

First Among Equals: The Utopian *Princeps*

The existence of a *princeps* in the "republic" of Utopia has proven a difficult crux for English translators of Utopia. The range of English translations of the Utopian *princeps* -- "prince," "governor," and even "mayor" -- gives some indication of the semantic problem: *princeps* is a word that for sixteenth-century humanists had an unmistakably monarchical meaning, but Utopia is not a monarchy.¹ Thus, translators are torn between rendering the Utopian *princeps* according to conventional sixteenth-century humanist usage or the quite different meaning that *princeps* has in the context of Utopia. Since, as Elizabeth McCutcheon has most effectively shown, the *neglecta simplicitas* of More's Latin style is anything but simple, the difficulty of finding an exact equivalent for *princeps* is not likely to be accidental.² Indeed, I want to argue that the confusing character of the Utopian *princeps* is deliberate on More's part and that this deliberate confusion serves a complex artistic purpose.

As a sixteenth-century humanist, Ralph Robinson translates the Utopian *princeps* as "prince." "Governor" and "mayor" are of course sixteenth-century words, but it is hard to imagine translating the title of Erasmus' *Institutio Principis Christiani* (1516), addressed as it was to Charles of Castile, the King of Spain and future Holy Roman Emperor, as anything other than *The Education of a Christian Prince*. Criticizing Robinson, Richard Marius has argued that *princeps* could simply mean "first official," not "prince."³ Marius' point may be technically correct, but humanist usage of *princeps* reflects a sad awareness that, as "advisers to the prince," the "first officials" to whom they offered their wisdom and learning were all too fallible monarchs. Thus, Sir Thomas Elyot defined *princeps* as "a prince, the first, or chief" in his 1538 *Dictionary*.⁴ Similarly, when Erasmus in the 1515 adage *Scarabeus aquilam quaerit*

castigates the rapacity and warmongering of European *principes*, he unmistakably means figures like Charles' grandfather, the Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian I, who had recently imposed a huge tax on the Netherlands, or the French monarchs of the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-centuries, with their insatiable desire for territorial expansion. Indeed, in this adage Erasmus uses *princeps* and *rex* interchangeably.⁵

Princeps is of course not a Utopian word but is itself a translation. In Book II Raphael uses *princeps* to denote an official for whom the Utopians have a word of their own -- the mock epithet *Ademus*. In Utopia a *princeps* is a mayor-like municipal official and is quite different from the *principes* who appear in Book I, which is largely devoted to an analysis of European politics. Why then does More not have Raphael call the Utopian *princeps* a *praefectus*, a word that More uses elsewhere for "mayor"?⁶

One answer is that More wants to preserve the verbal echo and thus satirically underscore the differences between rapacious European *principes* and their beneficent Utopian counterparts. Furthermore, the humanist philologist in More may also want his readers to take a fresh look at the word itself; as we shall see, historically *princeps* was an important marker of the end of the Roman republic. Ultimately, however; as a part of the political satire of *Utopia*, the existence of a *princeps* in Utopia cuts both ways: it demonstrates the inadequacies of European rulers but also suggests that the Utopians, despite their apparent removal from the power games of European courts, cannot escape the contamination of their political life by an office that denotes preeminence. This desire to be first of course can manifest itself in other political offices besides that of the "prince." Nevertheless, European-style monarchy clearly represents the apogee of the quest for preeminent political authority, and thus the shadow of the all-powerful prince falls over even the quite different Utopian *principes*.

Readers of Tacitus' *Annals* -- and his *Richard III* shows that More was one -- know that in pre-Augustan Rome *princeps* had the perfectly innocuous function of denoting the republican office *princeps senatus*. Augustus, however, *cuncta...nomine principis sub imperium accepit* [acquired complete dominion in

the name of *princeps*.] That is, Augustus, upon taking charge and effectively ending the Roman republic, cleverly avoided the opprobrious term *rex*, associated with the hated Tarquins, and cloaked his regal powers with a word whose provenance was the republic. Indeed, the word *imperium* gives some indication of the actual powers that Augustus acquired under the name of *princeps* since, according to the Oxford Latin Dictionary, it could denote the power enjoyed by both pre-republican kings and post-republican emperors. The shift in the meaning of *princeps* marks the transition from republican to imperial Rome, and this shift lies behind humanist usages of *princeps*. Thus in Erasmus' *Scarabeus aquilam quaerit* the eagle -- famed standard of ancient Rome's legions as well as symbol of the contemporary Holy Roman Empire -- designates a form of empowered greed that extends from antiquity to the sixteenth century.

