John Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*: Approaching Problematic Likeness as a Rhetorical Response to Ideas of Friendship

Hsin-yi Hsieh

ABSTRACT

Friendship and likeness were popular subjects in classical rhetoric and humanist education in sixteenth-century England, which John Lyly aimed to anatomize in his literary debut—*Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* (1578). A young Oxonian graduate, Lyly presented a challenge to the classical and biblical paradox of friendship that had been rhetorically bound up with the ideal of likeness. He, reader and contributor to the nascent form of English fiction, was aware of an active readership, and his investigation of the subject of friendship demonstrates his keenness to diversify an understanding of likeness as a variable element that goes far beyond the polar opposites of positive and negative assessments. Accordingly, this article examines Lyly's approach to a series of problematic likeness as a rhetorical response to ideas of friendship, how he manipulates and questions the problematic, mutating ideal of likeness from different layers of rhetorical resemblance. First, he considers his readership with reference to the literary likeness between his work and contemporary subjects. Second, he rethinks the unlikely likeness between young and old. Third, he doubts the uncertain, superficial likeness between man and man. Fourth, he describes a treacherous, inconstant likeness between man and woman. Finally, he wonders at a divine likeness between man and God but elaborates upon it more as his protagonist's practice of rhetorical persuasion.

KEYWORDS John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*, friendship, likeness

---

Ex-position, Issue No. 49, June 2023 | National Taiwan University
DOI: 10.6153/EXP.202306_(49).0001

Hsin-yi HSIEH, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, National Chung Hsing University, Taiwan

Introduction

As symylytude ioyned frendshippes, so dissimylytude disseuerith them.

--Cicero, De Amicitia[1]

John Lyly, reader and contributor to the nascent form of English fiction, was aware of an active readership, and his investigation of the subject of friendship demonstrates his keenness to diversify an understanding of likeness as a variable element that goes far beyond the polar opposites of positive and negative assessments.[2] He explores ideas of friendship as rhetorical issues, which involve a paradoxical blend of similitude and dissimilitude between juxtaposed objects. Modern scholarship on Lyly's first literary success *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* (1578, hereafter, the *Anatomy*),[3] although examined using different approaches, is commonly agreed to be an influential revival of an antique debate on the nature of love and friendship. Richard A. McCabe examines love as a rhetorical means for Euphues to express his "unbridled will" (306), whereas friendship is set in the background against the protagonist's unrequited love. Tom MacFaul further contextualizes the conflict between romantic love and ideal friendship in relation to "the narrative and dramatic form of the jealousy plot—in which two friends love the same woman" (65). Katherine Wilson considers love and friendship more as subjects of rhetoric than themes of a romantic story, believing that "Lyly provides plenty of hints that

The present article is part of a research project (102-2410-H-005-045-MY2) financed by National Science Council (National Science and Technology Council since 2022) in Taiwan. The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their encouraging suggestions and inspiring feedback, which helped improve the early version of the manuscript.

[1] This is the first English edition of Cicero's *De Amicitia*, translated by John Tiptoft in 1481; the above quotation is cited from Laurie Shannon (17).

[2] Modern literature on early modern likeness tends to be less pleasant. This is because, in Shannon's terms, "[w]hether sameness is empty, inevitable, reactionary, or impossible, each of these accounts—for diverse good reasons—casts likeness in negative terms" (20). However, contemporary readers, as Shannon attempts to demonstrate, never formed "a passive readership" on the "[r]hetoric of friendship likeness" (22). Shannon is correct, but her study rarely refers to Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*, where a series of problematic likeness indeed serves as a rhetorical response to ideas of friendship. In fact, Lyly was not only aware of an active readership but also eager to elaborate on the mutative power of rhetorical resemblance, a matter far more complicated than modern scholarship's approach to a mere binary opposition between positive and negative assessments.

[3] *The Anatomy* was first published in 1578, with a revised second edition and another reprint both published in 1579. The text of the *Anatomy* quoted throughout this essay is Leach Scragg's edition, which is based on the second edition, for, according to Scragg, "it was this text that became the basis for subsequent sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century editions" (Lyly 21).

reading the *Anatomy* should be regarded as an aesthetic rather than a moral experience" (56), in that "[r]aising children has turned into an aesthetic experience of comparing colour contrasts" (58). On the whole, earlier research treats Lyly's depiction of love as a correlated opposite to his investigation of ideas of friendship. However, the present article takes love as a kind of amity that bears a mutated resemblance to friendship—a rhetorical consequence of similitude; thus, the more similarity exists between love and friendship, the more problematic likeness is found both in the failure of romantic love and in the confusion of friendship. Love and friendship are neither antonyms, nor conflicting emotions reducible to polar opposites; instead, Lyly perceived them as rhetorical subjects with some curious likeness to one another.

The topic of friendship and likeness was commonplace when the *Anatomy* was revised and reprinted in 1579, followed by the publication of its sequel *Euphues and His England* (1580). Lyly was familiar with Greco-Roman rhetoric, where one person's likeness to another, especially regarding a good-natured birth, well-nurtured education, gentle manner, and, most importantly, virtuous character, were prerequisites for a true, long-lasting friendship. However, this young Oxonian graduate presented a challenge to the classical and biblical model of friendship that had been rhetorically bound up with the ideal of likeness. In the *Anatomy*, differences between characters are dismissed in the name of ideal similitude and are included under the notion of friendship on a wider scale. The ideal of likeness becomes problematic in the way that Lyly treats it as both a cause and solution to human conflict.

In sixteenth-century England, similitude was a widespread concept in rhetorical training, and likeness was a notable criterion for friendship in classical authorities, of which Aristotle and Cicero were most frequently referred to. Before an anti-Ciceronian movement arose in England in the 1590s, Cicero was a standard subject of Latin-learning, with *De Amicitia* (*On Friendship*) included as an essential reference text. Although, unlike Cicero, "little of Aristotle's work entered grammar school curricula directly" (Enterline 132), much of his philosophy, especially from *Nicomachean Ethics*, was condensed into easily memorized quotations for rhetorical purposes. In *Nicomachean Ethics*, books eight and nine focus on the subject of friendship (*philiā*/*φιλια*), which, according to Aristotle, "is a virtue or involves virtue, and is an absolute necessity in life" (8.2). For Aristotle there are three types of friendship, based on "utility," "pleasure," and "goodness" (8.3), a part of which mutated into Ciceronian ideas in *On Friendship*. For example, Aristotle holds some doubts about the reliability of likeness in nature, for there are unresolved conflicts in defining friendship with regard to whether "[o]pposition is a

helper," or really "like seeks like" (8.1). Cicero, on the other hand, proposes that friendship begins with the natural impulse of a shared attraction to virtue, for "nothing so powerfully attracts and draws one thing to itself as likeness does to friendship" (14).[4] Ciceronian rhetoric, developed from Aristotle's philosophy, is further drawn into *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531), in which Sir Thomas Elyot expounds "true friendship" as "an allectiue to good men, to seek for their semblable, on whome they maye practise Amitie" (P6r-v).[5] Thomas Wilson also compliments Cicero in *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553), where similitudes along with other figures, such as examples, comparisons, and allegories, are acknowledged as to "serue for amplifying" (Aa3r).[6] As a whole, friendship from an educational perspective of resemblance could serve as a topic for practicing rhetoric, as a relationship developing along with dialectic interactions between two or more sides, or as a rhetorical model practiced to debate with oneself or others.[7]

