

upon these first six books. This was the minimum of Virgil for polite society. It would appear that Shakspeare had at least this polite minimum of knowledge upon Virgil, and also that at least part of his knowledge was gained directly from the Latin. The knowledge displayed of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* is such as Shakspeare should have acquired in grammar school. A great deal of it is not the kind of information which one could have picked up from reading a translation, even where a translation existed. For Shakspeare is frequently speaking in the light of the conventional interpretation of his day, which was collected in and propagated itself from the annotated editions. Shakspeare's interpretation seems to flow from Servius and Willichius. This most likely means that the edition which he studied, or that his master most relied on, contained these commentaries. Servius was almost universal in the editions with commentary, but Willichius less so, though, as we have seen, even he was widely available. I have found no direct evidence that Shakspeare had used the current school edition with the side-notes of Manutius. But because of the nature of the annotation it would be highly accidental if such evidence should survive in such work as is Shakspeare's.