Indeed, the early sixteenth-century saw the power of monarchs clearly approaching rather than retreating from the precedent of imperial Rome. In 1494 Charles VIII of France had crossed the Alps and inaugurated a series of wars that demonstrated the weakness of city-states in comparison to the burgeoning nation-state, united under the leadership of a strong monarch. Likewise, in 1516 Henry VIII, despite his humanist education, was already giving signs of the extreme willfulness that would serve him well during the break from Rome. In a 1515 letter, Erasmus described himself as having awakened to the fact that the reign of Henry VIII would not be a "golden age."⁸ Nor in 1516 could anyone miss the potential of Charles of Castile, as King of Spain and grandson of the Holy Roman Emperor, to unite an enormous territory under his rule.

Like the Europeans, the Utopians have been given a chance to model themselves on imperial Rome. According to Raphael, some Egyptian and Roman sailors landed in Utopia in the third century A.D., and the Utopians learned from them every art *intra Romanum imperium, unde possit aliquis esse usus* (CW4, 108/8-9). But whatever else the Utopians absorbed from imperial Rome, they did not absorb its no longer republican form of government. For Utopia is republic in deed as well as name. Clearly, the Roman exaltation of one man to a position of preeminent and indisputable political authority did not pass the

Utopian test of *usus* or utility. The Utopian rejection of this aspect of Rome represents a road not taken in the history of Europe.

In *Utopia*, then, the *princeps* -- whether European or Utopian -- inevitably recalls Rome's complex political legacy to sixteenth-century Europe. However; the meaning of *princeps* is not limited to this legacy but shifts in different contexts. Indeed, the semantic variability of *princeps* is evident from the opening paragraph of Book I:

Quum non exigui momenti negocia quaedam invictissimus Angliae Rex Henricus eius nomine octavus, omnibus egregii *principis* artibus ornatissimus, cum serenissimo Castellae *principe* Carolo controversa nuper habuisset,... oratorem me legavit in Flandriam, comitem & collegam viri incomparabilis Cuthberti Tunstalli... Occurrerunt nobis Brugis (sic enim convenerat) hi, quibus a *principe* negotium demandabatur, egregii viri omnes. In his praefectus Brugensis vir magnificus *princeps* & caput erat, caeterum os & pectus Georgius Tlemsicus..., non arte solum, verum etiam natura facundus... tum assiduo rerum usu eximius artifex. ubi semel atque iterum congressi quibusdam de rebus non satis consentiremus, illi... Bruxellas profecti sunt, *principis* oraculum sciscitaturi. (CW4 46/8-29; italics mine)

[The most invincible King of England, Henry, the eighth of that name, who is distinguished by all the accomplishments of a model *monarch*, had certain weighty matters recently in dispute with His Serene Highness, Charles, *Prince* of Castile... he sent me as a commissioner into Flanders -- as a companion and associate of the peerless Cuthbert Tunstall.... We were met at Bruges... by those men put in charge of the affair by the *Prince* -- all outstanding persons. Their *leader* and head was the Burgomaster of Bruges... but their chief speaker and guiding spirit was Georges de Themsecke, Provost of Cassel, a man not only trained in eloquence but a natural orator -- most learned too in law and consummately skillful in diplomacy... When after one or two meetings, there were certain points on which we could not agree sufficiently, they bade farewell to us for some days and left for Brussels to

seek an official pronouncement from the *Prince*. (CW4, 47/8-33; I have italicized all translations of *princeps*)]

This passage, with all its humorous display of pomp and rank, also inflects the meaning of *princeps* in numerous ways. The royal *principes* are introduced first: King Henry VIII, adorned with all the arts of a *princeps*, and Charles of Castile, in 1515 a prince but not a king (here the two are uncharacteristically not synonymous, although they would be by the time More finished *Utopia*). Interestingly, a *princeps* who is also a mayor appears in the figure of the *praefectus Brugensis*, whose role is also that of *princeps* and *caput* of the opposing delegation. Of course, we soon learn the limits of the kind of preeminence that a local magistrate can enjoy in Europe. When a sticking point in the negotiations is reached, the opposing delegation repairs to Brussels to seek the *oraculum principis* -- i.e. the oracular dictate of their true head, Charles. This phrase, translated in CW4 as "official pronouncement of the Prince," conveys in a nutshell the thrust of More's satire against princely rule. For all the accomplishments and abilities of the opposing delegation and for all their own display of pomp and self-importance, they have no real authority. Instead, they must treat as not only "official" but also oracular and divine the pronouncements of someone their junior in experience, but their political superior.