Lyly's approach to ideas of friendship in the *Anatomy* is colored with both positive and negative effects of rhetoric that can be elegant, eloquent, persuasive, and impressive on the one hand, and artificial, fictional, temporary, unreliable, self-debating, less poetic, and loquacious on the other. In a broad sense, Lyly's use of "wit" presents an organic synthesis of the above-mentioned rhetorical effects that can be personified as the eponymous hero whose adventure is also composed of balance and antithesis, which is characteristic of Lyly's euphuism, a term first attributed to the prose narrative of the *Euphues* series. Particularly in the *Anatomy*, an instant male friendship is anatomized as an unstable effect of wordplay that involves dialectic progress between similitude and dissimilitude, and where an intense heterosexual love is not romantically displayed but doomed as though it were a catastrophic relationship contrary to an ideal of likeness. Seemingly, Euphues's journey to Naples is recounted as an Athenian youth's experience in search of a perfect friendship grounded in an ideal of likeness, in which Lyly shows there to be more imperfection than perfection. This ideal of likeness is intended to escape resemblance to moral purpose so as to create more room for accommodating differences.

---

[4] The Ciceronian quotations throughout this essay are cited from E. S. Shuckburgh's translation of the English title, *Treatise on Friendship and Old*. The style of documentation and the Arabic numeral here refer to the partition, as this edition has no book or chapter divisions.

[5] Although *The Boke Named the Governour* was first published during the reign of Henry VIII, there were more editions available throughout the sixteenth century, and at least two came out in Elizabethan times: one in 1565 when Lyly was a schoolboy, and the other in 1580 when Lyly was already known as the author of *Euphues* series.

[6] *The Arte of Rhetorique* was reprinted several times in the 1560s (at least in 1560, 1562, 1563, and 1567) and in the 1580s (at least in 1580, 1584, and 1585).

[7] See also the definitions of "rhetorical" in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter, the *OED*).

The present article examines Lyly's approach to a series of problematic likeness as a rhetorical response to ideas of friendship, which is grounded in the notion that likeness between objects is not absolute but relative, driven not by destiny but by choices. Through five problematic constructions of similitude, Lyly goes so far as to argue that the interplay between polar opposites is where we may perceive wit, namely, the mutative power of rhetorical resemblance. This power, however, also gives rise to the difficulty in maintaining the dynamic ideal of likeness. The first construction reminds us of marketplace demand and the emergence of a single-story narrative, which serves as the framework of Lyly's examination of a concept of likeness grounded in classical rhetoric in his first popular work. The interplay of convention with innovation adds another layer of complexity to the second problematic construction of similitude, namely, the unlikely likeness between younger and older generations, where we recognize some paradoxes in Elizabethan education as a barrier to intergenerational friendship. Given cultural differences and the competing imperatives to rely on printed authorities or personal experience, the third construction problematizes rather than manifests the reliability of young men's likeness by nature. In this context, Lyly juxtaposes the fourth construction to rethink the treacherous, inconstant likeness in heterosexual attraction as a quasi-friendship. Finally, the fifth construction presents renewed friendship as unsatisfactory evidence to men's pending pursuit of likeness to God—the central conceptual reference creating and embracing all kinds of differences. Euphues's quest for friendship progresses with his dialectic experience of rhetorical likeness to his seeming polar opposites (including an old hermit, a young gentleman, an inconstant lover, and God). Nevertheless, by means of Lyly's experimental rhetoric of dialectic resemblance, the more layers of similitude are involved, the more collisions of unlikeness are revealed, which follows the author's aim to entertain his readers while satirizing his protagonist and other characters.

Literary Likeness

The *Anatomy* can be analyzed and compared, along with its likeness as well as unlikeness, to what Lyly's predecessors had achieved and that in which writers after him might have become interested. Katherine Wilson reads the two parts of *Euphues* as Lyly's rival imitation of his predecessor George Gascoigne and as a model for a revised imitation by a later writer Robert Greene. To further this study, Andy Kesson explores early modern authorship with an interest in the growing popularity of "a single-story book" (67), which he can almost confirm to be initiated by Lyly, whose authorship's "cultural import and impact" on later generations,

including William Shakespeare, is evident in that "the majority of Lyly's plays were published in the 1590s, not the 1580s" (70). Kesson's argument not only challenges G. K. Hunter's "insistence on the 1580s-bound nature of Lyly's 'success'" (70), but also rethinks the paradox of Lyly's influence over Shakespeare, who, according to Hunter, was rather different from Lyly, for Shakespeare "looks forward where Lyly looks back" (Hunter 2). A recent critic of Lyly's approach to wit in his euphuistic prose, Yuval Kramer, also refers to Kesson's insight into the *Anatomy*'s "narrative unity" (Kesson 48), which is evident in its discursive title: "Very pleasant for all gentlemen to reade, and most necessary to remember. Wherein are contained the delights that Wit followeth in his youth by the pleasantnesse of loue, and the happinesse he reapeth in age, by the perfectnesse of Wisdome." Kramer quotes the complete title of the *Anatomy* (2), whereas Kesson begins his quotation with the word "wherein" to evidence that the work is promoted with "its narrative unity, rather than variety" (48). In addition, although Kesson shows interest in the significance of Lyly's first part of *Euphues* in the prose fiction market, Kramer pays more attention to the shaping of wit as a dangerous negotiation between the marketplace demand and the classical notion of moral value or universal truth than to the target readership. In general, Kramer reads Lyly's *Anatomy* as a prose fiction, wherein wit related to the writer's euphuistic style "is reimagined as a potent but dangerous force within the precarious tradition of Ciceronian rhetoric" (2). Yet, precarious though the rhetorical tradition was in the late Elizabethan era, the present article contends that the subtitle of the *Anatomy* highlights its appeal to a certain type of reader, foretelling Lyly's ambition of literary prominence as a debut writer more than his anxiety about classical references as a young Oxonian graduate. The idea of wit is personified through the author's style of euphuism, where an aesthetic experience of comparison and contrast is frequently achieved by the harmonious juxtaposition of a series of aesthetic disharmonies.

Taking account of his target readership, Lyly prefaced the main story of the *Anatomy* with two letters to establish its literary likeness to contemporary materials, simultaneously revealing his style as an unconventional renewal of classical rhetoric. The first letter is entitled "To the Right Honourable My Very Good and Master Sir William West, Knight, Lord Delaware . . . ," which is clearly addressed to Lyly's noble sponsor, although little about Lord Delaware has been recorded. To prevent himself from being accused of condoning Euphues's misdemeanors, Lyly makes an early excuse, explaining as a servant to his master, "[i]f then the first sight of Euphues shall seem too light to be read of the wise or too foolish to be regarded of the learned, they ought not to impute it to the iniquity of the author but to the necessity of the history" (28). The history here may refer to exempla,

namely the experience of others. As a young writer, Lyly knew how to use the popularity of his predecessors to his advantage in promoting his first book. For example, Elyot's *The Boke Named the Governour* was a popular source for Elizabethan readers to understand the ideal of friendship between gentlemen,[8] and Lyly rendered Elyot's writing on classical rhetoric to expect a creative, entertaining response from readers of the *Anatomy*. According to Elyot, the value of experience derives from two types of manner: one is "in acts committed or done by other men, whereof profit or damage succeeding," and the other "is called Example, & is expressed by history, which of Tully is called the lyfe of memory" (Cc3v). Elyot then refers to Aristotle and Pliny the elder, claiming that history "comprehendeth all thing that is necessary to be put in memory," so what is necessary to be recounted in a book is worthy of being named history and is "worthy to be had in remembrance" (Cc4v). At first glance, in his attribution of the supposed faults in Euphues to the "history" of someone's experience, Lyly apparently parallels his narrative with Elyot's work. Nevertheless, giving it a second look, we may see that Elyot's account is also an object of Lyly's parody, for Lyly has already reminded his master and noble reader, Lord Delaware, that the similarity between the wayward life of Euphues and the type of history as expounded by Elyot is grounded in a conditional prerequisite, limited to the reader's "first sight" of the protagonist. Lyly draws upon Elyot and other predecessors to assess the rhetorical familiarity of his narrative; but he also expects the reader to understand the *Anatomy* beyond memory or stereotype.

