

## “Humanist More” — Questions and Discussion Session with Dr. George M. Logan

**Clarence Miller:** There has always been a good deal of speculation about why More stopped where he did [i.e., in *The History of King Richard the Third*], and didn't finish it. You suggest he had other things to do, and that's true, but Dick Sylvester speculates, and other people speculate, about why he didn't go on.

**George Logan:** There's nothing, of course, to do *except* speculate. We can't really know, but many people *have* speculated, some more plausibly than others. One of the most frequent, I guess, speculations—I think it appears first in A.F. Pollard's article about the making of the *History*, and then Marius takes it up in his biography, too—is that More decided that the book could not be published, that it said too many nasty things about people who were in some cases alive, and in other cases had powerful children who were alive. And as any writer knows, there's a lot less incentive to keep writing if you can't publish—or, to take the student analogy, can't submit the thing to the professor. So that may have had to do with it.

It was surely also partly just the press of business. He talks in that prefatory letter to *Utopia*, the letter to Giles, about how hard it was to find time to finish that little book; and though that kind of talk is conventional, there is certainly no reason to think that it doesn't correspond with the truth in More's particular case. And this was only in 1516, before he became a royal counselor. Surely he got more busy, not less busy, after he became a full-time servant of the king.

And then, of course, it would help if we knew *when* he stopped. We know he started around 15—no, we don't really know. He may have started as early as 1513. Richard Sylvester thought he wrote between 1514 and 1518. I'm not sure that he may not have started until after he had finished *Utopia* [in 1516]. But in any case, we don't know when he started and we don't know when he stopped. There's no reason for thinking that he may not have gone on until the early 1520s. If he did, then doubtless one reason he stopped was because of the Reformation troubles brewing. He was obviously *very* caught up in what was happening to the Church, in the Church, and began to write that other kind of thing, which he doubtless thought was far more important than this humanist *History of Richard III*.

**Audience:** The difference between Cardinal Morton's presentation in *Utopia* and

*Thomas More Studies* 1 (2006)

how we find him at the end of the *History*, where he's tempting Buckingham into conspiracy, would you comment on that?

**Logan:** In fact, perhaps this is one thing that suggested your question: I could have commented on it in response to Clarence's question, couldn't I, because there have been people—and I'm one of them—who have wondered whether one reason why More stopped where he did was that he found himself in the sort of awkward position of describing his hero and mentor as a dissimulator just as wily as Richard was. That's what I had principally in mind when I said as my little transitional sentence [in the lecture] that in *Richard III* nobody's entirely good, except those two little princes in the Tower—not even Morton. And, as we can tell from a couple of passages in *Utopia*, the characterization—the little sketch of Morton right after Hythloday mentions that he had been at Morton's table, and then the remarks of More after Hythloday has recounted this episode, and then of course Morton's conduct throughout that episode—as we can tell from that, More admired Morton extremely highly: “mentor” is surely the right word, and, traditionally, it was Morton who got More into Oxford. And of course, Roper, More's son-in-law, in his biography, says that—More was 12-13-14, but this was a precocious kid—and Roper says that Morton said on more than one occasion to people at his table—where More was, in his capacity as page, *waiting* on the table—Morton said that “this child here waiting at table, whosoever shall live to see it, will prove a marvelous man”; and he was right about that, huh? So it was sort of mutual. I don't know if you could say that Morton *admired* More, but he certainly saw More as a “comer.” And Morton's role in *Richard III*: so Morton reappears at the beginning of that episode, which is the last episode, of course, of *Richard III* as it stands. He's given a character that's very like the characterization when he first appears in *Utopia*: it's this wonderful, perfect combination of practical experience and book-learning and intelligence and so on. And, of course, he conducts himself extremely well—extremely agilely—in that ensuing conversation with Buckingham. For those of you who don't know the passage, Buckingham is Richard's principal ally, and Morton, who's been taken prisoner in the *coup* on June 13<sup>th</sup>, is imprisoned in Buckingham's palace, and he begins to talk to Buckingham about how much nicer it would be if Buckingham were king instead of Richard. We don't really know how much of that happened—maybe it all did, because More may have heard it *from* Morton (though I guess even that doesn't mean it necessarily happened). And of course Buckingham *did* revolt, and Morton escaped his captivity. Buckingham revolted, and it failed, and Buckingham was executed in November. But, you know, Morton is conducting himself wonderfully in those terms—in practical, political terms—but, as I say, it's been noticed that it's sort of hard to tell Morton's dissimulation in that passage from Richard's dissimulation. And it *is* interesting that it just breaks off suddenly in the middle of the speech by Morton.