In *Utopia*, however, the only *princeps* is a local magistrate, who does not have to report to a higher authority. Russell Ames has noted that *Utopia* does not have one prince but that rather each Utopian city has its own elected prince.⁹ The elections of the *princeps* once again bring the Utopian criterion of utility into prominence:

Demum Syphroganti omnes, qui sunt ducenti, iurati lecturos sese, quem maxime censent *utilem*, suffragis occultis renunciant unum videlicet ex his quatuor, quos eis populus nominavit. Nam a quaque urbis parte, selectus unus commendatur senatui. Principis magistratus perpetuus est in omnem illius vitam, nisi tyrannidis affectatae suspicio impediatur. (CW4, 122/14-20)

[The whole body of syphrogants, in number two hundred, having sworn to choose the man whom they judge most useful, by secret balloting appoint a governor, specifically one

of the four candidates named to them by the people, for one is selected out of each of the four quarters of the city to be commended to the senate. The governor holds office for life, unless ousted on a suspicion of aiming at a tyranny. (CW4, 123/12-21)]

The electoral process carefully distinguishes the Utopia *princeps* from a tyrant. Although the Utopian *princeps* is in power for life, he can be removed if suspected of affecting tyranny. He is no "oracle," and, like all other Utopians, is judged pragmatically according to his ability to perform a function. The Utopian choice of a *princeps*, like their selective absorption of the arts of the Roman empire, rejects all that tends toward solely individual gratification and rapacity.

The Utopian *princeps* is also chosen out of the ranks of literati or the Utopian class that most resembles the humanists themselves:

Ex hoc literatorum ordine legati, sacerdotes, Tranibori, ac ipse denique deligitur princeps, quem illi prisca ipsorum lingua Barzanem, recentiore Ademum appellant. (CW4, 132/5-8) [It is out of this company of scholars that they choose ambassadors, priests, tranibors, and finally the governor himself, whom they call in their ancient tongue Barzanes but in their more modern language Ademus. (CW4, 133/5-9)]

Note that this list of Utopian officials begins with legates and ends with the *princeps* -- the two groups represented in the opening paragraph of *Utopia*. Of course, in Book I More and his fellow negotiators, as legates of monarchs, are merely creatures of the *principes* whom they serve. In Utopia, however, *principes* and *legati* are drawn from the same social ranks and thus no huge chasm of authority seems to separate them. Like other Utopians, the social order common to legates and princes eschews pomp and self-inflation. Thus, the Utopian *princeps* carries a handful of grain instead of a scepter. (CW4, 194/5)

But the Utopian *princeps* is also named *Ademus*, a ruler without a people. This name might seem to indicate that Utopia and the vision of a reformed politics that it represents is an impossibility. In *Scarabeus aquilam quaerit* Erasmus had

distinguished between *principes* as one finds them in historical annals and the *principes* who *administrent rempublicam in urbe Platonica*.¹⁰ Only the latter in Erasmus' view fitted the definition of the monarch as "utilissimum" -- a definition that recalls the criterion by which Utopian *principes* are elected. Yet, these Platonic *principes* are not a part of history. Similarly, the name *Ademus* suggests that the divergence of the Utopian *principes* from the Roman empire is not an alternative historical possibility but belongs entirely in the realm of unattainable ideals.

Yet, *Ademus* has another implication. The name also indicates the dependence of European potentates on the people as their audience. For the power of European princes is, in its own way, as illusory as the existence of Plato's philosopher kings. Without a populace willing to suspend its disbelief, European *principes* might well begin to discard their posturing and resemble their Utopian counterparts. Indeed, the collusion of the populace and the monarch is the point of the famous passage in More's *Richard III*, where the people of London are the tacitly assenting spectators of the *tragici ludi* or tragic games of Richard. As the people pretend to believe Richard's reluctance to become king, they become collaborators in his bid for the throne.¹¹