With a view to distinguishing the *Anatomy* from the market of the commonplace and to twisting didactic discourses into literary pastimes popular in elite circles, Lyly addresses his second letter to "gentlemen readers." He starts by revealing a former difficulty in deciding whether to send his "pamphlet to the printer or to the pedlar," for he "thought it too bad for the press and too good for the pack" (30). Surely Lyly was confident of the popular appeal of his first fiction, but he also realized how it differed from the tastes of contemporary educated society. Although with an apparent preference for gentlemen readers, Lyly's criteria for them are less strict and more generalized than his predecessors' expectations of young people. For example, Elyot dedicates his book to Henry VIII, explaining his attempt as to "treateth of the education of them, that here after may be deemed worthy to be gouernours of the publike weale" under the King's authority, which is why the book is named "The Gouernour" (A2v). Similarly, in *The Schoolmaster* (1570), Roger Ascham, a royal tutor to a young Queen Elizabeth before her coronation, relies on the book

[8] See also footnote 5 in the present article.

title to lay bare that his pedagogical treatise is "specially purposed for the priuate brining vp of youth in Ientlemen and Noble mens houses" (A1r); he then begins the preface to the reader with a reminiscence of his former service to Queen Elizabeth (A2r-v).[9] Comparing Euphues's practice in ideas of friendship to the pedagogy in *The Schoolmaster*, Jeff Dolven sees Euphues as a former pupil having experienced scenes of instruction where his instructor, like Ascham, made the "move to identify experience with romance" (97). Nevertheless, if we compare it to Elyot's and Ascham's approaches to their target readerships, Lyly's promotion of the *Anatomy* is conducted in a more playful manner. He analogizes the significance of books to gentlemen with the necessity of flowers to women, comparing the latter as just "a day's wearing" to the former as merely "an hour's reading" (30). On the one hand, Lyly is perhaps inviting his readers to classify his *Anatomy* as no more serious than a recreational book. On the other hand, while the book is considered "the anatomy of wit," it could hardly have been a leisurely pursuit for everyone. Thus, Lyly ends his letter with pride: "As for others, I care not for their jests, for I never meant to make them my judges" (31). Here, he is in a sense seeking a dialectic understanding between himself as author and the gentlemen who "will find no fault without cause, and bear with those that deserve blame" (31). Although distinguishing his noble and gentleman readers from less educated commoners and considering them likely to be more discerning, Lyly believes that his readers would nonetheless excuse his *Anatomy* for its factual accuracies and enjoy it as a literary entertainment rather than criticizing it as a didactic discourse.

In comparison with some pedagogical treatises or rhetorical pamphlets of the same decade, we hear more of Lyly's playful tongue than his serious notion of education in the *Anatomy*. For example, a year before the release of Lyly's book, Henry Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577) was published. In this rhetorical manual, Peacham elaborates the "causes of tropes" into three kinds: "necessitie," "will," and "arte" (C1r). Among them, Peacham takes "necessitie" as the most important, for wise men, in the case of wanting words, would be thus inspired to remember that

[9] *The Schoolmaster* was published posthumously two years after Roger Ascham's death in 1568. The author could have been popular in Elizabethan times as *The Schoolmaster* is on Laura Caroline Stevenson's list of Elizabethan popular literature. The book, besides the first edition in 1570, was published in 1571, 1573, 1579, and 1589, enabling Stevenson to regard it as one of the best sellers "first published 1559-1603 that went through three editions in *any* decade after their first appearance" (214). Grounded in Stevenson's criterion, Lyly's *Anatomy* was indeed more popular than many of its predecessors, as more than ten editions were published before the close of the Elizabethan era and two editions were even available in each of the consecutive years, 1579, 1580, and 1581, after its first publication (221).

> many things were verie like one to another in some respect of nature, thought it good to borrow ye name of one thing, to signifie another, which did in some part or property of nature resemble it, & thus began they to vse translated speech: declaring their meaning by similitudes and compared significations. (C1v)

Like an interesting parody responding to Peacham's advice, Lyly not only adopts the name but also the characteristic prototype of Euphues from Ascham's *The Schoolmaster*, a posthumous treatise on young learners' education. While "concerning trewe notes of the best wittes for learning in a childe" (D2v), Ascham refers to Plato's account of Socrates, introducing the Greek term *Εύφυής* as the first of seven types of wit: the quickest by nature but not the best for education (D2v-D3r). To further the uniqueness of wit, Lyly depicts Euphues in the *Anatomy* as a work that Nature, claiming to have crafted alone, was in fact created in collaboration with Fortune. As explained by the novel's narrator, Nature was,

> impatient of comparisons, and as it were disdaining a companion or copartner in her working, added to this comeliness of his body such a sharp capacity of mind that not only she proved Fortune counterfeit but was half of that opinion that she herself was only current. (32)

In this sense, even Nature had a counterpart who might be unlike her in appearance but similar in other ways, humorously responding to Peacham's proposition that "many things were verie like one to another in some respect of nature" (C1r-v). Similarly, Lyly's *Anatomy* might be different from contemporary works in appearance, but it does bear some literary likenesses to them in nature. While purposely modelling his writing on classical rhetoric, the author, intending to distance his creation from didacticism, elicits his readers to rethink the concords and discords through a different logic.

Unlikely Likeness

Lyly's dual approach to what he had learned and what he would like his readers to learn foregrounds the story of the *Anatomy* with the second problematic construction of similitude, namely, the unlikely likeness between the young and the old. This was a classical topic and also a recurrent subject in Lyly's writings. This single-story narrative progresses with the eponymous character's voyage, or a quest for the other self, a motif associated with the tradition of English romance going

back to Geoffrey of Monmouth in Medieval times and then developed into a genre not only popular in prose writing but also, by the seventeenth century, in theatrical fashion.[10] The narrator depicts Euphues as a product of Nature and Fortune, whose wit is superior to all and whose wickedness is second to none (33), which somehow influences his later experiences of making friends at different times. This young man departs from Athens (symbolic of Oxford) to Naples (symbolic of London), where "a court," according to the narrator, is "more meet for an atheist than for one of Athens, for Ovid than Aristotle, for a graceless lover than for a godly liver . . ." (33, 33n9). Travelling to continental Europe, especially for the purpose of studying in Italy, was popular among English young men in the Elizabethan era. However, Ascham claims in *The Schoolmaster* that Italian education is no longer as trustworthy as it was in the classical era and has become a deteriorating place full of negative temptations for young men (23). Although Lyly does not completely agree with this, he does refer to part of Ascham's pedagogy, and then personifies the ideas of wit through his portrayal of Eupheus, who has been shaped along with his experiences of encountering different types of likeness during his continuous questioning of ideas of friendship.