**Fr. Joseph Koterski:** I think it's in the reflections on Pico's writings that there's some alertness on More's part to the way in which temptations come to us, and what we have to do to resist temptation. Now, given what you've said about the events of April 1483, is More seeing this situation not only in light of Sallust and in light of Tacitus, but maybe in light of a sort of spirituality of how temptations can hit a man, and what happens if you don't resist them?

**Logan:** Well, he certainly could have, but I don't think he does. That would have been an alternative, wouldn't it? And that's basically the way modern historians write it. In the current standard biography of Richard, by Charles Ross, it's exactly that kind of thing. The previous major biography—and undoubtedly the most-read biography; and it's *fun* to read—is Paul Murray Kendall's *Richard III*. Kendall's enormously sympathetic to—is an apologist for Richard, really. Ross is not like that at all—he has a very cool eye on Richard. But he does see the story as that kind of story, as a guy caught up in events, threatened by the queen and her allies, and then more and more realizing what he can do, what the opportunity was, and succumbing to—I don't know if Ross uses the word “temptation,” but that's what he's talking about—temptation, and therefore, though Ross partially exculpates him because of the circumstances that Richard was in—the difficulty of the circumstances—nonetheless, his final judgment is to blame him for going on and doing a horrible thing, which is, as far as we can tell, to kill his nephews, his brother's children. But More didn't choose [that]—he *could* have seen it that way, a guy who was very much interested in temptation—but instead he chose to see it the other way, namely that Richard had *always* been that way, that it wasn't a matter of his succumbing to temptation in the spring of 1483, it was just that 1483 finally presented him the opportunity of a lifetime, the opportunity he'd been waiting for. The same thing happens in Shakespeare, of course. What's really striking about it in Shakespeare is that, in Richard's appearances in *Henry VI* Part Two and in the first half or so of *Henry VI* Part Three, Richard comes across as a very attractive character—the character in fact that really is pretty much the *historical* Richard as we now know him, this wonderful military leader, a man of great energy and idealism, and so on. And then just all of a sudden, in that famous soliloquy in the middle of *Henry VI* Part Three, after he's watched his brother court Elizabeth Woodville and stood on the side and made jokes about it with his other brother, George, George goes away, everybody goes away, and all of a sudden Richard says, “I am determined to prove a villain” [this line is actually from Richard's soliloquy at the beginning of *Richard III*], and I'll “set the murderous Machiavel to school.” So in Shakespeare, it's the same in a way, and different in a way. Shakespeare shows him as not always having been that way, but just having suddenly—well, maybe he *was* always that way, but it's sort of hard to reconcile the attractive, vibrant figure of *Henry VI* Part Two and the early part of *Henry VI* Part Three with that devious Machiavel who suddenly emerges. It's not clear whether Shakespeare means us to think that, well, he was always that way, but somehow he was this lovely, attractive young man before that, to all appearances. But with More, there's no—you know, he says grudgingly that he was a good military—he doesn't even say he was a good military leader: he says, “none evil captain was he in the war”—he wasn't half-bad as a captain in the war. And that's pretty much the only good thing that he says about him; so he doesn't read it as a narrative of temptation and fall, he reads it as a narrative of revelation of character that was bad from the womb.

**Aaron Thurow:** In what might be a similar issue, the deformity—I may not remember correctly, and perhaps you'll correct me if so—but I don't remember a model in Sallust and Tacitus for the addition of a physical deformity to tyrants. If it isn't there, what significance would you place on this addition that Shakespeare found so evocative?