In Utopia, however, the people do not lend their support to such princely games, and the point at which this becomes most evident is the visit of the Anemolian envoys to Utopia. These envoys are drawn from the nobility (CW4 154/10) -- a group in close proximity to that of European-style monarchs -- and they act accordingly. Thus, the Anemolians emulate princely pomp and try by their splendid dress *deos quosdam repraesentare* to the Utopian people (CW4 154/7). However, they merely succeed in appearing to be *moriones legatorum* (CW4, 154/31) -- a punning phrase that recalls More's own somewhat pretentious foolery in the service of Henry VIII at the outset of Book I. That is, the Utopian people who throng the streets to see the Anemolians remain unimpressed and completely misinterpret the Anemolians, taking the masters for slaves and idiots and the underlings for lords. *Superbi magis quam sapientes*, the Anemolians end up abashed (CW4, 154/6); they are deprived of a pliable *demos* and their experience shows that the name

Ademos undercuts the European as well as Utopian brand of politics.

In a letter to Erasmus written as *Utopia* was at the printer's, however, More himself suggested another reading of the encounter of Anemolians and Utopians. Indeed, he turned the encounter into a dream of a meeting between Utopian and European *principes* and wittily made himself the representative of the former.

...ita mihi assidue versatur ob oculos perpetuum destinari mihi principatum ab Utopianis meis, quin iam nunc mihi videor incedere coronatus insigni illo diademate frumentaceo, conspicuus paludamento Franciscano, praeferens venerabile sceptrum e manipulo frugis, stipatus insigni Amaurotorum comitatu atque ita celebri pompa legatis atque principibus aliarum gentium occurrere, miseris plane prae nobis, stulte videlicet superbientibus, quod veniant ornati pueriliter et mundo muliebri onusti,... Equidem etsi superis visum est nostram humilitatem ad hoc fastigii et sublimitatis evehere, cui nullum regum posse conferri censeo, veteris tamen illius consuetudinis quae mihi olim privato fuit vobiscum, numquam me sentietis immemorem... efficiam ut mortales omnes quos clementiae nostrae regit imperium, id honoris exhibeant vobis quem debent eis quos intelligunt ipsorum principi esse charissimos.¹²

[...For in my daydreams I have been marked out by my Utopians to be their king forever; I can see myself now marching along, crowned with a diadem of wheat, very striking in my Franciscan frock, carrying a handful of wheat as my sacred scepter, thronged by a distinguished retinue of Amaurotians, and, with this huge entourage, giving audience to foreign ambassadors and sovereigns; wretched creatures they are, in comparison with us, as they stupidly pride themselves on appearing in childish garb and feminine finery, laced with that despicable gold, and ludicrous in their purple and jewels and other baubles. Yet, I would not want either you or our friend Tunstal to judge me by other men, whose character shifts with fortune... you will never find me forgetful of that old friendship I had with you when I was but

a private citizen.... I shall definitely see to it that all mortals governed by my kindly rule will show you the honor due to those who, they know, are very dear to the heart of their king.]¹³

Here, the simplicity of Utopia once again appears to meet a form of display that is reminiscent of Anemolians; indeed, the phrase *stulte superbientibus* explicitly recalls the *superbi* rather than *sapientes* Anemolians. However, More identifies himself here with the Utopian *princeps* and leadership whereas in *Utopia* the pun on *moriones* had served to link More, as legate of Henry VIII, with the Anemolians. Indeed, the passage provides a wonderful example of what critics have seen as More's ability to enter his own fiction -- in this case, even after its apparent completion.¹⁴

In this letter to Erasmus, More becomes a character in a kind of brief *sequel* to *Utopia*. But most importantly the humor of the passage is that, however the character "More" dresses himself in the trappings of humility, including a Franciscan cloak, part of the pride and pomp conspicuously on display here belongs to him as well as to the Anemolian-like *principes*. Even as "More" protests that he will not forget his old friends, his magnanimity seems to exalt him to ever greater heights of self-esteem. Here, Utopian *principes*, as represented by "More," parody rather than simply form a humane alternative to their European counterparts. An *imperium* of clemency is nevertheless still an *imperium*, swelling with as much self-importance as the Anemolians.

This passage indicates the susceptibility of even a Utopian *princeps* to the temptations of an audience willing to attend to his self-importance. Earlier in the same letter, More had compared Erasmus himself to a king, whose familiarity More considered a personal *triumphus*. That comparison, coupled with the later triumphal progress of "More" as *princeps* of *Utopia*, contains a disturbing yet also amusing insight: Europe's humanist literati, even as they criticize and imagine alternatives to the ludic antics of princely courts, also ape those antics. The desire to be "first" and to dominate others extends even to areas of human endeavor like learning and virtue that the humanists attempted to make their own. Learning and virtue might seem as far removed from the

territorial disputes of European princes as Utopia itself, but they could elicit some of the same passions as the rivalries of monarchs.