It seems that staying away from what Euhpues has been familiar with helps him recognize what he might have lacked. Thus, as a stranger in Naples, our protagonist acquires sufficient companions but not true friendship, for he is cautious about making friends with flatterers or with the wisest in society (34). By chance, he runs into Eubulus, an old Neapolitan gentleman, who appreciates this young and newly made acquaintance for his quick wit by nature but blames him for his waywardness by nurture. Whether or not he is the wisest, Eubulus is never a flatterer who seeks a physical and verbal likeness to Euphues. Instead, during their heated exchanges, Eubulus time and again exposes his unlikeness to Euphues, hoping he would take the old man's apparent differences as a warning of the young man's approaching fate:

> Young gentleman, although my acquaintance be small to entreat you, and my authority less to command you, yet my good will in giving you good counsel should induce you to believe me, and my hoary hairs (ambassadors of experience) enforce you to follow me; for by how much the more I am a stranger to you, by so much the more you are beholding to me. (35)

[10] For details, see Helen Cooper, *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare* (2004).

Eubulus knows very well that he has neither the authority to command Euphues nor the intimacy to entreat him as a friend. Perhaps what makes this old man feel superior to his young counterpart are the "hoary hairs," which he calls the "ambassadors of experience." To make his argument more convincing, he refers to the history of the Trojans and the Lacedaemonians' education of their children who were shown "their filth" so as to be taught to "shun the like fault, and avoid the like vices when they were at the like state" (36). As an experienced old man, Eubulus admonishes Euphues, encouraging him to bear those examples in mind, for "a loathing of the like sins" might prevent him from making the wrong friends and loose indulgence (36). Nevertheless, the interaction between Euphues as the younger and Eubulus as the elder does not develop into a cross-generational friendship; instead, the readers witness a debate between education and experience as well as between art and nature.

In fact, the more authority Eubulus wants to demonstrate through his emphasis on one's age, citizenship, and current state, the more unlikeness, rather than companionship, he lays bare to Euphues. He speaks with a sense of superiority to his young acquaintance: "Thou art here in Naples a young sojourner, I an old senior; thou a stranger, I a citizen; thou secure doubting no mishap, I sorrowful dreading thy misfortune" (36-37). To Eubulus, living by the experience of authorities is more trustworthy than practicing one's own. He then asks Euphues to think about whether it is "not far better to abhor sins by the remembrance of others' faults than by repentance of thine own follies" (37). Here, the significance of "remembrance" echoes Elyot's defining history as "worthy to be had in remembrance" (263), which may also remind us of Lyly attributing Euphues's waywardness to "the necessity of the history" (28), in the letter addressed to his sponsor. Although inevitably referring to others' history, Eubulus shows more eagerness to share his own story with Euphues, who however, cannot wait to demonstrate the fault of the old through accumulating his own experience as a youth.

Euphues's response to Eubulus reveals more about his disagreement with the old man than his willingness to seek friendship from this aged authority figure. Addressing Eubulus as "father and friend," Euphues explains that Eubulus's age grants him the first title, and his honesty the second (38). The "father" on this occasion is less concerned with religious superiority or patriarchal authority, but functions more as a rhetorical expression of courtesy. Similarly, the "friend" here is concerned less with one's amity with another, but is in Euphues's regard the rhetorical opposite of a dishonest opponent. In fact, Euphues neither agrees that age can guarantee knowledge, nor believes that one's education can fashion one's nature, for nature is subject to change. To him, "Nature will have course after kind,"

which can be proved from some natural phenomena: for example, "that black will take no other colour; that the stone asbestos being once made hot will never be made cold; that fire cannot be forced downward" (39). Perhaps to some adults, the juxtaposition of black and white hairs suggests a contrast between young and old, but the metaphorical meanings of colors can vary from one person's experience to another. Euphues's retort reveals that increasing age cannot reduce the superiority of blackness. So, if Eubulus's "hoary hairs" used to be black, it does not mean that this black has been replaced by the hoary. Rather, it suggests that the slipping away of youth has deprived Eubulus of his right to possess blackness. From this perspective, Euphues speaks as though he has more authority than his aged friend.

Their debate reveals an unlikely likeness between the young and the old, elaborating on the both communicable and incommunicable attributes of one another. Eubulus claims the likeness of his younger self to Euphues, who however, denies the likeness of his future older self to Eubulus, for Euphues cannot have seen the younger self of Eubulus, who likewise can only imagine rather than see the true older self of Euphues. Therefore, the more Eubulus is eager to warn Euphues of the correlation between a young man's wayward path and an old man's regretful life, the more is Euphues reluctant to see the similarity between them. Curiously, the author, although young when composing this novel, does not strongly indicate a position on either side of the debate. He writes as if torn between the rhetoric on both sides, and thus, the greater the generational gap between Euphues and Eubulus, the more cross-generational resemblance Lyly's readers may perceive between the respective rhetoric of the young and old.

Uncertain Likeness

Whereas Euphues's unlikely likeness to Eubulus is incidental to their communication which is built on courtesy rather than on understanding and mutuality, the eponymous protagonist views his later confrontation with a Neapolitan youth, Philautus, as a consequence of nature. Given that nothing is more constant than nature's inconstancy, the more Euphues attempts to prove the naturalness of their mutual resemblance, ironically the more the unnaturalness of their friendship he reveals to himself as well as to his counterpart. Thus, the uncertain likeness between these two young men brings about the third problematic construction of similitude in the *Anatomy*.

Having no interest in the theological discourse of an aged stranger, Euphues goes on to look for a soulmate more similar to him in nature; and through debating

with himself between Greek and Roman rhetoric, Euphues attempts to work out his own version of synthesizing Cicero and Aristotle on the ideal of friendship. Having stayed in Naples for two months, Euphues "show[s] such entire love toward [Philautus] . . . determining to entre into such an inviolable league of friendship with him" (44). The reason for their friendship remains uncertain, but the narrator does leave some clues; perhaps it is because of Philautus's courtesy and Euphues's wit, or perhaps it is due to the force of destiny and the resemblance between them. This doubt is soon clarified, and the true answer is revealed in Euphues's own voice:

> "I have read," saith he, "a friend is in prosperity a pleasure, a solace in adversity, in grief a comfort, in joy a merry companion, at all times another I, in all places the express image of mine own person, insomuch that I cannot tell whether the immortal gods have bestowed any gift upon mortal men either more noble or more necessary than friendship." (44)

This account of Euphues's reading corresponds to a Ciceronian passage in *On Friendship*, in which Laelius demands Scipio to "regard friendship as the greatest thing in the world; for there is nothing which so fits in with our nature, or is so exactly what we want in prosperity or adversity" (5); also, to Cicero, "[i]n the face of true friend a man sees as it were a second self" (7). Given that *On Friendship* is adapted from the *Nichomachean Ethics*, what Euphues might have read sounds like a mixed bag, containing different definitions of friendship, some of which win his approval, whereas some he doubts. On the one hand, as if challenging an Aristotelian notion of friendship based on utility but ignorant of Aristotle's criticism on this unreliable amity, Euphues argues in a more Ciceronian way, believing that nothing worldly is comparable to the value of friendship (44). On the other hand, he seems to chime more with Aristotle, who states that "young people become friends quickly, but old people do not" (8.6), and meanwhile seems to forget Cicero's warning: "age . . . must have its proper position" (19) although "age need not be a burden" (3). Nevertheless, as discussed in the previous section of this article, age does mean something to Euphues and indeed serves as a hindrance to his relationship with Eubulus. Euphues's ambiguous position on classical rhetoric foretells the uncertainty of his approach to his friendship with Philautus.

