatever can build up the resources of the future speaker or writer” (qtd. in Sherman 61). It seems to be a commonplace in Renaissance culture that the commonplace book aids speaking and writing. As the *Courtier* makes clear, eloquence is based upon learning and imitation. Equipped with decorous eloquence, which is obtained from the models in the commonplace book, a variety of readers can discourse freely and fully on all subjects, including love.

Commonplacing has two senses: commonplace writing (e.g. Milton’s commonplacing) and commonplace digesting (e.g. Evans’s commonplacing). In both cases reading and writing are inseparable. A writer creates on the basis of his reading; readers read the compilation of a commonplace reader and learn how to speak and write from it. The actual and potential readers of *Hesperides* regularly combine writing with reading. A study of the readers of *Hesperides, or the Muses’ Garden* recovers some facets of the early modern rhetorical culture and reveals the educational value of the genre of the commonplace book.

WORKS CITED

- Beal, Peter. *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*. Vol. 1, 1450-1625. Part 2. London: Mansell, 1980.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Courtyer of Count Baldessar Castilio*. Trans. Sir Thomas Hoby. London, 1561. STC 4778.
- Dryden, John. *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. Ed. John L. Mahoney. New York: Irvington, 1982.
- Evans, John. *Hesperides, or the Muses’ Garden*. Folger MS V.b.93 (abbreviated as V.b.93). Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C., USA. Manuscript.
- Felltham, Owen. *Resolves*. 5th ed. London, 1634. STC 10760.
- Freeman, Arthur and Janet Ing Freeman. “Phillipps, James Orchard Halliwell (1820-1889).” In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hackel, Heidi Brayman. “The ‘Great Variety’ of Readers and Early Modern Reading Practices.” In *A Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. David Scott Kastan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999: 139-157.
- Halliwell, James Orchard. *An Account of the Only Known Manuscript of Shakespeare’s Plays*. London: John Russell Smith, 1843.
- . *Some Account of the Antiquities, Coins, Manuscripts, Rare Books, Ancient Documents, and Other Reliques, Illustrative of the Life and Works of Shakespeare*. Brixton Hill: printed for private circulation only [by T. Richards], 1852.
- . *A Brief Hand-List of Books, Manuscripts, &c., Illustrative of the Life and Writings of Shakespeare; Collected between the Years 1842 and 1859, by James O. Halliwell*. London: J. E. Adlard, 1859.

- , ed. *The Works of William Shakespeare*. 16 vols. London: printed for the editor by J. E. Adlard, 1853-1865.
- Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard. "Notes upon the Works of Shakespeare" (abbreviated as *Halliwell*). 128 vols. Shakespeare Centre Library, Stratford-upon-Avon, UK. Manuscript.
- Hao, Tianhu. "Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden and its Manuscript History." *The Library* 7th ser. 10.4 (Dec. 2009): 372-404.
- . "Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden": *The Study of an Early Modern English Commonplace Book*. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014.
- . "Commonplace Book Compilation and Early Modern Reading: The Case of *Hesperides, or the Muses' Garden*." *DramArt: Journal of Theatre Studies* 8 (2019): 97-112.
- Hinman, Charlton. "The 'Halliwell-Phillipps Facsimile' of the First Folio of Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 5 (1954): 395-401.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. David Scott Kastan. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2005.
- Parker, David R. *The Commonplace Book in Tudor London*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1998.
- Reed, John Curtis. "Humphrey Moseley, Publisher." *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers* 2.3 (1929): 59-142.
- Richards, Jennifer. *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Schoenbaum, Samuel. *Shakespeare's Lives*. New ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Sherman, William H. *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.
- Somerset, Alan. Review of James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps: *The Life and Works of the Shakespearean Scholar and Bookman*. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54 (2003): 223-226.
- Somerset, J.A.B. "James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps and His Scrapbooks." *REED Newsletter* 2 (1979): 8-17.
- Sorelius, Gunnar. "An Unknown Shakespearean Commonplace Book." *The Library* 5th ser. 28 (1973): 294-308.
- Spevack, Marvin. *James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps: A Classified Bibliography*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1997.
- . *James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps: The Life and Works of the Shakespearean Scholar and Bookman*. New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press & Shephard-Walwyn, 2001.
- Vaughan, Edward. *Ten Introductions How to Read*. London, 1594. STC 24599.
- Wilcox, Helen, ed. *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wolf, Edwin 2nd. *The Textual Importance of Manuscript Commonplace Books of 1620-1660*. Charlottesville, VA: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1949.