**Logan:** There is, from early on—I mean, More didn't make this up—a tradition that Richard was conspicuously deformed. In fact, as I said in the talk, it appears that, if he *was*, it was to a very minor and inconspicuous degree. It's of course always apparent in the portraits of Richard, but that's because the earliest of those portraits was altered—just repainted. You know, the famous one, the one that's on the cover of this book [i.e., Logan's edition of the *History*], Richard playing nervously with his ring on his finger, and the right shoulder's higher than the left. But not that long ago, x-ray analysis revealed that the right shoulder had been repainted to *make* it higher than the left. And then in subsequent pictures—though in some cases it's the left shoulder—one shoulder or the other is always higher too. It seems clear from the earliest accounts that there was nothing—maybe he did have some kind of scoliosis, but it clearly wasn't a particularly conspicuous deformity. He was a slight man, he was a small man, which really makes it all the more attractive that he was a terrific military leader. His brother, Edward, was tall and good-looking, but only intermittently interested in the wars, whereas Richard from the time he was eighteen was a major military leader in the family, despite his slenderness of build. So More didn't invent it [i.e., the idea that Richard was deformed], and he's relatively temperate about it. In that passage where he talks about Richard's physiognomy, he acknowledges that maybe some of this stuff has been exaggerated, that it may not all be true; but even though he does qualify, enter those caveats, nevertheless he kind of runs with it, doesn't he? And why, of course, is because he succumbs, as so many writers have over the centuries, to the idea that physical deformity is the outward manifestation of inward deformity—you know, the opposite of the kind of thing we find in Castiglione's *Courtier*, where the beauty of the woman is an index of her virtue. Every beautiful woman is virtuous—the kind of thing you can afford to think if you're a high-bred Italian aristocrat. (Laughter.) And this is sort of the other side of that.

And Shakespeare happily, enthusiastically follows him [i.e., More] in making Richard a monster, both morally and physically; and the physical monstrosity is a manifestation of the former. Of course, in Shakespeare there's the interesting additional thing where he has Richard suggest that it's maybe *because* of his physical deformity that he's become morally deformed. I wish I could quote those lines exactly, but you know what I'm talking about—in that same place, right at the beginning [of *Richard III*]: “Now is the winter of our discontent,” and so on—since I'm not suited for dancing, “I am determined to prove a villain.” Yeah, I'm glad you brought that up, because that sort of qualifies—not to say refutes—what I said about Shakespeare a few minutes ago. There's at least *that* attempt to explain what happened—though even there, it's not as if Richard has gradually become a villain because he's not suited to caper in the sunlight of York. But at least the suggestion that maybe over the course of his life, that he became a villain when he began to notice this physical difference, this disqualification for amorosness. It's interesting in this connection, too, that that other soliloquy I referred to in *3 Henry VI*, where he reveals his villainy for the first time in this series of plays, comes after he's watched this tall, good-looking, womanizing, flirtatious brother flirt with this woman. And again, I've never thought of this before, but that [point] sort of makes itself in that other soliloquy—where “I can't dance and court women”—and it's interesting that his first revelation of bitterness and villainy, in Shakespeare, comes as a response to watching somebody else's sex life, as it were, which he doesn't have. But of course

later he gets his *own* sex life, doesn't he, with Anne.

**Audience:** When you made reference to his soliloquy about outdoing “murderous Machiavel”—I know there's a dispute about Shakespeare: whether or not his wife came from a Catholic family. My question is: I have either read or heard that Cromwell gave *The Prince* to Henry VIII, and it was that blueprint that they used to go after Thomas More.

**Logan:** Well, I haven't heard that—so therefore it can't be true. (Laughter.) I *haven't* heard that. I don't know how likely it is. *The Prince*, of course—one of the fascinating things is that the two books I was talking about tonight and *The Prince* were all written within about five years of one another, but of course More didn't know about Machiavelli or vice-versa—because Machiavelli didn't *publish* *The Prince*. And when was it finally published? Was it 1531 [actually 1532]? So I don't know—maybe Cromwell could have seen it, but there were only a few years between the publication of *The Prince* and the execution of More. I don't know when there's evidence of the first copy of *The Prince* being in England. If they didn't read it, they would have liked it—that's for sure. (Laughter.)

**Gabriel Bartlett:** Reginald Pole had the conversation with Thomas Cromwell in 1528, and that's when he traces having been at least told about *The Prince*.

My question is: you mentioned the indebtedness of More in the *Utopia* to Plato, and the indebtedness of More in *The History of Richard III* to the classical historians on the question or theme of tyranny, but I was wondering whether you could say something, perhaps, a little more about the indebtedness of More in the *The History of Richard III* to Plato on the question of tyranny, because it seems to me that, for example in the *Republic*, tyranny looms large. Book IX is devoted to the question of the tyrant, and of course Thrasymachus is in one way or another a teacher of tyrants, or a would-be teacher of tyrants. And not only Plato but Socrates seems to have been interested in *types* who were, let's say, inclined toward tyranny, or interested in it, and for reasons which it would take a long time to try to suss out. So what were More's reasons for writing about a tyrant? Not Richard III in particular, but about a tyrant—what did he wish to understand in writing about a tyrant?