This insight of More's had its historical foundation. Titanic ego battles between humanists over scholarly and literary preeminence were legion during the Renaissance and represented the intellectual counterpart to the militarism of monarchs. Indeed, humanist polemics could become entwined with such princely warmongering. For instance, the poetic dispute (1513-1520) between More and the French humanist, Germain de Brie, was inaugurated by a poem that Brie wrote in response to a naval battle between the English and the French.¹⁵ Brie and More continued their hostilities intermittently, as did England and France, all the way to 1520, and thus this intellectual controversy provided a dramatic instance of humanists using their prime weapon -- the printing press -- to emulate the conflicts of European *principes*.

Ultimately the problem linking Utopian and European *principes* is fallen human nature and, in particular, its irreparable contamination by the sin of *superbia*, or pride. In his peroration, Raphael significantly calls pride the *omnium princeps, parensque pestium*, where *princeps*, translated in *CW* 4 as "chief," may also carry a suggestion of "prince" (242/25). Pride, according to Raphael, keeps other nations from adopting Utopian institutions whereas the Utopians are presumed to be free from its grasp. Yet, one point of More's revision of the Anemolian-Utopian encounter is to insinuate that the bearer of a handful of grain can display as much pride as the bearer of a regal scepter. Even in Utopia, where all are more or less equal, someone gets to be "first" in ways that recall, however distantly, the behavior of European monarchs. Pride, the ultimate *princeps*, is not entirely absent from Utopia, but rather demonstrates an ability to manifest itself in the apparently incongruous setting of a country without the usual marks of social difference -- wealth and possessions.

But in general the Utopian *principes* do present an attractive alternative to the *principes* that European humanists knew. To be sure, when More dreams of once again becoming a character in his own fiction and *princeps* of Utopia, his daydream does not bode well for the reformation of human nature and elimination of

the pride that Raphael unknowingly ascribes to the Utopians. But, as *princeps* of Utopia, the character "More" is constrained to display his power and self-importance in acts of clemency rather than murder. Similarly, in his battle with Brie, the historical More availed himself of erudition and print rather than artillery. The change of the medium in which fallen human nature expresses itself obviously makes a considerable difference. Thus, the most hopeful aspect of the *principes* is not their complete eradication of princely pride and hunger for domination, as Raphael argues, but rather their transformation of these inescapable attributes of human nature into a zeal for learning and a kind of political leadership that has the potential to be useful rather than merely destructive.¹⁶

Department of English
 Barnard College
 Columbia University
 New York, NY 10027-6598

David Butler

NOTES

1. The translation "governor" occurs *passim* in the Yale *Utopia*, ed. E. Surtz and J.H. Hexter, *CW* 4 (1965), the translation "mayor" in Paul Turner's translation (Penguin Books, 1961), and "prince" in Ralph Robinson's translations of 1551 and 1556. All references are to *CW* 4. J.H. Lupton in his 1895 Oxford edition also argues that the Utopian *princeps* is really a "mayor" (xlv and 136).

2. "Denying the Contrary: More's Use of Litotes in *Utopia*" in *Essential Articles for the Study of Thomas More*, ed. R.S. Sylvester and G.P. Marc'hadour (Hamden, CT: Archon, 1977), 263-74.

3. Marius' introduction to the Ralph Robinson translation of *Utopia* is found in the Everyman edition (London and Melbourne, 1988). The Oxford Latin Dictionary does give translations for *princeps* -- "leader" and "chief" -- that approximate Marius' "first official." My contention is not that Marius is wrong so much as that no sixteenth-century humanist could have read the word *princeps*, used as the designation of a political office, and not thought also of the monarchical meaning of *princeps*.

4. The facsimile edition of Elyot's 1538 *Dictionary*, ed. R.C. Alston (Menston, England: The Scolar Press Limited, 1970).

