

## ABRAHAM FRAUNCE, *THE SHEPHERDS' LOGIC* AND OTHER DIALECTICAL WRITINGS

Zenón Luis-Martínez, ed.

London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2016.

(by Rocío Gutiérrez Sumillera. Universidad de Granada)

sumillera@ugr.es

Many are the reasons why Zenón Luis-Martínez's critical edition of Abraham Fraunce's *The Shepherds' Logic* is a highly valuable contribution to early modern scholarship. On the one hand, Fraunce's *The Shepherds' Logic* was a relevant reflection on the arts of discourse in early modern England, and one that bears witness to the history of Ramism in that country, inseparable as well from the output of authors such as Roland MacIlmaine and Dudley Fenner. An adaptation of Ramus's *Dialecticae libri duo* (1556), *The Shepherds' Logic* revolves around the essential Ramist principle that logic ought to be separated from rhetoric, argues in favour of an idea of *method* that operates from general definitions towards particular precepts, and follows the Ramist practice of employing poetic examples to illustrate the principles of logic. Still, as Luis-Martínez shows, Fraunce is far from following Ramus blindly, and his thought diverges at times from that of Ramus. On the other hand, as the editor claims, "Fraunce's critical neglect after his death makes him a literary figure in need of reassessment", for even if his status may appear to be "that of a second-rate poet, the champion of a cause for the quantitative renovation of English metre that was born dead", he nonetheless "enjoyed a considerable notoriety during his lifetime" (18).

The edition of *The Shepherds' Logic* is a worthy philological endeavour also because the extant text has remained unpublished, is possibly unfinished, and relates in complex ways to Fraunce's published work *The Lawyer's Logic* (1588) and to

Edmund Spenser's *The Shepherd's Calendar* (1579). Indeed, it raises numerous questions in regard to Fraunce's literary milieu, while clarifying his understanding of poetry. In fact, the claim is made that *The Shepherds' Logic* is nothing short of "an independent and almost unique work for its distinct and exclusive focus on the relations between logic and poetry" (2), to the extent that it "is chiefly a book for poets and about poetry, a first-hand document showing how scholarly training in the arts of discourse could enlighten the composition and interpretation of poetic texts" (3). After all, we ought not to forget that Fraunce was a poet too: he translated in English hexameters Thomas Watson's *Amyntas* (1585), a collection of pastoral elegies in Latin, proving thus his commitment to the cause of quantitative verse. Also in hexameters was a series of mythological narratives after the manner of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* which he published in 1592; this became Fraunce's last book.

The only other attempt at an edition of this work was by Walter Ong's pupil Sister Mary M. McCormick, who in 1968 produced an old-spelling transcription of the text with a critical apparatus for her doctoral dissertation at St. Louis University (see Works Cited section for full reference). Ironically, her work has remained, as the text she edited, unpublished. Luis-Martínez has "newly transcribed the text using the manuscript and the facsimile edition, and compared the results with McCormick's text" (49). The 36 leaves in folio size of the manuscript, preserved in the British Library (Add MS 34361), additionally contain two companion essays also by Fraunce which have been likewise now edited: the six-page "On the Nature and Use of Logic", and the nine-page "A Brief and General Comparison of Ramus his Logic with That of Aristotle". These function as "theoretical supplements to the handbook-like exposition in *The Shepherds' Logic*" (3). The spelling and punctuation have been consistently modernised in the edition of all three texts contained in the manuscript.

Divided into eight sections, Luis-Martínez's 51-page introduction to his edition does much more than provide context to Fraunce's work: on its own it behaves as an abridged introduction to the disciplines of logic and rhetoric in the sixteenth century, the reform thereof launched by Ramus, its impact on the curriculum of English universities, and the ties between Ramism and Protestantism. It explains the ambivalence of Ramus towards Aristotle's dialectical works, his reform of the *Organon*, and his borrowings from the *Posterior Analytics*, which particularly shaped the development of his theory of method. It carefully studies the use of the abundant sources of *The Shepherds' Logic*, which include "Aristotle, Porphyry and Cicero among the classics; Peter of Spain and Duns Scotus among the scholastics; Philipp Melancthon, Johann Sturm, and Jacques Charpentier among the contemporary traditionalists; and Ramus, Omer Talon, Johann Piscator and

Friedrich Beurhaus among the contemporary reformers” (2). In this regard, Piscator’s *Animardversiones* (1581) becomes a major influence: on the one hand, Fraunce seems to have employed it “as a direct source for the text of Ramus’s manual” (25); on the other, Fraunce’s reliance on it accounts for some of his “conceptual discrepancies with Ramus” (26). Fraunce’s “Picastorian perspective” essentially results in his following the *via media* propounded by Picastor between Ramus and Melancthon’s thought (28).