**Logan:** I don't so much think he wished to understand anything: I think he figured he *already* understood perfectly well about tyrants. I think what he wanted to do was acquaint the world—to teach *other* people about tyrants. Tyranny is arguably his major theme in that part of his life. In the Latin epigrams, for example—I actually counted once, and I think more of them are about tyranny than any other single subject. It was something that he really was—I don't want to say “obsessed with”—not the right tonality—but he was certainly strongly, persistently concerned with tyranny. Probably, a lot of it originated not with Greek literature or even with Tacitus but with his observation, ironically—you know, the *History* did the Tudors so much good, because it so marvelously blackened their enemy and the guy that Henry VII, the first of the Tudors, had killed. More despised Henry VII, and regarded him as a tyrant certainly. And there's that poem when Henry, to More's delight, finally died and was succeeded by his son. He's just ecstatic, and it's amazingly bold—kind of “now the winter of our discontent is over, and suddenly

we're free and happy again.” And Henry VII wasn't a terribly attractive character in lots of ways: that's the person with tyrannical or quasi-tyrannical characteristics and behavior that More knew the most about, and I think he probably would have dearly loved to have written about Henry VII, but he couldn't do that because Henry VII's son was on the throne.

But at any rate, I think More regarded one of his major missions [as teaching about tyranny]—and this is part of the kinship with Erasmus. Those guys both write beautifully about politics—the same scathing contempt toward what goes on in the actual world of politics. So I think the spreading of truths about tyranny, the stripping bare of tyrants, the revelation of tyrants' methods—this intimidation. . . . One of the funny phenomena in *Richard III* that recurs several times is in that coda that I read at the end of my talk [i.e., the “kings' games” passage]. The tyrant will say things which he not only doesn't *expect* to be believed, he doesn't *want* [to be believed]. Sometimes he says lies that he wants to be believed; other times he tells lies which he doesn't expect or *want* to be believed. They are purely for the sake of intimidation. You're supposed to be horrified and scared to death by the fact that this guy will say these things. So tyranny and its machinations and how it works is *a* major, and in this part of his life before he got interested in sectarian problems, *the* major concern of his writing.

What he got—back to your original question (which I could, see, have just pretended I'd forgotten, since I don't really have anything to say about it)—what he may have gotten specifically from Plato—my answer to that is, “I don't know,” and you clearly know a lot more about that than I do. In truth, all I know about his relation to Greek writing on tyranny is really much more general. I know about Aristotle's remarks on it, and of the list of stereotypical attributes and behaviors of the tyrant. But that's a good question—needless to say, More was steeped in the *Republic* above all of Plato's works, and that would really be a good thing—if I were your age, I'd think about writing an article about that, because I think it's probably a really interesting subject to explore.

**Gerard Wegemer:** If the *Utopia* reveals to us some of the sources of economic injustice in England, does *Richard III* suggest anything about the political injustice that allows a tyrant to arise? One of the most dramatic scenes is when Elizabeth is protecting her child in sanctuary, and she gives all the reasons why prudence and every type of law should protect them, and then she gives him up. Why does she do that? And what is the *History* saying about why tyrants arise in a land that seems to have lots of laws and institutions to prevent it?

**Logan:** (Pause.) My luck has run out here. (Laughter.) You know how it is when you stand in this position and listen to questions: there's always this little moment of concern when somebody starts asking a question, and then usually you think, “oh yes, right, I see how I can answer that.” But two in a row here I'm not really (Laughter.) seeing entirely how to answer. Ask it again in a little more detail, and maybe that will be the answer—if you don't mind. I mean, while I'm thinking about it. You go on and talk a little bit.

**Wegemer:** If he is really exploring the problem of tyranny, and if he's bringing the Greek and Roman learning to bear on England . . .