Although supporting resemblance in nature as a more necessary criterion for genuine friendship, Euphues is neither convinced that only an old friendship is capable of withstanding trial, nor interested in cross-generational friendship. He questions the reliability of a proverb that "one should eat a bushel of salt with him

whom he meaneth to make his friend" (44), and recounts it as an impractical simile but one, however, to which both Aristotle and Cicero refer.[11] Euphues therefore concludes to "have Philautus for [his] fere . . . by how much the more [he] view[s] in him the lively image of Euphues" (44). To him, although the quick friendship between young gentlemen is not normally appreciated by the old, his friendship with Philautus happens just as naturally as "like will to like," a proverb also mentioned in Cicero's *On Friendship*. Nevertheless, it is stated in a jocular way, lamenting that old people are recognized as a group due to their shared complaints about their loss of taste and lack of pleasure when they become senile (Cicero 3). Such friendship is formed more by habit than by nature;[12] and the more Euphues and Philautus look alike in this way, the more doubts they may feel about their friendship.

With their courtly exchange of trust and affection, the friendship deployed between them becomes more rhetorical than substantive.[13] In his earlier reflection, Euphues is convinced of Philautus's likeness to him and thus declares, "how much the more I view in him the lively image of Euphues" (44), but Philautus is less sure of his likeness to Euphues although he would like to take Euphues's declaration as a rhetorical assurance of their mutual resemblance. Lingering at Philautus's place, Euphues endeavors to ensure this "gentleman and friend" his faithfulness; he then refers to examples taken from mythology and history, including "Damon to his Pythias, Pylades to his Orestes, Titus to his Gysippus, Theseus to his Pirithous, Scipio to his Laelius," which, however, in Euphues's terms "was never found more faithful than Euphues will be to Philautus" (45). As we may see, the faithfulness that Euphues proposes is cast in future form, or with a tone of expectation; and

---

[11] Among all these examples, the instance of Scipio and Laelius is adopted from Cicero's *On Friendship*, whereas the pair of Titus from Rome and Gysippus from Athens serves as an instance of international friendship; for different versions of Titus and Gysippus popular in Lyly's time, see A. B. Taylor, *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems*.

[12] William Baldwin, an Oxonian writer preceding Lyly, seemed to have been confused about this point. In "A treatise of morall phylosophie contaynyng the sayinges of the wyse," Baldwin starts his discussion of friendship and friends with the prerequisite that "FRendship is to be preferred before all worldlye thinges, because there is nothyng more agreable wyth Nature" (K2v). To illustrate his standing, Baldwin also quotes from Aristotle: "The frendshyp that is betwene good and honest menne, can not be broke nor altered" (K3r). Nevertheless, the good and honest in terms of Aristotelian virtue are closer to the effect of nurture than nature. On this ground, Baldwin's argument, perhaps running counter to his expectation, rings truer in that the ideal of friendship is trained rather than borne to be agreeable with Nature, although Baldwin had tried to demonstrate its naturalness in his moral ethics.

[13] In *The Arte of Rhetorique*, Wilson refers to "friendship" while expounding the skill of conversion, which is "an ofte repeatyng of the last worde, & contrarie to that which went before" (Dd3v). Wilson's sentence structure is as follows: "Whe~ iust dealing is not vsed: welth goeth away, fryndship goeth away, truth goeth awaie, all goodnes (to speake at a worde) goeth awaie" (Dd3v). He appropriates "friendship" as a figure of speech that an Elizabethan schoolboy, like Lyly, might have worked with to achieve rhetorical success.

what happens next apparently corresponds with but is indeed contrary to what the aforementioned examples, whether real or fictional, might have suggested. In response to Euphues's verbal warranty, Philautus says, "seeing we resemble (as you say) each other in qualities, it cannot be that the one should differ from the other in courtesy" (46). Obviously, Philautus cannot see what Euphues claims to have seen because he can only confirm what he has heard from Euphues. Passively acknowledging one's resemblance to another as an effect of rhetoric, Philautus seems to be surer of his likeness to Euphues in courtesy than in nature. Although referring to his belief in his newly made Athenian friend as the cause of his love toward him, Philautus also discloses his worry that they have not yet tested their mutual trust. Therefore, echoing Euphues's expression of courtesy in his unlikely friendship with Eubulus, Philautus divulges uncertainty disguised by courtesy. In contrast with Euphues's speech in the future tense, Philautus reminds Euphues of his affections in the past tense. He says to Euphues, "Thou mayst well perceive that I did believe thee that so soon I did love thee, and I hope thou wilt the rather love me in that I did believe thee" (46). The emphasis on "did" and the repetition of "love and believe" foster a sense of dubiety in how Euphues would repay Philautus.

Ideally, love, like empathy, is the foundation of true friendship; but in practice Euphues strengthens his affection for himself while weakening his compassion for his likeness (Philautus). Following the account of this verbal exchange between the two young gentlemen, the narrator repeats the cause of their mutual attraction with greater certainty: "Either Euphues and Philautus stood in need of friendship or were ordained to be friends" (46). Nevertheless, no matter whether necessity or destiny drew them together, their increasing affections for the same object diminishes their friendship that has been "augmented every day" (46). No sooner is the bond between them confirmed than they are separated by another bond due to sharing an object of affection. Lucilla, as the narrator describes, is not only beautiful and betrothed to Philautus but is also a temptation for Euphues, who not only resembles Philautus in his presence but also behaves like him in his absence. Philautus is betrayed in love as well as in friendship.

It looks as though romantic love has won first place in its competition with friendship. However, Euphues, is not sure whether "affection [shall] be of more force than friendship" (55) and does not deny that the former has some influence on the latter, for "where love beareth sway, friendship can have no show" (55). He then seizes the moment as "high time to unfold [his] secret love to [his] secret friend" (56), which is followed by his determination to "[l]et Philautus behave himself never so craftily" (56). The curious point is whom that secret friend may refer to: is it Lucilla or Philautus? The key lies in the paradox of the words "secret" and

"friend." On the surface, Lucillia can be Euphues's secret friend, for "friend," as defined by the *OED*, is a euphemistic alternative for addressing "a romantic or sexual partner, a lover." Nevertheless, if we look more deeply into the context, we may find that it is Philautus rather than Lucillia, who appears right after Euphues debates amity and romantic affection with himself. Philautus comforts and talks as a counselor to his troubled friend, not knowing that he himself has become a victim of Euphues's actions. In this sense, at least for the moment, Philautus is very likely to be the addressee of Euphues's "secret friend," for "secret," according to the *OED*, can refer to "a confidant," that is, a person whom one is intimate with, and whom one entrusts with private matters. However, considering another definition of "secret" in the *OED*, when one's "feelings," "passions," and "thoughts" remain secret, they are not "openly avowed or expressed" but are meant to be "concealed" and "disguised" and are "known only to the subject, inward, inmost." In view of the conflict between a friend as a secret lover and a friend as a secret keeper, Euphues holds back from confiding the whole truth to his supposed likeness in nature (Philautus), and resolves to keep it as a secret between himself and his lover as his other self (Lucilla).