5. The following passage from *Scarabeus aquilam quaerit* in ASD II-6 (400) offers an example of the apparent interchangeability of *rex* and *princeps*:

Sed hic protinus tacite mihi dicis, optime lector, quid haec imago ad regem, cuius propria laus est clementia, cumque plurimum possit, nulli tamen velle nocere ac solum aculeo carere seseque totum in populi sui commoditates impendere, adeo vt Niloxenus ille sapiens rogatus, quid esset vtilissimum, responderit 'Rex', id esse proprium veri principis indicans, vt, quantum in ipso sit, nemini noceat, prosit omnibus sitque magis optimus quam maximus. Quanquam non alia ratione potest esse maximus, nisi vt sit quam optimus, hoc est beneficentissimus in omnes. Equidem exemplar laudo non inscite depictum a philosophis, et haud scio an eiusmodi principes administrarent rempublicam in vrbe Platonica. Verum in annalibus vix vnum aut alterum reperias, quem ausis cum hac imagine componere (italics mine).

[But here, gentle reader, I hear you silently saying to me: what has this metaphor to do with being a king? A king's highest glory is to be merciful, and, being all-powerful himself, to wish to hurt no one; to lack a sting alone of all the hive, to devote himself entirely to the well-being of his people, so truly that when that wisest of sages Niloxenus was asked, "What is the most useful of all things?" he replied, *Rex*. He meant to say by that it is the mark of the true prince, to hurt no one, to be a benefit to all, as far as in him lies, and to be the best rather than the greatest. In reality, he can only be greatest by being best, that is by being the most beneficent of all. For my part, I admire the pattern monarch, which the philosophers skilfully paint for us, and I hardly think such princes are to be found ruling the state in the city of Plato. Certainly in the annals of history one could not find more than one or two whom one would dare to compare with this model.]

Translation from Margaret Mann Phillips, *Erasmus on his Times: A Shortened Version of the Adages* (Cambridge UP, 1967), 50-51. For a discussion of the topical references in *Scarabeus aquilam quaerit*, see "The Eagle of Empire: A Bird of Prey" in James Tracy's *The Politics of Erasmus: A Humanist Intellectual and his Milieu* (U of Toronto P, 1978), 23-47.

6. See CW 4, 298 for a discussion of More's use of *praefectus* to denote a "mayor".

7. The opening paragraph of Tacitus' *Annales*.

8. Letter 333, *Erasmii Epistolae*, ed. P.S. Allen (Oxford UP, 1909), 2: 70. Englished in *CWE* 3, 87-89.

9. See the following passage in Ames' *Citizen More and his Utopia* (Princeton UP, 1949), 86-7:

The election and function of a "prince" is described in a very vague way, perhaps with deliberate vagueness. It is not stated that there is one "prince" for all Utopia. It is said that every thirty families elect a Syphrogante, and that the Syphrogantes choose the prince from four candidates named by the people out of the four quarters of the city. Does this mean that each city has its own "prince" or chief magistrate? Does it mean that Amaurote, the chief city, elects the prince for all Utopia? This would be inconsistent with the otherwise complete equality of cities and citizens: Amaurote is merely the seat of Parliament. Either More was careless of details in this matter... or we are brought to the rather startling conclusion that there really is no prince in Utopia.

Ames signals his suspicions of the Utopian "prince" by enclosing the word in quotation marks. For Ames, the word is clearly a misnomer, but he offers no explanation as to why More gives Utopia a "prince" that is no prince.

10. Note 5 above.

11. *Historia Richardi Tertii in In Defense of Humanism*, ed. Daniel Kinney (CW15), 482.

12. Letter 499, *Epistolae Erasmi* 2: 414. Englished in *CWE* 4, 163-64.

13. I have quoted the translation from lxxviii-ix of Hexter's introduction to *CW* 4. Hexter's reading of this passage differs significantly from my own.

14. Elizabeth McCutcheon in *My Dear Peter: The Ars Poetica and Hermeneutics for More's Utopia* (Angers: Editions Moreana, 1983, especially 21ff. and 45ff.) and Clare M. Murphy in "Un aspect de *différance* dans l'*Utopie* de More," *Autrement Dire*, 3/4 (1986-87), 123-133 both address More's metafictional strategies and shifting personae in *Utopia*.

15. Stephen Foley, "Appendix A: The *Chordigera* of Germanus Brixius" in *Latin Poems*, ed. Clarence Miller, Leicester Bradner, Charles Lynch, and Revilo Oliver, *CW*3, Part II, 430-37.

16. I would like to thank the following for their generous help and encouragement with this article: Kathy Eden, Margaret Ferguson, Jean Howard, David Kastan, Anne Prescott, and the anonymous readers on the Editorial Board of *Moreana*.