**Logan:** Yeah, right—to explore the economic problems, basically, the systemic problems in the society—is there anything analogous to that in *Richard III*, in the exploration of tyranny? If there is, I don’t see what it is. Though I didn’t say it in the paper—sort of avoided saying it—the nature of the relationship between the classical models and *Utopia* seems to me very significantly different from the nature of the relationship in the *History*. The *History* takes a genre enthusiastically, without seeing the need to change anything. More’s fits right in with those classical histories—it’s a wonderful example of that kind of thing, and it takes this classical conception of the tyrant, and it takes above all Tacitus’ depiction of Tiberius—but no, I guess I don’t see the same kind of depth of analysis. I mean, that’s what you’re asking, huh?—is there the same kind of depth of analysis that we find in regard to social problems and especially with regard to the problems of crime and poverty in England, in Book 1 of *Utopia*? Is there an analogous depth of analysis of the workings of tyranny, the causes of tyranny, the sources of tyranny, the defects in institutions that may allow tyranny; and I was about to say, no, I guess I don’t see anything quite analogous, and I still don’t, but I see a little more than I did a minute ago, I guess. I mean, there is a somewhat different kind of analysis. He focuses more on the major stratagems of the tyrant—the major operational modes. Maybe just out of despair, there’s no talk about the institutional structure that allows tyranny to arise, because that institutional structure is obviously simply a given, isn’t it? Yeah, England has kings, and in this period they’re really not that much limited by Parliament. In *Utopia*, of course, he went on to speculate, “well, what would happen if you did away with the kings?” But for whatever reason—I think largely just because he’s writing in a different genre, where that kind of speculation—well, that’s a good way of putting it, actually. The genre in *Utopia* is indicated in its full title. It’s not just called *Utopia*, it’s called *On the Best State of the Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia*, and that genre, the philosophical dialogue or discourse on the best possible state of a polity, the best state of a commonwealth, is one that, from its very beginning in Plato, welcomed, in fact demanded, talk about absolutely fundamental changes, fundamental reordering of the state. Again, from the beginning in Plato, too, there’s no suggestion that these changes are actually going to be implemented—I mean, Plato himself says, Socrates says, this place [i.e., the Republic] is nowhere. We’ll never actually *find* this place. But at any rate, there he’s working in a genre which invites—nay, demands—deep reasoning about the causes of things, and radical suggestions for the possible abolition or amelioration of problems.

I guess one way to put it is that history is more cynical, more despairing. I guess it’s the difference between history and philosophy. History is a branch of rhetoric, and the rhetorician’s practical, the rhetorician just deals with the world as it is. And you’re going to get rid of tyrants and unscrupulous politicians in the world as it is? Ha, ha. Dream about it. All *Richard III* seems to me to teach you to do is how to recognize them and see through them. But there’s no suggestion about how we might prevent their rise or get rid of them. Because even recognizing them—and this is one of the important points, I think, of *Richard III*—even recognizing them doesn’t—I mean, all those people are standing there at that king’s game [i.e., in the scene near the end of the *History*], they know *exactly* what’s going on, but that doesn’t mean they can do a *damned* thing about it.

**Audience:** The question I have is, who did Thomas More expect to inform with

these works, and who did he actually inform or affect?

**Logan:** Well, it’s, I think, very clear what the intended audience was, particularly in the fact that he wrote two versions of it [i.e., of the *History*]. You know, he wrote one in Latin and one in English. It’s a fascinating compositional history: it’s not that he wrote it first in one and then translated it into the other; it’s been argued pretty persuasively that he sort of alternated them, that he would write in one language for a while, then write in the other, more or less translating, and then keep going in that language and translate into the other language, and so on. The Latin version is clearly directed to a European audience, and first and foremost—primarily, maybe almost exclusively—to an audience of his fellow humanists. He really, really, really wanted to establish himself with those guys. He wanted to be a full-fledged member of that Erasmus crowd. You can see it most clearly and sort of poignantly in the letters that he wrote to Erasmus before *Utopia* was published, while it was still being seen through the press by Erasmus. He’s just tremblingly eager; he really wants it to come out, he really wants Erasmus to collect, as Erasmus did, a bunch of complimentary letters from fellow humanists. And history—rhetorical history—is one of the major humanist genres. If you were looking to establish yourself as a humanist on a European scale, you could scarcely do any better than write a Latin history patterned after Sallust and Tacitus. And Tacitus was also extremely *hot*, because the first six books of the *Annals*, the part that includes the treatment of Tiberius, had been lost for centuries, and had only been recovered in 1509. It’s astonishing—it’s as if a major Shakespeare play or three major Shakespeare plays were suddenly recovered now. The first edition was published in 1515, and that’s mainly, I guess, why I think maybe he didn’t even start *Richard III* until after *Utopia*, because he couldn’t have seen Tacitus’ opening books of the *Annals*. He knew other Tacitus before, but to see this *major* work on his *major* subject obviously just excited him all to pieces.