The enthusiastic reception of Ramist logic at Cambridge becomes a focus of interest as well, and the circle of pupils among whom Laurence Chaderton was particularly inspiring is discussed. Not only is Fraunce among them, but also Gabriel Harvey, Spenser, and William Temple, all of whom affect or influence, in one way or another, Fraunce’s production. Given the scant biographical information we possess about both Fraunce and Spenser, educated guesses suggest that “if Fraunce did not meet Spenser in Cambridge, then his acquaintance with the *Calendar* and his determination to use it so extensively may have been encouraged by Harvey or more probably Sidney” (11). The origins of the project of *The Shepherds’ Logic* could thus be traceable to “Fraunce’s alleged first personal encounter with Sidney in 1581” (15), which makes the dedication of the extant version of the text to Edward Dyer somewhat puzzling, especially because the manuscript would appear to have been completed prior to Sidney’s death, and because the rest of Fraunce’s production was entirely dedicated either to Sidney or to a member of the Sidney family. Luis-Martínez’s sound explanation for Fraunce’s turn to Dyer looks at William Temple, Sidney’s personal secretary, and makes him wonder whether “despite his lifelong attachment to the Sidneys, the extant evidence about Fraunce might suggest that his personal expectations from the Sidney family were higher than his rewards” (19).

The exceptional fact that Spenser’s *The Shepherd’s Calendar* is the unrivalled source of Fraunce’s examples for his work on logic naturally becomes one of the main topics addressed in the introduction. Fraunce’s connection with Spenser and the reasons behind such a choice are explored in great detail: certainly, the unprecedented focus on a single author and a single work (and in the vernacular), and the acknowledgement in the title of the work itself of such a connection is a rarity worth examining. Even if many of the exemplars offered by Ramus were poetic, “Fraunce’s attention to poetry in a logic manual” is “unique”, and by means of his extensive use of the *Calendar*, Fraunce made “Spenser’s shepherds his titular characters and his sole authorities of logical wisdom”, and consequently “placed the relations between poetry and logic at the centre of his project” (36). For this reason Luis-Martínez understands *The Shepherds’ Logic* as “a poetic logic” (36) that perfectly illustrates the *natura*, *doctrina* and *usus* trinity: “In terms of

nature, poetry supplies the universal matrix of logical reasoning. In terms of doctrine, it helps illustrate theoretical principles. In terms of use, it becomes an object for analytical praxis and a model for the composition of new texts” (40).

The footnotes to the edited text include information about the use that Fraunce made of his Latin sources, and in addition offer information about the connection between Fraunce’s work and other contemporaneous material in the vernacular. For instance, Luis-Martínez presents telling parallels between Fraunce’s text and Dudley Fenner’s *The Artes of Logicke and Rethorike* (1584), which had gone unnoticed so far. This certainly sheds light on Fraunce’s “plagiarizing habits” (22). The footnotes also underscore “the scope of Fraunce’s indebtedness to Picastor” and his *Animaradversiones* (27). Moreover, passages from *The Lawyers’ Logic* are included either in bracketed additions to the body of the text, or in the footnotes and the appendixes: “These additions speculate on the possibility that Fraunce could have incorporated them into a final or ideal version of *The Shepherd’s Logic*” (49). In addition, Appendix III displays a comparative table of contents of *The Shepherd’s Logic*, Picastor’s edition of Ramus’s *Dialecticae libri duo*, and *The Lawyers’ Logic*. The other two appendixes provide excerpts and tables from *The Lawyers’ Logic* (Appendix I), and a series of highly helpful tables which catalogue, arranging them by month, the quotations from *The Shepherd’s Calendar* included in both *The Shepherd’s Logic* and *The Lawyers’ Logic* (Appendix II). These facilitate a comparison of the use of Spenser’s text in the two treatises. As customary with editions published by the MHRA, there is a “Textual Notes” section at the end of the work to supplement the rich comments of the footnotes that run throughout the text, a final glossary of rare and archaic words, and an updated bibliography.

144

## Works Cited

---

McCORMICK, Sister Mary M. (ed.) 1986. *A Critical Edition of Abraham Fraunce’s The Shepheardes Logike and Twooe Generall Discourses*. St Louis University: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.