When Euphues grows less certain about his likeness to Philautus, he turns to develop a clandestine relationship with Lucilla in the name of friendship and by virtue of another female friend, Livia, the feigned cause of his melancholy affection.[14] "Secret," as defined by the *OED*, also means "clandestine," especially when there might be something illicit concealed in one's intention to keep certain "actions," "negotiations," and "agreements" secret. Thus, in a more questionable and erotic way, Lucilla plays the part of another secret friend of Euphues. She claims to "enjoy [her] new friend," caring more about Euphues's friendship than Philautus's fury, and preferring Euphues's love to Philautus's possessions (70), which cleverly echoes biblical doctrines. As the Proverbs of Solomon suggest, one should "[m]ake no friendship with an angry man, neither go with the furious man" (22:24).[15] The General Epistle of James also states, "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world, maketh himself the enemy of God" (4:4); thus, the possession of Philautus echoes "the world" that refers to secular or material matters. Ironically, the original addressees of these words in the Gospel of James are the

---

[14] Euphues builds his friendship with Livia in the *Anatomy* and sends her a letter; and, in its sequel, Euphues writes her another letter in greeting as well as to inform her of his upcoming return from England to Athens.

[15] All biblical references cited in this essay are adopted from the Geneva Bible, which was first published as a complete version "in 1560 and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth" (loc. 273). In 1599, the Geneva Bible was published with "the most complete compilation of annotations of any of the Geneva editions" (loc. 280); for this reason, the 1599 edition is preferred in this essay.

"adulterers and adulteresses" whose "amity of the world" does promote "the enmity of God" (4:4). Euphues betrays Philautus as his supposed likeness in nature so as to embrace Lucilla as the likeness of his treacherous self, which soon leads Euphues to experience an ironic version of what the prophet complains about in the Book of Job: "All my secret friends abhorred me, and they whom I loved, are turned against me" (19:19).[16]

Treacherous Likeness

In Euphues's alliance with Lucilla lies the fourth problematic construction of similitude. Lucilla's resemblance to Euphues's treacherous self is latent in their shared trait of inconstancy, and her function as a shared, temporary object of male affection foregrounds her tendency to betray both of her male counterparts. As a likeness of Euphues, who becomes unfaithful to Philautus, Lucilla is inclined to become treacherous against the prototype of her likeness. She is not only the cause for the suspension of male friendship, but also the catalyst which causes Euphues to resume his amity with his male likeness.

Similar to his earlier rhetorical approach to Philautus's friendship, Euphues seeks an intimacy with his female likeness by accustoming Lucilla and himself to discover resemblance in contrasts and explore differences between similar objects. He describes her as a lady with golden hair that would be bleached white with age. To win her love, Euphues persuades Lucilla to use the freshness of her beauty in time:

> If you will be cherished when you be old, be courteous while you be young; if you look for comfort in your hoary hairs, be not waning in your bravery, be not squeamish in the waxing of your beauty; if you desire to be kept like the roses when they have lost their colour, smell sweet as the rose doth in the bud. . . . (50)

In the above quotation, the term "hoary hairs" contrasts with "golden locks," the word "comfort" links with "coy," and the phrase "in the waning of your bravery" is juxtaposed with "in the waxing of your beauty." Taking the last pair of antitheses

---

[16] As discussed above with reference to the *OED*, the word "secret" means personal, private, and close, namely, intimate; thus, a secret friend could refer to a man of counsel in this biblical quotation. The combination of "secret" and "friend" seems to be an English translation exclusive to the Geneva Bible whereas other preceding or following English translations contain words with related meanings, such as "inward" for "secret" and "familiar" or "counselor" for "friend."

for example, while they look quite similar in terms of spelling, structure, pattern, rhyme, and syllable, they do emphasize the contrast between youth and age as suggested in the first line. Interestingly, departing from the earlier young-old contrast of black-haired Euphues and hoary-haired Eubulus, Euphues's admonition of Lucilla explains that being old and being young are both essential chapters in human life. The old Lucilla and the young Lucilla refer to the same person; but, given that golden locks may turn grayish white, if the old Lucilla desires the benefits of being young, then the young Lucilla should respond in a timely fashion to Euphues's wooing.[17] Nevertheless, Lucilla replies: "in my opinion women are to be won with every wind, in whose sex there is neither force to withstand the assaults of love, neither constancy to remain faithful" (50), a clever response to Euphues's emphasis on the attributes of nature in retorting Eubulus's art of education, foretelling Lucilla's unfaithfulness in her pursuit of love. Lucilla is capricious by nature. Just like Euphues, who wishes that ideal education were subject to human nature, Lucilla hopes that ideal love could satisfy her female essence.

The secret love between Lucilla and Euphues is eventually revealed to Philautus through the words of Lucilla's father Ferardo, who vehemently denounces his wanton daughter; however, contrary to Ferardo's anger, Philautus shows less alarm at his lover's disloyalty than his friend's unfaithfulness. Although he does not confront Euphues face to face, Philautus writes as though he has been betrayed like King David, who wrote the Book of Psalms to praise God in times of adversity, the source of his faith in justice as, "the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, and the way of the wicked shall perish" (1:6). In his first epistle to Euphues, Philautus refers to God twice, warning him that "there hath never been any faithless to his friend that hath not also been fruitless to his God" (77), but "weigh[ing] the treachery the less in that it cometh from a Grecian in whom is no troth" (77). Philautus does not mean to blame the fault on original sin, nor does he attribute the fault to a Grecian disposition to deceive. But while accusing Euphues of

[17] Lyly's practice of rhetoric, especially on color, owes a great debt to Greco-Roman writers. His reference to golden locks is paradoxical here, for it may simply refer to a color which shines as gold or a color similar to yellow, which, as suggested by Aristotle, is closer to white but not exactly named white; see Aristotle, *Meteorology*, bk. 3, par. 4 (375^{a}6-8). Besides, the adjective "golden" can be used to modify the tone of a color, for example, "golden-red" (*rufus*), which according to Antonio Telesio, a sixteenth-century Italian humanist writer, is different from scarlet (*ruber*), for the latter is known as the color of blood whereas the former is not (22). With the word "golden," the modified color may sound brighter. Although Lyly did not directly cite Telesio's *On Colours* (1528), Telesio's writing reveals an Italian Renaissance assumption of classical color rhetoric; undoubtedly, most of Telesio's references to Greco-Roman writers, such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Pliny the Elder, were familiar to Euphues as well as to Lyly. In any case, although Lucilla's hair may not look as dark as young Euphues's, it is certainly brighter than Eubulus's and is going to be bleached by nature rather than replaced by art.

unfaithfulness, Philautus realizes that he is "too weak to wrestle for a revenge" (77); thus, he turns to seek recourse from God, who he believes would "shortly requite this injury" (77). Philautus cannot wait to see God punish this treacherous being who used to claim likeness to him.