Now, of course, anybody who could read Latin and basically anybody who could read more than at an elementary level would have been able to read the Latin version of *Richard III*. Whether he really thought that it was going to influence, affect, the Latin general reader, I don’t know. I think it was primarily directed to his fellow humanists. However, he also wrote the version in English, and that was clearly directed to his fellow citizens. I *hope* he didn’t regard it as a dumbed-down version; it’s not—it’s wonderful. It’s one of the great monuments in the development of English prose style. It’s an astonishing thing—it’s just so racy and lively and terrific. But clearly the very fact that he wrote it in English meant that it was directed at the English general reader. And I guess he must have expected—I mean, of course he never published it, so it didn’t do anything for anybody—but I guess that must have been what he had in mind—that that version, at least, would have instructed [his fellow citizens]. I mean, like everybody in the period, he believed in the Horatian formula that the purpose of literature is to delight and teach. And if that’s what literature is for, and the way literature works, you can’t hardly find a better example of literature than *Richard III*. It is utterly exhilarating—just the most fun to read, though the linguistic difficulties will slow you down a little bit. And it does—that was pretty much what I argued about it, not that that’s new or anything—it’s a brilliant picture of the machinations of tyranny. So if you read it, it at least puts you on your guard. Whether you can *do* anything about it, I don’t know.

Now, again, what effect did it *have* in the long run? It wasn't published by More, but it was caught up from 1543 and published, incorporated, in those chronicle histories, and especially in Holinshed and Hall, where Shakespeare read it. And you can pretty much say that the major effect that it had was through Shakespeare. It's because Shakespeare read that and recognized what it was, and paid More the great compliment of sometimes just sort of versifying More's scenes. And what's been the effect of Shakespeare's *Richard III* in the world? I don't know. It's impossible to measure the effect, but, my God, it sure has been *produced* lots of times. It's been one of the most popular of Shakespeare's works, and it's to be hoped that in this indirect way, some people learned something about something useful—about the behavior of tyrants. And then, of course, there are all those other readers who read it in Holinshed and Hall too; and there were other works, other plays in the period that did stage versions of More's *Richard*.

**Matthew Mehan:** You mentioned “rounding the cape” and “understanding the modern mind,” with the idea of *Utopia*, the great model, being the connectivity between all the different strata or parts of the culture. Is there an analogue in *Richard* to the idea of a person? You were surprised that the normal reading is, “Well, he was tempted into this situation,” as opposed to, “There's a more systemic relationship to the education of Richard from childhood.” Like what Freud came up with later, that it's all linked: you don't just have a midlife crisis—it was something in your teens. Is there an analogue *there* possibly?

**Logan:** No, I don't see an analogue there. It's interesting, isn't it? These books were written at almost the same time; but we know that More was thinking deeply, by sixteenth-century standards [of social analysis]. [J.H.] Hexter claims, and other people have claimed, that in fact very little of the social analysis of the period has this systemic, holistic approach. Obviously More *got* it [i.e., in *Utopia*], and where he learned to do it was from the Greeks; and my view is he did it in some ways better than they did. But in any case, this was obviously something that was very much on his mind in those years. But no, I don't see anything analogous to that in *Richard III*.

The boundaries of genres are so important in this period. They think about literature [differently]. When we write, we tend to write the same thing, maybe with slightly different subject matter, again and again, and we really only have two genres, three genres—we have plays, we have novels, and we have poems; and relative to novels, plays and poems hardly count anyway. And if a novelist writes novels, they're probably going to be pretty similar from one to the next. And in *this* period [i.e., the Renaissance], as in the classical world, people think so much, so fundamentally, about literature as divided quite strictly into different genres. And that has certain advantages, but it has certain disadvantages too. I think it just wasn't as natural for More to think thoughts—I mean, I'm talking about a literary system that's compartmentalized into separate genres, and that's what compartmentalization entails: it just wasn't the kind of thought that you got in rhetorical histories. It *was* the kind of thought that you got in books on the ideal commonwealth modeled after Plato and Aristotle. It's surprising that the same guy, writing at about the same time, would have had such largely—I mean, really, the only thing that's in common between those two books, that I can think of offhand, other than certain stylistic things, and that both of them are written in Latin versions, the only thing that's

really in common is the detestation of tyranny, the detestation of government as it is, of political business as usual. *That* is very similar in the two books, but no, I don't see that kind of systemic thing.

**Wegemer:** Thank you very much. (Applause.)

**Logan:** Well, thank *you* very much [to everyone]. It was very good of you to invite me. I'm delighted, I'm honored to have been asked to do this, and you're really just a terrific audience. I can't believe how many of you have come in the first place, and actually stayed, and asked all those good questions. I know Gerry thought, probably rightly, that he's rescuing me at this point. But you know, I think I would have stayed until it killed me. (Laughter, applause.)