In response to his male counterpart's Christianity-based claim, Euphues, with reference to pre-Christian writers, centers his letter on a defense of the value of heterosexual friendship. First, to rationalize his unfaithfulness—"for the love of a lady to violate and break the bonds of amity"—Euphues takes Euripides as his support, "who thinks it lawful for the desire of a kingdom to transgress that bonds of honesty" (79, 79n1). Like a trained virtue, "honesty," as discussed earlier, drew Euphues to take Eubulus as a nominal friend; but nominal as a male-male friendship is, this tie becomes less valued than a heterosexual bond in Euphues's mind. He argues: "The friendship between man and man as it is common so is it of course, between man and woman as it is seldom so is it sincere; the one proceedeth of the similitude of manners, the other of the sincerity of the heart" (79). These lines read like a revised patchwork of the Aristotelian notion of friendship. In the *Nichomachean Ethics*, Aristotle values "complete friendship" as the most ideal, which "is that of good people, those who are alike in their virtue" (8.3), and among most of whom "[l]ove and friendship, then, are found" (8.3), but "such friendships are rare, because people of this kind are few" (8.3). As for heterosexual friendship, Aristotle suggests: "The friendship of man and woman also seems natural . . . human being naturally tend to form couples . . . and reproduction is more widely shared with animals" (8.12). With reference to both Euripides and Aristotle, Euphues attempts to justify the relationship between him and Lucilla as a rare bond combining love and friendship. Obviously, Euphues argues as though ignorant of the genuine friendship Aristotle dialectically attempted to distinguish from others. Nevertheless, a rhetorical effect betrays Euphues's rhetorical intention, ironically divulging that this kind of "rareness" is in fact motivated by what Euripides said—a lawful desire and in Aristotle's understanding, merely something as natural as an animalistic drive for reproduction.

So far, the ideas of friendship we have encountered between Euphues and Philautus are rather unstable and are too miraculous to be true. As stated in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, young people "are quick to become friends and quick to stop; their friendship fluctuates along with what they find pleasant, and this sort of pleasure is subject to rapid change" (8.3). Euphues establishes his relationship with Philautus quickly through discourse but ends it with an exchange of epistles. In the letter from Philautus, this angry friend and desperate lover claims to avoid Euphues, "hereafter as a trothless foe" (77), followed by Euphues's cruel teasing about

Philautus's importunity of his friendship and for Lucilla's love. However, Euphues does not enjoy Lucilla's love any longer than his friendship with Philautus, for Lucilla does not mean to love either man but enjoys being the object of their competition. The relationship between Euphues and Lucilla is simply a trial for the friendship of Euphues and Philautus (81). When the latter is terminated, the former is no longer of interest to Lucilla.

Euphues indeed suffers from Lucilla's betrayal—a likeness to his treacherous self, and with dramatic speed, the bond of likeness between Euphues and Philautus is restored once the two men perceive each other's victim-like status and agree to view Lucilla as the only object of blame and shame. They shake hands and bid each other farewell. Distance then keeps these friends apart, as Philautus remains in Naples with his addiction to "the court," whereas the other returns to Athens, being "so wedded to the university" (87). Finally, Euphues and Philautus become further differentiated from one another but agree: "the conjunction of their minds should neither be separated by the length of time, nor alienated by chance of the soil" (87); the awareness of their differences teaches them to see the rarity of their similarities and vice versa.

Divine Likeness

Having experienced different types of problematic likeness to other people, Euphues turns to writing in the hope of restoring his likeness to God, as the trust of God is worthier than that of a friend and His words are more reliable than any acquaintance's advice. Whether or not Lyly sincerely thought about reforming himself as Euphues determines to do, his protagonist proposes a farewell to "the fine and filed phrases of Cicero, the pleasant elegies of Ovid, the depth and profound knowledge of Aristotle" (121). He bids goodbye to "rhetoric," "philosophy," and "all learning which is not sprung from the bowels of the holy Bible" (121), and then claims to have seen nothing worthier of imitating than "the sacred knowledge of God's will" (122). However, the more Euphues desires to achieve divine likeness, the more his account of God's words and human experience become mere rhetoric.

In his attempt to revive his former friendships in the name of God, Euphues crafts a commonplace book-like account of reflections on his previous experiences. He articulates his attitudes toward those whom he denied, or those whom he ever tried to build friendship with in his epistle collection. Under the heading of "Certain Letters Writ by Euphues to His Friends," Euphues recalls his respective experiences of making acquaintance with Philautus, Eubulus, and Livia. According to

Peter Mack, "note-taking and commonplace books" were classroom techniques by which Elizabethan pupils recorded what they had learned under the headings of popular subjects, such as "Friendship, Justice, and Mercy" (44). To understand a work by an author who might have been trained in this habit, readers, in Mack's terms, were also encouraged to "compare the views on a particular subject expressed in different sections or by different speakers within the same text" (44). Euphues's collection may serve as an example of this type.

The first letter is addressed to Philautus, and Euphues shows his disapproval of Philautus's lodging as a courtier in Naples but knows very well that a friend is to exhort, whereas a father is to compel. Thus, since he is neither a father with respectable authority nor a friend whose exhortation is always convincing, Euphues takes God as his support, warning Philautus not to indulge in that which may displease the Lord. Despite the geographical distance and cultural differences between Naples and Athens, according to Euphues, Philautus should "embrace Christ" and "leave the court" so as to fasten their friendship through re-establishing their likeness to each other (139). The juxtaposition of father and friend in Euphues's letter to Philautus also reminds us of Euphues's earlier discourse with the father-figure of Eubulus because of his age and as a friend because of his honesty.

This intertextuality informs Euphues's second letter, written to Eubulus, who is mourning the death of his young daughter. To comfort Eubulus in his grief, Euphues writes that honesty does not lie in one's "hoary hair" but is evident in one's deeds; thus, "to be buried with an honest name" is more glorious than "to go to the grave with a grey head" (140). Euphues then encourages Eubulus to "perform both the office of an honest man, and the honour of an aged father" so as to commend his late loss to God (140). So far, the case has been altered. Now, it is the turn of Euphues, the youth who has just recovered from emotional loss, to admonish Eubulus, the elder who has just suffered a family loss (139).

Grounded in a thematic interlock, Euphues's third letter is again addressed to Philautus and refers to the death of Lucillia. Like Eubulus's daughter, she died young, but unlike her was not honest. Given their unhappy experiences as victims of unfaithful Lucilla, Euphues urges Philautus to "shake off those vain toys and dalliances with women," if Philautus deems him a friend (141). Euphues then continues as though he is referring to Erasmus persuading a young gentleman to marriage, hoping Philautus will embrace Euphues's friend Livia if Philautus does indeed love Euphues as a friend (141).[18] Seemingly in accordance with God's wish,

[18] To reason the cause of the rhetorical conflict between Philautus and Euphues, we may give Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* another glance. Wilson refers to an epistle drawn by Erasmus on behalf of his friend to persuade a young gentleman to marry, in which the love of a good friend is distinguished from the love of a

Euphues desires a marriage between his two friends so as to unite one of his likenesses to another (141). Indeed, he addresses Livia as a friend, but in their correspondence both are more concerned about the bad influence of courtly life on Philautus. Informed by Livia of the gradual reformation of Philautus, Euphues responds with ambivalence. On the one hand, he keeps a neutral but didactic tone, elaborating that "God will both reward the godly zeal of the Prince and revenge the godless doings of the people" (148).[19] On the other hand, he divulges his personal happiness that Philautus is also single and a "pleasant companion" (150) in his upcoming journey to England, where he has "heard of a woman in all qualities excelleth any man" (149). Euphues's second letter to Philautus foretells that England would be the ideal destination for this pair of friends to explore because the female sovereign there is blessed with godly grace and her court is worth their service.

Besides Philautus, Eubulus, and Livia, there are two new friends in Euphues's letters, Botonio and Alcius, and letters addressed to the two conflate into a summary of Euphues's past and present. This helps readers review the protagonist's early misconduct and then evaluate how he has reformed himself. Botonio is punished with exile, which echoes Euphues's seclusion as a self-penalty for his former foolishness. Alcius is a young gentleman in Naples, "who, leaving his study, followed all lightness and lived both shamefully and sinfully, to the grief of his friends and discredit of the university" (144), which serves as an example in response to Euphues's wayward past. The combined stories of Botonio and Alcius thus bear comparison with Euphues's own story.

On the whole, in addressing his friends and their respective contexts, Euphues reflects on what he has learned from different authorities, believing that no one but God can save him from confusion. Under the conceptual framework of the anatomy of wit, Euphues practices rhetorical persuasion. He compares his experience of friendship with his quest for likeness to God. His account, in a relaxing tone, reads like a commonplace book, containing a verbal synthesis of divine likeness, which aims to furnish readers with pastime knowledge rather than instruct them in dogma.

---

gentlewoman as wife (f1v). In this way, romantic love and friendship are distinguished subjects from a biblical perspective. The former is usually limited to heterosexual intimacy, whereas the latter is more commonplace between men than among women, although female comradeship is occasionally referred to in the Bible.

[19] According to the *OED*, "prince" can be used to refer to a female sovereign, especially when referring to Queen Elizabeth I.

Conclusion

The *Anatomy* associates instructions on friendship with the ideal of likeness in rhetoric and then anatomizes them as wit through five problematic constructions of similitude so as to enforce the author's ambivalent attitude toward what he might have learned in his schooldays. Lyly interrogates ideas of friendship by way of Euphues's testing the reliability of the similitude model in his "anatomy of wit." Wit here is represented in the education of Euphues, as well as in the learning of his creator. However, as early as in the letters to his readers, Lyly claims that this seemingly wayward character is a necessary imitation of history rather than a work produced by him singlehandedly. Writing more as a rhetorical friend to gentlemen readers, Lyly intended to draw attention to the inherited discrepancy in the apparent similarity between what he planned to anatomize and what he and they might have been taught to anatomize.

Lyly's constructions of similitude are meant to be problematic for his readers, and Euphues's flawed resemblances are inevitable human experiences. His first confrontation with Eubulus exposes the divergent likeness of authorities, where the friendship between young and old is never clearly confirmed, even when the somewhat experienced young eventually renew their friendship rhetorically. His unnaturalness in making friends with Eubulus discloses his unlikely likeness to authorities that have been acknowledged by age or been institutionally deemed truths by mechanical schoolroom instruction. However, if the young-old amity is classically unnatural to Euphues, his friendship with Philautus, though seemingly bound up with their mutual likeness by nature, is not guaranteed either. Besides, Euphues's "rare" friendship with Lucilla is grounded in their treacherous likeness, which betrays the law of the constant inconstancy, that is, "nothing 'but that hath his contraries'" (43).[20] He then turns to seek help from God as another form of authority, hoping to achieve divine affinity and restore his closeness with the Almighty. However, as every reader surely knows, although God created Adam in His likeness, part of Adam was then used to create Eve. Adam failed to embody God's full likeness and was thus punished along with Eve. They had to leave their place of creation before they could restore their likeness to God and embark on an endless journey to perfection. Similarly, Euphues is made by his creator to depart from his homeland, and his experience of likeness is destined to be imperfect.

[20] In the *Anatomy*, Eubulus concludes his final exhortation to Euphues with: "neither is there anything but that hath his contraries" (43), adopted and rewritten by Scragg to demonstrate "the heart of Lyly's work," as "there is nothing 'but that hath his contraries'" (7).

The matter does not lie in whether Lyly disbelieved the Christian gospel of salvation or Euphues loses faith in restoring his friendship with Philautus through Christianity. Rather, only through recognition of one's imperfection would one learn to be humble and become willing to seek divine grace. Lyly was not ignorant of the Christian doctrine of Jesus's blood redeeming sinners, but he liked to paraphrase biblical doctrines (rather than quote them directly from the Old and New Testaments) so as to fit them into the context of his writing. Given that "perfection lies in the recognition of one's imperfection" (Straw 187),[21] the pursuit of one's likeness to God seems to be a never-ending dialectic process.

WORKS CITED

Aristotle. *Meteorology. The Complete Works of Aristotle*. Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Trans. E. W. Webster. Vol. 1. 1984. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995.

---. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans and ed. Roger Crisp. 2000. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2012.

Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster*. London, 1570. *Early English Books Online*. Web. Accessed 22 Mar. 2016.

Baldwin, William. "A treatise of morall phylosophie contaynyng the sayinges of the wyse." London, 1547. *Early English Books Online*. Web. Accessed 5 May 2007.

Cicero. *Treatise on Friendship and Old Age*. Trans. E.S. Shuckburgh. Kindle ed. N.p.: Waxkeep, 2005.

Cooper, Helen. *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2004.

Dolven, Jeff. *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance*. Kindle ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2007.

Elyot, Thomas. *The Boke Named the Governour*. London, 1531. *Early English Books Online*. Web. Accessed 8 Aug. 2016.

Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2012.

"Friend, n." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. Accessed 26 Nov. 2018.

The Geneva Bible. 1599. Kindle ed. N.p.: Tolle Lege, 2013.

Hunter, G. K. *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962.

Kesson, Andy. *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2014.

[21] The quotation is Carloe Straw's translation of the statement cited from *Moralia* by Gregory the Great (the bishop of Rome between the late sixth and early seventh centuries).

Kramer, Yuval. "The Shaping of Wit in the Euphuistic Prose of John Lyly." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 20.1 (2018): n. pag. Web. Accessed 24 Oct. 2019.

Lyly, John. *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and His England*. Ed and intro. Leah Scragg. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003.

MacFaul, Tom. *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Mack, Peter. *Elizabethan Rhetoric*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2002.

McCabe, Richard A. "Wit, Eloquence, and Wisdom in *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*." *Studies in Philology* 81.3 (1984): 299-324. *JSTOR*. Web. Accessed 16 May 2018.

Peacham, Henry. *The Garden of Eloquence*. 1577. *Early English Books Online*. Web. Accessed 23 Mar. 2016.

"Prince, n.I.1.b." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. Accessed 26 Nov. 2018.

"Rhetorical, adj." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. Accessed 26 Nov. 2018.

Scragg, Leah. Introduction. *Euphues: Anatomy of Wit and Euphues and His England*. By John Lyly. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003. 1-20.

"Secrect, adj.1.d.f; n.II.8." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. Accessed 26 Nov. 2018.

Shannon, Laurie. *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002.

Stevenson, Laura Caroline. *Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature*. 1984. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Straw, Carole. *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.

Taylor, A. B. *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Telesio, Antonio. *On Colours*. 1528. Ed and intro. Roy Osborne. Trans. Don Pavey. N. p.: Color Academy, 2002.

Wilson, Katherine. *Fictions of Authorship in Late Elizabethan Narratives: Euphues in Arcadia*. Oxford UP, 2006. *Oxford Scholarship Online*. Web. Accessed 26 Aug. 2015.

Wilson, Thomas. *The Art of Rhetoric for the Use of All Such as Are Studious of Eloquence, set forth in English*. London, 1553. *Early English Books Online*. Web. Accessed 2 July 2015.

***Manuscript received 15 July 2022, accepted for publication 19 Apr. 2023*